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Abstract

Aside the military fashion of ‘missions’, ‘field officers’ and ‘operations’, the humanitarian language started to add business and corporatist substances, such as ‘beneficiaries’, ‘clients’ ‘accountability’ and ‘brands’. The increasing trend of business terms adoption goes hand in hand with humanitarians embracing a wide array of business-like practices.

This paper aims to contribute to the ongoing debates on the implications of humanitarian to business shifting by exploring the theoretical and practical interferences of branding into the humanitarian field.

Branding steams out from business economics and commercial practice, being mainly associated with monetary gain and profit pursuit. Overall, this thesis attempts to add to the critical reflections on the evolution of the humanitarian action by exploring to which degree, why and how branding is imported into the non-profit humanitarian sector.
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Notes
1. Introduction

“Humanitarian organisations speak of ‘beneficiaries’, have offices that cultivate ‘clients’ and make use of their ‘brand’, aspire to increase their ‘efficiency’ and adopt modern ‘accountability’.”

Importing terms from other fields is not new for the humanitarians. From ‘mission’, to ‘field officers’ and ‘operations’, the military fashion of humanitarian language started to add business and corporatist substances. The emergence of business terms (such as branding) into the humanitarian vocabulary comes at a transformation time for the humanitarian field. As Barnett says, this transformation started in the 80’s within the midst of expanding scale, scope, and significance of the humanitarian action. A second stage followed in the 90’s, when the field became more professionalized and rationalized. Yet, did we entered a third stage? In the recent years voices like Hopgoods’ tell us about the growing marketization and commercialization of the humanitarian practice. Nowadays, humanitarians seek the expertise of advertisers, contract PR and communications agencies, and hire marketing consultants to promote, merchandize or advocate for their work and cause. As Vestergaard puts it, “while the practices of commercial organizations are becoming increasingly ethicalized, the practices of non-profit organizations are becoming increasingly commercialized”.

The most essential difference between for-profit and non-profit establishments is the very reason for which they exist. Putting together ‘business’ and ‘humanitarian’ may look controversial, but it is not a first. The humanitarians have been challenged to think about themselves in terms of business before. Two leading analysts of the international arena, Barnett and Weiss greatly shaped the understanding of the humanitarian action and also introduced “the humanitarian ‘firm’.”

Analysing the complex and challenging aspects of the current humanitarian marketplace, Weiss defines the humanitarian business and its determinants of success or failure, and describes humanitarian organisations as competing business entities. However, the adoption of business terms is obvious and certain, and it goes hand in hand with humanitarians embracing a wide array of business-like practices and there is an ongoing debate on either this means winning competition against cooperation for ‘doing good’. Schlesinger & al show that shifting humanitarians towards business values and behaviour in an increasing competitive environment can threaten their mission. Yet, nowadays humanitarian agencies search for ‘differentiation’, strive for favourable ‘positioning’, increase their ‘awareness’ and ‘visibility’, and display their ‘ownership’ by ‘branding’ everything from their NFI’s and aid packages, to football players, t-shirts, cars and mugs. All these leads us in the intriguing world of a concept streamed out from consumerism and capitalist logic: branding.

To begin with, I chose this topic not just because I found it intriguing, but avoided and eluding as well. As at the centre of their operations, humanitarians put at first their mission, while ‘sell’ tends to be rejected, and somehow related, so does the branding too.
At large, branding literature steams out from business economics and commercial practice. Within the growing trend of adopting business terms and business-like practices, I wanted to understand if and how the concept and practice of branding are imported in the humanitarian sector and what has been published on this subject. I found very few published works to tackle directly the subject of humanitarian branding and nothing to address specifically and in-depth defining branding for humanitarian organizations.

As the title suggests, this thesis seeks to find out how branding, a business concept is imported in the humanitarian sector. Considering the scarcity of literature, this paper is addressing the following research question: what are the challenges in defining, implementing, measuring and evaluating branding for humanitarian organisations?

The first section of the paper seeks to understanding what branding is, how it evolved in time, how it is made, what are its functions, and how it is measured. It also seeks to find out whether or not there are any knowledge gaps between for profit / non-profit branding literature.

In the second section, the study tries to assess if and how branding and its subsidiary derivates apply to the humanitarian sector by drawing a comparison between business and humanitarian theory and practice of branding. It will seek to find how concepts, principles and procedures of branding have been, or could be introduced and adapted to the extremely complex and difficult humanitarian practice.

Within the current context of scarce literature addressing this topic exclusively and in-depth, and using preponderantly comparative and meta-analyses from secondary sources, practice-based evidence and lessons learnt from various cases, this chapter will try to identify the main disparities and breaches that challenge both, the understanding and the practice of branding in the humanitarian field. Overall, this thesis attempts to add to the critical reflections on the evolution of the humanitarian action by exploring if, how, and why humanitarian organizations could benefit from branding. This paper aims to contribute to the overall debates on the implications of humanitarian to business shifting by exploring the theoretical and practical interferences of branding into the humanitarian field.

Conclusions sum up and puts in balance the theoretical and practical aspects of branding that challenge humanitarians at both, conceptual and implementations levels. In the end, this paper will review current and future challenges in if, how and what elements of branding impact the humanitarian response, and will try to open up to other associations raising from the fading division between commercial and non-commercial.

In Slim’s words, “certain humanitarian brands like the Red Cross, the United Nations, Oxfam and Médecins Sans Frontières are amongst the strongest in the world”\(^{10}\).

But what is a humanitarian brand? And what makes it strong? Ultimately, do strong humanitarian brands impact the humanitarian response?
2. Humanitarian

Concept delimitation

“We live in a world of humanitarianisms.” Before questioning the business-humanitarian oxymoron, we first need to clarify how the concept of humanitarian sector will be used in this paper. Although extensively used, this concept lacks clarification and there is no common delineation on what humanitarianism is and “who exactly qualifies as a humanitarian”.

Definition of terms

Based on the ALNAP framework on humanitarian system*, only the organizations having the humanitarian action as core mandate will be referred as humanitarian sector within the scope of this paper.

Although there are essential differences in their nature, structure, constituencies, mandates and responsibilities, the UN humanitarian brands and the NGOs brands are often referred all together as humanitarian brands. The unclear distinction between NGOs and UN humanitarian agencies derives from a multitude of sources varying from lacking knowledge and understanding of their specifics, from being perceived together in operations, from sharing private donor market, from money channelled through UN common funds for responding to emergencies (ERFs, CHF etc.), and so on.

The term of humanitarian(s) will be used in the sense drawn upon the way humanitarians are defining themselves through “the central aim” of their action which “is saving lives and alleviating suffering of people through action that is guided by humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence.”

3. Methodology and Limitations

This exploratory thesis on branding draws mainly on meta-study and systematic review of the theory, research and practice policies and papers steaming out from three main sources:

- the abundant existing literature and research on branding, brand management, brand communication, brand equity, and brand valuation in the business and commercial sector
- the emerging literature and research on branding, brand management, brand communication, brand equity, and brand valuation in the non-profit sector
- the very scarce body of literature on humanitarian branding

This study also uses secondary sources from the humanitarian sector, practice-based evidence and lessons learnt from various cases such as UNICEF, UNHCR, Care Intl., Red Cross, MSF, Oxfam, and Terre des Hommes.

The paper grounds in comparative research aimed to identify similarities and differences in the conceptualization and practice between for profit and humanitarian non-profit. It seeks to find how concepts, principles and procedures of branding have been, or could be introduced and adapted to the complex humanitarian practice.
Overall, the analysis model of this exploratory study is rooted in the branding elements, principles and functions. At first, it describes what, why how, where and when branding is used in the source field of business. Then, it explores if and to which extent the correlations between these dimensions and the causality relations can be translated or valid to the humanitarian field. The brand communication is constituent part in the overall brand strategy. This thesis search to find the overall ratio in how brand owners use brand strategy and communications to create brand equity for achieving strong brands valuable for both, organization and customers/stakeholders. In the end, it seeks to see if and how humanitarian branding impacts the humanitarian response.

The research model of this paper is illustrated bellow:

From the beginning, this study recalls its limitations:

- Branding is a complex, multidimensional and multifaceted concept. Within the limits of this paper, some elements of branding are not mentioned (e.g. brand architecture, brand extensions, a.o.) or not treated in details (e.g. brand communication/multichannel integrated communication). As such, this paper limits the brand communication topic to its degrees of predominance in the overall brand management. Thus, in the ‘brand as an outcome’ chapter the brand communication component is leading the overall brand consumer-centric approach, but this thesis will focus on how brand communication meets the challenging humanitarian field. The wide array of communications methods and techniques, multiplied by the many audiences humanitarian must address, engage and mobilize, multiplied again by various two-ways channels and the countless messages humanitarians have to convey make - a very large topic to debate on what, how and why. We’ll focus on what challenge brand communications in humanitarian sector, rather than analysing in detail various communication campaigns and materials.

- Similarly, there are limitations in depicting the case studies mentioned within the resources of analysis used in this paper. The case studies will be used in correlation with different branding components, elements and techniques, rather than treated as detailed individual case studies exposés. Additional information and illustrations on the case studies will be provided in foot notes, references and annexes.

- Branding is a multidisciplinary construct and an interdisciplinary creation within a large spectrum varying from economics, legal, and social sciences, to mathematics and
neuroscience. Bias may result from using mainly economic literature. This is a field of investigation largely driven by the business approach.

- This thesis seeks to find out how branding, a business concept is imported in the humanitarian sector. At large, branding literature steams out from business economics and commercial practice. Bias may also occur from the preponderant business perspective.

4. The concept of branding
4.1. Introduction to branding

Branding is not new neither for academics, nor for the business world. If one thinks that branding is relatively modern would be surprised to find out that it goes back in time, to the beginning of civilizations and into a wide variety of users and uses. In perhaps one of the best research on the history of the concept of branding, Bastos and Levy\textsuperscript{17} analysed and described the multi-dimensional and multi-functional aspects of branding and their evolution in time. From ancient times, to denote belonging people marked their skin (tribal tattoos, for example); to indicate ownership, cattle and slaves were marked with hot irons; as stigma and punishment, other humans like criminals, prostitutes and thieves were branded as well. Bastos and Levy argue that the most interesting aspect about branding is its ambivalence, given by the enduring negative and positive purposes, aspects and meanings at the same time. On one hand, there are the positive aspects of the purposes of branding: cosmetic, medicinal, social, psychological, political, and cultural. At the root of branding activity is the human desire to be someone, to create a personal and social identity, to present oneself as like other people (belonging), or unlike other people (stand out). On the other hand, “marking has a long, familiar history and widespread connotation of inferiority and stigma. (…) The brander was often regarded as superior to the branded”\textsuperscript{18}. Curious enough, nowadays this postulate is completely inverted, and in the modern branding ideology branded becomes superior, the Holy Grail of the consumerism era. From marking the skin to branding everything. These days, most of the negative connotations of branding have been abandoned for the positive commercial purposes, such as distinguishing brand names, indicating the maker, the origins or the quality of goods. However, the negative views endure and find expression in the existing skeptical views of “branding criticized as baleful, insidious, and manipulative.”\textsuperscript{19} Reflecting on the brands backlash era, Klein\textsuperscript{20} suggests that branding is an antisocial activity that results in environmental damage and human rights abuses. Supported by increasing anecdotal evidence, similar attitudes of distrust with brands and branding are widely spread into the humanitarian field, and they relate with the humanitarian reluctance and avoidance in approaching branding fearing instrumentalization of aid, or complicity into subversive commercial purposes of the profit driven business entities.

4.1.1. Definitions
So what are the brands? They pretty much look like an amoeba: constantly changing. Brands have existed for thousands of years and branding has been defined in many different ways over the time. Some argue that the modern era of brands started in the 19th century when attractive packaging and trademarks were introduced as guaranteeing authenticity. Others say that the concept of brand entered marketing in 1922 to designate the proprietary name.

In reviewing the concept of branding, we will focus mainly on the so-called contemporary approaches. They include how brand is understood and how it emerged as top priority for management starting with the early 1950s. This is considered a turning point in defining branding not just linked to the tangible features (such as identification of a product and the differentiation from its competitors by using of a certain name, logo, or other visual signs and symbols), but also taking into account the brand intangibles. As such, trust, pride, and emotional drivers started to be seen as key assets that allow a brand to achieve competitive differentiation, gain customers’ loyalty and be part of their lifestyles. Segmentation theories and studies arose, attempting to profiling segments of consumers by socio-economic variables (such as consumers employed status, income, education), demographic variables (such as age, civil status), but also by aesthetic preferences, emotional affinities and behaviour patterns that drive the buying decision making.

In the midst of the growing importance of brands aspects that transcend physical and concrete benefits and attributes, in 1958 Martineau introduced the first intangible asset of a brand - the concept of brand personality. He argued that beside the economic factors that remain important, consumers’ preferences for one brand over another result from the positive correlation between their own personality and the personality of the brand formed as a sum of perceptions about a product, service or business. Later on, Kotler & Pfoertsch pushed the boundaries of a brand and defined it as a set of perceptions and promises to the consumers. They also argue that brands hold power of influence in customer’s minds. Biel speaks about the “brand magic” and says that brands are “self-expressive” and “speak directly to consumers” by branding their sensorial, emotional and cognitive experiences, and connecting them within a reference group or culture. Therefore, the relationship that consumers form with a brand brings a specific behaviour in which the power of brands resides. In a holistic view, Kapferer defines the brand as a system of interconnected mental associations and relationships that has the power to influence the market by its sources of cumulative brand experiences.

