



# Indian Institute Of Management Kozhikode Working Paper

## EMPLOYEE BRAND BUILDING BEHAVIOR: SCALE DEVELOPMENT & VALIDATION IN B2B SERVICES CONTEXT

HemangJauhari  
Manish kumar  
Shailendra Singh

IIMK/WPS/153/OBHR /2014/11

March 2014



*IIMK/WPS/153/OBHR /2014/11*

**EMPLOYEE BRAND BUILDING BEHAVIOR:  
SCALE DEVELOPMENT & VALIDATION  
IN B2B SERVICES CONTEXT**

HemangJauhari<sup>1</sup>  
Manish Kumar<sup>2</sup>  
Shailendra Singh<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Doctoral Scholar (OB and HRM), Indian Institute of Management, Lucknow,  
Email: [hemang.jauhari@gmail.com](mailto:hemang.jauhari@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Indian Institute of Management Kozhikode, IIMK campus PO, Kozhikode- 673570,  
email: – [manish@iimk.ac.in](mailto:manish@iimk.ac.in)

<sup>3</sup>Professor (OB and HRM), Indian Institute of Management, Lucknow, Email: [shail@iiml.ac.in](mailto:shail@iiml.ac.in)

## EMPLOYEE BRAND BUILDING BEHAVIOR: SCALE DEVELOPMENT & VALIDATION IN B2B SERVICES CONTEXT

*Frontline service employees (FSEs) make or break a brand. Especially, in B2B services, their attitudes and behaviors are crucial in shaping valuable customer-related outcomes for a services firm/brand. Service firms are increasingly focusing on internal brand management to develop Brand Champions, who can live the brand and ensure its sustenance. However, the progress in this area has been marred due to infancy of research. In this paper, we address a major gap in this area pertaining to the conceptualization and measurement of behavior of Brand Champions, which is termed as Employee Brand Building Behavior (EBBB). In this study, we follow a five-step approach for developing and validating a scale of EBBB, using data from six samples of FSEs working in B2B services (N = 1886). First, using insights from literature and 25 in-depth interviews, we conceptualize EBBB and generate a pool of items. Second, we perform exploratory factor analysis for scale purification and examining the factor structure. Third, we check for the convergent and divergent validity of the EBBB dimensions, using confirmatory factor analysis. Fourth, we examine the scale for method effects. And finally, we test for the nomological validity of EBBB. This EBBB scale will be a great utility for practitioners and academicians, who wish to make contributions to the practice and theory of internal brand management.*

**Keywords:** *Employee brand building behavior; employee behavior; scale development; frontline service employee; internal brand management; business services; Indian context*

### INTRODUCTION

In light of the fact that services sector is the largest contributor in world's gross domestic product or GDP (Central Intelligence Agency, 2012), it will not be wrong to say that we live in a services-dominant world. The global phenomenon of sustained service growth has led to an array of questions that have significant implications for success of firms and quality of consumers' lives worldwide (Bitner & Brown, 2008). More than ever, research is needed to address these issues. And, because of the complex nature of services, many of these questions will require an interdisciplinary focus to answer (Ostrom et al., 2010). One such issue that needs to be examined from the lens of service marketing and organizational behavior principles is customer-contact employee/frontline service employee management (Ostrom et al., 2010; Kunz & Hogreve, 2011).

Frontline service employees (FSEs) are the face of a service brand and are responsible for brand promise delivery. In services that require high level of customer-FSE interaction (high-touch services), FSEs' behaviors are crucial in shaping customer experiences, attitudes, and behaviors with respect to the service brand (O'Loughlin, Szmigin, and Turnbull, 2004; Berry and Lampo, 2004; Liao & Chuang, 2004, 2007; Homburg, Müller, & Klarmann, 2011). It is due to this reason

that service brands are increasingly focusing on internal brand management as a strategy to foster *Brand Champions*, who can live the brand and ensure its sustenance.

Brand champions are the FSEs who transform brand vision into brand reality by living the brand and spreading the brand idea (Berry, 2000; Ind, 2001). In past, there has been extant research on positive service behaviors that can be associated with *Brand Champions*. For an instance, it is considered that FSE's in-role behavior (e.g., MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Rich, 2001; Wallace, de Chernatony, and Buil, 2011), extra-role behavior (e.g., MacKenzie et al., 2001; Wallace et al., 2011), customer oriented boundary spanning behavior (e.g., Bettencourt & Brown, 2003), service-oriented organizational citizenship behavior (e.g., Bettencourt, Gwinner, & Meuter, 2001), and brand citizenship behavior (e.g., Burmann & Zeplin, 2005; King & Grace, 2012; Chang, Chiang, & Han, 2012) should have positive influence on key organizational & customer related outcomes. Therefore, these positive behaviors are often associated with *Brand Champions*.

However, individually, these constructs cover a limited domain of positive behaviors that constitute a 'living the brand' aspect of *Brand Champions*. In an effort to aggregate and develop a more comprehensive set of behaviors that can be associated with *Brand Champions*, Miles and Mangold (2004) coined the term 'Employee Brand Building Behavior' (henceforth referred to as EBBB). Morhart, Herzog, and Tomczak (2009) define EBBB as employees' contribution (both on and off the job) to an organization's customer-oriented branding efforts. EBBB is operationalized as a four-dimensional construct, with retention, in-role behavior, participation, and word of mouth as sub-dimensions (Morhart et al., 2009). Although EBBB shares some similarities with the aforesaid positive service behaviors, it is more comprehensive in nature. Therefore, EBBB construct more appropriately represents the behavior of *Brand Champions*.

Thus far, infancy of research on EBBB and lack of concentrated efforts in exploring the structure and dynamics of EBBB have limited the growth of this area. It is the purpose of this paper to provide conceptual extensions to the EBBB construct and develop a validated scale to measure EBBB. And, for scale development and validation we consider business-to-business services context. The main reason for this specific choice of the context is highlighted below.

In past, studies on FSEs have concentrated mostly on business-to-consumer (B2C) services and have neglected business-to-business services (B2B) context (Baumgarth, 2010; Marquardt et al., 2011). Scholars opine that despite some similarities in B2B and B2C services, fundamental differences in their respective target audiences suggest the need for a more focused research in B2B service contexts (Marquardt, Golicic, & Davis, 2011; Ostrom et al., 2010; Kunz & Hogueve,

2011). B2B services fare higher on experience and credence attributes when compared to B2C services (Marquardt, Golicic, & Davis, 2011). And, in B2B services, the need for intense customer-employee interactions (Baumgarth & Schmidt, 2010), highly customized solutions (Baumgarth, 2010), and predominance of personal selling (Beverland, Napoli, & Lindgreen, 2007; Deeter-Schmelz & Kennedy, 2004; Lynch & de Chernatony, 2007) place a greater emphasis on managing FSEs who implement the brand strategy (Coleman, de Chernatony, & Christodoulides, 2011; Baumgarth & Schmidt, 2010). As a result, nurturing *Brand Champions* or fostering EBBB is of much higher importance in B2B services (e.g., Baumgarth, 2010). Therefore, in this study, we develop and validate a scale for measuring EBBB in B2B services context.

### **EMPLOYEE BRAND BUILDING BEHAVIOR (EBBB)**

The idea of FSE's actions determining the image of a service firm in a customer's mind underpins the concept of EBBB (Miles and Mangold, 2004; Morhart et al., 2009). Morhart et al. (2009) define EBBB as employee's contribution (both on and off the job) to an organization's customer-oriented branding efforts. Further, EBBB does not demarcate by the time or location—whether at work or not—but demarcate by the behavior's effect. In other words, no matter during the working hour or leisure time, no matter which situations, all the FSEs' behaviors that build the company brand are defined as EBBB.

Morhart et al. (2009) operationalized EBBB as a four-dimensional construct, with retention, in-role behavior, participation, and word of mouth as its sub-dimensions. Retention refers to FSEs' upholding their professional relationship with the service brand. In-role behavior refers to FSEs' meeting the standards prescribed by their organizational roles as brand representatives (either written in behavioral codices, manuals, display rules, and so forth, or unwritten). Participation refers to FSEs' active involvement in brand development (e.g., by internally passing on branding-relevant customer feedback from customer touch-points) by providing high-quality input to the company for its brand management. Word of Mouth refers to personal advocacy of the organization's service brand outside the job context as a credible form of advertising for actual and potential customers. Based on an extant literature review, Morhart et al. (2009) suggest that each of these four FSE behaviors is instrumental in strengthening a service brand.

This classification by Morhart et al. (2009) serves as a good starting point for developing an understanding about EBBB. However, based on an extensive literature review on FSEs and high-touch services, we identified some conceptual extensions that will enrich the understanding of EBBB and will more appropriately represent 'living the brand' perspective of *Brand Champions*.

In subsequent paragraphs, we elaborate on the dimensions of EBBB and highlight the points of differences with Morhart et al. (2009).

### **Organizational Allegiance (OA)**

It refers to FSEs' upholding their professional relationship with the organization due to affective commitment/emotional attachment to the organization. Organizational allegiance is subtly different from Morhart et al.'s (2009) 'Retention' dimension, in a way that FSE's retention in the organization can be attributed to either of the three forms of commitment: affective, normative, & continuance. However, organizational allegiance is due to affective commitment/ emotional attachment to the organization.

In a meta-analysis, Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnysky (2002) found that all three forms of commitment are negatively related with turnover (therefore, positively related to retention). Interestingly, correlations of affective, normative, & continuance commitments with turnover were quite similar ( $r = -.17, -.16, \& -.10$ , respectively). This suggests that all three forms of commitment associate quite similarly with retention. However, in the same meta-analysis, affective commitment related much strongly with attendance ( $r = .15$ ), job performance ( $r = .16$ ), & organizational citizenship behavior ( $r = .32$ ) as compared to normative commitment ( $r = \text{near zero}, .06, \& .24$ , respectively) & continuance commitment ( $r = \text{near zero}, -.07, \& \text{near zero}$ , respectively). In essence, this implies that although FSEs are almost equally likely to stay with the organization due to any of the three forms of commitment, only affectively committed FSEs are highly likely to 'live the brand' (e.g., Allen & Grisaffe, 2001).

This point can be alternatively debated from the perspective of theory of psychological withdrawal. Psychological withdrawal can take forms of job dissatisfaction, low affective commitment, lack of job interest, burnout, stress (Hanisch and Hulin, 1991), passive compliance, minimal effort on the job, lack of creativity, laziness, and lack of intense thinking on the job (Pinder, 2008). In contrary to others, employees who are affectively committed to the organisation avoid psychological withdrawal and maintain continued attachment to work (Blau & Boal, 1987). Whereas psychologically withdrawn FSEs can't be expected to 'live the brand', given that psychological withdrawal precedes behavioral withdrawal, in form of withholding effort at work or social loafing (Birati & Tziner, 1996; Kidwell & Bennett, 1993; Rosse, 1988), lateness (Hanisch and Hulin, 1990, 1991), absenteeism (Hanisch and Hulin, 1990, 1991), and finally turnover (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Tziner & Vardi, 1984; Hanisch and Hulin, 1990, 1991). Therefore, in view of the above arguments, we strongly believe that 'Organizational Allegiance'

(due to affective commitment), as a dimension of EBBB, is more appropriate as compared to 'Retention' (due to any of the three forms of commitment).

FSEs' organizational allegiance is of great importance to a services firm, especially in B2B services. In B2B services, customers want customized solutions that are often co-created in association with FSEs (Rauyruen & Miller, 2007; Leek & Christodoulides, 2012). As FSEs humanize a services brand and make customers emotionally connect to it, over a period of time, customers develop closeness, affection, and trust toward FSEs; all of which pay into a brand's competitive advantage (e.g., Beatty, Mayer, Coleman, Reynolds, & Lee, 1996; Crosby, Evans, & Cowles, 1990; File & Prince, 1993; Gremler & Gwinner, 2000; Hansen, Sandvik, and Selnes, 2003; Bove and Johnson, 2006, 2009; Morhart et al., 2009). However, when customers are confronted with ever-changing contact personnel, they have difficulty developing such a relationship with the corporate brand. This is why a service firm's ability to maintain stability in its customer-contact staff is crucial (e.g., Bendapudi & Leone, 2002). And, therefore, we consider FSE's organizational allegiance as a brand building behavior.

### **Prescribed Service Delivery Behavior (PSDB)**

The behavior that a FSE is expected to exhibit in order to meet the prescribed requirements of the job (either written in behavioural codices, manuals, display rules, and so forth, or unwritten) is referred to as prescribed service delivery behavior (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Fetter, 1991, 1993; Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1994; Williams and Anderson, 1991; Morhart et al., 2009). In services, a reliable role performance of FSE includes delivery of the brand-aligned functional (what is delivered) and emotional experience (how it is delivered) to the customers (Onkvisit and Shaw, 1989; Zeithaml and Bitner, 1996; de Chernatony and Segal-Horn, 2001; Morrison & Crane, 2007). And, this holds true even in B2B services (Lynch & de Chernatony, 2007; Coleman et al., 2011; Leek & Christodoulides, 2012).

