

QUT Digital Repository:  
<http://eprints.qut.edu.au/>



Schultz, Don and Kerr, Gayle F. and Kim, Ilchul and Patti, Charles (2007) *In search of a theory of integrated marketing communication*. *Journal of Advertising Education*, 11(2).

© Copyright 2007 Journal of Advertising Education

# **IN SEARCH OF A THEORY OF INTEGRATED MARKETING COMMUNICATION**

**Professor Don Schultz, Northwestern University, USA**  
**Dr Gayle Kerr, Queensland University of Technology, Australia**  
**Professor Ilchul Kim, Dongeui University, South Korea**  
**Professor Charles Patti, University of Denver, USA**

## **ABSTRACT**

For the most part, the literature base for Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC) has developed from an applied or tactical level rather than from an intellectual or theoretical one. Since industry, practitioner and even academic studies have provided little insight into what IMC is and how it operates, our approach has been to investigate that other IMC community, that is, the academic or instructional group responsible for disseminating IMC knowledge. We proposed that the people providing course instruction and directing research activities have some basis for how they organize, consider and therefore instruct in the area of IMC.

A syllabi analysis of 87 IMC units in six countries investigated the content of the unit, its delivery both physically and conceptually, and defined the audience of the unit. The study failed to discover any type of latent theoretical foundation that might be used as a base for understanding IMC. The students who are being prepared to extend, expand and enhance IMC concepts do not appear to be well-served by the curriculum we found in our research. The study concludes with a model for further IMC curriculum development.

## **KEYWORDS**

IMC education; curriculum; syllabi analysis; IMC theory building.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Since the formalization of the Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC) concept in the late 1980s (American Association of Advertising Agencies 1989, Schultz, Tannenbaum and Lauterborn 1993), researchers, practitioners and academicians have struggled to develop (a) a comprehensive definition of IMC on which all interested parties can agree, (b) a relevant theory base around which all the tools and techniques used in the practice of IMC can be aligned and applied, and (c) an acceptable methodology that accommodates the rapidly emerging and evolving forms of marketing communications developing in different ways and with varying speeds around the world.

The challenges and difficulties of developing suitable and sustainable solutions to the three areas identified above are well known and documented. They range from “something we have always done” (Spotts, Lambert and Joyce 1998) to “lack of a coherent theory base” (Kitchen and Schultz 1999, Cornelissen and Lock 2000, Gould 2000) and everything in between. Although the criticisms have likely been well deserved, those leveling them have, to this point, failed to provide much more than brickbats. There is clear evidence many people in both the academic and practitioner communities believe integration is a good thing (Duncan and Everett 1993, McArthur and Griffin 1997, Kitchen and Schultz 1999, Swain 2004). Although many companies and agencies espouse the various mantras that have developed, few solid suggestions or recommendations on how to deal with the subject on a conceptual or theoretical level have emerged. Thus, for the most part, the literature base for IMC has developed more from an applied and tactical level than from an intellectual and theoretical one. As a result, Integrated Marketing Communication, after a dozen or more years of

consideration, discussion and writing still remains an enigma to many and a challenge to most.

## **SEEKING A DIRECTION FOR IMC DEVELOPMENT**

Having been involved in the development and direction of IMC for a number of years on several continents as researchers, teachers and practitioners, we too have struggled with how to develop and delineate integrated marketing communication. In 2003, an opportunity arose to take a new approach and a new direction. The American Academy of Advertising (AAA) issued a call for papers for the Third Asia-Pacific Conference to be held in Hong Kong in June, 2005. A Special Topics session was proposed and accepted. The panel included several international academics working in the area of IMC. The research reported in this paper was part of that Special Session.

This Special Session focused on what was being taught in IMC around the world. Thus, our belief was that, by bringing together what was being taught as IMC in the various institutions around the world, we might well find the IMC threads which would allow us to provide a more comprehensive view of the subject. In short, by investigating what was being taught at the college and university level, we hoped a clearer definition and delineation view of IMC might emerge. Thus, we revised our project as something that might help answer some of the lingering questions with which practitioners and academics have been struggling.

