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Abstract

The purpose of the present study is to build a theoretically based and empirically grounded framework that enables a better understanding of corporate rebranding processes among small companies. Corporate rebranding is addressed from a visual viewpoint concentrating on changes to corporate name and logo. The theoretical background is based on corporate branding, corporate rebranding and organisational change literature.

The research setting is small software companies that operate in B2B markets. The empirical part is conducted as a multiple case study of three cases by gathering data both before and after corporate name changes. The main data gathering method was narrative interviews supported by several specifying interviews and secondary data.

The results are first presented as narratives followed by process descriptions and finally combined into an empirically grounded processual framework for corporate rebranding. First, context-related characteristics influencing and reasons for corporate rebranding are revealed. Second, sub-processes of corporate rebranding are presented during three different time periods; 1) before establishing the company, 2) after establishing the company during the time when the original corporate name is in use and 3) after establishing the company when the new corporate name is in use. Third, outputs of corporate rebranding are described in the forms of the new name and logo.

For small business managers the study offers four interesting findings. First, developing a new corporate name in company is cheap but may take several years. Using marketing communications agencies may result in a faster process, but in that case, the cost implications should be accepted. Second, the company should inform its stakeholders of the forthcoming name change for two reasons: 1) stakeholders may provide ideas for a new name; and 2) proactively spreading information on a forthcoming name change may avoid misunderstandings, for example, rumours of bankruptcy, when the name change is executed. Third, encouraging stakeholders to invent a new name and evaluate the potential new name may help to ensure that the new name will not cause any unwanted associations. Fourth, in launching the new name electronic devices may be far more cost-effective than expensive marketing communications campaigns to communicate the change.
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Tiivistelmä

Tämän tutkimuksen tarkoituksena on luoda teorioihin perustuva ja empirisesti perusteltu viitekehys, joka auttaa ymmärtämään yrityksen uudelleenbrändäyksen liittyvää prosessia pienissä yritysmarkkinoilla toimivissa (B2B) ohjelmistoyrityksissä. Yritysbrändäys nähdään visuaalisenä näkökulmasta, ja sillä tarkoitetaan yrityksen nimen ja logon vaihtamista. Tutkimuksen teoreettinen tausta on rakennettu yritysbrändäyksen, yrityksen uudelleenbrändäyksen ja organisaation muutosta käsittelevien kirjallisuusosuuksien perusteella. 


Tulokset esitetään ensin narratiiveinä, sen jälkeen prosessikuvioina ja lopuksi empirisesti perusteltuna viitekehysenä yrityksen uudelleenbrändäyksen prosesseista. Viitekehys koostuu kolmesta osasta: 1) yrityksen uudelleenbrändäyksen syyt ja siihen vaikuttavat kontekstin erityispiirteet, 2) yrityksen uudelleenbrändäyksen alaprosessit i) ennen yrityksen perustamista sekä sen perustamisen jälkeen ii) aikana jolloin yrityksen alkuperäinen nimi on käytössä ja iii) aikana jolloin yrityksen uusi nimi on käytössä, sekä 3) yrityksen uudelleenbrändäyksen lopputulema, eli uusi yritysnimi ja logo. 

Tutkimus tarjoaa pienyrityksille neljä tärkeää näkökulmaa. Ensinnäkin, uuden yritysnimen kehittäminen itse on edullista, mutta sopivan nimen löytäminen voi tällöin kestää vuosia. Markkinointiviestintätoimisto voi tuottaa nimen nopeammin, mutta silloin on hyväksyttävä siitä aiheutuvat kustannukset. Toiseksi, yritysten kannattaa informoida tärkeitä sidosryhmiä yrityksen alkuperäinen nimi on käytössä (mm. konkursseipäilyt) varsinaisesti nimen vaihtamisesta jo ennakkoon kahdesta syystä: 1) sidosryhmät voivat auttaa nimen keksimisessä, ja 2) näin voidaan välttää väärinkäytäyksiä (mm. konkursseipäilyt) varsinaisesti nimen vaihtamiseen liittyen. Kolmanneksi, kun sidosryhmät osallistuvat nimen kehittämiseen ja nimiehdotusten arviointiin, voidaan kartoittaa ja välttää ei-toivottuja ja ymmärrettäviä nimen liittyen. Neljänneksi, suurten markkinointiviestintäkampanjojen sijaan uuden nimen lanseeraamisessa kannattaa pohtia elektroniisten viestintävälineiden käyttämistä. 
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1 Introduction

1.1 Importance of the topic

This research aims to understand and describe corporate rebranding in small companies from a process perspective. In this particular study, ‘corporate rebranding’ means corporate name and logo change; ‘logo change’ consists of layout, fonts, colours, and text change; ‘process’ refers to the order of stages, subprocesses, events and activities that describe how things change over time; and ‘small companies’ refers to companies that employ fewer than ten (i.e. micro-sized companies).

This study is important for six theoretical and three empirical reasons. First, corporate branding has recently become one of the most often discussed phenomena both among managers and academics. On one hand, it builds on product branding in the discipline of marketing, where the role of branding and brand management has been primarily to create differentiation and preference for a product or service in the mind of the customer. On the other hand, it has developed from multidisciplinary studies with a starting point of organisational focus. (Knox & Bickerton 2003.) It is argued that the shift from product level to corporate level is not being addressed adequately in the marketing literature (Hatch & Schultz 2003), and that by relying on product branding, scholars have largely ignored the challenges presented by corporate brand management (Balmer & Gray 2003). Consequently, it is important to study branding at corporate level.

Second, in the literature of product branding, it is widely recognised that when a product brand reaches maturity, there are several ways to renew the brand (or rebrand) for example, through line extensions (extending to other product categories), distribution extensions, price reductions, facelifts, or repositioning the brand (changing the brand’s position within the product category) (Kapferer 2008: 33, 239, 324–326). Corporate branding refers to a process undertaken in order to create a strong corporate brand (see, e.g. Einwiller & Will 2002, Van Riel & Van Bruggen 2002, Urde 2003). The current literature on corporate branding often examines the subject from a perspective which assumes that once the corporate brand is created it should not be changed unless absolutely necessary, because changing a corporate brand has an impact on corporate brand equity (Muzellec 2006). Research on corporate rebranding is in its embryonic phase and has mainly concentrated on facelifts in the form of corporate name and aesthetics changes. It
is defined in the existing research as corporate name change (Muzellec, Doogan & Lambkin 2003), but, the literature also suggests that it concerns a change in aesthetics, brand positioning (Muzellec et al. 2003, Daly & Moloney 2004, Stuart & Muzellec 2004, Muzellec & Lambkin 2006) and/or brand values (Lomax & Mador 2006). In addition, it is suggested that corporate rebranding can be reinvention, refreshment, makeover, and renewal (Merrilees & Miller 2008). Given that corporate rebranding is quite a new research phenomenon, the existing research seems to struggle with conceptual confusion. Consequently, it is important to study rebranding at corporate level and clarify its definition.

Third, as revealed above, corporate rebranding is defined in the current literature as corporate name change. Although corporate name change is studied from both a financial viewpoint (e.g. Cooper, Dimitrov & Rau 2001, Rau, Patel, Osobov, Khorana & Cooper 2005, Cooper, Gulen & Rau 2005, Horsky & Swynge drouw 1987, Cooper, Dimitrov & Ragahvendra 2001, Wu 2010) and a marketing (corporate rebranding) viewpoint (e.g. Daly & Moloney 2004, Stuart & Muzellec 2004, Muzellec & Lambkin 2006, Lomax & Mador 2002, Kaikati 2003), the existing research approaches the phenomenon from different perspectives.

The financial approach has concentrated on examining corporate name changing strategies, whereas the main interests in corporate rebranding have been 1) clarifying the reasons for corporate rebranding (Muzellec 2006), 2) describing the type of corporate rebranding (Daly & Moloney 2004, Stuart & Muzellec 2004, Muzellec & Lambkin 2006, Lomax & Mador 2002), 3) examining old and new corporate name types (Muzellec 2006), and 4) describing how the new name is developed (Kaikati 2003) and launched (Kaikati 2003, Daly & Moloney 2004). The main difference between the approaches is that the financial research concentrates on corporate name change only, whereas corporate rebranding covers changes in any element of the corporate visual identity system (CVIS), that is, name, logotype and/or symbol, typography, colour palette, slogan, and tagline and/or descriptor (for further information on CVIS, see, for example, Melewar & Saunders 1998, Dowling 1994, Olins 1986, Melewar, Basset & Simões 2006, Van den Bosch, de Jong & Elving 2005, Van den Bosch, Elving & de Jong 2006). Although all the above-mentioned studies make significant contributions, they have concentrated on revealing only some aspects of the phenomenon. It is, therefore, important to concentrate on corporate name and logo change and combine the financial and marketing perspectives in order to understand corporate rebranding in more detail.
Fourth, corporate rebranding is about organisational change and refers to ‘doing’. In examining organisational change, ‘doing’ can be studied from a process perspective (e.g. Tsoukas & Chia 2005). Even though the existing research on corporate rebranding presents several contributions, the studies that have process elements (e.g. Kaikati 2003, Daly & Moloney 2004, Merrilees & Miller 2008) are few and each of them considers process from a slightly different perspective. Thus, the processes are therefore not commensurate.

Pettigrew, Woodman & Cameron (2001: 701) argue in the current organisational change literature that “it is one thing to analyse the factors shaping the fate of change episodes and a much bigger and more intractable problem to produce convincing evidence that a pattern of change initiatives contributes to organisational performance”. They also suggest that, even though it is a notably difficult research area, instead of concentrating only on the results of the change processes or than on the processes that lead to those results, the research should concentrate on a holistic appreciation of both the processes and outputs. The current literature on corporate rebranding seems confuse the process and the output of the process. In addition, the research suggests that corporate rebranding consists of several sub-processes; renaming (Kaikati 2003, Muzellec & Lambkin 2006), redesigning (Kaikati 2003, Muzellec & Lambkin 2006), launching (Kaikati 2003, Daly & Moloney 2004) and evaluating the new name (Kaikati 2003), but a detailed description of their relations, events, actions and actors is missing. Additionally, even though the current literature presents several reasons for corporate rebranding (see Muzellec 2006), the view combining both the reasons and the process is still missing. All in all, a processual framework for understanding corporate rebranding is still missing. Therefore, it is important to examine corporate rebranding from a process perspective, and to describe reasons for corporate rebranding, sub-processes of corporate rebranding and the outputs of corporate rebranding simultaneously.

Fifth, Krake (2005) classifies brands into four categories – beginning and underprivileged, emerging, accepted, and historic – based on what kind of role the brand management is given in the organisation and how the brand is recognised by its stakeholders. The current research concerning corporate names and/or corporate brands, from both financial and marketing perspectives, concentrates on examining brands mainly in situations where either the role of brand management is strong or recognition of the brand is high. Studying the beginning brands, where the role of brand management in the organisation is vague and external brand recognition is low, is rare. Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)
often belong in this group. Research into branding among SMEs was almost non-existent before 2005 (Ahonen 2008a), even though several researchers suggest that branding is important in SMEs as well (Abimbola 2001, Rode & Vallaster 2005, Wong & Merrilees 2005). Consequently, it is important to study beginning brands.

Sixth, studies of branding in SMEs involve a wide variety of perspectives, for example, brand management (Krake 2005, Berthon, Ewing & Napoli 2008), branding as a competitive strategy for demand management (Abimbola 2001), and brand affiliation and/or endorsement as a mode of internationalisation (Yakhlef & Maubourgret 2004). In particular, issues from the traditional product branding perspective are adopted (see, e.g. Berthon et al. 2008, Opoku, Abratt, Bendixen & Pitt 2007). Abimbola (2001) suggests that branding instruments such as trademarks, symbols, logos, brand names, firms’ reputations and integrated communications may not be applicable in all instances, but it is important to recognise their individual strengths and appropriateness and to blend the usage of these effectively. It is important, therefore, to provide a new approach to SME branding studies by studying corporate rebranding in the context of small businesses, and simultaneously, to reveal context-related characteristics that may influence corporate rebranding.

Empirically, this study is important for three reasons. First, rebranding has become a topical business buzzword. Almost every-day some organisation announces a change to its corporate image (for example, Citibank in 2007), an updated logo (for example, Finnair in 2001, Unilever in 2005), a relaunched corporate identity (for example, Stora Enso in 2011) or a name change (for example, BackRub to Google in 1998, Andersen Consulting to Accenture in 2001). Basically, these all concern the same phenomenon, and as we can see, the change concerns different industries. Famous corporate name changes are listed on the internet (http://www.famousnamechanges.net/html/corporate.htm), and guidelines of how to change the corporate name are continually being published (Taylor 2011, Leigh 2011). Even competitions about rebranding (www.rebrand.com) and logo designing (e.g. www.logoblog.com) are being arranged. All this indicates the importance of the subject in the business world.

Second, as the above indicates, changes in large multinationals are publicly known, mostly because the change in a corporate brand is communicated through extensive marketing communications campaigns. Compared to large companies, however, SMEs usually lack financial resources, and brand management is not given the priority it needs for creating a strong brand image (Opoku et al. 2007).
Branding is often considered expensive, and brand management often receives little or no attention in the daily run of affairs in SMEs (Krake 2005). Entrepreneurs therefore need to take an unconventional approach to branding (Berthon et al. 2008). This is also the case with corporate name change; companies cannot afford to hire expensive consultants or other professionals to provide a new name or logo for them. It is therefore important to examine how corporate name changes and logo changes are executed in small companies.

Third, it is suggested that corporate brands are more important than product brands in business-to-business (B2B) companies (Aspara & Tikkanen 2008). However, Ojasalo, Nätti and Olkkonen (2008) found that in software companies, the corporate brand and the product brand cannot be separated, and often the product name and the company name are the same. In addition, in software companies the product name is often recognised by the stakeholder while the company name is not. Therefore, it is important to study corporate rebranding especially among B2B software companies.

1.2 Objective and the research questions

My objective for this study is to build a theoretically based and empirically grounded processual framework that enables better understanding of corporate rebranding among small companies.

I have constructed the study around the following research question:

How can corporate rebranding in small companies be described in terms of processes?

To answer the research question, in Chapter 2 I will provide the theoretical background. It shows the roots of corporate rebranding in the field of corporate branding; explores the research phenomenon of corporate rebranding especially from a process perspective; and investigates organisational change processes in order to illustrate corporate rebranding as a change process. Choosing these for a theoretical background excludes several other interesting theoretical backgrounds (see Chapter 1.3.3). Understanding the chosen viewpoints and their relationships makes it possible to create a theoretical framework for the study. The framework consists of three viewpoints: 1) context-related characteristics influencing, and reasons for, corporate rebranding, 2) sub-processes of corporate rebranding, and
3) the outputs of corporate rebranding. Preliminary understanding of these viewpoints help in case-study selection and data gathering, and their final form is constructed during the study, in conjunction with data analysis.

The theoretical framework also helps in data analysis, operating as a basis for data categorisation when possible. Analysing the data also results in the creation of new categories based on the data, and the renaming of some existing categories. As an answer to the research question, I will provide an empirically grounded processual framework for corporate rebranding in small companies. The empirically grounded framework consists of three viewpoints: 1) context-related characteristics in, and reasons for, corporate rebranding, 2) sub-processes of corporate rebranding, in which sub-processes, their events and actors are described in different corporate rebranding stages with the help of process theories, and 3) the outputs of corporate rebranding in the forms of corporate name change type, logo change type, and corporate rebranding type.

1.3 Positioning of the study

This study is positioned at the crossroads of the marketing discipline and organisational studies. This is the subject of the first part of this chapter. The study draws, in particular, from three sources of literature: corporate branding, corporate rebranding, and organisational change – especially from a process perspective. These are presented next. But, choosing these was not straightforward, so, after a brief explanation of these sources, I will also present perspectives that were excluded from this study. Finally, at the end of the chapter, I describe my selection of the empirical context small software companies that operate in B2B markets.

1.3.1 Underlying research approaches

The study is positioned at the crossroads of two disciplines; marketing and organisational studies. From a marketing viewpoint, the underlying assumptions are close to those provided by the Industrial Marketing and Purchasing (IMP) Group (see e.g. Håkansson 1982, Möller & Wilson 1995, Håkansson & Snehota 1995, Wilkinson 2001, Ford, Gadde, Håkansson & Snehota 2003), even though the study does not concentrate on interaction, relationships or networks per se. It does, however, concentrate on business-to-business markets and adopts the think-
ing that an individual company has a number of exchange relationships with end-users, distributors, suppliers, and other counterparts, who are in this study called stakeholders. The goal of the study as well as the methodological choices made, including case studies and abductive research, follow those of the IMP research tradition (see, e.g. Lindberg-Repo 2001: 28). Process views offered by organisational studies and used in this study are much in line with the thinking espoused by IMP researchers (see, e.g. Tähtinen 2001, Halinen & Tähtinen 2002). However, the study has only loose links to the marketing viewpoint, because when I started this research, neither I, nor other researchers in my research community, were familiar with the corporate brand concept, and I started to find answers from the viewpoint of organisational research. In addition, branding in the marketing discipline is strongly based on product marketing and consumer behaviour (for a review, see e.g. Lindberg-Repo 2001), and they are inappropriate approaches for a study with this particular organisational focus.

From an organisational viewpoint, the study has a strong focus on organisational change. It is visible in this study, for example, in the literature review in which corporate branding is considered mainly from the viewpoint of multidisciplinary organisational research (e.g. Kennedy 1997, Dowling 1986, Abratt 1989, Stuart, 1998, 1999) rather than relying on the roots of product branding in the marketing discipline, or from the process view (e.g. Van de Ven & Poole 1995), which are seen rather from an organisational change viewpoint than from viewpoints employed by marketing researchers.

Despite the strong organisational focus and only a loose link to the marketing schools of thought, the study is grounded in the discipline of marketing. The main reason is due to the emphasis on the marketing discipline’s thinking on mutual exchange relationships over examining the organisational performance by organisational researchers.

1.3.2 The literature base

The first source of theoretical understanding is drawn from the literature of corporate branding because I see corporate rebranding as belonging in this research field. As Eriksson and Kovalainen (2008: 43) argue, at some point in the study a researcher needs to become familiar with the research field he or she is interested in. Traditionally, this is done at the beginning of the research project, but in practice the work of others is read throughout the research process. In qualitative research the idea is to clarify and sharpen the research questions throughout the re-
search process. At the time of writing this dissertation, no comprehensive literature review on corporate branding existed, and understanding the research field became more challenging because of the frequent misuse of the concepts related to corporate branding. Therefore, in light of the objective of the research, in this study I undertake a slightly wider review of corporate branding than would be strictly necessary. Corporate branding is a relatively new and fragmented research field, based on multidisciplinary organisational research and product branding in marketing, and, in order to gain a basic understanding of the background to this field, I found it especially important to briefly describe the roots of corporate branding (Bickerton 2000, Knox & Bickerton 2003) from multidisciplinary organisational viewpoint and in so doing, offer new insights to the marketing viewpoint. Even though corporate brand (see, e.g. Balmer 2001a, Hatch & Schultz 2003, Balmer & Gray 2003, Gylling & Lindberg-Repo 2006) and corporate branding (see, e.g. Einwiller & Will 2002, Van Riel & Van Bruggen 2002, Rode & Vallaster 2005, Urde 2003) are nowadays defined as quite broad concepts, in this study I examine them from a visual perspective only. This chapter provides the basis for understanding the corporate brand from a visual perspective, in the form of corporate visual identity systems (CVIS) (e.g. Melewar & Saunders 1999, Dowling 1994, Olins 1986, Melewar, Basset & Simões 2006, Van den Bosch et al. 2005, Van den Bosch et al. 2006) and the types of corporate names (Muzellec 2006). In addition, this theoretical viewpoint provides context-related characteristics from branding in small business (e.g. Krake 2005, Rode & Vallaster 2005, Merrilees 2007, Kollmann & Suckow 2007, Juntunen, Saraniemi, Halttu & Tähtinen 2010), B2B branding (e.g. Kotler, Pfoertsch & Michi 2006, Aspara & Tikkanen 2008), and branding in software business (e.g. Ojasalo et al. 2008), which may influence corporate rebranding processes.

In this study, I see corporate branding as being processes which, as also the data will reveal, begin before the company is even established (see also, e.g. Rode & Vallaster 2005, Merrilees 2007, Kollmann & Suckow 2007) and continue after establishment. Differences in brand management are based on either the growth stages of small businesses (Halttu, Juntunen, Saraniemi & Tähtinen 2009, Juntunen, Saraniemi, Halttu & Tähtinen 2010), the evolution of brands (Pitt, Watson, Berthon, Wynn and Zinkhan 2006) or, as described in Fig. 1, the recognition of brands starting from beginning brands and continuing to emerging brands, established brands, and finally, to historical brands (Krake 2005).
The second source of theoretical understanding is the literature of corporate rebranding. In this study I examine corporate rebranding during the first years of a company’s existence, that is, in a situation of beginning brands (see Fig. 1). The contributions from this theoretical view provide the reasons for corporate rebranding (e.g. Muzellec 2006, Muzellec & Lambkin 2006, Muzellec et al. 2003) and the current knowledge on corporate rebranding as a process (e.g. Kaikati 2003), both of which help in constructing the theoretical processual framework. In addition, corporate rebranding offers an understanding of the result of the process, in the form of the types of corporate rebranding (e.g. Lomax & Mador 2006, Daly & Moloney 2004, Stuart & Muzellec 2004, Muzellec & Lambkin 2006). In order to understand the results of processes in more detail, I also utilise the information gained from the research concerning corporate name-changing strategies from a financial perspective (e.g. Cooper et al. 2001, Cooper, Khorana, Osobov, Patel & Rau 2005, Cooper, Gulen & Rau 2005). Although it is suggested that corporate rebranding also includes corporate repositioning (e.g. Muzellec et al. 2003, Muzellec & Lambkin 2006), I see it in this study as a part of corporate renaming and redesigning, and therefore do not emphasise it here further. Additionally, as defined earlier, this study examines corporate rebranding from a visual viewpoint only, this means that I exclude corporate values change (Lomax & Mador 2006).

The third source of theoretical understanding is the literature of organisational change. Research has revealed thousands of different descriptions of process, but it is important to notice that not all forms of process research are the same
The process approach is used, for example, in describing new product development or business processes in general. My perspective for studying process is rooted in process research which concerns organisational change (see, e.g. Van de Ven & Poole 2005, Poole, Van de Ven, Dooley & Holmes 2000, Van de Ven 2007). I have chosen this perspective because it considers change, whereas general business processes are more static in nature, and my research phenomenon is a change situation. Even though the literature on new product development considers change and presents several process descriptions, it lacks a general process theory, unlike my chosen perspective. From an organisational change viewpoint I concentrate on planned change (see, e.g. Lewin 1951, Bamford & Forrester 2003), which, according to Weick (2000), can be illustrated with life-cycle process theory (Van de Ven & Poole 1995), and on emergent change (see, e.g. Burnes 1996, 2004, Dawson 1994) which can be illustrated (see Weick 2000) with teleology process theory (Van de Ven & Poole 1995). The positioning of the study to the contemporary literature is illustrated in Fig. 2.

**Fig. 2. A positioning of the study to the contemporary literature.**
The main contribution of this study is to corporate rebranding literature. However, because corporate rebranding is seen as a sub-process of corporate branding, the study also contributes to corporate branding literature. Additionally, the study also offers a contribution to process literature.

1.3.3 The exclusions

Choosing the above-mentioned theoretical approaches resulted in several exclusions. I discuss them below from three viewpoints: SME marketing and entrepreneurial marketing, communications, and brand equity and corporate brand equity. Even though each of these would have offered some understanding of corporate rebranding, their contribution to this study would not have been as valuable as the chosen viewpoints. In addition, it was necessary to leave these out in order to keep this study manageable.

SME marketing and entrepreneurial marketing.

SME marketing is an area of research in which the practices and content of SME marketing are both gaining much attention. In general, it is widely accepted that marketing in an SME is not like marketing in a large company on a smaller scale (Romano & Ratnatunga 1995, Storey 1994) but has its own characteristics, for example, due to scarce resources. The studies concerning SME marketing concentrate on, for example, the strategic marketing planning perspective (Brooksbank 1996, 1999, Ashill, Frederikson & Davies 2003, Hill 2001a, 2001b, Jocumsen 2004, McLarty 1998), marketing practices (Blankson & Stokes 2002, Siu, Zhu & Kirby 2003), owner/managers’ competences (Hill 2001a, 2001b), marketing as a holistic phenomenon (Hill 2001a, 2001b), entrepreneurial (Chaston 1997, Zontanos & Anderson 2004), and networking and relationships (Zontanos & Anderson 2004, Stokes & Lomax 2002, Gilmore, Carson & Grant 2001). Communications and branding are an almost untouched area. However, as suggested by several researchers (e.g. Abimbola 2001, Krake 2005), branding is also important among SMEs.

Research concerning entrepreneurial marketing can be seen from two perspectives. On the one hand, it concentrates on studying marketing in micro-sized companies, that is, companies that employ fewer than ten (e.g. Hill 2001a). This stream studies entrepreneurial marketing both as a philosophy and as a practice. Entrepreneurial marketing as a philosophy refers to the idea that a person, an en-
trepreneur, is “marketing-minded” and understands the marketing-related issues in all his or her thoughts and actions. Entrepreneurial marketing as a practice refers to how entrepreneurial companies implement marketing-related issues. On the other hand, entrepreneurial marketing as a philosophy is widely studied in large companies as well. These studies concentrate, for example, on how entrepreneurial employees are from having a marketing perspective in their work.

In this study, I see small companies as a research context in which I study the particular phenomenon I am interested in - corporate rebranding. In so doing, I am interested in how a phenomenon that combines both marketing-related and management-related knowledge is realised in small companies. To do so I utilise branding-related SME research only, and do not concentrate on developing SME marketing literature per se. I only seek to understand a specific phenomenon, which is usually studied among large companies, in a small business context. Similar to some other concepts – such as entrepreneurial marketing, which originally started from studying how entrepreneurs practice marketing but, as a philosophy, is often studied in large companies – this study aims to raise some interesting issues found in small companies which are worth discussing in large companies as well.

Communications

In corporate brand building, communications processes are seen as starting from corporate identity (see, e.g. Balmer and Gray 1999, 2000), which is communicated to stakeholders through primary communications (including products and services, market behaviour, behaviour towards employees, employee behaviour to other stakeholders, and non-market behaviour) and secondary communications (formal corporate communications, e.g. advertising, PR, graphic design, sales promotions etc., and visual identification systems); stakeholders use tertiary communications (word of mouth, media interpretation and spin, and competitors' communication and spin) to communicate these to each other. This framework builds on three different approaches; integrated marketing communication (IMC) in which, for example, the process starts from a prospect and the need for synergy and coordination is paramount (e.g. Schultz, Tannenbaum & Lauterborn 1994, Kitchen, Schultz, Kim, Han & Li 2004, Kitchen, Brignell, Li & Jones 2004, Duncan & Everett 1993, Nowak & Phelps 1994); corporate communications, which is the integration of management, organisational and marketing communications (e.g. van Riel 1995, Bickerton 2000, Balmer 2001a); and total corporate commu-
communications, whereby everything an organisation says, makes and does is seen to communicate (e.g. Balmer 1998). In addition to these, the role of uncontrollable communication, i.e. any “unintended or emergent messages through third party reports and informal communication on the part of employees with outsiders” (Markwick & Fill 1997: 402) is emphasised.

Even though I have limited the study of the phenomenon to a visual perspective, which is closely related to communications, the emphasis of this study is to understand the organisational processes of corporate rebranding. In so doing, I see that my chosen viewpoint is therefore other than just a communications perspective. Additionally, when I utilise communications-related concepts in this study, I do not consider them in as much detail as I would have if I had been examining the phenomenon from a communications perspective only.

**Brand equity and corporate brand equity**

Brand equity can be considered a result of the branding process. Brands and brand equity are considered strategic assets that are the basis for competitive advantage and long-term profitability (Kotler et al. 2006: 6). In the marketing domain, discussions are rooted in product branding, where the concept of brand equity refers to the asset-based, intangible properties of the brand (see e.g. Aaker 1992, Keller 1993, Lassar, Mittal & Sharma 1995, Pitta & Katsanis 1995, Berry 2000), which add (or subtract) value (Aaker 1991), and represents what the brand means to the customer. From an accounting viewpoint, brand equity refers to the financial value of the brand (see e.g. Biel 1992, Simon & Sullivan 1993), which is also discussed under the concept of brand value, representing what the brand means to a focal company (Raggio & Leone 2007). Recently, there have been several attempts to solve this conceptual confusion, and the need for examining co-created brand value – combining both the company and customer perspectives – has arisen (see, e.g. Merz, He & Vargo 2009, Brodie, Glynn & Little 2006).

Brand equity discussions are further developed by several authors (see e.g. Rios & Riquelme 2008, Rauyruen, Miller & Groth 2009, Taylor, Celuch & Goodwin 2004, van Riel, de Mortanges & Streukens 2005, M’zungu, Merrilees & Miller 2010, Saraniemi, Juntunen, Niemelä & Tähtinen 2010), also in the software business (Srivastava & Mookerjee 2004). Product brand discussions are often used as a basis for examining issues at corporate level especially in industrial B2B markets (e.g. Bendixen, Bukasa & Abratt 2004, Kuhn, Alpert & Pope 2008) and in B2B service markets (e.g. Taylor, Hunter & Lindberg 2007, Roberts &
Merrilees 2007, Davis, Gollicic & Marquardt 2008, Kim, Kim, Kim, Kim & Kang 2008, Rauyruen et al. 2009, Juntunen, Juntunen & Juga 2011), even though it is recognised that utilising these perspectives in the corporate domain cannot capture the multidimensional nature of a corporate brand, and a need for developing the corporate brand equity concept has arisen (see, e.g. Keller 2000, Juntunen, Juntunen & Juga 2011).

There are two reasons why I do not utilise corporate brand equity in this research. First, as suggested above, product brand equity is not sufficient to capture corporate brand equity, and there is still a need to develop the concept of corporate brand equity. Even though corporate brand equity can be seen as a result of the corporate branding – and its change as a result of the corporate rebranding – I do not follow that avenue in this study due to the lack of understanding of corporate brand equity. Second, in the marketing domain, brand equity refers to customers’ experiences of the brand. I was not able to gain the data from customers or other stakeholders, and therefore I could not study corporate brand equity.

1.3.4 Choosing the empirical context

It is argued that context is important in process studies (see, e.g. Pettigrew 1992). The following section describes how the existing research guided the choice of empirical context: small companies that operate in the B2B software industry.

First, I chose small businesses for the following reasons. The empirical research in corporate branding and corporate rebranding has concentrated mainly on large multinational companies that also often operate in consumer markets. However, SMEs – the companies that employ fewer than 250, have an annual turnover of up to 50 million euros, or a balance sheet total of no more than 43 million euros (European Commission 2009) – represent 99.8 percent of the business organisations in Europe (Schmiemann 2008) and therefore have a great impact on the world economy. It was suggested recently that branding is important in SMEs as well as in larger companies (see, e.g. Krake 2005; Wong & Merrilees 2005; Ahonen 2008a, Juntunen, Saraniemi, Halttu & Tähtinen 2010). In addition, because small companies often suffer from scarce resources, this offers an interesting context for revealing how they execute corporate rebranding practices.

Second, I chose B2B for the following reasons. B2B companies offer an interesting context – which differs from traditional consumer based product branding – for researching brands and branding at both the product and the corporate level. It has also received little attention from academics (Lynch & De Cherna-
tony 2004) even though many of the world’s strongest brands, for example, IBM, Microsoft, FedEx and Boeing, are B2B brands. Although they also operate in business-to-consumer (B2C) business, their main business operations concentrate on B2B (Kotler et al. 2006: 2). However, interest in B2B branding has increased in recent years (see, e.g. Lynch & De Chernatony 2004, Bendixen et al. 2004, Van Riel et al. 2005).

Third, I chose B2B software companies in particular for the following five reasons. Firstly, Aspara and Tikkanen (2008) argue that the research has implied that corporate brands are particularly important in the B2B context, but Ojasalo et al. (2008) were not able to separate corporate brand from product brand in their study among B2B software companies. Secondly, it is argued that small companies in the software industry face the problem that their product name is often well known among stakeholders but the company name is not (Ojasalo et al. 2008). In corporate branding, the company is often recognised because of its name (Balmer and Gray 2003). Thirdly, although current research delivers some brand-related issues in studies concerning software companies (e.g. Givon, Mahajan & Muller 1997, Priluck & Till 2010, Adler 2010) and corporate branding is empirically studied in some IT companies (e.g. Muzellec and Lambkin 2006), research on branding in the context of software companies seems to be scarce even though the software business is one of the major industries today. Current research discusses the components of brand equity (Srivastava & Mookerjee 2004) and the product brand building process (Ojasalo et al. 2008) in software businesses. Fourthly, according to Ojasalo et al. (2008), in software businesses the company name is often the product line’s “family name”, and the individual products are named by combining it with a product-specific extension. And fifthly, due to my previous co-operation with software companies that operate in B2B markets I was able to easily gain access to the companies in which the cases were conducted.

1.4 Scientific approach

Organisational change process – of which corporate rebranding is a part – is a central topic in studies of organisations. Researchers hold different views on the meaning of organisational change and how to study it. The questions are asked both ontologically and epistemologically. Ontology refers to the assumptions about the essence and existence of the phenomena under study (Burrell & Morgan 1979, Lincoln & Cuba 1985), and to the question “What is there in the world?”
Epistemology, on the other hand, defines how knowledge can be produced and argued for, and the criteria by which knowledge is possible. It defines and gives structures to what kind of scientific knowledge is available, and what the limits are for that knowledge. (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008.)

In this study my ontological view is based on hermeneutics and epistemological view on interpretivism. According to these perspectives, no objective reality exists. Instead, perceptions and experiences may be different for each person and change over time and context. In other words, reality is constructed by individuals and the purpose is to gain a deep understanding of the phenomenon under study rather than to develop universal laws explaining the phenomenon (Burrell & Morgan 1979). In other words, I support a subjectivist (Burrell & Morgan 1979) scientific approach to ontology which views the world as an ambiguous phenomenon that cannot be studied without a holistic approach. From a subjective ontological view, access to the external world is possible only through our own observations and interpretations (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008).

In studying change, the ontological view determines whether we view organisations as consisting of things or processes (Tsoukas & Chia 2002). The world can be seen to be made of things in which processes represent change in things, or as processes in which things are reifications of processes (Tsoukas 2005). The former represents an objectivistic view where an organisation is seen as a thing or a noun, a social entity or structure, and it is always something in some particular stage or phase of a process. The latter represents a subjectivist view where an organisation is seen as a verb, and organisation is a reification of a set of processes that maintain the organisation by continuously structuring it. (Van de Ven & Poole 2005.) Consequently, because of my subjectivist ontological view, I see an organisation as a continuously changing unit, a verb, and, therefore, consisting of processes.

In addition, epistemology can be seen from an objectivistic or subjectivist view. From an objective epistemological view, a world may exist as external and theory-neutral; and from a subjective view, access to the external world is possible only through our own observations and interpretations (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008). When studying change, the epistemological perspectives that are often used are 1) “variance theory” (Mohr 1982), which relies largely on causal statements and models that incorporate variables, where the process is seen either as a logic to explain causal relationships between independent and dependent variables, or as a category of concepts that refer to actions of individuals or organisations (Van de Ven 1992) – in other words, an objectivistic view; and 2) a process
view, which provides a narrative, describing a sequence of events, on how development and change unfold (Van de Ven 1992, Poole et al. 2000) – in other words, a subjectivist view.

Following the subjectivist approach, I support the second view, in which process is seen as a sequence of events that describes how things change over time. This perspective takes an historical developmental approach and focuses on the sequences of incidents, activities and stages that unfold over the duration of a central subject’s existence (Van de Ven 1992, Van de Ven & Poole 2005). Explanations are built as event-driven, from observed or recorded events to outcomes. In other words, the researcher picks certain kinds of events a priori and then records their occurrences over time. In this kind of research, no simple rules exist for such designs and some events can figure in more than one narrative. Most events that are observed probably have no obvious consequences, therefore requiring that researchers have strong a priori theoretically grounded notions of the expected causal processes. (Aldrich 2001.)

In this study, an instrumental multiple case study approach (Stake 2005) was chosen for the purpose of describing the specific business-related phenomenon of corporate rebranding in depth. The main data gathering method was narrative interviews supported by other interviews and secondary data. In the narrative interviews, each interviewee provided their own description of the process of corporate rebranding in their company. In order to understand how corporate rebranding was executed in each company, I first interpreted the descriptions in the form of narratives. The process approach (e.g. Van de Ven & Poole 1995, Poole et al. 2000) is sometimes called the “narrative approach” (Poole et al. 2000). While a narrative researcher is interested in the characteristics of stories and in the way that stories make experience meaningful, the intention of a narrative process researcher is to provide explanations of change processes as they unfold over time, rather than to present divergent narratives per se. In addition, when the narrative researcher focuses on the story as a construct that provides modes of interpretation and insight, the processual researcher is concerned with the ways in which individuals and groups can influence the views and actions of others in steering change processes. Narrative constructs that relate consequences to antecedents through event sequences in context over time thus appear to be particularly relevant to understanding the unfolding of complex organisational change processes. (Buchanan & Dawson 2007.) Those narratives I further interpreted to form process descriptions where I first revealed individual actions, and then constructed events from the actions, before finally combining the events into processes. Thus,
examining and interpreting the data from different viewpoints presents a hermeneutic circle. A more detailed description about empirical research is provided in Chapter 3.

1.5 Research strategy

Research strategy can be seen as an overall process by which the research is conducted (Remeney, Williams, Money & Swartz 1998). This study is abductive (see, e.g. Peirce 1931, Dubois & Gadde 2002) in nature, because I have conducted it by continuous discussion about the theories and empirical data. Fig. 3 describes how this thesis progressed.

The journey started by creating contextual and theoretical pre-understanding. Several factors provided an excellent basis for understanding the context from a small business perspective: my previous education concentrated on small business marketing, several of my relatives were entrepreneurs, and I have always been actively involved in small business. Theories arrange a set of concepts to define and explain some phenomenon (Silverman 2005: 78), and theoretically I was interested in communicational aspects of small companies. However, at that time the marketing literature seemed to concentrate on product-based communications, and although management literature presented some frameworks which supported my view, they all seemed to lack the customer perspective that I found especially important due to my marketing-related background. Accordingly, creating a theoretical framework for the study was challenging. Having only a basic theoretical framework based on my preliminary theoretical and contextual understanding, I therefore decided to begin the data gathering in Case 1 with the question “How does corporate rebranding happen in small B2B software companies?” As I explain in more detail in Chapter 3, I acquired my data in narrative manner, by letting the interviewees tell their stories rather than asking them a specific list of questions, and a large amount of secondary data was collected as well. Please note that in Fig. 3 only narrative interviews are presented; all other empirical data gathering was conducted all the way during the process.

I carried out the preliminary analysis and interpretation of the data simultaneously with writing the theoretical background for the study about the roots of corporate branding and visual aspects to corporate brand. Becoming familiar with the empirical data increased both my understanding of the context and my research phenomenon. As Eriksson and Kovalainen (2008: 41–42) describe, theory often
emerges through induction during the phases of data collection, analysis and writing; it consists of preliminary and changing assumptions that direct the way the research is done, and gets its final form after the data have been analysed and the data and method chapters written. This is also how this study proceeded. At this stage, writing the theoretical background about corporate branding and corporate rebranding increased my theoretical understanding and also helped in revising the theoretical framework. Both these empirical and theoretical aspects enabled me to gain the data from the Case 2, in a similar way to the first case. Again, after collecting the narrative interview data for the second case study, I carried out preliminary analysis and interpretation simultaneously with revising the theoretical background and extending it with process theories. Analysing and interpreting the data increased my understanding of the research phenomenon, and the theoretical part increased my theoretical understanding and resulted in a revised theoretical background and framework. These two cases were followed by gathering the data from the Case 3, and then continuing by both an in-depth analysis of the data and grounding the theoretical background and framework with the empirical data. All the data was analysed in depth several times, each time from different perspectives (for more detail, see Chapter 3.4). Each round helped sharpen the theoretical background, and led to revisions of the theoretical framework, and greater understanding of the empirical data in detail. It also enabled greater understanding of the special characteristics of the context. As a result, I was able to create both the theoretical framework for the study and an empirically grounded processual framework for corporate rebranding in small companies. Finally, comparing these resulted in the conclusions for the study.
Fig. 3. Research process.
1.6 The structure of the thesis

Even though this study is abductive in nature, the reporting is in a traditional form of reporting a business-related case study. This thesis consists of nine chapters in the following order (see Fig. 4).

The thesis begins with an introductory chapter in which I justify the research, and present the objective, research question, positioning, scientific approach and research strategy. After presenting this structure for the study, I continue by concentrating on the theoretical background of the study in Chapter 2, “Theoretical understanding of corporate rebranding as a process”. Here I first review the existing research on corporate branding in order to gain a basic understanding of the research field. Then I concentrate on describing the existing research on corporate rebranding, especially as a process. After that, I present organisational change research, including that which I base my understanding of organisational change processes on. As a conclusion to the chapter, the theoretical processual framework for studying corporate rebranding is outlined.

The empirical part of the study consists of five chapters: Chapter 3 presents the research strategy; Chapters 4 to 6 describe the corporate rebranding processes and types of empirical case studies; and Chapter 7 compares the corporate rebranding processes and types of the three case studies and the theoretical framework.

