

What Does *Brand* Mean? Historical-Analysis Method and Construct Definition

Barbara B. Stern

Rutgers Business School

This article addresses the meaning of the term brand means by presenting a method of historical analysis and construct definition based on information in the Oxford English Dictionary. The method's use is demonstrated in an analysis of the original meanings that underlie the term's usage both as a single word and in compounds such as brand competition, brand personality, brand reputation, and so forth. Literal (denotative) definitions and metaphoric (connotative) associations are examined to explain the use of brand to refer to a physical entity and/or a mental representation. The method is also theoretically grounded in the disciplines of philology (the history of words), poetics, rhetoric, and the philosophy of science. The historical-analysis method is applied to the meanings of brand, starting with its original usage about 1,500 years ago and culminating with the definitions used by authors in this special issue.

Keywords: *construct definition; historical analysis method; brand meaning*

Theories about brand management and marketing encompass systems for handling “brand equity,” “identity implementation,” “relationship spectrums,” “brand architecture audits,” “brand knowledge structures,” and “brand-product matrices.” The branding specialty has developed its own language and leadership within major corporations, advertising agencies, business schools, and consulting firms (Drawbaugh 2001:10-11).

The development of a specialized branding language has given rise to so varied an array of meanings that a basic definitional question—“What is a brand?” (Tybout and Carpenter 2001:76)—calls for examination. The purpose of this article is to address the issue of brand meaning in

marketing from the interdisciplinary perspective advocated in this issue by Brown, Dacin, Pratt, and Whetten (2006), focusing attention on the nature, function, locus, and valence of the term *brand*. In so doing, I trace the roots of the construct in its chronological context, taking as a starting point meanings of *brand* before the term entered marketing. This perspective differs from but relates to prior research on construct definition, which has taken as its entry point the analysis of marketing meanings (Brown et al. 2006; Stern, Zinkhan and Holbrook 2002; Stern, Zinkhan, and Jaju 2001), for I return to earlier, premarketing meanings. The point is to encourage a heightened awareness of word history to achieve more precise usage (Ciardi and Williams 1975) by revealing older meanings encapsulated in present ones (Dobni and Zinkhan 1990). The justification for going back to the term's historical underpinnings is that it sustains a classification scheme that organizes the conceptual research approaches used by authors in this issue. The scheme consists of a quadripartite set of dichotomies in the following categories: the nature of *brand* as literal and metaphoric, its function as entity and process, its locus as physical and mental, and its valence as positive and negative.

SEMANTIC CONFUSION

The need for orderly usage and consistent terminology (Brown et al. 2006) essential for scientific inquiry is particularly pertinent in reference to *brand*, a term that has become so overdefined that its meanings are variable. Problems of instability and idiosyncratic usage have beset *brand* for almost a century, carrying over from mass marketing to Internet and customer relationship marketing, in which the term's very existence has been questioned. Whereas some researchers say that brands, consisting of the visual and verbal representations associated with firms and their services, “are the hot idea in business today” (Drawbaugh 2001:2), others say that the corporate strat-

egy of building strong brands is about to be displaced by that of gathering consumer information (Peppers and Rogers 2004). In the information age, consumer brand perceptions are claimed not to be defined by the branded products themselves but rather by the information features on a site (Strauss and Frost 2001). Furthermore, whereas some researchers treat brand names in terms of firms' financial outcomes of brand equity (Ailawadi, Lehmann, and Neslin 2003), others deny that brand names have any objective existence in reference to brand relationships, where a brand is defined as a consumer's collection of perceptions (Fournier 1998).

The meaning of *brand* grows even more diffuse in the public press, where the term *unbranding* has been used randomly to refer to different things. One use refers to a selling campaign that the Democrats were urged to undertake to undo their weak brand image and try to appear tougher (Goldberg 2005). But another refers to an antiselling campaign called Unbrand America, sponsored by the Canadian proconsumer periodical *Adbusters* (2004), that urged Americans to express anticorporate sympathies by affixing big black dots over brand names and logos in towns and cities. However, some bloggers on the campaign's Web site claimed that the black dots were themselves a brand mark, for as one blogger pointed out, "Adbusters just launched a potentially powerful branding campaign, ironically entitled Unbrand America" (Adbusters 2004). But whereas one blogger described brands as a neutral means of transmitting either good or bad information (Mikkelson 2001), another claimed that the public is free to associate a brand with anything (Adbusters 2004). At the end, though, no one was sure whether *brand* applied to a corporate entity, a public perception, a repository of information, a financial outcome, or perhaps all at once. The Dude (Adbusters 2004), another blogger, expressed the confusion: "WHAT!! DOWNLOAD BLACK FLOOKING DOTS!!! Arrright, I guess so . . . whatever gets you guys off."

