Nenad Brkić[1]

Esmeralda Marić[2]

DIFFERENCES IN THE BRAND NAMING PROCESS BETWEEN B2B AND B2C COMPANIES IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

ABSTRACT

The literature suggests potential differences in brand naming approaches between business-to-business (B2B) and business-to-consumer (B2C) markets. Therefore, using the model of the brand naming process proposed by a group of authors, this study aims to determine the differences in the brand naming process between companies operating in the business and the consumer markets in an unexplored research context of Bosnia and Herzegovina (B&H). The research was conducted on 50 companies from B&H using an online survey. The results indicate that B2B companies are more likely to use the company (family) brand name and that B2C companies test ideas more often than B2B companies. Furthermore, the results show differences between B2B and B2C companies regarding branding objectives and brand name criteria. The limitation of this research is primarily the lack of an updated register of contacts of companies at the moment of the data collection.

Keywords: *Brand, Brand identity, Brand name, Brand naming process, B2B and B2C companies*

JEL: *M3, M31*

---

[1] Full professor, School of Economics and Business, Sarajevo, Trg oslobođenja - Alija Izetbegović 1, 71000 Sarajevo, email: nenad.brkic@efsa.unsa.ba

[2] Teaching assistant, School of Economics and Business, Sarajevo, Trg oslobođenja - Alija Izetbegović 1, 71000 Sarajevo, email: esmeralda.maric@efsa.unsa.ba

1. INTRODUCTION

If a company has reputable brands in its portfolio, its value is indisputable (Clifton and Simmons, 2003). The strongest brands are the most prized intangible assets (Mandić, 2007). Swystun (2007) sees the brand as a mixture of observable and unobservable attributes reflected in a trademark, which can have a significant impact if handled the right way. Product branding is important for B2B (business-to-business) and B2C (business-to-consumer) companies. Kotler and Pfoertsch (2006) state that it becomes unquestionable whether branding is necessary for the B2B market, and mention complex solutions being sold rather than simple products and services, the occurrence of very similar offerings, and price pressures as factors that make the need for B2B branding inevitable. Brand managers know that brand names can create prompt and deep-rooted values (Kohli and Labahn, 1997). Although some believe that naming brands in companies that sell industrial products is not as crucial as naming brands in companies that sell consumer goods, Kotler and Pfoertsch (2006) emphasize that a common practice of using traditional brand names in B2B companies is incredibly fruitless and therefore should be skipped. Choosing a brand name is one of the most critical processes that companies engage in when creating and launching new products. Customers can register the brand name and recall it from memory in a very short time (Keller, 2013). People often go to extremes when it comes to brand names, and brand names are often considered a point of failure for individual products or entire organizations (Davis and Baldwin, 2005). All this speaks in favour of the importance of a strategic approach to the brand name development process in B2B and B2C companies. This research attempts to detect potential differences in the brand naming process in B2B and B2C companies. One of the previously suggested models of the brand naming process is adapted and used in a new context.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. BRAND NAME

With rising competitiveness, companies find it harder to attract customers (Kollman and Suckow, 2007). Brand name is considered a key element of its identity and plays an important role in creating the preferable image. Changing a brand name is very expensive, so it is necessary to ensure that brand names comply with their strategic and legal roles (Blackett, 1998).

Collins (1977) concluded that people are never indifferent when it comes to brand names, even new ones. When introducing new products, marketing executives must create brand names that result in market success (Lefkowith and Moldenhauer, 1985). Although it seems like a very simple task, naming brands is a very demanding and time-consuming process. Large companies often hire professionals from various

agencies to come up with a suitable name. Some companies decide to do this process internally since the company's staff is best acquainted with what the brand portrays.

Brands such as Coca-Cola and McDonald's are the best examples of companies that consider their names the most prized asset because, apart from being memorable and recognizable, their brand names facilitate the introduction of new products (Meyers-Levy, 1989). It's undeniable that a brand should be advertisable. Keller (1987) proved that the presence of brand names and identification of product categories in ads resulted in better recall and advantageous decisions.

