UNIVERSITEIT TWENTE.

NYKAMP NYBOER ®

IMPROVING
BRAND
PERFORMANCE

Talk the talk, walk the walk: The relationship between brand management and brand promise delivery

Admitted: 18th December, 2016

Author: Wieke Lenderink
Student number: s1585584
(Marketing) Communication Studies
Faculty of Behavioural Management and Social Sciences
University of Twente, Enschede

Examination Committee
Prof. dr. M.D.T. de Jong
W. Bolhuis M.Sc.
J. Krokké M.Sc.

Abstract:
Strong brands are defined by their ability to deliver their brand promise. In order to do so, brand management must orchestrate the organisation to ensure consistency in the vision of the organisation and its stakeholders. This study aims to identify the relationship between brand management and brand promise delivery. Two separate quantitative studies were performed to map the level of brand management of organisations and their brand promise delivery. Study 1 revealed that organisations could be categorized into sceptics, beginners, advanced and experts level of brand management. Sceptics have the least developed brand management and expert have aligned the brand throughout the entire organisation. Study 2 revealed the extent to which each organisation was delivering their brand promise. Combining the results of both studies revealed that of the various levels of brand management, beginners have the lowest brand promise delivery and experts are the best in delivering their brand promise. In addition, experts are the best at delivering the brand promise through the brand touch points. Finally, they enjoy the most positive brand promise attitude. The study also revealed the influence of brand management as whole is greater than implementing separate constructs as certain facets on their own have a negative influence on external brand promise delivery. It is therefore recommended that organisations focus on each aspect of brand management and not solely focus on one or two facets in order to improve brand promise delivery.

Keywords: brand promise, brand management, brand touch points, brand promise delivery

1. INTRODUCTION

Due to globalisation and new technologies, organisations are facing extreme competition and market uncertainty (Helm & Jones, 2010). As a result, brands rise and fall in a blink of an eye. Therefore, creating a strong brand is vital. Strong brands benefit from more attention towards marketing communications, more favourable perceptions of products and more favourable responses of consumers to brand extensions (Hoeffler & Keller, 2003). Perrier (as cited in O'Cass & Viet Ngo, 2007) even argues that a brand can be accountable for more than half of an organisation's earnings.

This raises the question of what defines a strong brand? Berry (2000) states that a strong brand "is essentially a promise of future satisfaction" (p.129). The development of a great product/service is the starting point for every organisation. Subsequently brands make a promise to stakeholders concerning the relevant and unique benefits they will experience when acquiring their product/service. Communicating this promise attracts and gains stakeholders. The brand promise needs to be delivered to retain stakeholders (Campbell, 2002; Tosti & Stotz, 2001). According to Napier (2004) only organisations that recognise the importance of (delivering) the brand promise will be able to create strong and successful brands. Wheatley (2002) affirms this by arguing that defining a brand promise and delivering this promise are essential for building a strong brand.

Nonetheless, delivering the brand promise is easier said than done. In order to deliver, Muntinga (2014) advises brand management departments to live their brand.

Schultz and Barnes (as cited by Alsem & van Leer, 2013) define brand management as "the process of creating, coordinating, and monitoring interactions that occur between an organisation and its stakeholders, such that there is a consistency between an organisation's vision and stakeholders' belief about a brand" (p.12). De Chernatony (2010) states that "brand management defines an externally anchored promise and considers how staff can be orchestrated to ensure vibrant commitment to delivering the promise" (p.2) to the stakeholders. Communicating the brand promise might be the first step, but the promise needs to come through everything the brand says, does or delivers. Thus words and deeds must reinforce the brand promise. According to Berthon, Ewing, and Napoli (2008) the performance of a brand can be enhanced when organisations acknowledge the importance of brand management.

Even though the positive influence of brand management on brand promise delivery has often been assumed, scientific literature reveals a gap to identify the extent to which brand management and brand promise delivery are related to each other. This study aims to fill the gap and to inform brand managers about the extent to which a well organised brand management influences brand promise delivery. In addition, it provides insight in which brand management areas are the most influential and therefore are important for brand managers and organisations to focus on.

As the primary objective of this article is to study the extent to which brand management and brand promise delivery are related, the following research question will

be addressed:

What is the relationship between brand management and brand promise delivery?
In order to provide an answer to the main research question, the following two sub questions have been addressed:

1. *Which levels of brand management exist among organisations?*
2. *To which extent do organisations deliver their brand promise?*

In order to provide an answer to the main research question, two separate studies were performed to answer the sub questions. The objective of the study 1 was to map the level of brand management of Dutch organisations. Study 2 aimed to analyse the brand promise delivery of organisations according their internal and external stakeholders. Subsequently, the results of both studies are combined and related to each other in order to answer the main research question.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework provides an extensive overview of brand promise delivery and the factors influencing this process. First, the importance of brand promise delivery for organisations will be discussed. The brand promise can be delivered through countless moments of contact; such as advertisements, the product itself and the behaviour of employees. All these moments of contact must be aligned with the brand promise to ensure (consistent) brand promise delivery. Therefore, an overview of brand touch point categories will be provided. In order to optimise the brand touch points,

organisations must organise the brand internally and coordinate activities and processes with the brand promise to ensure coherence between the internal and external brand experience. Therefore, the orchestration of brand management to align the organisation and brand touch point categories with the brand promise will be discussed.

2.1 BRAND PROMISE DELIVERY

Brand promise delivery starts with communicating the brand promise to the market to encourage and motivate external stakeholders to purchase the brands' products/services. From this communicated brand promise expectations for the brand experience arise (Anker, Kappel, Eadie, & Sandøe, 2012). Meeting these expectations through delivering the brand promise leads to satisfaction with the brand, which is referred to as promise fulfilment (Punjaisri, Wilson, & Evanschitzky, 2008).

Thus from the moment of a stakeholders' decision to purchase a product or service, organisations must do their utmost to deliver their promise. Scientific research identifies satisfaction (Delgado-Ballester & Munuera-Alemán, 2001; Lau & Lee, 1999) and promise fulfilment (Butterfield, 1991) as antecedents for trust in the brand. As a result, organisations rely on brand promises to create shortcuts to consumers' trust (Ryder, 2003). Brymer (2003) even states that "brands are based on trust and promises" (p.73) and a leading brand represents a promise kept (Blackett, 2003). Not fulfilling the promise over time has an adverse effect on consumers' trust and commitment (Punjaisri et al, 2008). Keller (2003) argues that failure

to deliver the brand promise is one of the deadly sins of brands and brand management.

However, in reality consistency in delivering the brand promise is easier said than done. The creation of a strong brand goes beyond the development of marketing strategies in which the brand is used to attract consumers (Smith, 2003; Vázquez, Del Río, & Iglesias, 2010). Consistency has to be achieved company-wide and across all facets of contact between the brand and its stakeholders (De Chernatony & Segal-Horn, 2003).

Therefore, Muntinga (2014) recommends organisations to adopt a holistic view on their brand for the reason that consumers associate products/services with previous experiences of (dis)satisfaction. Adopting a holistic view involves "the implication that the brand is, or should be, no less than the DNA of the organisation, the fundamental building block and expression of its existence" (Smith, 2003, p.99-100). Duncan and Moriarty (1988) argue that every facet of the brand and the organisation sends a message, indicating the need for organisations to focus on every facet reinforcing the brand promise.

2.2.   BRAND TOUCH POINTS

Stakeholders come into contact with a brand through products/services, employees, marketing communications, visiting the stores and so forth. All these countless moments of contact affect the overall brand experience and satisfaction of stakeholders with the brand. But most importantly, they influence the delivery of the brand promise as well (Smith, 2003).

As the possibilities for contact are countless, prior research has focused on classifying brand touch points in various groups. The most substantiated classification of touch points in literature (De Chernatony as cited in Giling, 2006; Olins, 2003; van der Grinten as cited in Giling, 2006) is in the following four categories: product/service, behaviour, communication and environment. In the following section, the influence of each brand touch point category will be discussed.

2.2.1. PRODUCT OR SERVICE

One of the most obvious ways for a brand to manifest itself is through the product/service offered by the brand. Size, design, packaging, aesthetics, price and especially the experience with the product/service are all aspects that influence the decision making and satisfaction of consumers. Mooy and Robben (2002) even argue that the products/services offered by an organisation tell a message. This message must reinforce the brand promise.

2.2.2. BEHAVIOUR

How stakeholders are greeted, informed, helped, spoken to influences the brand experience of stakeholders. People are the most efficient brand delivery system. Therefore, the behaviour of employees who present, deliver or provide information about the product/service is tremendously important in the manifestation of the brand (Wheatley, 2002). Literature especially emphasises the influence of employees' behaviour in service organisations. Because, employees are the interface between a brand's internal and external identity

(Brexendorf & Kernstock, 2007; Harris & De Chernatony, 2001). Prior studies demonstrate that perceived service quality and customer satisfaction are positively influenced by employee behaviour (Kattara, Weheba, & El-Said, 2008; Lemmink & Mattsson, 1998). In addition, Sirianni, Bitner, Brown, and Mandel (2013) claim that employee behaviour, when aligned with the brand personality, has a positive influence on consumers' overall brand evaluation and perceived service quality.

2.2.3. CORPORATE AND BRAND COMMUNICATIONS

Sales promotions, logo's, brand name, corporate visual identity and product website are manifestations of a brand classified under communications. Communications can be split into two categories: (1) corporate communication and (2) brand/marketing communication (van der Grinten as cited in Giling, 2006).

The main goal of corporate communication is to inform internal and external stakeholders, whereas the main goal for brand/marketing communication is to attract external stakeholders. Product name, advertisements, sales promotions and product websites are illustrations of brand/marketing communications. Yoo, Donthu, and Lee (2000) found that a brand's advertising is linked to creating brand associations and brand awareness. This is substantiated by Grace and O'Cass (2005) who claim that communications such as promotions, brand names and advertisement have a significant effect on brand attitudes and consumer satisfaction.

In the past, communications have been the only brand touch point category in which the brand was reflected. Therefore, Mooy and Robben (2002) urge for communications (both corporate and brand) to deliver the same message as products/services do.

2.2.4. ENVIRONMENTS

The environment in which a brand operates is often overlooked as a form of brand touch point. However, stakeholders often visit stores to try out a product of to buy a product. In addition, nowadays stakeholders spend hours on online environments (product websites). Therefore, its importance must not be underestimated. Environments, online or offline (Seifer, 2007), involve retail environments such as stores and web shops, working environments like offices and warehouses and temporary environments such as exhibitions and fairs. According to Rapoport (as cited in Bitner, 1992) physical environments of organisations encompass many cues of the organisation's capabilities and quality. These cues communicate the organisational image and purpose to its stakeholders (Bitner, 1992) and influence consumers' satisfaction with the service delivered (Bitner, 1990).

Environments not only affect consumers but also employees. Previous research even reveals that "through careful and creative management of the servicescapes, firms may be able to contribute to the achievement of both external marketing goals and internal organisational goals" (Bitner, 1992, p. 67).

Nowadays almost all brands have online environments as well. Common physical elements are not present in online settings.

As a result, stakeholders rely on combinations of texts, visuals and audio communication to recall the brands. These 'cues' also influence the brand experience (Davis, Buchanan-Oliver, & Brodie, 2000). Alwi & Azwan (2013) argue that consumers rely on brands they trust in online settings, and, as mentioned, trust is built through brand promise delivery.

2.3. BRAND MANAGEMENT

Brand management is concerned with defining a promise, aligning and coordinating internal stakeholders and brand touch points to ensure promise delivery for external stakeholders (De Chernatony, 2010). Due to the increasing competitive pressures in the markets and the ability of stakeholders to choose between many different brands, it is important to create a strong and distinctive brand (Gilling, 2006). However, Keller (2003) states that regardless how strong a brand is at any point in time, every brand is susceptible and sensitive to poor brand management.

In the 90's, brand management departments focused primarily on coordinating marketing communications of the brand and concentrating on the needs of the consumers and how consumers perceived the marketing communication. From 2005, the focus has been on total branding; aligning all the brand touch points and the entire organisation with the brand values (Tilley, 1999). Brand management departments must embrace a brand-oriented mind-set, establish internal branding competences and enhance brand promise delivery in order to create a strong brand (Balakrishnan & Kerr, 2013; De Chernatony,

2010; M'zungu, Merrilees, & Miller, 2010).

For aligning the organisation with the brand values and/or brand promise the brand management cycle (Bolhuis, 2015) has been developed. This model claims that organisations must first establish the internal brand organisation before taking the next steps. Then organisations must formulate a brand strategy which needs to be rendered into building blocks for brand development. Once the guidelines for brand building blocks have been developed, the brand must be implemented. Lastly, organisations must evaluate their performance in order to pinpoint bottlenecks. The model has been developed to optimise and align the brand throughout the organisation (Bolhuis, 2015), see figure 1.

Figure 1

Brand Management Cycle (Bolhuis, 2015)

2.3.1. INTERNAL ORGANISATION

For decades, branding activities solely focused on external stakeholders. However, literature (Davis, 2002; Tilley, 1999) recommends organisations to let their brand act as a guiding principle for the entire organisation. Through adopting a brand-oriented mind-set, organisations place the brand at the heart of all their processes, communications and activities (Urde, 1999). Sharing and understanding of the brand

throughout the entire organisation, entails a top-down approach.

Top management support, commitment and embrace of the brand as a strategy driver and important organisational asset sets the right example for the rest of the organisation to follow. Chapleo (2004) claims that top management exercising brand ownership drives the internal brand. In addition, appointing a brand manager who is responsible for the brand, facilitates cohesion in all processes related to the brand (Kapferer, 2008).

