

One gets what one orders: Utilisation of digital marketing tools

***Heini Taiminen, Jyväskylä University, School of Business and
Economics, Finland****

This paper discusses the nature of the digital environment, digital marketing tools, their utilisation, and the consequences of the utilisation. Although digital marketing in its nature is interactive, it does not mean that the tools are used interactively. The distinction should be made between the nature of the channel and how it is harnessed, i.e., when evaluating the benefits that a digital marketing approach provides. As a conclusion, the paper shows that digital marketing tool utilisation should be seen as a multilayer concept where different digital channels can be utilised on three different levels, given as: (1) being present, (2) meeting customers online, and (3) serving customers online, and hence drive different kinds of marketing benefits.

Keywords Digital marketing, Digitisation, Interactivity, Marketing channels, Marketing tools, Social media

Introduction

Marketing in digital channels is here to stay. However, there is still limited understanding in the literature explaining how and why internet marketing really matters - what its link to business performance is (Brodie, Winklhofer, Coviello, & Johnston, 2007; Tsiotsou & Vlachopoulou, 2011). Furthermore, marketing is often considered to be behind other functions in its adoption of Information and Communications Technology (ICT) due to the lack of understanding about how ICT can serve marketing and business objectives (Brady, Fellenz, & Brookes, 2008). In order to fully transform companies' marketing into the digital age, we need to better understand the digital environment and digital tools and the benefits that they provide.

Despite the relatively short history of internet marketing research, it would be false to claim that digital marketing is a new practice. Over ten years

*Correspondence details and a biography for the author are located at the end of the article.

ago, Barwise and Farley (2005) had already declared that internet marketing was 'coming of age'. Brodie et al. (2007) supported this declaration and compared e-marketing with other contemporary marketing practices, noting that e-marketing had, to a large extent, become an integrated part of other marketing practices. This means that digital marketing should be seen as an element to serve different marketing goals via digital channels.

Electronic marketing, or digital marketing, can be defined as a management activity with the goal of identifying, preparing for, and satisfying the needs of customers (or other stakeholders) profitably in the digital environment or with bit-based objectives distributed through electronic channels (Rowley, 2008). Many definitions of e-marketing and i-marketing highlight the interactive nature of digital media, and e-marketing often focuses on using the Internet and other interactive technologies to create and mediate dialogue between companies and customers (Coviello, Milley, & Marcolin, 2001). Furthermore, Brodie, Saren and Pels (2011) even renamed e-marketing as interactive marketing. However, is e-marketing always interactive?

Interactivity refers to a two-way transfer of information between parties (e.g., customer and company or website and customer). Electronic dialogue provides an individual customer with easy access to information, and in turn creates an opportunity for a customer to provide information to businesses (Brodie et al., 2007; Coviello et al., 2001). From a company's point of view, interactivity creates value by providing customers with direct access to a company's resources; conversely, companies are also able to access information about customers' demands and product usage (Trainor, Rapp, Beitelspacher, & Schillewaert, 2011). Although the nature of digital media would provide opportunities for interactivity, it is important to distinguish between the nature of channels and how they are utilised. A channel can be interactive but still not be utilised in an interactive manner.

As Carr (2003) declares, IT does not provide a competitive advantage for companies. By saying this, he wants to direct interest towards the fact that IT has become a common feature in business, but that it does not itself provide competitive advantage. Competitive advantage arises from a strategic understanding of the best way to use IT (Borges, Hoppen, & Luce, 2009).

The aim of this paper is to discuss the nature of the digital environment, focusing particularly on the utilisation of different digital channels for companies' marketing purposes. As a conclusion, three levels of digital marketing communications are presented to create better understanding of the multilayer nature of digital marketing tools and the benefits that they might provide for companies.

Digitisation in marketing utilisation

Layers of internet

Digital marketing is a multidimensional and multidisciplinary concept, and is often used as a synonym for interactive or internet marketing (or i-marketing), e-commerce, and online marketing (see, e.g., Varadarajan & Yadav, 2009). E-marketing/digital marketing can be seen as merely comprising internet marketing (e.g., Barwise & Farley, 2005), but in a broader

sense, internet marketing can be seen as just one important component of e-marketing. 'Digital' refers to everything that is digitally mediated (from digital displays to mobile messages and the Internet). Internet technologies like mobile communications represent different forms of networks that enable communication via digital channels. Today, the distinction between internet usage and mobile network usage is almost impossible to make, due to smartphones, tablets, and 3-, 4-, and 5G connections. Clearly, the user experience is different, but the particular network technology under consideration no longer matters.

