Radboud University

The effect of verbal anchoring in logos of non-profit organizations on attitude towards logo and organization, perceived core value fit, and intention to donate and differences between The Netherlands and Hungary

Name: Patrik Posch

Student number: s1022073

Email: Patrik.Posch@student.ru.nl

Supervisor: Dr. A.P.J.V. van Hooft

Second assessor: Borana Lushaj

Institution: Radboud University

Date: 07.06.2021

Bachelor Thesis

Abstract

Logos play an important role in communicating an organization's identity to the public and they serve as visual elements that help organizations differentiate themselves from their competitors. The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of different verbal anchoring conditions (no, incomplete, or complete) on attitude towards logo and organization, perceived core value fit, and intention to donate regarding logos of non-profit organizations. Additionally, it was examined whether Dutch and Hungarian participants differed in terms of their tolerance of ambiguity and whether this affected their evaluations. In total, 63 Dutch and 74 Hungarian participants took part in an experiment, which was conducted by means of an online questionnaire. During the experiment, participants were randomly exposed to one condition, including logos of two non-profit organizations (WWF, UNICEF). Findings indicated no significant difference between the two countries in terms of their tolerance of ambiguity. In general, level of verbal anchoring was found to influence the attitude of respondents towards logos. However, it did not have an effect on attitude towards the organization, perceived core value fit, and intention to donate. Furthermore, nationality was only found to affect perceived core value fit. Therefore, no significant effect of nationality was discovered regarding attitude towards logo, attitude towards organization, and intention to donate. These findings imply that using logos that include the name of the organization may be the most effective in both countries if the aim is to increase attitude towards the logo.

Introduction

Logos can be defined as graphic designs used by organizations to differentiate themselves from their competitors, which can either include or exclude the company name (Bresciani & Del Ponte, 2017). They support organizations in communicating their values and identities and are usually aimed at capturing attention, as well as evoking the interest of (potential) customers (Kim & Lim, 2019). Therefore, logos are fundamental constituents of a brand that are aimed at conveying an organization's identity to the public (Buttle & Westoby, 2006). In addition, logos are distinctive symbols of organizations with the purpose of improving corporate image and reputation, determined by several factors, including company name, design, colour, and typeface (Foroudi, Melewar, & Gupta, 2017). If designed properly, logos may reflect corporate identity and the core characteristics of an organization in a clear, logical, and persuasive way (Foroudi, Melewar, & Gupta, 2017). Therefore, if there is a fit between the graphic design and what an organization stands for, logos may have a positive influence on purchase intention, as well as how a company is perceived by its customers (Fajardo, Zhang, & Tsiros, 2016).

In addition, culture seems to have an impact on the attitude and behaviour of individuals and therefore may also influence how organizations are perceived by the public (Kashif, Sarifuddin, & Hassan, 2015). In their research, Kashif et al. (2015) discovered that norms seem to influence intention to donate to charity organizations in a collectivistic culture. However, the present study is aimed at comparing two individualistic cultures, namely The Netherlands and Hungary. Hence, norms are not expected to play a central role in participants' donation intention. However, these two countries seem to differ most in terms of their uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede, 1980). This cultural dimension may also play a role in influencing donation intention, as well as other evaluations regarding non-profit organizations. Moreover, a difference in terms of tolerance of ambiguity is anticipated, since uncertainty seems to be correlated with tolerance of ambiguity (Furnham & Ribchester, 1995).

There seems to be a gap in the literature investigating logos of non-profit organizations and how different levels of verbal anchoring influence attitude and donation behaviour. Due to the fact that non-profit organizations are extremely dependent on donations, it is of great importance that their logos are designed in such a way that they convey organizational core values. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to address this research gap by investigating the effects of different levels of verbal anchoring on attitude towards the logo and towards the organization, intention to donate, and perceived core value fit, as well as whether tolerance of

ambiguity also influences this and whether there are differences between The Netherlands and Hungary in this respect.