The increasing importance of brands and branding brought an abundant literature. Heding & al compiled a comprehensible overview on brands conceptualization and management today. Based on extensive analysis of the research published between 1985 and 2006, they identified...
“seven schools of thought”*\textsuperscript{36} that represent in essence different perceptions of the brand, the nature of the brand consumer give & take, and how brand equity is created and managed. Rather than providing a definition of brand itself and setting boundaries around the concept, the existing diversity of brand and branding definitions reflect the development of knowledge, lack consensus and drive confusions and disagreements on what is actually measured in research. In time, branding drawn from a wide range of fields varying from sociology, psychology, anthropology, neuroscience, mathematics, legal, military, engineering and technology, and of course, economics. Numerous branding studies\textsuperscript{37} show that nowadays, brands are multi/inter-disciplinary constructs and the issue of different understandings and practices reflects within their multi-functionality. De Chernatony & Riley\textsuperscript{38} identified twelve main elements of a brand referred in terms of their roles: as legal instruments, logos, company, communication shorthand, risk reducers, identity systems, images in consumer’s minds, value systems, having personalities, parties to a relationship, adding value, and evolving entities\textsuperscript{39}. However, nowadays a brand is considered a shortcut to attributes, benefits, beliefs and values based on past and current experiences, associations and future expectations\textsuperscript{40}. Successful brands capture the hearts and minds of customers and of all the stakeholders a business entity may have (such as investors, employees, partners, suppliers, competitors, regulators, or members of your local community).\textsuperscript{41}

Branding is defined as the complex process of building, managing and communicating successful brands to increase profitability. Though branding has been mainly associated with monetary gain and commercial pursuit, Kotler & Levy\textsuperscript{42} held that for non-profit, branding “is not a matter of why, but how”. However, the body of branding literature steams out largely from business economics, and only in the last two decades there is an emerging field of research\textsuperscript{43} dedicated to exploring if non-profit brands are equivalent or can be related to commercial brands, and how branding procedures can be adapted to the field of non-profit, or if new measures should be introduced.

4.1.2. Functions

Historically, brands have been created to identify the owner or the provenience of a product, thus the main role of the branding is to differentiate and make a distinction\textsuperscript{44}. According to Kapferer, the shift towards modern brands started in the early 80s’ when brands began being understood as more than mere identifiers, but powerful differentiators to strengthen positioning within the market, gain competitive advantage and increase market shares to maximizing profits. In addition to the conventional visual identity of a brand (logo, name, slogan, brand stories and communication) Keller\textsuperscript{45} theorized the modern set of devices such as URL’s, symbols, characters, spokes people, packages, signage, promotional items and so on.
But perhaps the most interesting of Keller’s additions is the offensive/defensive view on the brands. He held that brands have their own strength and weakness and the key to brand equity is the mixture and balance between them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offensive Role</th>
<th>Defensive Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memorability</td>
<td>Transferability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningfulness</td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likability</td>
<td>Protectability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the ‘offensive’ hand, brands should be distinctive, relevant, and memorable, easily recognised and recalled. This means that brands should convey meaningful and persuasive content in a likeable and credible manner to achieve brand awareness and salience, and ultimately to build brand equity. On the other hand, for defensive purposes related to retaining and preserving the achieved brand equity, they should be transferable to additional products or services extensions, able to go across geographic boundaries and markets. Then, brands should be adaptable and flexible to transcend different cultures without diluting relevancy in time. Last, but not the least defensive criteria is protectability which considers the legal aspects of the brand, including unauthorised infringements. Currently and surpassing Keller’s views, brands reside less in a company monologue, but they are seen more as an interface between firms and their customers & stakeholders.

Aside the extensive list of roles\(^46\) that brands pile up, De Chernatony states the input-output perspective and says that a brand steams out from “a continuous process in which the values and expectations set by the company and enacted by its staff, are then interpreted and redefined by the consumers”.\(^47\)

According to Kapferer\(^48\) brands have the ability to “gain an exclusive, positive and prominent meaning in the minds of a large number of consumers”. Consequently, branding should focus on developing the brand value from a customer perspective. Kapferer describes eight brands function in the mind of the consumers - identification, practicality, guarantee, optimisation, characterisation, continuity, hedonistic, and ethical – and puts these functions in relation with the customers positive attitudes towards the brands and their perceived benefits such as: brand recognition as facilitating choice and loyalty, consumer values reflected in products that can represent their self-image, consumer’s pleasure towards brands that bring responsible behaviour in relationship with the society and so on. From company’s perspectives, Kotler & Pfoertsch\(^49\) define eight functions a brand can fill in order to gain the hearts and minds of consumers and stakeholders for a sustainable long run. They emphasize the functions that brands have for companies meeting increasingly complex business environments, proliferation of similar products, globalization, hyper-competition, and financial pressures\(^50\).
De Chernatony & McDonald\textsuperscript{51} show that for a company or organization the brand functions as a sign of ownership, a differentiating device, a strategic device, a risk-reducing device, a shorthand communication device, and a legal device.

Last, but not least, effective branding contributes internally by connecting emotionally the employees with the object of the brand (product/service and organization), understand the brand promise and enact so the expectations resulted from brand communications and advertising to be met. Several studies show that if the employees believe in the brand they represent and are well aware that each of them is a brand vector, and if they feel a common sense of purpose and identity, they are better motivated to work harder and their loyalty to the company increase\textsuperscript{52}.

Hatch & Schultz\textsuperscript{53} stress the saying of ‘practice what you preach’, recommending companies to practice the values they promote. They draw attention on the potential main gaps between employees, management and external stakeholders and warn on misalignments within the corporate branding.

Simplifying, the literature holds that there are three pillars of the branding functions - customer market, product market, and financial market. The total value cumulated in these levels is usually referred as brand equity.

**4.2. What makes humanitarian organizations different?**

**4.2.1. 70’s – 80’s: the Golden Era**

Until the 70’s there was little attention given to the branding in the non-profit sector, while humanitarian action has been largely seen as a peripheral phenomenon within the redistribution economy of surplus. The Red Cross is one of the most known humanitarian brands. It bears more than 150 years of existence, it is at the root of principled humanitarian action, it is experienced in communications and a widely recognized humanitarian mark. Yet, some\textsuperscript{54} will argue that the shift in paradigm towards humanitarian phenomenon worldwide appeared after the first advertising campaign of MSF in 1976, when the humanitarian adjective became a noun and “without borders” became the “global village”. As branding in the commercial sector, the ‘boom’ of the ‘humanitarian’ relied on the high penetration and proliferation of the mass communication channels, particularly television. Branding focused mainly on brand communications as the central element in building and managing a brand. Since then, “the international nonprofit organizations have become a powerful force in the world and have grown not only in numbers, but in terms of influence and visibility”\textsuperscript{55}. They “moved from
backstage to center stage in world politics, and are exerting their power and influence in every aspect of international relations and policymaking”\textsuperscript{56}. They are “no longer perceived as small bands of activists, but rather as the new super brands”\textsuperscript{57}, having “greater brand trust and potentially greater brand equity, than many major multinational corporations such as Coca Cola or IBM”\textsuperscript{58}.

### 4.2.2. 90’s: turning point in researching the non-profit branding

However, the growing importance of the humanitarians didn’t trigger the academic attention for studying earlier than the 90’s when there is a turning point in researching the non-profit branding, focusing on addressing the differences between non-profit and for-profit organizations. Andreasen & Kotler\textsuperscript{59} identified nine significant differences between the non-profit and for-profit environments that impact the ways of brand management. Briefly, these differences steam out from: lack of good secondary data; unreliable research data from consumers; problems and costs of the marketing development, consumer attitude variations are heavier and bigger; the offer is mainly based on availabilities and can hardly be changed to better fit the consumers’ needs; communication to consumers and stakeholders is more complex; benefits are not necessarily evident; sacrifices and costs can be disproportional and disconnected from the benefits; and the wide range of products are more difficult to communicate\textsuperscript{60}.

Oster\textsuperscript{61} suggests five major areas in which non-profit organizations differ from their for-profit counterparts: the organizational culture, the human resources, the collaborative rather than competitive approaches, the complexity of their customers and stakeholders, and the importance of their mission. Foreman\textsuperscript{62} suggests that by comparison with the international for-profit companies, the international non-profit organizations have a consensus building culture, allowing flexibility and a certain degree of autonomy for multi-site actions. This, Grossman & Rangan\textsuperscript{63} states, makes more difficult the implementation of any single organization-wide decision. Translated to the required features of consistency, clarity and continuity of branding, the standardized and central-coordinated work is a continuous struggle for the multi-sites and multi-roles humanitarian organizations. Benz study\textsuperscript{64} on the human resources concludes that non-profits offer more non-pecuniary benefits to their employees, largely motivated preponderantly by ideas and social vision. Internally, branding leads to a sense of identity and belonging. Also internally, the very recent emerging literature on humanitarian branding highlights the protective function of brands in operational settings. On one hand, since the demand for goods and services in the humanitarian field is “insatiable”, Foreman, Mei-Na & Sargeant\textsuperscript{65} argue that “competition has less relevance in the non-profit arena” and “alliances and collaboration efforts prevail even in competition for securing funds”. On the other hand,
similar to “competition against cooperation for ‘doing good’” asserted by Shlesinger & al\textsuperscript{66}, Alexander & al\textsuperscript{67} said that a “corporate model which stresses the values of strategy development, risk taking, and competitive positioning is incompatible with the non-profit model”, and warns that given the rising number of organisations and the increasing race for donations, “competition may cause a shift away from a focus on service”. However, integrity, reputation, and trust are critical to the overall humanitarian action and nowadays, the humanitarian brand has become a crucial differentiator for potential donations and operational market-shares\textsuperscript{68}.

4.2.3. Current Trends
But what about the brand trust of the recipients\textsuperscript{69} of goods or services provided by the humanitarian organizations? The relationship between the aid recipients and humanitarian organization is not a market-based transaction. Yet, it is equally important to gain the trust of beneficiaries. Unlike their commercial counterparts, humanitarian organizations must appeal to different publics, not merely consumers. Beneficiaries, donors, workforce, governments and local authorities are equally important audiences for the humanitarian address in which humanitarian mission becomes both, the goal and the rallying call. Failing one audience, or another, or all and humanitarians are concurrently “facing a crisis of legitimacy”\textsuperscript{70}. Dichter\textsuperscript{71} worries that increased competition, pressure for accountability, and difficulty in assessing effectiveness threaten the legitimacy of international non-profit organizations. Slim\textsuperscript{72} suggests “that the practice of commercial marketing may offer certain ways of thinking and techniques that can inform and confirm good practice in humanitarian persuasion” enabling the acceptance, access and the security of aid missions.

The last decades show two major trends in branding of both, for-profit and non-profit entities. Firstly, the brands are seen more as distinct personalities and less as reflections of product characteristics. Shifting away from product branding, perception of a brand in the eyes, minds and hearts of consumers and stakeholders are considered critical for a brand today. Therefore, the research and academic community\textsuperscript{73} endorse emotional brand strategies for building strong and powerful brands through nurturing the sympathy and attachment of various stakeholders to the organization as a whole. Secondly, also drifting away from product branding, there is a growing trend towards corporate branding considered to be more complex, and addressing and interacting with multiple stakeholder audiences. Aaker\textsuperscript{74} says that a corporate brand can “generate leverage, synergy and clarity” and that is particularly beneficial and useful in “cluttered confused and complex” environments, such as humanitarian settings. Smillie\textsuperscript{75} considers that building strong global brands is vital for the future survival of many of the humanitarian organizations existing today.
Either path one takes, how do you know it is working? How can we evaluate and measure the strengths and powers of a brand?

4.3. Frameworks for brand measurement and evaluation

In brand measurement and evaluations there are two key concepts very often used inaccurately: brand valuation is confused or mistaken with the concept of brand equity. Brand equity has become one of the hottest topics in the marketing literature and it is considered the “most valuable and potentially longest lasting property”. As mentioned in the brand Functions chapter, the total value cumulated by a brand in the three levels of customer, product and financial markets is usually referred as brand equity.

Brand valuation is considered part of brand equity, the financial value of a brand as an intangible asset. It can be defined as a “snapshot of future cash flows,” while the brand equity can be defined as “a measure of the emotional reservoir that reflects demand”.

4.3.1. Brand Valuation

There is an extensive body of research on brands financial value and measurement techniques, and recent studies look on how branding strategy impacts the brand value. Research shows that companies relying on corporate brand strategies have higher brand values than those that have a range of product brands or a mixed branding strategy.

One of the main methods for determining brand valuation for both, profit and non-profit business has been developed by Interbrand. It is a complex model, as for example only the brand strength score itself has seven variables: leadership, stability, market, internationality, trend, support, and protection.

Without overloading this paper with technical details, it worth mentioning that this model tries to capture the brand profitability or the “brand earnings”, and the “brand strength score” which is applied as a “brand risk” to the previously calculated brand earnings.

For several consecutive years, the Interbrand’s Best Global Brands reports place humanitarian brands in top 300 worldwide, alongside big corporations such as Apple, Google, IBM, Microsoft, Shell, JP Morgan, and running behind money, chocolate and watches as leaders of the Best Swiss Brands. No wonder with this data we are hearing voices like Einstein’s talking about the “rise of charitainment” and “hyper-charity” today.