## **SEARCHING ACADEMIA FOR AN IMC SOLUTION**

For the most part, IMC research has been primarily descriptive, conducted mostly by industry practitioners. The standard approach has been to compare and contrast the development of the concept among (a) client marketing and communication managers and their agencies or consultants, or (b) comparing practices among and between various nations or geographies (Duncan and Everett 1993, Phelps, Harris and Johnson 1996, McArthur and Griffin 1997, Eagle, Kitchen and Hyde 1999, Kitchen and Schultz 1999). Although these have been useful exercises, they typically have provided little more than descriptions of how IMC or IMC variations are practiced today. Little has developed in the way of theoretical underpinnings for the practices whether reported or observed. Most of these studies, using primarily closed-end, survey research approaches have provided precious little information on how or why or in what manner IMC or even the broader perspective of integration could, should or might occur or be practiced. Further, most of the published reports have provided few, if any, insights into the basic approaches, philosophies or concepts used when an “integrated approach” is either considered or discarded. Thus, we tend to know what was done in an IMC approach and how it was done, but we commonly do not know why it was done or the results that were obtained.

Since industry, practitioner, and even academic studies have provided little insight into what IMC is and how it operates, our approach has been to investigate other key constituency in the IMC community, that is, the academic or instructional group responsible for disseminating IMC knowledge. Our thought was, if practitioners can not provide the needed concepts and approaches to understanding IMC, perhaps those who

are teaching the subject can. Clearly the people providing course instruction and directing research activities have some basis for how they organize, consider and therefore instruct in the area of IMC.

## **METHOD**

Our first step was to review the results of a regional study conducted by Kerr, Patti and Chien (2004). These researchers identified the colleges and universities where IMC was being taught in Australia and New Zealand. They then analyzed the syllabi of various IMC courses and programs to reveal the name, discipline home, content, key constructs, delivery and demographic profile of the students. Results of that study were presented in the paper “Integrated Marketing Communication: New discipline with an old learning approach: A syllabi analysis” (Kerr, Patti and Chein 2004) at the Australia and New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference, 2004. This paper provided the format and the initial investigating constructs of name and disciplinary home of unit, content, key constructs, delivery and audience for the development of the extended global study reported in this paper. During analysis, these initial constructs were collapsed into the three key constructs of content, delivery and audience presented in this paper.

During fall/winter, 2004-2005, a group of international IMC graduate students under the direction of three professors representing three different institutions, from different parts of the globe, gathered additional instructional data from their home countries and others. The research was based on a global internet search of colleges and universities offering IMC instruction, along with their available IMC courses of instruction and supplemented by accompanying course syllabi. After the initial search,

the study was confined to 17 countries with 196 colleges and universities represented. Although gathering syllabi from internet sites is fraught with difficulties, the students were able to obtain sufficient samples to make the study reliable.

From the initial 17 countries investigated, six countries, Australia, Korea, New Zealand, Taiwan, the United Kingdom and the United States were selected for further in-depth analysis. Given the authors' previous experience in marketing, marketing communication and integrated marketing communication instruction, it was felt these six countries represented the majority view of IMC instruction around the world.

A web-based search was conducted of all colleges and universities in the six selected countries. Key word searches were focused on "Integrated Marketing Communications, IMC, marketing, marketing communications, promotion management, advertising, public relations, customer relationship management" and the like. The gathered syllabi included:

- \* Australia                      32 units
- \* Korea                              7 units
- \* New Zealand                      5 units
- \* Taiwan                              5 units
- \* United Kingdom                      10 units
- \* United States                      28 units.

These represent more than 50% of the IMC units targeted for collection in each country and varied from 50% in Korea and Taiwan to 70% in the US, 83% in Australia, 90% in New Zealand and 91% in the UK. The results of this data gathering provided the

basis for what we believe is a fairly complete understanding of the current IMC academic offerings around the world.

The syllabus or unit outline was chosen as the unit of analysis because of its importance as a guide to the instruction of subject areas in universities since the 19<sup>th</sup> Century. Its value lies in its three key functions. Firstly, it forms a contract with students, establishing grading and administrative procedures. Secondly, it is a permanent record of how the unit was structured and administered including credit hours, date of offer, prerequisite units, course aims and content. Thirdly, the syllabus is a learning guide, providing additional resources and planning and management skills (Parkes and Harris 2002) Of these three functions, it is the second that has encouraged many researchers to explore how subject areas were being taught (Baecker 1998, Smith and Razzouk 1993, Bain et al 2002). This research covers the broad areas of content, delivery and audience, which form the three areas of investigation in this study.

