10th International Strategic Management Conference

The Relationship between Internal Branding and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: The Mediating Role of Person-Organization Fit

Gaye Özçelik[a] , Mine Afacan Fındıklı[b], a[*]

[a] Okan University, İstanbul, 34722 , Turkey
[b]İstanbul Gelişim University, Istanbul, Turkey

Abstract

This study is an effort to examine an association between Internal Branding (IB) and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) with the mediator role of a Person-Organization fit (P-O fit). The main goal is to integrate internal branding and organizational citizenship behavior and reveal the potential relationships between the two constructs. A survey questionnaire form was used to collect data and 349 employees, who currently work in an organization, participated in the study. The findings showed that there is a significant association between internal branding and organizational citizenship behavior. On the other hand, it was found that person-organization fit does not mediate the relationship between internal branding and citizenship behaviour.

1. Introduction

Building strong brands through fostering positive customer experience and creating high customer loyalty is an extremely challenging but also a considerably significant route to achieve sustainable competitive advantage for organizations today. Top management calls for not only marketing and sales departments and/or direct customer-connected employees but the whole organization members to internalize the brand's identity, translate brand values into their everyday work attitudes and behaviours and to become brand ambassadors (Asha & Jyothni, 2013; Burman, Zeplin, & Riley, 2009; Burmann, & Zeplin, 2005; Ind, 2001).

Organizations expect their employees to be the pioneers of the employer brand who consistently deliver on the brand promise across all contact points, who are proud to speak in favour of the employer brand and the organization itself and to work for the organization (Asha & Jyothi, 2013). However, for this to happen, employees should first identify themselves with the brand values. When employees identify themselves with the brand, they will act in the way that supports the brand identity, which will develop brand commitment. Commitment to the employer brand will facilitate employees deliver on the brand promise across all stakeholders including customers. Before employees get motivated to fully meet external customers satisfaction, they must internalize the brand and its values (Miles and Mangold, 2004). For this reason, internal branding (IB) or internal brand management (IBM) is considered as a significant strategic process within the organization (Asha & Jyothi, 2011).

[*] *Corresponding author. Tel. + 90-216 6771630 - 2884. Fax. +90-2166771667.*

Email address: gaye.ozcelik@okan.edu.tr.

Identification with the brand is argued to be enhanced by certain behavioural characteristics performed by employees, which are neither forced nor rewarded by the organizations (Asha & Jyothi, 2013). These behaviours are also termed as "extra-role activities" and when individuals perform them, they are seen as having an intrinsic motivation on the individual. These extra-role behaviours are termed as Organizational Citizenship Behaviours (OCB), which refer to informal and voluntary conducts by employees at work (Podsakoff, et. al., 2000). Van Dyne et. al. (1995; p.218) also define these "extra-role behaviours" as "behaviour which benefit the organization…, which is discretionary and which goes beyond existing role expectations."

The rising interest in the area of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) has been found to have a positive influence on organizational effectiveness and an engaged workforce (Burmann, et. al. 2005). These behaviours would include punctuality, altruism, being conscientic, etc. Internal branding (IB) is also found to have a positive impact on attitudinal and behavioural aspects of employees in the delivery of the brand promise (Asha & Jyothi, 2013). When employees have brand commitment, they can naturally deliver on the brand promise. Commitment helps develop altruism, identification and internalization in the individuals with the organization. In this respect, IB efforts help build ownership of the brand and the organization, leading to citizenship behaviours (Asha & Jyothi, 2013).

Person-organization fit (P-O fit) is stressed as another important dimension for enhancing ownership and citizenship behaviour in literature. Person-organization fit is the degree to which an employee in the organization perceives compatibility within the workplace. It refers to individual's subjective approach about how well their personal values and characteristics are aligned with the company culture (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Cable & Parsons, 2001). When employees have a perception of person-organization fit, they try to make extra contributions to their companies by helping others, supporting co-workers, participating in discretionary organizational activities (Wei, 2012).