So far, numerous articles have been published on the topic of brand names. Keller, Heckler and Houston (1998) proved that when suggestive and nonsuggestive brand names were compared, a brand name that carried a product benefit resulted in a better recall of a benefit emphasized in an ad. When it is difficult to detect quality, brand names can effectively signal quality (Rao, Qu and Ruekert, 1999). Rao and Monroe (1989) proved that for consumer products, there was a positive relationship between the name of a brand and product quality. Furthermore, globalization is a trend, and companies must work on creating international brands (Schuiling and Kapfetrer, 2004). Due to numerous cultural differences, companies that operate internationally must take special care when choosing a brand name. Francis, Lam and Walls (2002) favour regional over global brands. Some of the recent research efforts were directed towards analyzing word mechanisms behind brand naming (Jeremić and Josijević, 2019), the effect of possessiveness in names on brand preferences (Khamitov and Puzakova, 2022), success factors of brand naming for cross-gender products (Ulrich, Azar and Aimé, 2020), superstition of brand names (Li, Hsieh and Chang, 2016), as well as the role of brand names in conveying the ethicality of a business (Klink and Wu, 2017).

Choosing the right name for the brand is important not only for B2C companies but also for B2B companies. A brand name can convey promises and tangible advantages of a company selling industrial goods and be used to build and maintain competitive advantages (Shipley and Howard, 1993). Companies in the B2B market often use the company name or name of a product category when naming new products. However, they must be careful with this strategy and brand extensions. In the research on the impact of brand extension on a family brand name, Loken and John (1993) presented results which indicated that dilution effects were present when attributes of brand extensions were incompatible with beliefs associated with the family brand.

The factors that led to the development of the brand naming theory include technological improvements, scaling production, science development, rising competitiveness, and enthusiasm about psychology and the way marketers can use that knowledge (Shevliakova, 2020).

2.1. BRAND NAME PROCESS

The first study on the brand naming process was conducted by McNiel, James and Zeren (1981). Based on a descriptive research approach, the authors proposed a six-stage model of the brand naming process but did not clearly separate branding objectives from brand name criteria. In one of the pioneering and most comprehensive studies on brand naming, Shipley, Hooky and Wallace (1988) analyzed the behaviour of British companies in this process. They proposed a model of six steps, including branding objectives, choosing branding strategies, specifying brand name criteria, generating brand name ideas, checking brand name ideas, and selecting a brand name. The research was descriptive in nature. The same brand naming process was utilized by Shipley and Howard (1993) in their study on B2B companies, taking into consideration the company's size. In their research on the brand naming process, Kohli and Labahn (1997) proposed a brand naming model with five distinctive steps: specifying branding objectives, creating brand name candidates, evaluating brand name candidates, selecting a brand name, and registering it. The authors compared the behaviour of B2B and B2C companies according to the model they proposed. Although they found statistically significant differences in certain steps of the process, the focus was predominantly on descriptive research. As a response to the emergence of online stores, Kollman and Suckow (2007) researched the brand naming process in the net economy. In addition to the traditional path followed by scholars mentioned above, these scholars suggest a path with domain availability check as a step in the process. They found a considerable amount of attention attributed to domain availability checks among online businesses, pointing out that the sooner they go through this step, the shorter the naming process lasts. Recent studies on brand naming processes are narrowly focused and relate to specific industries (e.g., Ab Gani et al., 2023). One such study focuses on investigating the brand naming process for new fruit-flavoured products, providing a detailed overview of all previously explored processes in the literature (Arthur and Bejaei, 2022).