Nonetheless, "whatever" is not a scientific construct, and I aim at clarifying meaning by historical analysis of the evolutionary changes whereby words survive, just as do stones of an ancient ruin, falling out of the original pattern to be used again in a new context (Ciardi and Williams 1975). The survival of *brand* is a signal of its vitality, for it is one of the most ancient words in English. It was first found in the Germanic languages that evolved into Old English (Anglo-Saxon), in which it appeared as a noun (ca. 1000) in the epic poem *Beowulf* (Heaney 2002) and as a verb (ca. 1400) in Wycliffe's religious tract *An Apology for Lollard Doctrines* (Todd 1842). In fact, the word is even older, dating from at least the late fifth century A.D., when the events in *Beowulf* took place (Klaeber 1950). Thus, *brand* was used for 15 centuries before it entered marketing in 1922, when it appeared in the compound *brand name* ("Brand Names on Menus?" 1922; *Oxford*

English Dictionary 2004:II.9), defined as a trade or proprietary name.

Long use is characteristic of the ordinary-language terms (Kyburg 1968) imported into marketing research and used idiosyncratically to express the various meanings (Underwood 1957:56) assigned to them by researchers (Feigl 1949). In this regard, researchers may be studying different things with the same name, the same thing with different names, or a combination of the two (Stern et al. 2001, 2002). Variability of usage has led to the claim that the private definition of terms is one reason why no theoretically grounded and practically applicable method of identifying relevant synonyms and associations has yet been advanced (Teas and Palan 1997).

THEORETICAL DEFINITION: PUBLIC, ACCESSIBLE, PRACTICAL

I advocate a historical method of objective word analysis that is not only theoretically grounded in the language disciplines but also readily accessible by the research community. The approach contributes to present and future research on brands by uncovering past meanings that shape current ones. The method itself is based on information in the *Oxford English Dictionary Online* (2004), which since its first edition in 1932 has been considered the dictionary of record for scholars. Entries include information about grammar, word derivation, and chronological usage, all of which draw from the linguistic, literary, and philosophical disciplines of philology, poetics, rhetoric, and philosophy of science. Philology and poetics are particularly valuable as sources of a basic definitional dichotomy between denotative and connotative meanings, in which denotation refers to literal word use and connotation to metaphorical use. The mission of philology is to trace the history of language development, and it is the source of information about a term's literal denotation: its primary reference. In contrast, the mission of poetics and rhetoric, previously used in advertising and marketing research (McQuarrie and Mick 1996; Stern 1989a), is to trace a term's connotation: the metaphoric associations that constitute its secondary or associative reference (Abrams 1999). In the philosophy of science literature, both literal and metaphorical meanings are considered important aspects of construct definition, whereby everyday language is translated into formal language terms for scientific discourse.

The translation process links the philosophy of science to the language disciplines in that both use the literary method of explication (*explication de texte*) or close reading (Underwood 1957) to define terms. Close reading is a formalist system of analyzing the meaning of words and larger verbal units that appeared in literary criticism and philosophy of science at about the same time (Ransom

1941) and was adopted later in marketing research (Stern 1989b). The method itself dates back to the exegetical study of biblical texts in medieval grammatical commentary (Bethurum 1960), in which its purpose was to reduce ambiguity so that the exact meaning of God's words could be discovered. It was adopted in French literary criticism and pedagogy from the sixteenth century on and by the late nineteenth century had become part of the American and British educational systems. In the twentieth century, the New Critics, who aimed at scientific precision in the analysis of texts (Berman 1988), hailed close reading as the most systematic means of understanding and classifying texts in accordance with historical principles (Howarth and Walton 1971). These principles have already been used in marketing research on brand image (Stern et al. 2001, 2002), in which *image* is an ordinary language term even older than *brand*.