The Internet can be seen to be formed through different technological layers (Web 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0) that represent the development of the World Wide Web. Web 1.0 refers to the first version of the World Wide Web comprising the static elements on the web. For Web 1.0, there was a presenter (the one who created the website), and the viewer, who did not play any role other than as an observer; the communication was unidirectional with no feedback. Next, there was an evolutionary process from Web 1.0 to Web 2.0 (Constantinides & Fountain, 2008). Web 2.0 can be seen as a shift from static presentation towards the original idea of the Internet as the semantic web that captures the idea of a more community-centred approach; in some ways, Web 2.0 and the semantic web represent rival but complementary options (Ankolekar, Krötzsch, Tran, & Vrandečić, 2008). The term Web 2.0 was first used in 2004 to describe how software developers and end-users were utilising the Internet in a new way (Barnes et al., 2012; Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). From a technical perspective, Web 2.0 is a collection of technologies that enables two-way communication online, and Web 2.0 can be seen as an umbrella term for these collaborative technologies (Constantinides & Fountain, 2008; Morrison, 2009). As Weinberg and Pehlivan (2011) describe, Web 2.0 consists of computer network-based platforms that enable social applications. Examples of Web 2.0 applications are social networking sites, wikis, blogs, podcasts, instant messaging, discussion forums, audio and video conferencing, group diaries and address books, hosted virtual offices, collaborative whiteboards, and presentation systems (Barnes et al., 2012), all of which have their own 'rules' for writing and running applications (Weinberg & Pehlivan, 2011). Essentially, Web 2.0 technologies support the creation of user networks, facilitating the flow of ideas by allowing users to efficiently create, share, and refine content (Constantinides & Fountain, 2008). Besides technological change, Web 2.0 represents an ideological change, as Web 2.0 has empowered users to become co-creators and active participants. Web 2.0 also created a foundation for user-generated content (UGC) and for social media (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). In the marketing literature, Web 2.0 often refers to the technological foundation of UGC (see, e.g., Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010; Weinberg & Pehlivan, 2011), and hence it includes the more technical side of social media (Constantinides & Fountain, 2008).

It is important to clarify that Web 2.0 has not replaced Web 1.0 because they represent different layers on the Internet. There are static Web 1.0 sites on the Internet meant just for viewing, without opportunities to comment or interact. This remains the case even though the current trend requires sites to be adopting the interactivity of Web 2.0.

Table 1 Special characteristics of different technological layers in the web

Web	Communication	Goal	Participants	Producer	Examples	Marketing as...
1.0	One-way	Visibility	Presenter-observer	'Elite users'/authorities	Static websites/personal websites	informing
2.0	Two-way	Open source, interactive, co-creation	Active partners	Everyone	Blogs, social media sites, Wikipedia	relationship building and engagement
3.0	Two-way, computer assisted	Tailoring	Computer-active partners	Everyone + computer	Automated marketing, personalised websites	serving

Based on, e.g., Ankolekar et al., 2008; Barnes et al., 2012; Constantinides & Fountain, 2008; Fuchs et al., 2010; Garrigos-Simon et al., 2012; Kaplan & Haenlein 2010; Morrison, 2009; Weinberg & Pehlivan, 2011

Web 3.0 refers to the latest technological development that has empowered computers and software to produce information and make decisions. These networked digital technologies support human cooperation (Fuchs et al., 2010), and can be described as an augmentation of human brainpower. Web 3.0 technologies make it possible to handle and process information from different sources with greater speed and power. As described by Garrigos-Simon, Alcamí and Ribera (2012), in the Web 3.0 era, firms can use the information gathered by organisations, before, during, or after contact with customers, via techniques such as data warehousing, data mining, or customer relationship management as well as by using various pieces of information from diverse social networks or the net in general.

From a marketing perspective, this enables more tailored communication, engaging customers in a more meaningful way and satisfying individuals' needs with the use of 'big data'. In the extreme, marketing can be fully tailored and automated. Web 3.0 also refers to the augmented reality as an extension of Web 2.0. Examples include Foursquare, an application helping users find new places and services based on recommendations from other users; the dating app, Tinder, that matches people who expressed an interest towards one other based on profile pictures; Nike window-shopping, making it possible to purchase products online that are visible in shop windows when the store is closed; the Tesco app that enables users to shop for groceries in metro stations by selecting the desired products by scanning their images with a mobile device; and other mobile apps such as the Pittsburgh Penguins Mobile, which enhances sporting events by providing new ways to follow the game. In Table 1, the special characteristics of different technological layers in the web are summarised.

