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OMC – need for at new typology for IMC?
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this article is challenge the current conceptual treatment of online marketing communications (OMC) as part of integrated marketing communications (IMC). The concept of integrated marketing communications has been defined by the integrated communications committee of the American Association of Advertising Agencies (AAAA) as follows (Smith, 1998):

A concept of marketing communications planning that recognizes the added value in a program that integrates a variety of strategic disciplines, for instance general advertising, direct response, sales promotion, and public relations –and combines these disciplines to provide clarity, consistency, and maximum communications impact.

There are other, competing definitions of integrated marketing communications (Kitchen, 2005). Many of these focus on adaptation of communications to stakeholder interests. The AAAA definition differs from these definitions due to its focus on IMC as a tool for creating added value and impact by integrating the various market communication disciplines available to the marketer and thus seems to be the best choice for the purpose of this article which is to discuss the integration of OMC into IMC, and not IMC as such. According to the AAAA definition, good IMC programmes should ‘combine these disciplines to provide clarity, consistency, and maximum communications impact’. To do so, the marketer has to be able to consider the elements in the IMC programme in a structured way with a clear picture of the function of each tool separately and in synergy with other tools. Therefore, IMC tools should be
classified in a consistent and intuitively understandable way. However, it seems that this need has not affected the way that online communication tools are classified as a part of IMC as we will show later in this article, and accordingly, there is a need to carry out a structured consideration of the distinctiveness of online communication tools.

In order to satisfy this need we first look into extant typologies for IMC and their treatment of OMC. Subsequently, we state a case why online communications are distinguished by more than their use of a new medium and we argue why they should not be integrated into the existing disciplines. Next, we consider whether OMC share so many common characteristics that they can be classified into one, single discipline, or if multiple OMC disciplines are needed. The discussion is based on a consideration of the common characteristics of and differences between a range of online marketing communication tools deducted from a thorough review of literature covering IMC and online marketing communications.

Before carrying out the consideration, we find it necessary to make a few clarifications concerning use of terms and scope of this article. The first clarification concerns online marketing communications, for which various terms are used in the literature. Examples are e-branding, e-media, e-marketing, interactive communications, WWW marketing, online marketing, interactive marketing, Internet marketing, and i-communications. In this article, ‘online communications’ are defined as communications where the user, via a computer, is connected to and served by a computer network.

The term ‘computer’ also poses problems, as especially mobile phones and other wireless devices increasingly can be regarded as computers making new applications possible, such as Location Based Services (LBS). In this article, to keep things simple, any device used for
accessing the Internet is considered a computer while it is used for this purpose. In addition to this technological limitation, we consider only online communication tools mentioned in the main works studied even though one could argue for the inclusion of upcoming possibilities, for example emoticon advertising, podcast advertising via RSS or the importance of blogging for online PR.

**EXTANT TERMINOLOGIES FOR IMC**

In the introduction we have already stated that there is no clear picture of the treatment of OMC in IMC or of IMC as such. To get an overview of the state-of-the-art as regards IMC disciplines, we have studied classifications presented in current textbooks on marketing management covering integrated marketing communications (e.g. Hollensen, 2003; Kotler, 2003), in IMC books (Belch & Belch, 2004; Pelsmacker, Geuens, & Van den Bergh, 2001; Duncan, 2002; Kitchen, 1999; Kitchen & de Pelsmacker, 2004; Pickton & Broderick, 2004), and in an older textbook on marketing communications (Delozier, 1978). The review revealed the classifications shown in table 1. As can be seen from table 1, communication tools are, as proposed in the AAAA definition, categorized into disciplines.

