SECTION: MARKETING AND ADVERTISING

DOI 10.70286/ISU-28.01.2026.014

BRAND ARCHITECTURE AS A MECHANISM FOR GLOBAL MANAGEMENT OF INTANGIBLE ASSETS

Dubas Vladyslav
PhD student
Department of International Trade and Marketing
Kyiv National Economic University
named after Vadym Hetman, Ukraine

In the contemporary economy, competitive advantage is increasingly driven by intangible assets—brand equity, reputation, intellectual property, customer relationships, organizational knowledge, and data. Among these, brands function as "coordination devices" that translate dispersed value-creation activities into market meaning and stakeholder trust. Brand architecture—the structured system that organizes brands, sub-brands, and endorsements within a portfolio—should therefore be treated not merely as a marketing choice but as a governance mechanism for global management of intangible assets. It provides decision rules for allocating investment, controlling risk, enabling value transfer, and ensuring strategic coherence across countries, channels, and stakeholder groups [1, 2].

Brand architecture defines the roles, relationships, and boundaries between corporate, product, and endorsed brands. In governance terms, it sets (a) ownership logic (what the corporate brand "guarantees"), (b) authorization logic (who can create/modify brand elements), and (c) value transfer logic (how equity moves between levels of the portfolio) [1, 3]. This matters globally because intangible assets are mobile yet fragile: reputation effects spill over borders, digital search amplifies signals instantly, and regulatory/partner ecosystems require consistent identity and accountability [2]. From an asset-management perspective, architecture helps firms manage four core intangible-asset tasks: 1) Capital allocation (where to invest to build equity most efficiently); 2) Risk control (limiting contagion from crises, quality failures, or geopolitical exposure); 3) Value leverage (transferring trust to new products/markets, enabling licensing and alliances); 4) Measurement and valuation (portfolio clarity supports consistent brand valuation and reporting) [1, 6].

There are five main brand architectures that are being used in modern business environment: branded house, house of brands, endorsed brands, sub-brands and hybrid architecture.

Branded House (Monolithic / Corporate-dominant): A single master brand spans offerings (e.g., one name across categories). Its primary intangible-asset effect is equity concentration: investments in one brand build a unified reservoir of awareness, associations, and trust, which can be leveraged across markets and launches [1, 3]. This can reduce global customer-acquisition costs through recognition and search visibility, and it strengthens corporate reputation, employer branding, and partner confidence (important in B2B and high-risk sectors) [2]. The trade-off is higher contagion risk: operational failures or reputational incidents can damage the entire portfolio because brand meaning is tightly coupled [1].

House of Brands (Pluralistic / Stand-alone brands): Multiple independent brands minimize linkage to the corporate parent. The intangible-asset effect is risk segmentation and precision positioning: each brand can target distinct segments, price tiers, or cultural contexts without dilution [1, 4]. This structure is also useful for M&A integration when acquired brands have strong local equity and should remain unchanged. However, it is typically more resource-intensive: marketing investments fragment across brands, and corporate-level reputation may be less visible to external stakeholders [1, 2]. Globally, a house of brands can outperform where markets require sharply differentiated propositions—but it requires advanced portfolio governance, brand valuation discipline, and duplication controls [6].

Endorsed Brands (Corporate endorsement + product brand autonomy): A product brand leads, while a corporate brand endorses (“by X”). This architecture creates a controlled equity transfer mechanism: endorsement provides credibility, quality assurance, and reputational backing, while allowing product brands to maintain differentiated identities [1, 4]. In global management terms, endorsed structures are effective when firms need both (a) local relevance or category-specific positioning and (b) cross-market trust anchored in corporate reputation. Endorsement also supports intangible assets tied to assurance (e.g., safety, reliability, compliance) because the corporate brand acts as a guarantee signifier [2].

Sub-brands (Master brand + sub-brand as differentiator): Sub-brands share the master name but add a differentiating label (e.g., “X Pro”). The intangible-asset effect is scalable meaning extension: firms can create new “micro-equity” nodes while keeping most equity at the master level [1, 3]. This improves launch efficiency and creates a structured innovation ladder. The key risk is meaning overload: excessive sub-brand proliferation can blur associations, complicate trademark strategy, and reduce clarity for global stakeholders [2, 5].

Hybrid architectures: Most multinational portfolios combine the above, reflecting category maturity, acquisition history, and regulatory constraints [1, 4]. The hybrid approach can optimize intangible assets by matching architecture to risk profile and market logic: for example, a branded house for core trust-sensitive offerings, and stand-alone brands for culturally sensitive or price-segmented categories. The governance challenge is ensuring consistent decision criteria for when to brand-house versus isolate [1].