In extension to Morhart et al.'s (2009) 'in-role brand building behavior' dimension, we explicitly include some additional behaviors in 'prescribed service delivery behavior' dimension (like serving customers in a conscientious, responsive, and courteous way), which are widely considered as in-role behaviors of FSEs and are important in determining the emotional experience of customers (Parasuraman et al., 1988; Bettencourt and Brown, 2003). Overall, FSE's prescribed service delivery behavior ensures the achievement of some acceptable level of quantity and quality of performance. Therefore, such a behavior is pivotal in shaping customer satisfaction with the service firm (e.g., Liao & Chuang, 2004; Piercy, Cravens, Lane, and Vorhies, 2006; Barger and Grandey, 2006; Hennig-Thurau, Groth, Paul, & Gremler, 2006;

Soderlund and Rosengren, 2004, 2008). For the reasons highlighted above, we consider FSE's prescribed service delivery behavior as a brand building behavior.

### **Proactive Customer Service Behavior (PCSB)**

Rank, Carsten, Unger, & Spector (2007) define proactive customer service behavior as an individual's self-started, long-term-oriented, and persistent service behavior that goes beyond explicitly prescribed performance requirements. In essence, proactive FSEs rely on their own initiative, rather than waiting to be prompted by their supervisors, co-workers, or customers (Raub& Liao, 2012).

While Morhart et al.'s (2009) 'Participation' dimension included FSE's proactive initiatives for brand development by internally passing on brand-relevant customer feedback, we additionally include FSE's customer related proactive behavior. Thus, proactive customer service behavior includes both pro-customer and pro-team initiatives of a FSE that ultimately translate into favorable customer-related outcomes. Various components of proactive customer service behavior are:

1) Information sensing: communicating with the supervisor proactively and providing the consumer's need information to the decision maker (Morhart et al., 2009). These communications can deal with perceived environmental changes, newly developed or unfulfilled customer needs, and opportunities to improve service delivery (Belschak & Den Hartog, 2010). Ultimately, such an active participation of FSE in brand development provides company with high-quality inputs for its brand management.

2) Knowledge sharing: actively disseminating the tacit on-the-job learning for making the team better equipped and prepared for future service delivery encounters (Bettencourt & Brown, 2003; Rank et al., 2007). By actively sharing their knowledge with team mates, FSEs ensure uniformity of service delivery, i.e. no matter which member of the team customer interacts with, service delivery remains uniform. In essence, this helps in countering problems emanating from 'heterogeneity' of service.

3) Collaboration: creating partnerships/collaborations with team mates for providing prompt and reliable customer service (Belschak& Den Hartog, 2010; Rank et al., 2007). Collaboration between team mates is required quite often in business services due to the complex nature (high inter-dependency) of such services. FSE's proactive collaboration helps customers enjoy a hassle free service, without having to worry for complex transitions between FSEs.



4) Proactive self-development: involves learning things that are important for delivery of credible service, but may not be formally identified/ taught. These proactive efforts of learning new skills for superior job performance become especially important in dynamic industries, like services, where not all the customer requirements/expectations can be met by formally prescribed guidelines. Moreover, it is very difficult to identify and formally train employees on dynamic requirements. Self-development is, thus, required for ‘adaptability’ (Halstead, Droge, & Cooper, 1993) and ‘flexibility’ in services delivery (Holyoak, 1991) during the creation of services jointly with the customers.

5) Ownership: taking ownership for tasks that need regular follow through/interaction with the customers (Rank et al., 2007; Raub& Liao, 2012). Such a behavior by FSE expresses care/concern towards the customer, which is a key node in relationship building.

6) Initiative: proactively suggesting ideas and solutions for potential customer problems (Rank et al., 2007). Such a behavior expresses FSE’s concern in the customer welfare, which helps in building a trust-based relationship.

FSEs who are proactive in their service delivery exceed customer expectations by customizing the service according to customer’s needs, even if it means going beyond their role description. In addition, they contribute to the effective team functioning by sharing their knowledge with team mates. This helps the entire team to better serve and satisfy the customers in future (Bettencourt & Brown, 2003). In past research, the importance of FSEs delighting the customer by providing little extras (extra attention and spontaneous exceptional service) during the service encounter has been well tested for customer satisfaction and positive emotional responses (e.g., Bitner, Booms, & Tetreault, 1990; De Jong & De Ruyter, 2004; Raub & Liao, 2012). Therefore, we consider FSE’s proactive customer service behavior as a brand building behavior.

### **Word of Mouth (WOM)**

WOM—from the employees—means that the employees spontaneously recommend their company during their daily life. It relates to behaviour directed at outsiders of the organization, including customers, potential customers, and potential employees (Bettencourt and Brown, 2003).

While Morhart et al. (2009) consider only valence of word of mouth (positive word of mouth) as brand building, it is believed that organizations do not only wish to promote positive word of mouth, but further desire that the word of mouth communication take place often (frequency), be communicated in great detail (detail), and be communicated to a large number of people (akin to

the reach of traditional media, in general, and the pass-along readership of print media, in particular) (Harrison-Walker, 2001; Mazzarol, Sweeney, & Soutar, 2007). On this basis, Harrison-Walker (2001) suggested that word of mouth has two components: activity (frequency, number of people told, and detail) and valence/praise (favorability and pride). Therefore, we subscribe to Harrison-Walker's conceptualization of word of mouth.

In general, word of mouth supports the organizational image, enhances its social legitimacy, and makes the organization more visible (Aldrich and Herker, 1977). Further, it is suggested that word of mouth can be three times as effective as traditional advertising (Hogan, Lemon, & Libai, 2004) because the communicator is not seen as having a vested interest in recommending the service and is likely to portray information in a meaningful way (Silverman, 2001). Word of mouth from FSEs, specifically, can have a significant influence on customers (actual & potential) and potential employees; and all of them are crucial for a services brand (while a service brand wants to attract customers for its survival, it also wants to attract the right talent for sustenance). Lusch, Boyt, & Schuler (1996) opine that employees are the strongest endorsers of a firm as an employer and as a service brand.

As FSEs work closely with customers in B2B services, their word of mouth has a huge impact on customer's brand awareness and perceived brand image (Baumgarth & Schmidt, 2010). Brand image, through a halo effect, impacts a customer's evaluation of service quality, value, satisfaction, & loyalty (e.g., Andreassen and Lindestad, 1998; Lai, Griffin, and Babin, 2009; Reichheld, 1993; Reichheld and Teal, 1996; Rucci, Kirn, and Quinn, 1998). From the perspective of potential customers too, FSE's word of mouth recommendation/advocacy is considered a credible form of advertising (Morhart et al., 2009).

From the perspective of potential employees, word of mouth, in general, has been shown to positively influence pre-hire recruitment outcomes such as the quantity and quality of the applicant pool, because it does not exist for any commercial purpose and is an unbiased source of information (Breugh & Starke, 2000; Collins & Han, 2004; Saks, 2005; Zottoli & Wanous, 2000; Collins & Stevens, 2002). These pre-hire outcomes can be more strongly influenced when the source of word of mouth are current employees (who are the most credible source of information) (Keeling, McGoldrick, & Sadhu, 2013).

In view of the above discussion, we consider FSE's word of mouth as a brand building behavior, along with FSE's organizational allegiance, prescribed service delivery behavior, and proactive customer service behavior. In the next section, we elaborate on the scale development & validation process.

## **SCALE DEVELOPMENT & VALIDATION**

Developing a measurement scale to measure the four dimensions of EBBB (organizational allegiance, prescribed service delivery behavior, proactive customer service behavior, & word of mouth) requires due consideration of issues of scale type and validity.

Highlighting the issue of scale type, Flynn & Percy (2001) argue that it is common in the scale development process to ignore the differences between theoretical (measuring a construct or phenomenon for theoretical explanation) and applied scales (measuring a construct or phenomenon for diagnostic or managerial reasons), which leads to the incorrect assumption that the same demands can be placed on both scale types. For example, if the aim of the research is to test a theory by examining constructs in relation to other phenomena then we should be aiming for a concise list of items capturing the heart of the construct (inventory of items is not necessary). In contrast, for applied scales, the goal is to try and achieve a complete coverage of the construct in order to make accurate predictions.

The second issue is of construct validity. Construct validity is of major importance with respect to theoretical scales. Therefore, tests for convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity are mandatory in the scale development process (Spector, 1992). Flynn & Percy (2001) believe that a theoretical scale needs to have a stable and known factor structure, so theorists can rely on its consistent performance in complex models.

In this research, our aim is to develop a scale that is useful for both practitioners and academics alike. Therefore, after due deliberation of the idiosyncrasies of applied versus theoretical scale development, we followed a stringent scale development process, guided by the work of Campbell and Fiske (1959), Churchill (1979), Flynn & Percy (2001), and DeVellis (2003).

The scale development & validation was carried out in five phases (refer Table 1) that involved data collection from six samples (refer Table 2), involving a total of 1886 respondents. In precise, review of the literature, in-depth interviews, & content validation by experts were used for item generation in Phase 1 in order to achieve comprehensive coverage of the construct. The assessment of the psychometric properties necessary in theoretical scale development (Hinkin, 1995) was adhered to in Phases 2, 3 4, and 5.

**Table 1. Phases of Scale Development**

RESEARCH PHASE	DATA SOURCE	PURPOSE
Phase 1: Item generation	Literature review Qualitative data – FSEs (N=25) Expert judges (N=12)	Content validity Face validity
Phase 2: Scale purification (EFA)	Sample 1 (N=330)	Dimensionality
Phase 3: Scale purification (CFA)	Samples 1-5 (N=1716)	Convergent validity Discriminant validity
Phase 4: Scale examination Method effects	Sample 6 (N=170)	Social-desirability effects
Phase 5: Scale validation	Samples 1-6 (N=1886)	Convergent validity Discriminant validity Nomological validity

### **Sample & Procedure**

As discussed earlier, the target population for this study consists of FSEs working in B2B services sector. For a better representation of the study population, we conducted this study on six samples (overall N = 1886).

Sample 1 consisted of FSEs, working in a mid-sized B2B IT services company, who closely interacted with customers for co-creation of services. In this sample, we solicited responses from FSEs and customers they interact with (on a regular basis). Firstly, we contacted the supervisors/managers of various teams in the organization; and with their help, we handed over hard copies of the survey (enclosed in an envelope that had a unique code on it for identification) to FSEs working under them. FSEs' participation in this survey, that asked them about their EBBB, was completely voluntary and they were assured of anonymity of their responses. However, to match the responses of FSEs with respective customers, we maintained a record of employee names, respective unique codes, and information about the customer they frequently interact with (this was done with the help of managers). FSEs were requested to submit the completed survey (sealed with signature) in 15 days. Out of 1330 distributed surveys, 535 surveys were returned (response rate: 40.22%). For the received responses, managers were requested to elicit feedback from the respective customers through an online survey. Overall, 330 matched pairs of responses were used from this sample (overall response rate: 24.81%).

Sample 2 consisted of FSEs working in a large B2B IT services company. We requested 1802 FSEs to voluntarily participate in an online survey (self-report), out of which 685 completed responses were received (response rate: 38.01%). In Sample 4, 243 out of 435 FSEs, working in a small B2B IT services company, completed an online survey (response rate: 55.86%). Sample 5 also consisted of FSEs working in a mid-sized B2B IT services company. But, in this sample, we received 258 matched responses of FSEs, their respective supervisors & customers (overall response rate: 21.50%). Procedure followed for conducting survey in this sample was similar to

that in Sample 1. As a point of difference, supervisors were also asked to rate FSEs in their team through an online survey.

Samples 3 and 6 were mixed samples—they consisted of FSEs from various business service industries. Participants of Sample 2 included senior executives who participated in management development program at a premier (tier-1) Indian B-school in a period of 12 months. We contacted only those executives who worked closely with customers in a B2B services environment. Out of 328 FSEs, 200 responded to the online survey (response rate: 60.97%). Participants of Sample 6 included senior executives who were enrolled in various part-time management programs at a premier (tier-1) Indian B-school. Out of all participants, 246 were found suitable for this study. We requested them to participate in a voluntary survey that was supposed to be filled by them and their respective supervisors. Overall, 170 responses (matched pairs) were received and found suitable for the study (response rate: 69.10%).

Importantly, in consideration of the extant research (e.g., Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff 2003; Conway & Lance 2010; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff 2012) that highlights the issue of common method variance associated with self-report survey; we adopted some of the suggested procedural remedies. As suggested by Podsakoff et al. (2012), we: a) kept the participation voluntary; b) promised anonymity of responses; c) explained in the cover story that there were no right or wrong answers; d) told participants that their feedback was valuable as the study was being conducted to improve the working conditions; e) promised that the aggregated feedback will be shared with the participants; f) eliminated proximity effects by splitting the survey across pages; g) temporally separated the measurement of predictor and criterion variables where the source of measurement was same; h) mixed the items randomly; and i) varied the anchor labels, wherever possible. In addition, all the participants across six samples were adequately rewarded for their participation in the survey. Characteristics of all the samples are highlighted in Table 2.

### **Phase 1: Item Generation**

In this phase, firstly, thorough literature review was done to develop a comprehensive understanding about EBBB dimensions (as presented earlier) and generate a pool of items. Secondly, 25 in-depth interviews were conducted to validate the understanding of EBBB and generate additional set of items.

