

The transformative role of branding as an architect of sustainable competitive advantage

CHEKAOUI Smina ¹

/

ANNABI Benaissa ²

¹High School of Commerce, Kolea, Algeria / s_chekaoui@esc-alger.dz.

²High School of Commerce, Kolea, Algeria / b_annabi@esc-alger.dz.

Received: 21/05/2025

Accepted: 23/06/2025

Published:30/06/2025

Abstract:

In an era of intensifying market competition and evolving consumer expectations, branding has emerged as a critical yet contested driver of sustainable competitive advantage. Despite its acknowledged importance, its conceptualization and operationalization remain fragmented across academia and practice. This paper synthesizes multidisciplinary perspectives to reframe branding as a dynamic, multidimensional construct that bridges organizational strategy and consumer perception. Through a systematic review of brand definitions and empirical analysis of case studies across industries, this paper maps the evolution of brand theory and its implications for competitive resilience.

Keywords: Brands; Branding strategy; competitive advantage; perception; differentiation.

Jel Classification Codes: : M31, M39, D11

Corresponding author: CHEKAOUI Smina, e-mail: s_chekaoui@esc-alger.dz.

1. INTRODUCTION

The evolution of branding as a strategic imperative has profoundly shaped organizational competitiveness across historical and contemporary contexts. Rooted in antiquity, early civilizations such as Mesopotamia and Greece employed markings to signify ownership and quality, laying the groundwork for modern branding practices (Sekar & Singh, 2005). The term itself, derived from Old Norse *brandr* (to burn), underscores its historical role in differentiation, a concept that expanded post-world war II, as mass production necessitated image-based distinction in saturated market (Klein, 2016). This progression reflects branding's transformation from tangible markers to intangible assets, positioning it as a critical driver of competitive advantage in volatile economies (Kapferer, 2013; Popoli, 2015).

Theoretical discourse reveals fragmented interpretations of brand essence, with scholars emphasizing its multidimensional nature. While early definition focused on logos and ownership, contemporary frameworks integrate cognitive, affective and connective dimensions (Rosenberg & Hoveland, 1960; Schiffman & Kanuk, 2007). Kapferer (2004) posits that branding transcends nomenclature, requiring sustained corporate investment to reshape product categories and consumer perceptions. De Chernatony and Riley's (1998) thematic synthesis of brand definitions highlight this duality, balancing functional attributes with symbolic value, a duality that underpins brand equity and loyalty (Moore & al., 2008).

Strategic branding's role in sustaining competitiveness becomes pronounced during economic crises, where price sensitivity and eroded loyalty threaten market stability. Propoli (2015) argues that differentiation through intangible resources, such as trust and emotional

resonance, mitigates these risks, enabling firms like Nike, Coca-Cola to avoid destructive price wars. Conversely, market orientation and adaptive positioning mediate brand success. Empirical studies demonstrate that crisis-era branding demands innovation in cost effective engagement (e.g. social media) while preserving core values, a balance exemplified by Nokia and Kellogg's resilience (Bothaat & al., 2020; Wreden, 2007).

This paper synthesizes these themes to explore how branding's evolution, from ancient marks to modern strategic architectures, has redefined its role in crisis navigation and competitive differentiation, with a pivotal research question: **How has branding's conceptual and functional evolution enabled organizations to harness it as a source of sustainable competitive advantage?** Drawing on multidisciplinary perspectives, we argue that brands are not static entities but dynamic processes, continually reshaped by technological, economic and sociocultural forces (Wreden, 2007; Kapferer, 2008). By examining historical precedents, crisis-era adaptations, and contemporary theoretical debates, this review aims to bridge fragmented discourses, offering scholars and practitioners a cohesive lens through which to reimagine branding's strategic potential.

2. The method

This literature review adopts a systematic synthesis of peer-reviewed articles, books and case studies to map brandings conceptual and functional evolution. Using Scopus, Jstor, Research Gate database, multiple sources were selected through keyword searches (Brand evolution, branding evolution, and competitive advantage) and citation chaining. Inclusion criteria prioritized seminal works (e.g. Kapferer, 2004; Holt & al. , 2004...) and recent empirical studies addressing branding's strategic shifts, with exclusion of non-academic texts.

Thematic coding organized findings into two analytical categories, Historical shift in branding purpose, its impact on competitive advantage with theoretical debates on intangible value creation. Cross-comparative analysis identified patterns across disciplines (marketing, sociology, and economics) to reconcile fragmented perspectives.