Based on stated above definition of brand architecture types, we can evaluate mechanisms through which architecture manages intangible assets globally. First mechanism is equity transfer and leverage. Here, brand extensions and cross-border scaling depend on “permission” from existing associations. Architecture clarifies which associations are owned by the corporate brand versus product brands and therefore where equity can be legitimately transferred without stretching credibility [3, 5]. Second mechanism is reputation risk containment, where architecture influences reputational spillovers. A branded house maximizes synergy but amplifies negative spillover; a house of brands contains crises but sacrifices shared reputation benefits [1]. In global crisis management, these structural properties are material. Third one is IP structure and legal defensibility. Clear architecture supports trademark hierarchies (what is registered, defended, licensed). It reduces naming conflicts, strengthens enforcement priorities, and lowers global legal complexity—particularly relevant when brands are among the most valuable identifiable intangibles. Forth mechanism is related to valuation, reporting, and M&A integration. Brand valuation standards emphasize clear brand identification, cash-flow attribution, and consistent assumptions; architecture provides the map needed to allocate value and manage portfolios during acquisitions, divestments, and licensing [6]. On top of all, there is stakeholder alignment beyond customers: in B2B and regulated environments, brand meaning must persuade multiple stakeholders (partners, regulators, employees, investors). Architecture defines which brand carries the “trust burden” and where proof points (certifications, standards, track record) should be anchored [2].

Based on these mechanisms, number of practical implications and recommendations could be done:

1) Businesses should treat brand architecture as a portfolio policy, not a design exercise: define decision rules for creating, endorsing, or retiring brands [1].

2) Businesses should link architecture to intangible-asset KPIs (brand equity, reputation indices, employer brand metrics, trademark health, licensing revenue) [3, 6].

3) Use architecture to balance global consistency vs. local relevance, explicitly documenting where adaptation is allowed and where it is not [2].

4) Build crisis protocols according to architecture type: contagion risk is structurally different in branded house vs. house of brands [1].

As a conclusion, we can state that brand architecture operationalizes the management of intangible assets at scale. By specifying how trust, meaning, and legal rights are structured across a global portfolio, it becomes a mechanism for allocating investment, accelerating growth, controlling reputational risk, and improving valuation clarity. In an economy where intangible assets account for a substantial share of enterprise value, architecture should be governed with the same rigor as financial and operational systems [1, 6, 7].

References

1. Santos Jr., E. C.; da Silva, F.; & González, A. “Brand Portfolio Strategy and Brand Architecture.” Cogent Business & Management, 5(1), 2018. pp. 148-165. DOI:10.1080/23311975.2018.1483465. (accessed 20 January 2026)

2. Kapferer, J.-N. The New Strategic Brand Management: Advanced Insights and Strategic Thinking (5th ed.). London: Kogan Page, 2012. pp. 309–336, 355, 415

3. Keller, K. L. Strategic Brand Management: Building, Measuring, and Managing Brand Equity (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education. 2013. pp. 107-112

4. Muzellec, L., & Lambkin, M. “Corporate branding and brand architecture: A conceptual framework.” Marketing Theory, 2009. pp. 39-54
5. Koschmann, A. Evaluating the House of Brands Strategy Using Brand Equity and Intra-firm Loyalty. Journal of Marketing Management, 7(1). 2019. pp. 95–105
6. ISO 10668:2010. Brand valuation — Requirements for monetary brand valuation. International Organization for Standardization, 2010.
7. Albertini, E., & Berger-Remy, F. Intellectual Capital and Financial Performance: A Meta-Analysis and Research Agenda. Management. 22(2), 2019. pp. 216–249.

“УПРАВЛІННЯ ПРОЄКТАМИ МІЖНАРОДНИХ РЕКЛАМНИХ СТРАТЕГІЙ”

Горечко Марія Василівна
здобувач вищої освіти магістерського рівня
Науковий керівник:
Бреус Світлана Василівна
доктор економічних наук
ПВНЗ «Європейський університет», Україна

У сучасних умовах глобалізації та посилення геополітичної нестабільності управління міжнародними рекламними проєктами виходить за межі суто маркетингових завдань й зокрема для транснаціональних корпорацій, таких як McDonald’s, діяльність на ринку України в умовах воєнного стану відбувається в умовах докорінної трансформації підходів до управління комунікаціями, пошуку балансу між глобальною стандартизацією бренду та критичною потребою в локальній адаптації стратегій до змін зовнішнього середовища та споживчої поведінки.

Теоретичну базу дослідження склали концепції міжнародного маркетингу та проєктного менеджменту (PMI, підходи Ф. Котлера та С. Ілляшенка). Використання системного підходу до визначення сутності поняття «проєктне управління в міжнародній рекламі» як інтегрованого процесу координації ресурсів, часу та креативного капіталу для реалізації стратегії «глокалізації» (think global, act local).

Типовим представником на ринку (прикладом ефективного антикризового управління) є лідер у своєму сегменті – ПІІ «Макдональдз Юкрейн Лтд», що демонструє високу життєздатність, так як компанія зуміла відновити операційну діяльність, незважаючи на збитковий 2022 рік (чистий збиток -2,1 млрд грн через закриття ресторанів):

- чистий дохід зріс з 3,2 млрд грн у 2022 р. до 12,9 млрд грн у 2023 р. та прогнозованих 16,8 млрд грн у 2024 р.
- рентабельність станом на 2024 рік становила 9,3%.

У результаті аналізування рекламної активності виявлено проблему «комунікаційного розриву» (глобальні рекламні кампанії корпорації часто не