ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER
Volume - 15 | Issue - 07 | July - 2026 | PRINT ISSN No. 2277 - 8179 | DOI : 10.36106/ijsr
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

THE BIG TENT PARADOX: A LITERATURE REVIEW ON INCLUSIVITY VERSUS DILUTION IN MASS-APPEAL BRANDING

Management

Dr. Faisal Qureshi ICL Graduate Business School 10 – 14 Lorne Street, Auckland, New Zealand

ABSTRACT

This comprehensive literature review examines the strategic construct of "Big Tent" branding, defined as a paradigm where brands cultivate mass-market appeal by anchoring their identity in inclusive, universal values to attract a diverse consumer coalition. Through a systematic analysis of peer-reviewed literature across marketing, consumer behaviour, and strategic management, this paper delineates the complex advantages and inherent drawbacks of this approach. The central contribution is the identification and analysis of "The Big Tent Paradox": the fundamental tension wherein the strategies that enable market dominance and cultural resilience through broad inclusivity simultaneously generate significant risks of brand dilution, stakeholder alienation, and ideological fragility. The review synthesizes three core advantages — the construction of expansive, resilient brand communities; the creation of sustainable competitive advantage through cultural pre-emption; and the accumulation of legitimizing stakeholder goodwill — against three primary drawback categories: meaning erosion and the "everything-to-everyone" trap, heightened vulnerability to activist scrutiny and hypocrisy accusations, and operational complexities in managing conflicting stakeholder demands. This paper further proposes a theoretical framework of "Strategic Equilibrium," positing that successful Big Tent management requires a principled core with flexible expression, authentic embeddedness of values, and tiered community engagement. The conclusion presents a formal research agenda with testable propositions, positioning this review as a foundational synthesis and catalyst for future empirical investigation into one of contemporary branding's most significant strategic dilemmas.

KEYWORDS

Big Tent Branding, Brand Dilution, Inclusive Marketing, Brand Community, Brand Paradox

INTRODUCTION:

The Strategic Imperative of Inclusivity in a Fragmented Marketplace

The contemporary commercial landscape presents brands with a formidable strategic conundrum. On one hand, digital media and shifting sociocultural values have fragmented consumer attention and identity, empowering niche communities and rewarding brands that demonstrate authentic specialization [9], [3]. On the other hand, the economic logic of scale and the cultural cachet of mainstream relevance continue to exert a powerful pull. In navigating this tension, an increasing number of prominent brands are adopting what can be termed a "Big Tent" strategy: an approach that forgoes narrow demographic or psychographic targeting in favour of building a broad, heterogeneous coalition united under a banner of inclusive, often values-based, brand ideology [10], [27].

From Coca-Cola's century-long ethos of "Open Happiness" to Nike's evolution from athletic performance to a platform for social advocacy with "Dream Crazy," and Apple's enduring association with creativity and challenging the status quo, Big Tent brands seek to become cultural touchstones. They aim not merely to sell products but to host a community—a "tent"—under which a wide array of individuals, regardless of background or belief, can find a sense of belonging and shared purpose [17]. This strategy is particularly salient in an era where consumers, especially younger cohorts, increasingly judge brands by their social positions and ethical stances [23], [11].

However, this ambitious strategy is intrinsically fraught. The act of expanding the brand's conceptual and communal tent to welcome ever-more diverse groups places immense strain on the structural integrity of the brand's core meaning. The very mechanisms that drive growth — broad messaging, value-based appeals, community cultivation — can, if mismanaged, hollow out the brand's distinctive identity, expose it to accusations of hypocrisy, and alienate the very groups it seeks to attract. This fundamental tension constitutes what this paper identifies as "The Big Tent Paradox": the concurrent, and often contradictory, pursuit of inclusive, mass-market appeal and the maintenance of a coherent, distinctive, and resilient brand identity.

This paper presents a systematic and integrative literature review to dissect this paradox. Its objectives are fourfold: first, to define and conceptualize Big Tent branding within the broader landscape of marketing theory; second, to synthesize the documented strategic advantages this model offers; third, to critically catalogue the inherent risks and drawbacks evidenced in scholarly research; and fourth, to integrate these insights into a coherent theoretical framework that not only explains the paradox but proposes pathways for its management. By examining the dialectic between inclusivity and dilution, this review provides scholars with a consolidated foundation for future research and offers practitioners a nuanced map for navigating one of the most complex challenges in modern brand strategy.