**Table 2. Sample Characteristics**

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS						
	SAMPLE1	SAMPLE2	SAMPLE3	SAMPLE4	SAMPLE5	SAMPLE6
<b>Size</b>	N=330	N=685	N=200	N=243	N=258	N=170
<b>Industry</b>	IT	IT	Mixed	IT	IT	Mixed
<b>Sector</b>	Services	Services	Services	Services	Services	Services
<b>Participants</b>						
FSE	*	*	*	*	*	*
Supervisor					*	*
Customer	*				*	
<b>Response Rate</b>	24.81%	38.01%	60.97%	55.86%	21.50%	69.10%
<b>Survey Mode</b>	Mixed	Online	Online	Online	Mixed	Online
<b>Temporal Separation</b>	NA	Yes	Yes	No	NA	Yes
<b>Method Effect</b>	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
<b>Gender (Males)</b>	88.80%	79.60%	90.50%	75.30%	77.50%	91.70%
<b>Mean Age (SD)</b>		33.16 (5.05)	33.40 (4.95)	32.35 (5.17)	27.88 (5.18)	34.01 (4.74)
<b>Age Group</b>						
20-30 yrs	24.25%					
30-40 yrs	60.00%					
40 + yrs	15.75%					
<b>Tenure in months (SD)</b>		45.13 (32.43)	59.68 (49.96)	53.96 (48.06)	30.36 (40.23)	51.41 (38.27)
<b>Tenure Range</b>						
0-1 yr.	10.90%					
1-3 yrs.	21.81%					
3-5 yrs.	11.81%					
5-8 yrs.	24.85%					
8+ yrs.	30.63%					

In-depth interviews with 25 FSEs (refer Table 3) were transcribed and analysed. Regarding the conceptualization of EBBB, there was a wide agreement that a brand champion's efforts to strengthen a services brand include delivering the promise (through in-role and proactive behaviors), staying with the brand (persistence of brand promise delivery through allegiance), and endorsing the brand by showing pride in it (word of mouth). The identified themes (based on the literature review and interviews) provided the guide for item generation. For generating a pool of 28 items, various scales of related constructs were consulted. Most of the items were adapted from existing scales and a few others were generated based on the interviews.

**Table 3. Qualitative Phase**

<b>SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS (QUALITATIVE PHASE)</b>	
Avg. Age (yrs.)	28.80
Gender	Males: 16; Females: 9
Avg. Experience (months)	80.48
Avg. Tenure (months)	53.72
Education	Undergraduate (18); Post-graduate (7)
<b>RESULTS OF THE QUALITATIVE PHASE (SUPPORT FOR EBBB DIMENSIONS)</b>	
Organizational Allegiance (Mentioned by 20/25 respondents)	“My relationship with the customer is the link between customer & the organization...neither my employer nor the customer wants to break this link” (R6)
	“XYZ (customer) regularly asks me if I have plans to leave...it’s true that XYZ is worried because if I leave, lot of things will be hampered” (R15)
	“No matter how much we focus on shadow resourcing (backup planning), SOPS (standard operating procedures), knowledge sharing (transfer of know-how), the fact remains that the loss of a face (FSE) is ultimately a loss...we cannot afford to follow McDonald’s model (at the burger chain, the person taking your order behind that counter just happens to be there. It’s otherwise completely driven by systems and processes), here we focus on trust-based on-going relationships between our people & clients” (R16)
Prescribed Service Delivery Behavior (Mentioned by 25/25 respondents)	“It’s a cardinal sin in this business to goof up on SLA (service level agreement that is generally translated into job requirements of FSEs)” (R1)
	“Meeting the SLA (what aspect of service) while being polite and courteous (how aspect of service) makes the client happy and satisfied” (R25)
	“Attitude matters so much in this business...there are so many competitors in the market who do the same thing; not many do it the same way...here, we focus on creating an experience (how aspect of service) along with the value (what aspect of service) and this makes us the industry leader” (R12)
Proactive Customer Service Behavior (Mentioned by 21/25 respondents)	“My customer is elated when I do something beyond the expectations...even my subtle initiatives are well appreciated & encouraged” (R3)
	“Customer orientation is the biggest asset in business services...other than routine things (SLAs) little extras at times make a lot of difference... I recently won a huge cash award from my client for an initiative (based on my foresight) that helped them avoid losses” (R8)
	“Our focus is to flourish a ‘we’ spirit rather than a ‘me’ spirit in the team...no single member can support a big client alone; it’s the entire team. Thus, even small personal initiatives for improving the team’s customer orientation are acknowledged & welcomed here” (R1)
Word of Mouth (Mentioned by 18/25 respondents)	“My friends take this company positively because of the way I project it...for them, I’m the credible storyteller” (R10)
	“I take pride in endorsing this company and my frequent advocacy definitely has an impact on people’s impression about this company” (R23)
	“Over years, I have developed such a close relationship with customers that my words/opinions can reinstate or break their faith in the company...customers often want to take the insider’s view of this company because they have a huge stake, their business is open to us and if we’re not doing well, they’ll not be well either” (R20)

This pool of items was then given to a set of 12 experts along with the definitions of EBBB dimensions to assess the content validity. Judges were asked to rate each item as ‘Essential’, ‘Useful but not essential’, or ‘Not necessary’ to measure the respective dimension of EBBB. Based on the ratings, Content Validity Ratio (CVR; Lawshe, 1975) was calculated using the

formula:  $CVR = [(E - (N / 2)) / (N / 2)]$ , where N is the number of experts and E is the number of experts who rated the item as essential. Items with CVR less than 0.56 (at  $p < 0.05$ ) were dropped at this stage. In total, 23 out of 28 items were used in the next stage of the scale development process.

### **Phase 2: Scale Purification (Exploratory Factor Analysis)**

Based on the ratings of experts, 23 items were considered to have sufficient face and content validity. Thus, these items were administered on Sample 1 for scale purification. These items were randomly ordered before administration and respondents were asked to rate them on a five-point likert scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree). All items were presented as declarative statements enabling respondents to effectively answer them on the Likert scale provided (DeVellis, 2003).

Once the data were received, we examined item completeness and the distributions of the item scores as indicated by the mean, median, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis. There were no missing values in the data. The means of all items ranged from 3.5 to 4.5 and all standard deviations exceeded 0.50 (lowest being 0.51), being indicative of adequate variability (Stumpf, Colarelli, & Hartman, 1983). Moreover, the responses showed a good distribution on the scale as skewness was less than 2 and Kurtosis was less than 5 (Ghiselli, Campbell, and Zedeck, 1981).

In the next step, we performed exploratory factor analysis (EFA) in SPSS Statistics 17.0 using maximum likelihood technique and promax rotation. The KMO measure of sampling adequacy showed a value of 0.90 while the Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant. Both of these results suggested going ahead with further investigation. EFA suggested a four-factor solution that explained 63.6% of the variance. In this suggested solution, we examined items that did not load strongly (that is, pattern coefficients of  $< 0.50$ ) and had high cross loadings (that is, cross loadings  $> 0.40$ ).



Table 4. EFA Results

CODE	ITEM	PATTERN COEFFICIENTS			
		1	2	3	4
OA1	It is personally important for me to stay with this organization for as long as possible	<b>.66</b>	.08	-.11	.03
OA2	If I am completely free to choose, I will prefer working for this organization	<b>.55</b>	.06	.12	.05
OA3	I will turn down an offer for a comparable job at another organization, if it came tomorrow	<b>.90</b>	-.07	-.01	-.05
PSDB1	I adequately complete my assigned duties	.16	<b>.58</b>	.06	.07
PSDB2	I follow through in a conscientious manner on promises made to the customers	-.08	<b>.70</b>	.03	.00
PSDB3	I sincerely engage in activities that are part of my performance evaluation	.02	<b>.75</b>	.03	.03
PSDB4	Regardless of circumstances, I am courteous and respectful to customers	.00	<b>.73</b>	-.08	-.11
PSDB5	I follow up in a timely manner to customer problems and requests	.00	<b>.83</b>	.00	.01
PCSB1	I proactively suggest ideas and solutions for potential customer problems	.01	.01	<b>.74</b>	.01
PCSB2	I proactively create partnerships with colleagues to better serve customers	.22	-.07	<b>.70</b>	-.06
PCSB3	I proactively take ownership by following through with customers	-.02	.08	<b>.76</b>	-.04
PCSB4	I proactively share my knowledge with team mates to enhance the team performance	-.14	.05	<b>.73</b>	.02
PCSB5	I proactively make constructive suggestions to improve our service delivery	-.13	.01	<b>.76</b>	.02
PCSB6	I proactively update my skills to better serve customers in future	.07	-.11	<b>.69</b>	.02
WOM1	I mention this organization to others quite frequently	.04	.08	.00	<b>.72</b>
WOM2	I use every opportunity to mention about this organization in my circle	-.05	.06	-.02	<b>.79</b>
WOM3	When I tell others about this organization, I tend to talk about the organization in great detail	.00	.00	.09	<b>.62</b>
WOM4	I say positive things about the organization in my circle of influence	.04	-.04	.03	<b>.74</b>
WOM5	I tell outsiders this is a great place to work	-.02	-.09	.00	<b>.79</b>
WOM6	I stress on the good points while talking about this organization	-.01	-.07	.02	<b>.80</b>
WOM7	I recommend this organization in my circle of influence	.00	.02	-.10	<b>.73</b>

Other than for 2 items, all pattern coefficients were above the cut-off and there were no high cross loadings. After deleting these two items (with low pattern coefficients), EFA was conducted again. This time, all the 21 items loaded strongly on their respective factors and there were no cases of high cross loadings (refer to Table 4).

We further optimized the scale using corrected item-total correlations. All the 21 items met the cut-off criterion of .30 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994) and, therefore, were considered for the next phase of scale development.

### **Phase 3: Scale Purification (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)**

A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted on the set of 21 items in Samples 1-5 using Lisrel 8.70 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 2004). Various model comparisons were performed to identify the sources of misspecification and derive conclusions on dimensionality of the constructs. Model fit was assessed using indicators, like overall model chi-square measure, Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) (Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen 2008). Relative  $\chi^2$  ( $\chi^2/df$ ) less than 3; RMSEA less than 0.08; CFI greater than 0.95; SRMR less than 0.08; and NNFI greater than 0.95 were taken as acceptable threshold levels (Hooper et al. 2008; Kline 2005). Overall, 5 models were specified in each sample:

- a) Model 1: 1-factor model; all 21 items loading on a single factor
- b) Model 2: 2-factor model; items of OA & WOM loading on one factor and items of PSDB & PCSB loading on another
- c) Model 3: 3-factor model; items of PSDB & PCSB forming one factor and OA & WOM as two separate factors
- d) Model 4: 3-factor model; items of OA & WOM forming one factor and PSDB & PCSB as two separate factors
- e) Model 5: 4-factor model; OA, PSDB, PCSB, & WOM as four separate factors

In all the five samples, Model 5 appeared to best fit the data in absolute sense (refer Table 5). In model 5, all the items loaded onto their respective latent factors significantly in all the five samples (minimum loading was .55). Further, in each sample, the hypothesized 4-factor model (Model 5) was compared with alternate models of 1, 2, and 3 factors (Models 1-4) based on the chi-square difference test. Through model comparisons, Model 5 was found to be a better fit to the data as the chi-square difference values were significant at 0.01 level of significance (refer Table 5). These significant chi-square difference values suggested that the larger model (Model 5) with more freely estimated parameters and less degrees of freedom was a better fit to the data than alternate smaller models.

