

Online Research @ Cardiff

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/88012/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Orazi, Davide C., Spry, Amanda, Theilacker, Max N. and Vredenburg, Jessica 2017. A multi-stakeholder IMC framework for networked brand identity. *European Journal of Marketing* 51 (3), pp. 551-571. 10.1108/EJM-08-2015-0612 file

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EJM-08-2015-0612> <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EJM-08-2015-0612>>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.





European Journal
of Marketing

A multi-stakeholder IMC framework for networked brand identity

Journal:	<i>European Journal of Marketing</i>
Manuscript ID	EJM-08-2015-0612.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Integrated marketing communications, Brand identity, Brand image, Brand Equity, Stakeholder theory, Contact points

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review

Article Title Page

A multi-stakeholder IMC framework for networked brand identity

Author Details *(please list these in the order they should appear in the published article)*

Author 1 Name: Davide C. Orazi
Department: Department of Management and Marketing
University/Institution: University of Melbourne
Town/City: Melbourne
State (US only):
Country: Australia

Author 2 Name: Amanda Spry
Department: Cardiff Business School
University/Institution: Cardiff University
Town/City: Cardiff
State (US only):
Country: United Kingdom

Author 3 Name: Max N. Theilacker
Department: Department of Management and Marketing
University/Institution: University of Melbourne
Town/City: Melbourne
State (US only):
Country: Australia

Author 4 Name: Jessica M. Vredenburg
Department: Department of Management and Marketing
University/Institution: University of Melbourne
Town/City: Melbourne
State (US only):
Country: Australia

NOTE: affiliations should appear as the following: Department (if applicable); Institution; City; State (US only); Country. No further information or detail should be included

Corresponding author: Amanda Spry
Corresponding Author's Email: sprya@cardiff.ac.uk

Please check this box if you do not wish your email address to be published

Acknowledgments (if applicable):
All authors contributed equally to the paper.

Biographical Details (if applicable):

[Author 1 bio]

[Author 2 bio]

[Author 3 bio]

[Author 4 bio]



Type header information here

Structured Abstract:

Purpose – Past integrated marketing communications (IMC) frameworks establish brand contacts as important sources of information and feedback. This paper discusses how the presence of multiple brand stakeholders and the proliferation of digital media increase the amount of brand information generated exponentially. When a firm fails to harness this information, it risks misalignment between brand identity and brand image, which, in turn, tarnishes brand equity.

Design/methodology/approach – Past IMC frameworks are reviewed and extended to identify the specific brand contact points between multiple stakeholders that hold significant potential to dynamically reconfigure brand identity. Theoretical propositions regarding the IMC function's role in managing these contact points to generate brand equity are offered.

Findings – The brand contacts described and their successful integration into a firm's brand-equity strategy extend current IMC-based brand-equity models and suggest fruitful, novel avenues for creating brand equity. Further, these brand contacts offer practical examples of how the scope of marketing communications can be redefined.

Originality/value – This paper contributes to the body of research on the elevation of IMC to a strategic-level function. In addition to the synergistic communication of the brand offering, IMC needs to play a pivotal role in coordinating the contacts between the brand and stakeholders, and in extrapolating relevant brand insights from these contacts.

Keywords: Integrated marketing communications, brand identity, brand image, brand equity, stakeholder theory, contact points.

Article Classification: Conceptual paper

For internal production use only

Running Heads:

Type footer information here

A multi-stakeholder IMC framework for networked brand identity

Abstract

Purpose – Past integrated marketing communications (IMC) frameworks establish brand contacts as important sources of information and feedback. This paper discusses how the presence of multiple brand stakeholders and the proliferation of digital media increase the amount of brand information generated exponentially. When a firm fails to harness this information, it risks misalignment between brand identity and brand image, which, in turn, tarnishes brand equity.

Design/methodology/approach – Past IMC frameworks are reviewed and extended to identify the specific brand contact points between multiple stakeholders that hold significant potential to dynamically reconfigure brand identity. Theoretical propositions regarding the IMC function's role in managing these contact points to generate brand equity are offered.

Findings – The brand contacts described and their successful integration into a firm's brand-equity strategy extend current IMC-based brand-equity models and suggest fruitful, novel avenues for creating brand equity. Further, these brand contacts offer practical examples of how the scope of marketing communications can be redefined.

Originality/value – This paper contributes to the body of research on the elevation of IMC to a strategic-level function. In addition to the synergistic communication of the brand offering, IMC needs to play a pivotal role in coordinating the contacts between the brand and stakeholders, and in extrapolating relevant brand insights from these contacts.

Keywords – Integrated marketing communications, brand identity, brand image, brand equity, stakeholder theory, contact points.

Paper type – Conceptual paper

1. Introduction

If you are from the UK, there is a more than 75 per cent chance that you own an Apple product. Chances are also that you would have bought that product through Apple's website, or you would at least have used the website to gather information about the product and brand. You would have (subconsciously or not) taken in Apple's clean and minimalistic website and the simple and innovative design of the products. Together, your impressions will have formed a specific image of the Apple brand in your mind, and this image may have a key reason you bought the product in the first place.

The ability to convey a consistent brand identity to prospective and existing customers represents a critical success factor in competitive, information-rich marketplaces (Fill, 2000; Gould *et al.*, 1999). Brand identity – the set of brand associations a firm intends to establish in consumers' minds (Aaker, 2002) – is conveyed through contact points between a firm and its customers, for instance through the company website. From a consumer's perspective, each contact point influences the perceived brand image – the brand associations formed in consumers' minds (Keller, 1993). Alignment between brand identity and brand image forms the bedrock of brand equity (Anisimova, 2010; De Chernatony, 1999; Roper and Davies, 2007), referring to a brand's worth in terms of strength and financial value (Burmam *et al.*, 2009).

Yet, the rapid evolution of digital media and the ensuing large volume of information produced have drastically changed the nature and frequency of contact points (Kitchen and Uzunoğlu, 2014). A brand's image is now not only shaped by *direct* interactions between consumer and firm (Schultz *et al.*, 1993), but also by the *indirect* interactions between consumers and multiple stakeholders connected to the firm (Merz *et al.*, 2009). The resulting network of stakeholders that is actively involved in the creation and communication of a brand (Payne *et al.*, 2009) has transformed brands into dynamic entities (Da Silveira *et al.*,

1
2
3 2013), rendering unilateral definitions of brand identity obsolete (Asmussen *et al.*, 2013;
4
5 Haarhoff and Kleyn, 2012).
6

7
8 Returning to the opening example of buying an Apple product, let's consider an Apple
9
10 Watch, your web-search may not only have brought up the brand website, but you could have
11
12 also learned that Apple has collaborated with Nike to install the Nike+ running app on every
13
14 device. Knowing Nike as a high-performance sports brand will, to some extent, influence
15
16 your perception of the Apple brand. During your search, you may also have found consumer
17
18 reviews of the Apple Watch. In contrast to your initial assessment, some consumers question
19
20 the product's technical abilities, portraying the Apple Watch as nothing but an expensive
21
22 status symbol.
23

24
25 Instead of buying the device online, you may now feel that you should try and assess the
26
27 Apple Watch first-hand. You visit Selfridges, a major UK department store, and find a
28
29 purpose-built Apple Shop set up within Selfridges, staffed by Apple salespeople. Since
30
31 Selfridges has built an upscale reputation in the UK, you assume that products sold in their
32
33 stores provide a certain level of quality. The fact that the Apple Shop is adjacent to brand
34
35 displays of Dior and Chanel further enforces your impression of Apple's high-end
36
37 positioning. As you are approached by a friendly and expert salesperson, you receive
38
39 competent answers to your questions, and the salesperson's enthusiasm may influence your
40
41 decision to buy the watch there and then.
42
43
44

45
46 Throughout the purchase decision-making process, you have encountered the brand at
47
48 multiple contact points and have interacted with a number of its stakeholders. In the process,
49
50 your perception of the Apple brand could have moved from one of technical efficiency and
51
52 performance, which may have been impacted by negative consumer reviews, to one of
53
54 exclusiveness and prestige, to a combination of the two, and will continue to evolve based on
55
56 your own experience with the product.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Brand managers are thus called upon to make sense of the critical contact points
4 occurring in the marketplace and to deploy marketing strategies and capabilities accordingly
5 (O'Cass and Weerawardena, 2009). Integrated marketing communications (IMC), in
6 particular, is viewed as the key marketing capability to convert branded assets and
7 communications into positive brand-equity outcomes (Luxton *et al.*, 2015; Ratnatunga and
8 Ewing, 2005). And, although scholars have long been sceptical about the effectiveness of
9 IMC for driving improvements in firm performance (Cornelissen and Lock, 2000), more
10 recent findings provide empirical evidence suggesting that IMC indeed contributes
11 considerably to both brand and financial results (Luxton *et al.*, 2015).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Despite IMC being a fundamental component of a firm's brand-equity strategy, existing
24 IMC-based brand-equity frameworks are faced with two main issues. First, they assume a
25 unilateral, linear definition and communication of brand identity to build brand equity
26 (Madhavaram *et al.*, 2005); however, the need for information gathering and sense-making
27 has long been acknowledged for the successful implementation of IMC (Schultz and Kitchen,
28 2001). Second, extant frameworks tend to exclude stakeholders outside the traditional firm-
29 consumer dyad, although, suppliers, retailers, employees, and even competitors shape the
30 image of a brand through their contact points with consumers. To date, however, IMC
31 frameworks provide little guidance regarding *how* a firm can coordinate and integrate the
32 contact points between the brand and its various stakeholders to inform a strategy for aligning
33 brand identity and brand image and ultimately, generating brand equity.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Against this background, this paper presents an extended and modernised IMC-brand
49 equity framework, which explains how the IMC function can effectively manage multiple
50 stakeholder contact points to elevate brand equity. Grounded in the four-stage model of IMC
51 implementation (Schultz and Kitchen, 2001) and the IMC-based brand-equity model
52 (Madhavaram *et al.* 2005), the proposed framework focuses on the role of IMC in managing
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and leveraging brand contacts between multiple stakeholders in pursuit of informing the
4
5 firm's brand-equity strategy. Alongside this framework, this paper offers testable
6
7 propositions regarding the ways in which multiple stakeholder contact points can be managed
8
9 by the IMC function to boost brand equity.
10
11