To ensure rigor, data extraction focused on recurring frameworks (e.g. Kapferer's brand identity prism, Holt's cultural branding) and contradictions (eg. functional vs emotional differentiation). This multidisciplinary triangulation clarifies how branding's evolving definitions and practices coalesce into competitive resilience, addressing the research question through synthesis rather than chronological narration.

3. The evolution of competitive advantage and its implications for branding strategies

The concept of competitive advantage has long been central to strategic management, yet its definitional ambiguity and operationalization remain subject of scholarly debate. Rooted in early works by Ansoff (1965), who framed competitive advantage as an organization's unique superiority over market rivals, the term evolved significantly through Porter's (1985) assertion that it constitutes the foundation for long-term performance, achieved via cost leadership or differentiated value. Barney (1991) further refined this notion by emphasizing the role of inimitable, value-adding strategies that yield sustained

profit (Barney, 1991, p.102). Despite these contributions, inconsistencies persist in defining its determinants, leading scholars to critique its conceptual fluidity and fragmented application across contexts (Arend, 2003; Sigalas & Pekka-Economou, 2013, O'Shannassy, 2008). Sigalas (2015) notably characterized competitive advantage as a latent construct, distinct from both its enabling resources and superior performance it generates, a critical distinction to disentangling theoretical discussions.

3.1. Theoretical foundations of competitive advantage

Two dominant paradigms have shaped the discourse of competitive advantage: industrial organization (IO) theory and the resource-based view (RBV). IO theory, popularized by Porter (1985), posits that external industry structures, such as competitive forces and market dynamics, dictate organizational success. Here, advantage arises from strategic positioning, whether through cost efficiency or differentiation aligned with customer willingness to pay (Attaran & al., 2012). In contrast, RBV proponents argue that internal capabilities, including tangible and intangible assets, drive sustained superiority (Barney, 1991; Greco & al., 2013). This perspective, emphasizing firm-specific resources like knowledge and competencies, aligns with Madhok and Keyhani's (2012) assertion that advantage stems from optimizing resources to meet latent market needs (Madhok & Keyhani, 2012, p.36). Empirical studies increasingly favor RBV, underscoring its reliability in explaining performance heterogeneity (Hajipour & Momeni, 2009, alimi & al., 2021).

3.2. Sustainable competitive advantage and strategic implications

The pursuit of sustainability in competitive advantage has intensified as markets globalize and consumer demands evolve. Porter's (1985) generic strategies, cost leadership, differentiation, and focus, laid early groundwork, while later scholars like Chaharbaghi and Lynch (1999) emphasized innovation in products and processes.

Kim and Mauborgne's (2005) blue ocean strategy expanded this discourse, advocating market creation over saturated industries (Mohagher & al., 2021). Sigalas & al. (2013) operationalized sustainability as the capacity to exploit opportunities and neutralize threats, yielding returns exceeding industry averages, a definition that bridges RBV and market-oriented logic (Madhok & Keyhani, 2012, p.324). Critically, sustainable advantage now hinges on dynamic capabilities, such as adaptability and strategic foresight, which enable firms to preempt market shifts (Bingham & Eisenhardt, 2008).

3.3. Reconciling theory with branding evolution

The evolution of branding reflects these theoretical shifts. Early branding strategies, aligned with IO theory, prioritized differentiation through product attributes or pricing. However, the rise of RBV reshaped branding into a vehicle for communicating relationships (Greco & al., 2013). Modern brands, such as Apple and Tesla, exemplify this transition; embedding RBV principles by Aligning their identities with unique capabilities like design excellence or sustainability leadership. Concurrently, the blue ocean strategy's emphasis on uncontested markets has spurred brands like Netflix to redefine industry boundaries through digital innovation (Kim & Mauborgne, 2005).

The conceptual journey of competitive advantage, from Porter's industry-centric

models to Barney's resource-driven frameworks, mirrors the strategic evolution of branding. As markets grow increasingly dynamic, the integration of RBV principles into branding strategies offers a pathway to sustainability, emphasizing adaptability, customer-centric value, and the strategic deployment of unique capabilities. Future research should explore how emerging technologies and consumer consciousness further reshape these paradigms; ensuring brands remain resilient in an era of relentless completion.