Digital marketing environment and tools

Website

The website has been described as the most important communication platform on the Internet (López & Ruiz, 2011). A company's website can

be described as the home of its brand (Christodoulides, 2009) and the most durable communication platform in the online environment (Karson & Korgaonkar, 2001). Websites may be considered as a form of communication that fulfils many of the functions of corporate advertising and can be seen as extensions, or as different forms of TV or printed advertisements (Hwang, McMillan, & Lee, 2003). In much research, the website has been compared to and treated as an advertisement (Hwang et al., 2003; Karson & Fisher, 2005; López & Ruiz, 2011; Sicilia & Ruiz, 2007). However, the expansion of Web 2.0 and the increased number of interactive elements on company websites might have made the comparison between a website and an advertisement outdated. According to the ideology of Web 2.0, current research highlights the importance of interactivity within the website, which can improve visitors' online experiences and lead to positive outcomes like favourable attitudes, product-relevant interest, and favourable intentions (van Noort, Voorveld, & van Reijmersdal, 2012). Examples of website features driving high or low interactivity are presented in Table 2.

As can be seen from Table 2, highly interactive functions add value to consumers' lives, and interactive websites are oriented towards customers. Interactivity can be seen as an antecedent of effective websites or as representing a background influence on other antecedents. There are different conceptions of which antecedents are included in efficient websites. Dickinger and Stangl (2013) note that among the most common antecedents are ease of use and usefulness, enjoyment, design, and content quality. Besides the importance of interactivity on the website, the question of what makes websites effective differs according to the goals that are set for the site and also according to the context and target audience of the website.

Table 2 Website features in high- and low-interactive websites

	Level of interactivity	
	High	Low
Contact	Online contact form	E-mail, phone number, and address
Registration	Possible to register to receive (product) updates	No possibility to register to receive (product) updates
Recommendation	Option to recommend the website to a friend	No option to recommend the website to a friend
Product order	Option to order products online	No option to order products
Product catalogue	Non-linear product catalogue with internal hyperlinks	Linear product catalogue
Stores	Interactive store locator	Linear list of stores
Language	Option to choose language	No option to choose language
Navigation guide	Site map	Unfolded menu bar

Adapted from van Noort et al., 2012

Online advertising

Traditionally, the role of an advertisement has been to deliver an announcement or persuasive message in the mass media for profit. To this end, the goal of advertising has been to inform and/or persuade people in a particular target market about products, services, organisation, or ideas (see AMA's 2015 definitions for advertisements and advertising). As described by the AMA, advertisements represent a one-way broadcasting tool to inform those who happen to see the advertisement. The purpose of the advertisement is relatively similar in an online environment, with deliberate messages placed on third-party websites, including search engines and directories, available through Internet access (Ha, 2008, p. 31). This definition considers advertising as placing advertisements and excludes marketers' own promotional websites, e-mails, and other forms of marketing communications. Ha (2008) also suggests distinguishing between online advertising and interactive advertising, noting that online advertising does not require interactivity, which aligns her definition with the ideology of Web 1.0.

Online advertising can be divided into push advertising (like e-mail ads, newsletters, banner advertising, pop-up advertisements), which closely resembles offline advertising, and on-demand advertising (like search engine marketing, smart/keyword activated banners), which allows for a more non-interruptive form of advertising.

Early studies of online advertising note that consumers react to online and offline advertising in a similar way (Dr  ze & Hussherr, 2003; Gallagher, Foster, & Parsons, 2001; Pavlou & Stewart, 2000). For online advertising, the emergence of Web 2.0 has also brought new opportunities and meaning. Advertising has transitioned from its traditional style based on interruption and repetition towards a style based on customer demand, immediate engagement, and advertising as a service (Rappaport, 2007). These new forms of advertising are more focused on a dynamic relationship between brands and consumers, acquiring insights into consumers through data on their behaviour and preferences and supported by technology (Rappaport, 2007).

Brettel and Spilker-Attig (2010) studied online stores and their advertising in the United States and France and found that on-demand channels have a stronger impact on sales than push channels (newsletter/e-mail). However, this might be explained by on-demand channels reacting to customers' interest in certain products or services (expressed, e.g., through a Google search), whereas when sending push messages to consumers, the retailer cannot know whether the customer is in the mood to buy. They also noted that the effectiveness is strongly moderated by culture. French customers, for example, tend to value the brand or online store, whereas in the US, customers tend to value prizes and promotions (Brettel & Spilker-Attig, 2010). Customers' preferences for on-demand channels might also be related to the irritation factor of push marketing. If the communication is found to be enjoyable and entertaining, and if the channel is perceived to be reliable, then the receiver is more likely to be persuaded by the marketing offer in that particular channel (Danaher & Rossiter, 2011). Dr  ze and Hussherr (2003) studied the effectiveness of banner advertising and argued that the click-through rate might not be a suitable measure for banner advertising

and that banner ads should be seen to serve more traditional advertising goals such as creating brand awareness. They also note that frequency and repetition, with meaningful content, are key to increasing ad recall.