Previous research suggests that B2B companies tend to attribute a reasonable significance to branding and choosing the right name for their brands, too (Shipley and Howard 1993). However, Keller (2013) notes that B2B companies often operate under the assumption that their product buyers are highly informed and professional and, therefore, direct less effort to the brand. Kohli and Labahn (1997) proved differences in the brand naming process between B2B and B2C companies concerning brand name testing, setting branding objectives, and deciding on brand name idea sources, idea generation methods, and participants involved in the final decision-making. Therefore, the authors conclude that differences in brand naming processes between companies do exist and point to lower importance attached to brand names in B2B companies.

3. METHODOLOGY

Our main research objective was to investigate whether there were differences between B2B and B2C companies in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Guided by the available literature presented above, we formulated the following hypothesis:

H: *There are differences in the brand naming process between B2B and B2C companies in Bosnia and Herzegovina.*

Our sample consists of 50 companies located in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The sampling method we used is convenience sampling. For data collection, we used an online survey.

The six-step model of the brand naming process suggested by Shipley, Hooky and Wallace (1988) was used in this research. However, some steps of the process have been adapted. For example, in the second step (selecting branding strategies), the use of the individual name, family name, or combination was investigated. Shipley, Hooky and Wallace (1988) emphasized that brand sponsor decisions were important for a wide range of consumer products. The purpose of this research is to provide a better understanding of the differences in brand naming processes between B2B and B2C companies. Because of the research context, brand sponsor decision analysis is neglected. Furthermore, for the purpose and scope of this research and the context in which it was conducted, investigating whether brand name ideas are tested at all was more important than analyzing participants in the brand name ideas screening.

The questionnaire was standardized, and all respondents answered the same questions. For the purpose of classifying companies into B2B or B2C groups, participants were asked the following question: "Who are your primary customers?". As Kotler and Armstrong (2018) state, companies operating in B2B markets sell products and services to business customers, while companies operating in B2C markets sell them to final consumers. Therefore, the possible answers offered to the question "Who are your primary customers?" were "business customers" and "final consumers". If the answer was "business customer", the company was considered a B2B company. If the answer was "final consumers", it was considered a B2C company. In our questionnaire, we used the combination of a 5-point Likert scale, multiple choice, and checkbox questions.

For our data analysis, we used SPSS. The Chi-Square Test and its alternatives and the Mann-Whitney U test were used to compare the answers given by employees from B2B and B2C companies. The Chi-Square Test and its alternatives were used to determine if there was an association between variables when both variables were nominal. It was necessary to ensure that the assumptions of the Chi-Square Test were met. When the stated assumption on the expected counts in cells (Yates, Moore and McCabe, 1999; Field, 2013) was violated, instead of the Pearson Chi-Square Test,

the values associated with the Likelihood Ratio and Fisher's Exact Test (2χ2tables) were reported. When the dependent variable was measured on a 5-point Likert scale to test differences between B2B and B2C companies, the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test was used due to the violated assumptions of the parametric t-test.

4. RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1. CHARACTERISTIC OF THE SAMPLE

Questions used to identify sample characteristics refer to the type of a company represented by the primary customers and the position of the respondent in the organizational hierarchy. Most of our respondents were in manager positions (86%), while the remaining 14% were in other positions. Most of the companies from the sample were B2C companies (73%), while the minority of them were B2B companies (17%).

4.2. HYPOTHESIS TESTING

When it comes to the differences between B2B and B2C companies in the importance attached to branding objectives, results (Table 1) indicate that B2B companies attach significantly lower importance to establishing a particular image as a branding objective than B2C companies.

Table 1: *Differences between B2B and B2C companies when it comes to the importance attached to branding objectives*