4. A synthesis of perspectives on the multifaceted nature of branding definitions

The conceptualization of brands has evolved significantly over time, reflecting shifts in academic thought and market dynamics. While early definitions emphasized tangible elements such as logos and trademarks (American Marketing Association, 1960), contemporary perspectives highlight the intangible, experiential and rational dimensions of brands (Keller, 1993; Rua & Santos, 2022). This analysis synthesizes twelve thematic classification of brands (de Chernatony & Riley, 1998, as cited in Maurya & Mishra, 2012) to explore their interplay, limitations, and relevance in modern marketing theory.

4.1. Firm-oriented versus Consumer-oriented perspectives

Brand definition can be broadly categorized into firm-oriented and consumer-oriented perspectives. Firm-centric themes, such as brand as a logo (AMA, 2007), legal instrument (Grainer, 1985), or company (Van Teil & Balmer, 1997), underscore brands as strategic assets for differentiation and competitive advantage. These themes prioritize organizational control, emphasizing trademarks, corporate identity and legal ownership. However, critics argue that such definitions neglect consumer agency, reducing brands to static symbols devoid of experiential meaning (Kapferer, 1995; Maurya & Mishra, 2012). For instance, the AMA's 2007 revised definition, while incorporating broader features like "any other identifier", remains anchored in a manufacturer-centric view, failing to address the role of consumer perceptions in brand co-creation (Meadows, 1983).

Conversely, consumer-oriented themes position brands as psychological constructs shaped by individual and collective experiences. Brand as a shorthand (Brown, 1992) and risk reducer (Bauer, 1960) highlight cognitive and emotional processes, where brands simplify decision-making and mitigate perceived risks. Similarly, brand as a personality (Aaker, 1997) and brand as a relationship (Blackston, 1992) emphasize anthropomorphic qualities, enabling consumers to form affective bonds with brands. These themes align with Schultz and Barnes' (1999) assertion that brands transcend functional attributes, embodying relational dynamics between buyers and sellers (Bačevac & al., 2020). Nevertheless, such perspectives risk oversimplification by neglecting institutional factors, such as legal framework or corporate strategies that shape brand trajectories (Maurya & Mishra, 2012).

4.2. Thematic overlaps and conceptual tensions

Several themes intersect, revealing tensions between identity (firm-created) and image (consumer-perceived). Kapferer's (1992) identity system, which integrated culture, personality and value, exemplifies this duality. While identity frameworks aim to align brand messaging with organizational values (Aaker, 1996), image-centric definitions stress that brands reside in consumers' minds as associative networks (Joyce, 1963; Pitcher, 1985).

This dichotomy underscores the challenge of balancing strategic intent with perceptual reality, a gap exacerbated by globalization, where brand must navigate diverse cultural contexts (Rua & Santos, 2022; Dimofte & al., 2008).

The value system theme further complicates this interplay. Sheth & al. (1991) conceptualize brands as clusters of functional, social and emotional values, yet these values are inherently subjective, shaped by individual and cultural contexts (Franzen & Moriarty, 2008). For example, brand as an evolving entity (Goodyear, 1996) posits that brands transition from commodities to cultural icons, reflecting shifts in consumer ownership and societal trends. However, this evolution remains understudied empirically, raising questions about stage boundaries and indicators of change (Maurya & Mishra, 2012).

4.3. Dynamic and contextual dimensions

Modern definitions increasingly recognize brands as dynamic, co-created entities. Rua and Santos (2022) argue that brands transcend physical products, operating as effective symbols shaped by global interactions and stakeholder relationships. This aligns with Lambin's (2008) view that brand value derives from transversal connections across markets and societies. However, such fluidity complicates management, as brands must reconcile consistency with adaptability to maintain relevance (Veloutsou & al. 2020).

5. Strategic branding as a catalyst for sustainable competitive advantage

In an era marked by intense market competition and shifting consumer preferences, the evolution of branding from a peripheral marketing tool to a core strategic asset emerged as a critical driver of organizational success. Drawing on theoretical frameworks and empirical insights, this study argue that effective branding hinges on aligning strategic objectives with consumer cognition while adhering to a structured developmental process.

By examining these themes, this paper argues that effective branding transcends aesthetic appeal, functioning instead as a dynamic tool for fostering customer loyalty, shaping consumer perceptions and securing long-term profitability.

