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Abstract
Purpose: To explore how aligning corporate brand identity elements with heritage within the Corporate Brand Identity Matrix (CBIM) may result in sustainable competitive advantage.

Methodology: This paper will use a multiple case study comparisons of Jaguar under the management of Ford and Tata. The study will be based on the application of the CBIM model and the additional heritage aspect within the brand core element. The study follows an abductive approach, while research data has been derived from secondary data such as financial statements, market reports and previous case studies.

Theoretical Perspective: This study is based on two different perspectives on brand management which are the market and brand orientation perspectives. Furthermore, literature has presented a model on managing corporate brand identity in the form of the CBIM model. In regards to heritage brands, the Heritage Quotient (HQ) model offers a way to determine the HQ of a corporate brand. These models will be used in analysis of the comparative case study selected.

Findings: A corporate brand must align its internal and external elements of the CBIM to the brand core to create sustainable competitive advantage. Misalignments are exasperated in the case of corporate heritage brands, due to heritage brands emphasis on elements such as track record and history that makes deviation from these elements more apparent. It is evident that heritage should be seen as a fundamental part of the brand promise in the CBIM model for a corporate heritage brand such as Jaguar. We propose that there is in fact a fifth sequence in relation to heritage found in the CBIM model. In which the brand core that holds the heritage aspect should be aligned with the elements of value proposition and positioning.

Research Limitations: This report will solely be based on one brand within the automotive industry. This is a limited sample which may not truly be representative of all heritage brands within different industries. Furthermore, due to time and space constraints this article focuses on the strategical diagonal, the competition diagonal, the communication horizontal and the interaction vertical of the CBIM model, and therefore disregards the reputational aspects.

Originality: This paper offers a comparative insight into the management of one brand by two corporate mothers and how divergent approaches to heritage can influence its success. This adds insight into how different management approaches can play an instrumental role in a heritage brand’s success.
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INTRODUCTION -

The purpose of this article is to explore corporate brand identity with the aim of highlighting the importance of aligning all the Corporate Brand Identity Matrix elements with heritage which may result in sustainable competitive advantage.

Since its founding in the 1920s, the name of Jaguar has been inextricably linked with high performance, as exemplified by its championships beginning in the 1930s at Le Mans. While the elements of luxury and performance intertwine to form the personality of the marque, sometimes described more as a mystique or a phenomenon than “just” another brand (Strach, Everett, 2006).

Consolidation of heritage brands within the automotive industry has dramatically decreased the number of Original Equipment Manufacturers within the last decades. One of the main reasons for this was brand corrosion caused by mismanagement. Acknowledging that heritage is a source for sustainable competitive advantage and how this is arguably a core value for Jaguar, we aim to explore how this has been utilised by two different management periods. The CBIM will be applied to Jaguar under the Ford Motor Company (Ford) and Tata Group (Tata) era to see how the alignment of corporate brand identity elements along with a heritage component in the brand core has influenced the success of the Jaguar brand.

As our hypothesis that heritage is of utmost importance for Jaguar and its brand, the Heritage Quotient Model (Urde, Greyser & Balmer, 2007) will be applied. This will be the starting point for the analysis and will serve as a basis for the brand core within the CBIM.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Corporate Brands with Heritage

According to Urde, Greyser & Balmer (2007), a heritage brands is when a corporation uses its heritage as part of its basis for its value proposition and positioning. All brands have history, whether a brand has heritage which can become a valuable, rare, inimitable non-substitutable resource, asset and brand core component for the company, is usually hidden from corporations. The path to finding (i.e. understanding) the hidden heritage within a brand will be the key to uncovering its value.

Brand heritage is defined by Urde et al. (2007) as “a dimension of a brand’s identity found in its track record, longevity, core values, use of symbols and particularly in an organisational belief that its history is important” (Figure 1).

Our definition of a corporate heritage brand is based on Urde et al. (2007,) original and general definition: “A [corporate] heritage brand is one with a positioning and value proposition based on its heritage (Urde, Nobel Prize heritage brand) Urde et al. (2007) made a distinction between “a heritage brand” and “a brand with heritage” and emphasised that making heritage part of a brand’s value proposition ultimately is a strategic management decision.

Urde et al. (2007), provides a way to determine and understand a brand’s heritage allowing for effective management and leadership of the heritage aspect.
The Heritage Quotient (HQ) model (Fig.1), illustrates five elements such as track record, longevity, core values, use of symbols and history important to identity. These five elements determine how high a degree of HQ may be present in the brand. The higher a brand’s HQ the more likely a powerful and valuable presence of heritage can be found within the brand.