In Chapter 8, “Findings”, I provide findings of the study in the form of an empirically grounded processual framework for corporate rebranding in small companies, and open a discussion. Chapter 9, “Conclusions”, ends the study by first summarising the findings, thereafter presenting the contributions of the study, then evaluating the study, and finally, suggesting further avenues of research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 1: Introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A guide to a research process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 2: Theoretical understanding of corporate rebranding as a process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate branding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate rebranding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational change processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical framework for corporate rebranding in small companies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 3: Research design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case study design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collecting, analysing and interpreting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapters 3-7: Analyses and comparisons of the cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context-related characteristics influencing and reasons for corporate rebranding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events, actions and actors in corporate rebranding sub-processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs of corporate rebranding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 8: Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context-related characteristics influencing and reasons for corporate rebranding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-processes of corporate rebranding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs of corporate rebranding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 9: Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical, methodological and managerial contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation, limitations and further studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 4. Content and structure of the study.**
2 Theoretical understanding of corporate rebranding as a process

The theoretical background of this study consists of three viewpoints; corporate branding, corporate rebranding and organisational change processes. Chapter 2.1 provides the background understanding about corporate branding as a research field in order to understand the research phenomenon - corporate rebranding - in relation to it. In addition to this, the chapter provides context-related characteristics that may influence the corporate rebranding process in small B2B software companies. Chapter 2.2 provides the main elements for the sub-processes of corporate rebranding, and the information about the outputs of the corporate rebranding. In chapter 2.3 the organisational change processes are examined in order to help build the theoretical framework, especially from the process perspective. The chapter concludes with chapter 2.4, in which I present the theoretical framework for studying corporate rebranding processes.

2.1 Corporate branding

This chapter first explores the origins of corporate branding, defines the term in relation to corporate brand, then moves on to describe the visual part of corporate branding – the main focus of this thesis – and finally goes on to describe the special characteristics of corporate branding in small companies that operate in B2B software industry.

2.1.1 Roots of corporate branding

The roots of corporate branding are multidisciplinary in nature. On one hand, it relies on traditional product branding in the marketing discipline, and on the other hand, it has developed from multidisciplinary studies where the starting point is organisational focus (see Fig. 5). (Bickerton 2000, Knox & Bickerton 2003.)
The major difference between these two perspectives is their starting point. In traditional product marketing the focus is on the customer; the role of brand and brand management has been primarily to create differentiation of and then a preference for a product or service in the mind of the customer (Bickerton 2000, Knox & Bickerton 2003). In the marketing discipline the roots of branding are based on product marketing and consumer behaviour (see, Lindberg-Repo 2001). Discussions from a product branding viewpoint concern, for example, brand image (e.g. Boulding 1956), brand positioning (Ries & Trout 1982) and brand identity (e.g. Kapferer 1997), and are often characterised by layers of added value built around the core functionality of the product or service to create and maintain distinction in a particular market. It is widely agreed that brand has tangible, visual and intangible elements (for a review, see, e.g. de Chernatony & Dall’Olmo Riley 1998). There are a number of generally accepted definitions for a brand (see, e.g. Kapferer 1997, Aaker & Joachimsthaler 2000a, Knox 2000), but one of the most known and most cited definitions of a brand is:

“A brand is a distinguishing name and/or symbol (such as a logo, trademarks, or pack design) intended to identify the goods and services of either
one seller or a group of sellers, and to differentiate those goods or services from those of competitors.” (Aaker 1991: 7)

Multidisciplinary discussions for their part, have an organisational focus and concern corporate personality (e.g. Olins 1978), corporate image and its management (e.g. Abratt 1989, Kennedy 1977), corporate identity and its management (e.g. Balmer 1997, Stuart 1999) as well as corporate reputation and its management (e.g. Fombrun & van Riel 1997). In each of these areas, discussions consider both the concepts perspective (from which the concept consists of) and the process perspective (how the process is managed). In addition, each of these is still its own research field, which goes forward and develops continuously. In addition, several authors have expanded on these concepts and the differences between them (see, e.g. Balmer 2001a, Gylling & Lindberg-Repo 2006). Balmer’s (2001) illustration of the differences is provided in Appendix 1.

The story of corporate brand began with the articles of Bernstein (1989) and King (1991) who first used the term “company brand”. Later this was replaced with the concept ‘corporate brand’, because brands at the corporate level are not limited simply to the overall organisation, but a wide variety of corporate entities within the organisation, including corporations, their subsidiaries, and groups of companies, may have their own brands (Harris & de Chernatony 2001).

A major research interest in corporate branding has been the internal perspective of corporate branding, and moreover, its management (Ahonen 2008b). This is understandable, given that the roots of corporate branding lie in the internal company processes of corporate identity management, corporate image management and corporate reputation management, which in corporate branding discussions are often considered to exemplify how to build a strong corporate brand (see, e.g. Urde 2003). Thus, corporate identity management and corporate branding are concepts that are often used interchangeably in the literature (Bickerton 2000). The second largest, albeit considerably smaller, research theme in the field is corporate communications (Ahonen 2008b). These studies often consider how the corporate identity is communicated to an external audience, that is, customers and other stakeholders. The aim of corporate communications is again to build a strong corporate brand in the minds of the stakeholders. Other research areas in corporate branding concern corporate brand image and reputation, and corporate identity and personality. Further important conceptual research has been devoted to clarifying the concepts closely related to corporate branding.
Continuing the categorisation of the articles found by Ahonen (2008) reveals that methodologically the studies represent equal amount qualitative and quantitative viewpoints (Appendix 2). Great amount of empirical studies have concentrated on retailing and business services (Appendix 3), and the theoretical background of the studies leans on product branding (Appendix 4). Small and medium sized businesses seem to be severely underrepresented in the empirical studies (Ahonen 2008a), although no research suggests that corporate branding has to be of more importance for larger companies.


### 2.1.2 Defining corporate brand and corporate branding

**Differences between a product brand and a corporate brand**

In principle it is possible to speak of three basic brand hierarchies in the companies, namely corporate-dominant, product-dominant, and mixed branding (Laforet & Saunders 2005). The literature offers a variety of differences between a product brand and a corporate brand. These concern their focus, management, responsible persons, disciplinary background, target group, communications, values, enactment, time horizon and importance to the company (for further information, see, Balmer 2001a, Hatch & Schultz 2001, Balmer 2003, Balmer & Gray 2003, Gylling & Lindberg-Repo 2006). Table 1 denotes the main differences.
Table 1. The characteristics of product brands and corporate brands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Product brands</th>
<th>Corporate brands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Product</td>
<td>Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Middle manager</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Middle manager</td>
<td>All personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognate discipline(s)</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Strategy/multi disciplinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Marketing communication</td>
<td>Total corporate communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target group</td>
<td>Customers and consumers</td>
<td>All internal and external stakeholder groups and networks, for example organisational and community members, investors, partners, suppliers and other interested parties (i.e. all company stakeholders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Mainly contrived</td>
<td>Those of founder(s) + mix of corporate + other sub-cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enactment</td>
<td>Consumer</td>
<td>Managers, through looking at values opportunities both inside and outside organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal dimension</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Past and future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time horizon</td>
<td>Short (life of product)</td>
<td>Long (life of company)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to company</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Product dominant, i.e. house of brands</td>
<td>Corporate dominant, i.e. branded house</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, companies often choose a brand structure that is neither purely corporate dominant nor product dominant; but instead is something in between (Aaker & Joachimsthaler 2000b, Laforet & Saunders 1999). Some researchers have also added service brand to the discussion (e.g. McDonald, De Chernatony & Harris. 2001, de Chernatony & Segal-Horn 2001, 2003), but it is a move that is opposed by some others, who suggest that in a service brand the primary brand is the company (Berry & Parasuraman 1991).

**Defining corporate brand**

In the existing research, corporate brand is most often defined with reference to Aaker’s definition of a product brand referring to the name of the company (see the previous chapter). The other definitions of corporate brand seem to vary, for example, from “a brand that spans an entire company (which can also have disparate underlying product brands)” (Argenti & Druckemiller 2004: 369) to “the
visual, verbal and behavioural expression of an organisation’s unique business model” (Knox & Bickerton 2003: 1013).

Academic and professional interests in corporate brands are based on the premise that a well-managed corporate brand differentiates the organisation from its competitors (Harris & de Chernatony 2001). Among organisational researchers in particular, a corporate brand was long seen as an explicit covenant, a promise, made between an organisation and its key stakeholder groups (Balmer 2001a, 2001b). Stakeholders are classically defined as “a group or individual who can have an effect on or be affected by the actions of an organisation” (Freeman 1984: 46), including, for example, employees, customers, investors, suppliers, partners, regulators, special interests and local communities (Hatch & Schultz 2003: 1042). From this perspective the covenant was promoted via multiple channels of communication to the stakeholders and the stakeholders experienced the corporate brand through the organisation’s products, services and staff behaviour (Balmer & Gray 2003).

In this study I view the corporate brand from a visual perspective as a set of symbols, that is, the name and aesthetics that allow stakeholders to construct their own meaning of the signs in the context of their own lives (see, Hatch & Schultz 2003).

**Defining corporate branding**

Research on corporate branding as a process can be categorised by three different viewpoints: 1) corporate identity management, 2) corporate brand building (later on: corporate branding), and 3) corporate brand co-creation. None of these is alone sufficient to explain my views on corporate branding. Specifically, as I pointed out earlier, I view the concept of corporate brand from a visual perspective as a set of symbols, and my view of corporate branding is a combination of the above mentioned discussions such that it a) emphasises the visual perspective based on corporate identity management but b) emphasises the role of the stakeholders as interpreters of corporate branding and therefore, c) sees stakeholders as co-creators in corporate branding.

The first of the above mentioned viewpoints offered by the literature offers the most information in support of that view, but because it concentrates strongly on the perspective of the organisation, to the detriment of the stakeholder perspective, alone I consider it too restrictive to represent my view. The second one builds on the grounds of the first and introduces the importance of stakeholders as
well. But, this perspective has developed into a view that is wider than seeing the corporate brand from the visual perspective, and therefore alone it cannot offer the information I require to understand the visual perspective. The third is one of the embryonic views in corporate branding. It expands the discussion of corporate branding by considering stakeholders to be co-creators in corporate branding. Again, even though this view offers an important view concerning the stakeholders, it builds on the product branding and corporate branding discussions and therefore offers only a limited view on the visual perspective. Overall, and in order to understand corporate branding from a visual perspective, I see it as necessary to understand all three viewpoints.

Conceptual developments in corporate identity management as a process (see, e.g. Stuart, 1998, 1999, Cornelissen & Elving 2003, Westcott Alessandri 2001, Bick, Jacobson and Abratt 2003, Cornelissen & Harris 2001) are based on organisational research and include several contributions based on the models of corporate image formation (e.g. Kennedy 1997, Dowling 1986, Abratt 1989) and corporate identity management (e.g., Baker & Balmer 1997, Markwick & Fill 1997, van Riel & Balmer 1997). A central point in the discussions has been how the corporate identity is and should be communicated to customers and other stakeholders. Communications processes are seen as starting from corporate identity (see, e.g. Balmer and Gray 1999, 2000), which is communicated through primary communications (including products and services, market behaviour, behaviour towards employees, employee behaviour towards other stakeholders and non-market behaviour) and secondary communications (formal corporate communications, e.g. advertising, public relations, graphic design, sales promotions and visual identification systems) to stakeholders, who use tertiary communication forms (word of mouth, media interpretation and spin, and competitors-communication and spin) to communicate the same to each other. This framework builds on three different approaches; integrated marketing communication (IMC) in which, for example, the process starts from a prospect and the need for synergy is paramount with coordination (e.g. Schultz et al. 1994), corporate communications, which is the integration of management, organisational and marketing communications (e.g. van Riel 1995, Bickerton 2000) and total corporate communications, whereby everything an organisation says, makes and does is seen to communicate (e.g. Balmer 1998). In addition to these, the role of uncontrollable communication, or any “unintended or emergent messages through third party reports and informal communication on the part of employees with outsiders” (Markwick & Fill 1997: 402) is also recognised. It is suggested that, as a result, those messages
create corporate image and corporate reputation, and the reputation of the company in the eyes of individuals and stakeholder groups will influence their willingness to either provide or withhold support for the company, in other words, good reputation may result in competitive advantage for a company (Balmer & Gray 1999, 2000). Theoretical frameworks are often extensive in nature and therefore empirical evidence on the area concentrates on the smaller part of the frameworks (see, e.g. Kiriakidou & Millward 2000, Wheeler, Richey, Tokkman & Sablynski 2006, Foo, Lowe & Foo 2001, Brønn, Engell & Martinsen 2006).

Even though the above mentioned discussions are sometimes conducted under the heading of corporate branding (see, e.g. de Chernatony 2001, Leitch & Richardson 2003), the role of research on corporate branding is to widen it by highlighting the customer perspective adapted from the marketing discipline. It is suggested that corporate branding surpasses product branding by ignoring product features and focusing on the underlying values and vision of the corporation (Hatch & Schultz 2003, Urde 2003), and goes beyond corporate identity by fusing the internal and external dimensions of corporations (Balmer & Greyser 2003). In other words, in this view the processes for understanding and creating corporate brand combines elements from the fields of marketing and multidisciplinary organisation studies.

Several researchers (see, e.g. Einwiller & Will 2002, Van Riel & Van Bruggen 2002, Rode & Vallaster 2005) define corporate branding as being a process of creating and maintaining a favourable image and reputation for the company (Einwiller & Will 2002, Van Riel & Van Bruggen 2002) by managing behaviour, communication and symbolism (Einwiller & Will 2002). As the definition reveals, corporate branding is seen to be much more than just the visual view. In fact, in the corporate branding field it is argued that visual symbolism has received too much attention in the models of corporate image management (Balmer 2001a). In addition, differing from the corporate identity management discussions, corporate branding emphasises not only the internal, but also the external processes in corporate brand building (see, e.g. Urde 2003, Hatch & Schultz 2001, 2003, Knox & Bickerton 2003, Rode & Vallaster 2005). Thus, corporate branding is seen as a dynamic process linking corporate identity and corporate image (Rode & Vallaster 2005, Hatch & Schultz 2003). In corporate branding discussions, the importance of the stakeholders is emphasised more than in corporate identity management discussions. They are, however, still seen as targets for company communications.
Recently there has been wider discussion about the role of the stakeholders in the process under the concept of *corporate brand co-creation*. Corporate brand co-creation is based on the view that the stakeholders are seen rather as co-producers (Pitt et al. 2006), partners or co-creators in developing the corporate brand than targets of it (Gregory 2007). Further, the concept favours the idea of the networks that an organization is involved in being a core part of its identity rather than elements external to it (Leitch & Richardson 2003). In addition, the company/stakeholder engagement and organisational self-disclosure are seen central concerns of brand co-creation (Hatch & Schultz 2010). Even though the contributions are few, they represent two kinds of viewpoints: those that, even when discussing corporate brand co-creation, rely on consumer goods, and those that consider corporate brand co-creation specifically from a corporate brand viewpoint. In the first case it is suggested that the brand does very little for commercial producers and a lot for its users. The users are also the producers, and in so doing, the margins between buyers and sellers are blurred (Pitt et al. 2006). It is also suggested that the control of the brand co-creation process moves out of the hands of the company into those of the consumers after the development of a new product and the creation of brand awareness through marketing and other communications (Boyle 2007). In the second case, it is suggested that the corporate brand develops over time through a process of dialogue and negotiation between an organisation and its internal and external stakeholders. This view makes no distinction between internal and external stakeholders, all are seen as partners. (Gregory 2007.) The most recent developments of the co-creation view in branding are discussed under the concept ‘identity based branding’ in the field of destination marketing (see Saraniemi 2009), but these have not yet had an impact on corporate branding discussions.

### 2.1.3 A visual perspective on corporate branding

It is suggested that the corporate brand name and/or logo play an important role in creating awareness and recognition (Balmer & Gray 2003, Van den Bosch et al. 2006, Melewar & Saunders 1998). There are two schools of thought on identity relating to the importance and management of corporate names: 1) the visual (or appearance) school and 2) the behavioural (or verbal) school. The visual school considers the name as one single variable among aesthetic elements - logotype, symbol, typography, colour palette, slogan, tagline, descriptor - of the corporate visual identity system (CVIS) (Melewar & Saunders 2000). CVIS provides an
organisation with visibility and recognisability. It symbolises an organisation for
external stakeholders (and hence contributes to the organisation’s image and reput-
ation), and also expresses the structure of an organisation to those external stake-
holders, expressing both its coherent whole and the relationships between divi-
sions or units. The internal function of CVIS relates to the way employees iden-
tify with the organisation as a whole and/or the specific departments they work
for. The effectiveness of a CVIS depends on its consistency. (Van den Bosch et al.
2006).

The behavioural school of thought suggests that feelings towards a corpora-
tion are formed based on historical performance, organizational culture and the
attitudes of employees, rather than those generated by a new name (Hatch &
Schultz 1997, Stuart 1999). This suggests that a traditional corporate name, for
example, the name of the founder or the name of the place where the company
was first set up, reflects the corporation’s history and identity better than a new
name will ever be able to (Muzellec 2006).

I see these as supportive rather than contradictory views. In this study I am
mainly interested in the visual perspective – both the name and aesthetics. But, I
am also interested in understanding the corporate name in more detail than is pos-
sible from just the visual perspective. Therefore, the following sections approach
the discussions about corporate visual identity systems as a basis, but divide them
into two viewpoints: corporate name, and aesthetics. In terms of the corporate
name, I combine both the schools of thought above and in addition to them, also
provide viewpoints from the financial literature on corporate name change. When
discussing aesthetics I remain in the field of CVIS.

Corporate name

Alternative types of corporate names can be labelled as descriptive, geographic,
patronymic, acronymic, associative and freestanding. Descriptive names describe
the product or service the company provides, or infer what it does (industry-
related attributes) or what it stands for (business values/culture attributes). They
often describe the organisations’ activity, but never depict a feature of the corpo-
ration. (Muzellec 2006.) Descriptive names are diminishing in popularity, essen-
tially because they offer the lowest level of protection in terms of trade mark (Da-
vies 2002). Geographic names refer to locations, and patronymic names are based
on a person. Acronymic names consist of letters and are often abbreviations (e.g.
IBM, GE). Associative (or suggestive) names evoke associations implicitly or
explicitly with product features (e.g. Jaguar) or a set of corporate values. They refer to the company’s way of doing business or its business culture, often representing what the company stands for. Freestanding (or arbitrary) names have no link with the product or service that they refer to but might have meanings of their own (e.g. Orange, Penguin) or have no intrinsic meaning at all being abstract names (e.g. Kodak, Xsara). (Muzellec 2006.)

It is found out that names descriptive or at least suggestive of the product’s relevant attributes are more likely to be recollected and liked (Klink 2001). For many corporate brands it is difficult to determine who their primary audience is (Muzellec 2006), so Kohli and Labahn (1997) suggest that names are not selected based on their salience but on their capacity to be accepted by a wide audience. This has led many corporations to articulate universal values in a universal manner. However, it is difficult to find values that appeal to all kinds of stakeholders. (Muzellec 2006.) In these cases, a dull name might be more acceptable than an eccentric one (Kohli & Labahn 1997). It is also said that many names suggesting performance are promoted mainly to investors, and names suggesting the idea of life are more often targeted at consumers and are communicated through the mass media (Muzellec 2006). Corporate names can also be industry-related in the sense that they follow institutionalized models that suggest category membership (Glynn & Abzug 2002). According to Muzellec (2006), the affinity between processes used to select the best name for a corporation may also explain some similarities between corporate names.

From the visual viewpoint it is suggested that it is important that companies choose a name that they do not need to change. That is due to the fact that changing a name is expensive, may nullify years of effort in building a strong brand which, if well judged, will yield loyal customers and higher margins, for example. In other words, changing a corporate name can seriously damage or even destroy the brand equity, because changing a brand’s name suggests the loss of all the values that the old name signifies. (Muzellec & Lambkin 2006.) Therefore, it is suggested that successful corporate rebranding may require the retention of at least some core or peripheral brand concepts to build a bridge from the existing corporate brand to the revised corporate brand. Any rebranding should also meet the needs of new market segments relative to the segments supporting the existing brand (Merrilees & Miller 2008). Findings also suggest that from the stock market perspective, a name change is associated with improved performance. It is also found that the greatest improvement has occurred in the companies that pro-
duce industrial goods and whose performance before the change was relatively poor. (Horsky & Swyngedouw 1987).

Aesthetics

It is suggested that revitalising and repositioning a brand through gradual, incremental modification of the brand proposition and marketing aesthetics is often a natural and necessary part of the task of brand management in response to changing market conditions (Aaker 1991, Kapferer 1997).

In this study, any discussion of aesthetics refers to the elements of CVIS other than the name, so the logotype and/or symbol, typography, colour palette, slogan and tagline and/or descriptor (see, e.g. Melewar & Saunders 1999, Dowling 1994, Olins 1986, Melewar, Hussey & Srivoravilai 2005, Melewar, Basset & Simões 2006, Van den Bosch et al. 2005, Van den Bosch et al. 2006). Logos and symbols are important in that they are used for identification (Dowling 1994: 132); people have been found to make different associations with different logos (Van Riel, Van den Ban & Heijmans 2001). A powerful corporate symbol may evoke not only an emotional response, but also make the task of formal corporate communications easier (Van Riel 1995: 39). It also acts as a mark of quality (Baker & Balmer 1997). Bernstein (1986) points out that what the symbol represents has value, not the symbol itself. Also colours elicit different responses from different people. For example Jenkins (1991: 163) notes that colour is an expressive tool in terms of visual identity and depends for its effect on two quite different considerations: (1) association with natural phenomena and (2) association with received cultural references. Typography can also mark out an organization’s visual identity - well-known examples being, for example, Cadbury, Coca-Cola and Kellogg’s. Sometimes the typography can be such a distinctive image that it can stand alone without a logo. (Baker & Balmer 1997.) Visual identity is not, however, the only way to recognise the company, for example, radio stations can be recognised on the basis of their sound logos (Balmer 2001a).

Thus, a poor use of corporate brand symbolism can limit the power of a corporate brand. However, because symbols and meanings are subjective, there is a difficulty in using rich symbolism to communicate the corporate brand. A suggested answer is either to choose symbols that can work universally or to translate rich symbolism into terms that members of target cultures respond to. (Hatch & Schultz 2003.)
2.1.4 Special characteristics of corporate branding in small B2B software companies

In order to understand the context-related specific characteristics of corporate branding this chapter first explores special characteristics of corporate branding in small companies, thereafter continues by examining special characteristics of branding in B2B companies, and concludes with special characteristics of branding in software companies.

Special characteristics of corporate branding in small business

In order to understand corporate rebranding in a small business context, I take a look into the existing research on corporate branding in the small business context.

According to Ahonen (2008a), branding, and especially corporate branding, in SMEs is seldom studied. Research on SME branding covers a wide variety of different perspectives on branding, including, for example, brand management (Krake 2005, Berthon et al. 2008), considering branding as a competitive strategy for demand management (Abimbola 2001), and brand affiliation and/or endorsement as a mode of internationalisation (Yakhlef & Maubourguet 2004). Issues identified from the traditional product branding perspective have been adapted including, for example, testing Keller’s (2000) brand report card (BRC) (Berthon et al. 2008) and utilising Aaker’s (1992) brand personality dimensions (Opoku et al. 2007). In addition, the importance of both functional and symbolic values suggested for instance by de Chernatony, Harris and Dall’Olmo Riley (2000) are emphasised (e.g. Krake 2005, Kollmann & Suckow 2007).

Recently corporate branding discussions have become, in one way or another, part of the field of interest. For example, researchers discuss differences between corporate branding and product branding (see, e.g. Balmer 2001a, Kollmann & Suckow 2007). There does seem to be some confusion, stemming from the fact that in some studies the theoretical background leans on product brand management even though the studied entity is a corporation (Krake 2005, Wong & Merrilees 2005). According to reference lists, several studies utilise corporate branding articles, but in only some studies was corporate branding considered in a versatile way (Rode & Vallaster 2005, Kollmann & Suckow 2007, Merrilees 2007). In addition, some studies utilised some corporate identity management studies (e.g. Markwick & Fill 1997). This is not a surprise because, as Knox and Bicker-
ton (2003) describe, the concepts of corporate identity management and corporate branding are often used interchangeably in the literature. Further to that, while the studies mainly concentrate on describing brand management issues in SMEs and take product branding as their theoretical background, Merrilees (2007) takes an entrepreneurial branding perspective on the phenomenon in his conceptual work, and addresses the challenges in brand-led SME new venture development with the help of existing case studies. In other words, Merrilees’ article seems, so far, to be the only attempt to consider the issue from an entrepreneurial perspective. For example, he raises the general issues of entrepreneurial research, such as innovation and creativity and opportunity recognition skills.

Empirical studies are often qualitative in nature, reflecting the embryonic nature of the field. In empirical studies companies operating in consumer businesses (B2C) are more often studied than B2B companies (see, e.g. Boyle 2003, Mowle & Merrilees 2005), services companies are also more often examined than manufacturing companies. (Ahonen 2008a.) In general, the targets of empirical studies are founders, entrepreneurs, owners, managers and junior members of the companies. These respondents are typical of small companies where an entrepreneur, owner and/or a manager are most often responsible for the company (Hill 2001a). However, several topical perspectives in corporate branding literature, for example internal branding and corporate rebranding, seem to be missing from the academic studies in the SME context (Ahonen 2008a), and this may offer several interesting research avenues for further studies.

Unlike with corporate branding in large companies, several SME branding studies suggest that corporate branding begins before the company is even established (see, e.g. Rode & Vallaster 2005, Merrilees 2007, Kollmann & Suckow 2007, Juntunen, Saraniemi, Halttu & Tähtinen 2010). In addition, in SME studies of corporate branding the role of the entrepreneur is emphasised (e.g. Krake 2005, Rode & Vallaster 2005, Merrilees 2007, Juntunen, Saraniemi, Halttu & Tähtinen 2010).

According to Krake (2005), responsibility for brand management lies at the management level; for example, brand policy and logo changes are made by the owner. Krake also lists several factors that influence the role of brand management in small companies: the owner/director/manager, market in which the company operates, the company structure, type of products, market orientation of the company, and competitors. The role of brand management, the available budget and creativity in marketing for their part, affect the marketing activities and how
messages are communicated from the company. Fig. 6 summarises the special characteristics of branding in small business.

**Fig. 6. Special characteristics of branding in small business.**

**Special characteristics of branding in B2B companies**

Business to business (B2B) companies offer an interesting context that differs from traditional consumer-based product branding for researching brands and branding both at product and corporate levels. B2B branding has received relatively little attention from academics (Lynch & De Chernatony 2004) even though the main business operations of many of the world’s strongest brands, for example, IBM, Microsoft, FedEx and Boeing, concentrate on B2B (Kotler *et al.* 2006: 2). However, interest in B2B branding has increased in recent years (see, e.g. Lynch & De Chernatony 2004, Bendixen *et al.* 2004, Van Riel *et al.* 2005).

It is suggested that in the B2B arena, a brand is more than a product or business. As Kotler *et al.* (2006: 5) state, a brand is a promise and a totality of perceptions, in other words, everything there is to see, hear, read, know, feel, think, and so on, about a company, product or service. “It also holds a distinctive position in customers’ minds based on past experiences, associations and future expectations. A brand is a shortcut of attributes, benefits, beliefs and values that differentiate, reduce complexity, and simplify the decision making process.” It summarises a person’s feelings towards a product or business. In addition, B2B brands reach not only customers but other stakeholders, for example, investors, employees, partners, suppliers, competitors and regulators as well. (Kotler *et al.* 2006: 4.) It is also suggested that corporate image and corporate brands may have a salient role in the selection of subcontractors (Blombäck & Axelsson 2007), and that in B2B markets brand equity exists in the form of a buyers’ willingness to pay a price premium for their preferred brand (Hutton 1997). Brand equity seems to be one of
the most studied issues in B2B branding, both in industrial (see e.g. Bendixen et al. 2004, Kuhn et al. 2008) and services (see e.g. Taylor et al. 2007, Roberts & Merrilees 2007, Davis et al. 2008, Kim et al. 2008, Rauyruen et al. 2009, Jun- tunen, Juntunen & Juga 2011) companies. Aspara and Tikkanen (2008) argue that, in general, corporate brands are particularly important in the B2B context. Fig. 7 summarises the special characteristics of branding in small business.

Fig. 7. Special characteristics of B2B branding.

Special characteristics of branding in software companies

Even though the current research delivers some brand-related issues in studies concerning software companies (e.g. Givon et al. 1997, Priluck 2010, Adler 2010) and corporate branding is empirically studied in some IT-companies (e.g. Muzellec and Lambkin 2006, Daly & Moloney 2004), the research on branding in the context of software companies seems to be scarce even though the software business is one of today’s major industries. The current research examines the components of brand equity (Srivastava & Mookerjee 2004) and the product brand building process (Ojasalo et al. 2008) in the software business. Because the Srivastava and Mookerjee (2004) study concentrates on brand equity, the company external view, it cannot assist this study. However, the study of Ojasalo et al. (2008) does provide several interesting viewpoints for this study (see, Fig. 8).

First, it should be noted that Ojasalo et al. (2008) were not able to make a distinction between software product branding and software corporate branding. They state that brand building is perceived in software companies as less important and has a less systematic and therefore a more minor role than technology development. Second, companies often take care of the visual image and material production themselves. It is challenging to get personnel to maintain a consistent line in communication. Third, the decision making related to branding is conducted by just a few managers; the staff are not generally involved. Fourth, the company name is often the product line’s “family name”, and the individual products are named by combining it with a product-specific extension. In addition
to these, the study offers several other interesting views on brand building in the software business, but concern aspects that are not in the purview of this study.

- No distinction between software product branding and software corporate branding.
- Companies take care of the visual image and material production themselves.
- Challenging to get personnel to maintain a consistent line in communication.
- The decision making related to branding is conducted by a few managers; the personnel are not involved.
- The company name is often the product line’s “family name”
- The individual products are named by combining the company name with a product-specific extension.

Fig. 8. Special characteristics of branding in software companies.

2.2 Corporate rebranding

2.2.1 Defining corporate rebranding

Rebranding in current literature is commonly used to indicate that the brand is reborn (Stuart & Muzellec 2004). According to Cambridge dictionaries online, one meaning of the prefix “re” is again; anew. Rebranding can occur at various levels of the brand hierarchy – the product, corporate or business unit levels – with interactions between the different levels (Muzellec & Lambkin 2006, Lambkin & Muzellec 2008). Similarly to product branding, product rebranding is a widely studied area in the marketing discipline (see, e.g. Melewar, Badal & Small 2006). Corporate rebranding is one of the most recent streams among corporate branding discussions while business unit rebranding seems to be almost an untouched area.

In the current academic research corporate rebranding often refers to a corporate name change and is defined as “the practice of building anew a name representative of a differentiated position in the mind frame of stakeholders and a distinctive identity from competitors” (Muzellec et al. 2003: 32). In other words, corporate rebranding can be seen as a strategy used by companies to change their image (Stuart & Muzellec 2004).

Even though defined as a corporate name change, the term rebranding is used to describe three different processes; changing a name, changing aesthetics and/or repositioning the brand (Muzellec et al. 2003). In short, renaming consists of selecting and launching a new name (Kaikati 2003). Changing aesthetics, or redes-
igning, means changing any other corporate visual identity (CVI) elements other than the name, such as the logotype and/or symbol, typography, colour palette, slogan and tagline and/or descriptor (for more information about CVI, see, e.g. Melewar & Saunders 1999, Dowling 1994, Olins 1986, Melewar et al. 2006, Van den Bosch et al. 2005, Van den Bosch et al. 2006). Repositioning is about making decisions to try to create a radically new position for the existing company in the minds of the customers (Muzellec et al. 2003, Kaikati 2003, Merrilees & Miller 2008), competitors and other stakeholders (Keller 2008), usually with large marketing communications campaigns (Kaikati 2003).

The major goal of this study is to understand rebranding at the corporate level. In other words, I concentrate on corporate rebranding and exclude product rebranding. The exception is one of the cases that was a business unit at the time, so we should describe the study as relating to business unit rebranding as well (see Fig. 9).

Fig. 9. Focus of the study in the field of rebranding.

I will examine both corporate name and aesthetics changes, and consider repositioning as being a part of both of these. Accordingly, in this research I define corporate rebranding as including both corporate name and aesthetics changes.

2.2.2 The reasons for corporate rebranding

This chapter examines the reasons for corporate rebranding based in two streams of literature; corporate rebranding and corporate visual identity change. The main
drivers for corporate rebranding are decisions, events or processes that result in a change in a company’s structure, strategy or performance of sufficient magnitude to suggest the need for a fundamental redefinition of its identity (Muzellec & Lambkin 2006), including, e.g. vision, strategy (Kaikati 2003) and values (Lomax & Mador 2006).

When considering corporate rebranding as being a name change, Muzellec and Lambkin (2006) described the reasons for it as including change in ownership structure (mergers & acquisitions, spin-offs, private to public ownership), corporate strategy (diversification and divestment, internationalization and localization), competitive position (erosion of market position, outdated image, reputation problems) and as prompted by the external environment (legal obligation, major crises or catastrophes). Additionally, most often the reasons for corporate rebranding are mergers and acquisitions, spin offs, a need for a change of brand image, or refocusing of the company. Juntunen, Saraniemi and Jussila (2009) add that a key reason for corporate rebranding is a change in ownership structure from public to private ownership. Fig. 10 summarises the reasons for corporate name change.

| Change in ownership structure | - Mergers & acquisitions, spin-offs, private to public ownership, public to private ownership, |
| Change in corporate strategy | - Diversification and divestment, internationalization and localization |
| Change in competitive position | - Erosion of market position, outdated image, reputation problems |
| Change in external environment | - Legal obligation, major crises or catastrophes |

**Fig. 10. Reasons for corporate name change.**

From corporate visual identity perspective, Baker and Balmer (1997) suggest that the reasons for corporate visual identity change are structural, strategic or result from management change, regulatory change, external/internal misunderstanding of the organisation and its purposes, increased or decreased scope of operations, competition, and the need for scale economies. According to Van den Bosch et al. (2006) repositioning an organisation or modernisation may be reasons for changing corporate visual identity. According to Stuart and Muzellec (2004), there are two reasons for logo change; first, the logo is changed when the organisation has changed its name, and second, to update the logo only in order to update it. I
categorise these to change in the company (structural and strategic change, management change, corporate name change, increased or decreased scope of operations), change in the external environment (regulatory change, competition and the need for scale economies) and willingness to change the corporate image (repositioning an organisation, modernisation, updating) and summarise them as the reasons for corporate logo change in Fig. 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in the company</th>
<th>Change in the external environment</th>
<th>Willingness to change the corporate image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- structural or strategic change</td>
<td>- regulatory change</td>
<td>- repositioning an organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- management change</td>
<td>- competition and the need for scale economies</td>
<td>- modernisation, updating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- corporate name change</td>
<td></td>
<td>- external/internal misunderstanding of the organisation and its purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- increased or decreased scope of operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 11. Reasons for corporate logo change.**

The goals of corporate rebranding are divided into two groups: reflecting the new identity of a company (e.g. if a company has gone through major changes and even the new identity of a company is formed) or creating a new image. In both cases the rebranding process includes both internalisation and externalisation, that is, affecting internal employees and the culture, as well as influencing external stakeholders and the images they have of the company. (Muzellec & Lambkin 2006.)

**2.2.3 Corporate rebranding as a process**

the topic seems to suffer from the same problem as corporate branding research: the examined phenomenon is so wide in nature that it is difficult to understand it as a whole. The current literature on corporate rebranding processes concentrates on examining corporate rebranding among large multinationals, and may therefore be looking at a different thing compared to research on corporate rebranding in small companies. However, because the existing research on corporate rebranding is scarce and there is a lack of small business perspective, I utilise the knowledge gained from large companies in creating the theoretical framework for this study.

Kaikati (2003) provides an extensive study of corporate rebranding from the process perspective. He suggests that corporate rebranding consists of four processes: selecting a new name, creating a new logo for the company, launching a new name, and evaluating the new name. He also describes each process in more detail. Even though Kaikati’s empirical study is on a large multinational company, it offers an encouraging basis and a good starting point for creating the framework for this study.

Other studies on corporate rebranding concentrate either on corporate branding in general without examining it from the process perspective (Muzellec & Lambkin 2006), or smaller parts of the process (Robinson & Wu 2008, Daly & Moloney 2004). Therefore they support understanding of either the main process or the sub-processes in more detail.

From a corporate rebranding perspective, Muzellec and Lambkin (2006) suggest that corporate rebranding consists of renaming, redesigning and repositioning, whilst Daly and Moloney (2004) concentrate on the communications aspect of corporate rebranding, that is the launch of the new corporate brand. From the financial perspective, Robinson and Wu (2008) suggest that corporate name change includes three different processes; identifying a set of potential names, approving the name change, and launching marketing and advertising campaigns.

From these contributions one can discern five basic sub-processes that are included in corporate rebranding; Renaming, Redesigning, Repositioning, Launching, and Evaluating, and they are discussed in more detail below. However, because Repositioning is about whether the positioning of the brand changes or stays the same in the course of the rebranding, and it is suggested that many name changes are invoked with the express purpose of altering the image of the existing brand (Muzellec & Lambkin 2006), I consider repositioning here as an integral part of Renaming and Redesigning. In other words, I assume that creating a new name includes, in one way or another, repositioning the brand, and that inevitably
means rejecting Repositioning as an independent sub-process of corporate re-branding.

Renaming

Renaming refers to the actions through which a new name is chosen and adopted for use. In order to understand the corporate rebranding sub-process of renaming, I construct it based on three sources of literature; corporate rebranding, the financial view of corporate name change, and corporate name development.

In the context of corporate rebranding, Kaikati (2003) suggests that the name selection process consists of four events: communication by management of the new identity of the company internally; invention of a new name by the marketing communications office and staff; creation of selection criteria for a new name by a branding consultancy, and selection of the new name by the executive committee.

From a financial perspective, Robinson and Wu (2008) suggest that corporate renaming has two events; identifying a set of potential names, and approving the name change. According to them, identifying a set of potential names is about working with name development and corporate identity consultants, and selecting a name. Approving the name change is done by the board of directors and shareholders.

Several studies (e.g. McNeal & Zeren 1981, Shipley, Hooley & Wallace 1988, Kohli & LaBahn 1997, Kollmann & Suckow 2007) have elaborated on the question of how a company name is developed and chosen before the company has been established. In this study, I utilise the work of Kollmann and Suckow (2007), who suggest that corporate naming has seven events; specifying of brand name objectives, creation of candidate name(s), evaluation of candidate name(s), choice of a brand name, checking of domain, domain registration, and trademark registration. However, according to the authors, the events are not necessarily executed in that order; the order in fact depends on the creators.

For the theoretical framework for this study, I provide six main events: Communication about the new identity, Invention of a new name, Creation of selection criteria for a new name, Evaluating the potential name(s), Selecting a new name, and Registering the new name (see Table 2). Unfortunately the existing research does not assign actors for all of the events.
Table 2. Renaming events and actors based on the existing research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate renaming event</th>
<th>Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicating the new identity</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventing a new name</td>
<td>Corporate identity consultants, marketing communications office, personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating selection criteria for a new name</td>
<td>Branding consultancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the potential name(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting a new name</td>
<td>Executive committee, the board of directors, shareholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering a new name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Communicating the new identity* is about the management the new identity internally (Kaikati 2003). *Invention of a new name* is about working with name development in order to create a prospective name (or a list of prospective names) (Kollmann & Suckow 2007). It is a step often conducted jointly with corporate identity consultants (Robinson & Wu 2008), the marketing communications office and other staff (Kaikati 2003). This may also include brainstorming (Stuart & Muzellec 2004). *Creation of the selection criteria for a new name* consists of specifying brand name objectives (Kollmann & Suckow 2007) and the precise selection criteria for the new name (Kaikati 2003). In large companies, this is done by branding consultancy (Kaikati 2003). *Evaluation of the potential name(s)* speaks for itself, and in *Selection of a new name* denotes the choice of a brand name made by the executive committee, the board of directors and/or the shareholders (Kaikati 2003, Robinson & Wu 2008, Kollmann & Suckow 2007). *Registration of a new name* is here intended to refer to name registration, domain registration, and trademark registration. I have combined all these under one heading because from the viewpoint of corporate rebranding, I assume that registration is only a small and official part of the process, constrained by the laws of the State, and so does not reveal as deep an understanding about the actors or their actions as the other events in the process may reveal.

**Redesigning**

The existing corporate rebranding research suggests that redesigning refers to logo change (e.g. Kaikati 2003, Stuart & Muzellec 2004). However, even though logo changes are widely studied, for example, from a corporate image management perspective (see, e.g. Dowling 1994, Henderson & Cote 1998, Van Riel et al. 2001), as with areas of corporate rebranding, the existing research scarcely
examines the processes involved in changing a logo. In terms of corporate rebranding, Kaikati (2003) suggests that a new logo for the company is created by a branding consultancy.

From the perspective of corporate visual identity change, Melewar et al. (2005) suggest five main events for corporate visual identity changes; examining the present corporate visual identity, defining a working brief to an external consultant, analysis of the firm’s brand values and strategy direction by a company and consultants, choosing a branding structure, and production of a logo/symbol, colour scheme and type font by the consultant’s designers. These are adopted as a basis for creating the theoretical framework for the study (see Table 3).