5.1. Digitalization and brand-customer dynamics

The digital era has amplified branding's complexity and redefined its imperatives. While digital platforms facilitates price transparency, commoditized products remain more vulnerable to price wars than differentiated brands. Successful firms harness digital platform to enhance customer engagement, transforming passive consumers into active advocates by leveraging technology to enhance accessibility and personalization, thereby deepening emotional connections. This shift necessitates customer-centric branding, where brands act as advocates rather than broadcasters, aligning with Kotler and Pfoertch's (2006) emphasis on clarity and consistency in brand communication. Thus, brands must balance scalability with hyper-personalization to avoid homogenization in an era of empowered consumers.

5.2. Branding strategy as a tool for consumer perception management

Central to branding efficacy is its capacity to reshape consumer perception, also called perceptual equity, a process defined by Kotler and Keller (2006, and cited in Bačevac & al., 2020) as the selective organization and interpretation of external stimuli, brand's signals. Bačevac & al. (2020) contend that branding strategies must be rooted in predetermined

goals aimed at altering these perceptual frameworks. For example, a cohesive branding strategy integrates distinct brand elements, such as a logo, messaging and values, across products and services, fostering a unified brand identity (Keller, 2008). This consistency ensures that consumers assign meanings to the brand, thereby influencing purchasing decisions.

Brand awareness further amplifies this effect, acting as a cognitive bridge that connects consumers to preferred brands during decision-making moments (Farhana, 2012, cited in Bačevac & al., 2020). Enabling consumers to recall and prefer specific brands amid competing alternatives. When consumers encounter a familiar brand, pre-existing perceptions of quality, reliability or prestige streamline the decision process, reducing dissonance. This perceptual dominance is cultivated through deliberate strategies such as the added-values framework, which embeds intangible attributes like reliability or prestige into consumer consciousness, positioning the brand as a mental shortcut in saturated markets.

5.3. Strategic branding, consumer loyalty and differentiation

Branding serves as a linchpin for cultivating enduring customer relationships, a notion underscored by MolkAra (2022), who posits that brands act as instruments for both identification and differentiation. In commoditized markets, where products attributes often converge, brands distinguish themselves through emotional resonance and perceived value.

For instance, companies leveraging strategic branding align their marketing strategies with consumer needs, transforming transactional interactions into relational engagements (MolkAra, 2022). In industries like beverages, where product homogeneity is prevalent, brand equity is rooted in emotional resonance to become the primary basis for consumer preference. Brands like Hammoud Boualem, an Algerian brand that is particularly renowned for its carbonated soft drinks, leverage symbolic associations, nostalgia, happiness or cultural relevance, to transcend product homogeneity.

In commoditized markets, branding serves as a critical differentiator. Bačevac & al. (2020) argue that brands achieve competitive advantage through either cost leadership (e.g. economies of scale in homogeneous markets) or premium differentiation (e.g. Michelin's reputation for quality). Market leaders like Tesla or Apple exemplify how brands leverage innovation and emotional resonance to dominate niches, while challengers such as Huawei adopt aggressive strategies to erode incumbents' shares.

This alignment not only enhances customer retention, a key determinant of profitability, but also solidifies the brand's position in the consumer's cognitive landscape. The emphasis on long-term relationships underscores branding's role as a strategic asset, one that requires continuous investment to maintain relevance and competitive edge.

However, sustaining differentiation demands rigorous environmental analysis. Organizations must continuously assess competitors' strengths, refine media strategies, and evoke emotional responses to avoid the commodity slide, which is a decay in brand equity precipitated by undifferentiated offerings.

5.4. The structured brand-building process

To mitigate the risks of brand erosion or commoditization, Kotler and Pfoertch (2006) advocate a systematic approach to brand building, comprising planning, analysis, strategy formulation, execution and revision (Bačevac & al., 2020). This iterative process ensures alignment between a brand's core identity and evolving market dynamics. For instance, brand planning necessitates clarity in defining long-term objectives, while brand analysis involves auditing internal capabilities and external competitive landscapes. Subsequent stages, such as brand strategy and building, operationalize these insights through targeted campaigns and stakeholder engagement. Finally, brand revision allows for adaptive recalibration, ensuring resilience against shifts in consumer preferences or technological disruptions. Intel's sustained dominance in the semiconductor industry exemplifies this model, as continuous innovation and repositioning counteracted potential commoditization.

5.5. Brand equity and financial valuation

The financial significance of branding is evident in mergers and acquisition, where intangible assets often eclipse tangible ones. Nestlé's acquisition of Rowntree and Procter & Gamble's purchase of Gillette highlight how brands command premiums reflective of future cash flows. Such transactions validate interbrand's approach to valuing brands as income-generating assets, contingent on sustained investment in marketing and innovation.