Moving towards the newer styles of online advertising, from the practitioners' perspective, the Advertising Research Foundation's researchers developed three interrelated models of online advertising that draw on technological development: (1) the on-demand model, (2) the permission-based (opt-in) model, and (3) the advertising-as-service model (Rappaport, 2007). The first, on-demand model, is based on consumers' ability to choose their content and interactions with brands, and captures the idea of a more personalised communication instead of advertising targeted at large market segments. It relies on search engine advertising and also on content personalisation, and it views consumers as active co-creators. The second model, the permission-based (opt-in) model, takes the goal of advertising to a deeper level and engages consumers. This requires understanding customers on a more meaningful level. As Rappaport (2007) points out, the basis of this engagement strategy is consumer data, drawing upon multiple sources that assist marketers in evaluating their engagement efforts, and meeting customers at multiple touch points and online channels. These two models of advertisements conform to the idea of Web 2.0. The final model, advertising as a service, aims to provide information and capabilities to customers that smooth transactions or enhance brand engagement. This is the most customer-centric perspective on advertising, and provides personalised services for customers by using technology. Advertising as a service takes Web 2.0 towards the idea of Web 3.0.

E-mail and instant messaging

E-mail has become part of people's everyday lives in workplaces and homes around the globe (Danaher & Rossiter, 2011). Although e-mail is a two-way communication channel, it is often used as a one-way push style of channel to deliver newsletters or advertisements, which hence makes it a more or less one-way promotion channel. E-mail offers companies opportunities to reach their customers more broadly, target specific communities, and interact with customers in a highly customised manner (Müller, Florès, Agrebi, & Chandon, 2008; Sharma & Sheth, 2004). E-mail is the fastest expanding new channel and represents a direct threat to postal mail (Danaher & Rossiter, 2011). In addition to promotional purposes, e-mail can also serve more relational outcomes like building and maintaining relationships (Simmons, 2007). Hence, e-mail has a twofold purpose: (1) it is a channel for impersonal one-way communication (one-to-many), and (2) it is a channel for personal and intimate one-to-one communication. In the first case, the focus is on promotion, and in the second case, the focus is on discussion and relationship building.

E-mail's cost-effective capability has given rise to the problem of unsolicited commercial communication (Moustakas, Ranganathan, & Duquenoy, 2006), and hence promotional e-mails have a negative connotation for many people. Danaher and Rossiter (2011) compared e-mail to other commonly used mass communication channels (such as radio, magazines, and newspapers), print direct mail (catalogues, personally addressed mail,

and generic mail) and to television, and found that e-mail (along with phone and SMS) delivers the lowest purchase intention and even leads to a negative engagement among consumers and also among business-to-business (B2B) customers. They also note that e-mail is less persuasive than print media and mass media as channels for marketing. This might be because of a reduction of trust due to an excessive amount of junk mail. However, newsletters can include information other than just purely promotion material, in the form of articles and instructions that people perceive to be valuable. In that case, the newsletter can be considered a customer service tool, especially when personalised.

Social media

Social media seems to be a successful tool for brand building and for engaging customers and establishing unique customer relationships. In addition to the softer outcomes, a recent study indicates that in some cases, usage of social media can also drive sales-related outcomes; customers who were committed through social media to the company were found to be more profitable than those who were not committed to the brand on social media (Rishika, Kumar, Janakiraman, & Bezawada, 2013).

Social media is not just one channel but a collection of channels that builds up to form Web 2.0. Furthermore, it is not just a digital channel but an arena for participation (Aula, 2010) or a place for communication. The further development of the Internet made it possible to create social networking sites like Twitter, YouTube, and Facebook, which have become amazingly popular. Today, social media includes a wide range of online, word-of-mouth forums including basic blogs, discussion boards, chat rooms, forums, moblogs (sites containing digital audio, images, movies, or photographs), and social networking websites (Mangold & Faulds, 2009). Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) have identified six different types of social media: collaborative projects (e.g., Wikipedia, OhMyNews), blogs (blogs, podcast, and Twitter), content communities (e.g., YouTube and Flickr), social networking sites (e.g., Facebook and LinkedIn), virtual game worlds (e.g., World of Warcraft) and virtual social worlds (e.g., Second Life and Habbo), and then classified them based on the level of self-presentation/self-disclosure they represent and their level of social presence/media richness.

Weinberg and Pehlivan (2011) provide a different kind of classification that differentiates channel types based on the half-life of information and the depth of information. This classification incorporates four categories: blogs, which aim to convey product knowledge; micro-blogs (e.g., Twitter), which aim to create awareness and recall; communities (e.g., different fan communities), which aim to establish and maintain relations; and social networks (e.g., Facebook), which aim to influence and track beliefs and attitudes.

Although these classifications provide an effective starting point for a more comprehensive understanding of social media, they do not factor in who owns the media channels or who defines the rules, which are important considerations. The main argument related to social changes brought by social media is that social media has turned the marketer-customer relationship upside down by shifting power from marketers to customers (Hennig-Thurau

et al., 2010). However, this common claim has been criticised, for example, Rappaport (2007, p. 138) states that *"it would be an error to think that control has shifted fully to the consumer"* since for the most part brands still *"set the stage and establish the rules"*. However, if the brand sets the stage and established the rules, does that arena still represent 'social media' or something similar to social media? Often, for example, blogs are classified as social media channels since they allow for two-way communication, although they often remain company owned and controlled.