Branding Objectives	Results of the Mann-Whitney U test
Establish a particular image	$Mdn_{B2B} = 4.00$, $Mdn_{B2C} = 5.00$, $U = 147.000$, $p = 0.006$, $r = -0.385$.
Establish a brand loyalty	$Mdn_{B2B} = 4.00$, $Mdn_{B2C} = 5.00$, $U = 192.000$, $p = 0.136$, $r = -0.211$.
Establish a product differentiation	$Mdn_{B2B} = 4.00$, $Mdn_{B2C} = 4.00$, $U = 216.500$, $p = 0.410$, $r = -0.117$.
Establish market positioning	$Mdn_{B2B} = 4.50$, $Mdn_{B2C} = 5.00$, $U = 248.500$, $p = 0.933$, $r = -0.012$.
Establish market segmentation	$Mdn_{B2B} = 4.00$, $Mdn_{B2C} = 4.00$, $U = 217.000$, $p = 0.425$, $r = -0.113$.
Establish brand reputation	$Mdn_{B2C} = 5.00$, $Mdn_{B2C} = 5.00$, $U = 237.500$, $p = 0.715$, $r = -0.052$.
Establish acceptance of the product	$Mdn_{B2B} = 4.00$, $Mdn_{B2C} = 5.00$, $U = 189.00$, $p = 0.136$, $r = -0.211$.

Source: *Authors' work*

Based on the results (Table 2), it can be concluded that there is a significant association between the use of the brand name strategy and the type of the company. This means that there is a significant difference between B2B and B2C companies when it comes to the choice of the brand name strategy. Results show that 64% of B2B companies have all or many products branded with only a family (company)

name. In contrast, 58% of B2C companies have all or many products branded with a combination of individual names and family names.

Table 2: *Association between the use of the brand name strategy and the type of the company*

	Pearson Chi-Square vs. Likelihood ration
Branding strategies*Type of the company	χ2(2, N = 50) = 17.877, p = 0.000 vs. **LR (2, N = 50) = 17.197, p = 0.000**

Source: *Authors' work*
The bolded results are chosen because of the test assumptions.

Table 3: *Association between the use of brand name criteria and the type of the company*

	Pearson Chi-Square vs. Fisher's Exact Test
Compatibility with desired product image*Type of the company?	χ2(1, N = 50) = 1.531, p = 0.216 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 0.304**
Consistent with the image of the company's other brands*Type of the company?	χ2(1, N = 50) = 0.211, p = 0.646 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 0.734**
Different from competition*Type of the company	χ2(1, N = 50) = 0.828, p = 0.363 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 0.529**
Trademark availability*Type of the company	**χ2(1, N = 50) = 0.010, p = 0.919** vs. p (two-tailed) = 1.000
Ease of registration*Type of the company?	χ2(1, N = 50) = 8.207, p = 0.004 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 0.019**
Consistent with company image*Type of the company	χ2(1, N = 50) = 0.066, p = 0.797 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 1.000**
Overall acceptability*Type of the company	**χ2(1, N = 50) = 0.149, p = 0.700 vs**. p (two-tailed) = 0.758
Attractive to customers*Type of the company	**χ2(1, N = 50) = 0.542, p = 0.462** vs. p (two-tailed) = 0.537
Positive connotations*Type of the company	χ2(1, N = 50) = 1.830, p = 0.176 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 0.213**
Memorable*Type of the company	**χ2(1, N = 50) = 0,000, p = 1.000** vs. p (two-tailed) = 1.000
Ease of recognition*Type of the company	**χ2(1, N = 50) = 2.794, p = 0.095** vs. p (two-tailed) = 0.118
Advertisable*Type of the company	**χ2(1, N = 50) = 0.066, p = 0.797** vs. (two-tailed) = 1.000
Ease of pronunciation*Type of the company	χ2(1, N = 50) = 0.123, p = 0.726 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 0.746**
Length*Type of the company	χ2(1, N = 50) = 0.176, p = 0.675 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 1.000**
Versatile among countries and languages*Type of the company	**χ2(1, N = 50) = 2.318, p = 0.123** vs. p (two-tailed) = 0.198
Versatile among products*Type of the company	χ2(1, N = 50) = 3.429, p = 0.064 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 0.085**
Persuasive*Type of the company	χ2(1, N = 50) = 0.680, p= 0.410 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 0.511**
Describes product uses, attributes, or benefits*Type of the company	χ2(1, N = 50) = 0.004, p = 0.951 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 1.000**
Understandable*Type of the company	**χ2(1, N = 50) = 0.066, p = 0.797** vs. p (two-tailed) = 1.000
Modern*Type of the company	**χ2(1, N = 50) = 0.001, p = 0.979** vs. p (2 two-tailed) = 1.000
Attractive to retailers*Type of the company	χ2(1, N = 50) = 0.954, p = 0.329 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 0.474**

Source: *Authors' work*
The bolded results are chosen because of the test assumptions.