[Take in table 1]

It is clear from the classifications presented in table 1 that there are two different ways of treating new forms of marketing communications. Some new tools have been added as
supplementary disciplines by some authors even though this only in some cases seems to be warranted by a special function. Relationship marketing and sponsorship in Kitchen (1999) and Kitchen & de Pelsmacker (2004), sponsorship, point-of-purchase and exhibitions by Pelsmacker et al. (2001), and events and packaging by Duncan (2002) are all granted distinct disciplines. The same tools have been included within the existing disciplines by other authors (e.g. Pickton & Broderick, 2004). OMC (Internet, interactive and e-communications) have been treated in the same manner; by some authors as a separate, single discipline, and included in the existing disciplines by other authors. The general literature in the field thus does not seem to agree on any common line in the development of disciplines aimed at covering the field of IMC and especially, OMC have not been consistently integrated. There, however, seems to be a consensus about the appropriateness of the disciplines advertising, PR and promotion, direct marketing, promotion, and personal selling. We, therefore, take our starting point in these disciplines and consider OMC tools in relation to this typology and refrain from discussing IMC typology as such.

WHY OMC DIFFER FROM OFFLINE MARKETING COMMUNICATIONS

Media are carriers of communication. According to Bordewijk & van Kaam (1986) all possible ways of sharing information (communicating) can be classified according to a) how much the user is in control of distribution of the communication, and b) to which extent this communication is produced by the user or the marketer. The classification is displayed in table 2. The resulting four types of communication are termed transmission, consultation, registration,
and conversation. They are displayed in table 2 with uppercase letters. Traditional media typically are carriers of only one type of communication, for instance is TV primarily a transmission based medium, whereas the telephone primarily is a conversational medium, and books and catalogues are consultation media. To facilitate all four types of communication, we thus need to integrate several of the traditional media channels.

[Take in table 2]

In many ways, online communications facilitates communication in the same way as offline communication media. For instance, online communications are able to facilitate transmission communication in the same way as broadcast media. At the same time, OMC can facilitate consultation communication because the user can choose to contact the marketer by e-mail. However, OMC are also distinct from offline communications in a number of ways. First and foremost, the Internet (online communications) can carry not just one but all four types of communication as can be seen from the fact that online communication tools are represented in all four quadrants in table 2. Online communications are able to, in one activity, transmit information to the customer, provide an opportunity for consultation, register click through, and let the customer communicate with other customers in an online forum. In addition, OMC allow communication transfer between many senders and receivers (Hoffman & Novak, 1996). OMC are also special because the information can (fairly) easily be updated and also be arranged in a manner that makes the user able to control distribution of marketer supplied communication, and also easily move between marketers. In addition to this, the independence of spatial and temporal
restrictions allows the communication receiver to be much more in control of when and where the information is retrieved as also put forward by Bauer, Grether, & Leach (2002). The special characteristics of OMC are displayed in table 3. In sum, the characteristics of OMC far surpass any individual offline media channel as also stated by Hoffman and Novak (1996: 65): ‘The hypermedia CME represents a fundamentally different environment for marketing activities than do traditional media and so-called interactive multimedia’. We, therefore, find that OMC tools are too distinct from offline tools to warrant a classification into the existing typology reducing the difference between the two to the use of just another media channel.

**AN ATTEMPT TO CATEGORIZE OMC TOOLS INTO DISCIPLINES**

In answering the question whether OMC then should be treated as one or as multiple disciplines, an exploratory approach was taken. Fifteen OMC tools were deducted from general IMC literature (Belch & Belch, 2004; Pelsmacker et al., 2001; Duncan, 2002; Kitchen & de Pelsmacker, 2004; Pickton & Broderick, 2004) as well as more specific OMC literature (Jensen & Fischer, 2004; Roberts, 2003; Strauss, El-Ansary, & Frost, 2003). An attempt was then made to categorize the fifteen OMC tools in an online analogue to four of the five standard IMC disciplines: Advertising, public relations, sales promotion, and direct marketing (see table 1). Furthermore, a fifth discipline: ‘online personal communications’, covering tools that are analogue to personal selling was added, as personal selling is not an online option because personal selling is, by definition, face-to-face, and online personal communication possibilities are far broader than just ‘selling’. Some of the tools considered can be assigned to more than one
discipline. In these cases, the categorization was based on the primary belonging. Below, a brief descriptive presentation of the fifteen tools categorized into the five disciplines is followed by a discussion considering whether the attempt points to a need for multiple disciplines, or if one discipline would be enough to cover the variations in online marketing communications tools.

