

Research Article

Synergy in Branding: The Influence of Employer Brand and Corporate Brand on Consumer Psychology and Repeat Experiences

Navin Kumar Shrivastava

Associate Professor, Birla Institute of Management Technology –Greater Noida, 201306, UP, India

*Corresponding Author

Navin Kumar Shrivastava

Article History

Received: 01.05.2026

Accepted: 25.05.2026

Published: 03.06.2026

Abstract: This paper explores the combined impact of Employer Brand (EB) and Corporate Brand (CB) on consumer psychology, specifically focusing on repeat experiences such as product repurchase and employee retention. Utilizing Signaling and Social Identity theories, the authors review recent literature to propose the "Integrated Brand Ecosystem" model, which visualizes how internal and external brand equity influence one another. The analysis reveals that corporate social irresponsibility causes a "spite effect," damaging both consumer and employee intentions, while sustainability and well-being initiatives act as positive signals that foster trust and loyalty. The study offers a unique framework called "Psychological Spillover" to explain the bidirectional relationship between EB and CB, recommending the merger of HR and Marketing functions. Although limited by its conceptual nature and lack of primary data, the research suggests that organizations should adopt Integrated Brand Management (IBM), treating company culture as a marketing tool and supporting "Employer Brand Ambassadors." Additionally, the study emphasizes that modern stakeholders demand corporate responsibility, meaning that unethical behavior risks boycotts and long-term damage to brand loyalty.

Keywords: Employer Branding, Corporate Branding, Consumer Psychology, Repeat Experience, Brand Love, Sustainability, Spillover Effect.

Copyright @ 2026: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution license which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use (NonCommercial, or CC-BY-NC) provided the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION

The modern business ecosystem is characterized by an unprecedented level of transparency and connectivity. In this environment, stakeholders—whether they are customers purchasing a smartphone or candidates applying for a software engineering role—access the same information channels. They read the same news, scroll through the same social media feeds, and share the same grievances. This convergence has rendered the traditional silos between "Corporate Branding" (the face the company shows the world) and "Employer Branding" (the face the company shows its talent) obsolete.

Corporate branding has historically focused on managing the reputation and image of the organization to external stakeholders to drive product sales and loyalty (Koch & Gyrd-Jones, 2019). Employer branding, conversely, has focused on the psychological contract with current and prospective employees to attract, retain, and engage talent (Dierickx et al., 2025). However, emerging research suggests a profound interplay between these two domains. A company that is perceived as an excellent place to work often enjoys a "halo effect" that boosts consumer trust, while a company with a tarnished corporate reputation faces significant hurdles in recruiting top talent (Silaban et al., 2023).

The central premise of this paper is that Consumer Psychology—the internal drivers of behavior such as trust, emotion, and perception—acts as the bridge between these two branding domains. When a consumer evaluates a product, they are increasingly evaluating the ethos of the company behind it. Similarly, when a job seeker evaluates an employer, they are heavily influenced by the market reputation of the corporate brand. The "Repeat Experience"—the holy grail of business success, manifested as customer retention and employee retention—is therefore a function of this integrated brand perception.

This paper aims to synthesize current academic discourse to answer a critical question: How do Employer Brand and Corporate Brand jointly influence consumer psychology to foster repeat experiences? By reviewing literature ranging from the role of sustainability (Chen et al., 2025; Tkalac Verčič & Verčič, 2025) to the mechanics of brand love (Wang et al., 2019) and the dangers of corporate social irresponsibility (Sweetin et al., 2013), this research develops a theoretical model of "The Integrated Brand Ecosystem."

EVOLUTIONARY DEFINITION AND CONTEXTUAL REFERENCE

To understand the synergy between these concepts, it is essential to trace their evolution and define them within the current context.

2.1. Employer Brand: From Recruitment to Psychological Contract

Definition: Employer Brand refers to the package of functional, economic, and psychological benefits provided by employment, and identified with the employing company (Ambler & Barrow, 1996). **Evolutionary Context:** Historically, employer branding was a sub-discipline of Human Resources, focused primarily on recruitment advertising—communicating "we are hiring" and "we pay well." However, as detailed by Dierickx et al. (2025), the concept has evolved into a strategic management tool centered on Employer Brand Personality. It is no longer just about salary; it is about the "warmth" and "competence" of the organization. In the current context, as highlighted by Tai et al. (2025), employer branding extends to retention and agile values. It encompasses the physical environment (de Campos Ribeiro & Minchella, 2025) and the digital employee experience (Mohammadi & Mohammadian, 2025). It has morphed from a transactional value proposition ("work for us for money") to a relational psychological contract ("grow with us because we share your values").

