ABSTRACT

Purpose- The development of research on Brand Citizenship Behaviors (BCBs) has brought about some reasonable disarray about the way of the build, and made it troublesome for everything except the most enthusiastic peruses to stay aware of advancements in this area. Theory and research on Brand Citizenship Behaviors (BCB) assume BCB as an arrangement of alluring practices that adds to the brand Performance. But the antecedents of BCB are not completely researched. This paper reviews the concept of BCB in relation with related concepts and empirical implications found in the existing knowledge sphere.

Methodology- Researchers followed literature Review as the main methodology to review the existing empirical knowledge to build conceptual content to support for the proposed research directions.

Findings- The findings provides the insights on how empirical findings being shared in literature reviews connecting the concept of Band Citizenship behavior and related concepts and implications.

Conclusion- Based on the discussion, postulate the future research directions in line with the empirical knowledge gaps found within.

Keywords: Brand citizenship behavior, brand commitment, job satisfaction, internal branding, implications.

JEL Codes: M31,M16,M12

1. INTRODUCTION

Brand citizenship behavior conduct is another idea that investigates deliberate activities and activities that are outside of the official obligations of the employees in the territory of the Organization's image. Brand citizenship behavior is, extent, based on the theory of the behavior of organizational citizenship which establishes that organizations need voluntary behavior of its employees as well as their job responsibilities (Ucanok & Karabati, 2013). In light of the possibility of “enthusiasm to corporate” and “individual innovative behavior” proposed by Barnard (1938), this documented was established by Katz (1964). Managers should furnish customers with a consoling message of their image which is conceivable through internal branding and brand citizenship behavior lastly prompts some positive outcomes for the organization. This requires a joint effort of marketing and HR administration during the time spent branding. (Porricelli, 2014).

In theoretical and experimental reviews on organization citizenship behavior, (Podsakoff et al, 2000) have distinguished seven measurements of Organizational Citizenship behavior which include: helping conduct, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual activity, social knowledge, and self-improvement. They likewise recognized four classifications of Organizational Citizenship behavior records (Job satisfaction and Organization commitment), work highlights (satisfactory work), organizational features (intelligent gatherings) and leadership values (clarification of prospect, giving a suitable model, and strengthening the gathering objectives) (Porricelli, 2014).

Brand Citizenship Behavior is a worldwide structure that incorporates the willful choices of employees to make a few practices that are outside their official and obligatory undertakings and reinforce brand identity. (Burmann and Zeplin, 2014).
2005) Examined the 7-dimensional guide of organizational citizenship behavior recognized by (Podsakoff et al, 2000) in the zone of marketing and hence, made the idea of brand citizenship behavior. These measurements later on were rethought by (Burmann et al., 2008) and were contracted to three measurements of readiness to help (brand acceptance), brand enthusiasm (brand advertising), and propensity for further improvement (brand development) (Porricelli, 2014).

Brand citizenship behaviors have a collective beneficial outcome on organizational functioning. Brand citizenship has been defined in the literature as a multidimensional concept that includes all positive relevant organizational behaviors of employees organizational traditional role behavior, including relevant extra-role of organization behavior, prior research of the background to the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is extensive (Jain et al., 2012); (Yi et al., 2013), but BCB is limited and there are even less attention.

However the concept of BCB and its relationship with related concepts including Internal Branding has been claimed as a notion to be further examined. This argument has been specifically mentioned with reference to different services content. (Hennayake, 2017) (Dissanayake & Neel & Jinadasa, 2017.) (Shaari et. al., 2012). Therefore this paper address to review and suggest future research directions address in to the foresaid empirical gaps.

Having said that, this paper has developed the objectives of the paper as fallows. This paper attempts to review the concept of BCB in relation with related concepts and empirical implications fund in the existing knowledge sphere and to postulate the future research directions in line with the empirical knowledge gaps found within.

