*First of all we would like to thank our reviewer for introducing new perspectives such as the affinities of the topic to mythology, literature and communications. The recommendations were very constructive and we hope that we have addressed all.*

Conceptual Foundations

(a)    Why Jung? The authors have selected Jung’s archetypes as the theoretical foundation for the paper. While Jungian approaches have been used by marketing and consumer researchers in the past (e.g., Hirschman), the reasons for this choice need to be justified in the context of other alternatives. Jungian approaches suffer from two core limitations: (a) the assertion of universality – which the authors note, and (b) the psychoanalytic heritage of the ideas (which presupposes a certain view of motivation) is disavowed by most contemporary psychologists.

*We added Freud’s heritage and contemporary research e.g. Jung’s contribution to the Big 5. We took the liberty to refer to Kant and Goethe re the origin of the term ‘archetype’ which may give it a more philosophical touch. We would have loved to substantiate the archetype concept by neurophysiological research but were not convinced about the reliability of claimed research findings so we added it under scope for further research (chapter: Implications).*

(b)   Literary archetypes: An alternative approach to studying the archetypal aspects of brand image can be found by scholars who adopt a literary or cultural view of archetypes, such as the ones advanced by Joseph Campbell or Northrop Frye (see, for example: Stern 1989). One could make the argument that using archetypes in advertising has greater affinities to mythology, literature and communications. Work on narrative theory and characterization in advertising also aligns with the archetype approach (see, for example: Mulvey and Medina 2003; Padgett and Allen 1997; Scott 1994; Stern 1988). This paper’s potential impact will be enhanced if it can find a way to align itself with this growing branch of advertising research.

*We took great effort introducing above mentioned perspectives into our paper. It stretches across the whole paper. We also mentioned the difference between semiotic and formalist approach.*

(c)    The abstract states: “Aaker is seen by many as the branding guru” and refers to Aaker (1997) in the introductory paragraph. Are you referring to David Aaker (the father) or Jennifer Aaker (the daughter)?

*We decided to call them both gurus because David obviously is the one but our paper refers to Jennifer.*

(d)   Indeed, Aaker (1997) is a highly-cited work. Are there any other limitations or criticisms the reader should be informed of? There has been some backlash to the application of brand personality to inanimate objects. This may be of concern, because the paper uses hotels as an example. Personally, I agree with you – brand personality is a key facet of brand identity. However, you may want to tell readers how brands can convey aspects of personality via advertising (see: Allen and Olson 1995). This is highly relevant to answering the “so what?” question that is addressed in the implications section.

*We added Allen & Olson and other limitations such as criticism on the conceptual, methodological and substantive level as well as confusing user profiles (e.g., upper class) with brand characteristics and weak discriminatory power.*

(e)   Page 2, line 62: I disagree with the claim that “above models can be seen as extensions of Aaker’s (1997) brand personality model.” The models you listed are variants of well-known hierarchy of effects models. Aaker’s approach is nested within these – it specifies a way brands can establish relevance in the eyes of consumers (via establishing a human identity or character).

*We revised the statement in the sense that it is part and not different from it.*

Methodology

(a)    Though the paper is exploratory, I am not convinced that it aligns with the “grounded theory” tradition. Grounded theory is based on the idea of immersion in data to induct new conceptual categories. I see the present study as using existing typologies and categories – there are no new concepts that emerge from the research that can be applied directly to future research.

*We fully agree and deleted the claim to be Grounded Theory.*

(b)   Sample size: A critical view would state that the present research relies on a very small sample of advertisements (n=2) to make its claims. After all, the research focuses on the capacity of an ad to convey archetypal and personality-based aspects of brand identity. The results would have been more compelling if the study measured the impact of ad campaigns (sets of related ads) in delivering a consistent (reliable) impression. Though such studies are rare, good interpretive and quantitative examples can be found in the literature. At a minimum, this exploratory paper should set a more specific and ambitious plan for systematic future research on the topic. For example, Padgett and Mulvey (2007) illustrate a method to identify personal values conveyed by 16 ad campaigns (another complementary dimension of personified brands) and Padgett and Mulvey (2009) demonstrate a novel way to characterize customer-brand relationship archetypes. Imagine a conversation with these authors: what do you contribute to the ongoing conversation?

*We cited Roberts (2010) who, based on extensive research, found different leading archetypes depending on the product category. We added our thoughts as scope for further research in chapter 4.We added Matzler et al. (Personality, person-brand fit, and brand community: An investigation of individuals, brands, and brand communities. Journal Of Marketing Management) as research on customer-brand relationship.*

(c)    Evidence of claim? Page 4, line 124 states: “European students did not know these two hotel chains and therefore were not pre-conditioned in any way. In contrast the 55 Asian students knew the chains.” Was brand familiarity actually measured, or was it assumed? The claim is very absolute – I wonder if any of them ever travelled internationally – presumably EMBAs would be more worldly or cosmopolitan than this…

*The survey was conducted face-to-face in the classroom and students asked personally. The two Asian hotel chains are globally not very prominent. Most Western executives stay at well-known global hotel chains (e.g., Accor, Hilton) because they have a corporate contract. Shangri-La and Banyan Tree are not that visible in Western countries. This stays in contrast to Asian executives.*

(d)   Figure 3: Because you are studying commercials (which unfold over time), I don’t think the single screenshots really add much value to the paper. However, if you included a storyboard (set of screenshots) for each ad, that would help the reader (for examples, see: Mulvey and Medina 2003; Scott 1994).

*We added more screenshots and background on the commercials. Whereas the BT commercials features beautiful pictures that are sequence-wise interchangeable, the BT commercial unfolds and has it climax at the end with the wolves warming the traveler.*

*(*e)   Clarity and elaboration of Page 5+: The methods section lacks clarity – it would be very difficult for a researcher to replicate the procedure. Please provide greater detail of the scales used, the anchor terms, and how the survey/rating task was administered (online? Paper and pencil?).

*We added the questions that participants were asked. Everything was based on pencil and paper.*

(f)     “Archetype Articulate Charisma” (heading title in Table 3): This is not clear. Either define the term in the text or use phrasing that is clear to the reader. Please don’t expect them to consult original sources by Jung!

*Changed in the term ‘manifestation.’*

Findings: Who rated the three personality traits? The student/respondents? How many items were used? Why do you not report reliability measures for the items and scale?

*The students. We added that part.*

(h)   Factor analysis: Have you reported principal components, or a rotated solution? More details are required.

*Principal Component with Varimax rotation. We added in the text.*

(i)      Interpretation: The interpretation of Archetypes seems to assume that the types are mutually-exclusive. However, this is not really the case. A close reading of some of the cited work (i.e., Mark and Pearson 1991) recognizes that archetypes can be blended.

*We changed the wording. In fact, the cited Cinderalla is a prime example of blended archetype.*

As mentioned at the onset of my review, I fully support the authors’ aim to revitalize and blend archetypal and personality-based approaches to brand identity. I hope my suggestions are given full consideration, as I believe that they will assist them in achieving this important objective.

*We hope that we have given full consideration to all comments. We found them very useful and they increased the value of our paper considerably.*