2.2. Corporate Brand: From Visual Identity to Stakeholder Covenant

Definition: A corporate brand is a visual, verbal, and behavioral expression of an organization's unique business philosophy, culture, and values. **Evolutionary Context:** Corporate branding began as an exercise in visual identity and naming conventions. However, scholars like Tarnovskaya (2015) and Balmer et al. (2020) argue for a more complex view: the corporate brand as a covenant or a contract with stakeholders. In the B2B and B2C contexts, the corporate brand has evolved to serve as a "master brand" that endorses products (Swoboda & Sinning, 2021). Contextually, it now includes the organization's historical narrative (Iglesias et al., 2020) and its stance on macro-societal issues like sustainability (Villagra & López, 2013). It is no longer a static logo but a dynamic, socially constructed identity (Essamri et al., 2019).

2.3. Consumer Psychology: From Rational Choice to Identity Expression

Definition: Consumer psychology studies how individuals relate to the goods and services they purchase, covering the mental and emotional processes involved. **Evolutionary Context:** Early consumer psychology focused on utility and rational decision-making. Today, it is deeply rooted in Social Identity Theory. Consumers use brands to express who they are (Lloyd & Woodside, 2013). The "Repeat Experience" is driven not just by product satisfaction, but by Brand Love (Wang et al., 2019) or Brand Rapture—an intense, almost spiritual connection to the brand. In the context of this paper, consumer psychology also encompasses the "willingness-to-punish" a brand for ethical lapses (Sweetin et al., 2013), a behavior traditionally associated with civic engagement but now common in commerce.

2.4. Repeat Experience: Loyalty and Retention

Definition: In this paper, "Repeat Experience" is a dual construct: (1) Consumer repeat purchase intention and (2) Employee repeat engagement/retention (or re-application). **Contextual Reference:** For consumers, repeat experience is the result of trust and brand love. For employees, it is the result of value congruence and satisfaction (Bahri-Ammari et al., 2025). The convergence occurs when a consumer's loyalty to a product brand (e.g., Nike) inspires them to seek employment there, or when an employee's pride in their company drives them to become a brand ambassador (Mutter, 2025).

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review is organized into three thematic streams: The Internal Drivers (Employer Brand), The External Drivers (Corporate Brand), and The Intersections (Consumer Psychology and Spillover).

3.1. The Internal Frontier: Employer Branding and the Psychological Contract

The literature on Employer Branding (EB) has shifted significantly toward understanding the signals sent to the market. Dierickx et al. (2025) established that "well-being policies" function as a signal of organizational warmth and competence. In an era of burnout, organizations that prioritize well-being attract applicants not just for the perks, but because the policy signals a safe, supportive psychological environment.

This signaling is crucial for the "Repeat Experience" of employees. Tai et al. (2025) explored how "agile values" moderate the relationship between employer brand and retention in high-tech startups. They found that in resource-constrained environments, the cultural fit—the promise of agility and autonomy—retains talent more effectively than financial incentives alone. This aligns with the findings of de Campos Ribeiro and Minchella (2025), who noted that physical office

design acts as a tangible manifestation of the employer brand, significantly influencing the intention to leave. If the physical space contradicts the promised brand (e.g., a "collaborative" brand with isolated cubicles), the psychological contract is breached, leading to turnover.

Furthermore, the digital transformation of EB is evident in the work of Buil et al. (2025), who introduced gamification in recruitment. By using gamified escape rooms, they found that engagement during the recruitment process translated into higher organizational attractiveness. This suggests that the "experience" of the brand begins at the application stage, setting the tone for the future employment relationship.

3.2. The External Frontier: Corporate Branding and Consumer Loyalty

On the corporate side, the focus is on the enduring nature of the brand. Koch and Gyrd-Jones (2019) proposed a dynamic, process-oriented approach to corporate brand positioning, suggesting that corporate brands are not static entities but are constantly negotiated through "positioning episodes." This dynamism is essential for maintaining repeat consumer experiences, as static brands risk obsolescence.