Aside from literature substantiating the importance of brand orientation for organisations and their performance (Baumgarth, 2010; Napoli, 2006; Voskuyl, 2009; Wong & Merrilees as cited in Hankinson, 2012), organisations must also acknowledge the importance of internal branding (Punjaisri et al, 2008; Punjaisri & Wilson, 2007). Recruitment, training and evaluating personnel should not solely be based on knowledge and skills but also on sharing and understanding of brand values (Nasr et al, 2014; Punjaisri et al, 2008). Personnel understanding, sharing and acting in line with the brand supports the delivery of the brand promise. Setting up the internal organisation of the brand ensures that the other four constructs of brand management are implemented more effectively.

2.3.2. BRAND STRATEGY

The organisational strategy must be translated into a brand strategy. The brand should be the driver of strategy in any organisation. For a brand to create value, the brand must position itself in the market and in the minds of consumers. Thompson (2003)

states that "taking up a position, in the sense of showing leadership and vision in how your brand will deliver its promise, meet people's needs and satisfying their expectations and desires" (p.80) is essential for every organisation.

When positioning the brand, organisations must focus on the position being relevant for stakeholders. In addition, the position must differ from competitors and suiting the organisation (Thompson, 2003). Strong brands meet and satisfy relevant functional and emotional needs of stakeholders, add value that differentiates them from their competitors but remain true to the identity of the brand and to the promises the brand makes.

In order to communicate the brand positioning to internal and external stakeholders, organisations specify their brand promise(s) (Burmann, Hegner, & Riley, 2009; Keller, 2003). The promise is everything the brand stands for, what it means and how it acts. Organisations must let the brand promise act as the guiding principle in communications, internal processes and the development of products/services. This will contribute to consistency in organisational activities (Thompson, 2003).

2.3.3. BRAND DEVELOPMENT

The formulated brand strategy must be developed into brand building blocks for symbolism, communication and behaviour before it can be implemented. Olins (2003) suggests that uniformity in the behaviour, appearance and performance of an organisation is fundamental for building a strong brand. For the reason that consistency is desired, defining guiding principles and

guidelines for corporate visual identity will safeguard visual coherence (Gilling, 2006; van den Bosch, de Jong, & Elving, 2005) and coherent use of wording, tone of voice, key messages and mediums in communications.

According to Wheatley (2002), personnel is often overlooked as a 'brand delivery system' despite people being the most effective in communicating the brand meaning. Via internal branding and guidelines for behaviour, organisations must try "to ensure that employees transform espoused brand messages into brand reality for customers and other stakeholders" (Punjaisri & Wilson, 2007, p. 60).

2.3.4. BRAND IMPLEMENTATION

Using tools and processes can enhance the implementation and application of the brand guidelines. Through the use of brand portals and image databases, the established guidelines and principles for corporate visual identity, communications and behaviours are made available and accessible for stakeholders. Portals provide the key branding rules and content created at brand development. For example, information about tone of voice, use of logo's and slogans and use of images (Schultz & Hatch, 2003).

Solely implementing a brand portal and/or an image database does not safeguard correct implementation of the brand. Organisations must implement processes and policies that assess whether brand touch points are in line with the brand positioning (Knox, 2004). In addition, as organisations often use agencies for the development of marketing communications and corporate visual identity, organisations

must ensure that these agencies are familiar with the brand positioning of the organisation and with the guidelines of the brand (Gilling, 2006).

2.3.5. BRAND PROTECTION

Van Buren (1999) stated that "what isn't measured, isn't managed" (p 72). In other words, without knowledge of the current brand performance transforming into a strong brand will be difficult. Implementing tracking and research instruments enables organisations to determine their progress regarding short-term and long-term goals set by management. However, organisations should not limit their evaluations to financial results such as market share. Benchmarks and market analyses are just as important to stay relevant and attractive to stakeholders.

Furthermore, analysing and measuring the brand experience of internal and external stakeholders helps to facilitate points of improvement for the brand on which organisations must take action (Keller, 2000). Besides information regarding the performance of the organisation, the brand must also be protected from incorrect and/or improper use (of the brand) (Roll, 2006) as this can damage the position and reputation of the brand.

2.4. CONCLUSION OF LITERATURE

In order to build a strong brand, organisations must define a brand promise and deliver this promise. Brand promises communicate the emotional and functional benefits stakeholders will experience when coming into contact with the brand.

However, delivering the brand promise is essential for gaining and retaining stakeholders.

Previous literature revealed that brand management is responsible for facilitating the means and processes to realise a shared perception of the brand among all stakeholders and brand touch points (De Chernatony & Segal-Horn, 2003; Sirianni et al, 2013). In order to facilitate cohesion, organisations must implement an internal organisation with regards to the brand, formulate a brand strategy, develop brand building blocks, implement the brand and evaluate its performance in order to align all parts and activities throughout the organisation with the brand promise.

As mentioned, the relationship between brand management and brand promise delivery remained unidentified in prior literature, therefore the current study focuses on the following research question: what is the relationship between brand management and brand promise delivery?

3. STUDY 1 – BRAND MANAGEMENT

The primary objective of study 1 was to map the level of brand management of organisations.

3.1. RESEARCH SAMPLE

Consultants of NykampNyboer, a specialist in brand management, have been contacted for finding suitable organisations for participation. The criteria were that headquarters had to be located in the Netherlands and their brands were well-known among consumers. In total 91

individuals responsible for the brand in their organisation were found of which 57 contacts were from the clientele of NykampNyboer and 34 were non-clientele. All 91 contacts were approached by e-mail for participation of which 29 invitees filled in the questionnaire (see table 1). For two organisations the number of respondents was two. The results of these two were combined, finalising a research sample of 27 organisations.

Table 1

Research sample – Study 1

Job Title	N
Brand adviser	2
Manager Brand	11
Manager Marketing / Communications	7
Head of Brand	4
Head of Marketing	5
Total	29

In table 2 key organisational characteristics are displayed. The table shows how the different industries, types and number of employees are represented in the research sample of study 1.

Table 2

Organisational characteristics - Study 1

Sector	N	%
Banking	4	15%
Financial services	2	7%
Insurances	7	22%
Retail & Wholesale	5	19%
Services	6	22%
Logistics	2	7%
Industry	2	7%
Type	N	%
B2C	11	41%
B2B	4	15%
B2C & B2B	12	44%
Employees	N	%
21 - 50	1	4%
51 - 100	1	4%
101 - 250	3	11%
251 - 500	2	7%
501 - 1000	2	7%
> 1000	18	67%

3.2. MEASUREMENT

By means of a quantitative research method, an online questionnaire administered using the online survey tool LimeSurvey, data regarding the brand management of participating organisations was mapped in order to categorize them in different levels of brand management.

The questionnaire administered has built and developed upon the scales used by Voskuyl (2009). The level of brand management was measured using five constructs: internal organisation, brand strategy, brand development, brand implementation and brand evaluation. Organisations were asked to rate to which extent the items were applicable to their organisation using a five-point Likert scale (1 = totally not applicable, 5 = totally applicable). The entire questionnaire can be found in Appendix 1.

The internal organisation was measured using 14 items (α=.93), of which six items measured the brand organisation (e.g. there is a brand manager who has and assumes official final responsibility for the brand) and eight items mapped brand-orientation (e.g. the brand is considered one of the organisation's most valuable assets).

Brand strategy (α=.93) was measured using five items related to brand positioning (e.g. the brand positioning is relevant to (potential) stakeholders) and four items related to brand guidelines (e.g. the brand positioning is rendered into concrete guidelines which serve as the basis for the development of products/services of the brand).

Brand development (α=.90) was measured using three items addressing the symbolism (e.g. the corporate visual identity makes the positioning of the brand visible), four items related to communication (e.g. a tone of voice has been defined in line with the brand positioning) and three items addressing behaviour (e.g. with the aid of an internal branding programme, the brand is being brought to the attention of staff members).

Brand implementation (α=.82) was measured using three items addressing tools (e.g. the brand guidelines are made available from a central online platform and are findable for all relevant (internal and external) stakeholders), four items addressing processes (e.g. communication materials are checked against the brand positioning before they are approved and introduced) and four items addressing policies (e.g. customer policy focused on the use of products/services is consistent with the brand positioning (e.g. support policy (help desk), warranty policy)).

Brand evaluation (α=.88) was measured using two items related to protection (e.g. the position and reputation of the brand are protected) and six items related to research (e.g. all relevant interactions with consumers are monitored and analysed).

3.3. PROCEDURE

Organisations were invited to participate via e-mail. The e-mail invitation contained a short introduction about the study, information regarding NykampNyboer, the link to the online questionnaire as well as information about the short report organisations would receive in turn for completing the questionnaire. The follow up study was not mentioned in order to keep it

compact and clear so that the threshold was low to participate. For information regarding the entire study, the organisations were referred to a website.

The questionnaire started with a short introduction stating the aim of the study, the time needed for completion, the short report and additional notes about the questionnaire. After all the questions, organisations could indicate whether or not they would like to participate in a follow up study or if they would like to receive more information first.

3.4. RESULTS

The aim of study 1 was to map the level of brand management of organisations. In order to categorize the levels of brand management, a K-means cluster analysis has been performed. For the K-means cluster analysis the five main constructs/variables of brand management were used as input. In addition, four clusters (organisation types) were used as starting point for the K-means clusters, which is similar to the study on brand orientation of Voskuyl (2009).

First, the results of the K-means cluster analysis will be discussed. Followed by an analysis of the role of internal organisation on the other main brand management constructs. Lastly, the Pearson's correlation coefficients of the brand management constructs will be discussed.

3.4.1. LEVELS OF BRAND MANAGEMENT

The K-means cluster analysis revealed four levels of brand management among the research sample (see table 3). Level 1 (sceptics) has the least developed level of

brand management (M = 1.42, n = 1). Followed by level 2 the beginners (M = 2.93, n = 6), level 3 the advanced (M = 3.52, n = 14) and level 4 the experts (M = 4.26, n = 6). A Kruskal Wallis (H(3) = 21.83, p = <.01) revealed that the differences between all levels were significant.

Besides the overall level of brand management, analyses were also performed to identify whether the organisations in the levels differ from each other regarding the main and sub constructs of brand management. Table 3 shows that sceptics have lowest scores on all main constructs of brand management, while experts have the highest scores on each of the main brand management constructs.

Table 3

Level of brand management - Study 1

	Sceptics* N = 1 M (SD)	Beginners* N = 6 M (SD)	Advanced* N = 14 M (SD)	Experts* N = 6 M (SD)
Brand management	1.42 (.00)	2.93 (.22)	3.52 (.19)	4.26 (.27)
Brand management constructs				
Internal Organisation	1.29 (.00)	3.02 (.43)	3.57 (.49)	4.24 (.40)
Brand Organisation	1.00 (.00)	3.36 (.54)	3.86 (.54)	4.39 (.54)
Brand Orientation	1.50 (.00)	2.77 (.41)	3.35 (.54)	4.13 (.43)
Brand Strategy	1.22 (.00)	3.04 (.51)	3.67 (.27)	4.72 (.36)
Brand Postioning	1.40 (.00)	3.20 (.73)	4.03 (.42)	4.80 (.25)
Brand Guidelines	1.00 (.00)	2.83 (.52)	3.23 (.41)	4.63 (.49)
Brand Development	2.00 (.00)	2.77 (.64)	3.45 (.35)	4.42 (.45)
Symbolism	3.66 (.00)	3.17 (.96)	4.05 (.76)	4.83 (.28)
Communication	1.50 (.00)	2.79 (.73)	3.50 (.40)	4.38 (.47)
Behaviour	1.00 (.00)	2.33 (.42)	2.79 (.93)	4.06 (.77)
Brand Implementation	1.36 (.00)	3.00 (.48)	3.40 (.31)	3.89 (.33)
Tools	2.33 (.00)	3.00 (.94)	3.14 (.81)	4.00 (1.17)
Processes	1.00 (.00)	3.04 (.80)	3.71 (.40)	4.33 (.20)
Policies	1.00 (.00)	2.96 (.78)	3.29 (.70)	3.38 (.38)
Brand Evaluation	1.25 (.00)	2.75 (.49)	3.48 (.46)	4.06 (.63
Protection	2.00 (.00)	3.25 (.94)	3.82 (.54)	4.08 (.80)
Research	1.00 (.00)	2.58 (.50)	3.67 (.49)	4.06 (.84)

Note: Scores are based on a five-point Likert scale (1= totally not applicable, 5 = totally applicable)

Note*: The levels of brand management differ significant from each other on each (main and sub) construct of brand management at the 0.05 level (1-tailed)

3.4.2. ROLE OF INTERNAL ORGANISATION

In the most ideal situation, organisations first implement and coordinate the internal

organisation of their brand. For the reason that internal organisation is seen as the construct which keeps the other constructs of brand management going. Therefore, further analyses, using the Mann-Whitney U test, were performed to identify the role of a well organised internal brand organisation on the rest of the brand management building blocks (see table 4).

Organisations where one of the board members has the brand formally in his/her portfolio and acts accordingly, have their brand strategy, brand development, brand implementation and brand evaluation more developed compared to organisations where board members do not act according to the brand.

When the board plays an active role in communicating the brand (both internal and external), organisations enjoy a more developed brand strategy, brand development, brand implementation and brand evaluation.