The reason close reading is important for scientific construct definition is that the New Critics' approach to words influenced philosophers of science such as Carnap (1962) and Underwood (1957), thereby solidifying a methodological link between science, philology, and poetics. Carnap was the first to use the term *explication*, borrowed from early New Critics such as I. A. Richards (1929) to describe the process in which an inexact, prescientific concept is transformed into a scientific one. The cross-fertilization of ideas occurred in the course of contact among Carnap, Richards, and C. K. Ogden, Richards's collaborator and the editor of the series in which Carnap published his first English work (Lentricchia 1980). Somewhat later, Underwood referred to the process of deriving the meaning of a term as literary definition, a reference to the historical examples in dictionary listings often taken from literature. The convergence of literary and scientific perspectives indicates that historical language analysis contributes to the research task of turning ordinary terms into constructs suitable for research (Underwood 1957). The following sections describe the quadripartite brand classification scheme in which the categories are nature (literal and metaphoric), function (entity and process), locus (physical and mental), and valence (positive and negative).

PHILOLOGY: DENOTATION AND LITERAL MEANING

As everyone knows, words constantly take on new meanings. Since these do not necessarily, nor even usually, obliterate the old ones, we should picture this process not on the analogy of an insect undergoing metamorphoses but rather on that of a tree throwing out new branches, which themselves throw out subordinate branches. . . . We shall again and again find the earliest senses of a word flourish-

ing for centuries despite a vast overgrowth of later senses. (Lewis 1960:8-9)

The classification of *brand* as a denotative and connotative term requires a (re)turn to philology, the dominant linguistic science in the nineteenth century, now somewhat eclipsed by the semiotic and structural paradigm shift. Whereas de Saussure (1907-1911/1959) and his followers studied language structure ("the components of a single language at a particular time"), philologists studied language history ("changes within a particular language, over a long course of time") (Abrams 1999:140-141). In marketing, philological research on premarketing meanings links up with research about changes in marketing meanings from the 1950s to the present. Changes over time are recorded in dictionary listings, a familiar source to researchers who studied dictionary use in English classes. In fact, at least one influential American rhetorician described the act of looking up a word as a miniature research problem (Watt 1952), which alludes to the scientific value of dictionary definitions. Watt's (1952) book as well as most subsequent freshman English handbooks includes user-friendly explanations of the items in dictionary entries such as grammar, etymology, labels, definitions, chronological examples, and synonyms, all of which are treated below in relation to *brand*. I suggest that the awareness of dictionary information plus its easy access can contribute to a researcher's capacity to generate solid construct definitions and to the research community's capacity to classify different approaches. I begin by summarizing the information in dictionary listings and applying it to *brand*.

DICTIONARY LISTINGS AND CLASSIFICATION CATEGORIES

Grammar: Function and Locus

The first item in a dictionary listing is a word's grammar or part of speech, referring to its function in a sentence. Function is basic to classification in that words can be sorted into different categories depending on what they do in a sentence. The classification of *brand* as either an entity or a process rests on the fact that it can be used as either a noun or a verb. As a noun, *brand* refers to entities such as people, places, things, and ideas; as a verb, it refers to processes included in a firm's endeavor to make a product meaningful (Calder and Reagan 2001), such as naming the product, targeting and positioning it, and communicating its benefits. Dual-function words are particularly flexible in that they can be combined into multiword noun phrases (*brand reputation*, *brand identity*, *brand commitment*) and verbal phrases formed by using the participial

-ing or -ed form (*branding power, branded product*), both of which extend and vivify meanings over time. Flexibility is demonstrated in the expansion of brand locus as an entity in the world and one in the mind to one in cyberspace, which points to the classification system as a trichotomy rather than a dichotomy. That is, in the world, *brand* denotes a name or mark that is associated with a product; in the mind, it denotes a mental representation, an idea, or a consumer's perception of psychological meanings (Tybout and Carpenter 2001); and in cyberspace, it denotes a repository of information.

Etymology: Nature

Etymology is the second listing item, referring to a word's derivation from an earlier language, which provides information about the nature and source of denotative and connotative meanings that English, an eclectic word borrower, inherited from its predecessors. *Brand* is derived from Old English and as such is part of the English language's original word stock, in which its earliest use in *Beowulf* was as a synonym for *sword* (*Oxford English Dictionary* 2004:II.8.a). This tells us that it has deeply rooted denotative meanings in the war and weapons vocabulary characteristic of early English poetry (Klaeber 1950), which resurface in modern connotative marketing metaphors such as *marketing warfare, battle of the brands, and killer brand*. In feminist marketing research, martial metaphors have been viewed as an evidentiary mark of the masculine ideology said to dominate marketing research (Hirschman 1991). However, from the etymological perspective, marketing research is better served by understanding how a word formerly defined as a sword has come to signify an implement in contemporary marketing battles for consumer dollars.