Within the explained framework above, this study aims at examining the relationship between internal branding and organizational citizenship behaviour. The study also focuses on the notion that person-organization fit, which is believed to be one of the precursors of OCB (Ruiz-Palomino & Martinez-Canas; 2014), mediates the relationship between internal branding and organizational citizenship behaviour. In this context, the study begins by a literature review of internal branding, organizational citizenship behaviour and person-organization fit. Research methodology and findings will be then presented. The results of analyses will be discussed and recommendations and implications for further research will be provided both for researchers and managers.

1. Literature Review

2.1. Internal Branding

Internal branding is defined as a set of strategic activities of a corporation to provide and ensure intellectual and emotional employee buy-in (Mahnert and Torres, 2007). It is a systematically organized process, which motivates and reinforces employees' acceptable brand behaviour guidelines in their daily work behaviours to help them deliver on the brand promise to customers (Matanda & Ndubisi, 2013). This approach serves employees to develop a feeling of commitment with the brand and the brand values. IB focuses on developing a mutual understanding of objectives, positioning and features of the brand promise, providing compatibility between employees' values and those of the organization and the brand and creating a sense of commitment within employees (Matanda & Ndubisi, 2013).

Internal branding aims to achieve this alignment by promoting the brand inside of an organisation through internal marketing practices (Drake et al., 2005). Apart from the practice of internal marketing it also requires human resource management practices and discipline to ensure internal branding (Punjaisri & Wilson, 2011). In addition, coordination between human resources (HR) and corporate communication that provides internal communication has been claimed to have a supporting effect upon the achievement of a successful internal branding process (Kamalanabhan, 2011:305). In the light of the review of literature, internal branding has been investigated under three dimensions; HR Involvement, Internal Communication & Training (Matanda & Ndubisi, 2013).

2.2. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

To ensure the sustainability of organizations, it is nowadays considered insufficient for the employee to fulfill their tasks just in the context of the job description (Katz, 1964:132) and it is revealed that the employees behaviours beyond specified role definitions lead more positive results (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997; Walz & Rush, 2000; Greenberg & Baron, 2000; Mohanty & Rath, 2012). It is observed that this kind of behaviour could be accepted as organizational citizenship behaviour. Initially called as "pro-social organizational behaviour", this has been named as Organizational citizenship behaviour after the development of the concept of " extra role behaviour". This kind of behaviour is defined as behaviour that is performed in order to help to fulfill the functions efficiently on a voluntary basis and without taking into consideration the formal reward system of the organization (Organ, 1997, s. 86). OCB is job-related, and yet not tied to the formal reward system. In literature, it is observed that OCB behaviour examined in five behaviour types (Organ, 1998)– altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness and civic virtue – (Asha and Jyothi, 2013:41) and helping behaviour, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue and self-development (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

Helping behaviour relates to helping other colleagues as volunteers in work-related problems or relates to the efforts to prevent the occurrence of problems. (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994: 351; Podsakoff, et. al.,, 2000: 517). Sportsmanship behaviour refers to any contribution to the organization's effectiveness and efficiency under unexpected circumstances by means of raising constructive ideas (Podsakoff, et. al., 2000: 517). Organizational commitment can be defined as "the sense of harmonious and strong attachment to the colleagues and the organization". Organizational compliance can be described as "the tendency of accepting and adhering to organizational rules, regulations and procedures" (Lee, et. al., 2013:55). Individual initiative entails the conduct of supporting an organisation by taking responsibilities voluntarily and creating novelties that will enhance organisational performance (Acar, 2006:8). Civic virtue has been defined as "the active involvement in the corporate governance on a macro-level interest basis" (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; 351). Self-development includes voluntary behaviors on the purpose of improving the knowledge, skills, and abilities (Podsakoff et al., 2000). As it can be seen from the above definitions, determined factors are closely related to each other. Organisational citizenship behavior has been identified within the scope of Podsakoff and Mackenzie's scale (1994) and organizational citizenship behavior has investigated under three dimensions; helping behavior, sportsmanship and civic virtue.