**Table 5. Model Comparisons**

SAMPLE 1							
MODEL	$\chi^2$	df	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI	NNFI	$\Delta\chi^2$ (df)
Model 1	3339.36	189	0.225	0.16	0.74	0.71	--
Model 2	1629.62	188	0.153	0.13	0.85	0.83	1709.74(1)
Model 3	1317.75	186	0.136	0.09	0.89	0.87	311.87(2) <sup>A</sup>
Model 4	904.84	186	0.108	0.11	0.91	0.90	724.78(2) <sup>B</sup>
Model 5	566.17	183	0.080	0.06	0.95	0.94	338.67(3) <sup>C</sup>

SAMPLE 2							
MODEL	$\chi^2$	df	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI	NNFI	$\Delta\chi^2$ (df)
Model 1	4451.02	189	0.182	0.11	0.85	0.83	--
Model 2	2854.78	188	0.144	0.11	0.90	0.88	1596.24(1)
Model 3	2262.08	186	0.128	0.10	0.92	0.91	592.7(2) <sup>A</sup>
Model 4	1551.54	186	0.104	0.07	0.94	0.93	1303.24(2) <sup>B</sup>
Model 5	916.49	183	0.077	0.06	0.96	0.96	635.05(3) <sup>C</sup>

SAMPLE 3							
MODEL	$\chi^2$	df	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI	NNFI	$\Delta\chi^2$ (df)
Model 1	1995.77	189	0.199	0.11	0.86	0.85	--
Model 2	1573.8	188	0.175	0.12	0.89	0.88	421.97(1)
Model 3	1348.24	186	0.161	0.11	0.92	0.91	225.56(2) <sup>A</sup>
Model 4	652.42	186	0.102	0.08	0.95	0.94	921.38(2) <sup>B</sup>
Model 5	414.14	183	0.072	0.06	0.97	0.97	238.28(3) <sup>C</sup>

SAMPLE 4							
MODEL	$\chi^2$	df	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI	NNFI	$\Delta\chi^2$ (df)
Model 1	3145.00	189	0.247	0.16	0.73	0.70	--
Model 2	1861.45	188	0.186	0.13	0.83	0.81	1283.55(1)
Model 3	1236.84	186	0.148	0.12	0.90	0.89	624.61(2) <sup>A</sup>
Model 4	1071.97	186	0.136	0.07	0.89	0.88	789.48(2) <sup>B</sup>
Model 5	440.54	183	0.074	0.05	0.96	0.96	631.43(3) <sup>C</sup>

SAMPLE 5							
MODEL	$\chi^2$	df	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI	NNFI	$\Delta\chi^2$ (df)
Model 1	3074.65	189	0.277	0.17	0.75	0.72	--
Model 2	1398.63	188	0.180	0.13	0.87	0.85	1676.02(1)
Model 3	1276.53	186	0.172	0.12	0.89	0.87	122.1(2) <sup>A</sup>
Model 4	490.25	186	0.091	0.07	0.95	0.95	908.38(2) <sup>B</sup>
Model 5	363.29	183	0.070	0.05	0.97	0.97	126.96(3) <sup>C</sup>

<sup>A</sup>Model 3 compared to Model 2

<sup>B</sup>Model 4 compared to Model 1

<sup>C</sup>Model 5 compared to the better model among Model 3 and Model 4 (In all cases, Model 4)

Overall, CFA results favoured the four-factor structure and indicated the distinctiveness of the four factors (discriminant validity). Further, given that all standardised loadings were significant and strong (Gerbing and Anderson, 1988), average variance extracted (AVE) was greater than 0.50 (barring an exception: AVE of PCSB in Sample 2 was .40; Fornell and

Larcker, 1981), and composite reliability (CR) was greater than 0.70 (Bagozzi and Yi, 1988; Bagozzi and Heatherton, 1994) in all the five samples, there was a strong evidence of convergent validity (refer Table 6 for loadings and Table 7 for correlations and reliabilities). As highlighted above, AVE of PCSB in Sample 2 was 0.40 (below the standard of 0.50). However, taking a holistic view, i.e. considering the fact that in all other samples PCSB met the standards for factor loadings, AVE, and CR; and even in Sample 2, loadings were strong and composite reliability was well above the cut-off, it can be believed that there is no threat to the convergent validity of PCSB.

**Table 6. CFA Results**

ITEM CODE	STANDARDIZED LOADINGS				
	SAMPLE1	SAMPLE2	SAMPLE3	SAMPLE4	SAMPLE5
OA1	0.66	0.82	0.67	0.89	0.77
OA2	0.70	0.82	0.84	0.94	0.60
OA3	0.81	0.75	0.81	0.93	0.82
PSDB1	0.73	0.77	0.82	0.70	0.85
PSDB2	0.65	0.81	0.84	0.73	0.87
PSDB3	0.80	0.82	0.82	0.86	0.88
PSDB4	0.63	0.80	0.80	0.89	0.86
PSDB5	0.85	0.88	0.89	0.91	0.71
PCSB1	0.72	0.56	0.78	0.75	0.71
PCSB2	0.77	0.55	0.74	0.85	0.87
PCSB3	0.80	0.58	0.76	0.63	0.80
PCSB4	0.69	0.72	0.82	0.64	0.88
PCSB5	0.66	0.75	0.72	0.73	0.89
PCSB6	0.67	0.61	0.57	0.67	0.82
PCSB7	0.72	0.56	0.78	0.75	0.71
WOM1	0.79	0.79	0.80	0.71	0.82
WOM2	0.83	0.70	0.72	0.80	0.71
WOM3	0.69	0.73	0.69	0.87	0.75
WOM4	0.76	0.63	0.67	0.83	0.83
WOM5	0.67	0.72	0.76	0.82	0.93
WOM6	0.71	0.70	0.78	0.62	0.79
WOM7	0.67	0.77	0.81	0.60	0.88

All loadings are significant at 0.01 level ( $t > 2.56$ )

**Table 7. Correlations & Reliabilities**

SAMPLE 1							
CONSTRUCT	AVE	CR	OA	PSDB	PCSB	WOM	MEAN(SD)
OA	.527	.769	--				4.37(.51)
PSDB	.543	.854	.56	--			3.92(.69)
PCSB	.519	.865	.49	.51	--		4.07(.64)
WOM	.538	.890	.41	.26	.23	--	3.75(.74)

SAMPLE 2							
CONSTRUCT	AVE	CR	OA	PSDB	PCSB	WOM	MEAN(SD)
OA	.636	.839	--				4.09(.75)
PSDB	.667	.909	.53	--			3.93(.66)
PCSB	.401	.798	.49	.43	--		4.25(.47)
WOM	.521	.883	.58	.57	.50	--	3.75(.73)

SAMPLE 3							
CONSTRUCT	AVE	CR	OA	PSDB	PCSB	WOM	MEAN(SD)
OA	.604	.819	--				3.50(.84)
PSDB	.697	.920	.53	--			3.91(.70)
PCSB	.542	.875	.48	.53	--		3.50(.79)
WOM	.561	.899	.48	.60	.63	--	3.72(.76)

SAMPLE 4							
CONSTRUCT	AVE	CR	OA	PSDB	PCSB	WOM	MEAN(SD)
OA	.847	.943	--				2.91(1.36)
PSDB	.677	.912	.30	--			3.54(.94)
PCSB	.512	.862	.39	.49	--		3.32(.85)
WOM	.572	.902	.59	.27	.43	--	3.09(1.08)

SAMPLE 5							
CONSTRUCT	AVE	CR	OA	PSDB	PCSB	WOM	MEAN(SD)
OA	.542	.777	--				3.42(1.09)
PSDB	.700	.920	.32	--			4.17(.73)
PCSB	.690	.930	.26	.46	--		4.31(.57)
WOM	.670	.934	.47	.40	.40	--	3.75(.75)

In addition, noticing high correlations between the four factors of EBBB in all the five samples (refer Table 7), we specified a second-order factor model in all the five samples. This model fit the data well, in absolute sense, across the five samples. Model fit indices of the second-order factor model were: Sample 1 ( $\chi^2$  [185] = 572.83, CFI = 0.95, NNFI = 0.95, RMSEA = 0.08, SRMR = 0.06); Sample 2 ( $\chi^2$  [185] = 919.75, CFI = 0.96, NNFI = 0.96, RMSEA = 0.07, SRMR = 0.06); Sample 3 ( $\chi^2$  [185] = 417.58, CFI = 0.97, NNFI = 0.97, RMSEA = 0.07, SRMR = 0.06); Sample 4 ( $\chi^2$  [185] = 466.83, CFI = 0.96, NNFI = 0.95, RMSEA = 0.07, SRMR = 0.07); and Sample 5 ( $\chi^2$  [185] = 374.29, CFI = 0.97, NNFI = 0.97,

RMSEA = 0.07, SRMR = 0.06). Moreover, composite reliability of the second order construct was above 0.7 in all the 5 samples (.75, .81, .83, .74, .72 respectively).

#### **Phase 4: Scale Examination**

Social desirability bias has always been a perturbing issue with self-report measures. Such a bias challenges the validity of a construct and affects the interpretation of relationships between constructs. Although, we took active measures (like promising the anonymity of responses; assuring that the responses will have no implications on the performance evaluation; appealing for true responses by explaining in the cover story that responses will be analysed in aggregate for the betterment of work conditions) for reducing the bias, the possibility of its existence cannot be denied. Therefore, we performed additional analysis to investigate this issue.

In Sample 6, we measured social desirability bias using a shortened version (13-items) of Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale by Reynolds (1982). Analyses were performed in Sample 6, following the procedure outlined by Williams and Anderson (1994). First, a baseline model was computed in which social desirability does not confound the responses on the EBBB scale. In this model, the relations between the latent variable for social desirability and the four factors of EBBB (OA, PSDB, PCSB, & WOM) were constrained to zero. Fit indices of this model suggested an average fit to the data ( $\chi^2$  [399] = 1577.38, CFI = 0.95, NNFI = 0.94, RMSEA = 0.09, SRMR = 0.08). Second, a confounded measurement model was inspected in which social desirability was assumed to influence the responses on the EBBB scale. In this model, paths were allowed between social desirability and the indicators of the four factors (OA, PSDB, PCSB, & WOM), that is, the 21 items of the EBBB scale. This model fit the data reasonably well ( $\chi^2$  [377] = 1321.83, CFI = 0.96, NNFI = 0.95, RMSEA = 0.08, SRMR = 0.06). Moreover, confounded model fit the data better than the baseline model ( $\Delta\chi^2$  [22] = 255.55, significant at  $p < 0.01$ ), which suggested that social desirability significantly confounded participants' answers on the EBBB scale.

To avoid the effect of social desirability bias on the relationship between EBBB and other constructs, two precautions were taken in further research: a) wherever considered appropriate, responses were taken from other sources (reliance on self-report was reduced); and b) wherever the reliance on self-report could not be traded off, social desirability was measured and its effect was weeded off.

#### **Phase 5: Scale Validation**

Prior to testing a partial nomological network of EBBB, it was considered important to investigate the potential overlap between EBBB and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). For this objective, OCB was measured using 14-item scale by Williams and Anderson (1991), where 7 items measured citizenship behavior targeted at individuals (OCBI) and 7 items measured citizenship behavior targeted at organization (OCBO). This approach for measuring OCB was used after considering the views of Spitzmuller, Van Dyne, & Ilies (2008) that the vast majority of OCB research can be subsumed into these two categories.

In Sample 4, items pertaining to EBBB (21 items) and OCB (14 items) were administered. Based on the recommendations of Bagozzi and Yi (1988), two models were specified: Model 1 that allowed the correlations between constructs to be constrained to unity and Model 2 that allowed the correlations between constructs to be free. Model 2 ( $\chi^2$  [545] = 1061.08, CFI = 0.96, NNFI = 0.95, RMSEA = 0.06, SRMR = 0.07) revealed a better fit than Model 1 ( $\chi^2$  [553] = 2162.15, CFI = 0.90, NNFI = 0.89, RMSEA = 0.11, SRMR = 0.13) on the basis of a chi-square difference test ( $\Delta\chi^2$  [8] = 1101.07, significant at  $p < 0.01$ ). This result suggests that these two constructs are indeed different.

Next, we tested if responses on two different scales for measuring EBBB correlated highly. In this regard, we measured EBBB in Sample 5 using two scales: scale developed in this study and scale by Morhart et al. (2009). As expected, second order latent factors of both the measures (each consisted of 4 first order factors) correlated highly ( $r = 0.86$ ).

In an effort to build a partial nomological network for EBBB, we considered various theoretically related constructs. First of all, to exhibit brand building behavior, one must be knowledgeable about various aspects of a brand (brand values, brand promise, functional & emotional aspects of brand promise delivery, etc.). Secondly, a FSE must have strong attachment with the brand/organization to be motivated to engage in brand building. And finally, a FSE must get the right environment at work to invest his/her personal resources in brand building.

Based on this basic premise, below, we develop a series of hypotheses suggesting that factors, like work engagement, affective commitment, & brand knowledge, will have a significant positive influence on EBBB. Further, by exhibiting brand building behavior, a FSE must be able to positively influence outcomes, like customer satisfaction & performance ratings (by supervisor). We detail these relationships in subsequent sections.

### *Work Engagement*

Work engagement is defined as a positive, fulfilling work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Romá, & Bakker, 2002). In essence, work engagement captures how employees experience their work: as stimulating and energetic and something to which they really want to devote time and effort (vigor); as a significant and meaningful pursuit (dedication); and as engrossing and something on which they are fully concentrated (absorption; Bakker, Albrecht, & Leiter, 2011). Engaged employees have a sense of energetic and effective connection with their work activities, and they see themselves as able to deal well with the demands of their jobs (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006). In addition to the focus on physical effort for pursuit of role-related goals, they are cognitively vigilant and emotionally connected to the endeavor (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995; Kahn, 1990).

Engagement emanates from various work-related factors, like job characteristics, organizational support, supervisor support, rewards & recognition, & organizational justice (Saks, 2006). And, all of these factors are necessary for fostering EBBB. For an instance, Miles & Mangold (2004) suggest that a conducive organizational climate, i.e. necessary support for brand building (organizational support), fairness in dealing with employees (justice), rewards and recognition for brand building efforts of employees (rewards & recognition), supervisor's influence in terms of goal-setting, visioning, transfer of organizational values, allocation of resources, timely feedback, job autonomy, & personal support (supervisor support & job characteristics), is necessary for upholding employees' psychological contract with the organization and making employees exhibit the desired brand image to customers. Therefore, it can be believed that various work-related factors (as discussed above) influence work engagement of employees; and, in turn, engaged employees exhibit EBBB (viewing engagement as an attitudinal predictor of EBBB).

