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Abstract

Purpose This research studies the effect of internal branding on brand supporting behaviour (in-role and extra-role) of bank employees in Egypt. It proposes a model which examines the relationship between internal branding and employees’ brand supporting behaviour, mediated by employees’ role clarity, affective commitment, and continuance commitment, in order to provide insights into the way in which employees can become brand champions.

Design/Methodology/Approach A single cross-sectional descriptive research was employed. A questionnaire was used to collect data from 400 frontline bank employees. Confirmatory Factor Analysis was used to test the validity of the scales, and Structural Equation Modelling was used to test the research hypotheses.

Findings The results showed that internal branding did not have a direct significant impact on employees’ in-role and extra-role behaviour. However, that impact only took place through employees’ role clarity and their affective commitment.

Implications The findings suggest that banks can differentiate their offers and build powerful corporate brands through their employees’ brand supporting behaviour. Therefore, bank managers need to consider internal branding within the context of a corporate marketing orientation. Moreover, enhancing employees’ role clarity and affective commitment will ensure sustainable brand supporting behaviour.

Originality This research is the first quantitative study to examine the impact of role clarity and continuance commitment as possible mediators to the proposed relationship. It further adds up to the internal branding literature, which is mostly qualitative or conceptual and thus suffers from limited conclusive evidence in terms of internal branding benefits and practical implications.
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1. Introduction

The intense competition nowadays has made customers approach many mature products as commodities (Ferrell and Hartline, 2008). More companies are now faced with difficulties in differentiating their offers, especially service companies where managers find themselves challenged by the intangibility, inseparability and variability of services (Wallace and de Chernatony, 2009). However, service variability can be considered as both “a cure and a curse” for the service company (Zeithaml and Bitner, 2003): a cure, because it can be used in differentiating organisational associations, building strong corporate brands, and winning competition; a curse, due to the difficulties of branding intangible offers (Aaker, 2004; Papasolomou and Vrontis, 2006).

Generally, organisational associations define any corporate brand, associations in terms of its heritage, ability to deliver customer value, employees, brand values (priorities), and
performance records (Aaker, 2004). More specifically, corporate brands can be viewed as a group of functional and emotional benefits (Balmer, 2001). In today’s competitive environment, providing functional benefits only (e.g. self-service technology) is no longer a source of sustainable competitive advantage; hence, organisations tend to focus on the emotional benefits of their value propositions, such as employees’ skills, knowledge, interactivity, and on-going relationships. These benefits are derived from the buying experience (Aaker, 2004; Balmer, 1995; Harris and de Chernatony, 2001; King and Grace, 2010). Consequently, employees are considered the foundation of the corporate brand (Aaker, 2004). In fact, they are the service brand (Wallace and de Chernatony, 2009), since they have a major role in translating the corporate identity, in the short run, into image and, in the long run, into reputation ( Balmer, 2013; Halliburton and Bach, 2012). Alternatively, they can reduce the credibility of the advertised message if their behaviour does not reinforce the communicated corporate brand values (Harris and de Chernatony, 2001).

Admittedly, corporate branding literature, from early on, has shed light on the essential role that employees play in corporate brand building (King, 1991, cited in Balmer, 2002). Moreover, during the 1980s and 1990s, when service companies started using brand management practices (Knox, 2004) literature recognized the importance of service personnel in delivering services, differentiating offers, and reducing the risk of these services being perceived as commodities (Balmer, 2001; Harris and de Chernatony, 2001; Papasolomou and Vrontis, 2006). More specifically, it stressed the need to consider employees as "brand ambassadors" (Harris and de Chernatony, 2001), and the importance of employees’ commitment, and the importance of consistency of the product/services performance in delivering the brand promise (Balmer, 2010). However, people are not alike; thus, customers may have to interact with different service personnel whose attitudes and behaviours may vary. Consequently, two gaps may result: first, the communication gap; which represents the difference between promised and actual service. This gap can be handled by internal marketing techniques that enables employees to deliver the service brand promises through complex strategies that involve hiring the right people, developing people to deliver quality service, providing the needed support systems, and retaining the best people (Zeithaml et al., 2009). In fact, previous research indicates that internal marketing significantly enhances extra-role behaviour of employees (e.g. SeyedJavadin et al., 2012). The second is the service performance gap; which represents the difference between service standards and actual service. Factors leading to this gap include employees who are untrained, unwilling, or unable to meet the service standards because of role ambiguity, role conflict, and/or inappropriate compensation or recognition (Zeithaml et al., 2009). These employees are not likely to be consistent in fulfilling the corporate brand promise.

Therefore, to ensure that all the service employees consistently build and maintain the desired corporate brand image, internal brand management/employee branding/internal branding has become of great importance in both the practice and the literature (Punjaisri et al., 2008). Internal branding is the term that is used throughout this research. In fact, turning employees into “brand champions” is the result of successful internal branding, which is a tool for influencing employees to fulfill the external brand promise by ensuring that they transform the corporate brand values into reality when fulfilling the brand promise (Punjaisri et al., 2009). This is simply achieved by meeting service standards.

Consequently, it may be argued that internal branding can be used to address the service performance gap. This notion was tackled by Punjaisri and Wilson (2011), who examined the
impact of internal branding (via training and internal communications) on employees’ in-role brand behaviour. However, they did not study role clarity as a possible mediator, although role ambiguity (lack of clarity) is a factor in creating the service performance gap. Whereas, King (2010) examined the impact of knowledge dissemination (internal communications and training) on role clarity and employees’ affective commitment and the consequent impact on extra-role brand behaviour without examining possible direct relationships between knowledge dissemination, extra-role and in-role behaviour. Hence, to fill this research gap, the current research examines the direct impact of internal branding on in-role and extra-role brand behaviour of employees (the two forms of brand supporting behaviour) as well as the indirect impact of it on behaviour through employees’ role clarity and their affective commitment.

Additionally, it is worth noting that the context of the current study is retail banking in Egypt, which has become more important and competitive after the banking reform program (Central Bank of Egypt, 2015; MENA value partners Newsletter, 2010). Furthermore, while banks generally offer a number of high involvement products, the focal brand is often the corporate brand (Lohndorf and Diamantopoulos, 2014; Wallace and de Chernatony, 2009). Thus, differentiating the banking offers depends on the way the employees provide the service (Papasolomou and Vrontis, 2006; Wallace and de Chernatony, 2009). Therefore, it is also essential to examine the impact of internal branding on bank employees’ behaviour through continuance commitment, especially that little quantitative work on internal branding exists and the majority of the previous studies examine the relationship between internal branding and affective commitment (e.g. King, 2010; King and Grace, 2012; Moawad, 2012) without investigating its relationship with continuance commitment. As a consequence, the direction and significance of the relationship between these two constructs are unclear despite its importance.

