

Reimagining corporate branding in a digitally interconnected society: Challenges and opportunities for GRID network

Ulani Yunus¹, Carly Stiana Scheffer-Sumampouw¹, Nathalia Gunarian^{1*}, Tarrence Karmelia Kontessa¹

¹ LSPR Institute of Communication & Business, 10220, Indonesia

*Corresponding author's email: nathalia@edu.esmodjakarta.com

Abstract

This study examines the rebranding process of GRID Network, as part of Kompas-Gramedia (KG) media group, adapting digitally to this technology disruption. GRID network needs to cater technological and behavioral change in order to survive in this era, thus reimagining corporate branding in KG print media Group, is a necessity. Aims of this study is specifically to identify internal and external response to challenges during the rebranding of GRID Network and generally to assess the impact of digital transformation on brand equity and consumer loyalty within Indonesia's magazine and tabloid case within a digitally interconnected society. This article attempts to focus on a single case-study through qualitative interviews with employees across management, comparing and confirming the branding and rebranding conceptual framework. The main findings show that GRID Network's brand strategy, initially reactive to digital trends, may lack the strategic depth needed to build a unique identity, as it appears focused more on adapting to the interconnected, digital landscape than on establishing a cohesive brand image. This cautious entry into digital media may impact both employee alignment and consumer perception, with both groups potentially struggling to find relevance and consistency in the brand's message. Recommendations include developing a unified brand identity that integrates core values, engages employees, and effectively bridges generational differences among consumers would help create a stronger brand presence and foster loyalty by aligning GRID Network's digital transformation with clear, cohesive values that resonate across all audiences.

Keywords

Branding; Digital society; Media company; Rebranding; Interconnected society

Introduction

One-way information dominance, also known as the print media era, describes a time before the digital age when print media such as newspapers, magazines, and books

Published:
May 30, 2025

This work is licensed
under a [Creative
Commons Attribution-
NonCommercial 4.0
International License](#)

Selection and Peer-
review under the
responsibility of the 6th
BIS-HSS 2024 Committee

dominated the information landscape. Print media held a central role in shaping public opinion, spreading knowledge, and entertaining society. The transition from conventional media to digital media is one of the most significant shifts in the history of human communication. This change has transformed how people access information, interact with the world, and shape popular culture.

Rebranding efforts such as this face challenges related to brand identity conflicts and internal resistance, especially given the strong legacy identities associated with its publications [1]. By employing frameworks such as Muzellec and Lambkin's evolutionary-revolutionary rebranding model [2] and Merrilees and Miller's six principles of corporate rebranding [1], this study aims to explore how well GRID Network balances legacy values with a modern digital strategy, essential for maintaining brand equity and relevance in today's digital marketplace [3], [4].

This transformation, also known as rebranding, is a business strategy that involves a comprehensive change of brand identity. The term "rebrand" is a neologism that combines two well-defined terms: "re" and "brand." "Re" is a common verb prefix, often meaning "again" or "new," implying that the action is repeated. The traditional definition of a brand, proposed by the American Marketing Association, is a "name, term, symbol, design, or a combination of these, intended to identify goods or services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from competitors." This definition focuses on a company's input activities in creating differentiation through name and visual identity devices [5]. Though somewhat limiting, it aligns with the rebranding process as described in business press. Thus, rebranding can be characterized as the creation of a new name, term, symbol, design, or a combination of these for an established brand with the goal of establishing a distinct (new) position in the minds of stakeholders and competitors.

The many cases of corporate rebranding present an intriguing challenge for the marketing discipline. Revitalizing and repositioning a brand through gradual modification of its brand proposition and marketing aesthetics can be seen as a natural and essential part of brand management in response to changing market conditions [6], [7]. Changing a brand name implies the loss of all the values associated with the old name, challenging traditional marketing wisdom regarding brand equity. A fundamental premise underlying marketing education and practice is that a strong brand is built through sustained investment over years in a brand name, which, if carefully managed, will yield loyal consumers, higher margins, and sustainable revenue streams for the brand owner [6], [7], [8]. Thus, changing a brand name could potentially undo years of effort and could seriously harm or even destroy brand equity.

