BRAND CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR: CONCEPTUALIZATIONS AND DIMENSIONS
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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to give a clear picture of brand citizenship behavior, its emergence, and development of the concept. Moreover, this study also tries to give the emerging views about the concept of brand citizenship behavior and its importance. This study conducts a systematic approach to review the literature and give a clear picture of conceptualization of brand citizenship behavior. This research highlights the brand citizenship behavior (BCB) concept itself, its dimensions and most commonly used dimension in different sector that will help the researcher to use the concept with clear indication of dimensions. Researchers have been studying and updating the brand citizenship behavior concept from past one and half decade. To measure the brand-related behavior of the employees, different researcher’s used different dimensions. Most of researchers used multidimensional measure to gauge brand-consistent behavior or brand citizenship behavior through the conceptualization suggested by Burmann and Zeplin (2005). While, some researcher’s (e.g., Henkel et al., 2007; Punjaisri and Wilson, 2007; Punjaisri et al., 2008; Punjaisri and Wilson, 2011; Punjaisri et al., 2009) measured the concept through uni-dimensional scale (See Table 2.3). Additionally, Burmann and Zeplin (2005) conceptualized brand-consistent behavior in seven dimensions under the umbrella of brand citizenship behavior. Most of the researchers used the dimensions of brand citizenship behavior in service intensive sector. All the dimensions of brand citizenship behavior previously discussed were conceptualized from the dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior suggested by Podsakoff et al. (2000) and conceptualized by Burmann and Zeplin (2005). On the other hand, Maloney (2007) conceptualized the dimensions of brand citizenship behavior with three dimensions including (1), brand missionary, (2), brand acceptance and (3), brand advancement through the three dimension of organizational citizenship behavior by Graham (1991) which includes (1). Obedience, (2). Loyalty and (3). Participation. This study will help the researchers
to identify the roots of brand citizenship behavior and provide guideline to conceptualize the construct in future studies.
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**Introduction**

Researchers have been studying and updating the brand citizenship behavior concept from past one and half decade (Ahn, Hyun and Kim, 2015; Bahamin and Abaei, 2015; Burmann and Zeplin, 2005; Chang, Chiang and Han, 2012; Erkmen and Hancer, 2014; Nyadzayo, Matanda and Ewing, 2015; Piehler et al., 2016; Porricelli, Yurova, Abratt and Bendixen, 2014; Shaari, 2012; Shaari, Salleh and Hussin, 2011; Shaari, Salleh and Hussin, 2012a). Number of publication in the area is limited as compare to other branding constructs but the role of brand citizenship behavior is very much important because researchers used the construct individually (Burmann and Zeplin, 2005) and as a main component of employee brand equity (Baumgarth, 2010; King and Grace, 2009, 2010; King, Grace and Funk, 2012). The concept of brand citizenship behavior was coined from the study of Burmann and Zeplin (2005) who conceptualized the concept on the study of Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000). The construct has been received much attention in organizational behavior research that is also known as pro-social or extra-role behavior of employees. Furthermore, Burmann and Zeplin (2005) defined brand citizenship behavior as the extra-role behavior in favor of brand that brings brand to life.

 Practitioners asserted that brand citizenship behavior is a key ingredient of internal branding, which encourages employees to align their behavior with organizational brand to create and maintain the consistent brand identity (Henkel et al., 2007; Baumgarth & Schmidt, 2010, Burmann & Konig, 2011). However, as exhibited by the research, the employees’ behavior is crucial in the internal branding process because all activities related to brand identity are based on the decisions and actions of employees particularly in service sector (Punjaisri et al., 2009a). This is because, in service-based organization, employees have direct contact with customers and other external stakeholders are the epitome of the brand in their eyes (Du Preez et al., 2017). Employees brand related behavior constantly transmit the positive brand image among all stakeholders — different researcher used different dimensions to measure the brand citizenship behavior. Hence, this study aims to identify the roots of brand citizenship behavior and provide guideline to conceptualize the construct.
Brand Citizenship Behavior

Brand citizenship behavior is the dominant concept to enhance internal brand equity (Ravens, 2014, p. 59) and provide the strongest foundation for competitive advantage (Shaari, Salleh and Hussin, 2012b, p. 27). Baumgarth and Schmidt (2010, p. 1252), term brand citizenship behavior as employee extra-role behavior. Burmann and Zeplin (2005, p. 282), described brand citizenship behavior as the employee extra-role behavior as well in favor of brand. While, King et al. (2012) termed brand citizenship behavior as brand-consistent behavior. Brand citizenship behavior also termed as behavioral branding quality (Henkel, Tomczak, Heitmann and Herrmann, 2007), employee brand building behavior (Morhart, Herzog and Tomczak, 2009; Swoboda, 2014), employee brand performance (Punjaisri and Wilson, 2007; Punjaisri and Wilson, 2011; Punjaisri, Wilson and Evanschitzky, 2009), core value behavior (Thorbjørnsen and Supphellen, 2011) and brand supporting behavior (Punjaisri, Wilson and Evanschitzky, 2008).

