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ABSTRACT

This study aims to investigate the multilevel relationship between corporate branding and customer-based brand equity. From prior research, a comprehensive scale of corporate branding is seldom conducted by researchers. Therefore, this research tends to develop a scale of corporate branding derived from theoretical perspectives and investigations the multilevel relationship between corporate branding and customer-based brand equity. In Study 1, this research focuses on the scale development of corporate brand. The guidelines of Hinkin (1998) are followed to determine the procedure for this scale development. A survey was conducted among a sample of 275 managers from 30 franchise organizations in Taiwan and five dimensions of corporate branding were obtained after EFA and CFA. These include communication and evaluation of corporate branding, departmental coordination of corporate branding, leadership and interaction with stakeholders of corporate branding, training and selection of corporate branding, and vision and culture of corporate branding. In Study 2, this research collects qualitative data via in-depth interviews of five-star hotels so as to prove the connection between theoretical perspectives and empirical practices. The implications of our findings, the limitations, and future studies are discussed.
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INTRODUCTION

In response to the dynamic and competitive environment, organizations have to make strategies adapted to the environment and then enhance their capability; that is, an organization may adopt the strategy of differentiated position related to the organizational symbolized values, such as corporate brands (Hatch and Schulz, 2003). In recent years scholars have proposed the concept of corporate branding to describe branding efforts especially focused on corporate brands as opposed to product brands. According to Harris and de Chernatony (2001), corporate branding includes the coordination of external and internal resources to contribute to a coherent brand reputation and a favorable brand identity that can be held by multiple stakeholders including employees, customers, and managers. Employees are key stakeholders who provide the interface between internal identity and external expression; thus they may be expected to interact with other stakeholders (i.e. customers) and in this interaction enhance the corporate brand values (Brexendorf and Kernstock, 2007). As argued by Hatch and Schulz (2003), an organization may communicate values, beliefs, basic assumptions of corporate brand to organizational members through corporate branding and thus induce organizational members perceive the brand in such a way that contributes to the success of corporate branding (Harris et al., 2001). Furthermore, Burmann and Zeplin (2005) assert that three important aspects, brand-centered HRM, brand communication, and brand leadership, can affect an employee’s brand-related cognitions (i.e. brand commitment). This is an example where the practices of corporate branding can induce employees to engender a positive identity with the brand.

Based on previous research, the concepts of corporate branding has been discussed by many scholars (i.e. de Chernatony, 1999; Urde, 2001; Leitch and Richardson, 2003; Balmer, 2001; Harris et al., 2001; Knox and Bickerton, 2003; Balmer and Gray, 2003; Hatch et al., 2003; Martin, Beaumont, Doig and Pate, 2005; Vallaster and de Chernatony, 2006; Uggla, 2006; Balmer, 2008), all of whom indicate that corporate branding is an important issue. However, few researches have investigated the dimensions of corporate branding and thus there exists a gap; we need to develop a scale for corporate branding. Although Souiden, Kassim and Hong (2006) proposed four dimensions of corporate branding (i.e., corporate name, image, reputation, and loyalty) to examine their joint effect on a customer’s product evaluation, these four dimensions which focus on customers’ perceptions are not comprehensive. Scholars have revealed important components of corporate branding including vision, culture, image (Hatch et al., 2003), brand-centered HRM (Burmann et al., 2005), interaction with multiple stakeholders (Leitch et al., 2003), brand leadership (Kay, 2006), brand communication (Harris et al., 2001), and departmental
coordination (de Chernatony, 1999). These aspects of corporate branding should also be included within the dimensions of corporate branding. From empirical evidences, the practice of corporate branding as adopted by franchise organizations have indeed involved transmitting vision, mission, and values to organizational members through various kinds of communication channels including departmental meetings, training and interaction with colleagues. However, researchers have not yet undertaken tasks to develop a comprehensive scale of corporate branding that will assist academics and practitioners in further understanding and using corporate branding. Therefore, the first objective of this research is to conduct scale development of corporate branding.

Corporate branding is regarded as underpinned processes which include strategic vision, organizational culture, and corporate images (Hatch et al., 2003), indicating that an organization can utilize corporate branding to transmit the vision and culture of the corporate brand toward external stakeholders. According to Leitch et al. (2003), through the process of interacting with multiple stakeholders, an organization can better understand how to manage the brand relationships; that is, an organization can obtain new insights from external stakeholders and establish good brand relationships with those external stakeholders. Martin et al. (2005) also contend that sophisticated human resource policies which help organizational members to establish a strong and positive brand identity can improve the external image and reputation of the corporate brand. As argued above, practices of corporate branding can foster a favorable image and reputation of the corporate brand, thus enhancing brand equity. However, few researchers have explored this relationship. Thus, the second objective of this research is to investigate the multilevel relationship between corporate branding and customer-based brand equity.

Building on the multilevel and quantitative results, this research further proves the generalizability of corporate branding via qualitative data collected from in-depth interviews of five-star hotels. Both quantitative and qualitative data can talk to theoretical perspectives. We adopt the perspectives of social identity and social exchange theories. As argued by Ashforth et al. (1989), employees with high social identity produce organizational commitment which contributes to the success of organizational activities. In addition, Chen and Klimoski (2003) argued that high-quality social exchanges will be produced when employees have high levels of mutual trust, respect, and loyalty with the organization. Extended from the above perspectives, this research argues that employees who identify the corporate brand and have high levels of mutual trust, respects, and loyalty with the corporate brand may produce positive cognition, thus contributing to the success of corporate branding. However, extant literature has yet to document these relationships. To sum up, we intend to clarify the multilevel relationship between corporate branding,
LITERATURE REVIEW

This section will first discuss the concept, definition and dimensions of corporate branding according to the literature. It is based on this concept and definition that this study will construct the scale of corporate branding.