Labels: Literal and Metaphorical Usage

Labels are listed after etymological derivations and refer to technical, obsolete, colloquial, or other word meanings in a particular subject area or time period. Labels provide classification information, and the two most useful ones are *Poet.* (*poetic*) and *fig.* (*figurative*), short for *figurative language*, which includes metaphors as well as similes and symbols. The presence of these labels in definitions of *brand* substantiate the classification categories of denotative and connotative and world and mind by telling us that in addition to the literal meaning of the term as a real-world entity, it also has connotative meaning as a bundle of mental associations in the metaphor *brand image*. This is one of the older brand metaphors applied in marketing, having first appeared in 1958 (Mayer 1958; *Oxford English Dictionary* 2004:II.9),

when it was generally defined as the impression of a product in the minds of potential users or consumers. Its application in marketing was extended and specified in later definitions, in which the phrase referred to a communicative act on the part of a brand, store, or corporation aimed at stimulating consumers' mental word pictures (Dobni and Zinkhan 1990; Stern et al. 2001, 2002).

Definitions and Quotations: Valence

The bulk of dictionary entries consist of definitions, in which phrases using synonyms to describe a term's meaning are followed by chronologically arranged quotations that illustrate historical usage. The definitions reveal *brand's* ambivalence, in that it has positive and negative meanings that contribute to multidimensional applicability. Ambivalence is inherent in the term's derivation from the Old Germanic *brinn-an* (to burn), referenced in its definition as an act, means, or result of burning. A positive definition relevant to marketing is the association with burning as a mark of identification, which first appeared in the fifteenth century, when *brand* signified a burn mark that was "a mark of ownership impressed on cattle, horses, etc." (*Oxford English Dictionary* 2004:I.4.d.), a meaning that survives today in cattle branding by ranchers. By the nineteenth century, the meaning of *brand* as a physical burn mark expanded to include that of a visual-verbal mark, imprinted indelibly "as a proof of ownership, as a sign of quality" (*Oxford English Dictionary* 2004:I.2.a.) that refers to a trademark affixed by burning or other means.

However, in addition to the positive meaning of identification, *brand* as a burn mark also has a negative meaning dating back to its use as a sign that communicates the idea of disgrace stamped on something odious. The negative meaning was the one that first entered modern marketing in the early compound *Brand X*, first used by Rorty (1934/1976) to compare the well-known Old Gold cigarette brand to an anonymous, unbranded, and presumably inferior product. Aaker (2004) pointed out the causes of a number of brands that became negatively valenced by events: Perrier by water contamination, Exxon by the Valdez oil spill, Firestone by the tire crisis, and Philip Morris by the cigarette health problems. In sum, the literal definitions reveal an intertwined bundle of valenced significations relevant to marketing—quality, physical visibility, concreteness, identification, and distinctiveness. The definitions in Main Heading II (*sword*) also reflect dual valence, for the Old English literal weapon of war refers both to its life-giving positive power, as in the sword of the tree of life (*Oxford English Dictionary* 2004:I.3.d, Example 2), and to its destructive negative power, as in its reference to inflamed armies with the brands of the furies

(*Oxford English Dictionary* 2004:I.3.c., Example 4). When *brand* is used as a verb, it is also dually valenced, with both positive implications (to signal proof of ownership, as a sign of quality) and negative ones (to mark or stamp with infamy, to stigmatize).

CONNOTATION AND METAPHORICAL MEANINGS

In addition to denotative literal meanings, historical analysis also uncovers connotative ones primarily found in the metaphoric associations signaled by the labels *Poet* and *fig.* (Abrams 1999). Insofar as dictionary definitions do not list connotative meanings directly (Watt 1952), it is up to researchers to interpret them. In this regard, metaphors are so common in everyday language that interpretation is a frequently repeated skill invoked almost unconsciously (McLaughlin 1990). Their ubiquity is built into the English language, for the generally accepted etymological view is that most words were originally metaphors (Ciardi and Williams 1975) and that associations can be traced to historical and linguistic usage. Literary critics and philosophers of science alike agree on the value of metaphors in scientific writing, with Derrida (1972/1982) pointing out that they are able to capture “the entire teleology of meaning, which . . . coordinates metaphor with the manifestations of truth” (p. 270). Harré (1970) made the metaphor-science relationship even more explicit, noting that descriptive terms in a scientific context take on the character of metaphors and that scientific description tends to be metaphorical. In scientific discourse, metaphors not only introduce new and surprising images but also shape what researchers perceive, know, and think about issues of interest (Abrams 1999).