This study follows literature review as its main method and accordingly, extended evaluation of empirical research works was carried out to investigate the niche of BCB. Further, special focused has been made to review the antecedents of the concept of BCB and its behavioral connections with different brand related concepts. It has organized the empirical contents validate the concept of BCB as one of the needed concept to be further examined with different contexts. Additionally, we attempt to highlight the empirical research gaps postulated by different studies to direct future studies.

Taken after by the given foundation, researchers have sorted out the paper content with objectives, system alongside theoretical review on the said topic under particular segements to give clear discussions, understanding the different discoveries delivered by various observational reviews identified with the precursors of BCB and finnaly it has given a conclusion before displaying the recommendations for future reviews and practices.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The Literature is starting broadly with a discussion of the concept of Brand Citizenship Behavior, followed by an insight within the dimensions of Brand Citizenship behavior and antecedents of BCB, its importance, empirical gaps and investigations.

2.1. Concept of Brand Citizenship Behavior (BCB)

Brands are not just visual or enthusiastic images. A brand is an identifiable item, organization or administration, including the total delivered and experienced (Argenti and Druckenmiller, 2004). To support the corporate brand, employees should demonstrate a behavior that is conceptualized as a Brand Citizenship Behavior (Burmann and Zeplin, 2005). BCB suggests the “advancement of an aggregate that describe a progression of generic behaviors (brand or autonomous industry) employee that redesign brand personality (Burmann and Zeplin , 2005) toward the day's end, BCB delineates the purposeful behavior of employees outside the yearnings of part and for the brand”. This incorporates the behavior that spotlights on subjects intra-organizational (like not complaining and help collaborators, without desires of rewards (organ, 1988) and additionally behavior is remotely coordinated (Burmann and Zeplin,, 2005).

The conceptualization of brand citizenship behavior is based on the concept of conduct of organizational citizenship (OCB) (Burmann and Zeplin., 2005). It is related to the behavior of employees, which is not a part of formal or rewarded function required directly by the Organization (organ, 1988). OCB is considered to have an internal focus where BCB includes the behavior which is directed to external recipients, thus, BCB is broader than the OCB. On the other hand, BCB has a focus more narrowly than the OBC by concentrating on the brand instead of organization (Burmann and Zeplin , 2005).

Brand citizenship conduct was initially presented by German researchers i.e. (Burmann and Zeplin , 2005). It was based on the hypothesis of Organization Citizenship Behavior (OCB). The behavior of employees in brand building has picked up consideration of researchers from the Western nations, for example, (Burmann and Zeplin , 2005), (Burmann et al., 2008), King and Grace (2008), and (Punjaisri and Wilson, 2007). This may lead to limited understanding about what are the real features of employee behavior that enhance the brand performance. (Baumgart and Schmidt, 2009; (Burmann and Zeplin, 2005). In this manner, (Burmann and Zeplin., 2005) had presented seven employee behavior that could clarify employees brand citizenship behavior.
Basically, BCB is characterized as "the employees deliberate premise to extend various non-specific behavior practices that improve the brand identity" (Burmann and Zeplin, 2005). The scientists additionally affirmed that BCB is a measure of the representative readiness to apply additional exertion that goes past its fundamental capacities i.e. anticipating the brand citizenship behavior. As per (Burmann and Zeplin, 2005), BCB is altogether not the same as OCB. BCB is a piece of OCB, as well as goes past the extent of OCB. This is on the grounds that BCB additionally consider the remotely focused on practices, for example, fortifying the nature of brand-customer relationship (satisfaction, loyalty and retention). Then again, OCB is something centered Intra-association is more execution related work (Burmann and Zeplin, 2005). (Burmann and Zeplin, 2005) Suggested, that, BCB comprises of seven measurements in particular (1) helping behavior, (2) brand consideration (3) brand enthusiasm (4) sportsmanship, (5) brand endorsement, (6) self-improvement, and (7) brand advancement.