12 13 14 **2. IMC: From buzzword to bedrock of brand-equity strategy** 15 16

17 18 19 *2.1 Elevation of IMC from a tactical to a strategic level* 20

21 Early conceptualisations of IMC focused on buzzwords such as 'one sight – one sound', or
22
23 'one voice' (Beard, 1997; Duncan and Everett, 1993; Nowak and Phelps, 1994), highlighting
24
25 the need to communicate consistent messages across different channels to meet customer
26
27 needs and build long-lasting relationships (Schultz *et al.*, 1993). More recently, IMC has been
28
29 defined as "an audience-driven business process of strategically managing stakeholders,
30
31 contents, channels, and results of brand communication programs" (Kliatchko, 2008, p. 140).
32
33 IMC has thus moved from a tactical tool for coordination of marketing communications to a
34
35 strategic process for converting communication and brand assets into positive brand-equity
36
37 outcomes (Luxton *et al.*, 2015; Ratnatunga and Ewing, 2005; Schultz, 2004).
38
39

40
41 This evolution, however, does not unfold automatically over time but follows a staged
42
43 process largely dependent on available resources and existing barriers to implementation.
44
45 Common barriers include organisational structure (e.g., silos) and culture (e.g., headquarter-
46
47 branch clashes), lack of internal coordination, staffing and budgeting constraints, and
48
49 managerial misunderstandings about the role of IMC (for a review, see Ots and Nyilasy,
50
51 2015). While the evolution of IMC to strategic business integration is commonly assumed in
52
53 academic research (see Kliatchko, 2008, 2009), successful application in practice necessitates
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 managerial commitment, understanding, and access to complementary resources to overcome
4
5 the above barriers to implementation.
6

7
8 Assuming that internal stakeholders are collaborating to achieve a harmonic
9
10 implementation of IMC, Schultz and Kitchen (2001) propose a four-stage model capturing
11
12 this process. The first implementation stage concerns the tactical coordination of marketing
13
14 communications (“marcoms”) managed by the firm, requiring interpersonal and cross-
15
16 functional communication. The second stage concerns the redefinition of the scope of
17
18 marcoms, placing consumers at the core of the firm’s business to devise effective
19
20 communications based on consumers’ wants and needs (Kitchen, 2005; Schultz and Schultz,
21
22 2003; Schultz, 1993a). In this stage, information about consumers is gathered and analysed,
23
24 actionable insights are extracted, and new marcoms are developed accordingly. The third
25
26 stage concerns the application of information technology to maintain fluid and flexible
27
28 informational networks with the purpose of creating a global customer database available
29
30 from each hub of the firm. Actionable insights can then be accessed more efficiently,
31
32 leveraging the global capacity of major firms. The fourth stage concerns the financial and
33
34 strategic integration of IMC, such that information, insights, and the correspondingly
35
36 informed marcoms are monitored from a return-on-investment (ROI) perspective.
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 *2.2 IMC as a determinant of brand equity*

44
45 The coordination of media and multiple contact points are core attributes of IMC (Kitchen *et*
46
47 *al.*, 2004; Low, 2000), necessary to convey a consistent brand identity and to achieve positive
48
49 brand equity (Madhavaram *et al.*, 2005). Although the branding literature entails several
50
51 perspectives, this paper considers brand identity to be the internally driven, aspirational set of
52
53 brand associations created, developed, and maintained by a firm to position a brand (Aaker,
54
55 2002). Conversely, brand image refers to the interpretation of brand identity resulting in a
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 specific set of brand associations held by consumers and other stakeholders (Keller, 1993).
4
5 Due to imperfections in the communication process, however, a perfect alignment between
6
7 brand identity and brand image is rarely achievable. Such misalignment is detrimental
8
9 because it can negatively influence consumer recall and buying behaviour towards a brand
10
11 (McGrath, 2005; Schultz, 1993b; Stammerjohan *et al.*, 2005) and may result in a loss of
12
13 brand equity (Burmam *et al.*, 2009; De Chernatony, 1999; Madhavaram *et al.*, 2005).
14
15

16
17 The brand-equity framework developed by Madhavaram *et al.* (2005) highlights the
18
19 importance of IMC in ensuring the communication of a consistent brand identity. The authors
20
21 present IMC as a fundamental component of a brand-equity strategy, defined as the “set of
22
23 processes that include acquiring, developing, nurturing, and leveraging an effectiveness-
24
25 enhancing, high-equity brand or portfolio of brands” (Madhavaram *et al.*, 2005, p. 69).
26
27 According to the framework, the firm’s internally driven brand identity informs the activities
28
29 carried out by brand stewards, who are responsible for communicating the brand identity to
30
31 the public (e.g., PR divisions or contracted advertising agencies). Brand stewards ensure that
32
33 interactions between brand and consumer lead to favourable and durable brand associations,
34
35 which, ultimately, increase brand equity (Kitchen *et al.*, 2004; Madhavaram *et al.*, 2005).
36
37 Brand equity then informs brand identity in a feedback loop, further influenced by macro-
38
39 and near-environmental factors such as evolving consumers’ preferences and competitors’
40
41 strategies (Madhavaram *et al.*, 2005).
42
43
44

45
46 An apparent limitation of this IMC-based brand-equity framework lies in the
47
48 conceptualisation of brand managers as active promoters of brand identity and consumers as
49
50 passive receivers. While most IMC frameworks recognise that firm-consumer communication
51
52 should be a bidirectional exchange of information (Schultz *et al.*, 1993; Smith *et al.*, 2006),
53
54 existing IMC-based brand-equity models do not acknowledge this dialogic dimension or the
55
56 role of stakeholders outside the traditional firm-consumer dyad. Overall, IMC-based brand-
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 equity models to date lack an explicit accounting for two emerging issues that add
4
5 considerable complexity to the communication of brand identity: (1) the evolution of digital
6
7 media and technologies, and (2) the multiplication of contact points now occurring between
8
9 the brand and its stakeholders.
10

11 12 13 14 **3. Digital media and multiple stakeholders increase the risk of misalignment** 15 16 17 **between brand identity and brand image**

18
19
20 Misalignment between brand identity and brand image is largely due to the limitations
21
22 inherent in the brand identity communication process, as this paper argues, these limitations
23
24 are exacerbated by two additional factors. First, the exponential increase of brand contact
25
26 points enabled by digital technology increases the frequency of interactions and
27
28 consequently, the amount of information generated through these contacts. Second, a
29
30 complex network of brand-relevant stakeholders further expands the number of possible
31
32 interactions where brand-relevant information is generated. Because these forces threaten to
33
34 widen the gap between brand identity and brand image, they have ensuing negative
35
36 consequences for brand equity (Anisimova, 2010; De Chernatony, 1999; Roper and Davies,
37
38 2007).
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 46 *3.1 The surge of digital media platforms*

47
48 The broad impact of digital technology on the amount of information produced is a well-
49
50 understood phenomenon. Modern times have witnessed a reversal from information scarcity
51
52 to information abundance (Floridi, 2014), to the extent that scholars refer to this as the
53
54 information-power based age (Labrecque *et al.*, 2013). Consumers increasingly use digital
55
56 media not just to research products and services, but also to engage with the companies they
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 purchase from, as well as other consumers and stakeholders (Garretson, 2008). Online
4
5 platforms are used to create, modify, share, and discuss consumers' experiences with
6
7 products, services, and the companies providing those (Kietzmann *et al.*, 2011).
8
9

10 From an IMC perspective, the need for coordination of multiple contact points has
11
12 sharply increased in recent years due to the evolution of information technology in the
13
14 domains of marketing and marcoms (Kitchen *et al.*, 2004). Historically, companies were able
15
16 to control brand-relevant information through strategic press announcements and skilled
17
18 public relations managers. Today, firms are increasingly relegated to mere observers. Modern
19
20 companies often have neither the knowledge nor the capacity to monitor and influence all
21
22 public comments posted by their customers (Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010). Many
23
24 organisations have thus come to realise that they can no longer hide behind polished facades,
25
26 as their activities are, in fact, transparent (Schultz *et al.*, 2000).
27
28
29

30 The threat from rising media coverage that forces companies to operate in the public eye
31
32 (Schultz *et al.*, 2000) is becoming even more salient with the growth of social media and the
33
34 apparent democratisation of corporate communication. Informational power has been
35
36 redistributed from those in marketing and public relations to the individuals and communities
37
38 that create, share, and consume social-media content. Communication about brands now
39
40 happens, with or without permission of the firms in question, rather than it being initiated by
41
42 the firm (Kietzmann *et al.*, 2011). Independent brand communities (Muñiz and Schau, 2007)
43
44 and consumer-generated advertising (Thompson and Malaviya, 2013) are but a few of the
45
46 activities outside the control of the firm that consumers use to interact with brands. And,
47
48 more often than not, contact points with a brand involve stakeholders other than the firm in
49
50 question.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

3.2 Multi-stakeholder brand theory

As the evolution of digital technology has prompted an interest in marketers, so the multiplication of contact points between brand constituents has redefined modern brands as being the product of interactions between multiple stakeholders (Vallaster and von Wallpach, 2013). Existing brand co-creation literature, in particular, points to brands as dynamic entities co-created through interactions between multiple stakeholders, both internal (i.e., employees) and external (i.e., consumers) (Payne *et al.*, 2009; Da Silveira *et al.*, 2013). If managed correctly, these dynamic social interactions among multiple stakeholders have been shown to increase the value of a brand (Merz *et al.*, 2009).

