EFFECTS OF BRANDING STRATEGIES ON RECOGNITION OF CORPORATE BRAND AT EUROPEAN UNION MISSIONS IN KENYA

Catherine Nyambura Kalya[1]

Dr. Kepha Ombui[2]

Dr. Mike Iravo[3]

Master of Business Administration, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya[1]
Project Supervisor, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya[2]
Project Supervisor, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya[3]

Abstract- This research explores the effects of adopting branding strategies for recognition of the EU corporate brand Missions in Kenya. This study also outlines some gaps that exist in the research of corporate branding and formulates a series of related research questions. Corporate brand management is a dynamic process that involves keeping up with continuous adjustments of vision, culture and image. The target population of the study consisted of 200 employees of the European Union Missions in Kenya. A sample size of 133 respondents from eight operations within the EU Missions in Kenya was drawn. Multiple regression was used to establish the effect of branding strategies on recognition of corporate brand at European Union Missions in Kenya. The results showed that corporate social responsibility strategy had a positive effect on corporate brand recognition and improves it by 0.676 standardized coefficients. Brand communities strategy and internal branding strategy had a negative effect on corporate brand recognition reducing it by 0.250 standard deviations and 0.307 standard deviations respectively. Brand asset management strategy was observed to have a positive effect on corporate brand recognition improving it by 0.391 standard deviations.

Key Words: Corporate Branding, Corporate Brand Identity, Brand Communities

1. INTRODUCTION

Corporate brands are increasingly an important element of organisational and marketing strategy (Balmer, 2001; Olins, 2000). A strong corporate brand acts as a focal point for the attention, interest and activity stakeholders bring to an organisation. A corporate brand attracts and orients relevant audiences, stakeholders and constituencies around recognisable values and symbols that differentiate the organisation. But corporate branding is not only about differentiation, it is also about belonging. The rise of corporate branding has raised awareness of the crucial role employees' play in the corporate branding process. When corporate branding works, it is because it expresses the values and/or sources of desire that attract key stakeholders to the organisation and encourage them to feel a sense of belonging to it.

Within marketing, branding and corporate identity studies, we find a growing awareness that corporate brands can increase the company's visibility, recognition and reputation in ways not fully appreciated by product-brand thinking. The corporate brand contributes not only to customer-based images of the organisation, but to the images formed and held by all its stakeholders, including: employees; customers; investors; suppliers; partners; regulators; special interests; and local communities. Furthermore, with the ubiquity of technology decreasing the potential for sustained competitive advantage, managers are focusing more on differentiating their Brands on the basis of unique emotional, rather than functional, characteristics (De Chernatony et al., 2001). It is this attraction and sense of belonging that affects the decisions and behaviours on which a company is built. A strong corporate brand taps this attractive force and offers symbols that help stakeholders experience and express their values and thereby keep them active.

The importance of employees to corporate branding and the need to better understand their behaviour and thus the organisational culture of the corporation have received particular emphasis in recent work. Harris and de Chernatony (2001), Hatch and Schultz (2001) as well as Wilson and Balmer (2001) have all argued that employees are key to building relationships with all the organisation's stakeholders as well as contributing to the meaning of the brand (i.e. by expressing to others who we think we are as an organisation).

Earlier research identified several factors influencing the global Branding strategies (Gabrelsson & Gabrielsson, 2003; Loustrarinen & Gabrielsson, 2004); and also factors influencing Branding strategies. In the corporate brand tool kit developed by Hatch and Schultz (2001), the gaps between strategic vision, organisational culture and corporate image serve to identify key problem areas for corporate brands. As corporate branding is about multiple stakeholders interacting with the organisation's employees, its success largely relies on employees' attitudes and behaviours in delivering the brand promise to external stakeholders (Schultz, & De Chernatony, 2002). To be recognised as a high-performing corporate brand, organisations have to understand and orchestrate their employees to align their attitudes to brand values and encourage a brand supporting behaviour. The corporate brand must resonate with the tacit meanings and values that organisational members hold and use (i.e. their actual identity). To create an authentic corporate brand, the organisation should build on the cultural values that produce the tacit symbolic meaning of the organisation. This implies that organisational members are important contributors to the creation of corporate brand value. The corporate brand most likely to succeed is one that directly connects strategic vision and organisational culture.

Corporate branding refers to the practice of promoting the brand name of a corporate entity, as opposed to specific products or services. The activities and thinking that go into corporate branding are different from product and service branding because the scope of a corporate brand is typically much broader. Corporate brands are characterised by their cultural, intricate and tangible elements and should demand total organisational commitment. In most instances, the conscious decision by senior management to distil the attributes of the organisation's identity in the form of a clearly defined branding proposition. This proposition may be viewed as a covenant with key stakeholder groups and networks which underpin an organisation's effort to communicate differentiate and enhance the brand by means of concerted communicated message or messages across multiple channels of communication. Corporate branding management requires senior management support (Balmer, 2001).

Corporate branding efforts generally involve projections of the company's distinctiveness by using the total corporate communication mix to influence external audiences, who are thereby encouraged to perceive and judge the organisation and its multiple offerings as attractive and desirable. Such images are expected to influence stakeholder behaviour in ways that generate brand equity at the corporate level (Keller, 2000).

Management practice suggests that stronger brands result from a consistent corporate brand identity with harmonised identity components. The EU Missions in Kenya have completed numerous successful projects and programmes in various sectors such as; infrastructure, communications and transport, water and energy, rural development, agriculture and food security, the environment and the sustainable management of natural resources, health and vocational training and governance. However, there is a major gap in communicating and aligning the EU corporate brand strategy to its employees. Thus, the employees within EU Missions in Kenya do not understand the EU as a corporate brand, its mandates, commitment and its responsibilities especially its stakeholders within whom they interact. As a result, the employees are not able to deliver the brand supporting behaviour and attitudes to the intended audience. In essence, it is through employees understanding their role and through aligning of corporate branding strategies that recognition of the EU corporate brand can be achieved. This study therefore, seeks to determine the effects of corporate branding strategies on the recognition of corporate brand at European Union Missions in Kenya.

The General objective of this study is to determine the effects of branding strategies on recognition of corporate brand at European Union Missions in Kenya. The specific objectives sought to determine the effects of corporate social responsibility on corporate brand recognition at European Union Missions of Kenya, to establish the effects of brand communities on corporate brand recognition at European Union Missions of Kenya, to establish the effects of internal on corporate brand recognition at European Union Missions of Kenya and to determine the effects of brand asset management on Corporate brand recognition at European Union Missions of Kenya.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Creating a coherent perception of an organisation in the minds of its various stakeholders is a major challenge faced by many organisations. Particularly in large multinational or international organisations, speaking with one voice is a challenging task. Large organisations often comprise multiple branches or divisions and subsequently multiple brands and cultures. Orchestrating the signals these diverse corporate subdivisions send out to their stakeholders is often impeded by various aspects such as historic turf wars between divisions, cultural and language differences, deficient management structures and unclear responsibilities, or simply by spatial separation. Furthermore, incoherence in messages and difficulties in co-ordination are often fostered by communication representatives' narrow focus on their particular stakeholder groups.

Certainly, during the late 1990s and the early 2000s, Branding emerged as a significant area of emphasis not only for companies and their products, but also for municipalities, universities, other Non-profit Organisations and even individuals. Branding became ubiquitous. Many consumer product companies began branding their products in earnest in the mid-to-late 1800s. Much of this work has been conceptual and, to date, there has been only limited empirical investigation of the processes that enable an organisation to engage successfully in Corporate Brand management.
Establishing successful Corporate Brand management practices relies on the identification of two factors: the mix of variables that comprise the Corporate Brand and the development of a marketing and brand management system for understanding this process of direction and control. Corporate Branding draws on the traditions of Product Branding in that it shares the same objective of creating differentiation and preference. However, this activity is rendered more complex by managers conducting these practices at the level of the organisation, rather than the individual product or service, and the requirement to manage interactions with multiple stakeholder audiences. There is support in recent literature for an increasing focus on the role of the organisation as a

strategic element in the Branding process (Abratt & Mofokeng, 2001; Cheney & Christiansen, 1999). It also highlights some of the problems inherent in managing a wider set of variables associated with the organisation.