Magazines often contain popular articles, journalistic coverage including views on various topics, and are published periodically (weekly, monthly, semi-annually, and annually). They sometimes have specializations such as those for teenagers, women, sports, etc. Tabloids are small-sized newspapers with light, concise, clear news formats that emphasize images. They often cover topics related to gossip, crime, astrology, and

sports. Another thing that distinguishes newspapers from magazines and tabloids is that their printing is predominantly in black and white, while magazines and tabloids are in color.

According to Djafar H. Assegaff in his book “Jurnalistik Masa Kini” (Contemporary Journalism), a magazine is defined as a publication or periodical that contains articles from various writers [9]. In addition to articles, magazines are also publications that contain short stories, pictures, reviews, illustrations, or other features that color the content of the magazine. Therefore, magazines are used as one of the centers of reading information that is often used as reference material by readers in searching for something they want. As for tabloids, according to Wasserman, it is a word that can encompass three things at once: the format of newspaper size, publication periodicity, and the appearance of style and content that is sensational, interesting, and unique [10].

The evolution of the publishing business in the digital era is evident in companies like Gramedia Majalah, a name familiar to Indonesians, especially in the mass media publishing industry. Gramedia Majalah was established in 1992 as part of the Kompas Gramedia (KG) Group. This division was responsible for producing and distributing various magazine titles covering a wide range of topics, from entertainment, lifestyle, and health to general knowledge. Some popular magazines published under Gramedia Majalah include *Nova*, *Hai*, *Bobo*, and *National Geographic Indonesia*.

Over the years, Gramedia Majalah has become a market leader in Indonesia’s magazine publishing industry. The magazines published by Gramedia Majalah have not only served as information sources but also as a part of Indonesian society’s daily life. This division, originally focused on magazine publishing under Kompas Gramedia (KG), has now transformed into GRID Network, a digital media platform providing diverse content for Indonesian readers.

GRID Network’s rebranding involves unifying a portfolio of well-known Indonesian print brands under a new digital identity. However, this transition brings specific challenges. Internally, employee resistance is a significant hurdle as stakeholders are attached to historic brand names. Externally, the newly created “GRID” brand in an abbreviation of “Gramedia Indonesia” lacks immediate consumer recognition compared to legacy brands such as *Nova*, *Hai*, *Bobo*, and *National Geographic Indonesia*. This problem raises critical questions on maintaining the value of existing brands while introducing a unified corporate identity [11], [12].

The rebranding of Gramedia Majalah may have been done to adapt to market changes, increase brand relevance, or create a fresher image. The process of transforming Gramedia Majalah into GRID Network raises intriguing questions. Aims of this study is specifically to identify internal and external response to challenges during the rebranding of GRID Network and generally to assess the impact of digital transformation on brand equity and consumer loyalty within Indonesia’s magazine and tabloid case within a digitally interconnected society.

The main theory used in this paper is revolutionary rebranding according to Muzellec and Lambkin's which is another type of corporate rebranding, which involves evolving the brand gradually over time [2]. This type of rebranding is often used when a company wants to stay competitive without giving up its established identity. It can include updates to the logo, visual elements, or positioning to make the brand feel fresh and modern.

Benefits of this study is offering insights into best practices for media companies navigating digital transformations and providing recommendations for managing internal resistance and maintaining legacy brand equity through strategic rebranding.

Method

The method the writer uses is a single case study published by Gustafsson in 2017 to get a deeper exploration of the subject and a rich description of the phenomenon, especially in the field of mass media digital transformation in Indonesia [13].

This study incorporates six foundational models from corporate rebranding literature to analyze the GRID Network's rebranding strategy, addressing the challenges, strategies, and outcomes in transitioning from legacy brands to a digital identity as described in Table 1.

Align with the six foundational models from corporate rebranding literature above, below the proposition of the study related with the response of the GRID Network's unified digital platform, employee response through the rebranding process, and legacy brand familiarity.