Market vs Brand Orientation
To evaluate a heritage brand, it is crucial to understand the approach that a company has taken and the consequent impacts from the chosen method. It has been established that there are two general approaches that a company can take: market or brand orientation.

Market Orientation – is an outside-in perspective where a company uses its brand image as the strategic resource (Urde, Baumgarth & Merrilees, 2013). The concept was pioneered by Drucker (1954) and prominently explored by Kohli and Jaworski (1990), Narver and Slater (1990) and Shapiro (1988). It can be concluded from their studies, that market orientation can be a company’s mindset or the resources put in place to exploit the customer’s needs and wants based on market research/ market intelligence. (Urde et al, 2013).

Brand Orientation – is an inside-out perspective, where a company uses its brand identity as the strategic resource (Urde et al., 2013). Focusing the brand as a resource is a relatively new concept (Melin, 1997; Urde 1994, 1997), pioneered by Aaker (1991), de Chernatony et al. 2011), Kapferer (2008), King (1991), and Olins (1978). Likewise, to market orientation, brand orientation can be a company’s mindset or considered as a type of corporate culture (Urde et al., 2013). Customer satisfaction is achieved with brand identity as the core aspect.

It has recently been acknowledged that a combination of these two approaches is a more appropriate brand management tool reflected in Urde’s CBIM (Corporate Brand Identity Matrix). An organisation with a brand oriented approach would be more inclined to ‘satisfy the needs and wants of its customers and stakeholders within the boundaries of its brand identity’ (Urde et al, 2011, p. 14). In contrast, an organisation with a market oriented approach would respond to and be guided by ‘the needs and wants of its customers and stakeholders’ in the corporate brand-building process (Keller,2001; Urde et al, 2011).

Corporate Brand Identity Matrix
The CBIM model (see fig.2) (Urde, 2013) develops the idea that a company should incorporate both a brand and market perspective. This comprises of a three-by-three matrix. “Three internal elements relate to the realities of the organisation and its values” (Urde, 2013). The three external elements develop a brands perception from the outside. Then there are three elements that link the internal and external elements together such as the company’s core values.

According to Urde & Greyser (2016), the different elements within the CBIM are linked through the brand core in diagonal, horizontal and vertical lines (Fig.3). These linkages go through the brand core, signifying that all elements are interrelated through the brand promise and core values. Thus, opposing linked elements needs to be aligned with each other through the brand core, otherwise misalignment in the corporate brand identity can manifest itself.

The Brand Promise & Core Values
According to Urde (2013), ‘brand core’ is defined as an entity of core values supporting and leading up to a promise. This places core values at the heart of the CBIM model and emphasizing its pivotal role and through the brand core its interrelation with all elements in the matrix.
The Strategy Diagonal – Mission & Vision and Positioning
The strategy diagonal is essential for corporate brand identity definition and alignment, as it connects the organisation’s mission and vision and its wanted position (Urde & Greyser, 2016).

The corporate mission is vital to the corporate identity, in explaining why the corporation exists and what engages and motivates it, beyond the aim of making money (Collin and Porras, 1998). A company’s vision extends the mission by formalising its view of where it is heading and what inspires it to move forward (de Chernatony, 2010). In the definition of corporate brand identity, mission and vision are sources of commitment (Senge, 1990). For an organisation with a brand oriented approach, the mission typically represents a point of departure in the process of defining corporate brand identity (Urde, 1994, 1997, 1999). The position element defines how management wants the corporate brand to be positioned in the market, and in the hearts and minds of key customers and non-customer stakeholders (Keller et al., 2012). It is closely related to the corporate brand identity (Kapferer, 2012), but must not be confused.

The Competition Diagonal – Value Proposition and Competences
The essence of the Competition Diagonal concerns the competences and capabilities of an organisation and how they are combined into the value-creating processes and potential competitive advantages. The competences are therefore the prerequisites to substantiate the value proposition, while the connection between these two elements is the overall brand promise to its key stakeholders (Urde & Greyser, 2016).

The value proposition element of the CBIM concerns the combinations of appealing arguments directed to customers and non-customer stakeholders (Frow and Payne, 2011; Rintamaki et al., 2007). An effective value proposition should lead to a favourable relationship between customers and the brand and ultimately to positive purchase decisions (Aaker, 1996, 2004), as well as a favourable reputation (Greyser, 2009).