Establishing a brand management department has a positive influence on the formulation of the brand strategy, brand development, implementation and evaluation of the brand. Assigning a brand manager with the final responsibility has a positive influence on the brand implementation and brand evaluation.

In addition, placing the brand manager directly under the board and he/she uses this position leads to a better developed brand strategy, brand development and brand implementation compared to organisations

Table 4

The role of internal organisation with regards to the other main brand management constructs

	Brand Strategy		Brand Development		Brand Implementation		Brand Evaluation	
	Under Performing	Well Performing	Under Performing	Well Performing	Under Performing	Well Performing	Under Performing	Well Performing
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
A member of the management team officially has the brand in their portfolio and acts accordingly.	3.18 (.99)*	3.97 (.56)*	3.14 (.89)*	3.65 (.63)*	3.01 (.67)*	3.55 (.47)*	3.04 (.73)*	3.56 (.76)*
There is a brand management department which is responsible – and assumes responsibility – for the brand.	2.71 (1.00)*	3.89(.63)*	2.86 (.62)*	3.60 (.74)*	2.69 (.89)*	3.50 (.42)*	2.63 (.93)*	3.53 (.65)*
There is a brand manager who has and assumes official final responsibility for the brand.	3.11 (1.05)	3.87 (.66)	3.14 (.56)	3.57 (.81)	2.95 (.76)*	3.49 (.49)*	2.89 (.84)*	3.53 (.70)*
The brand manager reports officially and directly to the management team, and utilises this position.	2.88 (.83)*	4.01 (.57)*	2.98 (.82)*	3.66 (.66)*	2.87 (.70)*	3.54 (.45)*	3.17 (.93)	3.45 (.72)
The brand manager has the authority to manage relevant departments in respect of the brand.	3.40 (.81)*	4.08 (.71)*	3.29 (.60)	3.70 (.93)	3.19 (.68)	3.58 (.40)	3.20 (.88)	3.61 (.55)
There is a member of staff who is responsible for familiarising employees with the brand, and actively assumes this role.	3.47 (.87)	4.01 (.67)	3.20 (.72)*	3.90 (.65)*	3.19 (.67)	3.61 (.38)	3.26 (.84)	3.54 (.67)
The management team considers the brand an inextricable part of its operations.	3.05 (.77)*	4.10 (.56)*	3.05 (.66)*	3.74 (.72)*	3.10 (.70)	3.52 (.48)	3.07(.88)	3.57 (.65)
The management team fulfils an active role in promoting the brand both internally and externally.	3.27 (.72)*	4.26 (.61)*	3.16 (.63)*	3.89 (.76)*	3.14 (.60)*	3.65 (.49)*	3.10 (.75)*	3.75 (.68)*
The brand is considered one of the organisation's most valuable assets.	3.11 (.89)*	3.96 (.65)*	3.32 (.53)	3.53 (.86)	3.17 (.75)	3.43 (.52)	2.94 (.97)*	3.58 (.58)*
There is a belief that active, effective brand management is vital to the organisation's success.	3.26 (.86)*	3.96 (.70)*	3.38 (.54)	3.51 (.90)	3.13 (.70)	3.49 (.50)	3.15 (.83)	3.52 (.73)
The brand is used to ensure optimum integration of the marketing communications	3.23 (1.00)*	3.93 (.60)*	3.11 (.83)*	3.66 (.67)*	3.10 (.80)	3.49 (.42)	3.16 (1.08)	3.49 (.53)
The brand is the strategic starting point for every part of the organisation and its activities.	3.49 (.73)*	4.75 (.50)*	3.30 (.68)*	4.40 (.54)*	3.31 (.62)	3.57 (.54)	3.33 (.76)	3.56 (.95)
The brand is used as a starting point for recruitment and selection of new personnel.	3.23 (1.00)*	3.93 (.60)*	3.11 (.83)*	3.66 (.67)*	3.10 (.80)	3.49 (.42)	3.16 (1.08)	3.49 (.53)
The brand is used as a tool for staff appraisals.	3.53 (.82)*	4.17 (.72)*	3.28 (.73)*	4.10 (.52)*	3.23 (.62)*	3.74 (.33)*	3.21(.75)*	3.92 (.66)*

Note: Scores are based on a five-point Likert scale (1= totally not applicable, 5 = totally applicable)

Note*: Difference between groups is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed)

that don't. Providing the brand manager with the authority to steer brand related topics among relevant departments leads to a better brand strategy.

Looking at the brand as an inextricable part of the organisational operations results in a better brand strategy and development of brand building blocks. In addition, using the brand as a starting point for all activities and parts of the organisation and to ensure optimum integration of the marketing communications has a positive influence on the brand strategy and brand development.

A management team that has an active role in promoting the brand both internally and externally has a positive influence on all the other main brand management constructs. In addition, using the brand as a tool for staff appraisals results in a more positive brand strategy, brand development, brand implementation and brand evaluation as well. However, using the brand merely as a starting point for recruitment and selection of employees only leads to a better brand strategy and brand development.

Finally, assigning a person responsible for reviving the brand amongst internal stakeholders has a positive influence on the development of guidelines regarding employee behaviour, trainings and internal branding programmes for employees (U = 35.00, z= -2.54, p = <.01).

3.4.3. CORRELATION BETWEEN BRAND MANAGEMENT CONSTRUCTS

The Pearson's correlations coefficients, see table 5, substantiated these findings. Strong positive correlations exist between internal organisation and brand strategy (r = .85), internal organisation (r = .70), between brand

development and brand implementation (r = .74) and between brand implementation and brand protection (r = .72). Further, moderate positive correlations exist between the rest of the brand management building blocks (.50 < r > .70). It can be concluded that the brand management building blocks are positively related to each other. However, this relation becomes weaker when the constructs are further away from each other in the brand management cycle.

The Pearson's correlations coefficients of the sub constructs were calculated as well (see table 5). There are low correlations between symbolism, tools, protection and the other sub constructs of brand management. In other words, symbolism, tools and protection of the brand are influenced less by the other constructs.

To summarise, organisations are recognizing the importance of brand management for their brand. They have shifted from viewing the brand as just the brand name, logo or symbol to viewing the brand as the guiding principle for organisational activities. Organisations have established a brand management department and assigned a brand manager who is responsible for the brand. In addition, boards of organisations are recognizing that the brand is one of the most valuable assets of an organisation. They consider the brand as an integral part of business operations.

However, they don't use the brand as a starting point for all parts and activities of their organisation. Organisations are capable of formulating a strong brand positioning and rendering it into guidelines and building blocks for symbolism (such as corporate visual identity) and (marketing)

Table 5

Correlation between the brand management constructs

	1	1a	1b	2	2a	2b	3	3a	3b	3c	4	4a	4b	4c	5	5a	5b
1. Internal Organisation	-			.85**			.68**				.70**				.59**		
1a Brand Organisation		-	.81**		.80**	.71**		.21	.62**	.68**		.21	.70**	.68**		.35*	.63**
1b Brand Orientation			-		.84**	.69**		.18	.61**	.78**		.07	.56**	.60**		.27	.59**
2. Brand Strategy				-			.64**				.64**				.59**		
2a Brand Positioning					-	.75**		.29	.63**	.65**		.12	.72**	.53**		.32	.62**
2b Brand Guidelines						-		.68**	.82**	.62**		.35*	.75**	.39*		.40*	.60**
3. Brand Development							-				.74**				.52**		
3a Symbolism								-	.70**	.29		.47**	.55**	.04		.27	.33*
3b Communication									-	.63**		.39*	.71**	.38*		.31	.56**
3c Behaviour										-		.27	.46**	.52**		.21	.47**
4. Brand Implementation											-				.72**		
4a Tools												-	.20	.00		.36*	.46**
4b Processes													-	.57**		.54**	.65**
4c Policies														-		.20	.44*
5. Brand Evaluation															-		
5a Protection																-	.68**
5b Research																	-

Note: *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed)

Note: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed)

communication. However, internal branding programmes and guidelines for employee behaviour are often overlooked and do not receive the attention they need. In other words, organisations are not rendering the brand through the entire organisation yet.

4. STUDY 2 – BRAND PROMISE DELIVERY

After mapping the brand management of organisations, data regarding their brand promise delivery has been collected. Using online questionnaires, administered in LimeSurvey, internal and external stakeholders were asked to evaluate the brand promise delivery of participating organisations.

4.1. RESEARCH SAMPLE

The research sample for measuring the brand promise delivery existed out of five organisations engaging internal stakeholders. The brand promise delivery among external stakeholders was measured for 11 organisations, see table 6 for the research sample.

Table 6
Research sample – Study 2

Industry	Type	Employees	N (internal)	N (external)
Banking	B2C&B2B	> 1000	-	159
Insurances	B2C	101 - 250	-	252
Insurances	B2C	251-500	44	312
Insurances	B2C	> 1000	-	310
Retail & Wholesale	B2C	251-500	-	162
Retail & Wholesale	B2C	> 1000	39	162
Retail & Wholesale	B2C	> 1000	-	162
Retail & Wholesale	B2C	> 1000	-	167
Services	B2C&B2B	> 1000	11	164
Services	B2C&B2B	51 - 100	46	305
Logistics	B2C&B2B	> 1000	235	323

4.2. MEASUREMENT

In order to map the brand promise delivery, questionnaires were developed for internal and external stakeholders. The questionnaires were similar to each other and only small differences were made. Respondents (both internal and external stakeholders) were asked to rate all items using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = totally not agree, 5 = totally agree or 1 = totally not delivered, 5 = totally delivered). The question regarding brand recommendation was on a scale from 1 to 10 (1 = totally would not recommend to 10 = totally would recommend). The complete questionnaires can be found in Appendix 2 and Appendix 3.

Brand promise delivery of each organisation (α=.84) was measured using three to five items, depending on the number of brand promises of the organisation (e.g. please indicate the extent which you feel 'brand' fulfils the following promises?).

Brand promise delivery in the four categories of brand touch points was measured (α=.87) using four items (e.g. please indicate the extent which you feel 'brand' fulfils the promises in each of the following channels?).

The brand promise attitude (α=.87) was measured using four items (e.g. I find this promise fits 'brand'). Brand recommendation of the stakeholders was measured using one single item, namely the Net Promoter Score question.

Brand promise support (α=.66) of internal stakeholders was measured using three items (e.g. I contribute to delivering the brand promise). While external stakeholders were

asked to indicate which factors influenced their brand image (e.g. my image of the brand was formed through personal experiences).

4.3. PROCEDURE

Organisations that indicated they would like to participate in the follow up study were send an e-mail containing the information and steps for study 2. In addition, the e-mail contained the link to the online questionnaire for internal stakeholders. Organisations were asked to distribute the link to at least 20 – 50 employees. Organisations which wanted to receive more information before deciding to participate, received an e-mail with information about the steps necessary for the follow-up study.

External stakeholders were approached for participation via an online panel. The introduction, stating general information about the questionnaire, was followed by the questions (see Appendix 2 and Appendix 3). Only external stakeholders who knew the brand participated in the study. Each respondent was asked to rate a maximum of six brands, depending on how many brands in the questionnaire the external respondent knew. The brands were distributed over three separate questionnaires.

4.4. RESULTS – INTERNAL BRAND PROMISE DELIVERY

The internal brand promise delivery has been mapped for five organisations. First, an overall description of the internal brand promise delivery will be provided. Second, analyses, using an independent T-test, were performed to find out whether there are any differences between internal stakeholders who are also customers of their brand and who are not. Finally, analyses researching the correlation between constructs of internal brand promise delivery were performed.

4.4.1. OVERALL DESCRIPTION

Overall, internal stakeholders feel that their brand is moderately delivering their promise (M = 3.67, SD = .49). Internal stakeholders who are customers of their brand evaluate the brand promise delivery more positive (t(369)= 2.33, p = .01) than employees who have not bought a product/service of their brand in the past year (see table 7).

Table 7

Mean scores on internal brand promise delivery constructs

	Customers	Non-customers	Overall
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
Brand Promise Delivery	3.72 (.63)*	3.49 (.65)*	3.75 (.53)
Brand Promise Delivery in Brand Touch Points	3.69 (.57)*	3.45 (.66)*	3.68 (.54)
Product/Services	3.72 (.76)*	3.48 (.82)*	3.61 (.77)
Behaviour of employees	3.72 (.86)*	3.55 (.82)*	3.72 (.78)
Communication	3.65 (.81)*	3.35 (.83)*	3.75 (.70)
Environments	3.67 (.79)*	3.40 (.85)*	3.63 (.78)
Brand Promise Attitude	3.91 (.61)*	3.51 (.62)*	3.99 (.59)
Brand Recommendation	8.36 (1.40)*	7.47 (1.66)*	8.49 (1.21)
Brand Promise Support	4.18 (.51)*	4.00 (.55)*	4.19 (.52)

Note: Scores are based on a five-point Likert scale (1= totally not applicable, 5 = totally applicable); brand recommendation scores are based on a scale of 1 to 10 (1= highly unlikely, 10 = highly likely)

Note*: Differences between groups is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed)

The brand promise is delivered best through the brand touch point category communication (M = 3.75, SD = .70), followed by behaviour of employees (M = 3.72, SD = .78). Internal stakeholders who have bought a product/services from their brand in the past year perceive the brand touch point categories to better deliver the brand promise delivery than internal stakeholders who haven't.

Internal stakeholders have overall a positive attitude towards the brand promise of their organisation (M = 3.81, SD = 0.61).