Corte and his colleagues report that, job attitudes, task variables, and various types of leadership appear to be more strongly related to the internal branding than the other streams of research (Della Corte et. al., 2012). Asha and Jyothi have also found that internal branding has a positive relationship with organizational citizenship behaviour (Asha & Jyothi, 2013). However, the current literature that investigates the relationship between internal marketing and organizational citizenship behaviour are scarce and more studies are needed to delineate whether there is a real link between these two concepts. So for our study, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 1: Internal branding is significantly associated with organizational citizenship behaviour.

2.3. Person-Organization Fit

P-O fit perception is concerned with the match that individuals perceive between their own values and those of the organization. Individuals who perceive fit with their organization are more satisfied with their job (Jansen & Kristof-Brown, 2006), are more committed to their organization (Cable & Judge, 1996). It is stated that P-O fit perceptions are strongly linked to organizational commitment (Kristof-Brown, et. al., 2005; Van Vianen, et. al., 2011). At the same time, studies indicate that employee's turnover intensions arise in case of incompatibility of P-O fit (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005).

Apparently, Person-organization fit could be evaluated by: (a) a direct measurement of perceived fit, (b) indirect cross-levels measurement of actual fit, or (c) indirect individual-level measurement of actual fit. Direct measurement, as the term implies, is directly and simply questions respondents for the degree of fit that can be present between the person and organization (Ferrat et. al., 2005:146). In this study, a direct approach measuring person – organization fit has been used and fit has been conceptualised as 'needs–satisfaction compatibility between individual and organisational values (Cable & Judge, 1996).

2.3.1 The Relationship between Internal Branding and Person-Organization Fit

Various studies have underlined the concept of person-organization fit, which refers to compatibility between employees own personal values, and the values of the organization and the brand according to the employees' perception. When there is a complete congruence between organizational values and individual brand values of the employees, employees develop a high level of identification with brand values and will be more motivated and committed to become brand ambassadors of them (Khan, 2009; Yaniv & Farkas, 2005; Cable & DeRue, 2002). The compatibility between people's values and organization values has been found to be associated with individual satisfaction, employee commitment, turnover and performance (Chatman, 1989). Brand values and person-organization fit are considered as the outcomes of the internal branding process (Asha & Jyothi, 2011).

Matanda and Ndubisi (2013) reported that internal branding which can be defined as the alignment of a corporation and employees around a brand is positively related to employees' perceived person–organization fit and intention to stay. In an internal brand building context, employees should demonstrate brand-consistent behavior and thus perform roles as brand builders (Vallester & Lindgreen,2012: 2). Burmann and Zeplin (2005) as well as Yaniv and Farkas (2005) proposed that internal brand building can also be related and proportionally be affected by person-organization fit. Likewise, Nicholas (2010) stated that high levels of person-organization fit are beneficial to organization and employees in several aspects including internal branding.

2.3.2. The Relationship between Person-Organization Fit and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

The concept of P-O it) deals with the congruence between the employee's own personal values and the values of the organization, from an employee point of view. In several studies it is revealed that (Chatman,1989; O'Reilly et al., 1991; Cable and Judge,1996,; Chan,1996; Cable and DeRue, 2002) the greater the P-O fit, the more the employees' satisfaction and the greater commitment both to the organization and its goals. Moreover, it is added that (Chatman, 1989; Cable and DeRue ,2002) employees who share the organization's values are more likely to demonstrate 'extra behaviour' (Yaniv and Farkas, 2005).

In this respect, the higher the P-O fit, the more ready employees will be to exert more efforts of extra-role behaviour.(Yaniv & Farkas, 2005). Person-organization fit may be a variable which facilitates the understanding of the link between internal branding and organization-citizenship behaviour. Considering these arguments, we propose that person-organization fit serves as a mediator between these two constructs. So the following hypothesis is formulated:

Hypothesis 2: Person-organization fit mediates the association between internal branding and organizational citizenship behavior.