Furthermore, the analysis results (Table 3) indicate that in the case of ease of registration, there is a significant association between the use of the criteria and the type of a company. In other words, there is a significant difference between B2B and B2C companies regarding the use of ease of registration as a brand name criterion. While 3 out of 14 B2B companies use the ease of registration as a brand name criterion, none of the B2C companies use it.

Regarding the brand name idea sources, results show no differences between B2B and B2C companies (Table 4).

Table 4: *Association between the use of brand name ideas sources and the type of the company*

	Pearson Chi-Square vs. Fisher's Exact Test
Marketing department *Type of the company	$\chi2(1, N = 50) = 0.893$, p = 0.345 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 0,436**
Advertising agencies*Type of the company	$\chi2(1, N = 50) = 0.759$, p = 0.384 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 0.657**
Marketing research agencies*Type of the company	$\chi2(1, N = 50) = 0.434$, p = 0.510 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 0.663**
Employees*Type of the company	$\chi2(1, N = 50) = 2.218$, p = 0.136 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 0.187**
Customers*Type of the company	**$\chi2(1, N = 50) = 3.378$, p = 0.066** vs. p (two-tailed) = 0.110
Sales force*Type of the company	$\chi2(1, N = 50) = 5.357$, p = 0.021 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 0.074**
Names in stock*Type of the company	$\chi2(1, N = 50) = 0.001$, p = 0.971 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 1.000**
Dictionaries and books*Type of the company	$\chi2(1, N = 50) = 2.822$, p = 0.093 vs**. p (two-tailed) = 0.126**

Source: *Authors' work*
The bolded results are chosen because of the test assumptions.

Table 5: *Association between the use of brand name generation methods and the type of the company*

	Pearson Chi-Square vs. Fisher's Exact Test
Brainstorming*Type of the company	$\chi2(1, N = 50) = 1.463$, p = 0.326 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 0.278**
Group discussions*Type of the company	$\chi2(1, N = 50) = 1.531$, p = 0.216 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 0.304**
Interviews with customers*Type of the company	$\chi2(1, N = 50) = 1.691$, p = 0.193 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 0.566**
Customer surveys*Type of the company	$\chi2(1, N = 50) = 0.004$, p = 0.951 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 1.000**
Focus groups*Type of the company	$\chi2(1, N = 50) = 0.397$, p = 0.529 vs. **p (two-tailed) = 0.611**

Source: *Authors' work*
The bolded results are chosen because of the test assumptions.

Results (Table 5) indicate no significant association between the use of brand name generation methods and the type of the company. In other words, there is no significant difference between B2B and B2C companies when using brand name generation methods.

According to the results presented in Table 12, there is a significant association between the testing of brand name ideas and the type of the company, i.e., there is a significant difference between B2B and B2C companies regarding the brand name idea testing. In B2C companies, ideas are tested in 15 out of 36 cases, and in B2B companies, they are tested in only 1 out of 14 cases (Table 6).

Table 6: *Association between the brand name idea testing and the type of the company*

	Pearson Chi-Square vs. Fisher's Exact Test
Brand name idea testing*Type of the company	$\chi2(1, N = 50) = 5.521$, p = 0.019 **vs. p (two-tailed) = 0.021**

Source: *Authors' work*
The bolded results are chosen because of the test assumptions.

Furthermore, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between B2B and B2C companies when it comes to the importance attached to personnel involved in the decision-making process of the final name (Table 7).