This ambiguity is, partly because continuance commitment has for long been considered as a quality that hinders personal adaptability, and hence as a negative aspect of an organisation (Suliman and Iles, 2000). This premise is empirically supported. For example, some studies show that continuance commitment has a significant negative impact on in-role behaviour (e.g. Huang et al., 2012) and on extra-role behaviour (e.g. Gautman et al., 2005). While others indicate that it is neither related to in-role behaviour (e.g. Chen and Francesco, 2003) nor to extra-role behaviour (e.g. Huang et al., 2012). Furthermore, Wallace et al. (2013) suggest that high levels of continuance commitment in retail banking can lead to anti-role (brand sabotage) behaviour. However, it has been argued, recently, that continuance commitment can be considered as a “culture-specific” dimension with an impact on behaviour that is not necessarily negative (Suliman and Iles, 2000; Wasti, 2002). More specifically, Suliman and Iles (2000) find that continuance commitment significantly enhances in-role behaviour in three industrial companies in Jordan. This result is interesting in that it contradicts the findings of studies set in other cultures. Therefore, the authors suggest that in Arab countries where there are high levels of unemployment, weak labour unions or none, and a collective orientation towards work, continuance commitment may be considered as a “positive organisational aspect”. Furthermore, a significant positive relationship between continuance commitment and extra-role behaviour of bank employees in an Egyptian city is reported by El-Masdy (2002). Apart from that study, continuance commitment in retail banks may be high because bank employees tend to have greater permanency and higher pay and rewards than employees of other service sectors (Wallace et al., 2013). This premise is supported by the findings of some studies that were conducted in the Egyptian banking sector, which revealed that the employees’ continuance commitment tends to exceed their affective and normative commitment (e.g. Abu El Fadle, 2007; Hawas, 2003).
For the aforementioned reasons, the present research investigates the role of internal branding in reducing the service performance gap by proposing that internal branding (which is considered one of the internal marketing tools) helps to transform employees into brand champions, who are committed to the brand and understand exactly what is expected of them in delivering the brand promise. Thus, in addition to performing their specific predetermined “in-role” duties effectively, they will voluntarily perform “extra-role” tasks to project the desired corporate brand and thus achieve brand differentiation. The research question then runs as follows: "What is the role of internal branding in reducing the service performance gap and achieving corporate brand differentiation through employees’ behaviour in retail banking in Egypt?" Accordingly, this research investigates how employees can become brand champions. It further examines the effect of internal branding on employees’ role clarity and brand commitment, as well, the impact of role clarity and brand commitment on employees’ brand supporting behaviour.

3. Literature

3.1. Corporate Brands: The Basis for Internal Branding

The corporate branding literature started in the 1990s, when Stephen King, a leading advertising consultant in England, predicted that corporate brands would gain more importance than product brands (Balmer, 2002). Then, Balmer (1995) wrote the first major article discussing corporate brands (Balmer, 2013) and since then, academic research within that area has progressed (Festcherin and Usunier, 2012; Harris and de Chernatony, 2001; Hatch and Schultz, 2003; Knox, 2004). However, interest in corporate brand management dates back to the 1950s, and it was initiated by the writings of the practitioners on advertising. In the 1960s, academic empirical research was focused on corporate brand image and reputation, but little attention was given to corporate brand management. By the 1970s, the difference between corporate identity (the distinctive organisational characteristics) and image (customers' perceptions of the organisation) was clarified by various authors. Moreover, research showed that employees had a crucial role in corporate image formation. In the 1980s, corporate identity received more attention, in both the USA and Britain, due to many factors, such as restructuring of organisations, mergers and acquisitions, short product life cycles, and adopting the marketing concept. Moreover, the end of the 1980s witnessed the beginning of globalisation along with its resulting challenges (Balmer, 1995). In the 1990s, the multidimensional nature of corporate identity was highlighted (Balmer, 2013).

A corporate brand involves using the unique attributes of the organisation's identity by its senior management and making a clearly defined branding proposition to its various stakeholders (Bamer, 2013). Hence, it is a brand built upon the corporate identity which incorporates the organisation's values and characteristics to provide a sense of individuality that can differentiate it from its competitors (McDonald et al., 2001).

Faced with increased competition, companies owning a powerful corporate brand can use it as a differentiating tool to maintain a sustainable competitive advantage. More specifically, a corporate brand clearly and consistently communicates the brand promise to various stakeholders. Moreover, it differentiates the corporate brand from its competitors. It also increases customers', and other stakeholders' loyalty to the corporation, increases the chances for strategic or brand alliances, and plays an important role in recruiting and retaining qualified staff.
(Balmer, 2001). Hence, corporate brand management aims to create and maintain a favourable corporate brand image in the minds of various stakeholders (Balmer, 1995; Xie and Boggs).

Balmer (1995) indicates that the three most common approaches to the corporate/product brand relationship are brand dominance, corporate dominance, and equal dominance. Brand dominance is when the product brand is not related to the corporate brand. While, corporate dominance is using the corporate name with all of the organisation's products. Whereas equal dominance is linking the product brands to the corporate brand. In fact, corporate brand management differs from product brand management in several ways. For example, creating and maintaining the corporate brand is the responsibility of all employees rather than the brand manager's responsibility. Moreover, corporate brands need to meet the expectations of the internal and external stakeholders rather than the expectations of the customers only. Corporate brand management, as well, needs to focus on total corporate communications rather than on marketing communications only (Balmer, 2001). Additionally, in service organisations, the service personnel are considered the service corporate brand, and the values held by them represent its heart, since everything they say and do communicates the corporate identity (Balmer, 2001; McDonald et al., 2001). In fact, when the customer's experiences with the service corporate brand are favourable and consistent, favourable and strong brand associations are likely to be formed in the customer's memory, which helps in forming a favourable corporate brand image into the customer's mind (Backhous and Tikoo, 2004; Harris and de Chernatony, 2001; Kimpakorn and Tocquer, 2010). Thus, each encounter between the customer and the service employee is important for building an image of the company in the customer's mind (Zeithaml et al., 2009). Additionally, in many cases, service employees are the only points of contact customers have with the organisation. Therefore, the management of service corporate brands requires customized concepts and methods (McDonald et al., 2001). Consequently, employer branding and internal branding have gained importance in branding of services (Devasagayam et al., 2010; King and Grace, 2010; Xie and Boggs, 2006) to ensure effective corporate brand management (Foster et al., 2010).

To clarify, corporate brand management provides the strategic focus for a brand's positioning and enables consistency of messages and decisions throughout the organisation by ensuring that the corporate brand’s promises are derived from the corporate culture and identity (Foster et al., 2010; McDonald et al., 2001). Hence, corporate brand management is mainly concerned with promise management, through using two of its pillars; employer branding and internal branding (Foster et al., 2010). That is, employer branding enables the organisation to differentiate itself from other employers, creating a perception within the labour market that it is a desirable place to work, in order to attract the best recruits whose values are similar to the corporate values. On the other hand, through internal branding the organisation communicates the corporate brand values to its employees to enhance their intellectual and emotional engagement with the corporate brand and ensure that they represent it. Indeed, internal branding can be referred to as internal corporate branding. Therefore, having a powerful corporate brand image requires the corporate identity to match the actual perceived image by the various stakeholders, which can result from the total corporate communications and commitment of all personnel (Balmer, 2013). Accordingly, corporate brand management ensures that all brand messages directed to various stakeholders are consistent and in-line with the corporate brand values (Foster et al., 2010).
3.2. Internal Branding and Employees’ Brand Supporting Behaviour

Internal Branding

Although a universal definition of internal branding has not yet emerged, many authors agree that successful internal branding makes sure that, when delivering a service, employees transfer the corporate identity (desired corporate brand image) into reality (Du Preez and Bendixen, 2015; Foster et al., 2010; Punjaisri and Wilson, 2011). Miles and Mangold (2005, p.535) provide a comprehensive definition of internal branding as “the process by which employees internalize the desired brand image and are motivated to project the image to customers and other organizational constituents.”

