# Corporate Brands: What are They? What of Them? (CORPORATE BRAND. CORPORATE BRAND MANAGEMENT) EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF MARKETING

2 authors:

John M.T. Balmer
Brunel University London
274 PUBLICATIONS   10,375 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Edmund R. Gray
Loyola Marymount University
36 PUBLICATIONS   1,465 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:

Project   aligning corporate communications View project

Project   TIME MATTERS: TEMPORALITY, HERITAGE & CORPORATE MARKETING View project

European Journal of Marketing

Article information:

Users who downloaded this article also downloaded:

For Authors

## About Emerald www.emeraldinsight.com

COMMENTARY
Corporate brands: what are they? What of them?

John M.T. Balmer
Bradford School of Management, Bradford, UK, and
Edmund R. Gray
Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles, USA

Abstract *This article examines the nature, importance, typology, and management of corporate brands. Argues that in making a distinction between corporate brands, corporate identities, and product brands, the underlying characteristics of corporate brands can be uncovered. A key thesis of the article is that a corporate brand is a valuable resource: one that provides an entity with a sustainable, competitive advantage if specific criteria are met. These criteria are defined in terms of an economic theory known as "the resource-based view of the firm". An affirmation of this economic doctrine requires corporate brands to be rare, durable, inappropriable, imperfectly imitable, and imperfectly substitutable. Also contends that the traditional tripartite, branding typology be expanded to reflect the new modes in which corporate brands are being utilised. These new corporate branding categories are: familial, shared, surrogate, supra, multiplex, and federal. Finally, reasons that the management of a corporate brand requires the orchestration of six "identity types". The critical identity type is the "covenanted identity" because it underpins the corporate brand. The covenanted identity comprises a set of expectations relating to an organisation's products/services and activities. Internally, it acts as a standard against which an employee/employer's actions can be evaluated. Argues that employees are crucial to the success, and maintenance, of corporate brands. Speculates that the current interest in corporate brands is redolent of a new dynamic in marketing. As such, corporate brands are symptomatic of the increased importance accorded to corporate-level concerns and concepts. This interest in corporate-level concerns should form the basis of a new branch of marketing: one that weft and weaves the concepts of corporate identity, image, reputation, communications along with corporate branding. The article concurs with Balmer and Greyser who argue that this area should be known as corporate-level-marketing.*

Corporate brands: what are they?

Adored, venerated and coveted by customers and organisations alike, corporate brands represent one of the most fascinating phenomena of the business environment in the twenty-first century (Olins, 2000; Lewis, 2000; Pauvit, 2000; Balmer, 2001a, b; Bickerton, 2000; Gray and Balmer, 2001; Hatch and Schultz, 2001; McDonald *et al.*, 2001; Ind, 2001; Newman, 2001; Simoes and Dibb, 2001; Balmer and Greyser, 2003). Their importance is irrefutable. Brands, in their various guises, are integral to our everyday existence (Sherry, 1995). This is particularly the case at the organisational level where the concept of the corporate brand now enjoys wide currency in business parlance. There is an increasing realisation that corporate brands serve as a powerful navigational

tool to a variety of stakeholders for a miscellany of purposes including employment, investment and, most importantly, consumer buying behaviour. Corporate brands appear to be invested with the Midas touch.

There are a number of schools relating to corporate branding and to branding generally, with brands being seen as:

- marks denoting ownership;
- image – building devices;
- symbols associated with key values;
- means by which to construct individual identities; and
- a conduit by which pleasurable experiences may be consumed.

Marks denoting ownership
Traditionally, corporate brands were viewed from the "sender-end" of the communications equation. In its simplest sense a brand denotes a name, logotype or trademark denoting ownership (Barwise *et al.*, 2000). The importance of corporate marks of ownership can be seen in relation to coats of arms. From the earliest times these heraldic symbols (when properly matriculated) have been accorded legal protection by the state. In both Scotland and England heraldic courts of law are an integral part of both countries' legal systems: the conferment of full coats of arms is still sought and coveted by many institutions: universities are a case in point (Baker and Balmer, 1997).

Image-building devices
Later on, branding was associated with corporate image building. However, branding was still at the sender-end of the equation and was something that was done to the consumer. Galbraith (1986, pp. 29-30) mirrored this "top-down" view of branding with his comment that: "By art and reiteration people are persuaded to believe in the peculiar conviviality associated with a particular brand."

Symbols associated with key values
The recent literature on corporate branding emphasises the importance of brand values: a brand is seen to encapsulate the additional values that are inherent in or associated with the corporation and its products and services. This is the dominant perspective on the area (DeChernatony, 1999; Tilley, 1999; Urde, 1999). As such, corporate brands are seen as a guarantee of quality, as an insurance against risk of poor performance or financial risk.

Means by which to construct individual identities
Increasingly, branding is considered from the "consumer-end" of the equation. As such, the consumption of brands by consumers defines who they are, wish to be and/or wish to be seen as (Kay, 1995; Elliot and Wattanasuwan, 1998; Newman, 2001). Simoes and Dibb (2001) conclude that our post-modern

consumer culture consumers realise that brands are vital in the construction of individual identities.

A conduit by which pleasurable experiences may be consumed
Schmitt (1999) adopts a somewhat novel approach. He argues that branding (and marketing generally) should be concerned with creating pleasurable consumer experiences.

Of course, the above approaches are not mutually exclusive. To us, it seems possible that many, if not all, of the characteristics may apply. For the main, the above schools of thought relate to product brands and, as such, accord primary importance to consumers. We argue, however, that corporate brands are crucial to myriad stakeholder groups. For example, corporate brands would appear to play a pivotal role in the construction of identities by many groups including employees (the esteem accrued to a new graduate who works for Ferrari), suppliers (the cachet of sourcing products for an exclusive retail emporium such as London's Fortnum and Mason) and governments (the city of Edinburgh's self-image as a major European city being underscored with the introduction of a direct air link to Frankfurt by Lufthansa.)

In summary, corporate brands have a utility in several regards: they communicate the brand's values (often seen as a promise), they afford a means of differentiation from their competitors, and they enhance the esteem and loyalty in which the organisation is held by its stakeholder groups (Balmer, 2001b).

Corporate brands: they are more than meets the eye
The importance and value of corporate brands has, to varying degrees, been alluded to in the literature for some considerable time (Hotchkiss and Franken, 1923; Kennedy, 1977). However, it was around the early 1990s that several leading branding and communications consultants explicitly mentioned (Bernstein, 1989) and then went on to assess (King, 1991) what was then called the "company brand". They appreciated, from the outset, that the most important brand was the company brand and that its day-to-day responsibility resided with no less a person than the organisation's chief executive. (Bernstein, 1989, pp. 317-18).

Among the most telling contributions to this *oeuvre* was that of the branding specialist Stephen King (1991). His article. entitled "Brand building in the 1990s" delineated some of the differences between product and company brands. He reasoned that the company brand required a multidisciplinary approach with the human resources department playing a vital role. As did Bernstein (1989), he argued that it fell to the CEO to manage the company brand. Alas, these early attempts to provide a fillip to company branding were largely in vain. Despite the penetrating luminosity of King's (1991) work, his insights were all-too-soon forgotten and the notion of the company as a brand

largely remained a forlorn idea. Its time had not yet come and his notion of the company brand was not to take flight.

The hiatus that followed King's (1991) article appears to have been broken around 1995. This time there were to be two crucial differences. First, there was to be no abatement in interest, and second, that the favoured label was not that of the company brand, but rather, a more encompassing, more strategic-sounding label: "the corporate brand". As such the concept of the corporate brand began to appear in both the title as well as in the content of articles (Balmer, 1995). The latter half of the 1990s witnessed a gradual crescendo of writing on the corporate brand and since then it has seized the imagination of scholars and managers alike and its rise has been inexorable. After years of inhabiting the shadows, corporate brands are now spoken of with considerable ebullience.

To us, there is an overarching explanation why use of the corporate brand in the literature (Balmer, 1995; Ind, 1997) has eclipsed that of the company brand (Bernstein, 1989; King, 1991). It is that brands, at the corporate level, are not simply limited to the overall organisation. A wide variety of corporate entities have brands including corporations, their subsidiaries, and also groups of companies (corporate branding networks). Moreover, corporate-level brands can also apply to countries, regions, and cities. As such, the concept "corporate brand" may be seen to mirror the complexity of the field in a manner that the company brand concept does not.

The ensuing interest in the corporate brand can be seen in the writing of practitioners (Macrae, 1996; Mitchell, 1997; Ind, 1997, 1998, 2001; Olins, 2000) as well as in the academic literature (Balmer, 1995, 2001a, b; Keller, 1998; Keller and Aaker, 1998; DeChernatony, 1999; Maathuis, 1999; Knox *et al.*, 2000; Bickerton, 2000; Gjols-Andersen, 2001; Gray and Balmer, 2001; Harris and DeChernatony, 2001; Newman, 2001).

Some of the early academic work in the area (whether writing about company or corporate brands) reached a broadly similar set of suppositions. The importance of staff in corporate brand building was emphasised, as was culture. The role of the chief executive as brand manager was stressed and the efficacy of the multidisciplinary approach was advocated. In one apocryphal statement it was argued that the new millennium would witness increased importance being assigned to the corporate brand (Balmer, 1995).

One trait of the early writing on company and corporate brands still characterises the contemporary literature. This manifests itself in the interchangeable use of the terms corporate branding and corporate identity. King (1991) disliked the corporate identity concept because he believed that graphic designers had debased it and consequently he studiously avoided all but passing reference to it. Conversely, in the early 1990s the term company brand carried few associations with graphic design.

A disconcerting trend from the world of consultancy over recent years has been the adoption of the term corporate branding by graphic design consultancies in describing their work and profession: this can only have a pernicious effect on the area. In part, this is understandable since both brands and identities have historically been regarded in visual terms. In the lead article of the *RSA Journal*, Aldersey-Williams (2000) castigated the graphic design approach to identity with his pithy remark that: "Designers talk strategy but like pretty shapes and colours". The same accusation can be levelled against those who, chameleon-like, have metamorphosised overnight into authorities on corporate branding. While there has been a change of name, there has not been attendant transformation in *raison d'être*: the industry still has a strong graphic design rather than a truly multidisciplinary derivation.

Alas, marketing scholars and others have largely ignored the challenges presented by corporate brand management. Various authors have argued that it requires a radical if not revolutionary reappraisal of branding and, moreover, of the marketing discipline generally (King, 1991; Balmer, 1998, 2001a; Balmer and Greyser, 2003). The extent of this myopia can be seen in marketing and in some branding texts which, although acknowledging the existence of corporate brands, fail to take cognisance that:

- corporate brands are fundamentally different from product brands in terms of disciplinary scope and management;
- corporate brands have a multi-stakeholder rather than customer orientation; and
- the traditional marketing framework is inadequate and requires a radical reappraisal.

Again, these differences have only emerged in the literature over the last decade or so (King, 1991; Balmer, 1995, 2001a; Balmer and Greyser, 2003).

Fortunately, the negatives have been assuaged by other, more positive, developments. This can be seen in the widespread use of the branding argot which, when applied to corporate entities, is far removed from its origins as a *patois* spoken by marketers. Evidence of this can be found in the work of economists such as Kay (1995), organisational behaviourists such as Hatch and Schultz (2001) and strategists such as Gray *et al.* (2001).

One characteristic of the corporate branding literature is the symbiosis of thought. As such, there appears to be a growing consensus as to the basic tenets the concept. Balmer (2001b) developed the mnemonic CCITE (C^2ITE) in an attempt to reflect the distinctive attributes of corporate brands. Table I, using the C^2ITE mnemonic, illustrates the similarity of thought within the literature.

Characteristics of corporate brands (C²ITE) Balmer (2001a)	Referred to in the literature by:
Cultural (corporate brands tend to have strong "cultural roots". An organisation's distinctiveness invariably finds one of its sourcers in the mix of subcultures found within organisations. These consist of corporate, professional, "national", and other types of culture)	Balmer (1995, 2001b), De Chernatony (1999), Hankinson and Hankinson (1999), Hatch and Schultz (2001), Johansson and Hirano (1999), Mitchell (1999)
Intricate (inherently intricate in nature: it is multidisciplinary and dimensional in that it impacts your many stakeholder groups and methods and is made known via multiple channels of communication[a])	Balmer (2001a, b), De Chernatony (1999), King (1991), Hatch and Schultz (2001), Keller (1999), Mitchell (1999), Olins (2000), Schmitt (1999), Urde (1994, 1999)
Tangible (includes: product/service quality, business scope, geographical coverage, performance-related issues, profit margins, pay scales etc. Also includes architecture, logos, etc.)	Balmer (2001a), DeChernatony (1999), Johansson and Hirano (1999), King (1991), Mitchell (1999), Schmitt (1999), Urde (1999)
Ethereal (includes elements such as "lifestyle" and "style of delivery". Also encompasses brand associations. For instance, there are often emotional responses to elements associated with the brand such as country-of-origin/industry)	Balmer (2001b), DeChernatony (1999), Hatch and Schultz (2001), Johansson and Hirano (1999), Keller (1999), Mitchell (1999), Schmitt (1999), Urde (1999)
Also requires *Commitment* (from all personnel. Senior management need to devote sufficient in resources, such as on going financial and communications support. An important aspect of this characteristic is that a corporate brand should elicit commitment from a variety of stakeholder groups and networks)	Balmer (1995, 2001b), De Chernatony (1999), Hatch and Schultz (2001), Johansson and Hirano (1999), King (1991), Urde (1999)

Notes: [a]Kay (1995 p. 261) notes that Price Waterhouse developed a powerful corporate brand in a period where advertising was prohibited on so-called "ethical" grounds in many of the markets in which they operated. In addition, Marks & Spencer established a strong corporate brand at a time when the policy of the company was not to engage in advertising at all. To us, it is apparent that since "controllable" communication (secondary communication) was largely absent, "non controllable" communication such as product and service quality (primary communication) and word-of-mouth (tertiary communication) played an important role and should as such be recognised. See Balmer and Gray (1999).

