

## BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Borel, L.-H. and Christodoulides, George (2016) Branding and digital analytics. In: Dall'Olmo Riley, F. and Singh, J. and Blankson, C. (eds.) The Routledge Companion to Contemporary Brand Management. Routledge Companions in Business, Management and Accounting. Abingdon, UK: Routledge. ISBN 9780415747905.

Downloaded from: <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/14186/>

*Usage Guidelines:*

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html>  
contact [lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk](mailto:lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk).

or alternatively

# Branding and Digital Analytics

Laurence-Helene Borel and George Christodoulides

Keywords: branding, digital analytics, social media, consumer brand engagement

## 1. Introduction

A brand is commonly defined as a cluster of functional and emotional benefits that promise a certain type of experience (e.g. de Chernatony & Christodoulides, 2004). Branding has traditionally focused on communications or one-way activities (Rubinstein, 2002) aimed at brainwashing the consumers with a view to create salience in their minds, develop positive associations and quality perceptions to ultimately secure their loyalty (Christodoulides 2009; Mitchell 2001). Branding was an exercise done *to/for* consumers as opposed to *with* consumers.

In the early days of the Internet the focus was on building corporate websites that reinforced a positive brand experience (de Chernatony & Christodoulides, 2004). This was known as the age of e-commerce when the aim was to build a corporate website whose 'look and feel' would be in line with the personality of the brand, the brand would be easy to locate online, the website would be reliable and the speed of download would be fast, navigation would be intuitive and companies would offer a differential reward for customers to visit and re-visit the corporate website. With the advent of web 2.0 and the social web (O'Reilly, 2005) as it is argued by Christodoulides (2009) the elements mentioned above became hygiene in that they no longer added value to the brand. Consumers now have raised expectations of brands

to deliver on these elements. Therefore, the presence of these elements would add no value to the brand; however, their absence would detract from the brand's equity.

With web 2.0 what have also become important is user-generated content (UGC) and social media it is, thus, less important what the company says about its brand(s) but what other customers and communities of interest say about the brand. A new host of factors have become available including Groups, Pod/vodcasts, Video sharing, Blogs, Widgets, VCAs, MUDs which allow consumers to also interfere with the values of the brand, for instance, by creating an advert for a brand and uploading this on a publicly accessible social media platform. By doing so, consumers are empowered to (indirectly) influence the brand's values.

In this chapter we argue that those brands who manage to engage consumers on three levels, *cognitively*, *emotionally*, and *behaviourally*, are those more likely to succeed in this highly competitive and crowded digital space. We go on to discuss in greater detail the three dimensions of engagement and how they can be measured and also share examples and case studies of successful campaigns aiming to stimulate cognitive, emotional and behavioural engagement.

## **2. From Web 1.0 to Web 2.0**

Prior to the Internet, traditional branding was by and large the exercise of a narcissist, the brand manager, who was preoccupied with creating a specific image for the brand, primarily through corporate communications shouting how wonderful the brand is, then passing on the desired image (identity) to consumers. Any voices diverging from this image had to be suppressed (Christodoulides, 2009). In the early days of the web,

the most significant branding tool for marketers online was the corporate website itself which often was static and resembled a catalogue. Marketers soon realized the interactivity potential of the Web and focussed their efforts on developing a compelling online brand experience for consumers.

By the early 2000, the Internet was undergoing significant transformation with a new generation of Web 2.0 websites appearing that used technology beyond the static pages of earlier websites. Coined in 1999 by Darcy DiNucci and popularized by Tim O'Reilly at the O'Reilly Media Web 2.0 conference in late 2004 (O'Reilly, 2005), Web 2.0 suggests the emergence of a new version of the World Wide Web; it does not refer to an update to any technical specification, but rather to cumulative changes in the way web pages are made and used. A Web 2.0 site allows users to interact and collaborate with each other in a social media dialogue as creators of user-generated content in a virtual community, in contrast to websites where people are limited to the passive viewing of content. Examples of Web 2.0 websites include, social networking sites (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube, Pinterest, Google+), blogs, wikis, video-sharing sites (e.g. YouTube, Vimeo, Vine), web applications and mashups.

This new branding philosophy resulting from the collaborative Web was first articulated through the service-dominant logic (S-D logic) literature, suggesting that customers make proactive contributions to brand interactions, rather than merely acting as passive recipients of brand-related cues (e.g. Vargo & Lusch, 2004). As a result, managers who had been accustomed to tightly controlling their brands suddenly had to relinquish some control (de Chernatony 2001; Christodoulides 2009), and learn to manage *many-to-many* communication, empowering consumers to not