Definition of Corporate Branding

Corporate branding is a systematic process planned and implemented by an organization to create and maintain a favorable image and reputation through sending signals to all stakeholders, managing organizational behavior, communication, and symbolism (Muzellec and Lambkin, 2006; Einwiller and Will, 2002). Hatch et al. (2003) describes corporate branding as an organizational tool that depends on strategy, organizational context, and communication to assist managers in analyzing organizational contexts aligned between strategic vision, organizational culture and corporate image. Knox et al. (2003) asserted that the management of corporate branding is “the activity is rendered more complex by managers conducting these practices at the level of the organization, rather than the individual product or service, and the requirement to manage interactions with multiple stakeholder audiences” (pp. 999). Corporate branding is considered a different management approach that must pay great attention to the role of employees who can facilitate or complicate the success of brand building (Harris et al., 2001).

As argued by Homburg and Pflesser (2000), behavioral perspective of market orientation describes employee behaviors related to generation, dissemination and responsiveness of market intelligence (Kohli and Jaworski, 1990), whereas the cultural perspective of market orientation is more associated with fundamental characteristics of the organization. Building on perspectives of market orientation, Baumgarth (2010) defined brand orientation as a specific type of market orientation which is highly related to brand management. Extended from perspectives of market orientation and brand orientation, this research regards practices of corporate branding can be regarded as corporate branding orientation which include behavioral and cultural components, contributing to the success of brand management. Based on the literature review, this study defines corporate branding orientation as a systematic processes of creating and maintaining a favorable image and reputation (Muzellec et al., 2006) and effective communication of signals and symbols toward internal and external stakeholders (Harris et al., 2001). It involves the practices of brand-centered HRM (Burmann et al., 2005), interactions with multiple stakeholders, departmental coordination (Leitch et al., 2003), and brand leadership (Burmann et al., 2005; Vallaster et al., 2006). The success of corporate branding depends on the alignment of
vision, culture and the strategies of the corporate brand (Hatch et al., 2003).

**Differences between Product Brands and Corporate Brands**

Corporate brands are different from product brands because in corporate brands there are multiple stakeholders, broader marketing mix, and total corporate communication (Balmer, 2001). The criteria of management, responsibility, cognate disciplines, communication mix, focus, and values reveal the difference between corporate brands and product brands (Balmer, 2001). Corporate brands are mainly managed by CEOs, responsibility is undertaken by all personnel and the brand is communicated with a set of fundamental core values that can become a powerful source of brand equity (Balmer, 1998; Uggla, 2006). The building of corporate brands includes internal and external core value-based processes that can contribute to the brand architecture, brand position, communication strategies, and the image of the corporate brand (Urde, 2001). Therefore, corporate brands defined by organizational values and goals can make an organization visible and notable (Kay, 2006) and contribute to the success of corporate branding (Harris et al., 2001).

**Corporate Brand, Corporate Identity, Corporate Image, and Corporate Reputation**

The concept of corporate brand is derived from organizational identity and associated with the concepts of corporate image, corporate reputation, and corporate perception. The elements of corporate brand are cultural, intricate, tangible and ethereal (Balmer, 2001). First, corporate identity gives organizations their distinctiveness and emphasizes several important elements including culture, strategy, structure, history, business activities, and market scope. Second, creating a positive image facilitates an organization in effectively managing their corporate image. There are three disciplinary approaches to corporate image that include psychology, graphic design and public relations, all of which contribute to the corporate identity. A positive corporate reputation benefits an organization, as the multiple stakeholders will all have a positive image of the organization. The objective of corporate identity is to acquire a favorable corporate reputation among multiple stakeholders thus allowing for competitive advantages including financial worth, traits and signals, formation, expectations, norms, assets and mobility barriers. Based on prior literature, corporate branding is regarded as organizational practices whose successful application secures the success of corporate identity (Abratt, 1989), corporate reputation (Harris et al., 2001; Van Riel and Balmer, 1997) and corporate image (Hatch et al., 2003).

**Key Concepts of Corporate Branding**

According to prior research in this area, eight key concepts of corporate branding are discussed. First, corporate branding is cultural, intricate, tangible, and ethereal
(Balmer et al., 2003). Corporate branding links three components including strategic vision, organizational culture, and corporate image (Hatch et al., 2003). Second, corporate branding depends on the interactive process with multiple stakeholders. As argued by Leitch et al. (2003), the brand web concept helps an organization to understand how to manage the web of brand relationships. Corporate branding can be considered as the outcome of the interactive process with multiple stakeholders (Knox et al., 2003). Third, key internal factors, including managers, teams and employees, are identified as important factors in corporate branding and can leverage brand resources and then enhance brand performance (Harris et al., 2003). Fourth, sophisticated HR policies can improve internal brand identity and external brand image. A strong and positive internal brand identity, established through sophisticated HR policies, may improve the external image and reputation of an organization and thus contribute to corporate branding (Martin et al., 2005).

Fifth, successful leaders who integrate multilevel resources can make appropriate corporate branding decisions. Corporate brand values shall be directed by managers who can make appropriate corporate branding decisions that establish corporate identity and enhance corporate reputation (Kay, 2006). Successful leaders are those who can integrate corporate identity structures, corporate branding structures and the individual stakeholders (Vallaster et al., 2006). Sixth, communicational context renders corporate branding an extremely powerful source of brand equity. Corporate branding is regarded as an organizational tool that uses strategic, organizational and communicational contexts to successfully brand a corporation (Hatch et al., 2003). The general advantages of corporate branding are that corporate brands are differentiated and publicized; in this way corporate branding is a powerful source of brand equity (Balmer, 2001; Uggla, 2006). Seven, corporate branding that emphasizes the multidimensional nature involved in the coordination of internal resources creates a favorable brand identity (de Chernatony, 1999). Eight, a corporate brand is considered to be an explicit covenant between an organization and its multiple stakeholders. The covenant asserted by a senior manager is promoted via multiple channels of communication including advertisement and through customer-service employees (Balmer et al., 2003). Six conventions of corporate branding proposed by Knox et al. (2003) include brand context (setting the coordinates), brand construction (the corporate brand positioning framework), brand confirmation (articulating the corporate brand position), brand consistency (developing consistent corporate brand communication), brand continuity (driving the brand deeper into the organization), and brand conditioning (monitoring for relevance and distinctiveness).

