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Author’s Note

I want to be a storyteller when I grow up. It’s the reason why I studied journalism as an undergrad. I was fascinated by the idea that everyone, as cliché as it may sound, has a story to share and I could play a role in helping them share it. I’m not exactly sure when I turned my attention to advertising and marketing as a career pursuit, but I do know that my favorite part about putting together a weekly newspaper in college was getting to write the headline. It was an opportunity and challenge to capture the essence of a news item and the attention of the reader in a limited space. It required brevity, creativity and quick, but critical, thinking. Advertising demands the same type of skills and provides another opportunity to be a storyteller – this time, through brands.

For this project, I wanted to try to contribute some unique aspect to brand storytelling. A couple of concepts we discussed in class as part of this M.A. Strategic Communications program really stuck with me and became the inspiration for this paper. First, brand archetypes are a simple but profound way to articulate the meaning of brands and the motivations for consumers to engage with them. How could this concept be incorporated to address a current communication issue? Second, discussion surrounding strategic self-presentation and how individuals “act” in purposeful ways to project a certain image seemed extremely relevant today, given our cultural climate and the saturation of social media as a tool for both individuals and brands to project a desirable image.

Combining these ideas together, I arrived at this question – how can brand archetypes help organizational and brand communicators more effectively manage
their social media presence? To answer that question, a literature review and three forms of research, including expert interviews, a content analysis and focus groups were conducted. On another level, my hope for this paper is to help elevate social media above oversimplified “tips and tricks” for management and position it as topic that deserves respect, higher-level thinking and careful consideration as part of the evolving promotional mix for marketers.

**Introduction**

“Like us on Facebook.” It’s a phrase that has injected itself into the cultural lexicon. The global social network phenomenon has paved the way for an explosion of similar sites, such as Twitter, Instagram, LinkedIn, Google+ and Pinterest. All are promising, in some form or another, greater connectivity between individuals.

Use of social networks is still growing. In Nielsen’s 2012 report on social media, over 520 billion minutes – total of personal computer, mobile app and mobile web time – were spent on social networking sites in the United States in July 2012 alone, a 21 percent year-over-year increase. That total means people are spending more time on social networks than any other site category, making up 20 percent of all personal computing time and 30 percent of all mobile time (p. 4).

**Follow the Leaders**

Naturally, brands see social media as an opportunity for greater connectivity between themselves and consumers, launching Facebook brand pages and Twitter accounts to attract some of those visitors. Instead of clicking the “like” button to show your approval for a friend’s political opinion, weight-loss resolution or latest
vacation photo, brands are hoping that “liking” its brand page will be the beginning of a beautiful friendship...or at least a first step in becoming a loyal brand advocate.

With these efforts, brands are managing to get attention, both positively and negatively. Oreo, named to Advertising Age's 2013 “Digital A-List,” lit up the social scene during the Super Bowl when the lights literally went out during the game. When it tweeted an image with the words, “You can still dunk in the dark,” within the first hour, it was retweeted 15,811 times and liked on Facebook 19,610 times (Schultz, 2013).

However, examples of brands’ misuse of social media are just as likely to grab headlines. On March 6, 2013, the day Taco Bell promised to release the Cool Ranch Doritos taco, failed to do so and its Facebook page became a sounding board for over 3,000 fans to vent their frustration (Edwards, 2013).

**Rules of Engagement**

The meaningful impact these interactions have on relationship intensity and return-on-investment seems to be inconclusive. On one hand, 65 percent of social media users say they will, at least once a month, learn about a brand, product or service; 53 percent will compliment a brand; and 50 percent will express concerns about a brand or service (Nielsen, p. 20). On the other hand, only 17 percent say they feel more connected to brands seen on social networking sites (p. 17) and the report offers no insight as to what this greater “connection” looks like. Additionally, in any given week, less than 0.5 percent of Facebook users interact with brands they are fans of (Nelson-Field & Taylor, 2012, p. 3). In this study, the authors defined interaction as taking the Facebook metric “People Talking About This”, which
includes the initial liking, liking specific content on a page, posting to a wall, commenting, sharing a post or other content from a page, answering a question, photo tagging, check-ins or RSVPing to an event, but removing the initial liking. By extracting this number, the authors suggest that this reveals the actual ongoing interaction brands seek to develop with consumers (p 3).

Consequently, communications professionals are trying to identify sound strategies for carrying their respective brands into the social media space.

**Story Time**

One emerging theme within these discussions has been the concept of storytelling. Kathy Oneto, vice president of brand strategy at Anthem Worldwide, in an article for *Fast Company*, called “story” the genre of choice in 2012, noting a number of industry articles identifying the trend. But Oneto was quick to point out the need to transform our understanding of story in the evolving marketplace:

“When it comes to brands and marketing, the application of story now needs to go beyond the traditional and ubiquitous tool of brand story; rather, it’s about engaging consumers in a brand’s stories and using the construct of stories and storytelling to create powerful connections” (Oneto, 2012).

Oneto goes onto cite Latitude, a research consultancy, and the recommendations they provide on telling effective stories based on their research. These recommendations include making stories immersive, interactive, integrated and impactful.
In the Beginning

So where do brands start? That leads to the purpose of this paper.

First, the literature review will further explore brand storytelling and social media research along with related concepts such as strategic self-presentation, brand personalities and, of particular interest, brand archetypes. The development of brand archetypes, grown out of archetypal psychology, attempts to help us “understand the intrinsic meaning of product categories and consequently helps marketers create enduring brand identities that establish market dominance, evoke and deliver meaning to consumers, and inspire customer loyalty...” (Mark, 2001, p. 12).

In a cover story for QRCA Views, a qualitative research publication, Fritz Grutzner, president and founder of the brand strategy firm Brandgarten, discussed the psychological foundation of brand archetypes.

C.G. Jung used the term “archetype” to refer to universal ideas or characters he found appearing consistently in dreams and stories from cultures around the globe. He felt that the archetypes were what made up the content of our “collective unconscious.” These characters shared fundamental similarities across time and across geographies (Grutzner, 2011, p. 18).

Professional and academic work relating to brand archetypes provides the inspiration for much of this paper’s original research, which will follow the literature review.
The use of brand archetypes on social media will primarily be examined through Facebook brand pages. Despite the increasing number of competitors, Facebook continues to be a social network behemoth. In July 2012, Nielsen reported that Facebook registered over a 150 million unique PC visitors. The next closest social site was Blogger with over 58 million unique visitors (p. 7). Over the same period, 17 percent of total consumer PC time was spent on Facebook (p. 4). Given its popularity among web users, organizations have seemingly chosen it as the go-to place for its social brand extension.

Researching brand pages on Facebook should then reveal interesting insights as to how effective brands are in maintaining archetypal consistency on Facebook; how easily consumers can identify various archetypes; and how easily they can relate them to their overall perceptions of those brands. These insights should help brands better transfer its overarching archetype to its social media presence, meaning brands will have a better guide for leveraging consumer interactions on networking sites.
Literature Review

Strategic Self-Presentation

Brands supposedly see an opportunity to engage with consumers on social networks. But that engagement is a two-way street. So where did brands get this idea – that consumers, with varying degrees of interests and loyalties to this or that product, care enough to engage with them? Some insight may be found in looking at research on strategic self-presentation.

Jones and Pittman (1982), citing Erving Goffman’s impression management work in 1959 in coining the term of self-presentation, suggest that the emphasis of his work was on the ways individuals, or actors, “perform” in certain public interactions based on their understanding of how they should behave in those moments. Jones and Pittman seek further exploration in a secondary emphasis – that individuals can and will take an active role in projecting their personalities in an attempt to shape how others see them. The authors formally call this strategic self-presentation and define it as “those features of behavior affected by power augmentation motives designed to elicit or shape others’ attributions of the actor’s dispositions” (p. 233).

Noting that this theory has to be rooted in a clear social motive, in this case, power, Jones and Pittman move forward in outlining five categories of self-presentation strategies: Ingratiation, Intimidation, Self-Promotion, Exemplification, Supplication:
1. **Ingratiation.** The actor is mostly concerned about being liked. They desire to be perceived as being warm, funny and charming. This can be off-putting if the ingratiation tactic is obvious. The “ingratiator’s dilemma” occurs when the actor’s desire to be liked by a particular target goes up, so the motivation to try harder also goes up, resulting in the chance for success going down.

2. **Intimidation.** The actor wants to be feared or believed and may try to convince others that he or she is dangerous. Typically, this is demonstrated in a high-power to low-power situation, such as a boss and employee. But there are exceptions, such as a child exercising their power over a parent in the grocery store begging for candy.

3. **Self-Promotion.** The actor seeks attribution of competence, whether it’s in their general ability or a specific skill. The “self-promoter paradox” is that it is difficult to claim competency, even if credible, because of the negative qualities, such as arrogance, that might be assigned to the individual making those claims.

4. **Exemplification.** The actor wants to demonstrate integrity and moral worthiness. They want to be thought of as honest, generous and self-sacrificing, and influence others by modeling this behavior.

5. **Supplication.** The actor advertises dependence to solicit help. By appearing weak and projecting dependence, a more “powerful” person will feel the moral and societal imperative to help. In stereotypical gender
roles, a woman might try to appear physically fragile to get help from a man, who wants to be thought of as masculine and strong.

While Jones and Pitman’s article highlights how individuals will take specific actions in shaping others’ impressions, and specific ways to do that, there has been more recent research that carries forward the concept of self-presentation online.

In 1999, Dominick saw personal home pages as carefully crafted forms of self-presentation. With an initial coding sample of over 500 web pages, one of the author’s goals was to see if Jones and Pittman’s self-presentation strategies were also used online. Whittling down the number of coded sites to 319 for various reasons (i.e. the author didn’t want to examine commercial sites), the coders determined that 270 of them classified as using one of the five self-presentation strategies with most of them, 58 percent, being identified as ingratiation (p. 652). Additionally, in his findings, Dominick discusses the web page authors’ use of web links as a self-presentation tactic called social association. “By providing a set of links to other sites, a person is indirectly defining himself/herself. In short, they are saying, here are other places I think are worthwhile to visit” (p. 655).

Schau and Gilly (2003), examining why and how individuals use personal websites, also discuss this type of phenomenon – referring to it as digital association. Citing previous research, the authors suggest that the mediation of things is one of the most important ways in which people socially relate to one another and that a relationship between a person and an object is not two-way (person-thing), but three-way (person-thing-person) (p. 388). As an example, if a consumer purchases a pair of Nike shoes, the consumer isn’t just buying Nike to
associate himself or herself with what he or she believes to be the qualities Nike represents (athleticism, strength, ability to overcome adversity). The idea is that other individuals will associate the same qualities with Nike, see the consumer’s Nike purchase and associate those same Nike qualities with the consumer.

Continuing the example, digital association takes place when a consumer blogs about their Nike purchase.

In their research, the authors examined 23 personal websites for a content analysis and conducted face-to-face interviews with each of the websites’ authors. There were also follow-up correspondences with the authors via email. Based on these interviews, Schau and Gilly determined that one of the appeals of creating a personal website for the authors was the allure of a worldwide audience. By utilizing “digital association”, website authors have established a new form of possession. This, Schau and Gilly suggest, makes the selection of brands for digital association that much more meaningful. “Because digital associations offer no use value to consumers creating personal sites, the brands’ symbolic values are explicitly and consciously considered before consumers communicate with the online world” (p. 399). Moreover, because online associations aren’t bound to financial or geographic restrictions, digital consumers “can activate a type of cobranding, commingling brand logos, and creating relationships between brands” (p. 400). Individuals as curators of their online identity, without these financial and geographic limitations, can digitally associate themselves with any brand they want. Simultaneously, because these online identities are meant for public consumption, individuals are more likely to be very selective in associating with those brands.
Using the “Big Five” human personality characteristics, openness, conscientiousness, agreeableness, extraversion and neuroticism (p. 403), Seidman (2012) studies the use of Facebook to fulfill needs of belonging and self-presentation. The author had participants complete a survey assessing personality and Facebook behaviors and motivations. Seidman summarizes the key findings:

High agreeableness and neuroticism were the best predictors of belongingness. Belongingness motivations are strong in agreeable individuals and these results suggest that Facebook is one tool by which they meet these needs. Neurotic individuals often have social difficulties; thus Facebook may be away for them to meet belongingness needs not sufficiently met offline. High neuroticism and low conscientiousness were the best predictors of self-presentation. Conscientious individuals are cautious in their online self-presentations. Neurotic individuals may use Facebook as a safe place for self-presentation, including hidden and ideal self-aspects. Mediational analyses suggest that the opportunity to express these self-aspects motivates the greater use of Facebook as a tool for personal disclosure (p. 405-406).

This section of the literature review shows that individuals can take an active role in presenting themselves, both in face-to-face interactions and, for the purposes of this study, online. To do this, individuals seem comfortable in carefully curating digital associations and Facebook provides such an opportunity to do so. In the next section, this concept will be further explored specifically through social media and how brands are trying to adapt.
**Social Media**

Social media plays a hybrid role in a brand’s promotion mix – at least that’s what Mangold and Faulds (2009) suggest. They define the first role of social as being in line with traditional integrated marketing communications (IMC) tools, meaning they can be used to talk to their customers. What makes social media unique is that it allows customers to communicate with one another. This is considered an extension of word-of-mouth communication, but those conversations have the ability to reach an exponential number of people (p. 359). The authors demonstrate these conversations in a new communications paradigm (p. 360) (Appendix 1).

Mangold and Faulds also emphasize the importance brands having a social media presence and that staying away or being silent on these channels is not an option, saying, “ignoring the realities of the impact of information transmitted through these forums on consumer behavior is tantamount to surrendering the communications process to the vagaries of the marketplace” (p. 365).

Kietzmann et al (2011) reference a 2010 quote from BBC Business Editor Tim Weber that, in essence, may capture what scares brands about staying silent on social media. “These days, one witty tweet, one clever blog post, one devastating video – forwarded to hundreds of friends at the click of a mouse – can snowball and kill a product or damage a company’s share price” (p. 242). The authors use this to segue into a “honeycomb” model that organizations can use to determine the specific functionality of a social site. Within the honeycomb, there are seven foundational blocks: identity, reputation, relationships, presence, sharing, conversations and groups (p. 243) (Appendix 2).
For each social network, categories are shaded in to varying degrees to represent what each network emphasizes. As an example, LinkedIn's main emphasis is identity, Foursquare is about presence, YouTube is about sharing, and Facebook is about relationships (p. 248) (Appendix 3). While this model provides a nice visual tool for brands to identify the function of social networks, there isn’t much discussion beyond tactical interaction with customers and, again, no real mention or recommendations for maintaining brand integrity.

**Storytelling**

Escalas (2004) says that people use stories to better understand their world, make sense of their own lives and figure out who they are as individuals and members of society (p. 168). She cites previous research on how narrative processing and the typical structure of a story – goals, actions and outcomes – helps stories to be stored in our memories and how they are likely to be self-related. She reasons then that a link can be created between brands and an ad story through perceived psychological benefits, labeling them “self-brand connections” or SBCs (p. 168).