Competences within the CBIM refer to extra strategic relevance relating to the creation and maintenance of sustainable competitive advantage. Those encompass an organisation’s capabilities and processes (Grant, 1991, 1996; Stalk et al., 1992; Leavy, 2003).

The Communication Horizontal – Expression and Personality
The communication horizontal stretches between the frameworks personality element, the brand core and the expression element.
‘Personality’ and ‘expression’, located to either side of the ‘brand core’ in the middle row of the matrix, bridge the internal and external components of the corporate brand Identity. In the CBIM, the personality element defines the combination of characteristics or qualities that form the corporate character. The expression element is concerned with all verbal, visual and other forms of identification as part of a corporate brand identity.

The culture of an organisation is a broad reflection of its corporate attitudes, values and beliefs, and of the ways in which it works and behaves (Hatch and Schultz, 2001; Schroder and Saltzer-Morling, 2006). From a strategic point of view, this element in the CBIM represents a source of differentiation and potential competitive advantage (Brexendorf and Kernstock, 2007; Burmann et al, 2009). Kapferer (2012) describes the corporate culture as a source of the brand’s ‘aspiration’ and its products; services and solutions are not only representations of its culture, but also a means of communication.

Overall, the literature review shows a gap to apply the CBIM in the context of comparing the corporate management alignment during different eras, as well as factoring in a corporate brand’s heritage as an influencing element to the corporate brand’s identity.

**Methodology**

For the first part of the analysis section of this paper we aim to investigate and determine the level of heritage quotient within the Jaguar brand. The level of heritage quotient will determine if Jaguar can be considered a corporate heritage brand, or simply a brand with heritage.
According to Kapferer (2012), corporate heritage brand fundamentally uses their heritage as part of the value proposition and positioning of a corporate brand. While brand identity – everything that makes the brand what it can be drawn upon the brand’s root and heritage (Kapferer, 2012). Heritage is therefore intrinsically linked to the brand identity and interrelated with brand promise and core values as a means of identification and purpose internally. We therefore argue that a “heritage aspect” should be placed within the brand core & promise of the CBIM model when analysing a corporate heritage brand. As the heritage aspect touched upon all the elements within the matrix, but this is especially the case with the value proposition and position elements.

If Jaguar can be considered a heritage brand, we will then analyse the brand with the use of two case studies (Jaguar under Ford and Tata) by applying the CBIM model (Urde, 2010) while using heritage as part of the brand core element. The different linkages of the strategy diagonal, the competition diagonal, the communication horizontal and the interaction vertical within the CBIM (Urde & Greyser, 2016), will form the basis of our analysis. Following the analysis will be a discussion around the findings and the implications they might have on a theoretical perspective.

**Research aim**
This research aims to explore how the alignment of corporate brand identity elements with heritage within the CBIM Framework can result in long term sustainable competitive advantage.

**Research Paradigm**
In our research study we have chosen to adopt an exploratory abductive approach. The reasoning behind this choice is to sanction the usage of our theoretical preconceptions from the course literature, while allowing us the freedom to add to the literature during our research process. Following the abductive approach will allow us to move between theory and empirical data, and work with the research data in a more integrated manner. Thus, abduction starts from an empirical basis such as induction, but do not reject theoretical preconception which is related to deduction (Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2009).

**Data Collection**
All of our data present in this paper were collected from secondary data sources such as databases, reports, articles, interviews and analyses. According to Bryman and Bell (2011), there are several key advantages of utilising secondary data and analyses such as cost and time efficiency, the high quality of data and more time for data analysis. We believe that the choice of using secondary data is most suitable for our case. Following the abductive approach, we will use both quantitative and qualitative secondary data in our research.

**Research Design**
We have decided to conduct a multiple case study of two cases with a comparative design (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Following such a case study design allows for a better understanding and comparison between two contrasting cases.

In our case, we compare the contrasting fortunes of Jaguar under the management of Ford and subsequently Tata Motors. We explore the management of the Jaguar brand between the two cases and its effect on sustainable competitive advantage. According to Bryman & Bell (2011), when comparing two or more cases, it allows the researcher to be in a better position to establish the circumstances in which a theory will hold or not. While comparison may in itself suggest concepts which may be relevant on emerging theory. Furthermore, comparative design allows distinguished characteristics of the two cases to act as a springboard for theoretical reflections, which fit well with our exploratory aim.