Dimensions of Corporate Branding
The concepts of corporate branding are related to vision, culture, image (Hatch et al., 2003), brand-centered HRM (Burmann et al., 2005), interaction with multiple stakeholders (Leitch et al., 2003), brand leadership (Kay, 2006), brand communication (Harris et al., 2001), and departmental coordination (de Chernatony, 1999). However, few researchers have explored the concepts of corporate branding with a comprehensive method. Based on key concepts of corporate branding, this research suggests six dimensions of corporate branding that include: (1) the vision, culture, and image of corporate branding, (2) interactions with multiple stakeholders of corporate branding, (3) leadership of corporate branding of corporate branding, (4) departmental coordination of corporate branding, (5) HR practices of corporate branding, and (6) communication of corporate branding.

First, characteristics of corporate branding are cultural, intricate, tangible, and ethereal, senior managers may frame the vision and culture of the brand through the process of corporate branding (Balmer et al., 2003; Hatch et al., 2003). Second, internal and external core value-based processes contribute to brand architecture and brand position. Communication strategies represent that interaction with multiple stakeholders can help an organization improve corporate branding and enhance brand equity through capturing diversified perspectives from internal and external stakeholders (Leitch et al., 2001; Knox et al., 2003). Third, brand leaders who can integrate corporate identity structures, corporate branding structures, and organizational members may frame the vision, culture, values, and conventions in such a way that corresponds to appropriate corporate branding decisions thus contributing to brand image and brand reputation (Balmer et al., 2003; Kay, 2006; Vallaster et al., 2006). Fourth, the internal factors, including managers, teams and employees, are identified as important factors that contribute to brand equity; nevertheless, organizational members from different departments may be difficult to coordinate (Harris et al., 2003). Therefore, a high level of the departmental coordination may contribute to positive corporate branding (Balmer et al., 2001; de Chernatony, 1999).

Fifth, a strong and positive internal brand identity can be established through the achievement of sophisticated HR practices such as brand-related training, selection, compensation, development, and promotion (Martin et al., 2005; Burmann et al., 2005). Sixth, the vision, culture, and covenant of corporate branding asserted by senior managers are promoted through multiple channels of communication; therefore, brand communication plays an important role in building a corporate brand (Balmer, 2001; Balmer, 2003; Uggla, 2006).

Definitions of Dimensions of Corporate Branding

This study further defines the dimensions of corporate branding and the
definition of each dimension is discussed as follows.

**Vision, Culture, and Image of Corporate Branding**

Hatch et al. (2003) stated that corporate branding involved the linking of three components, which include strategic vision, organizational culture, and corporate image. Strategic vision refers to the central ideas held by top managers that help to guide an organization toward future achievements. Organizational culture refers to the internal values, beliefs, and basic assumptions that communicate meaning to organizational culture to organizational members. Corporate image refers to overall impressions perceived by internal and external stakeholders. Based on Hatch *et al.* (2003), this study defines the vision, culture, and image of corporate branding as organizational tools implemented to transmit vision, belief, value, and the norms of the corporate brand to both internal and external stakeholders.

**Interactions with Multiple Stakeholders of Corporate Branding**

Leitch *et al.* (2003) regarded corporate branding as the outcome of an interactive process with multiple stakeholders. Within these multiple relationships, an organization is considered as the hub that generally has strategic and tactical control over the corporate brand. Therefore, an organization may transmit brand values to multiple stakeholders through various kinds of interactive processes including formal meetings, advertising and employee interaction with customers (Harris *et al.*, 2001). Based on the perspectives of several scholars (i.e. Leitch *et al.*, 2003; Harris *et al.*, 2001; Knox *et al.*, 2003), this study defines interaction with multiple stakeholders of corporate branding as the systematic process implemented by an organization to interact with internal stakeholders (i.e. managers, teams, and employees) and external stakeholders (i.e. customers, suppliers, and the government) to enhance brand performance, brand image, brand reputation, and brand equity.

**Leadership of Corporate Branding**

In order to develop a strong corporate brand, managers may make appropriate corporate branding decisions that can help an organization to develop a particular identity of the corporate brand and to build brand reputation (Kay, 2006). Managers who conduct corporate branding at multiple levels of the organization are required to interact with multiple stakeholder audiences (Knox *et al.*, 2003). This is why successful leaders of corporate branding are regarded as integrating forces that integrate the structures of corporate identity and mediate the relationship between corporate branding structures and organizational members (Vallaster *et al.*, 2006). In conjunction with the perspectives of several scholars (Knox *et al.*, 2003; Kay, 2006; Vallaster *et al.*, 2006), this study defines leadership of corporate branding as the implements that managers use to formulate corporate strategy and clear brand objectives which can be followed by organizational members as well as the
adjustment of products and services to enhance corporate brand values based on the information from internal stakeholders (i.e. employees) and external stakeholder (i.e. customers) (Vallaster et al., 2006).

Departmental coordination of Corporate Branding

Coordination of internal resources (i.e. functional capabilities, and communication capabilities) may help an organization to create a coherent brand identity and a favorable brand reputation (de Chernatony, 1999). In fact, organizational members who have different functional backgrounds can suggest new and useful perspectives for corporate branding; however, a unified view of the corporate branding strategy is an important role in successful management of corporate branding (Harris et al., 2001). As argued by Hatch et al. (2003), the integrated efforts of HR, communication and marketing departments bring the corporate activities of corporate branding; therefore, functional coordination can contribute to the success of corporate branding. In conjunction with the perspectives of several scholars (de Chernatony, 1999; Harris et al., 2001; Hatch et al., 2003), this study defines departmental coordination as practices which are implemented by different departments of an organization to frequently discuss and exchange information that contributes to the brand behavior internal members, brand image, and brand commitment proposed by the organization.