The emotional connection between consumer and corporate brand is profound. Wang et al. (2019) introduced the concept of "Corporate Brand Love" within hotel portfolios, finding that love for a sub-brand (e.g., a specific hotel) spills over to the corporate parent. This "love" is a stronger predictor of repeat purchase than mere satisfaction. Similarly, Lloyd and Woodside (2013) theorized "Corporate Brand Rapture," describing a state of intense engagement where the consumer becomes an advocate. This aligns with the work of Alwi (2009), who found that online corporate brand images significantly drive consumer loyalty by creating a sense of familiarity and trust.

However, this loyalty is fragile. Sweetin et al. (2013) demonstrated the "willingness-to-punish" phenomenon. Consumers actively seek to punish corporate brands for social irresponsibility. This psychological response is not just about avoiding the product; it is about active retribution, which severely damages the corporate brand equity.

3.3. The Intersection: Sustainability, Ambassadors, and Spillover

The most critical insight from the combined literature is the spillover between EB and CB. Sustainability as a Connector: Chen et al. (2025) provided compelling evidence that environmental pollution acts as a massive negative signal for employer attractiveness. Gen Z job seekers were willing to reject higher-paying "polluting" employers. Tkalac Verčič and Verčič (2025) expanded this, showing that sustainability is a key driver of employer brand evaluation across Generations X, Y, and Z. This mirrors the consumer perspective where CSR drives brand loyalty (François et al., 2021). Thus, sustainability is a "dual-use" attribute: it secures repeat buyers and repeat applicants.

The Ambassador Role: Mutter (2025) identified four types of employer brand ambassadors (Sparkers, Supporters, Seekers, Strikers). These are employees who leverage their social capital to endorse the corporate brand. This is the physical manifestation of the EB-to-CB spillover. When an employee shares their positive work experience on social media, they are acting as a corporate brand influencer. Silaban et al. (2023) confirmed that perceived credibility of corporate brand information on social media directly impacts job seeker intentions.

The Digital Mining of Perception: Mohammadi and Mohammadian (2025) utilized Aspect-Based Sentiment Analysis on Glassdoor reviews to uncover the Employee Value Proposition (EVP). They found that operational realities (management style, work-life balance) are the real drivers of reputation. This reinforces the idea that the "internal truth" of the employer brand eventually becomes the "external reality" of the corporate brand.

Process Attributes: Kanwal and Van Hoyer (2026) emphasized "process attributes" of the employer brand—distinctiveness, consistency, and consensus. They argued that these are as important as the content (salary/benefits). This consistency is vital for consumer psychology as well; consumers crave consistent brand experiences (Balmer & Thomson, 2008).

THEORETICAL UNDERPINNING

This paper is grounded in Signaling Theory and Social Identity Theory (SIT).

Signaling Theory: In markets characterized by information asymmetry, job seekers and consumers look for "signals" of quality.

Employer Context: Well-being policies (Dierickx et al., 2025) and green initiatives (Chen et al., 2025) are signals. They reduce the uncertainty for the applicant regarding the quality of the work environment.

Consumer Context: Corporate history (Iglesias et al., 2020) and CEO endorsements (Scheidt et al., 2018) are signals of stability and competence.

Application: When a company sends a positive signal (e.g., high sustainability ratings), it simultaneously reduces uncertainty for the consumer (safe product) and the applicant (safe job), thereby increasing the probability of repeat engagement from both.

Social Identity Theory (SIT): SIT posits that individuals derive part of their self-concept from their membership in relevant social groups.

Consumer Identity: Buying from a corporate brand allows a consumer to express their values (e.g., "I am an environmentalist because I buy from Patagonia").

Employee Identity: Working for an employer brand allows an employee to express their professional identity (e.g., "I am an innovator because I work at Google").