**JAGUAR HISTORICAL BACKGROUND**
In order to get a better understanding of the Jaguar brand it is important to first highlight the key events within their history and how it has...
become part of their strategy. By exploring Jaguars rich history, it becomes apparent that they have witnessed both prosperous and challenging periods (jaguarheritage.com, 2012).

In the summer of 1922 Sir William Lyons and William Walmsley founded the “Swallow Sidecar Company” in Blackpool, England as a motorcycle sidecar company. Known for their very stylish bodywork, Lyons and Williams extended their product offering and started to manufacture their first sport car bodies in Coventry by 1929. The company introduced their first self-designed complete car by 1931, called the SS 1 (standing for Swallow Sidecar 1). “In 1935 the ‘Jaguar’ name sprang upon the scene for the first time with a completely new saloon and sports car range.” (Strach, Everett, 2006) The so-called SS 100 was also the introduction of the leaping Jaguar (Leaper) as a hood ornament and would continue to be a high value brand emblem for brand recognition in the future and aligning the sporty feeling of the cars with a luxury image. Nevertheless, after World War II the unfavourable connotation to SS was dropped and Jaguar became the brand name.

By 1949, the newly introduced two-seat roadster, XK 120 emerged as the fastest car in the world, with a recorded top speed of 120 mph. Simultaneously the Jaguar slogan and expression of identity in “Grace, Space and Pace” was coined. In pursuance of the slogan, Lyons, having raced the early sidecars in several motorcycle races turned to motorsport with the Jaguar brand. The XK 120 won the first production car race at the newly opened Silverstone race track in 1949. Another major step for Jaguar’s racing pedigree and ultimately its heritage association was the participation at the 24 hours of Le Mans. Already in their second year of appearance in 1951, Jaguar won the race with the young Stirling Moss. Additional Le Mans victories followed in the years 1953, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1988 and 1990.

The year 1961 represented one of the most important years for Jaguar, as it marked the birth of an icon: The Jaguar E-Type. A memorable historic anecdote was conceived: On the first day of the Geneva Motor show, the audience rushed to the Jaguar booth, as word spread that the most astonishing car at the entire exhibition was displayed. To generate early leads and possible testing opportunities for potential buyers and press media, a second car had to be driven from England to Geneva. The combination of beauty, high performance and a competitive price made the E-Type and the Jaguar brand into an icon of the 1960s. Eventually Enzo Ferrari called the E-Type the most beautiful car he had ever seen.

Nonetheless, all was not well with Jaguar. For financial reasons in 1966, Jaguar merged with Austin Morris and MG, then later Rover and Triumph to form the British Motor Holding. By 1968 the British Motor Holding merged with Leyland Motors, and formed the multi-brand conglomerate British Leyland. This ultimately resulted in intra-brand rivalry, pitting Jaguar against Rover. The 1960’s and 1970’s also marked a period of strong unionisation in Great Britian culminating in strikes, divided management and quality problems across the British automotive industry. A stringent budget for Jaguars new development resulted in inferior design and brand reputation. In 1984, Jaguar was independent again and the newly appointed chairman John Egan highlighted that “ [...] Jaguar was reasonably profitable after separation from Leyland, reporting record sales of 49,500 vehicles in 1988. [...] The workforce numbered 12,000,” However a widely recognised problem was the infamous sloppy quality and outdated work practices throughout the company (Strach, Everett, 2006)

The Ford Era
Intrinsically important for this paper is the Ford Era. John Egan could not achieve substantial long term profitability to save the company and the Ford Motor Company bought Jaguar for $2.55 billion in 1989. [...] “Ford was already racking up experience with second-hand sports car brands in the 1970’s, when it acquired Ghia (producer of Ghia and De Tomaso cars) a...
famous design studio in Torino, Italy; and promptly downgraded the brand into a mere label for Ford’s own top lines (Štrach, Everett, 2006). Ford in the beginning took a very market oriented and image driven approach to the Jaguar brand. The first years can be described as a success: Jaguar kept racing the following year, adding another Le Mans victory. Jaguar maintained slight profitability and heavily investing in retooling and modernisation of the factory.