They find the brand promise credible and relevant, however they find the brand promises less distinctive from other providers. Moreover, internal stakeholders who have purchased a product/service from their brand in the past year, have a more positive brand promise attitude and would recommend the brand sooner to their friends and family compared to internal stakeholders who haven't purchased a product or service.

Internal stakeholders with a more positive brand promise attitude are also more supportive of the brand promise delivery (t(372)= 6.89, p = <.01). In addition, internal stakeholders with a more positive brand promise attitude, would recommend the brand sooner to friends and family (t(372)= 9.33, p = <.01).

Internal stakeholders find it important that the brand promise is delivered by the organisation (M = 4.42, SD = .71). It is remarkable that internal stakeholders feel that they themselves (M = 4.15, SD = .66) are contributing more to the delivery of brand promise than their colleagues do (M = 3,93, SD = .68).

A more detailed look, using an independent sample T-test, also revealed that when internal stakeholders find it important that the brand promise of their brand is delivered, they are more positive about the brand promise delivery (t(372)= 5.63, p = <.01), the brand promise delivery in the brand touch point categories (t(372)= 4.85, p = <.01), brand promise attitude (t(372)= 5.39, p = <.01) and brand recommendation (t(372)= 11.97, p = <.01).

Internal stakeholders who find it important that the brand promise is delivered also feel that they are contributing more to the brand promise delivery (t(372)= 5.96, p = <.01) compared to internal stakeholders who find it less important. In addition, these internal stakeholders are also more positive about the support of their colleagues about the brand promise delivery (t(372)= 4.43, p = <.01).

4.4.2. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN CONSTRUCTS

The Pearson's correlations coefficients (see table 8) indicate whether correlations exist between the constructs of brand promise delivery. The table reveals mainly low correlations (.30 < r > .50). Moderate correlations exist between brand promise delivery and brand promise delivery in the brand touch point categories (r =.67). In other words, the positive influence of the constructs on each other is low. Except for the relation between brand promise delivery and brand promise delivery in the brand touch point categories, they have a moderate positively influence on each other.

Table 8
Correlation between constructs of internal brand promise delivery

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Brand Promise Delivery	-	.67*	.49*	.32*	.42*
2. Brand Promise Delivery in Brand Touch Points	-	-	.43*	.37*	.44*
3. Brand Promise Attitude	-	-	-	.33*	.46*
4. Brand Promise Support	-	-	-	-	.31*
5. Brand Recommendation	-	-	-	-	-

Note*: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed)

4.5. RESULTS – EXTERNAL BRAND PROMISE DELIVERY

The external brand promise delivery has been mapped for 11 organisations. First, an overall description of the external brand promise delivery will be provided. Followed by analyses researching the differences

between external stakeholders who have bought a product/service of the brands in the past years and external stakeholders that haven't. Finally, analyses researching the correlation between constructs of external brand promise delivery were performed.

4.5.1. OVERALL DESCRIPTION

Overall, external stakeholders feel that brands are moderately delivering their brand promise (M = 3.49, SD = .71) (see table 9). However, they perceive the brands as living less up to their promise(s) than internal stakeholders do (U = 427046.50, z = -5.26, p = <.01).

Table 9
Mean scores on external brand promise delivery constructs

	Customers	Non-customers	Overall
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
Brand Promise Delivery	3.69 (.72)*	3.29 (.64)*	3.49 (.71)
Brand Promise Delivery in Brand Touch Points	3.65 (.68)*	3.28 (.61)*	3.47 (.67)
Product/Services	3.75 (.78)*	3.31 (.72)*	3.53 (.78)
Behaviour of employees	3.59 (.82)*	3.26 (.70)*	3.43 (.78)
Communication	3.66 (.79)*	3.29 (.89)*	3.48 (.76)
Environments	3.61 (.78)*	3.24 (.70)*	3.42 (.77)
Brand Promise Attitude	3.62 (.72)*	3.20 (.63)*	3.41 (.71)
Brand Recommendation	7.54 (1.67)*	6.09 (1.70)*	6.23 (2.26)

Note: Scores are based on a five-point Likert scale (1= totally not applicable, 5 = totally applicable); brand recommendation scores are based on a scale of 1 to 10 (1= highly unlikely, 10 = highly likely)
Note*: Differences between groups is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed)

According to external stakeholders, brands deliver their promise the best via their product/services (M = 3.58, SD = .78) followed by their communication (M = 3.48, SD = .76). The brand promise is least proven in the environments of the brands (M = 3.42, SD = .7).

External stakeholders don't find the brand promise(s) as relevant, credible and distinctive from competitors as internal stakeholders do (U = 344043.00, z= -11.40, p = <.01). In addition, they have a lower level of brand recommendation than internal

stakeholders (U = 284832.00, z= -15.06, p = <.01).

Analyses have been performed to research the differences between external stakeholders who are customers of the brand and between those who are not. The Wilcoxon rank sum test has been administered for the reason that the Levene's test indicated that equal variances cannot be assumed (see table 9).

When external stakeholders have bought a product/service from the brand in the past year, they are more positive about the brand promise delivery, the promises being delivered in brand touch point categories, have a more positive attitude towards the brand promise and would recommend the brand sooner to friends and family.

When looking at the factors which influenced the brand image, it can be stated that most external stakeholders base their brand image upon personal experiences with the brand, followed by what the media says, what others say and communication of the brand. External stakeholders are most positive about the brand promise delivery brand promise delivery in brand touch point categories, have a more positive attitude towards the brand promise and would recommend the brand sooner if they had a personal experience with the brand (see table 10).

When external stakeholders base the brand image upon the media, they are the least positive about the brand promise delivery, brand promise delivery in the brand touch point categories, brand promise attitude and brand recommendation. It is remarkable that external stakeholders are more positive about the brand promise

Table 10

Differences between external brand promise delivery constructs and factors of brand image influence

	Personal Experiences	Communication	What others say	Media
	N = 1471 (51%)	N = 895 (31%)	N = 741 (26%)	N = 713 (25%)
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
Brand Promise Delivery	3.64 (.76)	3.57 (.70)	3.50 (.70)	3.44 (.65)
Brand Promise Delivery in Brand Touch Points	3.60 (.72)	3.56 (.64)	3.48 (.65)	3.43 (.62)
Brand Promise Attitude	3.55 (.76)	3.50 (.69)	3.44 (.70)	3.38 (.67)
Brand Recommendation	7.26 (1.85)	7.10 (1.66)	6.80 (1.74)	6.67 (1.77)

Note: Scores are based on a five-point Likert scale (1= totally not applicable, 5 = totally applicable); brand recommendation scores are based on a scale of 1 to 10 (1= highly unlikely, 10 = highly likely)

delivery, brand promise delivery in the brand touch point categories, have a better brand promise attitude and would recommend the brand sooner when they base their brand image upon the communications of the brand than what other people say.

When external stakeholders know what the brand promises to consumers, they are more positive about the brand promise delivery (t(2421) = 24.77, p = <.01), brand promise delivery in the brand touch point categories (t(2477) = 27.91, p = <.01), have a better brand promise attitude (t(2477) = 49.07, p = <.01) and would recommend the brand sooner (t(2477) = 22.59, p = <.01).

Analyses also revealed that when a brand has three brand promises, they enjoy more positive responses of external stakeholders on the brand promise delivery (F(2,2420) = 27.78, p = <.01), the brand promise delivery in the brand touch point categories (F(2,2476) = 6.81, p = <.01) and they have a better brand promise attitude F(2,2476) = 15.46, p = <.01) than when they have four or five brand promises.

4.5.2. CORRELATION BETWEEN CONSTRUCTS

The Pearson's correlations coefficients, table 13, indicate mainly moderate to strong coherency (.53 < r > .96) between brand promise constructs. These correlations emphasize and substantiate the importance of externally delivering the brand promise. Delivering the brand promise correlates strongly with brand promise attitude (r = .74) and moderately with brand recommendation (r =.54). In other words, brand promise delivery, brand promise attitude and brand recommendation of external stakeholders have a positive influence on each other (see table 11).

Table 11

Correlation between constructs of external brand promise delivery

	1	2	3	4
1. Brand Promise Delivery	-	.82*	.74*	.54*
2. Brand Promise Delivery in Brand Touch Points	-	-	.73*	.53*
3. Brand Promise Attitude	-	-	-	.56*
4. Brand Recommendation	-	-	-	-

Note*: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed)

5. STUDY 1 AND STUDY 2 COMBINED

The aim of this study was to identify the relationship between brand management and brand promise delivery. In order to so, the results of study 1 and 2 were combined and analyses were performed among the constructs of brand management and brand promise delivery.

First, analyses were performed regarding the relationship of each construct of brand management and the constructs of brand promise delivery. Followed by an ANOVA analysing the differences between the levels of brand management defined in study 1 and the brand promise delivery.

5.1. INFLUENCE OF EACH CONSTRUCT

There is a positive relation between internal organisation and the internal brand promise

delivery constructs. The relation between the sub constructs of internal organisation (brand organisation and brand orientation) and the internal brand promise delivery is positive as well (see table 12).

There is a positive relation between brand strategy and internal brand promise delivery, brand promise attitude and brand recommendation of internal stakeholders. The positive relation between brand strategy and brand promise delivery in the brand touch point categories and brand strategy and brand promise support was not significant. This could be explained by the non-significant influence of the sub construct brand guidelines on the brand promise delivery in the brand touch point categories, brand promise attitude and brand promise support of internal stakeholders.

There is a positive relation between brand development and internal brand promise delivery, except for the brand promise support construct. When looking at the sub constructs (symbolism, communication and behaviour), this could be explained by the non-significant influence of communication and behaviour on brand promise support of internal stakeholders. There is a no significant relation between communication and brand promise delivery in the brand touch point categories and between behaviour and brand promise delivery in the brand touch point categories as well.

Brand implementation is positively related to all the internal brand promise delivery constructs. It is notable that the influence of tools is negative on all the internal brand promise delivery constructs. In other words, the positive influence of processes and policies is greater than the negative influence of tools on all the internal brand promise delivery constructs.

Finally, there is no significant relation

Table 12

Effects of brand management on internal brand promise delivery constructs

	Brand Promise Delivery		Brand Promise Delivery in Brand Touch Points		Brand Promise Attitude		Brand Promise Support		Brand Recommendation	
	Under performing	Well performing	Under performing	Well performing	Under performing	Well performing	Under performing	Well performing	Under performing	Well performing
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
Internal Organsation	3.53 (.67)*	3.97 (.44)*	3.50 (.60)*	3.91 (.50)*	3.67 (.64)*	4.16 (.48)*	4.10 (.54)*	4.24 (.47)*	7.83 (1.53)*	8.88 (1.19)*
Brand Organisation	3.57 (.65)*	4.01 (.46)*	3,53 (.59)*	3.98 (.50)*	3.73 (.65)*	4.14 (.46)*	4.10 (.54)*	4.27 (.44)*	7.94 (1.55)*	8.93 (1.03)*
Brand Orientation	3.64 (.66)*	3.88 (.39)*	3.62 (.61)	3.74 (.47)	3.78 (.63)*	4.19 (.53)*	4.14 (.53)	4.15 (.53)	8.09 (1.50)*	8.74 (1.50)*
Brand Strategy	3.64 (.66)*	3.88 (.39)*	3.62 (.61)	3.74 (.47)	3.78 (.63)*	4.19 (.53)*	4.14 (.53)	4.15 (.53)	8.09 (1.50)*	8.74 (1.50)*
Brand Positioning	3.50 (.69)*	3.90 (.49)*	3.50 (.60)*	3.81 (.56)*	3.67 (.62)*	4.03 (.58)*	4.10 (.55)*	4.20 (.49)*	7.80 (1.58)*	8.66 (1.24)*
Brand Guidelines	3.64 (.66)*	3.88 (.39)*	3.62 (.61)	3.74 (.47)	3.78 (.63)	4.19 (.53)	4.14 (.53)	4.15 (.53)	8.09 (1.50)*	8.74 (1.50)*
Brand Development	3.64 (.66)*	3.88 (.39)*	3.62 (.61)*	3.74 (.47)*	3.78 (.63)*	4.19 (.53)*	4.14 (.53)	4.15 (.53)	8.09 (1.55)*	8.38 (1.34)*
Symbolism	4.01 (.46)*	3.57 (.65)*	3.98 (.50)*	3.53 (.59)*	4.14 (.46)*	3.73 (.65)*	4.27 (.44)*	4.10 (.54)*	8.93 (1.03)*	7.94 (1.55)*
Communication	3.65 (.67)*	3.80 (.40)*	3.62 (.62)	3.67 (.48)	3.78 (.64)*	4.08 (.55)*	4.13 (53)	4.19 (.51)	8.08 (1.51)*	8.68 (1.39)*
Behaviour	3.64 (.66)*	3.88 (.39)*	3.62 (.61)	3.74 (.47)	3.78 (.63)*	4.19 (.53)*	4.14 (.53)	4.15 (.53)	8.09 (1.50)*	8.74 (1.50)*
Brand Implementation	3.56 (.68)*	3.87 (.51)*	3.54 (.60)*	3.79 (.58)*	3.74 (.64)*	3.97 (.69)*	4.10 (.55)*	4.22 (.47)*	7.91 (1.62)*	8.63 (1.14)*
Tools	3.90 (.49)*	3.50 (.69)*	3.81 (.56)*	3.51 (.60)*	4.03 (.58)	3.67 (.62)	4.20 (.49)	4.10 (.55)	8.66 (1.24)*	7.80 (1.58)*
Processes	3.53 (.67)*	3.97 (.44)*	3.50 (.60)*	3.91 (.50)*	3.67 (.64)*	4.16 (.48)*	4.10 (.54)*	4.23 (.47)*	7.83 (1.53)*	8.88 (1.19)*
Policies	3.56 (.68)*	3.87 (.51)*	3.54 (.59)*	3.82 (.58)*	3.74 (.64)*	3.99 (.59)*	4.11 (.55)*	4.21 (.47)*	7.93 (1.60)*	8.64 (1.16)*
Brand Evaluation	3.66 (.65)	3.67 (.55)	3.64 (.60)	3.50 (.60)	3.84 (.62)	3.68 (.70)	4.15 (.53)	4.08 (.52)	8.17 (1.54)	8.05 (1.20)
Protection	3.65 (.67)*	3.80 (.40)*	3.62 (.62)	3.67 (.48)	3.78 (.64)*	4.08 (.55)*	4.13 (53)	4.19 (.51)	8.08 (1.51)*	8.68 (1.39)*
Research	3.66 (.65)	3.67 (.55)	3.64 (.60)	3.50 (.60)	3.84 (.62)	3.68 (.70)	4.15 (.53)	4.08 (.52)	8.17 (1.54)	8.05 (1.20)

Note: scores are based on a five-point Likert scale (1= totally not applicable, 5 = totally applicable); brand recommendation scores are based on a scale of 1 to 10 (1= highly unlikely, 10 = highly likely)

Note*: Difference is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed)

between brand evaluation and the internal brand promise delivery constructs. When looking at the sub constructs, protection has a positive influence on the brand promise delivery. However, research has a negative influence on almost all the internal brand promise delivery. This could explain the non-significant relation between brand evaluation and the internal brand promise delivery constructs.