Conceptual Foundations: Mapping the Terrain of Big Tent Branding

To analyse the Big Tent phenomenon, it must first be defined within established marketing discourse. This section delineates its core characteristics and contrasts it with related strategic paradigms.

Defining the Big Tent Brand: Core Characteristics

Drawing from literature on cultural branding, brand communities, and stakeholder management, a Big Tent Brand is characterized by three interdependent pillars:

Identity Anchored in Universal, Ideological Values: The brand's core identity transcends functional benefits or category attributes. It is built upon abstract, culturally potent ideals-such as freedom (Harley-Davidson), empowerment (Nike), optimism (Coca-Cola), or environmental stewardship (Patagonia). These values act as what Holt (2004) terms "identity myths," providing consumers not just with a product, but with a symbolic resource for constructing their own identities and navigating cultural contradictions. This ideological foundation must be perceived as inclusive and expansive, capable of resonating across disparate social groups.

The Primacy of Value-Based Community: Success is measured through the lens of brand community development [17]. A Big Tent brand fosters a heterogeneous social collective where connections are not primarily between demographically-similar consumers, but between diverse individuals united by shared allegiance to the brand's core ideology. This community exhibits the classic markers of shared consciousness, rituals, and moral responsibility, but its membership is defined by affiliation with the brand's values rather than by pre-existing social similarity. The brand becomes a "nexus" for a broad network of stakeholder relationships [16].

Strategic Ambidexterity in Expression: To maintain relevance across its diverse constituency and amid cultural change, the brand must master ambidexterity. It requires a stable, enduring core identity - a "brand constitution"-while allowing for flexible, adaptive expressions in its marketing communications, product innovations, and partnerships [14], [26]. For example, Disney's core of "family-friendly magic" remains constant while its expressions evolve from animated fairy tales to the Marvel Cinematic Universe and Star Wars sagas, each appealing to different sub-audiences within the larger tent.

Contrasting Strategic Paradigms

The Big Tent approach exists on a spectrum of brand strategy. Distinguishing it from related concepts clarifies its unique value and risks.

Versus Niche Branding: Traditional positioning theory emphasizes differentiation and focused targeting [20]. Niche branding [15] seeks deep loyalty and premium pricing from a specific, narrow segment by catering precisely to its needs. The Big Tent model inverts this logic, seeking width over depth, and universal values over segment-specific benefits.

Versus Lovemark Brands: Roberts (2004) describes Lovemarks as brands that inspire "loyalty beyond reason" through a blend of mystery, sensuality, and intimacy. While a Big Tent brand can aspire to be a Lovemark, the latter concept does not inherently address scale. A Lovemark's intimacy might even be at odds with the Big Tent's expansive inclusivity, posing a fascinating sub-paradox: can a brand be intimately loved by millions who share little else in common?

Versus Cultural Branding: Holt's (2004) cultural branding is the process by which a brand becomes an iconic symbol by addressing acute societal contradictions. A Big Tent brand is often the outcome of successful cultural branding, but the terms are not synonymous. Cultural branding explains how a brand builds mythic status; Big Tent branding describes the structural form and strategic management challenges of maintaining that status at a massive scale.

The Allure of the Tent: Synthesis of Documented Advantages

A review of scholarly literature highlights compelling advantages that explain the adoption of Big Tent strategies, focusing on competitive insulation, organizational resilience, and cultural authority.

Market Pre-emption and Sustainable Competitive Advantage

By successfully occupying a broad, value-based position in the cultural landscape, a Big Tent brand can pre-empt competitors from claiming the same ideological space. This creates a sustainable competitive advantage rooted in cultural history and complex associative networks, which are difficult for rivals to replicate quickly or credibly (Holt, 2004). Barney's (1991) Resource-Based View of the firm supports this: a brand community built on authentic historical narratives and deeply held consumer allegiance constitutes a valuable, rare, and imperfectly imitable resource. Dove's "Campaign for Real Beauty," for instance, pre-emptively owned the territory of "authentic, inclusive beauty," forcing competitors like L'Oréal or Revlon to approach similar themes cautiously to avoid being seen as derivative. The first-mover advantage in staking a broad cultural claim can lead to a long-term monopoly on a particular set of consumer ideals.

