

Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets

Raden Roro Fatmasari (1) and Maya Ariyanti (2) (1) Yayasan Kreatif Indonesia Emas, Bandung | (2) Telkom University

Fatma.Sarie85@gmail.com ; ariyanti@telkomuniversity.ac.id

Abstract

This integrative evidence review examines brand authenticity and customer advocacy in competitive service markets by asking how brand authenticity is connected to customer advocacy and which conditions determine whether that connection becomes operationally meaningful. The article synthesizes peer-reviewed and institutional literature relevant to customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, emphasizing mechanisms, boundary conditions, and measurement choices rather than a universal average effect. Evidence associated with Lemon et al., 2016 and Hajli, 2015 is read with the wider source set to distinguish formal adoption from effective use, short-term response from durable capability, and observed association from causal interpretation. The synthesis identifies complementary roles for trust formation and risk reduction, digital capability, and governance or coordination routines. No survey, interview, experiment, proprietary dataset, or regression estimate is represented as having been collected for this conceptual review.

Keywords: brand, authenticity, customer, advocacy, competitive, service, markets, business, integrative review

Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets addresses a contemporary question in customer, market, channel, and business-model systems. The title implies a relationship between brand authenticity and customer advocacy, but the direction and magnitude of that relationship cannot be assumed from terminology alone. This review identifies mechanisms that plausibly connect the two, conditions that make those mechanisms stronger or weaker, and measurements needed to evaluate them without overstating evidence. Context, timing, implementation quality, and decision rights are therefore treated as analytical variables.

1. Introduction

The introduction defines the decision problem and explains why a conditional interpretation is preferable to a deterministic one.

From a governance perspective, Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Channel integration and consistency is most credible when supported by digital capability and brand credibility. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

The most decision-relevant question concerns the conditions under which the proposed relationship strengthens, weakens, or reverses. In Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets, brand authenticity can influence customer advocacy through relationship repair and switching-cost management. The pathway is conditional on competitive intensity and customer heterogeneity; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce service recovery.

From a governance perspective, Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Ecosystem coordination is most credible when supported by

channel maturity and competitive intensity. The reviewed literature (Kraus et al., 2022; Lemon et al., 2016) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

The synthesis treats brand authenticity as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of customer advocacy. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, customer-journey coordination changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while brand credibility shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with OECD, 2023 and Hajli, 2015 and is especially relevant in competitive service markets. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

From a governance perspective, Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Trust formation and risk reduction is most credible when supported by partner dependence and customer heterogeneity. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

2. Conceptual and Literature Review

The literature review organizes evidence around mechanisms, complementary capabilities, and boundary conditions.

From a governance perspective, Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Relationship repair and switching-cost management is most credible when supported by digital capability and partner dependence. The reviewed literature (Verhoef et al., 2021; Lemon et al., 2016) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable

assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets, brand authenticity can influence customer advocacy through ecosystem coordination. The pathway is conditional on competitive intensity and digital capability; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Kraus et al., 2022 and Hajli, 2015 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce commercial resilience.

From a governance perspective, Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Customer-journey coordination is most credible when supported by channel maturity and channel maturity. The reviewed literature (OECD, 2023; Morhart et al., 2015) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets, brand authenticity can influence customer advocacy through trust formation and risk reduction. The pathway is conditional on brand credibility and partner dependence; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce conversion quality.

For Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking brand authenticity with customer advocacy. Market sensing and rapid

experimentation provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on partner dependence, digital capability, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of retention.

3. Research Method

This manuscript is a conceptual narrative draft revised through a chronological source filter. Bibliography entries dated after 31 December 2023 and sentences explicitly invoking those years have been excluded. Original pre-cutoff references have been retained, with a limited historical source context added separately. This revision does not constitute a new systematic search, a meta-analysis, or a reproducible coding exercise. The historical source cutoff is stated here so that the scope of the discussion is explicit.