After analysing the relationship between brand management and the internal brand promise delivery, the influence of brand management on the external brand promise delivery was analysed (see table 13).

There is a positive relation between internal organisation and external brand promise delivery. In other words, brand organisation and brand orientation are positively related to all the external brand promise delivery constructs.

There is a positive relation between brand strategy and external brand promise delivery and between brand strategy and brand promise attitude of external stakeholders. The positive relation between brand strategy and brand promise delivery in the brand touch point categories and negative relation between brand strategy and brand recommendation was not significant. When looking at the sub constructs, brand positioning is positively related with all the external brand promise delivery constructs. However, brand guidelines are solely positively related with external brand promise delivery and brand promise attitude. The positive relation between brand guidelines and external brand promise delivery in the brand touch point categories and the negative relation between brand guidelines and brand recommendation of external stakeholders was not significant.

Table 13

Effects of brand management on external brand promise delivery constructs

	Brand Promise Delivery		Brand Promise Delivery in Brand Touch Points		Brand Promise Attitude		Brand Recommendation	
	Under performing	Well performing	Under performing	Well performing	Under performing	Well performing	Under performing	Well performing
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
Internal Organsation	3.43 (.72)*	3.57 (.70)*	3.41 (.69)*	3.54 (.64)*	3.32 (.71)*	3.54 (.68)*	6.73 (1.82)*	6.95 (1.85)*
Brand Organisation	3.43 (.68)*	3.51 (.72)*	3.40 (.67)*	3.48 (.68)*	3.29 (.73)*	3.46 (.69)*	6.67 (1.85)*	6.87 (1.82)*
Brand Orientation	3.48 (.72)*	3.58 (.69)*	3.45 (.67)*	3.57 (.66)*	3.37 (.70)*	3.69 (.64)*	6.78 (1.80)*	7.09 (2.02)*
Brand Strategy	3.46 (.73)*	3.54 (.67)*	3.46 (.68)	3.47 (.65)	3.40 (.70)*	3.46 (.72)*	6.84 (1.83)	6.78 (1.85)
Brand Positioning	3.46 (.77)*	3.51 (.69)*	3.41 (.74)*	3.48 (.65)*	3.31 (.73)*	3.45 (.69)*	6.87 (1.81)	6.80 (1.84)
Brand Guidelines	3.48 (.73)*	3.54 (.67)*	3.46 (.68)	3.47 (.65)	3.40 (.70)*	3.46 (.72)*	6.84 (1.83)	6.78 (1.85)
Brand Development	3.49 (.72)	3.52 (.69)	3.44 (.66)	3.47 (.67)	3.41 (.70)	3.44 (.72)	6.88 (1.80)*	6.58 (1.94)*
Symbolism	3.44 (.70)*	3.65 (.74)*	3.63 (.65)*	3.41 (.67)*	3.62 (.68)*	3.34 (.70)*	7.28 (1.81)*	6.66 (1.81)*
Communication	3.51 (.71)*	3.44 (.73)*	3.49 (.67)*	3.40 (.68)*	3.42 (.70	3.38 (.72)	6.87 (1.80)*	6.68 (1.92)*
Behaviour	3.48 (.72)*	3.58 (.69)*	3.45 (.67)	3.58 (.66)	3.37 (.71)	3.39 (.64)	6.78 (1.80)*	7.09 (2.02)*
Brand Implementation	3.51 (.72)*	3.38 (.68)*	3.48 (.67)*	3.36 (.66)*	3.44 (.70)*	3.25 (.71)*	6.87 (1.82)*	6.49 (1.90)*
Tools	3.53 (.69)*	3.43 (.74)*	3.51 (.64)*	3.40 (.72)*	3.49 (.68)*	3.29 (.73)*	6.87 (1.82)	6.75 (1.84)
Processes	3.42 (.73)*	3.56 (.69)*	3.43 (.71)*	3.50 (.64)*	3.34 (.71)*	3.47 (.70)*	6.81 (1.87)	6.83 (1.81)
Policies	3.50 (.71)*	3.36 (.70)*	3.46 (.67)	3.55 (.69)	3.40 (.71)	3.57 (.65)	6,78 (1.81)*	7.40 (1.99)*
Brand Evaluation	3.51 (.72)*	3.38 (.68)*	3.48 (.67)*	3.36 (.66)*	3.44 (.70)*	3.25 (.71)*	6.87 (1.82)*	6.49 (1.90)*
Protection	3.51 (.72)*	3.46 (.70)*	3.50 (.68)*	3.42 (.66)*	3.43 (.70)	3.40 (.71)	6.84 (1.86)	6.80 (1.79)
Research	3.52 (.71)*	3.44 (.71)*	3.49 (.68)*	3.42 (.66)*	3.44 (.70)*	3.35 (.71)*	6.90 (1.82)*	6.65 (1.84)*

Note: scores are based on a five-point Likert scale (1= totally not applicable, 5 = totally applicable); brand recommendation scores are based on a scale of 1 to 10 (1= highly unlikely, 10 = highly likely)

Note*: Difference is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed)

Brand development is negatively related with brand recommendation. The relation between brand development and the other external brand promise delivery constructs was not significant. This could be explained by the changing influences of the sub constructs of brand development. There is a negative relation between symbolism and the external brand promise delivery constructs. In addition, there is a negative relation between communication and the external brand promise delivery constructs. However, behaviour is positively related to the external brand promise delivery constructs. The variating influences of the sub constructs could have caused the non-significant influence of brand development on the external brand promise delivery constructs.

There is a negative relation between brand implementation and all the external brand promise delivery constructs. When looking at the sub constructs of brand implementation, tools is negatively related to the external brand promise delivery constructs. However, processes is positively related to external brand promise delivery. The influence of policies on brand promise delivery is not significant, except for the negative influence on external brand promise delivery and positive influence on brand recommendation.

Finally, there is a negative relation between brand evaluation and the external brand promise delivery constructs. Both protection and research have a negative influence on the external brand promise delivery. The negative influence of protection on brand promise attitude and brand recommendation was not significant.

5.2. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LEVELS OF BRAND MANAGEMENT

Due to the fact that the number of organisations in study 2 was smaller than the number of organisations in study 1, the participating organisations fell in the following three levels of brand management: beginners, advanced and experts (see table 14).

Table 14

Level of brand management in research sample of study 2

	Beginners* N = 2 M (SD)	Advanced* N = 8 M (SD)	Experts* N = 1 M (SD)
Internal Organsation	3.26 (.13)	3.86 (.34)	4.29 (.00)
Brand Organisation	3.84 (.24)	4.19 (.33)	4.17 (.00)
Brand Orientation	2.84 (.06)	3.61 (.41)	4.38 (.00)
Brand Strategy	3.37 (.05)	3.86 (.24)	5.00 (.00)
Brand Positioning	3.40 (.28)	4.17 (.32)	5.00 (.00)
Brand Guidelines	3.34 (.24)	3.46 (.48)	5.00 (.00)
Brand Development	3.46 (.09)	3.51 (.34)	4.60 (.00)
Symbolism	4.11 (.16)	4.11 (.87)	5.00 (.00)
Communication	3.41 (.24)	3.63 (.32)	4.75 (.00)
Behaviour	2.89 (.15)	2.76 (89)	4.00 (.00)
Brand Implementation	3.27 (.00)	3.58 (.32)	3.36 (.00)
Tools	4.22 (.16)	3.03 (.77)	2.00 (.00)
Processes	3.17 (.12)	3.97 (.34)	4.50 (.00)
Policies	2.66 (.24)	3.61 (.55)	3.25 (.00)
Brand Evaluation	2.45 (.65)	3.59 (.37)	3.25 (.00)
Protection	2.99 (.71)	3.63 (.43)	4.00 (.00)
Research	2.27 (.63)	3.66 (.49)	3.00(.00)

Note: Scores are based on a five-point Likert scale (1= totally not applicable, 5 = totally applicable)

Note*: The levels of brand management differ significant from each other on each (main and sub) construct of brand management at 0.05 level (1-tailed)

First, the differences between the levels of brand management and their internal brand promise delivery will be discussed. Followed by the differences between the levels of brand management and their external brand promise delivery. The ANOVA was performed using the levels of brand management as independent variable, and the brand promise delivery constructs as dependent variable.

An ANOVA was performed to identify differences between the levels of brand management and their results on the brand promise delivery constructs. The ANOVA revealed that experts deliver their brand promise the best $(F(2,416) = 18.37, p = <.01)$, followed by advanced and then by beginners. The difference between the experts and beginners was significant $(p = <.01)$, but the difference between the experts and advanced was not $(p = >.05)$.

Experts are better at delivering their brand promise through the brand touch point categories than beginners $(F(2, 416) = 11.02, p = <.01)$. But advanced were better at delivering their brand promise in the brand touch point categories than experts, however this difference was not significant $(p = >.05)$. Further analyses were performed among the different categories (products/services, behaviour, communication and environment) of brand touch points to identify where the difference between advanced and expert originates. The brand promise delivery through the behaviour of employees $(F(2, 416) = 302.23, p = <.01)$ was evaluated better by internal stakeholders of organisations with an advanced level of brand management than organisations with an expert level brand management.

The brand promise attitude of internal stakeholders is the best in organisations with an expert level of brand management $(F(2, 416) = 18.41, p = <.01)$, followed by advanced. Beginners have the least positive internal brand promise attitude. In organisations with an expert level of brand management internal stakeholders are very familiar with the brand promises, they find them fitting to the organisations and distinctive from competitors.

The brand promise support of internal stakeholders did not differ significantly between the various levels of brand management $(p = >.05)$. However, brand recommendation of internal stakeholders between the levels does differ $(F(2,416) = 19.49, p = <.01)$. The experts enjoy the best brand recommendation from internal stakeholders and beginners the least. The difference between the experts and beginners and the advanced and beginners was significant. However, the difference between the experts and the advanced was not significant.

Another ANOVA was performed to find out whether the external brand promise delivery differentiated among the levels of brand management. The results reveal that experts enjoy the highest level of external brand promise delivery $(F(2,2476) = 20.01, p = <.01)$, followed by beginners and then by advanced.

The same applies for brand promise delivery in the brand touch point categories. Expert have the highest level of overall brand promise delivery in the brand touch point categories $(F(2,2476) = 3.37, p = .02)$, followed by beginners and then by advanced. However, organisations with a beginners' level of brand management are better in delivering their promise through their products/services $(F(2,2476) = 243.29, p = <.01)$ than advanced level organisations. In addition, beginners are better at delivering the brand promise through the behaviour of employees $(F(2,2476) = 48.34, p = <.01)$ than advanced and experts are.

External stakeholders have the most positive brand promise attitude for organisations with an expert level of brand management ($F_{(2,2476)} = 28.09$, $p =$ <.01), followed by advanced and beginners. The brand recommendation of external stakeholders did not differ significantly between the levels of organisations ($F_{(2,2476)} = .15$, $p = .86$).

To conclude, experts in brand management enjoy more positive evaluations of their brand promise delivery, brand promise delivery in the brand touch point categories, brand promise attitude from internal and external stakeholders and their internal stakeholders will recommend the brand the soonest. The brand promise support of internal stakeholders did not differ between the levels of brand management. As well as the brand recommendation of external stakeholders did not differ between the levels of brand management.

6. DISCUSSION

The primary goal of this study was to identify the relationship between brand management and brand promise delivery. The current study revealed the level of brand management of organisations and how brand management influences brand promise delivery. First, the main findings of the two separate studies are discussed. Followed by the theoretical and practical implications of the studies. Limitations and recommendations for future research are made. Finally, in the conclusion the main research is answered upon.

6.1. MAIN FINDINGS

Study 1 revealed that the brand management of organisations could be categorized into four different levels. The following four levels of brand management were identified: sceptics, beginners, advanced and experts. Sceptics have the lowest level of brand management. They have not organised the internal organisation, brand strategy, brand development, brand implementation and brand evaluation in their organisation. They solely see the brand as a logo and therefore only focus on the development of guidelines for corporate visual identity.