only interact with the firm but also with other consumers (Hoffman & Novak, 1996). Consequently, brand management has undergone a significant transformation linked to the rise of the Internet (Hoffman, 2000) necessitating brands to augment their functional and emotional values also with social values (Yenicioğlu & Christodoulides, 2013), and shifting branding from a one-sided process ‘aimed at consumers’ (Web 1.0) to a much more complex process that involves a multi-level collaboration of firms, consumers, and brand communities (Web 2.0). This approach of collaborative branding can take several forms ranging from user-generated content, brand communities or consumer engagement tactics via social networks such as Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Google+, Instagram, LinkedIn, Pinterest or SnapChat, which are currently the most commonly used social networking sites by marketers and brands at the time of writing. These engagement tactics are increasingly referred to as Content Marketing, defined by the Content Marketing Institute (2014) as ‘*a marketing technique of creating and distributing valuable, relevant and consistent content to attract and acquire a clearly defined audience – with the objective of driving profitable customer action*’. Arguably, post-internet branding is about facilitating conversations around the brand (Christodoulides, 2009), in order to ultimately engage consumers on a cognitive, emotional and/or behavioural level. Engaged consumers are thought to play a key role in enhancing brand performance *inter alia* via greater emotional connection/attachment (Thompson & Sinha 2008; Algesheimer et al. 2010; Brodie et al. 2013), advocacy (Algesheimer et al., 2005), loyalty (Algesheimer et al. 2005; Bowden 2009; Brodie et al. 2011; Hollebeek, 2011a), and trust (Van Doorn et al. 2010; Vivek et al. 2011; Brodie et al. 2011, 2013).

### **3. Defining engagement: the new key construct for marketers**

Considerable conceptual/theoretical work has been carried out on the subject of engagement across various disciplines, resulting in a plethora of conceptualizations. However, research specifically addressing ‘customer/consumer engagement’ has only transpired in the marketing literature relatively recently (e.g. Van Doorn et al. 2010; Brodie et al. 2011).

There is not, however, such a thing as a common view of consumer engagement in the academic literature; instead, various definitions and applications of the construct exist. From the practitioner’s perspective, consumer engagement is defined as establishing a strong and enduring bond between brand and consumers based on an ongoing effort of the brand to activate consumers through interactions, shared values, experiential content and rewards (Schultz 2007, p. 7). Brodie et al.’s (2011) definition and conceptualization of consumer engagement is arguably the most comprehensive definition to date, suggesting five fundamental propositions on which a general definition of consumer engagement is drawn:

*“Consumer engagement is a psychological state that occurs by virtue of interactive, co-creative customer experiences with a focal agent/object (e.g. a brand) in focal service relationships. It occurs under a specific set of context dependent conditions generating differing consumer engagement levels; and exists as a dynamic, iterative process within service relationships that co-create value. Consumer engagement plays a central role in a nomological network governing service relationships in which other relational concepts (e.g., involvement, loyalty) are antecedents and/or consequences in iterative CE processes. It is a multidimensional concept subject to a context and/or stakeholder-specific expression of relevant cognitive, emotional and/or behavioral dimensions”* (Brodie et al. 2011, p. 11).

This definition is thought to be the most comprehensive in the literature for a number of reasons. First, Brodie et al.'s (2011) definition of engagement encompasses multiple perspectives of consumer engagement, resulting in a comprehensive overview and conceptualization of the construct. Second, the above definition includes other relational concepts such as involvement and loyalty, to reflect the complexity of the focal construct such as its psychological dimension, rather than solely focusing on the behavioural dimension of engagement. Third, the definition takes into account the three dimensions of engagement described in the organizational management literature (e.g. Fredricks et al., 2004), cognitive, emotional and/or behavioural, in generic terms, so that it be consistent with the conceptualization of consumer engagement in other contexts (Brodie et al., 2011). Each facet of consumer engagement as well as contextual dimensions of engagement will subsequently be discussed in this chapter.

### ***3.1 Cognitive engagement***

Cognitive engagement is one of the three dimensions of consumer engagement recognized by scholars as a key facet in the consumer-brand engagement process. Cognitive engagement draws on the idea of investment, and incorporates thoughtfulness and willingness to exert the effort necessary to comprehend complex ideas and master difficult skills (Fredricks, 2004). In the marketing literature, online engagement is characterized as a cognitive and affective commitment to an active relationship with the brand as personified by the website or other computer-mediated entities designed to communicate brand value (Mollen & Wilson, 2010). Consistently, Brodie et al.'s (2013) study of engagement in an online brand community reveals that

the engagement process is initiated mainly by consumers' information needs, which indicates that the engagement process might originate from cognition. More specifically, new members of a brand community may look for information within the online brand community, which leads them to be cognitively engaged with the content of the page (Brodie et al., 2013).

### ***3.2 Emotional engagement***

The second dimension of consumer engagement is emotional engagement, which encompasses consumers' positive and negative reactions (Fredricks, 2004). Consumer engagement leads to increased levels of involvement and trust which may, in turn, lead to the development of affective commitment, considered to be a more emotive basis for purchase (Bowden, 2009). Emotionally engaged consumers feel 'immersed' and passionate about their chosen brands, which they are willing to spend significant time and effort with (Hollebeek, 2011b). In addition to perhaps becoming more satisfied and loyal (Brodie et al., 2011; Van Doorn et al., 2010), customers may also experience relationship benefits from engaging with the brand community (Gummerus & Liljander, 2012). When firms engage customers, there is an opportunity that satisfying interactions may lead to trust; thus higher engagement should produce higher trust in the relationship because the company is perceived as caring (Vivek et al., 2012). However, excessive engagement levels may generate customer draining and/or fatigue, which may potentially be detrimental to customer loyalty outcomes (Hollebeek, 2011b).