The Synthesis: When the Corporate Brand and Employer Brand are aligned, the consumer and employee identities can merge. A consumer who loves a brand is more likely to apply for a job there to validate their identity, and an employee is more likely to advocate for the products to validate their professional choice.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Based on the literature review and theoretical framework, the following research questions guide this study:

- RQ1: How do specific Employer Brand attributes (well-being, agility, sustainability) function as signals that influence consumer trust and repeat purchase intention?
- RQ2: To what extent does Corporate Brand Social Irresponsibility (CSI) negatively impact both consumer "willingness-to-punish" and potential applicant "intention to apply"?
- RQ3: What is the mediating role of "Brand Love" and "Organizational Identification" in the relationship between Corporate Brand Reputation and Repeat Experiences (consumption and employment)?

Hypothesis

The conceptual framework anchors the study's logic within Organizational Values & Culture, radiating outward to define the interplay between the inner Employer Brand ring—comprising well-being policies, office design, and agile values—and the outer Corporate Brand ring, which includes sustainability and product endorsement. This architecture empirically grounds Hypothesis 1, which posits that inner-ring Employer Brand attributes like well-being and agility positively influence Consumer Trust; as Dierickx et al. (2025) and Tai et al. (2025) argue, these internal attributes serve as vital signals of ethics and competence that reassure consumers about the organization's character, thereby strengthening the foundational Consumer Psychology at the framework's base. Within the outer ring, the prominence of Sustainability validates Hypothesis 2, acting as a moderator that strengthens the path to the dual outcomes of Consumer Repeat Purchase and Employee Retention. Drawing on Chen et al. (2025) and Tkalac Verčič and Verčič (2025), the framework visualizes how green signals significantly reduce perceived risk for both consumers and applicants, enhancing the overall brand structure. Conversely, the model accounts for the fragility of this system through Hypothesis 3, illustrating that Corporate Social Irresponsibility (CSI) can disrupt the flow, triggering a "Spite Effect" where stakeholders actively choose boycott or avoidance rather than repeat engagement. Finally, the bidirectional "Psychological Spillover" arrows connecting the rings operationalize Hypothesis 4, demonstrating that the mechanism driving this flow is the "Employer Brand Ambassador." As noted by Mutter (2025) and Silaban et al. (2023), employees serve as credible mediators who translate internal satisfaction into external Consumer Brand Love, effectively bridging the gap between the inner and outer rings to sustain the cycle of repeat experiences.

Drawing on the theoretical underpinning and conceptual framework from the literature, the following hypotheses has been addressed in this paper:

- H1: Positive Employer Brand attributes (specifically well-being policies and agile values) have a significant positive influence on Consumer Trust in the Corporate Brand.
- H2: Environmental sustainability acts as a moderator, strengthening the relationship between Corporate Brand Image and both Consumer Repurchase Intention and Job Seeker Attractiveness.
- H3: Corporate Social Irresponsibility (CSI) triggers a "Spite Effect," leading to a negative correlation between CSI and Repeat Experience for both Consumers (Boycott) and Applicants (Avoidance).
- H4: The presence of "Employer Brand Ambassadors" (employees advocating for the brand) mediates the relationship between Employee Satisfaction and Consumer Brand Love.

METHODOLOGY

As this study aims to synthesize diverse streams of literature to propose a unified framework, it employs a Conceptual Review and Secondary Data Analysis methodology.

Research Design: A systematic qualitative review of the provided references was conducted. The references were categorized into three domains: Employer Branding, Corporate Branding, and Consumer Psychology. The analysis involved identifying converging themes, contradictions, and gaps to build a theoretical model.

Data Sources: The data consists of 38 peer-reviewed articles primarily from Scopus/WOS indexed journals published between 2004 and 2026. These sources cover diverse industries including high-tech startups, hospitality, sports, logistics, and manufacturing.

Analytical Approach: The analysis follows a Thematic Synthesis approach:

Coding: Key concepts (e.g., "trust," "punishment," "love," "signals") were extracted from the abstracts and findings of the provided articles.

Mapping: These concepts were mapped to the theoretical constructs of Signaling Theory and Social Identity Theory.

Model Building: The relationships identified in the literature (e.g., the link between office design and turnover) were extrapolated to the consumer context to propose the "Integrated Brand Ecosystem."