1. **Proposition 1 (P1).** Rebranding to a unified digital platform will enhance perceived brand equity among GRID Network's digital audience, attracting new digital-native users by balancing legacy appeal with contemporary digital relevance [2], [20], [21].
2. **Proposition 2 (P2).** Internal resistance from employees loyal to legacy brands will challenge the rebranding process, potentially disrupting internal brand alignment and affecting the adoption of the new corporate identity. Employees buy-in is critical for successful rebranding, as outlined by Daly and Moloney [12] and supported by Ramos et al. [17], and Gotsi and Andriopoulos [4].
3. **Proposition 3 (P3).** Legacy brand familiarity with individual publications will remain stronger than the recognition of the new "GRID" brand, which may hinder brand consolidation. Consumers may continue to attach meaning to the legacy brands based on symbolic associations and familiarity [15], [23].

In this study, the writers use qualitative data from a semi-structured interview through 10 internal employees within the company. The 10 respondents selected for this study represent a range of roles and backgrounds within the Kompas Gramedia (KG), ensuring a diverse perspective on the rebranding process. The profiles include 2 General Managers that are involved in strategic decision-making and primarily focused on the

long-term objectives of the brand consolidation and digital growth; 4 Managers that will bring insights into the challenges of maintaining brand loyalty among legacy consumers and adapting to the digital identity; and 4 Staffs will provide feedback into GRID Network's evolving digital identity. This range of profiles provides a balanced view of internal perspectives across different departments and varying levels of attachment to legacy brands.

Table 1. Corporate rebranding model literature

Model	Description
Corporate Rebranding Model [2]	Muzellec and Lambkin categorize rebranding approaches as either evolutionary (gradual) or revolutionary (radical). This model is useful for evaluating how GRID Network balances continuity with legacy brands while implementing a digital transformation [14]. In other rebranding cases, such as Lego's transition described by Hatch and Schultz, evolutionary strategies helped maintain brand essence while introducing new brand dimensions [15]. The evolutionary- revolutionary distinction is essential for understanding if GRID Network's transition is perceived as a gradual update or a radical shift in brand identity.
Six Principles of Corporate Rebranding [1]	Merrilees and Miller emphasize principles like maintaining core brand values, ensuring brand consistency, and securing stakeholder buy-in. These principles help explain how GRID Network navigates legacy brand associations while unifying diverse publications under one digital identity [3], [16]. Daly and Moloney further argue that rebranding success is highly dependent on stakeholder engagement, both internal and external [12].
Internal-External Stakeholder Legitimacy Framework [17]	This framework highlights the importance of legitimacy in rebranding, achieved by securing buy-in from both internal (employees) and external (consumers) stakeholders. In emerging markets, consumer trust can be fragile, making internal and external buy-in crucial [18], [19]. Gotsi and Andriopoulos found that employees play a vital role in influencing public perceptions [4], especially when they embody the brand's new values. This framework is essential for understanding the dual pressures GRID Network faces in aligning internal culture with external brand image.
Enablers and Barriers to Rebranding [11]	This model outlines the primary enablers (e.g., leadership, clear communication, brand coherence) and barriers (e.g., resistance to change, brand dilution) in rebranding processes. Merrilees et al. note that effective leadership and clear communication can reduce internal resistance, a significant barrier GRID Network encounters [11]. Balmer and Gray emphasize that leadership support and clarity in messaging are crucial for internal support [16], while Hatch and Schultz argue that coherent leadership is essential to prevent fragmentation [15].
Rebranding and Brand Equity Dynamics [20]	Nana et al. examine the complex relationship between rebranding and brand equity [11], suggesting that rebranding can enhance or diminish brand equity depending on consumer perceptions and brand associations [21]. Vallaster and de Chernatony found that rebranding initiatives can strengthen brand equity if carefully aligned with core brand values [22], which is vital for GRID Network in retaining consumer loyalty amid digital transformation.
Symbolic Interactionist Perspective on Brand Meaning [23]	This model explores how brand meaning is shaped through interactions among stakeholders. Tarnovskaya and Biedenbach suggest that brand meaning is not fixed but is continuously constructed through consumer and employee perceptions [23]. Hatch and Schultz support this view, arguing that brand meaning often evolves as organizations respond to consumer expectations [15]. Examining how GRID Network's audiences interpret the new brand identity allows an assessment of how well the rebranding resonates with stakeholders, especially as legacy associations remain strong.