The author describes the narrative process as it relates to a consumer purchase. In this case, it’s the purchase of a Volkswagen Passat:

An initial event (having two children) resulted in a psychological state (felt need for increased safety) that led to the formation of goals (buying a bigger car). Next, the consumer researches which car to buy (action) and purchases the car (outcome) (p. 169).
Escalas wanted to test a hypothesis – that consumers, with the help of narrative processing, develop self-brand connections and use the SBCs to shape their own identity. Performing an experiment that involved presenting ad-like objects in the form of storyboards, some using narrative structures and others without, the author found that narrative processing does improve the development of self-brand connections and that these SBCs are associated with better attitudes toward the brand and higher likelihood of purchase. Escalas concludes: “The meaning of a brand is often the result of its part of a story. Through the narrative meaning-making process, some brands become more important and valuable than others to consumers, becoming connected to consumers’ sense of self” (p. 176).

As mentioned previously, the unique aspect of social media is that consumers can talk about brands among themselves. Woodside et al (2008) suggest that storytelling doesn’t just help individuals assign meanings to events, but also encourages the act of sharing that story with others. Citing previous research, the authors say that storytelling is inherently pleasurable for the storyteller, allowing him or her to vent frustrations or relive positive experiences and to live out a archetype fulfillment as the protagonist in his or her story (p. 100).

In their study, the authors performed a complex content analysis to determine whether consumers, when retelling stories involving brands (in this case, through blogs), were more apt to tell it in a narrative/drama or lecture (attribute-benefit-satisfaction) structure. Woodside et al found that consumers, as authors of a personal experience relating to a brand, tend to adopt a narrative structure. Brands playing the “supporting role” in the drama help the protagonist achieve his/her
goals, consciously and/or unconsciously, and likely helps build very favorable consumer-brand relationships (p. 128).

**Brand Personality**

Ang and Lim (2006) suggest that brand personality affords organizations a sustainable advantage because it is more difficult to imitate than product attributes. They cite previous studies that demonstrate brand personalities’ ability to evoke emotions, build trust and loyalty and enhance consumer preference (p. 39). Using print ads with verbal and pictorial metaphors, the authors found that metaphors presented in either form can influence brand personality perceptions, saying that brands using the metaphors were perceived to be more sophisticated and exciting, although also perceived as less sincere and competent (p. 49). Despite this, Ang and Lim suggest that their findings mean metaphors can be strategically used “for creating or modifying desired brand personality perceptions” (p. 50).

In pursuit of developing a brand personality construct, Jennifer Aaker (1997) defines brand personality as the set of human characteristics associated with a brand (p. 347). To start, Aaker cites previous research suggesting that there will be a greater preference for a brand when it is able to associate itself with human characteristics that describe the actual or ideal self (p. 348). Using this logic, the author draws from the research on the “Big Five” human personality types to move the understanding of brand personality.

Using a complex factor analysis to identify brand personality dimensions, part of which involved asking participants to use a five-point Likert scale to
measure to what extent 114 personality traits describe 37 different brands, Aaker concludes that consumers perceive brands to have five distinct personality dimensions: sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication, and ruggedness (p. 353). Using a confirmatory factor analysis, Aaker believes a reliable, valid and generalizable 42-item Brand Personality Scale can be used as a comprehensive brand personality framework describing each of the five personality dimensions (p. 353).

Freling and Forbes (2005) used Aaker's personality dimensions in six different ad treatments (the five plus one with no brand personality) and studied reactions to them. They found that “A strong, positive brand personality also leads to more brand associations that are favorable, unique, strong and congruent – thus enhancing brand equity” (p. 409).

But there is debate over whether human personality characteristics are the best way to express brand personality types. Caprara et al (2001) designed a study to have subjects first describe their perceptions of three brand personalities and then their own personalities (p. 382). The authors found that the Big Five model only matched up fully when subjects describe their own personalities. Brand structures reflected blends of the Big Five and only two broader factors being identifiable – agreeableness/emotional stability and extroversion/openness.

The authors suggest, “while it may be possible to describe brand personalities with only a few factors, it is unlikely that the same factors used to describe human personality are suitable for the description of brands” (p. 392).
In their conclusion, the authors do not dismiss the importance of determining traits within brands and call for more research to better understand contextual meanings of words that shape brands’ personalities (p. 393).

**Brand Archetypes**

Mark and Pearson (2001) describe archetypes as a system for brands to manage meanings. Rooted in psychological concepts originally developed by psychologist C.G. Jung, the authors describe archetypal psychology as helping us “understand the intrinsic meaning of product categories and consequently help marketers create enduring brand identities that establish market dominance, evoke and deliver meaning to customers, and inspire customer loyalty – all, potentially in socially responsible ways” (p. 12).

The authors are confident in their approach based on research and experience. Pearson, at the time of the writing, had spent 30 years developing a reliable framework and applying it to leadership and organizational development and marketing (p. 12). Mark has experience in applying deep human insights and constructs to marketing for clients (p. 12).

The resulting system describes 12 archetypes: Creator, Caregiver, Ruler, Jester, Regular Guy/Gal, Lover, Hero, Outlaw, Magician, Innocent, Explorer, and Sage. The authors dedicate a chapter to each of the archetypes, describing them in-depth and dissecting them to illustrate the “Call”, or motivation, the different “Levels”, or messaging that might appeal to this target audience, and what “Shadows”, or negative aspects, of each archetype might exist (Appendix 4).
Mark and Pearson describe the relationships between these archetypes through motivational theory, condensing human motivation into four major areas positioned along two axes: Belonging/People and Independence/Self-Actualization running along a horizontal access left-to-right and Stability/Control and Risk/Mastery running top-to-bottom along a vertical access (p. 14) (Appendix 5).

Tsai (2006) argues that in order to achieve an icon status, brands have to do more than incorporate an archetypal strategy because the brand archetype that ultimately emerges is dependent on the consumers’ imagination – so it’s more about consumer perception than brand projection. “The representation of archetypal symbolism is actually an outcome that the consumer engineers through creative imagination, so whether or not the archetypal symbolism is perceived as a brand icon depends on how the consumer imagination creates the brand representation” (p. 654).

The author arrives at this conclusion after conducting 810 in-depth interviews with loyal consumers of the Nike Air Jordan brand. While emphasizing the impact the consumer imagination has on transforming a brand archetype into a brand icon, Tsai doesn’t dismiss the “universality” of the brand archetype idea. Instead, the author suggests that, in order to be effective, brands must align an archetype paradigm with other marketing approaches that consider the consumer’s utilitarian and affective goals. “Alongside symbolic representation, brand marketers must steer their endeavors towards assuring
the utilitarian quality and performance, as well as fostering the emotional values perceived by the consumer” (p. 660).

**Moving Forward**

The following are the highlights from the literature review:

- Individuals look to interact with brands online to help tell their personal story. By “liking” a brand page on Facebook, consumers are engaging in this digital association.
- Different social networks, such as LinkedIn, Twitter and Facebook all serve different functions.
- As mentioned in the Introduction, Facebook is the dominant social network. It is the most widely used network and, according to the literature, serves the widest range of functionality. It will be the research lens through which this paper examines social media.
- Through narrative processing, or storytelling, individuals are better able to process information and build self-brand connections.
- Brand archetypes, rooted in psychology, are recognized as a foundational way to build and maintain a brand identity and narrative.
- Attempts to measure brand personalities may provide an insight as to measuring brand archetypes online.
- Brands, key consumer influencers, and the general public are all, to some degree, controlling the ultimate brand message.
Research Questions

In the Literature Review summary, the foundation for wanting to better understand the relationship between brand archetypes and social media is laid. Through digital association, individuals have a desire to connect with brands and social media provides the perfect environment to help individuals achieve that. Storytelling builds a narrative between brands and consumers and brand archetypes are a very powerful way to articulate a brand’s meaning and develop that narrative. Building on this foundation, the following research questions regarding brand archetypes and social media are put forth:

RQ1. How do brand archetypes work in practice?
RQ2. How can brand archetypes, in theory, be applied to social media?
RQ3. Do archetypes currently translate to Facebook brand pages?
RQ4. How do consumers relate brands to archetypes?
RQ5. Do consumers recognize a connection between a brand’s overall archetype and its social media archetype?

Method 1 – Expert Interviews

In an attempt to answer the first two research questions, interviews were conducted with two brand archetype experts. While neither interviewee claimed to be a social media specialist, their understanding of brand archetypes and practical application with clients should enhance the brand archetype foundation laid out in the literature review and, in theory, the role of archetypes as it relates to social media. Each interview was conducted over the phone (Margaret Mark on April 8,
2013; Fritz Grutzner on April 22, 2013) and lasted about 45 minutes. A brief background of each interviewee is provided here:

**Margaret Mark, President, Margaret Mark Strategic Insight (MMSI)**

Margaret Mark is one of the leading thinkers on brand archetypes. With co-author Carol Pearson, she wrote one of the seminal pieces of literature on the topic, *The Hero and the Outlaw: Building Extraordinary Brands Through the Power of Archetypes* (2001). She’s a former Executive Vice President at Young and Rubicam, a marketing and communications agency. Now at Margaret Market Strategic Insight (MMSI), she continues to use archetypes to help clients identify their optimal branding platform.

**Fritz Grutzner, President and Founder, Brandgarten**

Fritz Grutzner started his brand strategy firm over eight years ago, basing their approach on the concept of brand archetypes. He is a former Marketing Vice President at Johnson & Johnson and a former Account Executive at advertising agency Campbell Mithun.

**Results 1 – Expert Interviews**

**Interview with Margaret Mark**

While the interview with Mark covered a lot of territory relating to brand archetypes and social media, there were three main insights that may be most appropriate to this paper: her discussion on brand consistency, challenging archetypes and applying archetypes to social media dialogue (*Appendix 6 for full transcript*).
Mark said that managing archetypes is especially challenging in today’s marketing environment. Even if a brand has done the right research and taken the right steps to crystallize the archetype, there are so many opportunities for the brand archetype to be diluted.

“Now you got all of these handoffs. So you got a traditional ad agency to deal with and maybe you’ve hired some people who are really good at social media and a design company that’s going to reexamine your packaging and another kind of company that’s going to help with promotion across your portfolio. So maybe you’re dealing with a half a dozen or a dozen vendors or partners of one kind or another and they’ve all got to get it.”

In discussing carrying over various archetypes to social media, Mark mentioned the Lover archetype as, potentially, being the most challenging.

“Because on one level, the Lover is about intimacy and so much of social media is not about intimacy, it’s about transparency. But that’s not to say that it couldn’t be. There’s the level of the Lover that’s feeling some loving connection to the planet, to the Earth, to each other. But again, the character of that, the benefit you’d derive from that, would be really different from say the Explorer or the Outlaw.”

Social networks offer opportunities for consumers to directly engage in conversations with brands, and Mark thinks it’s important for brands to translate the “archetypal essence” into all of these various conversations taking place with stakeholders.
Mark is quick to point out that this translating shouldn’t act as some sort of straitjacket, because you can’t really control what happens on social media. But, Mark says, you can shape the overall narrative of those conversations, which isn’t that much different from shaping the traditional advertising narrative. Mark compares it to putting together episodes that make up a television show season.

“They don’t decide what’s going to happen on Mad Men next week. They have a whole narrative for the season, maybe for the life of the program there is a narrative, I’m not sure – but certainly for the season. Then, once you’ve decided what’s that story you’re going to tell this season, you say, ‘Well, how does each spot or each episode I create fit in that larger narrative?’ That’s how I envision it taking shape in brand engagement or social media – that you anticipate the narrative structure, the narrative flow, and the benefits that accrue from that.”

**Interview with Fritz Grutzner**

Most of the interview with Grutzner centered around the “timeless” quality of archetypes – that the strength of these types of stories speak across cultures and demographics *(Appendix 7 for transcript)*. He talked about archetypes’ ability to connect with people at an emotional level.

“Storytelling and archetypes, which is a form of storytelling, are very powerful way of making sure that in your brand strategy, that you’re basing it on an emotional benefit. I think the timeless piece of that is that emotion wins. Emotion is going to win over time. If you win the heart, you’re going
win the head. Storytelling is an easy way for clients to understand a
technique for making sure your brand connects on an emotional level.”

He also said social media provides another opportunity to make those deep, emotional connections. But like Mark, Grutzner suggested that archetypes can act as more of an organizing principle than a way to message consistently on social networks.

“Because it’s two-way, it opens up a bigger opportunity for emotional connection with people...If you’re good at telling the story in a consistent way and delivering on the emotional part people that are looking for for your brand, I think you’ll self-select and attract those kind of people and engage in a conversation with them over social media.”

**Method 2 – Content Analysis**

A content analysis of several Facebook brand pages was conducted to reveal to what extent brands with established archetypes are carrying them over to their Facebook brand page counterparts. The structure of the coding sheet was adapted from an analysis Aaker had done in attempting to measure brand personality dimensions based on the “Big Five” human personality traits (1997).

First, using Mark and Pearson’s book on brand archetypes (2001), six single-word personality traits were assigned for each of the 12 archetypes *(Appendix 8)*. Next, Facebook brand pages were selected to represent each archetype. Again, these brands were listed as strong examples of archetypal brands in Mark and Pearson’s book and include Home Depot (Creator), AT&T (Caregiver), American Express
(Ruler), Miller Lite (Jester), Wendy’s (Regular Guy/Gal), Hallmark (Lover), Nike (Hero), Harley-Davidson (Outlaw), Mastercard (Magician), Coca-Cola (Innocent), Levi’s (Explorer) and Barnes & Noble (Sage) (Appendix 9).

Three coders, selected because of their relationship with the author, were asked to spend five to ten minutes with each selected Facebook brand page and rank each of the 72 personality traits on a five-point Likert scale (1=not at all descriptive, 5=extremely descriptive) (Appendix 10). The author did not conduct an content analysis because of bias – knowing which Facebook brand represented each archetype.

**Results 2 – Content Analysis**

After the coding was completed, two tactics were used in an attempt to interpret findings. First, “scores” for each personality trait were tallied for each of the Facebook pages, so there was a maximum score of 15 for each personality trait. Because six traits were selected to make-up an archetype, the top six trait scores were used to assign each Facebook brand page a new archetype. If there were tie scores, the author chose the trait that showed the most consistency between the coders. For example, if two traits scored a “12”, the trait with a “4, 4, 4” score was selected over the trait with the “5, 5, 2” score.

This tactic revealed that only three brand pages, Barnes & Noble, Nike and Wendy’s, maintained their original archetype – Sage, Hero and Regular Guy/Girl respectively. It’s also interesting to note that the Caregiver archetype was prevalent across many of the brands, including Hallmark, Mastercard and Home Depot. The
original archetype for these brands was the Lover, Magician, and Creator respectively. This may show that the default approach for many brands on social networks is to show that brands want to demonstrate care for their consumers, acting mostly as an extension of their customer service.

Many of the remaining brands either didn’t match their original archetype or were scattered across multiple archetypes, so a true archetype was too difficult to assign. This may reveal the difficulty brands are having in transitioning their “true” archetype to the social media space or that certain archetypes are more challenging than others to translate on social media.