Edelman rating models (Edelman Trust Barometer and Edelman Brand Relationship Index/Edelman Earned Brand) relate brands evaluation measure with the strength of the
relationship between consumers and brands. Edelman Index\textsuperscript{85} is a quantitative methodology evaluating seven dimensions of consumer’s relationship with brands, and the resulting index score, on a scale of 0-100, is an average of the seven dimensions. Edelman Trust Barometers relate the trust in brands with their financial performance.

Relating trust with funding, the 2007 Edelman Trust report placed MSF and Red Cross at the top of US donor’s funds recipients. Kylander\textsuperscript{86} attributes the funding success of MSF to the clarity and unicity of its mission (medical organization) as reducing perception risks in comparison with other organizations with multiple, different roles. This is a highly arguable point of view, as MSF, just like other organizations, fill a wide array of roles many times simultaneous and in the same site. However, ten years after, the Edelman Trust Barometer 2017\textsuperscript{87} shows “a decline in trust in NGOs in 21 out of 28 countries. In 11 counties NGOs are now less trusted than business. This suggests trust in the overall aid system is in decline”.

Based on the evidence of this alarming trend of erosion of trust in NGOs, Edelman warns on “threats to the financial and practical support so critically needed by people at the frontline of humanitarian response. As the world faces the greatest humanitarian crisis in a lifetime, compounded by international anti-foreign aid posturing, NGOs need to change how they engage with their audiences to regain their moral authority and fulfil their essential purpose”.

4.3.2. Brand Equity
And here it comes, the Holy Grail: Brand Equity. The term brand equity encapsulates the ‘trinity’ of “the financial value”, “the strength of consumer’s attachment to the brand” and “the description of associations and beliefs that consumers have about the brand”\textsuperscript{88}.

The vast literature on brand equity abounds in models and scores\textsuperscript{89}. It worth mentioning Aaker’s model which is extensively used in both, theory and practice. In Aaker’s view, the brand equity is “a set of brand assets and liabilities linked to a brand, its name and symbol that add to or subtract from the value provided by a product or service to that firm’s customers”\textsuperscript{90}.

He says that these assets and liabilities can be both, drivers and levers of the brand, and puts them as five main variables\textsuperscript{91}: brand loyalty, name awareness, perceived quality, brand associations, and other assets as for example, patents.

Revealing much on the state of branding research, it also worth mentioning that there is a great amount of variations in methods and models for defining and measuring something so major such as brand equity. Many authors\textsuperscript{92} dispute the mixture of trivial attributes and call for homogeneous and easily comprehensible meaning of brand equity.

Last, but perhaps most important to remark is that until very recently (see next, Kylanders’ IDEA) there was no brand equity model designed specifically for humanitarian organizations.

4.3.3. 21\textsuperscript{st} Century – there is any new stage nowadays?
Addressing the gap in modelling brand equity for non-profits, Kylander pioneering the first empirical studies to fundament a framework to help non-profits focus their scarce resources to strengthen their brands. Few years ago, Kylander’s brand IDEA*93 steamed out from research based on interviewing more than 70 individuals in over 40 organizations.

The IDEA framework is a brand equity model for international non-profits based on four dimensions, giving also the name of the model: Integrity, Democracy, Ethics and Affinity. In brief, integrity represent structural integrity, not moral integrity, and it refers to the organization’s identity-image alignment lining up with its mission. The proposed democracy implies a drastic shift away from in the traditional brand management and recommends organizations to “not police their brands, trying to suppress unauthorized graphics or other representations of the organization, but strive instead to implement a participatory form of brand management”94. Ethics refers to brand reflecting the core values of the organization, and affinity promotes collective over individual interests to harnessing partnership and collaboration with other humanitarian brands.

Kylander asserts that IDEA can engage the brand skeptics as the “new model allow their brands to contribute to sustaining their social impact, serving their mission, and staying true to their organization’s values and culture”. She says that “in addition to providing a framework for non-profit managers and organizational strategists to better manage their brands, the Brand IDEA may also prove useful in managing other tasks, such as board governance, global operations, and risk management”95. Although salutary and ground-breaking proposal, IDEA may be seen as a branded product itself, and only future studies will reveal if humanitarian organizations will embark on this path, or if they will be convinced to get the idea and make use of it.

4.4. Summing up

In the nowadays literature, brands are considered to be valuable assets for companies and organizations and the branding is considered to be as top priority for management.

There are many definitions of brands that represent in essence different perceptions of the brand, the nature of the brand consumer give & take, and how brand equity is created and managed. Overall, brands assets are not just linked to the tangible features (such as identification of a product and the differentiation from its competitors by using of a certain name, logo, or other visual signs and symbols*96), but also taking into account the brand intangibles (such as, trust, pride, and emotional drivers started to be seen as key assets that allow a brand to achieve competitive differentiation, gain customers’ loyalty*97).

Brands have multiple roles: as legal instruments, logos, company, communication shorthand, risk reducers, identity systems, images in consumer’s minds, value systems, having personalities, parties to a relationship, adding value, and evolving entities*98.
From the input-output perspective, a brand steams out from “a continuous process in which the values and expectations set by the company and enacted by its staff, are then interpreted and redefined by the consumers” ⁹⁹.

Overall, brands are the interface between firms and their customers & stakeholders. There is a vast body of literature defining brands and branding is largely referring to the commercial brands. Though branding has been mainly associated with monetary gain and commercial pursuit, since the 90’s, non-profit branding started to trigger the academic attention for studying. The relative recent turning point in researching the non-profit branding focus on addressing the differences between non-profit and for-profit organizations. Currently, there are many knowledge gaps on branding in the non-profit sector, and only in the last years there is an emerging field of research addressing branding charities. Up to date, there is a very scarce body of literature addressing specifically and in-depth the humanitarian branding.

Regarding the measurement and evaluation of brands performance, the literature holds that there are three branding pillars - customer market, product market, and financial market. The total value cumulated in these levels is usually referred as brand equity, and it is considered the “most valuable and potentially longest lasting property” ¹⁰⁰.

Focusing on the financial performance of a brand, brand valuation can be defined as a “snapshot of future cash flows” and it is considered part of brand equity measurement and evaluation. There is vast literature on brand performance measurement and evaluation, and it abounds in models and scores ¹⁰¹. On brand valuation, the most referred and influential are the Interbrand and Edelman methodologies and ratings. On brand equity, Aaker’s model is extensively used in both, theory and practice ¹⁰².

Up to date, there is only one model attempting to measure and evaluate the brand equity for charities: Kylander’s IDEA. This is a pioneering and newly emerging field, and there is no research so far on if or how this model is used.

5. Humanitarian Branding. An import in the haze of theoretical and practical challenges

Before exploring further the humanitarian understanding and practice of branding, it worth mentioning that humanitarian organizations themselves did some research related to the topic. I will mention perhaps the most significant two (ICRC and MSF initiatives).

Firstly, we must dismiss a common confusion. Most of the humanitarian organizations resume to having visual identity guidelines, often referred as branding manuals. These should not be confused with studies, because they are just toolkits, templates, and rules for graphical displays required for various communication outcomes as different support materials and products to be used throughout various dissemination channels.
After 150 years serving as internationally recognized symbols in humanitarian crises, the ICRC emblems were studied with the purpose of “reducing and eventually eradicating continual misuse”\(^\text{103}\). Though unique in the humanitarian landscape, as the Red Cross symbols are legally protected by the Geneva Conventions, in reality they don’t escape infringement and misuse. But this study is more than a visual identity guideline to be used by its offices and NSs. It is perhaps the most complete, complex and comprehensive branding in the humanitarian field as it treats history, progression of the symbols & symbolisms use and misuse, legal, normative and procedural aspects and so on, and makes recommendations beyond visibility and trademark legal protection. Moreover, this study shows the specifics of branding functions for the humanitarian agency. The offensive/defensive roles of a brand defined by Keller seems to apply differently and have distinctive meaning into the humanitarian sector. Fundamentally, there is a clear distinction between protectability (as described in 4.1.2. Functions) and protective value of a brand. What we need to emphasise within this study is its aim to “ensure greater respect for the emblems at all times, and in particular to preserve and reinforce their protective value”\(^\text{104}\).

In humanitarian settings, it happens the personalised relief to be target for seizure or capture of goods for different parties, varying from people in need, thieves’ bands, to armed groups. One may say that visual infringement has little importance and it is not a priority when “ISIS slaps branding”\(^\text{105}\) by taking your aid packages and brand over your brand. Unlike in the business sector, for the humanitarian field the visual expression of a brand has not just indicative and operational value, but protective value as well. And it is precisely that protective value that humanitarians understand very differently than their commercial counterparts. Beyond commercial laws protecting trade, brands and their emblems, there is the IHL – the rules of war protecting lives - trying to limit civilian casualties. Essentially, for humanitarians it is much more than the mere protection for copying, forging brands and faking products. It is about protecting lives. Both, humanitarian workers and beneficiaries.

Then, as Slim puts it, “one of the words on everybody’s lips is perception”\(^\text{106}\). Searching ‘in the eyes of others’, Abu-Sada researched how MSF’s work is perceived in volatile environments. She asserts that “NGOs must pay special attention to the notion of perception, both in the field and at their headquarters”, as “perception has a considerable impact on the quality of an organization’s operations, as well as on the safety of both national and international staff in the field, and the beneficiaries of those operations”\(^\text{107}\). In her study, she groups perceptions’ causal factors in three main categories: context-independent, such us organization’s activities in other sites, reputation and visibility on the international stage, principles and activities consistency; context-dependent like relevance of activities, the ways of implementations, integration into the pre-existing social fabric, communication strategy and
political positioning management of local human resources or its integration into the pre-existing socio-economic fabric; and characteristics directly linked to the operational environment, such as political context, previous military or humanitarian interventions, number and types of foreign actors present and so on. Another important highlight in Abu-Sada’s study is the gap between how humanitarians are perceived and how they think they are perceived. Very many times, humanitarians stress the crucial importance of their identity and image. The studies mentioned above and many other humanitarian initiatives focus on outcomes like perceptions and image, and have poor correlation in between inputs and outcomes.

That is why in the following chapters we will try to see how branding lenses explore the *identity as organizational input* and *the image as external reflection/outcome*, for afterwards to see how branding puts them into balance in what is usually called *brand integrity*.

5.1. How do humanitarians view branding

Not surprisingly, humanitarians define branding in for-profit, business language\(^{108}\). Kylander’s studies\(^{109}\) show that on one hand, this may be the result of the private sector experience of the brand executives in humanitarian organizations. On the other hand, not all humanitarians doing branding are marketing and advertising professionals, so we have to attribute the language to the commercial origin of the concept.

The issue of who is doing branding in the sector is crucial, and it drives the nature and the quality of both, the views humanitarians have on branding and the way they prioritize, build, implement and manage their brands. Rallying to the larger call nowadays for professionalization of the humanitarian sector, here too organizations face “an enormous challenge: the need to move from an amateur approach to a more professional system of management”\(^{110}\). Kylander asserts that “organizations with strong brands, do expend energy and resources building brand equity, but that the models they use are implicit and intuitive (mental models), and that these do differ from the existing for-profit models of brand equity”\(^{111}\). Here perhaps, as Aaker points out, firm stereotypes matter, as “non-profits are seen as warm and for-profits as competent”\(^{112}\), but this comes with opposing advantages and disadvantages for the credibility of both.

Kylander\(^{113}\) research shows that depending on the degree of brand orientation of the organization and the different levels of expertise, there are some predominant trends in the ways humanitarians define branding through the main functions it performs. Firstly, many times brand is referred as reduced to simple logos or emblems, the tangible, visual elements of a brand. Obviously, a brand is much more than a logo and having a distinct symbol doesn’t mean one has a brand. Then, there is the view on branding predominantly as a tool for fundraising. Expanding the approach on branding, some big international organizations (such
as UNICEF, MSF, ICRC, Oxfam) are building and cultivating their brands, but using scattered elements, as Kylander describes. 

Interviewing individuals in humanitarian organizations, Kylander shows that dominant brand paradigm focus on communications, as it is believed that “increased visibility, favourable positioning in relation to competitors, and recognition among target audiences would translate into fundraising success”. But the true emphasis on communication comes more from anecdotal and practice evidence than from research, although it is crucial to humanitarian missions in all stages from planning and funding to access, acceptance and security in implementation and exit.

Beyond their dependence on grants and donations, humanitarians are concerned by their reputation in the eyes of stakeholders and the community, and increasingly do pay attention to the brand absorbed by the perceptions about their organisations, missions, assistance, aid and services, and resulted from all their communications, actions and interactions. So, there is a certain degree of a broader, more integrated approach to brand strategy and management due to the sensitivity and vital role their positioning plays in both, operational sites (local focus) and global stage (big picture).

As in the commercial sector, there are also enthusiasts and sceptics on the humanitarian branding. Moreover, some may be simultaneous both. Kylander states that humanitarians “may shy away from adopting corporate brand building models in the fear that this may upset certain constituents”. Having a strong, trustworthy, credible and visible brand could be useful and beneficial for organizational, operational and mission purposes, but a brand is largely associate with vanity, which is seen somehow contradictory to the humanitarian values and scope, so it is not necessarily something humanitarians value. It doesn’t mean humanitarians are not proud people, but they take their pride mainly from their effective and principled humanitarian actions.

5.2. Input-Output branding perspective

As previously mentioned, humanitarian focus goes mainly on outcomes like perceptions and image, and lack or have poor correlation in between inputs and outcomes. As shown earlier (Fig.1, p17), De Chernatony sets up the input-output perspective asserting that a brand steams out from “a continuous process in which the values and expectations set by the company and enacted by its staff, are then interpreted and redefined by the consumers”.