As mentioned earlier, most of the work concerning internal branding is qualitative in nature or conceptual (Du Preez and Bendixen, 2015; Punjaisri and Wilson, 2011). Besides that, there is no agreement on the internal branding practices. Therefore, in order to address the current research question and objectives, while keeping the research scope manageable, this research adopts a functional approach to internal branding which builds upon that taken by Punjaisri and Wilson (2011), who studied internal communications and orientation and training as internal branding "mechanisms". In the present research, internal communications, orientation and training, performance feedback, and rewards are the proposed practices for two main reasons: first, the transferring of brand knowledge provides the context for the brand identity to become relevant to each employee. Therefore, it is considered to be what underpins internal branding (King and Grace, 2012). The second reason is that internal communications, training, and performance feedback are recommended for providing employees with the information needed to clarify their roles and help them perform their jobs properly (Zeithaml et al., 1988). Additionally, rewards help to maintain brand standards (Punjaisri et al., 2008).

Brand Supporting Behaviour

The performance of frontline service employees consists of in-role behaviour, extra-role behaviour, and anti-role (sabotage) behaviour. The latter means negative performance at the frontline, which opposes the communicated brand message, such as complaining about the job. Brand sabotage is likely when employees suffer high levels of role stress (Wallace et al., 2011).

In contrast, “living the brand”, “brand champions”, and “brand ambassadors” are terms used in the literature to refer to high performing employees who “bring the brand to life” for customers through their brand supporting behaviour (Wallace and de Chernatony, 2009). “In-role” and “extra-role” brand behaviour are two aspects used in the literature to describe brand supporting behaviour (Erkmen and Hancer, 2015). In-role behaviour is required and expected and is the basis of ongoing performance evaluation. If not manifested, it affects the rewards provided and may lead to imposing sanctions. Extra-role behaviour or organisational citizenship behaviour, however, is positive and discretionary behaviour characterized by being not specified in role descriptions, not recognized by the formal reward systems, and not a source of punitive consequences if not performed. However, supervisors value it (Dyne and LePine, 1998) because it leads to better coordination of the organisational activities. It also improves the organisation’s ability to attract and retain the best people by making the organisation a better place to work (Unal, 2013). Moreover, it can enhance the ability of the organisation to adapt to environmental changes (Srivastava, 2008), since the organisation’s dynamic environment may not allow the anticipation of all forms of desired behaviours from employees.
Although researchers agree that organisational citizenship behaviour is a multidimensional performance variable, there is no consensus on the number of its dimensions (Awwad and Agti, 2011; Unal, 2013). However, researchers classify it into two broad categories. The first category is organisational citizenship behaviour-organisational (OCB-O), which includes behaviours that benefit the organisation in general, such as following informal rules to maintain order (compliance and conscientiousness). The second category is organisational citizenship behaviour-individual (OCB-I), which includes behaviours that benefit specific individuals and indirectly benefit the organisation, such as helping overloaded co-workers in performing relevant tasks (altruism) (Unal, 2013).

Similarly, researchers do not agree on the dimensions of brand citizenship behaviour. For example, Burmann and Zeplin (2005) propose seven dimensions, which are helping behaviour, brand consideration, brand enthusiasm, sportsmanship, brand endorsement, self-development, and brand advancement. However, Burmann et al. (2009) suggest that it consists of only three dimensions: helping behaviour, brand enthusiasm, and propensity for further development. Similarly, the analysis by Chang et al. (2012) indicates that it consists of helping behaviour, sportsmanship, and the self-development of brand enhancement, whereas King and Grace (2012) suggest that organisational citizenship behaviour and brand citizenship behaviour can be considered synonymous due to the “subtle changes” made to the organisational citizenship behaviour construct. Thus, the current research measured extra-role brand behaviour by adapting the brand citizenship (extra-role) behaviour scale of King (2010) and the extra-role brand building behaviour scale of Morhart et al. (2009).

Previous research suggests that successful internal branding can turn employees into brand champions. Brand championship is measured in terms of employees’ affective commitment and brand citizenship behaviour (extra-role behaviour) according to King and Grace (2012), and in terms of employees’ brand building behaviour (extra-role behaviour) according to Lohndorf and Diamantopoulos (2014).

Consequently, drawing upon the Social Exchange Theory of Blau (1964), it can be argued that when an organisation fulfils the brand knowledge needs of its employees (i.e. provides the information and skills needed to deal with the inherent ambiguity of their roles) and helps them to better understand their roles as brand representatives, employees will, in turn, perform their in-role duties more effectively and display extra-role behaviour. Moreover, existing research on internal branding illustrates that it has a significant positive impact on employees’ in-role behaviour (Punjaisri and Wilson, 2011) and on extra-role (brand/organisational citizenship) behaviour (Ozcelik and Findikli, 2014). Additionally, King and Grace (2012) indicate that organisational socialization (an internal branding construct) has a significant positive impact on extra-role (brand citizenship) behaviour. Thus, the first research hypothesis is stated as follows:

H1: Internal branding is positively associated with employees’ brand supporting behaviour; a) in-role behaviour and b) extra-role behaviour.

3.3 Internal branding and Role Clarity

Frontline employees, such as sales-people and customer-service employees, are boundary spanners who interact directly with customers. Thus, their role in filtering and interpreting information from the organisation to its customers and vice-versa is important. The role of employees is defined by the expectations and demands communicated to them by other parties (top management, immediate supervisors and/or customers) (Zeithaml et al., 1988; 2009).
Therefore, boundary spanners may be subject to unclear expectations and verbal aggregation (Wallace et al., 2011). More specifically, they usually face two forms of role stressors, namely role conflict and role ambiguity (Stamper and Johlke, 2003; Teas et al., 1979). Role conflict occurs when the expectations of different parties conflict with one another, or when these expectations are excessive. Role ambiguity occurs when the employee lacks role-related information (Stamper and Johlke, 2003; Zeithaml et al., 1988). Therefore, role clarity is defined as the level of clarity employees have of their roles as a result of having brand knowledge (King, 2010).