3.Methodology

3.1. Research Goal

In this survey our objective is identify the relationship between internal branding and organizational citizenship behaviour. The mediating effects of person-organization fit on the relationship between these two constructs are also examined. To test the hypotheses, a field survey in the form of a questionnaire with a total of 35 measurement items was conducted. The study has used a convenience sampling technique. The survey of this study has been conducted on employees from selected organizations in Turkey.

The scale for measuring Internal Branding was borrowed from Matanda and Ndubisi (2010) where they developed a three sub-dimensional construct including human resources involvement in internal branding, training and internal communication. The construct involved 13 measurement items.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) was measured by the scale of Podsakoff and MacKenzie's (1994). The construct was measured with 14 items. The construct is comprised of three sub-dimensions, namely helping behaviour, civic virtue and sportsmanship. MacKenzie, Podsakoff and Fetter (1991,1993) indicates that even though these various forms of OCB may be conceptually distinct, employees and employers have difficulty making these fine distinctions and tend to lump them together (Podsakoff & MacKenzie,1994: 353)**.** The authors have formulated the 'Helping Behavior' dimension by incorporating scales of altruism, courtesy, cheerleading and peacemaking. Responses to the Internal Branding and Organizational Citizenship Behavior scales were obtained using 6 point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) 'Completely Disagree' to (6) 'Completely Agree' response choices.

To measure person-organization fit (P-O fit), the three reflective-item scale of overall fit from Cable and Judge (1996), called "Direct Fit Scale", where an employee's perception of his or her fit with an organization was assessed. The construct involved 3 measurement items. Responses to person-organization fit scale were also achieved using a 6 point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) 'Not at all' to (6) 'Completely' response choices. Data obtained from the participants were analyzed through the SPSS statistical package program and the proposed relations were tested through regression analyses. In addition, participants were asked about demographics, namely, gender, age, experience in the current organization (tenure-in years), education level, total work experience (in years).

The survey questionnaire was prepared in Turkish. Cheng et al.'s (2004) person-organization fit scale was translated to Turkish by Karakurum (2005). In this current study, this translation was used. The English-based Internal Branding and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour instruments were translated into Turkish by professional translators and researchers.

4. Data Analyses and Findings

4.1. Profile of Respondents

The survey of this study was conducted on 349 employees from selected organizations operating in various industries in Turkey. There were non-responded items in 22 questionnaires out of 327. Therefore these 22 questionnaire forms were excluded from the analysis. Therefore, data obtained from 327 employees, 187 of which were female making up 57,2 % of the sample. The age of the participants ranged from 18 years to 60 years. The mean age of the sample is 33. The participants having a university degree and master degree make up the 51 % and 10 % of the sample respectively. The tenure of the employees, which ranged between 1 to 28 years were put into analysis. The mean scores for tenure and total work experience of the participants are 5,65 and 11,14 in years. The details about the profile of respondents are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Sample Profile

Variable	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
Gender					
Female	187	57,2			
Male	140	42,8			
Age			33	7,62	18-60
Education Level					
High School	124	37,9			
University	177	54,1			
Graduate	26	8,00			
Ph.D.	-	-			
Tenure (yrs.)			5,65	5,18	0-28
Total Experience (yrs.)			11,14	8,02	1-37

Table 2 below demonstrates the means, standard deviations, alpha coefficients and correlations of the dimensions under study. It was found that all the inter-correlations were significant and positive as expected. In order to assess the internal consistency among the construct items, Cronbach's alpha coefficient scores were derived. The analysis showed that the coefficients for the constructs IB, P-O fit and OCB are .94, .87 and .78 respectively. The alpha for the scales suggests that there is a high internal consistency among the items. These findings are in congruence with what Nunnally (1978) asserted. He asserted that Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the scales used in research should have an "acceptable" reliability coefficient of at least .70 or higher. An important note is that one of the items in the sportsmanship dimension of OCB construct, namely-"always finds fault with what the company is doing"-was found to have a reliability score (α=.14) less than .30, lowering the Cronbach's alpha score of OCB scale to .72 and therefore this item was excluded from further analysis.