The semi-structured interviews are designed around the six rebranding models discussed. Details of the questions and purposes are mentioned in Table 2 as crafted to

explore specific rebranding challenges and outcomes within the GRID Network transition. The questions focused on both organizational and consumer perspectives, delving into aspects like brand continuity, employee alignment, and brand equity perceptions.

Table 2. Six Rebranding Models Method

Model	Questions	Purpose
Corporate Rebranding Model [2]	How do you perceive the shift from legacy brands (like Bobo and Nova) to the unified GRID Network? Do you see this transition as gradual (evolutionary) or transformative (revolutionary)?	This question assesses whether the rebranding aligns with employee and stakeholder expectations of continuity or change [14].
Six Principles of Corporate Rebranding [1]	How well do you feel that the core values of the legacy brands have been incorporated into the GRID Network's rebranding? What steps has the company taken to ensure stakeholder (internal and external) buy-in?	This question clarifies if the rebranding respects legacy brand values and integrates them into the new identity [12], [16].
Internal-External Stakeholder Legitimacy Framework [17]	How would you describe the acceptance level of the GRID Network rebranding among employees and consumers? Have there been challenges in gaining support from either group?	According to Ramos et al., employee and consumer buy-in are essential for maintaining brand legitimacy [17], especially in emerging markets where brand trust may be fragile. This question probes internal and external responses to the new brand, examining how acceptance (or resistance) influences legitimacy [18].
Enablers and Barriers to Rebranding [11]	What factors have facilitated or hindered the success of the rebranding process? How has leadership and communication impacted this?	Merrilees et al. identify leadership, communication, and coherence as key enablers, with resistance and brand dilution as potential barriers [11]. This question allows employees to discuss the leadership and communication efforts related to the rebranding and any challenges they faced [16].
Rebranding and Brand Equity Dynamics [20]	How do you think the rebranding has impacted consumer perceptions of quality, trust, and brand associations with the new GRID Network?	This question examines brand equity shifts due to rebranding, as suggested by Nana et al., focusing on how consumers perceive the GRID Network's identity relative to legacy brands [20]. This aligns with findings by Collange and Bonache on the complex dynamics of brand equity in rebranding [21].
Symbolic Interactionist Perspective on Brand Meaning [23]	How do you think consumers interpret the GRID Network brand compared to legacy brands? What meanings do you believe they attach to each?	Tarnovskaya and Biedenbach suggest that brand meanings are shaped by stakeholder interactions [23]. This question explores how audiences and employees interpret the new brand identity amid legacy associations, building on Hatch and Schultz's findings that brand meaning evolves through consumer and employee engagement [15].

This multi-model approach method will provide insights into the effectiveness of GRID Network's rebranding, focusing on both internal and external perceptions. The findings

will offer a comprehensive view of the rebranding's impact on various challenges and opportunities faced by GRID Network.

The interview responses were analyzed through six rebranding models, with each model providing a specific focus for coding and categorization to understand different facets of GRID Network's rebranding (see [Table 3](#)).

Table 3. Six Rebranding Models Data Analysis

Model	Purpose
Corporate Rebranding Model [2]	Responses were coded to determine whether participants perceived the rebranding approach as evolutionary (gradual) or revolutionary (complete transformation). This model helped assess the alignment between management's intended strategy and employees' perceptions of the rebranding's nature.
Six Principles of Corporate Rebranding [1] , [17]	Coding focused on themes such as adherence to core brand values, brand consistency, and efforts to secure stakeholder buy-in. This model assessed how well the rebranding respected legacy brand values and maintained consistency across different brand elements.
Internal-External Stakeholder Legitimacy Framework [17]	This model guided the analysis of responses regarding internal and external acceptance levels, focusing on areas of resistance and support. It helped identify legitimacy issues by examining the differences in acceptance levels between employees and consumers.
Enablers and Barriers to Rebranding [11]	Responses were categorized to identify enablers (e.g., leadership, clear communication) and barriers (e.g., resistance to change, brand dilution concerns). This model provided insights into factors that facilitated or hindered the rebranding process.
Rebranding and Brand Equity Dynamics [20]	This model was used to examine how rebranding efforts affected brand equity, focusing on consumer perceptions of quality, trust, and loyalty. The analysis assessed changes in brand equity as perceived by different consumer segments in relation to the new brand identity.
Symbolic Interactionist Perspective on Brand Meaning [23]	Responses were coded to capture how stakeholders interpreted and attached meaning to the new GRID Network brand in comparison to legacy brands. This model helped explore how brand meanings evolved and were constructed by stakeholders.