Drawing upon the Balance Theory of Heider (1958), a sustainable system should be balanced; it requires the same attitudes towards the object from both reference groups of the system. Hence, internal and external stakeholders’ brand perspectives and attitudes should be consistent (Burmann et al., 2009). In order to build and maintain a powerful corporate brand, internal branding should ensure that employees (the internal stakeholders/first reference group) project the desired corporate brand image to other stakeholders (the external stakeholders/second reference group) (Miles and Mangold, 2005). Hence, the employees should, at first, understand what is expected of them and how they should perform their roles as brand representatives (i.e. role clarity). In fact, research on the antecedents of role clarity/ambiguity shows that performance feedback (e.g. Mukherjee and Malhotra, 2006; Singh, 1993; Teas et al., 1979) and internal communications (e.g. King, 2010) are key antecedents for improving role clarity and reducing role ambiguity. Accordingly, H2 is stated as follows:

H2: Internal branding is positively associated with employees’ role clarity.

3.4. Internal Branding and Commitment

Employees’ Commitment

Early studies addressed commitment as a uni-dimensional construct that describes the employee’s identification with the organisation (Wallace et al., 2013). This perspective only reflects the affective dimension; it was introduced by Buchanan (1974) and expanded by Porter et al. (1974) and Mowday et al. (1979). In 1984, Meyer and Allen proposed the continuance dimension, taking into consideration the Side-bet Theory of Becker (1960) (Caruana and Calleya, 1998); which argues that employees can, sometimes, refuse better job offers provided by other employers as a result of some side bets they, the employees, have associated with their current job (Shepherd and Mathews, 2000). In 1990, Allen and Meyer suggested a third dimension, normative commitment, which reflects a perceived obligation to remain in the organisation (Meyer et al., 2002).

More specifically, affective commitment reflects employees’ emotional attachment to the organisation (Lambert et al., 2013), whereas continuance commitment (or calculative commitment) explains the process whereby employees bind themselves to the organisation through investing time and effort in it and receiving its rewards (Srivastava, 2008). The investments and rewards associated with the current job are considered side bets (Caruana and Calleya, 1998). If the employee leaves the organisation, he/she will lose these side bets and thus, the side bets will be regarded as the cost of leaving or sacrifices (lost side bets) (Lambert et al., 2013). Therefore, if employees perceived that the cost of leaving outweighs the benefits gained, they will not feel free enough to leave; this feeling is rather described as being locked into their organisation (Srivastava, 2008). Continuance commitment is, therefore, considered to be
positively related to investments (side bets) and negatively related to the availability of job alternatives (Srivastava, 2008).

For its part, normative commitment reflects the employees’ moral attachment to their organisation. Regarding the present research, the authors felt it was unnecessary to add the normative commitment dimension for several reasons. The first reason is that affective commitment and normative commitment are closely correlated (Meyer et al., 2002). The second reason is that the behavioural outcomes of normative and affective commitment tend to follow the same direction (Wallace et al., 2013). Another reason is that there is still much work needed in order to fully understand the normative commitment (Meyer et al., 2002). And, because such work is considered beyond the scope of the present research, it was decided following other organisational commitment studies (e.g., Wang et al., 2010) to exclude the normative commitment.

Internal Branding and Affective Commitment

Internal branding is considered a tool for ensuring that employees have a shared understanding of the desired corporate brand image and that they are able and willing to reflect this image to other stakeholders through their own behaviour. Therefore, the consistency of messages directed to various stakeholders is essential since inconsistent or conflicting messages can make employees question the integrity of their organisation and its values, which is likely to negatively impact their level of trust and affective commitment (Mangold and Miles, 2007). Hence, existing internal branding research focuses on studying the relationship between internal branding and affective commitment since; first, affective commitment involves value congruence between employees and their organisation (Wang et al., 2010). Second, internal branding aims to make employees internalise the corporate brand values and to be better equipped with brand knowledge to fulfil the brand promises (King and Grace, 2012). Third, affective commitment ensures the sustainability of brand supporting behaviour (Xiong et al., 2013). In fact, internal branding studies’ results (e.g. Burmann et al., 2009; Du Preez and Bendixen, 2015; King, 2010; Moawad, 2012) illustrate that internal branding has a significant positive impact on affective commitment. Hence, H3 is stated as follows:

H3: Internal branding is positively associated with employees’ affective commitment.

Internal Branding and Continuance Commitment

According to Wallace et al. (2013), it is important to consider more than the affective dimension of commitment when examining service employees’ attitudes and behaviour; given that when employees are subject to high levels of role stress and high levels of continuance commitment, the resulting performance can undermine the service brand (Wallace and de Chernatony, 2011). It is further noted that bank employees are more likely to have high levels of continuance commitment than employees working in other service sectors due to the higher side bets. In fact, continuance commitment of bank employees in Egypt tends to be high (e.g. Abu-El-Fadle, 2007; Hawas, 2003). Therefore, frontline bank employees may work against their bank’s brand (Wallace et al., 2013).

Given that the banking sector is the context of the study, it is important to examine the relationships between continuance commitment and other constructs under study. Accordingly, after a comprehensive review of the literature, the following could be noted: first, no
empirical study, to the best knowledge of the researchers, has examined the relationship between internal branding and continuance commitment. Second, and according to Meyer et al.'s (2002) meta-analysis, education and organisation-specific knowledge and skills can be regarded as a form of investment made within the organisation as a result of the time and energy put into them. Thus they correlate positively with continuance commitment. Consequently, the expected relationship between internal branding and continuance commitment is positive on the basis of two main arguments. Firstly, internal branding is considered a “subset” of internal marketing (Du Preez and Bendixen, 2015) or a “derivative” of it (Moawad, 2012) and Ismail (2008) reports a significant positive relationship between internal marketing and continuance commitment. Secondly, internal branding is concerned with disseminating and transferring brand knowledge and provided that employees who believe that their organisation-specific knowledge and skills cannot be easily transferred to another organisation tend to have higher continuance commitment. Therefore, H4 is stated as follows:

H4: Internal branding is positively associated with employees’ continuance commitment.

3.5. Role Clarity and Brand Supporting Behaviour

Generally, frontline service positions involve a high degree of interaction with customers, either transactional or tacit encounters. Transactional encounters are routine ones and thus can be fulfilled by following the work rules, procedures, and service standards (performing in-role duties). However, during tacit encounters, employees may not find rules to follow and may depend on their own judgement and experience (tacit knowledge). Since service encounters are becoming increasingly complex, now that customers are more knowledgeable and inclining towards a holistic buying experience, it can be expected that performing the in-role duties only is not enough to provide customers with a holistic buying experience and to achieve brand differentiation. Thus, employees should have the ability to deal with the ambiguity inherent in tacit encounters (Ghose, 2009). Consequently, it is argued that, in addition to performing their in-role duties effectively, employees should be ready and able to deal with tacit (complex) encounters and perform extra-role duties, reinforcing the brand’s communicated values, not least because employees are considered an important source for customers' information (King, 2010).

Empirical research on the relationship between role clarity/ambiguity and employees’ performance is limited. However, existing studies demonstrate a positive relationship between role clarity and performance and a negative relationship between role ambiguity and performance (Singh, 1993). For example, Mukherjee and Malhotra (2006) and Bush and Busch (1981) indicate that employees’ role clarity is positively related to their in-role behaviour. Moreover, Yadav and Rangnekar (2015) and King (2010) point out that role clarity has a significant positive impact on the extra-role (organisational/brand citizenship) behaviour of employees. Hence, H5 is stated as follows:

H5: Employees’ role clarity is positively associated with their brand supporting behaviour; a) in-role behaviour and b) extra-role behaviour.