The beginners have a higher level of brand management than sceptics but lower than advanced and experts. These organisations have organised the internal organisation of the brand, formulated a brand positioning and focus on correct brand implementation. However, defining brand guidelines and rendering the brand positioning into guidelines for communication and behaviour of employees is a bottleneck.

Advanced level organisations do not just see the brand as a logo or a name. They have set up the internal organisation, formulated a strong brand positioning and rendered it into brand guidelines. They have developed guidelines for symbolism and communications. In addition, they have implemented processes and policies to ensure brand touch points are in line with the brand positioning. Lastly, they protect and research their brand performance.

The expert level organisations have the highest score on each main and sub

construct. They don't just look at the brand as their logo or means of communication. They have rendered the brand throughout the entire organisation.

From study 2 it can be concluded that delivering a brand promise is easier said than done. Overall, brands are moderately delivering their brand promises. Internal stakeholders are more positive than external stakeholders about the brand promise delivery of organisations. However, this is most probably a bias as internal stakeholders have much more knowledge about the capabilities of their brand than external stakeholders do.

Stakeholders become more positive about the brand promise delivery when they are customers from the brand. In addition, organisations with three brand promises enjoy better brand promise delivery than organisations with four or five brand promises. This could be because with fewer brand promises there may be more focus on each brand promise.

The importance of brand promise delivery has been emphasized due to the fact that brand promise delivery has a positive relation with brand promise delivery in the brand touch point categories, brand promise attitude and brand recommendation of stakeholders (both internal and external).

When looking at the constructs separately, it can be stated that only internal organisation, brand strategy and brand development have a positive influence on brand promise delivery. The influence of brand implementation and brand evaluation appeared to be negative.

Combining the constructs led to the categorisation of various levels of brand

management. Organisations with an expert level of brand management are the best in delivering their brand promise, internally and externally. The same applies for the brand promise delivery in the brand touch points. In addition, experts enjoy the most positive brand promise attitude from internal and external stakeholders. Lastly, they enjoy the best brand recommendation of internal stakeholders.

6.2. THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

The findings of the studies provide both evidence and contradictions of existing scientific literature on the concept of brand management and brand promise delivery.

First, the current study showed that brand promise delivery is closely related to the brand promise attitude, brand recommendation and brand promise support of stakeholders. Brymer (2003) stated that "brands are based on trust and promises" (p.73) which already emphasized the importance of delivering the brand promises. In other words, the current study draws on the scientific literature (Blackett, 2003; Brymer, 2003; Keller, 2003; Punjaisri et al, 2008) emphasizing the importance of delivering the brand promise.

Second, formulating a brand positioning which is relevant, credible and distinctive revealed to be enhancing the internal and external brand promise delivery. This draws on the literature of Thompson (2003), who stated that organisations must take up a position in order to communicate their vision to stakeholders.

However, solely rendering the brand positioning into guidelines for symbolism is not enough. This study reveals that the

existing literature of Olins (2003) who stated that uniformity in the visual identity of organisations is needed to achieve consistency was not complete. Due to the fact that consistency needs to be achieved between the three concepts of symbolism, communication and behaviour. They must reinforce each other.

Additionally, there is a negative relation between symbolism and external brand promise delivery and between tools and external brand promise delivery. The differences between the levels of brand management and their brand promise delivery indicate that this could be explained by the fact that even beginners have developed guidelines for symbolism and implemented tools. Symbolism and the additional tools is probably the first thing on the agenda when thinking about brand management for organisations. The results reveal that solely developing guidelines for symbolism and implementing additional tools is not enough, the focus must be on the entire organisation.

This study provides evidence for the implementation of processes to ensure consistency in the brand touch points. However, the implementation of policies around customer services alone does not safeguard a better external brand promise delivery. This elaborates on the literature of Knox (2004), who stated that the implementation of processes and policies is needed to ensure that brand touch points are in line with the brand positioning. An explanation can be that even though organisations have defined guidelines for customer services in line with the brand positioning, they also need to monitor

whether the guidelines are lived by and implemented correctly.

Similar applies for the brand evaluation construct of brand management. Van Buren (1999) and Keller (2000) stated that organisations need to monitor their performance in order to manage the organisation and to pin point bottlenecks and points for improvement. The current study showed that monitoring the brand performance alone has a negative influence on the external brand promise delivery. This can be explained by the probability that even though organisations monitor their performance, they also need to develop and implement a plan of action to improve the bottlenecks. This is something the current study did not address and therefore was not measured.

Finally, the brand management cycle of Bolhuis (2015) has not been thoroughly used in scientific literature on the concept of brand management. Even though, certain brand management constructs had a negative influence on their own, the current study revealed that the combination of the constructs defined by Bolhuis (2015) enhanced the brand promise delivery. This research provides evidence for the model developed by Bolhuis (2015).

6.3. PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

Apart from the fact that this research contributes to the existing literature on the discipline of brand management and brand promise delivery, the results also provide implications for the management of organisations. This study provides insight into which aspects of brand management organisations must focus in order to improve

the delivery of the brand promise among internal and external stakeholders.

First, organisations must arrange their internal organisation. This begins with the board. The board needs to adopt a brand-oriented approach and view the brand as the most valuable asset of the organisation. In addition, organisations must establish a brand management department and assign a brand manager. The brand manager must be given the responsibility and authority to steer brand related topics in relevant departments.

Second, a relevant, distinctive and credible brand positioning must be formulated. This brand positioning needs to act as the basis for all the guidelines of the brand touch points.

Rendering the brand positioning into brand guidelines is not enough. In other words, organisations must not solely focus on their symbolism and additional tooling. Specific guidelines, attributes and brand buildings blocks for communications and behaviour of employees of the organisations need to be defined as well.

Finally, it is advised that organisations implement processes to ensure that guidelines developed are being followed. These processes must ensure that the brand touch points are line with brand positioning. In addition, organisations must reassure that these guidelines are being followed by their internal stakeholders.

To conclude, organisations need to stop viewing the brand as purely a logo or a name for the organisations. The brand must be rendered into the communications and behaviour of employees as well in order to enhance the brand promise delivery.

6.4. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Even though both studies were prepared, performed and processed with great care, some limitations are to be recognized when looking at the findings. These limitations must be taking into account for future research. In addition,

First, for the reason that the research sample in study 1 was to narrow, the results cannot be generalized. Therefore, the results of this study may not be applicable to other organisations. The objective of study 1 was to map the brand management of Dutch organisations in order to relate it the brand promise delivery. To validate the findings from study 1, further quantitative research with a larger research sample is needed.

Second, due to time restrictions the brand promise delivery of the brands was mapped using one measuring point. However, Punjaisri et al (2008) stated that not fulfilling the promise over time has an adverse effect on consumers' trust and commitment to the brand. Therefore, it is desired for future research, that study 2 is performed using multiple measurement points over time. When administering multiple measurement points, the level of consistency in the brand promise delivery can be mapped more accurately.

Third, the brand promise delivery in the brand touch point categories were measured using four items of which each item represented a brand touch point category. The brand promises of each organisations were combined for this question. For future research it is advised to measure the brand promise delivery in the brand touch point for each brand promise separately because then

more extreme results might be found between the promises. The same applies for the brand promise attitude. For future research it is advised to measure whether the promises are relevant, credible and distinctive for each promise separately.

Fourth, the distribution of the organisations between the levels of brand management was not equal. Most of the participating organisations fell in the brand management level of advanced. Having a larger and more equal distribution of the organisation between the levels could identify more and stronger effects of the brand management constructs on brand promise delivery. For future research it is therefore desired to receive the cooperation of organisations with larger differences between the levels of brand management.

Fifth, the number of respondents varied per organisation. It is desired that the number of respondents per organisation are equal in order to draw significant conclusions. For future research it is recommend to administer equal amounts of respondents per organisation.

Sixth, internal stakeholders of organisations were asked to evaluate and rate the brand promise delivery of their organisation. Results showed that the internal brand promise delivery was more positive than the external brand promise delivery. One must take into account that the responses of the internal stakeholders could be biased for the reason that they have way more knowledge of the brand's capabilities to deliver the brand promise than external stakeholders do.

Seventh, future research is necessary to research the relationship between brand management and brand touch points more closely. Especially because it is stated that all those countless moment of brand contact through the brand touch points have an impact on the brand promise delivery.

Finally, future research is necessary to research the influence of external factors on brand promise delivery. This study has focused on the internal factors influencing the brand promise delivery. However, it can be expected that there are many external factors influencing the brand promise delivery as well.

6.5.   CONCLUSION

The aim of the studies performed was to identify the relationship between brand management and brand promise delivery. This resulted in the following main research question: what is the relationship between brand management and brand promise delivery?

The results from the performed studies indicate that the influence of brand management vary between the brand management constructs. Internal organisation, brand strategy and brand development positively influence the internal and external brand promise delivery of organisations. However, brand implementation had a positive influence on the internal brand promise delivery and a negative influence on the external brand promise delivery. In addition, brand evaluation had no significant influence on internal brand promise delivery and a negative influence on the external brand promise delivery.

This present study showed, and as reflected in the internal and external brand

promise delivery of organisations, that the influence of combining the constructs of brand management is greater than the influence of each construct separately. In other words, experts in the field of brand management enjoy a better internal and external brand promise delivery than beginners in the field of brand management. When addressing the main research question of this study, it can be concluded that the brand management as a whole has a positive influence on the brand promise delivery of organisations. However, the relationship differs among the brand management and brand promise delivery constructs.

REFERENCES

Alwi, S., & Azwan Ismail, S. (2013). A framework to attain brand promise in an online setting. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, *31*(5), 557-578. DOI: 10.1108/MIP-04-2013-0063

Anker, T.B., Kappel, K., Eadie, D., & Sandøe, P. (2012). Fuzzy promises explicative definitions of brand promise delivery. *Marketing Theory*, *12*(3), 267-287. doi: 10.1177/1470593112451379

Balakrishnan, M.S., & Kerr, G. (2013). The 4D model of place brand management. In S. Sonnenburg & L. Baker (eds.), *Branded spaces* (pp. 31-42). Wiesbaden, Germany: Springer Fachmedien. doi: 10.1007/978-3-658-01561-9_2

Baumgarth, C. (2010). "Living the brand": brand orientation in the business-to-business sector. *European Journal of Marketing*, *44*(5), 653-671. doi: 10.1108/03090561011032315

Berry, L.L. (2000). Cultivating service brand equity. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 28*(1), 128-137. doi: 10.1177/0092070300281012

Berthon, P., Ewing, M. T., & Napoli, J. (2008). Brand management in small to medium-sized enterprises. *Journal of Small Business Management*, *46*(1), 27-45. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-627X.2007.00229.x.

Bitner, M.J. (1990). Evaluating service encounters: the effects of physical surroundings and employee responses. *The Journal of Marketing*, *54*(2). 69-82. doi: 10.2307/1251871

Bitner, M.J. (1992). Servicescapes: The impact of physical surroundings on customers and employees. *The Journal of Marketing*, 56(2) 57-71. doi: 10.2307/1252042

Blackett, T. (2003). What is a brand? In R. Clifton & J. Simmons (eds.), *Brands and branding* (pp. 13-25). London, UK: Profile Books Ltd.

Bolhuis, W. (2015, May). *Dicht de kloof tussen beloven en beleven* [Blog post]. Retrieved from http://www.nykampnyboer.com/nl/323-dicht-de-kloof-tussen-beloven-en-beleven

Brexendorf, T.O., & Kernstock, J. (2007). Corporate behaviour vs brand behaviour: Towards an integrated view? *The Journal of Brand Management*, *15*(1), 32-40.

Brymer, C. (2003). What makes brands great. In R. Clifton & J. Simmons (eds.),

Brands and branding (pp. 65-76). London, UK: Profile Books.

Burmann, C., Hegner, S., & Riley, N. (2009). Towards an identity-based branding. *Marketing Theory*, *9*(1), 113-118. doi: 10.1177/1470593108100065

Butler, J.K. (1991). Toward understanding and measuring conditions of trust: Evolution of a conditions of trust inventory. *Journal of Management*, *17*(3), 643-663. doi: 10.1177/014920639101700307

Butterfield, L. (2009). *Excellence in advertising*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Campbell, M.C. (2002). Building brand equity. *Journal of Medical Marketing*, *2*(3), 208-218.

Chapleo, C. (2004). Interpretation and implementation of reputation/brand management by UK university leaders. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, *5*(1), 7-23. doi: 10.1057/palgrave.ijea.2140201

Davis, S. (2002). Brand asset management: how businesses can profit from the power of brand. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *19*(4), 351-358. doi: 10.1108/07363760210433654

Davis, R., Buchanan-Oliver, M., & Brodie, R.J. (2000). Retail service branding in electronic-commerce environments. *Journal of Service Research*, *3*(2), 178-186. doi: 10.1177/109467050032006

De Chernatony, L. (2009). Towards the holy grail of defining 'brand'. *Marketing Theory*, *9*(1), 101-105. doi: 10.1177/1470593108100063

De Chernatony, L. (2010). *From brand vision to brand evaluation: the strategic process of growing and strengthening brands*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth Heinemann.