The shift towards a stakeholder-oriented approach to marketing has its roots in stakeholder theory, which promotes the explicit recognition and management of the roles, relationships, and interests of a firm's various stakeholders (Freeman, 1994). Stakeholder theory defines the primary purpose of the firm as serving and coordinating the interests of relevant constituents (Freeman, 1994) to ensure that each stakeholder strives to deliver high value inputs to the firm (Freeman *et al.*, 2004). Stakeholder theory thus recognises the importance of innovative practices that engage stakeholders in order to achieve value creation and shared risk, ultimately increasing "the size of the pie for everyone" (Freeman *et al.*, 2004, p. 366). While the co-creation literature cautions that such practices increase the risk of losing control (e.g., the multiplication of brand contact points increases the risk of deficiencies in the brand identity communication process), limiting stakeholder engagement can constrain information gathering and relationship building and decrease the value the firm can extract from its stakeholders (Hatch and Schultz, 2010).

4. The value of stakeholder-specific brand contacts for IMC

Despite a recognition that multiple stakeholders contribute to the creation of modern brands and that marketing communications are necessary in conveying the redefined brand identity to relevant stakeholders (Gregory, 2007), stakeholder theory is not sufficiently instructive as to how firms should integrate stakeholder dialogue into their processes (Driessen *et al.*, 2013). Prior studies on IMC do not take into account the multiplicity of brand-relevant stakeholders, often limiting their analyses to stakeholder monads or dyads (Ots and Nyilasy, 2015). This paper builds on the notion that the synergistic coordination of multiple media activities increases brand equity (Naik and Raman, 2003) and extends this notion to the synergistic coordination of multiple stakeholder contact points. The proposed framework is based on the key premise that the coordination of multi-stakeholder contacts increases brand equity through fostering alignment between brand image and identity. Theoretically, the proposed framework is grounded in Schultz and Kitchen's (2001) four-stage model and Madhavaram and colleagues' (2005) IMC-based brand-equity model, and extends both frameworks by (1) mapping the complex network of multi-stakeholder interactions that threaten to widen the chasm between brand identity and image, and (2) incorporating the recursive, ongoing information cycle stemming from multi-stakeholder interactions.

The four-stage model of IMC (Schultz and Kitchen, 2001) clearly identifies the importance of consumer-based data collection and sense-making (stage 2) in informing IMC strategies. The framework advanced in this paper seeks to extend this stage by mapping those specific brand contact points between stakeholders that are likely to generate relevant brand information (Figure 1). At the outset, the brand-identity strategy informs the IMC strategy, namely the coordination of marcoms and the monitoring of contact points between brand stakeholders. Through multiple stakeholder brand contact points, consumers perceive a

1
2
3 degree of alignment between brand identity and brand image, leading to brand equity. These
4
5 contact points generate brand information, and by monitoring when and how these brand
6
7 contacts occur, IMC can transfer the relevant brand information to the firm's research
8
9 function to interpret and extract meaningful brand insights. Through fostering collaboration
10
11 between the firm's research and branding functions, IMC enacts a gathering and sense-
12
13 making process around brand information generated across multiple contact points that
14
15 guides the realignment of brand image and brand identity. In line with Madhavaram et al.
16
17 (2005), there is an additional feedback loop that links the brand-equity strategy back to the
18
19 definition of brand identity. This feedback loop is influenced by macro-environmental factors
20
21 outside the control of the company. These are evolving customer trends, political factors,
22
23 economical factors, and technological factors beyond the influence of the company.
24
25
26

27
28 Intuitive as it may seem, an integrative and recursive information cycle is rarely
29
30 implemented in practice due to the barriers cited in Section 2.1. A detailed account of the
31
32 hindering effects of organisational barriers to implementation is not the primary focus of this
33
34 paper. The current framework concentrates, instead, on the role of appropriate resources and
35
36 capabilities in the effective implementation of the IMC brand-equity strategy. Strategic
37
38 management research discusses a host of capabilities that are known to influence a firm's
39
40 capacity to utilise information. In particular, absorptive capacity – “the ability of a firm to
41
42 recognise the value of new, external information, assimilate it, and apply it to commercial
43
44 ends” (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990, p. 128) – has emerged as being a critical capability.
45
46 Building absorptive capacity requires adequate resources to leverage the firm's knowledge.
47
48 The firm's absorptive capacity is thus argued to be necessary for the synergistic coordination
49
50 of multiple brand contacts. Given the wealth of information generated through multiple brand
51
52 contact points, it stands to reason that the IMC function's capability to utilise this information
53
54 to produce positive brand-equity outcomes would be strengthened when the firm has higher
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 levels of absorptive capacity to support this activity. The above discussion results in the
4
5 following propositions:
6
7
8
9

10 **P1.** The synergistic coordination of multi-stakeholders brand contact points enacted
11
12 by IMC facilitates the alignment of brand identity and brand image to improve brand
13
14 equity.
15

16
17
18 **P2.** The synergistic coordination enacted by IMC depends on the presence of (a) an
19
20 internal feedback cycle between the firm's research and branding functions, and (b)
21
22 sufficient absorptive capacity to make sense of the information collected and to
23
24 convert information into actionable insights for brand managers.
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Figure 1 here**
31
32
33

34 The following sub-sections map specific stakeholder contact points recognised to
35
36 generate brand-relevant information (Figure 2). When coordinated effectively by IMC, these
37
38 encounters hold the potential to increase brand equity due to the brand-relevant insights they
39
40 can generate (Table 1). Based on this central premise, testable propositions are developed for
41
42 each relevant stakeholder group. The framework first draws on Clarkson (1995) to narrow the
43
44 scope of the analysis to primary stakeholders (shareholders, employees, suppliers, retailers,
45
46 customers, and public policy makers), namely those that need to interact with the company on
47
48 a continual basis to guarantee its long-term competitive advantage. The paper then adopts a
49
50 consumer-centric perspective, focusing on consumers and those stakeholders that frequently
51
52 interact with consumers: employees, brand partners (i.e., suppliers and competitors, both in
53
54 terms of value aggregation and positioning), and retailers.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 2 here

Table 1 here

4.1 Consumers

The idea that consumers are central to IMC is widespread in the marketing communications literature. Similarly, the participation of consumers in a firm's value co-creation process, across several stages of production and consumption, constitutes one of the foundational pillars of modern marketing (Payne *et al.*, 2009; Vargo and Lusch, 2004). The value of consumer co-creative practices to the brand-equity strategy stems from delivering products and services that better satisfy consumers' needs, due to their active participation in the design and experience processes. Co-creation not only offers tangible benefits in terms of superior, user-centred design, but also improved brand perceptions as consumers react positively to communication that discloses a product or service has been co-created (Schreier, 2006). For instance, Burberry's emphasis on co-creation has grown to the extent that much of its marketing strategy is based on conversations between employees and customers. Consumers not only contribute to sales and service interactions, but also participate remotely in fashion shows, order items directly from the runway, and suggest new designs for the iconic Burberry trench coat. The development of the Burberry brand itself has been opened to consumers; specifically, elements of marketing communication content are co-developed with the brand's community through software called Buddy Media (Gouillart, 2012).

While firms oversee design-based co-creation activities from initiation through to termination, consumers also interact with brands through less tightly controlled communication-based practices. Relevant examples of such practices cited in recent studies

1
2
3 include impression management within independent brand communities and consumer-
4
5 generated advertising. Impression management refers to the active projection of favourable
6
7 brand impressions outside the community through brand evangelisation and justification of
8
9 brand devotion (Schau *et al.*, 2009). Brand evangelisation goes beyond simple social media-
10
11 based brand advocacy and reveals how the fiercest supporters perceive the brand. Consumer-
12
13 generated advertising (CGA), on the other hand, refers to communications that resemble
14
15 professionally developed commercials, but are, in fact, developed by consumers (Thompson
16
17 and Malaviya, 2013; Ertimur and Gilly, 2012). International brands such as T-Mobile,
18
19 Arsenal F.C., Pepsi, and many others employ CGA for promotional purposes, running
20
21 advertising competitions with the winning entries aired during popular global events. Coca-
22
23 Cola, for example, aired CGA communications during the 2014 FIFA World Cup.
24
25
26

27
28 Greater consumer independence in communication-based practices represents both an
29
30 opportunity and a risk for firms. While these practices can generate valuable brand insights
31
32 through impression management and CGA, they can also backfire. For example, the Apple-
33
34 Newton community was outraged over Apple's decision to discontinue their Newton tablet,
35
36 and expressed this outrage through negative publicity against Apple (Muñiz and Schau,
37
38 2007). Consumers can also sabotage brands through spontaneous, anti-brand CGA (Ertimur
39
40 and Gilly, 2012), or through participating in firm-sponsored CGA contests with brand-
41
42 harming entries. Chevrolet's launch of the Tahoe SUV through a firm-sponsored CGA
43
44 contest became famous for submissions that were mocking the vehicle for its negative
45
46 environmental impact (Sandoval, 2006). Such occurrences represent a re-appropriation of
47
48 brand meaning from the consumer side, motivated by vast misalignment between brand
49
50 identity and brand image, with potentially catastrophic effects on brand equity.
51
52
53