3.6. Employees’ Commitment and Brand Supporting Behaviour

Committed employees help to build the service brand by communicating the desired brand experience to customers during the service encounter and through their interactions with their colleagues, which facilitate the work environment (Wallace et al., 2013). In fact, there is a steady stream of research findings to suggest that affective commitment is positively associated with in-role behaviour (e.g. Chen and Francesco, 2003; Huang et al., 2012; Suliman and Iles,
and with extra-role (organisational/brand citizenship) behaviour (e.g. Burmann et al. 2009; Chen and Francesco, 2003; Gautam et al., 2005; King, 2010; Shore and Wayne, 1993). Accordingly, H6 is:

H6: Employees’ affective commitment is positively associated with their brand supporting behaviour; a) in-role behaviour and b) extra-role behaviour.

Unfortunately, continuance commitment has attracted less research than affective commitment has (Wasti, 2002). In addition, as mentioned earlier, different implications can be observed in terms of the direction and strength of the relationship between continuance commitment and in-role behaviour; for example, Chen and Francesco (2003) indicate that continuance commitment and in-role behaviour are not significantly related, although Huang et al. (2012) point out a negative relationship between them, while Suliman and Iles (2000), at the same time, indicate a significant positive relationship between the two constructs. Furthermore, research examining the relationship between continuance commitment and extra-role behaviour is very limited and the available results are also inconclusive. Some studies report that continuance commitment and extra-role behaviour are unrelated to each other (e.g. Davoudi, 2012). Whereas others observe that the relationship between the two constructs is significant and negative (e.g. Chen and Francesco, 2003; Shore and Wayne, 1993). While in the Egyptian banking context, El-Masdy (2002) points out that continuance commitment is positively related to extra-role behaviour, a finding which is in line with the arguments of Suliman and Iles (2000) and Wasti (2002) that continuance commitment is a “culture specific” construct. Hence, in the Egyptian context, H7 is:

H7: Employees’ continuance commitment is positively associated with their brand supporting behaviour; a) in-role behaviour and b) extra-role behaviour.

3.7. The Mediating Effect of Employees’ Role Clarity, Affective and Continuance Commitment

Since the lack of role clarity is among the factors that lead to the service performance gap (Zeithaml et al., 2009), Mukherjee and Malhotra (2006) examined the impact of role clarity on service quality as perceived by employees (an indication of their in-role behaviour); the relationship between the two constructs was found to be positive and significant. Moreover, King (2010) investigated the impact of brand knowledge dissemination (internal communications and training) on role clarity and affective commitment and the subsequent impacts on extra-role behaviour. She reported that, for frontline employees, all the resulted paths were significant. However, she did not examine the mediating impact of role clarity and affective commitment on in-role behaviour and, consequently, she did not tackle the significance of role clarity in reducing the service performance gap. Nevertheless, Punjaisri and Wilson (2011) studied the impact of internal branding on the in-role behaviour of employees mediated by their affective commitment. Their results indicated that affective commitment has no mediating effect, contradicting the findings of other internal branding studies that describe the relationship between internal branding and extra-role (brand citizenship) behaviour when mediated by affective commitment (e.g. King and Grace, 2010).

Furthermore, most internal branding research is conducted in the hotel and tourism industry (e.g. King, 2010; Moawad, 2012; Punjaisri and Wilson, 2011), while the context of the present research is the banking sector, where employees are believed to have high continuance commitment levels and where, also, the frontline employees usually face role stressors which
may weaken their brand behaviour (Wallace and de Chernotony, 2009; Wallace et al., 2011; 2013). Hence, the following hypotheses were proposed to better understand the relationship between internal branding and brand supporting behaviour (in-role and extra-role):

H8: Employees’ role clarity mediates the relationship between internal branding and brand supporting behaviour; a) in-role behaviour and b) extra-role behaviour.

H9: Employees’ brand affective commitment mediates the relationship between internal branding and brand supporting behaviour; a) in-role behaviour and b) extra-role behaviour.

H10: Employees’ brand continuance commitment mediates the relationship between internal branding and brand supporting behaviour; a) in-role behaviour and b) extra-role behaviour.

3.8. The Proposed Model

Based on the previous research hypotheses, the relationships among the research constructs are illustrated in Figure (1).

4. Research Methodology

4.1. The Population and Sample of the Research

The population of this research consists of every frontline employee (customer-service and teller) serving the retail customers of banks operating in Egypt. The number of employees working in the banking sector is around 77,000 (Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics, 2014).

In selecting the sample of the research, two-stage sampling was employed. First, a judgmental sample was used to select leading banks (according to total assets) operating in Egypt (The Africa Report, 2013). Leading banks were selected because they were perceived to have the capacity and the incentive to build and maintain strong corporate brands. Second, a simple random sample should have been employed since the population is homogeneous and definite, with complete and updated data about the sampling units available in each bank. However, snowball sampling was employed because the sampling frame could not be accessed from the banks.
After an exploratory phase, the data collection took approximately four months long (from September to December 2015). The number of questionnaires distributed was 600, with 413 returned. Out of those, 13 questionnaires were discarded due to incomplete/irrelevant responses. Thus, the response rate was 66.6% which is acceptable (Babbie, 2007, p.262).

Sampling units were allocated to every bank under study based on the percentage of each bank branches in Cairo, Giza, and Alexandria, the three largest Egyptian cities (Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics, 2014).

4.2. Measures

Before collecting the survey data, an initial pool of items was drawn from other scales from the literature, with acceptable validity and reliability levels. These items were reviewed by experts in marketing and human resources (content validity). The revised items were pretested among a group of bank employees, who also reviewed the items and suggested further changes. Accordingly, the questionnaire was modified, and then translated into Arabic, using back translation, and pretested among a sample of frontline bank employees.

The research data was collected through a questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale to measure the research variables (see Appendix). The 19-item internal branding scale was adapted from the work of Awwad and Agti (2011); Caruana and Calleya (1998); Chang et al. (2012); King (2010); Singh (1993), and Punjaisri and Wilson (2011). Role clarity was assessed by six items selected from King’s (2010). Affective commitment was measured using the affective commitment scale developed by Meyer et al. (1993). And continuance commitment was measured using five items from the continuance commitment scale developed by Meyer et al. (1993). In-role behaviour was assessed by three items from Punjaisri and Wilson (2011) and extra-role behaviour items were adapted from the scale items of King (2010) and Morhart et al. (2009).

4.3. Data Analysis and Results

SPSS v.23 was used to describe the characteristics of the respondents, while Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) was used to evaluate the proposed model and test the relationships among the research constructs. More specifically, SmartPLS v.3.2.2 was used because it does not create identification problems, especially with constructs having three indicators (performance feedback and in-role behaviour). Using SmartPLS also enables testing complicated relationships between different types of constructs (first and second order) more easily. Additionally, the main disadvantage of CB-SEM is the normality assumption of data which is commonly violated in social science (Kline, 2015), and the most appropriate software to deal with non-normal data is SmartPLS that tests the PLS-SEM (Hair et al., 2014; Henseler et al., 2009). Therefore, SmartPLS is now gaining a widespread application in marketing research (Hair et al., 2012).