The next step was to find an average score for each brands’ original archetype traits based on Mark and Pearson’s assignments. Barnes & Noble (Sage) ranked the highest with a score of 3.5, while American Express (Ruler) ranked the lowest at 1.89. Most brands scored under 3, which could, again, mean brands aren’t being perceived as being true to their original archetypes.

Finally, a “map” of the brand pages and their personality trait plot points can be seen on Appendix 11. As mentioned previously, this shows the propensity for brand pages to embody Caregiver personality traits. It also shows the dearth of Hero, Outlaw and Lover traits. Nike is the only brand to show any Hero qualities, which makes sense because Nike’s original archetype is the Hero.

If we are to assume that these 12 brands are still maintaining the overall archetype assigned to them by Mark and Pearson, the content analysis reveals that brands aren’t aligning themselves with that archetype on social media.
Method 3 – Focus Groups

The content analysis established a somewhat measurable way to assign brand archetypes to Facebook brand pages based on consumers’ perceptions of the existence of personality traits present within each archetype. Focus groups were selected as a research tactic to build on consumer perceptions of Facebook brand pages and archetypes, but from a different, and hopefully deeper level to better understand the “why” behind consumer perceptions.

Two focus groups were formed from a list of volunteer participants at the author’s workplace, Child Care Aware of Minnesota. Since these focus groups were taking place over the noon hour, lunch was offered as an incentive to participate. Each participant (13 total) was asked to complete a short pre-screening survey (Appendix 12). Participants were mostly female (92.3 percent) with at least one representative from every age bracket. Four participants were between ages of 35 and 44, representing 30.8 percent of the total group. Beyond demographics, the survey was meant to gauge each participant’s relationship with Facebook. All respondents said they had a Facebook account and 53.8 percent of them check their page at least once a day. Almost 31 percent said they check their page multiple times a day. As for brands on Facebook, 84.6 percent said they follow a brand or organization on the social networking site. As for brand interaction, 61.5 percent said they “Liked” a brand’s status update, 30.8 percent “Shared” a status update, and 15.4 percent posted a comment or question, while 38.5 percent said they have not interacted with a brand page at all.
The final question on the survey asked participants to list the top five brands they felt most connected to as a consumer. There was a list of 12 brands, one brand representing each of the archetypes (the same 12 brands used for the content analysis). The results from this question were used to divide the focus groups with the assumption being that individuals will have more experience and, thus, more to say about each of the brands. This approach also helped narrow down each focus group discussion to three brands as trying to discuss any more than three would, because of time limitations and participant interest, hinder the ability to fully flesh out opinions and reactions to each brand and their Facebook page.

As mentioned, each focus group was structured to last one hour. The first focus group centered on Barnes & Noble, Home Depot and Harley-Davidson. While the group originally included six participants, two had to dropout and one participated via telephone. The brands for the second focus group were Nike, Coca-Cola and Hallmark. Each participant was given a packet that included a listing of each brand archetype along with a brief description. The packet also included screen shots of the last five Facebook wall posts from each brand (See Appendix 14 for an example).

Before referencing the packets, participants were first asked for their general impressions of and experience with a specific brand. From there, participants were given about three minutes to review the brand archetype descriptions and then, as a group, discuss which archetype they thought was most appropriate for that brand. Then, participants were given two minutes to review the provided posts on the brand’s Facebook page and then offer reactions. Finally, participants were asked to
again review the archetype descriptions and compare and contrast the Facebook page with the overall perception of the brand and discuss whether it would be appropriate to assign the brand a new archetype.

This research was meant to attempt to see how readily and accurately (at least, based on the literature-based recommendations) consumers could identify brand archetypes if given archetypal information. This research also allowed consumers to, in their own words, explain why one archetype was more prevalent than the others, how it compares to a brand’s archetype on social media, and offer opinions as to whether it their efforts effectively reflected the overall brand.

The results section will be divided by each focus group with smaller sections dedicated to observations for each specific brand discussed.

**Results 3 – Focus Group (1)**

As previously mentioned, the first focus group, with four participants (three in-person; one via telephone), discussed Barnes & Noble, Home Depot and Harley-Davidson. Mark and Pearson (2001) assigned these brands the Sage, Creator and Outlaw archetypes respectively (*Appendix 13 for full focus group transcript*).

**Barnes & Noble**

When asked to discuss the Barnes & Noble brand, participants had mostly positive associations. They used words such as “friendly”, “polished”, and “smart” to describe their experiences with the bookseller brand. “They present a real classy image and there’s kind of a intellectual component to their presentation,” said one participant.
But there were a couple of negative observations too. One participant said they associated “guilt” with Barnes & Noble because she knew by shopping there, she was putting smaller, independent book sellers out of business. Another participant built on that idea by saying because they are a “big box” book retailer, you lose some of the quirks you might find at an independent store.

The focus group was then asked to assign an archetype to Barnes & Noble. While suggesting hints of the Creator, Regular Guy/Gal, and Magician, the group settled mostly on Sage as the archetype. As one participant put it, “I think they sort of present themselves as a guide to reading, but also everything else you can access through reading – presented as a scholarly endeavor.”

The group then shifted its attention to Barnes & Noble’s most recent Facebook posts (Appendix 14). While most did not offer a specific archetype alternative, many suggested that its Facebook represented a shift away from the Sage. With posts about recently released books and movies, one participant said it’s focus seem to be on popular culture and not as interested in making a “deeper connection” with readers. Having access to information about books before anyone else, one participant said that using that knowledge on Facebook revealed a Ruler quality.

For Barnes & Noble, this group of participants correctly assessed the brand as a Sage archetype (while also presenting observations as to why others fit them). On its Facebook page, the group thought Barnes & Noble moved away from that archetype, but said social media, as a medium, requires them to be different. “I think
in social media, they’re hitting a different audience. They have to do things a little differently.”

**Home Depot**

In discussing the Home Depot brand, “helpful” was a common theme. Many participants talked about employees’ willingness to answer questions and an ability to help a “project that would seem ridiculously out-of-reach for me get a little easier.” Another participant described them as cheerleaders. “I know if I have questions or if I’m scared of something, someone there is going to answer my questions and say ‘you can do this.’”

This helpful quality led a couple of participants to assert Home Depot as a Hero archetype with their ability to “save you” from overwhelming house projects. Others suggested the Creator archetype because of their creative thinking and ability to inspire ideas in their consumer. Because Home Depot’s employees are approachable, one participant suggested the Regular Guy/Gal archetype. Another thought the Magician stood out because of the transformative quality of home and yard projects. The archetype Caregiver was also mentioned because of the support Home Depot lends to individuals and their projects.

The Home Depot Facebook page (**Appendix 15**) was described as “playful” – citing the use of colors and images in its posts. One participant said that the page felt “super creative and inspiring”, so the Creator archetype still felt appropriate. One participant noticed that it was reaching out to a diverse audience, saying that posts seemed to have either a feminine or masculine quality. This observation, while also noting Home Depot’s responses to fans on the page, made a couple participants
believe these were clearly Caregiver and Regular Guy/Gal traits. “That’s their business to be responding to questions and inquiries, so I love that they are doing it here online.”

From this collection of responses, we see how subjective archetype opinions can be, both from the overall brand and Facebook page perspective. From a tactical standpoint, all of the participants responded positively to Home Depot’s use of vivid colors and images in posts and the efforts to respond to fan questions.

**Harley-Davidson**

While discussing the Harley-Davidson brand, two distinctive schools of thought seemed to emerge. Two of the participants, who own motorcycles, described Harley as “friendly,” “helpful” and “comfortable.” The other two participants, who said they did not ride or own motorcycles, described Harley as a counter-culture brand. One participant said, “I know I have that prejudice of like ‘bikers are scary’ and they’re going to mug me or kidnap me or whatever. I have a little bit of that even though I know that, intellectually, that’s silly.”

This translated into two archetype camps. Motorcycle owners said Harley-Davidson was the Explorer because the vehicles allow you to “explore the open road” while non-motorcycle owners, while agreeing with the Explorer observation, thought Harley embodied more of a Outlaw archetype.

These distinctions also carried over the groups’ observations about the Facebook posts (Appendix 16). Participants self-described as part of the “motorcycle culture” thought the mix of posts reached out to both men and women and celebrated its history and events. One of the non-motorcycle-riding participants
thought there was an inconsistent identity amongst the posts. In referencing a couple of the photos, the participant said, “I’m not picking up anything specific in terms of what about the bikes are you saying. And then this old school photo is very cool, very interesting, but it’s certainly not badass.”

The Harley-Davidson discussion illustrates the different opinions that exist between those who are closer to the brand and those who aren’t. This figurative proximity to the brand very clearly shaped brand archetype perceptions of both the overall brand and the Facebook page. This was noted by one of the participants, who said, “I think it’s the difference between knowing the culture and not knowing the culture. Because (another participant) and I have been part of the motorcycle culture, we see it differently a little bit, I think, than somebody who hasn’t been.”

Interestingly, those not as close to the brand correctly identified Harley-Davidson as an Outlaw, while those identified with the motorcycle culture said the Explorer was the more accurate archetype (albeit, both archetypes or similar to one another). Why might this be? One could argue that identifying Harley-Davidson cultural “insiders” and “outsiders” is in fact an Outlaw quality and one that “insiders” might not, because of bias towards the brand, be able to consciously recognize and identify.

**Focus Group 1 Summary**

- Consensus on brand archetype selection, for both the overall brand and the brands’ Facebook page, is difficult to reach.
- Participants responded positively to colorful use of images.
• Those who feel closer to a brand are more likely to agree on an archetype, but differ from those who aren’t as close to the brand.

• The Facebook page that seemed to most closely resemble its overall archetype (in this case, Home Depot), was the most positively reviewed by the participants.

Results 3 – Focus Group (2)

Like the first, the second focus group, with five participants, discussed three brands – Nike, Coca-Cola and Hallmark – based on the prescreening survey results (Appendix 17 for full focus group transcript). These brands were assigned the Hero, Innocent and Lover archetypes by Mark and Pearson (2001).

Nike

When discussing the first brand, Nike, participants used words like “leader”, “stable” and “energetic” to describe it. One participant even said “hero”, which happens to be one of the archetypes, saying that athletes, like Tiger Woods, are our cultural heroes and so many of them seem to wear Nike.

Naturally, when asked what archetype Nike would be, one of the first suggested was Hero. Other suggestions included Ruler, because of their role as an industry leader, and Regular Guy/Gal because, for one of the participants, “I grew up wearing Nikes and everybody wore Nikes. If you wore something else, you were weird. That’s where the Regular Guy comes into it for me.”

Another participant wondered aloud if there was a generational difference. Remembering when Nike first arrived into the market, the archetype she selected
was Creator “because it was new an innovative and maybe now it has become much more of the expected. It’s still stuck in my mind as edgy, new.”

Other participants suggested Explorer, but weren’t sure, based on the descriptions of that archetype, whether that was the best fit.

Turning attention to Nike’s Facebook posts (Appendix 18), a participant quickly pointed to the second picture (a runner extending their arms into the sky as she crossed a race’s finish line) saying, “Hero, you made it.” Another participant also said Hero about looking at the first picture, an image of NBA player LeBron James.

Other posts showed photos of shoes, which made one participant suggest Creator because the bright blue shoes showed a continuing “evolution” of the brand. The brightly colored signaled confidence to another participant, which he connected to the Ruler archetype. “You have to be pretty confident to rock some bright yellow kicks.”

Unexpectedly, when asked for whether they regarded Nike’s posts as something positively or negatively reflecting the brand, the conversation shifted towards a discussion on what types of brands the group generally follows on Facebook. Because Nike is such a well-known and dominant brand, one participant said he doesn’t need to follow on Facebook because reliable information can easily be accessed elsewhere. “But let’s say I find this niche shoe brand that I really like, I feel like I’d be more likely to follow them whereas Nike, ‘Oh, I can go to your website and find info consistently.’ I don’t really need to hear from you on a daily basis.”

Choosing to follow smaller brands or organizations on Facebook seemed to be a popular sentiment amongst the group. Talking about how she exercises caution
in selecting the brands she follows because of fear surrounding intrusive advertising, one participant said, "I probably follow more the niche, or the local (brands). Right next to us is a wonderful gift store. I follow them. I follow people that are small businesses that I have a personal connection to." Another participant said it depends on the locations she visits. “I follow the farmers market, so I know what’s going to happen at the farmers market. I follow the arboretum. But something like (Nike), I probably wouldn’t follow because I know where to go get it. I’ll just go down to the sports mart.”

**Coca-Cola**

The focus group described Coca-Cola as “addictive”, “trustworthy” and “reliable.” Even for non-pop drinkers, the Coke brand has left a strong impression. “I like the old ads. That’s all I think about. I like to teach the world to sing, Coke is the real thing, you know, those are what I remember back from the 60’s and 70’s and I love it. I remember dancing with my sisters,” said one participant. Another participant said Coke is soda.

When asked to describe the Coke archetype, Ruler was the first one suggested, referencing their position as a global leader and that sometimes there is a certain level of mistrust that comes along with it. The Hero archetype was mentioned in the same connotation as one participant said they can be a “bully” and that adjectives like competitive, courageous, arrogant, skillful, challenging and purpose are all applicable.

Despite some of these negative qualities, one participant did hit on Innocent archetype as one Coke being able to portray. “They just make you believe that Coke
is this wholesome product. Everybody drinks Coke. Your uncle drinks Coke, your
grandfather drinks Coke. Grandma is going to drink Coke with you.”

A couple of the participants said this idea tied into the Magician archetype.
Their ability to “pull us in” and being a visionary, charismatic and manipulative
brand were all Magician-like qualities.

When discussing the Facebook posts (Appendix 19), almost the whole group
agreed that there was a disconnect between their perceptions of the brand and their
perceptions of the Facebook posts. “I don’t recognize any of them,” said one
participant. “Yeah, it doesn’t feel as Magical,” said another participant. “Almost
Jester. Fun, playful, entertaining. I wouldn’t have imagined that as the long-term
vision of Coke.”

But this Facebook disconnect didn’t translate to a brand disconnect for most
of the participants. One participant said, “It doesn’t matter what they do” because
Coke is such a dominant category leader. Another participant said they understood a
different approach to Facebook. “I can segment that out the fact that it’s for a
different audience. It doesn’t change my allegiance. I just recognize that they’re
doing what any brand does and that’s trying to differentiate for different audiences.”

**Hallmark**

The most common word used by the focus group to describe Hallmark was
“sappy.” The word was used both positively and negatively. One participant
acknowledged that it was sappy, but also said Hallmark represented quality and
liked to buy cards “just because.” Another participant said Hallmark cards were
sappy-sweet and didn’t like buying cards for any particular occasion. One participant associated last-second shopping with Hallmark.

A number of archetypes were assigned to Hallmark. One was Caregiver because that’s the type of person who will buy Hallmark cards. Another said Innocent because she associated sappy with wholesome. Another participant suggested the Ruler because he viewed Hallmark as predictable and “you know what you’re getting” when you buy a Hallmark card. A couple of participants did suggest Lover as the Hallmark archetype, noting specifically the third level of the Lover describing spiritual love and self-acceptance.

When reviewing the Facebook page (Appendix 20), most of the group agreed that their content matched with their descriptions of the overall brand. One appreciated their consistent messaging, which fit into the Ruler description.