Table I.
Corporate brand characteristics

Corporate brands, corporate identities and product brands: what are the differences?

Although corporate brands are sometimes seen to be analogous to product brands, there are fundamental differences: this is an issue that has concerned writers for over a decade (King, 1991; Balmer, 1995; DeChernatony, 1999; Olins, 2000; Balmer, 2001a, b; Balmer and Greyser, 2003).

We also suggest that there are important differences between corporate brands and corporate identities. It has been observed that the concepts of corporate identity and corporate branding are often used interchangeably (Balmer, 1998).

Corporate and product brands
Table II illustrates the key differences between product and corporate brands. The key difference in conceptualisation is that corporate brand values tend to be grounded in the values and affinities of company founders, owners,

	Product brands	Corporate brands
Management responsibility	Brand manager	Chief executive
Functional responsibility	Marketing	Most/all departments
General responsibility	Marketing personnel	All personnel
Disciplinary roots	Marketing	Multidisciplinary
Brand gestation	Short	Medium to long
Stakeholder focus	Consumers	Multiple stakeholders
Values	Contrived	Real
Communications channels	The marketing communications mix	Total corporate communications Primary: performance of products and services; organisational policies; behaviour of CEO and senior management; experience of personnel and discourse by personnel Secondary: marketing and other forms of controlled communication Tertiary: word of mouth
Dimensions requiring alignment	Brand values (covenant) Product performance	Brand values (covenant) Identity (corporate attributes/sub cultures) Corporate strategy Vision (as held by the CEO and senior management)
	Communication Experience/image and reputation Consumer commitment	Communication Experience/image and reputation Stakeholders commitment (internal and external constituencies)
	Environment (political, economic, ethical, social, technological)	Environment (political, economic, ethical, social, technological)

Source: Adapted from Balmer (2001b)

Table II.
A comparison between product and corporate brands

management and personnel, whereas product brand values tend to be contrived and are the product of the not inconsiderable skills of invention held by marketing and advertising creatives.

Another difference relates to the role of employees *vis-à-vis* corporate brands. Personnel have a crucially important role in transmitting the brand's values and as such bring them to the heart of the corporate branding process. They provide the interface between the internal and external environments (Kennedy, 1977; Schneider and Bowen, 1995; Hemsley, 1998; Balmer and Wilkinson, 1991) and help build and maintain the corporate brand (King, 1991; Balmer, 1995; Ambler and Barrow, 1996; Harris and DeChernatony, 2001, Balmer, 2001a, b). This has particular significance for recruitment of personnel and the development of human resources in an organisation (Balmer and Wilkinson, 1991; Ambler and Barrow, 1996; Macrae, 1996; Knox and Maklan, 1998; Keller, 1999; Balmer, 2001b, Harris and DeChernatony, 2001; Ewing *et al.*, 2002).

A third difference is that corporate brands are an important element of a company strategy and this clearly is a senior management concern. The widespread consumer interest in brands and their economic benefit is another reason why they need to be considered when formulating strategic plans (Shoker *et al.*, 1994). In contrast, product brand management is principally a concern for middle management and falls largely within the remit of marketing.

Mention can be made of the literature on services brands, which in the context of the literature on product brands and the recent literature on corporate branding, represents a crucially important interim stage of development. The literature on services branding shares important similarities with the literature on corporate branding because it demonstrates that services branding is different from product branding (Levy, 1996; Stuart, 1997) in that services branding involves multiple interfaces (Bitner *et al.*, 1994) and that employees are of crucial importance to the process (Harris and DeChernatony, 2001; McDonald *et al.*, 2001). However, services branding, by its very nature, applies only to one category of corporate brands and would exclude corporate brands such as Nestlé, BP, and Philips.

Corporate brands and corporate identities

Although the two concepts are often used interchangeably this masks the fact that there are critical differences between them. The corporate identity concept, as we see it, refers to the distinct attributes of an organisation and as such addresses the questions "what are we?" and "who are we?". As such, it encompasses issues such as business scope and culture among others (Balmer and Greyser, 2003). Following this perspective, there are important differences between the concepts of the corporate identity and the corporate brand.

The first and most fundamental difference is that the identity concept is applicable to all entities. Yet, not every entity has, plans to have, wants or even needs a corporate brand. As such, a corporate identity is a necessary concept

whereas a corporate brand is contingent. For instance, the necessity or desirability of having or maintaining a corporate brand will be reliant on a host of other factors such as the organisation's strategy (the firm may operate in markets where corporate brands are redundant or where there is a monopoly, or where the markets are commoditised; the need for corporate brands within some parts of the public sector may not be as strong, although in others it most certainly is: the university sector is a case in point regarding the latter).

Consider the comparison made 20 years ago by two US corporations: Bechtel and Coca-Cola. The fixed assets of Bechtel were worth $6 billion while those of Coca-Cola were worth only $5 billion. Both companies had a similar number of employees (around 30,000). Coca-Cola was world-renowned, whereas Bechtel (a construction company) was generally unknown to the general public. However, in book value Bechtel was by far the more valuable of the two corporations in market value (Diefenbach, 1982). The reason was clear – Coca-Cola had maintained a highly valuable corporate brand. However, an examination of both entities in terms of their corporate brand value would almost certainly have resulted in a different scenario. Recent research identified Coca-Cola to be the world's most valuable corporate brand. The corporation, in its entirety, was estimated to be worth $142 billion: $84 billion of this sum is attributable to the goodwill associated with the corporate brand. This represents a remarkable 59 per cent of the total book value of the company according to Interbrand/Citibank (Barwise *et al.*, 2000, p. 93.)

The analysis of what is, and what is not a corporate brand is far from easy, however. Olins (2001, pp. 490-1) observes that British Airways, Orange and Manchester United (football/soccer club) are examples of organisations with clear corporate brands. However, he argues that Daimler Chrysler is not a corporate brand since the two brands (Daimler and Chrysler) have become separated from the new corporation's identity. In addition he notes that for organisations such as Unilever, Procter & Gamble and Diageo that have invested heavily in their product brands, the task of corporate brand building will be difficult.

The difference between the two concepts can be discussed in terms of their different values. There has been a good deal of discussion about the values of corporate brands (DeChernatony, 1999; Urde, 1997) but there appears to be little discussion of the differences between corporate brands and corporate identities. We make the distinction between the two concepts by arguing that an organisation's corporate brand values are a supra set of values that may inhabit one, or indeed, several organisations. Typically, corporate brand values are clearly articulated, concise, well defined and distinct. They are broadly constant over time and are discernible via corporate behaviours and activities. They require total organisational commitment, especially on the part of personnel. All facets of organisational life should be congruent with these values. However, there are other values and these are to be found in the identity of the organisation

An organisation's identity encompasses a bundle of values that are derived from a federation of subcultures, which are found within and outside the organisation (Balmer and Wilson, 1998): they continually evolve and are amorphous. This mix of values, to a considerable degree, gives an organisation its distinctiveness.

Table III makes a comparison between the concepts of corporate branding and corporate identity.

	Corporate identity	Corporate brands
Necessary or contingent?	Necessary	Contingent
Applicable to all organisations?	Yes	No
Stability of attributes	Constantly evolving	Relatively stable
Applicability	Normally a single entity	Normally a single entity but can be multiple
Management responsibility	CEO	CEO
Functional responsibility	All functions	All functions
Disciplinary roots	Multidisciplinary	Multidisciplinary
Principal drivers	Strategy, culture, vision	Branding covenant, culture
Gestation	Short	Medium/long
Stakeholder focus	Mainly internal. external stakeholders vary in importance depending on strategy	Mainly external. Internal stakeholders also important
Desired profile among internal and external stakeholder groups	Variable: low to high	Normally high
Importance of controlled communication	Variable	Normally crucial
Importance of advertising and visual identity	Variable	Normally crucial
Key elements	Culture (sub cultures), strategy, structure, communication, performance, perception	The branding covenant, communication plus other identity elements (actual, communicated, conceived, ideal and desired identities (see Balmer and Greyer, 2002)
Key dimensions requiring alignment	Organisational attributes – (including sub cultures)/ Communication/perception	Corporate brand covenant/communication plus other identity elements (including sub cultures)
Portability	Normally difficult	Variable
Financial goodwill	Variable	Can be very high indeed

Source: Balmer (n.d.)

Table III.
A comparision betweeen corporate identities and corporate brands

The corporate brand covenant

It has been argued that at the core of a corporate brand is an explicit covenant between an organisation and its key stakeholder groups, including customers (Balmer, 2001a, b). In the literature this covenant is often referred to in terms of "a promise" (Johansson and Hirano, 1999; Mitchell, 1999; Tilley, 1999). Frequently, this promise is encapsulated in the form of three words that combine the brand functions with descriptive and emotional modifiers, which Keller (1999, p. 43) describes as "brand mantras". Examples of the former include, "authentic athletic performance" (Nike) and "fun, family entertainment" (Disney). Typically, the covenant is asserted by an organisation's senior management in terms of a clearly articulated corporate branding proposition. It is promoted via multiple channels of communication, and is experienced through the organisation's products and services corporate, and, most importantly, through staff behaviour. Some organisations have gone so far as to prescribe a set of "laws" relating to the management and expression of the corporate brand. The Codex promulgated by Mercedes Benz for their global brand being a case in point (Schmidt and Ludlow, 2002). In Sweden, Volvo takes care to emphasise not only what should be communicated but what should not. The brand's association with safety means that we should not expect to see a Volvo appearing in a car chase (Tilley, 1999, p. 189).

A corporate brand may be viewed as a contract in that the company needs to articulate its accord with its key stakeholders by demonstrating, unceasingly and over time, that it has kept true to its corporate branding pledge. As such, the brand name and/or logo play an important part in creating awareness and recognition but also as "signs" of assurance. However, a number of authorities have cautioned against seeing branding as a one-way process that affects the image of those engaged in some form of branding partnership such as customers and employees. This is because these groups also have a key role in defining a brand's image (Johansson and Hirano, 1999).

The importance of the corporate brand covenant is such that it may be viewed as a distinct identity type (Balmer and Greyser, 2002). As such, its management requires alignment between five other identity types:

(1) actual;

(2) communicated;

(3) conceived;

(4) ideal; and

(5) desired (Balmer 2001c).

Moreover, in organisations having corporate brands, the above identity elements need to be brought into alignment with the covenanted identity (the underlying *raison d'etre* of the corporate brand). The same is true whether the corporate brand inhabits one or *many* organisations.

However, organisations do not always appreciate the nature of the covenant underpinning their corporate brand. Research undertaken by Opinion Research Corporation International (1999) of 100 global brands found that many organisations had failed to articulate a positioning strategy for their corporate brand: this mitigated against these brands realising their full potential.

The new corporate branding architecture

The recent importance attached to corporate brands and their management should, in our estimation, result in a corollary concern: corporate brand architecture (LaForet and Saunders, 1994; Kapferer, 1997; Aaker and Joachimsthalaer, 2000). Brand architecture refers to the relationships among and between corporate, company (subsidiary), and product brands. Such relationships embrace products and services, or a mixture of the two across the hierarchy of brands. However, such relationships are no longer restricted within the confines of *a single* corporation.

Olins' (1978) well-known categorization of brands according to a tripartite structure: monolithic, endorsed or branded, although hugely influential, is somewhat dated. Contemporary organisations face new and more complex challenges. Brand management has not only become more important, but also more intricate and complex. One of these challenges is that new branding categories have emerged: increasingly, this reflects the increasing incidence of shared corporate brands and the rise of networks centred on a corporate brand. Our analysis of the current business environment has resulted in the identification of six, new corporate/trans-corporate categorisations and a greatly extended branding architecture (see Table IV).