Theoretical framework

Logos

Previous research has discovered that logos that are more elaborate and more complex are likely to lead to more positive evaluations, as well as increased interest and liking when the logo is shown repeatedly (Henderson & Cote, 1998). However, repeated exposure may not always increase interest and preference for certain logos. In their second experiment, Janiszewski & Meyvis (2001) measured the effect of increased duration between stimulus presentations and the preference between multiple-meaning and single-meaning stimuli. It was found that during the initial exposure, single-meaning stimuli were preferred, however, after several exposures and increasing the interval between stimulus presentations, preference has shifted towards multiple-meaning stimuli (Janiszewski & Meyvis, 2001). Therefore, if the message of a logo has one, clear meaning, it is more likely to be preferred during the initial exposure, compared to a logo with multiple interpretations. Fajardo et al. (2016) looked at the effects of logo frames on purchase intent and whether it is also influenced by consumers' risk perceptions. It was found that under high risk, consumers perceived the logo frame to be protecting, whereas under low risk, logo frames were viewed as confining (Fajardo, Zhang, & Tsiros, 2016). This suggests that when risk is perceived to be high and consumers seek for security in a product, a logo frame is likely to have a positive effect on purchase intent. The opposite seems to be true when risk is perceived to be low and consumers seek autonomy, resulting in a negative effect on purchase intent (Fajardo, Zhang, & Tsiros, 2016). Machado, de Carvalho, Costa, & Lencastre (2012) discovered that in case of brand mergers, logos may be regarded as stability elements and are therefore equally important as the name of the organization. Logos may ensure a connection with the brand's past and that the company's heritage is properly respected (Machado, de Carvalho, Costa, & Lencastre, 2012).

Moreover, Das & Van Hooft (2015) discovered that if a logo design is changed substantially, it may affect the core value fit in a negative way. On the other hand, familiarity with logos may increase positive attitudes towards organizations, which is also referred to as processing fluency (Janiszewski & Meyvis, 2001). Consequently, more familiarity with a logo is likely to lead to customers becoming more engaged with that organization (Kim & Lim, 2019). In addition, colour choice also plays an important role in the way logos are seen by customers, since black logos tend to be perceived as more attractive, compared to coloured

logos (Bresciani & Del Ponte, 2017). Finally, Buttle & Westoby (2006) suggest that when launching a new brand, using a figurative logo instead of an abstract one may induce greater brand recognition.

Verbal anchoring

When a company name or a slogan is presented together with the logo, we speak of verbal anchoring. When presented together with logos, verbal anchoring may have an impact on how a logo or the organization itself is perceived by the public, either in a positive or negative way. In most cases, logos that include both an icon and a brand name tend to be seen as more attractive than those that only include either a company name or a graphic design (Bresciani & Del Ponte, 2017). Nowadays, almost every organization chooses to include a slogan along with their logo. Slogans are a crucial part of a brand's identity because – among other things – they may improve the image of a brand and help to differentiate the brand from its competitors (Kohli, Leuthesser, & Suri, 2007). In addition, slogans also contribute to brand equity which plays an important role in brand evaluations. A study conducted by Dahlén & Rosengren (2005) discovered that the value of a brand may influence slogan learning. Their findings suggested that slogans are generally liked better when presented for strong brands, compared to slogans for weak brands (Dahlén & Rosengren, 2005).

In her research, Philips (2000) examined the effects of verbal anchoring on comprehension and liking of image ads. It was discovered that verbal anchoring that offers a clue to the meaning of the image ad increased comprehension and liking. On the other hand, including verbal anchoring that completely explains the image ad had a negative effect on ad liking (Philips, 2000). Moreover, ads that convey clear messages were shown to be more effective, compared with ads that are open to multiple interpretations. Therefore, ads with a clear and straightforward message may lead to more positive attitude towards the ad, in contrast to ads that are more ambiguous. Bergkvist, Eiderbäck & Palombo (2012) conducted an experiment in which they investigated the effects moderate and complete headlines, or no headlines at all in ads have on brand communication effects. It was found that a complete headline resulted in more positive brand communication effects, compared to the other two conditions. Moreover, a complete headline resulted in a stronger, more positive brand attitude (Bergkvist et al., 2012). Additionally, their findings suggest that advertisements that present a clear conclusion and are not open to different interpretations tend to be more effective, compared to those that are open to different interpretations (Bergkvist et al., 2012). Similarly, verbal anchoring in logos may also affect how organizations are evaluated by the public.