2.1 Corporate Social Responsibility
CSR has been recognized all around the world as one of the suitable ways that should be applied in any business operations. It is believed that running a business ethically and responsibly will be able to construct a sustainable business success. In so doing, various benefits can be created abstractly and concretely, for example good images and brand valuation can be increased and good reputation of the organizations can be built as well (Bevan et al., 2004; Schaltegger & Burritt, 2005; Weber, 2008).

Apart from these, opportunity sources and innovation creation abilities can be expanded (Porter & Kramer, 2006; Stephenson, 2009; Weber, 2008). CSR also helps the organizations effectively deal with risks caused by social pressures and pressures from benefit groups (Bevan et al., 2004; Schaltegger & Burritt, 2005). Nowadays, CSR is becoming a business standard for any business organizations to provide their society with ethic performances (Cheng & Ahmad, 2010). All in all, CSR plays a vital part in developing businesses to be sustainably successful in the word of increasingly intense competitions these days.

Currently, consideration has been taken into the stakeholders' decision making involving among others, the organisations social responsibility. So, socially responsible investment has been progressively more concerned. With CSR, socially and environmentally destructive effects can be avoided, different needs of relevant stakeholders can be properly satisfied and high effectiveness of the corporate governance can be balanced. These require leaders who are able to proficiently tackle with such the changes. With the qualified leaders, any risks out of the corporate performances can be reduced. This is a new challenge for most organisations.

2.2 Brand Communities
Research on corporate branding has, in recent years, demonstrated a growing reflexivity about how brands are perceived by various actors inside and outside organisations and their responses to those perceptions. Corporate branding needs to be understood not only as a means of positioning, marketing and 'selling' a certain set of associations and images to consumers, it should also consider how consumers, employees, shareholders, suppliers and other interested parties respond to a an organisation based on what they think they know about it. The expression of an organisation's identity (or identities) through multiple channels, media platforms and business functions has, therefore, received increasing attention from scholars in corporate branding (Schultz, Hatch & Larsen, 2000).

Because the organisation is now conceived of as an 'expressive' entity capable of influencing the opinions of a range of stakeholders, both internally and externally, several scholars have called for a more integrative and multidisciplinary approach to the study of organisational identity, an approach which can more comprehensively articulate the ways in which organisations perceive themselves and how they want to be perceived by others (Dacin & Brown, 2006; Schultz, Hatch & Larsen, 2000).

2.3 Internal Branding
A strong brand has been found to be instrumental in the facilitation of improved brand loyalty, improved and greater stakeholder value, and clear, valued and sustainable points of differentiation as well as the simplification of decision making and the establishment of expectations (Davis, 2000; Keller, 2003). Employees who are in consensus with an organisation's brand are more likely to act consistently in ways supporting how the organization hopes that external stakeholders perceive it. By establishing effective systems for the management of the corporate brand, an organisation may engage its employees in its mission and plans (strategic, tactical and operational).

This engagement of employees in branding, leading to their representation of brand qualities to external stakeholders is often times referred to as internal branding, employee branding, or internal marketing (Keller, 2003; Mitchell, 2002). While branding initiatives most frequently focus on external stakeholders, internal branding and/or /employee branding efforts establish systems/processes and consequent employee behaviours that are consistent with the external branding efforts.

The terms employee branding and internal branding are essentially synonymous has also been used to describe these activities and programs (Mitchell, 2002). The organisation engages itself in activities to set up the stakeholders' perception. Delivering the brand promise depends on employees who, during encounters with stakeholders, determine whether the promise is kept or broken. To ensure that employees are able to deliver the brand promise, the organisation needs to engage in any activities and strategies that aid employees in their ability to deliver on brand promise.

Hatch and Schultz (2001) stress the importance of a coordinated internal and external corporate branding program and the inherent benefits of strategies that address not only the needs and wants of the stakeholders, but the proper hiring, placement, training, and motivation of employees who must deliver the corporate brand's promise. Management should be responsible for corporate brand training and education, that is, recruiting, training, motivating, rewarding and providing equipment and technology.

For instance, regular brand training sessions, a brand-based intranet site, internal publications, a speaker series, and even periodical corporate brand promise reminders on the start-up screens of employees' computers and Hallmark conducting periodical internal assessments of employees' perceptions of the corporate brand with the intent of focusing on closing the gaps between internal and external stakeholder perceptions (Davis, 2000). The assumption that internal branding could shape employees' behaviour is largely based on the assumption that when employees understand and are committed to corporate brand values; they will perform in ways that live up to stakeholders' brand expectations.

2.4 Brand Asset Management
The Brand Asset Management process involves four phases and eleven steps. The first phase is to develop a brand vision. It consists of a single step: developing the elements of a brand vision. The basic objective of this step is to clearly state what the branding efforts must do to meet corporate goals. The second phase is to determine the organisation's "Brand Picture" by understanding consumer perceptions about the brand and that of competitor brands.
This phase consists of three steps: determining the brand's image, creating the brand's contract - list of customer's perceptions of all the current promises the brand makes-, and crafting a brand-based customer model. This allows for understanding how consumers act and think, and how and why they make their decisions. The third phase is to develop a brand asset management strategy, in order to determine the correct strategies for achieving goals according to the brand vision. This phase consists of five steps: positioning the brand, extending the brand, communicating the brand's positioning, leveraging the brand, and pricing the brand. Finally, the fourth phase is to support a brand asset management culture. This final phase consists of two steps: creating a measure of the return on brand investment, and establishing a brand-based culture.

2.5 Critique of Existing Literature and Research Gaps
Corporate branding has been criticized as drawing on the traditions of product branding in that it shares the same objective of creating differentiation and preference. However, this activity is rendered more complex by managers conducting these practices at the level of the organisation and the requirement to manage interactions with multiple stakeholder audiences. Branding literature indicates that there is support for an increasing focus on the role of the organisation as a strategic element in the branding process (Abratt & Mofokeng, 2001).

It also highlights some of the problems inherent in managing a wider set of variables associated with the organisation. Despite a growing consensus about the benefits of corporate brand management (Fombrun & Rindova, 2008; Greyser, 2009), there remains considerable uncertainty over what this means in terms of management practices and the study of this emerging phenomenon.

Keller (2000) comments that many organisations are unsure what they should do to manage their corporate brand, whilst Balmer (1998, 2001) highlights the current confusion in the existing literature and stresses the need to understand the disciplines involved in managing and developing a corporate brand. Connected to this, there is failure to identify corporate branding elements and how these elements are managed (Balmer. 2001).

Many approaches in existing literature measure corporate reputation by overly focusing on the financial performance of organisations and on the views of external stakeholders. Further, there is as yet no established universal measure to assess both the internal i.e. identity and external i.e. image elements of corporate reputation and recognition. This suggests that there is a clear need to establish a new agenda and set of practices for corporate brand management at an organisational level.

Corporate branding necessitates a different management approach. It requires greater emphasis on branding strategies including factors internal to the organisation, paying greater attention to the role of employees in the brand building process. Corporate branding also requires a holistic approach to brand management, in which all members of an organisation behave in accordance with the desired brand identity.