In this paper, social media arenas are classified based on the ownership of the channel as: (a) owned social media arenas, and (b) sharing arenas (see Table 3).

Owned sites can be further classified into private and public sites, and sharing sites are defined by their focus on issues or on relationships. The main difference between owned channels and sharing channels is in the ownership and control of the platform. The owner defines the nature of interaction and the 'rules' of each specific platform. In owned arenas, the ownership is in the hands of a person/company. In sharing arenas, the platform provider defines the rules together with the public, and a single

Table 3 Different company roles in social media

	Ownership of the channel	Role of the company	Company...	Activity of company	Role in content creation	Content
Owned channel	Company	Owner	...creates social media platform itself	Active	Content creator/ content enabler/ curator	Company defines topics
Sharing channel	External service provider	Host	...has own medium in some social media channel (e.g., fan page in Facebook)	Active	Content creator/ curator	Company defines topics together with audience
		Participant	...participates actively in conversation in some social media arena	Active	One of the content creators/ commentators	Users define topics together with the company
		Object	...is the object of conversation (WOM)	Passive	None	Users define topic
		None	...is not discussed within social media arenas	Passive	None	None

company cannot control the conversation. Sharing arenas represent the basic idea of customer-owned media based on sharing, co-creation, and UGC. They form a kind of independent arena for participation. The role of the company is different: on owned channels, the company is the owner; in sharing channels, the company can act as host, participant, object, or remain anonymous. Different roles and actions are presented in Table 3. In addition, it should be noted that a company can also act as an advertiser on sharing channels by buying advertising space.

Monitoring and measurement tools

The interactive nature of digital marketing offers new opportunities to communicate and serve customers in new ways, including providing the ability to monitor and gain information. Digital marketing tools provide useful applications for measuring communication (Wymbs, 2011), and almost every action on the Internet can be tracked by other consumers and companies (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2010). These new dimensions of monitoring offer companies a tremendous opportunity to follow customer behaviour (Lemke, Clark, & Wilson, 2011) and to acquire information and feedback from different companies. Through this information, companies are able to see what works and what does not on the Internet, and they can develop their actions and even an entire marketing strategy to be more efficient and hence create more meaningful relationships with their customers. The information can be gathered through online monitoring or by following clickstream data, for example, retrieved from company-owned channels or from examining the statistics provided by external service providers. The options for measuring digital communication activity are numerous, however, there is considerable uncertainty about which metrics to use to gauge the effectiveness of the new media (Winer, 2009).

Three levels of digital marketing utilisation

As can be seen from the channel descriptions, digital marketing can also operate on different levels serving different marketing communication outcomes. Although digital tools provide the possibility of interactive communication, it does not mean that digital marketing is always interactive. Hence, it would be beneficial to treat digital marketing as a function that has different roles, as Orlikowski presented in the case of IT (see Orlikowski, 2000), penetrating different marketing practices as IT (Coviello et al., 2001). Orlikowski (2000) proposes viewing the use of technology as a process, suggesting that IT can play three different roles in organisations, reflecting different levels of IT integration in organisations. These three roles are inertia, application, and change. *Inertia* represents that most basic level of usage in which users choose to use technology to *preserve* the status quo. The *application* role of IT refers to situations where people choose to use new technology to augment or refine the existing ways of doing things, to *enhance* the status quo. The most sophisticated level, *change*, occurs when people want to alter their existing way of doing things and *transform* the status quo (Orlikowski, 2000).

Following Orlikowski's (2000) idea regarding the layers of IT usage, from the channel descriptions, digital marketing communications can also operate on different levels serving different marketing communication outcomes. These three levels are named as: (1) Being present, (2) Meeting customers online, and (3) Serving customers online (see Table 4), following the three layers of the Internet as presented earlier and the idea of three interrelated models of online advertising (see Rappaport, 2007).

Being present can be seen as the basic level of digital marketing that can be done via one-way online communication, providing Web 1.0 options. It is informing the customers about the brand and product offerings, and this is similar to traditional marketing, as was the case when websites acted as advertisements for companies (see, e.g., Hwang et al., 2003; Karson & Fisher, 2005; López & Ruiz, 2011; Sicilia & Ruiz, 2007).

The second level, meeting customers online, relies on the idea of Web 2.0 and the interactive possibilities that a digital environment provides. As explained before, interactivity within the Internet seems to have a positive impact on a company's online performance by focusing the attention of customers, developing stronger relationships, and increasing overall customer satisfaction (see, e.g., Simmons, 2007; van Noort et al., 2012). Being interactive, companies can create awareness, but more importantly, it opens up the opportunity to create deeper relationships with customers.