54
55 The current framework contends that firms must actively monitor and guide consumer
56
57 brand contacts to be in line with the firm's intended brand identity in order to minimise any
58
59
60

1
2
3 misalignment with brand image. While coordination is relatively straightforward for firm-
4
5 initiated co-production practices, the interaction of numerous and diverse consumer groups
6
7 (e.g., brand communities) with the brand, without the firm's direct involvement, complicates
8
9 communication and coordination processes immeasurably. In such situations, brand-relevant
10
11 information is generated and substantiated in alternative communications. Firms thus require
12
13 significant resources to be allocated to make sense of the overwhelming amount of
14
15 information produced by consumers (Hoyer *et al.*, 2010). The proposition below summarises
16
17 the discussion.
18
19

20
21
22
23 **P3.** Consumer-brand contacts are effective in aligning brand identity and brand image
24
25 (i.e., increasing brand equity), depending on IMC being actively involved in (a) the
26
27 coordination of such contacts, and (b) the internal dissemination of the information
28
29 these contacts generate.
30
31

32 33 34 *4.2 Employees*

35
36 As internal stakeholders, employees act as brand ambassadors who can leverage emotional
37
38 values attached to the brand (De Chernatony and Harris, 2000). Specifically, employees can
39
40 either reinforce or undermine brand values depending on whether the expressed values are
41
42 consistent or inconsistent with their personal values (Harris and De Chernatony, 2001).
43
44 Identification theory suggests employees who identify with the brand take pride in their
45
46 group membership and engage in behaviours that enhance the external image of the brand
47
48 (Dutton *et al.*, 1994; Turner and Oakes, 1986). The alignment between an organisation's
49
50 vision and its employees' values thus represents the core of the communication of a
51
52 consistent brand identity (Hatch and Schultz, 2003).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Employee identification can be enhanced through internal branding activities (Punjaisri
4 *et al.*, 2009). Such activities educate employees about the brand's values in order to
5
6 strengthen their intellectual and emotional engagement with the brand (De Chernatony and
7
8 Segal-Horn, 2001) and to ensure congruence between internal and external brand messages,
9
10 resulting in a shared understanding of the brand and internal commitment among employees
11
12 (Burmann and Zeplin, 2005). Internal branding further achieves acceptance of the brand by
13
14 enhancing an employee's brand knowledge, attitudes, and behaviours (Punjaisri and Wilson,
15
16 2007). Through internal branding, employees transform the brand promise into a reality that
17
18 reflects the brand's values and influences customers' expectations, particularly among front-
19
20 line employees, but increasingly also through interactions with, for example, brand managers.
21
22 While 'living the brand' is commonplace in socially engaged organisations such as UNICEF
23
24 or Greenpeace, there is an increasing realisation that internal branding also benefits the
25
26 external brand image. The Danish pharmaceuticals company Novo Nordisk, for example,
27
28 internally promotes its values as 'The Novo Nordisk Way of Life' and encourages their
29
30 implementation to create a strong employee bond with the brand and an outward expression
31
32 of the brand's values (Novo Nordisk, 2015).
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 However, communicating and training employees with respect to organisational values
40
41 does not guarantee adoption (Ind, 2003). Managers must lead by example and deliver a
42
43 corporate culture that attracts employees who identify with the organisational cause.
44
45 Patagonia, for instance, is making a profit by living its brand promise – to use business to
46
47 inspire and implement solutions to environmental crises – at all levels of the organisation,
48
49 which inspires trust, admiration, and aspiration amongst its consumers to live by the same
50
51 values (Chouinard, 2006). In addition, permitting employees to incorporate brand values into
52
53 their daily tasks requires empowerment and a loosening of management control to foster
54
55 creativity around the use of the brand (Hatch and Schultz, 2003). Bang & Olufsen, for
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 instance, has collectively redefined its brand values through a series of employee workshops
4
5 (Ravasi and Schultz, 2005), and Kraft is using an app called Foodii to gather employee
6
7 insights before collecting external input (Bulik, 2014).
8
9

10 The same ideas are echoed in IMC research: Duncan and Moriarty (1998) state that firms
11
12 need to develop strong internal communication before achieving external integration of
13
14 marketing communications. Because brand internalisation enables employees to consistently
15
16 deliver the brand promise to customers and other external stakeholders (Punjaisri and Wilson,
17
18 2007), the integration of brand identity into all facets of the organisation – recruitment,
19
20 training, appraisal, and rewards – becomes paramount (Ind, 2003). This paper thus suggests
21
22 that IMC should coordinate internal, brand-relevant activities, such as the selection and
23
24 training of frontline employees with regard to brand communication. Ultimately, each brand
25
26 contact between employees and customers is influenced by the attitudes and behaviours of
27
28 the individual employee and their delivery of the brand message (Punjaisri *et al.*, 2009). The
29
30 following proposition summarises this discussion.
31
32
33
34
35
36

- 37 **P4.** Internal branding, including the active involvement of IMC, is effective in
38
39 aligning brand identity and brand image (i.e., increasing brand equity), depending on
40
41 (a) a shared understanding of the brand identity between a firm and its employees, and
42
43 (b) a coherent communication of brand identity to consumers during contacts.
44
45
46
47

48 *4.3 Partners*

49
50 The current framework defines partners to be any entity – suppliers, collaborators, and, in
51
52 some cases, competitors – in the immediate environment of the focal firm. In addition, brand
53
54 partners can include persons (e.g., Jamie Oliver who endorses Tefal products which adds
55
56 recognition and personality to the brand's identity), places (e.g., Aldi's sponsorship of Great
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Britain for the 2016 Rio de Janeiro Olympic games is part of a wider strategy aimed at
4 establishing the retail brand as a beacon of good quality, healthy British food), and
5
6 institutions (e.g., in the UK, Starbucks uses its involvement with the Fair Trade Foundation to
7
8 convey legitimacy and social responsibility) (Briggs, 2015).
9

10
11 The primary purpose of brand partnerships is to leverage partners' desirable brand
12 associations to strengthen and improve the existing associations of the focal brand, thereby
13 boosting brand equity (Keller, 2003). Brand partnership literature broadly distinguishes
14 between ingredient branding and co-branding. Ingredient branding typically leverages certain
15 brand attributes through the incorporation of a partner brand (Kotler and Pfoertsch, 2010).
16
17 For instance, a number of major European automotive manufacturers – Alfa Romeo, Aston
18 Martin, Audi, and Mercedes – equip certain models with brakes by Brembo, the Ferrari F1
19 supplier, to solidify their positions as manufacturers of high-performance vehicles for car
20 enthusiasts. Co-branding arrangements, which are more reciprocal in nature, calibrate core
21 values associated with both brands aiming to reinforce each brand's current positioning or
22 reach out to new customer groups (Blackett and Boad, 1999). Gyrd-Jones and Kornum
23 (2013), in particular, discuss the importance of complementary cultures and values when
24 selecting partners to suit the focal brand's vision. For example, the recent launch of the co-
25 branded Balmain x H&M collection aims to augment H&M's positioning by targeting
26 customers with one-of-a-kind, luxury pieces, while enabling a larger, more diverse group of
27 customers to purchase and experience Balmain fashion (Kell, 2015).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Despite its many benefits, the joining of multiple brand identities bears risks of
48 discrepancy and incompatibility between the values of the involved brands (Leitch and
49 Richardson, 2003). Specific risks include dilution and loss of control over the brand's image,
50 confused positioning and the loss of focus on target groups, and reduced leverage and
51 potential in the future (Blackett and Boad, 1999). Consider, for instance, celebrity endorsers
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 tarnishing their brand equity through publicised scandals, leading to the risk of new negative
4 associations being transferred to the endorsed brand (Gwinner and Eaton, 1999; Simonin and
5 Ruth, 1998). For example, Nike withdrew its sponsorship of professional cyclist, Lance
6
7 Armstrong after his involvement in doping scandals, which resulted in him being stripped of
8 his seven Tour de France titles. Co-branding may also lead to a loss of control over brand
9 identity to another involved party (Kapferer, 2012), which can be diminished through active
10 dialogue between partner organisations (Hatch and Schultz, 2010; Merz *et al.*, 2009).

11
12 We propose that brand co-creation with partners occurs through the various brand
13 partnership activities discussed above, namely ingredient branding and co-branding. As
14 described, both of these activities are known to be effective in shaping the focal brand's
15 image, as the brand partnership allows for the transfer of new brand associations to the focal
16 brand, as well as for the strengthening and augmenting of existing brand associations (Keller,
17 2005). However, the ultimate effectiveness of these brand partnership activities reasonably
18 depends their implementation.