This explanation goes along with the belief that work engagement represents an inclusive view of the employee's agentic self, and therefore, engagement may provide a more comprehensive explanation for job performance effects than is provided by more familiar mechanisms that emphasize narrower aspects of the employee's self (Rich, Lepine, & Crawford, 2010). In support of this view, past research (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002; Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004; Rich et al., 2010, Saks, 2006; Shuck, Reio, & Rocco, 2011) has shown that employee engagement shares an important relation with a wide array of organizational outcome variables, such as retention, productivity, organizational citizenship behaviors, discretionary efforts, and overall job performance. In view of the above theoretical arguments and evidence of relationship between work engagement & outcomes (both prescribed & discretionary in nature, like EBBB), we hypothesize:



H1: FSEs' work engagement will be positively related to their EBBB

### *Affective Commitment*

Affective organizational commitment is defined as emotional attachment, identification, and involvement that an employee has with its organization and goals (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986). Employee's bond with their organization has been considered an important determinant of dedication & loyalty (Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001). Further, it is believed that affectively committed employees have a sense of belonging & identification that increases their participation in organizational activities, their willingness to pursue organizational goals, & their desire to remain in the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Affective commitment to the organization emanates from environmental factors, like justice, rewards, supervisor support (Rhoades et al., 2001), organizational socialization (job training, understanding, co-worker support, & future prospects), and organization's relationship orientation (shows respect, is cooperative, communicates well, is trustworthy, and encourages working towards a common goal; King & Grace, 2012). As a result, psychologically attached employees internalise the brand and are better equipped to fulfil the explicit and implicit promises inherent in the brand (e.g., Berry, 2000; Miles and Mangold, 2004; Burman & Zeplin, 2005; Burman, Zeplin, & Riley, 2008), which eventually results in better performance of employees (Castro, Armario, & del Río, 2005).

In past, studies have shown that affectively committed employees are less likely to leave (Meyer et al., 2002); and more likely to: perform effectively (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005; Riketta, 2002; Punjaisri & Wilson, 2011), be good organizational citizens (Meyer et al., 2002; Riketta, 2002), be proactive in customer service (Rank et al., 2007), exhibit service delivery behavior (Bettencourt & Brown, 2003), & exhibit brand citizenship behavior (King & Grace, 2010, 2012). In view of the above arguments and evidence of relationship between affective commitment & outcomes (both prescribed & discretionary in nature, like EBBB), we hypothesize:

H2: FSEs' affective commitment will be positively related to their EBBB

### *Brand Knowledge*

Brand knowledge can be viewed as the comprehension of the brand identity, i.e. employee understands what the brand stands for and how to deliver the brand promise (Xiong & King, 2013). It describes the cognitive representation of the brand within an employees' mind,

which can be interpreted as ‘schemata’ (Fiske & Linville, 1980). And according to Marcus & Zajonc (1985), these are structures of organized prior knowledge, which evolve by the abstraction of experiences and exert a strong behavioral influence (as cited in Baumgarth & Schmidt, 2010).

In customer facing role, employees’ understanding of the brand identity and service skills becomes crucial in effective brand management (Xiong & King, 2013). When employees are provided with knowledge that is relevant for the successful execution of their role, employees understand the brand strategy and the rationale behind management decisions with respect to employees, customers and service delivery, and in turn, employees reduce their role conflict/ambiguity (King and Grace, 2010). This is significant given that an increase in role ambiguity affects performance detrimentally (Babin and Boles, 1996). Moreover, when employees perceive they have sufficient knowledge at work and their work is meaningful, they become highly motivated and are more likely to deliver high quality work performance (Oldham and Hackman, 2010).

In support of the above arguments, Xiong & King (2013) found that FSEs’ brand knowledge directly impacts their brand endorsement, brand allegiance, & brand consistent behavior. Based on the theoretical rationale and empirical evidence for the relationship between brand knowledge and brand supportive behavior (closely associated with EBBB), we hypothesize:

H3: FSEs’ brand knowledge will be positively related to their EBBB

#### *Customer Satisfaction*

Customer satisfaction is defined as an overall evaluation of a firm’s products or services (Anderson, Fornell, & Rust, 1997; Gustafsson, Johnson, and Roos, 2005). It is an outcome of evaluation of the perceived discrepancy between prior expectations and the actual performance of the service (Tse and Wilton, 1988, Oliver, 1999). Satisfaction of customers with services of a company is considered as most important factor for the success of a services firm (Hennig-Thurau and Klee, 1997). Although, in a service delivery process, lot of other factors can influence customer satisfaction (e.g., design, physical evidence, price, etc.), we are specifically looking at customer’s satisfaction with the FSE, a customer interacts with.

Heskett, Jones, Loveman, Sasser, and Schlesinger’s (1994) ‘service profit chain’ postulates a chain of performance relationships commencing with a virtuous circle of internal service quality, service capability, employee satisfaction and loyalty (allegiance), productivity and output quality; which in turn drive service value, customer satisfaction and loyalty, leading to enhanced revenue growth and/or profitability. Adopting this view, many studies have shown

that employee productivity/ behavior (that emanates from employee satisfaction) leads to customer satisfaction. For example, it is evident that FSE's in-role performance (Piercy et al., 2006), including the functional and emotional aspects of delivery (Barger and Grandey, 2006; Hennig-Thurau, Groth, Paul, & Gremler, 2006; Soderlund and Rosengren, 2004, 2008), is positively related to customer satisfaction. In addition, from relationship marketing point of view, FSE's loyalty has been found to positively impact customer satisfaction & loyalty (Schneider, White, & Paul, 1998; Reichheld, 1996, 2001; Hansen et al., 2003).

Drawing from the disconfirmation paradigm of customer satisfaction (e.g. Oliver, 1997), Hennig-Thurau, Gwinner, & Gremler (2002) postulated that customers have expectations with regard to the behavior of service employees in interaction situations and that, when these are exceeded, the level of customer satisfaction with the service provider is positively influenced. In support of this argument, studies have shown that FSE's ability to delight the customer by providing little extras (extra attention and spontaneous exceptional service) during the service encounter leads to customer satisfaction and positive emotional responses (De Jong and De Ruyter, 2004; Hennig-Thurau, 2004).

In view of the above arguments and consideration of the fact that EBBB encompasses a wide array of employee behaviors that have been shown to impact customer satisfaction, we hypothesize:

H4: EBBB will be positively related to customer satisfaction

#### *Performance Ratings*

Performance is what the organization hires one to do, and do well (Campbell, McCloy, Oppler, & Sager, 1993). Performance is not defined by the action (behavior) itself but by judgemental and evaluative processes that focus on the outcome of such behavior (Sonnentag & Frese, 2002). In an organizational context, an employee's performance can be evaluated by any of the beneficiaries of that performance (other than self). For this research, we consider self & supervisor rated performance as an evaluation of FSE.

For a services firm, employees who 'live the brand' are invaluable assets. As FSE's brand building behavior comprehensively covers various aspects of job, it is highly obvious that FSE's brand building efforts will be rated favorably by the supervisor. On similar lines, in the past research, both in-role (e.g., Vandaele and Gemmel, 2006) and extra-role behaviors (Vandaele and Gemmel, 2006; Piercy et al., 2006; Griffin, Neal, & Parker, 2007; Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009) have been found to positively influence performance evaluation of employees (by supervisors). Therefore, we hypothesize:

H5: EBBB will be positively related to supervisor rated performance

Work engagement was measured in Sample 3 using a 9-item scale by Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova (2006). Affective commitment was measured in Sample 2 using a 5-item scale by Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli (2001). Brand knowledge was measured in Sample 2 using a 3-item scale by Xiong, King, & Piehler (2013). Customer satisfaction was measured in two samples (Sample 1 and Sample 5) using 4-item scale by Hennig-Thurau (2004). Supervisor rated performance was measured in two samples (Sample 5 and Sample 6). In Sample 5, job performance was captured using most recent performance appraisal scores (as given by supervisors) of the employees. In Sample 6, job performance was measured using a single-item measure of overall job performance that was adapted from Rotundo & Sackett (2002). Additionally, we measured social desirability bias in Sample 2 and Sample 3 using 5-item social desirability scale by Hays, Hayashi, & Stewart (1989).

Before testing the relationship between EBBB with affective commitment and brand knowledge (in Sample 2), we followed a latent variable approach (Williams, Gavin, & Williams, 1996) suggested by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff (2012) to investigate whether social desirability bias influenced the responses and relationships between these variables. Following this approach, the first model (Model 1) was a confirmatory factor model without social desirability paths, i.e. paths from social desirability latent factor to other substantive indicators (29 indicators of substantive factors like OA, PSDB, PCSB, WOM, affective commitment, & brand knowledge) were constrained to zero. Further, social desirability factor was uncorrelated with other factors. Model 1 revealed an acceptable fit to the data ( $\chi^2 [512] = 1680.61$ , CFI = 0.97, NNFI = 0.96, RMSEA = 0.06, SRMR = 0.07) and the correlations between substantive factors were significant and in expected direction.

Second model (Model 2) was a confirmatory factor model with social desirability paths. In Model 2, paths between social desirability latent factor and 29 substantive indicators were allowed to be estimated, but social desirability latent factor was uncorrelated with other substantive factors. Model 2 revealed an acceptable fit to the data ( $\chi^2 [483] = 1618.09$ , CFI = 0.97, NNFI = 0.96, RMSEA = 0.06, SRMR = 0.04). The comparison of Model 1 with Model 2 provided an overall test of relationships with social desirability, and it resulted in a significant difference ( $\Delta\chi^2 [29] = 62.52$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Thus, the restriction of the 29 factor loadings associated with social desirability to zero rejected. In fact, out of 29 factor loadings associated with social desirability 25 were significant ( $p < .05$ ). All the three indicators of brand knowledge and one indicator of PCSB (PCSB1) did not show significant association with social desirability.

Next, to assess social desirability effects on factor correlation parameter estimates, we specified the third model (Model 3), in which paths between social desirability latent factor and 29 substantive indicators were allowed to be estimated and social desirability latent factor was uncorrelated with other substantive factors, but correlations between substantive factors were constrained to the values obtained from Model 1. Model 3, a restricted confirmatory model with social desirability, revealed a good fit to the data ( $\chi^2$  [498] = 1620.82, CFI = 0.97, NNFI = 0.96, RMSEA = 0.06, SRMR = 0.05). The comparison of Model 2 with Model 3 provided the statistical test of whether differences in the two sets of factor correlations were significant and meaningful. A non-significant difference between these models ( $\Delta\chi^2$  [15] = 2.73,  $p > .05$ ) suggests that social desirability effects represented as factor loadings did not relate to or bias factor correlation estimates.

Based on the analyses, it was concluded that social desirability did have an impact on substantive indicators although not on the factor correlations. Therefore, social desirability factor was retained at indicator level to weed off its effect while computing the relation between EBBB, affective commitment, and brand knowledge. In line with the expectations (Hypotheses 2 & 3), both affective commitment (composite reliability = .83) and brand knowledge (composite reliability = .82) significantly positively associated with EBBB (path coefficients were 0.64 and 0.23, respectively).

Similar to the above analyses, a detailed investigation of social desirability bias was done in Sample 3 before assessing the relationship between work engagement and EBBB. However, the comparison of Model 1 ( $\chi^2$  [539] = 812.00, CFI = 0.97, NNFI = 0.97, RMSEA = 0.05, SRMR = 0.09) with Model 2 ( $\chi^2$  [509] = 752.66, CFI = 0.98, NNFI = 0.97, RMSEA = 0.05, SRMR = 0.05) suggested that social desirability bias did not affect the indicators significantly ( $\Delta\chi^2$  [30] = 59.34,  $p > .05$ ). Therefore, social desirability factor was not included while assessing the relationship between work engagement and EBBB. As expected (Hypothesis 1), work engagement (composite reliability = .83) was positively associated with EBBB (path coefficient = 0.56).

The relationship between EBBB and customer satisfaction was assessed in Sample 1 and Sample 5. Customer satisfaction (composite reliability = .85, in both the samples) related positively with customer satisfaction in both the samples (path coefficients were 0.62 and 0.72, respectively). Thus, Hypothesis 4 was supported.

Further, the relationship between EBBB and performance was assessed in Sample 5 and Sample 6. In both the samples, EBBB related positively with performance (path coefficients were 0.83 and 0.49, respectively), lending strong support to Hypothesis 5.

Finally, to compare the effectiveness of both the scales (our scale versus Morhart et al.'s scale) in measuring brand championship of FSEs, we specified a model with both measures of EBBB, customer satisfaction, and performance (Sample 5). This model fit the data well in absolute sense ( $\chi^2 [841] = 1252.16$ , CFI = 0.98, NNFI = 0.98, RMSEA = 0.04, SRMR = 0.07) and all the loadings were significant. In this model, our scale predicted performance (path coefficient = .85 versus .67) and customer satisfaction (path coefficient = .72 versus .53) better than Morhart et al.'s (2009) scale.

## **DISCUSSION**

Today, in an increasingly competitive marketplace, customer focus has become a major strategy for service firms (Liao, 2007; Raub & Liao, 2012). As a result, firms are focusing on nurturing *Brand Champions* for superior service delivery (King & Grace, 2012). Research on *Brand Champions*, however, might be hampered by the lack of a valid and reliable scale to measure the brand building behavior. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to develop a valid and reliable measure of EBBB.