*Online Advertising*

Two online communication tools resemble traditional advertising: Display advertising and paid search engine optimization (SEO).

There are two main types of *display advertising*: Embedded in the content and interfering with the content. Display advertising that is embedded in the content includes banners, buttons, and skyscrapers, whereas interfering advertising includes interstitial adverts and formerly also pop-ups.

*Search Engine Optimization (SEO) or Search Engine Marketing (SEM)* is generally divided into organic and paid optimization. Organic SEO refers to achieving good search rankings for a website without paying for it. Search engine algorithms use different parameters to assign websites a certain rank.

*Online Public Relations*

According to Holtz (2002), the possibilities that OMC offers within PR are media relations, the possibility to customize information, and the possibility to build email
relationships. In agreement with Holtz (2002), the following tools can be categorized as online public relations: Online media relations, online sponsorships, online events, and viral marketing as the main function of these tools are to create a positive attitude towards to brand or the company. Online media relations refer to a systematic monitoring of the company’s and/or brand’s online reputation. Forward & McCall (2001) suggest frequent monitoring of coverage about company, customers and competitors on webpages as well as in chat rooms and communities. A possibility is to use Internet Monitoring Services (IMS) that work just like search engines; however, in a more customised, rapid and dedicated way.

Online sponsorships constitute a fast evolving activity that offers an opportunity for combining traditional activity sponsorships and media sponsorships and thereby extends marketing strategy in new directions (Drennan & Cornwell, 2004). With the adoption of broadband, online events have become a viable communication activity. Online events are events in cyberspace and are, therefore, hyperreal. They could be product launches, fashion shows, presentation of financial statements, press conferences etc. (Duncan, 2002; Strauss et al., 2003). Viral marketing is deliberate spreading of a message through online word-of-mouth (Barratt, 2001). Viral marketing can be carried by multiple ‘agents’, for example e-mail, streaming video and audio, games, programmes, web sites, pictures or simple documents.

Online Sales Promotion

Sales promotion can be either trade or consumer oriented (Belch & Belch, 2004). Online activities targeted at inducing a purchase include online contests, coupons and rebates as well as
online affiliate programmes while e-learning training programmes are mainly trade oriented.

*Online competitions, coupons, samples, contests and sweepstakes* are all activities that are aimed at augmenting sales and encourage involvement and repeated visits (Pickton & Broderick, 2004).

In *affiliate programmes*, a link to the marketer’s website is placed on a host business's site. The host earns a commission whenever a visitor clicks the link and carries out a transaction with the sponsor (Papatla & Bhatnagar, 2002), just as manufacturers pay a commission to its selling agents. Online trade sales promotion traditionally includes sales training programmes. *E-learning* replaces face-to-face classroom instruction in a growing number of businesses (Schweizer, 2004). Learning Management Systems (LMS) can include any kind of multimedia content, synchronous as well as asynchronous communication, and all linked together and personalized (Sheng-Tun, Chu-Hung, & Pao-Ta, 2005).

*Online Direct Marketing*

*E-mail* is a common tool for online direct marketing. However, there are also other possibilities available in the form of microsites and context based services. *Microsites* are smaller websites developed for a specific purpose such as a product launch or specific campaign (Kitchen & de Pelsmacker, 2004). Microsites are often used in conjunction with e-mail marketing as ‘landing pages’, and are considered more involving and specific a broader main homepage because of the more targeted, and thus relevant, content.

*Context based services* involve location and time based services, for instance direct messages that not only are customized in content but also according to a specific situation.
Strauss et al. (2003) give the example of receiving a promotional message on your mobile device while driving by your favourite restaurant. Content based services utilize the possibilities of ubiquitous computing by communication based on context, for example location and time or a combination of these.