There are limitations to the scope of the work conducted to date and gaps in previous research carried out. These limitations can be attributed to the refinement and extension of the corporate branding concept. Because of the dynamism of Corporate Branding, needs have not been well mapped in previous researches. Initial conceptual work has focused on defining corporate brands against product brands and identifying key determinants in the corporate branding process (Harris & De Chernatony, 2001).

The initial attention to the value and antecedents of strong corporate brands has been extended to investigate in more depth the roles played by corporate identity, corporate personality, corporate culture, employees, leadership, among others, in the corporate branding process. This evolution of thinking can be witnessed in corporate branding papers of seven past special issues on Corporate identity and corporate marketing (Balmer, 2001), Corporate and service brands (Balmer & Gray, 2003), Corporate marketing (2006), Brand management (Davies, 2008), perspectives on corporate and organisational marketing (Balmer, & Greyser, 2011). Yet, despite the increasing interest in corporate branding, an examination of the literature suggests that gaps on important issues in this debate remain largely unexplored.

The first and most significant research gap is the lack of conceptual clarity, which has been shown by (Balmer, 2001). First the use of terminology is not always clear; reputation, image, branding, and identity being used somewhat interchangeably, as near substitutes when they should not be. The precise meaning of many terms remains largely undefined and there is clearly no real consensus on what they mean (Balmer, 2001) who provided a set of conceptual definitions for all constructs in the domain.

The second research gap relates to the basic premise of how we conceptualise corporate brands; which, inevitably, influences how we manage corporate brands. Traditionally, normative approaches to corporate branding have seen corporate brands as created and managed by senior management (Balmer, 2001). However, more recently, social constructionist approaches argue for corporate brands as vehicles of meaning that emerge from social interaction between the organisation and its environment (Leitch & Richardson, 2003).

To date, these two perspectives have been positioned as alternative approaches to corporate branding. Further progress in corporate branding research should be driven by an understanding of the two perspectives. The third research gap is related to an absence of research on senior managers' recognition of corporate brand building as a key corporate brand-building/management trait and the fit or alignment between the organisation and stakeholders' perspectives is an important theoretical proposition in corporate branding theory. Fourth research gap is related to tension, whether corporate brands need to be studied and managed at the organisational (management) or individual (employee) level.

Corporate branding research has traditionally focused on organisational practices that aim to develop and manage corporate brands (Balmer & Gray, 2003). However, if we consider corporate brands as broad concepts, focusing on the individual level (how employees experience, interpret and influence corporate brands) could bring valuable insights (Motion et al., 2003). There is, hence, a need for future studies to capture corporate branding across multiple levels of analysis.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a descriptive research approach where questionnaires were sent to every department whose operations are based in Kenya under the European Union. Descriptive research design was chosen because it enabled the researcher generalise the findings to a larger population and allowed for investigation of the research questions in realistic settings due to its convenience and accuracy, especially in data collection and analysis. The cost in this approach was reasonable considering the amount of information gathered. Descriptive research analysed the relations of variables under study using linear regression which revealed and measured the strength of the target group's opinion, attitude or behaviour with regards to improving the recognition of the EU corporate brand in Kenya. It also allowed greater flexibility in terms of money and time as well as avoiding the need for hunting for respondents more than once to produce a high response rate. These reasons justified the use of descriptive design and therefore generalised the findings to the EU corporate brand in Kenya.

The unit of analysis comprised and focused on the European Union Missions in Kenya. Currently there are five (5) active European Union operations in Kenya as per table 3.1. The unit of observation for this study constituted two hundred employees from these operations in Nairobi, as per table 3.1.

Table 3. 1: Study Population

No	Organisation	Location	No. of Employees
1	Kenya Missions	Upper hill, Nairobi	69
2	EIB	Upper hill, Nairobi	6
3	ECHO Nairobi	Upper hill, Nairobi	47
4	EU CAP NESTOR	Upper Hill, Nairobi	31
5	Somalia Missions	Upper Hill, Nairobi	34
6	EU NAVFOR	Mombasa	4
7	EUTM	Mombasa	4
8	EUSR	Upper Hill, Nairobi	5
		Total	**200**

Source: EU Missions Kenya 2015

The researcher stratified the population based on the number of operations and then, at 23% per strata, the researcher, randomly picked the samples. The sample was chosen from employees from European Union in Kenya. A carefully selected sample provided data representative of the population from which it was drawn. Sufficient sample size is the minimum number of participants required to identify a statistically significant difference, relationship or interaction. At least 30% of the total population is representative (Borg & Gall, 2003). The main factor considered in determining the sample size is the need to keep it manageable enough (Kothari, 2009).

The sample was selected on the basis of non-probability sample technique because the procedures that were used to select units for inclusion in a sample were much easier, less time consuming and cheaper. The unit of analysis in this study included these operations where convenience sampling was used. The units that were selected for inclusion in the sample were the easiest to access. The unit of observation was the individual staff members accessed in these operations. The researcher stratified the population based on the number of European Union operations and missions in Kenya; Kenya Missions, the European Investment Bank, Somalia Missions, European Commission Humanitarian Office (ECHO), European Union Naval Force (EU NAVFOR), EU Special Representative for Horn of Africa (EU SR), EU Training Mission (EUTM) and European Union Mission on Regional Maritime Capacity Building (EUCAP NESTOR Mission) which all have a total of two hundred (200) employees.

ISSN 2250-3153

The researcher then, at 66% per strata, randomly picked the samples. By selecting this sample size, the accuracy level of the information required was sufficiently met, the study sample was representative and had characteristics of the population and the value of the information in the study was also achieved. It also allowed the results to be generalised to the larger population and statistical analysis performed. To calculate the sample size based on the sample required to estimate a proportion with an approximate 95% interval level. Slovin's formula was used.

$n = N / (1 + N e^2) =$

$200 / (1 + 200 * 0.05^2) = 133.33$

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}$$

Where n = sample size
N = population size
e = margin of error (5%)

Table 3. 2: Target Population

No	Organisation	No. of Employees per Department	No. Of Employees	Sample Size (66%)
1	Kenya Missions	69	69	46
2	EIB	6	6	4
3	ECHO Nairobi	47	47	31
4	EU CAP NESTOR	31	31	21
5	Somalia Missions	34	34	22
6	EU NAVFOR	4	4	3
7	EUTM	4	4	3
8	EUSR	5	4	3
Total			**200**	**133**

Source: EU Missions Kenya 2015

The study employed Simple Random Sampling technique. Simple Random sample is a subset of individuals, that is, sample, chosen from a larger set, that is, population. In this method, each individual was chosen entirely by chance and as such had the same probability of being selected as part of the sample. This method of sampling is an unbiased technique and is important because the average sample accurately represented the population. It allowed drawing of external valid conclusions about the entire population. The researcher selected this sampling technique because of the ease of assembling the sample and it is also a fair way of selecting a sample from a given population since every individual was given equal chances of being selected and was representative of the population (Yates, 2008). The method is free from bias and prejudice, convenient and simple to use and sampling error is easy to assess. This sampling technique was best suited as data collection was efficiently conducted on randomly distributed questionnaires and the cost was also small enough.

Primary data was collected through the use of questionnaires. Questionnaires helped gather information on knowledge, attitudes, opinions, behaviours, facts and other information. A questionnaire is a set of questions that have been prepared to ask a number of questions and collect answers from respondents relating to the research topics. The questions were in printed or were in electronic form. The questionnaires consisted of close ended and open ended questions. Closed ended questions provided alternative answers for the respondents to choose from and facilitate easier analysis as they were in immediate usable form. The open ended questions were used to encourage the respondent to provide in-depth and felt responses and solicited for additional information from the respondents. The questionnaire comprised of two sections which were created using suitable questions modified from related research and individual questions formed by the researcher. The questionnaires were accompanied by a brief introduction and purpose of the research. The researcher emailed the questionnaires to the respondents as most of the respondents have access to the electronic mail. Participants were given time to respond after which the questionnaires were sent back to the researcher through electronic mail.