To measure the brand-related behavior of the employees, different researcher’s used different dimensions. Most of researchers (e.g., Baumgarth and Binckebanck, 2011; Burmann and König, 2011; Burmann, Zeplin and Riley, 2009; Chang et al., 2012; King and Grace, 2009, 2010; King et al., 2012; Porricelli et al., 2014; Shaari et al., 2012b; Swoboda, 2014; Xie, Peng and Huan, 2014) used multidimensional measure to gauge brand-consistent behavior or brand citizenship behavior through the conceptualization suggested by Burmann and Zeplin (2005). While, some researcher’s (e.g., Henkel et al., 2007; Punjaisri and Wilson, 2007; Punjaisri et al., 2008; Punjaisri and Wilson, 2011; Punjaisri et al., 2009) measured the concept through uni-dimensional scale (See Table 2.3). Additionally, Burmann and Zeplin (2005) conceptualized brand-consistent behavior in seven dimensions under the umbrella of brand citizenship behavior. Seven dimensions of brand citizenship behavior suggested by Burmann and Zeplin (2005) includes; (1). helping behavior, (2). brand consideration, (3). brand enthusiasm, (4). brand sportsmanship, (5). brand endorsement, (6). brand self-development and (7). brand advancement. Most of the researchers used the dimensions of brand citizenship behavior in service intensive sector. The paucity of studies seen from the manufacturing sector and banking sector in the case of brand citizenship behavior (See Table 1).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Citizenship Behavior/Brand-Consistent Behavior Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Measuremennt</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Detail of dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chang et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Brand Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Multidimensional</td>
<td>Helping Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sportsmanship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand Enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xie et al. (2014)</td>
<td>Brand Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Multidimensional</td>
<td>Willingness to Help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Propensity for further development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morhart et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Brand Building Behavior</td>
<td>Telecommunication</td>
<td>Multidimensional</td>
<td>Extra-Role Behavior (Participation and Word of Mouth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In-Role Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employee Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjaisri and Wilson (2007); Punjaisri et al. (2008); Punjaisri et al. (2009); Punjaisri and Wilson (2011)</td>
<td>Brand Performance</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Uni-dimensional</td>
<td>Brand Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henkel et al. (2007)</td>
<td>Brand-Consistent Behavior</td>
<td>Retailing, services and consumer goods</td>
<td>Uni-dimensional</td>
<td>Quality of Behavioral Branding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmann et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Brand Building Behavior</td>
<td>Auto, Financial Services, Retail, consumer goods, travel and telecommunication</td>
<td>Multidimensional</td>
<td>Helping Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand Enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand Self-Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Grace (2009); King and Grace (2010)</td>
<td>Brand Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>Services Industry</td>
<td>Multidimensional</td>
<td>Helping Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand Enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand Endorsement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The term “Brand Citizenship Behavior” was first sound from the article of Burmann and Zeplin (2005). Similar concept “organization citizenship behavior” has been widely seen in organizational behavior literature and which received considerable attention (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Smith, Organ and Near, 1983). Podsakoff et al. (2000), proposed seven dimensions to measure organizational citizenship behavior i.e. helping behavior, organizational compliance, individual initiative, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, self-development and civic virtue. All the dimensions represent the generic individual behavior in an organization. Therefore, more specifically, Burmann and Zeplin (2005) conceptualize the brand citizenship behavior in order to enhance brand identity. Later on, the concept was used by various scholars to check how effectively employees represent the brands (see-Baumgarth and Binckebanck, 2011; Burmann et al., 2009; Chang et al., 2012; King and Grace, 2009, 2010; King et al., 2012; Shaari et al., 2012b; Xie et al., 2014). Therefore, the concept is very famous in identity-based brand management where we checked that employee behavior that represents the brand.

Scholars defined the concept of brand citizenship behavior as:

- Brand citizenship behavior describes “a number of generic employee behaviors that enhance the brand identity” (Burmann and Zeplin, 2005, p. 266).
- It’s an employee engagement with the brand in the way that the employees are attitudinally and behaviorally ready to deliver brand promise (Baker, Rapp, Meyer and Mullins, 2014).
- Employee consideration toward brand in order to deliver brand promise in an appropriate manner when the employee goes beyond their formal jobs (Shaari, Salleh and Hussin, 2015).
• Non-enforceable, functional, extra-role behavior that contributes the performance of the brand (Xie et al., 2014).