Boush (1993) investigated whether slogans affect how brand extensions are evaluated. It was found that "slogans can alter the perceptions of the similarity of potential brand extensions to existing family-branded products and consequently of their evaluation as suitable extensions" (Boush, 1993). Kohli, Thomas, & Suri (2013) suggest that slogans usually facilitate brand recall, even if the logo is not depicted. They argue that slogan design and media exposure contribute to increased slogan recall. Kohli et al. (2013) accentuate that slogans are of vital importance for organizations as they may increase brand associations and attitudes towards the organization. Additionally, it was found that simple and short slogans tend to be remembered better in most cases (Kohli, Thomas, & Suri, 2013). Therefore, it may be better to keep slogans concise and easily digestible.

The cultural aspect

Culture can be defined as the way of life of a group of individuals, which consists of shared beliefs, values, traditions, and religion (Liu, Volcic, & Gallois, 2014). In addition, culture is prevalent in human life and it has been found to influence behaviour and perception processes (Liu et al., 2014). Therefore, it can be assumed that verbal anchoring of logos may have different effects on Dutch and Hungarian participants. Moreover, cultural dimensions were found to have an effect on the way consumers respond to natural logo designs. In general, cultures with high uncertainty avoidance tend to prefer logos with organic visual elements (Torres, Machado, de Carvalho, van de Velden, & Costa, 2019).

Hofstede (1980) conducted an extensive cross-cultural research and found notable differences between The Netherlands and Hungary in terms of their uncertainty avoidance. This cultural dimension concerns the extent to which individuals feel intimidated by ambiguous and uncertain situations. Hofstede (1980) ranked Hungary (82) much higher on this dimension, compared to The Netherlands (53) on a 100-point scale. However, the cultural dimensions constructed by Hofstede have received quite some criticism over the years and are even considered to be obsolete. Hence, this research focuses more on tolerance of ambiguity, since it has previously been associated with uncertainty avoidance (Furnham & Ribchester, 1995; McLain, 2009; Madzar, 2005).

According to Kashif, Sarifuddin, & Hassan (2015), culture significantly influences attitude, which – in case of individualistic cultures – is believed to predict people's intention to make donations. Supposedly, norms are more likely to influence donation intention in a collectivistic culture, since in this case individuals like to belong to a group and adhere to social norms (Kashif, Sarifuddin, & Hassan, 2015). Since Kashif et al. (2015) investigated a

collectivistic culture, no significant relationship was discovered between attitude and donation intention. Instead, result yielded a significant effect of social norms, past behaviour, and injunctive norms on people's intention to donate, which in turn resulted in higher willingness to donate money (Kashif et al., 2015).

Tolerance of ambiguity

Norton (1975) defines tolerance of ambiguity as "a tendency to perceive or interpret information marked by vague, incomplete, fragmented, multiple, probable, unstructured, uncertain, inconsistent, contrary, contradictory, or unclear meanings as actual or potential sources of psychological discomfort or threat" (p. 608-619). Tolerance of ambiguity and uncertainty avoidance have previously been acknowledged to be closely related (Madzar, 2005; Furnham & Ribchester, 1995; McLain, 2009). Even Hofstede (1984) uses these two concepts interchangeably and mentions ambiguity as a synonym for uncertainty (p. 112).