A total of thirteen (13) questionnaires were distributed randomly among employees from 3 European Union operations. This process helped refine the questionnaire, enhance its legibility and minimized the chances of misinterpretation, such as misleading questions that could have potentially resulted in invalid responses. Before the actual study, the instruments were discussed with the supervisors. The feedback from the supervisors helped in modifying the instrument. The pilot study allowed for pre-testing of the research instrument. The clarity of the instrument items to the respondents was necessary so as to enhance the instrument's validity and reliability. Test re-test method was used to pilot the questionnaires, which do not form sample of the study. Reliability was calculated with the help of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). A correlation coefficient greater or equal to 0.6 was accepted (George & Mallery, 2003).

ISSN 2250-3153
The researcher used qualitative research approach. Qualitative research is designed to address questions of meaning, interpretation and socially constructed realities (Newman et al., 2003). The researcher used the statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS version 21) computer program to facilitate addressing the research objectives. Quantitative data was summarised using descriptive statistics which included mean, mode, standard deviations, frequencies and percentages. Regression analysis was prepared to determine the effect of branding strategies on corporate brand recognition at the European Union Missions in Kenya. Relationship between variables was determined using the multiple regression model conceptualized as shown below:

$$y_i = \beta_1 x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \beta_3 x_{i3} + \beta_4 x_{i4} + \varepsilon_i$$

Where y_i is the dependent variable (Corporate brand recognition), x_{ij} is the ith observation on the jth independent variable, and where the first independent variable takes the value 1 for all i (so β_1 is the regression intercept), and ε_i is the error in the ith observation.
$y_i =$ Effect of Corporate brand recognition
$x_{i1} =$ Effect Corporate Social Responsibility
$x_{i2} =$ Effect Brand Communities
$x_{i3} =$ Internal Branding
$x_{i4} =$ Brand Asset Management
ε_i = Error Term.
Quantitative data was presented using tables and graphs. For better visual impact, data was represented in the form of diagrammatic representations such as pie charts, line charts and bar graphs. Qualitative data was derived from open ended questions in the questionnaire. The responses were thoroughly assessed and organised in to various categories, distinct from each other and the relationship among the identified categories established. Codes were used to generate themes and categories. Once the themes, categories and patterns were identified, the study was evaluated and analysed to determine the adequacy of the information and the credibility, usefulness, study consistency and validity in answering the study questions. From this information, the study developed narratives and interpretive reports in order to enhance the reader's knowledge, comprehension and application related to the research.

4. RESEARCH FINDINGS, SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Research Findings

4.1.1 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive data is used to give a general overview of the data. The respondents were asked to rate, using a likert scale ranging from 1 to 5, the extent to which they agree with statements related to the effects of branding strategies (corporate social responsibility, brand communities, internal branding and brand asset management) on corporate brand recognition. The ratings ranged from 1 to 5 (Where 1- strongly agree, 2- Agree, 3-Strongly disagree, 4-Disagree, 5-Neither Agree nor Disagree. The results are presented in table 4.4 along with standard deviations.

Table 4. 1: Summary statistics for main variables

Main Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Corporate Social Responsibility	133	2.339	0.878	1	4
Brand Communities	133	1.820	0.617	1	3
Internal Branding	133	1.626	0.553	1	3
Brand Asset Management	133	1.775	0.660	1	3
Corporate Brand Recognition	133	1.923	0.587	1	2

4.1.2 Information on Corporate Social Responsibility Strategy

This section analyses the questions addressed to respondents in relation to corporate social responsibility strategy. The questions in an elaborate way established the effect of corporate social responsibility strategy on recognition of corporate brand at European Union in Kenya. Table 4.2 illustrates the survey results on corporate social responsibility branding strategy.

Table 4. 2: Information on Corporate Social Responsibility Strategy

Statement	SA	A	SD	D	NA/D	Total
Corporations already invest in both branding and philanthropy, the rationale for integrating branding and CSR derives from the synergies created when both strategies merge	5%	5%	1%	36%	54%	100%

CSR Governance Structure is a collaborative scheme, which involves a partnership between the firm and an organisation in which the firm transfers resources to the Organisation in order to carry out CSR activities jointly	45%	34%	17%	0%	4%	100%
CSR is a legitimisation ethics and gives an instrumental perspective where Corporate Image is the prime concern	51%	30%	4%	0%	16%	100%
EU branded CSR has turned philanthropy from implicit delivery of the promise to an explicit one	41%	29%	4%	17%	9%	100%
EU as a brand through CSR has continuously been giving back to society	43%	49%	8%	1%	0%	100%
EU considers CSR as one of the suitable ways that should be applied in its operations.	43%	29%	5%	0%	23%	100%
CSR helps EU effectively deal with risks caused by social pressures and pressures from benefit groups	43%	58%	0%	0%	0%	100%
EU conducts CSR activities geared towards brand/visibility regularly	37%	30%	6%	0%	27%	100%

The respondents were asked whether Corporations already invest in both branding and philanthropy, the rationale for integrating branding and CSR derives from the synergies created when both strategies merge. 54% of the respondents were neutral, 36% disagreed, with 10% of the respondents agreeing and a paltry 1% of the respondents strongly disagreeing about the matter. On whether CSR Governance Structure is a collaborative scheme, which involves a partnership between the firm and an organisation in which the firm transfers resources to the Organisation in order to carry out CSR activities jointly, 79% of the respondents were in agreement whereas 17% were in disagreement with a paltry 4% being neutral.

On whether CSR is a legitimisation ethics and gives an instrumental perspective where Corporate Image is the prime concern, 81% of the respondents were in agreement with 4% being in disagreement and a paltry 4% being neutral. On whether EU branded CSR has turned philanthropy from implicit delivery of the promise to an explicit one, 70% of the respondents were in agreement with 21% disagreeing. On whether EU as a brand through CSR has continuously been giving back to society, 92% of the respondents were in agreement with 8% disagreeing. On whether EU considers CSR as one of the suitable ways that should be applied in its operations, 72% of the respondents were in agreement with 5% being in disagreement and 23% being neutral. On whether EU as a brand through CSR has continuously been giving back to society, 100% of the respondents were in agreement. On whether EU conducts CSR activities geared towards brand/visibility regularly, 67% of the respondents were in agreement with 6% disagreeing and 2% being neutral.

4.1.3 Information on Brand Communities Strategy

The study sought to establish the effect of brand communities' strategy on recognition of corporate brand at European Union Missions in Kenya, the respondents were asked whether Brand communities participate in the brand's larger social construction and play a vital role in the brand's ultimate legacy. Table 4.3 illustrates information on Brand Communities.

Table 4.3: Information on Brand Communities Strategy

Statement	SA	A	SD	D	NA/D	Total
Brand communities participate in the brand's larger social construction and play a vital role in the brand's ultimate legacy	45%	55%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Brand communities can strengthen brand equity, while also reinforcing the social nature of Brands.	35%	55%	0%	5%	5%	100%
Brand communities carry out important functions on behalf of the brand, e.g. sharing information, perpetuating the history and culture of the brand	37%	40%	0%	0%	23%	100%
They provide social structure to the relationship between employee and stakeholder	36%	56%	8%	0%	0%	100%
Brand communities have a common understanding of a shared identity of the EU brand	26%	60%	4%	0%	10%	100%

EU has demonstrated a growing response about how its brand is perceived	40%	52%	1%	4%	3%	100%
EU continuously expresses its identity through multiple channels to brand communities	45%	52%	0%	0%	3%	100%
EU understands and communicates its corporate branding strategies	48%	52%	0%	0%	0%	100%

Majority of the respondents (100%) were in agreement. On whether Brand communities can strengthen brand equity, while also reinforcing the social nature of Brands, 90% of the respondents were in agreement with a paltry 5% being in disagreement. On whether Brand communities carry out important functions on behalf of the brand, e.g. sharing information, perpetuating the history and culture of the brand, 77% of the respondents were in agreement with 23% of the respondents being neutral. On whether brand communities provide social structure to the relationship between employee and stakeholder, 92% of the respondents were in agreement with 8% being in disagreement.