As a result of a five-stage scale development & validation process, a parsimonious four-dimensional scale (with 21 items), demonstrating reliability and validity, was realised. The EBBB scale consistently demonstrated a four-factor structure across all the six samples, with four factors being labelled as Organizational Allegiance (OA), Prescribed Service Delivery Behavior (PSDB), Proactive Customer Service Behavior (PCSB), and Word of Mouth (WOM). Discriminant validity between the four factors established that the scale was measuring four distinct dimensions. Each dimension contributes individually to the operationalization of EBBB, and collectively, the four dimensions represent the most comprehensive understanding of EBBB. Further, these four factors load on a second order factor, supporting the notion of a common theme among these factors. Put in other words, As EBBB is conceptualised as a second order latent construct, employees are required to express a high degree of each of the four dimensions in order to score high on EBBB and emerge as a *Brand Champion*.

In line with the emergent research on the idea of employee brand championship (e.g., Miles and Mangold, 2004, Burman & Zeplin, 2005, Burman, Zeplin, & Riley, 2008, Punjaisri & Wilson, 2011, and King & Grace, 2012), EBBB-21 (scale developed in this study) positively related to the hypothesized antecedents (work engagement, affective commitment, & brand knowledge) and consequences (customer satisfaction & supervisor rated performance), lending an evidence of nomological validity. Further, valuable outcomes of EBBB, like customer satisfaction and supervisor rated performance, related better with EBBB-21 than

with EBBB-12 (scale by Morhart and colleagues). These findings lead to the conclusion that EBBB-21 is a more comprehensive and valid measure of employee's brand championship. In sum, through a thorough testing and validation process, it can be suggested that the extensions provided in this study to the EBBB construct have contributed to the richness of the construct in capturing the idea of employee brand championship.

### **Theoretical Implications**

EBBB is considered as an outcome of organization's employee branding/internal brand management efforts. Scarcity of a valid scale to comprehensively capture EBBB restricted the growth of employee branding research (Burmannel al., 2008). Scholars have relied on various measures that were believed to capture the 'living the brand' aspect of employees. However, lack of comprehensiveness and/or validity of these constructs marred the quality of findings. This EBBB scale (EBBB-21) contributes to the field of employee/internal branding in that it addresses the absence of a purely behavioural measure of employee branding efforts.

Albeit scholars have vouched for employee branding as strategic imperative for realising a brand aligned and productive workforce, no meaningful measurement has been available to empirically validate such affirmations. Studies have indicated a need for a scale that reflects brand-relevant facets of employee behaviour in more detail and that is able to enhance future strategic decision related to employee branding (e.g., Henkel et al., 2007; Burmannel al., 2008). EBBB-21 addresses this paucity by providing an efficient means of measurement that is more comprehensive than other available constructs and scales in this domain. This scale can be used when examining the employee behavioural effects of employee branding.

Further, FSE behavior and employee branding has been given high importance in B2B services. However, in absence of a consolidated construct that captures the breadth of FSEs' behavior in B2B services context, research progress has been limited. In this study, using a mixed approach (qualitative and quantitative), we have made an effort to consolidate the literature to widen and enrich the understanding about traditional employee behaviors. For an instance, a vast majority of the past studies in the domain of internal brand management or FSE management has ignored some of the important aspects, like: a) capturing both the 'what' and 'how' aspects of prescribed service delivery behavior; b) ignoring either the team-focused proactive behaviors or the customer-focused proactive behaviors while capturing proactivity of FSEs; c) ignoring the 'activity' aspect of word of mouth while concentrating only on the 'valence' aspect of word of mouth. It is, therefore, a quest of this study to provide a concrete conceptualization and operationalization of EBBB in order to propel the research on internal brand management of B2B services.

At last, it is also important to highlight that as EBBB captures employees' contribution in organization's brand building, there is a huge possibility that employees' self-report responses will be contaminated with biases, such as social desirability and impression management, among others. Indeed, it was found in this study that social desirability bias was present in two out of three samples despite following stringent procedural remedies. It is surprising that other studies in this area have not measured and reported such biases in employee self-reports on measures that supposedly reflected employees' brand championship. Social desirability bias has a potential of contaminating responses to an extent that conclusions on relationships between constructs can be misinterpreted. Thus, it is recommended to measure and weed out such biases (if present) before drawing conclusions about relationships between constructs. In this study, EBBB-21 positively associated with other hypothesized constructs even after weeding out the social desirability bias, which fortifies the findings and conclusions.

### **Practical Implications**

Glynn (2012) points out that at least 21 of the 100 best global brands (as per Interbrand, 2010) operate and earn substantial revenues from B2B markets, mostly services. And, in B2B services, FSEs or brand representatives have a crucial role to play in brand success (e.g., Baumgarth & Schmidt, 2010; Glynn, 2012; Leek & Christodoulides, 2012). Therefore, there is a rising concern among B2B service firms to foster *Brand Champions* who can represent the brand favorably (Baumgarth, 2010). However, in absence of a clear understanding about aspects, like 'what it takes to be called a *Brand Champion*' and 'how to measure it', internal brand management cannot be at its best.

This study clarifies both the aspects and suggests a measure to gauge the impact of internal brand management processes on employee-related behavioral outcomes. Insights from this study can be used for sensitizing managers about various aspects of brand championship in FSEs and devising strategies to foster and sustain the levels of EBBB in the organization. In other words, EBBB scale can be used to measure the impact of internal brand management activities on FSEs and contriving the corrective measures, based on the feedback.

For example, Thompson (2008) believes that one of the contributing factors to the demise of the financial services brand Merrill Lynch in the recent global economic crisis was the lack of brand engagement on behalf of the employees (if the employees of Merrill Lynch truly believed in and behaved according to the brand attributes promoted on the company's website, they would never have lent large amounts of money to entities who were not qualified to borrow a lawnmower). Therefore, active assessments using valid measures in the



organization may raise an alarm to the top management about the potential problems, such as the lack of pro-brand behaviour or intent on behalf of employees in the case of Merrill Lynch (King, Grace, & Funk, 2011).

Further, the significance of being able to measure one's actions, particularly when it involves a substantial organisational commitment with respect to time, money and personnel resources, is the increasing emphasis on senior management accountability (Srinivasan, Park, & Chang, 2005). Therefore, practitioners who are looking to justify or better their internal branding investments shall find this scale as a useful tool for impact assessment. However, it should be noted that proper precautions must be taken to factor out biases (like social desirability) for getting a more realistic estimate of EBBB, so that resulting actions/interventions can be better planned.

Moreover, measurement of EBBB in organizations is also necessary for better use of reward and recognition policies. Organizations would wish that the *Brand Champions* be adequately motivated through rewards & recognition for a continual behavioral engagement. Interestingly, we found in this study that, in Sample 5, EBBB related more strongly with customer satisfaction when compared to supervisor rated performance of FSEs, such that the difference in the two correlations was significant at .05 level of confidence (based on Steiger, 1980; Hoerger, 2013). Among various explanations of this phenomenon, one can be that appraisal systems or supervisor ratings fails to include some aspects of performance that are crucial for customer satisfaction. Insights from this research will be helpful in improving performance management systems, so that the desired behavior is rightfully rewarded.

### **Limitations & Future Scope**

Despite the contributions discussed above, this study has limitations that should be noted. First, the primary data on EBBB was received through self-report survey of employees, making it possible that common method variance inflated the relationships between variables (Podsakoff et al. 2003). We followed some procedural remedies, as suggested by Podsakoff et al. (2012), to avoid the problem of common method variance. In addition, we factored out the effect of social desirability bias in order to arrive at reliable conclusions. Still, the possibility of existence of common method variance cannot be ruled out completely.

As a remedy for common method variance, one might consider taking multi-rater feedback on EBBB. However, in this process, a researcher will be faced with further complications, such as selecting the significant others for every FSE in order to get an accurate feedback. Given that EBBB may be targeted at many stakeholders at the same time, identification of the

most appropriate raters can be a cumbersome process. In past, researchers have relied on supervisor reports on employee behaviors, like organizational citizenship behavior, for a realistic estimate. But, in case of EBBB, a supervisor report can, at best, be suitable for measuring prescribed service delivery behavior and team-focused proactive behavior. Therefore, no single source, other than employees themselves, can provide a realistic estimate of EBBB. And, of course, as discussed above, getting multi-rater feedback involves complications. Therefore, more research is needed to guide researchers in adopting the most suitable approach for measurement of EBBB.

Second, the present findings support the predictive (concurrent) validity of EBBB-21, with respect to customer satisfaction and performance, by means of cross-sectional associations (Hinkin, 1998). Future studies may further examine causal relations between EBBB and its consequences by means of longitudinal, cross-lagged, or (field-) experimental studies.

Third, the present study included two heterogeneous convenience samples and four different organization-specific samples. Future research in different B2B service industries (other than IT services) and countries may, however, further add to the generalizability of the findings. Although this study focused specifically on FSEs working in B2B settings, further testing of this scale in B2C settings will enhance the utility and scope of this scale.

Finally, future studies might also examine the relative contribution of each of the four dimensions of EBBB in the prediction of various outcomes& relative impact of various antecedents on each of the four dimensions.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aldrich, H. and Herker, D. (1977). Boundary spanning roles and organization structure. *Academy of Management Review*, 2: 217-30.
- Allen, N. J. & Grisaffe, D. B. (2001). Employee commitment to the organization and customer reactions: Mapping the linkages. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11(3), 209-236.
- Anderson, E. W., Fornell, C., & Rust, R. T. (1997). Customer satisfaction, productivity, and profitability: differences between goods and services. *Marketing Science*, 16(2): 129-145.
- Andreassen, T. W., & Lindestad, B. (1998). Customer loyalty and complex services: the impact of corporate image on quality, customer satisfaction and loyalty for customers with varying degrees of service expertise. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 9(1): 7-23.
- Ashforth B.E., Humphrey R.H. (1995). Emotion in the workplace: A reappraisal. *Human Relations*, 48: 97-125.
- Babin, B. J., & Boles, J. S. (1996). The effects of perceived co-worker involvement and supervisor support on service provider role stress, performance and job satisfaction. *Journal of Retailing*, 72(1): 57-75.
- Baek, T. H. & King, K. W. (2011). Exploring the consequences of brand credibility in services. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 25: 260 - 272.
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Heatherton, T. F. (1994). A general approach to representing multifaceted personality constructs: Application to state self-esteem. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 1(1): 35-67.
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, 16(1): 74-94.
- Bakker, A. B., Albrecht, S. L., & Leiter, M. P. (2011). Key questions regarding work engagement. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(1): 4-28.
- Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E. and Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands: resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management*, 43: 83-104.
- Barger, P. B., & Grandey, A. A. (2006). Service with a smile and encounter satisfaction: Emotional contagion and appraisal mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(6): 1229-1238.
- Barger, P.B., Grandey, A.A., (2006). Service with a smile and encounter satisfaction: emotional contagion and appraisal mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49: 1220-1238.
- Baumgarth, C. (2010). Living the brand: brand orientation in the business-to-business sector. *European Journal of Marketing*, 44(5): 653 - 671.
- Baumgarth, C.; Schmidt, M. (2010): How strong is the business-to-business brand in the workforce? *Industrial Marketing Management*, 39(5): 1250-1260.
- Beatty, S.E., Mayer, M., Coleman, J., Reynolds, K., & Lee, J. 1996. Customer-sales associate retail relationships. *Journal of Retailing*, 72: 223-47.
- Belschak, F. D., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2010). Pro-self, pro-social, and pro-organizational foci of proactive behavior: Differential antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83: 475-498.
- Belschak, F. D., & Hartog, D. N. (2010). Pro-self, pro-social, and pro-organizational foci of proactive behaviour: Differential antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83(2): 475-498.
- Bendapudi, N. & Bendapudi, V. (2005). Creating the living brand. *Harvard Business Review*, 83: 124-32.
- Bendapudi, N., & Leone, R. P. (2002, April). Managing business-to-business customer relationships following key contact employee turnover in a vendor firm. *Journal of Marketing*, 66: 83-101.
- Berry, L. L. & Lampo, S. S. (2004). Branding labour-intensive services. *Business Strategy Review*, 15: 18-25.
- Berry, L. L. (2000). Cultivating Service Brand Equity. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28: 128-37.
- Bettencourt, L.A. and Brown, S.W. (2003). Role stressors and customer-oriented boundary- spanning behaviors in service organizations. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 31: 394-408.
- Bettencourt, Lance A., Gwinner, Kevin P., & Meuter, Matthew L. (2001). A Comparison of Attitude, Personality, and Knowledge Predictors of Service-Oriented Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1): 29-41.
- Beverland, M., Napoli, J., & Lindgreen, A. (2007). Industrial global brand leadership: A capabilities view. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 36: 1082-1093.
- Birati, A. & Tziner, A. (1996). Withdrawal behavior and withholding efforts at work (WBWEW): Assessing the financial cost. *Human Resource Management Review*, 6: 305-314.
- Bitner, M. J. & Brown, S. W. (2008). The Service Imperative. *Business Horizons*, 51 (January-February): 39-46.
- Bougie, J.R.G., Pieters, R., & Zeelenberg, M. (2003). Angry customers don't come back, they get back: The experience and behavioral implications of anger and dissatisfaction in services. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 31(4): 377-393
- Bove, L.L and Johnson, L. W. (2009). Does "true" personal or service loyalty last? A longitudinal study. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 23: 187-194.
- Bove, L.L. & Johnson, L.W. (2006). Customer loyalty to one service worker: should it be discouraged? *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 23: 79-91.