19
20 The argument herein is that IMC should play a crucial role in initiating and
21 monitoring partner-branded communication, as well as in mitigating the aforementioned risks
22 associated with brand partner contacts. Specifically, the involvement of IMC should not only
23 encompass the execution of partner-branded communications, but also the vetting of
24 prospective brand partners on the basis of a thorough assessment of their brand associations
25 to ensure that partners with associations advantageous to the focal brand are selected. More
26 broadly, IMC involvement should extend to the monitoring of the cultural values of brand
27 partners, to ensure fit with the focal brand at both brand and corporate levels. Overseeing the
28 integration of partner-branded communications would be a logical extension of the IMC
29 function's current role, which involves the development and coordination of strategic, brand-
30 driven marketing communications (Schultz, 2004). Moreover, IMC represents the core
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 capability for the conversion of branded assets and communications into favourable brand-
4
5 equity outcomes (Ratnatunga and Ewing, 2005). The above discussion is summarised in the
6
7 following proposition.
8
9

10
11
12 **P5.** Brand partnerships are effective in aligning brand identity and brand image (i.e.,
13
14 increasing brand equity), depending on IMC being actively involved in (a) the
15
16 selection of brand partners that share similar brand values or provide complementary
17
18 brand values, and (b) the monitoring and coordinating of partner-brand contacts.
19
20
21
22

23 *4.4 Retailers*

24
25 Retailers differ from a firm's brand partners because they participate directly in exchanges
26
27 with consumers. Two contact points between retailer and focal brand, in particular, enable the
28
29 focal brand to leverage the retailer's brand associations, thereby influencing the perceptions
30
31 held by consumers and other stakeholders. These contacts are the choice of retail outlet and
32
33 joint promotions, such as cooperative advertising and in-store displays. Associative learning
34
35 theory explains these processes by considering human memory as "a network consisting of
36
37 various nodes connected by associative links" (Till and Shimp, 1998, p. 68). For brands, this
38
39 network entails a set of brand associations (i.e., nodes) that stakeholders hold in their memory
40
41 (Keller, 1993), which become connected through exposure to the pairing of two stimuli (e.g.,
42
43 retailer brand and focal brand, (Stuart *et al.*, 1987)).
44
45
46
47

48
49 In the current context, when a focal brand initiates a relationship with a retailer, the
50
51 nodes representing the identities of the focal brand and the retail brand become linked. The
52
53 retailer's brand associations become secondary associations to the focal brand, modifying its
54
55 brand image (Keller, 2005). Beyond attaining shelf space within a retailer, an associative link
56
57 will also form when the focal brand uses a concession business format. Known also as a
58
59
60

1
2
3 shop-in-shop, this format involves a focal brand leasing a designated space within a host
4 retailer to sell its products. For example, as outlined in the opening vignette, in Europe, Apple
5 is using the shop-in-shop approach to sell the Apple Watch in UK's upscale Selfridges
6 department stores (Barrie, 2015). The Apple Watch shop is placed beside Rolex, Dior, and
7 Chanel, enhancing the prestige of the Apple brand and together serving to reinforce the
8 prestige of the department store. Shop-in-shops allow brands to create a greater presence than
9 when only occupying allocated shelf space (KDM P.O.P. Solutions Group, 2015).
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Given its potential to shape a focal brand's associations, the above contact point between
20 a retailer and a brand affect the alignment between brand identity and brand image. The
21 cosmetics retailer Sephora, for instance, shapes the images of certain cosmetic brands by
22 stocking them on their shelves, as well as through marketing communications, such as in-
23 store displays, product demonstrations, and sampling. These activities serve to connect
24 cosmetic brands with the Sephora name, lending a host of secondary associations (e.g.,
25 French country-of-origin, wide and varied assortment, desirable atmosphere, and
26 accessibility).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 This paper further argues that retailer brand contacts positively impact brand equity only
38 when they bring the focal brand's image into alignment with its brand identity. Three
39 conditions are necessary to enact this alignment. First, the retail brand must possess a positive
40 brand image (Keller, 1993). When a focal brand leverages only strong, favourable, and
41 unique associations, retailers' contact points can bolster brand image.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Second, a retailer's associations should be compatible with those of the focal brand. The
49 brand extension literature reports that positive associations are more easily transferred when
50 the parent brand fits with the extension brand (Boush and Loken, 1991). Similarly, to boost
51 brand equity, retailer associations should be similar to the focal brand's desired identity.
52
53
54
55
56 Industry examples show the unfavourable outcomes of a mismatch in a focal brand's identity
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and a retailer's brand image. Calvin Klein's brand image, for instance, was tarnished with the
4 sale of CK jeans and underwear to discount retailers and off-price warehouses. The brand
5 associations of the discount retailers (e.g., affordable, accessible) were incompatible with
6 Calvin Klein's brand identity (e.g., luxury, exclusivity). The result was a misalignment
7 between Calvin Klein's intended brand identity and the brand image consumers perceived
8 (Ritson, 2008).
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 Third, pairing of the focal brand with the retailer brand should be repeated and
18 consistent. For example, a brand should commit to distribution through its chosen retailer, as
19 well as ongoing and integrated joint promotions with the retailer, the second proposed
20 retailer-brand contact point. Repeated exposure to two entities (e.g., the retail brand and the
21 focal brand together) strengthens the associative link (Martindale, 1991). A stronger
22 association will better leverage desirable secondary brand associations, which flow onto a
23 focal brand's image, in turn, bringing it into alignment with brand identity.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 Given that joint promotions and other retailer-based communications are traditional IMC
34 responsibilities, this function's involvement in the identification, selection, and ongoing
35 management of retail partners is pivotal in addressing the aforementioned criteria, and
36 ultimately, aligning brand image and brand identity for the creation of brand equity. The
37 arguments above lead to the following proposition.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 **P6.** Retailer-brand contacts are effective in aligning brand identity and brand image
47 (i.e., increasing brand equity), depending on IMC being actively involved in (a) the
48 selection of retailers with positive and favourable brand images, compatible with the
49 focal brand's identity, and (b) the management of retailer-brand contacts such that
50 they are repeated and consistent.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

5. Conclusion

Firms that recognise the evolution of consumer-brand contact points and implement updated IMC-based strategic processes to build brand equity stand to gain significant competitive advantage. This paper identifies two substantial changes to modern consumer-brand contacts. First, the entire network of a firm's stakeholders is now actively involved in the creation and communication of a brand's identity (Payne *et al.*, 2009), as well as being strongly influential in shaping the brand's image amongst consumers (Merz *et al.*, 2009). Second, new digital media and technologies further alter the traditional process of communication of a brand's identity, with a large amount of brand communication now occurring with stakeholders external to the firm (Kietzmann *et al.*, 2011). These changes affect the extent to which brand identity and brand image may be aligned and they have immediate implications for a firm's brand-equity strategy. While the brand-equity strategy is deeply intertwined with IMC, extant brand-equity frameworks (e.g., Burmann *et al.*, 2009; Madhavaram *et al.*, 2005) provide limited strategic guidance for navigating modern contact points.

Drawing together IMC, brand equity, and multi-stakeholder branding literatures, this paper offers two key contributions to theory. First, the paper contributes to IMC and brand equity literature by systematising the management of multi-stakeholder brand contacts as a viable strategy for fostering brand equity. While the co-creation literature has acknowledged the activity of multi-stakeholder brand co-creation (Schau *et al.*, 2009), it has not been systematised to reveal the full extent of entities and encounters that can be tapped by the IMC function to craft a brand-equity strategy. Following Burmann *et al.*'s (2009) contention that brand equity is created when brand identity and brand image are aligned, this paper proposes IMC as the marketing capability responsible for such alignment. By identifying relevant stakeholder groups and mapping concrete brand contacts, the current framework illuminates

1
2
3 those stakeholders and contact points that have the greatest potential to generate valuable
4 brand-relevant information. Beyond focussing the attention and ensuing efforts of IMC
5
6 towards particular stakeholders and contact points, the framework herein provides testable
7
8 propositions about the management of stakeholder-specific contact points. In so doing, this
9
10 research adds to the mounting evidence that IMC is a strategic, rather than tactical, function
11
12 within the firm (Kitchen and Burgmann, 2010).
13
14
15

16
17 Second, the proposed framework contributes to stakeholder theory and its application to
18 marketing, which has been criticised for failing to provide sufficient instruction for genuinely
19 including stakeholders in a firm's processes (Driessen *et al.*, 2013). This paper not only
20
21 identifies brand contact points as a practical strategy for inviting stakeholders into decision-
22
23 making and value-creation, but also pinpoints specific examples of brand contacts with each
24
25 stakeholder group and prescribes conditions for their successful management. In summary,
26
27 this paper presents a holistic framework for understanding and enacting multi-stakeholder
28
29 brand management through (1) considering the formation of brand identity and brand image
30
31 as an interactive and iterative process involving multiple players, and (2) positioning IMC as
32
33 the underlying coordinating function.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 *5.1 Managerial implications*

42
43 A key aim of this paper is to provide guidance regarding how the IMC function can navigate
44
45 contact points in a rapidly changing marketplace to drive brand equity. The research isolates
46
47 the specific contact points at which stakeholders contribute to the definition and
48
49 communication of a brand's dynamic identity to consumers. The contact points analysed in
50
51 this research show that firms can, and do, increasingly utilise a multitude of channels to
52
53 communicate with their various stakeholders and that consumers build brand perceptions
54
55 based on contact points not only with the firm, but with its various stakeholders. Beyond
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 merely recognising these critical contact points, the paper provides managerial guidelines for
4
5 IMC to manage these contact points such that brand identity and brand image can be brought
6
7 into alignment.
8
9

10 Due to the elevated and pivotal role of IMC in implementing a firm's brand-equity
11
12 strategy, the present research also suggests an assessment, and possible expansion, of those
13
14 brand management functions capable of navigating the increasingly complex nature of
15
16 today's branding environment. Furthermore, the deployment of IMC specialists across all
17
18 activities that potentially affect consumers' perceptions of the brand is recommended. This
19
20 paper identifies a host of activities (i.e., contact points) that define consumers' brand
21
22 perceptions, not always instigated and controlled by the IMC function, which would benefit
23
24 from the expertise of IMC specialists: (1) development, monitoring, and adjustment of
25
26 consumer-initiated communications; (2) screening and training of frontline employees; and
27
28 (3) selection and monitoring of brand partners and retailers. The interaction between IMC
29
30 specialists and those more functionally linked to the activity (e.g., human resources
31
32 specialists for frontline employee activities) is essential to ensuring these activities are
33
34 orchestrated in a way that contributes to aligning brand identity and brand image, and
35
36 therefore, brand equity.
37
38
39