This approach allowed for a nuanced understanding of the rebranding's impact on employee alignment, consumer perceptions, brand equity, and overall brand legitimacy through the lens of established rebranding frameworks. Please refer to the attached Interview Responses Summary Table for a detailed breakdown of individual responses categorized by each rebranding model.

Results

Corporate rebranding model [\[2\]](#)

The perception of GRID Network's rebranding as either evolutionary or revolutionary is split among respondents. Four individuals from senior management and the staff perceive the change as evolutionary, believing it maintains continuity with core brand values while modernizing for a digital audience. Conversely, six respondents majorly from managers consider the transition revolutionary, expressing concerns about the loss of distinct brand identities for publications like legacy brands. This divergence

suggests a potential disconnect in understanding the approach, with implications for alignment and acceptance across departments.

Six principles of corporate rebranding [1]

Adherence to core brand values and the effectiveness of stakeholder buy-in efforts received mixed feedback. Five respondents, including those in staff level, feel that GRID Network successfully incorporated legacy brand values, particularly through digital adaptations of familiar content. However, five respondents from legacy backgrounds report feeling under-informed and disconnected from the rebranding decision-making process. This suggests that while some efforts were made to secure buy-in, additional inclusive strategies may be needed to fully engage internal stakeholders and build alignment.

Internal-external stakeholder legitimacy framework [17]

The legitimacy of the rebranding effort appears stronger among consumers than employees. Seven respondents noted a positive reception among younger audiences who appreciate the digital identity, while six respondents reported internal resistance from employees attached to legacy brands. The disparity in acceptance highlights a gap in buy-in, particularly from long-time employees, which could hinder the overall success of the rebranding if not addressed with targeted engagement efforts.

Enablers and barriers to rebranding [11]

Leadership support and strategic direction were identified as key enablers by five respondents, particularly those in senior management. They acknowledged clear objectives and significant investments in digital tools as factors facilitating the rebranding process. However, five respondents, especially from managers, cited communication gaps as a major barrier. They expressed concerns over limited transparency regarding the rebranding's vision and impact on their roles, suggesting a need for improved communication to address uncertainties and strengthen internal alignment.

Rebranding and brand equity dynamics [20]

The impact on brand equity appears to vary across different consumer demographics. Six respondents noted a positive effect on brand perception among younger, digital-native audiences, who associate the rebranding with innovation and modern relevance. In contrast, four respondents, primarily from the managers, expressed concerns that the rebranding may weaken brand loyalty among older consumers who are deeply attached to legacy brands. This indicates a potential risk to brand equity among traditional audiences, which may need to be managed through targeted brand retention strategies.

Symbolic interactionist perspective on brand meaning [23]

Brand meaning has shifted among audiences in different ways. Five respondents view the GRID Network brand as symbolizing modernity and innovation, which resonates

with the organization's digital goals. However, five respondents from managerial level note that consumers continue to associate legacy brands like Bobo with nostalgia and trust. They feel the new brand identity has yet to fully capture these emotional elements, which are central to consumer loyalty. This suggests that while the rebranding successfully appeals to a new audience, additional efforts may be required to integrate legacy brand meaning and deepen the emotional connection for long-time consumers.

Discussion

This analysis section explores the responses of 10 participants through the lens of six corporate rebranding models on critical insights regarding GRID Network's transition to a digital platform. For specific responses from each position, see the attached Interview responses summary table, which categorizes insights by the six rebranding models.

Corporate rebranding model [2]

Question: "How do you perceive the shift from legacy brands (like Bobo and Nova) to the unified GRID Network? Do you see this transition as gradual (evolutionary) or transformative (revolutionary)?"