Table 3. Corporate redesigning events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate redesigning event</th>
<th>Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examining the present corporate logo</td>
<td>A company and brand consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a working brief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysing the firm’s brand values and strategy direction</td>
<td>A company and brand consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing logo structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a logo/symbol, colour palette and font type</td>
<td>Branding consultancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Examining the present corporate logo* is about assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the present corporate logo in relation to the external environment. *Creating a working brief* is about clarifying the central objectives of the new logo and presenting them to the external consultant. *Analysing the firm’s brand values and strategy direction* is done to ensure that the new logo will reflect those aspects. *Choosing a logo structure* involves decisions on the kinds of connections the logo should have to the previous logo and/or corporate products and/or subsidiaries. *Creation of a logo/symbol, colour palette and font type* refers to the production of the new logo by a branding consultancy.

**Launching**

*Launching* refers to how new brand is communicated to the stakeholders. The article by Daly and Moloney (2004) is one of the rare attempts to describe launching a new name in detail. It suggests that launching consists of both internal and external campaigns: an internal campaign consists of communicating the vision and values, and an external campaign includes five events: a pre-campaign situation analysis (clarifying the current situation), a partnership campaign (informing
the public about an acquisition), interim or dual branding campaign (in which the old and the new name are used together), a pre-launch campaign (which explicitly communicates the disappearance of the old name in the near future), and an actual launch campaign (involving above-the-line advertising and below-the-line promotion including concept stores, developing wraps and an exciting and publicity-oriented public launch).

The internal and external viewpoints on launching a new name are widely agreed in the literature, and it is also agreed that internal launching is conducted before external launching (Kaikati 2003, Muzellec & Lambkin 2006, Merrilees & Miller 2008). According to Kaikati (2003), *internal launching* is about top management introducing the new name internally to the employees by creating a series of global web casts and arranging events. Merrilees and Miller (2008) suggest a high level of brand orientation through communication, training and internal marketing.

*External launching* is often considered by other researchers to solely focus on the last of the stages suggested by Daly and Moloney (2004). As such, it is something done by top management by using ‘push’ marketing methods (promotion; postings to clients and journalists) (Kaikati 2003) and ‘pull’ methods (advertising in newspapers, business journals, television, sports events and through all possible communications media) (Kaikati 2003, Muzellec & Lambkin 2006, Robinson & Wu 2008).

In a similar way, Melewar *et al.* (2005) suggest that launching a new logo also consists of both internal and external launching. *Internal launching*, involves a manager presenting a new logo to the employees via video links, an intranet, stationery and promotional objects. *External launching* would be conducted through press conference hosted by a manager, as well as an advertising campaign and promotional materials, perhaps at sport events.

In conclusion, I categorise *Launching* as either *internal launching* or *external launching* (see Table). Internal launching consists of one event only, *Introducing the new name and/or logo internally to the employees*. It is about communicating the new name of the company (Kaikati 2003) as well as its vision and values (Daly & Moloney 2004) to the employees by the management.
Table 4. Launching events and actors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Launching events</th>
<th>Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal launching</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing the new name and/or logo internally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External launching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysing the pre-campaign situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing the stakeholders about the reason for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>name/logo change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executing a dual branding campaign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-launching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following Daly and Moloney (2004), External launching consists of five events; Analysing the pre-campaign situation, Informing the stakeholders about the reason for name/logo change, Executing a dual branding campaign, Pre-launching, and Launching.

**Evaluating**

Evaluating here refers to the evaluation of the result of corporate rebranding. The existing research reveals three different aspects on evaluating: ongoing evaluation throughout the process of planning the launch of a new corporate brand, a review or overall evaluation at the end of the launch stage to take a more holistic view of the planning process (Daly & Moloney 2004), and evaluating the new name after launch using a survey, reviewing customers’ purchase intentions and conducting customer research (Kaikati 2003).

In this study I see Evaluating as the overall evaluation at the end of launching, and based on the above mentioned, I divide it into two perspectives; Evaluating the new name, and Evaluating the process (Table 5).

Table 5. Evaluating events and actors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event in this study</th>
<th>Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the new name</td>
<td>Customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Daly and Moloney (2004) suggest that evaluating is done throughout corporate rebranding, for the purposes of the framework presented here, the limited form of Evaluating presented above is more suitable because evaluation taking place at an earlier stage does not consider the output of the process.
2.2.4 Outputs of corporate rebranding

In organisational change research, it is often typical to concentrate on describing either the change process or a result of it (Pettigrew et al. 2001). In section 2.1.3, I defined my view of corporate brands in this study as being primarily a visual perspective, based on which I divide this concept into the corporate name and aesthetics. In harmony with this logic, I concentrated in the previous section chiefly on the processes of Renaming and Redesigning. As the empirical part of the study will illustrate, those processes consist of cumulative events, which, for their part, are constructive in nature. In other words, they have a goal to reach, such as a new corporate name or rules on how to use a new logo, but during the event, no one knows how it will conclude. In other words, it can be seen that the output of the sub-processes is produced during the events. Thus, it is also important to examine these outputs in additional detail. In this section, the existing corporate rebranding types are initially reviewed, followed by an examination of corporate name changes and thereafter of logo changes.

Corporate rebranding types

The current research on corporate rebranding types has concentrated on examining the level of change in corporate rebranding. The level of change may vary from minor (Daly & Moloney 2004) or evolutionary change (Stuart & Muzellec 2004, Muzellec & Lambkin 2006) to intermediate change (Daly & Moloney 2004) to complete (Daly & Moloney 2004) or revolutionary change (Stuart & Muzellec 2004, Muzellec & Lambkin 2006). Of these, only revolutionary change is called rebranding (e.g. Daly & Moloney 2004).

The level of change is defined on the basis of the elements that are changed in corporate rebranding: brand name and/or brand values (Lomax & Mador 2006), aesthetics, repositioning and/or name (Daly & Moloney 2004), name, logo and/or slogan (Stuart & Muzellec 2004), or positioning and aesthetics (Muzellec & Lambkin 2006). In addition, Merrilees and Miller (2008) mention that corporate rebranding can take the form of reinvention, refreshment, makeover, and renewal, but they do not consider these in further detail. These are summarised in Table 6.
### Table 6. Corporate rebranding types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Change types</th>
<th>Changing element</th>
<th>Description of the change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daly and Moloney (2004)</td>
<td>Minor change</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>From a simple face lift to restyling or revitalising the brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate change</td>
<td>Repositioning</td>
<td>Use of marketing tactics, especially communication and customer service techniques to favourably reposition on existing brand name, thus giving it a new image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete change, i.e. rebranding</td>
<td>New name</td>
<td>Values and image of the new brand are communicated to all stakeholders through an integrated marketing communications campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart and Muzellec (2004)</td>
<td>Evolutionary</td>
<td>Logo and/or slogan Name, logo and/</td>
<td>A fairly minor development, so gradual that it is barely perceptible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revolutionary</td>
<td>slogan</td>
<td>A major, identifiable change that fundamentally redefines the company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muzellec &amp; Lambkin (2006)</td>
<td>Evolutionary</td>
<td>Positioning and aesthetics</td>
<td>Values and/or attributes are changed to meet either external or internal identified concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revolutionary</td>
<td>Positioning and aesthetics</td>
<td>Change of name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lomax and Mador (2006)</td>
<td>Re-defining</td>
<td>Existing name - new values &amp; attributes(v&amp;a)</td>
<td>Both values and name are changed to address fundamental problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re-naming</td>
<td>New name - existing v&amp;a</td>
<td>Dictionary explanations: The act of renewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re-starting</td>
<td>New name - new v&amp;a</td>
<td>Refreshment: The action of refreshing; to refresh someone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reinvention: To invent again something that has already been invented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though each of these studies offers a contribution, for the purpose of this study, these categorisations are not detailed enough to define the output of corporate rebranding. Therefore, I seek to continue developing the corporate name and change types, by utilising other literature as well.
Corporate name change types

In the existing research, the outputs of corporate name change are examined from three perspectives: 1) clarifying the name-choosing strategies (Collins 1977, Davies 2002, Muzellec 2006) 2) clarifying the types of the old and new names (e.g. Muzellec 2006), and 3) clarifying the change type from the old name to the new name (Robinson & Wu 2008, Wu 2010).

The first perspective refers to choosing a corporate name and establishing it in the minds of the consumers through repetition, choosing a corporate name that has desirable phonetic symbolism (Collins 1977), choosing a corporate brand name that not only takes into consideration the heritage of the corporation but also sets a direction for the future, choosing a new name that is noticed by external stakeholders but does not alienate the internal audience, or choosing a corporate name that either evokes industry-specific attributes or induces universal values (Muzellec 2006). The examination of corporate names from this viewpoint is not the focus of this study, because, in my opinion, understanding these would entail the examination of the corporate brands from a wider perspective than the one I have chosen (see section 2.1.2). Therefore, I concentrate on the second and third viewpoints in this study.

The second and third viewpoints examine the same phenomenon from slightly different perspectives, but I see them as supporting the purposes of this study, rather than being complementary. The second viewpoint refers to initially clarifying the type of the original name and then the type of the new name. This clarification helps in examining the change from the third viewpoint, which concentrates on revealing what kind of connections there are between the old and new names. These two viewpoints are examined next.

First, in clarifying the types of the old and the new name, Muzellec (2006) classifies alternative types of corporate names into six categories: descriptive, geographic, patronymic, acronymic, associative and freestanding names. These are presented in chapter 2.1.3. According to Muzellec (2006), the old corporate names are usually descriptive or person-based, and the new name types are more abstract by virtue of being either freestanding or associative. In addition, with regards to the new name, information about the name of the founder of the company, the place where the company was set up, and the sector of industry from which it emerged, is eliminated, and industry associations are replaced with non-figurative associations. Additionally, most of the names show no similarities with the previous names. This view is also supported by Kohli and Hemnes (1995) and Delattre (2002), who have found that new
names are shorter, product and geographic associations are removed, and many new words are created. It is also found that organisations follow the practices of other institutions from similar industries when it comes to adopting a new name (Glynn & Abzug 2002).

Second, examination of the corporate name change types has been conducted in the financial studies by Robinson and Wu (2008) and Wu (2010). Robinson and Wu (2008) present four types of corporate name change: radical name change, brand adoption, narrower focus, and broader focus. In radical name change, no semantic link to the firm’s prior name is left. Brand adoption is about adding terms of a well-recognised product (or business) to corporate names. Narrower focus concerns minor name changes that add terms identifying a particular product (or business) to the firm’s old identity, while broader focus concerns minor name changes that shed a part of the old name that identifies the firm with a particular product (or business).

Wu (2010) continues this discussion by presenting three types of corporate name change: a radically different name, the name of one of the company’s well-recognised brands, and a minor change in a name created by adding or deleting a part of the name. In the first instance, a firm adopts a radically different name to disassociate itself from a poor reputation. In the second one, the company takes the name of one of its well-recognised brands to take advantage of the association with a good reputation. In the third case, the company executes a minor change in its name by adding or deleting a part of its name that identifies it with a particular product, in order to accompany a narrower business focus or a broader business focus.

Following the logic of Wu (2010), I categorise the corporate name change types into three categories; 1) Reinventing, 2) Brand adoption, and 3) Makeover (see Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reinventing</th>
<th>Brand adoption</th>
<th>Makeover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adding something to or deleting something from the previous name</td>
<td>Taking the name of the company’s well-recognised brand</td>
<td>No link to the previous name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reinventing concerns a minor change in a name by adding or deleting a part of the name. Brand adoption involves the fact that the name of one of the company’s well-recognised product brands is taken as the corporate name. Makeover is about
creating a radically different corporate name which has no link to the previous name. In renaming the categories, I have utilised the work of Merrilees & Miller (2008), as described earlier.

**Logo change types**

This section is constructed on the basis of corporate rebranding literature. Also included are some viewpoints from the above mentioned literature concerning corporate name change types.

In this study, I see aesthetics change as evidenced especially in the company’s logo. The logo, for its part, I see consisting of layout, typography, text, and colour palette (see, e.g. Melewar & Saunders 1999, Van den Bosch *et al.* 2005, Van den Bosch *et al.* 2006). As a logo consists of several individual elements, in order to examine logo change I see it as necessary to consider how each of those elements change. It is possible that some of the elements do not change, while the changes that occur in other elements result in the logo change. For this purpose, I provide three categories for understanding change in these elements: no change, minor change and complete change (see Table 7). Here, my purpose is to understand the degree of change in the elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Minor change</th>
<th>Complete change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The element remains exactly the same</td>
<td>A minor change in the element by adding or deleting something</td>
<td>No link to the previous version of the element/logo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complete change is about changing an element in a way that it has no link to the same element in the previous logo. Minor change is about adding or deleting something from the same element in the previous logo, still remaining something old. And, because Daly and Moloney (2004) and Stuart and Muzellec (2004) present that it is possible to change only logo or slogan without changing the name, I assume that it is possible that some element does not change in the new logo while some of the others change.

As a conclusion, evaluating the level of change in each logo element, i.e. layout, typography, text, and colours, results in clarifying the logo change type. For keeping this evaluating manageable, I categorise logo change types in two categories only; 1) Refreshment, and 2) Renewal (see Table 8).
Table 8. Logo change types in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate name change type</th>
<th>Refreshment</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makeover</td>
<td>Intermediate change</td>
<td>Complete change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand adoption</td>
<td>Intermediate change</td>
<td>Intermediate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinventing</td>
<td>Minor change</td>
<td>Intermediate change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In **Refreshment**, some or many of the elements are changed in either a complete or a minor way. In **Renewal**, all the elements in a logo are changed completely and no link to the previous logo remains.

**Corporate rebranding types**

Combining corporate name and logo change types results in the clarification of the level of corporate rebranding as being either minor, intermediate or complete change (see, Table 9).

Table 9. Corporate rebranding types in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logo change type</th>
<th>Corporate name change type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refreshment</td>
<td>(minor change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>(complete change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makeover</td>
<td>Intermediate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(complete change)</td>
<td>Complete change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand adoption</td>
<td>Intermediate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(intermediate change)</td>
<td>Intermediate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinventing</td>
<td>Minor change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(minor change)</td>
<td>Intermediate change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When both corporate name and logo change types are complete changes, corporate rebranding represents a complete change. If both the above mentioned change types are minor changes, corporate rebranding represents a minor change. In all the other cases, the question deals with intermediate change.

### 2.3 Organisational change processes

The two dominant approaches to organisational change are planned and emergent change (e.g. Burnes 2004, Cummins & Worley 2001, Dawson 1994, Kanter, Stein & Jick 1992, Pettigrew 2000, Stace & Dunphy 2001, Weick 2000, Wilson 1992). Even though the researchers often prefer either of these, it has been suggested that one approach to change may be sub-optimal (Burnes 2004). It is sug-
gested that emergent change forms the infrastructure that determines whether planned change will succeed or fail (Weick 2000). In order to explain how and why a change process unfolds over time, planned change can be considered from the lifecycle process perspective and emergent change from teleology process perspective (for understanding process theories in general, see Van de Ven & Poole 1995) (Weick 2000). In order to understand corporate rebranding as a process, in this chapter I introduce these two change approaches and how these can be described as a process.

2.3.1 Planned change and life-cycle process theory

*Planned change*

Research on implementing change has its roots in two early works of Kurt Lewin. In the first one, organisational change is seen as a process that moves from one “fixed state” to another through a series of pre-planned steps. In this approach, change can be analysed by a construct. (Lewin 1951 via Bamford & Forrester 2003). In the second one the change is described through three learning steps of freezing, unfreezing and refreezing, recognising that old behaviour has to be discarded before any new one can be accepted and adopted successfully (Lewin 1958 in Bamford & Forrester 2003). According to Lewin, planned change is primarily aimed at improving the operation and effectiveness of the human side of the organisation through participative, group and team-based programmes of change (Burnes 2004). Since then, several authors have adopted similar approaches in building on the work of Lewin, including, for example, four (Bullock & Batten 1985), five (Judson 1991), eight (Cummings & Huse 1989, Kotter 1995), nine (Galpin 1996) and multi-phase (Armenakis, Harris & Feild 1999) models of implementing change.

It is suggested that the planned approach is heavily dependent on the role of the manager in laying down timetables, objectives and methods in advance (Wilson 1992). The approach is therefore characterised as being “top-down” change (Bamford & Forrester 2003). The planned approach is based on the assumption that everyone within the organisation agrees to work in one direction without disagreement. Most cases of planned organisational change can be categorised as episodic change, which is characterised by being “discontinuous, infrequent, and intentional” (Weick & Quinn 1999: 365). The presumption is that episodic change
occurs during periods of divergence when organisations are moving away from
their equilibrium conditions. Divergence is the result of a growing misalignment
between an inertial deep structure and perceived environmental demands. This
kind of change tends to occur in distinct periods during which shifts are precipi-
tated by external events such as technology change (Weick & Quinn 1999) or in-
ternal events such as change in strategy, structure and/or culture. The planned ap-
proach emphasises the importance of understanding the different states which an
organisation will have to go through in order to move from an unsatisfactory state
to an identified desired state. (By 2005)

Planned organisational change often produces unintended consequences (Jian
2007, Balogun & Johnson 2005), such as consequences that would not have taken
place if a social actor had acted differently, but that are not what the actor had
intended to happen (Jian 2007). These include, for example, unintended emotions
(Turnbull 2002), resistance (Harris & Ogbonna 2002) and environmental distur-
bance (McKinley & Scherer 2000).

Lifecycle process theory

Weick (2000) suggests that planned change can be considered from a lifecycle
process perspective. Lifecycle theory represents a metaphor of organic growth. In
this kind of process, the progression to the final end state is prefigured and re-
quires a specific historical sequence of events. Each of these events contributes to
a piece of the final result, and they must occur in the prescribed order because
each piece sets the stage for the next. There is a logic through which change may
happen. Each stage of development is seen as a necessary precursor of the suc-
ceeding stages and the stages or phases follow each other as a single, cumulative
sequence. For example, characteristics acquired in earlier stages are retained in
later stages, and the stages are related such that they derive from a pre-established
program or action routine and they channel the development of entities in a previ-
ously specified direction, typically of maintaining and incrementally adapting
their forms in a stable, predictable way. Over the longer term small changes may
accumulate to produce a larger change in degree or quality of the entity. (Van de
Ven & Poole 1995.) Lifecycle type change has three main characteristics: a singu-
lar, discrete entity undergoes change, yet maintains its identity throughout the
process; the entity passes through distinguishable stages, and; a programme exists
in nature, social institutions or logic that determines the stages of development
and their progression (Cunha & da Cunha 2003). An illustration of lifecycle process theory is presented in Fig. 12.

![Lifecycle process theory diagram](image)

**Fig. 12. Lifecycle process theory (Van de Ven & Poole 1995, published by permission of Academy of Management).**

### 2.3.2 Emergent change and teleology process theory

**Emergent change**

Planned change dominated the theory and practice of change management from the 1950s until the early 1980s (Burnes 2004). While planned change has many followers, it also has a number of critics (see, e.g. Garvin 1994, Schein 1985). In place of Lewin’s models, organisations were called upon to adopt flexible cultures promoting innovation and entrepreneurship and that encourage bottom-up, continuous and co-operative change, also called emergent change.

The emergent approach to change emphasises that change should not be perceived as a series of linear events within a given period of time, but as a continuous, open-ended process of adoption to changing circumstances and conditions (Burnes 1996, 2004, Dawson 1994). The emergent approach stresses the unpredictable nature of change, and views it as a process that develops through the relationship of a multitude of variables within an organisation. Apart from being a method of changing organisational practices and structures, change is also perceived as a process of learning. (By 2005)

Emergent change occurs when people carry out routines and deal with contingencies, breakdowns, and opportunities in their everyday work. It consists of ongoing accommodation, adoptions, and alterations that often go unnoticed but
produce fundamental change, without a pre-determined intention to do so. (Weick 2000)

The uncertainty of both the external and internal environment makes the emergent approach more pertinent than the planned approach (Bamford & Forrester 2003). To cope with the complexity and uncertainty of the environment, it is suggested that organisations need to become open learning systems where strategy development and change emerges from the way a company as a whole acquires, interprets and processes information about the environment (Dunphy & Stace 1993). The approach stresses the promotion of an “extensive and in-depth understanding of strategy, structure, systems, people, style and culture, and how these can function either as sources of inertia that can block change, or alternatively, as levers to encourage an effective change process” (Burnes 1996: 14).

Furthermore, Burnes (1996: 13) argues that “successful change is less dependent on detailed plans and projections than on reaching an understanding of the complexity of the issues concerned and identifying the range of available options”. It can, therefore, be suggested that the emergent approach to change is more concerned with change readiness and facilitating change than it is to provide specific pre-planned steps for each change project and initiative.

As the emergent approach to change is relatively new compared to the planned approach, it is argued that it still lacks coherence and a diversity of techniques (Bamford & Forrester 2003, Wilson 1992). Another criticism of the emergent approach is that it consists of a rather disparate group of models and approaches that tend to be more united in their scepticism towards the planned approach to change than on an agreed alternative (Bamford & Forrester 2003, Dawson 1994).

However, according to Burnes (1996) the general applicability and validity of the emergent approach to organisational change depends on whether or not one believes that all organisations operate in dynamic and unpredictable environments to which they constantly have to adapt. If so, Burnes (1996: 14) argues “the emergent model is suitable for all organisations, all situations and at all times”. According to Weick (2000, 238), seeing organisation as a structure may not reveal the value of emergent change as clear as when an organisation is seen as a process.
Weick (2000, 227) suggests that emergent change can be considered from the perspective of a teleology process. Teleology process theory represents the metaphor of purposeful co-operation. In this change type, an individual or a group of individuals or organisations who are sufficiently like-minded, act as a single collective, purposeful and adaptive entity to reach a goal. The way to reach an envisioned goal is not prefigured; instead, it is socially constructed during the process. Actions to reach the goal are taken, and the progress is monitored. The movement toward the goal can be observed: is it growing more complex or more integrated, or is it filling a necessary set of functions. In teleology process there is no prefigured rule, logically necessary direction or set sequence of stages, and it cannot be specified what kind of trajectory development of an organisational entity will follow. Instead, proponents of the theory focus on the prerequisites for attaining the goal: only certain functions and/or operations are defined for how to reach the goal. At its best this can only be a list of possible paths before relying on norms of decision rationality or action rationality. Development is seen as a repetitive sequence of goal formulation, implementation, evaluation and modification of goals based on what was learned or intended by the entity. Learning has an important role in the process: new goals are set on the basis of what was learned before.

The main process can be divided into several sub-processes. Development of each sub-process can be observed, and so what has been done and what has to be done can also be observed. Each sub-process can be restarted, independently of the other sub-processes. Teleological processes seek to diverge from the current order: it is a theory of dynamics. This kind of process inherently affords creativity because the entity, consisting of an individual or group, has the freedom to enact whatever goals it likes. Only the organisation’s environment and resources constrain what it can accomplish. This kind of change produces new action routines that may (or may not) create an original (re)formulation of the entity. It can produce highly novel features; the output is unpredictable because it is discontinuous with the past. Those undergoing such changes may experience a high degree of uncertainty and a need to make sense of changes. (Van de Ven & Poole 1995). A teleological type of change has three characteristics: it possesses a process of reflexive monitoring, it has explicit or implicit goals enacted through some visible mechanism, and there are some constraints that need to be respected in order to reach these goals (Cunha & da Cunha 2003). An illustration of lifecycle process theory is presented in Fig. 13.
According to Van de Ven (2007), lifecycle and teleology process theories are the most often used theories of development and change in the management literature. This is understandable because they both represent the change in one organisation, and when examining change in one organisation it is often easiest to study it through those theories. In addition, Van de Ven and Poole (1995) argue that most specific theories of organisational development and change are composites of two or more ideal-type motors. A summary of the lifecycle and teleology process theories is provided in Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Life-cycle</th>
<th>Teleology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Organic growth</td>
<td>Purposeful co-operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic</td>
<td>Imminent program</td>
<td>Envisioned end state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prefigured sequence</td>
<td>Social construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant adaptation</td>
<td>Equifinality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>In an entity from its initiation to its termination</td>
<td>A repetitive sequence of goal formulation, implementation, evaluation and modification of goals based on what was learned or intended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit of change</td>
<td>Single entity</td>
<td>Single entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of change</td>
<td>Prescribed</td>
<td>Constructive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A program, routine, rule or code exists in nature, social institutions or logic that determines the stages</td>
<td>The way to reach the goal constructs during the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End stage</td>
<td>Prefigured</td>
<td>A common end stage is socially constructed and cognitively shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requires a specific historical sequence of events</td>
<td>Goal is the final cause for guiding movement of an entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical</td>
<td>Unitary sequence which is cumulative and conjunctive</td>
<td>Development of an entity proceeds towards a goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event progression</td>
<td>Linear &amp; irreversible sequence of prescribed stages in unfolding of immanent potentials present at the beginning</td>
<td>Recurrent, discontinuous sequence of goal setting, implementation and adaptation of means to reach a desired goal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.3 The nature of corporate rebranding process

Few researchers have noted the possibility of studying a synthesis that incorporates both the debates on planned and emergent change (see, Cunha & da Cunha 2003, Beer & Nohria 2000) and lifecycle and teleology process theories (Van de Ven & Poole 1995). This chapter presents how I relate lifecycle and teleology process theory descriptions and the use of other process-related concepts in this study (see Fig. 14). I refer to process to mean the order of stages, sub-processes, events and actions that describes how things change over time.
Fig. 14. An illustration of the hierarchy of the process concepts used in this study.

Juntunen, Saraniemi, Halttu and Tähtinen (2010) suggested that corporate branding differs according to which stage of small business growth the company is in. According to the idea of small business growth, the growth develops through several stages (see, for example, Churchill & Lewis 1983) and moving from one stage to the other requires change (Scott & Bruce 1987). These ideas follow lifecycle process theory, because it is suggested that the progression to the end stage, a large and hopefully successful company, develops through certain stages which must occur in a prescribed order because each piece sets the stage for the next. The stages are cumulative in nature, because characteristics acquired in earlier stages are retained in later stages (Van de Ven & Poole 1995). According to the Cambridge Dictionary Online, a stage is “a part of an activity or a period of development”. I assume that in general, in a corporate rebranding process there are two main stages: the first one is the stage when the old corporate name is in use
and the new one is considered and decided, and the second one is the stage in which the new corporate name is adopted for use.

I see that each stage can be divided in several sub-processes. In corporate rebranding, these are renaming, redesigning, launching and evaluating. I assume that each corporate rebranding sub-process is part of a lifecycle in the sense that the events are executed cumulatively in a company in certain order depending on the context or company.

Each sub-process consists of events. By an event, I refer to several interrelated actions. For example, in the corporate renaming process events include inventing a new name and creating selection criteria for a new name. Kollmann and Suckow (2007) found that in developing a company name, companies go through certain events but the events need not happen in all companies in the same order. I therefore assume that each corporate rebranding sub-process is part of a lifecycle in the sense that the events are executed cumulatively in a company in certain order depending on the context or company.

Each event consists of several individual but interrelated actions. An ‘action’ is, for example, a decision made by a person or an email sent by someone. Following the logic of teleology process theory, I see that for attaining the goal of each event (whatever it is) is not prefigured. Only certain actions are defined for how to reach the goal of the event. Development of the event can be seen as a repetitive sequence of goal formulation, implementation, evaluation and modification of goals based on what was learned or intended by the entity in the actions. These actions neither have to happen in specific order nor be cumulative in nature. In so doing, I see that each event consists of a teleology process of actions.

### 2.4 The theoretical processual framework for corporate rebranding in small companies

The previous chapters have presented several perspectives on corporate branding, corporate rebranding and organisational change in order to better understand quite a new and fragmented research field of corporate branding and its special case of corporate rebranding from process perspective in particular. The purpose of the chapters has been to define and clarify the complex nature of corporate rebranding in order to create a more profound understanding of it.

This chapter presents a summary of the discussions above in the form of a theoretical processual framework for the study. The framework consists of context-related characteristics that may influence the process and the reasons for cor-
porate rebranding, sub-processes of corporate rebranding, and the outputs of the
corporate rebranding (see Fig. 15).

Fig. 15. The theoretical processual framework for corporate rebranding.

The following chapters summarise the main elements of the framework by con-
centrating first on the context-related characteristics influencing and reasons for
corporate rebranding, thereafter sub-processes of corporate rebranding, and fi-
ally, on the outputs of corporate rebranding.

2.4.1 Context-related characteristics influencing and reasons for
corporate rebranding

I provided the proposition of context-related characteristics influencing corporate
rebranding in chapter 2.1.4 on the basis of the special characteristics of branding
both in small business context, B2B business, and in software companies. These are summarised in Fig. 16.

**Characteristics of branding in small companies**
- Corporate branding begins before the company is even established
- The role of the entrepreneur is emphasised; (s)he is the personification of the corporate brand
- Responsibility of brand management lies at the management level
- The owner/director/manager, market in which the company operates, the company structure, type of the products, market orientation of the company, and competitors have an influence on the role of brand management

**Characteristics of B2B branding**
- Corporate brands are important
- Brand is a promise and a totality of perceptions
- B2B brand reaches all the stakeholders

**Characteristics of branding in software companies**
- No distinction between software product branding and software corporate branding.
- Companies take care of the visual image and material production themselves.
- Challenging to get personnel to maintain a consistent line in communication.
- The decision making related to branding is conducted by few managers; the personnel are not involved.
- The company name is often the product line’s “family name”
- The individual products are named by combining the company name with a product-specific extension.

Fig. 16. Context-related characteristics influencing corporate rebranding process.

The reasons for corporate rebranding were reviewed in chapter 2.2.2. The reasons were categorised into two groups; reasons for name change and reasons for logo change and are summarised in Fig. 17.
Fig. 17. Reasons for corporate rebranding.

In the theoretical processual framework for corporate rebranding in small companies, I assume that both context-related factors and reasons for corporate rebranding may influence sub-processes of corporate rebranding, which I will summarise next.

2.4.2 Sub-processes of corporate rebranding

This section summarises the theoretical discussions from the perspective of corporate rebranding sub-processes. I see the process as the nature, sequence, and order of events and activities that unfold over time (Van de Ven 1992, 170), and in corporate rebranding I concentrate on changing the corporate name or aesthetics (changing the logo, colours and fonts). I treat corporate rebranding as consisting of four sub-processes: Renaming, Redesigning, Launching, and Evaluating. In the next chapter I will first present corporate rebranding stages and sub-processes in general and then continue with a review of the events and actors in each corporate rebranding sub-process.

Corporate rebranding stages and sub-processes

Based on the literature, I see that corporate branding can be divided into two periods: the first, when corporate branding is conducted with the original corporate name, and the second, when corporate branding is conducted with the new corpo-
rate name. Following this logic, I assume that in general, sub-processes of corporate rebranding can also be divided into two main periods; the first, in the period when the old corporate name is in use, and the second, in the period when the new corporate name is in use. Here I call the first period Stage 1 and the second Stage 2 (see, Fig. 18).

**Fig. 18. Corporate rebranding stages and sub-processes.**

I assume that the order of stages follows the logic of a planned change process in that the two stages need to happen in certain order (Van de Ven & Poole 1995) and in so doing, are cumulative in nature. In other words, Stage 2 cannot exist before Stage 1, because in Stage 2 the question is about the *new* name, and in Stage 1 about the *old* name. Their characteristics enable the stages to be described by lifecycle process theory (Van de Ven & Poole 1995).

Based on the theoretical view, I see corporate rebranding as consisting of four sub-processes; *Renaming, Redesigning, Launching,* and *Evaluating.* I assume that *Renaming* and *Redesigning* need to be conducted during the time when the old corporate name is still in use, that is, during Stage 1, because a new name must surely be created before it can be launched or evaluated. In addition, I assume that *Redesigning* is also conducted before *Launching* because the new logo is created for the company before *Launching.* After the new name and logo are created, it is possible to move on to the Stage 2, the stage of the new corporate name. During this stage, *Launching* of the new corporate name is conducted. Because *Evaluating* concentrates on examining the customer view about the changes (e.g. Kaikati 2003) or evaluating the process (e.g. Daly & Moloney 2004), it seems natural that *Evaluating* is done at the end of the process, for example, after *Launching* the new name. I therefore assume that, at least for the most part, *Renaming, Redesigning, Launching* and *Evaluating* are consecutive processes and in so doing, rep-
resent planned change and can therefore be described with lifecycle process theory.

**Events and actors in sub-processes**

In the theoretical background I provide a more detailed description of the events of each of these four sub-processes and the actors involved in them, and have summarised them in Table 11. *Renaming* is as consisting of six main events; *Communicating the new identity of the company internally*; *Inventing a new name*; *Evaluating the names*; *Creating selection criteria for a new name*; *Selecting a new name*; and *Registering a new name*. Again, I assume that these need to be executed in a certain order, but, as the study of Kollmann and Suckow (2007) revealed, the order may vary. In so doing, I assume that *Renaming* mainly follows the logic of lifecycle process theory. It may however also have elements of teleology process theory, because the events do not need to be executed in a certain order, there is no predefined roadmap of how these events are to progress, and not all the events are cumulative in nature.

The existing research on corporate branding or corporate rebranding reveals five events under *Redesigning*: *Examining the present corporate logo*, *Creating a working brief*, *Analysing the firm’s brand values and strategy direction*, *Choosing logo structure*, and *Creating a logo/symbol, colour palette and font type*. Similarly to *Renaming*, I assume that these need to be executed in a certain order, but the order may vary.

*Launching* includes two aspects; *internal launching* and *external launching*. Several researchers suggest that external launching cannot be executed before internal launching, so I would infer that those aspects are also part of a lifecycle. More specifically, external launching is seen as consisting of several aspects. *Evaluating* includes two perspectives, *evaluating the new name* and *evaluating the process*. No research suggest order for these.
Table 11. Summary of events and actors in corporate rebranding sub-processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-process</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renaming</td>
<td>Communicating the new identity</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inventing a new name</td>
<td>Corporate identity consultants, marketing communications office, staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating selection criteria for a new name</td>
<td>Branding consultancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluating the potential name(s)</td>
<td>Executive committee, the board of directors, shareholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selecting a new name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registering the new name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesigning</td>
<td>Examining the present corporate logo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating a working brief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysing the firm’s brand values and strategy direction</td>
<td>A company and brand consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choosing logo structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating a logo/symbol, colour palette and font type</td>
<td>Branding consultancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launching</td>
<td>Launching internally</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introducing the new name internally to the employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Launching externally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-campaign situation analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informing the public about acquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interim/dual branding campaign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-launch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Launch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>Evaluating the new name</td>
<td>Customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluating the process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.3 Outputs of corporate rebranding

For revealing the outputs of corporate rebranding I created, classification categories (see this chapter, especially Table 13) which will help in analysing changes in the corporate name and the logo as an output of corporate rebranding. Additionally, this will help in revealing the corporate rebranding type.

The outputs of corporate rebranding can be examined through consideration of the changes that occur during the sub-processes of corporate rebranding from Stage 1 to Stage 2, in terms of both the corporate name and the logo. The type of name change can be revealed by initial examination of the corporate name types in Stage 1 and then in Stage 2, and on the basis of these, defining the corporate name change type. The types of logo change can be revealed by initial examination of changes in the logo elements, that is, examination of how each element in a new logo has changed compared to the previous logo. On the basis of this, the type of the logo change can be defined. The end result is to reveal the corporate rebranding type (see, Fig. 19).

Fig. 19. Processes for revealing the corporate rebranding type.

The examination of corporate name types is based on examining the old corporate name and the new corporate name type based on the categorisations that are in turn based on the theoretical background (see Table 12). The theoretical viewpoints suggested six different corporate name types: descriptive, geographic, patronymic, acronymic, associative and freestanding.

Examining corporate name types
Defining corporate name change types

Examining change in the logo elements
Defining the logo change type

Revealing the corporate rebranding type
Table 12. Corporate name types and their descriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Describes the product or service for which the company is designed or Infer what the corporation does (industry-related attributes) or what it stands for (business values/culture attributes). May describe the organisations’ activity, but never depict a feature of the corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic</td>
<td>Refers to locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patronymic</td>
<td>Person based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronymic</td>
<td>Consists of letters Is often an abbreviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associative</td>
<td>Evokes associations implicitly or explicitly with product features or a set of corporate values. Refers to the company's way of doing business or its business culture, often representing what the company stands for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freestanding</td>
<td>Has no link with the product or service that it refers to but might have a meaning of its own, or by being an abstract name, it may have no intrinsic meaning at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examination of the types of the old and the new corporate name operates as a basis for defining corporate name change types. Based on the theoretical background, I created three categories for corporate name change types: minor change, brand adaptation, and complete change (see Table 13).

Table 13. Name change, logo change and corporate rebranding types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of change</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name change</td>
<td>Reinventing Adding or deleting something to the name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>types</td>
<td>Brand adoption Taking a name of the company’s well-recognised brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makeover No link to the previous name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change types of</td>
<td>No change The element remains exactly the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logo elements</td>
<td>Minor change A minor change in the element by adding or deleting something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete change No link to the previous version of the element/logo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logo change</td>
<td>Refreshing Some or many, but not all, of the elements in the logo are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>types</td>
<td>Changed in either completely or minor way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renewal All the elements in the logo are changed completely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>Minor change Both corporate name and logo changes are minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rebranding types</td>
<td>Intermediate change Minor or intermediate name change and complete logo change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete change Both name change and logo change are complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Logo/element change types also have three categories: no change, minor change, or complete change. Logo change is based on the changes in the elements in the logo: layout, typography, text, and colours.

Comparison of both the name change type and the logo change type will result in revealing the total corporate rebranding change type, which consists of three categories too: minor change, intermediate change, and complete change. In minor change, some of the logo elements are changed but the corporate name remains the same. In intermediate change, name change represents either minor change or brand adaptation, and the logo is updated with the new name, while other elements remain the same. In complete change, both the name and the logo are changed completely.
3 **Empirical research design**

The research question of the study, “How can corporate rebranding in small companies be described in terms of processes?” guided my empirical research design. In this section, I first outline how I came to select my research approach, and continue by defining the case and research setting. The section continues by detailing the data collection for the empirical study, and finally concludes with a description of the data analysis.

### 3.1 Choosing the research approach

New phenomena are often studied by way of case studies (Yin 2003) because the latter can be particularly effective in providing new insights into a phenomenon of which very little is known (Eisenhardt 1989). This also has a relatively long history within business research and in the discipline of marketing. Therefore, noting the ontological and epistemological positioning of the study, I rely on a qualitative case study approach (Stake 2005, Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008) in my research design.

The research question of the study involves the examination of corporate rebranding as a process. Buchanan and Dawson (2007) call for case studies that combine elements of a narrative approach with processual/contextual analysis in the field of organisational change. For research design and the development of theory, this perspective has implications beyond existing processual perspectives. These often identify competing narratives, but seek to either report or reconcile them.

In order to understand this research phenomenon, corporate rebranding, in detail, I chose to use an instrumental case study (Stake 2005). In an instrumental case study, the case is seen as an instrument in understanding something else. Therefore, rather than attempting to understand a unique intensive or intrinsic case from the inside and providing a thick, holistic and contextualised description (Stake 2005, Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008) of it, I examine this phenomenon in all the cases in detail and aim to understand the process of how the phenomenon is executed.

A multiple case study can be seen as an instrumental case study extended to several cases (Stake 2005). I chose a multiple case study over a single case study because the current theory of corporate rebranding in general and in small business in particular, has gaps that demand elaboration. In addition, each case may
add something new to the understanding the phenomenon (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008: 122). By choosing some cases that are similar and some that are different, it is possible to provide theoretically interesting comparisons (see, Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008: 122). It is also suggested that in studying a process it is important to go beyond the explanation of a single case (Poole et al. 2000: 12). According to Poole et al. (2000: 12), a process study aims to find a general narrative that offers a common explanation for a range of cases, and finding such a general narrative requires matching specific cases to the general pattern.

Narrative, when used in the context of social sciences, refers to a research approach that has its ontological and epistemological roots in social constructivism (Berger and Luckmann, 1967) and does not usually consider itself as a process research. A narrative is a textual actualisation of a story that is usually told by someone (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008: 211–212, Elliot 2005) and includes the entire sequence of events from the beginning to the end. In this study, I gathered stories from the interviewees by using narrative interviews, and provided narratives on those stories. Explanation in process theories relies on the narrative that explains what led to what: the reasons that influenced the case, the order in which they occurred and how long they operated (Poole et al. 2000, 12–13), and what actors were involved (Pentland 1999). In addition, they conclude with results or an evaluation of outputs (Buchanan & Dawson 2007). Consequently, narratives give a sense of the whole, the “big picture” that lends significance to individual events. This is why the narrative approach can be considered as a “process approach”.