40 While the increased interaction between the firm and its stakeholders brings many
41
42 advantages, this paper highlights certain caveats stemming from open dialogue and
43
44 engagement with brand constituents. Disadvantages, such as the potential loss of control over
45
46 the brand's identity, indicate the need for marketing thought and experience to be shared
47
48 across other organisational functions. The increasing sophistication of brand management
49
50 requires not only the engagement of a growing network of stakeholders, but also an
51
52 increasing number of the organisation's internal functions, with the organisation ultimately
53
54 becoming "an amalgam of all these interests" (Hatch and Schultz, 2010, p. 603). Such an
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 outcome not only has vast implications for the governance of the brand, but also becomes an
4
5 integral part of the governance of the organisation itself.
6
7

8 9 10 *5.2 Future research*

11
12 The proposed theoretical framework calls for future empirical validation through both
13
14 quantitative and qualitative studies. From a quantitative perspective, survey research using
15
16 multilevel structural equation modelling offers a promising method to test the nested and
17
18 hierarchical nature of the proposed framework (e.g., internal-external stakeholders of the
19
20 firm, managers-employees-customers within the firm). Testing the stakeholder-specific
21
22 propositions herein can provide an empirical basis on which to build more complex models.
23
24 For example, the inclusion of the moderating effects implied in the current theoretical
25
26 framework (e.g., the level of collaboration between the brand strategy, market research, and
27
28 IMC functions of a firm; the level of absorptive capacity to support IMC processes) could
29
30 further extend the value of the model.
31
32
33

34
35 Qualitative methods, including case studies, interviews, and observations, would allow
36
37 researchers to witness and record the series of exchanges that make up contact points across a
38
39 network of stakeholders. Knowledge of the iterative process of negotiating and aligning
40
41 brand identity and brand image can usefully supplement the quantitative measurement of
42
43 outcomes (e.g., brand equity). Similarly, close observation of consumers' interactions with a
44
45 firm and their ensuing brand perceptions, and how these differ from interactions with other
46
47 stakeholders, would provide detail for comparisons of the relative potential of the firm and
48
49 various stakeholders to add to, or detract from, brand equity. Qualitative data collected inside
50
51 the firm could also provide rich contextual information for more thoroughly understanding
52
53 the moderating effects (e.g., cross-functional collaborations, absorptive capacity) proposed
54
55 for quantitative testing above.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 However, the rhizomatic and nodal nature of the proposed framework (DeLuze, 1987)
4 may require less orthodox methods of investigation. Link analysis, a subset of social network
5 analysis, can be used to evaluate the connections between different nodes. Quantitative
6 approaches in network analysis can be used to capture the interactional component of a
7 network (i.e., the links between nodes). Conversely, qualitative methods can offer a more
8 nuanced perspective on the network's structural components (i.e., the nodes, cf. Coviello,
9 2006). Overall, a mixed-methods approach to network analysis could yield greater insights on
10 the interactional and structural qualities of the proposed framework.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Aaker, D.A. (2002), *Building Strong Brands*, The Free Press, New York.
- Anisimova, T. (2010), "Corporate brand: The company-customer misalignment and its performance implications", *Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 17 No. 7, pp. 488-503.
- Asmussen, B., Harridge-March, S., Occhiocupo, N. and Farquhar, J. (2013), "The multi-layered nature of the internet-based democratization of brand management", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 66 No. 9, pp. 1473-83.
- Barrie, J. (2015), "Inside the luxury department store in London where Apple will launch the gold Apple Watch", *Business Insider Australia*, available at: <http://www.businessinsider.com.au/apple-watch-selfridges-2015-3> (accessed 27 November 2015).
- Beard, F. (1997), "IMC use and client-ad agency relationships", *Journal of Marketing Communications*, Vol. 3 No. 4, pp. 217-30.
- Blackett, T. and Boad, R.W. (1999), *Co-branding: The Science of Alliance*, Palgrave Macmillan:London.
- Boush, D. M. and Loken, B. (1991), "A process-tracing study of brand extension evaluation", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 16-28.
- Briggs, F. (2015), "Starbucks celebrates five years of 100% Fairtrade-certified espresso roast", *The Retail Times*, available at: <http://www.retailtimes.co.uk/starbucks-celebrates-five-years-of-100-fairtrade-certified-espresso-roast/> (accessed 7 December 2015).
- Broniarczyk, S. M., and Alba, J. W. (1994), "The importance of the brand in brand extension", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 214-228.
- Bulik, B.S. (2014), "Employees no longer baggage, but blessing", *AdAge*, available at: <http://adage.com/article/news/marketers-tap-employees-ads-focus-groups-brand-ideas/146943/> (accessed 6 December 2015).

- 1
2
3 Burmann, C., Jost-Benz, M. and Riley, N. (2009), "Towards an identity-based brand equity
4 model", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 62 No. 3, pp. 390-97.
5
6
7
8 Burmann, C. and Zeplin, S. (2005), "Building brand commitment: A behavioural approach to
9 internal brand management", *The Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 279-
10 300.
11
12
13
14 Chien, S. H., and Chen, J. J. (2010), "Supplier involvement and customer involvement effect
15 on new product development success in the financial service industry", *The Service*
16 *Industries Journal*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 185-201.
17
18
19
20
21 Chouinard, Y. (2006), *Let My People Go Surfing: The Education of a Reluctant*
22 *Businessman*, Penguin, New York.
23
24
25
26 Clarkson, M.E. (1995), "A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate
27 social performance", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 92-117.
28
29
30
31 Cohen, W.M. and Levinthal, D.A. (1990), "Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on
32 learning and innovation", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 35 No. 1 pp. 128-152.
33
34
35
36 Cornelissen, J.P. and Lock, A.R. (2000), "Theoretical concept or management fashion?
37 Examining the significance of IMC", *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 40 No. 5, pp.
38 7-16.
39
40
41
42 Coviello, N.E. (2006), "The network dynamics of international new ventures", *Journal of*
43 *International Business Studies*, Vol. 37 No. 5, pp. 713-31.
44
45
46
47 Da Silveira, C., Lages, C. and Simões, C. (2013), "Reconceptualizing brand identity in a
48 dynamic environment", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 66 No. 1, pp. 28-36.
49
50
51
52 De Chernatony, L. (1999), "Brand management through narrowing the gap between brand
53 identity and brand reputation", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 15 No. 1-3, pp.
54 157-79.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 De Chernatony, L. and Harris, F. (2000), "Developing corporate brands through considering
4 internal and external stakeholders", *Corporate Reputation Review*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 268-
5
6 74.
7
8
9
10 De Chernatony, L. and Segal-Horn, S. (2001), "Building on services' characteristics to
11 develop successful services brands", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 17 No. 7-8,
12
13 pp. 645-69.
14
15
16
17 Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1987), *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*,
18
19 Bloomsbury Publishing, Minneapolis.
20
21 Driessen, P.H., Kok, R.A.W. and Hillebrand, B. (2013), "Mechanisms for stakeholder
22 integration: Bringing virtual stakeholder dialogue into organizations", *Journal of Business*
23
24 *Research*, Vol. 66 No. 9, pp. 1465-72.
25
26
27
28 Duncan, T.R. and Everett, S.E. (1993), "Client perceptions of integrated marketing
29 communications", *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 30-39.
30
31
32 Duncan, T.R. and Moriarty, S.E. (1998), "A communication-based marketing model for
33 managing relationships", *The Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 62 No. April, pp. 1-13.
34
35
36
37 Dutton, J.E., Dukerich, J.M. and Harquail, C.V. (1994), "Organizational images and member
38 identification", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 39 No. 2, pp. 239-63.
39
40
41 Ertimur, B. and Gilly, M.C. (2012), "So whaddya think? Consumers create ads and other
42 consumers critique them", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 115-30.
43
44
45
46 Fill, C. (2000), "Essentially a matter of consistency: Integrated marketing communications",
47
48 *The Marketing Review*, Vol. 1 No. 4, pp. 409-25.
49
50
51 Floridi, L. (2014), *The Onlife Manifesto: Being Human in a Hyperconnected Era*, Springer,
52
53 London.
54
55
56 Freeman, R.E. (1994), "The politics of stakeholder theory: Some future directions", *Business*
57
58 *Ethics Quarterly*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 409-21.
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Freeman, R.E., Wicks, A.C. and Parmar, B. (2004), "Stakeholder theory and 'the corporate objective revisited'", *Organization Science*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 364-69.
- Garretson, R. (2008), "Future tense: The global CMO", *Economist Intelligence Unit*, available at: <http://www.economistinsights.com/sites/default/files/legacy/mgthink/googlefuturetense.pdf> (accessed 7 December 2015).
- Gouillart, F. (2012), "Co-creation: The real social media revolution", *Harvard Business Review*, available at: <https://hbr.org/2012/12/co-creation-the-real-social-me/> (accessed 27 November 2015).
- Gould, S.J., Lerman, D. and Grein, A.F. (1999), "Agency perceptions and practices on global IMC", *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 39 No. 1, pp. 7-20.
- Gregory, A. (2007), "Involving stakeholders in developing corporate brands: The communication dimension", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 23 No. 1-2, pp. 59-73.
- Gwinner, K.P. and Eaton, J. (1999), "Building brand image through event sponsorship: The role of image transfer", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 28 No. 4, pp. 47-57.
- Gyrd-Jones, R.I. and Kornum, N. (2013), "Managing the co-created brand: Value and cultural complementarity in online and offline multi-stakeholder ecosystems", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 66 No. 9, pp. 1484-93.
- Haarhoff, G. and Kleyn, N. (2012), "Open source brands and their online brand personality", *Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 104-14.
- Harris, F. and De Chernatony, L. (2001), "Corporate branding and corporate brand performance", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 35 No. 3/4, pp. 441-56.
- Hatch, M.J. and Schultz, M. (2003), "Bringing the corporation into corporate branding", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 37 No. 7/8, pp. 1041-64.

