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II. ABSTRACT

Merck KGaA is a global Science and Technology company, focusing on the Healthcare Industry, Life Science and Performance Materials. However, Merck in Portugal is a relatively small subsidiary with a midsized office in Miraflores, employing approximately 114 employees. Merck S.A. Portugal focuses mainly on the Healthcare Market. As the company went through a major transformation in 2016, it created a need to communicate on a low cost basis and in an efficient way, using digital as its main channel. The aim of this in company project was to introduce Employee Advocacy as a solution to digital communication. Employee Advocacy is a new communications concept derived from employee social media usage and employee word of mouth. It has been noted that employee networks are wider than company’s own and employee word of mouth is more trustworthy. Before the tool could be implemented the author did a research on what motivates employees to commit to Brand Citizenship Behavior, in other words, what is the driver that makes employees want to share company content on their personal social media profiles. Findings revealed that in the case of Merck S.A. Portugal employees individual internal drive and brand knowledge are factors affecting willingness to share on social media. Based on the results a series of internal strategies were applied on- and offline.
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III. RESUMO

Merck KGaA é uma empresa global especializada na Industria Farmacêutica, Life Science and Performance Materials. A Merck S.A. em Portugal é uma filial de tamanho médio, tendo aproximadamente 114 empregados. O escritório está localizado em Miraflores, Lisboa.

A Merck em Portugal está focada principalmente na indústria farmacêutica. Em 2016, a Merck empreendeu numa renovação incorporando a digitalização na sua estratégia, tendo implementado a comunicação digital numa maneira low cost e efetiva. O motivo deste trabalho ‘dentro de companhia’ foi introduzir o Employee Advocacy como um novo conceito de comunicação digital. Employee Advocacy é um conceito inovador que incorpora os empregados na comunicação corporativa. Os empregados podem partilhar conteúdo da Merck S.A. Portugal nas suas redes sociais privadas utilizando o conceito do word of mouth. As redes sociais dos empregados são maiores do que da empresa e o WOM é mais confiável. Antes de implementar a programa, a Merck S.A. Portugal precisava de fazer um estudo das necessidades e os motivos que levam os empregados a comprometer-se com o Brand Citizenship Behavior. Em outras palavras, quais são os fatores que fazem os empregados partilhar conteúdo nas suas redes sociais privadas. Os resultados mostraram que a vontade pessoal dos empregados (internal drive) e conhecimento da marca, têm impacto significante na vontade de partilhar nas redes sociais. Depois de obter os resultados, a empresa aplicou estratégias online e offline.

Palavras Chave: Employee Word of Mouth, Employee Advocacy, Brand Citizenship Behavior, Social Media
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IV. SUMÁRIO EXECUTIVO

O ‘In Company Project’ foi idealizado depois de detetada a necessidade de estabelecer uma comunicação institucional de forma diferente, ágil, digital e economicamente viável. Depois de avaliada a situação atual do modo de comunicar, foram efetuados estudos pertinentes pela Merck S.A. Portugal (Positioning and Reputation study, 2015) e pela Merck global (Merck Corporate Engagement Survey, 2016), e a solução foi identificada.

A resposta ao desafio era implementar uma ferramenta digital que permitisse aos colaboradores da empresa Merck S.A. Portugal contribuir na comunicação nas redes sociais utilizando as suas próprias redes como canal de comunicação.

Há uns anos atrás, uma start-up Finlandesa lançou uma ferramenta, SMARP, que funciona no nível de Employee Advocacy. Hoje em dia ‘Employee Advocacy’ é o Word of Mouth, feito pelos empregados duma empresa. A ferramenta SMARP facilita a participação proactiva dos empregados na comunicação da empresa, através de partilha de conteúdos verificados pela compliance (no caso da Merck S.A. Portugal).

Antes de começar, os objetivos do projeto foram identificados. A situação atual da Merck em Portugal mostrou falta de comunicação interna feita proactivamente e por esta razão, falta de conhecimento da empresa e do trabalho feito pelas diferentes áreas terapêuticas. Os objetivos eram os seguintes; estabelecer comunicação interna através da intranet, criar sinergias entre colegas e orgulho pelo empregador, o que resulta em employee advocacy nas redes sociais através de utilização da ferramenta SMARP.

Antes de avançar na implementação da SMARP, a equipa da Merck S.A. Portugal teve de ser preparada. Foi identificada que, se uma ferramenta desta natureza iria ser implementada e lançada sem preparação, a contribuição dos colaboradores seria baixa. Por esta razão, o autor investigou estudos feitos anteriormente pelo Merck localmente e globalmente e criou uma revisão de literatura extensa de outros estudos similares, feitos anteriormente. Da revisão de literatura surgiram cinco fatores importantes (apresentados como hipóteses) no estabelecimento de employee advocacy na Merck S.A. Portugal; conhecimento da marca, identificação pessoal com a organização, compromisso afetivo com a marca, cultura interna e nível de pro-atividade pessoal. Na base das hipóteses, uma estratégia para pré lançamento da ferramenta SMARP foi divulgada.
No primeiro, comunicação interna, foi implementado na intranet um conjunto de convívios da empresa, com o intuito de criar a sensação de equipa e passar informação da organização. Logo depois foram identificados os conhecimentos e o comportamento digital dos empregados. Após ter uma visão do estado digital, foi lançado o treino para toda a empresa em Portugal. O conceito employee advocacy foi abordado no final do treino. O treino e implementação digital foram alinhados com o estudo de Dreher (2014) apresentado na revisão de literatura. O estudo de Brand Citizenship Behavior foi implementado durante o projeto. Brand Citizenship Behavior significa vontade dos colaboradores em participar no word of mouth positivo do seu empregador. O conceito employee advocacy tem significância similar; vontade dos colaboradores de falar positiva e proactivamente sobre o empregador online. Por falta de estudos suficientes feitos sobre o employee advocacy, o autor optou por estudar os fatores que afetam positivamente Brand Citizenship Behavior, e destes resultados estabelecer conclusões sobre o que afeta a vontade de partilhar conteúdo. Ao final do estudo do BCB, a pro-atividade dos empregados e conhecimento da marca foram validados e a seguir utilizados no planeamento da estratégia de utilização do SMARP.

Os resultados depois do lançamento da SMARP mostraram uma elevada utilização dos empregados. Desde início, muitos colaboradores criaram contas e observavam os conteúdos, logo depois começaram a partilhar. No início da utilização o Management Team encorajou os colaboradores a utilizar a ferramenta. Foi dito que o SMARP era o único canal de comunicação aceite nas redes sociais, evitando assim partilhas não aprovadas pela área regulamentar de Merck. O conteúdo partilhado nos primeiros meses era sobre a Merck em geral, vídeos de Youtube e artigos partilhados pela sede da Merck em Alemanha. Assim alimentando curiosidade dos empregados e facilitando aprendizagem sobre a companhia. A seguir começou a criação de conteúdos de Portugal, o que foi um sucesso. A quantidade de partilhas do primeiro artigo de Merck Portugal foi de 29, com um alcance de 10 520 pessoas nas redes sociais. Através de comunicação proactiva dos sucessos e projetos da companhia, comunicados de ponto de vista “nós conseguimos e nossos sucessos” a Merck alimentou a necessidade dos colaboradores de partilhar conteúdo da empresa.

Os resultados de utilização do SMARP obtidos nos primeiros seis meses mostraram que as hipóteses foram validadas; conhecimento do brand e pro-atividade dos colaboradores estavam alinhados.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Context of in-company project

Merck S.A. Portugal went through a major change during the year of 2016. Not only did the company change its visual layout, branding and identity (Pharmaceutical Company to Science and Technology Company), Merck S.A. Portugal also started a fast paced digitalization of its business. Digitalization opened new windows in communication and marketing to various stakeholders of the company, positioning Merck as an early adopter of a digital strategy among other Pharmaceutical companies in Portugal. Yet, before the digitalization took off at Merck in Portugal a Reputation and Positioning survey showed alarming numbers regarding awareness and reputation of Merck among stakeholders. A secondary data collection (Positioning and Reputation Survey) was used as a baseline and motivator for change in the communication strategy and creation of the current study as an in-company project.

(Reputation study Merck S.A. Portugal, 2015)

The goal of the current in-company project was to incorporate a digital, a social media centered presence of Merck S.A. Portugal online, which involved employees as the main advocates of the company.

An Employee Advocacy program was decided to be launched. The employee advocacy tool allows employees to share company content on social media without fear of endangering compliance. However, before an employee advocacy tool could be implemented the readiness of the organization to commit to Brand Citizenship Behavior was to be measured. Based on the result of BCB the author made conclusions relative to employee advocacy and the early results obtained by using such a program for the purpose of communication.

1.2 Case Merck Portugal

At the moment the thesis was written, Merck in Portugal did not have an assigned communications person actively working on internal nor external communications. Regarding external communications the company was relying solely on a PR agency, working only part time on communications. Internal communications was conducted via a non-updated emailing list and a rudimentary intranet page “Location Room Portugal”, provided by Corporate. The communications activities were not close to sufficient to keep employees up-to-date, there
was a clear lack of communications between different departments and business units, communication was done independently by various areas, lacking synergies and the institutional presence was minimal. The positioning and reputation survey mentioned earlier supported the state of absence of communications. The author was assigned the challenge to try to solve in the best practical and digital way the lack of synergies between business units and areas, as well as lack of communication internally and externally. The path decided to be taken to solve the challenge was based on a strategy, starting from internal communications and working from there to establish an external presence resulting in Smarp, an employee advocacy tool. The strategy was strongly related on literature found when writing the thesis. Firstly, the internal communication was to be re-enforced both digitally and offline. Grace and King (2012), among other authors presented in the literature review, highlight the importance of internal communication to establish brand knowledge among employees. Brand knowledge was decided to be fortified by taking local internal action on corporate activities. The aim was to keep employees up-to-date on global activities which could also be reflected in Portugal, for example, diversity month. The various internal actions projected to be taken are also supported by the findings in the literature review regarding self-identification (communication of Corporate Merck values) and Affective Brand Commitment (organizing internal events such as, dress in color day among others). To support creation of internal culture and excitement among employees, several Merck Portugal events were to be organized apart from corporate activities. The aim of the events and activities were to establish a sense of belonging among employees, push colleagues to know each other better and speak about ‘WE’ and ‘US’. In order to create a sense of affective belonging and pride towards the company, a social responsibility program was decided to be launched before Christmas in collaboration with Aldeias-SOS Portugal and later on fortified with Aldeias-SOS Kap Verde.

Digital actions taken regarding internal communication were re-defining the construct of the intranet, Location Room Portugal. Previously the intranet consisted of one picture, news, internal announcements and some useful links. The communication was very basic and employees did not visit the page often. Re-constructing the intranet aimed for creating interest and employee pro-activeness. The new intranet was launched in late October with new features, such as image gallery of employees and all the activities conducted so far, an open chat “Sala de Estar” where employees could share own photos, comment, like and make announcements, updated calendar of activities at Merck as well as a plan to publish news more frequently. The several activities decided to be taken were supported by the literature.
review and the hypothesis established in this thesis. The main goal was to prepare Merck Portugal for the launch of the Employee Advocacy tool Smarp.

1.3 Employee Advocacy Background

Employee Advocacy is a new concept surging from Brand Citizenship Behavior. Brand Citizenship Behavior measures employee's willingness to commit to external, out of work-description, pro-brand behavior. (Rokka, Karlsson, Tienari, 2014) An employee can commit to BCB in various social situations online or offline. This study aims to determine the need of an employee advocacy tool and factors affecting the usage. Employee advocacy is measured online, on social media and refers to voluntary employee word of mouth. Employee word of mouth online is a relatively new trend which has gained attention in the past years. (Terpening, Li, Littleton 2016) It has been noted that employee WOM is stronger than company self-endorsement, or content created and shared by the company itself. The purpose of the in company project is to look into Brand Citizenship Behavior, measure the level of readiness of BCB at Merck S.A. Portugal to implement an employee advocacy tool. The factors affecting BCB are also noted as indicators which can constantly be improved to enhance BCB.

1.4 Framework of In Company Project

In section 2, Literature review, the author explores previously written studies and research regarding Brand Citizenship Behavior, eWord of Mouth as well as, social media and brand ambassadors. The goal is to try to define antecedents of Brand Citizenship Behavior.

Section 3, In Company Project: Merck. The content of this section explains Merck as a company and its presence in Portugal as well as, the legal environment it is facing. Finally, social media and the role of employees at Merck is explained.

Section 4, Methodology, this section looks into sources of secondary and primary data obtained. Secondary data is obtained from previous studies made for Merck S.A. Portugal and the primary data is based on the literature review. The primary data collection is conducted through a quantitative survey which utilizes tested and adapted questions for Merck Portugal employees.

Section 5, Results. In section five, the author reviews the results obtained using IBM SPSS and strives to validate the established hypothesis. The validation process is made with
Cronbach’s Alpha, Pearson’s Correlation and Regression Analysis using the Stepwise method.

**Section 6, Discussion of Findings.** The author validates two variables which affect Brand Citizenship Behavior, Brand Knowledge and Employee-Pro Activeness.

**Section 7, Actions taken for Merck Portugal.** The author explains the actions taken for Merck Portugal before and after the launch of SMARP. The author seeks to show which tactics taken are supported by the literature review and how the two validated hypothesis play an important role in BCB and Employee Advocacy.

**Section 8, Conclusions.** In the last section of the In Company Project the author gives guidance on future research and shares practical guidance in the usage of the Employee Advocacy tool.
2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Brand Citizenship Behavior

Employee conducted corporate communication is self-explanatory. It literally means people on the payroll of a company taking part in company related content. The ways in which employees can take part in communication are for example; sharing, liking, commenting, uploading employee generated text/photos and contribute to an already written article online (Rokka, Karlsson, Tienari, 2014) or sharing their knowledge within their social network offline with friends and family, for example (Morokane, 2014).