Narrative research has deep roots in anthropology and sociology, but this approach is fairly recent in organisational studies (Gabriel 2000). This might be because many business researchers find it difficult to comprehend the practical implications of the narrative results, even though it offers potential to go beyond the more traditional choices (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008: 7, 211). As Czarniawska-Joerges (1998) points out, narrative forms of reporting will enrich organisation studies by complementing, illustrating and scrutinising logical scientific forms of reporting. Therefore, instead of presenting the results of this study in a narrative form alone (see, e.g. chapter 4.2), I also decided to illustrate events, actions and actors in more detail by relying on more traditional ways of case study reporting. In this study, this means that I illustrated the contents of the narrative in detail by using figures, and supported these findings with direct quotations from the empirical data (e.g. chapter 4.3).
3.2 Defining a case and the research setting

Eriksson and Kovalainen (2008) suggest that the boundaries of the case should be identifiable in one way or another, and the researcher should pay particular attention to the criteria used in defining the boundaries of the case. Yin (2002) warns about choosing topics in which the beginning and the end of the case cannot be defined. So, I began my research by defining my case as being a process of corporate name change (Muzellec et al. 2003) which begins with noticing the reasons for the decision to change the company name (Muzellec & Lambkin 2006), ends when the new name is evaluated after its launching (Kaikati 2003), and also includes aesthetics change (Muzellec & Lambkin 2006).

As Eriksson and Kovalainen (2008) suggest, a researcher makes the case by carrying out the research, and in so doing, defines the boundaries of the case. I chose the interviewees being the most knowledgeable persons, i.e. those that had been personally involved in the corporate rebranding conducted in the companies. During the first interview, I revealed that in the first case, the need for the new name had originally arisen before the company was even established, and that they had tried to change the corporate name before the name change I was examining. In addition, they had changed the logo, fonts, and colour palette separately from the company name change. Accordingly, I realised that to understand the case in its entirety, I would have to redefine it. At this time, I specified my case definition by adding the concept that the total process of corporate rebranding consists of several different cycles of attempts to change the corporate name and the logo. With this addition in mind, I was able to form clarification questions on the changes, in case the interviewee did not spontaneously talk about them.

Because my only criterion for the case was that it was about corporate name change, I needed additional criteria for defining a research setting, such as companies capable of providing a case worth studying (see Table 14).
Table 14. The selection criteria for the companies in which the cases are conducted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The selection criteria for the company in which the case is conducted</th>
<th>Explanation/justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company that has implemented name change</td>
<td>Corporate rebranding is “the practice of building anew a name representative of a differentiated position in the mind frame of stakeholders and a distinctive identity from competitors”.  (Muzellec et al. 2003, 32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Company that is currently changing its name                         | Process is best revealed before the outcome is known (Poole et al. 2000)  
“It is even better to undertake real-time study of strategic change processes as they unfold in their natural field settings.” (Van de Ven 1992: 181) |
| Company is small sized                                              | Most of the corporate branding studies concern large multinationals (Ahonen 2008b)  
Branding is important in small companies as well (Krake 2005, Abimbola 2001) |
| Company operates in B2B markets                                     | Most often corporate branding studies concentrate on companies in the consumer business area (Ahonen 2008b)  
Corporate brands are particularly important in B2B sectors (Aspara & Tikkanen 2008) |
| Company operates in software business                              | Companies in the industry often suffer from a problem that their products are known but their company name is not so well-known among the stakeholders (Ojasalo et al. 2008) |

First, because Van de Ven (1992) and Poole et al. (2000) suggest that change is best revealed before the outcome is known, the first criterion for the company was that it was currently changing its name or about to change its name. Second, as most of the corporate rebranding studies are conducted among large companies (Ahonen 2008b) despite the suggestion that branding is also important in small companies (Abimbola 2001, Krake 2005), the case needed to be drawn from small sized company. Third, a great number of empirical studies on corporate branding are conducted among companies operating in the consumer business instead of those operating in B2B markets (Ahonen 2008b). Because corporate brands are important also in the B2B sector (Aspara & Tikkanen 2008), the company needed to operate in B2B markets. Fourth, Ojasalo et al. (2008) suggest that branding should be further studied in software businesses, which offer an interesting research context because small companies in the industry often suffer from a problem that their products are known but their company name is not so well-
known among the stakeholders. Due to those findings, the case had to be set in the software business.

In a multiple case study, the individual cases are chosen because it is believed that analysis of them will lead to enhanced understanding of a wider phenomenon and perhaps better theorising (Stake 2005). To ensure theoretically interesting comparisons (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008: 122), I provided, on the basis of the previous literature, two criteria to determine how the cases needed to be different; first, I wanted to find a case of corporate rebranding, and second, I wanted to find a case of business unit rebranding. As presented in chapter 2.2.1, rebranding can happen at different organisational levels, that is, product, business unit, or corporate levels. According to Muzellec & Lambkin (2006), both business unit rebranding and corporate rebranding concern corporate level rebranding. Consequently, I assume that they provide different aspects of corporate level rebranding.

Several candidates met many of the criteria presented above. For example, I found several small companies that operated in B2B markets in the software industry and which had already changed their names. However, the challenge was to find a company or a business unit that was currently changing or about to change its name. Accordingly, I found a corporate rebranding case (Case 1) in summer 2007 and a business unit case (Case 2) in summer 2008. After that, I found some other cases as well, but decided to exclude them from the study. In a multiple case study, each case can incrementally increase the ability of the researcher to generalise the findings; however, Eisenhardt (1989) suggests limiting the number of cases to the point where the incremental contribution of extra cases is only marginal. The new potential cases were quite similar to Case 1, and therefore, I concluded that they were unable to offer the new theoretically interesting comparisons that I was searching for. I still followed Eisenhardt (1989), who suggests retaining the flexibility to add more cases if necessary. Additionally, at the beginning of 2009, I found a corporate rebranding case (Case 3) which I thought differed from Case 1. In other words, in Case 1, the corporate name change was executed once, as opposed to twice in Case 3. Therefore, I decided to include the latter in the study. At this point, as I already had three cases that offered different and interesting aspects of the phenomenon, I chose to not include any new ones.

3.3 Collecting the data

Because my aim was to develop a theory and find theoretically interesting comparisons, I tried to collect similar kinds of empirical data on each case (Eriksson
In Case 1, the corporate name change was executed in autumn 2007 (see Fig. 20). Therefore, I collected the data (including the basis of the empirical pre-understanding, as will be described later) between August 2007 and April 2010. In Case 2, the business unit name was changed at the end of 2007. During the period the business unit existed, plans were made for spinning off from the mother company. These included plans for changing the business unit name. From Case 2, I collected the data between August 2008 and March 2009. In Case 3, the first corporate name change was executed in January 2001 and the second one in March 2009. From this case, I collected the data between March 2009 and May 2010.

Van de Ven (1992) suggests that it is first often necessary to obtain baseline information and develop a retrospective case history of the context and events leading up to the present venture that is being investigated. I improved my understanding of the case history by examining, for example, internet sites and industry magazines, as well as conducting three pre-interviews. One interview was conducted in each case, with the people who were actively carrying out the change process in the case (see Table 15). I gathered preliminary data during the time the case possessed its original name. I also gained business cards and some company documents, in addition to other materials, from the interviewees. In addition, I
was able to discuss the second and third cases with researchers and with some other people that had knowledge of these cases from their previous work with them. All this gave me an initial understanding of the subject and the cases, including, for example, the basic information about the business, size and products of the companies, and reasons behind their decisions to change their names.

Table 15. The data for creating empirical pre-understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Data gathering methods and sources for creating preliminary understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case 1</td>
<td>Pre-interview, internet sites, company documents, news about the company (both on the internet and in newspapers), business cards, memos, industry-related magazines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2</td>
<td>Pre-interview, internet sites, business cards, industry-related magazines, discussion with two researchers and one other person who knew the company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 3</td>
<td>Pre-interview, internet sites, company documents, business cards, industry-related magazines, discussions with two other persons that knew the company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the historical baseline is being developed, real-time study can commence using a variety of data collection methods (Van de Ven 1992). In a case study, the empirical research data can be either primary, such as that produced for the research project in question (e.g. via interviews, surveys, protocols, instructed stories or diaries, or via direct or participant observation) or secondary, such as that gathered from existing sources (e.g. documents, archival records, media texts, diaries, digital materials, physical artefacts, images, e-mails). Each source of empirical data has its own characteristics, strengths and weaknesses. The case studies are considered more accurate, convincing, diverse and rich if they are based on several types of empirical data, and crosschecking data from multiple sources provides a more reliable and multidimensional image of the phenomenon (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008.)

In Cases 1 and 3, I extended the data collection to include narrative interviews (see Table 16.) after the name change was completed. At the time of the interview, the manager of Case 2 was still considering the potential forthcoming name change. Indeed, as I have mentioned earlier, Case 2 did not change its name during the study, but because it had already changed its name before, I gathered the data from that name change in addition to their plans for the second name change.
Table 16. Primary data gathering in the cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Data gathering method</th>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>A number of (transcribed) pages</th>
<th>A number of memo pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case 1</td>
<td>Preliminary interviews by phone</td>
<td>A board member</td>
<td>10/2007</td>
<td>Ca. 20 min</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative interviews</td>
<td>A board member</td>
<td>28.2.2008</td>
<td>1:33:02</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A customer relationship</td>
<td>A customer relationship manager</td>
<td>18.8.2008</td>
<td>0:53:02</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A managing director A</td>
<td>A managing director A</td>
<td>16.6.2008</td>
<td>0:49:05</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A managing director A3</td>
<td>A managing director A3</td>
<td>10.7.2008</td>
<td>1:10:48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email interviews</td>
<td>A board member</td>
<td>27.11.2007-28.1.2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specifying interviews</td>
<td>A board member</td>
<td>27.10.2008</td>
<td>Ca. 20 min</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A managing director B</td>
<td>A managing director B</td>
<td>9.3.2009</td>
<td>Ca. 15 min</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email discussions</td>
<td>A managing director B</td>
<td>26.4.2010</td>
<td>Ca. 20 min</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: ca. 55min</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2</td>
<td>Pre-interview (email)</td>
<td>A managing director B</td>
<td>15.10.2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative interview</td>
<td>A managing director B</td>
<td>17.10.2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email discussions</td>
<td>A managing director B</td>
<td>29.10.2008</td>
<td>0:51:49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specifying interview</td>
<td>A managing director B</td>
<td>9.3.2009</td>
<td>Ca. 15 min</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 3</td>
<td>Preliminary interview</td>
<td>A managing director C</td>
<td>7.7.2009</td>
<td>Ca. 1h 30 min</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative interview</td>
<td>A managing director C</td>
<td>25.8.2009</td>
<td>1:11:54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email interview</td>
<td>A project coordinator</td>
<td>5.10.2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td>A managing director C</td>
<td>21.5.2010</td>
<td>Ca. 20 min</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to answer the research question based on my ontological view, I chose the most important primary data gathering method as being narrative interviews. In such interviews, I asked each of the interviewees to tell their own story of how corporate name change was conducted in their company. I started with corporate name change, because I assumed that asking about corporate rebranding might have caused problems in comprehension. In this type of interview, there are no prior hypotheses or propositions to be tested, and the participants – if both the interviewer and the interviewee are conversational – are encouraged to talk openly. In other words, they are encouraged to narrate their story from their own point of view and with their own words and ways of expression (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008: 216–217). In other words, I did not have any specific questions to ask; I only had a rough guide about the subjects that were theoretically related to the corporate rebranding (interviewee’s background, corporate name change - why, how, who, when, with what results -, logo change, launching, evaluating). If an interviewee did not spontaneously reveal something that belonged to the theoretical framework of corporate rebranding, I asked them to talk about those subjects as well. Asking the interviewee to narrate his own story involves paying attention to not only the anecdotes that people spontaneously recount in interview situations, but also to the role of the interviewer as an activator of narrative production (Elliot 2005: 28–35). In the interviews, I followed the rules of everyday communication, but moderated them with active listening, or in some interviews, by active story sharing. For example, one interviewee wanted to know what kind of co-operation the masters’ students in marketing at our department could be involved in with the companies. Therefore, I explained the options to him. This encouraged him to reveal more details of his experiences in the company.

I found the appropriate informants for the study with the help of the snowball method. In each case, an important person who was actively carrying out the name change process was the first informant. In the first case this was a board member, and in the second and the third cases, a managing director. I interviewed them and asked them to identify the other people actively carrying out the corporate name change. Accordingly, in the first case, three other persons were identified: a current managing director (later: managing director A3), a former managing director (managing director A1) and an employee (customer relationship manager). I interviewed them all, and again requested information from them regarding who else was actively involved in carrying out the process. All of them indicated the names of the three former persons. In addition, three of the interviewees suggested that it would also be important to interview new shareholder who had
just joined the business. Therefore, I interviewed him as well. Four of the interviewees indicated that a graphic designer had also been an important person in the redesigning process and that the second managing director (later: managing director A2) had been an important person in the renaming process. Despite this, the interviewees thought it inappropriate for me to interview them because they had already left the company. In addition, even though the customers and financiers who had participated in name development were mentioned, the interviewees felt that it was inappropriate to interview them either. In the second and the third case, the prime informant was the managing director. However, in these cases, gathering rich narrative data for research purposes proved to be a problem. In each case, the director had been the sole person actively carrying out the corporate rebranding process. Therefore it was challenging to persuade them to talk about their past actions, such as their invention of a new name on their own. If there had been other people actively participating in the process, everyone involved in the case could have told what they had done. Despite my asking several specific questions, such as, “Can you describe that in more detail?” or “What happened before that/next?”, they were unable to provide additional details on what they had done. Each of them named another person who had been planning the business at the time that the company/business unit was about to be established, but neither of those were actively involved in the company at the time of the interview. Accordingly, each of the managing directors felt that it would be inappropriate to interview them. Therefore, I had a total of seven narrative interviewees: five from the first case, one from the second case and one from the third case. I audio-recorded all the interviews and then transcribed them, with the result that more than seven and half hours of audio was transcribed into 146 pages of text.

During the interviews, I kept my own memos about the issues being discussed, how the interviewees were reacting and details on any additional information they donated (e.g. pictures of their software solutions), resulting in 17 pages of specific information (for an example of hand-written memos, see Appendix 5). During the interviews regarding the first case, I was also able to make some observations, as suggested, for example, by Van de Ven (1992). This resulted in three pages of my own memos, unfortunately compiled after the fact. After the interviews, I was able to ask specific questions via email; I also had five specific interviews: three with one interviewee from the first case, and one each with an interviewee from the second and third cases.

During and after the interviews, the interviewees gave me a large amount of additional material, including secondary data: internal documents, communica-
tions material and other material, such as articles published in the newspaper and videos (see Table 17; examples in Appendices 6 and 7). I stored the material carefully; the electronic data was stored as carefully organised files in the computer as well as in print form in a folder. This folder was where I stored all the other written material, case by case. I also documented my research process by maintaining a diary of what I had done and when, and how my own learning had developed. These are not included in the study and may be explicitly visible through the study, but they all have had their influence.

Table 17. Secondary data from the cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Type of secondary data</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case 1</td>
<td>Internal documents</td>
<td>Memos from meetings, examples of the original logo, examples of proposals for the original logo, examples of possible new colour palettes and fonts in the logos, examples of proposals for new logos, examples of proposals for product logos, lists of the names that were considered for the new names for the company, examples of slogans, e-mails, PowerPoint presentations, internal documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications material</td>
<td>Business cards, brochures, press releases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other material</td>
<td>Articles published in the newspaper, articles published in the internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2</td>
<td>Internal documents</td>
<td>Examples of the original logo, examples of possible new colour palettes and fonts in the logos, examples of proposals for new logos, examples of old logos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications material</td>
<td>Business cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other material</td>
<td>Articles published in the internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 3</td>
<td>Internal documents</td>
<td>Examples of the Internet sites from 2006 and 2007, documents about products, examples of old logos, examples of e-mails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications material</td>
<td>Business cards, envelopes, brochures, DVD-covers, videos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Altogether, keeping the small business context in mind, I believe I was able to provide rich data about my phenomenon from Case 1, and that the data was rich enough in Cases 2 and 3. In other words, the relatively small amount of interviews provided an enormous sample of different kinds of change events (e.g. Poole et al. 2000: 14), and this was supported by a large amount of secondary data.
3.4 Analysing the data

As Yin (2003) describes, analysing the qualitative data is about examining, categorising, tabulating and recombining the empirical evidence in order to generate answers to research questions. According to Eriksson and Kovalainen (2008: 217), the purpose, goals and research questions guide the decision of choosing the most feasible analysis type, and sometimes a researcher needs to adapt and refine specific methods and techniques to suit the goal of the study. Because my data consisted of both the interviews and secondary written material, and my purpose was to provide both a process description and its results, I used two approaches in data handling: narrative analysis and content analysis.

When using narrative analysis in process research, the purpose is to organise and interpret the empirical data that describe events and actions an organisation underwent as it changed. This analysis should be conducted in such a way that it constructs narratives that describe how these events and actions progressed over time. These narratives are then interpreted and discussed (Polkinghorne 1995, see also Poole et al. 2000: 5, 14, 19.)

I began by reading the interviews, e-mails, company documents and my memos several times in order to achieve a preliminary understanding of the phenomenon. I had two main questions in mind: first, whether the sub-processes of name changing, aesthetics changing, launching, and evaluating the result could be found, and second, what the order of events might be. I noticed that the phenomenon was not as straightforward as it appeared to be from the theoretical background; for example, in one of the companies, the name change appeared to last a long time, while simultaneously being felt to have failings. After achieving a rough preliminary understanding (for one example of preliminary understanding of the process, see, Appendix 8), I utilised QSR NVivo software for data storage and categorisation. I started by dividing the data from Case 1 into four rough categories, in other words, tree nodes, based on the theoretical background: name changing, aesthetics changing, launching, and evaluating of the result, so I used a direct approach to content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon 2005). From the interviews, the unit of analysis was the interviewees’ perception of these tree nodes, while from other documents, I searched for themes concerning each category.

After classifying the data into these categories, I started to examine the contents of each category in order to further classify the data in each category. When reading the data, I soon noticed that in some of the categories, I was able to utilise the theoretical sub-categories (e.g. in launching, which was theoretically divided
into internal and external launching and my data fitted into these categories). However, in some other categories, for example in corporate name change, I needed to create categories based on the data, that is to say, I relied on conventional content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon 2005) by allowing the sub-processes and their order to flow from the data. Here, I mainly focused on the meaning of the stories, that is, on the content of the interviews: what was being said (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008: 218, see also Riessman 2002, Elliot 2005). I noticed that different persons described the same sub-processes or their events differently. Therefore, I also relied on the other data, for example, by checking the dates of e-mails or company documents. Basically, I first noticed that corporate name change was not straightforward as there were three attempts to change it. Accordingly, I formed sub-categories, that is, tree nodes, from these three attempts, in chronological order and I continued by categorising the data into these categories. From this, I continued by trying to organise the data in each sub-category by chronological order. Again, I formed sub-categories (tree nodes) of events that I drew from the data, and classified individual actions under these categories.

This categorisation formed a basis for analysing the data. In order to understand the data from the organisational change perspective, which primarily concerns what people did and who was influenced by it, I created a table in which I compiled, when possible, the actions (what), who had done them, to whom, why, and with what results (see examples of Renaming in Appendices 9–11). Consequently, I searched for answers to whether the actions and events were executed top-down (i.e. planned change) or bottom-up (i.e. emergent change). I indicated in the table the events and the respective actions involved in them, and furthermore, what sub-process each event could be classified into. From this table, I also tried to understand the classified data from the process theory perspectives, for example, whether the order of the actions or events was predefined or constructed during the process, and whether the actions and events were cumulative or not in nature (e.g. Van de Ven & Poole 1995). Categorising the data from the two other cases was similar but more straightforward, because the data was not as rich as in the first case.

Until this, my analysis had almost only consisted of classification of the data into the above mentioned categories. Even though this had already provided interesting results, in my opinion, there was much more work to perform. Additionally, Poole et al. (2000: 19) suggest that once the pattern of events in a developmental process is found to exist, one can proceed with questions about the reasons for events, or their consequences, within the process pattern. Accordingly, I re-
categorised the data in order to understand the reasons behind each sub-process, event, or action, by creating free nodes of them.

To interpret the data I wrote narratives for each case; in Case 1, an individual narrative on each corporate rebranding sub-process, and in Case 2 and Case 3, one narrative for each that describes the entire corporate rebranding process.

After that, I changed my focus from the process to the definition of corporate brands and the outputs of the process. I first provided an analysis of how the interviewees defined corporate brands. This I did by classifying the data as free nodes to the categories that flow from the data.

Thereafter, I started to analyse the original and new names and logos (i.e. the aesthetics) of each case with content analysis, in order to reveal what elements had changed and what kind of change had occurred. In doing this, I relied primarily on written material, including brochures, business cards, envelopes, examples of proposals for the names and logos, internet sites, videos, and others, and supported this analysis with the interviews. This was a discussion with the theories in a particular way so that, for example, when I analysed the names, I tried to understand the types of the old and new names based on the classification provided in the theoretical background. I also tried to understand the type of the name change based on the theoretical categorisation of corporate rebranding and corporate name changing types. As a result, I created a table in which I justified my interpretations.

After I had created both the individual processes and their results, they needed to be combined to provide a wider understanding. Buchanan and Dawson (2007) indicate that in process research, where the narrative approach is used, the challenge lies in analysing components of data while also engaging in elements of conventional processual analysis, and then in providing a meta-analysis that provides a synthesis that is both polyvocal and coherent. I continued by first combining the processes of different cases, and thereafter by combining the empirical results and the theoretical background. This enabled me to create the empirically grounded framework for this study.
4 Case 1: Corporate rebranding - one name change

The research involved a case study consisting of three individual sets of data gathering, referred to as Case 1, Case 2 and Case 3. This chapter introduces the company in which Case 1 was executed in Section 4.1, and presents the subprocesses of corporate rebranding in Case 1: that is, **Renaming**, **Redesigning**, **Launching**, and **Evaluating**, in Section 4.2. The material is first presented in narrative form.

A narrative offers only one version of the truth, interpreted and told by somebody from a specific point of view, and it is, therefore, always possible to narrate the same events in a different way (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008: 223). Consequently, I continue after that by describing the events, actions and actors of each process in more detail in Section 4.3. Finally, at the end of the chapter, I discuss the results of corporate rebranding in Section 4.4.

4.1 Introducing the company in Case 1

I have chosen this case because it offers a “basic” example of corporate rebranding, in which the corporate name is changed only once.

4.1.1 Basic information about the company

Medanets Inc. is a company that offers wireless software solutions for hospitals. It is located in Kempele near Oulu, and employs five people.

Medanets was founded inside Innokas Medical Oy at the end of 2003, with the name WHealth. Innokas Medical is a rapidly growing Finnish company involved internationally in the design and manufacture of health care technology products. It employs more than 100 people. The headquarters of the company is located near Oulu, in Kempele.

A WILHO (Wireless Hospital) development project for the health care sector, funded by the Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation (Tekes) FinnWell programme, was undertaken in the Oulu region between 2004 and 2008. WILHO was recognised as a project that developed hospital processes and wireless technology. Innokas Medical participated in the project as the industrial operator and commercialiser of applications and operating models created by the research programme. Other organisations that participated in WILHO were Oulu
University Hospital, ODL Health, and the Centre for Wireless Communication research unit operating at the University of Oulu. The research consortium worked as a large work group in which they encouraged and benchmarked each other, and aimed at developing their business together. In Innokas Medical, there was a need to establish a new company, and resources were available. One mission of the consortium was to brainstorm ideas about what a new company would do. This led to the establishment of several research and product development projects.

As a result of this, WHealth Inc. was born and founded inside Innokas Medical. However, because the focus of the new company differed from the focus of the mother company, and there were not enough resources to keep it in the mother company, it was spun off by four people in December 2003. The company began its activities during the spring of 2004, with the managing director of Innokas Medical also being the managing director (referred to in this study as managing director A1) of the new company. The company was developed in order to combine the large amount of expertise in wireless technology in the Oulu area with the medical technology and medical equipment knowhow of Innokas Medical. There were two perspectives on what WHealth could do: first, from a technological perspective, the idea was to develop mobile technologies that could be used inside hospitals, because at that time the use of mobile phones inside hospitals was forbidden. The second perspective was to eliminate the wires connecting patients to different kinds of monitors, first in the intensive care unit and then in other departments. It was assumed that all the signals measured from a human being could be measured and entered wirelessly.

At the beginning, their work involved developing products in conjunction with a hospital, learning by doing together. At that time, the company participated in the research consortium mentioned before, and, through that, gained knowledge. After the beginning stage, a customer relationship manager from the company visited several hospital districts in order to sell their future solutions and consultations with doctors. Due to these visits and WHealth’s participation in the abovementioned research consortium, the company was well known among their important stakeholder groups. However, it faced some difficult problems. First, the whole wireless hospital concept proved to be so broad that it was difficult to develop the product. At that time, the company concentrated on consultancy and network planning, but because the technology was still in an embryonic phase, they were able to “sell only visions”. This resulted in the second problem: the future outputs, or visions, were hyped up in the newspapers and on the internet, as
part of a larger project, before any concrete results were gained. Customers wanted solutions to their current problems, and were therefore doubtful about the company. The customers did not believe in the company and considered it a company that only sold future visions, rather than anything concrete. Even though the articles resulted in increased awareness, the image of the company suffered. The third problem was that when the company participated in the research consortium, they conducted experiments which were free for their customers, because of the project. But, when they started to sell their product to customers through the visits of the customer relationship manager, no one wanted to buy anything because they were not prepared to pay for anything. In addition, through these visits, the customers noticed that the products were in their test phase, and this diminished their perception of the quality of the company’s product.

4.1.2 Original name and logo

Developing the original name of the company – before the company was even established – had been the work of those people who were about to establish the company. These included the manager and employees of the company, who arranged brainstorms and unofficial sauna-evenings with a small group of people.

The name for the new company, WHealth, came from the term “wireless hospital”. The W and H in WHealth were abbreviations of wireless hospital. Because the company concentrated on health care but only had a general vision and did not have a clear focus, they thought that the word “health” was suitable because it was a general word representing health, health care and welfare. They also thought that “wealth” could mean “welfare”. The letters W and H from the corporate name also appeared in the company logo (Fig. 21), which was developed in a DesignStart program by Tekes. In the logo, the name was written in the specific fonts whenever possible. The colour of the logo was blue because it was considered representative of the hospital environment.
However, before the company had even been established, it was noticed that the name was challenging to pronounce. A better name was not developed, as it was thought that the company could be established with one name, and the name could be changed later. Even though they did it this way, they recognised that a name change may not be good for the company. During the first years of the company’s existence, the name needed to be repeated several times, especially in Finland.

4.1.3 Software solution

The company offers wireless software solutions for hospitals (see, Fig. 22). Medanets Oy's product is a point-of-care recording system called Medanets ABS. The system enables nursing staff to record, save, and browse the results of patient measurements, for example blood pressure and oxygen saturation, with automatic data transfer via a Bluetooth bedside device using a lightweight personal digital assistant (PDA). The recording process uses radio frequency identification (RFID) tags which drive the user interface directly to the patient's needed input page. Recording modes are fully automatic, semi-automatic and manual. With fully automatic mode, the measurement device sends the result to the PDA and the user only needs to accept the value. With semi-automatic measurement, the result is provided according to the device used. Measurement data are transferred into the information system via a wireless network, and the information is immediately available to all system users.

Medanets ABS utilises the hospital's existing technology. In addition to patient monitors, the Medanets ABS system's components include a Medanets ABS server that controls the system and archives data, a wireless local area network (WLAN) transmitter/receiver connected to the patient monitor, standard WLAN base stations, and a nurse's terminal consisting of a PDA or laptop computer.
equipped with an RFID reader. RFID sensors are used to identify patients and measurement data. Alternatively, the system also supports the use of bar codes. Small Bluetooth-based devices are also supported.

![Diagram of system components]

**Fig. 22. Software solution in Case 1.**

The Medanets ABS system allows nurses to use their time more efficiently, as they no longer need to first record information on paper and then enter it into an electronic system. Time is freed for actual nursing work. As the number of recordings decreases, the possibilities of making errors also diminish. Because less time is spent doing routine tasks, the quality of nursing goes up and the nurses' work becomes more meaningful.

### 4.2 Narratives of corporate rebranding

This section describes, in a narrative form, how the sub-processes of corporate rebranding – **Renaming, Redesigning, Launching** and Evaluating – proceeded in the company. It is important to present this narrative, in order to understand what happened in the company before the process descriptions that are introduced in the next section.
4.2.1 Renaming

As already mentioned, at the beginning of the company story the managing director (A1) of the company was the same as in the mother company. In order to decrease the workload of the director and increase the company’s growth, a new managing director (A2) was chosen. He started in the company at the beginning of 2006. As some of the interviewees say, he was “a combination of an engineer and a business man” and had a strong vision that the meaning of WHhealth was to produce something conceptual and huge. WHhealth as a name described that kind of vision well.

The managing director A2 was, however, eager to change the company name. One reason for this was that connecting the company’s products with the company logo and name was considered difficult. Other reasons included those noticed before the company was established: the current name was difficult to write and pronounce; it had to be repeated several times; it was hard to remember and difficult to recall. He presented the idea of a name change to board members, with a list of “two A4s of possible names” which he had developed with personnel and stakeholders in consortium meetings. There were no criteria by which the new name would be chosen; the process started by thinking of what name would be nice or good and a lot of the work was done, for example, by ‘Google-ing’ the possible names. But, because he did not have any special name to suggest, the board members resisted the idea of changing the name. At that time, the focus and financing of the company were unclear. The developers of the name WHhealth also had strong feelings towards the name. At that time, the name was not changed, even though it was recognised that the company needed a new name.

When new people came onto the board in 2006 they thought that they needed to find a specific focus within the wider concept of the company and develop it, because the company was eager to grow. Continuing the existing approach of a wide and future-oriented business in this industry would have been risky. Accordingly, there was a huge divergence in the visions for the company between the managing director A2 and board members. One of the interviewees says: “Usually managing directors need to be strong persons that keep their own way and if it does not work, something needs to be done. And because they are such strong persons, it is easiest to change them.” In other words, this led to changing the managing director again.

Managing director A3 started in the company at the beginning of 2007. He was a “very specific and systematic thinking engineer with a university degree
from a world of large multinationals, and [he] started to navigate the product straight to that area in which the board defined it”. Hence, the focus of the company was changed; consultation was dropped and they started to concentrate on product solutions. New software, as well as focused product selling, was being planned. The company specialised in the design and implementation of internal wireless data networks for hospitals and the development and implementation of related wireless solutions, applying its knowhow to the Medical Devices Directive (MDD). As soon as the company managed to develop a product and concentrated on a narrower business focus, its products were considered more reliable and credible than ever before, and also the awareness of the company increased.

Besides reorganising the business, managing director A3 started to advocate the company change its name. The same reasons for a new name still existed: the current name was difficult and challenging to pronounce and write, and it had to be repeated several times; it was hard to remember and difficult to recall. As one of the interviewees says: “For example, two board members wrote it wrongly still in December, when I got emails from them.” But now there was a hurry to find a new name: the company was about to get some publicity. The plan was to profile the firm by its name, and a new name was needed.

Developing a new name began with brainstorming; as managing director A1 (who still stayed as one of the board members) describes, both inventing and developing the new name was “crazy madness among a small group of engineers”, where “ideas just bubble and they are just thrown into the air and every border is demolished”. Ideas for the name were also sent via email from one person to another, they were discussed, and brainstorming sessions were arranged where people considered the proposals. This resulted in a long list of different proposals for a name. Learning from the past, managing director A3 realised that it would be difficult for board members to choose from hundreds of names. Instead, choosing a name should be done in a way that first concentrates on one or two possible names which are then analysed. With this in mind, at the beginning of 2007, A3 suggested to board members a new name for the company. However, the board members did not agree unanimously with that name and therefore did not support the proposal. It was recognised that the goal was to change the name but it had to be done carefully. The name represented the company identity, and changing it may cause strong feelings.

After a new shareholder joined the company in autumn 2007, a brainstorming session for board members was held in order to find the focal targets for development, including strengthening entrepreneurship and marketing, and the impor-
tance of the company name and the development of the corporate brand. Board members and employees were involved in the process and actively searched for ideas for a new name and slogan. The company did not have a specific slogan but slogans were developed for different situations; sometimes somebody just invented something nice and wrote it and that was the slogan.

The basic idea behind developing the new name was that the company name would form a goal for the company, and should be as effective as possible for the employees, customers and shareholders. As one interviewee explains: “When you say that name aloud it tells or reminds what the company strives for, and what is the wholeness they want to do”. One of the interviewees had noticed that, “In general, the corporate names in medical business are awful, you cannot remember them, they haven’t thought at all how people remember the name. I do not know if anyone has paid attention to that.” The company wanted to avoid this. In addition, they wanted to find a name that would be totally free globally and not in use anywhere. In practice, this meant that Google should not return any hits for that name. This idea was also supported by the company lawyer, who suggested that Google was best for checking whether the name was available or not. In addition, they wanted the name of both the company and the product to be the same, because they thought that it would strengthen the brand and increase awareness. They already had an idea for the naming architecture; in other words, how to distinguish the product brand from the corporate brand. The basic idea was to use letters and numbers: “What seems to be a central challenge is that engineers love long abbreviations, and think that if a name of a gadget is four words we take the first letters from the words as an abbreviation and after that some numbers, with room for growth and representing serial numbers. It would be easy to say and at the same time mean a lot.”

The new name, Medanets, was not one which had been thought of in earlier rounds. It was invented by a board member and evaluated by managing director C and a board group. Medanets is an abbreviation of the words “Medical Data Networks”. Like the old name, the new name represents what the company does but also has an associative nature. The new name also describes the product of the company: they develop medical data networks inside and outside hospitals. The engineers got their product naming system as well: the product is called Medanets ABS. The old corporate name was replaced with the new one in the previously created logo. In addition, the name did not return any Google hits.

Reactions to the new name were tested locally among different stakeholders (for example among financiers) and globally (for example from six corporate
managers in the USA) by asking what they associated the new name with. Almost all associated the name with the medical industry, except one who thought it was a company operating in the media business.

Even though it was recognised that the process of finding a new name was not very systematic, managing director A1 says: “The process was more straightforward than development of the names and brands of WHealth and Innokas. But we had two members that came from large multinationals, and I think they had more experience about branding, at least they had followed how it happens, and therefore it was quite systematic and we quite fast chose the brand which we decided to develop further.”

4.2.2 Redesigning

From the beginning, the company’s personnel recognised that it was important to connect the future products of the company with the logo and corporate name. The need for a new logo came up during the summer of 2004 when personnel started to plan their products, attempting to see how the visual identity of the products would be similar to the company’s identity, and how the products would be connected to the company and the logo. However, it proved impossible to connect the products with the original logo. The company participated in the second DesignStart program by Tekes, and a marketing communications company was involved in developing a new logo, but no satisfactory solution was found.

Finally, the company decided to use a freelance graphic designer in logo design, and they got what they were looking for. In the new logo, small, green circles form an arc which represents the wireless data transmission (see Fig. 23 - but please not that at that time the text was “WHealth”). The previous blue colour was changed to green because it was the colour of the mother company, it represented a peaceful hospital environment, and it was considered a warmer colour than blue. A new font was chosen which was soft and “not too technical”, with the tails of the letters being soft. One criterion for the font was that it existed in MSWord software. The goal for the new visual identity was to present the company as a leader.
When the new name, Medanets, for the company was decided, the logo was updated with that name and text “Medical Data Networks” below it. However, the management board noticed that after the new logo was updated, the personnel thought it was a decision that could be changed again after only a week. For example, even the graphic designer was eager to change the font size of the text in the logo in different situations. There were people, however, who realised that a logo is the face of the company: “If you change some of a person’s face it is defaming towards that person, and, similarly if a text or a logo represents a company’s face then changing it is like a caricature of the company’s face. At least at the beginning it is better to be this strict and clear.”

4.2.3 Launching

During its existence, the company had discussed the forthcoming name change with its stakeholders, so they were aware that one day the company would change its name. Officially, Launching the new name happened fast and top-down. The new name was first presented by a board member to other board members in the middle of October 2007. The name was accepted, and the only criticism presented in the meeting was why the board member did not present any other options for a new name. After two weeks, managing director A3 informed, via email, the personnel of the company and the people in the mother company that the new name would be registered. A week after that, the chairman of the board sent an email in which he told everyone to use the new name from now on. Again, a few weeks later, at the end of November 2007, the name appeared on the Internet sites of the company and a press release about the name change was released. Customers and
other partners were informed via email, saying the reason for the name change was to make the name easier to pronounce.

The company wanted to make its name well known. It mentioned the name in press releases and in all communications material. An alterable, guiding communications plan was developed. An outline for the brochures was developed based on the comments and ideas gained from customers. The basis for the brochures was that they need not be technical even though the product was technological. In addition, they asked a local and a national newspaper to publish a wider article about the theme, but the name of the company was not mentioned in the articles.

4.2.4 Evaluating

At the beginning, there was resistance to, and doubt about, the new name, both inside and outside the company. Some of the creators of the name were still not satisfied with it. According to them, the name could have been shorter and more succinct, and it did not reflect the vision but rather the industry or products. One of the interviewees said that the name makes the company sound as if it would be a network supplier which constructs physical networks, and therefore it does not exactly reflect what the company does. However, the name was considered the best and “the only one which is suitable from the proposed names”. Moreover, they had no ideas for a better name even though one of the interviewees was “sure that there would be a better name but we have not invented it yet.” There was also some criticism of whether the name was a little bit “hard” and technologically oriented, and that this may be a weakness. On the other hand, even though the company provided hard technology, the name was used in a soft way with “a sweet and soft slogan” (wireless care, human touch) representing the service as human and soft. Feedback from outside the company indicated the name was most often considered good, except for one email in which the name was considered a total failure. The customers and stakeholders in the external environment did not see the change as radical because the same colour palette and similar graphic elements were used, and only the name changed in the logo.

Later on the name was accepted. It was thought that the new name was better than the old one and better described the product and what the company does. It is straightforward and easy to pronounce and right in every language. It stays in mind easily, it does not need to be repeated several times for the listener to understand it and there is a connection to what the company does. It was also recog-
nised that WHealth was remembered as a company that sold visions but had no products, but that Medanets had real products.

Finally, one of the interviewees mentioned that it was best to carry out a name change as early as possible, because it costs money. Even in a small company, it could cost thousands of Euros if they took everything into account. The costs would be more in a larger company. This company managed to change the name quite cheaply because they had only a few brochures with the old name and the product brochure about the new system included the new name.

4.3 Events, actions and actors in the corporate rebranding sub-processes

On the basis of the narratives presented earlier and a more detailed description of the actions revealed from the data and interpretations of the events and sub-processes (Appendix 9), this section presents an interpretation of each sub-process in the form of a process description. The main events in each corporate rebranding sub-process are described and an explanation provided for how they differ from the theoretical framework. The central actors in each event are presented, from the actor levels of management board, manager, employees and external stakeholders.

The theoretical processual framework for corporate rebranding suggests that processes are executed during two stages: the first stage is when the original name is in use, and the second stage is when the new name is in use. The first stage consists of sub-processes Renaming and Redesigning and the second stage of sub-processes Launching and Evaluating.

The data offered some interesting findings which reveal that these stages and processes do not best describe the corporate rebranding this small company went through. In analysing the data, I noticed that the processes that emerged from the empirical data were more ad hoc, chaotic, iterative and complex than the ones presented in the theoretical framework. I was able to find the sub-processes of Renaming, Redesigning, Launching, and Evaluating. Slightly diverging from the theoretical framework, the data revealed that Repositioning needed to be considered as part of Redesigning and Launching. There were two reasons for this: first, in Redesigning, for example, the colours, fonts and layout of the logo were based on how the company wanted to be seen in the eyes of its stakeholders; and second, because the company was a small company operating in B2B markets, it did not carry out any massive marketing communications campaigns in order to
change the stakeholders’ image of the company; instead, they delivered the changed message when Launching the new corporate name. Consequently, I move on to discussing the corporate rebranding sub-processes of Renaming, Redesigning, Launching, and Evaluating.

Although these sub-processes could be found (i.e. the data could be quite easily classified into these categories), and there was no need to make any changes to their names, the contents and order of these sub-processes diverged from the theoretical framework. The contents of the sub-processes are explained in detail later in this chapter, but before doing this some of the main differences to the theoretical background need to be clarified.

First, Renaming was not a simple and straightforward process. Instead, it consisted of two attempts to change the corporate name and one actual corporate name change; in other words, there were “three rounds of corporate name change”. As a whole, Renaming began at the end of 2003, before the company was even established, and continued until autumn 2007, when the new name for the company was finally chosen. During these almost four years, the process had varying periods of activity and non-activity. The most active periods of Renaming are illustrated in Fig. 24 and described in detail in Section 4.3.1.

Second, the process of Redesigning was undertaken not only after the corporate name was changed (Kaikati 2003) but also, separately, twice before the corporate name change. Consequently, the data provided “three case studies” of Redesigning: the first attempt during 2005 resulting in no change; the second one during the spring of 2007, separate to the corporate name change, resulting in a new
logo, colours and fonts; and the third one, updating the new logo with the new corporate name in the autumn of 2007, after the new corporate name was chosen.

Third, instead of being carried out only after the new name was launched, the evaluation was done several times during Renaming and Redesigning. These evaluations are therefore described as part of the sub-processes; in other words, these evaluations are not illustrated in Fig. 24. Instead, the sub-process of Evaluating refers here to the evaluation of the new corporate name. In the theoretical framework it was suggested that Evaluating was conducted after Launching the new name. According to the data, however, evaluation of the new corporate name began internally before the new name was launched, and continued both internally and externally after the launch.