One participant noted a difference between Hallmark and Coke’s approach to Facebook, saying that Coke markets to match their targeting while Hallmark targets the same audience no matter the media channel. “This is who we are, if you want to come to us, we want you here, but if not, go to Target.”

**Focus Group 2 Summary**

- Individuals are increasingly selective in choosing which the brands to follow on Facebook.
- Individuals are less likely to follow larger brands because there is a perceived lesser need to have that access to information
- In discussing overall Facebook reactions, participants favored the brand (Hallmark) whose Facebook page seemed to match its overall brand rather
than the brand (Coke) that tailored its Facebook approach to match who they believed to be Facebook’s audience.

**Limitations**

There are a few limitations to consider in this research paper. For starters, the expert interviewees, as previously mentioned, are the first to admit that neither is a social media expert and that, while having a keen understanding of brand archetypes, their ideas on how they can be applied to social networks can really only be discussed in theory and considered conjecture.

Many of the other limitations deal with the content analysis. First, while based on the literature, the author alone subjectively decided the 72 personality traits used for the coding sheet. There was no additional analysis done to determine whether the traits were all appropriate selections or whether the brand archetype examples would still be the best examples today. For example, would AT&T still be assigned the Caregiver archetype? As for the actual results, the procedure was not very complex, relying mostly on a few mathematical formulas (Appendix 11) to determine potential insights.

The challenge of measuring Facebook personality traits should also be pointed out here. By its very nature, consumers’ reactions to brand archetypes is experienced more passively and most likely at an unconscious level. To perform the content analysis, the coders were asked to keep this type of thinking at the forefront, disregard their preconceived attitudes about each of the brands, and in many cases, assign a score to very abstract personality concepts.
In hindsight, it may have been beneficial to have the coders perform two rounds of coding using the Likert scale. Similar to the focus group structure, the first round would be dedicated to determining the coders’ overall archetype perceptions of each of the 12 brands using the 72 personality traits, followed by a second round to code the Facebook pages. While this first round addition may have been too time intensive for the voluntary coders (one coder said reviewing each of the Facebook pages and recording responses took about four hours), overlaying each round’s results would allow the researcher to examine how closely aligned the coders’ perceptions of the brand archetypes for the Facebook pages aligned with their perceptions of the overall brand archetypes. Instead, the coding of the Facebook pages was only compared to the overall archetypes of the brands defined by Mark and Pearson (2001).

There are also limitations in the focus group research. While all the participants understood the concept of brand archetypes and seemed comfortable in the discussions, the exercise asked them to do very high-level, abstract thinking with very little time to review the definitions of each brand archetype. While first discussing the groups’ perceptions of each brand before each of the brands’ Facebook pages more accurately reflects consumer behavior – in that individuals most likely have preconceived notions about brands before interacting with brand profiles on social networks – to review static screen shots of Facebook posts takes the individual completely out of the environment in which he or she would normally view them. This could have impacted opinions.
Finally, each of the brands examined in this research were large, well-known organizations. In the opinion of this author, this impacted the research positively because greater familiarity of the brands most likely contributed to greater discussion in the focus groups and provided greater amounts of Facebook content to analyze. On the other hand, as articulated in the focus group, participants with an established relationship with the brand and its product were seemingly more forgiving of whatever disconnect they noted between their perceptions of the overall brand and that of the corresponding Facebook page. It would be interesting to see if this is a widespread sentiment across all brands or if smaller brands benefit more greatly from aligning their social media to properly reflect their overall brand archetype.

**Future Research**

There seems to be ample opportunity for more research on brand archetypes and social media. Researchers could perform more complex content analysis of brand pages on various social networks like Twitter, YouTube and LinkedIn to further understand the similarities and differences as to how consumers react to various archetypes.

In-depth interviews with consumers might allow brands to understand the higher-level thinking that takes place as they browse through the social profiles and how deep a connection brands can expect to make with them. These interviews may also provide greater insights into the level of expectations consumers have of brands on social networks and how those expectations shift depending on
preconceived perceptions of the brand and the ultimate function each social network serves for consumers.

**Discussion**

To lead into the Discussion and Recommendations, it may be helpful to reiterate the original research questions:

**RQ1.** How do brand archetypes work in practice?
**RQ2.** How can brand archetypes, in theory, be applied to social media?
**RQ3.** Do archetypes currently translate to Facebook brand pages?
**RQ4.** How do consumers relate brands to archetypes?
**RQ5.** Do consumers recognize a connection between a brand’s overall archetype and its social media archetype?

To answer the first question, the research shows that archetypes can provide a way for brands to tell their stories on social media and better connect with their consumers at an emotional level on these various networks. The literature reviewed for this paper seems to provide the evidence that consumers are willing to engage with brands through digital association, which can take the form of a “like” on Facebook.

Expert interviews helped answer both the first and second question, showing that brand archetypes and storytelling techniques have been an effective and “timeless” tactic for traditional advertising and the opportunity to do the same seems to exist on social media. But as a growing number of channels continue to be built into the marketing mix, there is also a growing opportunity for brand dilution.
During the interviews, it was suggested that archetypes can help brands develop narrative guidance on social media. It was also speculated that one of the archetypes, the Lover, might be challenging to carry over to social.

The content analysis bore this idea out, as the Lover, along with the Hero and Outlaw were the least prevalent archetype traits. The content analysis also reveals that personality parity exists amongst brands on social media. Only a small segment are acting out their archetypes on their branded networks, while others are defaulting to a Caregiver role or are completely unrecognizable, like American Express (Ruler), and “confused” by demonstrating traits across multiple archetypes.

In the focus groups, when given the definition of each of the archetypes, individuals were comfortable discussing the relationship between the archetypes and specific brands. Despite the strong discussion, groups were never truly able to reach a consensus in assigning an archetype to each of the brands. This could be explained by a number of possibilities. First, it could show how subjective and challenging it can be for consumers to assign an abstract concept, like archetypes, to a concrete brand. Second, it could also signify how consumers, at a deeper, more unconscious level, experience brand archetypes. Finally, the focus groups may accurately mimic how consumer experiences and opinions are continually reshaping brand perceptions for themselves and others around them. In social media, we can see this tangibly play out in Facebook comments and Twitter feeds.
**Recommendations**

**Identify the archetype**

It sounds simple, but when considering any social media program, brands should start by evaluating and reestablishing the overall brand archetype. As discussed in the expert interviews, the archetype isn’t there to necessarily determine individual conversations that take place on social media, but rather, is the organizing idea to build those conversations around – similar to developing a sound narrative for a traditional, commercial campaign.

By identifying the archetype, brands are also better positioned to align their social efforts with other communications efforts. In the focus groups, despite personal preferences for specific brands, individuals responded most positively to Facebook brand pages whose archetype was perceived to be synchronized with the overall brand archetype. Specifically, one focus group member pointed out a photo on Nike’s Facebook page *(Appendix 18).* The photo shows a woman crossing a marathon finish line, arms extended into the air, both seemingly exhausted from the race but reveling in the accomplishment. The focus group member said it looked “very heroic.” When discussing the Home Depot Facebook page, one of the focus group members pointed out Home Depot’s responses to questions and comments from their “fans.” She said that their responses seemed like a natural and great extension of her experiences in Home Depot stores. As mentioned previously, there was a much more distinctive negative reaction to the Coca-Cola Facebook page. The focus group members, all self-identified as either devout Coke consumers or at least
very familiar with brand, described its Facebook page as confusing and
unrecognizable.

**Adapt the archetype narrative to different social channels**

By building and maintaining this core archetypal narrative, brands are
afforded the flexibility to adapt the archetype to fit the function of the growing
number of social networks and the fluctuating popularity amongst them. By first
identifying the functionality of the social site using something like the honeycomb
models (*Appendix 3*), where LinkedIn serves an “identity” function and Foursquare
serves a “presence” function, brands can either seek out a social channel whose
function fits its archetype or find a way to have the archetype fit the social channel
function. As an example, an Explorer brand could cleverly use Foursquare for a
social adventure campaign or a Ruler brand could find a way to help LinkedIn users
take charge of their professional identity and become leaders in their careers.

**Build a team of brand “translators”**

When hiring a social media manager or strategist, it’s tempting to focus
solely on seeking out a digital native familiar with all the latest social tools and
trends. Brands need to make a conscious effort to make sure their social media team
isn’t just good at the tactical execution of social media tasks such as Facebook posts,
Tweet scheduling and Foursquare check-ins. It’s equally important, if not more so,
for the team to also be well-versed in the brand archetype and have a proper
understanding of how to maintain a consistent archetypal narrative across all
channels.
As organization build its social media teams, it’s critical, especially if it’s looking outside the company, to understand that the digital native will most likely be a brand refugee. Organizations must take the time to train the refugee to be fluent in the brand language. Handling social media means they’re handling, in many cases, the front lines of the brand experience and, in the mind’s eye of consumers, continually reshaping brand perceptions.

Equipped with this knowledge, these “brand translators” can help exercise a powerful point of differentiation. The content analysis revealed that brands are defaulting to a Caregiver, or customer-service-centric, archetype. This personality parity is an opportunity. To not inject some form of the archetype into the social narrative is an unintentional form of brand dilution, increasing the risk of getting lost in the noisy social space and leaving the reshaping of the entire brand conversation up to the consumers.

**Final Thoughts**

As Fritz Grutzner put it in his interview, brand archetypes have a “timeless” quality to them. Alternatively, social media, and especially the related research, is very much in its infancy and brands that are the most timely, adaptable and creative seem best positioned to win the day in this always on, 24/7 environment. There have already been countless articles with “tips” for brands to better manage their social media pages and other studies talking about consumers responding mostly to discounts and deals on social pages. But this seems to ignore the growing complexity and diversity of social networks and the consumers who choose to
participate. Storytelling, and specifically brand archetypes, have proven to be effective techniques for brands to connect with consumers. It’s a natural jump for researchers to apply these same techniques to social media and for marketers to delve deeper into understanding the connection between brand archetypes and the complex social relationships with their consumers.
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Appendix 1 – “New Communications Paradigm” incorporating social media
Appendix 2 – Social media “honeycomb” describing functionality and implications
Appendix 3 – Social media “honeycombs” with shadowing emphasis to show different social networks’ functionality

Figure 2. Contrasting the functionalities of different sites
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## Appendix 4 – List of brand archetypes (including “Call”, “Level” and “Shadow”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archetype</th>
<th>Call</th>
<th>Level One</th>
<th>Level Two</th>
<th>Level Three</th>
<th>Shadow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innocent</strong></td>
<td>A desire for purity, goodness, and simplicity</td>
<td>Childlike simplicity, naïve, dependent, obedient, trusting, idyllic</td>
<td>Renewal, positive, reinventing, reframing, cleanings, reentering the Promised Land</td>
<td>An almost mystical sense of oneness, whereby Innocence comes from values and integrity, not out experience; being, not doing</td>
<td>Denial, repression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explorer</strong></td>
<td>Alienation, dissatisfaction, restlessness, yearning, boredom</td>
<td>Hitting the open road, going out into nature, exploring the world</td>
<td>Seeking your own individuality, to individuate, to become fulfilled</td>
<td>Expressing Individuality and uniqueness</td>
<td>Being so alienated, you cannot find any way to fit in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sage</strong></td>
<td>Confusion, doubt, deep desire to find the truth</td>
<td>Search for absolute truth, desire for objectivity, looking to experts</td>
<td>Skepticism, critical and innovative thinking, becoming an expert</td>
<td>Wisdom, confidence, mastery</td>
<td>Dogmatism, ivory tower, disconnection from reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hero</strong></td>
<td>The bully kicks sand in your face or someone tries to intimidate or abuse you; a challenge beckons; someone needs you to help defend him or her</td>
<td>Development of boundaries, competence, mastery, expressed through achievement, motivated or test through competition</td>
<td>As with a soldier doing your duty for your country, organization, community or family</td>
<td>Using your strength, competence, and courage for something that makes a difference to you and to the world</td>
<td>Ruthlessness and obsessive need to win</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outlaw</strong></td>
<td>Feeling powerless, angry, mistreated, under siege</td>
<td>Identifying as outsider, dissociating from the values of the group or society in a way that flies in the face of conventional behaviors and morality</td>
<td>Behaving in shocking or disruptive ways</td>
<td>Becoming a rebel or revolutionary</td>
<td>Criminal of evil behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Magician</strong></td>
<td>Hunches, extrasensory or synchronistic experiences</td>
<td>Magical moments and experiences of transformation</td>
<td>The experience of flow</td>
<td>Miracles, moving from vision to manifestation</td>
<td>Manipulation, sorcery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regular Guy/Gal</strong></td>
<td>Loneliness, alienation</td>
<td>The orphan, feeling abandoned and alone, seeking affiliation</td>
<td>The joiner, learning to connect, fit in, accept help and friendship</td>
<td>The humanitarian, believing in the natural dignity of every person regardless of his or her abilities or circumstances</td>
<td>The victim who is willing to be abused rather than be alone, or the lynch-mob member, willing to go along with abuse in order to be one of the gang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lover</strong></td>
<td>Infatuation, seduction, falling in love (with a person, an idea, a cause, work, a product)</td>
<td>Seeking great sex or a great romance</td>
<td>Following your bliss and committing to whom and what you love</td>
<td>Spiritual love, self-acceptance, and the experience of ecstasy</td>
<td>Promiscuity, obsession, jealousy, envy, Puritanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archetype</td>
<td>Call:</td>
<td>Level One:</td>
<td>Level Two:</td>
<td>Level Three:</td>
<td>Shadow:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver</td>
<td>seeing someone in need</td>
<td>caring for and nurturing one’s dependents</td>
<td>balancing self-care with care for others</td>
<td>altruism, concern for the larger world</td>
<td>martyrdom, enabling, guilt-tripping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creator</td>
<td>daydreams, fantasies, flashes of inspiration</td>
<td>being creative or innovative in imitative ways</td>
<td>giving form to your own visions</td>
<td>Creating structures that influence culture and society</td>
<td>overly dramatizing your life, living a soap opera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruler</td>
<td>lack of resources, order or harmony</td>
<td>taking responsibility for the state of your own life</td>
<td>Exerting leadership in your family, group, organization, or workplace</td>
<td>becoming a leader in your community, field, or society</td>
<td>Tyrannical or manipulative behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jester</td>
<td>ennui, boredom</td>
<td>life as a game, fun</td>
<td>cleverness used to trick others, get out of trouble, and find ways around obstacles, transformation</td>
<td>Life experienced in the moment, one day at a time</td>
<td>self-indulgence, irresponsibility, mean-spirited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5 – Four areas of human motivation on two axes
Appendix 6 – Margaret Mark Interview Transcript

Tell me about yourself and the experiences regarding your professional background and experience

Let me begin by going back in time. We think of brands at three levels. We think about their attributes and their tangible properties and their benefits and their functional and emotional properties. Cold medicine can relieve a stuffy nose. That’s the attribute. It contains some decongestion is the attribute. The functional benefits is that it relieves the stuffy nose. The emotional benefit is that you’re back to yourself. The end benefit is that you can succeed in this Capstone project and in life. That’s a pretty common way of thinking about brands. Moving from the more product driven to the more consumer driven. People have hopes and dreams and you’re trying to ladder up to the attributes to make the connection between services and people.