• The non-prescribed behavior of employee that is congruent with brand values of the organization (Burmann et al., 2009).

The theme of all the definitions reflects that the brand-related behavior of employee is non-prescribed employee behavior. Hence, we can say that its employee deliberations towards brand in the manner that the employee delivers brand promise in a suitable way without caring his formal job description. This behavior is very much crucial because it’s the soul of the brand that puts life in the brand.

Burmann and Zeplin (2005), conceptualize the brand citizenship behavior into seven dimensions. The dimensions are related to the somewhat organization citizenship behavior (See Table 2.4) discusses by Podsakoff et al. (2000) but not the same by nature. Organizational citizenship behavior focused on the employee intra-organizational behavior but brand citizenship behavior reflects employee specific behavior that focuses on the brand-customer relationship (Shaari et al., 2012b, p. 29). Hence, we can say that organizational citizenship behavior represents the employee generic behavior but brand citizenship behavior represents the employee specific behavior towards the brand. Both behaviors are same in the case of discretionary in nature. Differences between dimensions of the both variables are described hereunder.

### Table 2

| Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Brand Citizenship Behavior |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| **Organizational Citizenship Behavior** (Podsakoff et al., 2000) | **Brand Citizenship Behavior** (Burmann and Zeplin, 2005) |
| Helping Behavior | Helping Behavior |
| Organizational Compliance | Brand Consideration |
| Individual Initiative | Brand Enthusiasm |
| Sportsmanship | Brand Sportsmanship |
| Organizational Loyalty | Brand Endorsement |
| Self-Development | Brand Self-Development |
| Civic Virtue | Brand Advancement |

Both Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Brand Citizenship Behavior having first dimension “employee helping behavior”. Podsakoff et al. (2000), considered it as an important
variable and defined it as a voluntary behavior of employee with other employees or preventing work-related problems. According to Podsakoff et al. (2000), the behavior is very important and almost scholars have to work in the area. The definition having two parts (1). Voluntarily behavior which means that the employee having the character of interpersonal helping and interpersonal facilitation, (2). Helping behavior which prevents work-related problems which mean curtesy. Same as organizational citizenship behavior, helping behavior is also the first dimension of brand citizenship behavior which defines the employee friendly, helpful and empathetic behavior with internal as well as with external customers (Burmann and Zeplin, 2005). In marketing literature, almost researcher used the dimension to measure brand-consistent behavior/brand citizenship behavior/brand building behavior (cf. Baumgarth and Binckebanck, 2011; Burmann and König, 2011; Burmann et al., 2009; Chang et al., 2012; King and Grace, 2010; King et al., 2012; Morhart et al., 2009; Porricelli et al., 2014; Shaari et al., 2012b; Xie et al., 2014).

Second one dimension to measure organizational citizenship behavior is organizational compliance (Podsakoff et al., 2000) when employee internalizes and accept organizational rules, procedure, and regulation and show some devotion towards them not only under observation or monitoring but under non-observation or non-monitoring (Podsakoff et al., 2000). In other words, it the condition when an employee is obedient towards organizational rules and regulation every time. Therefore, in brand citizenship behavior, the dimension is added as a brand consideration which describes the obedience of brand-related behavior in which an employee obedient to brand-related behavioral guidelines and reflection of brand impact before taking any action or communication in any situation (Burmann and Zeplin, 2005). Brand consideration is not commonly used dimension in marketing literature. Paucity of studies found where the dimension is used (Baumgarth and Binckebanck, 2011; Chang et al., 2012; King and Grace, 2010; King et al., 2012) but in the case of employee brand equity, brand consideration is commonly used dimension (e.g. Baumgarth and Schmidt, 2010; Grace, 2012; King and Grace, 2009; King et al., 2012).