In general, people with low tolerance of ambiguity tend to be reluctant towards ambiguous situations because it is more difficult to assess risk and make correct decisions, due to lack of information. On the other hand, high tolerance of ambiguity suggests that ambiguous situations are perceived to be challenging, desirable, and interesting (Furnham & Marks, 2013). Previous research has discovered that there is a "positive correlation between attitude toward ambiguity and attitude toward risk" (Lauriola and Levin, 2001). Therefore, preference for ambiguous situations seems to influence preference for risky situations. However, this preference was only found significant when participants had to avoid loss, in contrast with achieving gain (Lauriola and Levin, 2001). According to Furnham & Ribchester (1995), a culture that scores high on uncertainty avoidance generally tends to be less tolerant of ambiguous situations. Madzar (2005) suggests that low tolerance of ambiguity acts in accordance with a higher need for information. Consequently, it can be expected that a country which scores low on tolerance of ambiguity and as a result, high on uncertainty avoidance (i.e. Hungary) would have a higher need for information and therefore is more likely to prefer the presence of complete verbal anchoring, as opposed to incomplete- or no verbal anchoring at all. On the other hand, a country which scores high on tolerance of ambiguity and low on uncertainty avoidance, (i.e. The Netherlands) may be more approving of an incomplete- or no verbal anchoring at all. Therefore, a difference between the two countries is assumed with regard to the level of verbal anchoring, based on their presumed tolerance towards ambiguous situations. The theoretical framework presented above forms the basis of this study. In order to address the existing research gap, the following research questions were formulated:

RQ1: To what extent do The Netherlands and Hungary differ in terms of tolerance of ambiguity and how does this affect attitude towards logo and the organization, perceived core value fit, and intention to donate?

RQ2: To what extent does verbal anchoring in logos of non-profit organizations affect participants' attitude towards logo and the organization, and what are the differences between The Netherlands and Hungary in this respect?

RQ3: To what extent does verbal anchoring in logos of non-profit organizations affect perceived core value fit, and how does this differ between The Netherlands and Hungary?

RQ4: To what extent does verbal anchoring in logos of non-profit organizations affect the intention of participants to make donations, and what are the differences between The Netherlands and Hungary?

Method

Materials

This experiment was conducted by means of an online questionnaire. Logos of two non-profit organizations were selected for this research, namely that of WWF and UNICEF. Both organizations operate in The Netherlands as well as in Hungary, and they use slogans in both countries. Regarding Hungary, both organizations use slogans that are translated into the local language, whereas in The Netherlands, only UNICEF uses a Dutch slogan and WWF uses the original English version (see Table 1 and Table 2). In this research, only the levels of verbal anchoring of logos were manipulated. Each participant was randomly exposed to only one condition including the logos of both organizations, with either no verbal anchoring (i.e. only the logo), incomplete verbal anchoring (i.e. logo and name of organization), or complete verbal anchoring (i.e. logo, name of organization, and slogan). The logos and slogans were retrieved from the official websites and social media pages of the two organizations. Furthermore, participants were asked to fill in the online questionnaire in their first language (i.e. Dutch and Hungarian), in order to avoid their level of English influencing their comprehension of the questions and the experiment as a whole. The independent variables of this study were measured at nominal level.

Table 1. Logos with three levels of verbal anchoring shown to Hungarian participants.

	No	Incomplete	Complete
WWF			
UNICEF			

Table 2. Logos with three levels of verbal anchoring shown to Dutch participants.

	No	Incomplete	Complete
WWF			
UNICEF			

Subjects

In total 148 respondents started the questionnaire, however 11 of them did not finish it. Since this experiment required complete responses, partial and no responses were excluded from further analyses. Consequently, this research included 137 participants in total. 63 respondents indicated Dutch nationality and 74 were of Hungarian origin. It was important for all participants to be native speakers of either Dutch or Hungarian, since the questionnaire was translated into these two languages. The age of respondents ranged from 18 to 73 ($M =$ 26.38, $SD = 10.61$). Regarding gender, 40.1% of respondents were male, 58.4% were female, and 1.5% preferred not to disclose it. All participants were assigned to 3 general groups based on their level of education, namely 'secondary', 'tertiary' and 'other'. The majority of respondents (67.2%) have either completed or were still enrolled in institutions of tertiary education. On average, it took participants about 10 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Finally, respondents did not receive any form of compensation after completing the questionnaire.