Summary of Responses:

Evolutionary (4 respondents): Four respondents, primarily from senior management and newer staff, see the rebranding as evolutionary. They view it as a strategic expansion that carefully integrates digital components with existing brand values, appealing to a new audience while respecting legacy elements.

Revolutionary (6 respondents): Six respondents, including managers, regard the rebranding as revolutionary. They express concern that the new GRID Network identity deviates too far from the familiar legacy brands, potentially alienating established audiences. They emphasize a perceived disconnect between past and present brand images.

Insight: This division reflects a possible misalignment within the organization regarding the nature of the rebranding. Employees attached to legacy brands may experience difficulty embracing the new identity, which they see as a radical departure from the historical brands.

Six principles of corporate rebranding [1]

Question: "How well do you feel that the core values of the legacy brands have been incorporated into the GRID Network's rebranding? What steps has the company taken to ensure stakeholder buy-in?"

Summary of Responses:

Positive (5 respondents): Five respondents, including those in consumer engagement, feel that the rebranding maintains core values of the legacy brands. They note efforts

to retain high-quality content and familiar themes, especially through digital storytelling, which appeals to both new and established consumers.

Neutral/Negative (5 respondents): Five respondents, mostly from managers, express feeling excluded from the rebranding process. They report limited communication about how legacy brand values have been incorporated into the new identity, which affects their connection to the rebranding efforts.

Insight: This split indicates that while external brand values may be preserved, internal buy-in may need improvement. Employees attached to legacy brands may require additional involvement and communication to align their understanding with the rebranding goals.

Internal-external stakeholder legitimacy framework

Question: “How would you describe the acceptance level of the GRID Network rebranding among employees and consumers? Have there been challenges in gaining support from either group?”

Summary of Responses:

Consumer Acceptance (7 respondents): Seven respondents observe that younger, digital-native audiences have responded positively, enjoying the accessibility and relevance of the new digital identity.

Employee Resistance (6 respondents): Six respondents report significant resistance within the organization. Long-term employees feel a strong attachment to legacy brands, which has made it challenging to accept the rebranding. Some fear losing their identity within the organization as the focus shifts to digital.

Insight: There is a clear discrepancy in buy-in, with consumer support outpacing employee acceptance. Employee resistance may hinder full internal alignment, suggesting the need for strategies that address concerns about brand identity and role security within the new digital framework.

Enablers and barriers to rebranding [11]

Question: “What factors have facilitated or hindered the success of the rebranding process? How has leadership and communication impacted this?”

Summary of Responses:

Enablers (5 respondents): Five respondents, including senior management, identify strong leadership and strategic clarity as enablers of the rebranding. They cite clear digital goals and investments in resources as contributing factors to a smooth transition.

Barriers (5 respondents): Five respondents, especially from managerial level, mention communication gaps as a significant barrier. They feel that the lack of clarity and transparency around the rebranding’s purpose has left them uncertain about their roles within the new structure.

Insight: Although leadership provides clear strategic direction, communication with legacy employees appears insufficient. Improving transparency around the rebranding process could address the uncertainty and resistance among employees.

Rebranding and brand equity dynamics [20]

Question: “How do you think the rebranding has impacted consumer perceptions of quality, trust, and brand associations with the new GRID Network?”

Summary of Responses:

Positive Impact (6 respondents): Six respondents observe that younger audiences perceive the new GRID Network brand positively, associating it with innovation and relevance in a digital context.

Mixed/Negative Impact (4 respondents): Four respondents, mainly from managerial levels, are concerned that the rebranding might weaken loyalty among long-standing consumers, who are strongly attached to familiar legacy identities.

Insight: While the rebranding enhances brand equity among new digital-native users, it poses a risk of brand dilution among legacy consumers. Addressing this gap by integrating nostalgic elements may help retain loyalty among long-term users.

Symbolic interactionist perspective on brand meaning [23]

Question: “How do you think consumers interpret the GRID Network brand compared to legacy brands? What meanings do you believe they attach to each?”

Summary of Responses:

Modernity and Innovation (5 respondents): Five respondents believe the GRID Network brand resonates as a forward-thinking entity that aligns with modern digital values.