From the organization’s point-of-view, employees are middle men between external stakeholders and the company. Employees, deliver the message of the company to enhance reputation and elevate brand awareness among stakeholders (B2B clients, B2C customers, friends, family, colleague’s etcetera). (Rokka, Karlsson, Tienari, 2014) From the stakeholder’s perspective, employees are the ones who provide brand reality for the listener (Piehler, King, Xiong 2013). Therefore, employee communication needs to be aligned with the company’s communication regarding, brand/ -s, identity, and other messages intended to be communicated, that the reality perceived by the stakeholders is aligned with the intended message. When the messages are aligned, an increase in awareness and reputation may be obtained, not to mention a possibility to shape the image of the company (Morokane, 2014). Therefore, the company is in charge of giving the right guidance and tools for the employee, and encourage them to speak on behalf of the company. On the other hand, it is not sufficient to have only the company engaged, the employees need to be willing to collaborate as well (Grace, King 2012). There are documented ways to enhance employee conducted corporate communication, mainly sourcing from internal marketing, communication and training (Morokane, 2014) as well as, employees’ personal willingness to conduct brand citizenship behavior (Grace, King 2012; Helm, Renk, Mishra 2014).

According to Piehler et al. (2016) and Burmann & Zeplin (2005) brand citizenship behavior reflects the behavior of an employee which is congruent with the brand promise and –identity and the outcome is to strengthen the brand. Grace and King (2012) define brand citizenship behavior as extracurricular and voluntary employee activities on behalf of the brand/company for example, positive word of mouth. Therefore, it can be widely understood that brand
citizenship behavior is extra-role behavior conducted by the employee voluntarily and is in favor of the brand.

Burmann and Zeplin (2005) originally defined brand citizenship behavior as a spur from a previously established concept known as OCB (organizational citizenship behavior). As a criteria for organizational citizenship behavior, an employee must ‘live the brand’, indicating that employees exercise voluntary behaviors which are outside of role-expectations in their day-to-day work. However, brand citizenship behavior takes the concept of OCB further, claiming it to bring the brand to life. Therefore, brand citizenship behavior refers to additional, employee conducted voluntary pro-brand behavior which takes place externally. The employees who commit to BCB are generally referred to as brand ambassadors or employee advocates. An antecedent or requirement of BCB is brand commitment (Burmann, Zeplin. 2005). Brand commitment is defined as an affective, psychological attachment to the brand which drives employees to feel responsible of communicating it to others, in order to reach the brand goals. Burmann and Zeplin (2005) also define the antecedents of brand commitment as; compliance (consistent behavior with code and conduct), identification (belonging to the group) and internalization (pairing brand values with self-concept). These three antecedents are not interdependent, and therefore fulfilling one of the three alternatives is sufficient for BCB. However, before BCB can take place, employees need a sufficient know-how and resources to be consistent.

Helm, Renk, Mishra (2014) found in their research that brand pride is a factor which affects BCB (brand citizenship behavior). They also found that brand self-congruity (brand internalization, according to Burmann and Zeplin (2005) affect BCB, and therefore is an antecedent in the creation of brand ambassadors and employee advocates. Self-congruity means pairing the employees own values with the company’s to find a consistent ground (Burmann and Zeplin 2005). Self-congruity can be directed by the company through organizational socialization, previously presented by Grace and King (2012). Burmann and Zeplin (2005) also highlighted the importance of identification with the brand, by claiming that when an employee feels it belongs to a group, success and failures are sensed on a personal level. According to Piehler et al. (2016) when an individual identifies himself with a brand he automatically thinks and acts for the benefit of the brand, follows code and conduct as well as, commits to behavior which is beyond role requirements hence to, incorporating the brand to the self-concept. Also other authors referred to in this paper also agreed that, self-identification with the brand leads to brand citizenship behavior. (Rokka, Karlsson, Tienari 2014),(Dreher 2014), (Xiong, King, Piehler 2013), (DuBois Gelb, Rangarajan 2014).
When considering a corporate brand, Burmann and Zeplin (2005) draw a parallel between brand commitment and organizational commitment, referring to it as the same thing. Therefore, being committed to the corporate brand is also considered as to being committed to the employing organization.

2.2 eWord of Mouth

Grace and King (2012) investigate in what drives employees to feel brand commitment and what drives them to perform brand citizenship behavior. A vertinent of brand commitment is referred to as a positive emotion an employee has towards an organization (Grace and King 2012) or quoted from “Burmann and Zeplin (2005:284) /…/ extent of psychological attachment of employees to the brand, which influences their willingness to exert extra effort towards reaching the brand goals /…/” The higher the brand commitment, the higher the probability that the employee commits to brand citizenship behavior. In the core, the factor affecting employee’s emotions (BC) and motivation to act in order to go over and beyond (BCB) is a balanced relationship. The organization needs to provide the employee with information and knowledge related to the work and the brand itself (organizational socialization). Moreover, the environment has to be supportive and give space for relationship exchanges (relationship orientation). On the other hand, the employee has to be open to dialogue, have a desire to understand and be engaged to the work (employee receptiveness). Employee receptiveness is a character by the employee himself and therefore is difficult to be affected by the company. (Grace, King 2012)

Thus, Grace and King (2012) suggest the following research model;
The findings indicate that organizational socialization affect Brand Citizenship Behavior, referring to successful internal education and training. The finding agrees with Burmann’s and Zeplin’s claim of adequate know-how and resources before being able to commit Brand Citizenship Behavior. Moreover, brand commitment is affected by relationship orientation which reveals that, a supportive atmosphere with open communication is emotion based. Employee receptiveness has a strong effect on brand commitment (emotion) and brand citizenship behavior (action). Thus, a receptive employee may be a valuable asset for the company, due to willingness to perform brand citizenship behavior and feeling commitment to the brand. H3 and H4 were both validated. Furthermore, providing receptive employees with the possibility and knowledge to take part in communication may result in elevated job satisfaction. (Grace, King 2012)

Applying BCB in the social media context may be a solution for marketers who in today’s world are challenged to get through the clutter of noise. On the internet, the key for being listened to is to be authentic. Therefore; viral and buzz marketing are not perceived as authentic according to Morokane (2014), but merely a weak attempt to make an impression on customers. As earlier discussed, brand ambassadors are employees who commit positive word of mouth of their company. The act of WOM can take place both, offline (Morokane 2014) or online (Rokka, Karlsson, Tienari 2014) and it involves the employee’s personal network and contacts. A potential customer looking to obtain more knowledge about a product or service relies on the word surging from personal networks. Thus, employees have
power to influence and reassure people in their networks and therefore are important assets for the company (Morokane, 2014) (Dreher, 2014).

As of word of mouth, it has been studied for decades as the most authentic manner to communicate with customers (Harquail, 2009). Therefore, electronic word of mouth (eWOM on social media) is considered authentic and trustable. Furthermore, it is vital to point out that, there needs to be a reason, or rationale embedded in the employee’s words and a motivation from the employee. A reason can be, educating close friends, being the professional, specialist or solely pride. The employee needs to be driven by internal knowledge and engagement to speak in favor of the company (Morokane, 2014).

2.3 Employees as Brand Ambassadors and Advocates

As discussed in the previous section, Brand Citizenship Behavior is a positive character of an employee and therefore also found relevant to be nurtured. As previously hinted, in the past decade social media has pushed its way into the world of organizations. Social media is accessible around the clock, on different devices and therefore employee social media use is inevitable (Dreher, 2014). Although social media has become part of people’s everyday lives due to access without timeframe, companies have a history of banning access during working hours. Nowadays, the concept of brand ambassadors and employee communication online in favor of the organization has changed the conservative view of social media to a possibility. Therefore, according to Dreher (2014) organizations should provide access on social media during working hours. Companies choosing to incorporate social media need to define code of conduct and respect compliance in their respective market due to vulnerability of the business. Thus, employee conducted corporate communication takes different forms and should be strategically managed by the company. (Rokka, Karlsson, Tienari 2014)

The academic literature regarding employee conducted communication is fairly new. Terminology assigned to the act of employees emitting company information voluntarily or participating in corporate communication online varies depending on the author. The most commonly used term is ‘brand ambassador’. Which signifies an employee who, on behalf of the company, delivers the brand accordingly to stakeholders of the company (Rokka, Karlsson and Tienari 2014; Dreher 2014; Xiong, King, Piehler, 2013; DuBois Gelb, Rangarajan 2014). Other names encountered in literature are ‘brandividual/branded employee’ (Harquail 2009), ‘työntekijälähettiläs’ /’employee advocate’ (Isokangas,
Kankkunen, 2011; Terpening, Li, Littleton 2016). Other antecedents of brand ambassadors/employee advocates source from literature discussing brand citizenship behavior which is the basic driver for brand ambassadors/employee advocates. Another parallel trend source from an employee WOM –study which focused on what drives brand citizenship behavior (Morokane 2014). In this case, positive word of mouth is the outcome of BCB. The employee is called brand ambassador, -endorser or advocate.

Piehler, King and Xiong (2013), studied employees as brand ambassadors from service companies’ point of view where employees are in direct contact (face-to-face, over the phone) with the final customer. The authors research on what motivates employees to speak favorably of the company using the terminology; brand ambassador. Piehler, King and Xiong (2013) present three psychological states related to attitude and behavior; 1. Employee perceived brand knowledge, 2. Employee perceived brand importance, 3. Employee perceived brand role relevance. It was found that 2. Employee perceived brand importance and 3. Employee perceived brand role relevance affected employee brand commitment, whilst 1. Employee perceived brand knowledge had an impact on employee brand equity (EBE). The employee commitment to the brand (employee brand commitment) is related to EBE. Employee Brand Equity directly affects brand endorsement, brand allegiance and brand consistent behavior, which are the factors generating brand ambassadors.

**Figure 2.** Structural Model for creating Brand Ambassadors (Piehler, King, Xiong 2013)
The findings indicate that when employees believe that the brand is important and relevant, the employees are more committed to the brand. Whereas, knowledge of the brand itself leads directly to employee brand equity. Thus, when employees personally feel as part of the whole organization and have sufficient brand knowledge they are motivated to emit their perspective of the company to the clients. Without the identification and symbiosis with the organization and the brand, the employee does not feel necessary to conduct favorable additional company endorsement. The knowledge provided to employees comes from inside the company, indicating good brand communication and training of job position and relevance to the whole organization. The same results were found in the research made by Morokane (2014) where the employee willingness to commit positive WOM of an organization was studied. However, Grace and King (2012) proved in their research that solely activeness on behalf of the company is not enough for employees to conduct brand citizenship behavior. Employees need a personal motivation to participate as brand ambassadors.

Rokka, Karlsson, Tienari (2014) studied three Finnish companies in their research entitled “Balancing Acts: Managing employees and reputation in social media”. The authors found out that the three businesses studied (bank, food and consulting) had already incorporated social media in their businesses. Nevertheless, because the companies were from different sectors and had varying vulnerability they had different presence on social media. The findings of both studies by Rokka, Karlsson, Tienari (2014) and Piehler, King and Xiong (2013) articulate the need of employees to identify with the brand, and the value of employee word of mouth. Although Rokka, Karlsson, Tienari (2014) discuss the subject from an online perspective whilst Piehler, King and Xiong (2013) have an offline stance on the matter. Thus, Rokka, Karlsson and Tienari (2014) use a conceptual framework based on three research questions; RQ1: How do companies embrace social media and engage in online customer dialogue? RQ2: How do companies conceive the role of reputation (and reputation risks) in social media? and RQ3: How do companies seek to manage their reputation through employees? The central focus of the three research questions is employees ‘living the brand’. The research was implemented through a qualitative survey where managers of higher positions were interviewed.
The research proved that employees are seen as the main reputation builders and brand ambassadors on social media due to their personal voice giving an authentic flavor to the message. It is vital to say that, there is nothing artificial that can be communicated authentically, if it is not. Thus, an important finding was that leadership, internal culture and recruitment play an important role on who says and what is said online. Also Piehler et al. (2016) suggest that internal culture is vital for brand citizenship behavior, which is an antecedent of employee advocacy or brand ambassadors. The internal culture can be enhanced through training on brand and values, however it was also noted that social activities and mentoring play a significant role in enhancing internal culture. (Piehler et al. 2016) Digging into the internal communication, employees need to voluntarily identify themselves with a brand, this indicates successful internal branding to start with. The conclusion of the study was that employees can make or break the brand. It all depends on which approach regarding employee conducted corporate communication the organization decides to take, and what resources it wishes to allocate. (Rokka, Karlsson, Tienari 2014)

Gelb DuBois and Rangarajan (2014) approach employees as brand ambassadors from the point of view of sustaining and enhancing brand equity. In the study they refer to ‘brand equity’ as the level of distinguishing a product from others and elevating the favorable perception stakeholders have towards a brand. Although the study had a focus on service brands it also discussed the importance of delivering the brand in B2B markets and online. According to Gelb DuBois and Rangarajan (2014) maintaining brand equity through employees is a vital act hence to the possibility of company reputation being damaged for
some reason. At the moment the reputation becomes tainted, employees are in the front line of
the company, telling their personal networks about the situation from their point of view. The
personal network of the employee trusts more in the word of the employee than in the
universal negative message spread (Morokane, 2016; Gelb DuBois, Rangarajan,
2014) Moreover, on the B2B arena the impact and trustworthiness of employees is even more
important since clients and other stakeholders of the company have a bond of trust to the
employee and therefore also have more faith in his word. However, a negative incidence can
lead employees spreading content online which, on the other hand damages the reputation and
the brand. Therefore, it is considered beneficial to train staff about the message that is aimed
to be delivered, online and offline.
A parallel can be drawn from Gelb DuBois and Rangarajan (2014) to previously discussed
Balancing Acts, where the authors Rokka, Karlsson, Tienari (2014) commented that
employees can make or break the brand.
The qualitative survey conducted in the study Employee Contributions to Brand Equity used
different companies in various industries, like the study Balancing Acts. The main point was
to obtain a scattered result which could be widely implemented. The most important finding
was that employees need to have positive feelings towards the company in order to be able to
further deliver these feelings to stakeholders. This indicates a good internal atmosphere, and it
can be assumed that employee conducted corporate communication is associated with
emotions. The findings agree with Grace and King (2012) brand citizenship behavior –study,
which proved employee emotions to play a part in the willingness to contribute in favorable
communication regarding a company. (Grace, King 2012 previously presented in the
literature review).
Thus, Gelb DuBois and Rangarajan (2014) suggest management to implement an internal
culture which can be reflected externally by employees. Employees as brand ambassadors are
created by the company through thorough training. However, there are also employees who
willingly and without asking contribute to the brand beyond their own job description. These
employees were earlier discussed in the literature review as receptive employees. According
to the study made by Grace and King (2012) the employees who are receptive (already
willing to participate) should be identified and trained into becoming brand ambassadors.
Therefore, Gelb DuBois and Rangarajan (2014) suggest that companies should invest in their
employees and train them.
Morokane (2014) studied the reason employees engage in WOM on behalf of the company to stakeholders (family, friends) and social network. The author defines employees as ‘employee endorsers.’ As indicated in the previous studies, brand ambassadors and employee advocates are referred to be trained by the company. Therefore, internal management is seen as the corner stone in the process. Morokane (2014) studied employee willingness to take part in favorable WOM from the point of view of internal marketing and internal engagement. Internal marketing referring to employee’s overall knowledge of the brand. Thus, internal marketing is claimed to create a base for the employee to feel satisfaction due to alignment of own values with the company’s. A parallel can be drawn from engagement with the organization to engagement with the organization’s brand. Internal engagement, on the other hand refers to a psychological state of the employee of meaningfulness, availability and safety. (Presented and discussed in the study of Morokane (2014), apart from Figure 4 below). Perceived external prestige was proven to not have an impact on employee endorsement, and irrelevant to the discussion above. Therefore, it is left outside of the discussion.