Empirical studies further corroborate the link between brand equity and profitability. Binet's (2007) analysis of promotional campaigns revealed that budget cuts led to multi-year sales recovery periods, underscoring branding's role as a long-term investment rather than discretionary expenditure. This aligns with MolkAra's (2022) contention that strategic branding enhances financial performance by fostering customer retention and pricing power.

6. CONCLUSION

Brands defy singular definition, embodying a nexus of legal, cognitive, emotional and relational elements. As Schultz & al. (2015) note, brands act as connectors between organizations and stakeholders, necessitating strategies that harmonize identity with perceived value. The synthesis of themes highlights the need for holistic branding strategies. Practitioners must navigate legal protections (Isaac, 2000), cultivate emotional resonance (Kotler & al. 2006), and align identity with consumer perceptions (Gardner & Levy, 1955).

Academically, future research should address gaps in stakeholder inclusivity; most themes prioritize firms and consumers, overlooking employees, vendors, or shareholders (Maurya & Midhra, 2012). Additionally, operationalizing constructs like brand personality required resolving measurement inconsistencies (Azoulay & Kapferer, 2003), while empirical validation of evolutionary models remains critical.

In an era of globalization and digital interconnectedness, brands must evolve as living entities, responsive to culture, technological and economic shifts. This complexity underscores the imperative for interdisciplinary research and adaptive frameworks that capture brand's multifaceted essence.

The intersection of strategic branding and perception management reveals a symbiotic relationship: brands shape consumer perceptions, while these perceptions, in turn, dictate

brand success, those evading commodity slide.. MolKara's (2022) emphasis on customer retention aligns with Bačevac & al. (2020) structured framework, illustrating that profitability hinges on both rational and operational excellence. For instance, a brand that invests in personalized customer experiences (strategic branding) while adhering to a rigorous revision process (structured building) is better positioned to adapt to market shifts and sustain loyalty.

Moreover, the role of technology and leadership cannot be understated. As markets grow increasingly digital, brands must leverage data analytics during the brand analysis phase to uncover emerging trends, while maintaining leadership agility to implement timely revisions. Failure to do so risks relegating the brand to a generic commodity, devoid of the added values that justify premium pricing.

In conclusion, we can say that branding is a multifaceted discipline that demands strategic foresight, psychological acuity, and operational rigor. By anchoring strategies in consumer perception, adhering to structured building processes, and prioritizing long-term relationships. Organizations can transcend transactional dynamics to become irreplaceable fixtures in the consumer psyche. Future research should explore the role of cultural narratives in perception management, the intersection of digital transformation and brand authenticity or the impact of AI-driven analytics on brand revision processes, particularly as AI-driven personalization redefines consumer expectation. For now, the evidence is clear: in the battle for market relevance, branding is not merely an asset, it is a necessity. For practitioners, the imperative lies on treating branding not as a cost center but as a value-generating investment, integral to long-term organizational viability.

7. Bibliography List :

- American Marketing Association. (2007). Dictionary of marketing terms.
- Ansoff, H. I. (1965). Corporate Strategy McGraw Hill. New York.
- Atanasovski, V., & Veselinova, E. (2024). Creating a strategic competitive advantage through branding. *Journal of Economics*, 9(2), 30-41.
- Attaran, J., Divandari, A., & Adinov, H. (2012). Identification of the factors affecting market consolidation (achieving sustainable competitive advantage) Banking services in Bank Mellat based on source-based perspective. *Business Management*, Tehran School of Management. 4(1).
- Azoulay, A., & Kapferer, J. N. (2003). Do brand personality scales really measure brand personality?. *Journal of brand management*, 11, 143-155.
- Bačevac, S., Veselinović, J., & Životić, D. (2020). Branding and brand as factor of the competitive advantage in sports. *Facta Universitatis, Series: Physical Education and Sport*, 569-578.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of management*, 17(1), 99-120.
- De Chernatony, L., & Riley, F. D. (1998). *European Journal of Marketing*, 32(5/6), 414–430
- Farhana, M. (2012). Brand elements lead to brand equity: Differentiate or die. *Information management and business review*, 4(4), 223-233.
- Forghani Bonab, A., & Salimi Akbari, S. (2016). Developing a model of brand competitive advantage in the automotive industry (Case study of Pars Khodro Company). *Quarterly Journal of Management, Accounting and Economics*.1 (3)