Resilience Through Expansive, Self-Sustaining Communities

The diverse community fostered under the Big Tent is a source of remarkable brand resilience. Muniz and O'Guinn's (2001) brand community theory posits that such communities provide stability through shared consciousness and moral responsibility. In practice, this means that during a crisis — a product failure, a PR misstep, or an activist attack — a loyal and broad-based community can act as a defensive buffer. Community members often become brand advocates, defending the brand publicly and providing grassroots counter-narratives [12]. Furthermore, these communities are engines of value co-creation [22]. Members generate user-generated content, develop brand-related rituals, and share usage experiences, effectively performing free R&D, marketing, and customer service. This decentralized, participatory ecosystem makes the brand more adaptive and less reliant on top-down communication, enhancing its overall robustness.

Cultural Legitimacy and Accumulated Stakeholder Goodwill

By championing inclusive, often prosocial values, Big Tent brands accumulate cultural legitimacy — a perception that their existence and prominence are socially desirable and appropriate [8]. This legitimacy generates reservoirs of goodwill from consumers, media, employees, and even regulators. Stakeholder Theory [7] elucidates this advantage: by addressing the interests and values of a broad set of stakeholders beyond just shareholders, the firm secures greater latitude, support, and long-term viability. Patagonia's explicit and operationalized commitment to environmentalism, for example, grants it such profound legitimacy that criticisms of its high prices are often neutralized by its perceived ethical superiority. This "legitimacy capital" can be drawn upon in times of controversy, allowing the brand to weather storms that would sink a less esteemed competitor.

Economic Efficiencies of Scale and Scope in Marketing

From an operational perspective, a dominant Big Tent brand achieves significant economies of scale and scope. A single, high-production-value campaign promoting the brand's core ideology can resonate across millions, reducing the need for the costly and complex segmented marketing portfolios that niche-focused portfolios require [24]. Furthermore, the brand's equity, being based on flexible values rather than rigid product associations, facilitates more successful brand extensions [2]. Consumers are more willing to accept the brand in new categories if the extension feels like a logical expression of its core ideology. For instance, Apple's move from computers to music players, phones, and watches was credible because each new product was framed as an innovation that championed simplicity and creative empowerment-the brand's enduring ideological core.

The Cracks in the Canvas: A Critical Analysis of Drawbacks and Paradoxes

The literature is equally rich in documenting the significant risks of the Big Tent approach. These drawbacks are not mere operational challenges but often arise as direct, paradoxical consequences of the strategy's core tenets.

The Central Paradox: Brand Meaning Dilution

The most cited risk is brand dilution-the erosion of a brand's distinctive meaning as it stretches to accommodate broader audiences [1]. Kapferer (2012) warns of the "trap of breadth," where the brand becomes a vague, all-things-to-all-people symbol. When a brand's identity is reduced to broad, agreeable platitudes like "innovation" or "inspiration," it loses its sharp competitive edge, as these claims are easily mimicked. Park et al.'s (1986) brand concept-management framework suggests that a brand's image must be actively managed to remain congruent with its core concept. The Big Tent strategy constantly tests this congruence, risking a hollowing-out of meaning where the brand stands for everything in general and nothing in particular, weakening the intensity of consumer-brand connections.

The Authenticity Paradox and Activist Scrutiny

Big Tent brands that loudly champion social values inevitably attract hyper-scrutiny. This creates the authenticity paradox: to be inclusively credible, the brand must take a stand; but taking a stand makes it a target for exhaustive "authenticity audits" [5], [27]. Any perceived gap between the brand's rhetoric (e.g., "female empowerment") and its operational reality (e.g., gender pay gaps, stereotypical internal culture) is rapidly exposed, leading to accusations of "woke-washing" or hypocrisy [28]. The backlash can be severe and swift, as seen with Pepsi's 2017 ad featuring Kendall Jenner, which attempted to co-opt social justice imagery for commercial gain and was universally condemned as inauthentic and trivializing. The more values-based the tent, the higher the standard for behavioural integrity.