Literature suggests that workers who are committed to the brand are having the capacity to show good state of attitude and behavior toward the brand, in this manner expanding the external customer satisfaction. (Burmann and Zeplin, 2005). Employees in a soul of high brand citizenship will offer "everything" to accomplish individual fulfillment and destinations of the organization. For instance, these employees show high state of behavior and adherence to the estimations of brand, enthusiastic help, exhibit to deliberate brand commitment, looking for self-development in the brand’s qualities and to communicate positive words about the brand (Burmann and Zeplin, 2005); (Ind, N., 2001). Such behavior additionally demonstrates that employees are exceedingly conscious, fulfilled, committed, and faithful to the brand (Punjaisri and Wilson, 2007). Accordingly, employees with need such components not exclusively are disappointed and out of line to brand, likewise potentially weaken the overall performance of the brand particularly in the satisfaction of the brand promise to outer customers. In the initial study conducted by Burmann et. al., (2008), BCB is clarified by three principle measurements specifically; helping behavior, brand development, and brand enthusiasm. Nevertheless, they considered their study as a “first exploratory step towards the aim of providing a model of the BCB concept”

Moreover, the latest studies (Burmann et al., 2009) recommended further investigation within a quantitative data set. Therefore, a large-scale quantitative validation of the dimensions was done by Shaari et. al.(2012). They identified four dimensions of BCB: helping behavior, sportsmanship, self-brand development and brand endorsement. Since (Shaari et. al., 2012) work represents the most current and quantitative largest investigation of BCB, this study draws on the BCB-dimensions of the authors. In light of the discoveries, the scientists saw that BCB origination seen as ailing in term of prevalence when contrasted over OCB and need with be tried with new data. In that capacity, the present review utilized the first seven measurements of BCB as proposed before by (Burmann and Zeplin , 2005) basically to affirm the build construct validity and to give better comprehension of what constitute behavior of employees brand citizenship.

2.2. Dimensions of Brand Citizenship Behavior

In view of the literatures, brand citizenship behavior ordinarily talked about in view of two noteworthy streams, in particular (i) in-role behavior and, (ii) extra-role behavior. For example, Kimpakorn and Tocquer (2009), King and Grace (2008) and Punjaisri and Wilson (2007) highlighted brand citizenship behavior as additional toward in-role brand behavior while Morhart, Herzog and Tomczak (2008) and Burmann et al. (2008) expressed that brand citizenship behavior is best portrayed as extra-role brand behavior. In any case, there is no reliable phrasing utilized for both ideas of brand citizenship behavior. Another significant issue worried with such idea (in-role and extra-role brand behavior) is in regards to un-dimensional versus multidimensional of workers’ image reliable behavior. In this way, the current learn will look at whether such employees brand citizenship behavior is un-dimensional or best clarified by multidimensional idea.

Generally, in-role brand behavior is identified with a capacity of employees to convey the brand promise. As per Morhart et al. (2008), in-role behavior is meeting recommended brand roles while Burmann et al. (2008) named this as brand compliance. In-role behavior would be effectively satisfied by generally organization. Extra-role brand behavior alludes to employee’s eagerness to take additional miles in the interest of the organizations brand.

This incorporates occupation or task or behavior that goes past formal recommended brand roles, for example, positive word of mouth, participation, helping behavior, sportsmanship, brand enthusiasm and other workers’ extra brand effort (Burmann et al. 2008; Morhart et al. 2008). In view of the presumption that organization supported their brand competitive advantage through differentiation strategy, hence, extra-role brand behavior would be the best practice for brand differentiation.

This is on account of, to draw in employees with extra-role brand behavior that goes past their brand role is not effortlessly found in each association/brand. Additionally, Burmann et al. (2008) recommended that extra-role brand behavior is better than in-role brand behavior animating positive brand identity. Th usly, extra-role brand behavior will be inspected in this review which is conceptualized as brand citizenship behavior.

Employee brand citizenship behavior (BCB) is a moderately new idea that clarifies how employees could enhance their conveyance performance brand by adjusting their attitude and their behavior to the Organization’s brand. Basically, brand
citizenship behavior refers to the deliberate way of the specialists to extend a progression of utilized nonexclusive behaviors that enhance brand identity (Burmann and Zeplin, 2005).