- 1
2
3 Hatch, M.J. and Schultz, M. (2010), "Toward a theory of brand co-creation with implications
4 for brand governance", *Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 17 No. 8, pp. 590-604.
5
6
7
8 Hillyer, C. and Tikoo, S. (1995), "Effect of cobranding on consumer product evaluations",
9
10 *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 123-27.
11
12
13 Hoyer, W.D., Chandy, R., Dorotic, M., Krafft, M. and Singh, S.S. (2010), "Consumer
14 cocreation in new product development", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp.
15 283-96.
16
17
18
19 Ind, N. (2003), "Inside out: How employees build value", *The Journal of Brand
20 Management*, Vol. 10 No. 6, pp. 393-402.
21
22
23 Kapferer, J.N. (2012), *The New Strategic Brand Management: Advanced Insights and
24 Strategic Thinking*, Kogan Page Publishers, London.
25
26
27
28 Kaplan, A.M. and Haenlein, M. (2010), "Users of the world, unite! The challenges and
29 opportunities of Social Media", *Business Horizons*, Vol. 53 No. 1, pp. 59-68.
30
31
32 KDM P.O.P. Solutions Group (2015). "How shop-in-shops benefit both retailers and brands",
33 available at: [http://www.kdmpop.com/2014/05/How-Shop-in-Shops-Benefit-Both-](http://www.kdmpop.com/2014/05/How-Shop-in-Shops-Benefit-Both-Retailers-and-Brands.cfm)
34 [Retailers-and-Brands.cfm](http://www.kdmpop.com/2014/05/How-Shop-in-Shops-Benefit-Both-Retailers-and-Brands.cfm) (accessed 10 June 2015).
35
36
37
38
39 Kell, J. (2015), "H&M shoppers are freaking out over its latest high-end fashion partnership",
40 *Fortune*, available at: <http://fortune.com/2015/11/05/hms-balmmain-quickly-selling-out/>
41 (accessed 27 November 2015).
42
43
44
45
46 Keller, K.L. (2003) "Brand synthesis: The multidimensionality of brand knowledge", *Journal
47 of Consumer Research*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 595-600.
48
49
50 Keller, K.L. (2005), "Branding shortcuts: Choosing the right brand elements and leveraging
51 secondary associations will help marketers build brand equity", *Marketing Management*,
52 Vol. 14 No. 5, pp. 18-23.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Keller, K.L. (1993), "Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand
4 equity", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 57 No. 1, pp. 1-22.
5
6
7
8 Kietzmann, J.H., Hermkens, K., McCarthy, I.P. and Silvestre, B.S. (2011), "Social media?
9 Get serious! Understanding the functional building blocks of social media", *Business*
10 *Horizons*, Vol. 54 No. 3, pp. 241-51.
11
12
13
14 Kitchen, P.J. (2005), "New paradigm-IMC-under fire", *Competitiveness Review*, Vol. 15 No.
15 1, pp. 72-80.
16
17
18
19 Kitchen, P.J., Brignell, J., Li, T. and Spickett Jones, G. (2004), "The emergence of IMC: A
20 theoretical perspective", *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 44 No. 1, pp. 19-30.
21
22
23
24 Kitchen, P.J. and Burgmann, I. (2010), "Integrated marketing communication", in Seth, J.N.
25 and Malhotra, N.K. (2010), *Wiley International Encyclopedia of Marketing*, John Wiley &
26 Sons, Ltd, Chichester.
27
28
29
30 Kitchen, P.J. and Uzunoğlu, E. (2014), "Introduction: Integrated Communications in the Post
31 Modern Age", in Kitchen, P.J. and Uzunoğlu, E. (Eds), *Integrated Communication in the*
32 *Post Modern Era*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, pp. 1-18.
33
34
35
36
37 Kliatchko, J. (2005), "Towards a new definition of integrated marketing communications
38 (IMC)", *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 7-34.
39
40
41
42 Kliatchko, J. (2008). "Revisiting the IMC construct: A revised definition and four pillars",
43 *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 133-160.
44
45
46
47 Kliatchko, J. (2009), "IMC 20 years after: A second look at IMC definitions", *International*
48 *Journal of Integrated Marketing Communications*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 7-12.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 Kotler, P. and Pfoertsch, W. (2010), *Ingredient Branding: Making the Invisible Visible*,
Springer Science & Business Media, London.

- 1
2
3 Labrecque, L.I., vor dem Esche, J., Mathwick, C., Novak, T.P. and Hofacker, C.F. (2013),
4
5 “Consumer power: Evolution in the digital age”, *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 27
6
7 No. 4, pp. 257-69.
8
9
10 Leitch, S. and Richardson, N. (2003), “Corporate branding in the new economy”, *European*
11
12 *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 37 No. 7/8, pp. 1065-79.
13
14 Low, G.S. (2000), “Correlates of integrated marketing communications”, *Journal of*
15
16 *Advertising Research*, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 27-40.
17
18
19 Luxton, S., Reid, M. and Mavondo, F. (2015), “Integrated marketing communication
20
21 capability and brand performance”, *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 44 No. 1, pp. 37-46.
22
23
24 Madhavaram, S., Badrinarayanan, V. and McDonald, R.E. (2005), “Integrated marketing
25
26 communication (IMC) and brand identity as critical components of brand equity strategy:
27
28 A conceptual framework and research propositions”, *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 34 No.
29
30 4, pp. 69-80.
31
32
33 Martindale, C. (1991), *Cognitive Psychology: A Neural-network Approach*, Thomson
34
35 Brooks/Cole Publishing Co, Belmont.
36
37 McGrath, J.M. (2005), “A pilot study testing aspects of the integrated marketing
38
39 communications concept”, *Journal of Marketing Communications*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 191-
40
41 214.
42
43
44 Merz, M.A., He, Y. and Vargo, S.L. (2009), “The evolving brand logic: a service-dominant
45
46 logic perspective”, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 37 No. 3, pp. 328-
47
48 44.
49
50
51 Muñiz, Jr, A.M. and Schau, H.J. (2007) “Vigilante marketing and consumer-created
52
53 communications”, *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 35-50.
54
55
56 Naik, P.A. and Raman, K. (2003), “Understanding the impact of synergy in
57
58 multimediacommunications”, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 40 No. 4, pp. 375-88.
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Novo Nordisk (2015), "The Novo Nordisk way", available at:
<http://www.novonordisk.com/about-novo-nordisk/novo-nordisk-way.html> (accessed 6
December 2015).
- Nowak, G.J. and Phelps, J. (1994), "Conceptualizing the integrated marketing
communications' phenomenon: An examination of its impact on advertising practices and
its implications for advertising research", *Journal of Current Issues & Research in
Advertising*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 49-66.
- O'Cass, A. and Weerawardena, J. (2009), "Examining the role of international
entrepreneurship, innovation and international market performance in SME
internationalisation", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 43 No. 11/12, pp. 1325-48.
- Ots, M. and Nyilasy, G. (2015), "Integrated Marketing Communications (IMC): Why does it
fail? An analysis of practitioner mental models exposes barriers of IMC implementation",
Journal of Advertising Research, Vol. 55 No. 2, pp. 132-145.
- Payne, A., Storbacka, K., Frow, P. and Knox, S. (2009), "Co-creating brands: Diagnosing and
designing the relationship experience", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 62 No. 3, pp.
379-89.
- Punjaisri, K., Evanschitzky, H. and Wilson, A. (2009), "Internal branding: An enabler of
employees' brand-supporting behaviours", *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 20 No. 2,
pp. 209-26.
- Punjaisri, K. and Wilson, A. (2007), "The role of internal branding in the delivery of
employee brand promise", *Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 57-70.
- Ratnatunga, J. and Ewing, M.T. (2005), "The brand capability value of integrated marketing
communication (IMC)", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 34 No. 4, pp. 25-40.