HR Practices of Corporate Branding

Human resource management (HRM), which aligns external corporate image and internal employee identity, may obtain different information from many stakeholders seeking to improve the external image and reputation of the organization (Martin et al., 2005). Burmann et al. (2005) also contended that brand-centered HRM might contribute to an internalization of brand identity, something that is important to corporate branding. The HR practices of corporate branding are adopted by an organization to improve internal branding and employee brand behaviors that are consistent with the external branding efforts (Aurand, Gorchels and Bishop, 2005). That is, employees who are satisfied, motivated, empowered, and recognized via HR practices may provide services with higher quality, which is perceived directly by customers (Girod, 2005). As demonstrated by Aurand et al. (2005), HR practices that include selectivity in staffing, comprehensiveness of training, developmental performance appraisal, externally equitable rewards, and individually equitable rewards (Snell and Dean, 1992) can induce employees to implement brand-centered strategies, thus revealing that brand-centered HR practices contribute to the implementation of corporate branding. In conjunction with the perspectives of many scholars (Snell et al., 1992; Martin et al., 2005; Burmann et al., 2005; Aurand et al., 2005; Girod, 2005), this study defines HR practices of corporate branding as
systematic practices implemented by an organization to inspire organizational members to demonstrate positive brand attitudes and positive brand behaviors via brand-oriented HR practices such as brand-oriented selection, brand-oriented training, brand-oriented evaluation, brand-oriented rewards, and brand-oriented compensation.

Communication of Corporate Branding

The effective communication of corporate branding depends on the coherence of expression via the multiplicity of channels and news media that is directed at multiple stakeholders to create a strong corporate brand where the qualities of image, reputation, and commitment are reflected by the organization (Balmer, 2001; Kay, 2006). As argued by Harris et al. (2001), communication in the field of corporate branding contributes to the formation of congruent perspectives toward the corporate brand because organizational members with similar perceptions are more likely to have similar experiences, perspectives, and values that will help managers, teams, and employees communicate easily. Therefore, communication plays an important role in the implementation of corporate branding. In conjunction with the perspectives of several scholars (Balmer, 2001; Harris et al. 2001; Kay, 2006), this study defines the communication of corporate branding as communication practices implemented by an organization to transmit brand value to internal stakeholders (i.e. employees) and external stakeholders (i.e. customers) through formal channels (i.e. meetings) or informal channels (i.e. interactions between employees). The effects of communication are assessed regularly.

Corporate Branding and Customer-based Brand Equity

According to arguments of previous researches, important perspectives of corporate branding include vision, culture, and image alignment (Harris et al., 2001), brand leadership (Vallaster et al., 2006), interactions with multiple stakeholders (Leitch et al., 2003), departmental coordination (de Chernatony, 1999), brand-centered HR practices (Martin, Beaumont, Doig, and Pate, 2005; Burmann et al., 2005), and brand communication (Balmer, 2001). Thus, corporate branding, different from product branding, is characterized by high strategic focus, is both internal and external target oriented, and concerns the alignment of internal marketing and external marketing.

Corporate branding is significantly related to brand equity. According to Balmer (2001), strategic incorporation of branding can be communicated externally and internally, which may become powerful sources of brand equity. Balmer (2001) contends that corporate brand associations are derived from organizational identity and are related with concepts of corporate image, corporate reputation, and perception. Successful implementation of corporate branding may result in desirable corporate identity (Abratt, 1989), corporate reputation (Harris et al., 2001; Van Riel and Balmer,
1997) and corporate image (Hatch et al., 2003). Furthermore, an organization may obtain ideas, knowledge, and insights of the corporate brand from external stakeholders (e.g., customers and trade) and internal employees in the interactive process (Leitch et al., 2003). Then, an effective corporate branding strategy can be formulated to fulfill the needs of the stakeholders, thus enhancing brand evaluations and brand resonance with customers (Keller, 1993). As argued above, this research argues that an organization which successfully implements corporate branding may lead to the strengthening of customer-based brand equity and proposes hypothesis 2 as the following.

Hypothesis 1: Corporate branding positively affects customer-based brand equity.

METHOD

After the literature review this research aims to develop a scale of corporate branding according to the guidelines of Hinkin (1998). The detailed steps for developing a scale include items development, item elimination and content validity, factor analysis, and validity examination. The procedures carried out in each step are described as follows.

**Step 1: Items Development**

This study captures the concept of corporate branding through in-depth interviews with practitioners of franchises. Ten managers who worked in the franchise organization were interviewed, six were male and four were female. The age was distributed from 35 to 50 (the average age was 42) and the average tenure was 10 years. Throughout the process of in-depth interviews, the definition of corporate branding was introduced to these managers and then they were asked questions about the phenomenon and the presence of corporate branding within their own company. Questions included in this in-depth interview include, “Could you tell me how the senior manager transmits the vision and culture of corporate branding to organizational members?”, “The image of the corporate brand is influenced by internal and external stakeholders, such as frontline employees and customers. Could you tell me how you interact with multiple stakeholders in order to improve the image of the corporate brand?”, “Could you tell me what the role of the leader is in the process of corporate branding?”, “Could tell me how different departments of the company coordinate in order to enhance the brand value?”, “Could you tell me what practices of brand-related reward are?”, “Could you tell me what practices of brand-related training are adopted in your organization?”, “Could you tell me what practices of brand-related selection and evaluation are adopted in your organization?”, and “Could you tell me how the company communicates information concerning the corporate brand with internal and external stakeholders?”. Key concepts of corporate branding are captured from these in-depth interviews.
Each in-depth interview took between forty minutes and two hours depending on the organizational complexity. In the process of the in-depth interviews, each manager could freely express their opinions, which were audio recorded and converted to transcripts. The transcripts were reviewed in search of ideas that could be utilized as items in questionnaires. These ideas were discussed with two scholars in this field of study to ensure that the items conformed to the definition of corporate branding. After deleting ideas that did not match the definition of corporate branding, this study translated the ideas into items on the questionnaire.