BCB started from behavior of organizational citizenship that perceives the internal workings of micro level (the operation of the employee brand) to outer beneficiaries rather than full macro level performance (work and performance of the Organization) as it were. (Burmann et al., 2008), BCB is made out of seven building that is accepted to speak to the behavior identified with the brand of employees to enhance the accomplishment of the Organization’s brand and later to hold competitive advantage of the organization. The structures are as per the following:

**Helping Behavior.** Help behavior is related with inspirational attitude, sensitivity, kindness and compassion towards the customer, internal and external, assuming responsibility for assignments outside their area of the city if important, as a follow-up to the dissensions.

**Sportsmanship.** Sportsmanship is related without any grievances, regardless of the possibility that the brand commitment to bring about inconvenience; willingness to engage to draw in to for the brand even in the open door cost.

**Brand Endorsement.** Brand support alludes to the suggestion of the employees of the brand to others likewise in circumstances inconsequential to work for instance, companions; Thus the brand identity for the newcomers in the organization.

**Brand Enthusiasm.** Brand enthusiasm speaks to employees’ capacity to show additional works while taking part in brand-related behavior.

**Brand Consideration.** Consideration of brand refers to the grip of the employee to examples of behavior identified with the brand and the impression of the effect of brand before convey or act in any circumstance.

**Self-development.** Self-development speak to employees readiness to consistently enhance brand related

**Brand-advancement.** Advancement of brand alludes to the commitment of the employees to the adjustment of the idea of branding to the changing needs of the market or new organizational skill, as setting off to the customer or produces innovative thoughts.

BY and large, the development of secured thought of employees towards the brand that goes past its formal work recommended for the most part conveying the brand promise in a fitting way. Along these lines, in light of the understanding of the work of brand behavior proposed by (Burmann and Zeplin, 2005), it will be balanced in light of the way that it gives a fantasy all the more all encompassing viewpoint of the performance of the brand with respect to employees not at all like distinctive works.

In any case, the aftereffects of the examination of (Burmann et al., 2008) uncovered that exclusive three of the seven structures (i.e. helping behavior, brand development and brand enthusiasm) clarified brand citizenship behavior altogether. In that capacity, it is the need to test the new dataset development for the most part to build the predominance of the development.

**Table 1: Conceptualizing Employees Brand Citizenship Behavior- Dimension Based on Zeplin (2006) and Maloney (2007)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Helping Behavior</th>
<th>Sportsmanship</th>
<th>Org.Loyalty</th>
<th>Org.Compliance</th>
<th>Civic Virtue</th>
<th>Individual Initiative</th>
<th>Self Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burmann et.al (2008a), Burmann/ Zeplin (2005)</td>
<td>Brand Citizenship behavior is a total build which depicts various generic brand or industry independently employee practices that improve the brand personality dormant develop</td>
<td>Helping behavior uplifting disposition support and compassion towards inner and outside clients Going well beyond the employment</td>
<td>Sportsmanship no griping regardless of the possibility that engagement for the brand causes in accommodations : readiness to draw in with the brand even at higher open door cost</td>
<td>Brand endorsement suggestion of the brand to others additionally in non-work related circumspect for instance to companions passing on the brand personality to newcomers in the association.</td>
<td>Brand consideration to brand related behavior rules and impression of brand effect before correspondence or talking activity in any circumstance.</td>
<td>Brand advancement commitment to the adjustment of the brand personality idea to changing business sector needs or new authoritative capabilities for instance by passing on client input or creating inventive business thought</td>
<td>Brand enthusiasm Showing additional activity while drawing in brand related practices</td>
<td>Self-Development eagerness to ceaselessly upgraded brand related abilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.3. Brand Citizenship Behavior (BCB)-Antecedents