Jaguar proposed an opportunity for Ford to become active in the growing European luxury market. Through market intelligence and trying to meet unmet customer expectations, Ford saw Jaguar as a mere puzzle piece to fill the void within their own product portfolio (Urde et al., 2011; Štrach, Everett, 2006)

During the 1990’s, Ford increasingly focused on growing their luxury car portfolio with the acquisition of brands such as Aston Martin (1987/1993), LandRover (1999) and Volvo (1999). All these luxury car brands became part of Ford’s PAG. Synergies within the value chain were attempted by sharing design, development, utilising platform strategies, production, distribution and shared dealerships networks. Other management decisions included the elimination of the Roadster models, focusing on the expansion of the brand portfolio of "British Saloons", among others, the S-Type (1999) and the X-Type (2001) and the alignment of the complete marketing mix to more segments. For Jaguar, “[...] production figures did not recover to the 1988 level until 1998, and then shot upwards to 120,570 vehicles sold in 2003. (Štrach, Everett, 2006). Sales figures however began to plateau around 2003. The S-Type and X-Type let Jaguar attract more customers but ultimately diluted the brand as the distinctiveness was intangibly lost. This is demonstrated best by comparing the Ford Mondeo and the Jaguar X-Type which shared the same platform and many (visual) components. Due to low growths rates, a more diverse product proliferation and the strong competition constituted major problems for Jaguar and its profitability. Ford could never recover their initial investment throughout the Jaguar stewardship. By 2007 the Jaguar brand stood in stark contrast to their former brand values of Grace, Space and Pace. Furthermore, the Jaguar brand, historically, was very difficult to stretch, due to the decades-long narrow (and "Roadster-heavy") product range (Diez, 2015).

A way of rejuvenating a brand is by trying to evoke brand resonance (Kapferer, 2012). The decision for Jaguar to take part in Formula One, tried to achieve this and was unsuccessful in rejuvenating the brand. Jaguar could not match motorsport appeal it once inherited within their model line because a sporty roadster did not exist. Formula One participation resulted in unprecedented costs and only two podium finishes within five years of racing resulted in a ‘loser image’. The brand positioning and brand claim for performance and quality, therefore could not be satisfied and Formula One participation was withdrawn.

By the second quarter of 2004, Ford reported $362 million loss for its entire PAG (Štrach, Everett, 2006) of which Jaguar accounted for about half ($178 million). Ford tried as a last attempt to restructure Jaguar for $450 million by closing factories and laying off the workforce and discontinuing the Formula One participation. On the verge of the financial crisis in 2006-2007, Ford ultimately made the decision to save its core Ford brand, closed down the PAG and sold Jaguar as well as Land Rover to the Tata conglomerate from India for $2.3 billion. The Tata Era

The next period of Jaguar can be described as a complete turnaround. Within the agreed demerger and merger deal Ford still delivered crucial components until Tata’s Management could be fully deployed. Crucially, Tata with the purchase of the Corus Steel Group in 2007, also provided steel and aluminium for many European car manufacturers and utilised vertical integration at Jaguar, saving procurement costs.
Within the realm of product development Tata focussed on aluminium and lightweight components, improving on the quality. Tata invested faith in the British workforce that can be exemplified by trusting the head of design Ian Callum, who reintroduced the progressive vehicle design language. The Jaguar brand values returned with the words performance, luxury and style. Tata focused its competences on Jaguar and Land Rover (JLR) instead of spreading them across a portfolio of brands like Ford did. Management was left essentially British and they did not put the parent company executives in place. Slow culture change and trust was the key. Further innovation and development was put on the hybrid development, their special vehicle operations and the aftermarket profitability.

The most stunning decision of Tata was to bring back the spiritual successor of the E-Type, personified by the F-Type, which was showcased for the first time at the Paris Motor show in 2012. The competitive pricing, contemporary as well as reminiscent E-Type like design resulted in the re-emergence of the grace, space and pace identity. Further identity based promotional activities that aligned the newly formed company culture with the Britishness personified in the sponsoring of the British Invictus games, the inclusion of Jaguar in the marketing of the 90th birthday of HM Queen in May 2016 and ultimately in the infamous British villain campaign composed by the marketing agency Spark 44 (Spark 44, 2016).

Tata has managed to earn an 18.9% EBITDA margin on Jaguar alone by the year 2016 and has sold 96,449 Jaguar vehicles (Jaguar LandRover Annual Report Overview, 2016) It has guided its growth by utilising pathos, ethos and Logos elements without compromising Jaguars distinctiveness.

**ANALYSIS**

**HQ Analysis**

With the purpose to determine whether Jaguar is a heritage brand, we will apply the Heritage Quotient model (Fig.4) (Urde, 2007).