### ***3.3 Behavioural engagement***



The third dimension of consumer engagement is behavioural engagement, which draws on the idea of participation. Behavioural engagement includes the involvement construct and is considered crucial for achieving positive (for the brand) outcomes (Fredricks, 2004). Markets can be viewed as a set of conversations between the customer and the firm. This set of conversations implies interactivity, deep engagement, and the ability and willingness to act on both sides (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). Furthermore, consumer engagement is interactive, active, continuous, and customer centric, involving both prospects and potential customers (Sawhney et al., 2005). Behavioural engagement in the context of a brand community can be defined as a consumer's intrinsic motivation to interact and cooperate with community members (Wirtz et al., 2013). Typical online engagement behaviours include word-of-mouth recommendations, helping other consumers, blogging, writing reviews, or even engaging in legal action (Van Doorn et al., 2010; Wirtz et al., 2013). In engaging with a brand or a brand community, consumers aspire to obtain value from the organization and their brands (Wirtz et al., 2013) while positive experiences gained from these interactions serve to strengthen the consumer's relationship with the brand (Algesheimer et al., 2010). Active engagement in the form of membership continuance, participation, giving and receiving recommendations from other community members and creating brand-related user-generated content often lead to positive brand outcomes such as higher levels of brand equity, brand loyalty and customer advocacy (Algesheimer et al., 2005; Christodoulides et al. 2012). Finally, active engagement may lead to an increased willingness to adopt a firm's new products and a reduced risk of embracing competing products (Thompson & Sinha, 2008).

#### **4. Measuring Engagement: the practitioner's perspective**

In section 3, we discussed the importance of engagement and introduced its cognitive, emotional and behavioural dimensions. As noted earlier, engagement from the practitioner's perspective has been defined as *'establishing a strong and enduring bond between brand and consumers based on an ongoing effort of the brand to activate consumers through interactions, shared values, experiential content and rewards'* (Schultz 2011, p.7). In other words, brand managers through their Facebook posts, Tweets, Instagram photos and YouTube videos, aim to trigger positive consumer engagement with a focal brand through Likes, shares comments, retweets, or user-generated content creation.

Every marketing program has its key metrics. Email has open and click-through rates. Web sites have unique/return visitors, page views, dwell time and conversions. Social media has engagement rate. By measuring and monitoring consumer-brand engagement rates, brand marketers can benchmark their marketing goals, evaluate the effectiveness of social programs, and optimize brand campaigns for their target audience by understanding what type of content is successful (or not!) for their brands. A recent industry report published by the Internet Advertising Bureau (IAB 2014, p. 12), suggests that:

- Cognitive engagement maps changes in awareness, interest, and intent.
- Emotional engagement refers to how advertising or other brand related content makes the user feel towards the brand.
- Behavioural engagement may translate as user-initiated interactions.

In terms of measurement metrics, each dimension may be measured as follows:

- Cognitive: link clicks, viewing photos/videos
- Emotional: positive comments, blog posts, recommending a brand
- Behavioural: following a brand, Liking, retweeting, sharing a post on social media, or any form of conversation, which could be for instance by means of hashtags after seeing an ad.

Although engaging consumers on these three dimensions is crucial, it is worth noting, that practitioners tend to measure engagement as a whole, rather than through its individual cognitive, emotional and behavioural dimensions. This is partly due to limitations in metrics themselves, but also partly due to the necessity to provide ‘large’ engagement numbers to justify the effectiveness of social media efforts.

Table 1 below shows suggested consumer-brand engagement metrics across the main social networking sites, and highlights how each engagement dimension can also be measured.

**[INSERT TABLE 1 HERE]**

#### **4.1 WoM referrals**

Consumers talk within their online networks about brands, events and products, whether brands are listening or not. These messages from customers, fans and detractors can spread quickly and can have a large influence (positive or negative) on other consumers. These conversations are referred to as online word-of-mouth (WoM referrals). WoM referrals monitor is crucial to brand marketers in order to monitor and understand what is being said about their brand online, in order to tailor their

marketing communication, or pro-actively respond to negative comments in case of a crisis. Furthermore, as noted by Christodoulides et al. (2012) managers should thoroughly monitor all UGC related to their brand, not only from the defensive point of view of adding value while avoiding damage, but also to gain rich, unfiltered insights into customer perceptions of the brand.