Fourth, the new logo was created separately to Renaming, before the corporate name was changed, and was launched. Consequently, Launching was also a part of the Redesigning process (see Section 4.3.2). The launch of this logo is not illustrated in Fig. 24. Instead, similar to Evaluating, Launching refers here to Launching a new corporate name after the sub-process of Renaming resulted in choosing a new corporate name. Differing from the theoretical framework, Launching a new name was conducted internally soon after the new name was chosen, and externally after the logo and other communications material were updated, in other words, after Redesigning.

The data reveals that, diverging from the theoretical framework, the corporate rebranding sub-processes of Renaming, Redesigning, Launching and Evaluating are not necessarily consecutive processes that need to be carried out in this particular order. Instead, they can be separate processes not related to each other (such as Renaming and Redesigning before the corporate name change) but they can also be connected and consecutive (e.g. Evaluating and Launching a new corporate name cannot be executed before Renaming).

Based on the empirical data, the actors are categorised into the company’s internal and external actors. Because this study considers processes from the company’s perspective, there is a stronger focus on the internal actors. The internal actors are further categorised into management board, manager, and personnel, and all the external stakeholders are categorised as stakeholders.

4.3.1 Renaming

In the theoretical framework, corporate Renaming consists of six events: Communicating the new identity of the company, Inventing a new name, Creating selec-
tion criteria for a new name, Evaluating the potential names, Selecting a new name, and Registering the new name.

As the story of Renaming (Section 4.2.1) and the more detailed description of the actions during Renaming (Appendix 9) present, the data revealed not just one name change but two attempts to change the corporate name and one actual corporate name change. In other words, there are three cases of corporate name changes within one name change. In analysing the data it also became apparent that the data could not fit into the theoretical event categories, and the existing categories needed to be refined and a new category formed from the data. Next, the modifications made to the events are presented, and each of the events is discussed in detail.

First, because no structural change was implemented in the company, the data revealed that there was no new identity for the company to be communicated. Instead, the need for a new name was recognised by managing director A1 before the company was established, when he realised that the name that they were considering for a corporate name was difficult to pronounce. This difficulty was emphasised when customers and other stakeholders pronounced or wrote the name incorrectly after the company was established. Although these might be considered reasons for Renaming, the data show that understanding them was a result of Evaluating the current name. Therefore, the sub-process of Renaming started with evaluating the name, which is a new category compared to the theoretical framework. Please note that this evaluation is neither related to nor the same as the corporate rebranding sub-process of Evaluating, which refers to the evaluation of the new corporate name.

Second, for the same reason as above, the data did not reveal that the new identity should have been communicated internally. Instead, when the need for a new name was recognised, the information about the name change was spread not only to the internal stakeholders, but also to the most important external stakeholders in a board meeting of the WILHO research consortium. This event is therefore called Communicating the forthcoming name change. This event diverges from the event described in the theoretical framework in two ways: first, the content of communications concerns a forthcoming name change instead of an executed corporate identity change; and second, the forthcoming change is communicated not only to internal but also to external stakeholders.

Third, the name of the event Inventing a new name is the same as in the theoretical framework. The content of and actors in the event, however, differed from the theoretical framework. In the theoretical framework the employees were the
most important group involved in inventing a name. According to the data, however, external stakeholders, managing directors and board members also participated in inventing the name, in addition to the employees. Moreover, during the total process of Renaming, this event was conducted four times, and each time the actors and actions in the event varied.

Fourth, the name of the event Creating selection criteria for the new name is the same as in the theoretical framework. However, in contrast to the theoretical framework, the event was not implemented until the third round of inventing a new name. In other words, Inventing a new name led twice to Selecting the new name before the importance of Creating selection criteria for the new name was recognised and implemented.

Fifth, the name of the event Selecting a new name is the same as in the theoretical framework, but this event also differed from the theoretical framework in that the event was conducted twice, resulting in not selecting a new name, before the new name was selected the third time. Sixth, the name of the event Registering a new name is the same as in the theoretical framework.

Based on the three attempts to change the corporate name, the process description of corporate Renaming in Case 1 is described in Fig. 25. In the figure, the order of the six main events in the process is indicated with arrows and numbers: Evaluating the name, Communicating the forthcoming name change, Invent ing a name, Creating the selection criteria for the name, Selecting the name and Registering the name. In addition, the main actors – management board, managing director(s), personnel, and external stakeholders – are illustrated in each event with layered boxes in different colours. The results of each event are illustrated with the rounded rectangles, because these results operated as a basis for the start of the next event. Dashed arrows and boxes with dashed borders illustrate how the corporate renaming process is related to other corporate rebranding processes, namely Redesigning, Launching and Evaluating. Even though the focus of this study is on corporate rebranding, it is important to illustrate the relationship between corporate renaming and product renaming in the figure. As future chapters reveal, the data shows that corporate name and product name are interconnected in these three cases: a new corporate name is adopted as a product name (Case 1); the product name is adopted as a corporate name (Case 3); and the corporate name (or business unit name) describes how the product can be used (Case 2).
In summary, *Evaluating the name* was done by the managing director and the per-

---

**Fig. 25. Renaming in Case 1.**
sonnel and resulted in two decisions: first, the company was established with a difficult name because no better name was invented; and second, the difficult corporate name was eventually changed. These decisions led (1) to Communicating the forthcoming name change by the management board and the managing director A1, to both internal and external stakeholders. As a result, the stakeholders were aware of the forthcoming name change and were eager to participate in inventing the new name. These led (2) to alternation of Inventing the new name by the management board, managing director(s), personnel, and external stakeholders, and Selecting the new name (3–6) by the management board – resulting, however, in no satisfactory new name before (7) the selection criteria for the new name were created in Creating the selection criteria for the new name by the management board. This led (8) again to Inventing the new name and finally, (9) to Selecting the new name for the company. The selection of the new name, Medanets, triggered (10) the product Renaming process (although this is not a focus of this study and is therefore not discussed in detail it is illustrated here because it is important in understanding the relationship between the corporate name and the product name in the case study companies) and the other corporate rebranding sub-processes of Redesigning, Evaluating and Launching the new corporate name. The contents of these sub-processes are discussed in more detail in Sections 4.3.2 to 4.3.4. In the following section, the events of the corporate renaming process in Case 1 are described in more depth and in chronological order.

**Evaluating the name**

At the end of 2003, before the company had been established, the managing director A1 noticed that the name invented for the company, WHealth, was difficult to pronounce. Despite this, the company was established with that name. In the beginning stages of the company story, the difficulties with the name continued; for example, in almost every phone discussion with customers or other stakeholders they asked how to write the name, and it had to be repeated several times. In addition, the name was continually written incorrectly by customers and even board members. Even important stakeholder groups did not remember the company name, revealing that it was difficult to recall.

“If you said it [the name] there were an unbelievable number of opportunities of how to write it.” (Customer relationship manager)
“It is difficult to pronounce – it does not stay in the mind and it is difficult to recall.” (Managing director A3)

“Yes, we immediately noticed that the name is quite challenging to pronounce and it needed to be repeated several times. It worked better globally but in Finland it was all the time, ‘tuplavee hoo health’.” (Managing director A1)

The difficulty of using the name was considered a great problem, because it was recognised that one cannot build a brand with a name that is hard to pronounce. This led to a decision that the corporate name needed to be changed. This, in turn, led (illustrated in Fig. 25 by the number 1) to the second event, Communicating the forthcoming name change.

**Communicating the forthcoming name change**

Soon after the company was established, the managing director A1 and board members started to spread the word among their stakeholders that they would be changing the company name. This was done in WILHO consortium board meetings, for two reasons: first, they assumed that stakeholders would be able to help in inventing a new name; and second, this diminished the likelihood of any wrong assumptions concerning the name change, for example, that the name was being changed because the company was bankrupt rather than being just a cosmetic change.

“It [the information about the forthcoming name change] went through a consortium, it was a subject in a board meeting, and then we told it to the circle of acquaintances. And that is important because they are the ones who will then spread that information off the record; it does not go officially but the information starts to wriggle there.” (Managing director A3)

The most important stakeholders were therefore aware that the company would change its name, and they wanted to participate in the development of the new name. This triggered (2 in Fig. 25) the next event, Inventing the new name.

**Inventing the new name**

At the beginning of the company’s story, when the stakeholders were informed about the forthcoming name change, several stakeholders – for example, custom-
ers, university researchers and people from other companies – participated in developing a new name in project meetings and brainstorm sessions, in which the original purpose was to brainstorm what kind of business and products the company would be involved in. There were no rules for the development of the name or what kind of name it should be.

“It has been a kind of crazy madness among a small group of engineers – we start to ideate what it could be and write down everything crazy. The ideas just bubble and they are just thrown into the air and every border is demolished.” (Managing director A1)

Ideas for a new name were developed sporadically, and inventing the name was not systematic. After the managing director of the company changed in January 2006, a new managing director, A2, continued the name development. A2 created a list of possible names by searching with Google and discussing ideas with employees. This resulted in a two-page list of name proposals. This list operated as a basis for moving (3 in Fig. 25) to the next event, Selecting a name.

Selecting a name

Managing director A2 presented the idea of corporate name change in a board meeting in January 2007, along with a long list of possible names. But, at that time, the idea of a new name came as a surprise to the board members, and changing the name met resistance in a situation where the focus and financing of the company were unclear. In particular, the creators of the original name had strong feelings towards the name and did not want to change it.

“He [managing director] presented the name to the management board, and they were about to open the discussion, but somehow it got quite drop-dead comments which might be because this idea for change came so suddenly; and then there were people who were the fathers of the current name, they did not get inspired about the change because they had strong feelings towards that name.” (A board member)

The board members evaluated the current name and made lists of positive and negative issues concerning the name. Because the list of the negative issues proved to be longer than the positive issues, they realised that the name really
needed to be changed. They decided to continue with the original name, but also moved (4 in Fig. 25) to *Inventing a new name* again.

*Inventing a new name*

Inventing a new name continued in brainstorming, email discussions and in personal discussions during the spring of 2007. This time the board members and also some personnel participated in inventing the name. Again, this led to a long list of name proposals. From this, the process continued (5 in Fig. 25) to *Selecting the new name*.

*Selecting the new name*

In spring 2007, the proposals for a new name were discussed in a board meeting. One of the proposed names was WILHO, which was also the name of the research consortium. Because the board members thought that there would be several benefits in taking the name of the research consortium as the name of the company, they decided to choose it for the corporate name. After this they continued (6 in Fig. 25) to *Registering the new name*.

*Registering the new name*

The managing director tried to register the name but the registration was denied by the National Board of Patents and Registration of Finland. In other words, the company was not allowed to use the name WILHO as its name.

“...We tried WILHO. WILHO was born as a brand for that consortium and project, but we did not get rights for WILHO and then we decided to begin developing something else.” (Managing director A1)

This resulted (7 in Fig. 25), again, in *Inventing a new name*.

*Inventing a new name*

The board members decided to continue inventing a new name by brainstorming. They started to search for names which included “medi” or “meda”, as these referred to the medical industry.
“There were no rules for choosing the name, it just started from what name would be nice or good, just like in a creative way.” (A board member)

However, one of the board members recognised that before they could continue, they needed to create criteria for the kind of name they were looking for. This triggered (8 in Fig. 25) the event Creating selection criteria for a name.

Creating selection criteria for a name

Creating selection criteria for a name was the responsibility of a board member, who gathered a list of important criteria that a new name should conform to.

“I wanted to find a name that would be totally free globally. What we wanted to reach was a company name that forms a goal for the company and the name is as efficient as possible in the eyes of the personnel and customers and financiers.” (A board member)

The most important criterion was that the name should be available globally. Another important criterion was that the name be short. This was because, with the first computers, file names were allowed to be a maximum of only eight letters, and somehow this mindset was still dominant among these interviewees.

“Engineers love long abbreviations.” (A board member)

This brevity could be attained by developing a long name and then abbreviating it. An additional very important criterion was that the name needed to represent what the company does. After the criteria for a new name were created, the board members were able to go back (9) again to Inventing a new name.

Inventing a new name

From then on, one board member took an active role in inventing a new name. He continued thinking, on the one hand, of names which included “medi” or “meda”, which referred to the medical industry, and, on the other hand, of what the company does. He developed different kinds of names and tested their availability by using Google.
“Only me. Well, the management board participated in decision making but preparing for the name was a greatly individual work.” (A board member)

This resulted in a number of similar proposals for a new name. The process continued (10) to Selecting a name.

Selecting a name

The board member continued to Selecting a name. He asked the stakeholders – for example, financiers, university researchers, lawyers, and even people from other companies – to evaluate the proposals for a name.

“I asked one of my colleagues who lives in USA ... to ask ... five or six managers ... to comment on the possible name.” (A board member)

Based on the comments, he presented a proposal for a new corporate name in a board meeting in October 2007. The new name was Medanets, which is an abbreviation of Medical Data Networks. This time, board members liked the name. The only thing they criticised was why only one option was presented to them. Subsequently, it was decided that the company name would be changed to Medanets. (11)

Registering the name

Finally, the managing director registered the new name, and from then on it was in use.

4.3.2 Redesigning

The theoretical framework presented five events in Redesigning: Examining the present corporate logo, Creating a working brief, Analysing the firm’s brand values and strategy direction, Choosing logo structure, and Creating a logo/symbol, colour palette and font type.

In seeking to understand logo change, I started the interviews by assuming that logo change was carried out after the corporate name was changed. The data, however, revealed that corporate redesign was, similarly to Renaming, ad hoc, chaotic, iterative and complex process. It had three rounds; the first and the sec-
ond were executed independently from the corporate name change, during the
time when the original corporate name was still in use. First, they attempted to
redesign a logo but failed; second, they created the second logo as a separate
process from the corporate name change; and third, the second logo was updated
after the invention of the new name for the company.

Based on the analysis of these three rounds of redesign it became apparent
that the data could not fit into the theoretical event categories, and the existing
categories needed to be refined and three new categories formed from the data.
Next, the modifications made to the events are presented.

I was able to identify two events only that were suggested in the theoretical
framework: Examining the present corporate logo, and Creating a logo/symbol,
colour scheme and type font. Because these names did not optimally describe the
content of the events, in naming the events, I in part followed the events in Re-
naming. I named Examining the present corporate logo as Evaluating the existing
logo and Creating a logo/symbol, colour scheme and type font as Creating logo
proposals.

The following three events emerged from the data: Choosing a new logo,
Adopting the new logo for use, and Creating rules for using the new logo (see Fig.
26). Similarly to the first two events, in naming these events, I in part followed
the events in Renaming. However, Selecting a new logo was replaced with Choos-
ing a new logo. Launching the new logo was replaced with Adopting the new logo
for use. Launching refers to “an event to celebrate or introduce something new”
(Cambridge Dictionaries Online). According to the data, the new logo was not
introduced as such, either to internal or to external stakeholders. Instead, it was
simply adopted and all the material was updated.

The five events of Redesigning are next discussed in chronological order. An
explanation is provided of how the corporate Redesigning process is connected to
other corporate rebranding sub-processes, namely, Renaming, Launching and
Evaluating. The numbers 1–9 describe the order in which the company moved
from one event and/or sub-process to another.
Fig. 26. Redesigning in Case 1.

The development of the logo started in WHealth with the manager and employees Evaluating the existing logo. From these evaluations they created the criteria for a new logo. This list operated as a basis for the company to move (1) to the next process, Creating logo proposals. It began by the manager and personnel of WHealth discussing the criteria with the external stakeholders (i.e. personnel of the DesignStart project and the advertising agency) who were about to design a new logo. On the basis of these discussions, the logo creators created several proposals for a new logo, with different font types, layouts and colours. These operated as a basis for the next sub-process (2). In Choosing a logo the managers and personnel evaluated the proposals but found no logo they were satisfied with. This resulted in going back to (3) the process Creating logo proposals. This time, the company hired another external stakeholder, a freelancer graphic designer. The manager and the personnel discussed the criteria for a new logo with the de-
signer, who then created several proposals for a new logo. The proposals operated as a basis for moving (4) to the next sub-process, Choosing a logo. Again, the manager and employees evaluated the logo proposals, this time being satisfied with one logo, which they chose. This led to the next sub-process (5), Adopting a new logo for use, in which the graphic designer updated the Internet sites and internal material with the help of the manager and personnel. Adopting a new logo for use the new logo was followed by (6) a board member’s notification that some of the personnel were eager to modify the logo each time they used it. He therefore continued by creating criteria for a new logo and this resulted in the establishment of rules about how to use the new logo.

However, soon after Adopting a new logo for use the new logo, the company changed its name to Medanets as a result of the Renaming process. Changing the name resulted in (7) the process of Creating logo proposals again; the graphic designer was asked to update the new corporate logo with a new corporate name, and design the text under the corporate name. This led (8) to Choosing a logo, where the managers and personnel chose a logo for the company. This, in turn, led (9) to Launching. However, the new logo was not adapted for use at this time. Instead, it was launched simultaneously in Launching the new corporate name. As illustrated in the Fig. 26, the Redesigning process continued with the corporate rebranding sub-processes Launching and Evaluating.

In the following section, the events of the corporate renaming process in Case 1 are described in more depth and in chronological order

**Evaluating the existing logo**

Evaluating the existing logo included an assessment of how well it served the company and its needs. The need for a new logo arose when the personnel and the managers noticed that it was difficult to connect the forthcoming products of the company to the company logo. In addition, the logo was considered old-fashioned.

“We started to think of products alongside the company logo but it was extremely difficult to develop the products with the same expression. It [colour] was blue and we thought that it was a little bit cold.” (Customer relationship manager)

“The logo was perceived as old-fashioned, and so was the layout as well.” (Managing director A3)
The issues that emerged in the evaluation were used as a basis for establishing the criteria for a new logo.

**Creating logo proposals**

It was acknowledged that neither the manager nor the employees were able to create a new logo; they needed to use somebody else’s knowhow. The first logo for the company was created in the design development program DesignStart, offered by TE-centre, and now the company participated in the program for the second time. This time, an advertising agency participated in creating proposals for the logo.

“The first DesignStart was executed in 2004, spring I think, and then we executed another DesignStart which was related to these products ... but at that time we also wanted ... an advertising agency to participate.” (Customer relationship manager)

Development of a logo began by discussing the criteria for a new logo. On the basis of these discussions, designers created several proposals for a new logo.

**Choosing a logo**

Even though the designers from both the project and the advertising agency had created several logo proposals, when *Evaluating* the logos the managers and the employees in the company were not satisfied with any of them. Not even the advertising agency was able to create a logo that would solve their problem.

“But in my opinion we did not get any good results because there was that challenge of how to connect them [the products] to the logo.” (Customer relationship manager)

**Creating a logo**

Subsequently, cooperation between the project and the advertising agency was dropped, and the search for a new logo continued. The company hired a freelance graphic designer to design a logo. The development of a logo started with discussions with the graphic designer about the criteria for a logo.
“We first talked with the graphic designer, and on the basis of those discussions she created some logo proposals.” (Customer relationship manager)

The logo proposals were quite similar in nature (for some of them, see, Appendix 7). There were several main options and a number of slightly different versions of each.

Choosing a logo

The logo proposals were evaluated by managers and employees. Even though the manager and employees were aware of the criteria for a new logo, they admitted that there were no definite criteria for how to choose the logo.

“These [several pages of logo proposals] are in fact quite similar; there are just different options of these, for example, with different fonts. It was kind of a matter of opinion, we had these kind of proposals and of these we then chose ... the one which was supported most.” (Customer relationship manager)

“We then chose the one which looked the most pleasant.” (Managing director A3)

“We kind of discovered that this is a sympathetic figure, or it looks sympathetic.” (A board member)

Accordingly, the proposal which most appealed to the managers and employees and was liked best was chosen.

Adapting a new logo for use

Adopting a new logo for use mainly involved updating the communications material. The company’s internet sites were changed, as were all the written material in which the new logo needed to be used – for example, Power Point presentations and internal documents.
Creating rules for using the logo

It was noticed that some people in the company were eager to make small changes to the logo each time they used it depending on the purpose of its use. However, there were other people who saw the logo as the face of the company and recognised that the logo could not be changed all the time, and were strict in its use.

“After we decided on this logo I noticed that people thought that it was only one decision and after a week it can be something else. Some people tried to change ... the layout and ... fonts ... of the logo but I absolutely straight denied it – the logo is like the face of the company. If you change some of a person’s face it is defaming towards that person, and, similarly if a text or a logo represents a company’s face then changing it is like a caricature of the company’s face. At least at the beginning it is better to be this strict and clear.” (A board member)

Consequently, criteria for using the logo were created. These included instructions that the current logo could not be changed in any way.

Creating a logo

However, the new logo was in use for only a short time before it needed to be revised again. After the new company name was launched internally in autumn 2007, the recently created logo needed to be revised. This time, the layout, colours and fonts remained the same, and only the corporate name and slogan needed to be changed. A graphic designer was asked to change the corporate name and to create proposals for the text below the corporate name.

“In fact it was in that way that the logo changed before the name and for a while we had the old name and the new logo, but luckily it was only a short period.” (Managing director A3)

“Then we just gave her an assignment to replace WHealth with Medanets ... and below that came Medical Data Networks.” (Customer relationship manager)

As a result, the logo was created in which the name WHealth was replaced by the name Medanets. In addition, the text below the corporate name, where the slogan
used to be, became “Medical Data Networks” – the name which Medanets is an abbreviation of. After these changes, the new name and logo for the company were ready for Launching externally (9).

The company did not have a consistent slogan before. Instead, they changed it depending on the situation. When the company name was changed, they also wanted to use a slogan. Ideas for the slogan were developed by the company’s own personnel, but the final form of the slogan was formulated by the graphic designer who had created several proposals for a logo.

“As far as I know there was no slogan. Or if there was, it changed depending on the situation, just like someone just invented something nice and wrote it and there it was.” (A board member)

“There were different options and then we considered them ... and decided, let’s take this one.” (Managing director A3)

4.3.3 Launching

In the theoretical framework, Launching was presented as consisting of two sub-processes: first, Launching the new name internally, and second, Launching the new name externally. In this case, similar to the theoretical framework, both of these were found. In addition, the data revealed that internal Launching triggered Redesigning, and all the communications material needed to be updated before external launch (see Fig. 27). In the next section, Launching the new name internally and Launching the new name externally are presented in more detail.
Launching the new name internally

When a final decision for the new name was made by the management of the company, the process of adopting the new name for use was fast, taking from one to two months. The name change occurred in a situation in which the company had its products and wanted to start to grow with the help of its products. Launching the new name happened fast and top-down. During the autumn of 2007, two weeks after the board meeting in which the new name was accepted, the managing director A3 informed the personnel of the company and the people in the mother company, via email, that the new name would be registered.

“We made an internal newsletter – before we made this public announcement.” (Customer relationship manager)

“We were just told that it [the new name] was Medanets – in this email from the managing director.” (Customer relationship manager)
A week later, the chairman of the board released an email in which he told everyone that they should use the new name from now on. This resulted in the need to update the current logo with the new name and update the communications material – the internet sites, business cards, and envelopes – and the manager and the personnel updated the internal documents of the company, for example, PowerPoint slides.

“Indeed, everything changed. We created new PowerPoint slides, envelopes, business cards of course and all these kinds of things.” (Managing director A3)

After all the communications material that was visible to the external stakeholders was updated, the company was ready to move to Launching the new name externally. However, some internal material remained unchanged for some time. These were updated at the time these particular materials were needed.

**Launching the new name externally**

A few weeks after the board meeting (i.e. two weeks after the personnel were informed about the new name), the name was launched on the internet sites of the company. In addition, customers and other partners were informed via email, and a notice was attached saying the reason for the change was that the new name was easier to pronounce.

“The managing director sent emails – to the customers, partners – and there was a letter attached in which the easier use of the new name was explained. Of course, we updated our Internet sites.” (A board member)

“We thought about a press release but we decided that it would not raise any interest if this kind of small company changes its name so we persuaded [a newspaper] to publish a wider feature about this theme in general.” (A board member)

At that stage, the company wanted to make its name well known. It mentioned the new name in press releases and in all communications material. In addition, they asked a local and a national newspaper to publish a wider article about the theme. They provided the articles, but the name of the company was not mentioned.
4.3.4 Evaluating

In the theoretical framework, I stated that Evaluating consists of Evaluating the new name and Evaluating the process after Launching the new name. As described earlier, evaluating had an important role in Renaming and Redesigning. These evaluations are described as part of the abovementioned processes and are not considered here. Following the theoretical framework, Evaluating refers to evaluating the new corporate name. However, the data revealed that the new name was not the only issue that was evaluated, and Evaluating was not conducted only after Launching. The theoretical framework therefore needed several adjustments, and these I outline below.

First, the theoretical framework suggested that Evaluating the new name included corporate external evaluation of the new name: conducting a survey examining customers’ purchase intent, and conducting customer research. Even though the data revealed external evaluation of the new name, neither of these types of evaluation was found in this case. Instead, the data revealed that Evaluating the new name was conducted not only externally, but also internally. In other words, Evaluating the new name had two aspects: Evaluating the new name internally and Evaluating the new name externally.

Second, the data revealed that instead of being conducted after Launching, Evaluating the new name began before Launching it. In other words, when the new name was selected by the board member, he started to get evaluations about the name from the stakeholders – before he presented the name to the management board.

Third, in addition to the process of Renaming, Redesigning was also evaluated. Fourth, all the events in Evaluating are separate; even though they can be described in chronological order, they are not cumulative in nature but are separate events, and cannot be described in the same way as I have the former process descriptions. Instead of being related to each other, they are related to events in the other corporate rebranding sub-processes. Therefore, I illustrate the events of Evaluating – Evaluating the possible name, Evaluating the new name, Evaluating the Renaming process and Evaluating the Redesigning process - in relation to the other corporate rebranding sub-processes in Fig. 28 and describe them next in more detail.
Evaluating the possible name

In autumn 2007, when the board member invented a possibility for the new corporate name, he decided to ask some external stakeholders – for example, financiers, a lawyer, university researchers, friends and even the managers of other companies in other countries – to evaluate the candidates for the new name. Almost all stakeholders associated the name with the right industry except one, who thought it was a company operating in another business.

“I asked him [a friend in the USA] to ask ... from native Americans how this Medanets sounds and he gave quite positive [feedback]; he said that no one criticised it as causing any unwanted associations, although one of his colleagues said this firm operates in the media business, so this was a kind of wrong association, but most people had connected this straight to the medical business.” (A board member)
This proved to the board member that the name Medanets was good enough for the corporate name. He presented the name to the management board, who evaluated it. The possible new name engendered several feelings. Those who had invented the original company name were reluctant to change to a new name. Moreover, some of those who had been given ideas for a new name thought that the new name was not the best possible name. Some of them were not satisfied with the name. According to them, the name could have been shorter and more succinct, because it did not reflect the vision but rather the industry or products. In addition, the name was considered a little bit “hard” and technologically oriented, which was seen as a weakness.

“It sounded that, well, is it any better than WHealth?” (Managing director A3)

“Even though ‘Medical Data Networks’ refers to networks, we do not sell networks but utilise the existing networks.” (Managing director A3)

“[I do not know] if this Medical Data Networks of which this Medanets is an abbreviation describes our vision; maybe it is like an industry or product that we produce… I’m sure there would be a better name but we haven’t invented it yet.” (A board member)

Even though they thought the name was not as good as it could be, they were quite satisfied with it and decided to choose it for the new corporate name. After the name was chosen, it was first launched internally to the employees, and in the mother company Innokas Medical.

Evaluating the new name

As soon as the new name was launched internally, the personnel began to evaluate it. First they criticised it, arguing that the name did not describe what the company did; the name would be associated with a company supplying networks, which constructs physical networks, and their company did not, so it did not exactly reflect what the company does. In addition, they were quite unsatisfied with the new name because they had spent years inventing a possible name for the company, and the chosen name was none of those names.

“It was not any of those names on which we had spent so much time.” (Customer relationship manager)
Despite these arguments, the decision for the new name was maintained. After Launching the name externally, the stakeholders gave their feedback to the company personnel and the management board, by email and verbally. The feedback was mostly positive: the new name was easy to pronounce and remember, and had increased the awareness, recognition and recall of the company. The name was generally considered good, except for one email in which the name was considered a total failure.

“The feedback was positive – no one revealed any bad associations towards it. We have got questions: is it a little bit hard and is it too technology oriented? And this can be a weakness of that name.” (A board member)

After the launch, the managing director, management board and personnel evaluated the new name. They had become used to the new name and were not as reluctant about it. It was thought that the new name was better than the old one and better described the product and what the company does. In addition, it was recognised that awareness of the corporate name was good among the most important stakeholders.

“When we look back at how the brand describes what the company nowadays is doing, I think it is stronger and better and it describes what the company does and ... Medanets describes it much better than WHealth at that time.” (Managing director A1)

It was also recognised that the new name was straightforward and easy to pronounce and write in every language. It stayed in mind easily, it did not need to be repeated several times for the listener to understand it, and the name had a connection to what the company does.

Evaluating the Renaming process

After the name was launched externally, the Renaming process was evaluated by the managing director and the management board. They thought that the customers and other stakeholders did not see the change as radical because the company still used the colour palette and graphic elements that they had created before and which had been used for some time already. In other words, only the name changed.
“I have not heard any criticism – I think it [the name change] was kind of invisible.” (A board member)

Managing director A1 and a board member thought that the name change went well because they had a board member and managing director A3 who had worked in large companies before. They had followed how the large companies do branding, and therefore had some experience.

“But we had two members that came from large multinationals, and I think they had more experience about branding, at least they had followed how it happens, and therefore it was quite systematic and we quite quickly took the brand that we decided to develop further.” (Managing director A1)

However, they thought that when a small company changed its name no one would notice the name change. It was also argued that name change does not affect those who are not stakeholders of the company. On the other hand, they recognised that the company was operating in a niche and was therefore known among their stakeholders. They argued that communication around the forthcoming name change at the beginning of the company’s existence was good. It was acknowledged that if a change was communicated incorrectly, some competitors and customers may start to think the company was bankrupt and needed to change its name, because there were many examples of businesses that do not manage and need to be restarted with another name.

“The challenge is to build the message in a way that we are going forward, we have built a basis for building and now we are moving forward… If you launch a brand change in the wrong way it may cause problems in a business. Again, the brand reflects the company actions.” (Managing director A1)

Accordingly, the manager and the management board were satisfied with the Renaming process.

**Evaluating the Redesigning process**

After the new name was launched externally, the Redesigning process was evaluated by managing director A1 and the personnel. It was acknowledged that the logo change was executed at a good time because soon after the change they got
their product to market. They thought it was good that they had used professionals in logo design, and were quite satisfied with the result.

“It was great that we changed our visual look – soon after that we got our product to the markets.” (Customer relationship manager)

“At that time there were clever solutions with a small budget but at the same time using a real professional in communications, we began to transfer our vision to graphic material.” (Managing director A1)

They were also satisfied with the use of the freelancer graphic designer in Redesigning. They thought that the designer managed to capture the values and the business of the company well, and managed to turn them into visual material.

4.4 Outputs of corporate rebranding

In this section the outputs of the corporate rebranding process are presented with reference to the classifications provided in Section 2.4.3. As the previous section revealed, the sub-processes of Renaming and Redesigning in corporate rebranding were conducted several times. Therefore, rather than presenting one output of corporate rebranding only, several outputs are considered.

The following section concentrates first on corporate names, continues with logos, and finally, concludes with an interpretation of the types of corporate rebranding in Case 1.

4.4.1 Corporate names

In this section, the classification of corporate names is based on six categories – descriptive, geographic, patronymic, acronymic, associative, and freestanding (see, Table 12, page 85). However, in classifying the names it soon became apparent that, whilst the names can be quite easily classified into one category, they also had features of other categories. The classification is provided in Table 18.
Table 18. Summary of the name types and name change in Case 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name type</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Refers also to the name type</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Name change</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHealth</td>
<td>Freestanding</td>
<td>Has no meaning of its own</td>
<td>Acronymic</td>
<td>WH is abbreviation from Wireless Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wireless Health describes what the company does</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medanets</td>
<td>Freestanding</td>
<td>No intrinsic meaning</td>
<td>Acronymic</td>
<td>Is abbreviation from Medical Data Networks</td>
<td>Makeover</td>
<td>No link to the previous name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Describes the product of the company</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Medical Data Networks describes what the company does</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following sections describe the interpretations of the original name and the new name, and finally, the name change type.

The original name

The original name, WHealth, refers to wireless hospital, which W and H describe. The name is also related to health and health care.

“The name [WHealth] came quite straight from this wireless hospital, accordingly, there is W and H – which represent wireless hospital and ... it relates to health care ... so health is a general word representing health, health care and welfare. And then someone also grasped that wealth means welfare”. (Managing director A1)

Consequently, the original name has several features. It is freestanding, because it has no meaning of its own. It also includes the abbreviation WH from Wireless Health. Wireless Health is not the official corporate name, but it is descriptive because it describes what the company does. Accordingly, the name can be classified as being freestanding, but it has features from other categories as well.

The new name

The new name, Medanets, is an abbreviation of Medical Data Networks. Medical Data Networks describes the wireless network in the medical environment. In addition, Medanets is the name of the company’s product.

“It [Medanets] is Medical Data Networks, it particularly is that. There is a robust server and a great amount of software on the server, which gathers the data from the patients through a wireless network and exactly that data is medical and the whole environment is medical.” (Managing director A1)

“Medanets is also our product name ... but it is widened ... with an abbreviation Medanets ABS.” (Managing director A3)

Accordingly, the name Medanets is freestanding, because it has no intrinsic meaning and is abstract in nature. The name also has features of the acronymic name type because it is an abbreviation of the longer name, Medical Data Networks. Like the old name, Medical Data Networks describes what the company does, and
therefore has features of the descriptive name type. In addition, the corporate name is the same as the product name.

**Name change type**

The corporate name-change types created in the theoretical framework are categorised into three types: Reinventing, Brand adoption, and Makeover (Table 13, page 85).

Based on the framework, the change from WHealth to Medanets can be considered Makeover, a complete change. In Makeover, no link to the previous name exists. As I concluded above, both names are freestanding in nature, and neither name has any relationship to the other.

**4.4.2 Corporate logos**

In the theoretical framework I created the classification for examining logo change types (see Table 13, page 85) by analysing the changing elements in the logo. I provided three categories for the element changes: no change, minor change, and complete change, and two categories for the logo changes: Refreshment and Renewal. WHealth/Medanets executed two logo changes, and my interpretation of them is summarised in Table 19 and then explained in more detail below.

**Table 19. Summary of the logo changes in Case 1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logo</th>
<th>Font change</th>
<th>Text change</th>
<th>Colour change</th>
<th>Layout change</th>
<th>Total logo change type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="logo.png" alt="WHealth" /></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Refreshment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="logo.png" alt="Medanets" /></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Refreshment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First logo change type

In the original logo, the letters WH were inside a blue circle, and the small blue circle was separated from the blue circle next to it (see Table 19). The blue colour was chosen because it was seen to be typical of the business.

The new logo differed from the original logo almost completely. The blue colour was completely changed to green, because they thought that green would be a “softer” colour and still a colour that is typical of their business.

“Before, we had blue but we thought that it was a little bit cold, and ... our mother company is green, it was ... somehow we then concluded with green; maybe we wanted a softer colour, and then green is a colour that exists also in hospitals.” (Customer relationship manager)

Even though the layout of the logo was changed almost completely, one main element remained: the circles. One big and one small circle in the original logo were changed to small circles of different sizes, which formed an arc. The arc described the wireless data transmission and would have formed a big circle if the small circles were continued. Circles were considered important, because they described the industry in which the company operated. For these reasons, layout change can be considered minor.

“This is a good idea this circle and then this [arc] tells about that wireless data transmission. ... by changing colour it is possible to write anything here and still this arc tells that it is about the same company.” (Customer relationship manager)

“In this business many firms have these circles, somehow.” (A board member)

The font in the logo was also completely changed. An important criterion for fonts was that they needed to exist in Microsoft Word. Another important criterion was that they needed to be soft and not too technical.

“We purposively chose the font which exists in Word documents so that we don’t have to do special tricks in taking it into use. ... It was pleasant and not so technical a font, you see, maybe a little bit florid.” (Managing director A3)

“There was something soft in it [font] and these ends of the letters were kind of softer.” (Customer relationship manager)
Whereas in the original logo WH represented the corporate name, in the new logo the whole name, WHealth, was used. This represented a minor change in the text, because something was added to the previous text but another part remained the same.

In conclusion, even though from first appearances it may look like the original logo had been completely changed, this was not the case. Instead, the change can be considered minor, Refreshment, because both the layout change and the text change were minor, and only the colour change and the font change were complete.

Second logo change type

In the second logo change, all elements in the logo remained the same, except for the text which changed completely. This was because the management board had selected the new name, Medanets, for the company. The old corporate name in the previously created logo was replaced by the new corporate name.

“Then we also decided that the text Medical Data Networks will be there below Medanets” (A board member)

In addition to the new name, Medical Data Networks was also written under the corporate name. Accordingly, because only one element in the logo changed, the second logo change can also be considered Refreshment.

4.4.3 Corporate rebranding change types

As I proposed in the theoretical framework, when the types of corporate name change and corporate logo change are revealed, it is possible to consider the overall types of corporate rebranding change (see Table 9, page 68).

In this case, the first corporate rebranding exercise was conducted when the change of original logo was conducted separately from the corporate name change. In the previous section, I assessed that logo change as being Refreshment in nature. Therefore, at this time, corporate rebranding in WHealth/Medanets can be considered Refreshment, a minor change in the logo (see Table 20).
Table 20. Summary of the corporate rebranding types in Case 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Name change type</th>
<th>Logo change type</th>
<th>Corporate rebranding change type</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First change:</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Refreshment</td>
<td>Refreshment</td>
<td>Some of the logo elements are changed but the corporate name remains the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logo only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second change:</td>
<td>Makeover</td>
<td>Refreshment</td>
<td>Intermediate change</td>
<td>Name change was completely but logo change was minor only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>name and logo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second corporate rebranding exercise was conducted when the new name was created and the previously created logo was then updated. In this instance, corporate name change was complete, Makeover, in nature, but the logo change only Refreshment, minor, in nature. Thus, this is classified as an intermediate change.
5 Case 2: Business unit rebranding

This case was selected because it offers an example of business unit rebranding, which I assume differs from the “basic” corporate rebranding demonstrated in Case 1. In choosing it, I hoped that I would be able to make theoretically interesting comparisons which would then allow me to further develop the theories.

When this case was chosen for this study in autumn 2008, my purpose was to observe how the business unit of MSG Software, WhileOnTheMove (WOTM) changed its name. At that time, the business unit was also waiting for funding to spin-off from the mother company. However, during this study the business unit neither changed its name nor spun off from the mother company. In September 2010, the managing director of the mother company sold the mother company and established a new company from the business unit – with almost the same name: While on the Move (WOM).

Consequently, it was not possible to follow the business unit name change as I had planned. However, the business unit had executed one name change earlier on. Its original name was MSG Mobi, and the name was changed to WhileOnTheMove at the beginning of 2008. The change from MSG Mobi to WhileOnTheMove is described in the next section, but, unfortunately, it was not possible to provide “real-time data” from the business unit rebranding, and therefore the data is quite limited.

However, this case sheds light to such aspects of the phenomenon that otherwise would not have been revealed. Namely, the most important output of this case was the notice that in the case of the forthcoming spin-off, some events of corporate rebranding sub-processes can be planned and even executed before the company is established.

5.1 Introducing the business unit in Case 2

5.1.1 Basic information

After a few years of intensive work, MSG Mobi’s story started at the end of 2005 as a business unit of a larger company, MSG Software. The mother company, MSG Software, was established in 1989 in Oulu, Finland, and it has several offices around Finland. It provides software development and maintenance activi-
ties, serving customers in finance, industry, telecom and the public sector, and employs 25 people. The logo of MSG Software is presented in Fig. 29.

![MSG Software logo](image)

**Fig. 29.** The logo of the mother company in the Case 2.

The purpose of the business unit, MSG Mobi, is to develop, maintain and host mobile solutions that bring a company's services within reach of its employees and customers regardless of time and place. In addition, they provide mobile solutions for cities and citizens. Five persons from the mother company’s personnel worked for the business unit.

Both in the name of the mother company and a business unit, MSG represent an abbreviation of 'message'. The name, MSG Mobi, was mainly invented by the manager of the MSG Software, but an employee had given ideas and comment for the name.

![MSG Mobi logo](image)

**Fig. 30.** The first logo in Case 2.

An employee updated the typewriting (here considered as a logo) of the business unit name several times. Fig. 30 presents a logo that a managing director thought was in use for the longest period.

### 5.1.2 Software solutions

WhileOnTheMove (WOTM) develops mobile solutions that bring a company's services within reach of its employees and customers regardless of time and place. They also provide mobile solutions for cities and citizens.

WhileOnTheMove develops Near Field Communication (NFC) solutions and Location Based Services (LBS) for mobile use. The solutions are based on a Mobile Communication Services (MCS) platform, which consists of components on the mobile phone and on the mobile server which are needed in mobile applica-
tion development, services development on the mobile server, and integrations to a company's back-end systems and/or third-party content servers (for instance, maps, point-of-interest, news, weather, infotainment, etc.).

NFC is a new, short-range wireless connectivity technology which evolved from a combination of existing contactless identification and interconnection technologies. Products with built-in NFC simplify the way consumer devices interact with one another, helping people speed up connections, receive and share information and even make fast and secure payments. For instance, a traveller standing in front of an interesting sight, monument or painting need only touch a NFC tag with his phone and he will be provided with all the information related to the object. NFC can also be used in field-force solutions where there is a need to get data regarding a patient, machine or building. All the NFC applications are currently developed using Java. There will be Android, iPhone and Windows Phone versions available when the NFC phones are launched.