The third stage, serving customers' online, aims not only to create meaningful relationships and understanding, but actually to serve customers in the online environment following the idea of advertising as a service, for example (see Rappaport, 2007). In addition to the potential of Web 2.0, that of Web 3.0 can also be realised.

The stages are interconnected and not sequential. Depending on the marketing goals, different levels can be applied. Each channel can serve marketing on multiple levels as the channel descriptions make clear, for example websites can have the goal of simply creating awareness by adding interactive relationships to engage the customer, and then by customising the site, they also deliver customer service.

Discussion and conclusions

Following Day and Bens (2005), and Carr (2003), this paper wants to remind that technology is only a tool, which does not in itself provide competitive advantage for companies. Furthermore, this paper highlights that close attention should be directed to utilisation when inspecting the performance of digital marketing.

As shown in this paper, digital tools can serve many purposes, depending on how they are utilised. The presented three levels provide a new starting point to better understand the benefits of what digital marketing tools provide for company marketing, a great starting point to explain how and why internet marketing really matters and what its link to business performance is (see, e.g., Brodie et al., 2007; Tsiotsou & Vlachopoulou, 2011). That is, when measuring the success of the utilisation of digital tools, more attention should be paid to the manner in which they are utilised instead of focusing on the possibilities they provide. Depending on the style in which a company

Table 4 Three levels of digital marketing in different digital channels

Levels of marketing	Meaning	Function	Website	Advertising	E-mail	Social media (owned)	Social media (sharing sites)	Measurement and monitoring
Being present	Static online presence	Communicating the product/service offerings and creating awareness	Static website	Push ads	Advertising, newsletters	Blog, posting company related news type of content	Being present in social media (static site or advertising in these channels)	Measuring the effectiveness of company actions, i.e., click-through rate/brand awareness
Meeting customers online	Interactive online presence	Creating awareness through interactivity Possibility of creating relationships	Social media elements + interactive elements included	The on-demand model The permission-based (opt-in) model	Personalised newsletters	Blog with commenting option	Meeting the customer in social media channels Dialogue	Collecting customer information and utilising it to create more meaningful relationships with customer
Serving customers online	Understanding of customers on a more meaningful level	Optimising customer experience/serving customers online and creating engagement	Possibility of personalising site	The advertising-as-service model	Customer service via e-mail	Serving customers by providing valuable content	Serving the customers Solving problems in social media channels	Optimising customer experience

Based on the literature, e.g., Ankolekar et al., 2008; Barnes et al., 2012; Constantinides & Fountain, 2008; Fuchs et al., 2010; Garrigos-Simon et al., 2012; Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010; Morrison, 2009; Rappaport, 2007; Weinberg & Pehlivan, 2011

utilises these new digital tools, the company is able to receive certain benefits. This typology provides an effective tool for researchers to better understand the multidimensional nature of digital tools. Digital marketing cannot be a synonym for interactive marketing; interactive marketing is just one way to conduct marketing in digital channels. If we only capture the interactive nature of digital marketing when measuring the benefits, we miss a lot.

From a company management point of view, this typology provides a great source to evaluate digital tool utilisation within the company and also to evaluate the goals and the realisation to meet these goals. For example, if the company utilises digital tools at the first 'being present' level, it cannot set goals such as engagement since that would require a more advanced level of digital marketing tool utilisation. And if the company wants to serve customers through digital channels, it needs to use these channels in a way that enables them to serve the customers instead of just informing them. The modern view of marketing is that it is about serving customers, which means that companies need to carefully consider which of their online functions are driving customer service and which are not.