The Alienation Paradox: Polarization Within the Community

In the process of expanding to welcome new groups, the brand may inadvertently alienate its original or core segments — a phenomenon of identity polarization [6]. When a brand evolves its messaging or partnerships to reflect new cultural understandings, long-time customers may perceive this as a betrayal of their shared history and identity. Holt (2002) notes that cultural icons risk "losing their historic authenticity" as they evolve. For example, a heritage brand with patriotic, traditional imagery that pivots to emphasize global citizenship and progressive values may face boycotts and rejection from its once-loyal base, potentially fracturing the community it sought to unite.

The Co-Creation Paradox: Ceding Control to the Community

While community co-creation is a source of strength, it also poses a control paradox. Inviting stakeholders to shape brand meaning decentralizes authority [22]. Sub-groups within the community can hijack the brand's narrative for their own purposes, which may conflict with the brand's broader goals or values. Social media accelerates this, allowing fringe elements to associate the brand with controversial movements. Management must then decide whether to reprimand or disavow parts of its own community-a delicate act that can itself cause alienation. The brand becomes a contested space, and its stewards are not its sole authors.

Operational and Strategic Fragility

Finally, the Big Tent model introduces significant operational complexity. Stakeholder Theory [7] highlights the near-impossible task of satisfying a vast, diverse network of groups with often-conflicting demands. A brand praised for sustainability faces pressure from investors for quarterly growth (which may incentivize cost-cutting on ethical sourcing), from NGOs for radical transparency, and from price-sensitive consumers for affordability. Managing these tensions requires exhausting trade-offs. Furthermore, the brand's success is culturally contingent. Its broad appeal hinges on the continued resonance of its core ideology. A sharp sociocultural shift can render a brand's mythology obsolete, leaving it with a massive, expensive infrastructure tied to an outdated ideal — a risk Holt (2004) calls "cultural obsolescence."

Towards a Theoretical Synthesis: The Strategic Equilibrium Framework

The preceding analysis confirms that the advantages and drawbacks are two sides of the same coin, arising from the same strategic choices. Success, therefore, is not found in avoiding the paradox but in managing a dynamic Strategic Equilibrium. Drawing on the synthesized literature, this paper proposes a framework built on three management imperatives.

Imperative 1: A Principled, Immutable Core with Adaptive Expression

The brand must distinguish between its sacred core and its profane expressions. The core consists of non-negotiable, principled beliefs that are authentically embedded in the organization's DNA. The expressions-campaigns, products, collaborations-are adaptable tools to communicate that core to different constituencies and across time (Tushman & O'Reilly, 1996). Patagonia's core is the "irreducible commitment to saving our home planet"; its expressions range from $900 jackets to "Don't Buy This Jacket" ads to suing the US government. All expressions are coherent translations of the core. This prevents dilution by ensuring all brand activities are filtered through a consistent, meaningful lens.

Imperative 2: Embedded Authenticity Over Superficial Messaging

To mitigate the authenticity paradox, values must be operationalized, not just advertised. This requires what Vredenburg et al. (2020) term "authentic corporate activism," where social stances are backed by substantive action in supply chain management, corporate governance, internal culture, and political lobbying. Ben & Jerry's provides a model: its activism on climate change or racial justice is supported by sourcing practices, grant-making, and B-Corp certification. This embeddedness builds a "reservoir of trust" that can withstand scrutiny when individual campaigns or products miss the mark.

Imperative 3: Tiered Architecture for Community Management

Recognizing that a Big Tent houses a spectrum of engagement is crucial. McAlexander et al. (2002) suggest viewing the community as concentric circles: from devoted, central "insiders" to passive, peripheral "members." Communication and engagement strategies should be tiered accordingly. Insiders might be invited to co-design products or advise on strategy, strengthening their loyalty. The broader mass might be engaged through inspirational mass media. This tiered approach allows for depth of relationship where it matters most, without forcing the entire brand narrative to cater solely to the most vocal fringe, thus managing the co-creation and alienation paradoxes.

A Model of Equilibrium: The Core-Community Fit

Visualized as a model, equilibrium exists when there is a strong fit between the Clarity and Authenticity of the Brand's Core Principle and the Breadth and Engagement of its Community. A weak, vague core cannot support a broad community without dilution (e.g., Gap's failed 2010 rebrand). A strong, rigid core may only ever attract a narrow community (e.g., a niche luxury brand). The sweet spot-the Big Tent-is a strong, authentic core that is flexibly expressed to nurture a broad, engaged community. The manager's role is to constantly monitor and adjust this fit.