On whether Brand communities have a common understanding of a shared identity of the EU brand, 86% of the respondents were in agreement with 4% being in disagreement. On whether EU has demonstrated a growing response about how its brand is perceived, 93% of the respondents were in agreement while 3% of the respondents were neutral. On whether EU continuously expresses its identity through multiple channels to brand communities, 97% of the respondents were in agreement while 3% of the respondents were neutral. On whether EU understands and communicates its corporate branding strategies, majority of the respondents (100%) were in agreement.

4.1.4 Information on Internal Branding Strategy

In relation to internal branding strategy, the respondents were asked to establish the effect of Internal Branding strategy on recognition of corporate brand at European Union Missions in Kenya. Table 4.4 illustrates information on Internal Branding Strategy.

Table 4.4: Information on Internal Branding Strategy

Statement	SA	A	SD	D	NA/D	Total
Internal branding is an enabler of EU's success in delivering the brand promise to stakeholders	58%	41%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Internal branding assists EU in promoting the corporate brand to employees	16%	79%	4%	0%	1%	100%
Internal branding contributes in aligning EUs internal processes and corporate culture with those of the desired brand	63%	32%	0%	3%	2%	100%
EU internal branding portrays a consistent and continuous identity that is trusted	57%	40%	0%	0%	4%	100%
EU as a strong brand has been found to be instrumental in the facilitation of improved brand loyalty and greater stakeholder value	39%	52%	4%	2%	4%	100%
Employees who are in consensus with EU brand are more likely to act consistently in ways supporting how the EU hopes that external stakeholders perceive it	81%	9%	0%	0%	10%	100%
EU engages itself in activities to set up the stakeholders' perception	47%	46%	0%	0%	8%	100%
Internal branding stresses the importance of a coordinated internal and external corporate branding program	55%	41%	0%	0%	4%	100%

The respondents were asked whether internal branding is an enabler to EU's success in delivering the brand promise to stakeholders. Majority (100%) of the respondents were in agreement. On whether internal branding contributes in aligning EUs internal processes and corporate culture with those of the desired brand, 95% of the respondents were in agreement while 3% disagreed and 2% were neutral. On whether EU internal branding portrays a consistent and continuous identity that is trusted, 96% of the respondents were in agreement while 4% were neutral.

On whether EU as a strong brand has been found to be instrumental in the facilitation of improved brand loyalty and greater stakeholder value, 91% of the respondents were in agreement while 6% were in disagreement with 3% being neutral. On whether Employees who are in consensus with EU brand are more likely to act consistently in ways supporting how the EU hopes that external stakeholders perceive it, 90% of the respondents were In agreement while 10% were neutral. On whether EU engages itself in activities to set up the stakeholders' perception, 93% of the respondents were in agreement while 8% were neutral on the matter. On whether internal branding stresses the importance of a coordinated internal and external corporate branding program, 96% of the respondents were in agreement while 4% were neutral on the matter.

4.1.5 Information on Brand Asset Management Strategy

In relation to the using a likert scale ranging from 1 to 5, the respondents were asked to indicate effect of brand assessment management strategy on recognition of corporate brand at European Union Missions in Kenya. Table 4.5 shows information on brand asset management strategy.

Table 4.5: Information on Brand Asset Management Strategy

Statement	SA	A	SD	D	NA/D	Total
Brand asset management is a balanced investment approach for building and communicating the meaning of the brand, internally and externally	34%	62%	0%	0%	4%	100%
Brands and people are an organisation's most valuable asset	51%	47%	0%	0%	2%	100%
Brand asset management at EU involves every functional area	52%	20%	0%	2%	27%	100%
EU brand asset management clearly states branding efforts employees must make to meet corporate goals	40%	56%	0%	1%	4%	100%
EU understands employee and stakeholder perceptions about the brand through brand asset management	35%	36%	0%	22%	7%	100%
Brand asset management involves brand vision, picture, image and brand asset management culture	52%	43%	0%	0%	5%	100%
EU has developed a brand asset management strategy towards achieving its brand vision goals	58%	39%	4%	0%	0%	100%
EU management supports a brand asset management culture	63%	22%	0%	8%	7%	100%

The respondents were asked whether Brand asset management is a balanced investment approach for building and communicating the meaning of the brand, internally and externally. 96% of the respondents were in agreement while 4% were neutral about the matter.

On whether brands and people are an organisation's most valuable asset, 98% of the respondents were in agreement while 2% were neutral about the matter. On whether brand asset management at EU involves every functional area, 72% of the respondents were in agreement while 2% of were in disagreement with 27% being neutral. On whether EU brand asset management clearly states branding efforts employees must make to meet corporate goals, 96% of the respondents were in agreement while 1% was in disagreement with 3% being neutral about the matter.

On whether EU understands employee and stakeholder perceptions about the brand through brand asset management, 71% of the respondents were in agreement while 22% were in disagreement with 7% being neutral about the matter. On whether Brand asset management involves brand vision, picture, image and brand asset management culture, 96% of the respondents were in agreement while 5% were neutral about the matter. On whether EU has developed a brand asset management strategy towards achieving its brand vision goals, 96% of the respondents were in agreement while 4% were in disagreement about the matter. On whether EU management supports a brand asset management culture, 5% of the respondents were in agreement while 8% were in disagreement with 7% being in disagreement.

4.1.6 Information on Corporate Brand Recognition Strategy

Table 4.6: Information on Corporate Brand Recognition Strategy

Statement	SA	A	SD	D	NA/D	Total
Corporate Brands are cultural, as they reflect the organisation's sub-cultures	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	100%

Corporate brand recognition manifests emotional responses from stakeholder groups and the needs total commitment across the organisation	47%	49%	0%	4%	0%	100%
Everyone in the Organisation should be responsible for the Corporate Brand recognition and its maintenance	27%	21%	0%	12%	40%	100%
Corporate Brand recognition requires constant support, commitment and attention from the top management at large	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Corporate brand recognition responds to the expectations of multiple stakeholders, e.g. internal stakeholders, external stakeholders and networks	25%	52%	0%	8%	16%	100%
All employees represent the Corporate Brand and affect the perceptions of the external stakeholders	69%	25%	4%	0%	3%	100%
In corporate brand recognition, the relationship between the stakeholder and the organisation is more important	21%	72%	0%	0%	7%	100%
Values of the Corporate Brand have to resonate with the unspoken meanings and values that employees hold and use	48%	35%	0%	0%	17%	100%

As illustrated in table 4.6, the survey results indicated that corporate brands are cultural, as they reflect the organisation's sub-cultures with 100% of the respondents being in agreement. In terms of corporate brand recognition manifests emotional responses from stakeholder groups and the needs total commitment across the organisation, 96% of the respondents were in agreement while 4% of the respondents were in disagreement. In terms of everyone in the Organisation being responsible for the corporate brand recognition and its maintenance, 48% of the respondents were in agreement while 12% were in disagreement with 40% being neutral.