Figure 1 conceptualises a framework and encapsulates the study's central thesis by placing Organizational Values & Culture at the amber core, serving as the foundational signal generator for the entire system. Surrounding this nucleus, the Employer Brand is depicted as the green inner ring, featuring key internal drivers such as Well-being, Office Design, and Agile Values, which the research identifies as critical signals of organizational warmth and competence that attract and retain talent. This internal layer dynamically interacts with the blue outer ring representing the Corporate Brand, which encompasses external pillars like Sustainability, History, and Product Endorsement. The bidirectional arrows labeled "Psychological Spillover" between these rings visually represent the paper's primary finding: that internal employee satisfaction and external corporate reputation are mutually reinforcing, with one fueling the other through a seamless exchange of psychological signals. Ultimately, this integrated structure drives the two flanking outcomes of Consumer Repeat Purchase and Employee Retention/Application, both underpinned by the foundational role of Consumer Psychology and Trust. This alignment illustrates that the "Repeat Experience" for both customers and talent is sustained not by isolated strategies, but by a coherent ecosystem where core values consistently permeate every layer of the brand architecture.

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework of the Integrated Brand Ecosystem



Analysis

This section analyzes the literature to support the proposed hypotheses and framework.

8.1. Analysis of the "Green" Signal (Support for H1 & H2)

The literature presents a robust case for sustainability as a dual-driver of repeat experience. Chen et al. (2025) provide empirical evidence that Gen Z business students view pollution as a severe negative signal for employer attractiveness. Importantly, they found that a 50% wage premium could not offset the negative perception of a polluting employer. This aligns with the consumer psychology perspective presented by Villagra and López (2013), who analyzed "responsible brands." They found that consumers are increasingly scrutinizing the ethical values communicated by corporate brands. Analysis: The data suggests that sustainability is not a "nice-to-have" but a "hygiene factor" for the repeat experience. If the signal is negative (pollution), the organization loses both customers (due to ethical consumerism) and talent (due to value incongruence). This supports H2, showing sustainability as a critical moderator of brand image.

8.2. The Dark Side: Spite and Punishment (Support for H3)

Sweetin et al. (2013) introduced the concept of "willingness-to-punish." Their experimental design showed that consumers are not just passive; they are active agents who seek to harm brands that violate social contracts. This is corroborated by the findings of Chen et al. (2025), where job seekers actively avoided polluting firms. Analysis: This reveals a psychological symmetry. The emotion driving a consumer to boycott a brand is psychologically similar to the emotion driving a candidate to blacklist an employer. Both are forms of "disidentification." When the corporate brand acts irresponsibly, it breaches the psychological contract with all stakeholders, not just consumers. This supports H3, confirming the existence of a "Spite Effect" that damages repeat experiences across the board.

8.3. The Role of Culture and "Place" (Support for H1)

The physical and cultural environment of the firm serves as a tangible proof point of the brand promise. de Campos Ribeiro and Minchella (2025) found that office design (e.g., shared rooms vs. flex offices) directly impacts employee turnover intention. Extending this logic via Signaling Theory, the "place" of work is often visible or communicated to the outside world. A chaotic or depressing office environment signals a lack of care, which erodes consumer trust in the quality of the product. Conversely, Tai et al. (2025) highlight "agile values" in startups. Analysis: Agile values (flexibility, speed, innovation) are attractive to employees but are also highly valued by consumers in B2B and tech markets. When a company projects an image of agility (Corporate Brand) and delivers it via agile HR practices (Employer Brand), it creates a cohesive identity that fosters repeat engagement. This supports H1, indicating that internal cultural attributes are potent external signals.

8.4. The Ambassador Mechanism (Support for H4)

Mutter (2025) segments employees into "Sparkers" (highly positive) and "Strikers" (negative). Silaban et al. (2023) reinforce the power of social media credibility. Analysis: In the digital age, the boundary between internal communication and external marketing is porous. An employee's review on Glassdoor (Mohammadi & Mohammadian, 2025) is a piece of consumer-facing content. Therefore, Employer Brand Management is Corporate Brand Management. The "repeat experience" is fueled by these ambassadors. A consumer who interacts with a happy, empowered employee (a "Sparker") is more likely to develop Brand Love (Wang et al., 2019), validating H4.

FINDINGS

The analysis of the provided literature yields the following key findings:

The Dissolution of Boundaries: The primary finding is the complete integration of Employer and Corporate branding. Attributes traditionally reserved for HR (e.g., well-being policies, office design) are now primary drivers of consumer trust (Dierickx et al., 2025; de Campos Ribeiro & Minchella, 2025).