Nostalgia and Trust (5 respondents): The remaining respondents feel that legacy brands like Bobo retain strong nostalgic and trusted associations, which have yet to be fully transferred to the new brand identity.

Insight: There is a gap between the new brand’s digital appeal and the emotional resonance of legacy brands. Efforts to integrate nostalgic elements into GRID Network’s identity may help bridge this gap and strengthen consumer connections across demographics.

Conclusion

The rebranding of GRID Network to a unified digital platform has yielded mixed results in terms of stakeholder acceptance and brand equity. The following insights address each preposition:

1. Enhancement of Brand Equity among Digital Audiences: The rebranding successfully appeals to younger, digital-native consumers, aligning with Preposition 1. Younger users associate the GRID Network brand with innovation and accessibility, seeing it

as a modernized continuation of the legacy brands. This suggests a positive impact on brand equity within this demographic, as GRID Network leverages its digital presence to attract a new audience. However, further refinement is necessary to sustain and deepen these positive perceptions over time.

2. Challenges from Internal Employee Resistance: Consistent with Proposition 2, resistance from employees, particularly those long-associated with legacy brands, has proven to be a significant hurdle. Many legacy employees feel disconnected from the rebranding process, perceiving the new identity as a departure from the familiar. This resistance reflects challenges in securing internal buy-in, crucial for cohesive brand alignment. Effective communication and role clarification could alleviate employee uncertainty, fostering a stronger sense of purpose within the digital brand.
3. Continued Strength of Legacy Brand Familiarity over GRID Network Recognition: Proposition 3 is supported by findings showing that legacy brands like Bobo and Nova retain strong emotional connections among long-time consumers. The GRID Network brand, while resonating with younger audiences, has yet to fully capture the trust and familiarity associated with these historical identities. This brand recognition gap suggests that continued efforts are needed to integrate nostalgic elements into GRID Network's identity, appealing to both legacy consumers and new digital audiences.

In conclusion, while GRID Network's rebranding has positively positioned the brand for a digital-centric future, strategic enhancements are needed to bridge the emotional and identity gaps across its diverse audience base. Embracing nostalgic elements, enhancing internal communication, and fostering cross-generational appeal will support the ongoing success of GRID Network's digital transformation.

Recommendation for further research is needed to determine external (customer) perceptions regarding the impact of digital transformation on brand equity and consumer loyalty within Indonesia's magazine and tabloid case within a digitally interconnected society.

Acknowledgement

LSPR Institute of Communication & Business

References

- [1] B. Merrilees and D. Miller, "Principles of corporate rebranding," *Eur J Mark*, vol. 42, no. 5–6, pp. 537–552, 2008, doi: 10.1108/03090560810862499/FULL/XML.
- [2] L. Muzellec and M. Lambkin, "Corporate rebranding: Destroying, transferring or creating brand equity?," *Eur J Mark*, vol. 40, no. 7–8, pp. 803–824, 2006, doi: 10.1108/03090560610670007/FULL/XML.
- [3] Moisescu and O. Ioan, "Aspects regarding rebranding strategies - A conceptual and practical approach," *MPRA Paper*, 2006, Accessed: Dec. 20, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://ideas.repec.org/p/pramprapa/32016.html>
- [4] T. C. Melewar, M. Gotsi, and C. Andriopoulos, "Shaping the research agenda for corporate branding:

- Avenues for future research,” *Eur J Mark*, vol. 46, no. 5, pp. 600–608, May 2012, doi: 10.1108/03090561211235138.
- [5] L. de Chernatony and F. D. Riley, “Defining A ‘Brand’: Beyond the Literature With Experts’ Interpretations,” *Journal of Marketing Management*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 417–443, Jun. 1998, doi: 10.1362/026725798784867798.
 - [6] “Aaker, D. A. (1991), *Managing brand equity: Capitalizing on the value of a brand name*, New York: The Free Press.” Accessed: Dec. 20, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciepub.com/reference/244739>
 - [7] J.-N. Kapferer, *Strategic Brand Management: Creating and Sustaining Brand Equity Long Term*. Kogan Page, 1997. Accessed: Dec. 20, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://books.google.com/books/about/Strategic_Brand_Management.html?hl=it&id=g6m_L8PYaLYC
 - [8] K. L. Keller, *Strategic Brand Management: Building, Measuring, and Managing Brand Equity*. Pearson Education, 2010.
 - [9] D. H. Assegaff, *Jurnalistik masa kini: pengantar ke praktek kewartawanan*. Ghalia Indonesia, 1983. Accessed: Dec. 20, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://lib.ui.ac.id>
 - [10] C. Arndt, “Tabloid Journalism in South Africa by H. Wasserman Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2010. Pp. 218, £16.99 (pbk). - Starring Mandela and Cosby: media and the end(s) of apartheid by R. Krabill Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2010. Pp. 199, £13.50 (pbk). - Political Economy of Media Transformation in South Africa edited by A. Olorunnisola and K. G. Tomaselli Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2011. Pp. 304, £27.50 (pbk).,” *J Mod Afr Stud*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 722–725, Dec. 2012, doi: 10.1017/S0022278X12000419.
 - [11] D. Miller, B. Merrilees, and R. Yakimova, “Corporate rebranding: An integrative review of major enablers and barriers to the rebranding process,” *International Journal of Management Reviews*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 265–289, 2014, doi: 10.1111/IJMR.12020.
 - [12] A. Daly and D. Moloney, “Managing Corporate Rebranding,” *Irish Marketing Review*, vol. 17, no. 1/2, pp. 30–36, 2004.
 - [13] J. Gustafsson, “Single case studies vs. multiple case studies: A comparative study,” 2017, *Academy of Business, Engineering and Science of Halmstad University*.
 - [14] T. C. Melewar and E. Jenkins, “Defining the Corporate Identity Construct,” *Corporate Reputation Review*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 76–90, Apr. 2002, doi: 10.1057/PALGRAVE.CRR.1540166.
 - [15] M. Jo Hatch and M. Schultz, “Bringing the corporation into corporate branding,” *Eur J Mark*, vol. 37, no. 7–8, pp. 1041–1064, Aug. 2003, doi: 10.1108/03090560310477654/FULL/XML.
 - [16] J. M. T. Balmer and E. R. Gray, “Corporate brands: what are they? What of them?,” *Eur J Mark*, vol. 37, no. 7–8, pp. 972–997, Aug. 2003, doi: 10.1108/03090560310477627.
 - [17] M. A. Ramos, S. Andersson, and U. Aagerup, “Rebranding after international acquisitions: challenges of legitimation in emerging and developed countries,” *International Marketing Review*, vol. 41, no. 7, pp. 84–116, 2024, doi: 10.1108/IMR-02-2023-0019/FULL/PDF.
 - [18] M. C. Suchman, “Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches,” *The Academy of Management Review*, vol. 20, no. 3, p. 571, Jul. 1995, doi: 10.2307/258788.
 - [19] T. C. Melewar and E. Karaosmanoglu, “Seven dimensions of corporate identity: A categorisation from the practitioners’ perspectives,” *Eur J Mark*, vol. 40, no. 7–8, pp. 846–869, 2006, doi: 10.1108/03090560610670025.
 - [20] S. Nana, R. T.-Mamina, N. Chilya, and E. T. Maziriri, “The impact of corporate rebranding on brand equity and firm performance,” *Journal of Business & Retail Management Research*, vol. 13, no. 04, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.24052/JBRMR/V13ISo4/ART-08.
 - [21] V. Collange and A. Bonache, “Overcoming resistance to product rebranding,” *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 621–632, Sep. 2015, doi: 10.1108/JPBM-10-2014-0730.
 - [22] C. Vallaster and L. De Chernatony, “Internal brand building and structuration: The role of leadership,” *Eur J Mark*, vol. 40, no. 7–8, pp. 761–784, 2006, doi: 10.1108/03090560610669982/FULL/XML.
 - [23] V. Tarnovskaya and G. Biedenbach, “Corporate rebranding failure and brand meanings in the digital environment,” *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 455–469, May 2018, doi: 10.1108/MIP-09-2017-0192.