**Figure 4.** Employee endorsement model (Morokane 2014)

The findings of the research indicate that internal marketing does affect employee word of mouth (employee endorsement). Moreover, the findings made by Grace and King (2012) agree with Morokane’s (2014) findings that employees who identify themselves with the organization are more likely to commit positive WOM. It was also found that internal engagement positively affects employee endorsement. Another relevant finding revealed is that stakeholder’s view of the organization affects the employee’s view of the organization,
indicating that the overall image of an organization is imposed from both sides, employees and stakeholders.

Taking a strategic aspect in the physical incorporation of employee advocacy into an organization Dreher (2014) presents a structural recommendation of implementation. The previously discussed authors made their respective research on what variables are needed for building brand ambassadors and what may be the outcomes. The research paper by Dreher (2014) is considered vital in the process of discussing findings related to employee conducted corporate communication because, Dreher’s (2014) research gives guidelines of 'how’ and ‘why’ to implement social media into an organization and therefore is a practical view of the matter. A valuable observation of Dreher (2014) is that although employees would be banned access on social media it does not restrict them from using personal devices to access social media platforms at work. Like Gelb DuBois and Rangarajan (2014), Dreher (2014) found out that social media is emotional. Thus, if there is a negative thought about a company, it can be shared. Like previously discussed studies, Dreher points out that employees are a vital part of reputation building and brand delivery. The author suggests that employees, ‘embody’ the corporate character, thus employees are vital brand ambassadors of the company.

Dreher (2014) suggests eight managerial steps to strategically implement social media into an organization. The kick-off principle introduced is gaming. The employees need positive reinforcement to participate. In Dreher’s case, employees are rewarded after conducting various tasks in establishing a presence on social media. For example, a reward follows when a Google+ account is created. On the other hand, the gaming principle may cause employees a sensation of being forced by the company to implement social media. Rokka, Karlsson, Tienari (2014) claimed in their study that employee participation on social media and communication needs to be voluntary. Grace, King (2012) pointed out that the employee needs to be receptive, in other words, accept the rewarding. Therefore, the social pressure and gifts handed out need to be thoroughly thought of before implementation.

The eight pillars Dreher (2014) introduced are;

- Research
- Access
- Commitment
- Social Media team
• Guidelines and Policies
• Training and Education
• Integration
• Goal setting and Measurement

Thus, ‘research’ indicates a company-wide social media audit from the perspective of the organization and the employee digital footprint. The major factor of launching an employee advocacy program is to provide ‘access’ on social media at work and enhance its usage during working hours. Employees can be asked to update profile information during working hours. On the other hand, the management has to be committed to the new culture. Therefore, ‘commitment’ from the management is an extremely important aspect on launching employee advocacy. In order to have a team to follow up and take care of the steps in implementation as the back office of the project a ‘social media team’ is necessary, according to Dreher (2014). The participating employees need to be communicated clearly the rules of the game to avoid misuse and misunderstandings. Thus, ‘guidelines and policies’ which agree with the company standards. The employees need to have corresponsive ‘training and education’ to thoroughly internalize employee advocacy and their role in it. Nevertheless, communication goes through ‘integration’ when all messages are combined with the knowledge of all employees and the company message is constant. In the end it is vital to have a feedback of how employee advocacy worked, both short run and long run, ‘goal setting and measurement’.

Terpening, Li and Littleton (2016) present employee advocacy as an already incorporated process. An employee advocate is the same as a brand ambassador, however with a minor difference. When a company uses an employee advocacy program it is accessible for the whole organization in general. Thus, Terpening, Li and Littleton (2016) claim in their study that companies engaged earlier in brand ambassador programs which resulted in employees being brand ambassadors of the company. Thus, the difference lies in the access. Brand ambassadors are claimed to be selected and trained employees whereas an employee advocate can be anyone. Nevertheless, the structure of implementing a program and the variables needed before implementation are same for both. The separation between these two terms, employee advocate and brand ambassador was made by Altimeter in their report entitled “Social Media Employee Advocacy: Tapping into the power of an engaged workforce” (Terpening, Li, Littleton 2016). It is vital to point out that the difference between employee
The advocate and brand ambassador has not been made in previously discussed literature. Therefore, the author continues to examine brand ambassadors and employee advocates as the same.

Terpening, Li and Littleton (2016) conducted a research both as a qualitative and a quantitative survey in Europe and USA. The interviewees were brands, employees and generic public to obtain a holistic view of the impact of employee advocacy. The measures were the following; for **brands**; need to communicate. For **employees** the motivator to participate in employee advocacy and for **generic public**; the reaction to the message received from employees of a company. Key findings presented in the report are the fact that, from the consumer’s perspective 31% per cent claimed that they understand better the company their connection is employed for. Thus, employee communicated messages were found more valuable than traditional digital advertising by the consumers. Therefore, employee advocacy programs had a better outcome than digital advertising with a better click-through rate, elevated reach and shares. On the other hand, it is found important that employees align with the company communication, and identify themselves with the content when conducting employee advocacy. Messages shared in employee networks which are not relevant to the employee or the respective network may cause de-friending. It was found that employees who participate in employee advocacy claim to feel an elevated connection and enthusiasm for their employing company. From the consumers’ perspective, the most important posting employees made were posts related to recruitment. The final interesting finding was related to working culture between USA and Europe, where it was reported that Europe lags in employee advocacy hence to the willingness of keeping work and private life separate.

### 2.4 WEB 2.0 & SOCIAL MEDIA

Web 2.0 refers to social media platforms. These platforms allow users to connect and interact through the creation of own profiles, building networks of friends and colleagues and by sending private and public messages (Ouirdi, Ouirdi, Segers, Henderickx 2015). It is vital to point out that media 2.0 platforms are built for individual use only, which gives way for employees to advocate and build relationships with stakeholders on the behalf of the company (Harquail 2009; DuBois Gelb, Rangarajan 2014). As earlier discussed, the employees are positioned as middle men between the company and the stakeholders. (Xiong, King, Piehler 2013) According to Harquail, individual voice on web 2.0 platforms is perceived more trustworthy than organizational communication online (Harquail 2009). The same argument is
supported by a study made by Altimeter claiming that, web 2.0 platforms (social media) are solely created for individual use. Therefore, employee messages were found to be more interesting than organizational communication online (referring to a company speaking about itself or conducting communication from a corporate profile). (Terpening, Li, Littleton 2016).

When looking back at the research conducted regarding brand ambassadors and employee advocates it is important to remind that corporate communication conducted by employees on social media platforms can only be conducted when; employees know their brand, can relate to it and the internal working atmosphere is good. (Xiong, King, Piehler 2013; Rokka, Karlsson, Tienari 2014; Dreher 2014).

In the following section the author presents three different social media platforms which are of importance to the social media atmosphere in Portugal, and useful in the implementation of a social media employee advocacy tool. The choice of social media platforms available on Smarp for employee sharing was based on Smarp’s suggestion of channels to use and a social media training conducted at the Merck office in October 2015. The suggestion of channels in Portugal was made by MORE, a digital communications agency which is part of Lift World. (Lift World, 2017)

2.4.1 Facebook

Created in 2004 by Mark Zuckerberg, Facebook is the world’s largest social networking platform. The social networking platform was originally created for students of Harvard to keep in contact. The platform gained popularity rapidly and spread to other universities. (Nations, 2016) Today, Facebook’s mission is to allow people to connect around the world and enable them to share. The ideology is to be able to stay in touch with friends and family no matter where they are, and at the same time be updated of the happenings in the world. (Facebook 2016) Business has been present on Facebook ever since it was created. The most common ways businesses can use Facebook is through creation of fan pages for their business/products/brands, buy Facebook adds to redirect people to their fan page/website, connect with their customers. Facebook allows a dialogue between a company and its customers and obtain statistics of the activity on their page. (Facebook business, 2016)
2.4.2 Linkedin

World’s most popular professional networking platform was launched in 2003. The founders are; Allen Blue, Konstatin Guericke, Reid Hoffman, Jean-Luc Vaillant and Eric Ly. Linkedin gained popularity immediately after its launch. After 30 days of operation it gained 4,500 members. Today Linkedin works with a diversified business model. The platform offers; talent solutions, marketing solutions and premium subscription products from which it generates revenues. Linkedin is adapted globally and is available in 24 languages. (Linkedin, 2016) Companies can use Linkedin for their business purposes by creating a company page (for free), purchase the talent solution program which enables HR to track optimal candidates for their business or buy Linkedin marketing solutions to promote business. Linkedin offers additional programs for business usage. Linkedin Elevate is a tool to enhance Relationship Economics. The tool lets employees participate in employee advocacy on behalf of the company. However, Elevate is restricted only to Linkedin and cannot therefore be used across several social media platforms. (Linkedin, Elevate 2016)

2.4.3 Twitter

Twitter is a social networking platform used for microblogging. It means that members of the network can post a maximum of 140-characters long messages, tweets, to their followers. As of difference to Linkedin and Facebook, on Twitter everybody can follow each other without any restrictions. It means to say; Twitter is public. (Rouse, 2015) The Twitter platform is namely used for up-to-date interaction. The social network is utile for businesses who wish to stay on top of the wave of what is happening in their industry, engage in dialogue with customers and attract new possible customers. A company can also buy adds on Twitter to promote its business. (Twitter, Business 2016)

The three different social media channels presented above, Facebook, Linkedin and Twitter were the channels chosen on Smarp. Before an employee advocacy tool could be launched the employees needed to be trained. A social media training was organized at Merck in Portugal for the whole company in collaboration with MORE, a digital communications agency. The tactical act to implement a social media training was in line with Sonia Dreher’s (2014) study which gave recommendations on implementation of social media to a company, pillars five and six (Guidelines and Policies & Training and Education) were supported in the training at Merck.
The social media training was organized twice and gained much interest among employees. The training started from the very basics of social media and built up on employee advocacy. After the digital/social media training employees could ask for help in establishing social media channels.

The Power Point presentation conducted by More to Merck can be found in Appendix 1 Social Media Training.
3. IN COMPANY PROJECT: MERCK

3.1 Merck KGaA

Known as the world’s oldest pharmaceutical and chemical company, Merck was founded by Friedrich Jacob Merck in Darmstadt, Germany in 1668. Still today, the original founding family remains the majority owner of the company.

Today, Merck operates in 66 countries and employs close to 50 000 employees globally. The organization is divided into three businesses; Healthcare, Life Science and Performance Materials. Thus, being a globally dispersed company the different businesses of Merck have varying names depending on the geographical location. Internationally, Merck is known by its name. However, in the USA and Canada, the business of Healthcare is known as EMD Serono, Life Science is known as MilliporeSigma and Performance Materials is known as EMD Performance. In the past year Merck has gone through a corporate wide image and identity change. Nowadays, Merck is known as a Science and Technology company (instead of former; pharmaceutical and chemical company). Thus, Merck continues its business in the above mentioned areas but has integrated several businesses under its name. (Merck Group Communications, 2016) Moreover, the Merck’s logo has gone through an image change. The former Merck’s logo is now replaced with Merck (the name) which can be represented in several different colors. An additional image was introduced, the vibrant M which is made to represent Merck. However, the vibrant M is not the official logo.

Not only has the company had a change of looks and identity, it started a wide digitalization process with the prestigious goal to digitalize the whole company globally.

Figure 5. Merck Logo

3.2 Merck S.A. Portugal

Merck S.A. was established in Portugal in 1934, more than 80 year ago. Currently, the Merck office is located in Miraflores, Algés and employs around 114 employees. Merck’s activities
in Portugal are divided into Consumer Health, Biopharma and Life Science. Biopharma consists of business areas such as; Cardio Metabolic Care, Oncology, Neurology & Immunology and Fertility & Endocrinology. Consumer Health is focused on over-the-counter medicines, such as Vigantoletten and UL-250. The current Managing Director of Merck in Portugal is Bruno Wohlschlegel. He is German and has been leading the company since October 2014. (Merck 2016)

3.3 Legal Communication Restrictions on the Pharmaceutical Industry

Merck, as any other pharmaceutical business needs to work under compliance. Some of the laws related to advertising of medicinal products are discussed in the following section. The aim is to give the reader guidance of what can, and what cannot be done regarding advertising. According to the Ministry of Health, Decree-law no. 176/2006 any medicinal product which is under prescription cannot be promoted to the public. However, general information regarding human health or diseases can be communicated (disease awareness). Thus, without mentioning the medicine by its name, nor indicating to the medication. Therefore, advertising medicine among the generic public is prohibited in case the medicine is under prescription, contains substance which is a narcotic or psychotropic defined by the Portuguese State or supported by National Health Service. On the other hand, over-the-counter medicines can be promoted to the general public, thus under various laws. (Ministry of Health, Decree-Law no. 176/2006)

In general terms, Merck should not take any chances regarding communication which might leak information that can be understood as promotion or advertising of products that are not allowed to be promoted. Thus, a communication plan made for Merck in Portugal should use social media to increase general awareness of Merck such as: position Merck as a Science and Technology Company, increase knowledge of research and innovation in Portugal, social responsibility, workplace, events and activities open for general public.