Table 7: *Differences between B2B and B2C companies in the importance attached to different personnel involved in the decision-making process*

Personnel involved in the decision-making process	**Results of Mann - Whitney U test**
Outside trademark attorney	$Mdn_{B2B} = 1.00$, $Mdn_{B2C} = 3.00$, mU = 176.500, p = 0.089, r = -0.240
Advertising agencies	$Mdn_{B2B} = 2.00$, $Mdn_{B2C} = 2.00$, U = 246.500, p = 0.902, r = -0.017
Market research agencies	$Mdn_{B2B} = 2.00$, $Mdn_{B2C} = 3.00$, U = 251.000, p = 0.982, r = -0.003.
Specialized consulting firms	$Mdn_{B2B} = 2.00$, $Mdn_{B2C} = 2.00$, U = 200.000, p = 0.239, r = -0.167.
Managers (brand, product, etc.)	$Mdn_{B2B} = 5.00$, $Mdn_{B2C} = 4.00$, U = 222.000, p = 0.490, r = -0.098.
Senior marketing managers	$Mdn_{B2B} = 4.00$, $Mdn_{B2C} = 4.50$, U = 250.500, p = 0.972, r = -0.005.
Team of individuals from marketing	$Mdn_{B2B} = 4.00$, $Mdn_{B2C} = 5.00$, U = 216.000 , p = 0.403, r = -0.118.
Product development team	$Mdn_{B2B} = 3.00$, $Mdn_{B2C} = 4.00$, N = 36), U = 171.000, p = 0.067, r = -0.258.
Entire marketing department	$Mdn_{B2B} = 4.00$, $Mdn_{B2C} = 4.00$, U = 218.500, p = 0.442 , r = -0.109.
Company legal counsel	$MdnB2B = 2.00$, $MdnB2C = 3.00$, U = 174.000, z = -1.728, p = 0.084, r = -0.244.

Source: *Authors' work*

Since the evidence presented above proves some differences between B2B and B2C companies in some of the steps of the brand naming process, we can say that our hypothesis is partially supported. Our research yielded some differences in results when compared to the research of authors who suggested the model we used (Shipley, Hooky and Wallace, 1988). B2B companies do not attach the same importance to establishing a particular image as B2C companies. They also test their brand name ideas less frequently compared to B2C companies, which corresponds to the findings of Kohli and Labahn (1997). Additionally, B2B companies pay more attention to ease of registration than B2C companies, which is in line with the findings that show that industrial companies rely more on trademark registration requirements communicated by their legal advisors (Kohli and Labahn, 1997). Although more and more branding experts stress the importance of branding in the B2B market, B2B companies are still unaware of how important branding is for desired outcomes such as purchase intention, which is not the case with B2C companies (Laroche, Kim and Zhou, 1996).

Furthermore, B2B companies use family (company) names more often than B2C companieswhich are more inclined to combine individual and family (company) names. This means that B2B companies work on building a corporate brand. By using the family (company) name for all or most products, they try to transfer the associations related to the corporate brand and family brands to individual products. It is a strategy that facilitates the introduction of new products to the market but also implies a great risk. If one product fails, the failure can be transferred to the entire product group or the entire company.

On the other hand, by using the combination of individual names and family (company) names in most cases, B2C companies play it safe. When this strategy is used, the presence of a family name facilitates the introduction of new products, while using an individual name limits potential problems with the product to the product in question.

5. CONCLUSION

Considering the differences that emerged from our results, we can conclude that there are some differences in the brand naming process between B2B and B2C companies. Findings on the brand naming strategy and testing are particularly intriguing, leading us to think that B2B companies in Bosnia and Herzegovina still don't attach high importance to brand naming, as opposed to recommendations from the branding literature (Kotler and Pfoertsch, 2006).