*Online Personal Communications*

Three OMC tools can be classified as online personal communication: Personalization, online communities, and online games. The web is growing exponentially, and at the same time, the human capacity to digitize content is constant. *Web personalization*, among other things, is a promising approach aimed at overcoming this dilemma. Personalization can be carried out in more or less advanced ways. One approach is to use manual decision making systems that are based on user demographics collected through registration. In addition, they are static. More advanced methods include collaborative filtering systems, as known from amazon.com, where personal preferences are correlated with group preferences and recommendations are given based on the group’s behaviour. Such systems are often referred to as recommender systems. To make systems even more intelligent, research is focused on retrieving the personal click stream information (CSI), and, in real-time, translate the personal behaviour into recommendations or showing preferred content. This is often referred to as Web usage mining (WUM) or more generally as ‘mass customization’ (Shahabi & Banaei-Kashani, 2003; Mobasher, Cooley, & Srivastava, 2000).
**Online communities** are ‘voluntary associations of people with shared interests or common purposes’ (Rheingold, 1993). Hagel and Armstrong’s (1996) later definition supports that notion by suggesting that online communities bring people together with a common set of interests. Jepsen (2006) showed that online communities are regarded as an important source of information in pre purchase search. Online communities can be user-driven as well as marketer-driven, the latter often in the form of ‘brand communities’ and online communities can take on many forms such as Multi User Domains (MUD), often referred to as forums, and Internet Relay Chat (IRC) (Trabak, 2000; e.g. Smith & Kollock, 1999). Trabak (2000) refers to a classification based on the user’s motivation, which can be goal-driven, profession-driven or lifestyle-driven. All types of online communities can be employed within marketing communications.

*Online games* used as OMC often are referred to as advergaming (e.g. Garcia, 2004; Lee, 2003). According to Garcia (2004) online gaming can be implemented in three different ways: 1) *Embedded*, where advertisements are embedded in an existing game, 2) *Media-partner sponsorships*, where an existing game or portions of a game is sold, and 3) *Custom*, where the game is developed specific to the client’s needs.

**ONE OR MULTIPLE OMC DISCIPLINES?**

OMC can only be regarded as one, single discipline if the tools used in OMC do not differ in important characteristics. One approach to evaluating this is to look into the function of the tools. In the above brief description of the fifteen tools, there are some functional similarities across the tools. However, these similarities can be ascribed to the features of online
communications as such that were described earlier in this article (table 3). Looking beyond these similarities, there are important differences across the tools presented. The tools that we ascribed to online advertising are primarily employed for creation of attention. Attention is created through appearance of commercials and links on the receiver’s computer. In addition to this, the user is very often encouraged not only to receive the message passively but to act on the message and click on the advertisement or the link displayed. The tools that we ascribed to online PR and public relation are mainly image creating activities and thus have an entirely different function than the tools ascribed to online advertising. The third group of tools, labelled ‘online sales promotion’, is primarily targeted at inducing sales and thus again has a function that is distinct from the other tools. Looking at the fourth group of tools, ‘online direct marketing’ the distinction is less clear as this group differs from the other groups due to the direct contact between marketer and customer and not due to any special function in the communication mix. The same applies to online personal communications, for which the present categorization is characterized by the type of communication rather than their function. However, even though the primary function of the tools in these two last groups is unclear, it is clear they differ from the functions of advertising, PR and public relations, and sales promotion.

In conclusion to this, we thus find that the simplistic categorization above into the five online disciplines adapted from the classical IMC disciplines shows a diversity in the OMC tools that does not allow them to be categorized into one single discipline. According to the AAAA definition, the idea behind IMC is to integrate tools from distinctive disciplines. Therefore, OMC tools should be classified into such disciplines.
**A new typology for OMC**