2.3.1. Internal Brand Management Concept

Podsakoff et al. (2000) identify estimations of authority as an antecedent to the OCB. This incorporates, verbalize the vision, giving an appropriate model and advance the acknowledgment of the Group’s objectives. As far as promoting, inside brand Management (IBM) covers these ideas and it might be contended that an antecedent to the BCB truth be told, the greater part of the recognized reviews (Burmann et al., 2009) (Chang et al, 2012) (King and Grace, 2012); (Shaari et al, 2012) utilize some type of IBM as a forerunner to BCB. IBM is a subset of interior showcasing that spotlights on the advancement, fortifying and support of the Organization’s image. It is an idea that emerged in the mid 1970’s when Berry et al (1976) suggested that representatives are inside customer who must be fulfilled. The idea has advanced in the course of recent decades to wind up plainly a multidimensional idea (Gezen et al., 2007). While a few creators trust that the inside advertising is operationalized through inner correspondence (Chang et al., 2009); (Punjaisri and Wilson, 2007), others trust that the most vital measurement is the Training (Farzadatal., 2008; (Gezen et al., 2007), but then others propose look into inward prompting as the significance of the measurement (Lee and Wen-Jung, 2005); (Wilde and, Parks, 2005). All things considered, will be considered fundamentally a HR capacity that incorporates the preparation and training of inner prompting (Gray, 2006); (Zamperakis &., Moustakis, 20007) 20007), fulfilling and rousing (Lee and Wen-Jung, 2005), and the enlistment of workers (Arnett and Laverie and McLane, 2002). These starts are intended to help employees to adequately communicate with customers.

As per the view of Burmann and Zeplin (2005),IBM as a blend of three levers. Initially, centered on the brand, HR administration guarantees an identity personal brand fits through recruitment, selection and advancement of employees. This is taken after the organizational socialization of employees by method for direction, training, social functions and programs of guide for the casual transmission of brand identity. The second lever is to fortify the brand among employees producing familiarity with brand and under changeless through internal communication, the more traditional part of internal branding. Leadership of the brand that is energized at all levels of the Organization so that employees “living the brand”. (Burmann and Zeplin., 2005)They contend that IBM made with these levers in the games amusement, BC, which thus brings about the BCB. After (Burmann et al., 2009), internal brand management is displayed as a moment arrange preparing gave by three levers, as a brand identity (BId), brand communication (BCom) and brand leadership (BLead).

According to King and Grace (2012), the part of organizational socialization of IBM, yet contend that the orientation relationship (between the Organization and its employees), and receptivity of the employee (the psychological characteristic of the employees) are extra segments. Again they build up a model of rivalry in which the segments of IBM make (BC) and in this manner BCB, as well as make BCB straightforwardly, i.e. BC mediates the Relationship amongst IBM and BCB. Additionally, Brand Knowledge and Brand Rewards have been recognized as huge factors observed with in Internal Branding to be tried with BCB.
2.3.2. Brand Commitment

Podsakoff et al. (2000) said that, the investigation of the Organizational Commitment is known in the area for the direct of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. On account of corporate branding Brand Commitment (BC) is synonymous with Organizational Commitment (Porricelli, 2014) the Brand Commitment is a key component in the Organization success of numerous enterprises, for example, tourism and hospitality (Ahn and Kim & Lee, 2016). The vital thing in this exploration is the idea of commitment to employees with the Organization’s brand. As per Kimpakorn and Tocquer (2010), this review characterizes employees BC as a dynamic association with the organization that makes employees willing and glad to share their brand knowledge to others. Such employees are mentally and affectively dedicated to supporting the brand. Miles and Mangold (2004) proposed that absence of employee commitment to a brand may bring negative word of mouth concerning the endeavor or inability to convey the client encounter determined by the BC.