3.4 Employees as Brand Ambassadors at Merck

Merck S.A. in Portugal conducted a reputation survey in 2015 in order to obtain an overview of its situation regarding positioning and reputation. The positioning and reputation study was
divided into three subcategories; HCP (Health Care Professionals), Media and Generic Public. The results obtained showed that the generic public were lacking knowledge of Merck, and the media had also low awareness of the company itself. On the other hand, HCP’s (health care professionals) were familiar with the pharmaceutical company. Until today, Merck in Portugal has not actively engaged in external communication, due to the company working in the pharmaceutical business in Portugal. The business of Merck in Portugal is divided into Consumer Health (over the counter products) and Biopharma (prescription medicine). The main business area is biopharma which limits communication possibilities due to legal restrictions in Portugal.

Results obtained from” Brand Familiarity” indicated that, only 19% of the Generic Public knew Merck and 2% separated Merck from its competitor, Merck Sharp and Dome (MSD) (responses 42 510). Media recognized the brand better, 83% were familiar with the brand but only 13% knew that Merck and MSD are two different companies (responses 56). (Positioning & Reputation, 2015)

On behalf of reputation, several aspects of improvement were identified. Emotional Reputation (recommend, trust, say something positive, buy products, invest, work) and Rational Reputation (products & services, innovation, workplace, governance, citizenship, leadership and performance) both scored average in the study.

**Figure 6.** Overall reputation and awareness / Generic Public (Positioning & Reputation, 2015)

![Figure 6. Overall reputation and awareness / Generic Public](image)

**Figure 7.** Reputation scale (Positioning & Reputation, 2015)

![Figure 7. Reputation scale](image)
The gravest aspect needed to be improved, was awareness among generic public. It needs to be pointed out that generic public includes many important stakeholders for the company: old acquaintances, colleagues from current and former businesses, family members, friends, colleague friends, possible future employees, opinion leaders, students, un-recognized patients, caregivers, etc. These profiles were regarded as having an importance to the company, but had not been actively targeted in means of communication before. Therefore, evidence from the positioning and reputation study indicated that a change needed to be made. Furthermore, pointing out that Merck conducted the brand and image change in 2015-2016, a more proactive stance was to be taken regarding communication.

Therefore, an employee advocacy program was decided to be implemented to Merck in Portugal. The employee advocacy program allows employees to participate in the company’s communication on social media through sharing company content from a platform called Smarp. The employee advocacy program was believed to be lucrative due to the possibility of speaking to stakeholders in an authentic manner and obtaining a wider audience than through traditional advertising, and for a lower cost. (Reputation study Merck S.A. Portugal, 2015)

3.5 SMARP

Smarp is a social media sharing tool which allows employees to share content on various social media channels. Each employee uses his own social media account for sharing, in other words, the content shared is personal and the choice to share is individual.

Smarp was created in 2011 by two Finnish students. Initially the focus was on professional branding and creating a role for employees on social media. The idea behind Smarp was the potential in employee’s networks, which tend to be 10-15 times larger than corporate social media accounts. Nowadays the company is focusing on mutual benefit for the employing organization and the employee, following the mantra “humanizing brands”. It was also discovered that the employee word of mouth is far more trustworthy than the communication conducted by a company. Shortly after launching the platform the company started to grow its business. Nowadays Smarp is a highly successful and acknowledged Employee Advocacy tool. The company is located in Finland, Sweden, Singapore, Dubai, England and New York.
Smarp comes with several features, the most known is gamification. Each time an employee shares content, he gains points for sharing, which are displayed on the platform on a leader board. The positive reinforcement of gaining points is believed to drive the employee participation. The platform measures analytics of content shared through engagement measures and spread of content on social media, allowing companies to set up KPI’s for success. (SMARP, 2017)

3.6 Hypothesis Formulation and Conceptual Model for Merck Case

According to Grace and King (2012) an employee needs to be exposed to internal communication, and participate in internal training regarding the brand, to have adequate brand knowledge. Brand knowledge is an antecedent for employees to commit brand citizenship behavior. (Grace and King 2012), (Burmann and Zeplin 2005). Also Xiong, King and Piehler (2013) claim that brand knowledge affects Employee Brand Equity, which is an antecedent of brand endorsement, brand consistent behavior and brand allegiance, a parallel is drawn to brand citizenship behavior.

Applying the above mentioned findings to the case of Merck, the following hypothesis (1) was formulated:

**Hypotheses 1**: Brand knowledge positively affects Brand Citizenship Behavior in the case of Merck, S.A.

Rokka, Karlsson and Tienari (2014) found out in their study that employees need to identify themselves with the brand in order to become brand ambassadors, which means to say, speak favorably of the company/brand/workplace. On the other hand, Burmann and Zeplin (2005) point out that self-identification leads to BCB since a person feels a personal obligation to perform extra-role behavior. Helm, Renk and Mishra (2014) claim that the employee has to go through self-brand congruity, which means having the same values in order to be engaged to the organization. A similar engagement idea surfaced in the research of Xiong, King and Piehler (2013), where the authors found that if an employee does not identify himself and create a sense of unity with the organization, he will not conduct brand citizenship behavior. The author chooses to follow Burmann and Zeplins (2005) example (previously discussed) by
defining corporate brand as the organization itself to avoid confusion, since the organization holds several brands under a common name.

Applying the above mentioned findings to the case of Merck, the following hypothesis (2) was formulated:

**Hypotheses 2:** Self-identification with the organization positively affects brand citizenship behavior, in the case of Merk, S.A.

Dreher (2014), Dubois Gelb and Rangarajan (2014), Helm, Renk, Mishra (2014), Rokka, Karlsson, Tienari (2014) and Burmann and Zeplin (2005) claim that employee advocacy is emotion based. A positive feeling towards an organization/brand or company affects the willingness to contribute positive word of mouth of a company in other words, BCB.

Applying the above mentioned findings to the case of Merck, the following hypothesis (3) was formulated:

**Hypotheses 3:** Affective brand commitment positively affect employee willingness to commit to brand citizenship behavior, in the case of Merk, S.A.

Grace and King (2012), Burmann and Zeplin (2005) and Piehler et al. (2016) claim that employees are to be given the right training to commit BCB, but also the right environment, which needs to be supportive. Both Piehler, King and Xiong (2013) and Rokka, Karlsson and Tienari (2014) found out that the employee willingness to commit BCB comes from inside the company, indicating a good and supportive culture. Apart from formal training, internal culture can be spruced up by social events and mentor programs. These activities help employees enjoy the company and develop a sense of belonging which affect BCB (Burmann and Zeplin 2005).

Applying the above mentioned findings to the case of Merck, the following hypothesis (4) was formulated:

**Hypotheses 4:** Internal culture positively affects brand citizenship behavior in the case of Merk, S.A.
Rokka, Karlsson and Tienari (2014) found out in their study that employee advocacy needs to be voluntary. Employees forced to contribute brand citizenship behavior will result in revolt and most likely adverse communication. Also Morokane (2014) proved that employees need to be receptive. It means to say, the employee must have an internal will to contribute to BCB. Employee receptiveness is an individual character which cannot be affected by the company. Also Grace and King (2012) suggest that employees need a certain level of engagement towards the work to contribute in BCB, which signifies an internal drive.

Applying the above mentioned findings to the case of Merck, the following hypothesis (5) was formulated:

**Hypotheses 5:** Employee pro-activeness positively affects brand citizenship behavior in the case of Merck, S.A.

Based on the above mentioned hypotheses the author presents a conceptual model. The established hypotheses aim to define which independent variables have an impact on Brand Citizenship Behavior in the case of Merck. In this case, the author wishes to define which factors affect employee willingness to conduct BCB in the form of WOM of the company.
Based on the following five hypotheses the conceptual model was drawn accordingly:

**Figure 8. Conceptual model**
4 METHODOLOGY

4.1 Data Collection

4.1.1 Secondary Data

The secondary data is collected from three different secondary data sources. First, the author used data from a Positioning and Engagement survey which was made to measure the knowledge HCP’s (Health Care Professionals), Media and Generic Public has got of Merck S.A. Portugal.

Secondly, data was retrieved from Merck Corporate Engagement Survey 2015 (results for Portugal). Questions of the Engagement Survey made in 2015 are partly used in the final survey to support the final questionnaire.

Thirdly, the author uses an extensive literature review to measure the willingness of employees to conduct Brand Citizenship Behavior. The literature review is divided into three parts, what motivates employees to commit BCB, how BCB/Employee Advocacy can be implemented to an organization and finally, how does BCB/Employee Advocacy affect the organization.

4.1.1.1 Merck Corporate Engagement Survey

The table below demonstrates questions which were considered important in the realization of the thesis. The questions were also used in the primary data collection executed by the author.

One of the questions in the questionnaire presented to employees spoke about As One for Patients initiative. The ‘As One For Patients’ concept was launched in 2015 in order to provide a common goal and mindset for colleagues of Merck globally. Portugal adapted the concept and applied it throughout the organization to all employees in 2015 and the concept is still in active use.

The Figure below demonstrated the Merck Corporate Engagement Survey 2015 results for the questions used in the thesis and the results obtained by the questionnaire conducted by the author for the in company project. The questions were the same, but the outcome of the results obtained demonstrate different values.
As it can be noted, the overall values of the Merck Corporate Engagement Survey 2015 results for Portugal have lower values than the Brand Citizenship Behavior survey executed one year later.

The biggest increase of positive perception was in questions 2, 3, 4 and 5. The highest increase was in question 5, “I am familiar with the ‘As One For Patients’ initiative’s goals and deliverables.” With a positive difference of 34.3%. However, as the surveys were done by different entities and environments the results cannot be relied on, they mainly worked as an indicator to prove that Merck in Portugal is moving towards the right direction regarding engagement.

### 4.1.2 Primary Data

The primary data of the thesis was collected through a quantitative survey made on Google Typeforms. The author seeks to measure the correlation between five established hypotheses and Brand Citizenship Behavior in the case of Merk. The questions are retrieved from previously tested scales and Merck Corporate Engagement Survey 2015 and used to measure the same purpose as the original authors did. The answers are measured on a 1-7 Likert Scale, which is the same measure used in the previously used and validated scales.
4.2 Questionnaire and Sample Design

The quantitative data was collected via a questionnaire. The questions are divided into seven sections.

1) **Demographics** to measure gender and age.

2) **Brand Citizenship Behavior.** Employees of Merck S.A. Portugal were asked three questions to measure level of willingness to perform extra-curricular, out of job-description, brand endorsement. The scale of BCB was adapted from Van Dyne et. Al (1994) and employees were asked questions on a 7-point Likert scale that ranged from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree). See Appendix 2

3) **Brand Knowledge.** Employees of Merck S.A. Portugal were asked to answer four questions related to their own perception of personal brand knowledge. The questions to measure brand knowledge were adapted and modified to be suitable for the questionnaire from the Merck Engagement Survey (2015) and original questions from Baugmarth and Schmidt (2010). The questions asked were measured on a 1-7 Likert scale, strongly disagree to strongly agree. See Appendix 2

4) **Self-Identification.** Employees of Merck S.A. Portugal were asked to answer four questions relative to self-identification to the employing organization. The scales used in the questionnaire were adapted from three different studies; Soane et. Al (2012); Williams & Anderson (1991); Ganesan & Weiz (1996). The answers were measured on a 1-7 Likert scale, strongly disagree to strongly agree. Appendix 2

5) **Affective Commitment.** Employees of Merck S.A. Portugal were asked to answer five questions about positive emotional attachment to the organization. The questions were adapted from validated scales in studies conducted by; Soane et. Al (2012), Merck Engagement Survey (2015) and Meyer and Allen (1997). The answers were measured on a 1-7 Likert scale, strongly disagree to strongly agree. Appendix 2

6) **Internal Culture.** Employees of Merck S.A. Portugal were asked to answer four questions about their perception on internal culture. The questions for internal culture were fully adapted from the Merck Engagement Survey (2015). The answers were measured on a 1-7 Likert scale, strongly disagree to strongly agree. Appendix 2
7) **Employee Pro-Activeness.** The employees of Merck S.A. Portugal were asked to answer five questions related to their own will to contribute voluntarily to brand endorsement. The questions used in the questionnaire were adapted from validated scales by Bettencourt (1997) and Diamantopoulos and Lohndorf (2014) as well as, Merck Engagement Survey (2015). The questions used from Diamantopoulos and Lohndorf (2014) were modified by the author to be suitable for the questionnaire used in the company project. The answers were measured on a 1-7 Likert scale, strongly disagree to strongly agree. Appendix 2

The population analyzed in the study comprises the employees of Merck S.A. Portugal. It needs to be pointed out that the employees chosen are working in the physical office as well as, the sales representatives working outside of the office. Other employees, such as Patient Support Nurses etc., were left out of the survey due to vague attachment to the brand/organization. Some of the questions used in the questionnaire were modified to be better suitable due to the specific pool of respondents, in order to obtain answers close to real life. On the other hand, the questions were gathered from authors who used validated scales as well as, the Merck Engagement Survey (2015).

The questionnaire was sent out to all employees on the general emailing list MEPO_Portugal and additional employees not updated to the current emailing list, the number of recipients was 149. The amount of responses to the final survey was 103. The response rate was 69%, which was considered sufficient. The timing of the questionnaire was three weeks, between 20.2.2017 and 11.3.2017. The employees were sent two reminder emails to fulfill the questionnaire before the deadline to make sure the response rate was sufficient.

5. RESULTS

5.1 Demographics

The respondents of the survey came from different age groups, gender and they had spent varying time working for Merck in Portugal. In the questionnaire the employees were also asked to indicate what type of content they like to share most and in which social media channels.
The age distribution is presented in the table below. The biggest age group in the survey were employees between 40-50 years old, with 45 respondents corresponding to 43.7% of the sample (103 respondents). The smallest group were the youngest employees, 20-30 years old with 7 respondents representing 6.8% of the sample.

**Figure 10. Age Distribution**
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The gender distribution between respondents of the survey is 46.6 percent female (48 respondents) and 53.4 percent male (55 respondents). As it can be noted, the slight majority of respondents are male.

**Figure 11. Gender**
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Regarding years worked for Merck in Portugal, the majority of employees have been with the company for more than 10 years, with a percentage equal to 51.5%. The second biggest group, 37.9%, are employees who have worked for Merck between 0 and 5 years. The smallest group is people employed between 5 and 10 years representing 10.7%.