When I was at Young and Rubicam, there was a lot of sophistication around product attributes. Clients were very good at figuring out the optimal bundle of attributes to put together in a product. So, should the cold remedy have a decongestant? Should it have a painkiller? How do we bundle together the perfect storm of attributes to be competitive in the marketplace?

We as a marketing community was pretty good at creating benefits, at laddering up from those attributes to benefits. Around the 1970s, the psychographic segmentation was created. There were now powerful research tools to say, “Which segment is going to identify with which kind of benefit, both on a functional, but more importantly, an emotional or psychological benefit and we could parse marketplaces and say, well here, in the dental category, are the people that care about fresh breath because they are out there dating and want to be sexually attractive and here are the people, you know, so we could zero in on a particular segment with the right bundle of attributes and the right functional benefits and the right emotional benefits. We were good at that. But when it got to taking that to next level, which at the end of the day, what does your brand mean? What does it all add up to? We were just incompetent to put it mildly and we still are for the most part. And that’s crazy. Because meaning is where it’s happening. Yeah the attributes are important and the benefits are important but your competition can rip them off in a nanosecond. If you’re meaning, the Apple company’s meaning is what makes it a phenomenon. The meaning that they’ve created. Yes, they offer products that have interesting, fun attributes and good functionality. But what makes an Apple product an Apple product is it’s meaning, yeah? We had no system for meaning. No research tools of any significance for understanding meaning, for crafting meaning, for measuring meaning, for refining meaning. We had no brand management methods or concepts, so the same kind of qualities and credentials that a brand manager on some novelty chewing gum that would be gone in 10 years, those same qualities and credentials would be sought after in a brand manger for an iconic like Levi’s. All the way up the line, from the research tools, to the methods, to the constructs, to the people qualities, we weren’t developing any kind of expertise in the development and management of meaning. I think it’s still the case. I think it’s still a very sloppy business for the most part with exceptions.

Is this the best possible meaning?

It seemed like a particularly powerful way to think about meaning, to attach sort of a primal, even primitive, meanings to brands to tap into sort of symbolism and expression that has existed throughout time. Whoa. What are you unearthing here? What can you activate by thinking about meaning on that level?

Anything that helps us get serious and professional about the management of meaning is going to advance the field.
Since I wrote the book, I’ve developed several research tools to help develop meaning, nurture it, understand it. They rely on different techniques. Some of them are verbal and some are visual. But I feel the progress I’ve made since the book publication has been in the insight tools. And now I have more of a toolkit than at the time of that writing. I’ve also now had hundreds of real-world experiences in the application of archetypal branding. I see some real interesting patterns in the companies that are able to implement this easily. You know, we uncover the archetypal meaning of their brand or corporation. Some companies are able to very easily assimilate that and put it into practice and some have a terrible time with it, a really difficult time with it and need a lot of handholding and guidance.

Now, to your topic, in this multiplatform world that we’re in where a brand’s meaning is expressed across so many platforms, and in so many ways and so many interactions with the consumer, the companies that are good are getting really good and the companies that are bad are getting really bad – intensifying whatever the basic competence is, positively or negatively.

When I read your note, I thought, wow, what a great topic. This is really important at this particular moment.

**Have you been able to pinpoint within a particular company that separates those that know what they are doing those that don’t?**

This is hypothesis. Companies that are very dependent on linear processes try to incorporate it, but I think, the kind of work I do, is so emotional and conceptual, that if it doesn’t fit to sort of a “check this box, check that box”, if they are just trying to say “I got an archetype. Check!”, my predication is that it isn’t going to work. They are just trying to sort of force it into a linear process of development of marketing that reduces it to something inexistent.

Companies that still have really strong values and belief systems at their core, that are guided by emotional intelligence as well as rational marketing principle, the companies that can put those two together, they are so right for this can of thinking, for archetypal branding. Often, they are companies, not surprisingly, where their founder is still alive.

We all admired, for so many years, Ben and Jerry’s. So much of what we admired was that they were doing so many important things from a marketing standpoint but you also felt like the place had soul. That Ben and Jerry believed in something.

Apple, with Steve Jobs, you felt the soul, you felt the vision. You felt that this wasn’t just a marketing playbook with the 15 things got to have and they are putting it in place. You felt more than that, right?

I think companies where a visionary, charismatic founder is still alive, one of my clients was Ralph Lauren. To this day, you feel in every single thing they do, you feel something bigger and more powerful than just they’ve done all the right things. You feel like they believe in something.

A lot of international companies, I’ve worked a lot in Brazil and Australia, and they bring more passion to their brands and to their businesses and more of that sense of conviction. And so the archetype becomes, one, it grows out of the truth, about what is driving the business, there is some powerful force that’s driving it. The archetype just helps identify it and crystalize it. And then they say, “oh wow, this is wonderful. Now I have a way to talk about what I’ve always intuitively believed and felt. Now I have a construct for it.”

On a more micro-level, there might be a kind of Myers Briggs type that’s better at brand development

**What was the initial reaction from clients when you tried to have them articulate the brand in this way?**
I think most clients have been intrigued. Even the most linear thinker, by the book, linear check-the-boxes thinker, knows there is a difference between an Apple and a Dell or a Coke and a Fanta. We all kind of know there is some quality, an indefinable quality, to the powerhouse iconic brands and we wish we had it on our brand. So you’d have to be a slug to not feel that sense that difference and say, “I want to be the Coke. I want to be the Apple. How do I do that?” Everyone, virtually everyone, recognizes that there is something that makes brands great – really meaningful, really powerful; arguably beneficial in the world.

When they hear about archetypes and they see the evidence that’s it’s driven brand success and it’s driven profitability, you know it’s really hard to argue with. Where people divide, is how well can you internalize it. It’s the kind of thinking that, if you’re trying to develop an archetype for your brand, if you can’t sort of connect at a more personal and emotional level with the concept, if you’re doing it at arms length, saying I need brand personality, I need an archetype, I need a brand ladder, I need a brand pyramid, and there’s no deeper connection to the concept, I’m less confident that you’re going to be able leverage this to its fullest power.

Let me throw out another challenge for you to wrestle with. Maybe you have that success with your brand. Maybe you’ve done this kind of work and you’ve crystallized it and done the right kind of consumer insight research and you’re confident that it’s right.

Now you got all of these handoffs. So you got a traditional ad agency to deal with and maybe you’ve hired some people who are really good at social media and a design company that’s going to reexamine your packaging and another kind of company that’s going to help with promotion across your portfolio. So maybe you’re dealing with a half a dozen or a dozen vendors or partners of one kind or another and they’ve all got to get it.

Do you see a challenge in how archetypes can be translated to social media?

It’s sort of a pioneering application, an application of this kind of thinking that needs trailblazers. In principle, I don’t see what couldn’t be done or why it wouldn’t be a good idea. I think of an Explorer brand and the implication for the dialogue of being an Explorer brand – that seems so interesting to me.

There’s a grid in my book, I don’t know if anyone pays attention to it, but it has become terribly important in my work. It’s where the 12 archetypes are organized in terms of the fundamental consumer fear and the consumer desire that they address. You might want to think about that page a little bit because it has become very important to me. If you always remind yourself of the fundamental consumer desire that the archetype is about and then say how does the dialogue fulfill that desire. If you are an Explorer brand for example, the fundamental desire is self-actualization. I want to become as happy and fulfilled an individual as I can be. I want to realize my own unique individual destiny. And part of that might involve journeys. The journeys can be literal ones or difficult ones. They can be journeys of the imagination. Journeys of the soul, mystical journeys, they can just go on and on. If that’s at the heart of my brand, how does that translate into a dialogue. How do I facilitate self-actualization through the nature of the user experience or the consumer dialogue? That’s going to be really different, if your jumping off point is to say well, my brand is about feeling secure, feeling confident that I’m safe, and that I’m not taking undue risks. The nature of that experience, dialogue and interaction is going to be driven by that ultimate benefit.

I think there’s so much opportunity for real creativity and brand differentiation because I get the feeling that a lot of people are doing the same thing out there in social media.

Look at it through the lens of consumer benefits. Everything is benefit driven. You don’t do anything unless you are going to get something out of it, no matter how conscious or unconscious it is. If you choose to engage around a brand, what are you getting out of it and how does that differ from brand-
to-brand? If it doesn’t differ, then that’s a problem because if everyone is circling around the same benefit – a sense of connection and belonging – well, that’s not differentiating. If you’re an Every-Person brand, if you’re Budweiser, the benefit of engagement should be a feeling of connection to ordinary people like me or a feeling that it doesn’t matter whether you are a CEO or a student, we’re all in the same boat here, kind of a leveling quality which is a lovely dimension of the Every-Person. Or a feeling that every voice counts, that’s another lovely, equalitarian principle of the Every-Person archetype. So those could all be drivers for a Budweiser strategy for engagement, but if you are a Levi’s and are trying to reclaim your Explorer roots, then it’s about individuality and being unique and connecting with your tribe, not with the whole human race. Connecting with other people like you who are seeker and searchers and want to be different if that’s what it takes to be self-actualize, to realize who you really are. The kind of engagement you are going to encourage is going to be really different, worlds apart, from the Budweiser Every-Person.

From my limited vantage point, I’m not seeing that benefit or character of the engagement is different all that much. It feels kind of mushy to me. That’s the opportunity to kind of push it apart from the soul of the brand and the ultimate quest that that particular archetype needs a.....

**Are there any particular archetypes strike you as difficult to cross over into social media? As an example, the Outlaw archetype.**

The Outlaw is so powerful in the social media and the political world. You think of the Outlaw dimension that is the revolutionary and wanting to take radicle means if necessary to change things that aren’t working for yourself or for a society. That’s where moveon.org and the whole PETA thing and the issue and policy-driven world, the gun control debate, countless revolutionary engagements out there and there are no reason that can’t be brought over to the brand word. I could see the Outlaw living very happily in social media.

The one that came to mind as a bit of a challenge for me, when you first asked the question, was the Lover because on one level, the Lover is about intimacy and so much of social media is not about intimacy, it’s about transparency. But that’s not to say that it couldn’t be. There’s the level of the Lover that’s feeling some loving connection the planet, to the Earth, to each other. But again, the character of that, the benefit you’d derive from that, would be really different from say the Explorer or the Outlaw

**Have you found communication-related research that has been applicable to further develop archetypes? Do you see an overlap?**

There should be an overlap. Any good work should dance around the same truths. Before I had ever heard the word archetype, I was a consumer insights person and I would depth research with consumers and I’d uncover things that were archetypal. I didn’t know they were archetypal, but they were. I think if you sent two, great consumer insights people out and said, "get at the heart of the matter of this consumer issue", and then you sent someone else out and said, "use archetypes as your lens to get at the heart", they should come up with something pretty close. If you’re digging deep enough and unearthing something that’s really fundamentally true, there shouldn’t be competing truths. So I think there’s overlap in a lot of these methods. I’m not sure if you’re familiar with Gerry Zaltman. He looks at something called deep metaphors. I look at that yeah, yeah, I can see it. I can see the overlap. I favor my system, but I can see the wisdom of his. So I think they are similar. The difference for me, and the reason why I have more confidence in archetypes, because I didn’t invent them – they have been revealed. If you take the Jolly Green Giant, he was the green man, this giant in the valley. (35:35) Well, if you do a Google search on the green man, and you might want to because it’s sort of fun, you’ll find that since ancient times, there has been a symbol that is a green man, that is the man of the forest. And he showed up in cultures that never had any interface with one another. And showed up about every thousand years. And showed up again in early Christianity and was a symbol in early Christian churches. The concepts I believe in have evidence, have a trail of evidence, that says throughout human history, we have wanted these concepts. These concepts have been
important to us and we have expressed them again and again, the world over. They seem to follow certain threads. You know, one is an Innocent kind of thread and one is a Hero kind of thread and I have reason to believe that this isn’t imaginary, that this is something baked into the human condition because they have revealed themselves over and over again. So when I look at other constructs, whether it’s Gerry Zaltman’s or Aaker’s concepts, I think that’s interesting, but why do you believe that is fundamental to the human condition? Maybe they don’t, maybe they just say this is a really interesting way to look at brand personality. I’m more interested in saying I want to know something about the human condition that I can connect with brands.

**In your experiences, how much of finding an archetype is luck versus true planning?**

I think it’s lucky mostly. And sometimes, an archetype, I know it sounds like hocus focus, but I really think it’s true, I think a founder or someone from an ad agency, so if you use Steve Jobs as an example. From the time he was your age, he was this quintessential seeker, you know? He insists on going to an alternative kind of college, he drops out, he’s a dilatant, he sits in on a classes, he’s not a metriculated student. He’s searching, seeking, searching, right? He’s on this journey. Even in his death, he was on a journey. He was exploring alternative medicine. He wasn’t just following the groove, the expected path. He was seeking, searching. When an archetype is that powerful in a person, as it was in him, then he creates a business, of course, it’s going to be expressed in his business. It couldn’t be otherwise. So do we call that accident? I wouldn’t call that accident, but it’s not exactly conscious either. So that’s what I do, again, it’s trying to make conscious powerful concepts that are often unconscious. And they are little bit dangerous when they are entirely unconscious because if Steve Jobs couldn’t have crystallized that feeling he had, that instinct, that vision and then he died, then no one would know how to sustain it. The work I did for Ralph Lauren was to codify what he does, to say, to put a form around it so that it lasts beyond me, so I can hand it off to other people and make it part of my legacy.

For some, in rare examples, it’s a true accident. So like the Marlboro story is that started off as woman’s cigarette and then an ad agency came along with the concept of the cowboy, and the client said let’s try it and took of like crazy. Well, that’s an accident. You threw some arrows in the air and one landed in a really good place.

But I think, probably more often the case, is something akin to the Steve Jobs example that somewhere along the lines, somebody with the reigns, had a powerful archetypal energy, an archetypal vision, and it became manifest in the marketplace. And then very often, the people who succeeded him or her didn’t understand that and didn’t know how to sustain it.

**How do the five steps relate to social media?**

I think to the point of this conversation, it would be adding a step before staying on course, which would be translating the archetype in multiple conversations in multiple platforms. I think now social media is such a widely used and potentially powerful, I think it’s yet to reveal its role in the marketing mix. We all think it’s important and necessary, and it probably is, but I don’t think it hasn’t been fully realized or begun to be fully realized. But I think since everyone’s doing it, it would be wise, if I were writing another book for example, to add a step which is about the art and science of translating your archetypal essence into all of these simultaneous conversations with your stakeholders.