- Grundey, D. (2009). Branding strategies during economic crisis: avoiding the erosion. *Economics & Sociology*, 2(2), 9-22.
- Haghighi Kafash, M., Hamidi Binabaj, M., Karimi Alavijeh, M, R., & Khalilnejad, Sh. (2020). Strategic Branding. *Strategic Management Studies*, No. 43.
- Haghighi Kafash, M., Hamidi Binabaj, M., Karimi Alavijeh, M, R., & Khalilnejad, Sh. (2019). Explaining the model and presenting the challenges of strategic branding in the saffron industry, *Iranian Journal of Management Sciences*, Fourteenth Year, No. 55.
- Hajipour, B., & Momeni, F. (2009). Competitive advantage: A case study of knowledge-based companies. *Journal of Strategic Management Studies*, 1(3), 45–62.
- Hajipour, B., & Momeni, M. (2009). Recognition of resource-based approach to organizational resources and sustainable competitive advantage studied: Saran Production Company. *Management Thought*, third year, first issue.
- Howard, J. A. (1977). *Consumer behavior: Application of theory*. McGraw-Hill.
- Kapferer, J. N. (2013). The New Strategic Brand Management. *Journal of Brand Strategy*, 2(3), 312-313.
- Keller, K. L. (1993). Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. *Journal of marketing*, 57(1), 1-22.
- Kim, W. C. (2005). Blue ocean strategy: from theory to practice. *California management review*, 47(3), 105-121.
- Kim, W. C., & Mauborgne, R. (2005). *Blue ocean strategy*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Kirca, A. H., Jayachandran, S., & Bearden, W. O. (2005). Market orientation: A meta-analytic review and assessment of its antecedents and impact on performance. *Journal of marketing*, 69(2), 24-41.
- Klein, N., & Schmidt, I. (2016). *No logo*. Picador
- Kotler, P., & Pfoertsch, W. (2006). B2B branding dimensions. *B2B Brand Management*, 65-156.
- Madhok, A., & Keyhani, M. (2012). Acquisitions as entrepreneurship: Asymmetries, opportunities, and the internationalization of multinationals from emerging economies. *Global Strategy Journal*, 2(1), 26-40.
- Maurya, U. K., & Mishra, P. (2012). What is a brand? A Perspective on Brand Meaning. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 4(3), 122-133.
- Mohaghar, A., Asgharizadeh, E., Ghodsypour, S. H., & Samarrokhi, A. (2021). Presenting a Conceptual Model Delineating the Effect of Production and Operations Strategies on Sustainable Competitive Advantage in Iranian Automotive Industry: The Case of Tehran Automobile Manufacturing Companies. *The Journal of Productivity Management*, 15 (1 (56 spring), 163-187.
- MolkAra, M. (2022). The role of strategic branding in sustainable competitive advantage. *International Journal of Business Management and Entrepreneurship*, 1(1), 6-10.
- Popoli, P. (2015). Reinforcing intangible assets through CSR in a globalized world. *Journal of Management Policies and Practices*, 3(1), 23-30.
- Popoli, P. (2017). Advancing insights on brand management. In *Advancing insights on brand management*. Rijeka, Croatia: InTech.
- Porter, M. E. (1985). *Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance*. Free Press.
- Rua, O. L., & Santos, C. (2022). Linking brand and competitive advantage: The mediating effect of positioning and market orientation. *European research on management and business economics*, 28(2), 100194.

- Sarkar and Singh (2005). New Paradigm in Evolving Brand Management Strategy. *Journal of Management Research*, 5(2), pp. 80-90.
- Salimi, A., Sanaei, A., & Ansari, A. (2020). Integrated conceptual model based on integrity to create, maintain and develop marketing capabilities, sustainable competitive advantage and superior business performance. *The Journal of Business Management*, 12(3).
- Schultz, D. E., & Barnes, B. E. (1999). *Strategic brand communication campaigns*. NTC Business Books.
- Schultz, D. E., Barnes, B. E., Schultz, H. F., & Azzaro, M. (2015). *Building customer-brand relationships*. Routledge.
- Sigalas, C., & Economou, V. P. (2013). Revisiting the concept of competitive advantage: Problems and fallacies arising from its conceptualization. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, 6(1), 61-80.
- Van Gelder, S. (2003). *Global brand strategy: unlocking brand potential across countries, cultures & markets*. Kogan Page Publishers.