In terms of corporate brand recognition requiring constant support, commitment and attention from the top management at large, all the respondents were in agreement. In terms of corporate brand recognition responding to the expectations of multiple stakeholders, e.g. internal stakeholders, external stakeholders and networks, 76% of the respondents were in agreement while 8% were in disagreement with 16% being neutral. In terms of all employees representing the corporate brand and affecting the perceptions of the external stakeholders, 93% of the respondents were in agreement while 4% were in disagreement with 3% being neutral. In terms of corporate brand recognition, the relationship between the stakeholder and the organisation being more important, 93% of the respondents were in agreement while 7% were neutral. In terms of values of the Corporate Brand resonating with the unspoken meanings and values that employees hold and use, 83% of the respondents were in agreement while 17% were neutral.

4.1.7 Model Fit

Multiple regression analysis results were carried out to determine the relationship between the dependent variables and independent variables. The dependent variable in this case was corporate brand recognition while the independent variables were corporate social responsibility, brand communities, internal branding and brand asset management.

Table 4.7: Model fit

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.754[a]	0.569	0.556	0.462

a. Predictors: (Constant), Corporate Social Responsibility, Brand Communities, Internal Branding, Brand Asset Management
b. Dependent Variable: Corporate Brand Recognition

Table 4.7 illustrates the results for variations between the dependent and the independent variables. The correlation coefficient R = 0.754 indicates that the dependent variable i.e. Corporate Brand Recognition and independent variables i.e. Corporate Social Responsibility, Brand Communities, Internal Branding, Brand Asset Management have a moderate degree of correlation. The (R Squared) value of about 0.569 indicates that 56.9% of the variation in corporate brand recognition was explained by corporate social responsibility, brand communities, internal branding and brand asset management strategies.

The adjusted coefficient of determination (Adj R Squared) was less than the unadjusted Coefficient of determination as it should always be (Adj R Squared=0.569 < R Squared = 0.556). This still implied that 55.6% of the variation in corporate brand

ISSN 2250-3153
recognition was explained by corporate social responsibility, brand communities, internal branding and brand asset management strategies.

Table 4.8: Analysis of Variance Test Results

Item	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	36.400	4	9.100	42.578	.000[b]
Residual	27.571	129	.214		
Total	**63.970**	**133**			

The result predicts the dependent variable by showing how well the regression equation fits the model. The significance value P = 0.00 of the regression model was less than the level of significance of 0.01 at 95% confidence level. This indicates that the overall regression model statistically significantly corporate brand recognition at European Union Missions in Kenya and supports the notion that there exists a strong positive relationship between the study variables.

The multiple regression model with corporate brand recognition as the dependent variable and corporate social responsibility, brand communities, internal branding and brand asset management strategies as independent variables was estimated in the study. The standardised Beta coefficients were considered because the raw units of the dependent and independent variables are not generally familiar in terms of commonly used standardised units of measurement such as income, years, currency among others. The standardised Beta coefficients are convenient since they represent the dependent and independent variables in terms of *t* scores such that the information is conveyed in terms of standard deviation and hence the question of strength of association relative to the variation in this distribution is answered.

4.1.8 Distribution of Coefficients

The table of coefficients below measures individual relationship between the various variables (branding strategies) and corporate brand recognition. The table shows the coefficients Betas for each of the predictor and its values indicate the individual contribution of each predictor to the model. Table 4.9 illustrates the distribution of coefficients.

Table 4.9: Distribution of coefficients

a. Predictors: (Constant), Corporate Social Responsibility, Brand Communities, Internal Branding, Brand Asset Management

Items	Standardised Coefficients			95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	Beta	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Constant		3.791	.000	.252	.802
Corporate Social Responsibility Strategy	.676	10.243	.000	.421	.623
Brand Communities Strategy	-.250	-3.324	.001	-.400	-.102
Internal Branding Strategy	-.037	-.386	.700	-.225	.152
Brand Asset Management Strategy	.391	4.349	.000	.208	.556

b. Dependent Variable: Corporate Brand Recognition

Note: The significance testing hypothesis accept p<0-05, value P = 0.00

From the regression model, the following regression equation was derived:

$$\mathbf{Y = 0.679\, x_{i1} - 2.50\, x_{i2} - 0.037\, x_{i3} + 0.391\, x_{i4} + \varepsilon_i}$$

Where,

$y_i =$ Effect of Corporate brand recognition

$x_{i1} =$ Effect Corporate Social Responsibility

$x_{i2} =$ Effect Brand Communities

$x_{i3} =$ Internal Branding

$x_{i4} =$ Brand Asset Management

ε_i = Error Term.

The regression results based on the beta coefficients from the above regression model indicated that; corporate social responsibility strategy has a positive effect on corporate brand recognition and improves it by 0.676 standardized coefficients. Brand communities strategy and internal branding strategy had a negative effect on corporate brand recognition reducing it by 0.250 standard deviations and 0.307 standard deviations respectively. Brand asset management strategy was observed to have a positive effect on corporate brand recognition improving it by 0.391 standard deviations.

4.2 Summary of the Findings

The number of respondents of the study was 133 with a sampling rate of 100% from European Union Missions operations and missions in Kenya. To ensure the collection of rich information, the study focused on respondents from different age brackets and who were from different operations with different years of service from the European Union Missions operations and missions in Kenya.

On the first specific objective, the study was to determine the effect of corporate social responsibility on corporate brand recognition at European Union Missions of Kenya. The results indicated that few respondents strongly disagreed with the information provided indicating that corporate social responsibility (0.676) had a positive effect on corporate brand recognition at European Union Missions of Kenya. The finding was established to be consistent with Bevan et al., (2004); Schaltegger & Burritt, (2005); Weber, (2008) and Cheng & Ahmad, (2010).

On the second specific objective, the study was to establish the effect of brand communities on corporate brand recognition at European Union Missions of Kenya. The study measured how the respondents rated the list of information on brand communities' strategy presented by strongly agreeing, agreeing, strongly disagreeing or neither agreeing nor disagreeing. The results indicated that some of the respondents strongly disagreed with the information provided. Brand communities strategy had a negative effect on corporate brand recognition at Beta=-.250, t=-3.324, significance 0.001. This means that brand communities strategy negatively affected corporate brand recognition showing that the result was inconsistent with Dacin & Brown, (2006), and Schultz, Hatch & Larsen, (2000).

On the third specific objective, the study was to determine the effect of internal branding strategy on corporate brand recognition at European Union Missions of Kenya. The results indicated that some of the respondents disagreed with the information provided indicating that internal branding strategy had a negative effect on corporate brand recognition at Beta=-0.37, t=-3.386, significance .007. Most respondents strongly agree that employees who are in consensus with EU brand are more likely to act consistently in ways supporting the EU hopes that the external stakeholders perceive it. This means that internal branding strategy negatively influences corporate brand recognition showing that the result is inconsistent with Zeithaml et al., (2006); Hatch and Schultz (2001).

On the fourth specific objective, the study was to determine the effect of brand asset management strategy on corporate brand recognition at European Union Missions of Kenya. The study measured how the respondents rated the list of information on internal brand asset management strategy presented by strongly agreeing, agreeing, strongly disagreeing or neither agreeing nor disagreeing. The results indicated that few respondents strongly disagreed with the information provided indicating that brand asset management strategy had a positive effect on corporate brand recognition at Beta=.391, t=-4.349, significance .000. Most respondents strongly agree that the management should support a brand asset management culture. This means that brand asset management strategy positively influences corporate brand recognition showing that the results are consistent with Davis & Dunn (2002).

4.3 Conclusion

On the overall, the relationship between the four branding strategies and corporate brand recognition is statistically significant. In view of the findings, this study established that the effects of branding strategies on recognition of corporate brand at European Union Missions in Kenya. Strategies such as corporate social responsibility and brand asset management had a positive effect while internal branding and brand communities strategy had a negative effect on recognition of corporate brand at European Union Missions in Kenya.