**Step 2: Item Elimination and Content Validity**

Several stages of analysis were carried out before the final questionnaire items were determined. First, three professors read and discussed all the generated items one by one to ensure that they are congruent with the definition of corporate branding and the wording are clear in meaning. Second, three Ph.D. candidates from the department of Business Administration at the university in northern Taiwan were asked to categorize these items according the definition. The results could be (a) matched, (b) not matched, or (c) not categorized. Through this process the researchers could ensure that the items distinguished the constructs clearly. The items would be deleted if 2 of the 3 Ph.D. candidates suggested that the item did not match or could not be categorized according to the definition of the dimension. Based on this process, three of thirty-seven items were deleted. The inter-rater reliability is 0.94. The items used to measure the dimensions of corporate branding are described as follows.

**Vision, Culture, and Image of Corporate Branding:** Measurement items include V1“Our company transmits the vision of the corporate brand to organizational members through a variety of channels”, V2“Our company transmits belief, value, and the norm of the corporate brand to organizational members through various kinds of channels”, and V3“Our company creates a climate where it is able to realize the values of the corporate brand”.

**Interactions with Multiple Stakeholders:** Measurement items include V4“Our company would accept suggestions from organizational members in order to enhance the service quality and brand image”, V5“Our company would accept the suggestions provided by customers in order to enhance the service quality and brand image”, V6“Our company would accept suggestions provided by other stakeholders (i.e. suppliers and/or government) in order to enhance the service quality and brand image”, and V7“Our company would provide good product and service quality in order to realize brand commitment”.

**Leadership of Corporate Branding:** Measurement items include V8“Our senior managers suggest brand strategies which are based on the values of the corporate brand proposed by our company”, V9“Our senior managers establish clear brand
goals which inspire employees to greater achievements”, and V10“In order to enhance the brand value, our senior managers adjust the content of product and service according to the responses of customers”.

**Departmental Coordination:** Measurement items include V14“Different departments of our company work together in designing activities for improving the brand image”, V15“Different departments of our company often discuss how to make employees express positive brand behavior”, V16“Different departments of our company often exchange information in order to ensure that each department understands customer perception of the corporate brand”, and V17“Different departments of our company work together in inspiring value and commitment to the corporate brand”.

**HR Practices of Corporate Branding:** Measurement items include V18“When employees display behaviors fostering brand value, our company provides these employees with informal rewards such as encouragement”, V19“When employees display behaviors that foster brand value, our company provides these employees with formal rewards such as compensation”, V20“When the market share of the brand enhances, our company rewards employees who participate in brand-related activities”, V21“Our company compensates employees for providing brand-related creativity and information”, V22“Our company helps newcomers to understand brand-related value and spirit through training”, V23“Our company maintains the personal value and behavior of employees consistent with brand value through training courses”, V24“Our company focuses on cultivating brand-related talents”, V25“During job training, our company transmits skills of service to employees and inspires them to demonstrate positive brand behaviors”, V26“Our company considers the personal value of applicants to recruit employees with person-brand fit”, V27“Our company considers the personal traits of applicants to recruit employees with person-brand fit”, V28“The brand image may help our company to recruit appropriate employees when recruiting newcomers”, V29“Our company considers employee brand-related behavior in the process of evaluation”, V30“Our company makes employees compare their behaviors with a brand-related standard via self-evaluation or colleague-evaluation”, and V31“Our company regularly assesses employee contribution to brand value”.

**Communication of Corporate Branding:** Measurement items include V32“Our company often communicates brand-related spirit, content, and value when developing new products or services”, V33“Our company often transmits values of the brand to organizational members through various kinds of informal channels, such as interactions between colleagues”, V34“Our company often transmits values of the brand to organizational members through various kinds of formal channels, such as
regular meetings”, V35“Our company often transmits values of the brand to stakeholders through interaction between organizational members and stakeholders (i.e. customers, suppliers, and the government)”, V36“Our company often transmits values of the brand to stakeholders through various kinds of communicative channels such as advertisements, meetings, public relations, and networks”, and V37“Our company regularly assesses the effect of its communication”.

**Step 3: Data Collection**

The reason that this research collects data concerning corporate branding from store managers is because they are regarded as key informants that clearly understand that practices of corporate branding that are implemented. Data collection captured the perspective of store managers from franchise organization for developing a scale of corporate branding. Participants at the organizational level are store managers from 30 franchise organizations in Taiwan and are recruited through the Taiwan Chain Store and Franchise Association. We first visited the senior manager or the store manager in person to inquire about their willingness to participate in the survey. This was followed up with phone conversations.

The data collection phase took place over a four-month period. During the first two months, data was collected to conduct exploratory factor analyses. 150 questionnaires were returned among 160 questionnaires distributed and 135 were valid. This represented a response rate of 80 percent. Regarding the respondent’s characteristics, 46.7 percent were male and 53.3 percent were female, 53.3 percent were between the ages of 26-35 and 66.4 percent held a bachelors degree. During the second two months, data was collected to conduct confirmatory factor analyses. In this second-wave of data, 155 questionnaires were returned among 170 questionnaires distributed and 140 were valid. This represents a response rate of 82 percent. Regarding the respondent’s characteristics, 36.4 percent are male and 63.6 percent are female, 50.7 percent are between the ages of 26-35 and 63.6 percent have a bachelor degree. Furthermore, research assistants invited customers to fill out a questionnaire concerning brand equity. 1300 questionnaires were sent out and 577 questionnaires were returned. This represented a response rate was 44.39%.

**Step 4: Exploratory Factor Analyses**

By conducting a principle component analysis with orthogonal (VARIMAX) rotation using the first-wave of data, this study examined the dimensionality of corporate branding. Several cross-loading items including V3, V4, V5, V11, V12, V13, V17, V18, V19, V21, V24, V25, V27, V28, V29, V32, and V37 were deleted (Conway and Huffcutt, 2003). This study further examined the dimensionality of corporate branding with the remaining 20 items. The selection criteria for these items was that factor loadings of these items appeared higher than 0.5. The KMO value was
0.917 and the Barlett Sphericity Test results were significant (p-value<0.001).