LBS is an information service that can be accessed with GPS-equipped mobile devices. LBS utilises the ability to make use of the geographical position of the mobile device. LBS services can be used in both customer and employee contexts. Typically, LBS services include services to identify the location of a person or object, for example, parcel, vehicle and person tracking services. Combining the position of the person or object with a map (base map, road map, city map, etc.) makes it easier to visualise the situation in hand. An example is a mobile field-force solution for loggers who work in the forest. The mobile solutions fetch work orders from the back-end systems and combine GPS position and base map, showing the worker's position and the geographic area to be worked. After the work has been done the logger can send detailed work results to the back-end system. The mobile field-force solution also has safety features: the worker can be traced if there are doubts about the worker's health.

5.2 Narrative of business unit rebranding

After a few years of intensive work, MSG Mobi started its own story in 2005 as a business unit of a larger company, MSG Software. Five persons from the mother company's personnel worked for the business unit. From the beginning of the business unit story it was clear that they wanted to spin off from the mother company. That is why the manager of MSG Software told the important stakeholders about this forthcoming change.
In the name, MSG refers to an abbreviation of “message”. The name, MSG Mobi, was invented mainly by the manager of MSG Software, but an employee had also given ideas and comments.

The business unit operated in the USA markets in the winter of 2007–2008. There they faced a problem with the name of the business unit because, in the USA, MSG means monosodium glutamate (also known as sodium glutamate). MSG is a food ingredient, which has been under debate in the USA due to the negative effects it has on health according to some studies (e.g. worsened asthmatic symptoms). Consequently, the Americans always asked whether they knew what MSG meant, and criticised the name, saying it was not good. On the other hand, this was considered somewhat acceptable in the business unit because they thought they were recognised and remembered. In addition, the problem did not exist in the European markets. However, this issue was considered problematic.

Before going again to the USA, in spring 2008, the manager wanted to avoid the name-related problems and changed the name of the business unit to WhileOnTheMove. WhileOnTheMove described the use of the product. People use mobile software when they are on the move with their mobile phone – not when they are at home or at the office.

Fig. 31. The second logo of Case 2.

The personnel were informed about the new name and the new internet sites, in the monthly meetings. The new domain was registered, and the internet sites were updated. The internet sites were considered important because, in the industry, everything happens on the internet. In addition, an employee changed the typesetting and layout of the corporate name (see Fig. 31). He had done this several times for the previous corporate name, because he wanted to update the visual presentation of the name.
5.3 The events, actions and actors in business unit rebranding sub-processes

I chose Case 2 for this study because it was about to rename its business unit and also spin it off from its mother company. Neither of these changes was conducted during the study. However, the business unit had changed its name before, and it was possible to examine this change. In addition, during the time of the data collection, the managing director was continuously planning the spin-off. In these plans he considered changing the existing name of the business unit to something else. Therefore, even though it appeared that this case could not be used in this study because it neither changed its name nor spun off during the data collection, it nevertheless proved to be an extremely interesting case.

In this case, the data revealed both business unit rebranding and plans for business unit rebranding for the time when the business unit would spin off from the mother company. The sub-processes of business unit rebranding are described in Fig. 32, and thereafter the sub-processes both in business unit rebranding and plans for business unit rebranding are discussed next in more detail.

![Fig. 32. Business unit rebranding sub-processes in Case 2.](image)

5.3.1 Renaming

In this case, Renaming can be seen as consisting of two different but intertwined processes: Naming the spin-off and Renaming the business unit (see, Fig. 33).
Here, *Naming the spin-off*, refers to a long process of developing a new name for the current business unit which was planned to spin off from the mother company. This process consisted of planning five events: *Communicating the forthcoming spin-off, Inventing the new name, Creating criteria for the name, Selecting the name, and Registering the name*. In other words, some actions in these events had already been conducted, but neither of these events was “finished”, for example, communicating the forthcoming spin-off continued, and all the other events as well.
Renaming the business unit refers to a very quick process of actually changing the business unit name because of external pressures in the USA markets. This process consisted of three events: Evaluating the name, Selecting the name and Registering the domain.

Fig. 33. Renaming in Case 2.
In *Renaming* the business unit the events are cumulative in nature; they were executed in a certain order and there was a result for each event. In *Naming the spin-off*, however, the events were at planning stage and they were not executed in any specific order. All these events are described in detail in the following section, first concentrating on *Naming the spin-off* and then continuing with *Renaming the business unit*.

**Naming the spin-off**

**Communicating the forthcoming spin-off**

As soon as MSG Mobi started as a business unit of MSG Software, the manager told the employees that one day, when the business unit got funding, it would be spun off from the mother company. He also spread the word among important external stakeholders – customers, potential customers, financiers – that they were about to spin off.

“Most of our [MSG Software] employees should know, we have discussed with them that we aim to spin off a company when we get funding – and then the externals, we have done much of that work by telling the customers, potential customers and different kinds of stakeholders that ... this is the business unit of MSG Software and our goal is that this will be an separate company some day. It is quite widely known and will not be a surprise for anyone. It is not a secret operation, it is better that as many as possible know that – for example, letting small scale investors or business angels know about us.” (Managing director B)

He thought that, in this way, the customers and potential customers would be able to distinguish between the business of MSG Software and the business unit more clearly.

**Inventing the name for the spin-off**

During its existence, the manager had been inventing the name for the spin-off. In addition, a few employees had also participated in inventing the name. They did not arrange any particular brainstorms or meetings around creating the name, they just threw ideas up in the air about what could be a good name for the company. The manager also said that the advertising agencies were eager to offer their ser-
VICES, but he thought that the people in the company were the most likely to know what their company did and what kind of name could describe it best.

“They have been thinking some three years…probably one or two guys who have been working with us but are not anymore … but with a quite small group, we have been thinking about it. Advertising agencies and others would have been eager to consult about the name and the brand and the colours and everything, but I do not know whether we can find the name with money.” (Managing director B)

The manager also explained that they needed to find a name for their product. A central issue was whether their product name and corporate name should be the same. He recognised the positive aspects of the names being the same, but he also realised that choosing the same name for both the product and the company would be challenging.

“We should also invent a name for our mobile platform, it is also a painful operation, and then for the company, and then see whether they are the same or different … in the short term it is good but in the longer term when technologies change … it will be a burden, especially because the corporate name should be the one that lasts for a longer time, it cannot be tied to a specific technology.” (Managing director B)

He particularly emphasised that the technologies in their industry develop continually and extreme rapidly. If the corporate name is tied into the technology, it may become outdated soon and need to be changed again.

Creating criteria for the name of the spin-off

The manager had not created any rules for the kind of name the company name should be, but he clearly had some criteria that the new name should fulfil. One criterion was domain availability. He thought that this was crucial in name development. Even though they had created a long list of names, they faced the problem of the domain names being mostly reserved. Another criterion was that the name needed to be short, from five to eight letters, and still describe what the company does.

“Whether the domain is available, well, it is quite crucial in [name development], we have invented several names, but the domains are reserved. It is
kind of a restricting factor…in inventing the company name. It is a difficult job to invent a name with five to eight letters to describe what the company does ... and if you look at the new companies in the USA in the IT business, they have absolutely foolish names which may partly be because of this – that all the logical names are reserved.” (Managing director B)

Selecting the name for the spin-off

The manager also considered how they would select the right name for the company. Obviously, he thought that the name needed to fit the criteria he had for the corporate name. He also realised that because all the logical corporate names were reserved, there was a possibility that some other kind of name needed to be selected.

“IT is hard, today, or laborious I think that if you find a good name then you notice that it is in use or its website is in use. It has to be squeezed when it looks like we will get funding.” (Managing director B)

The length of time it took to select a good name for the company was seen in relation to the funding for the spin-off; the manager realised that they had time for inventing a new name as long as the spin-off did not get funding, but if they received funding, the new name needed to be selected quickly.

Registering the name for the spin-off

The manager also thought about registering the new corporate name for the spin-off. He considered it a simple process of just filling in the forms and returning them to the trade register.

“When it looks like we will get funding, we need to fill in the forms to the trade register.” (Managing director B)

Renaming the business unit

Evaluating the business unit name

During the winter of 2007–2008 the business unit operated with the name MSG Mobi. When the business unit was operating in the USA markets with the name MSG Mobi, it faced the problem that the customers criticised the name and asked whether they were aware that MSG meant monosodium glutamate.
“The Americans always ask, do we know what MSG is. In Europe it does not count.” (Managing director B)

Even though the name was not considered problematic in the European markets, the issue in the USA resulted in the decision that the name needed to be changed. This led (1) to Selecting a new name.

**Selecting a new name**

Due to the fact that the business unit was going to the USA again, there was pressure to change its name before that trip. The company had used slogans WhileOnTheMove and WhileOnTheGo to describe the use of the product, in their brochures, on their internet sites and in other written material. The manager and an employee thought that both of the slogans had positive and negative aspects as names, but they selected WhileOnTheMove for the business unit name. They thought it described well what the customer could do with the product.

“It was so hurried when we were going again. We visited USA ... every month ... and we needed before that meeting to change once again ... the domains.” (Managing director B)

This resulted in the decision to use the name WhileOnTheMove as a business unit name and led (2) to Registering the domain. This also led (3) to Evaluating the new name, and they immediately realised that the name was too long for the company.

**Registering the domain**

The manager registered the domain whileonthemove.com for the business unit. In addition to that, he also kept the earlier domains, msgmobi.com and msgmobi.mobile, in order to reroute the stakeholders who knew the previous name but not the new name, to the newly created internet sites.

“Those who have known us a long time talk about MSG, because this [WhileOnTheMove] is not a company.” (Managing director B)
5.3.2 Redesigning

In order to understand Redesigning in this case, I took the five categories that I had found in the first case – Evaluating the (existing) logo, Creating logo proposals, Choosing a new logo, Adopting the new logo for use, and Creating rules for using the new logo as a basis for classification of the data. However, it soon became apparent that, in this case, it was not straightforward to classify the data under all these categories, for three reasons: first, the data revealed that the business unit did not have any specific logo. Instead, their layout of the business unit name, including fonts and colours, was considered the logo. Second, the above-mentioned business unit logo had been modified and changed several times by an employee, and the manager was not even able to tell how often the logo had been changed. Unfortunately, because the employee had left the company and, therefore, also the business unit, the manager considered that interviewing him would not be proper, so I was not able to get the data from his perspective in order to clarify this. And third, similar to Renaming, Redesigning was considered from two perspectives: Designing of the spin-off and Redesigning of the business unit (see Fig. 34).
Fig. 34. Redesigning in Case 2.

Designing the spin-off concentrated on Examining ideas for the spin-off logo. The reason why I consider this Redesigning even though I call it Designing is that, as explained earlier, my aim was to gain data from the business unit but it neither made this change nor spun off from the mother company, and therefore it was not possible to complete the data gathering. Redesigning the business unit concerns not only the quick change of the business unit name and logo as an answer to the external pressure exerted by customers (in this case in the USA), but also the continual updating and development of the business unit logo during its lifetime. This Redesigning consisted of three main ongoing events: Creating logo proposal(s), Choosing a new logo, and Adopting the new logo for use. As demonstrated below,
it is impossible to provide a detailed description of all the logo changes the business unit executed. Therefore, I can also assume that the order of these events was the same. In the following section, each of these events is explained in more detail.

**Designing the spin-off**

**Examining ideas for a spin-off logo**

The ideas for a spin-off logo were researched by examining other internet sites. The manager had chosen a few internet sites he liked, and he tried to understand the logic that was used on those sites.

“We have examined many websites in order to get ideas of what kind of style we want ... what issues there are and how does it look; but what colour it is and so on, I have no idea yet what it could be.” (Managing director B)

The basis for the colours that were used in MSG Mobi came from the mother company. The mother company used a specific colour of red in its logo that always needed to be the same. The manager thought that similar colours would be useful in designing the logo for the spin-off, or at least similar logic in using the colours needed to be adopted, that is, choosing the specific colours and not changing them continually.

“MSG Software has the colours and everything for the logo – they need to be a certain red – I do not know why, I have not been designing them, it is chosen; there might have been a reason why it is just this red, not blue or something else.” (Managing director B)

The manager believed strongly that the people in the company were best placed to know the business in which they operated and the specialities of the industry. Therefore he thought that they could provide the ideas for the logo and colour palette by themselves, with the final touches coming from the advertising agency.

“Maybe some advertising agency would then think about it. We might have all the ideas but the final touch.” (Managing director B)
Creating logo proposals for the business unit, Choosing a new logo for the business unit, and Adopting the new logo of the business unit for use

In the business unit, Redesigning the logo was a continuous process of Creating logo proposals, Choosing a new logo, and Adopting the new logo for use. The manager stated many times that an employee had frequently created proposals for a new typesetting of the business unit name, then just chose some of these and started to use the new version. He had informed the manager about the changes, but because the manager was not able to create a visual design by himself, he relied on this employee. Below is one of the research discussions about the logo, its elements and how the employee often changed the logo.

“Does this Mobi [MSG Mobi] have its own logo?” (Researcher)

“No.” (Managing director B)

“It is only this WhileOnTheMove?” (Researcher)

“Yes it is.” (Managing director B)

“But does it have its own logo or is it just–” (Researcher)

“No, no logo.” (Managing director B)

“--this name, layout, font?”(Researcher)

“Yep, and it has been changed again this time.” (Managing director B)

“There is no specific [element] in it which would always be the same, for example, the font?” (Researcher)

“No, he [an employee] has created them, I do not know how many versions there are.” (Managing director B)

Unfortunately, on the basis of the discussions with the manager, it proved to be impossible to disaggregate these events from each other in more detail.
5.3.3 Launching

Similar to the other corporate rebranding sub-processes above, Launching was also divided into two main views: Planning launching the spin-off name, and Launching the new name in the business unit (see Fig. 35).

![Diagram: Launching in Case 2](image)

Both of the abovementioned processes consisted of Launching internally and Launching externally. These events are described in more detail below.
**Plans for Launching the spin-off**

**Launching internally**

Even though the manager said that they had not planned how they would launch the new name of the spin-off, he listed several issues that proved that they already had a rough plan for the launch. He listed several important aspects that they needed to take into account when launching the new name of the spin-off.

“We have not planned that yet (**laughing**). Roughly, it is quite clear that we just need to start informing – about the background and so on – who will become owners ... and the board ... what we sell. But then if there will be a new name and internet sites, that will demand a great deal of work.” (Managing director B)

According to managing director B, they would first spread general information about the spin-off among the employees of the mother company and the new company. This included giving information via monthly meetings and internet sites concerning, for example, the owners, and what the new company will do. After the employees were informed, they would then launch the spin-off to external stakeholders. But, before external launching could be executed, a new logo for the spin-off needed to be created and all the communications material needed to be updated. Subsequently, this would lead to the event *Creating logo proposal(s) for the business unit* in the Redesigning process.

**Launching externally**

According to the manager, after creating a new logo and adopting it, and updating all the communications material, the company would be ready to launch the spin-off externally. He thought that in this business the internet was the most important way to publicise the changes; people in the industry think that everything happens on the internet.

“The people here think that it is only the web pages.” (Managing director B)

Therefore, he considered the internet the main channel for information about the spin-off, but also recognised that the main stakeholders needed to be informed via email and personal contact.
Launching the new name of the business unit

Launching the new name internally

Launching the new name internally involved telling the employees that the business unit had changed its name. As already described, the name change needed to be done fast because the company was going on a business trip to the USA, and they wanted to go on that trip with a new name. Consequently, the employees were only hastily informed in a monthly meeting that the business unit would be using the new name, WhileOnTheMove, from now on.

“We have not done much internal marketing. We introduce in our staff meetings once a month our stuff, we have not introduced them very much.” (Managing director B)

After this, an employee created a new logo – layout, colours and font types – for the new business unit name. This led to the event Creating logo proposal(s) for the business unit in the Redesigning process.

Launching the new name externally

After the new logo was created, chosen and adopted, the new name was ready to be launched externally. This mainly involved publicising the name change and the new name on the internet sites.

“In fact, we only changed our websites.” (Managing director B)

Again, the manager thought that in their industry everything happened on the internet, and therefore he did not consider any other ways of communicating the name change were necessary.

5.3.4 Evaluating

As the previous sections have revealed, the other business unit rebranding processes – Renaming, Redesigning, and Launching – have consisted of both the plans for the spin-off and what was actually done about the business unit name change. Evaluating the new business unit name differs from these in that it was not possible to distinguish between these two aspects. Both of these were found, because the new name was evaluated both individually and in connection to the possible new name for the spin-off. However, here I do not separate these two perspec-
tives, but consider them both in *Evaluating the new business name*. In addition to this, the data also revealed *Evaluating the Renaming process* and *Evaluating the Redesigning process*. These are illustrated in Fig. 36 and discussed next in more detail.

![Diagram](image)

**Fig. 36. Evaluating in Case 2.**

It is important to remember that in this section, *Evaluating* concerns only *Evaluating the new business unit name*, WhileOnTheMove. *Evaluating the old business unit name*, MSG Mobi, was conducted as part of the *Renaming* process (see Section 5.3.1).

**Evaluating the new name**

Evaluation of the new name began as soon as the name for the business unit was chosen. The evaluation was done by the managing director. He thought that the name WhileOnTheMove aptly described how the product could be used.

“It describes well the use of it [the product]. As a corporate name it is not the best possible – it is too long. ... It is quite long for a name and we should invent a new corporate name once again but it could stay as a slogan. We should find much strongly an own feature for that [the name of the forthcoming spin-off] in order to make it stand out from MSG Software.” (Managing director B)
However, as a negative aspect, the manager thought that WhileOnTheMove was too long a name for the company. In addition, he thought that the name of the spin-off should be more distinguishable from the name of the mother company in order to differentiate the new company and its business from that of the mother company. They had already used WhileOnTheMove as a slogan before the manager thought that the current business unit name could be retained as a slogan for the new company as well.

**Evaluating the Renaming and Redesigning processes**

The manager also evaluated the total process of business unit rebranding. He thought that in *Renaming* and *Redesigning*, even though they had done their best and were satisfied with the results, there were always stakeholders who criticised their choices and what they had done. Therefore he saw the processes mentioned below as continuous work in making things better.

“Name and colours – you can work with it and develop it endlessly and you will never get the one that everyone considers extremely good, there is always someone who likes and someone who does not like ... They ask, why that kind of name, why MSG Mobile, why that kind of font, and so on ... Different people look at different aspects.” (Managing director B)

In particular, he considered inventing the name for the company extremely difficult. This was for two reasons. First, he thought that the name should describe what the company does and it should be shorter than eight letters. And second, when one has invented corporate names that fill these criteria, almost all the names are taken. As a result, because all the good names had been reserved, this led to choosing abstract names and one could not tell what the company does.

**5.4 Outputs of business unit rebranding**

**5.4.1 Business unit names**

The business unit changed its name once from MSG Mobi to WhileOnTheMove (see Table 21).
Table 21. Summary of the name types and name change in Case 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name type</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Refers also to the name type</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Name change</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSG Mobi</td>
<td>Acronymic</td>
<td>Abbreviation of message</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Describes what the company does</td>
<td>Makeover</td>
<td>No link to the previous name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WhileOnTheMove</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Describes how the product can be used</td>
<td>Freestanding</td>
<td>Has no meaning of its own</td>
<td>Makeover</td>
<td>No link to the previous name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The original name

In the original name, MSG Mobi, MSG was an abbreviation of message. According to the manager, their business was about delivering messages. Mobi came from mobile, and although quite a general name, it also describes what the company does.

“MSG refers to message and in producing IT software it kind of is delivering messages, after all.” (Managing director B)

In conclusion, the name is acronymic in nature, but it also has elements of the descriptive name type.

The new name

The new name of the business unit, WhileOnTheMove, was originally used as a slogan. Pressure to rapidly change the business unit name resulted in a quick decision to use the previous slogan as the business unit name. WhileOnTheMove describes how the product of the company can be used: via the mobile phone when you are out of your home or office.

The name is therefore descriptive in nature. It also has features of an abstract name, because it has no meaning of its own. From this viewpoint, it represents a freestanding name.

Name change type

The name change type from MSG Mobi to WhileOnTheMove was complete in nature, Makeover. There was no link between the original name and the new name.

5.4.2 Business unit logos

Clarifying the types of logo change proved to be challenging. This was because, first, the business unit was not a company and therefore did not have a specific corporate logo; and second, the business unit name formed a kind of logo for the company, in that it was typography, but this typography was changed several times. Here I consider these as logos, and concentrate on only two: the original
logo of MSG Mobi, and the logo of WhileOnTheMove. These are summarised in Table 22.

**Table 22. Summary of the logo change type in Case 2.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logo</th>
<th>Font change</th>
<th>Text change</th>
<th>Colour change</th>
<th>Layout change</th>
<th>Logo change type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSG Mobi</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOM</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The original logo of the business was a grey-coloured typograph of the business unit name. The new logo was also a typograph of the business unit name, and also included the abbreviation of the business unit name, “WOM”. The font of the logo was changed to a completely new one. The text was also changed completely, because of the new business unit name. In addition, the grey colour was completely changed to red and black. Similarly, the layout of the logo changed completely. The logo change therefore represents Renewal, a complete change.

**5.4.3 Business unit rebranding type**

The business unit executed only one rebranding exercise: changing the business unit name and, at the same time, changing the business unit logo (see Table 23).

**Table 23. Summary of the business unit rebranding type in Case 2.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Name change type</th>
<th>Logo change type</th>
<th>Corporate rebranding type</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name and logo</td>
<td>Makeover</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Complete change</td>
<td>Both name change and logo change are complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this change, both the business unit name and the logo were completely changed. This represents complete corporate, or business unit, rebranding. However, it should be kept in mind that the business unit actually created several versions of the logo and may have used many of them, but even the manager was not
sure how many different logo versions had been used. This analysis is therefore not the whole truth. Instead, in this analysis only the logos that were in use for the longest time period were presented.
6 Case 3: Corporate rebranding - two name changes

I chose Case 3 because it offers a corporate rebranding example of two name changes. In so doing, I assumed that it differs from Case 1, in which only one corporate name change was executed. This difference offered interesting theoretical comparisons with the other two cases, making it possible for me to develop the theories in this study further.

6.1 Introducing the company in Case 3

6.1.1 Size and personnel

Media Solutions Siurua Inc. was established in 1996, in Oulu, Finland. The managing director (C) had been interested in providing Internet sites, and decided to launch a company in that area of business.

The company is owned by its manager. Another person was also an owner when the company was established; he still owns a small share of the company and belongs to the management board, but for several years he has worked outside the company and does not participate actively in company development. The number of employees has varied, but the company has always employed fewer than ten people. At the time of data gathering the company employed seven people.

In spring 2009 the company changed its name to Galaxo Inc. Nowadays it is one of the leading suppliers of electronic information channel services in Finland. They offer consultation, design and maintenance services for electronic information channels. After the study, in October 2010, Galaxo adopted two more auxiliary firm names to use: Galaxo Digital Signage and Galaxomedia.

6.1.2 Software solutions

Galaxo provides options for information management through managing the content of a display network, web page or internal service, by using the internet, extranet, intranet, an infochannel (Digital Signage) and mobile channels. All these are under the same product name, Galaxo®.
Galaxo information management centre offers versatile tools for web publishing, feedback management and newsletter management tools. These have been developed according to real customer needs, and through these, for example, a company’s products, services and current affairs can be easily represented through the web to interested parties.

Various user rights can be set according to an organisation’s needs, whether Galaxo® is used as an intranet or also as an extranet environment. Information can be targeted to specific user groups, such as personnel, partners and customers. A browser-based user interface makes the distribution of contacts, files and current affairs very easy.

Digital signage refers to the use of modern display panels, digital content and internet technology to deploy a network of rich-media signs to replace traditional print signs. The content of a presentation may be text, images, sound, videos or information from external systems. A presentation can be targeted locally, nationally or globally. The content can be updated online on one terminal or on a global office network. Content management is performed with an internet browser according to user rights. Digital signage can be deployed at almost any location where people gather, shop, entertain, walk by and wait; for example, digital signage can be used for driving impulse purchases, promoting in-store offers, informing and educating customers, or even for training staff globally.

Galaxo infochannel is a real-time communication channel consisting of a network of high-quality digital displays. The service is perfect for communicating, demonstrating and showing the way, for both a company’s own customers and its own staff. Galaxo infochannel total delivery package consists of hardware and software solutions that help companies to reach their target audience – exactly when they need to. Besides effective and targeted communication, Galaxo infochannel also lets companies benefit from quick and easy revision of the content on display. The content does not have to be similar everywhere; it can even be different on each display. There is an unlimited network of displays as the displays can be located around the city, around the country or around the world. Any particular display can be selected on the basis of its location and use. By taking advantage of the position data of the displays, a company can be guaranteed to reach its target audience.

The contents displayed on Galaxo infochannel can be created and updated by the user, all changes are made easily through an internet connection and content on the displays can be text, sound, pictures, video clips, animated clips or information from other databases. The display contents can also employ automatically-
updated information such as weather forecasts, news or public transport timetables.

Galaxo also offers services in expert consultation, system design, support and content, and has a wide network of partners.

6.2 Narrative of corporate rebranding

Media Solutions Siurua Inc. was the official name of the company. The name of the company came straight from what the company does, media solutions, and it also includes the last name of the founder. The business started to grow, and the first employees were hired in 1999. The company concentrated on software development. As the manager says, he got the idea for the first firm name when he was sitting in a forest, hunting elks. He also designed the logo for the company (see, Fig. 37).

![First Logo of Case 3](image)

Fig. 37. The first logo of Case 3.

However, the manager soon noticed that the name was difficult to use; the internet domain was difficult to use, and he had to repeat to the customers how to write the name. In addition, at the end of 1999, the manager found the logo outdated. He hired a student to design a new logo for the company, as her thesis. The result was a new logo (Fig. 38), in which black and red flames illustrated the dynamic nature of the industry, and also formed MSS, the abbreviation of the company name. In addition, the company name existed under the flames. The new logo was adopted for use and established at the beginning of 2000.
From this logo, the manager got an idea for how to make the corporate name more usable. At the beginning of 2001, he registered four auxiliary firm names: MSS Group, MSS Consulting, MSS Networks and MSS Interactive. In addition, he got the domain for MSS Group. He also updated the corporate logo by replacing the original corporate name with the name MSS Group (Fig. 39).

During this time, the company had been developing their products. The main product was established in 2002 with the name MSS Ferris. The name for the product came from a Ferris wheel; its purpose was to illustrate that the customer can choose the products and/or services from the “baskets” the company offered. During the years, awareness of the product increased among customers, and the business started to grow, nationally and internationally.

In 2005, the business model of the company was changed. The manager recognised the need to renew the product name. He asked an advertising agency to create a new name for the product; a name that would work well in branding the product, especially in an international context. An advertising agency created the name Galaxo for the product, and also created a logo and a symbol for the product (Fig. 40).
The colours of the previous logo remained in the new logo, but the new common theme was space. The manager registered the product, and since then the product name has been written as Galaxo®. The company launched the new product name by sending newsletters to their customers and other important stakeholders via their intranet and extranet solutions and emails, and creating an animation for the internet sites. In 2007, the corporate logo was, again, refreshed (Fig. 41).

During these years, the stakeholders, especially the customers, seemed to know Galaxo® better than the name of the company, even though the company name or, at least the logo or the flames of the company logo, were used in their communications material. Therefore, at the beginning of 2009, the manager decided to change the corporate name so it was the same as the product name, Galaxo, and the logo of the product was adopted as the logo of the company as well. The old name was still registered as an auxiliary firm name.

The new corporate name was introduced to the customers and other stakeholders through the intranets and extranets, and also in some emails. However, the manager did not hurry to eliminate the old name of the company. For example, the old name stayed beside the new name outside the building, and the envelopes with both the product name and the flames from the old logo still remained in use.

After the name change the manager recognised that for some of the customers the change was good, because they talked only about Galaxo. Others, despite the information about the change, still used the old corporate name. In addition, the
manager found it challenging to use the same name for the name of the product and the company, until he made the decision that when the question was about the product, it was always written as Galaxo®, and when the question was about the company, it was always written Galaxo Inc. or Galaxo Ltd. (or Galaxo Oy in Finnish).

### 6.3 Sub-processes of the corporate rebranding

A timeline of the sub-processes that proved to be important from the perspective of corporate rebranding is presented in Fig. 42.

![Fig. 42. Corporate rebranding sub-processes in Galaxo.](image)

In summary, the manager invented the original corporate name before establishing the company in 1996, and designed the first logo for the company soon after the company was established. At the beginning of 2000, a graphic designer student created the second logo for the company as her thesis. Soon after that, the manager registered four auxiliary firm names for the company. He found one of the auxiliary firm names useful in gaining the internet domain, and at the beginning of 2001 changed that name to the second logo. By 2002, the company had developed the pre-version of its current product, and at that time they named the product. In 2005, the advertising agency created a new name, logo and symbol for the company’s product. After that, the manager registered one more auxiliary firm name for the company. During that time, the company became known for its product. Therefore, the manager decided to change the company name so it was the same as the product name, in spring 2009. The new name was launched both
to the internal and external stakeholders by using the intranet and extranet solutions of the company. After the launch, the manager got feedback about the new name from the stakeholders, and he also noticed that some of the customers used the new name fluently while others still used the old name.

Providing a detailed description of the sub-processes proved to be challenging for two reasons: first, the data gained did not reveal very detailed descriptions about the events of the sub-processes; and second, the sub-processes were often closely related in that one event in one process resulted in one event in another process, so describing the processes as separate processes was difficult. Despite this, I will next describe the corporate rebranding sub-processes of **Renaming, Redesigning, Launching and Evaluating** in as much detail as possible, while also trying to illustrate how they are interconnected.

### 6.3.1 Renaming

In this section, the main events, actions and actors of the corporate **Renaming** process are presented. Corporate **Renaming** includes: **Evaluating the name, Inventing a new name, Selecting the name and Registering the name** (see, Fig. 43).
Soon after the company was established, at the end of the 1990s, the managing
director noticed that the name Media Solutions Siurua was difficult to use.

“It [the original corporate name] was unbelievably difficult to use. No one
was able to use it, and they used many different versions [of it]: Media Siurua
and Solutions Siurua and, you name it, and it was absolutely too long a name.
I decided that ... the name needs to be changed.” (Managing director C)

As a result, the managing director made the decision that the corporate name
needed to be changed. This led (1 in Fig. 43) to Inventing a new name.

**Fig. 43. Renaming in Case 3.**

**Evaluating the name**

Soon after the company was established, at the end of the 1990s, the managing
director noticed that the name Media Solutions Siurua was difficult to use.

“It [the original corporate name] was unbelievably difficult to use. No one
was able to use it, and they used many different versions [of it]: Media Siurua
and Solutions Siurua and, you name it, and it was absolutely too long a name.
I decided that ... the name needs to be changed.” (Managing director C)

As a result, the managing director made the decision that the corporate name
needed to be changed. This led (1 in Fig. 43) to Inventing a new name.
Inventing a new name

At the beginning of 2000, a freelance graphic designer created a new logo for the company. In the logo, the flames formed MSS, and these gave the manager ideas for a new corporate name.

“There are three flames which ... form MSS.” (Managing director C)

He invented several versions of possible corporate names, including MSS. This was followed (2 in Fig. 43) by Selecting the name.

Selecting the name

From the invented names, the managing director registered four names as auxiliary firm names in January 2001: MSS Consulting, MSS Networks, MSS Group and MSS Interactive.

“MSS Group came from Media Solutions Siurua. We did not have any other companies ... but we got a domain for that ... and that is why we changed it.” (Managing director C)

For one of the names, MSS Group, manager C managed to gain a domain, and that is why he decided to use it. He updated the logo with the name, used the name as a corporate name in all communications material, and launched them to the stakeholders. In other words, this concluded (3 in Fig. 43) in Redesigning and Launching. Later on, in September 2005, the managing director registered one more auxiliary firm name, MSS Design, for the company.

Evaluating the name

In 2005, the product of the company was renamed. An advertising agency created a new name for the product, Galaxo. They also designed a logo and a symbol for the product. The product was launched to stakeholders by creating animations on the internet sites and by using other electronic communications channels.

“We named the product MSS, it was easiest, and then it was Ferris ... it came from the Ferris wheel ... it did not work well but with that we went. When we wanted to get rid of that Ferris ... they [an advertising agency] designed that picture and a logo for Galaxo. It was kind of a turning point when [an adver-
advertising agency] created that name and logo. ... first it was searching ... they offered only one choice from an advertising agency. The greatest launching was done when we changed Ferris to Galaxo, we made an animation and said that Ferris is now Galaxo.” (Managing director C)

During this time, especially between 2007 and 2009, the product became well known among the stakeholders. This led (4 in Fig. 43) to Evaluating the name. The manager noticed that the product name was often better known than their corporate name.

“It [the product] has been Galaxo for several years already – the product kind of goes before the company.” (Managing director C)

This encouraged the manager to move (5 in Fig. 43) to Selecting the name.

Selecting the name

Because their product was known as Galaxo and the company name was long and difficult to use, the managing director thought it natural to change the product name to the corporate name as well.

“No one knew it [Media Solutions Siurua], there were many different versions of it – it was absolutely too long a name. Galaxo as a product has been since 2005 ... it became known as a product. Because we repeated Galaxo [product name] everywhere it was natural [and just] a matter of time before we renamed our company Galaxo. It [Media Solutions Siurua Ltd.] was our official name until March this year [2009]. We kind of lingered the change.” (Managing director C)

This led (6 in Fig. 43) to Registering the new name.

Registering the new name

Accordingly, the corporate name became Galaxo. At this time, the managing director registered Galaxo as a corporate name and Media Solutions Siurua as an auxiliary firm name, and continued (7 in Fig. 43) by Launching the new name to the stakeholders.
6.3.2 Redesigning

In the data, four Redesigning actions were found: Creating logo proposals, Choosing a logo, Launching a new logo, and Adapting the product logo as the corporate logo. The events and their main actors are summarised in Fig. 44 and then described in detail.

Fig. 44. Redesigning in Case 3.

Creating logo proposals

At the beginning of 2000, a graphic designer student created some graphic software for the company, as her thesis. As a part of the software design, she also created a proposal for a new company logo.

“A graphic designer did [the second logo] as her thesis.” (Managing director C)
This resulted in a logo proposal, and led (1 in Fig. 44) to Choosing a logo.

**Choosing a logo**

The manager was satisfied with the new logo proposal, and decided to choose it as the new logo for the company. The decision was easy, because he thought that the colours in the logo represented the dynamics of the graphic industry, and the flames in the logo formed MSS, the abbreviation from the long corporate name Media Solutions Siurua.

“There are three flames which describe the dynamic of the graphic industry – and they form MSS.” (Managing director C)

This resulted in a new logo for the company and led to (2 in Fig. 44) Adopting a new logo for use.

**Adopting a new logo for use**

After that time, the new logo was used in all the communications material. When the new logo had been in use for some months, the managing director got an idea that, because the flames in the logo formed MSS, MSS could be something that could also be used in the corporate name. This is connected to the Renaming process (3 in Fig. 44) in that this led to Inventing a new name for the company. The renaming process concluded with the managing director registering four auxiliary firm names. One of these names was MSS Group, which the managing director decided to use as a corporate name. This led (4 in Fig. 44) to Creating logo proposal.

**Creating logo proposal**

This time the managing director himself created a proposal for the new logo, in which he mainly concentrated on how the name MSS Group could be written in the logo.

“This MSS Group came from me.” (Managing director C)

Thereafter he continued (5 in Fig. 44) to Choosing a logo.
Choosing a logo

Choosing a logo was easy for the manager. He was able to choose the font in the logo that he wanted.

This resulted (6 in Fig. 44) in launching the new name and logo.

Adapting the product logo as the corporate logo

Later on, during the spring of 2009, the product name was adopted as the name of the company. The old corporate logo was left out, and the only logo the company used was the product logo - also as the corporate logo. With the corporate name they used either Inc. in the texts or a slogan, for example on the internet.

“We registered it [the product logo] and got that ‘r’ [®] there quite soon ... we do not have a separate company logo at all ... we use Galaxo Inc. for example in offers.” (Managing director C)

“Sometimes we use with it [the corporate name] ... this ‘see it everywhere’ ... but we aspire that it is in the presentation – and the logo is that one [a product logo].” (Managing director C)

6.3.3 Launching

In this case, the specific categorisation to internal and external launching of the new name could not be done. This was because launching the new name was done electronically by using the company’s own products, such as numerous electronic channels, both internally and externally, at the same time.

“Well, launching was left, we did it on the side of other jobs ... we informed our customers ... and other stakeholders ... through our solutions ... we did not provide any press release ... we have done this with quite a low profile.” (Managing director C)
6.3.4 Evaluating

In this case, the events Evaluating the new name and Evaluating the renaming process existed. But, in addition to these, a new category was found in this case, namely, Evaluating the use of the new name (see Fig. 45).

Each of these was a separate event not directly connected to the others. Each of these are discussed in more detail in the next section.

Evaluating the new name

After the new name was launched, it was evaluated by the manager. When the advertising agency developed the name for the product, he immediately thought it was a good name. That first impression seemed to last, because he also thought that Galaxo was a good company name as well.

“Surprisingly soon I noticed that I adopted the name. When the product was Ferris ... I can never imagine that the corporate name would be Ferris some-
thing, I mean this was the name which was good immediately.” (Managing director C)

**Evaluating the use of the new name**

The manager noticed that, on the one hand, it was a bit difficult that the company had the same name as the product, because it was not always self-evident whether the customers were talking about the product or the company. In particular, he thought that on invoices, contracts and other written material the company needed to be careful to differentiate the product and the company.

“On the other hand, it is a little bit difficult when the firm name and the product name are the same. We want that Galaxo is in view everywhere, in that way it is at least more efficient.” (Managing director C)

On the other hand, he thought that repeating one name everywhere was more efficient than using two different names. This was because the stakeholders always connect the product to the right company.

**Evaluating the Renaming process**

The manager also evaluated the renaming process. He thought that in his company the process was not very straightforward; instead, finding the new name for the company had lasted several years in total. According to him, they could have been more efficient, especially in launching the new name, but he nevertheless thought that they had managed the name change well – partly because they had managed their product well.

“We could have been more efficient ... we still have our light signs outside the building on the wall. I think it is most important in these [name changes] that you go forward in a determined way. ... but this has been quite painless because we have managed so well in the productisation of Galaxo.” (Managing director C)

According to the manager, the process did not end when the new name was launched to stakeholders. It continued, for example, by making decisions about how long the old corporate name would be in use.
6.4 Outputs of corporate rebranding

6.4.1 Corporate names

Even though this case company officially changed its name only once, from Media Solutions Siurua to Galaxo, it also used one of its auxiliary firm names, MSS Group, as a corporate name. Consequently, in this case there were two corporate name changes that were visible to the stakeholders: first, changing the name Media Solutions Siurua to MSS Group, and second, changing both of these to Galaxo. The types of the names and changes are summarised in Table 24. This section first examines the type of the first name and continues by considering the type of change from one name to another name.
### Table 24. Summary of the name types and name changes in Case 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name type</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Refers also to the name type</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Name change type</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Solutions Siurua</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Describes what the company does</td>
<td>Person based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS Group</td>
<td>Acronymic</td>
<td>Contains abbreviation MSS from Media Solutions Siurua, Group kind of specifying word</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>MSS is also in use in the product name</td>
<td>Reinventing</td>
<td>Abbreviating Media Solutions Siurua to MSS, adding the word Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galaxo</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Same as the product name</td>
<td>Freestanding</td>
<td>The name Galaxo has a meaning of its own</td>
<td>Brand adoption</td>
<td>The name of the well-recognised product is taken as the corporate name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The original name

The original name for the company was invented by the manager. The name describes what the company does: it offers media solutions. Consequently, the name is descriptive in nature. In addition, the surname of the manager is contained within the name, and that makes the name patronymic.

First change – from Media Solution Siurua to MSS Group

The second name of the company, MSS Group, was only an auxiliary firm name, but for many years it was widely in use. For example, it was visible on the internet sites of the company, and the domain also included “mssgroup”. Thus, even though the name was not officially the corporate name, it was widely used, and so I consider it here.

MSS is an abbreviation of Media Solutions Siurua, therefore the name is acronymic in nature. The word “Group” after MSS is a general word, and therefore the total name MSS Group does not fit into any other categories. At that time, the abbreviation MSS was also in use in the product name. Therefore, the name has features of a descriptive name as well.

Changing the corporate name from Media Solutions Siurua to MSS Group represents Reinventing, a minor change. This is because Media Solutions Siurua is abbreviated into MSS, so something is deleted from the original name. In addition, the word Group is added into the name.

Second change – from MSS Group to Galaxo

The third name of the company, Galaxo, is the same as the name of the company’s well-recognised product, therefore the name is descriptive in nature. Galaxo as a name can be considered a freestanding name, because it has a meaning of its own.

The change from MSS Group (or from Media Solutions Siurua) to Galaxo can be considered a brand adoption, because the name of the well-recognised product is adopted as the corporate name. From the corporate name perspective only, the change would be a makeover, complete change.
6.4.2 Corporate logos

The company in this case executed four logo changes altogether. After the company had taken the product name as the corporate name, it left the old corporate logo out and adopted the product logo as the new corporate logo. Accordingly, this type of logo change was new compared to the theoretical background, and therefore, a new change type needed to be created. This was done by adopting one of the corporate name change types, ‘brand adoption’ (see chapter 2.4.3), to use. The four logo changes are summarised in Table 25 and are then discussed.