- Breaugh, J. A. and Starke, M. (2000). Research on employee recruitment: So many studies, so many remaining questions. *Journal of Management*, 26: 405-434.
- Burmann, C. Zeplin. S. (2005). Building brand commitment: A behavioral approach to internal brand management. *Journal of Brand Management*, 2(4): 279-291.
- Burmann, C., Zeplin, S., & Riley, N. (2008). Key determinants of internal brand management success: An exploratory empirical analysis. *Journal of Brand Management*, 16(4): 264-284.
- Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological bulletin*, 56(2): 81.
- Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H., & Sager, C. E. (1993). A theory of performance. In E. Schmitt, W. C. Borman, & Associates (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 35–70). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Castro, C. B., Armario, E. M., & del Rio, M. E. S. (2005). Consequences of market orientation for customers and employees. *European Journal of Marketing*, 39(5/6): 646-675.
- Central Intelligence Agency (2012). <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/xx.html>.
- 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.
- Chang, H. H. & Liu, Y. M. (2009). The impact of brand equity on brand preference and purchase intentions in the service industries, *The Service Industries Journal*, 29: 1687-1706.
- Chong, M. (2007). The role of internal communication and training in infusing corporate values and delivering brand promise: Singapore Airlines' experience. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 10(3): 201-212.
- Churchill Jr, G. A. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of marketing research*, 64-73.
- Coleman, D., de Chernatony, L., & Christodoulides, G. (2011). B2B service brand identity: Scale development and validation. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 40(7): 1063-1071.
- Collins, C. J. and Han, J. (2004). Exploring applicant pool quantity and quality: The effects of early recruitment practice strategies, corporate advertising, and firm reputation. *Personnel Psychology*, 57: 685-717.
- Collins, C. J. and Stevens, C. K. (2002). The relationship between early recruitment-related activities and the application decisions of new labor-market entrants: A brand equity approach to recruitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87: 1121-1133.
- Cooper-Hakim, A., & Viswesvaran, C. (2005). The construct of work commitment: testing an integrative framework. *Psychological bulletin*, 131(2): 241.
- Crosby, L., Evans, K. & Cowles, D. (1990). Relationship quality in services selling: an interpersonal influence perspective. *Journal of Marketing*, 54: 68-81.
- de Chernatony, L. (1999) Brand Management Through Narrowing the Gap Between Brand Identity and Brand Reputation, *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15:1-3, 157-179.
- de Chernatony, L., and Segal-Horn, S. (2001). Building on services characteristics to develop successful service brands. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 17: 645-669.
- Dean, A. M. (2004). Links between organizational and customer variables in service delivery: evidence, contradictions and challenges. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 15: 332-50.
- de Chernatony, L., Harris, F., & Christodoulides, G. (2004). Developing a brand performance measure for financial services brands. *The Service Industries Journal*. 24: 15–33.
- Deeter-Schmelz, D. R., & Kennedy, K. N. (2004). Buyer–seller relationships and selling in an e-commerce world. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 19: 188–196.
- DeVellis , R . F . (2003). *Scale Development – Theory and Applications* , 2nd edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Devlin, J.F., Gwynne, A.L., & Ennew, C. (2002). Antecedents of service expectations. *The Services Industries Journal*, 22: 117–131.
- Elaine Wallace, Leslie de Chernatony, Isabel Buil, (2011). Within-role, extra-role and anti-role behaviours in retail banking. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 29(6): 470 – 488.
- Erdem, T., Swait, J. & Valenzuela, A. (2006). Brands as signals: a cross-country validation study. *Journal of Marketing*, 70: 34-49.
- File, K. M., & Prince, R. A. (1993). Evaluating the effectiveness of interactive marketing. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 7: 49–53.
- Fiske, S. T., & Linville, P. W. (1980). What does the schema concept buy us? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 6(4): 543-557.
- Flynn, L. R., & Percy, D. (2001). Four subtle sins in scale development: some suggestions for strengthening the current paradigm. *International Journal of Market Research*, 43(4): 409-424.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of marketing research*, 39-50.
- Gerbing, D. W., & Anderson, J. C. (1988). An updated paradigm for scale development incorporating unidimensionality and its assessment. *Journal of Marketing research*, 186-192.
- Ghiselli, E. E., Campbell, J. P., & Zedeck, S. (1981). *Measurement theory for the behavioral sciences* (Vol. 8). San Francisco: WH Freeman.

- Glynn, M. S. (2012). Primer in B2B brand-building strategies with a reader practicum. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(5): 666-675.
- Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(2): 327-347.
- Gustafsson, A., Johnson, M. D., & Roos, I. (2005). The effects of customer satisfaction, relationship commitment dimensions, and triggers on customer retention. *Journal of marketing*, 210-218.
- Halstead, D., Droge, C., and Cooper, M. B. (1993). Product warranties and post-purchase service: A model of consumer satisfaction with complaint resolution. *Journal of Service Marketing*, 7: 33-40.
- Hanisch, K. A. & Hulin, C. L. (1990). Job attitudes and organizational withdrawal: An examination of retirement and other voluntary withdrawal behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 37: 60-78.
- Hanisch, K. A. & Hulin, C. L. (1991). General attitudes and organizational withdrawal: An evaluation of causal model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 39: 110-128.
- Hansen, H., Sandvik, K., & Selnes, F. (2003). Direct and indirect effects of commitment to a service employee on intention to stay. *Journal of Service Research*, 5: 356-368.
- Hansen, H., Sandvik, K., & Selnes, F. (2003). Direct and indirect effects of commitment to a service employee on intention to stay. *Journal of Service Research*, 5: 356-68.
- Harris, L.C., & Ogbonna, E. (2002). Exploring service sabotage: The antecedents, types, and consequences of front-line, deviant, antiservice behaviours. *Journal of Service Research*, 4(3): 163-183.
- Harris, L.C., & Ogbonna, E. (2006). Service sabotage: A study of antecedents and consequences. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34(10): 543-558.
- Harrison-Walker, L.J. (2001). The measurement of word-of-mouth communication and investigation of service quality and customer commitment as potential antecedents. *Journal of Service Research*, 4: 60-75.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(2): 268.
- Hartline, M. D., Maxham III, J.G., & McKee, D. O. (2000). Corridors of influence in the dissemination of customer-oriented strategy to customer contact service employees. *Journal of Marketing*, 64: 35-50.
- Hays, R. D., Hayashi, T., & Stewart, A. L. (1989). A five-item measure of socially desirable response set. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 49(3): 629-636.
- Henkel, S., Tomczak, T., Heitmann, M., & Herrmann, A. (2007). Managing brand consistent employee behaviour: relevance and managerial control of behavioural branding. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*: 16(5): 310-320.
- Hennig-Thurau, T. (2004). Customer orientation of service employees: Its impact on customer satisfaction, commitment, and retention. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 15(5): 460-478.
- Hennig-Thurau, T., & Klee, A. (1997). The impact of customer satisfaction and relationship quality on customer retention: A critical reassessment and model development. *Psychology & Marketing*, 14(8): 737-764.
- Hennig-Thurau, T., Groth, M., Paul, M., & Gremler, D. D. (2006). Are all smiles created equal? How emotional contagion and emotional labor affect service relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, 70: 58-73.
- Hennig-Thurau, T., Gwinner, K. P., & Gremler, D. D. (2002). Understanding relationship marketing outcomes an integration of relational benefits and relationship quality. *Journal of service research*, 4(3): 230-247.
- Heskett, J.L., Jones, T.O., Loveman, G.W., Sasser, W.E. Jr, and Schlesinger, L.A. (1994). Putting the service profit chain to work. *Harvard business review*, 72(2): 164-174.
- Hinkin, T. R. (1995). A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations. *Journal of Management*, 21(5): 967-988.
- Hoerger, M. (2013).  $Z_H$ : An updated version of Steiger's  $Z$  and web-based calculator for testing the statistical significance of the difference between dependent correlations. Retrieved from [http://www.psychmike.com/dependent\\_correlations.php](http://www.psychmike.com/dependent_correlations.php)
- Hogan, J.E., Lemon, K.N. and Libai, B. (2004). Quantifying the ripple: word of mouth and advertising effectiveness. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 44(3): 271-280.
- Holyoak, K. J. (1991). Symbolic connectionism: Toward third-generation theories of expertise. In K. A. Ericsson & J. Smith (Eds.). *Toward a general theory of expertise*: 301-335. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Homburg, C., Müller, M., & Klarmann, M. (2011). When does salespeople's customer orientation lead to customer loyalty? The differential effects of relational and functional customer orientation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*. 39: 795-812.
- Hooper, D., Coughlan, J., & Mullen, M. R. (2008). Structural equation modelling: Guidelines for determining model fit. *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, 6: 53-60.
- Ind, N. (2001). *Living the Brand*. London: Kogan Page.
- Interbrand (2010). Best global brands. Available at "<http://www.interbrand.com/en/best-global-brands/2013/top-100-list-view.aspx>" [Accessed 26th January 2011].
- Jong, A. D., & De Ruyter, K. (2004). Adaptive versus Proactive Behavior in Service Recovery: The Role of Self-Managing Teams. *Decision Sciences*, 35(3): 457-491.
- Jöreskog, K., & Sörbom, D. (2004). LISREL 8.70. *Chicago: Scientific Software International Inc.*

- Kahn, W.A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33: 692-724.
- Keeling, K. A., McGoldrick, P. J., & Sadhu, H. (2013). Staff Word-of-Mouth (SWOM) and retail employee recruitment. *Journal of Retailing*.
- Kidwell, R.E. & Bennett, N. (1993). Employee propensity to withhold effort. A conceptual model to intersect three avenues of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 18: 429-456.
- King, C. and Grace, D. (2012). Examining the antecedents of positive employee brand-related attitudes and behaviours. *European Journal of Marketing*, 46: 469 – 488.
- King, C., & Grace, D. (2010). Building and measuring employee-based brand equity. *European Journal of Marketing*, 44(7/8): 938-971.
- King, C., Grace, D., & Funk, D. C. (2011). Employee brand equity: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Brand Management*, 19(4): 268-288.
- Kline, R.B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling (2nd Edition)*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Kunz, W. & Hogreve, J. (2011). Toward a Deeper Understanding of Services Marketing: The Past, the Present, and the Future. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 28(3): 231-247.
- Lai, F., Griffin, M., & Babin, B. J. (2009). How quality, value, image, and satisfaction create loyalty at a Chinese telecom. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(10): 980-986.
- Laroche, M., McDougall, J., Bergeron, J., & Yang, Z. (2004). Exploring how intangibility affects perceived risk. *Journal of Service Research*, 6(4): 373-389.
- Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personnel psychology*, 28(4): 563-575.
- Leek, S., & Christodoulides, G. (2012). A framework of brand value in B2B markets: The contributing role of functional and emotional components. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 41(1): 106-114.
- Leslie de Chernatony, Susan Drury & Susan Segal-Horn (2003). Building a Services Brand: Stages, People and Orientations. *The Service Industries Journal*, 23(3): 1-21
- Liao, H. & Chuang, A. (2004). A multilevel investigation of factors influencing employee service performance and customer outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47: 41-58.
- Liao, H. & Chuang, A. (2007). Transforming service employees and climate: A multilevel multi-source examination of transformational leadership in building long-term service relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 1006-1019.
- Liao, H. (2007). Do it right this time: The role of employee service recovery performance in customer-perceived justice and customer loyalty after service failures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 475-489.
- Lusch, R. F., Boyt, T., & Schuler, D. (1996). Employees as customers: The role of social controls and employee socialization in developing patronage. *Journal of Business Research*, 35(3): 179-187.
- Lynch, J., & de Chernatony, L. (2007). Winning hearts and minds: business-to-business branding and the role of the salesperson. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 23: 123-135.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., and Fetter, R. (1991). Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons' performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50: 123-150.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., and Fetter, R. (1993). The impact of organizational behavior on evaluations of salesperson performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 57: 70-80.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., and Rich, G. A. (2001). Transformational and transactional leadership and salesperson performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 29: 115-34.
- Marcus, H., & Zajonc, R. B. (1985). *The cognitive perspective in social psychology*. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 137-230). NY: New York.
- Marquardt, A. J., Golicic, S. L., Davis, D. F. (2011). B2B services branding in the logistics services industry. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 25: 47-57.
- Mathieu, J. E. & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108: 171-194.
- Mazzarol, T., Sweeney, J. C., & Soutar, G. N. (2007). Conceptualizing word-of-mouth activity, triggers and conditions: an exploratory study. *European Journal of Marketing*, 41(11/12): 1475-1494.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, 1(1): 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of applied psychology*, 78(4): 538.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61: 20-52.
- Miles, S. J. and Mangold, G. (2004). A Conceptualization of the Employee Branding Process. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, 3, 65-87.
- Morhart, F. M., Herzog, W., & Tomczak, T. (2009). Brand specific leadership: Turning employees into brand champions. *Journal of Marketing*, 73: 122-142.
- Morrison, S. & Crane, F. (2007). Building the service brand by creating and managing an emotional brand experience. *Journal of Brand Management*, 14 (5): 410 – 421 .