5.2.1. Brand as an input

The most important organizational branding input is setting up the brand identity and the brand strategy around it. The brand identity steams out from an organization and drives good image, credibility, trust and reputation. It is what your brand stands for, so it is substance oriented and strategic by encapsulating who you really are, what you do and where you want to be. It is total
promise that a company makes to consumers and all its stakeholders. Within the strategic process, the brand identity bears an important function.

For Kapferer\textsuperscript{119}, the brand identity is brand’s essence, its meaning, and its direction. He says that a brand will be considered strong if it is capable of incorporating all features into an effective effort to avail a concise, transparent and appealing brand identity, and puts a tool at hand: the six sections Brand Identity Prism.\textsuperscript{120}

According to Aaker, whose Identity Model\textsuperscript{121} is widely known and used, successful brand management includes “understanding of how to develop a brand identity, knowing what the brand stands for, and effectively expressing that identity”\textsuperscript{122}.

At the core of the identity-based brand management is the brand self-definition as the conventional visual brand identity (logo, name, slogan, brand stories and communication\textsuperscript{123}), a cluster of values and a mission/vision.

Being focused on the internal side of a brand and the resulting external brand image amongst buyers and other external audiences, Burmann & al assert that the identity-based brand management has proven to be the most efficient management model to make successful brands\textsuperscript{124}.

But is it applying to humanitarian organizations? And if yes, how?

*Conventional Visual Brand Identity ((logo, name, slogan, brand stories and communication)*

Very often, the brand elements and the brand identity are used next to each other to identify the brand. Conventional brand elements\textsuperscript{125} form the visual identity of a brand\textsuperscript{126} (logo, name, slogan, brand stories and communication) which represents and convey the core brand identity, therefore should be properly managed to ensure long-term consistency and to avoid deviations which may jeopardise the brand identity\textsuperscript{127}.

In terms of visual identities, humanitarian organizations developed a wide range of logos and emblems coming out in a large palette of colours, striving to ‘stand out’, ‘differentiate’ themselves and look ‘appealing’, trying also to convey their symbolic quality in their symbols. As their commercial counterparts, they also appealed the neuro-linguistic techniques\textsuperscript{128} for developing persuasive visual communications. Many humanitarian organizations wrapped up their visual identities into visual guidelines and templates for implementation across their communications, merchandising and aid to ensure the requested consistency and avoid deviations which may jeopardise their identity. They used their brand visuals for ‘offensive’ and ‘defensive’ roles, for indicative purposes (from signalizing their presence, to trustworthy symbols and stories for funding), and as protective devices for access, acceptance and security in the field.

It seems that humanitarian organizations followed the identity-based prescriptions for visual brand elements. To a certain degree, the formula is applying. But how does it work? Briefly,
we will describe some examples of challenges humanitarian organizations encounter on the way:

Dilution and imitation – after more than 150 years, the Red Cross symbol has a large awareness and broad recognition. It is the emblem of ICRC and in spite of its long history, international legal protection and internal rules and procedures, it became a genuine symbol for medical assistance. This dilutes the ICRC identity as it is not just a medical organization, but it has a much larger mandate and a wide-ranging list of activities in humanitarian assistance, normative framework, and so on.

Then, this emblem is not a completely exclusive symbol for the Red Cross organizations. All over the world, same cross or very similar, in the same red tints or other colour variations is used for signalizing other medical facilities such as pharmacies, hospitals and ambulances, or other businesses and activities varying from veterinary centres to army first aid kits. This issue is treated by the ICRC as emblem misuse, and efforts are made to protect the copyrights: “In order to ensure universal respect for and protection of the emblems, each State party to the 1949 Geneva Conventions has an obligation to enact national legislation with the aim of regulating the use of the emblems and of preventing and punishing their improper use both in times of war and peace”129. Though, it remains difficult to almost impossible to eradicate the Red Cross improper use that potentially brings confusion and diminishes its protective value.

Then, dilutions and imitations don’t happen only with logos. The MSF ‘without borders’ became a fashionable slogan in the nowadays globalization era, and other entities started to claim the same – as for example, UBS calling for ‘banking without borders’130.

Confusion and misunderstanding - derive also from the specifics of the humanitarian contexts and settings. Often, the population in the operational theatres is illiterate. Therefore, relying on graphical representations is vital. But what can be clearly understood in one place, can bring confusion and/or misinterpretation in another place. This happened for example in Kenya where the MSF logo was associated with a ‘man with the spear’131. Taking into account the cross-cultural graphic symbolism complexity, MSF considered the re-branding and discussions are still ongoing in terms of necessity, opportunity and so on. At its inception in 1971, MSF logo was the red cross, but later on they defined their own visual identity, the current logo. Yet, in some of the ongoing re-branding proposals the cross variations appear again.132

Additional symbolic load - may occur in partnerships and cross-promotions, as displaying other logos and identities affects your own. One example is the USAID policy requesting visibility, which is to some extent incompatible with the principle of neutrality, not to mention it may be problematic, unwelcomed and even dangerous in some sites. Then, differentiation can be problematic as often the relief provided by an organization is branded with another (e.g.
INGOs and NGOs distribution of UNHCR plastic sheets and other NFI s, and of WFP food aid).

Break chain in visual consistency - is sometimes resulting from the indicative-protective conflicting. As previously mentioned, visual consistency is essential to not “jeopardise the identity”133. Yet, there are situations when the visual consistency may clash with the mission consistency. So, humanitarian organizations may need to sacrifice their visual appearance in order to fulfil their missions. This, for example happed in Congo 2009, when hostile attitudes and perceptions towards the UN peacekeeping patrolling in personalized white cars determined MSF to paint their cars in fuchsia134.

Yet, humanitarian organizations do care about appearance. ‘Doing good and looking good’. Aaker, the father of modern branding recommends that branding professionals should lead the efforts for successful branding135. There are humanitarian organizations that externalized to advertisers the service for their branding. Here worth mentioning Care’s Intl. re-branding*136 done by McCann137 in 2000. Decades after iconic ‘care packages’ the research (1999-2000, mainly qualitative, focus groups) found it to be “relics of a paternalistic and culturally myopic era”138. Following the re-branding, the organization changed not only with a new “community of hands”139 logo, but also claiming clear positioning with the slogan of “ending world poverty” and emphasizing empowering women as a new core value into its new identity.

Without contesting the expertise on branding of the advertising agency, the results and impact of the re-branding on CARE’s functional capacity is uncertain in the absence of research. More recently, Oxfam launched its new global identity140 and perhaps further studies will show if and how re-branding helps improving their humanitarian response and the necessary funding for it.

But what we need to highlight here is the crucial role of research for originating action, either ‘in house’ or with the help of contracted professionals. Advertisers may not be aware on sensitivity of the issues, or with all their research they may not grasp the essences of the humanitarian action and its principles, and one can end up with a wrong call. UNHCR contracted Young & Rubicam141 in the creation of “1 is too many” global campaign142. The message that was meant for good, turned up from a McCarthism*143. The message aims to pinpoint the refugees’ tragedy, trying to emphasise both, the large numbers of affected people and to give life value to the numbers. Indeed, even one refugee in the millions raising is too many. But the political chase and the “commies”*144 hunting remains in the background, and perhaps this luggage should not have anything in common with the call for neutral and impartial humanitarian assistance.

Emphasizing once more the issue of research, monitoring and evaluation. Here too, it is very challenging for humanitarian organizations to allocate the necessary means from their already
limited resources. The issue of research, remains crucial for both, preliminary and periodical brand evaluations.

Last, but not least, Kylander recommends humanitarian organizations to lax control, to not policing their brands\textsuperscript{145}. But what if they lose it completely and be totally “hijacked”\textsuperscript{146}? Here is the trap of capitalizing and control. And this may have been the case of Terres des Hommes Sweetie campaign\textsuperscript{147}. Caught in the media spin, TdH somehow lost control and capitalized little from this campaign. Rather, the benefits run towards the media chasing sensationalist news, the Interpol and the award winning Lemz Advertising Agency\textsuperscript{148}.

\textit{Values}

In branding literature, many authors\textsuperscript{149} assert that value-driven organizations are more successful because values are powerful differentiators and what you stand for drives clear-cut positioning.

Humanitarian organizations are value-driven organizations as they are guided by principles, ethics in standing for their causes and missions.

Plenty of humanitarian URLs are in place online stating ‘our values, or ‘our principles’, ‘our vision’ and ‘our mission’. How does that work?

At first, the solid rock foundation of the humanitarian action is given by the humanitarian principles\textsuperscript{150}, which define who they are, what they do and how do they do it. There is a vast literature and an ongoing debate on the relevance and importance of the humanitarian principles for the overall humanitarian action and response. From the branding point of view, these principles make simultaneously, common ground/differentiation, and positioning.

Many humanitarian organisations state the principled humanitarian action, so these principles represent a common ground for the organizations, rather than differentiation. Perceived together, the common ground side reaction is similar to a ‘snooker effect’ and it becomes more visible when scandals occur. One for all and all for one. What happened in one place, will find reflection in another place or worst, all over humanitarian geography. It takes one to mistake, and all could be labelled the same. This has important implications not only for fundraising and image, but in terms of operational grounds as well. As for example, immunization ‘prohibition’ in Pakistan\textsuperscript{151}, humanitarian contested and a crisis of legitimacy, both locally and worldwide. Such precedents\textsuperscript{152} showcase and/or contribute to the erosion of credibility of the overall humanitarian brand.

According to their understanding of the relationship between politics and humanitarianism, Barnett classifies humanitarian organizations in Dunantist and Wilsonian\textsuperscript{153}. There is a third type, solidarist organizations, which are “openly identify with one party to a conflict and thus do not care about neutrality”\textsuperscript{154}. As such, ICRC and MSF are the best known Dunantist organizations, while Oxfam and Save the Children are considered Wilsonian. According to
Barnett, often the Dunantists are seen as the “high priests” of humanitarianism and their founding principles, but Wilsonians as well claim following same principles, so the demarcations get blurred once more in terms of what is common ground and what is differentiation.

Another important challenge for brand differentiation and positioning is coming from the unclear distinction between NGOs and UN and other intergovernmental organizations. On one hand, there are essential differences in their nature, structure, constituencies, mandates and responsibilities. On the other hand, in operations they are seen together, working jointly or separately. Moreover, in integrated missions, they are all working under the peacekeeping-military protection. Confusions and misunderstandings derive from a multitude of sources. Humanitarian positioning is very complex, on various levels, multiple stages and with many actors. On positioning in relation with the state power, there is an ongoing debate on the place and role of the third sector within the welfare State. Evans & Laville have a distinct theory, largely overlooked or unknown in relation with humanitarian positioning. They assert that the role of non-profit depends on the type and nature of the welfare State itself. They describe two distinct realities and concepts into the welfare geopolitics today: the US/Anglo-Saxon and European models. Essentially, in the European model the voluntary sector has intermediary nature within a ‘welfare pluralism’/ the intermediate area within the tri-polar welfare triangle, while in the US/Anglo-Saxon it is part of the welfare mix. It would be useful, or at least interesting to see how humanitarians would fit within this approach, but this could be in itself another subject for study. Nevertheless, Barnett & Weiss argue the consequences of the increasingly dominant neoliberal paradigm and point out that on hand, governments cut money for certain services. So, the non-profits expand to meet the newly unmet demands and to do so, they need new sources of revenues. Barnett & Weiss say that consistent with the neoliberal principles, the major donors money are channelled through NGOs rather than UN, as they want to target funds on issues of interest to them and to have more control over how recipients spend the money. However, both NGOs and UN have “very little choice but to comply with the ‘new public management’ agenda” and this environment lead by competition for funds and brand visibility. Therefore, when an organization survival depends on making strategic choices in such environment, “its interests will be shaped, often unintentionally, by material incentives”. Consequent to internalizing the values and methods from their commercial counterparts, organisations look increasingly ‘corporate’ and they began to resemble firms.

Ethics is another important value component within the identity of humanitarian organizations. “Humanitarian ethics unpack the values behind the humanitarian endeavour”. Humanitarians are committed to the humanitarian ideals, striving to make the right choice and do no harm. In the field, humanitarian workers have to make hard choices and encounter difficult dilemmas in
their daily operations and actions. They allocate vast contemplation and rational on the moral implications of their operations and decisions, and they critically analyse the ethical pitfalls of humanitarian action.

Generally, humanitarian organizations put great value on ethics as the corner stone of their moral agency as base for the much needed credibility, reputation, and trust. Many humanitarian operational sites are located in different countries and regions with a different cultural, religious and socio-economical fabrics. Are their values universally valid?

In this era of globalization, the global humanitarian brands encounter similar challenges with the multi-national commercial brands.

Humanitarians are facing the challenge of finding, translating and relating their values with correspondents in different cultures, religions and ideologies. Pinpointing the issues of perceptions of the beneficiaries on humanitarian action, Donini & al led the first large scale study showing that the ‘predominant Western NGOs discourse is a discourse of power, a neocolonization form and recommends ‘northern enterprise’ organizations to make room for other forms of universality in order to be accepted by the populations they intend to assist”166. Since then, many papers abound in recommendations, lessons learnt and good practices for bridging cultural and religious gaps. Slim points out that “today’s concerns about perception focus mainly on Iraq and Afghanistan and the new context of global terror and counter-terror. […] But it is also important to keep any discussion of humanitarian perception geographically broad and historically aware”167.