The Fragility of the Repeat Experience: Repeat purchase and retention are not automatic. They are vulnerable to "single-point failures" in ethics. The "Spite Effect" (Sweetin et al., 2013) and the rejection of polluters (Chen et al., 2025) demonstrate that one negative signal can permanently damage the relationship with both customers and talent.

The Power of "Process": It is not just what the brand offers (content), but how it offers it (process). Kanwal and Van Hoye (2026) emphasize that distinctiveness and consistency are key. If the recruitment process is gamified and engaging (Buil et al., 2025), it sets a precedent for a positive product experience.

History as a Trust Anchor: Corporate history and core values (Urde, 2009; Iglesias et al., 2020) serve as the bedrock for both consumer and employee psychology. A strong historical narrative provides the stability needed for long-term relationships (repeat experiences).

The Feedback Loop: There is a bidirectional causality. A strong Corporate Brand attracts better talent, who create better

products (Swoboda & Sinning, 2021), which reinforces the Corporate Brand. Conversely, poor Employer Branding (high turnover, bad reviews) poisons the Corporate Brand well.

CONCLUSION

This paper set out to explore the influence of Employer Brand and Corporate Brand on consumer psychology and repeat experiences. Through a comprehensive review of contemporary literature, it has established that these two domains are inextricably linked through the mechanisms of psychological signaling, social identity, and emotional connection.

The "Repeat Experience"—whether it is a consumer buying a product for the tenth time or an employee staying with a firm for a decade—is driven by a cohesive brand narrative. When the internal reality (Employer Brand) aligns with the external promise (Corporate Brand), it creates a powerful "Brand Rapture" (Lloyd & Woodside, 2013) and "Brand Love" (Wang et al., 2019). However, this alignment is delicate. Missteps in sustainability, ethics, or culture trigger a psychological "spite" response that alienates both markets.

The era of managing Employer and Corporate brands in isolation is over. The modern organization must view its employees as brand ambassadors and its customers as potential talent pools. The psychological levers that drive retention are the same that drive loyalty: trust, consistency, shared values, and emotional well-being.

Implications to Industry and Academia

11.1. For Industry

Integrated Brand Management (IBM): Companies should dismantle the silos between HR and Marketing. Recruitment campaigns should be designed as marketing campaigns, and marketing campaigns should highlight employee stories. The use of gamification (Buil et al., 2025) is a prime example of a tactic that serves both recruitment and engagement.

Investment in "Culture as Product": Office design (de Campos Ribeiro & Minchella, 2025) and well-being policies (Dierickx et al., 2025) are not overhead costs; they are marketing investments. They create the visual and emotional evidence that the brand promise is real.

Risk Management via Sustainability: Given the severe backlash against polluters (Chen et al., 2025) and the importance of CSR (François et al., 2021), sustainability must be central to the strategy to protect the brand from the "willingness-to-punish" (Sweetin et al., 2013).

Leveraging Ambassadors: Managers must identify and nurture "Sparkers" (Mutter, 2025). These employees are the most authentic channel for influencing consumer psychology. Employee advocacy programs should be a KPI for marketing departments.

11.2. For Academia

Unified Theoretical Models: Future research should develop and test unified models of brand equity that include both consumer and employee variables as dependent and independent variables.

Longitudinal Studies: There is a need for longitudinal research to track how a change in Employer Brand (e.g., a new policy) impacts Consumer Psychology over time.

Cross-Generational Analysis: As Tkalac Verčič and Verčič (2025) noted, different generations value brand attributes differently. Academics should explore how Gen Z's focus on sustainability reshapes the traditional Corporate Brand vs. Employer Brand dynamic.

Limitations of Research

This research is subject to certain limitations. First, it relies on a conceptual review of existing literature; while the synthesis is robust, it lacks primary empirical data validation of the specific "Integrated Brand Ecosystem" model proposed here. Second, the literature reviewed is biased toward recent publications (2019–2026), which may underrepresent historical longitudinal trends. Third, the references cover a wide range of industries (tech, hospitality, sports), which, while providing breadth, may obscure industry-specific nuances. For instance, the impact of office design may be less significant for remote-first tech companies compared to manufacturing firms. Finally, the "repeat experience" for consumers (purchase) and employees (retention) are operationalized here as psychological constructs; actual behavioral data might differ from stated intentions found in the reviewed surveys.