Jaguar’s promise to deliver fast and beautiful cars has been evident since its inception in 1922. The track record is demonstrated by continuously introducing innovative and iconic vehicles such as the SS 1, the XK120, the E-Type and most recently the F-Type. Longevity is most visible in the design language of jaguar cars constructed over time demonstrated such as the roadster models. Furthermore, motor racing has always been linked to Jaguar and this stems from the founder’s passion in racing that has permeated through their culture. Grace, space and pace has been the Jaguar mantra since the 1940’s. This long held core mantra has become an integral part of Jaguar’s brand identity, and over time part of its brand heritage.

While the use of symbols is most prevalently embodied in the ‘Leaper’ bonnet ornament front grill design and the ‘Growler’ on the steering wheel. Jaguar has been and is using their history to advertise their brand. Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track Record</th>
<th>Established 1922, XK120 was the fastest car in the world, E-Type in 1963, The Icon, The F-Type as a modern reincarnation of the E-Type, Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longevity</td>
<td>Since 1922 they have been at the forefront of British motor engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Values</td>
<td>Grace, space and pace – heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of symbols</td>
<td>The Leaper and the Growler, Jaguar feline, heritage brand trust; British racing green, Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History as important to identity</td>
<td>Sir William Lyons, Sir Stirling Moss, Racing Pedigree ( 7 Le Mans victories, 1940’s symbolic British villain car</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 - HQ Model of Jaguar
has been long used as a part of their value proposition. Every customer who buys a Jaguar is not just buying a car, the customer is buying a piece of history. History of Jaguar is further embodied today by utilising prominent figures such as Sir William Lyons, Sir Stirling Moss, Ian Callum and most recently Sir Ben Kingsley. We therefore argue that Jaguar has a high degree of HQ. From this, heritage is seen as an integral part of the brand identity of Jaguar alongside brand core mantras such as “Grace, Space and Pace”. Due to Jaguars’ use of history and the emphasis they place on their heritage in relation to its value proposition and positioning, in the minds and hearts of its key stakeholders.

We believe that heritage is a fundamental part of Jaguar’s brand core. Deviations from its heritage which impacts its HQ elements (e.g. track record), can influence the perception stakeholders will have on Jaguar, which may very well manifest itself in company performance.

CBIM Analysis
The main part of this analysis is to discover how key linkages have been utilised by Ford and Tata within the CBIM. This hereby connects the strategy diagonal, the competition diagonal, the interaction vertical and the communication horizontal as key linkages in our analysis (Urde & Greyser, 2016.)

**CBIM – Ford**

**The Strategy Diagonal**
Under Fords ownership, Jaguar had very little autonomy and was part of Fords overall strategy to become the world’s leading automotive consumer company. (Ford annual report, 2004) Jaguars vision in 2000 was to represent “an elegant, sensuous original with refined power” (Ford Motor Company, 1998).

This aligned to the brand core through the original grace, space and pace mantra. However, this position in the minds and the hearts of the consumer was not conveyed through the vehicle offering. The vehicles had lost their competitive edge, the X-Type (sharing one platform with the Ford Mondeo) and S-Type represented lower entry models and a market oriented approach by Ford that did not fulfil the promise of the brand core. This highlights a poor execution in the positioning and a misalignment in the CBIM. Consequently, production figures did rise, but stagnated around 2003 and the brands resonance and image displayed a misalignment with the core values.

**The Competition Diagonal**
Due to cost saving measures it becomes evident that Ford amalgamated the dealer network and sold Jaguars alongside Volvo and Aston Martin vehicles. By creating comparison and framing bias (Evans, Stanovich 2013) between brands during purchase decisions made by the consumer, this caused brand corrosion. Craftsmanship was not directly visible from the final consumer in the dealership. The multi-brand dealerships created tangible and visual intra brand competition. The corpus delict (the body of the crime) in the case of buying a Jaguar was not anymore packaged in its history, it was framed alongside Ford Mondeos.

![Figure 5 - Comparative price advert - Ford Era](image)
Ford did modernise and innovate the production facilities of Jaguar which became a competency. However, Jaguar’s other key competences that consisted of innovation, performance and excellent craftsmanship were not demonstrated. This always stood for distinctiveness which was being lost in the value proposition of the consumer. Ultimately, it did not fulfil the brand core promise and utilise Ford’s competencies.

The Communication Horizontal
Jaguar is personified per se by its animalistic name, its nature of speed and aggressiveness, its heritage and Britishness. These characteristic elements transcend towards the brand core and are externally mirrored in the expression element. During the Ford era, the expression through the advertising is largely aligned with the core values. There are limited cases where the expressions in the form of advertising did not fully align with the core promise such as the comparative price advert (see Fig. 5) which communicates a more “value for money premium car” image. But overall the communication horizontal had good linkages with only small mishaps along the way.