Commercial brands also encounter many challenges in the era of multi-national corporations. Trying to address a wide variety of issues in branding universality, such as the ‘country of origin’ effect168, many authors and practitioners advanced methods and procedures for brands global implementation and evaluation. The relational, community and cultural169 approaches on branding stress that global brands must read the cultural foundations as they move from country to country selling their products. Holt170 neatly formulates the importance of context focus and developed conceptual and methodological frameworks for managing global brands. So far, there is no research done on if and how these branding techniques would unfold in non-profit settings.

Within the current trend of humanitarians shifting to business there is a wide call for enhancing public-private partnerships. And this may lead to another challenge on values. What happens when humanitarian and business values meet? An example of joining values and forces is the co-brand UNICEF-Pampers campaign. Both, humanitarian brands and their commercial counterparts give big importance to their values, and it is largely considered that social good is good branding173. While the value-driven
branding aims to maximizing profit for one side, for the other the same approach aims to the very reason for which they exist.

Beside other values that drive purchase decision-making (price, shelf availability, brand awareness & recognition, functional product benefits etc.) due to the partnership with UNICEF, Pampers gained the social good value which translated in something like: buy one diaper and not only simplify your caregiving and do good to your baby, but help another child to get a vaccine. Adding the solidarity and social good value, matching the responsible and emotionally empathic to the cause buyers (preponderantly made by mothers worldwide) leads to a more favourable preference\textsuperscript{174} to choosing one product over another, which in result brings an increase in sales volumes, and consequently, in profits. Sharing a part of these profits for humanitarian and social good benefits brings a plus into the P&G’s CSR\textsuperscript{175} capital, and the overall brand. Who is winning more from it? Humanitarian cause or the P&G business? Maybe this is less important as long as both win enough of what they need. On one hand, some may say UNICEF-Pampers is a successful (winning prize)\textsuperscript{176} and productive partnership. On the other hand, maybe humanitarians are right to fearing complicity into subversive commercial purposes of the profit driven business entities\textsuperscript{177}. However, P&G’s outside-in initiatives are not limited to UNICEF-Pampers campaign. As Barnett & Weiss noticed as well, Save the Children carries the logo\textsuperscript{178} for one of their ‘longest-standing partners’: P&G. The Children’s Safe Drinking Water (CSDW) program is another P&G signature programme launched in 2004. At its 10\textsuperscript{th} anniversary in 2014, the company estimated that over 9 billion litres of clean drinking water had been delivered due to the usage of its PUR technology, saving about 32000 lives and prevented 250 million days of diarrheal illnesses across 71 countries. P&G has the goal of delivering 15 billion litres by 2020\textsuperscript{179}.

Yet, new types of partnerships and new sources of funding are highly arguable, in a larger debate on what Barnett & Weiss called money and morality\textsuperscript{180}. Barnett & Weiss\textsuperscript{181} exemplify “Oxfam’s website telling corporate donors, ‘your company will benefit in many ways from being associated with a leading international organization whose ethics and professionalism are recognized worldwide’”, question this isomorphism, and ask “how do humanitarian brands remain distinct from commercial ones?”

**Mission / Vision**

The mission-vision component is what you do and where you want to go. What humanitarian organizations do defines them, give them relevance and is at the core of their legitimacy and existence. Therefore, mission and operational focus is at the core of their business\textsuperscript{182}. For humanitarian organizations, as Kylander says, their mission is their ‘profit’\textsuperscript{183}. In fact, responding to a multitude of needs, humanitarians are people on multiple missions.
Here, the concept of brand experience could get high relevance. ‘Doing good and looking good’ while you are doing it. Branding leading authors such as Aaker and Keller assert that brand experience builds on three main pillars: rational (utility functions), subjective (emotional, how they feel) and symbolic benefits (wider social functions).

One may say is very easy to for humanitarians to build positive brand experience as doing good is their mission. Simply put it, you help people and people are happy to receive your help. Or, you helped me once and I will be happy to continue to receive your help or to receive your help in the future. But humanitarian assistance is much more complex than that, and building positive brand experience may be in fact, very difficult.

Here too, we will showcase some of the challenges humanitarians will encounter in their way of building positive brand experience.

‘Doing good and looking bad’ - This may happen due to the multiple and diverse mission variation, highly dependent on the context specific needs. Different missions in time and/or in the same sites confuse beneficiaries not understanding clearly what the organization does. Then, different missions in different sites result in what it looks to be an apparent gap between punctual operations and the overall mandate and scope. Managing a brand in such variations is hard and complicated.

‘Doing good, but doing bad’ – due to the complex and highly volatile environments, humanitarian good doings may result in some wrong doings within the given context. Some precedents have been extensively analysed within the self-critical reflection in the humanitarian field. Just one example is constituted by the aid in the Rwandan refugee camps in Zaire 1994-1995. Though intended for refugees, it also strengthened those responsible for perpetrating genocide. Humanitarians were fuelling the conflict. Doing good brand may be trapped and building positive brand experience for humanitarians is not an easy task.

‘Looking bad, but doing good’ - Complex and highly sensitive contexts in which their missions and operations take place may lead to other misinterpretations. For example, on one hand for MSF ‘temoniage’ is part of their identity. On the other hand, the ICRC identity is deeply rooted in its mandate and long experience history and they are very keen on humanitarian diplomacy values, and not speaking out. Though debatable, it is a strategic choice that enables the organization to access highly sensitive crisis (e.g. the first organization allowed access in Ukraine), or delicate and complex operations such as assisting Guantanamo detainees.

‘Looking good, but not doing so well’ – Terres des Hommes Sweetie campaign was a visibility success. Aside the image-mission capitalization and control issues previously mentioned, looking good and fame didn’t bring much on the side of mission and operational success. TdH core mission is to actually protect and assist children in different, very dreadful situations. Maybe it was “a major breakthrough” and “a great result” to identify 1000 people on
webcam child sex tourism, but legally convicting predators abusing computer generated children didn’t prove easy. And ultimately, how many children benefited from that? ‘Doing bad and looking bad’ – Rating the success or failure of humanitarian missions is not an easy job. In news accounts, after the 2010 earthquake in Haiti, the “American Red Cross raised half a billion dollars and built six homes”. What led the failure is again context dependent. The Red Cross claimed the report is lacking in "balance, context and accuracy”. However, the labelling went through.

Then again, in humanitarian settings it is very difficult to say what is good and what is bad.

5.2.2. Brand as an output

From the output perspective, the image-based brand management focus on consumers & stakeholders mind-set. As the power of a brand resides in the hearts and minds of customers and of all the stakeholders a business entity may have (such as investors, employees, partners, suppliers, competitors, regulators, or members of your local community), perceptions, knowledge, awareness and emotional connections are considered vital to driving the image. Many authors say that positive attributes and perceived qualities, and good awareness and recognition lead to brand favourable positioning and loyalty, which ultimately contribute to the overall brand equity. The output-based brand management focus on the external side of a brand and on strengthening it through communications (placed at the core of the brand strategy in image-based approach).

In branding, there is a clear distinction between short and long term orientations in the external reflections of a brand: image/short term and reputation/long term.

The brand image can be defined as the current views of the customers about a brand. It is a unique set of associations and the overall impression in consumers’ mind that is formed from all sources.

In assessing the image, very often the Brand Associative Network Memory Model is used to collect and map the brand perceptions, associations and attributes, resulting into a snapshot image at a certain time. This methodology requires qualitative and quantitative measurements of customers mind-set (brand attributes and benefits spontaneously evoked or assisted recall by consumers), then the mental network memory being mapped by strength, favourability and uniqueness.

Similarly, but not following the methodology mentioned, MSF is collecting perceptions in the theatre of their operations to determine the favourability preceding, during and/or after programmes implementation. Focusing mainly on the imperatives of the operational focus, MSF perception collection relies on different methods of data gathering and interpretation, so comparisons in between operations or in the same operations at different times, and extrapolations in the overall MSF brand would slam into doubtful and ambiguous estimations.
This may be an example of what Kylander mentioned as “intuitive models” rather than systematic branding approach in non-profit organizations?*. Brand reputation is the long-term and enduring outcome, resulted from the quality of multiple previous brand experiences, cumulative associations, attributes, benefits and emotions in time. It is the total sum of the brand track record. The brand reputation is one of the most important intangible asset of a brand, and its polarity leads to +/- brand credibility and trust, as building blocks of brand equity.

However, all brand image, reputation, credibility and trust can be strengthen through effective brand communication. Moreover, increased access to information challenge the ‘traditional brand communications’ and the transparency of organizations (mission statements, affiliations can easily be verified & evaluated) and push them to be honest and even force them to not just make public statements, but take conclusive actions.

As seen in the previous chapters, there are many studies focusing on perceptions in the humanitarian field, and we’ve briefly mentioned some of the existing challenges in assessing real and/or perceived quality of the humanitarian action.

Due to the emphasis on communications in brand strengthening management and strategy, we will focus the ‘outcome’ chapter on the brand communication component and how it unfolds in the challenging humanitarian field.

Firstly, for the sake of terms proper definition and following the humanitarian usual references, we must make some distinctions between humanitarian communications*, humanitarian negotiations*, humanitarian diplomacy*, and the way humanitarians communicate for a wide array of purposes (from corporate brand, mission, cause, funding/donations appeals, image, to operational, with beneficiaries & communities for programmes implementation etc.). Generally, the branding theory and practice frameworks emphasize the communication component in the overall brand management, and Keller state that 360 degrees, brand integrated multi-channel communication* is not just unavoidable, but necessary for building strong brands. As mentioned in the limitations of this thesis, we will focus on what challenges brand communications in humanitarian sector, rather than analysing in detail various communication campaigns and materials.

Central to brand communication engine is the essential brand muscle: the added value. As it is largely considered that social good is good branding*, so commercial brands are competing not only on their functional benefits in their markets, but also in accumulating social added values and good points on their CSRs and their overall unique brand benefits. And here, P&G mentioned earlier, is just one of multiple other examples possible*.

For humanitarian organizations saving lives and alleviating peoples’ suffering are great added values. Such great benefits sound very appealing and simple to market. But the humanitarian
reality shows that depicting human suffering is not an easy task. Next, we’ll mention briefly few of the challenges they are facing in their rallying calls.

**Ethical considerations** – in managing the visibility of suffering. Humanitarian communication has to show not only the reality they encounter in emergencies and the ordeal of the affected people, but also where they stand in relation to them. Portraying beneficiaries as passive recipients is not just often criticized as paternalistic, but also untrue. Most of the time, beneficiaries reached the humanitarian help after enduring indescribable painful and dangerous journeys. They are not passive at all, but courageous and heroic fighter for their lives. Degrading imagery can have many faces and may have also dire consequences, so humanitarians apply moral filters to picturing the realities in the field. Unlike in the commercial counterpart, striking and shocking visuals don’t bring just good awareness and recall, but can endanger peoples’ lives.

**Stereotypes** – are often used by the moneymaking brands in commercials and ads. But, what works in the advertising business may leaving a negative trace in the humanitarian sites. On one hand, oversimplifications and generalizations of the complex humanitarian contexts can result in dire outcomes such as instrumentalization of aid or even endangering beneficiaries and humanitarian workers lives. On the other hand, perpetuating labels and even stigmas (such as poverty, illness related stigmas as for example, HIV/AIDS etc.) do not contribute to restoring human dignity.

**Emotional/Rational balance** – Illustrating humanitarian settings is not cartography, nor impersonal statistical marketing charts. They involve context, people, emotions and actions. Humanitarians have to struggle to find the thin balance between emotional storytelling and showcasing their work, every single time.

**Distant suffering** – has lower empathic resonance in comparison with that is happening in the proximity of a group or individual. With the nowadays new communication technologies the world seems more interconnected and global than ever. But many authors such as Boltanki, Chouliaraki and Vestergaard assert that there are many ifs and hows on screens and new media for reducing the distance to the people suffering in humanitarian emergencies.

**Overexposure and redundancy** – Repeated and protracted calamities have invariable outcomes: people fleeing and in need for shelter, wounded and in need of medical care, post-traumatic psychological support, food shortages and famine, and so on. An endless story of human suffering, a constant need for assistance, and the relentless humanitarian response to address the needs. The humanitarian mission doesn’t change much and follows the same pattern of urgency and intensity. This may have a redundancy effect on their audiences. For example, the mandate of UNHCR didn’t change much since its creation in 1950. So did their video stories. Moreover, their storytelling pattern seams unchanged since Nansen’s assistance in Russian
famine. The storytelling recipe - showing large number of people affected by crisis, maybe pining one case to illustrate and personify the drama, then organization access and its additional logistic challenges, then the relief alleviating people suffering – still applies in their nowadays refugee media.

Humanitarians have to be creative and find new ways in telling their brand stories, or when they make the calling for mobilization and support for their cause. **Supra-saturation and compassion fatigue** – “the mediation of misfortune may foster apathy and acceptance of the banality of suffering or „compassion fatigue“”. A body of literature is arising on scrutinizing this phenomenon and its implications for both, humanitarian field and society at large.

Keller asserts that the added value is the engine for the brand knowledge as the main driver of strong brand equity and successful brands, and that can be achieved by ample outreach communication campaigns.

For humanitarian organizations as for their commercial counterparts, both, to be known and how you are known are equally important.

Generally, humanitarians have limited resources and plenty of other emergency needs require prioritization in resource allocation. Unlike their commercial counterparts, they cannot afford to spend at least 25% of their total budget on pretty ads and fancy promotions.