De Chernatony, L., & Segal-Horn, S. (2003). The criteria for successful services brands. *European Journal of Marketing*, *37*(7/8), 1095-1118. doi: 10.1108/03090560310477681

Delgado-Ballester, E., & Munuera-Alemán, J.L. (2001). Brand trust in the context of consumer loyalty. *European Journal of Marketing*, *35*(11/12), 1238-1258. doi: 10.1108/EUM0000000006475

Duncan, T., & Moriarty, S.E. (1998). A communication-based marketing model for managing relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, *62*(2), 1-13. doi: 10.2307/1252157

Freedman, J.L., & Fraser, S.C. (1966). Compliance without pressure: The foot-in-the-door technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *4*(2), 195. doi: 10.1037/h0023552

Giling, A. (2006). *Geïntegreerd merkbeleid: Het wiel van de toekomst*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Stichting Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek Commerciële Communicatie.

Ghodeswar, B.M. (2008). Building brand identity in competitive markets: a conceptual model. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, *17*(1), 4-12. doi: 10.1108/10610420810856468

Grace, D., & O'Cass, A. (2005). Examining the effects of service brand communications on brand evaluation. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, *14*(2), 106-116. doi: 10.1108/10610420510592581

Hankinson, G. (2012). The measurement of brand orientation, its performance impact and the role of leadership in the context of destination branding: An exploratory study. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *28*(7/8), 974-999. doi: 10.1080/0267257X.2011.565727

Harris, F., & De Chernatony, L. (2001). Corporate branding and corporate brand performance. *European Journal of Marketing*, *35*(3/4), 441-456. doi: 10.1108/03090560110382101

Helm, C., & Jones, R. (2010). Brand governance: The new agenda in brand management. *Journal of Brand Management*, *17*(8), 545-547.

Hoeffler, S., & Keller, K.L. (2003). The marketing advantages of strong brands. *The Journal of Brand Management*, *10*(6), 421-445. doi: 10.1057/palgrave.bm.2540139

Kapferer, J.N. (2008). *The new strategic brand management: Advanced insights and strategic thinking*. London, UK: Kogan Page publishers.

Kattara, H.S., Weheba, D., & El-Said, O.A. (2008). The impact of employee behaviour on customers' service quality perceptions and overall satisfaction. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, *8*(4), 309-323. doi: 10.1057/thr.2008.35

Keller, K.L. (2000). The brand report card. *Harvard Business Review*, *78*(1), 147-157.

Keller, K.L. (2003). *Strategic brand management: building, measuring and managing brand equity*. New Jersey, NJ: Pearson Education.

Knox, S. (2004). Positioning and branding your organisation. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, *13*(2), 105-115. doi: 10.1108/10610420410529735

Lau, G.T., & Lee, S.H. (1999). Consumers' trust in a brand and the link to brand loyalty. *Journal of Market-Focused Management*, *4*(4), 341-370. doi: 10.1023/A:1009886520142

M'zungu, S.D., Merrilees, B., & Miller, D. (2010). Brand management to protect brand equity: A conceptual model. *The Journal of Brand Management*, *17*(8), 605-617.

Meyers, D. (2003). Whose brand is it anyway? In N. Ind (ed.). (2003). *Beyond branding*. (pp.21-35). London, UK: Kogan Page Publishers.

Mooy, S.C., & Robben, H.S. (2002). Managing consumers' product evaluations through direct product experience. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, *11*(7), 432-446. doi: 10.1108/10610420210451625F

Muntinga, D. (2014). *Merkbeheer: Het merkmanagement van morgen.* Amsterdam, Netherlands: Stichting Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek Commerciële Communicatie.

Napier, S. (2004). *The future of branding* (Dissertation, Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, United States of America). Retrieved from: http://scholarworks.rit.edu/theses/7678

Napoli, J. (2006). The impact of non-profit brand orientation on organisational performance. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *22*(7-8), 673-694. doi:10.1362/026725706778612176

Nasr, M., Mahmoudzadeh, S., Mousavi, S., & Boostani, A. (2014). The role of management's tendency and personnel's motivation in fulfilment of brand promise. *Management Science Letters*, *4*(6), 1077-1084. doi:10.5267/j.msl.2014.5.025

Punjaisri, K., & Wilson, A. (2007). The role of internal branding in the delivery of employee brand promise. *The Journal of Brand Management*, *15*(1), 57-70.

Punjaisri, K., Wilson, A., & Evanschitzky, H. (2008). Exploring the influences of internal branding on employees' brand promise delivery: Implications for strengthening customer–brand relationships. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, *7*(4), 407-424. doi: 10.1080/15332660802508430

O'Cass, A., & Viet Ngo, L. (2007). Market orientation versus innovative culture: Two routes to superior brand performance. *European Journal of Marketing*, *41*(7/8), 868-887. doi: 10.1108/03090560710752438

Olins, W. (2003). *Wally Olins. On brands*. London, UK: Thames & Hudson.

Rodgers, J.L., & Jackson, M. W. (2012). Are we who we think we are: evaluating brand promise at a liberal-arts institution. *Innovative Higher Education*, *37*(2), 153-166. doi: 10.1007/s10755-011-9187-7

Roll, M. (2006). *Asian brand strategy: how Asia builds strong brands*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ryder, I. (2003). Anthropology and the brand. In N. Ind (ed.). (2003). *Beyond branding*. (pp.139-160). London: Kogan Page Publishers.

Schultz, D.E. (2001). Getting to the heart of the brand. *Marketing Management*, *10*(3), 8-9.

Schultz, M., & Hatch, M.J. (2003). The cycles of corporate branding: The case of the Lego company. California *Management Review*, *46*(1), 6-26. doi: 10.2307/41166229

Seifer, B. (2007). Brand strategy and retail environments. *Design Management Review*, *18*(2), 17-25. doi: 10.1111/j.1948-7169.2007.tb00079.x

Sirianni, N.J., Bitner, M.J., Brown, S.W., & Mandel, N. (2013). Branded service encounters: strategically aligning employee behaviour with the brand positioning. *Journal*

of Marketing, *77*(6), 108-123. doi: 10.1509/jm.11.0485

Smith, S. (2003). Brand experience. In R. Clifton & J. Simmons (eds.), *Brands and branding* (pp. 97-111). London, UK: Profile Books.

Thompson, A.B. (2003). Brand positioning and brand creation. In R. Clifton & J. Simmons (eds.), *Brands and branding* (pp. 79-95). London, UK: Profile Books.

Tilley, C. (1999). Built-in branding: how to engineer a leadership brand. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *15*(1-3), 181-191. doi: 10.1362/026725799784870405

Tosti, D.T., & Stotz, R.D. (2001). Brand: building your brand from the inside out. *Marketing Management*, *10*(2), 28-33.

Urde, M. (1999). Brand orientation: A mind-set for building brands into strategic resources. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *15*(1-3), 117-133. doi:10.1362/026725799784870504

Van Buren, M.E. (1999). A yardstick for knowledge management. *Training & Development*, *53*(5), 71-78.

Van den Bosch, A.L.M., De Jong, M.D.T., & Elving, W.J.L. (2005). How corporate visual identity supports reputation. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, *10*(2), 108-116. doi: 10.1108/13563280510596925

Vázquez, R., Del Rio, A.B., & Iglesias, V. (2002). Consumer-based brand equity: Development and validation of a measurement instrument. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *18*(1-2), 27-48. doi: 10.1362/0267257022775882

Voskuyl, I. (2009). *Merkoriëntatie als succesrecept.* Amsterdam, Netherlands: Stichting Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek Commerciële Communicatie.

Yoo, B., Donthu, N., & Lee, S. (2000). An examination of selected marketing mix elements and brand equity. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *28*(2), 195-211. doi: 10.1177/0092070300282002

Wheatley, C. (2002). Delivering the brand experience: keeping the promise. In D.J. Burnett & D.G. Oblinger (eds.), *Innovation in student services: Planning models blending high touch/high tech*, (pp. 15-22). Michigan: Society for College and University Planning

APPENDIX 1 | QUESTIONNAIRE BRAND MANAGEMENT

Introduction:
Hello,

Thank you for your interest in our research.

The University of Twente in collaboration with NykampNyboer, a specialist in brand management, has started a large-scale scientific study to research the effects of brand management. You are invited to participate in this study. Completing the questionnaire will take about 15-30 minutes. In return you will receive a compact report which gives insight into the quality and level of brand management in your organisation.

If you have any questions about the survey, please send an email to wieke.lenderink@nykampnyboer.com.

Thank you for participating in our research.

Sincerely,

Wieke Lenderink

Explanation of the questionnaire:
When talking about the brand positioning, brand promise or other brand related terms, this always concerns the brand you are employed.

With concepts such as the brand management department and brand manager it concerns the department or person specifically assigned to manage the brand. It does not matter if the department or person in you organisation has a different name.

You can pause the questionnaire at any moment using the "Resume Later" button at the top of the questionnaire. When you would like to continue with the questionnaire, please press "Load unfinished questionnaire". The questionnaire is completely anonymous and there are no wrong answers possible.

Questions:
Please indicate to what extent each of the following situations applies to your organisation.

	Not at all applicable	Not applicable	More or less applicable	Applicable	Totally applicable
1. A member of the management team officially has the brand in their portfolio and acts accordingly.	O	O	O	O	O
2. There is a brand management department (e.g. which is part of a marketing communications department) which is responsible – and assumes responsibility – for the brand.	O	O	O	O	O
3. There is a brand manager who has and assumes official final responsibility for the brand.	O	O	O	O	O
4. The brand manager reports officially and directly to the management team, and utilises this position.	O	O	O	O	O

5.	The brand manager has the authority to manage relevant departments such as Marketing Communications, Online/Social Media and HR in respect of the brand.	O	O	O	O	O
6.	Within the organisation (in HR or Marketing), there is a member of staff who is responsible for familiarising employees with the brand, and actively assumes this role.	O	O	O	O	O

Please explain your answer below (optional)

....

Please indicate to what extent each of the following situations applies to your organisation.

		Not at all applicable	Not applicable	More or less applicable	Applicable	Totally applicable
1.	The management team considers the brand an inextricable part of its operations.	O	O	O	O	O
2.	The management team fulfils an active role in promoting the brand both internally and externally.	O	O	O	O	O
3.	The brand is considered one of the organisation's most valuable assets.	O	O	O	O	O
4.	In the organisation, there is a belief that active, effective brand management is vital to the organisation's success.	O	O	O	O	O
5.	The brand is used to ensure optimum integration of the marketing communications	O	O	O	O	O
6.	The brand is the strategic starting point for every part of the organisation (e.g. Finance, HR and Sales) and its activities.	O	O	O	O	O
7.	The brand is used as a starting point for recruitment and selection of new personnel.	O	O	O	O	O
8.	The brand is used as a tool for staff appraisals.	O	O	O	O	O

Please explain your answer below (optional)

....

Please indicate to what extent each of the following situations applies to your organisation.

		Not at all applicable	Not applicable	More or less applicable	Applicable	Totally applicable
1.	A brand positioning has been defined that clearly describes what the brand stands for.	O	O	O	O	O
2.	The brand positioning is relevant to (potential) stakeholders: the brand meets their personal needs.	O	O	O	O	O
3.	The brand positioning is distinctive from competitors.	O	O	O	O	O
4.	The brand positioning fits the identity of the organisation.	O	O	O	O	O

		Not at all applicable	Not applicable	More or less applicable	Applicable	Totally applicable
5.	A brand promise has been formulated (e.g. in the form of a slogan or tagline), which makes the brand positioning concrete and communicable to internal and external stakeholders.	O	O	O	O	O

Please explain your answer below (optional)

....

Please indicate to what extent each of the following situations applies to your organisation.

		Not at all applicable	Not applicable	More or less applicable	Applica ble	Totally applica ble
1.	The brand positioning is rendered into concrete guidelines which serve as the basis for communication of the brand.	O	O	O	O	O
2.	The brand positioning is rendered into concrete guidelines which serve as the basis for development of products/services of the brand.	O	O	O	O	O
3.	The brand positioning is rendered into concrete guidelines which serve as the basis for (online and offline) environments of the brand.	O	O	O	O	O
4.	The brand positioning is rendered into concrete guidelines which are the basis for personnel behaviour.	O	O	O	O	O

Please explain your answer below (optional)

....

Please indicate to what extent each of the following situations applies to your organisation.

		Not at all applicable	Not applicable	More or less applicable	Applica ble	Totally applica ble
1.	The corporate visual identity makes the positioning of the brand visible.	O	O	O	O	O
2.	The building blocks of the corporate image have been fully defined (logo, colour, typography, visual language, brand forms, icons, illustrations, photography, etc.).	O	O	O	O	O
3.	The corporate image has been applied to the most important resources, e.g. printed matter, digital applications, vehicles and equipment.	O	O	O	O	O

Please explain your answer below (optional)

....

Please indicate to what extent each of the following situations applies to your organisation.

	Not at all applicable	Not applicable	More or less applicable	Applica ble	Totally applica ble
1. A tone of voice has been defined in line with the brand positioning.	O	O	O	O	O
2. Guidelines have been defined for text in offline and online communications.	O	O	O	O	O
3. From the brand positioning key messages have been defined for use in internal and external communications.	O	O	O	O	O
4. The brand positioning is used to determine which means of communication to be deployed.	O	O	O	O	O

Please explain your answer below (optional)

....

Please indicate to what extent each of the following situations applies to your organisation.

	Not at all applicable	Not applicable	More or less applicable	Applica ble	Totally applica ble
1. The brand positioning is rendered into specific guidelines for employee behaviour.	O	O	O	O	O
2. There are courses, e-learnings, workshops, newsletters, etc. designed to make employees aware of the brand.	O	O	O	O	O
3. With the aid of an internal branding programme, the brand is being brought to the attention of staff.	O	O	O	O	O

Please explain your answer below (optional)

....