Majority of respondents indicated that corporate social responsibility strategy had a positive effect on recognition of corporate brand at European Union Missions in Kenya. Corporate social responsibility strategy is a strong tool in improving recognition of corporate brand in terms of giving back to society, dealing with risks and brand visibility among others.

On brand communities' strategy, most respondents indicated that it had a somewhat negative effect on recognition of corporate brand at European Union Missions in Kenya. Strategies which were identified to have a negative effect included carrying out important functions on behalf of the brand, strengthening brand equity, while also reinforcing the social nature of brands and having a common understanding of a shared identity of the EU brand among others.

On internal branding strategy, most respondents indicated that it had somewhat a negative effect on recognition of corporate brand at European Union Missions in Kenya. Strategies which were identified to have a negative effect included internal branding which assists EU in promoting the corporate brand to employees, internal branding which contributes in aligning EUs internal processes and corporate culture with those of the desired brand and EU engaging itself in activities to set up the stakeholders' perception among others.

On brand asset management strategy, most respondents indicated that it had a positive effect on recognition of corporate brand at European Union Missions in Kenya. Strategies which were identified to have a positive effect included brand asset management at EU involving every functional area, EU understanding employee and stakeholder perceptions about the brand through brand asset management, EU developing a brand asset management strategy towards achieving its brand vision goals and EU management supporting a brand asset management culture among others.

4.4 Recommendations
4.4.1 Policy Recommendations

Corporate social responsibility strategy should be regularly used especially in all EU operations in Kenya so as to continue enhancing the recognition of corporate brand at EU Missions in the country.

EU Missions operations in Kenya should focus on enhancing the use of brand communities' strategies in all operations so as to improve the recognition of corporate brand in terms of carrying out important functions on behalf of the brand, strengthening brand equity, while also reinforcing the social nature of brands and having a common understanding of a shared identity of the EU brand among others.

Internal branding strategy at the EU Missions operation mission ought to be enhanced as well so as to improve its effect on the recognition of corporate brand in terms of promoting the corporate brand to employees, contributing and aligning EUs internal processes and corporate culture with those of the desired brand, and EU engaging itself in activities to set up the stakeholders' perception among others.

Brand asset management strategy which was identified to have a positive effect on the recognition of corporate brand at EU Missions operations in Kenya should continue to be enhanced and used within the organisation.

4.4.2 Recommendations for Further Research
The research gap of this study focused on four key areas which focused on how recognition of corporate brand within organisations may be improved. The study therefore proposes that future research should be carried out in the following key areas: To investigate the effect of brand communities strategies on recognition of corporate brand in organisations in Kenya; and to investigate the effect of internal branding strategies on the recognition of corporate brand in organisations in Kenya.

REFERENCES
Aaker, David A. (2004), *Brand Portfolio Strategy "Leveraging the Corporate Brand"* California Management Review, 46 (3), 6-18.

Aaker, David A. & Erich Joachimsthaler (2000), *Brand Leadership*, London Free Press.

Abratt, R., & Mofokeng, T. N. (2001). *Development and management of corporate image in South Africa*. European Journal of Marketing, 35(3-4), 368-386.

Akchin, D. (2001) *Non-profit marketing: just how far has it come?* Non-profit World 19(1), 33–5

Andreasen A. R & Kotler P (2003) *Strategic Marketing for Non-profit Organisations*, Pearson Education, New York, NY.

Alsem, K. J. & Kostelijk, E. (2008), *Identity based marketing: a new balanced marketing paradigm*. European Journal of Marketing, 42 (9/10), 907–914

Azoulay, A. & Kapferer J. N. (2003). "*Do brand personality scales really measure brand personality?"* The Journal of Brand Management 11(2), 143-155.

Bagozzi, R. P. & Utpal M. D. (2006), '*Antecedents and Purchase consequences of customer participation in Small Group Brand Communities'*, International Journal of Research in Marketing. 23 (1), 45–61

Baldauf, Artur, Karen S. Cravens, & Gudrun Binder (2003), "*Performance Consequences of Brand Equity Management: Evidence from Organisations in the Value Chain",* Journal of Product and Brand Management, 12 (4), 220-236.

Balmer, J. M. T. (2001), "*Corporate identity, corporate branding and corporate marketing: seeing through the fog"*, European Journal of Marketing, 35 (3/4), 248-91.

Bevan, S., Isles, N., Emery, P., & Hoskins, T. (2004). *Achieving high performance: CSR at the heart of business. London:* The Work Foundation, London. 19-34

Burmann, C., Jost-Benz, M., & Riley, N. (2009). *Towards an identity-based brand equity model.* Journal of Business Research, 62, 397-397.

ISSN 2250-3153
Bendixen, Mike, Kalala A. Bukasa & Russell Abratt (2003), *"Brand Equity in the Business-to- Business Market"*, Industrial Marketing Management, 33, 371-380.

Berger, J., & Heath, C. (2007). *Where consumers diverge from others: Identity signalling and product domains*. Journal Consumer Research, 34(2), 121-134.

Bhattacharya, C. B., & Korschun, D. (2008). *Stakeholder Marketing: Beyond The Four P's & the Customer*. Journal of Public Policy and Marketing, 27(1), 113–116.

Blumenthal, Dannielle & Alan J. Bergstrom (2003), "*Brand Councils That Care: Towards the Convergence of Branding and Corporate Social Responsibility"*, Brand Management, 10 (4/5), 327-341.

Bob Frame (2005) *corporate social responsibility: A challenge for the donor community*, Development in Practice, 15(3-4), 422-432.

Boone, M. (2000), "*The importance of internal branding",* Sales & Marketing Management,
152 (9), 36-8.

Bulmer, M. (2004), *Questionnaires, Benchmarks in Social Science Research Methods*, M., London, Sage Publications.

Cheng, W. L., & Ahmad, J. (2010). *Incorporating stakeholder approach in corporate social responsibility (CSR): A case study at multinational corporations (MNCs) in Penang*. Social Responsibility Journal, 6 (4), 593-610.

Chen, Arthur C.H. (2001), "*Using Free Association to Examine the Relationship Between Characteristics of Brand Associations and Brand Equity",* Journal of Product and Brand Management, 10 (7), 439-451.

Connelly, L. M. (2008). Pilot studies. *Medsurg Nursing*, 17(6), 411-2.

Crowther David & Aras Güler (2008), *Corporate Social Responsibility,* Denmark, Ventus Publishing ApS.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Los Angeles, Sage Publications,

Davis, S.M. (2000), *Brand Asset Management: Driving Profitable Growth through Your Brands*, San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass.

De Chernatony, Leslie & Susan Segal-Horn (2001), "*Building on Services' Characteristics to Develop Successful Services Brands",* Journal of Marketing Management, 17.

Dolnicar, S., Irvine, H. and Lazarevski, K. (2008), *"Mission or money? Competitive challenges facing public sector non-profit organisations in an institutionalised environment",* International Journal of Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 13, 107-117.

Dolnicar S, Lazarevski K (2009) *Marketing in non-profit Organisations: an international perspective.* International Marketing Review, 26 (3), 275-291.

Doyle, Peter (2001), "*Building Value-Based Branding Strategies*, Journal of Strategic Marketing, 9 (1), 20-30.

Eagle, L. & Kitchen, P. J. (2000) *IMC, brand communications, and corporate cultures client/advertising agency co-ordination and cohesion.* European Journal of Marketing, 34 (5/6), 667–686.

Einwiller, S. & Will, M. (2002). *Towards an integrated approach to corporate branding - an empirical study.* Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 7(2), 100-109.

Fill, C. (2001) *Essentially a matter of consistency: integrated marketing communications*. The Marketing Review, 1 (4), 409–425.