The Interaction Vertical
While under Fords Stewardship, Jaguar underwent a major production rejuvenation, however the company culture was a top down approach with a ‘change of guard’ in the management. A significant majority of executives were being directly sourced from Ford’s management. It wasn’t about Ford’s disrespect of Jaguar’s culture, it was that they perceived their own culture as superior based on Ford’s successful track record. Jaguar was essentially added to Ford’s ever-expanding PAG’s portfolio which spread their resources too thinly.

From a consumer perspective, the experience changed from a relational to a transactional customer relationship under Ford’s stewardship. Evidentially, dealerships became focused on profitability and did not provide a customer experience that aligns with their Jaguar’s core identity losing a sense of exclusivity and Grace.

CBIM - Tata
The Strategy Diagonal
Tata’s vision for Jaguar was to “to create and build beautiful fast cars that bring the
enjoyment and exhilaration of driving to life (Jaguar LandRover Annual Report Overview, 2016). A brand orientated approach, resulted in the resurrection of the iconic E-Type in its modern day reincarnation of the F-Type. Coming from the inside out and aligning the once famous icon with a modern day interpretation and not a down market model was chosen.

The defining Jaguar car was brought back and additionally the introduction of the Special Vehicle Operations Unit gave the consumer individualisation that reinstalled Jaguar’s position and resonance (Kapferer, 2012) in the hearts and minds of the consumers. More focus was put on the aftermarket, which has the highest profitability in the automotive industry further increasing Tata’s successful tenure. In this case we see a clear alignment in the three elements of the CBIM.

**The Competition Diagonal**
Under Tata, modern day dealerships only accommodate two brands, Jaguar and Land Rover which allow for distinguished product offerings. Both brands do not engage in intra-brand competition which is a major advantage A market orientated approach, introduced the Jaguar F-Pace. Furthermore, the off-road F-Pace has already proven to be one of Jaguar’s most successful models and is aligned with brand core.

This is achieved through the successful execution of their competencies, harnessing adopted shared platforms and emphasis on innovative design and performance. Thus, building on their core competencies is resulting in their competitive advantage. Additionally, the F-Pace provides a luxury SUV that demonstrates grace and space. These new Jaguars are perfectly aligned with the brand core.

**The Communication Horizontal**
Tata has managed to align historical facts with the personality of the brand. Jaguar’s historical ties with villains who preferred to steal Jaguar cars as a getaway vehicle, due to their speed, manoeuvrability and space (grace space and pace), is personified in their expressional elements. Further connotations of this alignment are shown with the James Bond villain car, which is a Jaguar and the current set of ‘British Villain – It’s good to be bad” adverts (See Fig.7).

![British Villain Campaign](image)

*Figure 7 - British Villain - It's good to be bad- Tata Era

Besides that, Jaguar is also able to express their people focus and British distinctiveness through the sponsoring of the Invictus Games and the British Monarchs (HM Queen Elizabeth’s 90th birthday.) The personality is successfully expressed aligning these elements.

**The Interaction Vertical**
Different stakeholders were addressed by Tata who implemented vertical integration by supplying Jaguar with aluminium and steel from their daughter brand, Tata Steel, formally Corus Steel who they bought in 2006. This relationship between the stakeholder is an innovation in the supply chain that is embedded in their brand core. Tata, decided to leave the existing management structure intact and leave the British managers in place. There wasn’t any attempt to impose Indian managers on JLR. All the key personnel retained their position (manager-magazin/reuters 2008)
Capitalising on the corporate culture, Tata developed the recruitment methods to excel their intake of talented personnel. Today, the graduate schemes are highly regarded in the UK. Managing people and their resources describes their efforts to achieve organisational excellence that is demonstrated throughout their brand core and heritage. From a consumer perspective, Jaguar are developing a more exclusive relationship from the point of sale through to the aftermarket care building customer loyalty.

**Findings/Discussion**

As established from the HQ model, Jaguar has a strong HQ and throughout history has strategically used heritage as part of its value proposition and positioning in the minds of its consumer. We therefore perceive Jaguar as a corporate heritage brand.

Reflecting on the analysis on the two case studies, both Ford and Tata respected the brand core and promise of Jaguar. This is mostly evident in the similarities in both companies’ internal elements except culture. Personality differ in the advertisement. The expression of individual advertisements differs, but the symbols are largely similar.