The third dimension of organizational citizenship behavior is individual initiative. It’s a task-related behavior of employee where behavior is beyond the minimal excepted level (Podsakoff et al., 2000). In the behavior, employee tries to show creative and innovative behavior to perform and improve the organizational task by showing extra enthusiasm, voluntary takes extra responsibility and encourage other to act as same manner (Podsakoff et al., 2000). In contrast, Burmann and Zeplin (2005) conceptualized the dimension in brand citizenship behavior as brand enthusiasm, where an employee shows extra initiative while the employee involves in brand-related behaviors. Mostly, scholars used the dimension to measure the brand-consistent behavior of the employee (e.g. Burmann and König, 2011; Burmann et al., 2009; King and Grace, 2010; Porricelli et al., 2014; Xie et al., 2014). In the case of internal brand equity or employee brand equity, King and Grace (2010) and Baumgarth and Binckebanck (2011) used the dimension but later on King et al. (2012) excluded the dimension from the measurement of employee brand equity.
The fourth dimension of the brand citizenship behavior is *Brand Sportsmanship*. The dimension is related to the employee sportsmanship suggested by Podsakoff *et al.* (2000) to measure the concept of organizational citizenship behavior. In order to measure organizational citizenship behavior, the sportsmanship is defined as “a willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining” (Organ, 1990, p. 96). Whereas, Burmann and Zeplin (2005) defined Brand Sportsmanship as the condition when an employee is engaged with brand inconvenience where the employee doesn't have any complaint regarding that one inconvenience. On the other hand, employee stuck with the brand even with high opportunity cost. Only a few studies found where scholars used the dimension to measure the brand-consistent behavior (e.g. Baumgarth and Schmidt, 2010; Chang *et al.*, 2012; Shaari *et al.*, 2012b).

The fifth dimension of brand citizenship behavior is *brand endorsement*. The dimension is related to the dimension suggested in organizational citizenship behavior named “organizational loyalty” by Podsakoff *et al.* (2000). Organizational loyalty defined as spreading the organizational positive image and goodwill to the others (Jones and George, 1998). Moreover, protecting, endorsing and defending organizational objectives (Borman and Motowidlo, 1997; Podsakoff *et al.*, 2000). Same as above, brand citizenship behavior having the dimension named brand endorsement. Where employee having behavior to endorse the brand to others in non-job-related conditions both inside and outside the organization (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2000) because every employee of an organization is a part time marketer (Gummesson, 1991). A small number of studies used the dimension to measure the brand-consistent behavior (e.g. Baumgarth and Binckebanck, 2011; King and Grace, 2010; Morhart *et al.*, 2009; Shaari *et al.*, 2012b).

The sixth dimension of organizational citizenship behavior is *self-development* where employee having behavior to improve their skills, knowledge, and abilities (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2000) and the dimensions is considered as the key dimension of the organizational citizenship behavior (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2000). In the case of self-development behavior employee “seeking out and taking advantage of advanced training courses, keeping abreast of the latest developments in one’s field and area, or even learning a new set of skills so as to expand the range of one’s contributions to an organization” (George and Brief, 1992, p. 155). Therefore, Burmann and Zeplin (2005) conceptualized the dimension in brand citizenship behavior by the name of brand self-development. Where, the employee is willing to enhance and engage in developing brand-related skills knowledge and abilities. Dimension is also considered as key dimension in brand citizenship behavior because number of studies used brand self-development to measure brand citizenship behavior (e.g., Baumgarth and Binckebanck, 2011; Burmann and König, 2011; Burmann *et al.*, 2009; Chang *et al.*, 2012; King *et al.*, 2012; Porricelli *et al.*, 2014; Shaari *et al.*, 2012b; Xie *et al.*, 2014). In the case of employee brand equity/internal brand equity, Baumgarth and Binckebanck (2011) used the dimension to measure the extra-role behavior of the employee. Further, King and Grace (2009) and King and Grace (2010) do not use the dimension while conceptualizing and measuring employee-based brand equity. Later on, King *et al.* (2012) included the dimension to measure employee brand equity (See Table 2.5).
The last dimension to measure organizational citizenship behavior is civic virtue. It’s a macro level interest or commitment towards an organization where employee show his readiness to participate in governance as to attend organization meetings opinion expression on organizational strategies and in policy debates Podsakoff et al. (2000). The dimension is used in brand-consistent behavior as brand advancement where the employees “contribution to the adaptation of the brand identity concept to changing market needs or new organizational competencies” (Burmann and Zeplin, 2005, p. 284). The concept is not commonly used to measure brand-consistent behavior (See Table 3). in the case of internal brand equity/employee brand equity, only Baumgarth and Schmidt (2010) used the dimension to measure brand-consistent behavior.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commonly used dimensions of Brand Citizenship Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = Helping Behavior, 2 = Brand Consideration, 3 = Brand Enthusiasm, 4 = Brand Sponsorship, 5 = Brand Endorsement, 6 = Brand Self-Development and 7 = Brand Advance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the dimensions of brand citizenship behavior previously discussed were conceptualized from the dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior suggested by Podsakoff et al. (2000) and conceptualized by Burmann and Zeplin (2005). Approximately researcher’s used the dimensions of brand citizenship behavior suggested by Burmann and Zeplin (2005) but Maloney (2007) conceptualized the dimensions of brand citizenship behavior with three dimensions including (1), brand missionary, (2), brand acceptance and (3), brand advancement through the three dimension of organizational citizenship behavior by Graham (1991) which includes (1). obedience, (2). loyalty and (3). participation. Further, König (2010), Piehler (2011), Burmann and König (2011), Porricelli et al. (2014) and Ravens (2014) validated the construct. He defined brand citizenship behavior as “global concept which encompasses all brand-related behavioral intentions of a channel marketer that strengthen the brand identity of the manufacturer brand.
aggregated construct” (Maloney, 2007, p. 83 & 190). The dimensions of the brand citizenship behavior suggested by Maloney (2007) are described hereunder:

- **Brand Missionary**: Brand Missionary is defined as employee honest loyalty towards manufacturer brand towards all aspects of the brand including all the behavior needed to represent brand identity outside. It communicates the dimension of individual initiative of Podsakoff *et al.* (2000) and organizational loyalty dimension of Graham (1991). It also integrates the dimension of brand enthusiasm by Zeplin (2006).

- **Brand Acceptance**: Brand Acceptance is defined as compliance and acceptance with organizational rules and regulation that encompasses all behavior of the employees that reflect formal rules and requirements of the manufacturer brand. The dimension is conceptualized through the Graham (1991) dimension organizational obedience. Furthermore, the dimension is significantly overlapped with the category of brand consideration of Zeplin (2006) and brand compliance of Podsakoff *et al.* (2000). The dimension is very important because the dimension is commonly used dimension in the conceptualization of employee brand equity/ internal brand equity (e.g., Baumgarth and Schmidt, 2010; King and Grace, 2010; King *et al.*, 2012). Hence, the importance of brand acceptance cannot be ruled out.

- **Brand Advancement**: Brand advancement is defined as the employee behavior that having proactive influence on the management of brand to strengthens the brand by encouraging employees to look for the advancement of their skills and knowledge. The dimension also represents equally termed brand advancement suggested by Zeplin (2006) and being closer to civic virtue suggested by Graham (1991). The dimension discussed in detail previously. The category is important because most of the researcher used the dimension to measure the branding behavior of employee (See Table 3).

**Conclusion and Discussion**

The systematic review of BCB contributes to a growing body of evidence indicating that employees’ behavior are often measured by the multidimensional constructs instead to measure by unidimensional (e.g., Burmann *et al.*, 2009; King & Grace, 2010; Morhart *et al.*, 2009; Baumgarth & Binckebanck, 2011; Burmann & König, 2011; Ravens, 2014; Porricelli *et al.*, 2014; Xie *et al.*, 2014; Shaari *et al.*, 2012b; Chang *et al.*, 2012). Indeed, these studies revealed that multidimension is not only a viable method of measuring BCB but also that it may represent a preferred manner of measuring employees’ BCB. Thus, to understand the phenomenon of employees’ brand building behavior, it seems vital to determine BCB construct upon multiple factors such as individual initiative, enthusiasm, compliance and acceptance with organizational rules and regulation, advancement of skills and knowledge.

To recap findings brand citizenship is the pivotal construct of internal branding that comprises all brand related behavioral performance of internal stakeholders that strengthened the organization's brand identity. In the context of internal branding, despite a fair amount of research attention, the scholars consider different approach regarding the dimensions of BCB.
construct. Since Burmann and Zeplin (2005) measure BCB construct based on the seven dimension as described by Podsakoff et al. (2000). Although in the similar context — employees brand supportive behavior researchers do not consider or evaluate its dimensionality (e.g. Henkel et al., 2011b; Tomczak et al., 2009; Wentzel et al., 2011). While Maloney (2007) conceptualized the dimensions of BCB with three dimensions.

Consequently, this study draws on relevant brand citizenship behavior based on the findings of Porricelli et al. (2014), Xie et al. (2014), King et al. (2012), Burmann and König (2011), Burmann et al. (2009) and Maloney (2007). These studies verify three dimensions nonetheless with different dimensions (Table 3). Based on theoretical development of the construct, this research posits helping behavior is an important dimension of brand citizenship behavior and should not be ignored. Hence, this study suggests a three-dimension structure of brand citizenship behavior consisting of brand acceptance, brand advancement, and helping behavior including brand missionary as a type of helping behavior.

References