Conclusion, Implications, and a Formal Research Agenda

Theoretical and Managerial Implications

This integrative review yields significant implications that extend both scholarly discourse and executive practice. By moving from a descriptive analysis to a paradox-centred framework, it offers clarified pathways for future research and more sober strategic guidance for practitioners.

Theoretical Implications: Advancing the Discourse on Brand Strategy

First, this review contributes to brand strategy theory by formally naming, defining, and problematizing "Big Tent Branding" as a distinct strategic archetype. Prior literature has richly explored related concepts — cultural branding (Holt, 2004), brand communities [17], and authentic activism (Vredenburg et al., 2020) — but often in isolation. This synthesis demonstrates that the Big Tent is the ambitious confluence of these phenomena: it is a cultural brand that explicitly seeks a mass, heterogeneous community through values-based appeals. By framing its central tension as a strategic paradox [29] rather than a simple set of trade-offs, the analysis elevates the discussion. It shifts the scholarly question from "What are the pros and cons?" to "How can opposing forces of inclusivity and dilution be productively sustained over time?" This paradox lens is crucial, as it recognizes that the drawbacks are not external risks to be mitigated, but endogenous tensions generated by the strategy's very success.

Second, the proposed Strategic Equilibrium Framework offers a dynamic model for understanding brand resilience. It challenges static, feature-based models of brand equity (e.g., Aaker, 1997) by emphasizing the relational and contextual nature of strength for mass-appeal brands. The framework posits that equity is not a monolithic score but a function of the ongoing fit between a non-negotiable core and an adaptable community. This aligns with and extends ambidexterity theory (Tushman & O'Reilly, 1996) into the domain of brand identity, suggesting that the most resilient brands are those capable of "exploiting" a stable core identity while "exploring" new expressions and audience connections. Furthermore, it integrates stakeholder theory [7] at the brand level, providing a template for mapping and managing the often-competing expectations of a diverse brand community.

Finally, this review refines the theory of brand dilution. It argues that for Big Tent brands, dilution is not merely the over-extension of product associations [2], but more profoundly, the erosion of ideological credibility. Dilution occurs when the expansive, flexible expressions of the brand cease to be credible translations of its core principle, rendering the brand's values performative and its community fragile. This conceptualization links brand strategy more directly to literature on organizational hypocrisy [28] and authentic leadership.

Managerial Implications: A Cautionary Framework for Strategic Choice

For practitioners, this review serves not as a prescriptive handbook but as a cautionary framework for strategic choice and identity stewardship.

The primary implication is a fundamental recalibration of risk assessment. The allure of the Big Tent — mass appeal, cultural relevance, premium valuation—can obscure its high-stakes nature. Managers must understand that adopting this strategy is not a low-risk path to growth but a commitment to managing a high-stakes strategic identity. It demands what we term existential consistency: every major decision, from product development and supply chain management to marketing communications and CEO activism, must be vetted for congruence with the brand's proclaimed core values. The fallout from missteps is not merely a failed campaign but a legitimacy crisis that can unravel community trust rapidly, as seen in cases of perceived "woke-washing."

Consequently, this review argues that the tent's structural strength is determined less by the size of its poles — the marketing budget, media spend, and distribution muscle — and more by the integrity of its foundational stakes. A massive budget can raise a tent quickly, but only deeply embedded, operationalized principles can anchor it against cultural storms. This shifts managerial focus from communication tactics to organizational design and governance. It implies investing in mechanisms that ensure values are embedded: embedding ESG metrics in executive compensation, instituting ethical sourcing audits, creating community advisory boards, and fostering an internal culture that lives the brand's external promises.

The Equilibrium Framework provides a practical diagnostic tool. Managers can regularly audit their brand's position by asking:

Core Clarity: Is our central principle absolutely clear, non-negotiable, and authentically embodied in our operations?

Expression Flexibility: Are our campaigns and innovations perceived as fresh, relevant, and inclusive adaptations of that core, or as opportunistic departures from it?

Community Cohesion: Are we fostering a sense of shared belonging among diverse members, or are we allowing (or causing) factionalism and polarization within our community?