Table 2. Means, Standard Deviations, Coefficient Alphas and Correlations of the Sub-Dimensions

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. IB Factor - HR Involvement	(,708)	,489**	,542**	,286**	,290**	,251**	,528**
2. IB Factor 2- Training	,489**	(0,675)	,834**	,198**	,221**	,072	,530**
3. IB Factor 3- Internal Communication	,542**	,834**	(0,655)	,160**	,199**	,084	,494**
4. OCB Factor 1- Helping Behavior	,286**	,198**	,160**	(0,758)	,374**	,044	,124*
5. OCB Factor 2-Civic Virtue	,290**	,221**	,199**	,374**	(0,211)	-0,04	,192**
6. OCB Factor 3- Sportsmanship	,251**	,072	0,084	0,044	-0,04	(0,784)	,139*
7. Person-Organization Fit	,528**	,530**	,494**	,124*	,192**	,139*	(0,731)
Means	11,084	34,132	12,886	17,121	19,009	14,831	11,125
Standard Deviation	5,611	5,211	3,272	4,861	6,761	5,792	3,785

** $p< .01$, * $p< .05$

The results of the factor analysis of the internal branding scale are demonstrated in Table 3. The internal branding scale has been borrowed from Matanda and Ndubisi (2010), who have developed three sub-dimensions, namely Human Resource Involvement in Branding Processes, Internal Communication and Training. However, in this study the items of training and internal communication were loaded on the same factor. So the IB factors were reduced to two sub dimensions; human resource involvement in branding processes, and Internal Communication & Training. The percentage of variance explained for IB dimensions-HR Involvement in Processes, Training-Internal Communication are 56,571 and 14,237 respectively. The total variance explained for internal branding dimension is 70.808 (%).

Table 4 presents the results of the factor analysis for organizational citizenship behavior scale. The percentage of variance explained for OCB dimensions-Helping behavior, Civic Virtue and Sportsmanship are 29,023, 19,698 and 12,000 respectively. The total variance explained for OCB is 60.721 (%).

Table 3. Factor Analysis for Internal Branding

	Components	
	HR Involvement	Internal Communication
INTERNAL BRANDING - Total Explained Variance for IB: 70,808 (%)		
Factor 1: HR Involvement, *% of Variance Explained (56.571 %), Mean: 17.121 Standard Deviation: 4.861*		
I use knowledge about the company brand to perform my job.	0,876	
Our organisation's brand values guide the way I deal with customers	0,866	
I am aware of the skills I need to deliver brand values.	0,860	
Brand values are included during our training in this organisation.	0,642	
Factor 2: Internal Communication& Training, *% of Variance Explained (14.237 %), Mean: 16.924 Standard Deviation: 5.795*		
I am adequately informed about my company's financial position		0,651
I am made aware of the overall policies and goals of my organisation		0,732
I receive communication from the personnel department on a regular basis		0,833
Written communication (newsletters, memos) are adequate within this organization		0,727
I am regularly notified of important changes that occur in my organisation		0,799
The training provided by my organisation enables me to deliver the brand promise		0,834
My organisation informs employees in a good way the things that are relevant to them		0,840
We are encouraged to suggest ways to improve our organization.		0,869
People who work here are encouraged to come up with new ideas to improve our organisation		0,842

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

a.Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

Table 4. Factor Analysis for Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