Corporate brands and the resource-based view of the corporation[1]

The resource-based view of the firm helps us understand why corporate branding imparts long-lasting value. This economic theory is based on the proposition that firms are heterogeneous in terms of their resources and internal capabilities, and that these resources and capabilities can provide the basis for superior performance if they meet specific criteria. The first criterion is that they must be strategically valuable in the sense that they give the corporation some advantage over its competitors. For example, a resource such as a new process technology might generate lower operating costs and higher margins. Such a resource, however, renders only fleeting above average profits unless the advantage is sustainable over a relatively long period. To accomplish this, the theory posits that the resource must meet the criteria of being rare, durable, inappropriable, imperfectly imitable, and imperfectly substitutable.

The sustainable valuable resource must be rare in the sense that a competitor cannot easily purchase it in the marketplace. Durable means that the resource's value does not depreciate rapidly. Inappropriability implies that the company that owns the resource can capture the major share of the profits

New corporate brand category	Explanation	Example
Familial	The sharing/adoption of the same corporate brand by two entities within the same industry or sector. There is, sometimes, a geographical distinction	Hilton (UK), Hilton (USA), Shell (UK), Shell (The Netherlands)
Shared	As above, but operating in distinct and sometimes related, markets. Not usually geographically distinct.	Rolls Royce (Engineering/Aero Engines) (UK) Rolls Royce (car subsidiary of BMW) Volvo (commercial vehicles, engineering – Sweden) Volvo (car subsidiary of Ford USA)
Surrogate	A franchise arrangement whereby one organisation's products/services are branded as that of another.	British Regional Airways Use of the British Airways brand
Supra	A quasi, "arch", brand used to supra endorse company brands. Particularly common within the airline sector. Unlike ordinary corporate brands, this branding category is derived from several rather than from a single corporate entity. As such, its "ethereal" and "virtual" qualities are greater.	"One world" Airline Alliance "Star" Airline Alliance Qualifier group" Airline Alliance
Multiplex	Multiple uses and, possibly, multiple ownership/rights of a corporate brand among a variety of entities in a variety of industry sectors. (Similar to the Japanese *Keiretsu* philosophy)	Virgin Virgin Atlantic Airways Virgin Trains Virgin (Financial Services)
Federal	The creation of a new corporate brand by separate companies who pool their resources in a joint venture, to, in effect, create a new identity/company.	Airbus Consortium

Source: Balmer (n.d.); also see Balmer and Greyser (2003)

Table IV.
New corporate
branding categories

that flow from it. Imperfect imitability denotes that it is extremely difficult for a competitor to internally recreate the resource. And finally, imperfect substitutability suggests that new technologies, paradigms, or business models are unlikely to render the resource in question obsolete or significantly weaker (Barney, 1986; Grant, 1991; Peteraf, 1993). A strong, well-managed corporate brand, in our opinion, meets the above criteria and thereby qualifies as a sustainable valuable resource. To demonstrate this, let us look at corporate branding in light of these criteria.

Value

By establishing a corporate brand a company can distinguish and differentiate itself in the minds of all its stakeholders. Similar to a product brand, a corporate brand makes the company and its espoused values easily identifiable and connotes a level of quality and consistency of performance in the minds of its target audiences. For product brands the focus is on customers and for corporate brands for stakeholders. Consequently, a corporate brand provides an umbrella of trust for the company in extending its product or service line and even in diversifying into dissimilar products and services. Corporate brands are also transferable assets: they can be bought, and sold; they may also be coveted, as the struggle by Mercedes Benz and Volkswagen over the Rolls Royce car marque testifies. Or, consider the Ford Group, which has, over recent years, acquired a number of prestigious corporate brands as part of its strategy to acquire a suite of up-scale brands – to date it has acquired Aston Martin, Jaguar, Porsche and Volvo. Ford's acquisition of these brands may be seen to be more effective in terms of cost, time and risk aversion than attempting to build up new high-prestige brands that lack the rich brand heritage of Jaguar and the others.

An effective corporate brand often has a latent value in terms of excess capacity that can be applied to other markets (Peteraf, 1993). The use of corporate brands in the launch of new products is a case in point. For instance, it has been shown that the deployment of a brand name for a new product/service increase the success rate by 20 per cent and saves 26 per cent on the costs of a new product launch (Newman, 2001).

Disney provides a good example of the leveraging of an enviable corporate brand reputation. The corporation extended its corporate brand from animated cartoons to full-length motion pictures, and then to theme parks, cruises, speciality products, and retail stores. The Easy Group, founded in the UK by the Greek magnate, Stelios Haji-Ioannou, whose Easy brand is based on a low price, frills-free service proposition, has migrated from its budget airline (EasyJet) roots, and now encompasses car hire, Internet cafes, and financial services. Another model is that provided by Sir Richard Branson's Virgin brand, which has been stretched to extraordinary lengths so as to encompass, among others, savings, sodas, spirits, gyms, as well as compact discs, trains and planes. The ubiquity of the Virgin brand is such that it appears to have suffused the entire panoply of branding types from product through to service, as well as encompassing company brands.

Of course, as pointed out by Collis and Montgomery (1995), there are limits to extending the corporate brand. To a large extent this will be dependent on the elasticity of the values underpinning the corporate brand and the degree to which the corporate brand values are industry-specific. Understanding the limits of the corporate brand requires particular skill on the part of senior management: a mistake in this regard can considerably reduce the equity that

986

has been accrued to the corporate brand. This can be seen in relation to Virgin's disastrous use of its brand on its railway subsidiary which, until comparatively recently, was characterised by its antiquated and shabby rolling stock, its poor time-keeping, slimmed-down catering services and high ticket prices. The latter provides a good example of what Greyser (1999) calls the "promise-performance" gap. Such occurrences can have a deleterious effect on a corporation's share-price.

The value of a corporate brand manifests itself in other ways. For instance, branded companies may also have an edge in finding venture partners (Barney and Hansen, 1994). Investors also seek strong corporate brands. The value attached to a corporate brand materially enhances the capitalisation of companies and often results in higher price-earnings ratios. Interbrand, in their 1999 analysis of the world's most valuable brands, concluded that 59 per cent of Coca-Cola's, 61 per cent of Disney's and 64 per cent of McDonald's capitalisation was attributable to the worth of the company brand (Barwise *et al.*, 2000, p. 93). The financial value of corporate brands comes to the fore during corporate takeovers. The $12.6 billion paid by Philip Morris for the purchase of Kraft (the $12.6 billion representing six times the book value of the company) is attributed principally to the goodwill associated with the Kraft brand name (Newman, 2001, pp. 410-15). In the UK, the value of corporate brands has started to appear on the balance sheet of corporations.

However, placing a firm financial value on corporate brands remains controversial and there is far from agreement as to the methodology that should be employed. Consider the discrepancy in relation to the corporate brand value of Coca-Cola, which has been valued at $15 billion by AC Nielsen and $ 68.945 billion by Interbrand (Schmidt and Ludlow, 2002, p. 2). What is incontrovertible is that corporate brands as well as other intangible assets can have a balance sheet value.

One of the greatest benefits of an effective corporate brand is its effect on non-product market areas, such as its role in the recruitment and retention of valuable employees. Hence, the corporate brand can be of inestimable value to an organisation's human resources department. This is because an organisation's corporate brand values can serve as a template against which prospective employees can be evaluated. Virgin Atlantic selects its personnel not only according to their skill or experience, but also the degree to which their beliefs and personality are in alignment with the values of Virgin's corporate brand (Mitchell, 1999, p. 32). Waterstones, a leading UK retail book outlet, regards recruitment as an integral component of the management of its corporate brand (Ind, 1997).

A cororally premise relating to the above is that human resources managers should occupy a position of pivotal importance in supporting the corporate brand (King, 1991; Balmer, 2001b). Finding suitable employees who have an

affinity with the corporate brand would suggest that corporations benefit not only in terms of employee commitment to the corporate brand, but also enjoy a demonstrable financial advantage in terms of the costs associated with recruitment, training, the employment of agency staff and the payment of overtime. The value of branding to recruiters and other human resource functions has, until comparatively recently, been seen as a characteristic of Japanese companies. Just as consumers construct identities through branding, so do employees. Johansson and Hirano (1999, p. 94) point out that a Toyota employee is proud to call himself a *Toyota-jin* (a Toyota-man).

The value of a corporate brand can also manifest itself in other ways. For instance, branded corporations may have an edge in finding venture partners (Barney and Hansen, 1994). In addition, a strong corporate brand can cushion a company in time of crisis (Greyser, 1999). Ford, for example, because of its long-standing corporate brand reputation, may have escaped consumer wrath in the tyre controversy with Firestone several years ago. Of course, there are limits to stakeholder understanding, and Firestone's role in the calamity clearly exceeded these limits, and the same is true to an even greater degree for Arthur Andersen's involvement in the Enron debacle.

What is clear is that the value of corporate brands takes on many forms. Research undertaken by MORI, the British opinion research consultancy, among senior managers supports this broad proposition. Its research found that a corporate brand had a perceived value in terms of increased profile, customer attractiveness, product support, visual recognition, investor confidence, as well as in encapsulating organisational values and providing staff motivation (Lewis, 2000).

We should not be surprised to find that the value of brands, in whatever their guise, has long been recognised, as the following quote testifies:

> The good will of certain well-established names and brands is valued in the millions of dollars, and ranks high among the assets of the companies responsible for them. In the great majority of fields ... practically every one discriminates between brands in making a purchase. In many lines it has come be regarded as the simplest and surest way to obtain standard quality and service (Hotchkiss and Franken, 1923)

Rarity

We argue that a corporate brand is rare because it is the result of a unique historical pattern of development which suffuses a corporate brand, not only with a rich palette of characteristics that are functional (quality, performance, familiarity and predictability), but also with myriad ethereal elements that are rich in image as well as in symbolic terms. These functional and ethereal values over time are represented by what are known as corporate brand values. These values (along with the tangible elements of the corporate brand) have their roots in an organisation's identity (Balmer, 2001b) as well as in its culture (Hatch and Schultz, 2001). There is a growing realisation that a discussion of

corporate brands cannot be undertaken in isolation from a discussion of an organisation's identity (DeChernatony, 1999; Simoes and Dibb, 2001; Balmer, 2001a, b; Balmer and Greyser, 2003).

The importance of culture (or more appropriately subcultures, see Balmer and Wilson, 1998) to an organisation's identity has been recognised by identity scholars for the last decade or so (Abratt, 1989; Balmer and Wilkinson, 1991; Balmer and Wilson, 1998; Balmer, 1998; Dowling, 1993; Hatch and Schultz, 1997; Fiol *et al.*, 1998, Rindova and Schultz, 1998). Unsurprisingly, because of a corporate brand's inextricable link with identity, the importance of culture in understanding corporate brands has also been asserted (Balmer, 2001b; DeChernatony, 1999; Hatch and Schultz, 2001).

As a result of the above, no two brands are identical, although some have similar characteristics such as Coca-Cola and Pepsi Cola. Their rarity, resulting from their complexity, and comparatively long gestation, helps explain why some corporations are willing to pay a premium price for corporate brands rather than invest time, finance and other resources in creating a subsidiary corporate brand *de novo*, as was discussed with the Ford example cited earlier.

But the corporate brand does not transplant as readily as a product brand. Conglomerates and holding corporations typically go to great lengths to maintain the integrity of newly acquired corporate brands: Wal-Mart's acquisition of the Yorkshire-based (UK) ASDA supermarket chain is a case in point, as is Ford's acquisition of Jaguar and Volvo. Often, this requires that an arms-lengths approach be adopted. A predatory acquisition can result in the annihilation of the brand and in a merger, the two corporations normally fuse their corporate brands often in the mistaken belief that they have, overnight, created a new brand. Consider for example AOL TimeWarner, HBOS (formerly Halifax plc and the Bank of Scotland) and DaimlerChrysler. Also, in a merger, the original brands and names sometimes disappear without trace, as in the case of Hoechst and Rhone-Poulenc, which became known as Aventis.

Durability
Corporate brands are generally believed to have greater longevity than most other types of valuable resources. The realisation that the Coca-Cola brand is older than the physical plant and equipment used in production is a sobering one indeed. Grant (1991) observed that corporate brands tend to decay relatively slowly; cases in point being BP, Sears Roebuck and Sony. However, there are older, more venerable examples of the longevity of corporate brands. Ancient seats of learning such as Oxford, Cambridge or the Sorbonne, and London's coterie of old-line private bankers such as Childs, Coutts, Drummonds and Hoare are just a few examples of corporate brands that have spanned the centuries.

While a superior product can dramatically yield competitive advantage in our high-tech milieu, this advantage is all too often short lived; today's

products have notoriously short life cycles. However, the values associated with a corporate brand can be enduring. This helps to explain the shift of emphasis from product line brands to corporate brands.

Maintaining the substance, credibility and values of a corporate brand is a complicated and unremitting task. It requires continuous reinvestment (Reed and De Fillippi, 1990; Grant, 1991), and ongoing support from senior management (King, 1991; Balmer, 1995, 2001b). Moreover, a corporate brand needs total organisational commitment assurance; congruent total corporate communication (congruent over space and time), and fidelity to the notion that behaviour mirrors rhetoric (Balmer, 2001b, p. 15).