Ultimately, this review advises that the decision to pursue a Big Tent strategy should be a deliberate one, made with the full understanding that it requires a permanently paradoxical mindset. The leader's role becomes that of a paradox navigator, not a problem solver, continuously balancing expansion with focus, inclusivity with integrity, and cultural currency with timeless principle. For many organizations, a focused, niche-driven strategy may be a more sustainable and lower-risk path. For those who choose the Big Tent, this review provides the map to its inherent contradictions, arguing that success lies not in avoiding them, but in mastering the dynamic tension they create.

Further Research: A Formal Agenda

To advance beyond this conceptual review, future empirical work is essential. The following propositions offer a starting point:

P1: The relationship between brand community breadth and brand strength is curvilinear (inverted U-shaped), with strength increasing up to an optimal point of breadth, after which dilution effects dominate and strength declines.

P2: Brands that score higher on measures of "embedded authenticity" (e.g., B-Corp status, substantive CSR investment, executive compensation tied to ESG goals) will demonstrate greater resilience (less stock volatility, faster recovery) following a controversy related to their core values than brands with only rhetorical authenticity.

P3: Consumer perceptions of a Big Tent brand's authenticity will be more strongly influenced by the actions and communications of fellow community members (peer co-creators) than by official brand communications, particularly in social media environments.

P4: There is a "cultural velocity" effect: Big Tent brands in fast-moving cultural categories (e.g., fashion, social media) will experience more frequent and severe cycles of expansion and contraction than those in slower-moving categories (e.g., outdoor equipment, automotive), requiring different equilibrium management tactics.

Methodologically, testing these propositions calls for mixed-methods approaches: large-scale panel data to trace brand strength and breadth over time (P1); event studies of corporate crises (P2); network analysis and sentiment tracking of social media brand communities (P3); and comparative historical case studies across industries (P4).

In conclusion, the Big Tent branding strategy encapsulates a central dilemma of modern capitalism: the tension between the scale demanded by markets and the authenticity demanded by people. This review has argued that this is not a problem to be solved but a paradox to be managed with strategic discipline, ethical consistency, and a deep understanding of the dynamic community one seeks to host. As societal fragmentation and the demand for corporate responsibility both intensify, the strategic management of the Big Tent Paradox will remain a critical frontier for both marketing scholarship and practice.

REFERENCES

[1] D. A. Aaker, "Should you take your brand to where the action is?," Harvard Business Review, vol. 75, no. 5, pp. 135–143, 1997.
[2] D. A. Aaker and K. L. Keller, "Consumer evaluations of brand extensions," Journal of Marketing, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 27–41, 1990.
[3] A. Arvidsson and A. Caliandro, "Brand public," Journal of Consumer Research, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 727–748, 2016.
[4] J. B. Barney, "Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage," Journal of Management, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 99–120, 1991.
[5] M. B. Beverland, "Crafting brand authenticity: The case of luxury wines," Journal of Management Studies, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 1003–1029, 2005.
[6] C. B. Bhattacharya and S. Sen, "Consumer–company identification," Journal of Marketing, vol. 67, no. 2, pp. 76–88, 2003.
[7] R. E. Freeman, Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
[8] J. M. Handelman, "Corporate identity and the societal constituent," Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 107–114, 2006.
[9] D. B. Holt, "Why do brands cause trouble?," Journal of Consumer Research, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 70–90, 2002.
[10] D. B. Holt, How Brands Become Icons: The Principles of Cultural Branding. Harvard Business Press, 2004.
[11] E. Izberk-Bilgin, "Infidel brands," Journal of Consumer Research, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 663–687, 2012.
[12] W. Jarvis et al., "Customer engagement in CSR," Journal of Service Theory and Practice, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 833–853, 2017.
[13] J. N. Kapferer, The New Strategic Brand Management, 5th ed. Kogan Page, 2012.
[14] K. L. Keller, Strategic Brand Management, 4th ed. Pearson, 2013.
[15] P. Kotler and K. L. Keller, Marketing Management, 15th ed. Pearson, 2016.
[16] J. H. McAlexander, J. W. Schouten and H. F. Koenig, "Building brand community," Journal of Marketing, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 38–54, 2002.
[17] A. M. Muniz Jr. and T. C. O'Guinn, "Brand community," Journal of Consumer Research, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 412–432, 2001.