**Figure 12.** Years employed for Merck in Portugal

When asked what employees like to share on social media, the answer was the following. 52.4% of the employees like to share content which is related to the pharmaceutical industry. The value is equal to the willingness to share corporate content, 52.4%. The most popular type of content to share on social media is content related to Merck S.A. Portugal, 63.1%.
Furthermore, the preferences of content to share was divided between Male and Female. For both males and females content of Merck S.A. Portugal has got the highest value, 29% for females and 34% for males. On the other hand, women least liked to share corporate content (24%), whereas males’ least liked to share content of the pharmaceutical industry (25%). Corporate content is derived by global activities and communicated via corporate social media and other online channels, whereas content from Merck S.A. Portugal is generated from local activities as well as content regarding Portugal where Merck was involved.

Content regarding pharmaceutical industry is categorized as knowledge content and it is derived from general pharmaceutical news.

**Figure 13. Content sharing (multiple choice)**
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**Figure 14. Preference of content to share**

![Graph showing the percentage preferences of content sharing for females and males, divided into Merck S.A. Portugal, Pharmaceutical Industry, and Corporate Content.]
To give another perspective to preferences for sharing, the table below is divided into years employed for Merck in Portugal. The employees who have spent least time working for Merck S.A. Portugal (0-5 years) like to share most content related to the pharmaceutical industry and least corporate content. Employees who worked for Merck S.A. Portugal between 5-10 years like to share most content related to Merck S.A. Portugal and least corporate content. Employees who spent more than 10 years at Merck S.A. Portugal like to share most content related to Merck S.A. Portugal and least content related to the pharmaceutical industry.

**Figure 15. Preference of content to share compared to time employed**
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The most popular social media channel to share on is LinkedIn 61.2%. Facebook is nearly as popular with 59.2%. As it can be noted, Twitter is the least interesting channel to share content on, with 4.1%. Other social media channels had a value of 23.5%.
To have a more specific view of social media channel preferences, the chart above was further divided into female and male. As it can be seen below, the most popular social media channel for women is Facebook with 28.4%, whereas males prefer LinkedIn 33%. For both groups, male and female, Twitter was the least popular platform with 1.9% for both.

Figure 16. Preference to share on social media channels

Figure 17. Social media channels preferences divided by gender
5.1.1 Hypothesis Testing

After the survey was completed, a descriptive analysis of the scales was performed to check for mean and standard deviation among each item for each scale.

**BRAND KNOWLEDGE**

**Table 1** Brand Knowledge, Mean values and Standard Deviation

|                                                | I know how Merck S.A. Portugal is different from our competitors. | I know the value Merck S.A. adds to the society. | I am well informed about the values represented by the brand | I know which attributes of our brand differentiate us from our competitors. |
|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| N Valid                                        | 103                                                             | 103                                           | 103                                                      | 103                                                             |
| Missing                                        | 0                                                                | 0                                             | 0                                                        | 0                                                                |
| Mean                                           | 5,689                                                           | 6,146                                         | 6,262                                                    | 5,951                                                           |
| Std. Deviation                                 | 1,2448                                                          | .8678                                         | .9596                                                    | .9840                                                           |

**Figure 18.** Brand Knowledge Scale Items by Gender
As it can be seen in figure 18 above, the lowest mean value is 5.7 for “I know how Merck S.A. Portugal is different from our competitors.” The highest mean value is 6.3 for the question “I am well informed about the values represented by the brand”.

For female respondents the lowest mean score is 5.3 for “I know how Merck S.A. Portugal is different from our competitors” and “I know the value Merck S.A. adds to the society.” And the highest mean values are 6.0 for the questions “I know which attributes of our brand differentiate us from our competitors” and “I am well informed about the values represented by the brand”.

For the category male respondents, the lowest mean values are 6.1 for “I know how Merck S.A. Portugal is different from our competitors” as well as “I know the value Merck S.A. adds to the society.” The highest mean value is 6.5 for “I know which attributes of our brand differentiate us from our competitors.”

SELF IDENTIFICATION

Table 2: Self Identification, Mean and Standard Deviation

|                              | Being a member of Merck S.A. Portugal energizes me. | I feel like I am part of Merck S.A. Portugal. | The values that are important to Merck S.A. are also important to me. | My values are similar to those of this organization. |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| N Valid                      | 103                                               | 103                                         | 103                                                               | 103                                                 |
| Missing                      | 0                                                 | 0                                           | 0                                                                 | 0                                                   |
| Mean                         | 6,000                                             | 5,981                                       | 6,330                                                             | 6,214                                               |
| Std. Deviation               | .9802                                             | 1,2756                                      | .9224                                                             | .9145                                               |
In the items for the scale of self-identification, the lowest mean value are for the questions “I feel like I am part of Merck S.A. Portugal” and “Being a member of Merck S.A. Portugal energizes me”. The highest mean value is for “The values that are important to Merck S.A. are also important to me.” For female respondents, the lowest mean value (5,6) is for the question “Being a member of Merck S.A. Portugal energizes me.” The highest mean value, 6,2 is for the question “My values are similar to those of this organization”. For male respondents, the lowest mean value is for the question “The values that are important to Merck S.A. are also important to me.” with a mean corresponding to 6,1. The highest means score for male respondents is for “My values are similar to this of this organization”, with a mean 6,4.
**AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT**

**Table 3:** Affective Commitment, Mean and Standard Deviation

|                                | N  | Valid | Missing | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------------------|----|-------|---------|------|----------------|
| This organization inspires me to do my best work every day. |    | 103   | 0       | 5,883| 1,2151         |
| I feel positive about my work. |    | 103   | 0       | 6,165| 1,9299         |
| I am enthusiastic about my work. |    | 103   | 0       | 6,204| 1,9636         |
| I feel like “part of the family” at our brand. |    | 103   | 0       | 5,767| 1,3001         |
| I feel “emotionally attached” to our brand. |    | 103   | 0       | 5,971| 1,0977         |

**Figure 20.** Affective Commitment Scale Items by Gender

The highest mean value for hypothesis three, “Affective commitment positively affect employee willingness to commit brand citizenship behavior” is for the question “I am enthusiastic about my work” and “I feel positive about my work” with mean values 6.2. The lowest mean value, 5.8 is for the question “I feel like “part of the family” at our brand”.

Among female respondents the highest mean value is divided between two questions, “I feel like “part of the family” at our brand” and “This organization inspires me to do my best work every day”. The lowest mean value, 5.6 is for “I feel “emotionally attached” to our brand.”

For male respondents the highest mean value is 6.4 for the questions “This organization inspires me to do my best work every day”, “I am enthusiastic about my work” and “I feel
like “part of the family” at our brand”. The lowest mean score is for “I feel “emotionally attached” to our brand”, mean 5,9.

INTERNAL CULTURE

Table 4: Internal Culture, Mean and Standard Deviation

|                                      | This organization's mission and goals provide meaningful direction to me. | I can clearly explain what makes working here different from other organizations | I am familiar with the "As One For Patients" initiative’s goals and deliverables. | I believe the "As One for Patients" cultural initiative will drive positive change through this organization |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| N Valid                              | 103                                                                       | 103                                                             | 103                                                                           | 103                                                                           |
| Missing                              | 0                                                                         | 0                                                               | 0                                                                             | 0                                                                             |
| Mean                                 | 5,699                                                                     | 5,621                                                           | 5,757                                                                         | 5,825                                                                         |
| Std. Deviation                       | 1,0557                                                                   | 1,0490                                                          | 1,1502                                                                        | 1,0425                                                                        |

Figure 21. Internal Culture Scale Items by Gender

The highest mean value for the following hypothesis is 5,8, “I believe the “As one for Patients” cultural initiative will drive positive change through this organization” and “I am familiar with the “As One For Patients” initiative’s goals and deliverables”. The lowest mean
value is 5.6 “I can clearly explain what makes working here different from other organizations.” Among female respondents the highest mean value is 5.7 for “This organizations mission and goals provide meaningful direction to me” and “I believe the “As one for Patients” cultural initiative will drive positive change through this organization”. The lowest mean value is 5.3 for “I am familiar with the “As One for Patients” initiative’s goals and deliverables.”

For male respondents the highest mean value is, 6.2 for “This organizations mission and goals provide meaningful direction to me” and the lowest value 5.8 for “I believe the “As one for Patients” cultural initiative will drive positive change through this organization” and “I can clearly explain what makes working here different from other organizations”.

**EMPLOYEE PRO ACTIVENESS**

**Table 5: Employee Pro Activeness, Mean and Standard Deviation**

|                                    | I would not hesitate to recommend this organization to a friend seeking employment | Given the opportunity, I tell others great things about working here. | I bring up Merck S.A. in a positive way in conversations I have with friends and acquaintances. | In social situations, I often feel the need to speak favorably about Merck S.A | On social media, I often feel the need to speak favorably about Merck S.A |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| N Valid                            | 103                                                                               | 103                                                               | 103                                                                                                                              | 103                                                                      | 103                                                                      |
| Missing                            | 0                                                                                 | 0                                                                 | 0                                                                                                                                | 0                                                                        | 0                                                                        |
| Mean                               | 6.155                                                                             | 6.049                                                             | 6.068                                                                                                                            | 5.699                                                                    | 5.291                                                                    |
| Std. Deviation                     | 1.1944                                                                            | .9223                                                             | 1.0123                                                                                                                           | 1.1702                                                                   | 1.3622                                                                   |
The highest mean value is 6,2 “I would not hesitate to recommend this organization to a friend seeking employment.” The lowest mean is 5,3 “On social media, I often feel the need to speak favorably about Merck S.A.” Female respondents had the highest mean value for “In social situations, I often feel the need to speak favorably about Merck S.A.” The lowest mean value is 5,7 for “I would not hesitate to recommend this organization to a friend seeking employment.” For Male respondents the highest means score is 6,5 “Given the opportunity, I tell others great things about working here.” The lowest mean value is 6,0 for two questions, “On social media, I often feel the need to speak favorably about Merck S.A.” and “I would not hesitate to recommend this organization to a friend seeking employment.”.
**BRAND CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR**

**Table 6**: Brand Citizenship Behavior, Mean and Standard Deviation

|                             | Valid | Missing | Mean   | Std. Deviation |
|-----------------------------|------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Other people would characterize me as an employee who represents our brand favorably in conversations. | 103  | 0       | 6,000  | .8632          |
| Other people would characterize me as an employee who defends our brand if outsiders criticize it. | 103  | 0       | 6,087  | 1,0395         |
| Other people would characterize me as an employee who tell others our brand is a good place to work. | 103  | 0       | 6,068  | .9524          |

**Figure 23.** Brand Citizenship Behavior Scale Items By Gender

The dependent variable, Brand Citizenship Behavior, has got the highest mean value, 6,1, for “Other people would characterize me as an employee who defends our brand if others criticize it.” The lowest mean value is 6,0 for “Other people would characterize me as an employee who represents our brand favorably in conversations.” For female respondents the highest mean value is 5,9, “Other people would characterize me as an employee who defends our brand if others criticize it.” And lowest value 5,8 “Other people would characterize me as an employee who represents our brand favorably in conversations.”. Among male respondents, the mean values are the same (6,3) for all the questions.
5.2.1 Reliability Tests

In order to validate the Likert scales for their internal consistency, Cronbach’s Alpha was performed. The results obtained proved that all scales have high internal consistency. Therefore new compound variables were derived from the original items using the mean (Luo Y. 2003).

The complete figures can be found in the Appendix Cronbach’s Alpha.

**Figure 24. Cronbach’s Alpha**

| Dependent variable | Cronbach’s Alpha | > 0.7 VALID |
|--------------------|------------------|------------|
| Hypothesis 1       | 0.824            | 0.7 VALID  |
| Hypothesis 2       | 0.851            | 0.7 VALID  |
| Hypothesis 3       | 0.872            | 0.7 VALID  |
| Hypothesis 4       | 0.857            | 0.7 VALID  |
| Hypothesis 5       | 0.872            | 0.7 VALID  |

5.2.2 Pearson’s Correlation

The results obtained for Pearson’s Correlation shows that there is a positive correlation among all the independent variables and the dependent variable, indicating that a growth in value for the independent variables also increases the value of the dependent variable.

The p-value value for all correlations is below p <0.05 indicating that there are significant correlations between the dependent and independent variables. Table 7 below shows Pearson’s correlation between BCB and other variables. The complete table can be found in Appendix 5.
### 5.2.3 Regression Analysis and validation of Hypothesis

After confirming the correlation using Pearson’s Product-Moment Correlation the author moved on to executing a Regression Analysis using the Stepwise method in order to exclude the nonsignificant independent variables. However, before executing the stepwise method, series of validation tests needed to be conducted. The author conducted and validated six assumptions.

The results of the assumptions and tables can be found in Appendix 5: Regression Analysis Validation. According to Field A. (2009), if a one or more assumptions are violated, the data cannot be generalized beyond the sample. On the other hand, the analysis and hypothesis are constructed to be used solely for Merck S.A. Portugal, and therefore the results obtained are only meant to be used for the sample tested (Field A. 2009). Therefore, five out of six assumptions held for the Multiple Linear Regression model, the hypothesis testing may move to the next face, Regression Analysis using the Stepwise method. There are two different types of stepwise method, forward and backward. In the thesis the author used the forward method which selects the best independent variable towards the remaining variables. In case adding another independent variable results in a better result, the stepwise method selects another independent variable. The process of adding independent variables and comparing them to the remaining variables continues until the model does not improve significantly. (Mooi E., Sarstedt M., 2011)

The tables for stepwise method can be found in Appendix 6 Regression Analysis using the Stepwise Model.

#### Table 7: Pearson’s correlation

| Hypothesis (H0: BCB dependent) | H1: Brand Knowledge affect BCB | H2: Self Identification affect BCB | H3: Affective Commitment affect BCB | H4: Internal Culture affect BCB | H5: Employee proactiveness affect BCB |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Pearson Correlation            | 1                               | .578**                            | .614**                             | .538**                          | .601**                              | .665**                             |
| Sig. (2-tailed)                | .000                            | .000                              | .000                               | .000                            | .000                                | .000                               |
| N                               | 103                             | 103                               | 103                                | 103                             | 103                                 | 103                                |

(Mooi E., Sarstedt M., 2011)
As it can be seen in table 10 beneath, Hypothesis 1 and 5 were selected by the stepwise model. Hypotheses H1: Brand Knowledge and H5: Employee Pro-activeness were validated since Sig. was below <0.05. (See table below, highlighted in green)

TOL > 0,1 assumption holds, the independent variables are not correlated among themselves and VIF < 10 Assumption holds, there is no serious correlation among explanatory variables. Durbin Watson is 2,250 which is considered good since the value is close to 2.