As reported in Table 2, this study obtained five principal factors that contribute to corporate branding. These include communication and evaluation of corporate branding (CECB), departmental coordination of corporate branding (DCCB), leadership and interaction with stakeholders concerning corporate branding (LISCB), training and selection of corporate branding (TSCB), and vision and culture of corporate branding (VCCB) and explained 74.77 percent of the total variance. Reliability was examined on all the remaining items from the 5 dimensions assessment. As a test of reliability, Cronbach’s alpha value was used to represent internal consistency. The results show that the values were 0.919, 0.9, 0.83, 0.82 and 0.92, indicating that the items are reliably measuring the constructs and variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Communication and evaluation of corporate branding</th>
<th>Departmental coordination of corporate branding</th>
<th>Leadership and interaction with stakeholders of corporate branding</th>
<th>Training and selection of corporate branding</th>
<th>Vision and culture of corporate branding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V30</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V31</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V33</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V34</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V36</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V35</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V16</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>-0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>-0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V22</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V23</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>0.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V20</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V26</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 EFA of Corporate Branding (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Communication and evaluation of corporate branding</th>
<th>Departmental coordination of corporate branding</th>
<th>Leadership and interaction with stakeholders of corporate branding</th>
<th>Training and selection of corporate branding</th>
<th>Vision and culture of corporate branding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variance %</td>
<td>19.41</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>11.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative variance %</td>
<td>19.41</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>62.94</td>
<td>74.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha</td>
<td>0.919</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 5: Definitions and Measures of Dimensions

Communication and Evaluation of Corporate Branding (CECB)

This study defines the first dimension, communication and evaluation of corporate branding, as communicated practices which are implemented by an organization to transmit brand values to internal stakeholders (i.e. employees) and external stakeholders (i.e. customers) through formal channels (i.e. meeting) or informal channels (i.e. interactions between employees). Furthermore, we evaluated practices that are utilized by an organization to assess employee brand-oriented behavior and contribution. Items pertaining to the communication and evaluation of corporate branding include V30, V31, V33, V34, V35, and V36.

Departmental Coordination of Corporate Branding (DCCB)

This study defines the second dimension, departmental coordination of corporate branding, as practices implemented by an organization to facilitate discussion between different departments and to exchange information, thus contributing to employee brand behavior, brand image, and brand equity. Items pertaining to this dimension include V14, V15, and V16.

Leadership and Interaction with Stakeholders of Corporate Branding (LISCB)

The third dimension, leadership and interaction with stakeholders of corporate branding, is defined by this study as the methods that are adopted by senior managers. These methods not only frame corporate strategy and clear brand objectives which can be followed by organizational members, they also adjust the contents of products and services to enhance corporate brand values according to interactions with multiple stakeholders, thus enhancing brand performance (i.e., brand image, brand reputation, and brand equity). Items pertaining to this dimension include V6, V7, V8, V9, and V10.

Training and Selection of Corporate Branding (TSCB)

This study defines the fourth dimension, training and selection of corporate
branding, as practices that are adopted by an organization to assist newcomers in understanding brand-related value and spirit which encourage them to display good service behavior. Practices of selection are adopted by an organization when brand managers feel personal values of applicants are consistent with brand values. Items that pertain to the training and selection of corporate branding include V20, V22, V23, and V26.

Vision and Culture of Corporate Branding (VCCB)

The fifth dimension, vision and culture of corporate branding, is defined by this study as tools implemented by an organization to transmit brand-related vision, belief, value, and norms to internal and external stakeholders through multiple channels, thus contributing to the image and reputation of the corporate brand. Items pertaining to the vision and culture of corporate branding include V1 and V2.

**Step 6: Confirmatory Factor Analyses**

The fitness indices of corporate branding include $\chi^2$/d.f. = 2.02, GFI = 0.81, RMSR = 0.050, CFI = 0.98, NFI = 0.96, RMSEA = 0.086 and demonstrate that the fitness of the model is satisfactory. Although the fitness indices are good, it is possible to obtain better fitness in another competition model. As shown in Figure 1, the fitness of the five-dimension model is better than the fitness of the one-dimension model, which demonstrates that the five-dimension approach is appropriate in developing a scale of corporate branding.

![Figure 1: Measure Model of Corporate Branding](image)

Secondary CFA of Corporate Branding

A secondary CFA was conducted for the scale of corporate branding and the fitness indices of the secondary CFA of corporate branding include $\chi^2$/d.f. = 1.90,
GFI=0.81, RMSR=0.053, CFI=0.98, NFI= 0.96, RMSEA=0.082 which demonstrate that the fitness of the model is great. As showed in Figure 1, the standardized λ of each indicator is greater than 0.73 and the T value of each indicator reaches the significant level of 0.01. Thus, corporate branding can be regarded as one coherent construct composed of five secondary levels of latent constructs.

Discriminant and Convergence Validity of Corporate Branding

Based on Jöreskog and Sörbom (1981), two conceptually similar concepts are distinct if PHI $\pm 1.96 \times$ standardized error excludes 1. As reported in Table 2, the results show that discriminant validity exists among dimensions of corporate branding. According to the results in Table 5, the standardized λ of each indicator is greater than 0.73 and the T value of each indicator reaches the significant level of 0.01 thus indicating that each construct has convergent validity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>VCCB</th>
<th>LISCB</th>
<th>DCCB</th>
<th>TSCB</th>
<th>CECB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VCCB</td>
<td>0.86$^a$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.12)$^b$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.98$^c$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISCB</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCCB</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCB</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CECB</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $^a$ PHI, $^b$ Standardized Error, $^c$ T