Inappropriatability

As stated above, inappropriatability means that a firm cannot lose profits from a valuable resource to another entity or person. Collis and Montgomery (1995) note that certain kinds of tangible resources are always subject to bargaining by a variety of stakeholders such as customers, suppliers, distributors, and employees. Perhaps the most common example of such a resource is employees. As an illustration, highly successful securities brokers can change employers and take important clients with them or bargain to appropriate a larger share of the profit from their employers. Franchise-quality sports stars have the same capability. The corporate brand, conversely, is a very different kind of resource. Because it is largely intangible, it cannot be bargained or "spirited" away. It is a resource which is historical and perceptual, a resource that is dependent, to a considerable degree, on perception, beliefs, and experiences. This has long been recognised by managers and consultants, as the following well-known aphorism given by one senior Coca-Cola executive illustrates:

> If Coca-Cola were to lose all of its production-related assets in a disaster, the company would survive. By contrast, if all consumers were to have a sudden lapse of memory and forget everything related to Coca-Cola the company would go out of business (quoted in Barwise *et al.*, 2000, p. 73)

Imperfect imitability

A corporate brand is also difficult, if not impossible, to imitate for two major reasons. The first is that brand signifiers (names, logos, colours, music, etc.) are normally patented by the corporations. As such they are protected by law from imitation by competitors. For instance, no other company can legally use the Nike name or the "swoosh". The second and perhaps more essential reason is that the underlying substance of the corporate brand is intangible and consequently difficult to replicate.

Resource-based theorists suggest that valuable, intangible resources, which are typically rooted in a unique historical pattern of development, tend to provide enduring advantage because they are protected by one or a combination of two isolating mechanisms: social complexity and causal

ambiguity (Reed and DeFillippi, 1990). Both of these mechanisms are at work in relation to corporate branding.

Social complexity. This first mechanism recognises that the resource is composed of many interrelated elements so that few or no individuals have the depth of knowledge to comprehend the overall package. The corporate branding process involves not just the firm's formal communication system, but also the many interactions a company has with its various stakeholders. These interactions include areas such as products and services, market and on-market behaviour, and human resources. Internally, personnel's affinity to a variety of subcultures gives an organisation's identity a distinctiveness (Balmer and Wilson, 1998) that also finds expression in the corporate brand. Given the magnitude and diversity of these interactions and communications, it would be very difficult for anyone to grasp the intricacies of the overall process.

Causal ambiguity. The second isolating mechanism is the result of the cause-and-effect relationships in the process that go unrecognised. As we have already argued, brand building involves a concerted interdisciplinary effort. Causal ambiguity operates primarily through word-of-mouth communication and media interpretation, which can play a large role in forming the image and reputation of the corporate brand. Such tertiary communication cannot be completely comprehended by either company managers or outside observers (Balmer and Gray, 1999).

Just as there is a mosaic of elements forming a corporate brand there are also numerous elements that can bring about its decline or demise. A failure to understand the company's business, cultures, identity, structure, and the impact of environmental forces are just some of these elements (Balmer, 2001b, p. 4).

In sum, because of the social complexity and causal ambiguity implicit in the corporate brand-building process, it is virtually impossible for a competitor to imitate a corporate brand. It is eminently possible, however, for a competitor to develop a superior substitute corporate brand.

Imperfect substitutability
The substitutability threat suggests that a firm's valuable corporate brand can be vitiated or "upstaged" by a competitor's brand. This threat is the most difficult one to analyse and guard against. There is always a danger that your corporate brand will lose ground to a competitor (Dierickx and Cool, 1989). In the early part of the twentieth century, Montgomery Ward was the dominant corporate brand in the US retail industry but was overtaken by Sears Roebuck in the 1950s, which more recently has been surpassed by Wal-Mart. IBM is no longer the paramount corporate brand in the computer industry and McDonald's is constantly looking over its shoulder at Burger King and others. McEvily *et al.* (2000) argue that there are strategies that companies can follow to diminish this threat.

The key strategy for protecting the corporate brand from a substitute brand is continuous improvement. This should be distinguished from the earlier articulated strategy of reinvesting, to protect the brand from depreciation. Continuous improvement requires investing on an ongoing basis in enhancing the factors that create value and, moreover, help to differentiate the brand. The nature of such improvements will necessarily be industry and brand specific but will almost certainly include product and service performance, innovation, design, and style. This is no easy task, however, since it means committing the corporation to periodic, if not continuous, strategic change and innovation. Jack Welch, in his 20 years as CEO of General Electric, consistently emphasized change and improvement at all levels of the organization to stay ahead of competitors (*Fortune*, pp. 185-7). As a consequence, General Electric today has one of the strongest and most admired corporate brands in the world.

Conclusion

In an era where the boundaries between corporate entities have become less distinct, where there is a blurring of the margins between the internal and external environment, and where traditional approaches to marketing have come under scrutiny, the corporate brand has emerged as a particularly salient and robust concept. In addressing the question of why a successful corporate brand is a sustainable, valuable strategic resource, we have argued that an answer can be found in the economic theory called "the resource-based view of the firm". According to this theory, a corporate brand can provide a sustainable competitive advantage to a company if it is characterised by value, rarity, durability, inappropriatability, imperfect imitability, and imperfect substitutability.

To us, corporate branding provides a powerful aperture by which to comprehend organisations and their interface with myriad stakeholder groups. The Latin phrase *Vultus est index animi* captures the awesome nature of corporate brands. Translated, the literal meaning of the phrase is: "The expression on one's face is a sign of the soul". It takes only a small leap of imagination to realise that for many organisations, the corporate brand is the face of the organisation. As such, when we regard a thriving corporate brand that has stood the test of time, we also see something of that organisation's identity. An identity that has been astutely nurtured and maintained over successive generations, that has enjoyed wide staff commitment to its ethos and values – a commitment that has in turn been reciprocated by those stakeholder groups who are crucial to the organisation's ongoing success and continuance – furnishes a sound underpinning for a successful corporate brand.

We have explained the differences between corporate brand and corporate identities and have argued that the notion of the corporate brand is fundamentally different in several crucial aspects from its sister concepts of

corporate and organisational identity. One crucial difference is that while the identity concept is applicable to entities of every hue, the corporate branding concept is not. Identity is a given necessary whereas corporate brands are contingent. An organisation's identity is a prerequisite to the establishment of a corporate brand. Every corporate brand has, so to speak, an ancestral home. *Quod erat demonstrandum*[2].

However, once established, a corporate brand can have a life of its own: it can be bought, borrowed, sold and, in certain circumstances, be shared among a variety of organisations.

We have urged caution on the part of scholars and practitioners when contemplating brands: this is because corporate brands are crucially different from product brands in terms of their composition, constituencies, maintenance, management as well as disciplinary roots. Indeed, the emerging theory on corporate branding is largely antithetical to traditional approaches to branding. Indeed, the genesis of corporate branding is, to a significant degree, to be found within the literature on corporate and on organisational identity. Both literatures emphasise the importance of personnel and of staff affinities to subcultures. The importance of adopting a multidisciplinary perspective on the part of corporate identity scholars has clearly influenced current thinking on corporate brands.

In this article we have advanced the view that the corporate brand covenant (the long-term commitment made between those who own as well as by the myriad stakeholders who "consume" the brand) should be viewed as an additional identity type: "*the covenanted identity*". Building on Balmer's (2001c) earlier model relating to the management of identities (The AC^{2}ID Test ^{TM}) we argue that the effective management and maintenance of a corporate brand entails bringing into alignment the various identity types with the covenanted identity/the corporate brand (see Balmer in Balmer and Greyser, 2003. p. 251).

In addition, we have explored the boundary-spanning characteristics of corporate brands and have found that the existing tripartite branding typology (monolithic, endorsed and branding) to be inadequate in the context of the contemporary business environment. Our analysis has resulted in an extension of this typology with six additional branding categories:

(1) familial;

(2) multiplex;

(3) shared;

(4) surrogate;

(5) supra; and

(6) federal.

This reflects the different ways in which organisations utilise the corporate brand covenant. (Often a single corporate brand covenant is shared by different organisations.)

We have noted that since the early 1990s there has been a growing chorus of execration from both practitioners and scholars at the failure on the part of scholars to face up to the changes presented by what we now call corporate brands. These protestations are, at last, being heard. Currently, corporate branding is generating considerable excitement from marketing scholars (as well as those from other disciplines) and account is being taken of the protestations of King (1991) and others. It comes with a realisation that corporate brands are not only redolent of our aeon, but represent a missing dynamic in management thought and practice.

However, we are of the view that the concept of the corporate brand is only one element of a much broader tableaux: a tableaux, of which the concepts of corporate reputation and image, total corporate communications and, more significantly, corporate and organisation identity studies are integral. In their totality, these concepts afford a powerful means by which the corporation can be revealed, understood and managed. Not only do they represent a new gestalt of the corporation, but also the building blocks of a new philosophy of management, that of "corporate level marketing" (Balmer and Greyser, 2003).

In our estimation, the epiphany of corporate branding will herald a new episode of marketing's odyssey, namely: the advent of corporate-level marketing.

Notes

1. This section of this article is a development of our initial examination of corporate brands and the resource-base view of the corporation. See Gray and Balmer (2001).

2. Literal translation: which was to be proved.

References

Aaker, D. and Joachimsthalaer, E.A. (2000), "The brand relationship spectrum: the key to the brand architecture challenge", *California Management Review*, Vol. 42 No. 4, pp. 8-23.

Abratt, R. (1989), "A new approach to the corporate image management process", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 63-76.

Aldersey-Williams, H. (2000), "Ten reasons why corporate identity is irrelevant", *RSA Journal*, Vol. CXLVIII No. 5495, pp. 4-6.

Ambler, T. and Barrow, S. (1996), "The employer brand", *Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 24-46.

Baker, M.J. and Balmer, J.M.T. (1997), "Visual identity: trappings or substance?", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 31 No. 5, pp. 366-82.

Balmer, J.M.T. (1995), "Corporate branding and connoisseurship", *Journal of General Management*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 24-46.

Balmer, J.M.T. (1998), "Corporate identity and the advent of corporate marketing", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 14 No. 8, pp. 963-96.

Balmer, J.M.T. (2001a), "Corporate identity, corporate branding and corporate marketing: seeing through the fog", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 35 No. 3 and 4, pp. 248-91.

Balmer, J.M.T. (2001b), "The three virtues and seven deadly sins of corporate branding", *Journal of General Management*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 1-17.

Balmer, J.M.T. (2001c), "From the Pentagon: a new identity framework", *Corporate Reputation Review*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 11-21.

Balmer, J.M.T. and Gray, E.R. (1999), "Corporate identity and corporate communications: creating a competitive advantage", *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 171-6.

Balmer, J.M.T. and Greyser, S.A. (2002), "Managing the multiple identities of the corporation", *California Management Review*, Vol. 44 No. 3, pp. 72-86.

Balmer, J.M.T. and Greyser, S.A. (Eds) (2003), *Revealing the Corporation: Perspectives on Identity, Image, Reputation, Corporate Branding and Corporate-Level Marketing*, Routledge, London.

Balmer, J.M.T. and Wilkinson, A. (1991), "Building societies: change, strategy, and corporate identity", *Journal of General Management*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 20-33.

Balmer, J.M.T. and Wilson, A. (1998), "Corporate identity: there is more to it than meets the eye", *International Studies of Management and Organizations*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 12-31.

Barney, J.A. (1986), "Organizational culture: can it be a source of sustained competitive advantage?", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 656-64.

Barney, J.A. and Hansen, M.H. (1994), "Trustworthiness as a source of competitive advantage", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 15 No. 5, pp. 175-90.

Barwise, P., Dunham, A. and Ritson, M. (2000), "Ties that bind: brands, consumers and businesses", in Pavitt, J. (Ed.), *Brand New*, V&A Publications, London, pp. 71-108.

Bernstein, D. (1989), "Corporate void", *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 8, pp. 315-20.

Bickerton, D. (2000), "Corporate reputation versus corporate branding; the realist debate", *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 42-8.

Bitner, M., Booms, B. and Mohr, L. (1994), "Critical service encounters: the employees' viewpoint", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 58, October, pp. 95-106.

Collis, D.J. and Montgomery, C.A. (1995), "Competing on resources: strategy in the 1990s", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 73 No. 4, pp. 118-28.

DeChernatony, L. (1999), "Brand management through narrowing the gap between brand identity and brand reputation", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 15 No. 1-3, pp. 157-80.

Diefenbach, J.M. (1982), "Design as a management tool", paper presented at the Design Management Institute Conference, 9-10 December, Boston, MA.

Dierickx, I. and Cool, K. (1989), "Asset stock accumulation and sustainability of competitive advantage", *Management Science*, Vol. 35 No. 12, pp. 1504-11.

Dowling, G. (1993), "Developing your company image into a corporate asset", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 101-9.