**When writing this book, did you envision where you’d break down the archetype that granular of a level?**

I wouldn’t think of micromanaging the conversation to that level. I would think about the overall narrative, the overall shape of the conversation and the benefits that accrue from it. I’m not saying everything’s got to be in this straight jacket and so prescribed and so controlled because you can’t control what happens. But you could shape the narrative. And I’m not so sure that’s different from
shaping the advertising narrative. Yeah, it’s one-sided, but you still have to have some plan for saying I’m going to start here and then build my stories there. If you’re going to have a campaign, an ad campaign of any real endurance and power, you don’t decide on it commercial by commercial. They don’t decide what’s going to happen on Mad Men next week. They have like a whole narrative for the season, maybe for the life of the program there is a narrative, I’m not sure – but certainly for the season. And then once you’ve decided what’s that story you’re going to tell this season, you say, well, how does each spot or each episode I create fit in that larger narrative? That’s how I envision it taking shape in brand engagement or social media – that you anticipate the narrative structure, the narrative flow, and the benefits that accrue from that. And then you probably have certain milestones or guideposts along the way.
Appendix 7 – Fritz Grutzner Interview Transcript (condensed and edited)

(We started discussing the history of archetypes without a direct, formal question)

In our company, we do a lot of work on the figuring out the archetype and. We’re not a social media place, so often someone will come to us with a social media partner who helps them.

So we can talk about that theoretically.

A lot of people talk about archetypes.

The term goes back to Carl Jung. What he meant was that he believe all humans shared what he called a collective unconscious.

You wouldn’t have said the “hero”, you would have said this character of achievement. He got to that by looking at all cultures of all time.

One way to think about archetypes is like a bucket that’s already there in our subconscious. When we see things and hear about characters, we tend to naturally put them into one of these buckets, almost like a stereotype. The human mind is by recognition, so we see something, we think we’re familiar with, “oh yeah, I know that character.” We don’t maybe say it out loud, but we kind of know that story, that character, and what to expect from that character.

James Bond would be a classic heroic character. He’s fulfilling this core, archetypal pattern, but doing it in a modern way that we can identify with.

You either believe or you don’t – that these buckets sort of exist in our subconscious. And if you do, you can really try to use them to better market your brand and find a core narrative for your brand story. Hollywood believes it. Hollywood understands it and Hollywood has been pretty successful in tapping into that need we have, that love of stories that we have.

They were really the first ones to kind of codify it talk about it. They took Jung’s seven archetypes and through their research, they fleshed it out into a system of 12 archetypes and have been the basis of a lot of people’s work. We use 12 in our work.

He’s how you can think about using them. What you are really trying to understand is your consumer’s need.

When people buy Johnson’s baby products, let’s say Johnson’s baby powder.

What are clients’ reactions to this archetype idea?

I don’t necessarily go to that level of details with a client.

People don’t buy things, they buy the story about the thing. What that means, if you think about one car from another.

When we talk to clients, they totally understand the idea of “we need to tell a story with the brand” because that will help consumers understand who we are. Archetypes are a very powerful way to make sure those stories are consistent and think through what stories they should tell.
Is the idea of storytelling a recent trend?

We’ve been in business now for eight years and we’ve been using archetypes for about 11 years, even before I started this company. I was at a conference of marketers about 11 years ago and there were probably 300 marketers from all over the country. They were given a whole series of presentations, probably 12 or 15 different presentations over the course of three days. And they’re all really interesting, latest trends in marketing. At the end, we had to rate which one did you find most interesting. And overwhelmingly, the one they found most interesting was the one about archetypes.

So on one hand, it seems a little bit ethereal. Smart people kind of get it, they connect with and it makes sense to them. I think it makes sense to them because it functions in so many aspects of our lives – in the books we read, the movies we see, the characters in whom we identify. Intuitively, it makes a lot of sense for brands if you can get past the term of “archetype” when you explain what that is.

Is it a fad?

Storytelling seems to be in everybody’s lexicon right now – everybody’s talking about how you tell a good story with your brand and a lot them mean different things by that. But I think it’s building and I haven’t seen …

You’re probably going to see the idea of storytelling being very popular for a while still, I don’t think it’s peaked, and part of that because I think it’s a really compelling idea. I think what’s maybe more important is that, what people are realizing more and more, that brands can connect deeply on an emotional level besides just a functional level. The more we understand about the brain, every day we find new things about how the brain functions, the more that that points to that being the key – how can you connect on an emotional level with your target. Storytelling and archetypes, which is a form of storytelling, are very powerful way of making sure that in your brand strategy, that you’re basing it on an emotional benefit. I think the timeless piece of that is that emotion wins. Emotion is going to win over time. If you win the heart, you’re going win the head. Storytelling is an easy way for clients to understand a technique for making sure your brand connects on an emotional level.

In our business, we’ve grown every year for eight years and have pretty much done the same thing, you know, pushed the same approach for all of that time. I know it’s just one little snapshot, but the people we work with, it seems to be very simple.

Delta faucet. Regular guy message. They had a brand book that they completed. I think a lot of companies,

Here’s what our logo should look like, more of a style guide than a core, emotional essence. Our summary of segmentation study – these kind of consumers, and these kinds of consumers. Those are hard for companies to work with.

Elements of their strategy identified, but we took it to a whole different level. When we do research, we do psychology.

There is some kind of resistance

But archetypes can be simplified:

Global work for McNeil. You probably don’t need 80 different brand strategies.

You only need three different brand stories to use throughout the world: achievement/strength, caring/compassion, ability to transform. Process in aligning all of their brand strategies around the world. Help really simplify.
**Is there a challenge in matching up the archetype to social media strategy for brands?**

I think it can be a very powerful organizing principle for social media. At a superficial level, people think about archetypes, they think "oh, that's the personality of the brand." It's actually much deeper than that – it's the core story that guides how you show up and interact with the consumer, whatever's the touch point. The challenge with social media is you'll often have people posting things on behalf of the company and you'll have lots of different personalities of people posting those things.

If you are Johnson and Johnson and look at their corporate postings, everything that they do you can tie it back to a theme of caring somehow. To me, those are the most powerful because it continues to consistently build the story of this is a company that cares in all media. Whereas, if you read a lot of posts from companies, they build from news about the company, to promotional offers, it often leads the consumer wanting or confused about “who are these guys” “who is this brand that I thought I knew?”

**Social media is always on and two-way communication model. Is there a big enough distinction between social media and traditional media?**

Because it's two-way, it opens up a bigger opportunity for emotional connection with people. I might write Johnson and Johnson when I feel the need for caring or I might respond to their posts, either an affirmation or a question about caring. If I’m a mentor brand, I might be able to answer questions for people, I might be really good at helping them see the truth and feel smart. If I’m a wizard brand, I might help them feel transformed and different. You kind of self-select like brands do. Certain people are attracted to a Porsche and certain people are attracted to a Prius. If you’re good at telling the story in a consistent way and delivering on the emotional part people that are looking for for your brand, I think you'll self-select and attract those kind of people and engage in a conversation with them over social media.

I think of archetypes as more of an organizing principle than as a way of messaging consistently. It says I’m trying to help people feel a certain way and people that want to feel that way will connect with us.

**Should brands be first listening or communicating through social media?**

If you have an established brand. You’re probably going to have a brand perception already.

It’s a complement but not a substitute for dealing with the fundamental need to try and understand the psychological underpinnings of the emotional relationship you have with your brand.

You can listen to category chatter on the web, but you wouldn't be able to listen of brand chatter on the web because nobody’s heard of you yet.

**Tell me about your work at Brandgarten.**

We just try to focus on the timeless part of it. It will be interesting to see what Twitter will end up being

Humans are humans. From thousands and thousands of years, we've evolved as emotional beings, as emotional animals, social animals that have used emotion to survive and remember and learn. Today, we put on suits and go to work in skyscrapers and sit at boardroom tables, but deep down, we are still driven emotionally and every important choice we make, emotion plays a huge role and plays a huge role in the choices in brands we like and don’t like.
To me, those things are timeless and universal. And I think the social media people that understand the importance of social will do better than the people that don’t. We’re a company that focuses more on the timeless part of it.

Tell me about your background; your experience.

Studied literature in college. German literature
Masters degree in german philology study of old literature and languages and ethnoology
MBA
Worked at Campbell Mithun for three years as an Account Executive
Germany with Johnson and Johnson as a brand manager 4 years
J&J in New Jersey – 7 years VP of Marketing for baby products
10 years ago – moved back to Wisconsin and started doing brand consulting, started company brand
8 years ago

What really appealed to me is the simplicity of it. Humans don’t have that many emotions and if you believe these 12 are fundamental emotions, you should be able to build a brand strategy around it.
## Appendix 8 – List of brand archetype personality traits for Content Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archetype</th>
<th>Personality Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innocent</td>
<td>Wholesome, Simplistic, Gentle, Values-driven/Morals, Pure, Trusting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explorer</td>
<td>Adventurous, Freedom, Discovery, Individualistic, Youthful, Rugged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>Expertise, Objective, Scholarly, Professional, Contemplative, Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hero</td>
<td>Competitive, Courageous, Arrogance, Skillful, Challenging, Fearless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlaw</td>
<td>Unconventional, Shocking, Disruptive, Rebellious, Counter-culture, Revolutionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magician</td>
<td>Transformative, Miraculous, Manipulative, Innovative, Charismatic, Visionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Guy/Gal</td>
<td>Belongingness, Empathetic, Realistic, Connective, Accepting, Down-to-Earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lover</td>
<td>Intimate, Passionate, Committed, Indulgent, Sensual, Spiritual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver</td>
<td>Altruistic, Nurturing, Helpful, Selfless, Supportive, Kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creator</td>
<td>Creative, Inspiring, Influential, Artistic, Expressive, Perfectionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruler</td>
<td>Leadership, Controlling, Responsible, Proud, Confident, Predictable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jester</td>
<td>Fun, Playful, Entertaining, Comedic, Clever, Mean-Spirited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 9 – List of archetypes, brand example and number of Facebook brand page “likes”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archetype</th>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Likes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creator</td>
<td>Home Depot</td>
<td>1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>3.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruler</td>
<td>American Express</td>
<td>2.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jester</td>
<td>Miller Lite</td>
<td>1.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Guy/Gal</td>
<td>Wendy’s</td>
<td>2.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lover</td>
<td>Hallmark</td>
<td>587,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hero</td>
<td>Nike</td>
<td>12 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlaw</td>
<td>Harley-Davidson</td>
<td>4.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magician</td>
<td>Mastercard</td>
<td>4.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent</td>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>61 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explorer</td>
<td>Levi’s</td>
<td>17 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>Barnes &amp; Noble</td>
<td>1.5 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 10 – Sample Coding Sheet

**CODER 1**
**Facebook Branding Page Coding Sheet**

**Brand:** ______________________________________________

**Date Reviewed:** ______________________

**Instructions:** Please spend five to 10 minutes reviewing this Facebook brand page, paying attention to content such as status updates and fan interactions (i.e. replying to a fan comment).

When you’ve finished reviewing the page, please complete the coding sheet below. Using a five-point Likert scale, rank each characteristic as to how well it describes the Facebook brand page (1 = not at all descriptive, 5 = extremely descriptive). Please respond only to Facebook content and not other perceptions about each brand. If it helps, think of each brand page as if it were a person and each word as a characteristic describing or being demonstrated by that person.

**Rank on five-point Likert scale (1 = not at all descriptive, 5 = extremely descriptive)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrogance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belongingness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clever</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemplative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courageous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruptive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down-to-Earth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertaining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indulgent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influential</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean-Spirited</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miraculous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passionate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebellious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolutionary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shocking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skillful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconventional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values-driven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesome</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youthful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Archetype</td>
<td>Archetype Score</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Avg. Score</td>
<td>Book Archetype</td>
<td>Archetype Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Express</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nike</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Book Archetype = Brand Archetype assigned by Mark & Pearson (2001)
- CA Results = Assigned Facebook brand archetype based on Content Analysis
- Archetype Score = Total scores tallied for each of the “Book Archetype” traits
- Percentage = “Archetype Score” divided by total possible score
- Avg. Score = Average 1-through-5 score for each of the “Book Archetype” traits
Appendix 12 – Focus Group Prescreening Survey Results (Question 1 is omitted because it asked for the name of participant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Gender</th>
<th>Create Chart</th>
<th>Download</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered question</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped question</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Age</th>
<th>Create Chart</th>
<th>Download</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 64</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Do you have a Facebook account?</th>
<th>Create Chart</th>
<th>Download</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. On average, how often do you use Facebook?</th>
<th>Create Chart</th>
<th>Download</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple times a day</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a day</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a month</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a month</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6. Do you follow any brands or organizations on Facebook?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. If Yes, have you interacted with any brand or organization Facebook page in any of the following ways (check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Liked&quot; a status update, photo, or video</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted a comment or question</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Shared&quot; a status update</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent a message</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have not engaged with brands on Facebook</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. From the list below, please select the top five brands you feel most connected to as a consumer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Express</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes &amp; Noble</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallmark</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harley-Davidson</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Depot</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levi's</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastercard</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller Lite</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nike</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy's</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 13 – Focus Group (1) Transcript

BARNES & NOBLE

The first brand we’re going to talk about today is Barnes & Noble. In your own words, describe what you think of when you think of Barnes & Noble?

Bright. Friendly. Welcoming. It has books, what’s not to love? Just very friendly. It’s a very comforting feeling when I see a Barnes and Noble.

Coffee, jazz, books and guilt. Being an independent bookseller killer.

I shop there a lot. It’s a positive association. Shops a couple times a month. I usually go there and browse, whatever comes out that is new, choose things, and buy them on my Nook.

I don’t go to the store that often, but I’ll go online and check out the latest offerings from my favorite authors and then go and download them on my e-reader.

If you were to describe Barnes & Noble as a friend, what personality traits or quirks would you use to describe them?

I would say patient. We bring (my daughter) with us all the time. They are always really amused to see her and happy to see her. Like my friends usually are.

Polished and smart. They present a real classy image and there’s kind of a intellectual component to their presentation.

I want to contrast that because they are a big box store. They are all the same – for good or for worse. It’s comforting, but you’re missing the quirks of an independent bookstore.

Comfortable. The environment is always welcoming and open. I think the staff are very helpful and friendly.

What brand archetype would be most appropriate for Barnes & Noble?

Depending on my mood, I was say either Sage or Creator. If I’m in the mood for a tech book, they I would say Sage. If I’m looking for something that’s just fluffy, I would assign Creator.

I would have them in the Sage bucket. I think they have this highly professional approach to their business. I think they sort of present themselves as sort of a guide to reading, but also everything else you can access through reading. Presented as a scholarly endeavor.

I have to totally agree. What you said earlier really resonated with me about the smart presentation of their business, so I have to go with Sage too, I think. Although I had thoughts about Regular Guy/Gal only because I feel like anybody can go in there. I don’t think they are marketing to a specific demographic, maybe middle class, which is maybe that’s why I feel comfortable going in there. When I walked into the Galleria I feel way too poor to shop there in Edina. I don’t feel like that in Barnes and Noble. I can go in there and that's fine.

Even the Edina Barnes and Noble though, still has that kind “we're apart from the rest of the Galleria” feel.

I would agree with the Sage, definitely. The other one that resonated with mean a little bit was the Magician. Only because, when I think of books and how they can transform people as they read them, I think that’s one kind of popped for me. It’s not so much Barnes & Noble’s brand, but their product.
What is your initial reaction to the sample of Barnes & Noble’s Facebook posts? Good or bad.

Two of them are movies. Two of them are books and then one is just kind of a question trying to engage people. That’s a pretty good spread of things trying to hit multiple audiences.