But maybe what they can do better without requiring large budgets, is improving targeting, messaging customization and timing in running communication campaigns. Nowadays, when with the modern technologies we can profile in real time either groups or individuals there is no need for the old school segmentation studies. Once targets done, the messages should be customized to match better the audience profiles and the specific medium. Scanning humanitarian communication materials they very often use the same for everybody and on all channels. Now, simply put it, for example the Facebook audience is very different than that on Linkedin.

However, Keller’s ample outreach communication campaigns may make one known, but this doesn’t necessary men better.

UNICEF Zero – immunization campaign made the entire steering, 360 degrees, and integrated multi-channel communication campaign with all the pretty visuals and celebrities endorsements. Reports KPIs show it to have been an outreach success. Yet, as they advertised themselves, ‘likes’ on Facebook won’t buy any vaccine.

Communicating humanitarian brand is very complex. Humanitarian organizations have to communicate for a wide array of purposes and with many different audiences. While nurturing good image they have to make sure is not detrimental to their missions and to the identity of the organizations on the long run. For humanitarian organizations fame is not all, and it
doesn’t bring any added value if not contributing to the quality, impact and effectiveness of the humanitarian response.

5.2.3. Brand Integrity

Firstly, achieving and protecting brand integrity should not be confused or reduced to protecting copyrights and trademarks. Brand integrity is the overall proven and trusted ability to fulfil the brand promise. It is putting in balance input/identity and output/image.

If brand equity would be a simple mathematical equation it would look like:

\[
\text{if } \text{Brand Identity} = \text{Brand Image} \Rightarrow \text{Brand Integrity} (+/-), \text{if repeated/constant in time} \Rightarrow \text{Reputation} (+/-)
\]

But there is no perfect and perpetual equilibrium, nor a magic formula to achieving it.

As there are many challenges to the humanitarian endeavours to manage their reputation and trust, the emphasis should draw on identity. Not because it was recommended as being most efficient management model to make brands a success\(^{211}\), but because the mission is at the core of humanitarian existence. Prioritizing their identity over their image means staying truthful to their raison d’être. Mitchell says that one should ‘focus on shaping your brand identity, and do your best, so brand image will follow as a natural result’\(^{212}\). But as illustrated by examples, many challenges are in the way, and not always doing good means looking good.

Good image also weighs heavily in the brand equity balance, so it is important and efforts should continuously be made to nurture it throughout credible, persuasive and transparent communication. Building trust increases the visibility, which pushes an organization to be more accountable, that in return results in greater trust. In the haze of multiple challenges, maybe Kylander’s trust causal loop may be a useful tool,\(^{213}\) especially nowadays when we talk about the crisis of legitimacy and erosion of the credibility/trust of humanitarians.

Into this identity-image continuously evolving dynamic losing some points is unavoidable, but in chasing good image, identity should not be forgotten or lost. Seeing identity, image and integrity balance in interdependence, correlation, and dynamic relation requires monitoring and periodic evaluations for systematic revisions.

‘Do what you say, and say what you do’ is the way to achieving brand integrity, and it is generally valid for any corporation, organization or individual entity. But for the humanitarian organizations, integrity oblige to higher moral grounds and it is more than just a tool for achieving a more efficient and effective service delivery. They are not only aid providers, but the value guardians and the very instruments for fostering and maintaining a strong civil society\(^{214}\).

5.3. Branding as tool for funding

As mentioned previously\(^{215}\), another predominant trend in the ways humanitarians define branding through functional lenses is to see it as a tool for fundraising.
The world has never seen such a massive proliferation of NGOs as in the past few decades. Among the numerous and continuously mushrooming humanitarian organizations, the largest 20 INGOs account for 50% of the total funding and activities in the sector. Overall, the humanitarian sector is dominated by the UN, the Red Cross and other large INGOs cloud. As mentioned earlier, researchers argued on the competitive-collaborative relationship between organizations in the field, but there is a consistent and increasing body of literature showing that the era of cooperation for ‘doing good’ is fading in the face of growing fierce competition for market share inside and outside the UN and the largest INGOs cloud.

Yet, the competition for funds is not the only one increasing, so are the money too. The financial resources available for the humanitarian sector show a third consecutive growth in overall spending, and reaching the highest record of US$28.0bn for the total international humanitarian assistance in 2015. This is certainly an increase, but it fades as soon as we relate it with the growing needs of the growing numbers of people caught in humanitarian crises occurring from natural disasters, food insecurity, water scarcity, armed conflicts or social unrest. In 2015, estimates showed 89 million people affected by natural disasters as the earthquake in Nepal, and some 65 million people more, affected by conflict-induced crisis such as Syria, Iraq, South Sudan and Yemen. To face of such large-scale human suffering, the World Humanitarian Summit and other global bodies urge for the search of new measures and types for financing to ensure sufficient and appropriate funds to address the needs of people in crisis contexts.

A key finding of a quantitative study made on UK's top 500 fundraisers is that high brand-oriented attract significantly more income than low brand-oriented fundraisers. Hankinson argues that “strong recognizable brands attract more voluntary donations than those without. […] Transforming charity into brands allows donors to identify more precisely what the charity does and the values it represents. This in turn allows donors to identify and select those charities whose values most closely match their own.”

Why did we have to talk about brand valuation in the previous chapter? Most of the humanitarians I know would raise an eyebrow on putting a price tag on ‘doing good’ and ‘saving lives’. But while most humanitarians are trying their best to optimize money spending for better responding to the needs of people affected by humanitarian crisis, donors are counting the numbers of their market value and keep an eye on the rating scores (such as Edelman and Interbrands).

Eikenberry & Kluver held that the new and emerging donors “scrutinize charitable causes like potential business investments. They look for a way of giving that is “consistent with their own results-oriented values and their own patterns of behaviour. […] donors like to practice “venture philanthropy,” which is “the application of venture capital principles and practices”.
“They want a ROI (return on investment), a SROI (social return on investment), FROI (financial return on investment), or EROI (emotional return on investment)”

In this view, humanitarians caution in venturing for funds and their risk avoidance to instrumentalization is justified, as while getting financial support they can be potentially dragged in donor’s foreign policy or their own international branding strategy.

Within the changing humanitarian landscape, the Non-Western donors such as Gulf States are increasingly funding humanitarian action, and their contribution is highly related to their foreign policies, to combating the terrorism related criticism/accusations, and to raising their own profile in the international arena. Funding as a branding tool renders external and internal stakes, political for the States and commercial and profit-driven for private donors. The sources of the funds can challenge greatly the neutrality principle, and the money sources may be the sources of aid politicization. As Donini said, “humanitarian action is part of global governance, if not of global government”

There are other drawbacks on the money trail.

Driven by the forces of globalization and competition, the UN & INGOs cloud is disputed. There is a growing call for democratization and localization of aid. The issue with the small NGOs, grassroots organizations and local implementing partners is that they are more affected by the contract competition. As Eikenberry & Kluver show, market orientation and contract competition is also practiced by the large humanitarian organizations, but there is a higher variation for the small organizations. In practice, anecdotal evidence shows that local partners change their core mission depending on the needs and on what funds are allocated for. The localization of aid have to consider the issue of control and accountability to ensure the quality of the humanitarian response and to avoid potential drawbacks such as what we have called the eroding credibility ‘snooker effect’ for all humanitarian organizations involved.

In appealing for, administrating and allocating funds humanitarian organizations bear huge responsibilities. Though debateable, several failures and pitfalls are mentioned the past. Some examples: Live Aid Ethiopia ’80s inflating the abusive government; Oxfam raising many for a non-existent famine in Cambodia ’70s; Sri Lanka tsunami 2004 got great awareness, great empathy, and lots of money - resulting in overlapping, redundancy and lacking effectiveness. Condemned to repeat?

The general humanitarian landscape is changing and many are facing important challenges of legitimacy, credibility and effectiveness. As mentioned earlier, the Edelman Trust Report 2017 urge organizations to find new ways “to regain their moral authority and fulfil their essential purpose”

As previously mentioned, there is an ongoing debate on the effects of marketization and business-like shifting on the humanitarian organizations. Alexander & al signals that a
“corporate model which stresses the values of strategy development, risk taking, and competitive positioning is incompatible with the non-profit model”, and warns that given the rising number of organisations and the increasing race for donations, “competition may cause a shift away from a focus on service” 230. Barnett & Weiss said that when an organization survival depends on making strategic choices in an environment lead by competition for funds “its interests will be shaped, often unintentionally, by material incentives” 231. Dolnicar & Lazarevski urge humanitarian organizations to apply a mission “filter” in order to ensure their mission is not compromised in the pursuit of money 232. Stride 233 shows that under the pressure of 'getting the cash', humanitarian fundraisers tend to adopt thrilling and sensationalistic approaches (as for example, using shocking and dreadful imagery to urge the appeal), while many other humanitarian practitioners tend to favour more careful and cautious tactics.

In Strides’ study, “one senior charity communication executive has described this tension as 'trying to hold two wild horses running in the opposite direction" 234. Dolnicar & al even raised the dilemma of ‘mission or money’ 235. There is no evidence for such dilemma. Reality reveals that there is mission and money, rather than mission or money. Both are much needed by people affected by dreadful situations, either man made or natural disasters. Those wild horses must run together, must run hard and fast, and above all, in the same direction: saving and protecting lives, alleviating suffering and restoring human dignity. Perhaps, as Kylander & al asserted, better branding practices and tactics may be useful for the humanitarian organizations to boosting the necessary funding for both, their organizations survival as instruments for achieving their vital and imperative missions.

6. Conclusions

I find that writing the conclusions of this thesis is perhaps the most difficult exercise, as I think rather than findings, this paper rises even more questions and it is pretty much as a Pandora’s Box: opened to further inquiries.

What really makes a successful humanitarian brand? Difficult to say. It may be useful if humanitarian branding would be properly defined, rolled out, monitored and assessed. Even so, a recipe may not function or may need continuous adaptations in the continuously volatile and unstable humanitarian settings.

There is a growing evidence that branding is adopted and practiced by the humanitarian organisations. Stride warns on “the misappropriation of techniques developed specifically for the commercial environment” and urge the call for conceptualizing branding “in order to establish whether branding is an appropriate and effective tool in the charity context” 236.
The import from business into humanitarian field seems to be scattered and fragmented, and as Stride and many others authors quoted in this paper remarked, branding seems to be little understood. Along the branding process, the import into the humanitarian field seems to be:

However, humanitarian brands are brands. As Vestergaard says, inevitably, humanitarian organizations participate in the consumer culture, and they encounter enormous challenges. In this light, perhaps humanitarians should not avoid the branding topic, but learn, keep being informed on what is out there, and perhaps make use of it. Continuing reluctance and avoidance of the subject won’t help as nowadays we can’t say anymore, we were young, we didn’t have experience or we didn’t know.239

Does branding impacts the humanitarian response? Assertions are divided. On one side, some authors like Kotler & Pfoertsch, Kylander, Stride and Hankinson state that better branding could be beneficial. On the other side, authors like Barnett & Weiss, Hopgood, Schlesinger & al raise concerns on the implications of the increasingly ‘corporate’ humanitarian organizations fighting for competitive advantages. In the absence of research, branding theoretical frameworks or practical matters implications remain inconclusive.

Some branding concepts, practices and tactics may be useful for humanitarian organisations to achieve their missions. Perhaps future research will reveal more on if or not.

There are more and more humanitarian crisis and people in need, and less and less money to assist the affected populations, while the credibility and trust in humanitarian actors is fading. Aspen Institute asserts that organizations could benefit from the marketization trends, and as such may be more reliable resource streams, greater efficiency and innovation, better targeting of services to client needs, and possibly increased legitimacy and greater accountability.

There has never been a larger need of humanitarian assistance in the world as it is today. Right now, about 145 million people need protection and life-saving humanitarian aid.

Maybe, as Lowcock says, “building a better business model and operating system” will prove useful for dealing with the extent and complexity of humanitarian crisis worldwide. At any degree and whatever forms the adoption of business-like language and practice will be, addressing the needs and saving lives will remain the priority today and in the years to come.

There is a lot of space for improvements in the humanitarian action. Branding may be or not just one of them. Though imperfect as it is, I have witnessed humanitarian alleviating the suffering of people in most dire circumstances, and I strongly believe in what it does and what it stands for: life.

In the end, I will place some key messages:

- Humanitarian organizations are business entities. The mission is their ‘profit’
In the pursuit of their mission, humanitarian organizations forsake many organizational benefits, such as control over program implementation, funding, and recognition.

For their array of missions, they must invest in their infrastructure to survive, retain employees etc., and, ultimately, succeed at their operations.

Identity, image, perception, credibility, trust, visibility, awareness, persuasion, engagement, mobilisation etc. are essential for humanitarian organisations to fulfil their missions.

All these elements are concealed in the multifaceted branding.

Therefore, branding is unavoidable.

This paper barely scratch the surface into this topic newly emerging in the field of research and only recently drawing the attention of the academia. Perhaps future research will shade more light in the haze of humanitarian branding theory and practice.

Kotler & Levy held that for non-profit, branding “is not a matter of why, but how”. *242

For humanitarian branding, more questions remain on both, why and how.
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Annex 1: Key Words & Definitions

Brand
The brand is and has been defined in many different ways over the years, depending on the perspective from which the brand is perceived. Often that depends on the academic background of the author/originator of the different definitions. In the classical definition, the brand is linked to the identification of a product and the differentiation from its competitors, through the use of a certain name, logo, design or other visual signs and symbols.