## **FINDINGS**

These findings seek to define what academics consider to be IMC by examining what they teach. In structuring a syllabi analysis, there are three factors that can be used to define the units offered in an academic program - content, delivery and audience. This analysis compared syllabi across six countries on these three factors in order to examine each factor, then compare, contrast and synthesize the results, building an academic interpretation of IMC.



## Content of the unit

The academic content of each unit in each of the six countries was identified and tabulated. These findings were then broken down further into content modules by course and by country. The results of this analysis appear in Table 1.

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

Based on this aggregation of courses, content and materials, groupings of content were developed by the researchers. These have been modularized under subject headings and are presented in Figure 1.

---

Insert Figure 1 about here

---

Based on the five modular units from which course content was aggregated, the most comprehensive programs are offered in Australia and New Zealand, with major content areas in communication, planning and marketing communication tools and minor content in marketing. The US offerings are similar, except for the omission of the communication module, which is usually taught in core units. The focus of the UK units is communication, with planning as a minor content area. Both Korea and Taiwan have no major areas of content, taking a more generalist approach with minors in marketing, communication, planning and marketing communication tools.

Of particular interest is the absence of an IMC module in all programs identified across the six countries. Australia was the only country to teach all content in the IMC module as outlined in Figure 1. But even there, the percentage of units teaching IMC was very low, from 3% on perceptions of IMC and how IMC works to 31% on the organization of IMC. Therefore, few IMC units include specific IMC content areas such as perceptions of IMC, organization of IMC or how IMC works. When reviewed from a practical level, the content being presented as IMC represents more of a traditional marketing communication and planning unit than a focused IMC approach.

In summary, the content of the units studied appears to present IMC primarily as a process designed to assist in the coordination of marketing communication disciplines. The focus is functional and methodologically-based. The planning framework employed is similar to that found in an advertising or marketing plan, including such things as objectives, budget and evaluation. Similarly, advertising components such as creative, media and evaluation often appear. Some background marketing, communication or consumer behavior theory is also commonly included in the module. Sadly, the content analyzed was almost devoid of any IMC constructs or theory. It was very reminiscent of a traditional marketing communication or promotion management program rather than one devoted to the teaching, understanding and practice of current-day IMC.

### **Delivery**

This area of definition looks at how the unit is delivered both physically and conceptually. The physical delivery of the unit is easiest to assess. Almost exclusively, IMC is delivered face-to-face, in a typical classroom lecture environment. There is some evidence of online, interactive tutorial work and some flexible delivery using those

methodologies. One total online program was found at West Virginia University in the US, but that is the exception to the general rule.

In terms of how IMC is delivered conceptually, we found most approaches were based on a traditional marketing communication view rather than an IMC focus. This conclusion was reached by agreement of the three professors after evaluating the name of each unit, required or recommended textbooks, major constructs evident from the curricula, and the writers and research that formed the content of the unit.

An important clue as to whether the delivery was from a traditional marketing communication or an IMC approach was often found in the name of the unit. In over one-third of all identified units, including 79% of units in the US and 60% of units in Taiwan, the unit is titled IMC. More commonly, it is labeled marketing communication in 75% of units in the UK, 57% of units in Korea and 50% of units in Australia. It is also known by other names such as Promotion Management or Advertising Management in 80% of the units in New Zealand and 34% of the units in Australia.

The textbook used for course instruction also conceptually define the academic approach employed. Worldwide, Belch and Belch's, "Advertising and Promotion: An Integrated Marketing Communications Perspective" is the most used text, i.e., used in 50% of the Australian, 40% of the Taiwan, 20% of New Zealand and 17% of US units, yet, this text is essentially an advertising-dominated text with integration added as an overview in the last few years. Shimp (2003) is the next popular text, used by around 25% of units in the UK, Korea and Australia. Neither of these two main texts (accounting for approximately 75% of all IMC units in Australia alone) were written or developed as

IMC texts. They are essentially advertising or promotion management texts, which have been updated in the last decade to include an IMC orientation.