Acknowledgement

The authors wish to acknowledge the valuable contributions of the various scholars whose works were reviewed in this paper. The insights from Dierickx et al., Sweetin et al., Chen et al., and others have provided the foundational pillars for

this conceptual framework. We also extend our gratitude to the academic community for continuing to explore the intricate relationships between organizational identity and stakeholder psychology.

REFERENCES

1. Alwi, S. F. S. (2009). Online corporate brand images and consumer loyalty. *International Journal of Business and Society*, 10(2), 1–19. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-77749279615&partnerID=40&md5=10a9ad1211c49dd833227d485630b460>
2. Bahri-Ammari, N., Soliman, M., & Salah, O. B. (2025). The impact of employer brand on job seekers' attitudes and intentions: The moderating role of value congruence and social media. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 28(2), 93–107. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41299-022-00154-8>
3. Balmer, J. M. T., Lin, Z., Chen, W., & He, X. (2020). The role of corporate brand image for B2B relationships of logistics service providers in China. *Journal of Business Research*, 117, 850–861. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.03.043>
4. Balmer, J. M. T., & Thomson, I. (2008). The shared management and ownership of corporate brands: The case of Hilton. *Journal of General Management*, 34(4), 15–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030630700903400402>
5. Buil, I., Catalán, S., & Hernández-Ortega, B. (2025). Building strong employer brands: The role of gamification. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 34(7), 1091–1110. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPRM-07-2024-5349>
6. Chen, X., Lemański, M. K., Staszów, M., & Watters, C. (2025). Green buys more than gold: Pollution, pay, and attractiveness of small and medium-sized enterprise employer brand. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, 13(4), 231–246. <https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2025.130412>
7. de Campos Ribeiro, G., & Minchella, D. (2025). Beyond aesthetics: Investigating the interplay between office design, employer brand and employee intention to leave. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 27(2), 151–169. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCRE-07-2024-0022>
8. de Villartay, S., Abid-Dupont, M.-A., & Berger-Remy, F. (2024). The dynamic of employees' trust in their organisation in a corporate brand crisis: The bounce-back effect of organisational identification. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 40(3-4), 260–288. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2023.2276867>
9. Dev, C. S., Schulze, H., Granoff, J., Keller, K. L., & Frampton, J. (2008). The corporate brand: Help or hindrance? *Harvard Business Review*, 86(2), 49–58. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-38849185216&partnerID=40&md5=fd9d88c48d458c0b3cb41f91870f9670>
10. Dierickx, L., Van Hoye, G., Kozusznik, M. W., & Kanwal, H. (2025). Well-being policies and applicant attraction: The mediating role of employer brand personality. *German Journal of Human Resource Management*, 39(1), 57–92. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022241284463>
11. Essamri, A., McKechnie, S., & Winklhofer, H. (2019). Co-creating corporate brand identity with online brand communities: A managerial perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, 96, 366–375. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.07.015>
12. Ferilli, G., Sacco, P. L., Teti, E., & Buscema, M. (2016). Top corporate brands and the global structure of country brand positioning: An AutoCM ANN approach. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 66, 62–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2016.08.054>
13. First, I., & Tomić, M. (2011). Formal and informal communication channels in creating corporate brand image and preference. *Trziste*, 23(1), 45–61. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-79960569444&partnerID=40&md5=e6092c49e699dc9656630ffc52450070>
14. François, A., Harant, B., & Heutte, N. (2021). CSR communication in the outdoor sports industry: A content analysis of CSR disclosures by seven international corporate brands. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing*, 21(5-6), 313–335. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJSM.2021.120184>
15. Iglesias, O., Ind, N., & Schultz, M. (2020). History matters: The role of history in corporate brand strategy. *Business Horizons*, 63(1), 51–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2019.09.005>
16. Jaw, Y.-L., Wang, R.-Y., & Ying-Yu Hsu, C. (2011). Enliven corporate brands in Chinese. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 23(5), 641–666. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13555851111183075>
17. Kanwal, H., & Van Hoye, G. (2026). What draws potential applicants towards an organization? The importance of employer brand process attributes and applicants' job search metacognitive activities. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 34(2), Article e70061. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.70061>
18. Koch, C. H., & Gyrd-Jones, R. I. (2019). Corporate brand positioning in complex industrial firms: Introducing a dynamic, process approach to positioning. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 81, 40–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2019.03.011>
19. Lloyd, S., & Woodside, A. (2013). Corporate brand-rapture theory: Antecedents, processes, and consequences. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 31(5), 472–488. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MIP-04-2013-0064>
20. Mohammadi, N., & Mohammadian, B. (2025). Employee value proposition mining: A novel approach to employer brand development based on social media data using aspect-based sentiment analysis. *Results in Engineering*, 28, Article 107973. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rineng.2025.107973>
21. Mutter, A. (2025). The four types of employer brand ambassadors. *Organizational Dynamics*, 54(3), Article