The American Marketing Association (AMA) defined the brand in 1960 as: A name, term, sign, symbol, or design, or a combination of them which is intended to identify the goods or services of one seller or a group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competitors.

Other more recent definitions of branding also include internal and organizational processes. Many brand management books today feature extremely broad definitions, because they aim at covering all the different aspects and facets of the brand and how it has developed over time.

Brand architecture
Brand architecture is the structure that organizes the brand portfolio. It defines brand roles and relationships among a company’s brands, e.g. the role between a car brand and the model brand (as in Volkswagen Golf). Some corporations choose to communicate the corporate brand to the market while others choose to market product brands to specific segments and keep the corporate brand in the background. According to Ollins (1990) a brand architecture can be structured in three main ways. Monolithic brand structure equals a structure where the company relies solely on a corporate brand, at the other end of the spectrum there are the individually branded products and finally the brand architecture can consist of endorsed brands, which are a hybrid, where a corporate brand is used to endorse the corporate brands in the portfolio - Aaker and Joachimsthaler (2002), part III and Kapferer (1997).

Brand audit
A brand audit assesses the health of a brand. Typically, it consists of a brand inventory and a brand exploratory. The brand inventory is a detailed internal description of exactly how the brand has been marketed. The brand exploratory is an external investigation of what the brand means to consumers (through focus groups and other marketing research techniques). Brand audits are most useful when conducted on a regular basis (Keller 2000).

Brand community
A brand community is a social entity where consumers interact socially with a brand as the pivotal point of their interaction. Brand communities take place in Internet-based settings, in geographically bound clubs, and at so-called brandfests (social gatherings arranged by the marketer). The emergence of brand communities implies a shift in negotiation power between marketer and consumer as consumers claim more power when acting in groups.

Brand culture
Brand culture is a term that has been increasingly used over the last few years. It sometimes refers to the organizational culture of the brand and sometimes to the brand as part of the broader cultural landscape. An insight into the organizational perspective of brand culture is made on the identity approach of brand management, to show how brands affect macro-level culture and how they can benefit from playing an active role in mainstream culture (Schroeder and Salzer-Morling 2006).

Brand equity
Fundamentally, the goal for any brand manager is to endow products and/or services with brand equity (Park and Srinivasan 1994; Farquhar 1989). Brand equity defines the value of the brand and can refer to two understandings of brand value, namely a strategic, subjective understanding or brand equity as a financial, objective expression of the value of the brand.

In the financial understanding of brand equity, the concept is a way to account for how much value a brand holds. Brand equity is one of the intangible entries on the balance sheet (like goodwill and know-how). Being able to account for how much the brand holds is extremely important, both in relation to financial statements, mergers, acquisitions, and as a tool for brand managers to argue their case.

The subjective understanding of brand equity refers to the consumers’ perception of the brand and is strategically valuable for brand management. Consumers are the ones who experience the brand, and their perception of brand equity can be defined as: ‘A consumer perceives a brand’s equity as the value added to the functional product or service by associating it with the brand name’ (Aaker and Biel 1993 p. 2). Creation
of brand equity is at the heart of brand management and the seven brand approaches feature seven varied perspectives on how to work strategically with brand equity optimization. Aaker (1991) and Keller (1993)

**Brand essence**

Most academic brand management authors agree that every brand has an identity and that every brand identity contains an essence (DNA or kernel) that is the very core of the brand. The brand essence is most often an abstract idea or sentence summarizing what is the heart and soul of the brand. In order for the brand not to become compromised, the brand essence should stay the same over the course of time and no marketing actions that will compromise the brand essence should be allowed. Finding the right brand essence requires insight into the many facets of the brand. Ref. brand identity system in Aaker and Joachimsthaler (2002) and Kapferer (1997, where the same notion is called brand kernel), and in Keller (2003, where it is called brand mantra).

**Brand extensions**

A brand can be extended into new product categories. Brand extensions are often necessary when adapting to changes in the environment or in order to reap the full benefits of a strong brand. Extensions have many benefits. In the beginning, brand extensions were used as a strategic tool mainly to enter new markets (Aaker and Keller 1990). Today, brand extensions are also used to underpin and develop the brand to meet market changes.

A successful brand extension should respect the brand essence and thereby be based on the core of the brand and be true to the brand vision. If a brand is extended to a product category or to clients in a way that does not at all consider the core of the original brand, both brands risk dilution. Excellent treatments can be found in Kapferer (1997), chapter 8 and Keller (2003), chapter 12.

**Brand genealogy**

A genealogist goes back in history, uncovers family histories and constructs family trees. Brand genealogy is a managerial mindset introduced in the cultural branding model (Holt 2004) where the brand manager goes back and uncovers the brand’s history. In the cultural approach, it is assumed that brands play important roles in mainstream culture and that the ways they play these roles determine their level of success. An introduction to this managerial mindset is found in How Brands become Icons by Douglas B. Holt (2004).

**Brand icon**

An exclusive elite of valuable brands can claim icon status, which is considered the holy grail of brand management. An iconic brand holds references that most people agree upon and it obtains that status by playing an active role in contemporary culture. An introduction full treatment to brand icons is found in How Brands Become Icons by Douglas B. Holt (2004).

**Brand identity**

Brand identity refers to the identity of the brand. There are many different perceptions of what the brand identity consists of. But the more common definition of brand identity is that it is; ‘a set of associations the brand strategist seek to create or maintain’ (Aaker and Joachimsthaler 2002, p. 43). The brand identity is hence something that the marketer ‘has’ as well as something he tries to create through the right brand strategy. The brand identity must express the particular vision and uniqueness of the brand – what the brand stands for basically, and the brand identity must be of a long-lasting or permanent nature. If the brand identity is both unique, distinct, and a clear expression of what the brand is all about as well as long-lasting, then it can create the basis of a solid, coherent and long-lasting brand and be the driver of all brand-related activities.

**Brand image**

The image of the brand is the perception of the brand by consumers. The goal of working strategically with brand image is to ensure that consumers hold strong and favourable associations of the brand in their minds. The brand image typically consists of multiple concepts: perception, because the brand is perceived; cognition, because that brand is cognitively evaluated; and finally attitude, because consumers continuously after perceiving and evaluating what they perceive form attitudes about the brand (Aaker and Joachimsthaler 2002, p. 43; Keller 1993, 2003; Grunig 1993). Brand image is the pivotal point of the consumer-based approach.

**Brand loyalty**

Achieving a high degree of loyalty is an important goal in the branding process. Loyal consumers are valuable consumers because it is much more expensive to recruit new customers than nursing and keeping existing ones. Brands are important vehicles when building consumer loyalty as they provide recognizable fix points in the shopping experience. Read Keller chapter 5 in (2003) about developing loyalty programs.
The concept of brand loyalty has been elaborated in the relational approach that seeks to answer how and why loyal brand consumers consume the brand of choice.

**Brand Management**

Brand management is the application of marketing techniques to a specific product, product line, or brand. It seeks to increase the product's perceived value to the customer and thereby increase and brand equity.

**Brand personality**

Consumers display a tendency to endow brands with human-like personalities. Working strategically with brand personalities has been a widespread practice for many years. The Big Five of human personality psychology and Jungian archetypes are frameworks often implied to deepen the symbolic exchange between brands and consumers. Brand personality is part of most identity systems in the traditional brand management books.

**Brand positioning**

The idea of brand positioning is based on the assumption that consumers have limited mind space for commercial messages and that the most successful brands hence are the ones able to position themselves in the minds of consumers by adapting the most congruent and consistent commercial message. The idea is linked to the information-processing theory of consumer choice. More in *Positioning: the Battle for your Mind* by Ries and Trout (2001).

**Brand revitalization**

A brand sometimes ages and declines in strength because as time goes by it loses its relevance and attractiveness for consumers. There can be different reasons for that ageing or decline in brand relevance, e.g. the brand may not have adapted to changes in the environment or to changes in consumer preferences. Sometimes the situation occurs where the brand simply ages along with the ageing of its core consumers. The solution for an ageing brand or a brand in decline can be revitalization. The key for brand management when revitalizing a brand is always to start the process by identifying or reviving an existing brand vision and finding new and innovative ways of making that brand vision relevant once again for existing or new consumers. Kapferer (1997).

**Brand strategy**

The majority of brand management books feature generic ‘one size fits all’ guidelines for building a brand strategy. It is our conviction that the every brand is unique and requires its own unique recipe for success. The aim of a brand strategy is to enhance the internal and external opportunities of the brand. The brand strategy must be strategic, visionary and proactive rather than tactical and reactive. Each brand must find its own holy grail to success – in the shape of a unique and relevant brand identity and brand vision, which are the first elements that must be in place when developing a brand strategy. The brand vision is brought to life through a customized brand strategy able to release the full potential of the brand. Brand managers must have long-term rather than a short-term focus. If the performance of the brand is based on quarterly sales figures, chances are that the brand strategy will end up being much more tactical than strategic, without enough visionary thinking to drive the growth and the strength of the brand in the future.

A prerequisite for making the brand strategy work is that it is closely linked to the business strategy. This means that the brand and the brand strategy should not be perceived as something other than or as an addition to business strategy developed at late stages in a product launch for example. In an ideal world, business and brand strategy should be developed simultaneously and support each other. The brand vision must also resonate with consumers and differentiate the brand from competitors. Once the brand vision has been established, a customized range of elements that comprise the brand strategy should be prioritized and developed. The brand strategy will typically consist of a customized range of elements from the seven brand approaches. Each of the seven brand approaches has certain strengths and weaknesses, which is why a customized combination of elements from the relevant approaches that matches the specific challenges and opportunities the brand faces will provide a foundation for the right brand strategy.

**Brand stretch**

It is assumed that all brands have a core that should stay the same over the course of time (see the section about brand essence). When a brand is extended into new product categories, or joins co-branding ventures, its identity is stretched. The trick is to stretch it enough to be able to go in new directions, but never to stretch it to such an extent that the essence is diluted. Kapferer (1997).

**Co-branding**
Co-branding—also called brand bundling or brand alliances—occurs when two or more existing brands are combined into a joint product or are marketed together in some fashion. Co-branding occurs when, for example, two or more brands are combined in a joint product or brand. This phenomenon is also called brand alliances or brand bundling. The two companies should consider carefully what their strategic alliance means for their respective brand portfolios, as their brands will become more associated in the future through the new product. Keller (2013) chapter 7 describes this phenomenon in more detail.

**Corporate brand**

When the corporation is branded instead of the individual products, a corporate brand is the case. In most literature on corporate branding it is assumed that the energy and inspiration of the brand stem from within the organization and that a branding strategy, in order to be successful, requires the engagement of the whole corporation.

**Employee branding**

Employee branding is defined as ‘the process by which employees internalize the desired brand image and are motivated to project the image to customers and other organizational constituents’ (Miles and Mangold 2004 p. 68). It is a notion resembling the ‘living the brand’ concept.

**Employer branding**

The term ‘employer branding’ relates to strategies for communicating about a company as an attractive employer to both current and potential employees. It is a hot management topic at the moment with a corresponding number of books and articles. Employer branding relevant literature is Barrow and Mosley (2005) emphasizing the interrelationship between HR, communication and top management, and Lievens and Highhouse (2003) about the emotive and tangible benefits for both potential and actual employees.

**Product brand**

A product brand is a brand linked to the product and not to the corporation and describes a situation where each individual product has its own brand. Choosing to brand the corporation or the product is a question of brand architecture. Marketing a product brand holds several advantages, such as the liberty to market to different segments, the ability to close unsuccessful brands without harming the mother corporation, etc.

**Viral branding**

The term covers mechanisms where consumers help or in some cases take over the marketing of the brand. A marketer who applies a certain amount of ‘coolness’ to the brand often initiates viral branding, the coolness starts a process where consumers spread the brand like a virus. Having consumers support the marketing process, and by their autonomy giving the brand a higher level of authenticity, can be beneficial for the marketer. Still, viral branding implies a risk of a contrary marketing effort, where the brand is ‘hijacked’ and taken in unintended directions through autonomous meaning-making among consumers. Even though a brand community is a narrower concept than viral branding, the mechanisms behind the two concepts are comparable; they are described in the community approach, *Brand Hijack: Marketing without Marketing* by Wipperfürth (2005).
### Annex 3: Brand Functions

**Keller’s Brand Roles & Brand Elements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Packaging and Signage</th>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Logos and Symbols</th>
<th>Brand Elements and URL</th>
<th>Memorability</th>
<th>Meaningfulness</th>
<th>Likability</th>
<th>Transferability</th>
<th>Adaptability</th>
<th>Protectability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally more useful for brand recognition</td>
<td>Generally more useful for brand recognition</td>
<td>Generally more useful for brand recognition</td>
<td>Can be chosen to enhance brand recall and recognition</td>
<td>Can reinforce almost any type of association, although sometimes only indirect</td>
<td>Can evoke much verbal imagery</td>
<td>Can be somewhat limited</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Generally good, but with limits</td>
<td>Can be closely copied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be chosen to enhance brand recall and recognition</td>
<td>Can convey almost any type of association explicitly</td>
<td>Can combine visual and verbal appeal</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Can typically be redesigned</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can convey almost any type of association explicitly</td>
<td>Can evoke much verbal imagery</td>
<td>Can be somewhat limited</td>
<td>Can be somewhat limited</td>
<td>Can be close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand definition</th>
<th>Antecedents</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>Logo</em></td>
<td>Name, term, sign, symbol, design, product characteristics.</td>
<td>Identify, differentiate through visual identity and name. Quality assurance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <em>Risk reducer</em></td>
<td>Confidence that expectations being fulfilled.</td>
<td>Brand as a contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <em>Image</em></td>
<td>Consumer centred. Image in consumers' mind is brand &quot;reality&quot;.</td>
<td>Firm's input activities managed using feedback of image to change identity. Market research important. Manage brand concept over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <em>Value system</em></td>
<td>Consumer relevant values imbue the brand.</td>
<td>Brand values match relevant consumer values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. <em>Relationship</em></td>
<td>Consumer has attitude to brand. Brand as person has attitude to consumer.</td>
<td>Recognition and respect for personality. Develop relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. <em>Evolving entity</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change by stage of development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4: Brand Equity models

Aaker’s Brand Equity

- Reduced Marketing Costs
- Trade Leverage
- Attracting New Customers
  - Create Awareness
  - Reassurance
  - Time to Respond to Competitive Threats

- Anchor to which Other Associations Can Be Attached
  - Familiarity-Liking
  - Signal of Substance/Commitment
  - Brand to Be Considered

- Reason-to-Buy
  - Differentiate/Position
  - Price
  - Channel Member Interest
  - Extensions

- Help Process/Retrieve
  - Information
  - Reason-to-Buy
  - Create Positive
  - Attitude/Feelings
  - Extensions

- Provides Value to Customers by Enhancing Customer’s:
  - Interpretation/Processing of Information
  - Confidence in the Purchase Decision
  - Use Satisfaction

- Provides Value to Firm by Enhancing:
  - Efficiency and Effectiveness of Marketing Programs
  - Brand Loyalty
  - Prices/Margins
  - Brand Extensions
  - Trade Leverage
  - Competitive Advantage

Keller’s Customer-Based Brand Equity (CBBE) places the customer’s mindset in the center of brand equity
The four principles of Nonprofit Brand IDEA are **brand integrity, democracy, ethics,** and **affinity**.