In an attempt to provide some IMC content focus, the three professors, based on their knowledge of the topic and their previous teaching experience, identified nine key IMC constructs from the current literature. Those were:

- Strategic integration
- Message integration
- Synergy
- Brand equity
- Multiple audiences
- Managing contact points
- Relationship building
- Continuous, circular and responsive

It was believed that these constructs would provide an additional indication on whether the unit was truly focused on IMC or simply using IMC terminology to update existing advertising, marketing communication or promotional management courses. None of these constructs were readily apparent in the curricula. If they were found at all, they mostly appeared as existing constructs borrowed from advertising or marketing theory. For example, creative content is widely taught except in the UK and Korea. However, it is unclear from the syllabi whether this is presented as message development or message integration. A similar case could be made for media and strategic integration.

In other content areas, such as synergy, multiple audiences and relationship building, there was no evidence of the construct being covered in the surveyed units on a continuing basis. It might, however, be taught as part of related content and thus be an integral part of the unit. For example, relationship building might possibly be taught as a part of public relations or direct marketing curricula. In contrast, brand equity is taught in most countries and database is particularly strong in Korea and Taiwan. Clearly, there is no academic consistency in what or how IMC is being taught around the world.

Similarly, existing syllabi failed to identify current IMC research and key IMC writers. Again, this does not necessarily mean these elements are not included in the course content. It simply means that it does not appear to be a core part of the unit's instructional focus. For the most part, much of the curriculum content reflects the strategic and tactical decisions facing practitioners. These areas, in our view, would be enhanced by the existing body of IMC research, yet, those studies were not apparent in our analysis of the syllabi. On the positive side, there is content on IMC as information that seems to fit with the units in Taiwan and the UK that explore the semiotics of IMC. Similarly, two units in the UK and Australia look at how IMC works, but these examples are the exception rather than the rule.

Our syllabi analysis also included a review of the books of readings, reference lists and literature reviews required by courses in Australia, the UK and the US. Perhaps the key writers and current research form part of the curriculum or assignment work in these areas, but that was not articulated in the syllabi either.

In summary, both the physical and the conceptual delivery of the units purportedly teaching Integrated Marketing Communication are not that at all. They are

largely traditional advertising, promotion and marketing communication courses that have been either re-named or slightly adjusted to include an IMC view. That is, the course work is reflective of the basic promotional framework or the specific disciplines that make up IMC such as advertising, sales promotion, direct marketing, public relations and the like. Thus, in our view, based on the textbooks, key constructs and research found in the analysis of the syllabi, the units billing themselves as IMC represent primarily a traditional marketing communication development and delivery approach. We found very little evidence of IMC in any of the factors identified or studied.

### **Audience**

The students studying IMC are almost exclusively undergraduates in Korea (100%), Australia (94%) and New Zealand (80%). However, the focus of IMC teaching is at the graduate level in the UK (67%), Taiwan (60%) and the US (67%). In addition to the 46% of IMC units in the US that are taught at the graduate level in either a Masters or MBA program, a further 21% are packaged as executive education certificate courses. This second graduate market was not observed in the other countries investigated, although it is known that executive education is conducted by industry bodies and often by professional instructional units of colleges and universities not directly connected to the degree-granting units we studied. In the UK, for example, the Chartered Institute of Marketing, a professional association has, in the past, offered a Diploma in IMC.

Most of the IMC students are studying business in Australia (100%), New Zealand (100%) and the UK (100%). In Korea, IMC students are studying communication. IMC is split between Business and Liberal Arts (commonly journalism)

in Taiwan. In the US, IMC's disciplinary instructional home is divided between Business (58%), Communication (29%) and Liberal Arts (13%), commonly journalism.

These findings suggest IMC is seen as a basic foundation unit for undergraduate business majors in Australia and New Zealand and communication undergraduates in Korea. In the US and UK, IMC is seen as a more advanced discipline, building on perhaps a more generalist undergraduate degree. In the US and UK, IMC is also packaged for practitioners in short-term executive education courses, which may or may not provide even a certificate of completion. The priority in these programs appears to be to further educate the more educated, particularly practitioners. IMC is generally presented as a single unit, apparently building on other related disciplinary areas such as business, marketing and perhaps advertising. Only in the US (at the postgraduate level) and in Australia (at both the undergraduate and postgraduate levels) has IMC been developed into an entire program. This may represent some maturity in the discipline in these countries or simply reflect a student demand or faculty interest.