On the other hand, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test on standardized residuals had a result of D0,000 < 0,05 indicating that the result is non-normal. The results of the K-S test can be found in Appendix 6.

Table 10: Stepwise method, included variables, R² and Durbin Watson

| Model | Coefficientsa | Collinearity Statistics |
|-------|---------------|-------------------------|
|       | Unstandardized | Standardized | t | Sig. | Tolerance | VIF  |
| B     | Std. Error    | Beta        |    |      |            |      |
| 2     | (Constant)    | 2,111       | ,438 | 4,817 | ,000      |      |
|       | H5:Employee   | ,432        | ,083 | ,503 | 5,198      | ,000 |
|       | pro-activeness|             |      |      | ,559      | 1,789|
|       | H1:Brand      | ,235        | ,093 | ,244 | 2,522      | ,013 |
|       | knowledge     |             |      |      | ,559      | 1,789|
|       | Adj R2:        | ,465        |      |      |            |      |
|       | Durbin-Watson  | 2,250       |      |      |            |      |

a. Dependent Variable: H0:BCB dependent

Finally, the hypothesis validated were;

**Hypothesis 1**: Brand Knowledge positively affect Brand Citizenship Behavior

**Hypothesis 5**: Employee Pro-Activeness positively affect Brand Citizenship Behavior
6. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The hypothesis established in the thesis had a scientific back up from previous studies as well as an adaptation regarding questions to Merck S.A. made by the author. The research questions were collected from validated and published research and the Merck Corporate Engagement survey. In the case of Merck S.A. Portugal, only two hypothesis remained impactful on Brand Citizenship Behavior.

The results of the last analysis conducted, regression analysis, using the stepwise method excluded three out of five established hypothesis. In the end, Hypothesis 1; Brand Knowledge and Hypothesis 5; Employee Pro-Activeness were supported, indicating that these two hypotheses have a direct impact on Brand Citizenship Behavior in the case of Merck employees. The other three hypothesis; H2: Self-identification, H3: Affective Commitment and H4: Internal Culture were not supported, indicating that they do not have a direct impact on Brand Citizenship Behavior in the current case.

It is believed that in the case of Merck S.A. Portugal, Brand Knowledge is a critical factor which affects employees internal will to share. If the employees are encouraged to share content they are highly unfamiliar with, the participation would be low, hence to unfamiliar content about employing organization placing the sharing person in danger of losing credibility. It is vital to point out that ‘personal networks’ signifies personal connections recognizing the employee sharing. If unfamiliar content is shared and the employee is asked questions which he/she would not be able to answer, the sharer is no longer listened to. Therefore, all content placed into SMARP is previously well communicated on the intranet or via email. All ongoing activities on Merck Portugal –level and organizational campaigns are first made known internally before releasing them on SMARP. Brand Knowledge i.e. content about the employing organization on local and global level is a critical factor affecting BCB, as proven in the research. On the other hand, Employee Pro-Activeness is fed by messages showcasing what a good and interesting place their employing organization is. The employee sharing content which he is familiar with and considers interesting, places the sharer in the shoes of an opinion leader making the employee look like an expert in his field. Therefore, any employee with the need to be visible and heard will share interesting content he is familiar with, which agrees with the findings made in the research.
7. ACTIONS TAKEN FOR MERCK PORTUGAL

The motivation to conclude the in company project was the need to establish communications in a cost efficient way by using digitalization. As the author already knew the concept of employee advocacy before starting at Merck Portugal, the communications idea was presented short after researching the actual situation regarding communications. During the writing of the thesis the author started implementing strategies (presented as hypothesis) which prepared the company for the launch of SMARP.

The renewal started from internal communication. It was discovered that the main communications channels were email and the company intranet, EVA. Merck Portugal had a proper page on the corporate intranet site called “Location Room Portugal”. Emails were sent frequently on an un-updated emailing list. Due to a high amount of emails received daily, and some never reaching all colleagues, Location Room Portugal was considered the best platform for communication. However, after pulling out a traffic analysis on the amount of visitors on the intranet, the amount of visits was low. Employees had no interest in visiting the site moreover, each time news were published the employees had no alert on new content and therefore, many messages remained unread.

According to previous literature presented in the literature review, brand knowledge is an antecedent of brand citizenship behavior and the way brand knowledge is increased among employees is through internal communication (Grace, King 2012). Therefore, the first renewals made were in internal communication. The actions conducted were to re-construct Location Room Portugal to a vibrant and lively site where all employees could participate in communication. The re-structuring of the site included re-organizing the content, publishing a rotating gallery of images of colleagues in different events, updated calendar across all events in the four therapeutic areas in biopharma, a newsfeed/chat where all colleagues could post photos, write updates and like each other’s posts (and later on SMARP was integrated through an external iframe). When the new intranet was published all employees were invited in a competition of publishing photos and commenting/liking to break the ice in using the intranet. The emailing list was also updated at the same time by the IT department, allowing internal messages to fluctuate in a more efficient manner.

Via the newly structured internal communication, brand knowledge was passed to employees as internal messages containing information, news, events and activities communicated on the intranet and email. Later on, employees could post their own photos on the intranet and some
were also published in the rotating image gallery. Employee Pro-Activeness was intended to be boosted through tone of communication and company activities. The ‘tone’ of communication regarding any message sent was pride and joy. It means to say, that nothing was written with a ‘flat’ tone. Messages were written by using Merck specific font, superlatives, encouragement etcetera. Each achievement was communicated as “our” and “we”. As an example, Head and Neck Cancer Awareness Week and the participation of Merck Portugal in a Public Petition on full rehabilitation of teeth after oral surgery was communicated internally for weeks to encourage colleagues to sign the petition and share it on social media. To further activate social media usage, the General Manager published an article on Linkedin about Merck Portugal’s actions regarding the petition. The article was shared internally and employees were encouraged to like, comment and share the post.

**Figure 25.** General Manager’s article on Linkedin

![General Manager’s article on Linkedin](image)

We already signed the public petition – Head and Neck Cancer

Published on August 8, 2016

Merck Portugal took part in the 78th Cycling Tour of Portugal in collaboration with the Portuguese Study Group for Head and Neck Cancer (GECCP) providing free screenings to the public.

Each year, approximately 2500 cases of Head and Neck Cancer are diagnosed in Portugal. So far, Merck’s successful collaboration with GECCP has resulted in screening of more than 628 people during the event, of which 21 cases have been identified and sent for further examinations. The free screening will continue over the weekend in the last stages of the cycling tour, Setubal and Lisbon.
When the petition finally reached the needed signatures to be accepted, the internal messaging was written as “our success” and “we made it happen”. Moreover, other activities were conducted on a way to increase employee pro-activeness, such activities were for example; Halloween party where employees were encouraged to bring their kids in costumes to the office, São Martinho was celebrated by Merck Sponsored chestnuts for all by-passers in front of the office building including employees, at Christmas employees did their own Christmas calendar which was published on Location Room Portugal, a social responsibility program was established in collaboration with Aldeias-SOS permitting all employees to participate in charity activities etcetera. All of the above mentioned activities were conducted in order for colleagues to know each other better, know their General Manager and create a sense of WE-spirit. The above mentioned activities were in line with findings made by Dreher (2014), DuBois Gelb, Rangarajan (2014), Helm, Renk, Mishra (2014), Rokka, Karlsson, Tienari (2014) and Burmann and Zeplin (2005) who all claimed that employee advocacy is emotion based. A positive feeling towards the employing organization increases willingness to commit word of mouth. The events and activities were organized keeping in mind Self-identification with the organization as well as, Affective brand commitment (Burmann, Zeplin 2005).

In the literature review the author presents Dreher’s (2014) eight steps in the implementation of employee advocacy to the organization. In the following paragraph the author presents actions taken according to Dreher’s (2014) recommendations;

*Research*, Merck Portugal conducted a Digital Footprint survey on Survey Monkey ([Appendix 3: Digital Footprint Survey](#)) before conducting Employee Advocacy & Social Media training with MORE (Lift World, 2017) to employees ([Appendix 1, social media training](#)). The aim was to have a “scratch the surface” -understanding on the digital savviness of employees at Merck Portugal.

*Access*; Employees were helped to establish social media platforms and encouraged to use them.

*Commitment*; The senior management was “bought in” the employee advocacy project with the help of the General Manager. The goal was to have full support and encouragement by senior management to activate employees on social media and become employee advocates.

*Social Media Team*; A group of administrators for SMARP was established and trained for the use of the tool
Guidelines and Policies: Part of the external digital training was Compliance and Social Media rules by Merck (conducted internally by Regulatory Affairs).

Training and Education: Employee Advocacy and Social Media training organized for the entire organization at Portugal. The training was an intensive 1-day course which was organized twice. After the training SMARP administrators helped employees to create social media platforms and gave guidance in usage.

Integration & Goal setting and measurement was conducted after the launch of SMARP. Employees were fully aware that the only channel where “risk free” content could be found, accepted by compliance was on SMARP. By only using SMARP for external Merck Portugal communication all company messages (corporate and local) could be unified in one voice, hence to employees sharing the same content in the same time frame. After the launch and successful onboarding of employees on the tool, goal setting and measurement was started. KPI’s were set for the entire organization for 2017 with the help of a support consultant from SMARP and other objectives were set case wise by each therapeutic area wishing to use SMARP as part of a campaign.

7.1 SMARP in usage

The following text aims to show results obtained from Merck Portugal from an institutional perspective and also provide an example of a therapeutic area which chose to use SMARP in a campaign.

As earlier mentioned KPI’s were set for the entire use of SMARP. In the figure below the KPI’s set in April 2017 are demonstrated.
The KPI’s set were aimed to reach for breakeven on the initial investment made. SMARP costed Merck 7000€ for a one year license. The KPI’s in figure 26, above give an indication on how SMARP should be used to reach ROI at the end of the year.

The objectives before KPI’s were to increase employee enrollment via connecting personal social media channels to SMARP, to create content on a timely basis (especially content for Portugal, which had a higher “share –rate” on social media) as well as remind employees of new content to share via push-notifications on iPHONE, iPAD and via email. The KPI’s, on the other hand were reflections on the set objectives; \textit{increase click and share per post}. The click and share rate is the amount of initial shares through SMARP divided by the amount clicks gained in total. This can be translated in the following way; the more interesting content the employee is familiar with, the more initial shares the content gains. For example, content of Merck S.A. Portugal doing social responsibility. Connections in the networks of employees are colleagues from other countries, friends, connections from competing companies etcetera, who are interested in activities conducted by Merck spread through the employees account.

The figures set as KPI’s were: Facebook 3.90 (per post), Linkedin 1.51 (per post) and Twitter 0.77 (per post). The Estimated Earned Media Value (EEMV) at the point in time was 3 370€. Each development/KPI check meeting was set for every three months to define strategies to..
reach the breakeven (7000€). (EEMV, Smarp calculates the monetary value of content on different social media platforms based on the rates the SoMe channels sell visibility. EEMV is translated the amount that could have been invested in total on social media channels without using SMARP.)

After the first KPI setting for institutional usage, three tactics to increase usage were set; First, to boost employee willingness to share on SMARP each month a list of “Top Merck Influencers” was published by email and as an internal message on SMARP. SMARP had also a weekly leader board on the platform to show the influencer ranking. It was recognized that the leader board would work as an ego-booster for the most sharing employees and as a motivator to share for the employees who did not appear on the table.

**Figure 27. Top Merck Influencer June 2017**

(The names are removed to protect privacy.)

---

**Estimados Colegas,**

Aqui partilhamos os **TOP 6 INFLUENCADORES** do mês do Junho!

1. (1.5K)
2. (1.0K)
3. (550K)
4. (900K)
5. (1.5M)
6. (2.0M)

Parabéns aos **TMF’s!**
( Top Merck Influencer )
Secondly, a tactic taken was to plan and program a SMARP training for colleagues. A presentation with the following agenda (figure below) was prepared to increase awareness of usage, share best practices with the teams and help each team set KPI’s for campaigns where SMARP was included. The organizer of the training visited each therapeutic area –team on a cycle meeting to do a 30-minute presentation on SMARP with the aim to clear doubts regarding usage of the platform.

**Figure 29. Treino SMARP**
Thirdly, an action taken was to increase the production of Merck Portugal content. Therefore, the communications team for Merck Portugal started to create content of each event and activity in which Merck was associated. The content was published on the LinkedIn of the General Manager and re-shared on SMARP. Also general PR’s for example, research investment conducted by Merck to iBET was published in a more generalized article aimed for the public in general.

As last, the Neurology team chose to use SMARP in its marketing and communications plan for World MS Day 2017. The usage of SMARP included re-publishing all articles and news found online which were of Merck Portugal, reported by media and bloggers. Such channels were for example, SIC noticias, Saúde Online, RTP and the Portuguese blogger Claudio Ramos. The results obtained from SMARP were the following:

**SMARP WMSD** – Shares 152 / Total clicks 180 / Reach 34,470 / Reactions 137

**Figure 30.** Casa da Esclerose Múltipla desafia população a perceber sintomas da doença

**Figure 31.** WMSD Results SMARP

- Shares: 152
- Total Clicks: 180
- Reactions: 137
- Views: 34,470K
Based on the results above of the Neurology team’s testing on SMARP the results were positive. However, before content was released on SMARP communication regarding WMSD activities were done on a broad scale internally, therefore all employees were familiar with (what, why and when) the content available for sharing. Moreover, to further understand and increase employee engagement the following objectives and KPI’s were set for other therapeutic areas wishing to use SMARP in their campaigns.