The main contribution of this paper is reflected in a better understanding of the approach to the brand naming process in B2B and B2C companies in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In addition to the fact that the results contribute to theory by clearly

indicating the steps in the brand naming process in which there are differences between B2B and B2C companies, the paper also has some managerial implications. Managers could perhaps think about alternatives for their brand name strategy, considering what contemporary literature suggests (Kotler and Pfoertsch, 2006). Alternatives would allow them to reduce the risk of jeopardizing the corporate brand. In line with the recommendations drawn from putting our results in the context of the available literature, we suggest that managers in B2B companies could also pay more attention to establishing a particular image and testing their ideas. If they decide to take alternative strategies, testing is more likely to happen.

The main limitation of this research is the lack of an updated register of relevant contacts (brand or marketing managers) of Bosnian and Herzegovinian companies from the B2B and B2C markets.

Like any other research, this one also carried out limitations in the form of possible biases - confusion of the respondent's own views and those of the company.

Future research into the process of naming brands could be concentrated on specific industries and company naming processes.

LITERATURE

1. Ab Gani, M. A. A., Ramlie, M. K., Ramli, I., Khairudin, K. A., Pahme, N. F. M. (2023). "Brand Naming Process in Malaysia Small and Medium Enterprise: A Need Assessment Analyses". Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 13(5), 2164-2171

2. Arthur, J., Bejaei, M. (2022). "The Process of Creating a New Brand Name for a Fruit Variety: A Review and Suggested Improvements". Horticulturae, 8(11), 990.

3. Blackett, T. (1998). Trademark, London, England: Macmillan Press Ltd.

4. Clifton, R., Simmons, J. (2003). Brands and branding, London, England: Profile Books Ltd.

5. Collins, L. (1977). "A Name to Conjure With", European Journal of Marketing 11(5), 337-363.

6. Davis, M., and Baldwin, J. (2005). More than a name: An introduction to branding, Lausanne: AVA Publishing

7. Field, A. (2013). Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics (4th ed.), London, England: SAGE Publications.

8. Francis, J. N. P., Lam, J. P. Y., Walls, J. (2002). "The Impact of Linguistic Differences on International Brand Name Standardization: A Comparison of English and Chinese Brand Names of Fortune-500 Companies", Journal of International Marketing, 10(1), 98–116.

9. Jeremić, J. R. D., Josijević, J. M. (2019). "THE COMPOUNDS AND BLENDS IN BRAND NAMES OF BABY PRODUCTS", Nasleđe, 111.

10. Keller, K. L. (1987). "Memory Factors in Advertising: The Effect of Advertising Retrieval Cues on Brand Evaluations", Journal of Consumer Research, 14(3), 316–333.

11. Keller, K. L. (2013). Strategic brand management: Building, measuring, and managing brand equity (4th edition), Harlow, England: Pearson Education Inc.

12. Keller, K. L., Heckler, S. E., Houston, M. J. (1998). "The Effects of Brand Name Suggestiveness on Advertising Recall", Journal of Marketing, 62(1), 48–57.

13. Khamitov, M., Puzakova, M. (2022). "Possessive brand names in brand preferences and choice: the role of inferred control", Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 50(5), 1032-1051.

14. Klink, R. R., Wu, L. (2017). "Creating ethical brands: The role of brand name on consumer perceived ethicality", Marketing Letters, 28, 411-422.

15. Kohli, C., Labahn, D. W. (1997). "Creating Effective Brand Names: A Study of The Naming Process", Journal of Advertising Research, 37(1), 67-75.

16. Kollman T., Suckow, C. (2007). "The corporate brand naming process in the net economy: Qualitative market research", An International Journal, 10(4), 349-361.

17. Kotler, P., Armstrong, G. (2018). Principles of Marketing (14th edition), New Jersey, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.

18. Kotler, P., Pfoertsch, W. (2006). B2B brand management, Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer

19. Laroche, M., Kim, C. Zhou, L. (1996). "Brand familiarity and confidence as determinants of purchase intention: An empirical test in a multiple brand context", Journal of business Research, 37(2), 115-120.