### **IS THERE A THEORY OF IMC?**

This article was based on the premise that IMC, after more than a dozen years of professional and academic activity and development, still lacks a solid theoretical base. Our aim in conducting this study was to identify some theoretical underpinnings for the concept, using the content of courses of instruction found in major colleges and universities around the world. Unfortunately, our review of the 87 teaching units identified through our research in the six countries studied, Australia, Korea, New Zealand, Taiwan, the UK and the US, failed to discover any type of latent theoretical

foundation that might be used as a base for understanding IMC. Clearly, based on our review, each faculty or academic has his or her own view of IMC and has developed the course and unit content to fit that view. This is apparent from the wide variations in how the curriculum and even individual courses are organized and taught.

Perhaps the best way to address this situation is to draw from the discipline itself and try to apply the following IMC principles to IMC education.

1. Begin with the customer.

Students, the ones who are being prepared to extend, expand and enhance IMC concepts, do not appear to be well served by the curricula we found in our research. For the most part, units identified as IMC are generally nothing more than marketing, advertising or promotional management programs re-fitted with IMC terminology. Whether this occurs because of the lack of a theoretical base, content or curriculum development or is simply the result of a faculty and/or instructor updating an existing course with some current IMC terminology (which certainly seems to be the case with many of the textbooks), cannot be determined from our study. What we do know is that what is often being offered as IMC is far from what is currently known or understood about the subject. Marketing education needs to begin with students, the actual consumers of IMC education who will be expected to practice the field upon graduation. As with existing IMC theory, the audience or consumer must be considered as one of the key elements in any type of IMC education, and efforts must be made to develop IMC content that best serve their needs.

2. Look at what you deliver.



While it is true that some new texts and professional books devoted to IMC are starting to appear, see Duncan (2004), Schultz and Schultz (2004), Pickton and Broderick (2005) and Kitchen and Pelsmacher (2004), there is still a dearth of suitable teaching materials.

Furthermore, this research showed that the content of the IMC units was largely driven by the textbook adopted. Therefore, we recommend that publishers do more than give an advertising or promotions management text an “IMC focus”. There is a need for true IMC texts that encompasses the theory, research, key writers, and models of IMC. With text books driving unit content, unless the texts are truly representative of the discipline, the unit will also fail to reflect true IMC content.

### 3. Collaborate.

Working together, breaking down silos, is another IMC principle which could be applied to its educational practice. Special topic sessions, such as the IMC Education panel at the AAA Hong Kong 2005 Conference, can bring together educational practice from across the world. Likewise special interest groups can help guide the development of IMC curriculum. Even the writing of this article engendered a collaborative spirit amongst IMC academics world-wide, with many academics happy to share their curriculum for analysis. There appear to be many willing collaborators to take up the enrichment of IMC education.

### 4. Don't promise what you cannot deliver.

Although there is the need to improve and innovate, there is also the imperative to distinguish what is IMC from what is a traditional marketing communication approach. It is vital that marketing educators stop calling the instructional units IMC until the instructional program is more than a rehabbed marketing, advertising or promotional

management instructional unit. This would be more honest and realistic compared to what is being taught.

We were disappointed to not find one, clearly articulated approach to IMC being taught anywhere in the world. Certainly there is sufficient published research with more coming each year. The Winter 2006 issue of the *Journal of Advertising* was devoted to Integrated Marketing Communication, with a dozen juried articles included. Seminars and conferences on IMC are numerous and continuing. For example, the annual conference held by the *Journal of Marketing Communication*, now in its 12<sup>th</sup> year, has always devoted a majority of its sessions to integration and integrated marketing communication. The students of the Integrated Marketing Communications Department at Northwestern University in the U.S. publish an annual peer-reviewed journal (*Journal of Integrated Marketing Communication*) devoted to both the latest thinking and practice in IMC. Ph D dissertations continue to be researched, developed and published in a number of universities. The trade press and practitioners continue to expand the concepts of IMC with most in agreement that the topic is no longer just an alternative to traditional approaches, but, indeed, a requirement in the 21<sup>st</sup> century marketplace. Yet, in spite of all these available materials, no agreed upon theoretical base for IMC has emerged.