I think they are very good at capturing the way books exist in the marketplace, sort of far out of just reading – there’s movies, cover art. So it’s interesting to capture the casual reader.

I like the poll question. I like that they are actively engaging their audience. Not just putting information out there – go see this, or go read this. They are asking, what do you think? They are acknowledging that not everyone is going to agree.

I really like how they are reaching out and trying to engage a diverse population. You are talking about cookbooks, so they are reaching out to people who are cooking and then there are different audiences that might be interested in those movies. The other thing that I kind of caught onto is that they are all timely. They are all things that are going on right now. It’s Mother’s Day weekend, these books are coming out, these movies are coming out. I like how they keep all things very current.

Is this a true representation of what their brand should be or want it to be? How do these posts inform your opinions of the overall brand?

I think the fact that they have access to information about books before anybody else in the industry made me think that they have sort of a Ruler thing going on. They are right on type of their game, but I did sort of think, I did sniff a little bit of the Ruler.

I don’t see as much of the Sage. It is a little pop-culture. When we were talking about Sage and scholarliness and all that kind of stuff, that’s not coming through on these. I’m don’t know if that matters or not. Obviously, they are trying to connect with what people are interested in and maybe not everybody is interested in a deeper, great works of fiction, but I guess Great Gatsby would be on that list.

Maybe they are aware of their probably Sage representation when it comes to their actual stores, and they are trying to shake that up a bit, loosen that up a bit, with their social media, which would make complete sense.

Or maybe they are trying to reach other people who wouldn’t normally come into a Barnes & Noble – trying to engage new people. I saw this on their Facebook and it drew people in.

I do agree with everyone else has said that it’s maybe a slight stretch from what we were seeing – especially when we all agreed on Sage earlier. But I also think social media has to be different than the perception, in this example, the box store. I think in social media, they’re hitting a different audience, they have to do things I little differently.

Why would it make sense to change a personality on social media?

Because they are a big box store. I wouldn’t think they would want to pigeon hole themselves into one particular way of being. Diversifying and basically saying there is more than one side to how we are is something they would want to do.
First tell me a little bit about your perceptions of the Home Depot brand.

We got a Home Depot right here in town. I use it, not all the time, but it's one of the few we'll use for any yard work or home improvement products. I always find them really helpful and boy, can you learn a lot of them.

I don't have a house, so I don't go that often, but I think I would choose it. My Dad is a Menards shopper. When I think of Menards, I think about that really annoying guy. I feel like Menards is more of a “man” store, but I feel like Home Depot, I would choose that. I could go there and ask some questions. They do give off that sense of “you could come and ask us, and we’ll answer things for you.”

I think Home Depot is about two things – weekends. I'm only there on Saturdays and I have my coffee and I’m only accountable to this project, but really, it's still the weekend. And then, accessibility. Projects that would seem ridiculously out-of-reach for me get a little easier.

I always get mixed feelings whenever I get near or go into a Home Depot because I feel three things. One, I feel tired already because after I'm done here, I have to go do the thing that I got the stuff for. I feel some sense of comfort because I'm going to get answers there. I know if I have questions or if I'm scared of something, someone is there going to answer my questions and say “you can do this” – they’re kind of a cheerleader. The third thing is trepidation because anytime I go in there, I see all the other things I want to do, “I can do that to the house” and it's hard to keep myself focused, and hold myself back. I love going there. It's fantastic. It's someplace both my husband and I can shop. He can go be his manly, I know what I’m doing self and at the same time, I can go in there, say I’m not sold, so sell me. And they’re willing to do that. Either back him up, or tell me he’s crazy.

How would you describe Home Depot's archetype?

I think they do a really good job of portraying themselves as a Hero. They are very much “we can help you out. If you feel like you are overwhelmed, come see us. We will help you out, we will save you” and very Regular Guy/Gal. I can go in there, I see people who are obviously Edinanites who are also in there and we all have them same exact look on our face. So I think those two mix really well.

I see sort of a Caregiver/Creator hybrid. It’s all about “save us from a mediocre house.” I’m so bored with my house, I can make it better. They have to be creative with you. But then I need a lot of support. They are the Caregivers to inspire people, they're influential.

Hero and Creator thrown in. They can inspire you to “oh, I didn’t even that was possible. I didn’t know I could do that. Oh, now I have ideas.”

I would reiterate everyone and also again, Magician kind of stuck with me. Again, I think because they help you see things you can do and change things, transform things in your own home or yard. So that one hit for me as well.

What are your observations about the Home Depot Facebook page posts?

One of the things that strikes me right away is they are reaching out both in feminine and masculine ways, I think, so again, trying to get diverse audiences.

I think it's really playful. You could have an old school moment and draw your Mom a picture and look, there's trees with faces. I'm getting more playful than “here's how you replumb your bathroom.” They're not technical. This is stuff I could do.
I think their use of color plays into that too. They’re playful.

And the people who are responding are very playful, except for the people that are complaining about the discount.

**Does that jive with what you believe the brand to be already? Does it fit with the archetype?**

I think it makes it more Regular Guy/Girl than Hero for me.

It feels super creative and inspiring, so it feels Creator to me still.

I would agree with both of those.

It feels more like what my husband is. He’s the guy everyone calls when something goes wrong in the house. He knows how to fix them, but he’s also one of the gang, so you can just approach him and he’ll “sure, I’ll come right over.” That’s the feeling I get with this. There’s still that hero mentality, but there’s a little bit more of that “I’m really approachable.”

It looks like they’re replying. I didn’t even look at that with Barnes and Noble. That says to me, that they’re engaging.

**Does that fit in with their brand?**

Yeah, they could be carrying that over to online.

I also picked up on, that they replied. That does really lend themselves to, they are the Helper, the Caregivers. That’s their business to be responding to questions and inquiries, so I love that they are doing it here online.

**HARLEY-DAVIDSON**

**Tell me about your experiences with the Harley-Davidson brand or your perceptions of the brand.**

We own a Harley. We ride it as much as we can in the months that we can in Minnesota. We’ve actually been down to it, if you look at this first (Facebook) posting, you’re talking about the 110th anniversary in Milwaukee, we went down to the 105th five years ago and had a really good time. We’re very much Harley-Davidson people.

**What about the brand appeals to you?**

It’s American. It’s a close-knit family, caring, really friendly we are at the different stores across the area. Everyone is super friendly and helpful. It’s just really comfortable.

**Other thoughts about the Harley brand?**

We our motorcycle people. We don’t have Harleys, but we have Goldwings. I like the dichotomy. Harley-Davidson people are extremely friendly people. There’s not one Harley-Davidson person I’ve met that when you ride up on our Goldwing that does not say hello. Or doesn’t even look at the Goldwing and just say, “Hey, that’s a really cool bike.” But at the same time, I’ve heard people who aren’t motorcycle people saying, “Well, Harley-Davidsons are so loud and they all look like they’re mean people.” But no, they’re not. But I like that about Harley-Davidson. That’s one of the cool things about Harley-Davidson as a brand. It does kind of exude that we’re Outlaws and we’re rough-and-tumble, but at the same time, when you get down to it and actually talk with people, they are the nicest people you could ever meet. I’ve met meaner Goldwing people than any Harley-Davidson people.
I think of it has definitely a counter-culture brand.

I don’t have an experience with motorcycles at all, but it is something I just know. If someone said motorcycle to me, that would probably be the first name, the first brand I would think of. But I do have that, I know I have that prejudice of like “bikers are scary” and they’re going to mug me or kidnap or whatever. I have a little bit of that even though I know that, intellectually that’s silly.

**What archetype would you assign to them?**

Explorer.

Very strongly Explorer. They outwardly exude a little bit of the Outlaw, but at their core, Explorer is, I think, what they are.

I definitely agree with that and I also think Regular Guy/Gal because of the friendliness and openness.

**Is there difference between someone familiar with the brand and not familiar with the brand/product?**

I think it’s the difference between knowing the culture and not knowing the culture. Because (another participant) and I have been part of the motorcycle culture, we see it differently a little bit, I think, than somebody who hasn’t been.

Probably Outlaw, but I agree with Explorer. That makes sense to me because you think of motorcycles and open road and going places and driving fast.

So, not commenting on motorcycle people, just commenting on their brand and the marketing I’ve seen, I think it’s in the Outlaw category from my perspective.

**Reactions to Facebook page posts.**

I think the different posts that they’ve got here are trying to reach across a wide variety of audiences. The first one, by them saying, “This could be you”, is trying to draw everyone in to this idea of “Come to this big celebrating. You picture could be on all of these fliers” trying to build the excitement. Then, if you scroll down to the other two, one is strictly about woman riders, which I think is fabulous because it’s so known for the men, the rough, the tumble, and that, so I love that their including a post about women. And the post about the historical post is fabulous.

I don’t see as consist an identity in this set of posts, as maybe I felt like I did with Home Depot. It’s a little bit less connected.

I think this image of the “Welcome to Milwaukee”, it sort of feels like they are harking back to the glory days of the brand. So I get that, so it’s got this old-school look to it. And then photographs of the bikes, like you can’t go wrong I suppose, but I’m not picking up anything specific in terms of what about the bikes are you saying. And then this old school photo is very cool, very interesting, but it’s certainly not badass.

They’re destroying the Outlaw!

That’s why they’re Explorer! They’re exploring the open road!

I like that they are tying in the history with their anniversary coming up. And I also really like the fact that they are calling out to the women, which is really great. Especially since Harley-Davidson has
always been kind of, in a lot of people’s eyes, the woman is the person on the back. It’s nice to see that they are bucking that a little.

**Having reviewed all of these, is there a type of content or theme that really ties into the brands or are they moving away from their core brand?**

I think Home Depot ties in very nicely. To me, it’s obvious that they’re comfortable in the role that they’re in. It works for them, it’s good branding for them, so they just settled down nicely and continued to work with that. It seems to me that Barnes and Noble is trying to break away from the “we’re a big box store and we’re polished” to be a little more friendly. And maybe Harley-Davidson is trying to figure out what exactly what direction their online presence is going to take.

**Is this the type of content you would respond positively to? Is one type of content more appealing?**

I liked Home Depot because I felt like there was a big variety. Barnes and Noble is trying to have a variety, but Home Depot did it. I think they pretty much nailed it in their posts. I guess I’m not as interested in motorcycle culture, but I’m trying to imagine if I was, but I do feel like it is a little bit less interesting, less variety, less different things they are trying to grab you with. But I think Home Depot did a really good job of the three.

I would agree. Home Depot was definitely more engaging, more attractive to a broader audience. I think that Barnes and Noble has to use social media little different to try to get people to think of them besides the big box store. And Harley-Davidson, and again, maybe it’s because I’m involved with it, I do see diversity here because I see their history, I see them going after woman, I see them celebrating their brand, but I definitely agree that Home Depot nailed better than any of the other two.

I felt like Barnes and Noble was super polished and I was distanced by that – it was sort of predictable. Home Depot, I’m really impressed. Every single post felt very like a mini piece of art, really, really strategic. I felt like Harley-Davidson was just a little more all over the place.
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THE GREAT GATSBY hits theaters this Friday! Are you planning to see it?
Get Psyched for the Gatsby Premiere With 4 Amazing Trailers
www.barnesandnoble.com
Leo, cocktails, jazz, and polo—check out four glitzy trailers (click to watch!).

The first ENDER'S GAME trailer is here! Thoughts?
http://bit.ly/YsHnVr

ENDER'S GAME -- Trailer
Stay Informed: IF-Sentinel.com Become a Fan on Facebook:
Facebook.com/EndersGame

Tammy Tisdale Uh ender thought he was training/playing a game, an smaller.... They are going to ruin another great book! 12 hours ago via mobile · Like
Jeff Tweeter I just started reading the series last fall. Very pumped to see this!!! I thought Speaker For The Dead, Xenocide and Children Of The Mind were incredible. I'm currently just about done with Shadow Of The Giant. It, and Shadow Puppets are/were difficult...See More 9 hours ago · Like
Brand Archetypes on Social Media

Barnes & Noble
7 hours ago

Just revealed: the cover of Anne Rice’s new novel, THE WOLVES OF MIDWINTER (out 10/15)
Pre-order now to get a signed copy (limited quantity available): http://bit.ly/141RqV

ANNE RICE
THE WOLF GIFT CHRONICLES
THE WOLVES

Like · Comment · Share
482 people like this.
View 6 more comments

Barnes & Noble Dezirae Cortez here’s the first in the series!
http://www.barnesandnoble.com/w/the-wolf-gift-anne-rice/1106658839?ean=9780307742100
The Wolf Gift
www.barnesandnoble.com
Available in: NOOK Book (eBook), Paperback, Hardcover, Audibook. When Reuben Go... See More

Barnes & Noble
9 hours ago

Here’s the best cookbook of the year, per the James Beard Awards: http://bit.ly/Yusz91
Congratulations to all the winners! http://bit.ly/16YKauF

THE FOOD OF LATIN AMERICA
GRAN COCINA LATINA
MARICEL E. PRESILLA

Like · Comment · Share
228 people like this.
View 1 more comment

Beverly Stapley Like I really need another cookbook? Not!
8 hours ago · Like · 1

Barnes & Noble
5 hours ago near New York, NY

Who’s the scariest fictional mother?
The Worst Mothers in Fiction and Film
www.barnesandnoble.com
If you’d like to get all passive-aggressive in your Mother’s Day gift-giving this year, consider the following: (Click to read more)

Like · Comment · Share
79 people like this.
View previous comments
2 of 57

Grace D Lavarias Norman Bates mother
2 hours ago via mobile · Like · 1

Martha Allard The Leandro’s brother mother, Sofia.
about an hour ago via mobile · Like
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The Home Depot

If the trees in your yard could talk, what would they say?
http://thd.co/188n3N4

695 people like this.

Joe Grassia when my trees start talking back to me it is time to pack up.
Like · Reply · 15 · Yesterday at 9:37am

The Home Depot replied · 3 Replies

Carol Triano I pine fir yew!!!!!!!
Like · Reply · 10 · Yesterday at 9:37am

Happy Cinco de Mayo!

SPRING IS NATURE’S WAY OF SAYING “LET’S PARTY!”
- Robin P. Williams

803 people like this.

LouAnne Smith Collier why not give BACK to every Veteran the discount you used to allow them.
Like · Reply · 4 · Sunday at 10:20am

Jennifer Glover Longtime Home Depot customer, still remember when my mom worked in the paint department 10-15 years ago. The Laurel Home depot leaves much to be desired. They have everything I can think of, you can spend hours in there. Biggest complaint is that the e...See More
Like · Reply · 1 · Monday at 12:32am

Jennifer Glover Still never got my store credit or money back but I will take it as a loss. Last dime HD will EVER see from me, Thank you very much!
Like · 1 · Monday at 12:37am
The wedding party layout is beautiful, but what are the pros and cons of having a greenhouse wedding? http://thd.co/18aOsy7
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Harley-Davidson
3 hours ago

Do you remember your first time easing out the clutch and rolling on the throttle? The women begin their first day on their bikes, anxious to learn how to ride. In Episode 3 of “My Time to Ride,” see how their nerves turned into excitement. http://social.h-d.com/q3R

Like · Comment · Share

3,816 people like this.