Please indicate to what extent each of the following situations applies to your organisation.

	Not at all applicable	Not applicable	More or less applicable	Applica ble	Totally applica ble
1. The brand guidelines are made available from a central online platform and findable for all relevant (internal and external) stakeholders.	O	O	O	O	O
2. The online platform is user friendly, up to date and offers added value in applying the brand.	O	O	O	O	O
3. All brand assets (e.g. logos, photographs, communication materials) are saved centrally and digitally and made available.	O	O	O	O	O

Please explain your answer below (optional)

....

Please indicate to what extent each of the following situations applies to your organisation.

		Not at all applicable	Not applicable	More or less applicable	Applicable	Totally applicable
1.	New products/services are checked against the brand positioning before they are approved and introduced.	O	O	O	O	O
2.	Communication materials are checked against the brand positioning before they are approved and introduced.	O	O	O	O	O
3.	A group of preferred agencies that are familiar with the brand are used to develop the marketing communications (e.g. campaigns, online communications and visual design).	O	O	O	O	O
4.	Within the organisation it is clear that it is possible to ask questions about (the application of) the brand (e.g. at the brand management department, or marketing (communication)).	O	O	O	O	O

Please explain your answer below (optional)

....

Please indicate to what extent each of the following situations applies to your organisation.

		Not at all applicable	Not applicable	More or less applicable	Applicable	Totally applicable
1.	All internal processes that are relevant to the brand experience of external stakeholders are in line with the brand positioning.	O	O	O	O	O
2.	Customer policy during the purchase of products/services is consistent with the brand positioning (e.g. Ikea furniture you need to get out of the magazine and Wehkamp receive your order the same day if you order before 12:00 am)	O	O	O	O	O
3.	Customer policy focused on the use of products/services is consistent with the brand positioning (e.g. support policy (help desk), warranty policy).	O	O	O	O	O
4.	Customer policy focused on after-purchase of products/services is consistent with the brand positioning (e.g. complaints handling, return policy and retention policy).	O	O	O	O	O

Please explain your answer below (optional)

....

Please indicate to what extent each of the following situations applies to your organisation.

		Not at all applicable	Not applicable	More or less applicable	Applica ble	Totally applica ble
1.	Proactive monitoring prevents abuse and improper use of the brand.	O	O	O	O	O
2.	The position and the reputation of the brand are protected.	O	O	O	O	O

Please explain your answer below (optional)

....

Please indicate to what extent each of the following situations applies to your organisation.

		Not at all applicable	Not applicable	More or less applicable	Applica ble	Totally applica ble
1.	Clear objectives have been defined for the brand, and the extent to which these objectives were achieved is measured on a regular basis.	O	O	O	O	O
2.	Tracking and research instruments are used for monitoring of the brand on a daily basis..	O	O	O	O	O
3.	The market (social trends and competitors) is monitored to keep the brand up to date and relevant.	O	O	O	O	O
4.	All relevant interactions with consumers are monitored and analysed.	O	O	O	O	O
5.	The brand perception of internal stakeholders in the organisation is monitored on a regular basis.	O	O	O	O	O
6.	The brand perception of external stakeholders is monitored on a regular basis.	O	O	O	O	O

Please explain your answer below (optional)

....

How is the brand management team within your organisation put together?

....

How would you summarise your organisation's brand positioning?

....

How many employees does your organisation employ?
O <20
O 21 – 50
O 51 – 100
O 101 – 250
O 251 – 500
O 501 – 1000
O > 1000

What is the most important target group for your organisation?
O Consumers
O Organisations and corporations
O A combination of the above groups

Is your organisation listed?
    O Yes
    O No

Are headquarters located in the Netherlands?
    O Yes
    O No

In case the answers is 'No' on the question above:
To what extent do you have control/say over the brand?
    O The corporate visual identity, positioning and communication are predetermined and provided by our headquarters.
    O The corporate visual identity and positioning are predetermined, but I have personal say over the content of communication of the brand.
    O The corporate visual identity is predetermined, but I have freedom over the content of the communication and positioning of the brand.
    O Only the logo is predetermined, further I have complete freedom over the content of the corporate visual identity, positioning and communication of the brand.

For which brand did you complete the questionnaire?
....

What is your official job title?
....

After completion of this study, in which we assess the quality of brand management, we are initiating a follow-up study in which we measure the effects of brand management on the brand touch points and brand performance. Are you interested to participate in this study as well?
    O Yes, I would like to participate
    O Perhaps, I would like to receive more information
    O No, I'm sure I do not want to work on this
    O Otherwise, namely….

These were all the questions. As a thank you, we want to send you the results of your organisation at the end of the study. On which e-mail address would you like to receive the results of the study?
    ....

The questionnaire has been completed successfully. Thank you for your cooperation! When all the questionnaires are returned, you will receive the report in which you will gain insight into the quality and level of brand management within your organisation.

APPENDIX 2 | QUESTIONNAIRE BRAND PROMISE DELIVERY – INTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS

Introduction
Dear colleague

Thank you for your participation in this study. In this study we will ask you a few questions about your knowledge of and experience with a few brands. When answering the questions and statements it is not about actual knowledge but your personal opinion, feeling or experience. There is no right or wrong answer. Always choose the answer that best approximates your opinion. Filling in the questionnaire is strictly personal and the results will be processed anonymously.

Thank you for your participation and good luck with filling out the questionnaire

Questions:
Please indicate the extent which you feel 'brand' fulfils the following promises?
The promises are designed specifically for each organisation

	Is completely not fulfilled	Is not fulfilled	Is more or less fulfilled	Is fulfilled	Is completely fulfilled
Brand Promise 1	O	O	O	O	O
Brand Promise 2	O	O	O	O	O
Brand Promise 3	O	O	O	O	O
Brand Promise 4	O	O	O	O	O
Brand Promise 5	O	O	O	O	O

Please indicate the extent which you feel 'brand' fulfils the promises in each of the following channels?

	Is completely not fulfilled	Is not fulfilled	Is more or less fulfilled	Is fulfilled	Is completely fulfilled
Products / Services	O	O	O	O	O
Knowledge, attitude & behaviour of employees	O	O	O	O	O
Communication (e.g. website, social media, ads, letters)	O	O	O	O	O
Environments (e.g. website, shop, office)	O	O	O	O	O

'Brand' promises the following to its customers: 'brand promise'
Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

	Totally disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Totally Agree
I know that *'brand'* promises this	O	O	O	O	O
I find this a relevant feature of *'brand'*	O	O	O	O	O
I find this promise fits *'brand'*	O	O	O	O	O
I find this promise distinctive compared to other providers	O	O	O	O	O

On a scale of 1 to 10, how likely is it that you would recommend the brand to a family member, friend or colleague.

Very unlikely									Very likely
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

'Brand' promises the following to her customers: brand promise.
Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements (Only internal stakeholders)

	Totally disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Totally Agree
I'm working on delivering on our brand promise	O	O	O	O	O
My colleagues collaborate in delivering on our brand promise	O	O	O	O	O
I think it's important that our brand promise is fulfilled	O	O	O	O	O

How many years do you work for 'brand'?
....

Which department do you work?
....

Have you consumed products or services from the 'brand' in the past year

O   Yes, in the past year I have consumed products / services from this brand

O   No, in the past year I haven't consumed products / services from this brand

The questionnaire has been completed successfully. Thank you very much for you cooperation!

APPENDIX 3 | QUESTIONNAIRE BRAND PROMISE DELIVERY – EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS

Introduction
Dear respondent

Thank you for your participation in this study. In this study we will ask you a few questions about your knowledge of and experience with a few brands. When answering the questions and statements it is not about actual knowledge but your personal opinion, feeling or experience. There is no right or wrong answer. Always choose the answer that best approximates your opinion. Filling in the questionnaire is strictly personal and the results will be processed anonymously.

Thank you for your participation and good luck with filling out the questionnaire

Questions:
To what extent do you know the following brands?

	I don't know the brand at all	I only know the brand of name	I know the brand more or less	I know the brand well	I know the brand very well
Brand 1	O	O	O	O	O
Brand 2	O	O	O	O	O
Brand 3	O	O	O	O	O
Brand 4	O	O	O	O	O
Brand 5	O	O	O	O	O

Please indicate the extent which you feel 'brand' fulfils the following promises?

	Is completely not fulfilled	Is not fulfilled	Is more or less fulfilled	Is fulfilled	Is completely fulfilled
Brand Promise 1	O	O	O	O	O
Brand Promise 2	O	O	O	O	O
Brand Promise 3	O	O	O	O	O
Brand Promise 4	O	O	O	O	O
Brand Promise 5	O	O	O	O	O

Please indicate the extent which you feel 'brand' fulfils the promises in each of the following channels?

	Is completely not fulfilled	Is not fulfilled	Is more or less fulfilled	Is fulfilled	Is completely fulfilled
Products / Services	O	O	O	O	O
Knowledge, attitude & behaviour of employees	O	O	O	O	O
Communication (e.g. website, social media, ads, letters)	O	O	O	O	O
Environments (e.g. website, shop, office)	O	O	O	O	O

'Brand' promises the following to its customers: 'brand promise'
Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

		Totally disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Totally Agree
1.	I know that *'brand'* promises this	O	O	O	O	O
2.	I find this a relevant feature of *'brand'*	O	O	O	O	O
3.	I find this promise fits *'brand'*	O	O	O	O	O
4.	I find this promise distinctive compared to other providers	O	O	O	O	O

Please indicate which means has shaped your image of 'brand'. Please note that multiple answers are possible.

- O   Personal Experiences
- O   Communication (Brochures, advertisements, websites, etc.)
- O   What others say
- O   Media ((newspaper) articles, items on TV or radio, other publications)

For each of the following brands, on a scale of 1 to 10, how likely is it that you would recommend the brand to a family member, friend or colleague.

	Very unlikely									Very likely
Brand 1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Brand 2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Brand 3	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Brand 4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Brand 5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Please indicate for each of the following brands whether you've consumed products or services from them in the past year

	Yes, in the past year I have consumed products / services from this brand	No, in the past year I haven't consumed products / services from this brand
Brand 1	O	O
Brand 2	O	O
Brand 3	O	O
Brand 4	O	O
Brand 5	O	O

The questionnaire has been completed successfully. Thank you very much for you cooperation!

APPENDIX 4 | TABLES

Table 15

Brand management measurements

Construct	Number of items	α
Internal Organisation	**14**	**.94**
- Brand organisation *(e.g. "there is a brand manager who is formally responsible and takes overall responsibility for the brand")*	6	.86
- Brand orientation *(e.g. "the brand is recognised as one of the most valuable asset of the organisation")*	8	.92
Brand Strategy	**9**	**.93**
- Brand positioning *(e.g. "a brand positioning has been defined that clearly describes what the brand stands for")*	5	.85
- Brand guidelines *(e.g. "the brand positioning is translated into concrete guidelines which serve as the basis for communication of the brand")*	4	.92
Brand Development	**10**	**.93**
- Symbolism *(e.g. "the corporate visual identity makes the positioning of the brand visible")*	3	.84
- Communication *(e.g. "from the brand positioning key messages have been defined for use in internal and external communications")*	4	.82
- Behaviour *(e.g. "the brand positioning is translated into specific guidelines for employee behaviour")*	3	.92
Brand Implementation	**11**	**.82**
- Tools *(e.g. "the brand guidelines are centrally made available on an online platform and findable for all relevant (internal and external) stakeholders")*	3	.78
- Processes *(e.g. "new products/services are assessed against the brand positioning before they are approved and introduced")*	4	.87
- Policies *(e.g. "customer policy focused on after-purchase of products/services is consistent with the brand positioning (e.g. complaints handling, return policy and retention policy")*	4	.84
Brand Evaluation	**8**	**.88**
- Protection *(e.g. "there is proactively monitoring to prevent abuse and improper or inappropriate use of the brand")*	2	.75
- Research *(e.g. "clear objectives have been set for the brand, and the extent to which these objectives are achieved is measured regularly")*	6	.86
General Questions	**-**	**-**
How is the brand management team within your organisation put together? *How would you summarise your organisation's brand positioning?* *How many employees does your organisation employ?* *What is the most important target group for your organisation?* *Is your organisation listed?* *Are headquarters located in the Netherlands?* *To what extent do you have control/say over the brand?*	-	-

Table 16

	Number of items	α
Brand Knowledge (external only)	-	-
"To what extent are you aware of the following brands?"		-
Brand Promise Delivery	5	.84
(e.g. "please indicate to which extent you feel *brand* lives up to each of the following promises?		
Brand Promise Delivery in Brand Touch Points	4	.87
(e.g. "please indicate to which extent you feel *brand* lives up to the promises in each of the following channels?")		
Brand Promise Attitude	4	.87
(e.g. "I think this is a relevant feature of 'brand")		
Brand Experience	-	-
(e.g. "please indicate through which ways your image of 'brand' has been formed")		
Brand Recommendation	-	-
On a scale of 1-10, how likely is it that you would recommend 'brand' to a family member, friend or colleague?		
Brand Promise Support (Internal only)	3	.66
(e.g. "my colleagues contribute to fulfilling our brand promise		
General Questions	-	-
Have you consumed product/services from 'brand' in the past year?		
At which department do you work? (internal only)		
How many years have/are you working at 'brand'? (internal only)		