Profile of Respondents

This is illustrated in Table (1)

Table (1) Characteristics of Respondents

(Insert Table 1)
Validity and Reliability of Scales

A systematic approach was taken to validate the proposed model (Hair et al., 2014; Henseler et al., 2009).

Convergent validity was assessed by examining the minimum requirements for factor loadings and the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) of the constructs. In examining the AVE, it was found that the AVE of both continuance commitment and internal branding was less than 0.50 (the recommended threshold). Therefore, items number 15 and 32 (the items having the lowest loadings on their constructs) were deleted. This action established convergent validity. More specifically, the factor loadings of all reflective indicators were greater than 0.71 and all of the AVE of items by their respective constructs were greater than 0.50 (Malhotra, 2010). Discriminant validity was evaluated on the basis of the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) criterion (Henseler et al., 2015). All constructs met the HTMT0.85 conservative criterion.

Moreover, all constructs met the recommended cut-off point for establishing composite reliability (CR) which is greater than 0.70 (Malhotra, 2010), where the CR of the constructs ranged between 0.80 and 0.95.

Consequently, the $R^2$ for in-role behaviour, extra-role behaviour, employees’ role clarity, and affective commitment were very acceptable. More specifically, as shown in Table (2), the four exogenous variables (internal branding, role clarity, affective commitment and continuance commitment) explain 46% of in-role behaviour and 55% of extra-role behaviour. Meanwhile, internal branding explains 50% of role clarity, 37% of affective commitment and 4% of continuance commitment which is considered a weak value for $R^2$. Please refer to Table (2) to review the AVE, CR and $R^2$ values.

Afterwards, a bootstrapping procedure, with 5000 subsamples, was applied to obtain inference statistics (Ringle et al., 2015), as illustrated in Table (2).

Table (2) Measurement Model Evaluation and the Findings about Direct Paths
(Insert Table 2)

As shown in Table (2), most direct paths were supported at a 99.9% confidence level, t value ±3.21, and p value < 0.001 and at 99% confidence level, t value ±2.58, and p value < 0.01. So, H5a to H7b were all supported. However, the direct relationships between internal branding and both forms of brand supporting behaviour (H1a and H1b) were not supported and thus H1 was not supported.

To test the indirect relationships between the constructs, the approach suggested by Preacher and Hayes (2004; 2008) was followed as illustrated in Table (3) (Nitzl et al., 2016). First, the direct relationships between internal branding and in-role and extra-role behaviour (without the presence of any mediator) were examined (Step 1). To proceed with the analysis of the mediators’ effects, these relationships need to be significant (Hair et al., 2014) (see Table 3). Then, to measure the indirect effects of internal branding on in-role and extra-role behaviour, one mediator at a time was introduced to the model and the relationships were examined, then more than one mediator was introduced and the relationships were re-examined (Step 2). After that, the total impact of the exogenous variable on the two endogenous variables was calculated (Step 3). Finally, the variance accounted for (VAF) mediation effects were computed and the hypotheses involving role clarity, affective commitment, and continuance commitment as
mediators were accordingly assessed in light of the values of the VAF. More specifically, if the VAF of the proposed mediator is less than 0.2, then the variable does not have a mediating effect, if the VAF ranges from 0.2 to 0.8, then the variable has a partial mediating effect, and if the VAF is over 0.8, then the variable has a full mediating effect (Preacher and Hayes, 2004; 2008).

Table (3) Results of Examining the Mediation Impacts

According to the results shown in Table (3), H8 and H9 were partially supported, where role clarity was found to partially mediate the relationship between internal branding and in-role behaviour (H8a) and that between internal branding and extra-role behaviour (H8b). Moreover, affective commitment partially mediated the relationship between internal branding and in-role behaviour (H9a) and that between internal branding and extra-role behaviour (H9b). However, no statistical support was found for H10, which proposes that continuance commitment mediates the relationship between internal branding and both forms of brand supporting behaviour. Furthermore, multiple parallel mediation analysis was conducted to interpret the relationships between the exogenous variable (internal branding) and each of the two endogenous variables (in-role and extra-role behaviour) (Hayes, 2013).

5. Discussion

This research provides empirical evidence that adds to the internal branding literature, which still suffers from scarcity of quantitative work. By measuring employees' role clarity and their affective and continuance commitment, it was possible to examine how these constructs may explain the effect of internal branding on brand supporting behaviour (both in-role and extra-role). The research further provides more insights on the nature of continuance commitment in a sector which is characterized by having high continuance commitment levels and in a country whose culture is different from the Western and Asian cultures (within which most employees' commitment studies are conducted).

Findings indicate that although the relationship between internal branding and both forms of brand supporting behaviour was in the predicted direction ($t=1.611$, $p=0.107$ and $t=1.037$, $p=0.300$, respectively), internal branding did not directly improve employees in-role behaviour, nor did it directly enhance their extra-role behaviour to a significant extent. This result contradicts previous internal branding studies in other service industries; especially in the hotel and tourism industry (e.g. Punjaisri and Wilson, 2011; King and Grace, 2012; Ozcelik and Findikli, 2014).

In contrast, internal branding had significant impacts on employees' role clarity ($t=23.791$, $p=0.000$), affective commitment ($t=17.688$, $p=0.000$), and continuance commitment ($t=3.672$, $p=0.000$). Furthermore, role clarity and affective commitment significantly improved both forms of brand behaviour (in-role, $t=8.894$, $p=0.000$ and extra-role, $t=7.930$, $p=0.000$). These findings concur with the previous studies (e.g. Du Preez and Bendixen, 2015; King, 2010; Makharjee and Malhotra, 2006). The results further imply that employees' role clarity (ability to perform tasks) and their affective commitment (willingness to perform these tasks) contribute to bridging the service performance gap and enable banks to achieve sustainable brand differentiation by displaying the emotional benefits of their brands through their employees' (King and Grace, 2012; Papasolomou and Vrontis, 2006). This finding is also consistent with Harris and de Chernatony's (2001) recommendation that actions should be taken by organisations...
to ensure that employees, who are the sources of customers' information and the communicators of the brand's emotional characteristics, reflect the brand's desired image.