**Figure 32. Objectives and KPI’s for campaigns**

| Treino Smarp KIIP’s |
|---------------------|
| 1. Grupo: XX (permite filtrar) |
| 2. Partilhas: Quantidade |
| • Texto pré-definido |
| • Texto introdução |
| • Vídeo/Texto |
| • Utilização de hashtags |
| • Push Notification |
| 3. Clicks: Quantidade |
| 4. Reach: Quantidade |
| 5. Reactions (like): Quantidade |

As it can be noted, SMARP is a never ending work field for the communications team. On the other hand, an elevated usage among employees and good knowledge on best practices accompanied with help from SMARP administrators and quality content makes SMARP a highly utile tool for Employee Advocacy. For Merck Portugal as a pioneering Healthcare Company in the digital environment, SMARP offers a competitive advantage, hence to the pharmaceutical field still being extremely conservative in the case of using digital in communication not to mention, employee advocacy.
8. CONCLUSIONS

8.1 Limitations

The aim of the study was to prove different factors affecting employee willingness to conduct Brand Citizenship Behavior. The hypotheses were retrieved and established from other validated studies presented in the literature review. The questions used in the survey conducted were further selected from other authors validated scales, Merck Corporate Engagement Survey 2015 and adapted to Merck S.A. Portugal by the author. Due to lack of research in the area of Brand Citizenship Behavior and Employee Advocacy in the area of the pharmaceutical industry, the author was forced to adjust questions and scales from various sources. The literature used was collected primarily from published articles. To have up to date information the author used also company specific published works and sources from the internet. However, these sources of information were only used when needed to strengthen the claims. The in-company project had a specific target group, the employees, to study. Therefore, questions from the Merck Employee Engagement Survey 2015 were modified to better correspond to Merck in Portugal.

8.2 Future Research and Practical Suggestions

As of future research the author suggests to dig deeper into employee pro-activeness and look into the psychological aspects of internal drivers and motivation. As of brand knowledge, it is considered important to have a specific view of what is included in brand knowledge and what topics regarding the brand and company are considered interesting.

It is also thought of interest to research the concept employee advocacy and the employee advocacy tool to note how employee engagement to the platform can be affected by different company activities offline, which are later on shared online to discover the most “interesting” content shared. It needs to be pointed out that the content employees share with pride (example, opinion article by the Managing Director) was proved to gain much attention on the social media channels of the employees.

As mentioned several times in the thesis, employee advocacy is a new term and it has not been duly researched yet. However, the concept is gaining a lot of attention at this moment.

As a reference already mentioned in the thesis, Linkedin Elevate, is a rising star in employee
advocacy which gives good analytics for recruiters etcetera. However, the platform is only limited for LinkedIn.

From a practical perspective, implementing a tool such as SMARP is an ongoing project. After implementation the owner(s) of the tool needs to further develop the usage strategy, content mapping and engagement. Employees need to constantly be informed about the existence of the platform, if not it will be forgotten. SMARP can be used for both internal and external communication. In case employees are wanted to be reached with internal (blocked social media sharing) or external content, push notification function provided by the tool is very helpful to reach also sales force, for instance. The push notification is useful also because it alerts on all mobile devices and iPads which have SMARP installed as well as, sends emails. In this way employees can be reminded of important content on an up-to-date basis. Moreover, regarding content it is suggested to have a strategy of content published for each quartile to avoid frantic searching and non-important content. After using SMARP for approximately seven months with good results, the KPI’s set by the consultant at SMARP are to be met. Therefore, it is vital to set tactics on how to reach the objectives. The tactics can be managed and changed depending on their functionality and outcome. One tactic taken which was expected to make a change was to have additional trainings on the usage for both employees and senior management. For Merck Portugal, training is forecasted for the last two quartiles of the year where the leader of the project visits cycle meetings to give additional 30 minute trainings to employees on how to use SMARP in marketing, communications and individual use.

After six months of using SMARP, Merck Portugal had already obtained results regarding visibility. The results were observed via the Merck PT SMARP platform, which showed a visibility result of 348,63K. On the other hand Opinion Leaders (employees who most used SMARP) acknowledged in verbal conversations that their connections had, in conversation, mentioned Merck Portugal activities and asked questions about the company after seeing content published on social media. Therefore, it can be concluded that Merck S.A. Portugal has gained visibility and increased knowledge among relevant stakeholders after six months of usage. In case SMARP is proactively used by administrators and strategies to enhance employee usage are further developed, SMARP will have a significant contribution on visibility and awareness on a low cost basis on Merck S.A. Portugal.
9. REFERENCES

Books

Field A. Discovering Statistics using SPSS; *Sage publications Ltd. 3rd* edition p. 251 [http://www.soc.univ.kiev.ua/sites/default/files/library/elopen/andy-field-discovering-statistics-using-spss-third-edition-20091.pdf](http://www.soc.univ.kiev.ua/sites/default/files/library/elopen/andy-field-discovering-statistics-using-spss-third-edition-20091.pdf)

Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J. Commitment in the workplace; Theory, Research and Application, Sage, *Thousand Oaks, CA.*

Merck Group Communications 2016, *Merck- Who we are*, Merck Group

Mooi E., Sarstedt M. 2011. The process, Data and Methods Using IBM SPSS Statistics, *A Concise Guide to Market Research*, Springer Heidelberg Dordrecht London New York

Journals

Baumgarth, C., Schmitdt, M. 2010 Industrial Marketing Management, How strong is the business-to-business brand in the workforce? An empirically tested model of “internal brand equity” in a business-to-business setting. *Industrial Marketing Management* 39:8 1250-1260

Bettencourt, L. A., 1997 Customer voluntary performance: Customers as customers in service delivery. *Journal of Retailing* 73:3, 383-406

Burmann C., Zeplin S. 2005 Building brand commitment: A behavioral approach to internal brand management. *Brand Management* vol. 12, no.4 279-300 Henry Stewart Publications

Chunyan X., Bagozzi K., Meland K.V. 2015 The impact of reputation and identity congruence on employer brand attractiveness. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, vol. 33 2:124-146

Dreher S. 2014 Social Media and the world of work: A strategic approach to employees’ participation on social media. *Corporate Communications: An international Journal* vol.19 344-356

DuBois Gelb B., Rangarajan D. 2014. Employee Contributions to Brand Equity. *California Management Review* 56:2

Ganesan, S., Weitz,B., 1996 The impact of Staffing Policies on Retail Job Buyer Attitudes and Behaviors *Journal of Retailing*, 72:1 31-56

Grace D., King C., 2012 Examining the antecedents of positive employee brand-related attitudes and behaviours *European Journal of Marketing* vol. 46 469-488
Helm SV., Renk U., Mishra A 2016 Exploring the impact of employee’s self-concept, brand identification and brand pride on brand citizenship behaviors. *European Journal of Marketing* vol.50 58-77

Kankkunen P., Isokangas A. 2011 Suora yhteys, Näin sosiaalinen media muuttaa yritykset. Taloustieto Oy

Luo Y. 2003, Industrial Dynamics and Managerial Networking in an Emerging Market: The case of China, *Strategic Management Journal* 24: 1315–1327

Ministry of Health, Decree-Law 176/2006. Official Journal, 1st series:167

Ouirdi A.E, Ouirdi M.E, Segers J & Henderickx E. 2015. Employees' use of social media technologies: a methodological and thematic review *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 34:5, 454-464

Piehler R., King C., Burmann C., Xiong L. (2016) The importance of employee brand understanding, brand identification and brand commitment in realizing brand citizenship behavior. *European Journal of Marketing*, 50:9/10 1575-1601

Rokka J., Karlsson K., Tienari J. 2014. Balancing Acts: Managing employees and reputation in social media. *Journal of Marketing Management* 30: 7–8, 802–827

Soane, E., Truss, C., Alfes, K., Shantz, A., Rees, C., 2012 Development and application of a new measure of employee engagement: The ISA Engagement Scale. *Human Resource Development International* 15:5, 529-54

Terpening E., Li C., Littleton A. 2016 Social Media Employee Advocacy: Tapping into the power of an engaged social workforce. *Altimeter @ Prophet*

Van Dyne. L., Graham, J.W., Dienesch, R.M, 1994 Organizational citizenship behavior: construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of management journal*, 37:4 765-802

Williams, L. J., Anderson, S. E. 1991, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management* 17:3, 601-617

Xiong L., King C., Piehler R. 2013. That’s not my job: Exploring the employee perspective in the development of brand ambassadors. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 35: 348-359

**Unpublished work**

Harquail C.V. 2009 *The Rise of the Brandividual*: Rendering organizational authenticity through social media. Research paper, Authentic Organizations

Morokane MP. 2014. *Drivers of employee propensity to endorse their employer’s brand*. Research project, Gordon Institute of Business Science. University of Pretoria.
2015, *Positioning & Reputation; value management* Reputation study Merck S.A. Portugal

Electronic documents

Facebook, *About Facebook* [https://www.facebook.com/pg/facebook/about/?ref=page_internal](https://www.facebook.com/pg/facebook/about/?ref=page_internal) 30.10.2016

Facebook, *Business, overview* [https://www.facebook.com/business/overview](https://www.facebook.com/business/overview) 30.10.2016

Lift World, [http://liftworld.net/liftworld/](http://liftworld.net/liftworld/) 25.6.2017

Linkedin, *About Linkedin, Company Information* [https://press.linkedin.com/about-linkedin](https://press.linkedin.com/about-linkedin) 30.10.2016

Linkedin, *Business Linkedin, Elevate* [https://business.linkedin.com/elevate/why-create-social-employees](https://business.linkedin.com/elevate/why-create-social-employees) 30.10.2016

Merck 2016, *Merck S.A. Portugal* [http://www.merck.pt/en/index.html](http://www.merck.pt/en/index.html) 1.10.2016

Nations D., 2016, *What is Facebook; What Facebook is, where it came from and what It does* [https://www.lifewire.com/what-is-facebook-3486391](https://www.lifewire.com/what-is-facebook-3486391) 4.10.2016

Smarp, *Company* [http://www.smarp.com/company/](http://www.smarp.com/company/) 18.5.2017

Rouse M., *What is, Definition Twitter* [http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition/Twitter](http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition/Twitter)

December 2015 I Brought 30.10.2016

Twitter, Business, *Intro to Twitter for Business* [https://business.twitter.com/en/basics/intro-twitter-for-business.html](https://business.twitter.com/en/basics/intro-twitter-for-business.html) 1.11.2016
10. APPENDIX

Appendix 1: Social Media Training
Queremos ser ouvidos

Agentes de mudança

Criar influência

Autoridade

Transparente

Genuína

AS REDES SOCIAIS
**Facebook**
A rede social mais antiga.
Características:
- Compartilhamento de postagens.
- Interatividade.
- Algortimismo Tela.
- Ferramentas para empresas.
- O algoritmo de exibição de conteúdo de empresas digitais poderosa.

**Linkedin**
A rede social B2B.
Características:
- Profissionais.
- Empresas.
- Redes de informações.
- Os dados e o conteúdo.
- Tendências e atualizações.

**Instagram**
A rede social mais visual.
Características:
- Imagens.
- Vídeos.
- Story.
- Mão de oficina.
- Algoritmo.

**Twitter**
A rede social de texto.
Características:
- Tweets.
- Redes de informações.
- Denúncias.
- Tendências.
- Tendências.
- Estilo de vida.
- Redes de informação.

**Youtube**
A rede social de vídeo.
Características:
- Vídeos.
- Características da plataforma.
- Reprodução de vídeos.
- Comentários.
- Transmissão de vídeo.

**Snapchat**
A rede social de mensagens.
Características:
- Mensagens.
- Redes de informações.
- Envio de mensagens.
- Exclusão.
- Exclusão.
- Público.

**Business Network**
A rede social de negócios.
Características:
- Profissionais.
- Empresas.
- Redes de informações.
- Tendências.
- Tendências.
- Exclusão.
- Exclusão.
- Público.
Os Portugueses

84% navega no Facebook
83% navega no YouTube
82% utilizou uma rede social na última semana
79% utilizou uma rede social para comunicar-se com amigos
75% consideram aumentar o tempo dedicado às redes sociais na última semana
72% segue figuras públicas
72% utiliza redes sociais para educação
67% utiliza redes sociais para entretenimento
68% enviar e receber mensagens
68% visualização de vídeos
65% comentar as publicações de amigos
63% compartilha/converte
61% ler notícias em sites de informação
61% partilha de links de artigos

AS EMPRESAS EM PORTUGAL

36% adotou soluções de social business
34% planeta há menos de 6 meses
33% não adotou e nunca o fará
16% não sabe e soube
EMPLOYEE ADVOCACY

Empowering & Engaging
| Enthusiasm & Word-of-mouth
| Motivation
| Brand Construction

Reach & Influence
| Value Proposition
| Customer Experience
| Branding

Credibility
| Authenticity
| Transparency
Appendix 2: Questions

Demographics

Gender
- Male
- Female

Age
- 20-40 years old
- 40-70 years old

Years employed for Merck in Portugal
- 0-5 years
- 5-10 years
- 10 ->
I like to share… (multiple answer)
…Corporate content
…content of Merck S.A. Portugal
…content related to the Pharmaceutical Industry

Please classify each of the following questions in a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

1. Other people would characterize me as an employee who represents our brand favorably in conversations 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. Other people would characterize me as an employee who defends our brand if outsiders criticize it 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. Other people would characterize me as an employee who tell others our brand is a good place to work 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. I know how Merck S.A. Portugal is different from our competitors. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. I know the value Merck S.A. adds to the society (environment/modified) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. I am well informed about the values represented by the brand 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. I know which attributes of our brand differentiate us from our competitors 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. Being a member of Merck S.A. Portugal energizes me (modified) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. I feel like I am part of Merck S.A. Portugal (modified) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. The values that are important to Merck S.A. are also important to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. My values are similar to those of this organization 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. This organization inspires me to do my best work every day 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. I feel positive about my work
14. I am enthusiastic about my work
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. I feel like “part of the family” at our brand
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. I feel “emotionally attached” to our brand
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. This organization’s mission and goals provide meaningful direction to me
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. I can clearly explain what makes working here different from other organizations
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. I am familiar with the “As One For Patients” initiative’s goals and deliverables
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. I believe the “As One for Patients” cultural initiative will drive positive change through this organization
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. I would not hesitate to recommend this organization to a friend seeking employment
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. Given the opportunity, I tell others great things about working here
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. I bring up Merck S.A. in a positive way in conversations I have with friends and acquaintances.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. In social situations, I often feel the need to speak favorably about Merck S.A. (modified)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. On social media, I often feel the need to speak favorably about Merck S.A. (modified)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Appendix 3: Digital Footprint Survey
Digital Footprint survey

The aim of the survey was to measure the social media usage of employees at Merck Portugal. The survey results are used to organize a content and social media workshop in October for employees at Merck.

The survey was anonymous and voluntary.
The results were obtained between: 20.9-25.9.2016
The total amount of participants was 58, indicating over 50% participation.