Nomological Validity

Nomological validity describes the degree to which a developed scale can accurately predict other concepts according to the theoretical base (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, and Tatham, 2006). Based on theoretical perspectives, corporate branding is significantly related to brand equity. Corporate brands are different from product brands in their highly strategic focus and internal and external targets. Strategic incorporation can become a powerful source of brand equity (Balmer, 2001). As argued by scholars (Aaker, 1991; Keller and Lehmann, 2001; Muzellec et al., 2006),
corporate brand equity, which is related to the brand name and symbols, is the response to the brand given by multiple stakeholders such as employees, customers, and suppliers. Balmer (2001) argues that corporate brands are derived from organizational identity and are associated with the concept of corporate image, corporate reputation, and perception. Corporate branding is regarded as an organizational practice whose successful application depends on the success of corporate identity (Abratt, 1989), corporate reputation (Harris et al., 2001; Van Riel et al., 1997) and corporate image (Hatch et al., 2003). Therefore, this study investigated the relationship between corporate branding and brand equity to prove nomological validity. This study adopted the scale of brand equity proposed by Yoo and Donthu (2001) to measure brand equity. Measurement items of brand equity include “I consider myself to be loyal to the store brand”, “The store brand would be my first choice”, “I will not buy other brands if the store brand is available”, “The likely quality of the store brand is extremely high”, “The likelihood that the store brand would be functional is very high”, “I can recognize the store brand among other competing brands”, “I am aware of the store brand”, “Some characteristics of the store brand come to my mind quickly”, and “I can quickly recall the symbol or logo of the store brand”. Cronbach’s alpha value for the scale was 0.9.

As for correlation results, corporate branding is significantly associated with brand equity ($r=0.287^{**}$, $P<0.05$). This study further investigated the relationship between corporate branding and brand equity.

**Table 3 Multilevel Effect of Corporate Branding on Customer-based Brand Equity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Brand equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.77***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate branding</td>
<td>0.253***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>-0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance $^a$</td>
<td>798.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Deviance is a measure of model fit. Deviance =-2* log-likelihood of the full maximum-likelihood estimate. Organizations $n=30$; Supervisors $n=250$; Customers $n=577$ ***$P<0.01$, ** $P<0.05$, *<0.1

Multilevel Analysis

As reported in Table 3, corporate branding positively affects brand equity ($\beta$
=0.253, p<0.01), revealing that corporate branding can contribute to brand equity. Based on above-mentioned results, nomological validity is demonstrated.

**STUDY 2**

The data utilized in study 2 were collected from in-depth interviews of managers and frontline employees of five-star hotels in Taiwan. The case study approach was utilized by this study to obtain the practical phenomena which talk to dimensions of corporate branding and enhance generalizability of the scale of corporate branding.

**Data Collection and Methodology**

As argued by Eisenhardt (1989), case studies which help researchers understand each case individually can obtain complete information. In 2012, semi-structured interviews were utilized to understand the practical phenomenon of hotel management through managers and employees. Table 4 presents the details of five-star hotels which help this research deeply understand practical phenomenon of corporate branding.

**Table 4 Details of Five-star Hotels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Case</th>
<th>The Ambassador Hotel</th>
<th>Sheraton Hotel</th>
<th>Regent Taipei Hotel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffs Number</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>Over 186,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches</td>
<td>Ambassador Hotel</td>
<td>Sheraton Taipei Hotel</td>
<td>Grand Formosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Taipei Hotel</td>
<td>Sheraton Hsinchu Hotel</td>
<td>Silks Palace at National Palace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ambassador Hotel</td>
<td>Hsinchu Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Hsinchu Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ambassador Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regent Taipei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Kaohsiung Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Silks PLACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Just Sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WASABI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SPICE MARKET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Brand</td>
<td>Integrity, teamwork, innovation, feedback</td>
<td>Warm and Cordial, share, and Contact Induction Hotel</td>
<td>Grand Formosa In Search Of Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star-rated</td>
<td>Five-star Tourism Hotel</td>
<td>Five-star Tourism Hotel</td>
<td>Five-star Tourism Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Service</td>
<td>Amba Taipei Ximending-Creative Opening</td>
<td>My Humble House</td>
<td>Wasabi Spice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garden Villa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Just Café Domino'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Practical Phenomenon and Dimensions of Corporate Branding**

This research conducts the scale development of corporate branding through data of chain stores and franchise organizations and intends to enhance generalizability of the scale via in-depth interviews of hotel managements. In-depth interview contents
which talk to dimensions of corporate branding are described as follows.

Communication and Evaluation of Corporate Branding

This research defines the dimension as communicative practices which are implemented by an organization to transmit brand values to internal stakeholders (i.e. employees) and external stakeholders (i.e. customers) through formal channels or informal channels. According to in-depth interview contents, the organization transmits brand values to employees via formal and informal channels. Employees who feel brand values are meaningful can know how to treat the family members, colleagues, and customers. Brand values are promoted via internal and external interactions.

Departmental Coordination of Corporate Branding

The dimension is defined as practices implemented by an organization to facilitate discussion between different departments and exchange information, thus contributing to brand strength. From in-depth interviews of five-star hotels, employees are also required to participate in the cross-department training, to work temporarily in other departments, to understand the cooperation between different departments. When interacting with customers, employees from different departments have coordinate with each other, thus contributing to customer satisfaction and brand loyalty.

Leadership and Interaction with Stakeholders of Corporate Branding

This research defines the dimension as leadership styles adopted by brand managers to frame brand strategy which can be followed by organizational members to improve the process of interaction with customers and enhance service quality. As reported in Table 5, brand managers can encourage frontline employees to display good service behavior via brand leadership. In daily job, brand managers make employees service behavior transformed through transmitting brand values, such as enthusiasm, steadiness, and kindness of the brand. As for formal approaches, employees are awarded (e.g., commendation, bonus, and the hotel’s dining coupons) when they have special contribution to the hotel’s performance, colleagues, and customers.

Training and Selection of Corporate Branding

Training and Selection of Corporate Branding is defined as brand practices adopted by an organization to assist newcomers in understanding brand value and spirit which encourage them to display good service behavior. Brand selection is utilized by brand managers to select employees with person-brand fit. As showed in Table 5, brand managers observe the applicants’ attitude from details of the interview to judge if he or she is suitable to the hotel job. They first consider applicants’ personality, instead of their knowledge or skills, because specialties can be leaned,
whereas their personality is hard to be changed.