Gender ($\chi^2 (4) = 4.05$, $p = .399$), age ($F (2, 136) = 0.374$, $p = .689$), and level of education ($\chi^2 (4) = 2.31$, $p = .679$) were evenly distributed across all three conditions. The distribution of participants in terms of gender ($\chi^2 (2) = 1.74$, $p = .419$) was equal across the two nationalities. However, age ($t (135) = 32.43$, $p = .002$) and level of education ($\chi^2 (2) = 9.41$, $p = .009$) were shown to be significantly different across the two nationalities. On average,

Hungarian participants (*M* = 28.95, *SD* = 12.19) were slightly older than Dutch participants (*M* = 23.37, *SD* = 7.38). Moreover, significantly more Hungarian respondents (72.1%) indicated secondary level of education, compared to Dutch respondents (27.9%). On the other hand, more Dutch respondents (54.3%) indicated tertiary educational level, compared to Hungarian respondents (45.7%).

Design

This experiment consisted of a 3 (level of verbal anchoring: no-, incomplete-, or complete verbal anchoring) x 2 (nationality: Dutch, Hungarian) design, in which the level of verbal anchoring and nationality were between-subject factors. Each respondent was asked to evaluate the logos of two non-profit organizations with the same level of verbal anchoring. The condition each participant was exposed to (i.e. no-, incomplete-, or complete verbal anchoring) was selected randomly.

Instruments

Respondents were asked to fill in an online questionnaire that was created using Qualtrics. In this questionnaire, participants were asked to evaluate the logos of the two organizations based on their level of verbal anchoring (no-, incomplete-, complete verbal anchoring). In the beginning, participants were asked whether they recognized each logo, which was measured by a simple yes/no question (based on Das & Van Hooft, 2015).

Attitude towards the logo was measured by a 7-point semantic differential scale, comprising five items (based on MacKenzie & Lutz, 1989; Philips, 2000, adopted by Das & Van Hooft, 2015). In case of both logos, the statement 'I perceive this logo as…' was presented to participants, including the following items: '*good/bad*', '*pleasant/unpleasant*', '*favourable/unfavourable*', '*like/dislike*', and '*enjoyable/not enjoyable*'. The reliability of the items was good, with all alphas above: α = .83. Subsequently, composite means of the evaluations provided for both logos were calculated, to be used in further analyses.

Attitude towards the organization was measured by a 7-point semantic differential scale, comprising four items (based on Jun, Cho, & Kwon, 2008). In case of both logos, the statement 'To me this organization is…' was presented to participants, including the following items: '*unfavourable/favourable*', '*bad/good*', '*unlikeable/likeable*', and '*negative/positive*'. The reliability of the items was good, with all alphas above: α = .88. Subsequently, composite means of the evaluations provided for both logos were calculated, to be used in further analyses.

Perceived core value fit was measured by a 7-point semantic differential scale (based on Das & Van Hooft, 2015), comprising five items. For each logo, participants were asked to indicate to what extent they felt the core values of each organization were reflected by their logos. The following question was presented in case of both logos: 'To what extent do you think the logo fits the following core values of the organization?'. The core values of WWF presented for Hungarian participants were '*globális*', '*független*', '*kulturálisan sokszínű*', '*tudomány által vezérelt*', and '*felelősségtudatos*'. The core values of WWF presented for Dutch participants were '*dapper*', '*gepassioneerd*', '*geleid door wetenschap geïnspireerd door de natuur*', '*samewerken*', and '*integer*'. The core values of UNICEF presented to Hungarian participants were '*gondoskodó*', '*tisztelettudó*', '*becsületes*', '*megbízható*', and '*felelősségtudatos*'. The core values of UNICEF presented to Dutch participants were '*zorgzaam*', '*respectvol*', '*integer*', '*vertrouwen*', and '*aansprakelijk*'. The reliability of the items was acceptable, with all alphas above: $\alpha = .77$. Subsequently, composite means of the evaluations provided for both logos were calculated, to be used in further analyses.

Intention to donate was measured with two 7-point semantic differential scales (based on Smith & McSweeney, 2007). The statements 'I will donate money to this charity organization.' and 'I will donate money to other charities or community service organizations.' were anchored by '*strongly disagree/strongly agree*'. The reliability of the items was acceptable, with all alphas above: $\alpha = .74$. Subsequently, composite means of the evaluations provided for both logos were calculated, to be used in further analyses.