As of a summary;
It can clearly be noted that employees of Merck use rather actively social media, even at work. The most used platforms were LinkedIn (1) and Facebook (2). 67% of respondents said they "sometimes share their opinion on social media". This referring an active mindset rather than a passive, indicating a good stance to implement EA. Among the respondents were five (5) employees who use social media widely enough to blog.

Question 1
Do you use social media?

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents who use social media, with 87.27% saying yes and 12.73% saying no.]

Amount of responses: 55

YES : 87.27%
NO : 12.73%

Question 2
Which of the following social media platforms do you use?

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents using different social media platforms, with LinkedIn at 90.38%, Facebook at 78.85%, Twitter at 13.46%, Instagram at 38.46%, and Pinterest at 30.77%.]

Amount of responses: 52

LinkedIn: 90.38%
Facebook: 78.85%
Twitter: 13.46%
Instagram: 38.46%
Pinterest: 30.77%
Question 3
How often do you use social media?

Amount of responses: 56

- All the time: 19.64%
- Once or twice a day: 48.21%
- Once a week: 21.43%
- Once a month: 3.57%
- Never: 7.14%

Question 5
Is your LinkedIn profile up to date?

Amount of responses: 55

- Yes, always: 34.55%
- I updated it a while ago: 29.09%
- I updated it when I created it: 14.55%
- I do not want to give my information away: 1.82%
- I do not have a LinkedIn: 20.03%

Question 4
Do you use social media at work?

Amount of responses: 56

- Every day: 12.50%
- Sometimes: 53.57%
- I do not know if I am allowed to: 3.57%
- Never: 30.36%
Question 6
If you have LinkedIn. Do you have Merck Group as your current employer?

Amount of responses: 54

Yes: 77.78%
No: 9.26%
I do not know: 0%
I do not have LinkedIn: 12.9%

Question 7
Do you like to share your opinion on social media?

Amount of responses: 55

All the time: 0%
Sometimes: 67.27%
Never: 23.25%
Do I have to?: 3.64%
I am afraid: 0.9%

Question 8
Do you belong to/follow professional groups on social media?

Amount of responses: 55

Yes, several: 14.55%
Yes, some: 54.55%
I would like to: 0%
No: 30.91%
Appendix 4: Cronbach’s Alpha

Dependent variable, BCB:

| Summary Item Statistics |
|-------------------------|
| Item Means | Mean | Minimum | Maximum | Range | Maximum / Minimum | Variance | N of Items |
|-------------|------|---------|---------|-------|-------------------|----------|------------|
|             | 6,052 | 6,000   | 6,087   | .087  | 1,015             | .002     | 3          |

Reliability Statistics: Cronbach’s Alpha 0,783 > 0,7 VALID
Hypothesis 1: Brand Knowledge positively affect brand citizenship behavior

| Item Means | Mean | Minimum | Maximum | Range | Maximum / Minimum | Variance | N of Items |
|------------|------|---------|---------|-------|-------------------|----------|------------|
| Item Means | 6,012| 5,689   | 6,262   | .573  | 1,101             | .063     | 4          |

Reliability Statistics: Cronbach’s Alpha 0,824 > 0,7 VALID

H2: Self-identification with Merck S.A. positively affects brand citizenship behavior

| Item Means | Mean | Minimum | Maximum | Range | Maximum / Minimum | Variance | N of Items |
|------------|------|---------|---------|-------|-------------------|----------|------------|
| Item Means | 6,131| 5,981   | 6,330   | .350  | 1,058             | .029     | 4          |

Reliability Statistics: Cronbach’s Alpha 0,851 > 0,7 VALID

H3: Affective commitment positively affect employee willingness to commit

| Item Means | Mean | Minimum | Maximum | Range | Maximum / Minimum | Variance | N of Items |
|------------|------|---------|---------|-------|-------------------|----------|------------|
| Item Means | 5,998| 5,767   | 6,204   | .437  | 1,076             | .034     | 5          |

Reliability Statistics: Cronbach’s Alpha 0,872 > 0,7 VALID

H4: Internal culture positively affects brand citizenship behavior

| Item Means | Mean | Minimum | Maximum | Range | Maximum / Minimum | Variance | N of Items |
|------------|------|---------|---------|-------|-------------------|----------|------------|
| Item Means | 5,726| 5,621   | 5,825   | .204  | 1,036             | .008     | 4          |

Reliability Statistics: Cronbach’s Alpha 0,857 > 0,7 VALID
H5: Employee pro-activeness positively affects brand citizenship behavior

| Summary Item Statistics |
|-------------------------|
|                         |
| Item Means              |
| Mean 5,852              |
| Minimum 5,291           |
| Maximum 6,155           |
| Range 0,864             |
| Maximum / Minimum 1,163 |
| Variance 0,129          |
| N of Items 5            |

Reliability Statistics: Cronbach’s Alpha 0,872 > 0,7 VALID
## Appendix 5: Regression analysis validation

| 1) Pearson’s Product-Moment Correlation | Previously analyzed, Pearson’s Product-Moment Correlation was validated. |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2) The mean of the residuals component is zero | The assumption holds, residual = 0. |
| 3) There is no correlation among the residual terms | The value of Durbin-Watson is 2.255. The value is close to 2, therefore the residuals are assumed to be independent. |
| 4) The variance of the random term is constant | The scatterplot shows that the assumption of homoscedasticity is not valid, the scatterplot shows heteroscedasticity, meaning an uneven spread around zero. As it can be seen, the dots are spread mostly between 0-1 on the right side of the scatterplot. The assumption is not validated. |
| 5) Normality of the residuals | ANOVA (appendix 3) for the regression analysis is 0.000 signifying sig.< 0.05. It can be concluded that the linear regression under analysis is valid, at least some of the explanatory variables used are important in explaining the dependent variable Brand Citizenship Behavior. |
| 6) There is no correlation among the explanatory variables | TOL > 0.1 Assumption holds, the independent variables are not correlated among themselves. VIF < 10 Assumption holds, there is no serious correlation among explanatory variables. |
| Correlations                                      | H0:BCB dependent | H1:Brand knowledge affect BCB | H2:Self identification affect BCB | H3:Affection commitment affect BCB | H4:Internal Culture affect BCB | H5:Employee pro-activeness affect BCB |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| **H0:BCB dependent** Pearson Correlation **.578** | 1                | **.614**                      | **.538**                          | **.601**                          | **.665**                      |                                      |
| **Significance (2-tailed)**                       | **.000**         | **.000**                      | **.000**                          | **.000**                          | **.000**                      | **.000**                            |
| **N**                                            | 103              | 103                           | 103                               | 103                               | 103                           | 103                                  |
| **H1:Brand knowledge affect BCB** Pearson Correlation **.578** | 1                | **.684**                      | **.589**                          | **.701**                          | **.664**                      |                                      |
| **Significance (2-tailed)**                       | **.000**         | **.000**                      | **.000**                          | **.000**                          | **.000**                      | **.000**                            |
| **N**                                            | 103              | 103                           | 103                               | 103                               | 103                           | 103                                  |
| **H2:Self identification affect BCB** Pearson Correlation **.614** | 1                | **.702**                      | **.713**                          | **.758**                          | **.758**                      |                                      |
| **Significance (2-tailed)**                       | **.000**         | **.000**                      | **.000**                          | **.000**                          | **.000**                      | **.000**                            |
| **N**                                            | 103              | 103                           | 103                               | 103                               | 103                           | 103                                  |
| **H3:Affection commitment affect BCB** Pearson Correlation **.538** | 1                | **.702**                      | **.766**                          | **.760**                          | **.760**                      |                                      |
| **Significance (2-tailed)**                       | **.000**         | **.000**                      | **.000**                          | **.000**                          | **.000**                      | **.000**                            |
| **N**                                            | 103              | 103                           | 103                               | 103                               | 103                           | 103                                  |
| **H4:Internal Culture affect BCB** Pearson Correlation **.601** | 1                | **.713**                      | **.766**                          | **.767**                          | **.767**                      |                                      |
| **Significance (2-tailed)**                       | **.000**         | **.000**                      | **.000**                          | **.000**                          | **.000**                      | **.000**                            |
| **N**                                            | 103              | 103                           | 103                               | 103                               | 103                           | 103                                  |
| **H5:Employee pro-activeness affect BCB** Pearson Correlation **.665** | 1                | **.758**                      | **.760**                          | **.767**                          | **.767**                      |                                      |
| **Significance (2-tailed)**                       | **.000**         | **.000**                      | **.000**                          | **.000**                          | **.000**                      | **.000**                            |
| **N**                                            | 103              | 103                           | 103                               | 103                               | 103                           | 103                                  |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Residuals Statistics

|                | Minimum | Maximum | Mean  | Std. Deviation | N  |
|----------------|---------|---------|-------|----------------|----|
| Predicted Value| 3,7832  | 6,8151  | 6,0518| ,55906         | 103|
| Residual       | -1,41339| 1,11971 | ,00000| ,56840         | 103|
| Std. Predicted |         | -1,365 | ,000  | 1,000          | 103|
| Value          | -4,058  | 1,365   | ,000  |                | 103|
| Std. Residual  | -2,425  | 1,921   | ,000  | ,975           | 103|

a. Dependent Variable: H0:BCB dependent

Model Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|---|----------|-------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| 1     | ,701a| ,492     | ,466              | ,58287                    | 2,255        |

a. Predictors: (Constant), H5:Employee pro-activeness affect BCB, H1:Brand knowledge affect BCB, H3:Affective commitment affect BCB, H2:Self identification affect BCB, H4:Internal Culture affect BCB

b. Dependent Variable: H0:BCB dependent

ANOVA

| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F       | Sig. |
|-------|----------------|----|-------------|---------|------|
| 1     | Regressio n    | 31,880 | 5 | 6,376 | 18,768 | ,000b |
|       | Residual       | 32,955 | 97 | ,340 |        |      |
|       | Total          | 64,835 | 102 |        |      |

a. Dependent Variable: H0:BCB dependent
b. Predictors: (Constant), H5: Employee pro-activeness affect BCB, H1: Brand knowledge affect BCB, H3: Affective commitment affect BCB, H2: Self identification affect BCB, H4: Internal Culture affect BCB
Appendix 6: Regression Analysis using the stepwise method

### Model Summary

| Model | R   | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|-----|----------|-------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|
| 1     | .665<sup>a</sup> | .443     | .437              | .59815                      |               |
| 2     | .690<sup>b</sup> | .476     | .465              | .58288                      | 2.250         |

a. Predictors: (Constant), H5: Employee pro-activeness affect BCB  
b. Predictors: (Constant), H5: Employee pro-activeness affect BCB, H1: Brand knowledge affect BCB  
c. Dependent Variable: H0: BCB dependent

### ANOVA

| Model | Sums of Squares | df | Mean Square | F         | Sig.   |
|-------|----------------|----|-------------|-----------|--------|
| 1     | Regression     | 28,699 | 1 | 28,699     | 80,214   | .000<sup>b</sup> |
|       | Residual       | 36,136 | 101 | .358      |          |        |
|       | Total          | 64,835 | 102 |            |          |        |
| 2     | Regression     | 30,860 | 2 | 15,430     | 45,415   | .000<sup>c</sup> |
|       | Residual       | 33,975 | 100 | .340      |          |        |
|       | Total          | 64,835 | 102 |            |          |        |

a. Dependent Variable: H0: BCB dependent  
b. Predictors: (Constant), H5: Employee pro-activeness affect BCB  
c. Predictors: (Constant), H5: Employee pro-activeness affect BCB, H1: Brand knowledge affect BCB
## Excluded Variables

| Model | Model | Beta In | t | Sig. | Partial Correlation | Collinearity Statistics | Tolerance | VIF | Minimum Tolerance |
|-------|-------|---------|---|------|---------------------|-------------------------|-----------|-----|------------------|
| 1     | H1: Brand knowledge affect BCB | 0.244<sup>b</sup> | 2.522 | 0.013 | 0.245 | 0.559 | 1.789 | 0.559 |
|       | H2: Self identification affect BCB | 0.257<sup>b</sup> | 2.306 | 0.023 | 0.225 | 0.426 | 2.347 | 0.426 |
|       | H3: Affective commitment affect BCB | 0.076<sup>b</sup> | 0.662 | 0.510 | 0.066 | 0.422 | 2.370 | 0.422 |
|       | H4: Internal Culture affect BCB | 0.221<sup>b</sup> | 1.935 | 0.056 | 0.190 | 0.412 | 2.429 | 0.412 |
| 2     | H2: Self identification affect BCB | 0.178<sup>c</sup> | 1.498 | 0.137 | 0.149 | 0.367 | 2.721 | 0.367 |
|       | H3: Affective commitment affect BCB | 0.028<sup>c</sup> | 0.246 | 0.806 | 0.025 | 0.409 | 2.444 | 0.350 |
|       | H4: Internal Culture affect BCB | 0.128<sup>c</sup> | 1.039 | 0.301 | 0.104 | 0.346 | 2.890 | 0.346 |

a. Dependent Variable: H0: BCB dependent
b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), H5: Employee pro-activeness affect BCB
c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), H5: Employee pro-activeness affect BCB, H1: Brand knowledge affect BCB
### Coefficients\(^a\)

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficient | Collinearity Statistics |
|-------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
|       | B   | Std. Error | Beta | t   | Sig. | Tolerance | VIF |
| 1     |     |            |      |     |      |           |     |
| (Constant) | 2,710 | .378 | 7,172 | .000 |
| H5: Employee pro-activeness affect BCB | 665 | 8,956 | .000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| 2     |     |            |      |     |      |           |     |
| (Constant) | 2,111 | .438 | 4,817 | .000 |
| H5: Employee pro-activeness affect BCB | 503 | 5,198 | .000 | .559 | 1,789 |
| H1: Brand knowledge affect BCB | 244 | 2,522 | .013 | .559 | 1,789 |

---

a. Dependent Variable: H0: BCB dependent

### Kolmogorov-Smirnov\(^a\) and Shapiro-Wilk

|          | Kolmogorov-Smirnov\(^a\) | Shapiro-Wilk |
|----------|---------------------------|--------------|
|          | Statistic | df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| Unstandardized Residual | .127 | 103 | .000 | .949 | 103 | .001 |
| Standardized Residual | .127 | 103 | .000 | .949 | 103 | .001 |