In sifting through all the syllabi, textbooks and other materials, as reported in this paper, we did identify the ingredients for a theoretical base for IMC that could be developed. Much of that was the result of our own discussions of how Integrated Marketing Communication should be taught and the tools and resources needed to do a credible job in preparing students. In the next section, we provide our initial thinking on

the underpinnings of Integrated Marketing Communications which we believe can lead to an IMC theory base.

### **Identifying the Key Elements of IMC**

Integrated Marketing Communications, as it is taught today based on our review of the syllabi, tends to be very tactically oriented. That is, it appears to be very “hands-on” and “how-to”, almost to the point of being approached as a trade or a craft. Thus, there is much reliance on the use of field examples and marketplace illustrations to teach the “here’s how” of IMC, but not the “here’s why”. Part of that likely comes from the traditional approaches to advertising, sales promotion, direct marketing and public relations teaching which essentially try to imbue students the elements of an advertising campaign or a public relations program or a sales promotion event. Certainly that is the case in the textbooks being used, i.e., Belch and Belch, Shimp and others.

If one goes back up stream, however, that is, back to what supports the various functional practices, there are some basic elements that make up integration. Those are the basic elements that are being combined, aligned or indeed, integrated in any type of IMC program. They are:

- \* Audiences or customers, that is, the people or firms or organizations for whom the communication programs are being developed and to whom they will be directed.
- \* Delivery Systems, that is, the media or other methods by and through which the communication programs will be delivered to the selected audiences or customers.

- \* Content, that is, the information or messages or incentives that will be delivered to the customers or audiences through the delivery systems.

Thus, integration, in its simplest form, is the development, organization, alignment and implementation of these three elements. It is how the elements are coordinated and aligned that really make Integrated Marketing Communication.

Our initial visualization of the theoretical base for IMC is shown as Figure 2 below.

---

Insert Figure 2 about here

---

### **The Three Circles**

We have visualized IMC as three overlapping elements shown above. It is how the areas are combined and coordinated that make up the theoretical base for IMC. If one thinks of the three areas as Venn Diagrams, it is easy to see that in some integration situations, the Audience or Customer element will be most important. In others, it might be the Delivery System and in still others, it might well be the Content. It is how the IMC manager mixes and matches the three elements that really make up the practice of integrated marketing communications.

The value of IMC, which has often been so difficult for both practitioners and academics to articulate, comes from the synergy created by the three elements when they are properly combined. That is, when the three elements are properly aligned and used in the proper manner, the marketplace effect is greater than when each is used separately or

individually in the development of a communication program. An example of this has been provided by Naik and Raman in their groundbreaking article on IMC synergy that appeared in the November, 2003 issue of *Journal of Marketing Research*.

As shown in the illustration above, each of the three circles has substantial theory inherent in the element. For example, the Delivery element consists of the distribution of the messages and incentives and the logistical elements that make the distribution possible. Content consists of both the acquisition or gathering of information and the manner in which that information is managed, i.e., through proper attention to editing, opinions, culture and the like. The Audiences or Customers include both the identification of the proper groups or individuals or firms or societal elements that create the common bonds of the groups and the maintenance of the cohesion among those units over time. Thus, IMC, as marketing, advertising, communication and the other elements that make up commercial communication have borrowed from other fields to make up a new and unique set of theory and knowledge, so we believe it is possible with IMC.

The three circles illustrated above are only our first attempt at identifying the concepts and approaches that might lead to the development of a theory base for Integrated Marketing Communications. Although the model is not fully explored, we believe it does provide the beginnings of a theoretical base for the discipline. Certainly, it is stronger and better articulated than any we found in the syllabi investigated. Thus, we offer it for consideration and development by the academy.