The levels of WoM referrals around the brand would typically be measured using industry tools such as Sysomos, Brandwatch or Radian 6. These industry tools scrape the web for brand mentions using *boolean queries*, in other words, complex keywords searches, that can include or exclude certain keywords to return the most accurate results. Common WoM referrals metrics include:

- Sentiment analysis: the sentiment of each post would be analyzed manually to understand how consumers feel about the brand/product.
- Topic analysis: the mentions are analyzed manually to understand how consumers talk about the brand
- Media type analysis: the mentions are analyzed via the dashboard to understand where are consumers talking about the brand the most (e.g. Twitter, Facebook, blog posts, or mainstream media)
- Share of voice analysis: the mentions are analyzed via the dashboard to measure the number of brand mentions vs. competitor brand mentions

#### **4.2 Academic measures of engagement**

Despite great academic interest in the engagement construct, scholarly research addressing ‘engagement’ has been predominantly exploratory in nature, whilst empirical research in this area remains extremely limited (Hollebeek, Glynn and

Brodie 2014). Hollebeek et al.'s (2014) recent development and validation of a scale of consumer brand engagement specifically in social media settings, offers scholars and practitioners a simple paper and pencil instrument to measure this complex construct. The scale relies on consumer's perceptions of cognitive, emotional, and behavioural engagement with a brand in social media rather than on *actual* engagement. However, this scale could be used to measure consumers' engagement levels by means of a survey with a view of complementing and enhancing practitioner measures as outlined in table 1. Such triangulation of measures could facilitate the undertaking of enhanced predictability of consumers' future purchase intent of specific brands within a brand's portfolio (Hollebeek, Glynn and Brodie, 2014, p. 162). The scale of consumer brand engagement comprises of 10-items measuring the cognitive, emotional and behavioural dimensions of the construct as shown in table 2.

**[INSERT TABLE 2 HERE]**

#### **4.3 Measuring engagement: summary**

Although the engagement construct comprises of three dimensions, cognitive, emotional and behavioural, practitioners tend to measure construct as whole by analyzing the number of interactions consumers have with a focal brand across the brand's social networking sites. This section has reviewed a number of metrics utilized by practitioners to measure engagement levels on Facebook, Twitter, YouTube as well as WoM referrals, which are used to evaluate the success of a brand's efforts and to optimize a brand's content strategy. Despite a plethora of metrics available to brand managers, one of the remaining challenges is the lack of attribution of social media marketing on the bottom line. Although engagement

metrics can help measure a brand's success in social media, these metrics do not provide marketers with accurate sales figures, making it difficult to report on a social media campaign's ROI. It is, however, safe to say that social networking sites, are working with marketers to solve this lack of social media attribution. Facebook for instance, has recently announced the introduction of a new 'Purchase' button (Facebook, 2014), which will appear in Facebook posts, thus allowing marketers to directly measure accurately Social Media ROI. Twitter, on the other hand, have recently rolled out conversion tracking within their advertising offering (Twitter, 2014), which allows managers to accurately track attribute conversions beyond last URL-click, to include actions driven by all types of ad engagements (like clicks, retweets, or favourites).

In sum measuring engagement can help brand managers:

- Understand what type of content is successful or fails to engage fans and use this knowledge to optimize their brand's content strategy
- Measure the success of brand campaigns (Social Media ROI)
- Benchmark social media efforts against key competitors either through engagement metrics or WoM referrals metrics
- Drive traffic to the brand's website to ultimately increase purchase consideration and sales
- Report ROI figures to senior management; the more successful a social media campaign, the higher the budget allocated to social media channels in the future

## **5. Facilitating consumer engagement**

The previous two sections of this chapter have first defined the construct of engagement, which comprises of three dimensions, cognitive, emotional, behavioural engagement. As highlighted in section 4, the effectiveness of social media and content activities is measured by looking at metrics such as engagement levels, reach, impressions, videos views, engagement and WoM referrals, to establish what type of content and tactics are successful for engaging consumers with brands. Managing brands online is no longer about controlling or tightly managing brands, but about facilitating conversations between the brand and consumers. The authors have argued that brands that are successful in social media facilitate the three dimensions of engagement: cognitive, emotional and behavioural through their content strategy.

### ***5.1 Facilitating cognitive engagement***

As noted earlier, cognitive engagement draws on the idea of investment, and incorporates thoughtfulness and willingness to exert the effort necessary to comprehend complex ideas and master difficult skills (Fredricks, 2004). When users join a brand community or a brand's social network site, they may become cognitively engaged with the content of the page, by looking for information about the brand.

Brodie et al.'s (2013, p. 109) engagement framework suggests that the engagement objects within an online brand community may be themes (brands, product, services, organization, industry), the online community itself, community roles or community members. In their subsequent consumer engagement process framework (2013, p. 110) the authors reveal that members partake in a variety of tasks such as learning, advocating, sharing, co-developing or socializing. The triggers prompting the onset of

specific consumer engagement occur when the consumer recognizes a need to solve a specific problem or satisfy a want, performs a search, identifies a specific online community, and begins an interactive relationship with the community by posting a comment. Thus, in order to cognitively engage consumers, brand managers should ensure that cognitively engaging/informational content is easily searchable on their social networking sites. This could be achieved, for instance, through photo albums, custom-built forum/FAQ tabs on Facebook, pinned posts, YouTube, playlists, or hashtags which allow tagging of information by topic and is easily retrievable.

Rolex ([www.facebook.com/rolex](http://www.facebook.com/rolex)) is a great example of a brand organizing its Facebook content to cognitively engage consumers. Rolex have created a custom-built Facebook tab, which pulls in video playlists directly from their YouTube channel. The tab allows fans to browse various Rolex models and watch informational videos about their chosen watch.