	Components		
	Helping Behavior	Civic Virtue	Sportsmanship
ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR - *Total Explained Variance for OCB: 60,721 (%)*			
Factor 1: Helping Behaviour, *% of Variance Explained (29.023 %), Mean: 34.133 Standard Deviation: 5.281*			
Willingly gives of his or her time to help other agents who have work-related problems	0,737		
Is willing to take time out of his or her own busy schedule to help with recruiting or training new agents	0,763		
"Touches base" with other before initiating actions that might affect them	0,681		
Takes steps to try to prevent problems with other agents and/or other personnel in the company	0,675		
Encourages other agents when they are down	0,703		
Acts as a "peacemaker" when others in the agency have disagreements	0,567		
Is a stabilizing influence in the agency when dissention occurs	0,589		
Factor 2: Civic Virtue, *% of Variance Explained (19.698 %), Mean: 12.887 Standard Deviation:3.278*			
Attends functions that are not required but help the company image		0,788	
Attends training/information sessions that agents are encouraged but not required to attend		0,831	
Attends and actively participates in agency meetings		0,718	
Factor 3: Sportsmanship, *% of Variance Explained (12.000 %), Mean: 14.616 Standard Deviation:6.082*			
Consumes a lot of time complaining about trivial matters			0,908
Tends to make "mountains out of molehills" makes problems bigger than they are			0,943
Always focuses on what is wrong with this or her situation rather than the positive side of it			0,903

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

a.Rotation converged in 4 iterations.

Results of the regression analyses are presented in Table 5. According to the results, internal branding (β=,339; p:,000) had a significant relationship to organizational citizenship behavior. The standard error for this raw regression coefficient is .03. The analysis showed that less than 12 percent of the variability in brand supporting behaviors of employees can be accounted for by organizational citizenship behavior of employees. Although internal branding was not accounting for a huge amount of prediction, results were still significant. This means that H1 is supported.

Table 5. Results of Mediated Multiple Regression (Mediator analysis)

	Person-organization Fit (Mediator)	Organizational-Citizenship Behavior (Dependent Variable)	
Independent variables	*Model 1*	*Model 2*	*Model 3*
	Standardized β Coefficient	*Standardized β Coefficients*	
Internal Branding	0.594**	0.339**	0.292**
Person-Organization Fit			0.078
R^2/ Adjusted R^2	0.352 / 0.350	0.115 / 0.112	0.119 / 0.113

** Significant at the 0.01 level

In order to conduct the regression analyses and testing for mediation in the meantime, the three conditions should be met in order to decide whether mediation has occurred (Baron & Kenny, 1986). These conditions pertain to whether;

   i)   internal branding is associated with OCB,
   ii) internal branding is associated with P-O fit (direct effect),
   iii) Internal branding is associated with OCB, together with P-O fit dimension.

As the organizational citizenship behavior was regressed on internal branding behavior supporting H1, the first requirement for mediation analysis was met at the same time. Secondly the result of analysis as to whether, person-organization fit was regressed on internal branding or not, presented that employee branding (β=,594; Adjusted R^2=,350, p:,000) had a significant relationship to P-O fit. Third step was where the internal branding and person-organization fit dimensions were used simultaneously to predict the organizational citizenship behavior in the regression analyses. The previously significant path between the IB and OCB (β=,594; p:.000) was reduced to β=.292 at the 0.01 significance level and the result was significant. However, the criterion that P-O fit should be a significant predictor of the OCB was not found (β=,078; p:,247). Therefore, one of correlation coefficients for the path moderating variable-dependent variable (MV-DV) measuring the direct effect is found to be statistically insignificant (Table 5). So, the mediated regression analysis results show that the P-O fit does not significantly mediate the relationship between internal branding and organizational citizenship behavior. The findings support neither full nor partial mediation. So the results do not support H2 hypothesis.

5. Conclusion

The study explored the extent to which internal branding was associated with their citizenship behaviors in the organizations. In addition, the study aimed at discovering whether the congruence of employees' perceived values with values of the organization provided a mediating role in the relationship between employees feeling of commitment with the brand and employees' citizenship behaviors towards their organizations. The findings of this study presented that the degree of association between internal branding and citizenship behaviors of employees were not so strong, the results indicated a certain degree of congruence between the two dimensions. This result is consistent with the recent research. For instance Asha and Jyothi (2013) reported a positive and significant correlation between internal branding and organizational citizenship behavior. The more committed the employees were to the brand, the more citizenship behaviors they exhibited in their interaction with the people in the organizations.