Analysis of metaphors has been a subject of research for 25 centuries by literary critics and scientists since Aristotle, and controversy still exists about the best way to interpret them (Abrams 1999). I recommend the clear-cut similarity and comparison method dating back to Aristotle’s *Poetics* (Butcher 1961) and *The Art of Rhetoric* (Lawson-Tancred 1991), in which metaphors compare the underlying similarities in two ostensibly dissimilar things to evoke the vivid mental word pictures locked up in words (Abrams 1999; Ciardi and Williams 1975). More recently, Zaltman’s (1996:13) metaphor elicitation technique established metaphor analysis as a new research technique that allows firms to uncover “deep, latent, and emerging thoughts and feelings” about offerings.

Brand is particularly likely to be used metaphorically because of its ancestry: metaphors were the primary dictional device in Anglo-Saxon poetry (Hulbert 1961). Interpretation of the comparison between a brand (a physical, inanimate entity) and another physical inanimate entity is straightforward in that both items belong to the

same category of being. For example, Berry and Parasuraman (1991:118) compared branding to a “tool—a form of evidence” of a service firm’s marketing practices, with the comparison resting on similarities between a firm’s legal mark and a rancher’s red-hot burning iron as signs of ownership. Just as the red-hot iron identifies and differentiates a cattle owner’s stock, so too does a corporate legal instrument establish the firm’s service to customers as important and different from other firms (Berry and Parasuraman 1991). Note that the metaphorical comparison is rooted in the historical association of *brand* as a positive evidentiary mark that signifies a firm’s identifiability, quality offerings, and stability.

Other metaphors are based on a wide range of comparisons between brand attributes and those of human beings. The first instance appeared in Warner’s (1602/1999) *Albion’s England*, comparing *brand* with the imprint that a beloved knight makes on a woman’s heart (*Oxford English Dictionary* 2004, verb, 2.b). Current metaphors include *brand personality*, which compares brands and people in terms of their unique traits, and *brand identity*, which makes a similar comparison on the basis of the central, enduring, and distinctive traits common to both (Brown et al. 2006). New metaphors such as *brand reputation* are created by researchers to expand or modify earlier comparisons already in use. For example, *brand reputation* is distinct from *brand identity* or *brand personality* in that it compares a person’s character—“the condition, quality, or fact of being highly regarded or esteemed” (*Oxford English Dictionary* 2004:3.a.)—with that of a brand. Furthermore, *brand reputation* is also differentiated from *brand image*, an older metaphor that compares a physical mark (on goods or services) and its mental representation (in consumers’ minds) on the grounds of visibility. The metaphor expresses a distinction between image, which is a firm-directed communicative act that conveys what an organization wants others to know about it, and reputation, which is a consumer-controlled perception about an organization (Brown et al. 2006). The continued creation of novel comparisons stimulates the research community to notice of the similarities between very different things (Lawson-Tancred 1991) and things that might otherwise have been overlooked (Davidson 1984).

BRAND MEANINGS AND NEW DIRECTIONS IN RESEARCH

Table 1 presents the classification system in which the conceptual brand-research approaches of this special issue’s authors are classified by nature, function, locus, and valence into the categories of literal and metaphoric, entity and process, world and mind, and positive and negative. The table indicates that one article (by Varadarajan, DeFanti, and Busch) treats *brand* as literal, six articles