Marmite ([www.facebook.com/marmite](http://www.facebook.com/marmite)) the controversial 'Love or Hate' yeast spread (known as Vegemite in Australasia) also has a custom-built Facebook tab, which allows fans to browse recipes but also to submit their own, engaging fans not only cognitively but also emotionally when submitting recipes through user-generated content creation.

## ***5.2 Facilitating emotional engagement***

The second dimension of engagement is emotional engagement, whereby consumers are 'immersed' and passionate about their chosen brands, and are willing to spend significant time and effort with them (Hollebeek, 2011b). Emotional engagement



based on definitions from the literature can be considered to be the ultimate goal for brand managers, as emotionally engaged consumers are likely to follow brands across multiple social networking sites and to advocate the brand's products to their peers.

There is a number of ways in which brands can facilitate emotional engagement with consumers through social networking sites or brand communities. For instance, Nutella has recently launched its Nutella Stories campaign ([http://www.nutellastories.com/en\\_UK/](http://www.nutellastories.com/en_UK/)) to celebrate the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the brand, and has received over 76,000 stories to date. Fans are encouraged to share their love of Nutella by submitting their stories and photos, and will receive in return a gift from Nutella. This campaign is a successful example of a brand positively influencing brand-related communications, sharing the Nutella love, through user-generated content.

Starbucks is another brand harnessing the power of their community through the My Starbucks Idea community (<http://mystarbucksidea.com>). With a strong presence on multiple social networks, the brand has set a high bar when it comes to being social and engaging its customers. They are at or near the top of nearly every major brand ranking in social media. The My Starbucks Idea website encourages customers to submit ideas for better products, improving the customer experience, and defining new community involvement, among other categories. Customers can submit, view, and discuss submitted ideas along with employees from various Starbucks departments 'Idea Partners'. The company regularly polls its customers for their favourite products and has a leader board to track which customers are the most active in submitting ideas, comments, and poll participation. The site is simultaneously a

crowd-sourcing tool, a source of market intelligence that brings customer priorities to light, an on-line community, as well as an effective branding tool.

Furthermore, fans who are deeply passionate and emotionally engaged with their brands, going as far as creating and running online Facebook pages and/brand communities to share their passion for the brand with other fans. World Nutella Day (<http://www.nutelladay.com/>) is a brand community set up in the early days of social media in 2007, by Nutella fan Sara Rosso. The community boasts, at time of writing, 6,700 Twitter followers and 46,000 Facebook fans. In late 2013, Ferrero S.p.A, tried to shut down the World Nutella Day fan community resulting in a backlash from community members. Ferrero S.p.A's move indicates a misunderstanding of brand co-creation and engagement manifest through a narcissistic desire to tightly control the brand. By contrast other brands comprehend and capitalize on consumers' need to co-create and jointly own the brand, for example Coca-Cola's Facebook fan page was originally set up unofficially by two fans before the brand took guardianship, although the original creators are still actively involved in the management of the fan page.

As demonstrated in the World Nutella Day example brand managers faced in this situation, should work together with emotionally engaged fans to preserve these unofficial communities rather than attempt to shut them down. Ferrero S.p.A's cease and desist, could have negatively impacted on sales of the brand by upsetting advocates of Nutella, in addition to a PR crisis. Following World Nutella Day fans' outrage, Ferrero S.p.A made the decision to retract its cease and desist, and are now collaborating with the unofficial community

### ***5.3 Facilitating behavioural engagement via hashtag campaigns***

Behavioural engagement is the dimension of engagement, which appears to be most commonly triggered through brand managers' activation attempts, and manifests itself through Likes, shares, and tweets as a direct response to a campaign.

There are multiple ways to engage consumers through branded hashtags in terms of media type (TV, print, OOH, online) but also in terms of different engagement mechanics and intensity such as sharing (e.g. Budweiser's SuperBowl #bestbuds ad), gamification (e.g. British Airways #RacethePlane), WoM referrals such as incorporating positive Tweets about a brand on an advert or a website, or UGC (e.g. Pantene's #Shinestrong). Furthermore, recent empirical research conducted by the authors in the context of branded hashtag engagement in advertising, identified four main drivers of engagement: entertainment value, emotional value, and creativity.

The Budweiser 2014 Super Bowl commercial featured a baby Clydesdale and a puppy who become friends against all odds. The commercial used a high emotional appeal, resulting in high consumer engagement by means of hashtag, totalling 59K mentions on Twitter, and was the ad that was the most Tweeted about during the Super Bowl XLVIII (Adweek, 2014).

Pantene's #ShineStrong is a perfect example of branded hashtag campaign successfully tapping into sharing, WoM referrals, and UGC. The 60-second commercial empowering women to #ShineStrong, was viewed more than 46 million times in just a few months, inspiring discussion through the hashtag. Sheryl Sandberg's even shared the video on her Facebook page! In addition, Pantene teamed up with popular YouTubers including Gigi Gorgeous, LaurDIY and Nanalew to create vlogs for their audience, thus, spreading the message further to targeted audiences.