Elliot, R. and Wattanasuwan, K. (1998), "Brands as symbolic resources for the construction of identity", *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 131-44.

Ewing, M., Pitt, L., DeBussy, N. and Berthou, P. (2002), "Employment branding in the knowledge economy", *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 3-22.

Fiol, C., Hatch, M.J. and Golden-Biddle, K. (1998), "Organizational culture and identity: what's the difference anyway?", in Whetten, D.A. and Godfrey, P. (Eds), *Identity in Organizations: Developing Theory Through Conversations*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 56-9.

Galbraith, J.K. (1986), *The Anatomy of Power*, Hamish Hamilton, London.

Gjols-Andersen, P. (2001), "A case study of the change of brand strategy in Lego from a focus on the famous building brick to introducing a broad variety of Lego products in the children's universe", PhD thesis, Copenhagen Business School, Copenhagen.

Grant, R.M. (1991), "The resource-based theory of competitive advantage: implication for strategy formulation", *California Management Review*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 114-35.

Gray, E.R. and Balmer, J.M.T. (2001), "The corporate brand: a strategic asset", *Management in Practice*, No. 4, pp. 1-4.

Greyser, S.A. (1999), "Enhancing and advancing corporate reputation", *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 177-81.

Hankinson, P. and Hankinson, G. (1999), "Managing successful brands: an empirical study which compares the corporate cultures of companies managing the world's top 100 brands with those managing outsider brands", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 15 No. 1-3, pp. 135-55.

Harris, F. and DeChernatony, L. (2001), "Corporate branding and corporate brand performance", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 35 No. 3 and 4, pp. 441-56.

Hatch, M.J. and Schultz, M. (1997), "Relations between organizational culture, identity and image", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 31 No. 5, pp. 356-65.

Hatch, M.J. and Schultz, M. (2001), "Are the strategic stars aligned for your corporate brand?", *Harvard Business Review*, February, pp. 128-34.

Hemsley, S. (1998), "Internal affairs", *Marketing Week* No. 2 April, pp. 49-53.

Hotchkiss, G.B. and Franken, R.B. (1923), *The Leadership of Advertised Brands*, Doubleday Page, New York, NY.

Ind, N. (1997), *The Corporate Brand*, Macmillan, London.

Ind, N. (1998), "An integrated approach to corporate branding", *Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 5 No. 5, pp. 323-9.

Ind, N. (2001), *The Corporate Brand*, New York University Press, New York, NY.

Johansson, J.K. and Hirano, M. (1999), "Brand reality: the Japanese perspective", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 15 No. 1-3, pp. 93-105.

Kapferer, J.N. (1997), *Strategic Brand Management*, 2nd ed., Kogan Page, London.

Kay, J. (1995), *Foundations of Corporate Success*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Keller, K.L. (1998), *Strategic Brand Management: Building, Measuring, and Managing Brand Equity*, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Keller, K.L. (1999), "Brand mantras: rationale, criteria and examples", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 15 No. 1-3, pp. 43-51.

Keller, K.L. and Aaker, D.A. (1998), "Corporate level marketing: the impact of credibility marketing on a company's brand extensions", *Corporate Reputation Review*, Vol. 1 No. 4, pp. 356-78.

Kennedy, S.H. (1977), "Nurturing corporate images – total communications or ego trip?", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 11, pp. 120-64.

King, S. (1991), "Brand building in the 1990s", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 3-13.

Knox, S. and Maklan, S. (1998), *Competing on Value*, Financial Times/Pitman, London.

Knox, S.D., Maklan, S. and Thompson, K.E. (2000), "Building the unique organizational value proposition", in Schultz, M., Hatch, M.J. and Larsen, M.H. (Eds), *The Expressive Organization*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 138-53.

LaForet, S. and Saunders, J. (1994), "Managing brand portfolios: how the leaders do it", *Journal of Advertising Research*, September-October, pp. 64-76.

Levy, M. (1996), "Current accounts and baked beans: translating FMCG principles to the financial sector", *Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 95-9.

Lewis, S. (2000), "Let's get this in perspective", paper presented at the Confederation of British Industry Branding and Brand Identity Seminar, Bradford School of Management, Bradford, 24 February.

McDonald, M.H.B., DeChernatony, L. and Harris, F. (2001), "Corporate marketing and service brands", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 35 No. 3 and 4, pp. 335-52.

McEvily, S.K., Das, S. and McCabe, K. (2000), "Avoiding competitive substitution through knowledge sharing", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 294-311.

Maathuis, O. (1999), "Corporate branding: the value of the corporate brand to customers and managers", unpublished PhD thesis, Erasmus University, Rotterdam.

Macrae, C. (1996), *The Brand Chartering Handbook*, Addison-Wesley, London.

Mitchell, A. (1997), *Brand Strategies in the Information Age*, Financial Times Report, London.

Mitchell, A. (1999), "Out of the shadows", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 15 No. 1-3, pp. 25-42.

Newman, K. (2001), "The sorcerer's apprentice? Alchemy, seduction and confusion in modern marketing", *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 20, pp. 409-29.

Olins, W. (1978), *The Corporate Personality: An Inquiry into the Nature of Corporate Identity*, Design Council, London.

Olins, W. (2000), "How brands are taking over the corporation", in Schultz, M., Hatch, M.J. and Larsen, M.H. (Eds), *The Expressive Organization*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 51-65.

Olins, W. (2001), "Global companies: the inexorable rise of the corporate state? The Second Lord Goold Memorial Lecture delivered at Templeton College, Oxford University", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 35 No. 3 and 4, pp. 485-96.

Opinion Research Corporation International (1999), *Global 100: Attitudes to Corporate Branding*, Opinion Research Corporation International, Princeton, NJ, April.

Pauvit, J. (2000), *Brand New*, V&A Publications, London.

Peteraf, M.A. (1993), "The cornerstones of competitive advantage: a resource-based view", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 14, pp. 179-91.

Reed, R. and DeFillippi, R.J. (1990), "Causal ambiguity, barriers to imitation, and sustainable competitive advantage", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 88-102.

Rindova, V. and Schultz, M. (1998), "Identity within and identity without: lessons from corporate and organizational identity", in Whetten, D.A. and Godfrey, P. (Eds), *Identity in Organizations: Developing Theory Through Conversations*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 46-51.

Schmidt, H. and Ludlow, C. (2002), *Inclusive Branding*, Palgrave Macmillan, Houndmills.

Schmitt, B. (1999), "Experimental marketing", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 15 No. 1-3, pp. 53-67.

Schneider, B. and Bowen, D. (1995), "Employee and customer perceptions of service in banks: replication and extension", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 70, pp. 423-33.

Sherry, J. (1995), *Contemporary Marketing and Consumer Behaviour*, Sage, London.

Shoker, A., Srivastava, R. and Ruekert, R. (1994), "Challenges and opportunities facing brand management: an introduction to the special issue", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 31, May, pp. 149-58.

Simoes, C. and Dibb, S. (2001), "Rethinking the brand concept: new brand orientation", *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, Vol. 5 No. 4, pp. 217-24.

Stuart, F.I. (1997), "The influence of organizational culture and internal politics on new service design and introduction", *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol. 9 No. 5, pp. 469-85.

Tilley, C. (1999), "Built-in branding: how to engineer a leadership brand", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 15 No. 1-3, pp. 181-91.

Urde, M. (1997), "Brand orientation – development of brands as strategic assets and protection against trademark degeneration", PhD thesis, University of Lund, Lund.

Urde, M. (1999), "Brand orientation", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 15 No. 1-3, pp. 117-33.

Further reading

Albert, S. and Whetten, D. (1985), "Organizational identity", in Cummings, L.C. and Staw, B.M. (Eds), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 7, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, pp. 263-9.

Amit, R. and Schoemaker, P.J.H. (1993), "Strategic assets and organizational rent", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 14, pp. 33-46.

Balmer, J.M.T. (2002), "Of identities lost and found", *International Studies of Management and Organization*, Vol. 32 No. 3, pp. 10-27.

Balmer, J.M.T. and Soenen, G.B. (1999), "The ACID Test^{TM} of corporate identity management", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 15 No. 1-3, pp. 69-92.

Fombrun, C.J. and Van Riel, C.B.M. (1998), "The reputational landscape", *Corporate Reputation Review*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 5-13.

Fortune (1999), *Fortune*, Vol. 22 No. 10, 22 November, pp. 185-7.

Gray, E.R. and Balmer, J.M.T. (1998), ""Managing corporate image and corporate reputation", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 31 No. 5, pp. 695-702.

Kapferer, J.N. (1991), *Strategic Brand Management*, Kogan Page, London.

Macrae, C. (1999), "Editorial", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 15 No. 1-3, pp. 1-24.

Schultz, M., Hatch, M.J. and Larsen, M.H. (Eds) (2000), *The Expressive Organization*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Urde, M. (1994), "Brand orientation – a strategy for survival", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 18-32.

Van Riel, C.B.M. (1995), *Principles of Corporate Communication*, Prentice-Hall, London.

This article has been cited by:

1. Vincent Dutot, Sylvaine Castellano. 2016. Designing a Measurement Scale for E-Reputation. *Corporate Reputation Review* **18**, 294-313. [CrossRef]

2. Jing Zhang, Yanxin Jiang, Rizwan Shabbir, Miao Zhu. 2016. How brand orientation impacts B2B service brand equity? an empirical study among Chinese firms. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing* **31**:1. . [Abstract] [PDF]

3. Selva Staub, Ramazan Kaynak, Tarkan Gok. 2016. What affects sustainability and innovation — Hard or soft corporate identity?. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* **102**, 72-79. [CrossRef]

4. Burçak Çağla Garipağaoğlu. 2015. Branding in Higher Education: A Case Study from Turkey. *Higher Education Policy* . [CrossRef]

5. Suraksha Gupta, John M.T. Balmer, Brian Low. 2015. Brands in, from and to emerging markets: The role of industrial relationships. *Industrial Marketing Management* **51**, 4-10. [CrossRef]

6. Kayhan Tajeddini, Ulf Elg, Pervez N. GhauriEnhancing Organizational Performance of International SMEs through Inter-Firm Marketing Collaborations 109-133. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF] [PDF]

7. Adri W A J van der Merwe, Gustav Puth. 2015. Towards a Conceptual Model of the Relationship between Corporate Trust and Corporate Reputation. *Corporate Reputation Review* **17**, 138-156. [CrossRef]

8. Vicenta Sierra, Oriol Iglesias, Stefan Markovic, Jatinder Jit Singh. 2015. Does Ethical Image Build Equity in Corporate Services Brands? The Influence of Customer Perceived Ethicality on Affect, Perceived Quality, and Equity. *Journal of Business Ethics* . [CrossRef]

9. Veronika Tarnovskaya. 2015. Corporate brand as a contract with stakeholders – theology or pragmatism?. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning* **33**:6, 865-886. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

10. Alireza Sheikh, Ming Lim. 2015. The making of brand attachment and brand meanings: the case of a UK engineering services firm. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning* **33**:6, 887-907. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

11. Aihwa Chang, Hsu-Hsin Chiang, Tzu-Shian Han. 2015. Investigating the dual-route effects of corporate branding on brand equity. *Asia Pacific Management Review* **20**, 120-129. [CrossRef]

12. Paul Chad. 2015. Utilising a change management perspective to examine the implementation of corporate rebranding in a non-profit SME. *Journal of Brand Management* **22**, 569-587. [CrossRef]

13. Michela Mingione. 2015. Inquiry into corporate brand alignment: a dialectical analysis and directions for future research. *Journal of Product & Brand Management* **24**:5, 518-536. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

14. Amber L. Stephenson, Alex Heckert, David B. Yerger. 2015. College choice and the university brand: exploring the consumer decision framework. *Higher Education* . [CrossRef]

15. Holly Cooper, Dale Miller, Bill Merrilees. 2015. Restoring luxury corporate heritage brands: From crisis to ascendency. *Journal of Brand Management* **22**, 448-466. [CrossRef]

16. John M T Balmer, Mario Burghausen. 2015. Explicating corporate heritage, corporate heritage brands and organisational heritage. *Journal of Brand Management* **22**, 364-384. [CrossRef]

17. Morteza Khojastehpour, Raechel Johns. 2015. The role of MNC's subsidiaries in creating multinational corporate brand. *Journal of Strategic Marketing* 1-14. [CrossRef]

18. Silvia Biraghi, Rossella Chiara Gambetti. 2015. Corporate branding: Where are we? A systematic communication-based inquiry. *Journal of Marketing Communications* 1-24. [CrossRef]

19. Ulla Hakala, Paula Sjöblom, Satu-Paivi Kantola. 2015. Toponyms as carriers of heritage: implications for place branding. *Journal of Product & Brand Management* **24**:3, 263-275. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

20. Jasmina Ilicic, Cynthia M. Webster. 2015. Consumer values of corporate and celebrity brand associations. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal* **18**:2, 164-187. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