TABLE 1
Classification of Research Approaches

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Literal (L) or Metaphoric (M)</i>	<i>Entity (E) or Process (P)</i>	<i>World (W) or Mind (M)</i>	<i>Positive (P) or Negative (N)</i>
Metaphoric					
Berger, Cunningham, and Drumwright	Set of long-term, enduring, and distinctive characteristics associated in memory of corporate employees	M	E	M	P
Brown, Dacin, Pratt, and Whetten	Totality of all stakeholders' mental associations about the organization; central, enduring, distinctive identity	M	E	M	P
Chun and Davies	Mental association held by stakeholders; metaphor of a brand as a person having personality	M	E	M	P
Handelman	Symbolic social space; resides in a fluid and fragmented social realm	M	P	M	P
Pitt, Watson, Berthon, Wynn, and Zinkhan	Symbols around which buyers and sellers can establish a relationship, thereby creating a focus of identity	M	P	M	P
Ellen, Webb, and Mohr	Image of products and services; associations in minds of consumers	M	P	M	P
Literal					
Varadarajan, DeFanti, and Busch	Assets of a firm; assets reside in the brand names owned by a firm	L	E	W	N
Integrative					
Einwiller,	Brand identity: what the branded entity really is	L	E	W	P
Fedorikhin, Johnson, and Kamins	Brand image: associations in perceivers' mind; overlap between perceived brand identity and one's own personal identity	M	P	M	P
Jaju, Joiner, and Reddy	Corporate identity or corporate name; identifies all the brand associations of a firm	L	E	W	P
	Source of information to stakeholders	M	P	M	P
Sen, Bhattacharya, and Korschun	Proprietary mark or name that serves as identifier for entity	L	E	W	P/N
	Brand essence: branding is consumers' mental associations with a brand	M	P	W	P/N

treat it as metaphorical, and three treat it as integrative. The metaphoric articles are divided between those that treat *brand* as an entity and those that treat it as a process, with the integrative articles incorporating both functions. Both the metaphoric and the integrative articles also treat the term as a mental representation, although the latter include its meaning in the world. As to valence, only Varadarajan et al. focus on *brand's* negative valence, and only Sen, Bhattacharya, and Korschun focus on the positive and negative meanings. Taken as a whole, there are two general patterns: one is connotative, including the categories of metaphor, process, mind, and positive, with one including both positive and negative valence; the other is denotative, including the categories of literal, entity, world, and positive, with one focusing only on negative valence. The general patterns of commonalities and differences sustain the classification scheme on the basis of a parsimonious and "systematic categorization of theoretical perspectives" (Hirsch and Levin 1999:202). In this sense, the sample is characterized by multiple inclusionary approaches that fit together under the rubric of *brand research* and that are open to evolution, integration, and new directions.

New directions include testing the scheme on a more comprehensive sample, tracing the life cycle of current approaches, and studying neglected areas of research. Note that even though the scheme enabled the organization of approaches into a limited number of categories, it was tested on a small sample and needs further testing on a more comprehensive set of articles dating from the time when the term first entered marketing. I emphasize that the patterns found in a limited sample of articles should be tested on a more comprehensive sample, one that begins when the term entered marketing literature. This has already been done for *brand image* (Dobni and Zinkhan 1990), revealing the chronological progression of problem framing in the metaphor's 50-year history and in this way enabling researchers to see not only relationships among different approaches, but also evolutionary changes in the types of problems studied. Changes are often associated with the development of new metaphors (*brand harmony*, *brand entropy*, *brand orchestration*, *brand architecture*, *brand essence*; Yastrow 2003) that represent new directions in research approaches, and the

metaphors in general have not yet been studied from the historical perspective.

I suggest that investigating the path of literal and metaphorical usage in our own field requires a life cycle approach, needed to uncover the evolutionary pattern that "provides a scholarly dynamic or dialectic that is both descriptively accurate and intellectually valuable" to the research community (Hirsch and Levin 1999:199-200). A life cycle study of research approaches is needed to understand the origins, maturity, decline, and rebirth of new ways of thinking about *brand*. In addition, even though the classification scheme rests on familiar categories of nature, function, locus, and valence, the categories may require modification when a longitudinal sample is examined. Full understanding of where we are now and where we can go in the future can best be accomplished by examining a more comprehensive sample that shows where we have been and how we got there.

An additional direction for research is investigation of areas that have not yet been fully studied: the gaps exposed by the classification scheme. One area ripe for future research is the issue of negative brand meanings, the subject of only one article in this sample. Also needed is research on visual-verbal processing, for whereas the literal approach implies that brand meaning consists of verbal information, the metaphorical one implies that it consists of pictorial images, and the integrative articles imply the presence of both. Given that much less is known about metaphor processing than about information processing, further research is needed to understand the role of metaphors in fixing brand identity in consumers' minds, the relationship between types of processing, and their attitudinal outcomes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to the editors for their insightful comments and helpful feedback on earlier versions of this article. I am also grateful to the reviewers for their detailed comments and constructive suggestions.