- **Brand integrity** means that the organization’s internal identity is aligned with its external image and that both are aligned with the mission. The word integrity means structural integrity, not moral integrity. Internally, a brand with high structural integrity connects the mission to the identity of the organization, giving members, staff, volunteers, and trustees a common sense of why the organization does what it does and why it matters in the world. Externally, a brand with high structural integrity captures the mission in its public image and deploys that image in service of its mission at every step of a clearly articulated strategy.

- **Brand democracy** means that the organization trusts its members, staff, participants, and volunteers to communicate their own understanding of the organization’s core identity. Brand democracy largely eliminates the need to tightly control how the brand is presented and portrayed. The appetite for brand democracy among nonprofit leaders is largely a response to the growth of social media, which has made policing the brand nearly impossible.

- **Brand ethics** means that the brand itself and the way it is deployed reflect the core values of the organization. Just as brand integrity aligns the brand with mission, brand ethics aligns both the organization’s internal identity and its external image with its values and culture. This is about more than being known as an ethical organization, but extends to the organization’s use of its brand in ways that convey its values. We heard many stories of lapses in brand ethics, such as using pitiful photographs of an organization’s beneficiaries to motivate donors. Yasmina Zaidman, communication director at Acumen Fund, contrasts these exploitative images with Acumen’s tagline “Seeing a world beyond poverty.” Acumen avoids “images of poverty that … dehumanize the people whom we want to actually help,” she says, instead promoting images of “pride and dignity.”

- **Brand affinity** means that the brand is a good team player, working well alongside other brands, sharing space and credit generously, and promoting collective over individual interests. An organization with strong brand affinity attracts partners and collaborators because it lends value to the partnerships without exploiting them. Organizations with the highest brand affinity promote the brands of their partners as much as or more than they promote their own brands, redressing rather than exploiting the power imbalances that inevitably exist in any partnership or collaboration.
Annex 5: Brand as Input

Aaker’s Brand Identity Model

Annex 5.1.: CARE Re-branding
## Annex 5.2.: Terre des Hommes Sweetie campaign

After reading an article about men who abuse underage girls via webcam in other countries, Mark Woerde, co-founder and director of strategy at Lemz, approached Terre des Hommes to collaborate on an initiative that would help tackle the problem by mobilising politicians and police world-wide.

The online campaign concept was centered on Sweetie, a 3D generated child character resembling a girl from the Philippines and, realistic enough to attract online interaction with potential predators on international chat sites for several weeks. During this time, the backstage team using her as a disguise interacted with more than 20000 online predators. After names, locations and webcam footage of abusers was gathered a global PR campaign was launched to announce the findings and hand over the results to Interpol, positioning the initiative as one of the largest campaign against Webcam Child Sex Tourism in recent history.

Sweetie was a global phenomenon. Billions of people worldwide saw her online and on the news. The media spin run for several month, focusing on the action for catching the ‘bad guys’, the alleged predators, so the Interpol became the main protagonist within the media exposure.

Lemz gets one of the [Cannes Lions 2014](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_0oVlhSDWsK)
European approach
- the third sector is set apart from the state and market, as a kind of ‘independent sector’ or as natural feature of a ‘civil society sector’

US/Anglo-Saxon approach
- Third sector is part of the welfare mix
- Liberal

Source: based on Pestoff (1992, p. 25)

Media coverage has been rather spectacular, especially in the US. The campaign was covered by Oprah Winfrey’s television show, possibly the biggest publicity plum there is in America. The Pampers/UNICEF team was honored by the Clinton Global Initiative, an important recognition in a world where corporate involvement in development work is sometimes viewed with suspicion. During the first year of the global campaign, Pampers/UNICEF won a “Corporate Halo” from the TrendSight Group, which monitors campaigns thought to resonate with American women. In an online survey TrendSight conducted, consumers wrote that the campaign “recognizes our bond with babies as universal and can cut across cultures and consumerism” and “appeals to our need to band together as women for the greater good of our families and the world.” However, the promotion did not do as well in North America as it did in the rest of the world, and was not continued after 2008. (http://www.brandchannel.com/2015/09/28/pampers-unicef-10-years-092815/)

Pampers campaign as a new source of funding

Pampers-UNICEF “1 pack = 1 vaccine”
= 7 US cents / diapers pack

Though the money going to UNICEF is actually donated by consumers, we cannot assume that the donations would have gone to UNICEF without the campaign.

At their 10th anniversary celebration, UNICEF –Pampers announced big numbers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNICEF Campaign: Aware Versus Unaware (Index)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Image Perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TNS 2009

In France, where consumers reported to IPSOS researchers that social issues influence their purchases at somewhat higher levels than elsewhere in Western Europe, the overall image perception of Pampers has shown striking and sustained improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Image Perception Evolution (Index versus pre-UNICEF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TNS 2009

After four years, both image perception and purchase intent for Pampers in Western Europe continued to be much higher among UNICEF campaign-aware consumers.
Annex 6: Brand as Output

Brand Associative Network Memory Model

- Qualitative and quantitative measurements of customers mind-set (brand attributes and benefits recalled and evoked by consumers)
- Resulting in mapping of the mental network associations by strength, favourability and uniqueness

Samples: Volkswagen & Chevrolet
Keller’s Brand Knowledge Model

Keller’s Secondary Sources of Brand Knowledge
Kotler & Keller - Integrated Multi-Channel Communication to build Brand Equity
UNICEF Sweden: Slacktivism doesn’t save lives

Video

But I think everything will be alright.
Annex 7: Brand Integrity

Brand Trust Model for humanitarian non-profits | Kylander 259
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4.3.1. Brand Valuation

4.2.3. Current Trends

4.2.1. What makes humanitarian organizations different?


Foreman K., Capitalising on the Value of a Brand Name, 1992, XXIX, pp35-58


Smilie L., The alms bazaar: altruism under fire: non-profit organizations and international development, Ottawa International Development Research Centre, 1995

4.3.2. Brand Equity


Idem 80

Interbrand, Brand Valuation: A versatile strategic tool for business


Einstein M., Compassion, Inc.: How Corporate America Blurs the Line between What We Buy, Who We Are, and Those We Help, University of California Press, 2012


Edelman PR, Trust Barometer 2017 and Regaining Trust in Civil Society article, Edelman Magazine, July 2017

4.3.2. Brand Equity


Annex 4: Brand Equity models: Aaker’s Brand Equity, Keller’s CBBE, Kylander’s IDEA


Annex 01: Key words & definitions


Annex 5.2: Terres des Hommes Sweetie campaign
http://www.adweek.com/brand-marketing/23-campaigns-will-won-ions-cannes-158192/


More on humanitarian principles in JCR; Bennett M., Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism, 2011

Case debates in various CERAH lectures, 2014-2016

E.g. Save the Children and the polio tests supposing for chasing Bin Laden in Pakistan, resulting in expelling the organization from the country and high reluctance to polio immunization campaigns, and any other humanitarian programmes.

"because they follow in the footsteps of Woodrow Wilson’s belief that it was possible and desirable to transform political, economic, and cultural structures so that they liberated individuals and produced peace and progress, desire to attack the root causes that leave people at risk”, Barnett M., Humanitarianism transformed, Perspectives on Politics, 2005, Vol. 3, Iss. 4, p728


Nickolls J. quoted in Volberg T., The politicization of humanitarian aid and its effect on the principles of impartiality, neutrality and partiality, 4.4.3. Iraq Chapter, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, 2006


See Annex 5.3.: European and Anglo-Saxon welfare models


Idem Barnett & Weiss


Donini A., Minear L., Smilie I., van Baarda T., Welch A.C., Mapping the Security Environment: Understanding the Perceptions of Local Communities, Peace Support Operations, and Assistance Agencies, Tufts University, Feinstein International Famine Centre, 2005

A. Donini in C. Abu-Saba, In the Eyes of Others How People in Crises Perceive Humanitarian Aid, MSF, USA, 2012, p99

Slim H., How We Look: Hostile Perceptions of Humanitarian Action, presentation to conference on Humanitarian Coordination, Montreux, Switzerland, April 2004, p2


See Annex 1: Key words & definitions

Annex 5.4.: UNICEF – Pampers campaign; https://www.unicef.org/media/media_85657.html; https://www.pampers.co.uk/about/


Taylor Nelson Sofres (TNS) 2009, see data in Annex 5.4: UNICEF-Pampers campaign

See Acronyms list: CSR is Corporate Social Responsibility


See humanitarian relations to branding in previous chapters
http://www.savethechildren.org/site/8rKLXMGip4Eh/b/917161/t/8E35/p/Procter__Gamble.htm


Kylander, Hoogpoor, Barnett and many others assert the same


CERAH Lectures 2014-2015, ref. e.g.: JCR; IRC and the Nazy concentration camps


https://www.propublica.org/article/how-the-red-cross-raised-halaf-a-billion-dollars-for-haiti-and-built-6-homes

5.2.2. Brand as an output

As described in 4.1.1. Definitions, p8


See Annex 6 Brand as Output: Brand as Associative Network Memory Model

Valérie Babize, Head of Field Communications, MSF Switzerland, CERAH lectures 2014-2015

Humanitarian communication is usually referred to all ITCs used as component of twenty-first century humanitarian response operations during both natural disasters and armed conflict. In how information is communicated and received during crises there is no accepted common definition of what constitutes 'humanitarian communications', nor what defines the 'humanitarian use of ICTs'.

Humanitarian negotiations purpose is to ensure the impartial protection of, and the provision of assistance to, civilians affected by armed conflict and other people rendered hors de combat, as stipulated by international humanitarian law, human rights law and refugee law. Source: Griffoli D. B. & Picot A., Humanitarian Negotiation, Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, 2004

Humanitarian diplomacy, as defined by the ICRC, is persuading decision makers and opinion leaders to act, at all times, in the interests of vulnerable people, and with full respect for fundamental humanitarian principles.

See Annex 6: Brand as Output, Keller’s Integrated Multi-Channel Communication to build Brand Equity


More recently, the SDCs framework has been launched. Business sector companies are operationalizing and adapting the 2030 agenda to their own business specifics, and advertise this accordingly. E.g.: Deloitte

Donini, Boltanski, Chouliairaki, Vestergaard

Levy Sidney J. & Rook D.W., Brands, Consumers, Symbols and Research, SAGE Publications, 1999


http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/features/bonus-video/famine-ar/...ch=Home# a=2 69126845 1262630385 1507382097 =134741600 1507382097


Annex 6: Brand as an output – Keller’s Brand Knowledge Model

Annex 6.1.: UNICEF Zero immunization campaign
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Burmann C., Riley N., Halasovitch T. & Schade M., Identity-Based Brand Management, Gabler Publishing House, 2017


See Annex 7 Brand Integrity: Kylander’s Brand Trust Model
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Greensmith J., Trends in fundraising and giving by International NGOs, presented in the Panel Session - The Changing Paradigm of International Giving, at the 27th International Fundraising Congress (IFC), Noordwijkerhout, The Netherlands, October 2001

see 4.2.2. 90’s: turning point in researching the non-profit branding, pp12-13

Market share - not only in terms of funding, but also in terms of geographical representation (e.g. presence in the Sudan case), or need to be where the ‘big trouble’ is (e.g. CNN effect and the case of 2004 tsunami that points out and argue the redundancy, overlapping and lack of efficiency)

Global Humanitarian Assistance initiatives, Global Humanitarian Assistance Report 2010


Hankinson P., Better branding leads to more charitable giving, The Edge 7, Swindon, ESRC, 2001


The Trouble With Aid, BBC documentary, 2012, http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/01p81km


Lindberg M. & Bryant C., Going Global: Transforming Relief and Development NGOs, Bloomingfield CT Kumanian Press, 2001
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