Meanwhile, Kimpakorn and Tocquer (2010) proclaimed that, in the administration business, employees need to comprehend the significance of the corporate brand in the brains of customers at the same time, more essentially, employees must be committed on supporting the brand and passing on a predictable brand experience to customers. In the service area specifically, employees convey the brand understanding to customer through their services, which must not just viably make the brand soul and values in the psyches of customer additionally permit clients to build up an emotional connection with the brand. An extended thought has been highlighted by Dissanayake & Hamid (2017) referring employee commitment nourished through the internal marketing leads higher level of service quality experience to customers. The brand commitment has been characterized as the mental and emotional connection with the brand. Truth be told, brand commitment is the powerful urge of the Organization’s employees to ensure the brand. (Burmann and Zeplin , 2005) Define the brand as a mental obsession of the employees to the brand, the propensity of the employees of the brand commitment to and endeavor to accomplish the objectives and procedures of the brand. The making of the idea of the brand commitment is a critical component in strengthening and achievement of internal brand (Ahn and Kim & Lee, 2016). (Podsakoff et al, 2000) report that OC is the most normally distinguished antecedent of OCB .For the situation of corporate brands, for example, that, BC is viewed as synonymous with OC (Burmann and Zeplin , 2005); (Burmann et al., 2009); (King and Grace , 2012); (Shaari et al, 2012). In expansion to that Brand commitment measures (Porricelli, 2014) (Bagher ,Masoume and Milad, 2016) as found in most recent reviews.

2.3.4. Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is the phenomenon created in fact several factors. Job satisfaction is an independent variable in depending on variables such as productivity, absenteeism, and return, behavior of the person in the society. Behavior of the person in family and in part on the individual attitude towards the political social, Cultural environment. Job satisfaction is a positive emotional state causes the evaluation of the job or work experience. In other words job satisfaction is related to level of satisfied expectation of the work. In additions job satisfaction affected some variables as age work experience, gender education and job classification. Job satisfaction is a combination of cognitive satisfaction and emotional satisfaction. Cognitive satisfaction is based on logical and rational evaluation of condition of works. Therefore cognitive satisfaction is an evaluation based on comparisons without relying on emotional judgment considering opportunities and revenues while emotional satisfaction general evaluation of person towards. This satisfaction can be seen within the positive and good mood and feeling of individual when they are at work. (Ismaili & Renani, 2007)

Job satisfaction can be characterized as the passionate sentiment delight that is experienced by an employee because of many components of work (Evans, Pucik & Bjorkman, 2011; Intaraprasong, Dityen, Krugkrunjit & Subhadrabandhu, 2012; Mohammad, Habib & Alias, 2011; Narang & Dwivedi, 2010; Swaminathan & Jawahar, 2013). Satisfaction of work as a motivational component could contribute towards positive organizational factors elements, for example, performance and commitment (Özturk, 2010). Work fulfillment has been observed to be a powerful element to the OCB by different looks into (Özturk, 2010). Diverse investigates use and characterize the measurements of job satisfaction variably.

Be that as it may, the most prevalent are to be specific: pay, the work conditions, promotional opportunities, supervision and colleagues. These pointers are likewise considered as situational elements of the association. Work conditions incorporate the work itself and the everyday operations that every representative would need to experience. Supervision as an estimation a employees relationship with his/her predominant and colleagues as an estimation of the worker’s association with different employees in the organization. None of the recognized reviews utilized job satisfaction (JS) as an antecedent of BCB. Be that as it may, as per (Podsakoff et al, 2000), it is a settled antecedents of OCB under the category of employee characteristics. Both the reviews by van Dyneetal (1994) and (Bettencourt et al, 2001) which were utilized as a part of the conceptualization of BCB utilized JS as an antecedent of OCB.
2.3.4. Importance of Brand Citizenship Behavior

The basic role of internal branding is to transform employees into brand ambassadors through brand identity based behaviors. Brand citizenship behavior is a "worldwide idea that outlines all brand relevant behavioral performance of internal partners that are steady with the brand identity and the brand value proposition and strengthen the brand". Regardless of the thought that employee brand aligned behavior is spoken to similarly in different internal branding conceptualizations, the current state of research on brand citizenship behavior is still in its outset.