- Murphy, K.R. (1993). *Honesty in the workplace*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Nunnally, J. C. and Bernstein, I. H. (1994), *Psychometric Theory*, 3d ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- O'Loughlin, D., Szmigin, I. & Turnbull, P. (2004). Branding and relationships: customer and supplier perspectives. *Journal of Financial Services Marketing*, 8: 218-30.
- Oldham, G. R., & Hackman, J. R. (2010). Not what it was and not what it will be: The future of job design research. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 31(2-3): 463-479.
- Oliver, R. L. (1997). *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*. Irwin/McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Oliver, R. L. (1999). Whence consumer loyalty? *The Journal of Marketing*, 33-44.
- Onkvisit, S. and Shaw, J.J. (1991). Is services marketing really different? *Journal of Professional Services Marketing*, 7: 3-17.
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of applied psychology*, 71(3): 492.
- Organization*, 5(1): 27-53.
- Ostrom, A. L., Bitner, M. J., Brown, S. W., Burkhard, K. A., Goul, M., Smith-Daniels, V., Rabinovich, E. (2010). Moving forward and making a difference: Research priorities for the science of service. *Journal of Service Research*, 13(1): 4-36.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V., & Berry, L. (1985). A conceptual model of services quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49: 41-50.
- Peccei, R., & Rosenthal, P. (1997). The antecedents of employee commitment to customer service: Evidence from a UK service context. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 8: 66-86.
- Piercy, N.F., Cravens, D.W., Lane, N., and Vorhies, D.W. (2006). Driving organizational citizenship behaviors and salesperson in-role behavior performance: the role of management control and perceived organizational support. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34: 244-62.
- Pinder, C. C. (2008). *Work motivation in organizational behavior*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1): 122.
- Podsakoff, P. M. and MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviour and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31: 351-363.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63: 539-569.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of applied psychology*, 88(5): 879.
- Punjaisri, K. & Wilson, A. (2011). Internal branding process: key mechanisms, outcomes and moderating factors. *European Journal of Marketing*, 45(9/10): 1521 - 1537.
- Punjaisri, K. and Wilson, A. (2007). The role of internal branding in the delivery of employee brand promise, *Journal of Brand Management*, 15:57-70.
- Rank, J., Carsten, J. M., Unger, J. M., & Spector, P. E. (2007). Proactive customer service performance: Relationships with individual, task, and leadership variables. *Human Performance*, 20:363-390.
- Raub, S.P. & Liao, H. (2012). Doing the right thing without being told: Joint effects of initiative climate and general self-efficacy on employee proactive customer service performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97: 651-667.
- Rauyruen, P., & Miller, K.E. (2007). Relationship quality as a predictor of B2B customer loyalty. *Journal of Business Research*, 60, 21-31.
- Reichheld, F. F. (1993). Loyalty-based management. *Harvard business review*, 71(2): 64-73.
- Reichheld, F. F. (1996). Learning from customer defections. *Harvard Business Review*, 74(2): 56.
- Reichheld, F. F. (2001). *The loyalty effect: The hidden force behind growth, profits, and lasting value*. Harvard Business Press.
- Reichheld, F. F., & Teal, T. (1996). *The loyalty effect: The hidden force behind growth, profits and lasting value* (Boston, MA, Harvard Business School Press).
- Reynolds, W. M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-crowne social desirability scale. *Journal of clinical psychology*, 38(1): 119-125.
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: the contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of applied psychology*, 86(5): 825.
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: the contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of applied psychology*, 86(5): 825.
- Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3): 617-635.
- Richins, M. L. (1987). A Multivariate Analysis of Responses to Dissatisfaction. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 15: 24-31.

- Riketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(3): 257-266.
- Rosse, J.G. (1988). Relations among lateness, absence, and turnover: Is there a progression of withdrawal? *Human Relations*, 41: 517-531.
- Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: a policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 66.
- Rucci, A. J., Kirn, S. P., & Quinn, R. T. (1998). The employee-customer-profit chain at Sears. *Harvard Business Review*, 76: 82-98.
- Sabine M. (2010). Characteristics of services - a new approach uncovers their value, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 24(5): 359 – 368.
- Saks, A. M. (2005). The impracticality of recruitment research. In A. Evers, N. Anderson, & O. Voskuil (Eds.). *Handbook of Personnel Selection*: 419-439. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7): 600-619.
- Sartain, L. (2005). Branding from the inside out at Yahoo!: HR's role as brand builder. *Human Resource Management*, 44: 89-93.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire a cross-national study. *Educational and psychological Measurement*, 66(4): 701-716.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire a cross-national study. *Educational and psychological Measurement*, 66(4): 701-716.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness studies*, 3(1): 71-92.
- Schneider, B., White, S. S., & Paul, M. C. (1998). Linking service climate and customer perceptions of service quality: Tests of a causal model. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 83(2): 150.
- Shore, L. M., & Martin, H. J. (1989). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment in relation to work performance and turnover intentions. *Human Relations*, 42(7): 625-638.
- Shuck, B., Reio Jr, T. G., & Rocco, T. S. (2011). Employee engagement: An examination of antecedent and outcome variables. *Human resource development international*, 14(4): 427-445.
- Silverman, G. (2001). *Secrets of Word-of-Mouth Marketing*, AMACOM Books, New York, NY.
- Singh, J. (2000). Performance productivity and quality of frontline employees in service organizations. *Journal of Marketing*, 64: 15-34.
- Söderlund, M., & Rosengren, S. (2004). Dismantling 'positive affect' and its effects on customer satisfaction: an empirical examination of customer joy in a service encounter. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 17: 27-41.
- Söderlund, M., & Rosengren, S. (2008). Revisiting the smiling service worker and customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 19(5): 552-574.
- Soderlund, M., Rosengren, S. (2008). Revisiting the smiling service worker and customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 19: 552-574.
- Soderlund, M., Rosengren, S., (2004). Dismantling positive affect and its effects on customer satisfaction: an empirical examination of customer enjoying a service encounter. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 17: 27-41.
- Sonnentag, S., Frese, M., (2002). Performance concepts and performance theory. In: Sonnentag, S. (Ed.), *Psychological Management of Individual Performance: A Handbook in the Psychology of Management in Organizations*. Wiley, Chichester, pp. 3-25.
- Spector, P. E. (1992) *Summated Rating Scale Construction: An Introduction*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Spitzmuller, M., Van Dyne, L., & Ilies, R. (2008). Organizational citizenship behavior: A review and extension of its nomological network. In J. Barling & C.L. Cooper (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational behavior*: 106-123. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Srinivasan, V., Park, C. S., & Chang, D. R. (2005). An approach to the measurement, analysis, and prediction of brand equity and its sources. *Management Science*, 51(9): 1433-1448.
- Steiger, J. H. (1980). Tests for comparing elements of a correlation matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 87: 245-251.
- Stumpf, S. A., Colarelli, S. M., & Hartman, K. (1983). Development of the career exploration survey (CES). *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 22(2): 191-226.
- Sturdy, A. (1998). Customer care in a consumer society: smiling and sometimes meaning it.
- Thompson, J. (2008) Best global brands: Lessons learned .22 September, [http://www.brandchannel.com/features\\_effect.asp?pf\\_id=441](http://www.brandchannel.com/features_effect.asp?pf_id=441).
- Tse, D. K., & Wilton, P. C. (1988). Models of consumer satisfaction formation: an extension. *Journal of marketing research*, 204-212.
- Tziner, A. & Vardi, Y. (1984). Work satisfaction and absenteeism among social workers: The role of altruistic values. *Work and Occupations*, 11: 461-470.
- VanAuken, B. (2003). *Brand aid: an easy reference guide to solving your toughest branding problems and strengthening your market position*. New York: American Management Association.



- Vandaele D. Gemmel P. (2006). Boundary-spanning behavior of frontline service employees: impact on performance productivity and quality. *Proceedings of 2006 Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management*, Atlanta, Georgia, United States August 11-16, 2006.
- V-W.Mitchell & M. Greatedorex (1993). Risk Perception and Reduction in the Purchase of Consumer Services. *The Service Industries Journal*, 13(4): 179-200.
- Wallace, E, deChernatony, L (2008). Classifying, identifying and managing the service brand saboteur. *Service Industries Journal*, 28: 151-165.
- Wallace, E; de Chernatony, L (2007). Exploring Managers' views about Brand Saboteurs. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 23(1-2): 91-105.
- Wallace, E; de Chernatony, L (2009). Exploring Brand Sabotage in Retail Banking. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 18 (3):198-211.
- Webster, F. (2000). Understanding the relationships among brands, consumers and resellers. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, 28: 17-23.
- Webster, F. and Keller, K. L. (2004). A roadmap for branding in industrial markets. *Journal of Brand Management*, 11: 388-402.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1994). An alternative approach to method effects by using latent-variable models: Applications in organizational behavior research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(3): 323.
- Williams, L. J., and Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17: 601- 617.
- Williams, L. J., Gavin, M. B., & Williams, M. L. (1996). Measurement and nonmeasurement processes with negative affectivity and employee attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(1): 88.
- Winsted, K. F. (2000). Service behaviors that lead to satisfied customers. *European Journal of Marketing*, 34: 399-417.
- Xiong, L., & King, C. (2013, January). Employee Brand Understanding: A New Perspective in Measuring the Effectiveness of Internal Brand Management. In *The 18th Annual Graduate Education and Graduate Student Research Conference in Hospitality and Tourism*.
- Xiong, L., King, C., & Piehler, R. (2013). "That's not my job": Exploring the employee perspective in the development of brand ambassadors. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 35: 348-359.
- Xiong, L., King, C., & Piehler, R. (2013). "That's not my job": Exploring the employee perspective in the development of brand ambassadors. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 35: 348-359.
- Zeithaml, V. A., Bitner, M. J., Gremler, D. D., & Pandit, A. (2011). *Services Marketing: Integrating Customer Focus Across the Firm* (5<sup>th</sup> Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Zeithaml, V. A., Parasuraman, A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). Problems and strategies in service marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(2): 33-46.
- Zeithaml, V. and Bitner, M.J. (1996). *Services Marketing*. McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Zeithaml, V.A., Berry, L.L. & Parasuraman, A. (1988). Communication and control processes in the delivery of service quality. *Journal of Marketing*, 52: 35-48.
- Zottoli, M. A. and Wanous, J. P. (2000). Recruitment source research: Current status and future directions. *Human Resource Management Review*, 10: 353-382.

## Indian Institute of Management Kozhikode

<i>Type of Document</i> <b>(Working Paper/Case/ Teaching Note, etc.)</b>	<i>Ref. No.: (to be filled by RCP office)</i>
<b>Working Paper</b>	<b>IIMK/WPS/153/OBHR /2014/11</b>
<i>Title:</i> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>EMPLOYEE BRAND BUILDING BEHAVIOR: SCALE DEVELOPMENT &amp; VALIDATION IN B2B SERVICES CONTEXT</b></p>	
<i>Author(s):</i>	<i>Institution(s)</i>
HemangJauhari	Doctoral Scholar (OB and HRM) Indian Institute of Management, Lucknow hemang.jauhari@gmail.com +919458475027
Manish Kumar	Assistant Professor, Organizational Behaviour & Human Resource Management Area, Indian Institute of Management Kozhikode
Shailendra Singh	Professor (OB and HRM) Indian Institute of Management, Lucknow shail@iiml.ac.in +919450930055
<i>Subject Areas :</i> <b>Organizational Learning</b>	<i>Subject Classification Codes, if any:</i>
<i>Supporting Agencies, if any:</i> NA	<i>Research Grant/Project No.(s):</i> NA
<i>Supplementary Information, if any:</i> NA	<i>Date of Issue: (to be filled by RCP office)</i> <b>March 2014</b>
<i>Full text or only abstract to be uploaded on website: (please choose one)</i>	<i>Number of Pages:</i> <b>43</b>
<b>Abstract:</b>  <p><i>Frontline service employees (FSEs) make or break a brand. Especially, in B2B services, their attitudes and behaviors are crucial in shaping valuable customer-related outcomes for a services firm/brand. Service firms are increasingly focusing on internal brand management to develop Brand Champions, who can live the brand and ensure its sustenance. However, the progress in this area has been marred due to infancy of research. In this paper, we address a major gap in this area pertaining to the conceptualization and measurement of behavior of Brand Champions, which is termed as Employee Brand Building Behavior (EBBB). In this study, we follow a five-step approach for developing and validating a scale of EBBB, using data from six samples of FSEs working in B2B services (N = 1886). First, using insights from literature and 25 in-depth interviews, we conceptualize EBBB and generate a pool of items. Second, we perform exploratory factor analysis for scale purification and examining the factor structure. Third, we check for the convergent and divergent validity of the EBBB dimensions, using confirmatory factor analysis. Fourth, we examine the scale for method effects. And finally, we test for the nomological validity of EBBB. This EBBB scale will be a great utility for practitioners and academicians, who wish to make contributions to the practice and theory of internal brand management.</i></p>	
<b>Key Words/Phrases:</b> <i>Employee brand building behavior; employee behavior; scale development; frontline service employee; internal brand management; business services; Indian context</i>	
<i>Referencing Style Followed:</i>	

Research, Conference And Publication Office

Indian Institute Of Management Kozhikode

IIMK Campus P.O., Kozhikode 673 570

Kerala, India

Telephone +91 495 2809 238

E-mail [rcp@iimk.ac.in](mailto:rcp@iimk.ac.in)

website [www.iimk.ac.in](http://www.iimk.ac.in)