The discussion in the above showed that OMC needs a typology with several disciplines. The next step, therefore, is to develop these disciplines. We find that it is preferable to use the traditional OMC disciplines as a starting point even though the appropriateness of this typology can be questioned. In favour of such a classification speaks that the three classical disciplines advertising, PR, and sales promotion have been included by all IMC authors from Delozier (1978) and forward. It is therefore a classification that is easy to understand for marketers. Also, the functions of these online disciplines are similar to that of their offline counterparts. There is, in recent literature, a consensus that direct marketing is an important IMC discipline on the same level as the original four disciplines. However, as put forward in the above, online direct marketing does not serve a special function as opposed to, for example, relationship marketing. Online direct marketing is, therefore, not added to the classification. Further, we also find that ‘personal communications’ pose problems if treated as a separate discipline. This is due to the following arguments. Firstly, the function of this communication is not to be ‘personal’. Personality is only a tool used for creating a sustaining relationship to and between customers in order to induce repeat purchases and positive word-of-mouth. Secondly, the majority of OMC descriptions do not include online personal selling. Thirdly, some contemporary IMC discipline descriptions have not included personal selling, (e.g. Kitchen & de Pelsmacker, 2004). We, therefore, find that ‘relationship communications’ is a better descriptor for our fourth and last discipline in which the tools serve the function of creating and sustaining relationships with
customers. The tools that were ascribed to personal communications are, accordingly, all ascribed to ‘relationship marketing communications’ instead.

In conclusion, the four disciplines listed below in table 4 along with relevant OMC tools are believed to be sufficient to give a complete picture of OMC. In table four, we have reallocated the tools that were assigned to direct marketing to the disciplines for which the function of the tool seems to be most appropriate. E-mail involves personal contact between marketer and customer, and is, therefore, often used for relationship communications. Microsites have content that is interesting for the customer and have therefore been categorized with other awareness creating tools as online advertising. Last, content cased services are used to contact to customers when they need a service in order for them to purchase this service. Therefore, we have reallocated this tool to online sales promotion.

[Take in table 4]

INTEGRATION OF OMC DISCIPLINES

Integration of OMC disciplines and their tools is an important issue in IMC as one of the special features of OMC is the ability of seamless integration of disciplines. In our opinion, such integration is necessary to create value as proposed in the AAAA IMC definition. Whereas IMC in general have been widely accepted and adopted within traditional disciplines, OMC is for many firms limited to the “mandatory” website. This is not optimal, because only by integrating online disciplines will firms be able to grasp the full potential of OMC. An integration of OMC
disciplines involves for example using online advertising to increase awareness and image, and to drive traffic. Online PR can be implemented to build stakeholder and media relations and protect reputation, as well as ensure viral distribution of the company’s message. In addition to this, online sales promotion should be used to drive sales, but also to support distribution. Finally online relationship marketing can be used to create and sustain brand awareness by involving the consumer in the company, and play a role in market intelligence by learning about customer problems and thoughts from communication in online communities and using this knowledge to create better and more relevant online advertising.

Taking integrated marketing communications even further, it is, of course, essential that OMC disciplines are integrated with traditional disciplines. Finding the right mix between offline and online advertising for example using online advertising to take over where offline wears out and using offline advertising to create awareness of online sites is important. Other examples of integration of offline and online marketing communication are using traditional media relations for the first contact but follow services up with online PR tools; initiating instant fast and wide reaching sales promotion online to drive sales to offline distribution, and follow up with further offline sales promotions; reducing travelling expenses by switching between offline and online sales force training; and combining offline and online direct marketing with telemarketing as acquisition tool and e-mail as follow up. The list is long and illustrates that the potential in OMC is very large if used in a targeted way with focus on OMC possibilities.

**CONCLUSION**
Mostly, current typologies for IMC integrate OMC into the traditional disciplines, while some typologies treat OMC as one, additional discipline. As the discussion in this article shows, this is not a fruitful way to go because online communications are facilitating an entire new track of possibilities; OMC encompasses all types of communication that we know from traditional offline communications and, in addition, provides new opportunities for personal communication, creation of hyperreal communities and events, linking of activities by the use of hypertextuality, and interactivity with the audience because of the freedom from geographical and temporal limitations.