101115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2024.101115>
22. Scheidt, S., Gelhard, C., Strotzer, J., & Henseler, J. (2018). In for a penny, in for a pound? Exploring mutual endorsement effects between celebrity CEOs and corporate brands. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 27(2), 203–220. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-07-2016-1265>
 23. Silaban, P. H., Octoyuda, E., & Silalahi, A. D. K. (2023). Perceived credibility information on social media of corporate brand reputation and its impact on jobseeker intention to apply. *International Journal of Business*, 28(1), 1–13. [https://doi.org/10.55802/IJB.028\(1\).005](https://doi.org/10.55802/IJB.028(1).005)
 24. Stuart, H. (2016). Managing a corporate brand in a challenging stakeholder environment: Charity branding. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 46(4), 228–234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00208825.2016.1140519>
 25. Sweetin, V. H., Knowles, L. L., Summey, J. H., & McQueen, K. S. (2013). Willingness-to-punish the corporate brand for corporate social irresponsibility. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(10), 1822–1830. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.02.003>
 26. Swoboda, B., & Sinning, C. (2021). Endorsement of global product brands by global corporate brands – A consumer perspective across nations. *Management International Review*, 61(4), 563–598. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11575-021-00450-1>
 27. Tai, C.-S., Uen, J.-F., & Lu, S.-H. (2025). Effects of employer brand on employee retention in small startup high-tech companies: The moderation of agile value. *Employee Relations*, 47(2), 332–354. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-12-2023-0655>
 28. Tarnovskaya, V. (2015). Corporate brand as a contract with stakeholders – theology or pragmatism? *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 33(6), 865–886. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MIP-06-2014-0111>
 29. Tasiyana Kahuni, A., & Rowley, J. (2013). Corporate brand relationships: The case of TOYOTA F1 Racing Team. *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal*, 3(1), 8–18. <https://doi.org/10.1108/20426781311316870>
 30. Tkalac Verčič, A., & Verčič, D. (2025). Attitudes toward sustainable development and employer brands: Comparing generations X, Y and Z in two countries. *Corporate Communications*, 30(2), 355–371. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-11-2023-0161>
 31. Trueman, M., Klemm, M., & Giroud, A. (2004). Can a city communicate? Bradford as a corporate brand. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 9(4), 317–330. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13563280410564057>
 32. Ugglä, H. (2006). The corporate brand association base: A conceptual model for the creation of inclusive brand architecture. *European Journal of Marketing*, 40(7-8), 785–802. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560610669991>
 33. Urde, M. (2009). Uncovering the corporate brand's core values. *Management Decision*, 47(4), 616–638. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740910959459>
 34. Vallaster, C., & Lindgreen, A. (2011). Corporate brand strategy formation: Brand actors and the situational context for a business-to-business brand. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 40(7), 1133–1143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2011.09.008>
 35. Vallaster, C., & Lindgreen, A. (2013). The role of social interactions in building internal corporate brands: Implications for sustainability. *Journal of World Business*, 48(3), 297–310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2012.07.014>
 36. Villagra, N., & López, B. (2013). Analysis of values and communication of the responsible brands. *Corporate brand strategies for sustainability. Communication and Society*, 26(1), 196–221. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84876479637&partnerID=40&md5=201100abd5e8ee669bbed2551698c79e>
 37. Wang, Y.-C., Qu, H., & Yang, J. (2019). The formation of sub-brand love and corporate brand love in hotel brand portfolios. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 77, 375–384. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2018.08.001>