REFERENCES

- Aaker, David A. 2004. *Brand Portfolio Strategy: Creating Relevance, Differentiation, Energy, Leverage, and Clarity*. New York: Free Press.
- Abrams, Meyer H. 1999. *A Glossary of Literary Terms* (7th ed.). Boston: Henle & Henle.
- Adbusters. 2004. "Unbrand America: Campaign Summary 2004." Available at <http://adbusters.org/metaspolitical/unbrandamerica/2004/>
- Ailawadi, Kusum L., Donald R. Lehmann, and Scott A. Neslin. 2003. "Revenue Premium as an Outcome Measure of Brand Equity." *Journal of Marketing* 67 (October): 1-17.
- Berman, Art. 1988. *From the New Criticism to Deconstruction: The Reception of Structuralism and Post-Structuralism*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Berry, Leonard S. and A. Parasuraman. 1991. *Marketing Services: Competing Through Quality*. New York: Free Press.
- Bethurum, Dorothy, Ed. 1960. *Critical Approaches to Medieval Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Brown, Tom J., Peter A. Dacin, Michael G. Pratt, and David A. Whetten. 2006. "Identity, Intended Image, Construed Image, and Reputation: An Interdisciplinary Framework and Suggested Terminology." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 34(2): 99-106.
- Butcher, S. H., Trans. 1961. *Aristotle's Poetics*. New York: Hill & Wang.
- Calder, Bobby J. and Steven J. Reagan. 2001. "Brand Design." In *Kellogg on Marketing*. Ed. Dawn Iacobucci. New York: John Wiley, 58-73.
- Carnap, Rudolf. 1962. *Logical Foundations of Probability* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge Kegan Paul.
- Ciardi, John and Miller Williams. 1975. *How Does a Poem Mean?* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Davidson, Donald. 1984. *Inquiries Into Truth and Interpretation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1982. "White Mythology: Metaphor in the Text of Philosophy." In *Margins of Philosophy*. Trans. Alan Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 207-271. (Original work published 1972)
- de Saussure, Ferdinand. 1959. *Course in General Linguistics*. Trans. Wade Baskin. New York: Philosophical Library. (Original work published 1907-1911)
- Dobni, D. and George M. Zinkhan. 1990. "In Search of Brand Image: A Foundation Analysis." In *Advances in Consumer Research*. Eds. Marvin E. Goldberg, Gerald Gorn, and Richard W. Pollay. New Orleans, LA: Association for Consumer Research, 110-118.
- Drawbaugh, Kevin. 2001. *Brands in the Balance: Meeting the Challenges to Commercial Identity*. London: Reuters.
- Feigl, Herbert. 1949. "Operationism and Scientific Method." In *Readings in Philosophical Analysis*. Eds. Herbert Feigl and Wilfrid Sellars. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 498-509.
- Fournier, Susan. 1998. "Consumers and Their Brands: Developing Relationship Theory in Consumer Research." *Journal of Consumer Research* 24 (March): 343-373.
- Goldberg, Jeffrey. 2005. "The Unbranding: Can the Democrats Make Themselves Look Tough?" Available at http://www.newyorker.com/printables/fact/050321fa_fact
- Harré, Rom. 1970. *The Principles of Scientific Thinking*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heaney, Seamus, Trans. 2002. *Beowulf: A Verse Translation*. New York: Norton.
- Hirsch, Paul M. and Daniel Z. Levin. 1999. "Umbrella Advocates Versus Validity Police: A Life-Cycle Model." *Organization Science* 10 (March-April): 199-212.
- Hirschman, Elizabeth C. 1991. "A Feminist Critique of Marketing Theory." In *Gender and Consumer Behavior Conference Proceedings*. Ed. Janeen Costa. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 324-340.
- "Brand Names on Menus?" 1922. *Hotel World* 94 (March 9).
- Howarth, W. D. and C. L. Walton. 1971. *Explications: The Technique of French Literary Appreciation*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hulbert, James R. 1961. *Bright's Anglo-Saxon Reader*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston
- Klaeber, F., Ed. 1950. *Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg* (3rd ed.). Boston: D.C. Heath.
- Kyburg, Henry E., Jr. 1968. *Philosophy of Science: A Formal Approach*. New York: Macmillan.
- Lawson-Tancred, H. C., Trans. 1991. *Aristotle: The Art of Rhetoric*. London: Penguin.
- Lentricchia, Frank. 1980. *After the New Criticism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lewis, C. S. (1960). *Studies in Words*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayer, Martin. 1958. *Madison Avenue, USA*. New York: Harper.
- McLaughlin, Thomas. 1990. "Figurative Language." In *Critical Terms for Literary Study*. Eds. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 80-90.
- McQuarrie, Edward and David Glen Mick. 1996. "Figures of Rhetoric in Advertising Language." *Journal of Consumer Research* 22 (March): 424-438.
- Mikkelsen, Barbara. 2001. "Troop Loops." Available at: <http://www.snopes.com/business/alliance/troop.asp>