Furthermore, the present research displayed a rather interesting finding about the continuance commitment of frontline bank employees. The literature indicates that bank employees tend to have high levels of continuance commitment which is associated with low performance levels, and some employees may even engage in brand sabotage behaviour (Wallace et al., 2013). However, current findings revealed that the continuance commitment of frontline bank employees did not result in low levels of performance and is not likely to result in brand sabotage behaviour. On the contrary, it significantly increased employees’ brand supporting behaviour (both in-role, $t=3.189$, $p=0.001$ and extra-role, $t=2.795$, $p=0.005$). This finding is not consistent with the findings of other empirical studies about continuance commitment conducted in non-Arab cultures (e.g. Chen and Francesco, 2003; Gautam et al., 2005 and Huang et al., 2012). Thus, it can be concluded that the argument of Suliman and Iles (2000) and Wasti (2002) regarding that continuance commitment is a “culture specific” construct is supported in the current study. This implies that in Egypt, as in Jordan, due to high levels of unemployment, the nature of the labour market, and other economic conditions, as well as the collective orientation towards work, continuance commitment could be considered as a positive organisational characteristic that enhances brand behaviour (Suliman and Iles, 2000).

Additionally, results indicated that internal branding impact on employees’ brand supporting behaviour took place through its influence on both employees’ role clarity ($VAF =0.62$ on in-role and $VAF=0.57$ on extra-role) and their affective commitment ($VAF =0.29$ on in-role and $VAF =0.49$ on extra-role). While continuance commitment did not have a mediating impact ($VAF =0.07$ on in-role and $VAF=0.07$ on extra-role). Furthermore, when role clarity and affective commitment together acted as mediators, they both fully mediated the relationships between internal branding and in-role behaviour ($VAF = 0.81$) and internal branding and extra-role behaviour ($VAF= 0.90$). Moreover, role clarity, affective commitment and continuance commitment together fully mediated the relationships between internal branding and in-role behaviour ($VAF= 0.82$) and extra-role behaviour ($VAF= 0.91$). Analyzing these figures indicates that the impact of internal branding on brand supporting behaviour (in-role and extra-role) through its influence on role clarity and affective commitment had the greatest effect on the two endogenous variables (in-role and extra-role behaviour). Nevertheless, continuance commitment had no mediating effect (according to the multiple mediation analysis), since the difference between the indirect effect of internal branding on employees' brand supporting behaviour, through role clarity, affective commitment, and continuance commitment, and its indirect effect through role clarity and affective commitment was zero.

Accordingly, findings indicate that internal branding helped employees to understand their roles better and have a greater sense of belonging to their banks, which consequently improved their brand supporting behaviour (in-role and extra-role), which is vital for service companies. That is, since employees embody the service brand (Harris and de Chernatony, 2001; Wallace and de Chernatony, 2009); then, their brand perceptions and attitudes may affect those of customers (Balmer, 2001; Devasagayam et al., 2010). Indeed, if they do not deliver the brand promises consistently, both customers’ trust and brand commitment are jeopardised (Erkmen and Hancer, 2015; Kimpakorn and Tocquer, 2010).

Nonetheless, today's competitive banking environment makes banks strive to maintain their positions. As a result, customer-service staff in banks are assigned and urged to achieve high
“sales targets”, in addition to performing their principal tasks (determining customers’ needs, answering their inquiries, giving them adequate professional banking advice, and matching their needs with the appropriate banking products). Their performance is evaluated from the perspective of both the output targets (sales) and the behavioural targets (the quality of interactive service), but with greater emphasis on the former. As for bank tellers, management evaluating their performance usually emphasizes the importance of fulfilling their output measures, while, customers expect them to be accurate, fast, and friendly (Zeithaml et al., 1988).

Consequently, frontline bank employees may experience role conflict (Zeithaml et al., 1988) when they find themselves under the pressure of trying to meet both types of targets at the same time. Hence, they are more likely to focus on meeting one type at the expense of the other, and thus their performance is likely to be affected. This may explain why internal branding did not have a significant direct impact on employees’ brand supporting behaviour (in-role and extra-role). Therefore, role conflict may impede the positive impact of internal branding on employees’ brand behaviour. This explanation is consistent with Zeithaml et al. (1988), who indicated that role conflict is psychologically uncomfortable for employees and tends to negatively impact their performance.

6. Managerial Implications and Recommendations

In light of the research findings and the insights gained from the exploratory phase of the study, senior management of banks may consider the following:

First, adopting internal branding as a part of the corporate marketing orientation (Balmer and Greyser, 2006; Punjaisri and Wilson, 2011). This may entail re-considering the criteria used for evaluating the performance of frontline bank employees (customer-service and tellers). More specifically, in spite of having some sales responsibilities, as a part of the customer-service positions, the customer-service staff in banks should not bear the responsibility of generating sales as their main task or focus. In other words, “sales targets” should be assigned only to the banks’ sales staff.

Consequently, the performance of customer-service staff can be evaluated either by a system that incorporates output and behavioural measures, with greater emphasis on the latter; or by using a system that depends on behavioural measures only to avoid the possibility that customer-service employees may seek to maximize their earnings (from commissions/bonuses) at the expense of the quality provided to customers (Papasolomou and Vrontis, 2006). At the same time, evaluating the performance of bank tellers should be based on a system that incorporates output and behavioural measures, rather than a system which gives more weight to output measures, to encourage performance on their part which is aligned to customers’ expectations of service quality (Papasolomou and Vrontis, 2006).

Second, setting a clear corporate branding strategy that guides all corporate decisions and activities will ensure that the internal communications are consistent with the external marketing communications which will enable employees to meet customers’ expectations by delivering the service that is promised. Moreover, close coordination of all bank functions tends to create a sense of ownership of the corporate brand among all employees and enhance team spirit (Harris and de Chernatony, 2001).

Third, measuring brand perceptions, attitudes, and behaviour of employees by conducting regular internal market research and reacting to the resulted findings with the appropriate decisions. For example, mechanisms, as dialectical inquiry, can be used for harmonizing
employees' brand perceptions (Harris and de Chernatony, 2001) and internal branding programs may be tailored to respond to specific brand knowledge needs of employees working in certain departments or belonging to certain age groups. Moreover, supervisors, at all managerial levels, should be encouraged and trained to become transformational brand leaders (Mohart et al., 2009). Similarly, regularly measuring the level of customers’ satisfaction through conducting multiple types of research, such as customer satisfaction surveys and mystery shopping, to provide better understanding of the customers’ needs and wants (Zeithaml et al., 2009).

7. Limitations of the Study and Suggested Future Research

The following three limitations may affect the generalization of results. However, these limitations may also provide fruitful areas for future research.

First, more research is needed to understand the antecedents of continuance commitment in the Egyptian banking context, since the $R^2$ of continuance commitment is considered weak (0.041) indicating that internal branding, which is supposed to result in “education and organisational-specific knowledge and skills” (Meyer et al., 2002), explains only 4% of continuance commitment.

Second, the sampling frame of frontline employees working in retail divisions of banks could not be accessed; consequently snowball sampling was used to select the sampling units. The present study can be replicated in other service organisations, where sampling frames can be accessed and probability sampling techniques can be employed.

Third, the current research was conducted in branches of banks operating in three large Egyptian cities (Cairo, Giza and Alexandria). Therefore, the model of the present research can be reincorporated to be conducted in other high contact service industries (such as insurance companies, telecommunications and airline companies) and in other cities and countries.