21. Mari Juntunen. 2015. Time-based modifications to process theory illustrations through a corporate rebranding case study. *Baltic Journal of Management* **10**:2, 222-242. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

22. Coyte Cooper, Erianne A Weight, Nick Fulton. 2015. Investigating organizational core values in NCAA athletic departments. *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal* **5**:1, 50-64. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

23. Morteza Khojastehpour, Ahmed Shahriar Ferdous, Michael Polonsky. 2015. Addressing the complexities of managing domestic and multinational corporate brands. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* **20**:1, 48-62. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

24. Chris Chapleo. 2015. An exploration of branding approaches in UK universities. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* **20**:10.1002/nvsm.v20.1, 1-11. [CrossRef]

25. Deli Yang, Mahmut (Maho) Sonmez, Qinghai Li, Yibing Duan. 2015. The power of triple contexts on customer-based brand performance—A comparative study of Baidu and Google from Chinese netizens' perspective. *International Business Review* **24**, 11-22. [CrossRef]

26. Bikram Jit Singh Mann, Mandeep Kaur Ghuman. 2015. What and how to communicate about a corporate brand with the consumers: An exploratory study. *Journal of Marketing Communications* 1-20. [CrossRef]

27. Mai An Tran, Bang Nguyen, T.C. Melewar, Jim Bodoh. 2015. Exploring the corporate image formation process. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal* **18**:1, 86-114. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

28. Stephen Lloyd, Arch G. Woodside. 2015. Advancing paradox resolution theory for interpreting non-profit, commercial, entrepreneurial strategies. *Journal of Strategic Marketing* **23**, 3-18. [CrossRef]

29. Rogelio Puente-Díaz, Judith Cavazos-Arroyo. 2015. The categorisation of brands: The case of P&G™ branding strategy. *International Journal of Psychology* n/a. [CrossRef]

30. Zhibin Lin, Xinming He. 2014. The images of foreign versus domestic retailer brands in China: A model of corporate brand image and store image. *Journal of Brand Management* . [CrossRef]

31. Philip J Kitchen, Marwa E Tourky, Dianne Dean, Ahmed S Shaalan. 2014. Corporate Identity Antecedents and Components: Toward a Theoretical Framework. *Corporate Reputation Review* **16**, 263-284. [CrossRef]

32. Erik Braun, Jasper Eshuis, Erik-Hans Klijn. 2014. The effectiveness of place brand communication. *Cities* **41**, 64-70. [CrossRef]

33. Ahmad Zaki, Mahfud Sholihin, Zuni Barokah. 2014. The association of Islamic bank ethical identity and financial performance: evidence from Asia. *Asian Journal of Business Ethics* **3**, 97-110. [CrossRef]

34. Mats Urde, Christian Koch. 2014. Market and brand-oriented schools of positioning. *Journal of Product & Brand Management* **23**:7, 478-490. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

35. Jaakko Aspara, Hanna-Mari Aula, Janne Tienari, Henrikki Tikkanen. 2014. Struggles in organizational attempts to adopt new branding logics: the case of a marketizing university. *Consumption Markets & Culture* **17**, 522-552. [CrossRef]

36. Zalfa Laili Hamzah, Sharifah Faridah Syed Alwi, Md Nor Othman. 2014. Designing corporate brand experience in an online context: A qualitative insight. *Journal of Business Research* **67**, 2299-2310. [CrossRef]

37. Sharifah Faridah Syed Alwi, Philip J. Kitchen. 2014. Projecting corporate brand image and behavioral response in business schools: Cognitive or affective brand attributes?. *Journal of Business Research* **67**, 2324-2336. [CrossRef]

38. Mario Burghausen, John M.T. Balmer. 2014. Corporate heritage identity management and the multi-modal implementation of a corporate heritage identity. *Journal of Business Research* **67**, 2311-2323. [CrossRef]

39. Roland H. Bartholmé, T.C. Melewar. 2014. The end of silence? Qualitative findings on corporate auditory identity from the UK. *Journal of Marketing Communications* 1-18. [CrossRef]

40. Sylvie Laforet. 2014. Managing brand portfolios: audit of leading grocery supplier brands 2004 to 2012. *Journal of Strategic Marketing* 1-18. [CrossRef]

41. Geraint Holliman, Jennifer Rowley. 2014. Business to business digital content marketing: marketers' perceptions of best practice. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing* **8**:4, 269-293. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

42. Stephen Wilkins, Jeroen Huisman. 2014. Corporate images' impact on consumers' product choices: The case of multinational foreign subsidiaries. *Journal of Business Research* **67**, 2224-2230. [CrossRef]

43. Christine Hallier Willi, Bang Nguyen, T.C. Melewar, Charles Dennis. 2014. Corporate impression formation in online communities: a qualitative study. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal* **17**:4, 410-440. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

44. Tatiana Anisimova. 2014. Benchmarking desired corporate brand image in relation to stakeholders: a managerial perspective. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal* **17**:4, 441-463. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

45. Amber L. Stephenson, David B. Yerger. 2014. Optimizing engagement: brand identification and alumni donation behaviors. *International Journal of Educational Management* **28**:6, 765-778. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

46. Amber L. Stephenson, Nikki Bell. 2014. Motivation for alumni donations: a social identity perspective on the role of branding in higher education. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* **19**:10.1002/nvsm.v19.3, 176-186. [CrossRef]

47. Nagwa El Gazzar, Maha Mourad. 2014. The Effect of Online Communication on Corporate Brand Image. *International Journal of Online Marketing* **2**:10.4018/IJOM.20120101, 1-15. [CrossRef]

48. Carlo Rohner,, Battal Kalan,, Kim Oliver Tokarski. 2014. Corporate Brand Management von KMU: Eine qualitativ-explorative Bestandsaufnahme der identitätsbasierten Markenführung bei Schweizer und Liechtensteiner Unternehmen. *ZfKE – Zeitschrift für KMU und Entrepreneurship* **62**, 99-123. [CrossRef]

49. Mahsa Ghandehary, Hojjat Harati, Javad Khazaei Pool. 2014. Identifying and ranking the effective factors on customer values. *Education, Business and Society: Contemporary Middle Eastern Issues* **7**:1, 57-74. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

50. Mari Juntunen. 2014. Interpretative narrative process research approach to corporate renaming. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal* **17**:2, 112-127. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

51. Riza Casidy. 2014. Linking Brand Orientation with Service Quality, Satisfaction, and Positive Word-of-Mouth: Evidence from the Higher Education Sector. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing* **26**, 142-161. [CrossRef]

52. Carl Jon Way Ng. 2014. SEMIOTICIZING CAPITALISM IN CORPORATE BRAND ENACTMENT. *Critical Discourse Studies* **11**, 139-157. [CrossRef]

53. Richard Brophy. 2014. Rebrand in crisis: how Liberty came to Ireland. *Journal of Strategic Marketing* **22**, 93-103. [CrossRef]

54. Emmanuel Selase Asamoah. 2014. Customer based brand equity (CBBE) and the competitive performance of SMEs in Ghana. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* **21**:1, 117-131. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

55. Chi-Tai Wang, Chui-Sheng Chiu. 2014. Competitive strategies for Taiwan's semiconductor industry in a new world economy. *Technology in Society* **36**, 60-73. [CrossRef]

56. Julie McColl, Christopher Moore. 2014. Developing and testing a value chain for fashion retailers: activities for competitive success. *The Journal of The Textile Institute* **105**, 136-149. [CrossRef]

57. Vilma L. Luoma-aho, Mirja E. Makikangas. 2014. Do public sector mergers (re)shape reputation?. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* **27**:1, 39-52. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

58. Tatiana Anisimova, Felix Mavondo. 2014. Aligning Company and Dealer Perspectives in Corporate Branding: Implications for Dealer Satisfaction and Commitment. *Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing* **21**, 35-56. [CrossRef]

59. Carmen Gallucci, Rosalia Santulli. 2013. Il family brand nella comunicazione online. Un focus sul settore vino. *MERCATI E COMPETITIVITÀ* 127-148. [CrossRef]

60. John M T Balmer. 2013. Corporate brand orientation: What is it? What of it?. *Journal of Brand Management* **20**, 723-741. [CrossRef]

61. Marino Bonaiuto, Stefano De Dominicis, Laura Illia, Belén Rodríguez-Cánovas, Gabriele Lizzani. 2013. Managing employer brand attributes to attract potential future leaders. *Journal of Brand Management* **20**, 779-792. [CrossRef]

62. Mats Urde. 2013. The corporate brand identity matrix. *Journal of Brand Management* **20**, 742-761. [CrossRef]

63. Thomas Leppelt, Kai Foerstl, Carsten Reuter, Evi Hartmann. 2013. Sustainability management beyond organizational boundaries–sustainable supplier relationship management in the chemical industry. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **56**, 94-102. [CrossRef]

64. Vernon H. Sweetin, Lynette L. Knowles, John H. Summey, Kand S. McQueen. 2013. Willingness-to-punish the corporate brand for corporate social irresponsibility. *Journal of Business Research* **66**, 1822-1830. [CrossRef]

65. Mari Juntunen, Jouni Juntunen, Vesa Autere. 2013. Recruits' Corporate Brand Co-creation Experiences of the Finnish Military Forces. *Corporate Reputation Review* **15**, 88-104. [CrossRef]

66. Tatiana Anisimova. 2013. Evaluating the impact of corporate brand on consumer satisfaction. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics* **25**:4, 561-589. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

67. Christine Vallaster, Sylvia von Wallpach. 2013. An online discursive inquiry into the social dynamics of multi-stakeholder brand meaning co-creation. *Journal of Business Research* **66**, 1505-1515. [CrossRef]

68. Oriol Iglesias, Nicholas Ind, Manuel Alfaro. 2013. The organic view of the brand: A brand value co-creation model. *Journal of Brand Management* **20**, 670-688. [CrossRef]

69. Tanya Bondarouk, Huub Ruël, Elena Axinia, Roxana Arama What Is the Future of Employer Branding Through Social Media? Results of the Delphi Study into the Perceptions of HR Professionals and Academics 23-57. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF] [PDF]

70. Anna Blombäck, Christina Scandelius. 2013. Corporate heritage in CSR communication: a means to responsible brand image?. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* **18**:3, 362-382. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

71. Anna Blombäck, Olof Brunninge. 2013. The dual opening to brand heritage in family businesses. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* **18**:3, 327-346. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

72. John M.T. Balmer. 2013. Corporate heritage, corporate heritage marketing, and total corporate heritage communications. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* **18**:3, 290-326. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

73. Riza Casidy. 2013. How great thy brand: the impact of church branding on perceived benefits. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* **18**, 231-239. [CrossRef]

74. Sharifah Alwi, Shahril Azwan Ismail. 2013. A framework to attain brand promise in an online setting. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning* **31**:5, 557-578. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

75. Zoe Lee. 2013. Rebranding in brand-oriented organisations: Exploring tensions in the nonprofit sector. *Journal of Marketing Management* **29**, 1124-1142. [CrossRef]

76. Alfonso Siano, Agostino Vollero, Maria Giovanna Confetto, Mario Siglioccolo. 2013. Corporate communication management: A framework based on decision-making with reference to communication resources. *Journal of Marketing Communications* **19**, 151-167. [CrossRef]

77. Christine Vallaster, Adam Lindgreen. 2013. The role of social interactions in building internal corporate brands: Implications for sustainability. *Journal of World Business* **48**, 297-310. [CrossRef]

78. Richard Gyrd-Jones, Bill Merrilees, Dale Miller. 2013. Revisiting the complexities of corporate branding: Issues, paradoxes, solutions. *Journal of Brand Management* **20**, 571-589. [CrossRef]

79. Richard J. VareyCorporate Reputation and the Discipline of Marketing Communication 104-120. [CrossRef]

80. Esben KarmarkCorporate Branding and Corporate Reputation 446-458. [CrossRef]

81. Christofer Pihl. 2013. In the borderland between personal and corporate brands – the case of professional bloggers. *Journal of Global Fashion Marketing* **4**, 112-127. [CrossRef]

82. Bikram Jit Singh Mann, Mandeep Kaur. 2013. Exploring branding strategies of FMCG, services and durables brands: evidence from India. *Journal of Product & Brand Management* **22**:1, 6-17. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

83. Nha Nguyen, André Leclerc, Gaston LeBlanc. 2013. The Mediating Role of Customer Trust on Customer Loyalty. *Journal of Service Science and Management* **06**, 96-109. [CrossRef]

84. Benjamin D Golant. 2012. Bringing the corporate brand to life: The brand manager as practical author. *Journal of Brand Management* **20**, 115-127. [CrossRef]

85. Carsten Reuter, Philipp Goebel, Kai Foerstl. 2012. The impact of stakeholder orientation on sustainability and cost prevalence in supplier selection decisions. *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management* **18**, 270-281. [CrossRef]

86. Jatinder J. Singh, Oriol Iglesias, Joan Manel Batista-Foguet. 2012. Does Having an Ethical Brand Matter? The Influence of Consumer Perceived Ethicality on Trust, Affect and Loyalty. *Journal of Business Ethics* **111**, 541-549. [CrossRef]