The remaining discussion proposes mechanisms and research questions. It does not supply new observations, estimated coefficients, or verified causal effects. Earlier reference entries retained from the source draft are retained as supplied and should be assessed against the original publications when interpreting specific claims. Sources added during this revision support only the historical context described in the dedicated source-context section.

4. Evidence Synthesis: Mechanisms

The first synthesis layer asks how the proposed relationship works in practice and which intermediate processes can be observed before the final outcome changes.

The synthesis treats brand authenticity as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of customer advocacy. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, customer-journey coordination changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while digital capability shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with OECD, 2023 and Kraus et al., 2022 and is especially relevant in competitive service markets. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets, brand authenticity can influence customer advocacy through trust formation and risk reduction. The pathway is conditional on competitive intensity and channel maturity; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce conversion quality.

From a governance perspective, Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Market sensing and rapid experimentation is most credible when supported by channel maturity and partner dependence. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

From a governance perspective, Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Channel integration and consistency is most credible when supported by brand credibility and digital capability. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets, brand authenticity can influence customer advocacy through relationship repair and switching-cost management. The pathway is conditional on partner dependence and channel maturity; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence

associated with Hajli, 2015 and Lemon et al., 2016 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement

should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce service recovery.

5. Evidence Synthesis: Boundary Conditions

The second synthesis layer examines why results may differ across settings even when the focal intervention appears similar.

For Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking brand authenticity with customer advocacy. Trust formation and risk reduction provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on digital capability, competitive intensity, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of conversion quality.

A mechanism-based reading avoids assuming that identical labels produce identical outcomes. In Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets, brand authenticity can influence customer advocacy through market sensing and rapid experimentation. The pathway is conditional on competitive intensity and brand credibility; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce retention.

For Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking brand authenticity with customer advocacy. Channel integration and consistency provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on channel maturity, customer heterogeneity, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Lemon et al., 2016 and Lemon et al., 2016 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of market access.

A recurring issue in research on Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Brand Authenticity may be associated with customer advocacy, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when brand credibility is weak. The mechanism examined here is relationship repair and switching-cost management, which connects the focal practice to changes in service recovery. Sources such as Hajli, 2015 and Hajli, 2015 are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

The synthesis treats brand authenticity as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of customer advocacy. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, ecosystem coordination changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while partner dependence shapes how consistently

that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Morhart et al., 2015 and Morhart et al., 2015 and is especially relevant in competitive service markets. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

6. Integrated Discussion

The integrated discussion reconciles different findings by distinguishing mechanism, context, timing, and measurement.

The most decision-relevant question concerns the conditions under which the proposed relationship strengthens, weakens, or reverses. In Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets, brand authenticity can influence customer advocacy through market sensing and rapid experimentation. The pathway is conditional on digital capability and channel maturity; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce retention.

For Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking brand authenticity with customer advocacy. Channel integration and consistency provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on competitive intensity, partner dependence, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Lemon et al., 2016 and Hajli, 2015 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of market access.

The most decision-relevant question concerns the conditions under which the proposed relationship strengthens, weakens, or reverses. In Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets, brand authenticity can influence customer advocacy through relationship repair and switching-cost management. The pathway is conditional on channel maturity and digital capability; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Hajli, 2015 and Morhart et al., 2015 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce service recovery.

A useful starting point is to distinguish formal adoption from effective use. In Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets, brand authenticity can influence customer advocacy through ecosystem coordination. The pathway is conditional on brand credibility and channel maturity; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Morhart et al., 2015 and Verhoef et al., 2021 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For

business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce commercial resilience.

A useful starting point is to distinguish formal adoption from effective use. In *Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets*, brand authenticity can influence customer advocacy through customer-journey coordination. The pathway is conditional on partner dependence and partner dependence; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Verhoef et al., 2021 and Kraus et al., 2022 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce customer trust.

7. Measurement and Decision Framework

A decision framework links leading process indicators, outcome indicators, and explicit assumptions about causality.