Table 25. Summary of the logo changes in Case 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logo</th>
<th>Font change</th>
<th>Text change</th>
<th>Colour change</th>
<th>Layout change</th>
<th>Total logo change type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Refreshment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS Group</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Refreshment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS Group</td>
<td>Complete (but the same as in the product logo)</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Refreshment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>galaxo</td>
<td>Brand adoption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First logo change type

The first logo was actually the typography of the corporate name rather than a logo, but I consider it here as a logo. In the logo, the text “Media Solutions” was written with bold, gold letters, and below that was the text “Media Solutions Siuru Oy”.

At first sight it looks like the second logo was almost completely changed from the first one. Examining the changes in detail, however, it can be concluded that there were only minor changes to the logo, in other words, Refreshment.
In the second logo, the font was completely changed. The text change was minor, because in both logos the text Media Solutions Siurua Oy was present. The gold colour was completely dropped and changed to red and black, because, as the manager says, red is a dynamic colour and describes the dynamics of the industry.

“Then came red which is such a dynamic colour and on the other hand that white, we could use it both ways, black background with white or black.”
(Managing director C)

In the second logo, the layout of the logo has some similar elements to the first logo. In both of the logos “a figure” is placed above the text Media Solutions Siurua Oy; in the first logo this is the text Media Solutions, and in the second logo it is the red and black flames that describe MSS. Accordingly, the layout change is minor in nature.

Second logo change type

The change from the second logo to the third logo was also Refreshment, minor in nature. In this change, only the text below the flames was changed from Media Solutions Siurua Oy to MSS Group. All the other elements remained the same.

Third logo change type

The third logo change type was, again, Refreshment in nature. In this change the font was changed completely. However, the font was the same as in the product logo. The text and colours remained the same, but the layout of the logo represents a minor change. The flames were moved from above the text to the upper left corner and they were given a lesser role than in the previous logo.

Fourth logo change type

In the fourth logo change the logo change type was brand adoption. This time the logo of the company’s product was adopted as the logo of the company. In this change, from the viewpoint of corporate logo, the text remained the same but all the other elements changed.
6.4.3 Corporate rebranding types

In this case, four corporate rebranding exercises were carried out (see, Table 26). The first rebranding was conducted only on the original logo, separately from the corporate name change. As I described in the previous section, this change was minor in nature, and because the corporate name was not changed, the type of corporate rebranding was Refreshment of the logo. The second change involved using the auxiliary firm name as the corporate name, and in this change, the corporate logo was also updated. Both the name change and the logo change were minor in nature. The third change involved, again, changing the corporate logo without changing the corporate name. This logo change was also minor in nature. And finally, the product name was adopted as the corporate name, and in this change the old corporate logo was dropped, and the product logo was adapted as the corporate logo from then on. At this stage, both name change and logo change was brand adoption.

Table 26. Summary of the corporate rebranding types in Case 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Name change type</th>
<th>Logo change type</th>
<th>Corporate rebranding type</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First change:</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Refreshing</td>
<td>Minor change</td>
<td>Some of the logo elements are changed but the corporate name remains the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logo only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second change:</td>
<td>Reinventing</td>
<td>Refreshing</td>
<td>Minor change</td>
<td>Both name change and logo change were minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>name and logo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third change:</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Refreshing</td>
<td>Minor change</td>
<td>Some of the logo elements are changed but the corporate name remains the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logo only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth change:</td>
<td>Brand adoption</td>
<td>Brand adoption</td>
<td>Intermediate change</td>
<td>Both name change and logo change were brand adoptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>name and logo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 Comparisons of the corporate rebranding processes

In this chapter I will compare the corporate rebranding processes of the three cases. I selected the cases involved using theoretical selection in order to choose cases sufficiently different to allow theoretically interesting comparisons. Case 1 is a case of corporate rebranding in which the corporate name was changed once, Case 2 is an example of business unit rebranding, and Case 3 a case of corporate rebranding in which the corporate name was changed twice.

The comparisons of context-related characteristics in corporate rebranding are made by comparing the theoretical framework to the empirical data derived from the cases. All the other comparisons are made by first comparing the three cases and then comparing the theoretical framework to the empirical data derived from the cases. Case 2 is slightly different in that, although there is a similar discussion of the events and actors in the corporate rebranding sub-processes, the analysis includes both the process of planning the spin-off and the actual renaming of the business unit.

This chapter first presents context-related characteristics in and reasons for corporate rebranding, then continues on to review the main events and actors in corporate rebranding sub-processes, and finally, examines the outputs of corporate rebranding.

7.1 Context-related characteristics in and reasons for corporate rebranding

This section focuses on the context-related characteristics in and reasons for corporate rebranding found in the three cases. Rather than discussing about context-related characteristics case by case, I provide a general view of them by first discussing their relationships, and then continuing by presenting the context-related characteristics in detail. Thereafter I continue by discussing the reasons for corporate rebranding first case by case and then by comparing the theoretical framework to the empirical data derived from the cases.
7.1.1 Relations of the context-related characteristics in and reasons for corporate rebranding

In the theoretical framework, I suggested that context-related characteristics, including the special characteristics of branding in small businesses, B2B branding and branding in software companies, are background characteristics that may influence sub-processes of corporate rebranding (see, Fig. 46). In addition, I assumed that the reasons for corporate rebranding influence sub-processes of corporate rebranding.

Fig. 46. Theoretical and empirical relations of context-related characteristics, reasons for corporate rebranding, and sub-processes of corporate rebranding.

The data, however, revealed that rather than being background characteristics, the context-related characteristics are present in the sub-processes – in other words some of them could only be found after the processes were constructed. Therefore I see it as necessary to adjust the theoretical framework with empirical findings by suggesting that not only the context-related characteristics have an influence on corporate rebranding sub-processes, but also sub-processes of corporate rebranding have an influence on the context-related characteristics.

In addition, in the theoretical framework no connection between the context-related characteristics and the reasons for corporate rebranding was suggested. The data revealed that context-related characteristics influenced the reasons for corporate rebranding. Examples will be provided in the next two sections.
7.1.2 Context-related characteristics

Some of the context-related characteristics are presented in the earlier chapters as part of sub-processes, and some of them became obvious from the empirical data in some other way. In the theoretical framework I suggested that context-related characteristics include special characteristics of branding in small business, B2B branding and branding in software companies. I discuss them next in the order above.

Special characteristics of branding in small businesses

In the theoretical framework it was suggested that there are four special characteristics of branding in small business: 1) corporate branding begins before the company is even established; 2) the role of the entrepreneur is emphasised, and (s)he is the personification of the corporate brand; 3) responsibility for brand management rests at management level and; 4) several individual issues – like the owner/director/manager, market, the company structure, type of products, market orientation, and competitors – have an influence on the role of brand management in small companies (see Fig. 47).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical characteristics</th>
<th>Empirical characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Corporate branding begins before the company is even established</td>
<td>- Corporate rebranding begins before the company is even established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The role of the entrepreneur is emphasised</td>
<td>- The role of the entrepreneur/manager is emphasised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Responsibility of brand management rests at management level</td>
<td>- Responsibility of brand management rests at management level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Owner/director/manager, market, the company structure, type of the products, market orientation, and competitors have an influence on the role of brand management</td>
<td>- Owner/director/manager, business and markets, the company structure, type of the product, stakeholders' awareness of the products and stakeholders have an influence on corporate rebranding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Empirically all these characteristics were found. The previously provided process descriptions provided support for the characteristics of Corporate branding begins before the company is even established, and Responsibility for brand management rests at management level. As the processes of Renaming in Case 1 and Case 2 revealed, the need for a new corporate name was noticed before the com-
pany was established. In so doing, the empirical data reveals that also corporate rebranding begins before the company is even established.

In each case, the roles of the manager and the company structure in the corporate rebranding were enormous; in Case 2 and Case 3 the manager was often the only person prosecuting events in the corporate rebranding sub-processes. The important role of the entrepreneur as a personification of the corporate brand was not found from the process descriptions, but it became obvious from the interviews. It was seen that a personal brand could be an entrepreneur or the manager of the company.

“-- a personal brand needs to be developed as being a front man of the company.” (A board member)

In addition, the product, business and the markets in which the company operate, were considered important in corporate rebranding. The interviewees recognised clearly that there are differences in branding in different industries and emphasised that the context-related characteristics are important in brand building. Many of the interviewees had a background in telecommunications in a large multinational company. Therefore they had previous experience of brand building – if not experience of building a brand. However, working for a large company, they had followed product brand building closely from inside the company. One of the interviewees describes the importance of the nature of the business as follows:

“But selling the future is not the same in this business as it is in telecommunications. There they sell the future all the time, what it is about to come. You cannot do business with what you have now but you do business with what you promise you will do in the future. … But it is not the game here. It is much more about the customers – that they look what you are selling. … they are not interested in what your vision is in two or three years. Maybe it will be emphasised in the future but now it is much more about what do you have now. You either have something or not, well, come again when you have something and let’s see then. In that sense this is very simplified and that is just about the customers. These doctors are peculiar people, not like engineers. There is not much long-term thinking. They live today, what is it about today and what can I do with this, how would this help my job and so on. It is not easy to get the message across that this is the first step and in the future we will build great functionality onto this. This kind of message is not easily
accepted, they do not think in the long term. In the mobile business they think: if I invest in this, what can I build on it? But this kind of mindset is totally missing here.” (Managing director A3)

It was also recognised that the business that they are doing and their products are as such not anything special, but their solutions offered to end users are new and may have a great impact for them.

“Our business is so new that even though it is not an amazing issue we produce but when we bring it to the end customers it is a huge change there” (Managing director A3)

Rather than just the type of products influencing the role of brand management, as theoretically suggested, stakeholder awareness of the products was shown to be important in influencing corporate rebranding. In Case 3, the corporate name was changed to mirror that of the best-known product, because it was noticed that the product name was better known than the corporate name. In addition, rather than seeing only competitors influencing the choice, several other stakeholders, including financiers and customers, had an influence on the invention of a new name for the company, its evaluation, and also on the design of a new corporate logo.

**Special characteristics of B2B branding**

In the theoretical background, three characteristics of B2B branding were presented (see, Fig. 48). Two of those were found in the empirical data as well, albeit slightly modified. The characteristic relating to *The B2B brand reaches all the stakeholders* could not be found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical characteristics</th>
<th>Empirical characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Corporate brands are important</td>
<td>- Corporate brands are important, but a B2B company can become a brand only if its product becomes a brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brand is a promise and a totality of perceptions</td>
<td>- The brand is a promise and a totality of perceptions, and depends on the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A B2B brand reaches all the stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 48. Theoretical and empirical characteristics of B2B branding.*
According to the interviewees, one never knows what might become a brand. They emphasised that the brand is known in its target group and the strength of a brand depends on the stakeholders. It was suggested that a B2B company which provides products can become a brand only if its product becomes a brand and the name of the company is changed to being the same as that of a product. This was emphasised by Case 3, which actually changed its corporate name to the same as the name of its product.

“But a company that sells something concrete — you cannot brand that kind of company but it will become branded if its product becomes a brand.” (Shareholder)

The first thought of many of the interviewees was that a corporate brand was a spiritual and immaterial issue of little importance in the B2B context. However, when they gave the issue more thought they started to list several other issues related to it. They described that a B2B brand in small companies consists of two sides: on the one hand, the brand is seen as consisting of the stakeholders’ image and awareness of the company, their trust in it, and the credibility the firm has with them. A different perspective on the brand of a small business in the B2B market is arrived at if we consider it based on how the staff of the company do their work; for example, the quality of the products, delivery times, customer service and corporate culture. The strength of the corporate brand could then be seen as coming from actions. It was recognised that a brand that is something abstract cannot be created, it has to include something concrete.

“I do not think brand is important in business to business because brand is image and awareness. In business to business we have euros, delivery times, functionality and credibility.. okay, we can think these are a brand.” (Shareholder)

“A brand … is more like a spiritual issue, in that it reflects the spirit of the company and the way they work and the substance and quality of its products, it is an extremely huge issue” (Managing director A1)

It was suggested that for a business to business brand, credibility and trust are essential, especially in gaining new customers. Because several interviewees had experience of spin-offs, it was also noticed that the mother company may increase the credibility of the spin-off.
“In gaining new customers, it [a company brand] has the most crucial impact. I think the credibility is … the most important, like a starting point. One central element is trust… if you sometimes blunder into something then the customers understand, or forgive it more easily, if the firm has a good image and a good brand.” (A board member)

Another important aspect of branding in the B2B context that the interviewees emphasised is staff behaviour. Employees are seen as the most important brand builders; their everyday behaviour needs to be professional. In addition, all forms of communication are seen as important in brand building.

“Marketing and selling are not separate functions but an essential part of the business, maybe even the most important brand builder, or in smaller parts, the most important actors are a secretary and a seller in the customer interface every day; how she behaves, how she acts, how she talks, it has an incredible impact on how the stakeholders see the company … and all the personnel, of course, also in large companies, but the smaller the company the more the emphasis is on the whole staff” (Shareholder)

“What kinds of people, whether they are reliable, is it easy to talk to them, whether they have both ears and a mouth, and also a brain. How the company documents look, are they easy to read, is the product presented in an understandable and systematic way, how a business card looks, it creates an impression of whether this is a clumsy company or one that knows what it is doing. These all create an impression of whether we are top professionals but also of our humanity. There is always a hard and soft side, both should be apparent.” (A board member)

**Special characteristics of branding in software companies**

The theoretical framework suggested six characteristics of branding in software companies (see Fig. 49).
Diverging from the theoretical framework, the case studies revealed that there are distinctions between product branding and corporate branding. The corporate brand was developed during the first years of the company’s existence, until the product became well-known. At that point, as in Case 1, the product might be renamed to match the corporate name, or as in Case 3, the company might be renamed to match the product name.

Similarly, even though the theoretical part suggested that companies take care of the visual identity by themselves, in Cases 1 and 3, external stakeholders were used to design the logo. However, neither of the case companies used marketing communications professionals to design the logo as might be expected; instead, in Case 1 this was done by a freelancer graphic designer and in Case 3 by a graphic design student. In Case 2, an employee continuously updated, developed and changed the logo, showing that, as predicted in the theoretical framework, it is challenging to use staff to maintain consistent communication styles. This was also recognised in Case 1, where the management board needed to create rules for use of the logo.

Also similar to the theoretical view, as the outputs of the name changes revealed, the new corporate names arrived at in the case studies are the same as the product names. Unlike the portrayal in the theoretical framework, the original corporate names, however, differed from the product names.

**Fig. 49. Theoretical and empirical characteristics of branding in software companies.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical characteristics</th>
<th>Empirical characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- No distinction between software product branding and software corporate branding</td>
<td>- There is a distinction between software product branding and software corporate branding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Companies take care of the visual image and material production themselves</td>
<td>- Companies utilise <strong>external stakeholders or personnel</strong> in creating visual image and communications material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Challenging to get personnel to maintain a consistent line in communication.</td>
<td>- Challenging to get personnel to maintain a consistent line in communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The decision making related to branding is conducted by few managers; the personnel are not involved.</td>
<td>- The company name is often the product line’s “family name” after the product has become well-known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The company name is often the product line’s “family name”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The individual products are named by combining the company name with a product-specific extension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.1.3 Reasons for corporate rebranding

Reasons for Renaming

In all the cases the reason for the name change was that the original name was difficult to use (see, Table 27). The difficulties varied; in Case 1 the name was difficult to write and pronounce, in the Case 3 the name was long and difficult to write, and in Case 2 the name had wrong associations. It is worth remembering that Case 3 registered the name only as an auxiliary firm name, not as an official new corporate name. The firm in case study 3 also conducted another name change to reflect its product name, because the product was better known than the company. At this time, the corporate name was officially changed.

Table 27. Summary of the reasons for renaming in the three cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to write and pronounce, difficult to connect the company's products to it</td>
<td>Has unfortunate associations</td>
<td>1. Too long, difficult to use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Product better known than the company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the theoretical framework four main reasons for corporate renaming were suggested; change in ownership structure, change in corporate strategy, change in competitive position and change in external environment (see, Fig. 50).
The empirical part of this study revealed that none of these was the reason for corporate rebranding in the three cases studies. Instead, in each case, the common reason for the name change was that the existing name was difficult to use; the name was difficult to write and/or pronounce, it was too long, it had unfortunate associations, or, was not as well-known as the name of the company’s product. Therefore, I formed a new category for reasons for corporate rebranding; difficulty of using the existing corporate name. This is one of the main findings of the study at hand.

**Reasons for Redesigning**

The reasons for Redesigning were similar in all the cases (see Table 28). In Cases 1 and 3, the reason for changing the logo for first time was that the original logo was outdated, and the reason for changing the logo for the second time was that the company had changed its name, and the logo had therefore to be updated. Also in Case 2, the reason for logo change was that the business unit name had changed.
Table 28. Summary of the reasons for Redesigning in the three cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Old-fashioned, cannot connect products</td>
<td>1. Old-fashioned</td>
<td>1. Old-fashioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the company</td>
<td>Business unit name had changed</td>
<td>2. Corporate name had changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Corporate name had changed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The existing research suggested that reasons for logo changes are change in the company, change in the external environment, and willingness to change the corporate image (see, Fig. 51).

### Theoretical reasons
- Change in the company
  - structural or strategic change, management change, corporate name change, increased or decreased scope of operations
- Change in the external environment
  - regulatory change, competition and the need for scale economies
- Willingness to change the corporate image
  - repositioning the organisation, modernisation, updating, external/internal misunderstanding of the organisation and its purposes

### Empirical reasons
- Change in the company
  - corporate name change, business unit name change
- Willingness to change the corporate image
  - modernisation/updating

Fig. 51. Summary of the reasons for Redesigning in the three cases.

The empirical data supported the view that a logo is changed because it would benefit from modernisation and/or updating. The other reasons were change of the corporate name and change of the business unit name. However, the empirical data did not reveal change in the external environment as a driving force.

### 7.2 Sub-processes of corporate rebranding

This chapter summarises the main events and actors in corporate rebranding sub-processes.

#### 7.2.1 Renaming

In the cases, the number of events in Renaming varied from three in Case 2 to six in Case 1 (see, Table 29). In all the cases, the events Evaluating the name, Invent-
ing the name and Selecting a new name were found. In addition to these, also Registering was found in all the cases, but whereas it was Registering the new name in Cases 1 and 3, it was Registering the domain in Case 2. This was because the Case 2 was a business unit, and even though it changed its name, it could not be registered.

In all the cases the Renaming process began with Evaluating the name. Before the next event could begin, its predecessor event needed to end with some result. Even though all the events were not found in all the cases, the order of the events that were found was always the same. In addition, some events in the processes seemed to be repeated, so if some event did not result in a satisfactory result the process continued from some of the previous events. The only exception to this was the process of planning the spin-off in Case 2, where it was impossible to find any specific order for the events, as they had been executed more or less simultaneously.

The type and number of actors and the amount of them in the events varied between the cases. In the Case 2 and Case 3 the manager was almost the only person that participated in a process. In the Case 3, the only stakeholders other than the manager were the personnel who participated in Inventing a name. In Case 2, in addition to the manager, personnel participated in Inventing a name and Selecting a name, and external stakeholders actively criticised the name in Evaluating the name. In Case 1 the most vocal actors were the management board and manager, who were both active implementers of four events, and in addition, the staff participated in two events, Evaluating the name and Inventing a name, and external stakeholders participated in Inventing a name.
Table 29. Summary of Renaming in the three cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main events in renaming before establishment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the name: manager, personnel</td>
<td>1. Naming the forthcoming spin-off</td>
<td>Evaluating the name: manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicating about the forthcoming spin off: manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inventing the name: manager, personnel</td>
<td>Inventing a new name: manager, personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating criteria for the name: manager</td>
<td>Creating criteria for the name: manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selecting a name: manager</td>
<td>Selecting a name: manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registering the name: manager</td>
<td>Registering the name: manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main events during the original name</strong></td>
<td>2. Renaming the business unit</td>
<td>Evaluating the name: manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating the forthcoming name change: management board, manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inventing a new name: manager, personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventing a new name: management board, manager, personnel, stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td>Selecting a new name: manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating criteria for a new name: management board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Registering a new name: manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting a new name: management board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Registering the domain: manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering a new name: manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Renaming of the product in line with corporate name: management board)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When compared to the theoretical framework, the empirical data revealed all the same events (see, Fig. 52). In addition, with one exception, the events were executed in a similar order. The exception was the event \textit{Evaluating the potential name(s)}. Whereas in the theoretical framework this was presented as the third event after \textit{Communicating new identity internally} and \textit{Inventing a name}, in all the empirical cases this was the first event that was done. This is understandable, when one recalls the reasons for \textit{Renaming}: in the theoretical view all the reasons for corporate name changes were \textit{change} in something, and the company needed to accept and adapt the change. In the empirical cases, the reason for \textit{Renaming} was that the corporate name was difficult to use. As a result of that difficulty, it is understandable that the corporate name was largely carefully evaluated before the decision was made on whether it should be changed. In addition, according to the empirical data, evaluating the name occurred as a part of several other events.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Theoretical events and actors} & \textbf{Empirical events and actors} \\
\hline
\textit{Communicating the new identity} & \textit{Evaluating the name} \\
management & manager, personnel, external stakeholders \\
\textit{Inventing a new name} & \textit{Communicating the forthcoming name change} \\
Consultants, marketing communications office, personnel & management board, manager \\
\textit{Evaluating the potential name(s)} & \textit{Inventing a new name} \\
Executive committee, the board of directors, shareholders & management board, manager, personnel, stakeholders \\
\textit{Creating selection criteria for a new name} & \textit{Creating criteria for a new name} \\
- & management board \\
\textit{Selecting a new name} & \textit{Selecting a new name} \\
- & management board, manager, personnel \\
\textit{Registering the new name} & \textit{Registering a new name} \\
- & manager \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Theoretical and empirical events and actors in Renaming processes.}
\end{figure}

The theoretical framework provided actors for only three events; \textit{Communicating the new identity}, \textit{Inventing a new name}, and \textit{Evaluating the potential name(s)}. Compared to the actors in the empirical cases, the actors in \textit{Communicating the new identity} and \textit{Communicating the forthcoming name change} were management. Whereas in the theoretical framework \textit{Inventing a new name} was done by personnel and external professionals, in the empirical cases it was done by management, personnel and stakeholders (but stakeholders other than marketing
communications professionals, such as customers). The empirical data revealed that Creating criteria for a new name as well as Registering a new name were conducted by management, and in addition, personnel also participated in Selecting a new name.

In conclusion, in the empirical cases the Renaming process was largely carried out by the management, including both the management board and a manager, which is typical for small companies but differs from what is typical for large companies, at least according to the theoretical framework. Personnel participated more actively in many of the events in the empirical case studies than was predicted by the theoretical framework.

### 7.2.2 Redesigning

In the case studies, the amount of events in Redesigning varied from three in Case 2 and 3 to five in Case 1 (see, Table 30). In all the cases, the events Creating logo proposals, Choosing a logo, and Taking a new logo into use were found. The other events that were found in the Case 1 were Evaluating the existing logo, and Creating rules for using the logo. In addition, in the Case 3, the event Adapting the product logo as the corporate logo was found, and in the Case 2, Examining ideas for a logo was found.

In all the cases these events were cumulative in nature, so the previous event had to produce some kind of result before the next event began. Similarly to the Renaming processes, when some event in the Redesigning processes did not produce a satisfactory result, the process continued on from some of the previous events.
Table 30. Summary of Redesigning in the three cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for logo change</strong></td>
<td>1. Old-fashioned, cannot connect products and the company</td>
<td>Business unit name had changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Corporate name had changed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main events in Redesigning during the original name</strong></td>
<td>Evaluating the existing logo: manager, personnel</td>
<td>1. Designing the spin-off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating logo proposals: stakeholders</td>
<td>Examining ideas for the logo: manager, personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choosing a logo: manager, personnel</td>
<td>2. Redesigning the business unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adapting a new logo for use: manager, personnel, stakeholders</td>
<td>Creating logo proposals: personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating rules for using the logo: management board</td>
<td>Choosing a logo: personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The theoretical framework suggested five events in the *Redesigning* process (see Fig. 53). The empirical data revealed seven quite different events in *Redesigning*: Evaluating the existing logo, Examining ideas for a logo, Creating logo proposals, Choosing a logo, Adapting a new logo for use, Creating rules for using the logo, and Adapting the product logo as the corporate logo. In all these events management - either a management board or the manager - was involved. Personnel were active in carrying out the first six of the above mentioned events. External stakeholders, however, carried out only two of the events; Creating logo proposals and Adapting a new logo for use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical events and actors</th>
<th>Empirical events and actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examining the present corporate logo</td>
<td>Evaluating the existing logo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a working brief</td>
<td>manager, personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysing the firm’s brand values and strategy direction</td>
<td>Examining ideas for a logo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a company, brand consultants</td>
<td>manager, personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing logo structure</td>
<td>Creating logo proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a logo/symbol, colour palette and font type</td>
<td>manager, personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>branding consultancy</em></td>
<td>Choosing a logo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting the product logo as the company logo</td>
<td>Adapting a new logo for use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manager, personnel, stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating rules for using the logo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>management board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adapting the product logo as the company logo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 53. Theoretical and empirical events and actors in Redesigning.**

This study contributes by producing the events and actors of the *Redesigning* process from small business perspective. Whereas the current theoretical view was that a branding consultancy designs a logo, in small companies the management of the company is likely to be responsible for redesign.

### 7.2.3 Launching

In all the cases *Launching* was split into launching internally and launching externally (see Table 31). In Case 3, both forms of launching were delivered simul-
taneously, but in Case 1 and Case 2 Launching internally was conducted before Launching externally.

In addition, in these cases, after the new name was launched internally, this triggered a Redesigning process, because a new logo needed to be created - or, in fact, the old one needed to be updated with the new corporate name - before the new name could be launched externally.

Launching internally was conducted in all the companies by the management, including the management board and/or the manager. Launching externally, for its part, was conducted in each case by the manager, and in addition in Case 1, by the personnel and external stakeholder (a freelance graphic designer) and in Case 2 by the personnel.
Table 31. Summary of Launching in the three cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main events in launching</th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Launching internally: management board, manager</td>
<td>1. Planning Launching the spin-off</td>
<td>Launching internally and externally: manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Launching externally: manager, personnel, stakeholders</td>
<td>Launching internally: manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Launching externally: manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Launching the new name of the business unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Launching internally: manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Launching externally: manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The empirical data confirms the theoretical framework by revealing both Launching internally and Launching externally (see Fig. 54). However, from the empirical data the events suggested by the theoretical framework could not be found. Therefore, these are not described in detail in the empirical data.

### 7.2.4 Evaluating

The events involved in Evaluating varied from three in Cases 2 and 3 to five in Case 1 (see Table 32). In all the cases Evaluating included Evaluating the new name and Evaluating the Renaming process. In addition to these, in Cases 1 and 3 the event Evaluating the Redesigning process was found. Additionally, in Case 1 the event Evaluating the possible new name was found. In this case Evaluating the possible new name refers to the evaluation of the new name after its selection but prior to its registration, which was exceptional compared to the other cases and the theoretical background. In Case 3, the event Evaluating the use of the new name was found.

In Cases 2 and 3, the only person who conducted the evaluation was the manager. In Case 1, management (the management board and/or the manager) took part in all the events in Evaluating. In addition to them, personnel participated in Evaluating the new name and Evaluating the Redesigning process, and external stakeholders participated in Evaluating the new name and Evaluating the possible new name.
Table 32. Summary of Evaluating in the three cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main events in Evaluating</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main events in Evaluating</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main events in Evaluating</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the possible new name: management board, stakeholders</td>
<td>Evaluating the new name: manager</td>
<td>Evaluating the new name: manager, stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the new name: management board, manager, personnel, stakeholders</td>
<td>Evaluating Renaming process: manager</td>
<td>Evaluating the use of the new name: manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the Renaming process: management board, manager</td>
<td>Evaluating Redesigning process: manager</td>
<td>Evaluating the Renaming process: manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating Redesigning process: manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The empirical part offers interesting insights compared to the theoretical framework (see Fig. 55). In the theoretical part it was suggested that Evaluating is about evaluation of the new name by the customers and evaluation of the process. The empirical data, however, revealed that customer - or rather, stakeholder in general - evaluations of the new name constitute only one aspect of Evaluating. There are two reasons for that: first, according to the data, management and personnel also conducted evaluations of the new name, and second, in addition to evaluating the new name and the Renaming process, three other events were found in Evaluating; Evaluating the possible new name, Evaluating the use of the new name, and Evaluating the Renaming process.

**Fig. 55. Theoretical and empirical events and actors in Evaluating.**

In all the cases, all the events under Evaluating were individual events. In other words, there was no order in which they had to be executed. The events were mainly conducted after the new name was launched externally, only in Case 1 Evaluating the possible new name was conducted before Internal launching, and the personnel evaluated the new name before External launching.

### 7.2.5 The processual view on corporate rebranding sub-processes

According to the data, the sub-processes of Redesigning, Launching, and Evaluating needed to be subdivided into smaller entities; Redesigning to Redesigning and Updating the logo, Launching to Internal launching and External launching, and Evaluating to Pre-evaluating, Internal evaluating, and Post-evaluating. Combin-
ing these sub-processes of the three examined cases resulted in description of the processual view on corporate rebranding sub-processes (Fig. 56). The processual view reveals the stages of corporate rebranding, the order of the sub-processes, as well as the actors in each sub-process. These are reviewed briefly below.

In the theoretical framework it was assumed that corporate rebranding consists of two stages: ‘Stage 1’ during the time of the original corporate name and; ‘Stage 2’ during the time of the new corporate name. The empirical data, however, revealed three stages: ‘Stage 1’ before the company was even established; ‘Stage 2’ during the time of the original corporate name and; ‘Stage 3’ during the time of the new corporate name. In Stage 1 in the Case 2 a manager began planning the corporate rebranding about a forthcoming spin-off. Here all the sub-processes of corporate branding - Renaming, Redesigning, Launching, and Evaluating were found, and many of the events in them were planned or even executed. An exception was Redesigning, as part of which only ideas for new logo were being gathered. However, at this stage the processes and their events were not executed in any specific order, and neither of the events resulted in any output.

In addition, in the Case 1 the need for a new name arose during the Stage 1, even before the company was officially established. In other words, the sub-process of Renaming began already in Stage 1, and continued after establishing the company, in Stage 2.

Similarly to the Stage 1 in the theoretical framework, empirically the Stage 2 of corporate rebranding was the time when the original corporate name was in use. In this stage, two corporate rebranding sub-processes, Renaming and Redesigning, were executed independent of each other in all three cases. Renaming was an extensive process of up to five events and involving management, staff and external stakeholders. At this stage, when the new name for the company was chosen but not yet registered, differing from the theoretical framework, Pre-evaluating, which is about evaluating the possible new name was conducted in the Case 1. In all the cases when the logo of the company was considered old fashioned, a Redesigning process was conducted to create a new logo for the company in a situation where the company was operating with its original name. At this stage, the process of Redesigning was quite extensive consisting of up to seven different events and involving the participation of management, staff and external stakeholders. In the Case 3 also Redesigning instigated the Renaming process in a situation where the manager got an idea for the corporate name from the newly created logo.
Fig. 56. A processual view on corporate rebranding sub-processes.
Stage 3 was diverged into five sub-processes: *Internal launching, Internal evaluating, Updating the logo, External launching, and Post-evaluating* instead of two described in the theoretical framework. In all the cases the Stage 3 begun after the new corporate name was registered. In Case 1 and Case 2 it was continued with the *Internal launching* of the new name by the management and followed by *Internal evaluating* of the new name. At this stage, whatever the result of the evaluation, the cases continued on with the new name. In Case 3 these events could not be found. Additionally, after *Internal launching* the process of *Updating the logo* was undertaken in all the companies (or after registering the new name in Case 3). At this stage redesigning was conducted in all the cases as *Updating the logo*, which consisted of three *Redesigning* events only that were executed mainly for changing the new corporate name to the existing logo. After the logo was updated and adopted for use, including, for example, on all communications material, the corporate rebranding process continued with *External launching* of the new name and logo to the stakeholders. Finally, in all the cases *Post-evaluating*, which was quite similar to *Evaluation* in the theoretical framework, was conducted including evaluation of both the outputs and the processes.

### 7.3 Outputs of corporate rebranding

#### 7.3.1 Name changes

In the theoretical section, it was suggested that former company names would be descriptive or person-based, and the new name types are more likely to be abstract, being either freestanding or associative (Muzellec 2006). According to the empirical data, all the original company names were of different types, varying from descriptive to freestanding to acronymic (see Table 33). What they had in common was that they all had descriptive features. The new names, were almost all descriptive with freestanding features or freestanding with descriptive features.
Table 33. Summary of the name types and name changes in three cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original name type</td>
<td>Freestanding</td>
<td>Acronymic</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Has also features)</td>
<td>Acronymic</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Patronymic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Freestanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New name type</td>
<td>Freestanding</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>1. Acronymic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Has also features)</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Freestanding</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from</td>
<td>Acronymic</td>
<td>Freestanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name change type</td>
<td>Makeover</td>
<td>Makeover</td>
<td>1. Reinventing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Brand adoption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In cases 1 and 2, the name change type was *Makeover*, while in Case 3, which demonstrated two changes, the first one was in the nature of *Reinventing* and the second one was *Brand adoption*.

7.3.2 Logo changes

The number of logo changes varied from one in Case 2 to four in Case 3. In the first of the logo changes, the font and colour were changed completely in all the cases, and other elements either in a minor way or completely (see Table 34). In Cases 1 and 3, the logo change was minor, Refreshment, while in Case 2 it was complete, Renewal. In the second of the logo changes the only element that was changed was the text, which was changed either in a minor way or completely in both cases. All the other elements remained the same in both cases.
### Table 34. Summary of the logo changes in the three cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First logo change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Font change</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text change</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour change</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout change</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total logo change</td>
<td>Refreshment</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Refreshment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second logo change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Font change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text change</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total logo change</td>
<td>Refreshment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Refreshment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third logo change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Font change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total logo change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refreshment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fourth logo change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand adoption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the third logo change in Case 3, the font was changed completely and the layout in a minor way, while text and colours remained the same. The fourth logo change in Case 3 was brand adoption, where the logo of the company’s product was adopted as the logo of the company. Overall, in the logo changes, the only complete change was executed by the firm in Case 2 while all the other logo change types were minor in nature, despite brand adoption in Case 3.

#### 7.3.3 Corporate rebranding types

The data revealed that the case companies conducted corporate rebranding exercises between one and four times (see Table 35).
Table 35. Summary of the corporate rebranding types in three cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First change</strong></td>
<td>Logo: Minor change</td>
<td>Name and logo: Complete change</td>
<td>Logo: Minor change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second change</strong></td>
<td>Name and logo: Intermediate change</td>
<td></td>
<td>Name and logo: Minor change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third change</strong></td>
<td>Logo: Minor change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fourth change</strong></td>
<td>Name and logo: Intermediate change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only Case 2 conducted a complete change. It is, however, worth bearing in mind that in that case the information on all changes may not have been available, so Case 2 may not be fully comparable with the other cases.

The other cases, however, provided examples of only minor or intermediate changes. This means that in neither case was both the corporate name and the logo changed completely and simultaneously.
8 Findings

The study reported here aims to determine how we could describe corporate rebranding processes in small companies. The previous chapters have concentrated on developing the theoretical framework for the study, describing the multiple case study of three empirical cases as well as comparing the empirical cases and the theoretical framework. In this chapter I summarise the empirical findings and present them as an empirically grounded processual framework for corporate rebranding in small companies (Fig. 57).

The resulting framework consists of three main elements: the context-related characteristics in and the reasons for corporate rebranding; sub-processes of corporate rebranding and; the outputs of corporate rebranding. The framework is a combination of all the analyses and interpretations of the data in this study and is a simplified description of dynamic and even chaotic processes, events and actions revealed by the data.

In short, context-related characteristics have an influence on corporate rebranding processes, but they also come into existence through the processes. They also have an influence on reasons for corporate rebranding. The reasons for corporate rebranding, for their part, influence sub-processes of corporate rebranding.

Four sub-processes of corporate rebranding, Renaming, Redesigning, Launching, and Evaluating, are executed during three stages. The events of the sub-processes can be planned and even proceed before establishing the company, in Phase 1. Renaming and Redesigning are mainly conducted during Phase 2, and Launching and Evaluating during Phase 3. Please note that the size of the stages and sub-processes in Fig. 57 does not describe their duration but is different only for technical reasons.

The outputs of corporate rebranding are a new corporate name and new corporate logo. In addition, as an output, the corporate rebranding type can be defined. The following section provides a summary of each of the main elements of the processual framework.
Fig. 57. An empirically grounded processual framework for corporate rebranding in small companies.
8.1 Context-related characteristics in and reasons for corporate rebranding

Context-related characteristics in corporate rebranding are special characteristics of branding in small business, B2B branding, and branding in software companies. They are not only “background factors” that affect the corporate rebranding process, but they also contain characteristics that construct and come into existence as the process develops. For example, the role of the small business manager is important in corporate rebranding, as he might be the only person conducting it. In addition, the relation of a product brand and a corporate brand is strong in the software business (see, e.g. Ojasalo et al. 2008). As this study revealed, a company can either be renamed according to its well-known product, or the product can be given the corporate name. Context-related characteristics may also influence the reasons for corporate rebranding.

The reasons for corporate rebranding can be divided in two categories; reasons for name change (renaming) and reasons for logo change (redesigning). Reasons for renaming vary from change in ownership structure or corporate strategy to competitive position, and external environment. Even though none of these was found in this particular study, they are general occurrences that might result in corporate rebranding. In this study, a totally new reason emerged; difficulty in using the existing corporate name. The emergence of the difficulty reason, establishes that a major change event occurring in the background may not always be a prerequisite for corporate rebranding and in so doing, it offers one of the contributions of the study. However, it should be noted that this new category is related to the other categories. For example a merger or acquisition, representing a change in company’s ownership, and a merging of two companies with different product ranges or market positions may be what creates the difficulty in using the former corporate name.

The reasons for logo change may vary from a change happening in the company (for example, corporate name change) or in the external environment to a desire to change the corporate image (for example, modernisation/updating the current logo). Even though change in the external environment was not found in this particular study, it can be considered a general occurrence that might result in corporate redesigning.
8.2 Sub-processes of corporate rebranding

Description of corporate rebranding sub-processes reveals the stages of corporate rebranding, the order of the sub-processes, as well as the actors in the sub-processes. The process description is a combination of all the analyses and interpretations of the data in this study and is a simplified illustration of dynamic and even chaotic processes, events and actions revealed from the data.

Corporate rebranding consists of four sub-processes; Renaming, Redesigning, Launching, and Evaluating, which are further divided into eight sub-processes as will be explained below. The sub-processes are executed during three time periods, here termed stages: ‘Stage 1’ before the company is even established; ‘Stage 2’ during the time of the original corporate name and; ‘Stage 3’ during the time of the new corporate name. Two stages of the theoretical framework are adjusted according to the empirical data, which suggests that corporate rebranding may begin in small companies even before the company is established.

In Stage 1 it is possible for a manager to begin Planning the forthcoming corporate rebranding. This can be the case, for example, when the question is about a forthcoming spin-off. Spin-offs are one important reason for corporate rebranding (Muzellec & Lambkin 2006). In planning the forthcoming corporate rebranding all the sub-processes of corporate branding - Renaming, Redesigning, Launching, and Evaluating - can be considered, and many of the events in them can be planned or even executed. However, it should be remembered that this study does not argue that this kind of planning would be executed in every company in which a spin-off is planned, or by all entrepreneurs who are planning to establish a company. Furthermore, this study neither suggests that each of these would be planned, nor that these would be planned or executed in a structured way. Rather, these are iterative and ad hoc processes which do not produce any result at this stage. Thus, one of the main findings of the study is that as long as corporate rebranding is at the planning stage, the processes and their events are not executed in any specific order, and none of the events results in any output. Therefore, in Planning the forthcoming corporate rebranding the corporate rebranding sub-processes and their events represent teleology process theory.

The sub-process of Renaming can also begin in Stage 1. This may be applicable to entrepreneurial companies where the entrepreneur/manager evaluates the name developed for the company even before officially establishing the company and realises that it is not the best possible, but nevertheless decides to establish the company with the initial name.
Stage 2 of corporate rebranding is the time when the original corporate name is in use. In this stage, two corporate rebranding sub-processes, Renaming and Redesigning, can be executed independently of each other. Renaming is about creating a new name for the company. It is an extensive process of up to five events and involving management, staff and external stakeholders. If the logo of the company is considered old fashioned, a Redesigning process can be conducted to create a new logo for the company in a situation where the company operates with its original name. The process of Redesigning is also quite extensive consisting of up to seven different events and involving the participation of management, staff and external stakeholders. Accordingly, Renaming and Redesigning represent teleology process theory at this stage, even though, according to the data, it is possible that Redesigning instigates the renaming process. At this stage, when the new name for the company is chosen but not yet registered, a part of Evaluating, namely, Pre-evaluating the possible new name can be conducted by management board, personnel and external stakeholders. Processes are iterative and consist of several attempts to execute the events.