## REFERENCES

- Baecker, Diann L. 1998. "Uncovering the rhetoric of the syllabus: The case of the missing I." *College Teaching* 46, 2: 58-62.
- Bain, Craig E, Alan I. Blankley, and L. Murphy Smith. 2002. "An Examination of Topical Coverage for the First Accounting Information Systems Course." *Journal of Information Systems* 16, 2: 143-64.
- Cornelissen, Joep P, and Andrew R Lock. 2000. "Theoretical Concept or Management Fashion? Examining the Significance of IMC." *Journal of Advertising Research* 40, 5: 7-15.
- Duncan, Thomas R. 2002. *IMC: Using Advertising and Promotion to Build Brands*. Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2002.
- Eagle, Lynne, Philip Kitchen, Ken Hyde, Wilna Fourie, and Mani Padiseti. 1999. "Perceptions of Integrated Marketing Communications among Marketers & Ad Agency Executives in New Zealand." *International Journal of Advertising* 18, 1: 89-119.
- Gould, Stephen J. "The State of IMC Research and Applications. 2000. " *Journal of Advertising Research* 40, 5: 22-23.

Kerr, Gayle, Charles Patti, and M Chien. 2004. "Integrated Marketing Communication: New Discipline with an Old Learning Approach: A Syllabi Analysis." Paper presented at the *Conference Proceedings Australia and New Zealand Marketing Academy*, December 2004, Wellington New Zealand.

Kitchen, Philip J, and Don E Schultz. 1999. "A Multi-Country Comparison of the Drive for IMC." *Journal of Advertising Research* 39, 1: 21-38.

McArthur, David N., and Tom Griffin. 1997. "A Marketing Management View of Integrated Marketing Communications." *Journal of Advertising Research* 37, 5: 19.

Naik, P. and Raman, K. 2003. "Understanding the Impact of Synergy in Multimedia Communications." *Journal of Marketing Research* 40, 4: 375.

Phelps, Joseph E., Thomas E. Harris, and Edward Johnson. 1996. "Exploring Decision-Making Approaches and Responsibility for Developing Marketing Communications Strategy." *Journal of Business Research* 37, 3: 217-23.

Schultz, Don E and Heidi Schultz 2004. *IMC: The Next Generation*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Schultz, Don E, S Tannenbaum, and R Lauterborn. 2003. *The New Marketing Paradigm: Integrated Marketing Communications*. Illinois: NTC Business Books.

Smith, Mary F and Nabil Y Razzouk. 1993. "Improving classroom communication: The case of the course syllabus," *Journal of Education for Business* 68, 4: 215-21.

Spotts, Harlan E.; Lambert, David R.; Joyce, Mary L. 1998. "Marketing Dèjà Vu: The Discovery of Integrated Marketing Communications." *Journal of Marketing Education* 20, 3: 210-18.

Swain, William N. "Perceptions of IMC after a Decade of Development: Who's at the Wheel, and How Can We Measure Success?" 2004. *Journal of Advertising Research* 44, 1: 46.



## TABLES

**Table 1: Content of IMC units as a percentage of total IMC units across six countries**

<b>Content</b>	<b>Aus</b>	<b>Korea</b>	<b>NZ</b>	<b>Taiwan</b>	<b>UK</b>	<b>US</b>
Role of IMC	100	86	80	75	78	79
IMC in Marketing	28	57	20		22	47
Perception of IMC	3				11	
Consumer Behaviour	66	29	40	25	22	26
Organization of IMC	31		20			5
Situation Analysis	19	29	20			16
STP	31	29	40			21
Product Life Cycle	9	29	20			
Communication Theory	59	29	80	50	56	5
Brand	13	29	40	50	22	63
Database	6	57		50		5
How IMC works	3				11	
Plan/Develop IMC	19			50	33	58
Implementation	6				11	
Objectives	56		80	25	22	47
Budget	56	14	60	25	11	42
Creative	85	29	80	100		74
Media	94	62	100	25	44	68
Measurement	94	43	80	75	44	63
Ad Research/ Testing	9	14	20			11

Ethics/ Social	44	29	60		33	5
Legal	9		60			5
International	28	14	60			11
Advertising / Corp Adv	47	86	20	50	78	58
PR	90	29	60	50	67	53
DM	78	29	60	25	67	53
Sales Promo	90	57	100	25	78	53
Personal Selling	50	43		25	33	21
Internet Interactive	44	29	60			11
Sponsorship	13	29	40	25	11	11
Conference	3					
Word of Mouth	3					
Future Challenges	6					

## FIGURES

Figure 1: Modularization of IMC Content



**Figure 2: The Three Circles of IMC Theory Development**