**Vision and Culture of Corporate Branding**

This research defines vision and culture of corporate branding as tools implemented by an organization to transmit brand-related vision, belief, value, and norms to internal and external stakeholders through multiple channels. From the in-depth interview contents, different five-star hotels have different brand values, such as integrity, teamwork, innovation, social responsibility, cautiousness, carefulness, and the peace of mind. In daily job, service-contact employees share brand values with colleagues and customers.

**Table 5 In-depth Interview Data and Dimensions of Corporate Branding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Corporate Branding</th>
<th>In-depth Interview Data of Five-star Hotels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Evaluation of Corporate Branding</td>
<td>1. The brand value is meaningful, because it is practical to my life, including how to treat the family, colleague, customers, and so on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Coordination of Corporate Branding</td>
<td>2. I share the brand values with my friends and customers, and tell them something that is different from the other hotels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. We will tell the superior the customers’ suggestions when we receive them. We are willing to share with customers and satisfy their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and Interaction with Stakeholders of Corporate Branding</td>
<td>1. Employees are awarded by managers when they display good service behaviors. I show our brand’s enthusiasm, steadiness, and kindness from our heart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. When employees become the managers, they will know the meanings of brand values and need to know how to implement the brand strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The managers recommend and choose three employees who have special contribution to the hotel’s performance, colleagues, and customers. The chosen employees are awarded via the commendation, bonus, and the hotel’s dining coupons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 In-depth Interview Data and Dimensions of Corporate Branding (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Corporate Branding</th>
<th>In-depth Interview Data of Five-star Hotels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Training and Selection of Corporate Branding | 1. The ways of inspections during recruitment are various, such as situation simulation, interview topics on everyday life and habits to understand the applicants in real life.  
2. We will observe the applicants’ attitude from the details to judge if he or she is suitable to the Hotel’s job.  
3. The first point we consider is applicants’ personality, instead of their knowledge or skills. Specialties can be leaned, whereas their personality is hard to be changed. |
| Vision and Culture of Corporate Branding | 1. The four core values are integrity, team work, innovation, and social responsibility.  
2. Our brand values include cautiousness, carefulness, the peace of mind, and responsibility. In daily job, we share brand values with colleagues and customers.  
3. The orientation integrates the new employees into our organization through conceptual and cultural trainings. Employees will know the brand spirit of the hotel and the direction they pursue. Some conceptual spirit which makes members feel glorious will never change. |

**DISCUSSION**

**Scale Development**

In conjunction with numerous theoretical perspectives, this study obtained six dimensions of corporate branding which include vision, culture, and image of corporate branding, interactions with multiple stakeholders, leadership of corporate branding, departmental coordination, HR practices of corporate branding, and communication of corporate branding. Items development was conducted by this study according to existing theoretical perspectives. This study further conducted content validity testing through the professional advice of experts including three professors and three Ph.D. candidates. The data collection was conducted in two-waves where the first-wave of data was collected to conduct exploratory factor analyses and the second-wave of data was used to conduct confirmatory factor analyses.

After exploratory factor analyses and confirmatory factor analyses, five dimensions of corporate branding isolated by this study include communication and evaluation of corporate branding, departmental coordination of corporate branding,
leadership and interaction with stakeholders concerning corporate branding, training and selection of corporate branding, and vision and culture of corporate branding. Based on secondary CFA, corporate branding can be regarded as one coherent construct composed of five latent constructs. This study further discovered that discriminant validity and convergent validity exists among dimensions of corporate branding. According to the theoretical methods, the relationship between corporate branding and brand equity was investigated to prove nomological validity. In order to examine the generalizability of corporate branding, this research further collected quantitative data from customer-contact employees and middle-level managers of five-star hotels. The results indicate that the scale of corporate branding can be regarded as effective tool of brand management in food-drink franchise organizations and five-star hotel.

Comprehensiveness and Effectiveness of the Scale

Based on results of Souiden et al. (2006), four dimensions of corporate branding include corporate name, image, reputation, and loyalty. However, these dimensions focus on customer perceptions and are not comprehensive enough because corporate branding involves multiple stakeholders. Based on the multiple perspectives of scholars, this study utilized comprehensive perspectives to develop a scale for corporate branding. Five dimensions of corporate branding obtained by this study through guidelines of Hinkin (1998) include communication and evaluation of corporate branding, departmental coordination of corporate branding, leadership and interaction with stakeholders of corporate branding, training and selection of corporate branding, and vision and culture of corporate branding. The organization can utilize the scale to measure perspectives of multiple stakeholders and frame brand strategy, thus enhancing the effectiveness of brand management.

The Application of the Scale

Several applications for this scale of corporate branding are discussed as follows. First, the scale of corporate branding can help senior managers to understand the degree of corporate branding that contributes to the brand equity. Second, it provides a useful source for brand managers to understand what dimension need to be improved, thus helping brand managers implement comprehensive practices of corporate branding. Third, the results of measuring corporate branding can help senior managers to make proper brand strategies that fit each marketing environment and enhance brand equity. Fourth, dimensions of corporate branding can become guidelines to be followed by brand managers while implementing practices of corporate branding. Fifth, the scale of corporate branding can be applied to all kinds of franchise organizations which focus on the brand management. Sixth, the scale of corporate branding can become a reference material when senior managers want to
construct a system of corporate branding.

**Limitations and Future Studies**

Limitations and future studies are noted by this study. First, the data was collected from 30 franchise organizations and not randomly from Taiwan markets. Future studies could collect data using a random sample. Second, this study collected quantitative data from food-drink franchise organizations and qualitative data from five-star hotels in Taiwan. Future studies can collect data from different industries (e.g., high technology industry) to further examine the differences. Third, this study collected data on corporate branding from the perspective of middle-level managers. Future studies can collect data both from middle-level managers and senior managers to reveal the differences. Fourth, this study developed a scale of corporate branding according to theoretical perspectives. Future studies can enhance the comprehensiveness of corporate branding using practical perspectives such as brand social responsibility. Fifth, customer-based brand equity was utilized to prove the nomological validity. Future studies could examine criteria-related validity by utilizing the scale developed by Souiden et al. (2006).
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