Stage 3 begins after the new corporate name is registered and consists mainly of two sub-processes: Launching and Evaluating. These are presented in Fig. 57 as independent processes that are conducted simultaneously. Therefore it can be considered that they accord with teleology process theory. However, both the theoretical part and empirical data revealed that in order to understand these better they both need to be divided into smaller sub-processes. Launching is divided into Internal launching by the management and External launching by a manager, personnel and external stakeholders. Internal launching is very weak; orders are simply given with an expectation of compliance with minimal explanation. Evaluating is divided into Internal evaluating by the management and personnel, and Post-evaluating to evaluate both the outputs and the processes by management, personnel and external stakeholder. However, there is almost no attempt to evaluate either processes or outputs (for more details, see Chapter 7.2.5).

In addition to these, in this stage the process of Updating the logo as a result of corporate name change can also be undertaken. Even though this is about redesigning, at this time the process is not as extensive as the process of Redesigning at the previous stage; this time it consists up to three events. These smaller sub-processes, in turn, can be arranged in a specific order in which the previous sub-process need to be conducted and result in some output before the following one can be finalized. Therefore, these represent lifecycle process theory.
Of course, it should be noted that it is possible to conduct the sub-processes and their events in a different order than presented here. As this study revealed, it is also possible that the different sub-processes and/or their events are at least planned and perhaps also partly conducted simultaneously. In other words, as long as they are in in the course of being conducted, but while they have not resulted in an output, they represent teleology process theory. Nevertheless, it might also be possible – at least afterwards – to arrange them into the order in which they occurred based on the dates when they resulted in some output.

In conclusion, sub-processes are management-centric and the involvement of other stakeholders is limited. Many decisions are made in a reactive, *ad hoc* way with weak use of criteria, instead of being formally planned, and cumulatively, these *ad hoc* decisions amount to something close to chaos.

### 8.3 Outputs of corporate rebranding

For revealing the outputs of corporate rebranding I created, based on the existing research, classification categories (see Chapter 2.4.3, especially Table 13) which helped in analysing changes in the corporate name and the logo as an output of corporate rebranding. Additionally, this helped in revealing the corporate rebranding type. Creating this categorisation provides one contribution of the study.

Type of name change can be revealed by first examining the original corporate name type and then the new name type. On the basis of these, it is possible to define corporate name change type: Reinventing (minor change), Brand adaptation (intermediate change), or Makeover, (complete change). Revealing logo change type begins by first examining how each element (layout, typography, text, colours) in a new logo is changed compared to the previous logo, and on the basis of this, the type of the logo change can be defined being either Refreshment, (minor change), or Renewal (complete change). Based on name and logo change types it is possible to reveal whether the type of corporate rebranding is minor, intermediate or complete change in nature.

One important finding in this study was that whereas the existing research suggested that the corporate names are one specific type (Muzellec 2006), the names in the cases belonged into some main category but in addition to that, had elements of other categories. In addition, in this specific context the companies seem to change their names from a name that either is descriptive or at least, has features, to descriptive names that have freestanding features, or freestanding names that have descriptive features. In addition, acronyms seem to be popular.
both in old and new names, and official name changes are either complete or a brand adoption.

As described in the theoretical part and revealed also in the empirical data, companies change their logos separately from the corporate name change, and also simultaneously with the name change. On both occasions, the logo changes are, according to the study, minor in nature. However, diverging from the theoretical framework, logo change can also be brand adoption, as it was in Case 3, where the logo of the product was adopted as the logo of the company.
9 Conclusions

In this chapter, I summarise the findings, present the theoretical, methodological and managerial contributions of the study, evaluate the research process, assess the limitations of the study and finally, provide some ideas for further studies.

9.1 Summary of the findings

The purpose of the study was to determine how we could describe corporate rebranding processes in small companies. Specifically, the study aimed to answer the following research question: How can corporate rebranding in small companies be described in terms of processes?

In answer to the research question I provided an empirically grounded processual framework of corporate rebranding in small companies. The framework provides three different viewpoints: 1) context-related characteristics in and reasons for corporate rebranding, 2) sub-processes of corporate rebranding, and 3) the outputs of corporate rebranding.

Context-related characteristics are special characteristics of branding in the context; in this study, small business, B2B branding, and branding in software companies. They have an influence on corporate rebranding processes, but also come into existence through processes. In addition, they influence the reasons behind corporate rebranding, which vary from major change events in a company’s internal or external environment to difficulties with using the existing corporate name, a factor found in this study. The reasons indentified as being behind corporate rebranding, for their part, influence sub-processes of corporate rebranding.

Four theoretical sub-processes of corporate rebranding, Renaming, Redesigning, Launching and Evaluating, are further divided into eight sub-processes based on the empirical data and analyses: Renaming, Redesigning, Updating the logo, Internal launching, External launching, Pre-evaluating, Internal evaluating and Post-evaluating. Sub-processes are executed during three time periods, here labelled stages: ‘Stage 1’ before the company is even established; ‘Stage 2’ during the time of the original corporate name and; ‘Stage 3’ during the time of the new corporate name. Accordingly, corporate rebranding may begin in small companies during Stage 1 with planning and even executing some of the events in the sub-processes. Thus, at this stage, when sub-processes have not resulted in any output, they represent emergent change and teleology process theory. Renaming, Redes-
signing and Pre-evaluating are mainly executed during Stage 2, and Updating the logo, Internal launching, External launching, Internal evaluating and Post-evaluating during Stage 3. Some of them - for example, Renaming and Redesigning - can be conducted simultaneously, while some of them are conducted in a specific order in which one process results in some output before the second process can result in output. In so doing, from a process view corporate rebranding consists of both teleology and life-cycle processes. Furthermore, sub-processes are management-centric with limited involvement on behalf of other stakeholders.

Each sub-process consists of several events and actions. Because the empirical data was gathered both before corporate name changes were complete (in other words; while corporate name changes were being executed) and after the name was changed, it was possible to find the elements of both lifecycle and teleology process theories from within sub-processes. In sub-processes, many decisions are made in a reactive, ad hoc way with weak use of criteria, instead of being formally planned, and cumulatively these ad hoc decisions come close to the chaotic. Events are iterative, chaotic and ad hoc in nature. As the events are conducted, so when they have not brought about any specific outcome, sub-processes represent emergent change and are teleological in nature. However, when the events have resulted in outcomes, it is possible to arrange them into a specific order. In other words, at this time it becomes possible to describe the processes as lifecycle processes which represent planned change. Accordingly, even though the events in sub-processes are chaotic in nature and conducted without formal planning, once they have been conducted, it is possible to arrange the events into a specific order. In so doing, the illustration of the process follows the logic of lifecycle process theory rather than teleology process theory. There are almost no attempts to evaluate either processes or outputs.

Outputs of corporate rebranding include the new corporate name and the new logo. Based on name and logo change types it is possible to reveal whether the type of corporate rebranding is a minor change, an intermediate or a complete change in nature. In this specific context the name changes are mainly complete. The new names seem to have elements of several name categories. Descriptive names or names that have descriptive features are changed to descriptive names that have freestanding features, or freestanding names that have descriptive features. In addition, acronyms are popular both in old and new names, and official name changes are either complete or a brand adoption. Interestingly, new corpo-
rate names are either the same as the product name or describe the use of the product.

Logos are changed separately from the corporate name change, and also simultaneously with the name change. On both occasions, the logo changes are, according to the study, minor in nature.

9.2 Theoretical contribution

This study has discussed corporate rebranding in the context of small business, specifically among software companies that operate in B2B markets. By constructing an empirically grounded processual framework for corporate rebranding in small companies the study has concentrated on building new theory. In doing so, it offers five theoretical contributions; three to corporate rebranding literature, one to corporate branding literature, and one to literature on organisational change processes.

The first theoretical contribution to corporate rebranding literature relates to the concept of corporate rebranding. This study reveals two main options; 1) the corporate name is changed, and as a consequence, the corporate visual identity is also updated, and 2) corporate visual identity is changed. In the first, corporate rebranding is a process of renaming and updating the company’s visual identity, launching these both to the internal and external stakeholders and during and after the process, evaluating both the outputs of the process and the process itself. In this case, corporate rebranding can consist of reinventing, brand adoption or a makeover. In the second option, corporate rebranding is the process of refreshing or renewing the corporate brand by changing the visual identity of the company and adopting the new visual identity. The findings of the study support those of existing studies that suggest that corporate rebranding is about corporate name change (Muzellec et al. 2003, Daly & Moloney 2004, Stuart & Muzellec 2004, Lomax & Mador 2006) and/or change in aesthetics (Muzellec et al. 2003, Daly & Moloney 2004, Stuart & Muzellec 2004, Muzellec & Lambkin 2006). The prior research, however, lacks the description of these changes and their relation to each other, which this study provides. However, due to the visual view of this study the contribution is limited when it concerns rebranding or corporate rebranding in general, because the study neither touches upon line extensions, distribution extensions or price reductions (Kapferer 2008: 239) for example, which are typical in product branding, nor does it address repositioning (Muzellec et al. 2003, Daly & Moloney 2004, Stuart & Muzellec 2004, Muzellec & Lambkin
2006) or changes in brand values (Lomax & Mador 2006) suggested in corporate rebranding literature.

The second theoretical contribution of the study to the corporate rebranding literature is the description of corporate rebranding from a process perspective. In this study, I presented an empirically grounded processual framework for corporate rebranding in small companies that covers all the following aspects: context-related characteristics in and the reasons for corporate rebranding, sub-processes of corporate rebranding, as well as the outputs of corporate rebranding. Several researchers (e.g. Muzellec & Lambkin 2006, Kaikati 2003, Daly & Moloney 2004, Merrilees & Miller 2008) have concentrated on parts of the process and provided notable contributions, but until this study, a processual framework for corporate rebranding has remained undeveloped.

The third theoretical contribution to corporate rebranding literature is the content of the framework. The framework provides three different viewpoints: 1) context-related characteristics in and reasons for corporate rebranding, 2) sub-processes of corporate rebranding, and 3) the outputs of corporate rebranding. I discuss each of these below in the above mentioned order.

Through this study I revealed that the main reason for corporate rebranding in small B2B software companies is difficulty in using the corporate name. For example, the name is difficult to pronounce or write, it is too long, it has unfortunate associations, or the product name is better known than the corporate name. Even though Muzellec & Lambkin (2006) have provided a wide list of reasons for corporate rebranding and the list is completed by other researchers (Juntunen, Saraniemi & Jussila 2009), the issue of difficulty in using the corporate name has been missing. In addition, the existing reasons have concentrated on the viewpoint that in the background of corporate rebranding is always change in something; for example, change in ownership structure or in external environment. According to this study, such kind of change occurring in the background is not a prerequisite of corporate rebranding. Thus, a poorly named brand in the first instance reflects the limited sophistication of SME branding.

The context-related characteristics category covers three viewpoints: special characteristics of branding in small companies; special characteristics of B2B branding; and special characteristics of branding in the software business. The role of these characteristics is two-fold: first, some of them are “background characteristics” that have an influence on both corporate rebranding processes and the causes of corporate rebranding; second, some of them are characteristics that evolve as the processes proceed. The existing research lacks both the detailed de-
scription of context-related characteristics and the understanding of their role. In so doing, the current development of the theory makes an important contribution.

Illustration of sub-processes of corporate rebranding offers a detailed description of Renaming, Redesigning, Launching, and Evaluating. The description consists of the order of the sub-processes, and the events and actors associated with them. In short, Redesigning can be a separate process from Renaming. In other words, logo change can be executed separately from corporate name change. But, they can also be related in a way that when a corporate name is changed, the logo is usually subsequently updated as well. The study highlighted that Launching and Evaluating are not just sub-processes that are conducted in this order after the new name is developed and a new logo is designed. Instead, they need to be divided into smaller parts; launching into internal and external variants, and evaluating into pre-evaluating, internal evaluating and post-evaluating consisting of evaluation of outputs and of processes. The order in which those sub-processes are implemented may vary, but the data revealed some consistency, so for example, internal launching is executed before external launching, and updating the logo is conducted before external launching. The existing research has discussed different perspectives on launching and evaluating (see, e.g. Kaikati 2003, Daly & Moloney 2004) but the existing research lacks the kind of detailed description provided in this dissertation of how they are related.

In addition to the order of the sub-processes, the current study reveals a detailed description of events and their order and of who the actors are in each event of each sub-process, as well as identifying new events and actors in the sub-processes. For example, the study revealed that Evaluating consists of six different events that are conducted by the management board, the manager, staff and/or stakeholders, while the existing research had provided only two events in Evaluating and in only one of the events had it been noted that customers were included amongst the actors in the event (Kaikati 2003, Daly & Moloney 2004). Nonetheless, in general, sub-processes are management-centric with a limited involvement of other stakeholders, which supports the view of Krake (2005) that the responsibility of branding in SMEs rests at the management level. The role of the entrepreneur/manager is also emphasised in corporate rebranding, as it is also in SME branding in general (see, e.g. e.g. Krake 2005, Rode & Vallaster 2005, Merriées 2007, Juntunen, Saraniemi, Halttu & Tähtinen 2010). Perhaps due to the limited entrepreneurs’ knowledge, the processes are ad hoc, chaotic and iterative in nature.
To understand the outputs of corporate rebranding, I have created criteria by which to evaluate both name and logo changes individually, and also criteria to determine how combining these will result in revealing the change type of corporate rebranding. With these criteria it is possible to examine the output of the corporate rebranding in the form of new corporate name and new corporate logo, as well as define the type of corporate rebranding. The existing research has concentrated on defining the level of change – varying from minor/evolutionary to complete/revolutionary – based on the elements changed in corporate rebranding: brand name and/or brand values (Lomax & Mador 2006), aesthetics, repositioning and/or name (Daly & Moloney 2004), name, logo and/or slogan (Stuart & Muzellec 2004), or positioning and aesthetics (Muzellec & Lambkin 2006). However, even though each of these has provided contributions to the area, they have concentrated on evaluating both the name and logo change simultaneously, while however, lacking information on how the level of change is defined.

The fourth theoretical contribution is to corporate branding literature: the finding that corporate rebranding may already have begun before the company is even established. The study provides an example of a manager about to establish his company under a name invented for the company, but realising even before registering the name that it was not satisfactory and would have to be changed at some point in the future. Even so, he establishes the company under the original name. Furthermore, the study provides an example of a manager about to spin the business unit off from the mother company, and in the process planning and even executing events of each corporate rebranding sub-process before establishing the company. These findings support the view of several researchers (Rode & Vallaseter 2005, Merrilees 2007, Kollmann & Suckow 2007, Juntunen, Saraniemi, Halttu & Tähtinen 2010) especially from the SME branding viewpoint, who suggest that corporate branding begins before establishing a company.

Fifth, the study contributes to the literature on organisational change processes by revealing that the same sub-processes or the same events in a sub-process can either be part of a lifecycle or teleological in nature depending on when the changes are observed and what the relationships involved. The study revealed that when corporate rebranding was at the planning stage (in Case 2), the sub-processes and their events were teleological (see, Van de Ven & Poole 1995) in nature: they were conducted mainly by a manager to reach a goal - finding a new name for the business unit or the future company. The way to reach the goal was not prefigured, but was socially constructed during the process of talking with people and getting new ideas, and the goal was revised based on what was
learned. The instigator of the rebranding only knows of some events that have to be done, for example, to invent a new name and register it, as well as to design a logo, choose colours and fonts for the corporate aesthetics. The manager planned the sub-processes and their events independently of other sub-processes and/or events, that is, the planning did not follow any specific order.

But, when the sub-processes and their events were executed it proved possible to arrange both the sub-processes and their events in chronological order. The order was revealed by the interviewees’ accounts and from the secondary data, for example, from company documents and emails. The case study made it possible to see the sub-processes and their events from a lifecycle process perspective. In this view, each event contributed to the final result of the sub-process in a cumulative way (Van de Ven & Poole 1995). In addition, it was obvious that each event had to produce in some result before the next event could conclude in its targeted result. Additionally, the result of each event operated as a basis for the next event.

In addition, the sub-process Redesigning was conducted independently of Renaming providing the corporate name was not being changed, that is, they represent teleology process theories. After Renaming had resulted in the desired output, the choice of a new corporate name, Redesigning commenced, by updating the logo. Thus, at this time the sub-processes reflected lifecycle process theory. In conclusion, the study reveals both the lifecycle and teleology process theories suggested by Van de Ven and Poole (1995), and also combines them as called for by Cunha and da Cunha (2003) and Van de Ven & Poole (1995). In addition, the results also support Weick (2000) who suggests that the same change can be observed differently.

### 9.3 Methodological contribution

This study provides a methodological contribution to the field of corporate rebranding. Several pieces of research adopting a case study approach report using interviews in the course of data gathering. I, however, used narrative interviews as my primary data gathering method. Narrative interviews differ from thematic interviews in that in a narrative interview the researcher asks the interviewee to tell his/her own story about some event or issue, and only provides specifying questions when absolutely necessary.

Compared to thematic interviews where the research often has predefined questions, narrative interviews offer access to a more profound understanding of how the interviewee has experienced the phenomenon under study.
Buchanan and Dawson (2007) call for process studies that would combine case studies and the narrative approach. Even such types of studies are conducted in other fields, the approach is new among corporate rebranding studies, at least at the time of the research planning and data gathering. Recent studies of corporate rebranding have concentrated on examining the phenomenon by using case studies (Kaikati 2003). In addition, secondary data is often used when giving examples of the cases (Merrilees & Miller 2008).

9.4 Managerial contribution

This study describes how corporate rebranding was conducted in three small companies that operate in B2B markets in the software industry. In this chapter I discuss four issues that may be of interest to small business managers.

First, if there are not sufficient resources to use professionals who could (re)design a logo or develop a name in a short time, it has to be accepted that the choice could involve the organisation in a long process of inventing and designing. The case study followed here revealed the process of renaming the company may last up to four, or even ten years. Companies in a hurry to rebrand may have to accept the cost implications, in order to quickly achieve their goals.

Second, companies choosing the longer process of inventing a name, would be wise to revisit what is to hand. Do they have stakeholders who could contribute to inventing a new name? Have they asked for ideas from relatives or friends? Or colleagues or customers? Or, whether they can tap into resources provided through cooperation with education institutions in the area?

It would be wise for the company to advise people of the forthcoming name change for two reasons: first, stakeholders may prove a good source of ideas for a new name; second, proactive spreading of information may avoid misunderstandings when the name change is executed, for example, rumours of bankruptcy can be pre-empted.

Third, it is wise to approach a name change slowly. Before registering a new name in haste, firms should ask their stakeholders to evaluate the potential new name. For example, stakeholders could be asked what kind of associations the new name invokes, or what colour would describe a company of that name. Information on negative associations provided by stakeholders is likely to hold true for a wider constituency, including customers. Negative associations, whatever the source, are something to be avoided, and such feedback may give new insights useful to the planning of the visual identity of the company.
Fourth, company management should note the potential of electronic devices when launching a new name to external stakeholders, which may be far more cost-effective than expensive marketing communications campaigns to communicate the change.

9.5 Evaluation of the study

As Eriksson and Kovalainen (2008, 281) point out, a qualitative research report is often like a novel that consists of a topic, a problem, research questions and an argument. In so doing, it forms a plot, which ties all the chapters and sections of the report together. Each part of the report should benefit the whole.

Instead of being a logical and linear process consisting of stages that follow each other in a linear way, this has been a constructive - or teleology - process consisting of continuous discussion with different actions that needed to be completed in order to finalize the research. Basically, these actions have not followed each other in a certain order. Therefore, I have tried to meet the criteria for assessing qualitative research and the criteria for the evaluation of the research (see, e.g. Silverman 2005: 228) as the journey progressed so as to provide a trustworthy whole (see, Lincoln & Cuba 1985). Evaluating trustworthiness includes evaluating the credibility, transferability, dependability and conformability of the research process, and may allow other researchers to design quite a similar study for revealing results that are close to those provided in this study.

Dependability is concerned with the researcher’s responsibility for offering information to the reader, that the process of research has been logical, traceable and documented (Lincoln & Cuba 1985). Even though I feel that my research process has not always been so logical, I have tried to illustrate the total process from the introduction, in chapter 1, and explain whether there have been any inconsistencies during the study. The basis of this study has been that I have tried to base choosing research methods on my ontological and epistemological views, and in so doing, find the methods with which I can answer my research question as reliably as possible. Furthermore, I have tried base all the choices I have made in research design on the existing literature and explain my choices in as much detail as possible. In addition, I have tried to write this report as logically as possible, that said, I admit that the form of this research report represents a more traditional way to write a research report than being truly qualitative in nature. Traceability I have tried to strengthen by being careful in using references; I have tried to use the existing sources carefully by not changing their meaning and al-
ways refer carefully to those sources I have used. This concerns the context, theoretical background as well as methodological literature. I documented all my empirical data in one way or another; I audio-recorded the interviews and then transcribed them, I kept memos about each interview and conversation, I stored and
printed each e-mail on the subject, and I carefully filed every other piece of written material I obtained during the process. I also documented my research process
by keeping a diary of what I have done and when, and how my own learning has
developed. Not all of the actions will be explicitly visible in the content of the
report, but they all have an effect on the whole. I have also tried to illustrate different stages I have gone through with the data in order to make it possible for
other researchers to reach the same conclusions. Of course, the study could have
included more information on some issues; it could have included screen prints of
the data handling in the QSR NVivo software, or it could have reproduced some
interviews in their entirety, but in this study I felt that to do so would not further
the understanding of the results, so I omitted them.
Transferability is concerned with the responsibility of researchers to show the
degree of similarity between their research and other research in order to establish
a connection to the previous results (Lincoln and Cuba 1985). This came quite
naturally through the abductive nature of the study and the whole research report
is based on the same. My research process was always a continuous discussion
with the context, theories and my data. This ensured that my theoretical background consists of those issues that are important from the data perspective, I analysed the data in several rounds, tried to ensure the data is equivalent to the theories and context-related issues, and that the context-related issues concentrate on
specific perspectives on the theories and data. Specifically, I have discussed similarities and differences between my data and theories in Chapter 7. However, because corporate branding has its roots both in product branding in the marketing
discipline and in multidisciplinary organisation studies (Bickerton 2000, Knox &
Bickerton 2003), some may argue that transferability of the results should have
been extended into these discussions as well. It was a deliberate choice to discuss
the findings only in relation to the corporate branding and corporate rebranding
literature in order to strengthen those specific research fields.
Credibility refers to whether the researcher is familiar with the topic, whether
the data is sufficient to merit the researcher’s claims, whether the links between
observations and categories are logical, and whether other researchers could come
relatively close to researcher’s interpretations on the basis of the material (Lincoln
and Cuba 1985). Examining corporate rebranding among small companies from a
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process perspective proved to be more challenging than I had imagined. Looking back this research process, I now understand that theoretically I have struggled in solving a problem in a muddled research field in which several researchers have noticed that there are several areas of confusion (see, e.g. Aspara & Tikkanen 2008) and in which several different concepts are used interchangeably (Bickerton 2003). I have tried, however, to carefully explain my choices of the theoretical aspects that have helped me understand my phenomenon from the perspective I wanted to understand it. In addition, I have tried to be careful in excluding perspectives that were not important or would have just added confusion (chapter 1.3.3). Choosing the ones I did has forced the omission of several other important views, but, this study should be seen as a starting point from which the phenomenon can be studied further from other perspectives.

Because I wanted to gain empirical data from the software companies that were currently changing or about to change their names, there potential candidates were limited. The companies I managed to find were micro companies employing less than ten people. In two of the companies the entrepreneur/manager was the only person that was wholly responsible for corporate rebranding. Even though, I asked several times whether there were other people actively involved in the process, neither of the interviewees was able to name anyone other than themselves. I suspect that some other people were involved in the process in some lesser capacity, but they were certainly not still with the companies, and so it was impossible to interview them.

Despite this, I have tried to make the data gathering systematic and to ensure that I have gathered all the relevant secondary material related to my phenomenon, and in the preliminary data gathering I have tried to gain a holistic picture about the phenomenon I am interested in by interviewing all the people that actively involved in implementing the process. This, however, proved to be a problem in Cases 2 and 3, in which the managers concerned reported being almost the only person to have carried out corporate rebranding processes. This can be considered as a problem from the research design viewpoint, because it restricted how rich the data was in comparison to Case 1. Viewing the main emphasis in this research as being to reveal a process of corporate name change, the data I could gain from two cases was not excellent for that purpose. Despite that, I described their processes as reliably as was possible. On the other hand it could be considered a strength, because even though the manager was the only person I was able to interview, given the nature of a small business, I think I managed to provide sufficiently rich data from those interviews and cases in general.
Despite e-mail interviews, the primary empirical data consists of 15 interviews in total: three preliminary interviews, seven narrative interviews and five specifying interviews. Some fellow researchers might consider that a low number for a doctoral dissertation. However, given the qualitative nature of the study, the narrative nature of the interviews, the small size of the case study companies and the method of choosing the interviewees, I would argue that this study has produced a rich stream of data more than capable of answering its research question. To support the small number of interviews, I have also used triangulation in the sense of checking the progress of different events from different sources, for example, by combining different interviews, e-mails, and examples of logos and planned corporate names. Several different rounds of data analysis ensured that I was able to view my data from several different perspectives, and this helped me to enhance the categories I made from my data. In my opinion, it is possible that other researchers would arrive at similar results as I did, but it is also possible that another researcher examining my data, would find there some other perspective that I was not able to find.

Another question is, whether I should have changed my viewpoint and also sought out the external stakeholders as data sources. If I had, however, the purpose of the study would not have been the same. As Poggie (1965: 284 via Van de Ven & Poole 1995) summarises: “A way of seeing is a way of not seeing”. In addition, although I chose the cases to report on the actions of companies that were about the change their names, one of the cases I followed did not result in a name change during the research period. It might be suggested that I should have dropped that particular case from the case study and found another case to replace it. It is a moot point, especially as the case in question concerned business unit rebranding, which could be seen as another reason for excluding the case. However, I chose to stick with reporting on the case because the data I gained, despite the issues above, confirmed my findings from other cases, and most importantly, revealed that several events in each sub-process were planned or even executed before the company was established. In addition, the case offered data on all the issues that happened up to the point of choosing the new name.

Conformability refers to the idea that the data and interpretations of an inquiry are not merely imagined. It is about linking findings and interpretations to the data in ways that can be easily understood by others. (Lincoln & Cuba 1985.) I have tried to clearly explain - even in the table of the contents - when I am referring to the original data (i.e. quotations) and when I am dealing with something that is subject to interpretation (i.e. narratives, descriptions of the corporate re-
branding sub-processes, comparisons of the cases). I have also tried to make analysis visible by adding the descriptions of the orders of the individual renaming actions as appendices. I have analysed the data in several different rounds again and again from slightly different perspectives in order to ensure data triangulation and that I found all the interesting issues that could be found. I have also evaluated these findings in the light of the previous literature in order to deepen understanding of the data. However, because my phenomenon proved to be quite a wide one, despite trying to concentrate on the corporate name and aesthetics aspects alone, I have had to exclude some detailed descriptions of the data analysis.

9.6 Limitations of the study

As with any research process, the current study does have some shortcomings. First, I chose the corporate branding, corporate rebranding and organisational change processes for the theoretical background for the study. As a consequence, the study has excluded several interesting viewpoints.

Second, in this study I concentrated on examining a phenomenon usually studied with large multinationals and companies that operate in the consumer business sector in the restricted context of small companies providing product solutions. Accordingly, my conceptual foundations – except for the context-related issues – are based on the studies of large companies, while my data concentrates on small companies. There might be resultant inconsistencies between the data and theories, even though I have tried to highlight any potential inconsistencies as clearly as possible.

Third, because the study was conducted with a case study approach in one specific context, the statistical generalisation of the results is not possible either to other small companies in different industries or to large companies. Despite this, as is typical of case studies, the analytical generalisation can be made, because I used a previously developed theory as a template with which to compare the empirical results, and the cases showed replication in several ways (see, e.g. Rowley 2002).

Fourth, the decision to focus on the visual aspects of corporate rebranding has naturally restricted the study, leaving other important viewpoints unaddressed. For example, line extensions, distribution extensions, price reductions, or repositioning the brand (Kapferer 2008: 239) are considered important in product branding and brand values, corporate culture and internal branding are considered impor-
tant issues in corporate branding, and examining them from a corporate rebranding viewpoint would have offered interesting results. Employing them might have offered a richer description of the phenomenon. However, due to the limited data and the nature of narrative interviews these issues were not raised in the interviews, which may mean that these are odd concepts in small companies. Similarly, providing a comprehensive view to corporate rebranding as a process came up against the problem that companies do not concentrate on launching and evaluating. Due to the limited data, this study concentrates much more on name and logo change, than on launching and evaluating. In addition, if launching had been considered from the viewpoint of internal branding, it might have offered a richer and more multidimensional description, and the study might have been able to shed more light on evaluating if external stakeholders had been interviewed.

Fifth, instead of concentrating only on the internal viewpoint, the study could have been more valuable if it had been conducted from the viewpoint of corporate brand co-creation (see, e.g. Boyle 2007, Gregory 2007, Juntunen 2011). Gathering the data from external stakeholders too, including, for example, customers, might have offered a more comprehensive view on the phenomenon. Related to this is the positioning of the study. As presented in the introduction, the study is strongly based on organisational research. If the study had been rooted in the research provided by the Industrial Marketing and Purchasing (IMP) Group from the very beginning, it might have made different kinds of contributions.

9.7 Avenues for further studies

This journey of mine has proved to me that the amount of research gaps in the current literature is enormous – and I cannot wait to get at them. Nevertheless, continuing from this study I would like to mention four main avenues for further studies.

First, each of the limitations I described above could form the basis of further studies. It would be valuable to study corporate rebranding in small business contexts other than in the B2B software company context. Examining small B2B companies that operate in the product business in other industries would perhaps reveal other aspects, either confirming these results or challenging them. In addition, studying corporate rebranding in small B2B services companies might result in interesting comparisons with this study, and help to develop the theories further. After these openings it might be possible to develop quantitative measures for corporate rebranding and continue in quantitative manner. In addition, a new
trigger for corporate renaming was found in this study, specifically, the difficulty of using the name. As this study was only a three case study, this finding cannot be statistically generalised, but the role of the finding definitely merits more examination.

Second, as I outlined in the theoretical framework, corporate branding has several other aspects apart from the visual, which was the primary aspect in this study. It would be important to study corporate rebranding by examining the changing of the other corporate branding related concepts, for example, corporate values or corporate identity. In addition, due to the shortcomings in this study, corporate rebranding sub-processes of launching and evaluating should be further examined.

Third, the amount of corporate branding studies has extensively increased during the last few years. They offer several new insights to study. Rather than being developed, it has recently been suggested that a corporate brand is co-created with its stakeholders (e.g. Gregory 2007, Boyle 2007, Juntunen 2011). In the current study, stakeholders connected to one company were observed to have participated in the development of the new company name. It would be interesting to continue by examining the role of stakeholders in corporate rebranding.

Fourth, any of the theoretical perspectives I excluded from the study could offer an interesting perspective from which to re-examine the data and/or offer new insights into ways to acquire new data on corporate rebranding. For example, it might be fruitful to study what kind of impact the changing of a market orientation would cause among stakeholders? Or the impact of corporate rebranding related to a specific entrepreneur?
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### Appendices

**Appendix 1: Illustration of some concepts close to corporate brand (Balmer 2001a, published by permission of Emerald Group Publishing Limited).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Addresses key question</th>
<th>Comments/explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate identity</td>
<td>What are we?</td>
<td>Also involves addressing a series of questions including: What is our business/structure/strategy/ethos/market/绩效/history and reputation/relationships to other identities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational identity (corporate personality)*</td>
<td>Who are we?</td>
<td>The mix of dominant/ascendant subcultures within/ transcending the organisation. Employees' relationships with myriad organisational identities (holding company, subsidiary/ies, departments, original, current and emergent identities), Professional, cultural, industrial, sexual identities, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual identity (visual identification system)</td>
<td>What are the organization's symbols and system of identification?</td>
<td>Do the organisation's visual (and verbal) cues communicate what/who we are? What/Who we were? What/Who we wish to be? A mix of the above? Is there clarity or confusion? Does it reflect or possibly inform current strategy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate communication</td>
<td>Is there integrated communication?</td>
<td>In relation to management, organisational and marketing communications. Are they integrated in terms of management, philosophy and process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total corporate communications</td>
<td>Is there concurrency in vertical and horizontal communication?</td>
<td>Vertical: between corporate communication, corporate actions, performance and behaviours and between third parties. Horizontal: as above but also concurrency over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate image</td>
<td>What is the current perception and/or profile?</td>
<td>In relation to the immediate mental perception of the organisation held by an individual, group or network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate reputation</td>
<td>What distinctive attributes (if any) are assigned to the organisation?</td>
<td>The enduring perception held of an organisation by an individual, group or network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: The methodology applied in corporate branding studies (continued from Ahonen 2008b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix 3: Industries studied empirically in corporate branding studies (continued from Ahonen (2008b)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunication</td>
<td>Gotsi et al. (2008), Piña et al. (2006), Rubinson &amp; Pfeiffer (2005), Schoenfelder &amp; Harris (2004), Sichtmann (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airline companies</td>
<td>Hatch &amp; Schultz (2003), Supphellen &amp; Nysveen (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT and electronics</td>
<td>Kowalczyk &amp; Pawlish (2002), Spears et al. (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>van Rekom et al. (2006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Theoretical background of the corporate branding studies (partly continued from Ahonen (2008b))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical approach</th>
<th>Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product and corporate branding</strong></td>
<td>Merrilees &amp; Fry (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Branding and services</strong></td>
<td>Andriopoulos &amp; Gotsi (2000), de Chernatony &amp; Cottam (2008), Hardaker &amp; Fill (2005), McDonald et al. (2001), Merrilees &amp; Miller (2008), Papasolomou &amp; Vrontis (2006b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical approach</td>
<td>Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-branding approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous theoretical approaches</td>
<td>Balmer &amp; Greyser (2006), de Chernatony &amp; Cottam (2008), Fan (2005), For-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: An example of the hand-written memo page during the narrative interview in Case 3.
Appendix 6: Example of secondary data in Case 3 (DVD-covers).
Appendix 7: Examples of logo proposals in Case 1.
Appendix 8: An example of preliminary understanding of the corporate rebranding process in Case 1.
### Appendix 9: Corporate renaming actors, actions, events and sub-processes in Case 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions/events in stories</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>Why</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>To/from whom</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Event in renaming process</th>
<th>Sub-process in renaming process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End of 2003</strong></td>
<td>Managing director A1</td>
<td>Understands that the name is challenging to pronounce</td>
<td>Establishing the company with a difficult name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noticing the challenge to pronounce the name</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Establishing the company, 31.12.2003</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January 2004 - November 2007</strong></td>
<td>Customers</td>
<td>Send letters with wrongly written corporate name</td>
<td>To managing director, employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noticing difficulties in using the name</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ask how to spell the corporate name</td>
<td>From managing director, employees</td>
<td>By phone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluating the current name</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ask how to write the corporate name</td>
<td>From managing director, employees</td>
<td>By phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In 2004</strong></td>
<td>Managing director A1, board members</td>
<td>Tell in Wilho board meeting and avoid rumours that the company will change its name</td>
<td>To participants in Wilho consortium</td>
<td>By discussing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness about the forthcoming name change increased</td>
<td>Informing stakeholders about the forthcoming name change</td>
<td>Informing about the forthcoming name change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wilho project participants</strong></td>
<td>Give ideas for a new name</td>
<td>In project meetings and brainstorm</td>
<td>To participants in the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developing alternative names</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions/events in stories</td>
<td>Results of analyses</td>
<td>Event in renaming process</td>
<td>Sub-process in renaming process</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>What</td>
<td>Why</td>
<td>How</td>
<td>To/from whom</td>
<td>Result</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2006-April 2007</td>
<td>Creating possible names</td>
<td>Creating possible names</td>
<td>Developing alternative names</td>
<td>Inventing a new name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing director A2</td>
<td>Googling, no criteria, just ideas for free names</td>
<td>No criteria, just ideas for names</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Creating possible names</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing director A2, employees</td>
<td>Discussing about possible names</td>
<td>A board member</td>
<td>Noticing difficulties in using the name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2006</td>
<td>Explaining the difficulties using the name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing director A2</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>About 200 name options as a list</td>
<td>Presenting potential name(s) to the management board</td>
<td>Selecting a new name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2007</td>
<td>Presenting possible names</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing director A2</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management board</td>
<td>Evaluates the current corporate name in order to understand whether the name needs to be changed</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gathering positive and negative issues concerning the current name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List of positive and negative issues</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluating the name(s)</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions/events in stories</td>
<td>Results of analyses</td>
<td>Sub-process in renaming process</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>What</td>
<td>Why</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management board</td>
<td>Understands the need for a new name</td>
<td>The list of negative issues is longer than positive issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management board</td>
<td>Evaluates the possible names</td>
<td>Evaluating the name(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management board</td>
<td>Cannot choose a name from a long list</td>
<td>None of the names is satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007 Management board</td>
<td>Developing new names</td>
<td>Brainstorms, email discussions, discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management board</td>
<td>Decides to change the name to Wilho</td>
<td>Wilho was the name of the research consortium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management board</td>
<td>Tries to register a new name</td>
<td>In the National Board of Patents and Registration of Finland</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions/events in stories</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>What</td>
<td>Why</td>
<td>How</td>
<td>To/from whom</td>
<td>Result</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of analyses</td>
<td>National Board of Patents and Registration of Finland</td>
<td>Denies registering the name Wilho</td>
<td>Rejecting a name</td>
<td>Selecting a new name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event in renaming process</th>
<th>Sub-process in renaming process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notice difficulties in using the name</td>
<td>Evaluating difficulties in using the name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October 2007</th>
<th>Board member</th>
<th>Presents the need for a new name</th>
<th>The list of negative issues is longer than positive issues</th>
<th>To management board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management board</td>
<td>Accepts that the name development need to continue</td>
<td>Developing alternative names</td>
<td>Inventing the new name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board members</td>
<td>Brainstorming the new names</td>
<td>Defining the criteria for a new name</td>
<td>Inventing a new name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board member</td>
<td>Defining the criteria for a new name</td>
<td>A list of criteria for a new name</td>
<td>Inventing a new name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board members</td>
<td>Continue developing the new name</td>
<td>Developing alternative names</td>
<td>Inventing a new name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board member</td>
<td>Creates a list of possible names</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>What</td>
<td>Why</td>
<td>How</td>
<td>To/from whom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board member</td>
<td>Checks the availability of alternative names</td>
<td>Googling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board member</td>
<td>Chooses a potential name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2007 Board member</td>
<td>Presents an option for a new name</td>
<td>Want to change the name</td>
<td>By discussing in a meeting</td>
<td>Other board members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board members</td>
<td>Accepts a new name</td>
<td>The proposal for a new name was good enough</td>
<td>By discussing in a meeting</td>
<td>New name for a company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing director A3</td>
<td>Tries to register a new name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 10: Renaming events and actors in Case 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>Event in renaming process</th>
<th>Sub-process in renaming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006 Managing director B</td>
<td>Registers the domain for the business unit MSG Mobi</td>
<td>Noticing the challenge to pronounce the name</td>
<td>Evaluating the current name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2007-2008 Customers</td>
<td>Ask whether they know what MSG is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 2008 Manager + employee</td>
<td>Choose to use the slogan WhileOnTheMove as a business unit name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager Checks the domain availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager Registers the domain and keeps the old domain as well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager + employee Recognises that WhileOnTheMove is too long for a company name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager + employee Inventing different corporate names</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advertising agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 11: Corporate rebranding sub-processes and events in Case 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renaming</th>
<th>Redesigning</th>
<th>Launching</th>
<th>Evaluating</th>
<th>Product renaming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>End of 1990s</strong></td>
<td>Manager notices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that the corporate name is difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning of 2000</strong></td>
<td>Manager gets</td>
<td>Freelancer graphic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ideas for a new name from the</td>
<td>designer creates a new logo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>logo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager decides</td>
<td>Manager launches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to take the logo into use</td>
<td>the new logo in the Internet sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End of 2000</strong></td>
<td>Manager invents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the name MSS Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning of 2001</strong></td>
<td>Manager registers</td>
<td>Manager updates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>four auxiliary firm names for the</td>
<td>the logo by replacing Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>company</td>
<td>Solutions Siurua with MSS Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager updates</td>
<td>Manager launches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the logo by replacing Media Solutions</td>
<td>the new name and logo via Internet sites and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siurua with MSS Group</td>
<td>e-mails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2002
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Renaming the product as MSS Ferris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advertising agency creates a new name (Galaxo), logo, and a symbol for the product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager renames the product as Galaxo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager launches the new product name and logo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Manager registers the auxiliary firm name MSS Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Manager updates the logo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2009</td>
<td>Manager notices that the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Renaming stakeholders recognise better the product name than the corporate name

Manager registers the name Galaxo as a firm name and the name Media Solutions Siurua as an auxiliary firm name

Manager informs the personnel and the external stakeholders that the name is changed

Manager leaves the corporate logo away and uses only product logo

Manager does not hurry in eliminating the old name signs but uses them together with the new signs outside the office

Manager notices that the new name works well

March 2009

March 2009-
Manager notices challenges in using the same name for the product and the company.
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