- 1
2
3 Ritson, M. (2008), "The poisoning of the Calvin Klein brand", *Branding Strategy Insider*,
4
5 available at: <http://www.brandingstrategyinsider.com/2008/09/the-poisoning->
6
7 [o.html#.VmUYrkbXosI](http://www.brandingstrategyinsider.com/2008/09/the-poisoning-o.html#.VmUYrkbXosI) (accessed 27 November 2015).
8
9
- 10 Ravasi, D., and Schultz, M. (2007) "Organizational culture and identity at Bang & Olufsen",
11
12 in Lerpold, L., Ravasi, D., van Rekom, J. and Soenen, G. (Eds), *Organizational Identity in*
13
14 *Practice*, Routledge, London, pp. 103-120.
15
- 16 Roper, S. and Davies, G. (2007), "The corporate brand: Dealing with multiple stakeholders",
17
18 *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 23 No. 1-2, pp. 75-90.
19
- 20 Sandoval, G. (2006), "GM slow to react to nasty ads", *CNET*, available at:
21
22 <http://www.cnet.com/au/news/gm-slow-to-react-to-nasty-ads/> (accessed 7 December
23
24 2015).
25
26
- 27 Schau, H.J., Muñiz, A.M. and Arnould, E.J. (2009), "How brand community practices create
28
29 value", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 73 No. 5, pp. 30-51.
30
31
- 32 Schreier, M. (2006), "The value increment of mass-customized products: An empirical
33
34 assessment", *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, Vol. 5 No. 4, pp. 317-27.
35
36
- 37 Schreier, M., Fuchs, C. and Dahl, D.W. (2012), "The innovation effect of user design:
38
39 Exploring consumers' innovation perceptions of firms selling products designed by users",
40
41 *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 76 No. 5, pp. 18-32.
42
43
- 44 Schultz, D.E. (2004), "IMC receives more appropriate definition", *Marketing News*, Vol. 38
45
46 No. 15, pp. 8-9.
47
- 48 Schultz, D.E. (1993a), "Integration helps you plan communications from outside-in",
49
50 *Marketing News*, Vol. 27 No. 6, p. 12.
51
- 52 Schultz, D.E. (1993b), "Maybe we should start all over with an IMC organization",
53
54 *Marketing News*, Vol. 27 No. 22, p. 8.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Schultz, D.E., Tannenbaum, S.I. and Lauterborn, R.F. (1993), *Integrated Marketing*
4
5 *Communication: Pulling It Together & Making it Work*, NTC Business Books, Chicago.
6
7
8 Schultz, M., Hatch, M.J. and Larsen, M.H. (Eds) (2000), *The Expressive Organization:*
9
10 *Linking Identity, Reputation, and the Corporate Brand*, OUP, Oxford.
11
12 Schultz, D.E. and Kitchen, P.J. (2001), “The role of integrated communication in the
13
14 interactive age”, in Schultz, D.E. and Kitchen, P.J. (Eds), *Raising the Corporate*
15
16 *Umbrella: Corporate Communications in the 21st Century*, Palgrave/St Martin’s Press,
17
18 New York, pp. 82-114.
19
20
21 Schultz, D.E. and Schultz, H. (2003), *IMC, the Next Generation: Five Steps for Delivering*
22
23 *Value and Measuring Returns Using Marketing Communication*, McGraw Hill
24
25 Professional, Boston.
26
27
28 Simonin, B.L. and Ruth, J.A. (1998), “Is a company known by the company it keeps?
29
30 Assessing the spillover effects of brand alliances on consumer brand attitudes”, *Journal of*
31
32 *Marketing Research*, Vol. 35 No. 1, pp. 30-42.
33
34
35 Smith, T.M., Gopalakrishna, S. and Chatterjee, R. (2006), “A three-stage model of integrated
36
37 marketing communications at the marketing-sales interface”, *Journal of Marketing*
38
39 *Research*, Vol. 43 No. 4, pp. 564-79.
40
41
42 Stammerjohan, C., Wood, C.M., Chang, Y. and Thorson, E. (2005), “An empirical
43
44 investigation of the interaction between publicity, advertising, and previous brand attitudes
45
46 and knowledge”, *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 34 No. 4, pp. 55-67.
47
48
49 Stuart, E.W., Shimp, T.A. and Engle, R.W. (1987), “Classical conditioning of consumer
50
51 attitudes: Four experiments in an advertising context”, *Journal of Consumer Research*,
52
53 Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 334-49.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Thompson, D.V. and Malaviya, P. (2013), "Consumer-generated ads: Does awareness of
4 advertising co-creation help or hurt persuasion?", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 77 No. 3, pp.
5 33-47.
6
7
8
9
10 Till, B.D. and Shimp, T.A. (1998), "Endorsers in advertising: The case of negative celebrity
11 information", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 67-82.
12
13
14 Turner, J.C. and Oakes, P.J. (1986), "The significance of the social identity concept for social
15 psychology with reference to individualism, interactionism and social influence", *British*
16 *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 237-52.
17
18
19
20
21 Vallaster, C. and von Wallpach, S. (2013), "An online discursive inquiry into the social
22 dynamics of multi-stakeholder brand meaning co-creation", *Journal of Business Research*,
23 Vol. 66 No. 9, pp. 1505-15.
24
25
26
27
28 Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2004), "Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing",
29 *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 68 No. 1, pp. 1-17.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1

Examples of contact points affecting the alignment between brand identity and brand image

Stakeholder	Contact points	Selected references
Consumers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication of co-produced designs: Collaboration between firm and consumers in the design of a product or service (e.g., user involvement in design, new product development activities) and ensuing communication of the collaborative effort. • Community-based impression management: Active projection of a favourable brand impression outside the community through brand evangelisation and justification of brand devotion. • Consumer-generated advertising (CGA): Creation of advertisements and communication material, either spontaneously (i.e., unsolicited CGA) or invited by the firm through competitions or other promotional activities (i.e., solicited). 	<p>Chien and Chen (2010); Schreier (2006); Schreier <i>et al.</i> (2012)</p> <p>Muñiz and Schau (2007); Schau <i>et al.</i> (2009)</p> <p>Ertimur and Gilly (2012); Thompson and Malaviya (2013)</p>
Employees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employees as brand ambassadors: Employee endorsement of the brand values exerts powerful influence on customers' perceptions of the brand, as employees are situated on the periphery of the organisation, in direct contact with customers. • Person-organisation fit (POF): Employees that share an organisation's values are more likely to contribute to the organisation in constructive ways (i.e., live the brand). • Internal branding: Communicate and educate employees about the brand values to enhance their intellectual and emotional engagement with the brand, resulting in a shared understanding of the brand and internal commitment among employees. 	<p>Harris and de Chernatony (2001)</p> <p>Ind (2003)</p> <p>Burmann and Zeplin (2005); De Chernatony and Segal-Horn (2001); Punjaisri and Wilson (2007)</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

<p>Partners</p> <p><i>(Suppliers & other companies)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-branding and brand alliances: Encompass a variety of marketing activities that involve the use of two (or more) brands for the purpose of evoking favourable associations of both brands. • Ingredient co-branding and ingredient branding: Describe the use of ingredient or component brands (or the creation of such) for a focal product to project the ingredient’s associations onto the focal brand. 	<p>Blackett and Boad (1999)</p> <p>Hillyer and Tikoo (1995); Kotler and Pfoertsch (2010)</p>
<p>Retailers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: Refers to two formats in which a focal brand is placed in a retailer, allocated shelf space or a concession business (i.e., shop-in-shop), leading the retailer’s brand associations to become secondary associations to the focal brand. • Joint promotion: Encompasses any marketing communication pairing a focal brand with a retail brand (e.g., cooperative advertising or an in-store display), which connects the two brands in order for a retailer’s brand associations to transfer to a focal brand. 	<p>Keller (2005)</p> <p>Broniarczyk and Alba (1994); Simonin and Ruth (1998)</p>





Figure 1
Multi-stakeholder Brand-equity Strategy



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Figure 2
Map of Brand-relevant Stakeholder Contacts Reviewed




Table 1

Examples of contact points affecting the alignment between brand identity and brand image

Stakeholder	Contact points	Selected references
Consumers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication of co-produced designs: Collaboration between firm and consumers in the design of a product or service (e.g., user involvement in design, new product development activities) and ensuing communication of the collaborative effort. • Community-based impression management: Active projection of a favourable brand impression outside the community through brand evangelisation and justification of brand devotion. • Consumer-generated advertising (CGA): Creation of advertisements and communication material, either spontaneously (i.e., unsolicited CGA) or invited by the firm through competitions or other promotional activities (i.e., solicited). 	<p>Chien and Chen (2010); Schreier (2006); Schreier <i>et al.</i> (2012)</p> <p>Muñiz and Schau (2007); Schau <i>et al.</i> (2009)</p> <p>Ertimur and Gilly (2012); Thompson and Malaviya (2013)</p>
Employees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employees as brand ambassadors: Employee endorsement of the brand values exerts powerful influence on customers' perceptions of the brand, as employees are situated on the periphery of the organisation, in direct contact with customers. • Person-organisation fit (POF): Employees that share an organisation's values are more likely to contribute to the organisation in constructive ways (i.e., live the brand). • Internal branding: Communicate and educate employees about the brand values to enhance their intellectual and emotional engagement with the brand, resulting in a shared understanding of the brand and internal commitment among employees. 	<p>Harris and de Chernatony (2001)</p> <p>Ind (2003)</p> <p>Burmann and Zeplin (2005); De Chernatony and Segal-Horn (2001); Punjaisri and Wilson (2007)</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

<p>Partners</p> <p><i>(Suppliers & other companies)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-branding and brand alliances: Encompass a variety of marketing activities that involve the use of two (or more) brands for the purpose of evoking favourable associations of both brands. • Ingredient co-branding and ingredient branding: Describe the use of ingredient or component brands (or the creation of such) for a focal product to project the ingredient’s associations onto the focal brand. 	<p>Blackett and Boad (1999)</p> <p>Hillyer and Tikoo (1995); Kotler and Pfoertsch (2010)</p>
<p>Retailers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: Refers to two formats in which a focal brand is placed in a retailer, allocated shelf space or a concession business (i.e., shop-in-shop), leading the retailer’s brand associations to become secondary associations to the focal brand. • Joint promotion: Encompasses any marketing communication pairing a focal brand with a retail brand (e.g., cooperative advertising or an in-store display), which connects the two brands in order for a retailer’s brand associations to transfer to a focal brand. 	<p>Keller (2005)</p> <p>Broniarczyk and Alba (1994); Simonin and Ruth (1998)</p>

Peer Review

Figure 1

Multi-stakeholder Brand-equity Strategy





Figure 2

Map of Brand-relevant Stakeholder Contacts Reviewed



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49