Freeman, Edward. (2010) *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*, Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.

Gobé, Marc (2001), *Emotional Branding: The New Paradigm for Connecting Brands to People*, New York, Allworth Press.

Gabrielsson, M. & P. Gabrielsson, 2003, '*Global Marketing Strategies of Born Globals and Globalising Internationals in the ICT field'*, Journal of Euromarketing 12 (3/4), 123–145.

Geuens, M., Weijters, B., & Wulf, K. (2009). *A new measure of brand personality.* International Journal of Research in Marketing, 26, 97-107.

Harris, F. & de Chernatony, L. (2001), *Corporate branding and corporate brand performance,* European Journal of Marketing, 35, 441-57.

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

Hogg, M.A. & Vaughan, G.M. (2002) *Social Psychology*. 3rd Edition, London Prentice Hall.

Haslam, S. A., Ellemers, N., Reicher, S. D., Reynolds, K. J., & Schmitt, M. T. (2010). *The social identity perspective today: The impact of its defining ideas*, New York, Psychology Press.

Hatch, Mary Jo & Majken Schultz (2003), "*Bringing the Corporation into Corporate Branding"*, European Journal of Marketing, 37 (7/8), 1041-1064.

Ind, N. (2004) *'Living the brand: How to transform every member of your organization into a brand champion*,' London, Kogan-Page.

James E. & Rose-Ackerman S. (2013), *The Non-profit Enterprise in Market Economics*; UK, Taylor & Francis.

Johnson G. & Scholes K. (2002). *Exploring Corporate Strategy, Text and Cases*, 6th Ed. Prentice Hall, Pearson Education Limited.

Kapferer J. N. (2008), *The new strategic brand management, creating and sustaining brand equity long term*, Kogan Page, London

Keller, K. L. (2003), *Strategic Brand Management: Building, Measuring, and Managing Brand Equity*, Upper Saddle River, NJ, Prentice-Hall.

Kitchen, P. J., Brignell, J., Lit, T., & Jones, G. S. (2004), *The emergence of IMC: a theoretical perspective.* Journal of Advertising Research, 44 (1), 19–30.

Knox, Simon & David Bickerton (2003), "*The Six Conventions of Corporate Branding",* European Journal of Marketing, 37 (7/8), 998-1016.

Kotler, Philip (2000), *Marketing Management.* The Millennium Edition, Upper Saddle River, Prentice Hall.

Kotler, P. & Kevin, L. K. (2005) *'Marketing Management,* Upper Saddle River, NJ, Prentice-Hall.

Kressmann, F., Herrmann, A., Huber, F., Huber, S., & Lee, D. -J. (2006*). Direct and indirect effects of self-image congruence on brand loyalty.* Journal of Business Research, 59, 955-964.

Laforet , S. (2010). *Managing brands: A contemporary perspective*. London: McGraw-Hill Education.

Lambe, C. J., Wittmann, C. M. & Spekman, R. E. (2001), *Social Exchange Theory and Research on Business to Business Relational Exchange.* Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing, 8(3), 1-36.

Laplume, A. O., Sonar, K., & Litz, R. A. (2008). *Stakeholder theory: Reviewing a theory that moves us*. Journal of Management, 34(6), 1152–1189.

Logman, Marc (2004), "*The Logman Model: A Logical Brand Management Model",* Journal of Product and Brand Management, 13 (2), 94-104.

Luostarinen, R. & M. Gabrielsson, (2004), '*Finnish perspectives of international entrepreneurship',* Handbook of Research on International Entrepreneurship, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar.

McAdam, Rodney & Denis Leonard (2003), *"Corporate Social Responsibility in a Total Quality Management Context: Opportunities for Sustainable Growth"*, Corporate Governance, 3 (4), 36-45.

McAlexander, James H., John W. Schouten, & Harold F. Koenig (2002), "*Building Brand Community"*, Journal of Marketing, 65, 38-54.

Melewar, T. C. (2003), *Determinants of the Corporate Identity Construct; A review of the literature*, 9, (4), 195-220

Mugenda O. M. & Mugenda A. G. (2003). *Research methods: Quantitative and qualitative approaches*, Nairobi, ACTS Press.

Muniz, Albert M. Jr. & Thomas C. O'guinn (2001), "*Brand Community",* Journal of Consumer Research, 27, 412-432.

Ogula, P. (2005). *Research methods*. Nairobi, CUEA Press.

Peltier, J.W., Schibrowsky, J.A., & Schultz, D.E. (2003) *Interactive integrated marketing communication: combining the power of IMC, the new media and database marketing.* International Journal of Advertising, 22 (1), 93–115.

Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2006). *The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility*. Harvard Business Review, 84(12), 78-92.

Pringle, H. & William, G. (2001) *'Brand manners: How to create the self-confident organization to live the brand'*, Hoboken, NJ, John Wiley & Sons.

Ruf, B. M., Muralidhar, K., Brown, R. M., Janney, J. J., & Paul, K. (2001). *An empirical investigation of the relationship between change in corporate social performance and financial performance: A stakeholder theory perspective*. Journal of Business Ethics, 32, 143–156.

Schaltegger, S. & Burritt, R. (2005). *Corporate Sustainability*. In H . Folmer & T. Tietenberg, (Eds.), The International yearbook of environmental and resource economics, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Simões, Claudia, Sally Dibb & Raymond P. Fisk. (2005), *"Managing corporate identity: an internal perspective.*" Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science 33 (2) 153-168.

Simon Knox & David Bickerton, (2003) "*The six conventions of Corporate Branding*", European Journal of Marketing, (37),7/8, 998 – 1016.

Shanghverzy T. (2003), *Market and community as strategies for change*, International handbook of educational change (1), Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Schultz, M. & de Chernatony, L (2002), *Introduction: The challenges of corporate branding, Corporate reputation*, 5, (2/3) 109 – 113.

Schultz, M., Mary, J. H. & Morgan, H. L., (2000) *'The expressive organization: Linking identity, reputation, and the corporate brand*', New York, Oxford University Press.

Stephenson, A. (2009). *The Pursuit of CSR and Business Ethics Policies: Is it a source of competitive advantage for organizations?* The Journal of American Academy of Business, 14(2), 251–262.

Susan, F. (2005), "*Marketing and non-profit organizations*", Henley Manager Update, 16 (3), 1-8.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). *An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. The social psychology of intergroup relations*, Monterey, CA, Brooks-Cole.

Turner, John C., & Katherine J. Reynolds, (2001), "*The social identity perspective in intergroup relations: Theories, themes, and controversies.*" Blackwell handbook of social psychology: (4) 133-152.

UNRISD (2003) 'Corporate social responsibility and development: towards a new agenda?', summary of presentations made at the UNRISD Conference of the same title, 17–18 November, Geneva.

Ruvio, A. (2008). *Unique like everybody else? The dual role of consumers' need for uniqueness.* Psychology and Marketing, 25(5), 444-464.

Vignoles, V. L., Chryssochoou, X., & Breakwell, G. M. (2000). *The distinctiveness principle: Identity, meaning, and the bounds of cultural relativity*. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4(4), 337-354.

Waldman, D. A., Siegel, D. S., & Javidan, M. (2006). *Components of CEO transformational leadership and corporate social responsibility*. Journal of management studies, 43(8), 1703-1725.

Weber, M. (2008). *The business case for corporate social responsibility: a company-level measurement approach for CSR.* European Management Journal, 26(4), 247-261.

Yates, Daniel S; Moore David S & Starnes Daren S. (2008). The Practice of Statistics, 3rd Ed. Freeman.

Yorke DA (2007) *Marketing and Non-Profit-Making Organisations.* European Journal of Marketing 18(2),17–22.