- Oxford English Dictionary Online*. 2004. Retrieved May 28, 2004, from http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/00026646?query_typedword&queryword=brand&edition
- Peppers, Don and Martha Rogers. 2004. *Managing Customer Relationships: A Strategic Framework*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Ransom, John Crowe. 1941. *The New Criticism*. Norfolk, CT: New Directions.
- Richards, Ivor A. 1929. *Practical Criticism: A Study of Literary Judgment*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace.
- Rorty, James. 1976. *Our Master's Voice: Advertising*. New York: Arno. (Original work published 1934)
- Stern, Barbara B. 1989a. "Literary Criticism and Consumer Research: Overview and Illustrative Analysis." *Journal of Consumer Research* 16 (December): 322-334.
- . 1989b. "Literary Explication: A New Methodology for Consumer Research." In *Interpretive Consumer Research*. Ed. Elizabeth C. Hirschman. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 48-59.
- , George M. Zinkhan, and Morris B. Holbrook. 2002. "The Netvertising Image: Image Communication Model (NICM) and Construct Definition." *Journal of Advertising* 31 (Fall): 15-28.
- , ———, and Anupam Jaju. 2001. "Marketing Images: Construct Definition, Measurement Issues, and Theory Development." *Marketing Theory* 1 (December): 201-224.
- Strauss, Judy and Raymond Frost. 2001. *E-Marketing* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Teas, R. Kenneth and Kay M. Palan. 1997. "The Realms of Scientific Meaning Framework for Constructing Theoretically Meaningful Nominal Definitions of Marketing Concepts." *Journal of Marketing* 61 (April): 52-67.
- Todd, J. H., Ed. 1842. *An Apology for Lollard Doctrines*. London: Camden Society.
- Tybout, Alice M. and Gregory S. Carpenter. 2001. "Creating and Managing Brands." In *Kellogg on Marketing*. Ed. Dawn Iacobucci. New York: John Wiley, 74-102.
- Underwood, Benton J. 1957. *Psychological Research*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Warner, William. 1999. *Albion's England*. Early English Books Online. Available at <http://www.lib.umi.com/eebo/image/20226> (Original work published 1602)
- Watt, William W. 1952. *An American Rhetoric*. New York: Rinehart.
- Yastrow, Steve. 2003. *Brand Harmony*. Boston: Tom Peters.
- Zaltman, Gerald. 1996. "Metaphorically Speaking: New Technique Uses Multidisciplinary Ideas to Improve Qualitative Research." *Marketing Research* 8 (Summer): 13-20.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Barbara B. Stern (bbstern@aol.com) is Professor II of marketing at Rutgers Business School. She was awarded her Ph.D. by the City University of New York. Her articles have appeared in leading marketing journals such as the *Journal of Marketing*, the *Journal of Consumer Research*, the *Journal of Advertising*, the *Journal of Advertising Research*, the *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, and others. In addition, she is a coeditor of the journal *Marketing Theory* and the author of numerous articles in the proceedings of conferences of the Association for Consumer Research, the American Marketing Association, and the American Academy of Advertising. In 1995, she was a co-chair of the American Marketing Association Summer Educators' Conference, and in 1997, she received the Outstanding Contributions in Advertising Research Award from the American Academy of Advertising. Her primary research interest is the adaptation of literary theory and methods to the analysis of advertising, marketing, and consumer text.

Copyright of Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science is the property of Springer Science & Business Media B.V. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.