87. Janet Haddock-Fraser. 2012. The Role of the News Media in Influencing Corporate Environmental Sustainable Development: An Alternative Methodology to Assess Stakeholder Engagement. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* **19**:10.1002/csr.v19.6, 327-342. [CrossRef]

88. Michael Hutchinson, Gregg Bennett. 2012. Core values brand building in sport: Stakeholder attitudes towards intercollegiate athletics and university brand congruency. *Sport Management Review* **15**, 434-447. [CrossRef]

89. Marina Mattera, Verónica Baena, Julio Cerviño. 2012. Analyzing Social Responsibility as a Driver of Firm's Brand Awareness. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* **58**, 1121-1130. [CrossRef]

90. Manuela Gussoni, Andrea Mangani. 2012. Corporate branding strategies in mergers and acquisitions. *Journal of Brand Management* **19**, 772-787. [CrossRef]

91. John M.T. Balmer. 2012. Strategic corporate brand alignment. *European Journal of Marketing* **46**:7/8, 1064-1092. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

92. Adam Lindgreen, Yue Xu, François Maon, Jeremy Wilcock. 2012. Corporate social responsibility brand leadership: a multiple case study. *European Journal of Marketing* **46**:7/8, 965-993. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

93. Russell Abratt, Nicola Kleyn. 2012. Corporate identity, corporate branding and corporate reputations. *European Journal of Marketing* **46**:7/8, 1048-1063. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

94. Jay Sang Ryu, Jane Swinney. 2012. Aligning business owners for a successful downtown brand. *Journal of Place Management and Development* **5**:2, 102-118. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

95. Rob VanWynsberghe, Inge Derom, Elizabeth Maurer. 2012. Social leveraging of the 2010 Olympic Games: 'sustainability' in a City of Vancouver initiative. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events* **4**, 185-205. [CrossRef]

96. Qin Sun, Audhesh Paswan. 2012. Country branding through Olympic Games. *Journal of Brand Management* **19**, 641-654. [CrossRef]

97. François Robichaud, André Richelieu, Robert Kozak. 2012. Branding as a communications strategy: A framework for desired brand identity. *Journal of Brand Management* **19**, 712-734. [CrossRef]

98. Gary Davies, Rosa Chun. 2012. Employee as symbol: stereotypical age effects on corporate brand associations. *European Journal of Marketing* **46**:5, 663-683. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

99. T.C. Melewar, Manto Gotsi, Constantine Andriopoulos. 2012. Shaping the research agenda for corporate branding: avenues for future research. *European Journal of Marketing* **46**:5, 600-608. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

100. Marc Fetscherin, Jean-Claude Usunier. 2012. Corporate branding: an interdisciplinary literature review. *European Journal of Marketing* **46**:5, 733-753. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

101. James E. Richard, Annie Zhang. 2012. Corporate image, loyalty, and commitment in the consumer travel industry. *Journal of Marketing Management* **28**, 568-593. [CrossRef]

102. Oriol Iglesias, Eduard Bonet. 2012. Persuasive brand management. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* **25**:2, 251-264. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

103. Mari Juntunen. 2012. Co-creating corporate brands in start-ups. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning* **30**:2, 230-249. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

104. Wei-Lun Chang, Kuan-Chi Chang. 2012. Estimating the value of corporate co-branding synergies. *Kybernetes* **41**:1/2, 239-253. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

105. Anna Blombäck, Marcela Ramírez-Pasillas. 2012. Exploring the logics of corporate brand identity formation. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* **17**:1, 7-28. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

106. Anandan Pillai. 2012. Corporate branding literature: A research paradigm review. *Journal of Brand Management* **19**, 331-343. [CrossRef]

107. Vanessa Ratten. 2011. International sports management: Current trends and future developments. *Thunderbird International Business Review* **53**, 679-686. [CrossRef]

108. Minna Mäläskä, Saila Saraniemi, Jaana Tähtinen. 2011. Network actors' participation in B2B SME branding. *Industrial Marketing Management* **40**, 1144-1152. [CrossRef]

109. Christine Vallaster, Adam Lindgreen. 2011. Corporate brand strategy formation: Brand actors and the situational context for a business-to-business brand. *Industrial Marketing Management* **40**, 1133-1143. [CrossRef]

110. Beth Harben, Sandra Forsythe. 2011. Cause–brand alliances: Less familiar brands with familiar causes. *Journal of Brand Management* **19**, 132-142. [CrossRef]

111. Christina Öberg, Christina Grundström, Petter Jönsson. 2011. Acquisitions and network identity change. *European Journal of Marketing* **45**:9/10, 1470-1500. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

112. Ahmed Alamro, Jennifer Rowley. 2011. Antecedents of brand preference for mobile telecommunications services. *Journal of Product & Brand Management* **20**:6, 475-486. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

113. Shaun M. Powell. 2011. The nexus between ethical corporate marketing, ethical corporate identity and corporate social responsibility. *European Journal of Marketing* **45**:9/10, 1365-1379. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

114. Jaakko Aspara, Henrikki Tikkanen. 2011. Corporate marketing in the stock market. *European Journal of Marketing* **45**:9/10, 1446-1469. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

115. Bradford T. Hudson. 2011. Brand heritage and the renaissance of Cunard. *European Journal of Marketing* **45**:9/10, 1538-1556. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

116. Elif Karaosmanoğlu, Ayşe Banu Elmadağ Baş, Jingyun (Kay) Zhang. 2011. The role of other customer effect in corporate marketing. *European Journal of Marketing* **45**:9/10, 1416-1445. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

117. Khanyapuss Punjaisri, Alan Wilson. 2011. Internal branding process: key mechanisms, outcomes and moderating factors. *European Journal of Marketing* **45**:9/10, 1521-1537. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

118. Oriol Iglesias, Jatinder J. Singh, Mònica Casabayó. 2011. Key changes and challenges for brands in an uncertain environment. *Journal of Product & Brand Management* **20**:6, 436-439. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

119. Ulla Hakala, Sonja Lätti, Birgitta Sandberg. 2011. Operationalising brand heritage and cultural heritage. *Journal of Product & Brand Management* **20**:6, 447-456. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

120. Noel Scott, Ann Suwaree Ashton, Peiyi Ding, Honggang Xu. 2011. Tourism branding and nation building in China. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research* **5**:3, 227-234. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

121. Riza Casidy Mulyanegara. 2011. The relationship between market orientation, brand orientation and perceived benefits in the non-profit sector: a customer-perceived paradigm. *Journal of Strategic Marketing* **19**, 429-441. [CrossRef]

122. Riza Casidy Mulyanegara. 2011. The Role of Brand Orientation in Church Participation: An Empirical Examination. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing* **23**, 226-247. [CrossRef]

123. Robert L. Cardy, Mark L. Lengnick-Hall. 2011. Will They Stay or Will They Go? Exploring a Customer-Oriented Approach To Employee Retention. *Journal of Business and Psychology* **26**, 213-217. [CrossRef]

124. Hongwei He, Yan Li. 2011. CSR and Service Brand: The Mediating Effect of Brand Identification and Moderating Effect of Service Quality. *Journal of Business Ethics* **100**, 673-688. [CrossRef]

125. John M T Balmer. 2011. Corporate heritage brands and the precepts of corporate heritage brand management: Insights from the British Monarchy on the eve of the royal wedding of Prince William (April 2011) and Queen Elizabeth II's Diamond Jubilee (1952–2012). *Journal of Brand Management* **18**, 517-544. [CrossRef]

126. Chris Chapleo, María Victoria Carrillo Durán, Ana Castillo Díaz. 2011. Do UK universities communicate their brands effectively through their websites?. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education* **21**, 25-46. [CrossRef]

127. Rita Järventie-Thesleff, Johanna Moisander, Pikka-Maaria Laine. 2011. Organizational dynamics and complexities of corporate brand building—A practice perspective. *Scandinavian Journal of Management* **27**, 196-204. [CrossRef]

128. Joanna Minkiewicz, Jody Evans, Kerrie Bridson, Felix Mavondo. 2011. Corporate image in the leisure services sector. *Journal of Services Marketing* **25**:3, 190-201. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

129. Jay Sang Ryu, Jane Swinney. 2011. Downtown branding as an engine of downtown business success in small communities. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy* **7**, 81-90. [CrossRef]

130. Aron O'Cass, Ranjit Voola. 2011. Explications of political market orientation and political brand orientation using the resource-based view of the political party. *Journal of Marketing Management* **27**, 627-645. [CrossRef]

131. Johan Gromark, Frans Melin. 2011. The underlying dimensions of brand orientation and its impact on financial performance. *Journal of Brand Management* **18**, 394-410. [CrossRef]

132. Roland H. Bartholmé, T.C. Melewar. 2011. Exploring the auditory dimension of corporate identity management. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning* **29**:2, 92-107. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

133. Julie McColl, Christopher Moore. 2011. An exploration of fashion retailer own brand strategies. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal* **15**:1, 91-107. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

134. Subodh Bhat, Camilla Jane Burg. 2011. Does communicating corporate parent brand heritage help spin-off stock performance?. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* **16**:1, 27-37. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

135. Luca Petruzzellis, Salvatore Romanazzi, Leslie de Chernatony. 2011. Branding relationships in financial services: Paradigm shift in Mediterranean countries. *Journal of Brand Management* **18**, 312-328. [CrossRef]

136. Mari Juntunen, Jouni Juntunen, Jari Juga. 2011. Corporate brand equity and loyalty in B2B markets: A study among logistics service purchasers. *Journal of Brand Management* **18**, 300-311. [CrossRef]

137. Philip J. Kitchen, Inga BurgmannIntegrated Marketing Communication . [CrossRef]

138. John M T Balmer. 2010. Explicating corporate brands and their management: Reflections and directions from 1995. *Journal of Brand Management* **18**, 180-196. [CrossRef]

139. Abhijit Sengupta, Danica Vukadinović Greetham. 2010. Dynamics of brand competition: Effects of unobserved social networks. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* **34**, 2391-2406. [CrossRef]

140. Steve Burt, Keri Davies. 2010. From the retail brand to the retail-er as a brand: themes and issues in retail branding research. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management* **38**:11/12, 865-878. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

141. Steve Wood, Michelle Lowe, Neil Wrigley. 2010. Conceptualising innovative customer-facing responses to planning regulation: the UK food retailers. *The Service Industries Journal* **30**, 1967-1990. [CrossRef]

142. Mari Juntunen, Saila Saraniemi, Milla Halttu, Jaana Tähtinen. 2010. Corporate brand building in different stages of small business growth. *Journal of Brand Management* **18**, 115-133. [CrossRef]

143. Olutayo Otubanjo, Temi Abimbola, Olusanmi Amujo. 2010. Conceptualising the notion of corporate brand covenant. *Journal of Product & Brand Management* **19**:6, 410-422. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

144. A.E. Kirby, A.M. Kent. 2010. Architecture as brand: store design and brand identity. *Journal of Product & Brand Management* **19**:6, 432-439. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

145. Carley Foster, Khanyapuss Punjaisri, Ranis Cheng. 2010. Exploring the relationship between corporate, internal and employer branding. *Journal of Product & Brand Management* **19**:6, 401-409. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

146. Bharati Bina Hawabhay, Russell Abratt, Mark Peters. 2010. The Role of Corporate Communications in Developing a Corporate Brand Image and Reputation in Mauritius. *Corporate Reputation Review* **12**, 3-20. [CrossRef]

147. Sabrina Bresciani, Martin J. Eppler. 2010. Brand new ventures? Insights on start-ups' branding practices. *Journal of Product & Brand Management* **19**:5, 356-366. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

148. Jaakko Aspara, Henrikki Tikkanen. 2010. The Role of Company Affect in Stock Investments: Towards Blind, Undemanding, Noncomparative and Committed Love. *Journal of Behavioral Finance* **11**, 103-113. [CrossRef]

149. Tatiana Anisimova, Felix T. Mavondo. 2010. The performance implications of company-salesperson corporate brand misalignment. *European Journal of Marketing* **44**:6, 771-795. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

150. Harlan E. Spotts, Marc G. Weinberger. 2010. Marketplace footprints: connecting marketing communication and corporate brands. *European Journal of Marketing* **44**:5, 591-609. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

151. Stuart Roper, Gary Davies. 2010. Business to business branding: external and internal satisfiers and the role of training quality. *European Journal of Marketing* **44**:5, 567-590. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

152. Arja Lemmetyinen, Frank M Go. 2010. Building a brand identity in a network of Cruise Baltic's destinations: A multi-authoring approach. *Journal of Brand Management* **17**, 519-531. [CrossRef]

153. Tatiana Anisimova. 2010. Corporate brand: The company-customer misalignment and its performance implications. *Journal of Brand Management* **17**, 488-503. [CrossRef]