References

- AMA (2015). AMA Dictionary. *American Marketing Association*. Retrieved 1st June 2015 from <https://www.ama.org/resources/Pages/Dictionary.aspx>
- Ankolekar, A., Krötzsch, M., Tran, T., & Vrandečić, D. (2008). The two cultures: Mashing up Web 2.0 and the Semantic Web. *Web Semantics: Science, Services and Agents on the World Wide Web*, 6(1), 70-75. doi: 10.1016/j.websem.2007.11.005
- Aula, P. (2010). Social media, reputation risk and ambient publicity management. *Strategy & Leadership*, 38(6), 43-49. doi: 10.1108/10878571011088069
- Barnes, D., Clear, F., Harindranath, G., Dyerson, R., Harris, L., & Rea, A. (2012). Web 2.0 and micro-businesses: an exploratory investigation. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 19(4), 687-711. doi: 10.1108/14626001211277479
- Barwise, P., & Farley, J.U. (2005). The state of interactive marketing in seven countries: Interactive marketing comes of age. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 19(3), 67-80. doi: 10.1002/dir.20044
- Borges, M., Hoppen, N., & Luce, F.B. (2009). Information technology impact on market orientation in e-business. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(9), 883-890. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.10.010
- Brady, M., Fellenz, M.R., & Brookes, R. (2008). Researching the role of information and communications technology (ICT) in contemporary marketing practices. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 23(2), 108-114. doi: 10.1108/08858620810850227
- Brettel, M., & Spilker-Attig, A. (2010). Online advertising effectiveness: a cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, 4(3), 176-196. doi: 10.1108/17505931011070569
- Brodie, R.J., Saren, M., & Pels, J. (2011). Theorizing about the service dominant logic: The bridging role of middle range theory. *Marketing Theory*, 11(1), 75-91. doi: 10.1177/1470593110393714
- Brodie, R.J., Winklhofer, H., Coviello, N.E., & Johnston, W.J. (2007). Is e-marketing coming of age? An examination of the penetration of e-marketing and firm performance. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 21(1), 2-21. doi: 10.1002/dir.20071
- Carr, N.G. (2003). IT doesn't matter. *Harvard Business Review*, 81(5), 41-49.
- Christodoulides, G. (2009). Branding in the post-internet era. *Marketing Theory*, 9(1), 141-144. doi: 10.1177/1470593108100071

- Constantinides, E., & Fountain, S.J. (2008). Web 2.0: Conceptual foundations and marketing issues. *Journal of Direct and Digital Marketing Practice*, 9(3), 231-244. doi: 10.1057/palgrave.dddmp.4350098
- Coviello, N.E., Milley, R., & Marcolin, B. (2001). Understanding IT-enabled interactivity in contemporary marketing. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 15(4), 18-33. doi: 10.1002/dir.1020
- Danaher, P.J., & Rossiter, J.R. (2011). Comparing perceptions of marketing communication channels. *European Journal of Marketing*, 45(1/2), 6-42. doi: 10.1108/03090561111095586
- Day, G.S., & Bens, K.J. (2005). Capitalizing on the internet opportunity. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 20(4/5), 160-168. doi: 10.1108/08858620510603837
- Dickinger, A., & Stangl, B. (2013). Website performance and behavioral consequences: A formative measurement approach. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(6), 771-777. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.09.017
- Dréze, X., & Hussherr, F.X. (2003). Internet advertising: is anybody watching? *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 17(4), 8-23. doi: 10.1002/dir.10063
- Fuchs, C., Hofkirchner, W., Schafranek, M., Raffl, C., Sandoval, M., & Bichler, R. (2010). Theoretical foundations of the web: cognition, communication, and co-operation. Towards an understanding of Web 1.0, 2.0, 3.0. *Future Internet*, 2(1), 41-59. doi: 10.3390/fi2010041
- Gallagher, K., Foster, K.D., & Parsons, J. (2001). The medium is not the message: advertising effectiveness and content evaluation in print and on the web. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 41(4), 57-70. doi: 10.2501/JAR-41-4-57-70
- Garrigos-Simon, F.J., Alcamí, R.L., & Ribera, T.B. (2012). Social networks and web 3.0: their impact on the management and marketing of organizations. *Management Decision*, 50(10), 1880-1890. doi: 10.1108/00251741211279657
- Ha, L. (2008). Online advertising research in advertising journals: a review. *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising*, 30(1), 31-48. doi: 10.1080/10641734.2008.10505236
- Hennig-Thurau, T., Malhotra, E.C., Friege, C., Gensler, S., Lobschat, L., Rangaswamy, A., & Skiera, B. (2010). The impact on new media on customer relationships. *Journal of Service Research*, 13(3), 311-330. doi: 10.1177/1094670510375460
- Hwang, J.S., McMillan, S.J., & Lee, F. (2003). Corporate web sites as advertising: an analysis of function, audience and message strategy. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 3(2), 10-23. doi: 10.1080/15252019.2003.10722070
- Kaplan, A.M., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media. *Business Horizons*, 53(1), 59-68. doi: 10.1016/j.bushor.2009.09.003
- Karson, E.J., & Fisher, R.J. (2005). Predicting intentions to return to the web site: extending the dual mediation hypothesis. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 19(3), 2-14. doi: 10.1002/dir.20040
- Karson, E.J., & Korgaonkar, P.K. (2001). An experimental investigation of internet advertising and the elaboration likelihood model. *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 23(2), 53-72. doi: 10.1080/10641734.2001.10505120
- Lemke, F., Clark, M., & Wilson, H. (2011). Customer experience quality: An exploration in business and consumer contexts using repertory grid technique. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 39(6), 846-869. doi: 10.1007/s11747-010-0219-0
- López, I., & Ruiz, S. (2011). Explaining website effectiveness: The hedonic-utilitarian dual mediation hypothesis. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 10(1), 49-58. doi: 10.1016/j.elerap.2010.04.003
- Mangold, W.G., & Faulds, D.J. (2009). Social media: The new hybrid element of the promotion mix. *Business Horizons*, 52(4), 357-365. doi: 10.1016/j.bushor.2009.03.002