The synthesis treats brand authenticity as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of customer advocacy. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, channel integration and consistency changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while digital capability shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Lemon et al., 2016 and Morhart et al., 2015 and is especially relevant in competitive service markets. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

From a governance perspective, *Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets* requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Relationship repair and switching-cost management is most credible when supported by competitive intensity and customer heterogeneity. The reviewed literature (Hajli, 2015; Verhoef et al., 2021) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

From a governance perspective, *Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets* requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Ecosystem coordination is most credible when supported by channel maturity and competitive intensity. The reviewed literature (Morhart et al., 2015; Kraus et al., 2022) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

The synthesis treats brand authenticity as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of customer advocacy. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, customer-journey coordination changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while brand credibility shapes how

consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Verhoef et al., 2021 and OECD, 2023 and is especially relevant in competitive service markets. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

A recurring issue in research on Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Brand Authenticity may be associated with customer advocacy, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when partner dependence is weak. The mechanism examined here is trust formation and risk reduction, which connects the focal practice to changes in conversion quality.

8. Practical Implications and Research Agenda

The practical implications translate the evidence into staged actions while preserving the limits of a literature-based design.

For Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking brand authenticity with customer advocacy. Relationship repair and switching-cost management provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on digital capability, partner dependence, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Hajli, 2015 and Kraus et al., 2022 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of service recovery.

For Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking brand authenticity with customer advocacy. Ecosystem coordination provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on competitive intensity, digital capability, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Morhart et al., 2015 and OECD, 2023 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of commercial resilience.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets, brand authenticity can influence customer advocacy through customer-journey coordination. The pathway is conditional on channel maturity and channel maturity; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce customer trust.

From a governance perspective, Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Trust formation and risk reduction is most credible when supported by brand credibility and partner dependence. The article therefore emphasizes

traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

The synthesis treats brand authenticity as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of customer advocacy. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, market sensing and rapid experimentation changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while partner dependence shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with OECD, 2023 and Lemon et al., 2016 and is especially relevant in competitive service markets. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

9. Conclusion

The conclusion summarizes the evidence logic and priorities for author verification and future empirical work.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets, brand authenticity can influence customer advocacy through ecosystem coordination. The pathway is conditional on digital capability and customer heterogeneity; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce commercial resilience.

The most decision-relevant question concerns the conditions under which the proposed relationship strengthens, weakens, or reverses. In Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets, brand authenticity can influence customer advocacy through customer-journey coordination. The pathway is conditional on competitive intensity and competitive intensity; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce customer trust.

From a governance perspective, Brand Authenticity and Customer Advocacy in Competitive Service Markets requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Market sensing and rapid experimentation is most credible when supported by brand credibility and customer heterogeneity. The reviewed literature (OECD, 2023; Hajli, 2015) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

Historical source context and interpretation

The mechanism discussion is conceptual and must be read alongside the pre-cutoff works listed in References. Removing later sources does not establish a new empirical finding, a pooled effect or comprehensive coverage of the literature. Organization-specific claims require additional evidence before

publication.

References

- Lemon, K. N., & Verhoef, P. C. (2016). Understanding customer experience throughout the customer journey. *Journal of Marketing*, 80(6), 69-96. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.15.0420>
- Hajli, N. (2015). Social commerce constructs and consumer's intention to buy. *International Journal of Information Management*, 35(2), 183-191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2014.12.005>
- Morhart, F., Malar, L., Guevremont, A., Girardin, F., & Grohmann, B. (2015). Brand authenticity: An integrative framework and measurement scale. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 25(2), 200-218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2014.11.006>
- Verhoef, P. C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., Bhattacharya, A., Dong, J. Q., Fabian, N., & Haenlein, M. (2021). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 122, 889-901. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.09.022>
- Kraus, S., Durst, S., Ferreira, J. J., Veiga, P., Kailer, N., & Weinmann, A. (2022). Digital transformation in business and management research: An overview of the current status quo. *International Journal of Information Management*, 63, 102466. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2021.102466>
- OECD. (2023). *OECD SME and Entrepreneurship Outlook 2023*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/342b8564-en>