Branded hashtags, unlike other engagement tactics, have the benefit of allowing brand managers to reach existing fans as well as non-existing fans of a brand. Furthermore, excitingly for brand managers, branded hashtag engagement is not dependent on prior brand familiarity or involvement with a brand (Borel, 2014). A well-executed branded hashtag campaign can break through the clutter and engage existing or new customers through high advertising appeals such as entertainment, emotion or creativity (Borel, 2014). However, as branded hashtag campaigns become more common, particular care should be taken to ensure that the branded hashtag has a clear call to action, and offers conversational and community benefits allowing a user to engage with other users and grow their network. Thus, branded hashtag campaigns should be planned carefully to achieve specific brand objectives such as heightened brand equity, brand trust, WoM referrals and increased sharing intent, increasing the brand's share of voice through WoM referrals and eyeballs through sharing (Borel, 2014).

## **5. Summary and implications for brand managers**

This chapter has highlighted the key challenges managers face when managing their brands online. As noted in this chapter, traditional branding was by and large the exercise of a narcissistic brand manager preoccupied with creating a specific image for the brand, primarily through corporate communications and passing on the desired image to consumers. The rise of Web 2.0 on the other hand, has marked a radical transformation in the way brands are developed and managed. Brand managers who had been accustomed to tightly controlling brands have had to learn to market with consumers, to co-create the brand. Consumers no longer want to be 'talked to

anymore', but want to interact, converse, buy and consume brands that care about them.

The key construct resulting from this new branding philosophy, which underpins this chapter, is the construct of engagement. This aims to establish a strong and enduring bond between brand and consumers based on an ongoing effort of the brand to activate consumers through interactions, shared values as well as experiential content and rewards, and comprises of three dimensions cognitive, emotional, and behavioural.

We have shown through various case studies and examples, how practitioners may trigger each engagement, and argued that the most successful brands in the digital space are the ones who concurrently activate these three dimensions through their content strategy. Brand management in the era of the Social Web requires managers to be both creative and analytical. On the one hand, managers [often with the help from other consumers in a dialectical process, see Sing (2012)] need to create brand stories that successfully engage consumers on a cognitive, emotional and/or behavioural level. On the other hand, brand managers should be analytical in order to measure engagement to tailor their brand stories based on consumer engagement levels but also report on the success of their campaigns, and crucially secure social media investment dollars from senior management by demonstrating the effectiveness of these campaigns.

Engagement across Facebook, Twitter and YouTube is typically measured by looking at engagement metrics, reach and impression metrics, and video views, traffic

sources, geographic impact and audience retention in the case of YouTube. Measuring engagement can help marketers not only tailor their content strategy but also crucially report on the success of social media campaigns. Furthermore, measuring WoM referrals using third party tools such as Sysomos, Brandwatch or Radian 6, can be used as a powerful market research tool to understand how consumers feel and talk about brands, and act upon these insights.

## References

Adweek (2014), *Infographic: Budweiser wins the hashtag Super Bowl*, Available from: <http://www.adweek.com/news/technology/infographic-budweiser-wins-hashtag-super-bowl-155442>

Algesheimer, R., Dholakia, U., M., Herrmann, A. (2005), "The Social Influence of Brand Community: Evidence from European Car Clubs", *Journal of Marketing*, 69 (July 2005), pp. 19–34

Algesheimer, R., Borle, S. Dholakia, U., M., Singh, S., S. (2010), "The Impact of Customer Community Participation on Customer Behaviors: An Empirical Investigation", *Marketing Science*, 29 (4), pp. 756-769

Borel, L.H. (2014), "A model of antecedents and consequences of branded hashtag engagement", MRes thesis, Birkbeck, University of London

Bowden, J.L. (2009), "The Process of Customer Engagement, a conceptual framework", *Journal of Theory and Practice*, 17, pp. 63-74

Brodie, R.J., Hollebeek, L. D., Juric, B., & Ilic, A. (2011), "Customer Engagement: Conceptual Domain, Fundamental Propositions, and Implications for Research", *Journal of Service Research*, pp. 252-271

Brodie, R.J., Llic, A., Hollebeek, L. (2013), "Consumer Engagement in a virtual community: an exploratory analysis", *Journal of Business Research*, 66 (1), pp. 105-114

Christodoulides, G. (2009), "Branding in the Post-Internet Era", *Marketing Theory*, 9 (1), pp. 141-144

Christodoulides, G., de Chernatony, L. (2004), "Dimensionalising on- and offline brands' composite equity", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 13 (3) pp.168 – 179

Content Marketing Institute (2014), Useful content should be at the core of your marketing strategy, Available from: <http://contentmarketinginstitute.com/what-is-content-marketing/>

de Chernatony, L. (2001), "Succeeding with brands on the Internet", *Journal of Brand Management*, 8 (3), pp.186-195

Facebook (2014), *Testing a New Way for People to Discover and Buy Products on Facebook*, Available from: <https://www.facebook.com/business/news/Discover-and-Buy-Products-on-Facebook-Test>