The literature shows that employees' commitment with the brand and brand values engenders employees develop an intrinsic motivation for promoting the excellence of their organizations. They easily try to make extra efforts for their organizations, which are called "extra-role behaviors" by helping others, supporting coworkers, participating in discretionary organizational activities. Developing feelings of citizenship is an important determinant for improving organizational performance. Employees develop their perceptions about their organizations' intentions from their HR policies and practices in the sense that HR practices convey information from the organization to its employees (Wei, et. al., 2010). This helps employees develop positive perceptions and attitudes for working in the organization. Ensuring employees being 'good-citizens' at the workplace can be linked to employee's brand commitment and their willingness to demonstrate extra effort towards reaching the brand's goals. In that sense, not only the function of HR but also function of marketing should be working in congruence for creating brand ambassadors. So managerial

functions in organizations should successfully guide the experiences of employees in organizations about the brand and brand values.

The study tried to contribute to research field, through including internal branding, organizational citizenship behaviour and person-organization fit all together. However though, the study indicated that there was no mediation of the person-organization fit dimension in the relationship between internal branding and organizational citizenship behaviour. This result may be attributed to the fact that internal branding is a relatively new concept for national academic environment as well as literature and might not be deliberately implemented in many organizations. Not many research have focused on the link between employees brand pioneering behaviors and their effort to do extra work for the organization. Therefore, the participants in our sample might be unable to develop an understanding of internal brand management. So a link between P-O fit and internal branding might then be hard to be established.

Some limitations of the study should also be noted. Since "convenience sampling" methodology was used to determine the study population, the method of sampling can be regarded as a limitation by definition. Further focus and attention should be devoted in the coming studies to purposefully select those organizations, which strategically aim at internal branding initiatives. Another limitation can be the scale that has been used in the current study. When defining the internal branding scale, translation-back translation method was employed. Although every item in the scale was analysed and approved by experienced academics, when the statements in the scale context were evaluated, they were clearly found to point out a corporate structure and an innovative management approach that bring the internal branding in the frontline. Yet for this study, a brand pioneering perspective might have not been cultivated in employees working for these organizations.

This study tries to be a prologue for further research in the areas of internal branding and organizational studies. From an international perspective, it is mostly seen as a projection of various marketing strategies in the contemporary scientific publications. Implementation of this research in well-structured corporations with a strrong-internal branding focus can help us to reveal the possible existence of such relationships within the study boundaries. In this manner, it can be possible not only to study P-O fit and OCB dimensions but also the study can be extended to other sub topics of organizational behavior field and possible positive contributions of internal branding on corporate outcomes can be investigated.

References

Acar, Zafer A. (2006), Örgütsel Yurttaşlık Davranışı: Kavramsal Gelişimi ile Kişisel ve Örgütsel Etkileri, DoğuşÜniversitesi Dergisi, 7(1): 1-14.

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

Asha, C. S., & Jyothi, P. (2011). Internal Branding: Exploring the Employee's Perspective, *Journal of Economic Development, Management*, IT, Finance and Marketing, 3(2), 1-27.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173.

Berry, W. D., & Feldman. S. (1985). *Multiple Regression in Practice: Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences*, 07-050. Newbury Park: CA: Sage.

Burmann, C., & Zeplin, S. (2005). Building brand commitment: A behavioural approach to internal brand management. *Journal of Brand Management*, 12(4): 279–300.

Burmann, C., Zeplin, S., & Riley, N. (2009). Key determinants of internal brand management success: An exploratory empirical analysis, *Brand Management*, 16 (4), 264-284.

Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1996). Person-organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, 67, 294–311.

Cable, D. M., & DeRue, D. S. (2002). The convergent and discriminant validity of subjective fit perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 875–884.

Cable, D. M., & Parsons, C. R. (2001). Person‐organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior and HumanDecision Processes*, 54, 1‐23.

Chatman, J.A. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: a model of person-organization fit, *Academy of Management Review*, 14(3), 333–349.

Della Corte, V; Mangia, G,; Cascella, C.; Zamparelli, G.; Tomo, A. (2012). Employer Branding Management As A Strategic and Organizational Control Tool. *Chinese Business Review*,11,11, pp. 996-1014.