Based on the above, it is clear that we need an entirely new set of online disciplines adding an extra layer onto integrated marketing communications: Online versus offline. This conclusion is further supported by the following facts: Online communications involve a host of ways to communicate that need to be integrated in ways that exploit their full potential for communicating with customers and other stakeholders in a, for them, relevant way. Also, thinking along the lines of old disciplines considering OMC on a lower level, does not force marketers to really focus on the possibilities in OMC and how these open up entirely new ways of integrating disciplines to meet needs of customers and other stakeholders. Therefore, OMC should not be split up and drowned in the traditional disciplines. Consequently, to keep focus on the online possibilities, we have to think of online separately from offline. In addition to this, the number of OMC tools is so large and different in aim and scope that it is too simple to just treat OMC as one discipline and consequently, we need an entire typology for OMC.

Our proposition is thus a new typology for OMC consisting of four disciplines: Online advertising, online public relations and publicity, online sales promotion, and online relationship
communications. We have considered how fifteen online tools can be categorized into the new disciplines. It is our belief that by extending any IMC project and typology with the four online disciplines, better integration and more holistic marketing communications will result.

Looking forward, one of the lessons of our work with this article is that there are a host of existing typologies in this research area. We chose to stick to the traditional disciplines concerning which there seems to be consensus. However, in future research, an interesting topic would be to look deeper into the evolution that has taken place for traditional disciplines in order to create a typology that is clear and that can be accepted by the scientific community. Also, as put forward in the beginning of this article, the field is constantly evolving. Therefore, there is a constant need to consider how new ways of communicating with customers should be integrated into IMC typologies. This task is, of course, easier if there is agreement on the present typology.
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TABLE 1. Approaches to defining disciplines in IMC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Advertising</th>
<th>(Marketing) Public Relations</th>
<th>Sales Promotion</th>
<th>Personal Selling</th>
<th>Direct marketing (communications)</th>
<th>Relationship Marketing</th>
<th>Sponsorship</th>
<th>Point-of-purchase communications</th>
<th>Exhibitions and trade fairs</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Packaging</th>
<th>The Internet</th>
<th>Interactive Marketing</th>
<th>E-communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DeLozier (1976)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen (1999)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Pelsmacker et al. (2001)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan (2002)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belch &amp; Belch (2004)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of communication controlled by marketer</td>
<td>Communication produced by marketer</td>
<td>Communication produced by user</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSMISSION</strong></td>
<td>Display Advertising, Search Engine Marketing, Microsites</td>
<td><strong>REGISTRATION</strong> FAQ-pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGISTRATION</strong></td>
<td>Brand Communities, Tacking and online survey data, (Web Personalisation)</td>
<td><strong>CONSULTATION</strong> Websites, e-mail and other online pull-media, viral marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSULTATION</strong></td>
<td>Non-marketer websites</td>
<td><strong>CONVERSATION</strong> User-driven online communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONVERSATION</strong></td>
<td>User-driven online communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3. Shared characteristics of OMC tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freedom from temporal and spatial restrictions</td>
<td>Consumers can access information whenever they want to, regardless of physical location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many-to-many communication</td>
<td>The Internet enables many people to communicate directly and immediately with each other due to the freedom from spatial and temporal distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactivity</td>
<td>The information the user gets is often dependent on the input given to the computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertextuality</td>
<td>Information can be updated frequently at a low cost and links from one location enable users to move seamlessly among locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalization</td>
<td>Interactivity and efficiency in information transfer allows individualized information and communication at a sustainable cost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4. An OMC typology and related tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online Advertising</strong></td>
<td>Display advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Search engine optimization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Microsites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online Public Relations and Publicity</strong></td>
<td>Online media relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online sponsorships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viral marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online Sales Promotion</strong></td>
<td>Online competitions, coupons, samples, contest, and sweepstakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affiliate programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context based services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online Relationship Communications</strong></td>
<td>Direct e-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Web personalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online games</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>