Fredricks, J.A., Blumenfeld, P.C., Paris, A.H. (2004), "School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence", *Review of Educational Research*, 74, pp. 59–109

Gummerus, J., Liljander, V. (2012), "Customer Engagement in a Facebook Brand Community", *Management Research Review*, 35 (9), pp. 857-877

Hoffman, D.L. (2000), "The Revolution will not Be Televised: Introduction to the Special Issue on Marketing Science and the Internet", *Marketing Science*, 19 (1), pp. 1–3

Hollebeek, L. D. (2011a), "Demystifying customer brand engagement: Exploring the loyalty nexus", *Journal of Marketing Management*, 27 (7-8), pp. 785-807

Hollebeek, L. D. (2011b), "Exploring customer brand engagement: definition and themes", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 19 (7), pp. 555-573

Hollebeek, L.D., Glynn, M.S., Brodie, R.J. (2014), "Consumer Brand Engagement in Social Media: Conceptualization, Scale Development & Validation", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 28 (2), pp. 149-165

Mitchell, A. (2001), *Right Side up: Building Brands in the Age of the Organized Consumer*. London: HarperCollinsBusiness



Mollen A, Wilson H. (2010) “Engagement, telepresence and interactivity in online consumer experience: reconciling scholastic and managerial perspectives”, *Journal of Business Research*, 63, pp. 919–925

O’Reilly (2005), *What is Web 2.0? Design Patterns and Business Models for the New Generation of Software*, Available from: [http://mediaedu.typepad.com/info\\_society/files/web2.pdf](http://mediaedu.typepad.com/info_society/files/web2.pdf)

Prahalad, C. K., Venkatram R. (2000), “Co-opting Customer Competence”, *Harvard Business Review*, 78, pp. 79-87

Rubinstein, H. (2002), “Branding on the Internet: Moving from a communications to a relationship approach to branding”, *Interactive Marketing*, 4(1), pp.33-40.

Sawhney, M., Verona, G., Prandelli, E. (2005), “Collaborating to Create: The Internet as a platform for customer engagement in product innovation”, *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 19(4), pp. 4-17

Schultz, D.E., Block, M. P. (2011), “Understanding customer-brand engagement behaviours in today’s interactive marketplace”, *Micro & Macro-Marketing*, 2, pp. 227-243

Singh, S. and Sonnenburg, S. (2012), “Brand Performances in Social Media”, *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 26(4), pp.189–197.

Social Bakers (2014a), *Finding the right engagement rate for your page in 2014*, Available from: <http://www.socialbakers.com/blog/2137-finding-the-right-engagement-rate-for-your-facebook-page-in-2014>

Social Bakers (2014b), *Socialbakers now recommends interactions over engagement rate*, Available from: <http://www.socialbakers.com/blog/2199-socialbakers-now-recommends-interactions-over-engagement-rate>

Thompson, S.A., Sinha, R.K. (2008), “Brand communities and new product adoption: the influence and limits of oppositional loyalty”, *Journal of Marketing*, 72 (6), pp. 65-80

Twitter (2014), *Conversion Tracking for websites*, Available from: <https://support.twitter.com/articles/20170807-conversion-tracking-for-websites>

Van Doorn, J., Lemon, K. N., Mittal, V., Nass, S., Pick, D. N., Pirner, P., Verhoef, P. C., (2010), “Customer Engagement Behavior: Theoretical Foundations and Research Directions”, *Journal of Service Research*, 13 (3) 253-266

Vargo, S. L., Lusch, R. F. (2004), “Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing”, *Journal of Marketing*, 69, pp. 1-17

Vivek, S.D., Beatty, S.E. & Morgan, R.M. (2012), “Consumer Engagement, exploring customer relationships beyond purchase”, *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 20 (2), pp. 122-146

Wirtz, W., Ramaseshan, B., Van de Klundert, J., Canli, Z., G., Kandampully, J. (2013), “Managing brands and customer engagement in online brand communities”, *Journal of Service Management*, 24 (3), pp. 223-244

Yenicoglu, B. & Christodoulides, G. (2014), “Branding in the Age of Digital Connectivity” In: Moutinho, L., Bigné, E. and Manrai A.K. (Eds.) *The Routledge Companion to the Future of Marketing*, London: Sage.

## **Recommended reading**

Brodie, R.J., Llic, A., Hollebeek, L. (2013), “Consumer Engagement in a virtual community: an exploratory analysis”, *Journal of Business Research*, 66 (1), pp. 105-114

Christodoulides, G., Jevons, C., Bonhomme, J. (2012), "Memo to Marketers: Quantitative Evidence for Change, How User-Generated Content really affects Brands", *Journal of Advertising Research*, 52 (1), pp. 53-64

Hollebeek, L.D., Glynn, M.S., Brodie, R.J. (2014), "Consumer Brand Engagement in Social Media: Conceptualization, Scale Development & Validation", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 28 (2), pp. 149-165

## **Abstract**

This chapter addresses the changes branding has undergone in recent years with the rise of Web 2.0 and the challenges marketers face managing and measuring brand efforts in the digital world. Traditional branding was by and large the exercise of a narcissist who was preoccupied with creating a specific image for the brand, primarily through corporate communications, whereby consumers were passive recipients of brand messages. The rise of Web 2.0 has however drastically changed consumer behaviour and brand management, empowering consumers to interact and collaborate with each other, freely sharing experiences about brands, both good and bad. As a result brands have flocked social networking sites, in an attempt to join these conversations and engage consumers with carefully selected brand content.