Stephi Alderson Mortensen best $300 dollars I ever spent! the Riders Edge course!!!!
Like · Reply · 8 · 3 hours ago

Connie Werner I was 8 months pregnant and learned to ride on a dirt rade. Of course I fell but picked it up and went for it again. It was a 650 Honda so had to buy one since I had so much fun.
Like · Reply · 7 · 3 hours ago

Harley-Davidson
7 hours ago

The Bond of the Bike Runs Deep. See how we’re honoring the rich history and the inspiring stories of Harley-Davidson’s Iron Elite: http://bit.ly/14imUY

Like · Comment · Share

6,096 people like this.

Livia Bono Felipe Fiuza
See Translation
Like · Reply · 4 · 7 Hours ago

7 Replies

Marcello Sley Rolls-Royce
Like · Reply · 1 · 5 hours ago · Edited

View 29 more comments

Harley-Davidson
updated their cover photo.
10 hours ago

Thank you to Alfonso M. from Colombia for submitting this week’s cover photo. Submit your 110th Celebration Graphic today: http://bit.ly/110graphic

Like · Comment · Share

3,457 people like this.

Billy Burgess Remember the good ole daze when, we had base ball, hot dogs chevrolet, and Harley Davidson, ALL Made in the good ole USA
Like · Reply · 4 · 9 hours ago

Louise Baudra 😍
Like · Reply · 8 hours ago

View 10 more comments
Appendix 17 – Focus Group (2) Transcript

NIKE

Tell me about your perceptions or experiences with the Nike brand?

When I think of Nike, the first thing that comes to mind is they are sports apparel. They are the leaders and everyone copies them. Nike is cutting edge. I’ve been attached to Nike for as long as I’ve played sports. Unless I found another brand that specializes in a sport that I prefer, Nike’s my fallback.

I would go with the fallback as well because I have four boys and we always wear Nike shoes. I think of this distinct order as well. So I think of my kids and we always bought Nike. That to me was a little bit of a symbol in Chaska. The other thing I think of is his Tiger Woods because he always has Nike on.

I just like Nike because you know it. It’s easy to recognize and most stores carry it.

It’s the number one sporting apparel. I think of Nike and the first things that came to mind is Tiger Woods and then my son, he always wears Nike gym shorts when he’s wearing casual clothes.

I would say cutting edge. I have got this odd but personal connection in that my friend from college was in advertising, we went separate ways, but had a lot of classes together and she went to work for Weeden/Kennedy, which is the ad firm that does Nike and the women’s Nike apparel and that campaign. Even in the advertising world, that was a premiere place to be. Forward thinking, very innovative.

If you could describe Nike as a friend of yours, what personality traits would you assign to them?

Leader. They're the person everyone else in the room would look up to.

Stable. Solid, consistent. Always there for you.

Energetic. You’re working out, you’re using Nike.

Hero. Because it seems like a lot of heroes in sports are wearing Nike.

It's interesting that you said stable because I thinking maybe more that person out on the edge. In keeping with how I think about the brand, I think innovative.

What brand archetype would assign to Nike?

Hero.

Ruler for me. Kind of a little bit Regular Guy/Gal.

I wonder if this is generational. It was all about Adidas when I was little and Nike was kind of new on the scene, so I thought Creator because it was new and innovative and maybe now it has become much more of the expected. It’s still stuck in my mind as this edgy, new...

I grew up wearing Nikes and everybody wore Nikes. If you wore something else, you were weird. That’s where the Regular Guy comes into it for me.

That’s maybe the evolution of it because I thought Creator too because we also saw all of these superstars wearing it. This was a creation of a new image for us.
Nike was really the first ones to use athletes to their advantage. Look at Jordan. Jordan blew up because of Nike and Nike blew up because of Jordan. They are Creators in that regards too.

**Is that a positive or negative connotation?**

To me, I look at it as a positive because like multiple people have said, you know what you’re going to get out of Nike. You know it’s going to be a quality product and it’s going to meet your needs. There isn’t any guesswork about it. Whoever is on top is usually something you can rely on.

*(Back to original question)*

I picked Explorer, but when I read the definition or the Call, it had negative things listed. And I don’t connect...

I had the same reaction. But the Call, I had the same reaction because I started going immediately “oh, the Explorer”, but then “alienation” and “dissatisfaction”, but the rest fits. Quite literally hitting the open road.

I think you could probably say Explorer more so earlier on, when you guys were first being exposed to Nike. They were out there trying to attract people.

**Why the Hero?**

Like I said earlier, I think our heroes are athletes.

**What is your reaction to Nike’s Facebook posts?**

The second picture says, “Hero, you made it.”

The third one with the blue shoes is sort of that Creator evolution type.

Is this meant to be more of an Outlaw type of thing with the dog? I’d love to know what they’re saying

The first picture can be a Regular Guy.

To me, the first one’s the Hero because of the MVP. It’s LeBron, you got to respect LeBron.

See, that’s cutting edge. Everything is neon. It was in the paper today.

When you were a size 11, the last thing you wanted was neon shoes.

If everybody else wears them, then they want them.

To me, it keeps going back to Creator.

It kind of goes back to Ruler for me too because of the confidence aspect. You have to be pretty confident to rock some bright yellow kicks.

**Do their posts reflect the overall Nike brand?**

*(yes agreeing)*

**Is it mostly positive for you? Is this something you’d interact with?**

Oh yes, absolutely.
I think the only negative, and it's true of anything when something dominates the market, there can be a backlash. I don't think they get caught up in some of the same, what do I want to say, you know, like the recent thing with Bangladesh. Maybe historically, there was a time Nike was accused of using sweatshops or whatever. That would be the only time, but I haven't heard anything lately.

My first thought, I didn't know if it was true or not, which is why I didn't say anything right away, was China and I stopped buying Nikes after that.

When I think of stuff like Nike and Facebook. The stuff I tend to follow on Facebook, like different brands or anything, they're not always the leader in whatever area they play to. Because I can go find info on Nike anywhere. But let's say I find this niche shoe brand that I really like, I feel like I'd be more likely to follow them whereas Nike, “Oh, I can go to your website and find info consistently.” I don’t really need to hear from you on a daily basis. It's just one of those things that I guess I just wouldn’t be as likely to follow an industry leader.

When you interact with Facebook, is that a common idea? That you’d be more likely to follow a smaller, niche brand or a larger brand with more recognition?

I don’t do a lot of following of corporate because I’m cautious of that – that I’m either going to be bombarded with advertisements or I’m going to bother all of my friends because of the pop-ups saying I recommended it. I hate that. The other day, I’m trying desperately to follow some major thing on Facebook and all these things are popping up from some trading company, and I’m like “I don’t want to look at purses right now.” I guess I’m not a good one to ask. I probably follow more the niche, or the local. Right next to us, is a wonderful gift store. I follow them. I follow people that are small businesses that I have a personal connection to.

Or where I’m going to go. I follow the farmers market, so I know what's going to happen at the farmers market. I follow the arboretum. But something like (Nike), I probably wouldn’t follow because I know where to go get it. I’ll just go down to the sports mart.

The big ones, I tend to follow if there's something in it for me. If they're going to throw me a 15 percent off through their website if I follow them, ok, I'll pay attention. If they’re just giving me random updates, I don’t feel the need. Whereas I’d be more likely to follow a smaller brand just because I don't hear much about them and this might be one of the few forms of communication they get out.

**COCA-COLA**

Tell me about your reactions to Coke as a brand.

That's pretty much my brand loyalty if I had to have one is Coca-Cola. I like their products. I always drink my daily Diet Coke. I went to the museum several times in Atlanta and that’s where I had to go to conferences a lot. Just like any other big monolith, they have their history, but I like their product.

It’s been around forever and it’s by far, I don’t drink soda anymore, but Coca-Cola is it. It’s just number one in my book.

Same for me, it’s number one. I can drink up to like six in one day. It’s terrible! I love Diet Coke.

I don’t drink pop either very much, but I like the old ads – that’s all I think about. I like to teach the world to sing, Coke is the real thing, you know, those are what I remember back from the 60's and 70's and I love it. I remember dancing with my sisters.

Coke, to me, is kind of just is soda. People call different types of soda "Coke”. I automatically associate with every type of soda. It's just embedded in my mind.
If Coke was a personality, how would you describe it?

Trustworthy.

Maybe it’s just my perception them over the last couple of years, but they’re almost that person that they’re so powerful that you can’t fully trust them. They dominate the market so much that you just go “oh, it’s Coke. It’s always going to be there.” But Coke is there for a reason and it’s kind of scary.

It’s addictive, so addictive.

So an addictive personality?

I would say reliable. It’s always the same and tastes good.

I was thinking of that person that is everywhere – social butterfly. Oh my God, they’re here too!

You know Coke too?!

**What is Coke’s archetype?**

Ruler.

That was my first one – Ruler.

See, I can’t decide if it’s mistrust, because I felt some of these same kind of things with Nike, I sometimes just inherently, if somebody has so much of the market, there’s just something about that, that clearly I must have some anti-capitalist views.

I’d say Hero. I consider them a little bit of a bully when they take over. But the adjectives – competitive, courageous, arrogant, skillful, challenging, purpose – they all apply.

Another one, even though it kind of goes against my feelings on Coke, but I think they do a really good job of portraying it is Innocent. They just make you believe that Coke is this wholesome product. Everybody drinks Coke. Your uncle drinks Coke, your grandfather drinks Coke. Grandma is going to drink Coke with you. It’s supposed to remind you of family and, like, I don’t know. Coke to me is one of those things that does kind of remind me of being Innocent even though I don’t always feel that way.

That ties right into the Magician. That’s the one that keeps coming back to my mind. Because they have that way of doing it – they pull us in.

Super manipulative.

Charismatic. Visionary. Magician is probably a good one for my feelings too. I was thinking about, it’s not really a Lover, that whole loving family kind of thing, but I think Magician is better. I’m trying to think about, where would those polar bears be? I don’t know where that fits.

**Are these mostly negative associations?**

I think they’re mainly positive. I don’t know, it’s one of those things that, when something bad comes out about them, it resonates in my mind, because they’re so powerful, how much else have them been able to keep away from me?
I’m doing a lot of the same. I hate being manipulated. I can appreciate the cleverness with which they do their advertising and I appreciate the fact that they’ve done an amazing job of grabbing market share. I just personally sometimes get “Gah!”, you know, I hate the feeling that I’m falling for the cute polar bears.

I don’t really let that effect the fact that I’ll still drink it. It’s so engrained in me that even if I have reservations about Coke as a company, I’ll still be like “Yeah, I’m still going to drink it. It’s delicious.”

I think it’s interesting because you guys are all raising sort of these corporation things and saying you drink pop. I don’t drink pop and I think they’re great.

**What are your reactions to Coke’s Facebook posts? Does it confirm or change perceptions of their archetype?**

It’s so much different from the old ads.

The only one I really like is the Mother’s Day one. I don’t even have a clue about this one on the bottom of the page.

I don’t recognize any of them.

Maybe their Facebook media is very different from their television.

I think their logo on top is very family-friendly.

Yeah, it doesn’t feel as Magical. Almost Jester. Fun, playful, entertaining. I wouldn’t have imagined that as the long-term vision of Coke.

It doesn’t matter what they do.

It hurts for me.

I can segment that out the fact that it’s for a different audience. It doesn’t change my allegiance. I just recognize that they’re doing what any brand does and that’s trying to differentiate for different audiences.

**HALLMARK**

**What are your experiences with Hallmark?**

Hallmark is the best. It’s quality.

I hate Hallmark. I hate sappy-sweet stuff. I don’t like cards. We call them “made up days.” They just keep making up days you have to buy another card.

I’m the extreme opposite. Just the other, I bought a card for someone just because they mean so much to me.

I do like to buy cards just because. I do not like to buy a card just because it’s a day.

I associate Hallmark with last second shopping. Thinking “oh crap” I have to get a card for someone.

I like Hallmark. I like buying cards for people.
For me, it's that history of not being crazy about the sappiness and yet I always fall for it. I don't know what to call that – embarrassment and guilt. Again, they are a market leader and you always think of that Hallmark Hall-of-Fame and those sappy specials – like an extended, really long commercial that makes you cry.

I just associate Hallmark with cards. I don't necessarily buy Hallmark cards. I'm not the kind that buys those sappy cards. I buy the ones that have that dry sense of humor in the writing and that's not necessarily Hallmark.

**What about the archetype?**

I'd say Caregiver because a lot of times, that's who is going in to buy cards.

I agree with that.

Innocent. I do associate Hallmark with being sappy and wholesome.

I hadn't looked at Innocent yet, but especially when I look at the summary, values-driven. It's got some of that. I suppose Lover too.

I thought about Lover also. That was the first one I thought of. Under the level three, the spiritual love and self-acceptance. And number two. You only buy cards for people you care about.

I would say Ruler. They're predictable. You know what you're getting.

Would this be the friend that makes us cry all the time?

**What are your impressions of Hallmark from looking at the Facebook page?**

They're consistent with what I've always thought of Hallmark.

Because they're a Ruler!

It could be that they're more consistent in how they market to all groups.

The opposite of Coke, I believe. Coke markets to match their targeting, while Hallmark targets the same audience.

This is who we are, if you want to come to us, we want you here, but if not, go to Target.

The fact that people who would come on here and post stuff, is fascinating to me. I might post that with my friends.

A lot of bored people out there.

I think consistency is important, so I like the way Hallmark markets. I like seeing a consistent message.

I just like that they are smart enough to use Facebook in their advertising.

I almost feel like Hallmark has to approach it that way. I don't think they're as dominant as Coke. Where as Coke can kind of do what they want. Hallmark, even though they are dominant in that area, it's not something you'd think about it all the time. So I think they have to offer people a little bit more than Coke does.
Of the three we looked at, what made the best connection? What is the most effective use of the channel?

I’d say Hallmark.

I would say Nike.

Hallmark.

I’d say Nike. They're choosing imagery and things that are tied to the ultimate use of their brand that fit better for me in a way that’s better than others. They are kind of finding, for me, a happy medium. Tweaking enough but still focused on the core.

Coke just doesn’t make sense to me. I don’t know how to relate to that.
Appendix 18 – Nike Facebook Page Posts
13.1 miles to conquer. 3 styles to commemorate the journey. This weekend, We Run DC.
Appendix 19 – Coca-Cola Facebook Page Posts

A sip of Coke is a sip of “AHH” so we made AHHH.com. But it's also “AHHH” so we made AHHH.com and AHHH.com. Every time you add takes you somewhere new. Start exploring today! http://AHHH.com/

A Mother's Day tip: Small gifts can still go over big.

Thanks for the birthday wishes! Let's raise our glasses in a toast! (Hopefully yours is full of Coke. Otherwise, this just got awkward.)
Brand Archetypes on Social Media

Newton's Law of AHH: Motion: a Coca-Cola at rest will not stay at rest. Test it for yourself: http://ahhh.com/

Happy Cinco de Mayo! Guess what's inside? (Fingers crossed for mini cans of Coke.)
Appendix 20 – Hallmark Facebook Page Posts
Moms are the ninjas of nice.

MOMS ARE THE NINJAS OF NICE

—DAN T, HALLMARK WRITER