**Ford**

We argue that Ford predominantly followed a market orientated approach because they wanted to target the needs and wants of particular young segment that wanted to buy into premium car brands. Jaguar was just another portfolio brand within the PAG. It is perceived that under Ford’s Stewardship, Jaguar was disassociated with the heritage.

Although they modernised the factories, Ford did not utilise Jaguar’s competencies, demonstrated by the highly criticised X-Type. Jaguar did not deliver on their brand promise and wanted to deliver a convenient and value for money positioned, for a young generation of vehicle users who wanted to join the premium car market. This accumulated in the misalignment in the external and internal elements of the CBIM. The Americanisation of the management structure influenced the culture at Jaguar that led to a transactional relationship with customers.
**Tata**

On the other hand, Tata adopts a “hybrid” brand-to-market orientated approach. Heritage was re-instated as a key part in the positioning as well as their value proposition, demonstrated in the F-Type. This proposition is clearly different to Ford’s approach and is consistent with Jaguars brand core. Furthermore, Tata exploited the pre-existing competencies of Jaguar and added a new competency in the vertical integration with Tata Steel.

Tata trusted the management team to handle brand and deliver results. We argue this approach is considered a brand orientated approach. However, in the introduction of the F-Pace SUV in recognition of market trends. This resulted in an alignment of the entire CBIM model.

Interestingly, when we look at Jaguar being a corporate heritage brand and utilising the CBIM model with heritage as part of its brand core. We find a strong correlation in sequential links between value proposition, positioning and the brand core. As discussed, Urde et al (2007) defines a heritage brand as when a corporation uses its heritage as part of its basis for its value proposition and positioning. Furthermore, Kapferer (2012) describes that a brand’s identity draws from its roots and heritage. While during brand decay, the brand assets are not lost immediately as the brand image resonates in the consumer’s long-term memories.

This may offer an explanation to why under Ford’s stewardship, there were too many changes and diversions from their core values which caused a dysfunctional fit between consumer’s expectations and Jaguars deliverance. This naturally led to Jaguar’s brand corrosion during the Ford era. As within the mind and hearts of consumers, the expectations of Jaguar was not met under Ford’s stewardship. While under Tata, the value proposition and positioning was purposely aligned with the brand core element and within the core its heritage. Which resulted in improved consumer satisfaction (JaguarUSA, 2016; Dailymail, 2012) and financial performance (Jaguar LandRover Annual Report Overview, 2016).

This suggests that there is a direct link between the value proposition, positioning and brand core elements for the CBIM matrix suggesting that there is in fact a fifth sequential link in relation to heritage (see Fig.9). All in all, this paper argues that Ford were unable to successfully align the key elements of Jaguar’s brand identity. Tata were successful in effectively aligning the key elements of Jaguar’s brand identity, utilising heritage as the core value. This is more than evident in Tata’s reign, with Jaguar taking profitability in the last six years in stark contrast to Fords inability to produce similar results.

**CONCLUSION**

In Conclusion, it is imperative for a corporate brand to align the internal and external elements of the CBIM to the brand core as this creates sustainable competitive advantage. As misalignments are even more exacerbated in the case of corporate heritage brands due to heritage brands emphasis on elements such as track record, history, etc. which makes deviation from these elements even more apparent. It is therefore evident that heritage should be seen as a fundamental part of the brand promise/core value in the CBIM model for a corporate heritage brand such as Jaguar.

**THEORETICAL/MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS**

This research has added to the corporate brand literature, specifically within the application of the CBIM model. Furthermore, this article has argued for the theoretical applicability of the CBIM in a comparative case study whilst incorporating corporate heritage brand management. In addition to that heritage has been strongly linked with its effects on the
value proposition and position while being part a fundamental part of the formation of the brand core in terms of identity and purpose (i.e. promise and core values). The research findings have culminated into the discovery that when using the CBIM model on a corporate heritage brand, the value proposition as well as the position have to be crucially aligned with the brand core and promise, of which heritage is of vital pertinence for such brands.

**FURTHER RESEARCH AND LIMITATIONS**

Further research is needed in regards to the applicability of the V-Line within heritage brands. Interviews with Ford, Jaguar and Tata managers would substantiate the research. Cases such as Volvo and the management change with the Chinese conglomerate Geely, Land Rover respectively and Patek Philippe would represent a strong point for further research. The comparative case study solely focused on Jaguar and used the sequential lines of Mats Urde out of his CBIRM model without the reputation element. Further study including the reputational aspects would provide further insight into the management of corporate heritage brands.
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