This chapter first introduces the construct of engagement, and its three dimensions, cognitive, emotional and behavioural. Second, we discuss how marketers can measure this engagement across a number of key platforms, including Facebook, Twitter, YouTube to mobilize WoM. Finally, we discuss how brands can successfully manage the three dimensions of engagement and share recent examples of successful engagement campaigns.

## Tables and Figures for insertion

*Table 1: Engagement metrics for the main social networking sites*

Social networking site	Engagement dimension	Measurement metric	Additional information
<b>Facebook – post engagement</b>	Cognitive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Website clicks (traffic)</li> <li>- Photo/Video views</li> <li>- Tab views</li> </ul>	<p><b>Post engagement:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Post reach is the number of people who have seen a post. A post counts as reaching someone when it's shown in News Feed</li> <li>- Post reach can be segmented by fans/non fans and Organic reach vs. paid reach</li> </ul> <p><b>Page engagement:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Page engagement is the total amount of engagement-related actions on a Facebook page</li> <li>- Page engagement actions include: post likes, post comments, post shares, offer claims, question follows, website clicks, photo views, video views, Page likes, check-ins, Page mentions, tab views, question answers, question follows.</li> <li>- Figures are for the first 28 days after a post was created and include people viewing a post on desktop and mobile</li> </ul>
	Emotional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Post comments</li> <li>- UGC upload</li> <li>- Page mentions</li> </ul>	
	Behavioural	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Page Likes</li> <li>- Post Likes</li> <li>- Post shares</li> <li>- Check-ins</li> <li>- UGC upload</li> </ul>	
<b>Twitter</b>	Cognitive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reach</li> <li>- Impressions</li> <li>- Website clicks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Typically measured via listening tools/statistic tools such as Sysomos, Tweetreach, Hootsuite</li> <li>- For advertisers, data provided by Twitter within the analytics dashboard for both organic and paid tweets: <a href="https://analytics.twitter.com/">https://analytics.twitter.com/</a></li> </ul>
	Emotional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Brand mentions (@ replies)</li> </ul>	
	Behavioural	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Following a brand</li> <li>- Retweeting</li> <li>- Favoriting a Tweet</li> </ul>	

<b>YouTube</b>	Cognitive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Video views</li> <li>- Audience retention</li> <li>- Traffic sources</li> <li>- Audience demographics</li> <li>- Geographic impact</li> </ul>	- Statistics available from the YouTube analytics panel
	Emotional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Commenting</li> <li>- Sharing</li> <li>- Remixing a video through UGC</li> </ul>	
	Behavioral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Favouriting a video</li> <li>- Sharing a video</li> </ul>	
<b>WoM referrals</b>	Emotional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sentiment analysis</li> <li>- Topic analysis</li> <li>- Share of voice analysis</li> <li>- Media type analysis (e.g. Twitter, Facebook, blogs, mainstream media)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Third party tools e.g. Sysomos, BrandWatch, Radian 6</li> <li>- Searches conducted through boolean queries, complex keywords searches set up within the third party tool</li> </ul>

*Table 2: Scale of Consumer Brand Engagement (Hollebeek, Glynn and Brodie, 2014)*

<i>Engagement dimension</i>	<i>Scale items</i>
<i>Cognitive processing</i>	COG. PROC.1: Using [brand] gets me to think about [brand] COG. PROC. 2: I think about [brand] a lot when I'm using it COG. PROC. 3: Using brand stimulates my interest to learn more about [brand]
<i>Affective (Emotional)</i>	AFFEC 1: I feel very positive when I use [brand] AFFEC 2: Using [brand] makes me happy AFFEC 3: I feel good when I use [brand] AFFEC 4: I'm proud to use [brand]
<i>Activation (Behavioural)</i>	ACTIV 1: I spend a lot of time using [brand], compared to other [category] brands. ACTIV 2: Whenever I'm using [category], I usually use [brand]. ACTIV 3: [Brand] is one of the brands I usually use when I use [category].

## **Biographical notes**

Laurence-Helene Borel is a Digital Marketing Manager with a decade experience in international digital marketing across the automotive, oil and technology sectors. A passionate advocate of social media and its impact on brand management, Laurence-Helene recently completed a Masters by Research in Marketing at Birkbeck, University of London, investigating the antecedents and consequences of branded hashtag engagement. Laurence is a regular speaker at industry events and conferences.

George Christodoulides is a Professor of Marketing at Birkbeck, University of London. His research interests lie in the areas of brand management and e-marketing, particularly consumer-based brand equity conceptualization and measurement and the impact of interactive/social media on consumer-brand relationships. He is a regular presenter and invited speaker at international conferences and his research has appeared in leading scientific journals.