20. Lefkowith E. F., Moldenhauer C. A. (1985). "Recent Cross-Currents in Brand Name Development and How to Cope with Them", The Journal of Consumer Marketing, 2(2), 73-77.

21. Li, H. H., Hsieh, M. Y., Chang, W. L. (2016). "Lucky names: Superstitious beliefs in Chinese corporate branding strategy for bank marketing", The North American Journal of Economics and Finance, 35, 226-233.

22. Loken, B., John, D. R. (1993). "Diluting Brand Beliefs: When Do Brand Extensions Have a Negative Impact?", Journal of Marketing, 57(3), 71–84.

23. Mandić, M. (2007). "Connection between customer relationship management and brand equity", Market-Tržište, 19(1), 85-98.

24. Meyers-Levy, J. (1989). "The Influence of a Brand Name's Association Set Size and Word Frequency on Brand Memory", Journal of Consumer Research, 16(2), 197-207.

25. Rao, A. R., Monroe, K. B. (1989). "The Effect of Price, Brand Name, and Store Name on Buyers' Perceptions of Product Quality: An Integrative Review", Journal of Marketing Research, 26(3), 351–357.

26. Rao, A. R., Qu, L., Ruekert, R. W. (1999). "Signaling Unobservable Product Quality through a Brand Ally", Journal of Marketing Research, 36(2), 258–268.

27. Schuiling, I., Kapferer, J. N. (2004). "Real Differences between Local and International Brands: Strategic Implications for International Marketers", Journal of International Marketing, 12(4), 97–112.

28. Shevliakova, D. A. (2020). "Company naming strategies in the Italian interior design industry", Training, Language and Culture, 4(2), 31-42.

29. Shipley D., Howard P. (1993). "Brand: Naming Industrial Products", Industrial Marketing Management, 22(1), 59-66.

30. Shipley, D., Hooky, G. J., Wallace, S. (1988). "The Brand Name Development Process", International Journal of Advertising, 7(3), 253-266.

31. Swystun, J. (2007). The brand glossary, Hamshire, England: Palgrave Macmillan

32. Ulrich, I., Azar, S. L., Aimé, I. (2020). "Stay close but not too close: The role of similarity in the cross-gender extension of patronymic brands", Journal of Business Research, 120, 157-174.

33. Yates, D., Moore, Moore, D., McCabe, G. (1999). The practice of statistics (1st ed.), New York, NY: W.H. Freeman.

34. McNeal, James U., Zeren, L. (1981). "Brand Name Selection for Consumer Products." MSU Business Topics Spring. 35-39.

Nenad Brkić

Esmeralda Marić

RAZLIKE U PROCESU IMENOVANJA BRENDOVA IZMEĐU B2B I B2C KOMPANIJA U BOSNI I HERCEGOVVINI

SAŽETAK

Literatura sugerira da postoje potencijalne razlike u pristupima imenovanju brendova između poslovnih (B2B) tržišta i potrošačkih (B2C) tržišta. Koristeći model procesa imenovanja brendova koji su predložili raniji autori, ovo istraživanje ima za cilj utvrditi razlike u procesu imenovanja brendova u kompanijama koje posluju na poslovnim i potrošačkim tržištima u dosad neistraženom kontekstu Bosne i Hercegovine (BiH). Istraživanje je provedeno na uzorku od 50 kompanija iz BiH putem online upitnika. Rezultati ukazuju da su B2B kompanije sklonije korištenju korporativnog (porodičnog) imena brenda, dok B2C kompanije češće testiraju ideje nego B2B kompanije. Osim toga, rezultati pokazuju razlike između B2B i B2C kompanija u pogledu ciljeva brendiranja i kriterija za odabir imena brenda. Ograničenje ovog istraživanja je, prije svega, nedostatak ažuriranog registra kontakata kompanija u trenutku prikupljanja podataka.

Ključne riječi: *Brand, Identitet brenda, Naziv brenda, Proces imenovanja brendova, B2B i B2 kompanije.*

JEL: *M3, M31*