Furthermore, this research extends the literature of the mediating effects of role clarity, affective commitment, and continuance commitment. Multiple parallel mediation analysis was used as it concentrates on analyzing the effects of multiple mediators without taking their in-between relationships. Thus, future studies may examine the series of multiple mediation of the causal effect of these mediators (e.g. role clarity on affective commitment) (Mukherjee and Malhotra, 2006) on the relationship between internal branding, in-role and extra-role brand behaviour.
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Appendix

*Questionnaire Statements*
Internal Communications

1) The bank I work for communicates its brand promise well to its employees.
2) The bank I work for communicates the importance of my role in delivering the brand promise.
3) Internal communications provide all the essential information for me to perform the service according to the brand’s expectations.
4) The brand’s mission and its promise are constantly reinforced through internal communications.
5) My manager regularly meets all employees to report about issues relating to the whole bank.
6) My manager regularly gives me feedback about issues affecting the work environment.

Orientation and Training

7) New employees are oriented towards the bank’s vision, mission and values.
8) The bank teaches me why things should be done not just how to do them.
9) The bank provides me with appropriate skills in relation to delivering the brand’s promise based on the brand’s standards.
10) Training programs usually help me come up with new and better suggestions of how to do the job.
11) This bank has the flexibility to accommodate the different training needs of employees.
12) Training programs help me better understand current and future customers’ needs.

Performance Feedback

13) I receive enough information from my boss about my job performance.
14) I periodically receive feedback from my boss on my job performance.
15) I know how well I am performing my job.

Rewards

16) I am informed about how the bank rewards employees.
17) The reward system in this bank is linked to business goals.
18) My bank compensates employees for providing brand-related information.
19) When employees display behaviour that fosters brand values, the bank gives them formal rewards.

Role Clarity
20) Having information about my bank’s brand improved my understanding of my job.
21) I understand what is expected from me because I got information about the bank’s brand.
22) I know how I should behave while on the job.
23) I know how to make specific job decisions because I got enough information about my bank’s brand.
24) I know how to handle unusual problems/situations in my job.
25) In my job, I know exactly what output (outcome) is expected from me.

Affective Commitment

26) I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this bank.
27) I feel as if the bank’s problems are my own.
28) I feel I belong to this bank.
29) I feel emotionally attached to this bank.
30) I feel like “a member of the family” at my bank.
31) This bank has a great deal of personal meaning for me.

Continuance Commitment

32) Right now, I feel that staying with my bank is a matter of necessity.
33) It would be very hard for me to leave this bank right now, even if I wanted to.
34) Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided to leave this bank.
35) I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this bank.
36) One of the few negative consequences of leaving this bank would be the scarcity of available alternatives.

In-role behaviour

37) I feel that the quality level of my services meets the bank’s brand standards.
38) I can successfully fulfil the responsibilities of my job.
39) I can effectively fulfil the promises that the brand has with its customers.

Extra-role behaviour

40) I can take responsibility for tasks outside my own area, if necessary.
41) I always consider the impact of my behaviour on the brand before acting.
42) I am always interested to learn more about the brand and what it means for my role.
43) I regularly recommend (the bank) to friends and relatives.
44) I voluntarily pass on brand knowledge to new employees.
45) I usually make suggestions for improving the customers’ brand experience.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Managerial/Supervisory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Length of Service:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 years</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 3 to less than 6 years</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years and more</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Degree:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Age:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30- less than 40</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - less than 50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and more</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Gender:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table (2) Measurement Model Evaluation and the Findings of Direct Paths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-role behaviour (En1)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-role behaviour (En2)</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity (M1)</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment (M2)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment (M3)</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Branding (Ex)</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path coefficients</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exogenous Variable</strong></td>
<td><strong>Endogenous Variable</strong></td>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ex)</td>
<td>(En1)</td>
<td>H1a</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(En2)</td>
<td>H1b</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(M1)</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>0.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(M2)</td>
<td>H3</td>
<td>0.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(M3)</td>
<td>H4</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M1)</td>
<td>(En1)</td>
<td>H5a</td>
<td>0.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(En2)</td>
<td>H5b</td>
<td>0.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M2)</td>
<td>(En1)</td>
<td>H6a</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(En2)</td>
<td>H6b</td>
<td>0.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M3)</td>
<td>(En1)</td>
<td>H7a</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(En2)</td>
<td>H7b</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance level is 99.9%, p value < 0.001, t value ±3.21 (for path coefficient only).**

R² for En₁ is 0.45, for En₂ is 0.55, for M₁ is 0.50, for M₂ is 0.37 and for M₃ is 0.04.
Table (3) Results from Examining the Mediation Impacts

### Step (1) Direct Path coefficients without mediator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exogenous Variable (Ex)</th>
<th>Endogenous Variables(En)</th>
<th>( \beta \ (Sig) )</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Branding (Ex)</td>
<td>In-role behaviour (En1)</td>
<td>( 0.549^{***} )</td>
<td>Significant, go to step (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extra-role behaviour(En2)</td>
<td>( 0.584^{***} )</td>
<td>Significant, go to step (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Step (2) Indirect Path coefficients with the mediator

\[ \text{Path} = (\text{exogenous to mediator}. \text{mediator to endogenous}) \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Role Clarity (M1)</th>
<th>Affective Commitment (M2)</th>
<th>Continuance Commitment (M3)</th>
<th>(M1 and M2)</th>
<th>(M1 and M3)</th>
<th>(M2 and M3)</th>
<th>(M1, M2 and M3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Ex-En1)</td>
<td>( 0.341^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.161^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.037^{*} )</td>
<td>( 0.443^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.384^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.156^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.447^{***} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ex-En2)</td>
<td>( 0.331^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.270^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.038^{*} )</td>
<td>( 0.523^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.375^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.267^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.526^{***} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Step (3) Total Path coefficients with the mediator = (Direct + Indirect effect)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Role Clarity (M1)</th>
<th>Affective Commitment (M2)</th>
<th>Continuance Commitment (M3)</th>
<th>(M1 and M2)</th>
<th>(M1 and M3)</th>
<th>(M2 and M3)</th>
<th>(M1, M2 and M3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Ex-En1)</td>
<td>( 0.546^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.415^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.549^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.345^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.331^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.441^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.545^{***} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ex-En2)</td>
<td>( 0.581^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.448^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.583^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.462^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.372^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.539^{***} )</td>
<td>( 0.579^{***} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mediation effect Variance Accounted For VAF=(Indirect effect / Total effect)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Role Clarity (M1)</th>
<th>Affective Commitment (M2)</th>
<th>Continuance Commitment (M3)</th>
<th>(M1 and M2)</th>
<th>(M1 and M3)</th>
<th>(M2 and M3)</th>
<th>(M1, M2 and M3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Ex-En1)</td>
<td>( 0.62 )</td>
<td>Partial mediation</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>Partial mediation</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>No mediation</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ex-En2)</td>
<td>( 0.57 )</td>
<td>Partial mediation</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>Partial mediation</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>No mediation</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance level is 99.9\%, \( p \text{ value} < 0.001, t \text{ value} \pm 3.21 \).
Significance level is 99\%, \( p \text{ value} < 0.01, t \text{ value} \pm 2.58 \).