- Morrison, K. (2009). The implications of 'jam' and other ideation technologies for organizational decision making. *Cultural Science*, 2(1), 1-9.
- Moustakas, E., Ranganathan, C., & Duquenoy, P. (2006). E-mail marketing at the crossroads: A stakeholder analysis of unsolicited commercial e-mail (spam). *Internet Research*, 16(1), 38-52. doi: 10.1108/10662240610642532
- Müller, B., Florès, L., Agrebi, M., & Chandon, J.-L. (2008). The branding impact of brand websites: do newsletters and consumer magazines have a moderating role? *Journal of Advertising Research*, 48(3), 465-472. doi: 10.2501/S0021849908080471
- Orlikowski, W.J. (2000). Using technology and constituting structures: A practice lens for studying technology in organizations. *Organization Science*, 11(4), 404-428. doi: 10.1287/orsc.11.4.404.14600
- Pavlou, P.A., & Stewart, D.W. (2000). Measuring the effects and effectiveness of interactive advertising: A research agenda. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 1(1), 61-77. doi: 10.1080/15252019.2000.10722044
- Rappaport, S.D. (2007). Lessons from online practice: new advertising models. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 47(2), 135-141. doi: 10.2501/S0021849907070158
- Rishika, R., Kumar, A., Janakiraman R., & Bezawada, R. (2013). The effect of customers' social media participation on customer visit frequency and profitability: An empirical investigation. *Information Systems Research*, 24(1), 108-127. doi: 10.1287/isre.1120.0460
- Rowley, J. (2008). Understanding digital content marketing. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 24(5/6), 517-540. doi: 10.1362/026725708X325977
- Sharma, A., & Sheth, J.N.W. (2004). Web-based marketing: the coming revolution in marketing thought and strategy. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(7), 696-703. doi: 10.1016/S0148-2963(02)00350-8
- Sicilia, M., & Ruiz, S. (2007). The role of flow in website effectiveness. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 8(1), 33-44. doi: 10.1080/15252019.2007.10722135
- Simmons, G. (2007). I-branding: Developing the internet as a branding tool. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 25(6), 544-563. doi: 10.1108/02634500710819932
- Trainor, K.J., Rapp, A., Beitelspacher, L.S., & Schillewaert, N. (2011). Integrating information technology and marketing: An examination of the drivers and outcomes of e-Marketing capability. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 40(1), 162-174. doi: 10.1016/j.indmarman.2010.05.001
- Tsiotsou, R.H., & Vlachopoulou, M. (2011). Understanding the effects of market orientation and e-marketing on service performance. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 29(2), 141-155. doi: 10.1108/02634501111117593
- Van Noort, G., Voorveld, H.A.M., & van Reijmersdal, E.A. (2012). Interactivity in Brand Web Sites: Cognitive, Affective, and Behavioral Responses Explained by Consumers' Online Flow Experience. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 26(4), 223-234. doi: 10.1016/j.intmar.2011.11.002
- Varadarajan, R., & Yadav, M. (2009). Marketing strategy in an internet-enabled environment: A retrospective on the first ten years of JIM and a prospective on the next ten years. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 23(1), 11-22. doi: 10.1016/j.intmar.2008.10.002
- Weinberg, B.D., & Pehlivan, E. (2011). Social spending: Managing the social media mix. *Business Horizons*, 54(3), 275-282. doi: 10.1016/j.bushor.2011.01.008
- Winer, R. (2009). New communications approaches in marketing: Issues and research directions. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 23(2), 108-117. doi: 10.1016/j.intmar.2009.02.004
- Wymbs, C. (2011). Digital marketing: The time for a new "Academic Major" has arrived. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 33(1), 93-106. doi: 10.1177/0273475310392544

About the Author and Correspondence

Heini Taiminen (née Lipiäinen), DSc, is a Postdoctoral Researcher at the University of Jyväskylä, School of Business and Economics. In her research she has specialised in digital marketing and is currently focused on working with social marketing related themes with a digital twist. Her biggest interest professionally relates to digital marketing, behaviour change, behaviour maintenance, and branding. She has previously published in *Industrial Marketing Management*, *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, *Journal of Systems and Information Technology*, and *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*.

Heini Taiminen, Postdoctoral Researcher, Marketing, Jyväskylä University, School of Business and Economics, PO.Box. 35, 40014 Jyväskylä, Finland.

E heini.taiminen@jyu.fi

© of Marketing Review is the property of Westburn Publishers Ltd or its licensors and its content may not be copied or e-mailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without first obtaining the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or e-mail articles for individual, non-commercial use only. This article has been reproduced by EBSCO under license from Westburn Publishers Ltd.