154. Paulo de Lencastre, Ana Côrte-Real. 2010. One, two, three: A practical brand anatomy. *Journal of Brand Management* **17**, 399-412. [CrossRef]

155. Rianne Appel-Meulenbroek, Dave Havermans, Ingrid Janssen, Anneke van Kempen. 2010. Corporate branding: an exploration of the influence of CRE. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate* **12**:1, 47-59. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

156. Alfonso Siano, Philip J. Kitchen, Maria Giovanna Confetto. 2010. Financial resources and corporate reputation. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* **15**:1, 68-82. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

157. Ram Herstein, Yoram Mitki, Eugene D Jaffe. 2009. Corporate Image Reinforcement in an Era of Terrorism through Integrated Marketing Communication. *Corporate Reputation Review* **11**, 360-370. [CrossRef]

158. Anna Blombäck, Olof Brunninge. 2009. Corporate identity manifested through historical references. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* **14**:4, 404-419. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

159. Joachim Kernstock, Tim Oliver Brexendorf. 2009. Implications of Habermas's "theory of communicative action" for corporate brand management. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* **14**:4, 389-403. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

160. Tamilla Curtis, Russell Abratt, William Minor. 2009. Corporate brand management in higher education: the case of ERAU. *Journal of Product & Brand Management* **18**:6, 404-413. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

161. Helle Kryger Aggerholm, Mona Agerholm Andersen, Birte Asmuß, Christa Thomsen. 2009. Management conversations in Danish companies. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* **14**:3, 264-279. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

162. Gregory Ashworth, Mihalis Kavaratzis. 2009. Beyond the logo: Brand management for cities. *Journal of Brand Management* **16**, 520-531. [CrossRef]

163. Jennifer Rowley. 2009. Online branding strategies of UK fashion retailers. *Internet Research* **19**:3, 348-369. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

164. Rehnuma Ali-Choudhury, Roger Bennett, Sharmila Savani. 2009. University marketing directors' views on the components of a university brand. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing* **6**, 11-33. [CrossRef]

165. Roger Bennett, Rehnuma Ali-Choudhury. 2009. Prospective Students' Perceptions of University Brands: An Empirical Study. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education* **19**, 85-107. [CrossRef]

166. John M.T. Balmer. 2009. Scrutinising the British Monarchy. *Management Decision* **47**:4, 639-675. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

167. John M.T. Balmer. 2009. Corporate marketing: apocalypse, advent and epiphany. *Management Decision* **47**:4, 544-572. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

168. Mats Urde. 2009. Uncovering the corporate brand's core values. *Management Decision* **47**:4, 616-638. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

169. John M. T. Balmer, Helen Stuart, Stephen A. Greyser. 2009. Aligning Identity and Strategy: Corporate Branding at British Airways in the Late 20th Century. *California Management Review* **51**, 6-23. [CrossRef]

170. Nicholas Alexander. 2009. Defining brand values through sponsorship. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management* **37**:4, 346-357. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

171. Adrian Payne, Kaj Storbacka, Pennie Frow, Simon Knox. 2009. Co-creating brands: Diagnosing and designing the relationship experience. *Journal of Business Research* **62**, 379-389. [CrossRef]

172. Roderick J. Brodie, James R.M. Whittome, Gregory J. Brush. 2009. Investigating the service brand: A customer value perspective. *Journal of Business Research* **62**, 345-355. [CrossRef]

173. Leslie de Chernatony, Susan Cottam (née Drury). 2009. Interacting contributions of different departments to brand success. *Journal of Business Research* **62**, 297-304. [CrossRef]

174. Hugh Wilford. 2009. Cities and their brands: Lessons from corporate branding. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy* **5**, 26-37. [CrossRef]

175. Martin Christopher, Barbara Gaudenzi. 2009. Exploiting knowledge across networks through reputation management. *Industrial Marketing Management* **38**, 191-197. [CrossRef]

176. References 233-262. [Citation] [Enhanced Abstract] [PDF] [PDF]

177. OunJoung Park, Liping A. Cai, Xinran Y. LehtoChapter 6 COLLABORATIVE DESTINATION BRANDING 75-86. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF] [PDF]

178. Anna BlombäckChapter 6 Brand meaning and impact in subcontractor contexts 223-261. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF] [PDF]

179. Jakob Lauring, Christa Thomsen. 2009. Collective ideals and practices in sustainable development: managing corporate identity. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* **16**:10.1002/csr.v16:1, 38-47. [CrossRef]

180. Rui Vinhas Da Silva, Sharifah Faridah Syed Alwi. 2008. Online corporate brand image, satisfaction and loyalty. *Journal of Brand Management* **16**, 119-144. [CrossRef]

181. Leo P. Dana, Kate E. Winstone. 2008. Wine cluster formation in New Zealand: operation, evolution and impact. *International Journal of Food Science & Technology* **43**:10.1111/ifs.2008.43.issue-12, 2177-2190. [CrossRef]

182. Sharifah Faridah Syed Alwi, Rui Vinhas Da Silva. 2008. Online and Offline Corporate Brand Images: Do They Differ?. *Corporate Reputation Review* **10**, 217-244. [CrossRef]

183. Jakob Lauring, Christa Thomsen. 2008. Ideals and practices in CSR identity making: the case of equal opportunities. *Employee Relations* **31**:1, 25-38. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

184. Ram Herstein, Yoram Mitki, Eugene D. Jaffe. 2008. Communicating a new corporate image during privatization: the case of El Al airlines. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* **13**:4, 380-393. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

185. Veronika Tarnovskaya, Ulf Elg, Steve Burt. 2008. The role of corporate branding in a market driving strategy. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management* **36**:11, 941-965. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

186. Apisit Chattananon, Meredith Lawley, Numchai Supparerkchaisakul, Lackana Leelayouthayothin. 2008. Impacts of a Thai cause-related marketing program on corporate image. *International Journal of Emerging Markets* **3**:4, 348-363. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

187. John M.T. Balmer. 2008. Identity based views of the corporation. *European Journal of Marketing* **42**:9/10, 879-906. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

188. Rui Vinhas Da Silva, Sharifah Faridah Syed Alwi. 2008. Online brand attributes and online corporate brand images. *European Journal of Marketing* **42**:9/10, 1039-1058. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

189. Ram Herstein, Yoram Mitki. 2008. From branded to endorsement corporate identity strategy: the case of the Fattals Hotel Management Group. *Tourism Review* **63**:3, 48-56. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

190. Rita Kottasz, Roger Bennett, Sharmila Savani, Rehnuma Ali-Choudhury. 2008. The role of corporate art in the management of corporate identity. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* **13**:3, 235-254. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

191. Åsa Wallström, Ted Karlsson, Esmail Salehi-Sangari. 2008. Building a corporate brand: The internal brand building process in Swedish service firms. *Journal of Brand Management* **16**, 40-50. [CrossRef]

192. Ranis Cheng, Tony Hines, Ian Grime. 2008. Desired and perceived identities of fashion retailers. *European Journal of Marketing* **42**:5/6, 682-701. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

193. Bill Merrilees, Dale Miller. 2008. Principles of corporate rebranding. *European Journal of Marketing* **42**:5/6, 537-552. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

194. Anita Zednik, Andreas Strebinger. 2008. Brand management models of major consulting firms, advertising agencies and market research companies: A categorisation and positioning analysis of models offered in Germany, Switzerland and Austria. *Journal of Brand Management* **15**, 301-311. [CrossRef]

195. Hong-Wei He. 2008. Corporate identity/strategy interface: implications for corporate level marketing. *European Journal of Marketing* **42**:1/2, 10-15. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

196. Myfanwy Trueman, Diana Cook, Nelarine Cornelius. 2008. Creative dimensions for branding and regeneration: Overcoming negative perceptions of a city. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy* **4**, 29-44. [CrossRef]

197. Tatiana Anatolevena Anisimova. 2007. The effects of corporate brand attributes on attitudinal and behavioural consumer loyalty. *Journal of Consumer Marketing* **24**:7, 395-405. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

198. Manto Gotsi, Constantine Andriopoulos. 2007. Understanding the pitfalls in the corporate rebranding process. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* **12**:4, 341-355. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

199. John M.T. Balmer, Mei-Na Liao. 2007. Student corporate brand identification: an exploratory case study. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* **12**:4, 356-375. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

200. Pascual Berrone, Jordi Surroca, Josep A. Tribó. 2007. Corporate Ethical Identity as a Determinant of Firm Performance: A Test of the Mediating Role of Stakeholder Satisfaction. *Journal of Business Ethics* **76**, 35-53. [CrossRef]

201. Michael Bendixen, Russell Abratt. 2007. Corporate Identity, Ethics and Reputation in Supplier–Buyer Relationships. *Journal of Business Ethics* **76**, 69-82. [CrossRef]

202. Heather Skinner, Krzysztof Kubacki. 2007. Unravelling the complex relationship between nationhood, national and cultural identity, and place branding. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy* **3**, 305-316. [CrossRef]

203. Shirley Leitch, Judy Motion. 2007. Retooling the corporate brand: A Foucauldian perspective on normalisation and differentiation. *Journal of Brand Management* **15**, 71-80. [CrossRef]

204. Tim O Brexendorf, Joachim Kernstock. 2007. Corporate behaviour vs brand behaviour: Towards an integrated view?. *Journal of Brand Management* **15**, 32-40. [CrossRef]

205. Anna Blombäck, Björn Axelsson. 2007. The role of corporate brand image in the selection of new subcontractors. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing* **22**:6, 418-430. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

206. Ram Herstein, Yoram Mitki, Eugene D. Jaffe. 2007. From blueprint to implementation. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* **19**:6, 485-494. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

207. Hong-Wei He, John M.T. Balmer. 2007. Identity studies: multiple perspectives and implications for corporate-level marketing. *European Journal of Marketing* **41**:7/8, 765-785. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

208. Francisca van Dijken. 2007. Corporate social responsibility: market regulation and the evidence. *Managerial Law* **49**:4, 141-184. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

209. Abhijit Sengupta, Danica Vukadinovic Greetham, Michael SpenceAn Evolutionary Model of Brand Competition 100-107. [CrossRef]

210. Joan C. HendersonCommercial Crises 145-162. [CrossRef]

211. Magdalena Florek, Andrea Insch, Juergen Gnoth. 2006. City Council websites as a means of place brand identity communication. *Place Branding* **2**, 276-296. [CrossRef]

212. Jon Hulberg. 2006. Integrating corporate branding and sociological paradigms: A literature study. *Journal of Brand Management* **14**, 60-73. [CrossRef]

213. John M T Balmer, Stephen A Greyser, Mats Urde. 2006. The Crown as a corporate brand: Insights from monarchies. *Journal of Brand Management* **14**, 137-161. [CrossRef]

214. Rui Vinhas Da Silva, Sharifah Faridah Syed Alwi. 2006. Cognitive, affective attributes and conative, behavioural responses in retail corporate branding. *Journal of Product & Brand Management* **15**:5, 293-305. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

215. Laurent Muzellec, Mary Lambkin. 2006. Corporate rebranding: destroying, transferring or creating brand equity?. *European Journal of Marketing* **40**:7/8, 803-824. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

216. Christine Vallaster, Leslie de Chernatony. 2006. Internal brand building and structuration: the role of leadership. *European Journal of Marketing* **40**:7/8, 761-784. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

217. John M.T. Balmer, Stephen A. Greyser. 2006. Corporate marketing. *European Journal of Marketing* **40**:7/8, 730-741. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

218. Henry Yu Xie, David J. Boggs. 2006. Corporate branding versus product branding in emerging markets. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning* **24**:4, 347-364. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

219. An Shi, Gao Liang, Wang JianCorporate Brand Cube: Building Strong Corporate Brands 743-748. [CrossRef]

220. Markus Eberl, Manfred Schwaiger. 2005. Corporate reputation: disentangling the effects on financial performance. *European Journal of Marketing* **39**:7/8, 838-854. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

221. Annette L.M. van den Bosch, Menno D.T. de Jong, Wim J.L. Elving. 2005. How corporate visual identity supports reputation. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* **10**:2, 108-116. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

222. Prashant Mishra, Soumya SarkarCustomer-Based Corporate Brand Equity (CBCBE) in Business-to-Business Firms: 1729-1746. [CrossRef]

223. Elisa GiacosaInnovation in Luxury Fashion Businesses as a Means for the Regional Development 206-222. [CrossRef]

224. Alfonso Siano, Mario Siglioccolo, Carmela Tuccillo, Francesca ConteMuseum Communication: 151-179. [CrossRef]

225. Jennifer Rowley, David BirdOnline Branding 122-142. [CrossRef]

226. Alfonso Siano, Mario Siglioccolo, Carmela Tuccillo, Francesca ConteMuseum Communication: 1172-1200. [CrossRef]

227. Prashant Mishra, Soumya SarkarCustomer-Based Corporate Brand Equity (CBCBE) In Business-to-Business Firms: 73-90. [CrossRef]

228. Anup RajBranding and CSR in Indian Agribusiness 165-176. [CrossRef]