Ferrat, Thomas, W.; Enns, Harvey, G.; Prasad, Jayesh (2005) .An Emprical comparison of direct and indirect measures of person-organization fit (P-O) Fit, SIGMIS-CPR'05, April 14–16, 2005, Atlanta, Georgia.

Greenberg, J., & Baron, R. (2000). *Behavior in Organizations: Understanding and Managing the HumanSide of Work*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Ind, N. (2001). *Living the Brand: How to Transform Every Member of Your Organization into a Brand Champion*. Kogan Page: London.

Jansen, K. J., & Kristof-Brown, A. (2006). Toward a multidimensional theory of person-environment fit. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 18, 193–212.

Karakurum, M. (2005). *The Effects of Person-Organization Fit on Employee Job Satisfaction, Performance and Organizational Commitment in a Turkish Public Organization*, Masters Thesis in Psychology. Graduate School of Social Sciences, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Katz, D. (1964). Motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9: 131–146.

Khan, B. M. (2009). Internal Branding: Aligning Human Capital Strategy with Brand Strategy, The Icfai University, *Journal of Brand Management*, 6(2), 22-26.

Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 281–342.

Miles, S. J. & Mangold, G. (2004). A Conceptualization of the Employee Branding Process, *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, 3 (2/3), 65-87.

Mahnert, K. E., & Torres A. M. (2007). The Brand Inside: The Factors of Failure and Success in Internal Branding, *Irish Marketing Review*, 19(1/2), 54-63.

Matanda, M. J., & Ndubisi, N. O. (2013). Internal marketing, internal branding, and organizational outcomes: The moderating role of perceived goal congruence, *Journal of Marketing Management*, 29(9-10=, 1030-1055.

Mohanty, J., & Rath, B. (2012). Influence of Organizational Culture on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Three-sector Study. *Global Journal of Business Research* , 6 (1), 65-76.

Nicholas, M. (2010). Harnessing high person-organization fit to enhance employee outcomes: Best practice suggestions for managers, *Management thesis of The College Of St. Scholastica*, 1-77.

Nunnally J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

O'Reilly, C., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D.F. (1991) People and organizational culture: a profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit, *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(3), pp. 487–516

Organ, D. (1997). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: It's Construct Clean-Up Time. *Human Performance*, 10 (2), 85-97.

Organ, D. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington, MA:Lexington Books.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B. and Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Critical Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research, *Journal of Management*, 26 (3), 513-563.

Podsakoff, P., & MacKenzie, S. (1994). Organizational Citizenship behaviors and Sales Unit Effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research* , 31 (1).

Podsakoff, P., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. (1997). Organizational Citizenship Behavior and The Quantity and Quality of Work Group Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* , 82 (2).

Ruiz-Palomino, P. & Martinez-Canas, R. (2014). Ethical Culture, Ethical Intent, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Moderating and Mediating Role of Person–Organization Fit. Journal of Business Ethcis, 120, 95-108.

Vallaster, C., & Lindgreen, A. (2012). The role of social interactions in building internal corporate brands: Implications for sustainability. *Journal of World Business*. 1-14. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2012.07.014

Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L, & McLean Parks, J. (1995). Extra role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (a bridge over muddied waters). *Research in Organizational Behavior*, In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), 17, 215-285.

Van Vianen, A., Shen, C., & Chuang, A. (2011). Person-organization and person-supervisor fits: Employee commitments in China context. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* , 32, 906-926.

Walz, S., & Rush, M. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: Their relationship to organizational effectiveness. Journal of Hospitality and Tourism , 24 (3), 301-319.

Wei, Y-C. (2012). Person-Organization Fit and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Time Perspective, Journal of Management and Organization, 18(6), 833-844.

Yaniv, E. & Farkas, F. (2005). The Impact of Person-Organization Fit on the Corporate Brand Perception of Employees and of Customers. Journal of Change Management 5(4). 447-461.