Employee behavior consist the target or endogenous variable of internal branding, (Vallster and De Chernatony, 2006) and brand Citizenship Behavior is a fundamental to fulfillment of the brand guarantee, employees who are accountable for fulfilling the brand guarantee must pass on the organization dependably to accomplish and keep up the pined for character with the brand. (Punjaisri and Wilson, 2007) Most internal brand models mirror a general comprehension of the significance of employee Citizenship Behavior. In-sights into the way toward accomplishing and keeping up employee brand-related behavior and improvement of a particular definition are recent brand citizenship behavior is potentially the most predominant conceptualization.

Meanwhile, Brand Citizenship Behavior has been highlighted in the recently held studies as to examine with some of the brand evaluation contexts namely brand attitude, brand trust and brand love specially referring to the services sector organizations including banking segment (Dissanayake, 2015; Dissanayake & Ismail, 2015). Further, BCB has been mentioned as research directions to be examined with brand evaluation contexts in the services brands including g financial services (Dissanayake & Neel & Jinadasa, 2017.) (Hennayake, 2017)

3. CONCLUSION

Explore on the point of Brand Citizenship Behaviors has significantly expanded over the previous decade. In any case, this quick development in research has brought about the advancement of a few issues, including the requirement for better comprehension of the conceptual similarities and differences between various types of behavior of brand citizenship, and in addition antecedent and results of its nature. In this paper, attempted to address these natures and antecedents, and in addition recognize valuable roads for future research. All in all, it is an energizing and element field of research and the expectation that this paper will help speed advance here by highlighting a few key issues that need consideration.

Antecedents to BCB are the variables that upgrade or obstruct the level of employees brand performance in an organization. It is uncovered from the different observational reviews that there is a positive connection amongst BCB and the performance of the organization (Shari et al, (Punjaisri and Wilson, 2007) (Burmann and Zeplin, 2005). For rehearsing chiefs, the fundamental ramifications of the present review is that knowing the antecedents’ managers could be better ready to cultivate employees OCB. Aside from the traditional measures of employee profitability, it is essential for managers to screen that arrangement of work behaviors that goes past the part depiction additionally are imperative supporters of the viability of the organization. Accordingly, it was noticed that BCB has been studied subject to multiple antecedents. Thus, antecedents of BCB could be examined with empirical rationales made on research gaps found in different service sectors, working conditions and country perspectives depending on the application intensity (Dissanayake, 2015); (Dissanayake and Ismail, 2015). Therefore, testing these recommended precursors in distinctive hierarchical setting direct researchers to advance the comprehension of how different work conditions influence employees engaging to take part in BCB.

With reference to the empirical research perspectives, BCB could be examined in the difference services sectors including financial services to investigate how it does influence the brand evaluation contexts (Dissanayake and Ismail, 2015) (Dissanayake & Neel & Jinadasa, 2017.) (Hennayake, 2017). Alongside, this study reveals several dimensions of BCB being researched in the empirical studies whilst highlighting the relationships amongst other related concepts. Further the concept of BCB could be hypothesized with Internal Branding Variable such as Brand Knowledge and Brand Rewards in line with postulated research gaps this argument is supported by the contribution made by (Shaari et. al., 2012), it could postulate that BCB as one the concepts yet to be researched in line with the well-supported empirical research gaps alongside the other related concepts as justified whilst managerial implications could be proposed accordingly. Thus, we suggest that effect of brand citizenship behavior has to be further examined with supported variables and measuring factors as demanded by the empirical gaps and practice-related significance including services (Dissanayake, 2015). The contribution made by Shaari et. al. (2012) directs a critical pace to foresaid argument in hypothesizing future studies. This paper has highlighted some research contexts to be examined with BCB namely Banking, Insurance, media transmission and hospitality segments as rising service segments in the vast majority of developing countries, for instance, suggestions given by Dissanayake (2015) Dissanayake & Ismail (2015) Hennayake (2016). Accordingly, this paper patterns to be a review of the concept of BCB as a searchable notion in line with the rationalized empirical gaps in different business sectors and economies.
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