Tolerance of ambiguity was measured by a 7-point Likert scale, developed by McLain (2009), comprising thirteen items (see Appendix A). All items were anchored by '*strongly disagree/strongly agree*'. After reverse-coding some of the items, their reliability was found to be good, with all alphas above: $\alpha = .82$. Subsequently, composite means of all items were calculated, to be used in further analyses.

In addition to the aforementioned scales, some background information was asked from participants at the end of the questionnaire, namely past donation behaviour, their age, gender, level of education, and nationality. Past donation behaviour was measured with a simple yes/no question (based on Kashif, Sarifuddin, & Hassan, 2015). The following statement was presented to participants: 'Over the past 2 years, I donated money to charities or community service organizations'.

Procedure

In order to facilitate respondents' comprehension of the current research, the questionnaire was translated into the respective languages (i.e. Dutch and Hungarian). Therefore, two versions of the same questionnaire were created, using Qualtrics. The two versions were distributed online, and participants were informed about their possibility to stop with the questionnaire at any time. Additionally, participants were informed that their answers and personal data are treated anonymously and were asked if they agree to these conditions before starting the questionnaire. Each respondent was randomly exposed to only one level of verbal anchoring (either no-, incomplete-, or complete verbal anchoring), including logos of both charities.

Statistical treatment

In order to measure the dependent variables of this study (i.e. attitude towards logo, attitude towards organization, perceived core value fit, and intention to donate), two-way ANOVAs were used. Moreover, an independent samples t-test was used to assess the difference between the two countries in terms of their tolerance of ambiguity.

Results

This section presents the results of the statistical analyses, regarding the effects of different levels of verbal anchoring (no-, incomplete-, or complete verbal anchoring) in logos of non-profit organizations on attitude towards logo and organization, perceived core value fit, intention to donate, and whether differences exist between The Netherlands and Hungary.

An independent samples t-test for tolerance of ambiguity did not show a significant difference between The Netherlands and Hungary (t (135) = 0.66, p =.502). Since no cultural differences were discovered, nationality was used as the second independent variable.

In order to measure whether participants recognized the two logos, several chi-square analyses were conducted separately for each logo, based on condition (i.e. level of verbal anchoring) and nationality. With regard to the logo of WWF, the analysis for condition was not significant (χ^2 (2) = 3.10, p = .213). However, the analysis for the logo of WWF and nationality was found to be significant (χ^2 (1) = 5.34, p = 0.21). The analysis showed that 6 out of the 74 (8.1%) Hungarian participants did not recognize the logo of WWF (regardless of the level of verbal anchoring) and all Dutch participants recognized the logo of WWF. With regard to the logo of UNICEF, a chi-square analysis showed a significant difference between logo recognition and condition (χ^2 (2) = 14.59, p = .001). Another chi-square analysis for the logo of UNICEF and nationality was significant (χ^2 (1) = 6.28, p = .012). The two analyses found that 7 out of the 74 (9.5%) Hungarian participants did not recognize the logo of UNICEF in case of the no verbal anchoring condition.

In order to measure attitude towards the logo, a two-way ANOVA was conducted with level of verbal anchoring and nationality as factors. The analysis showed a significant main effect of the level of verbal anchoring on attitude towards the logo (F (1, 131) = 4.65, p =.011). The nationality of respondents did not show a significant main effect on attitude towards the logo (F (1, 131) = 0.01, p =.938). Moreover, the interaction between the two factors was also not significant (F (2, 131) = 0.86, p = .427). It was found that respondents showed a higher attitude towards logos with incomplete verbal anchoring (M = 5.66, SD = 0.82), compared to logos with complete verbal anchoring (p = .008, Bonferroni correction; M = 5.14, SD = 0.76). However, no significant differences were discovered between incomplete- (M = 5.66, SD = 0.82) and no verbal anchoring (p =1.00, Bonferroni correction; M = 5.56, SD = 0.84), nor between complete- (M = 5.14, SD = 0.76) and no verbal anchoring (p = 0.57, Bonferroni correction; M = 5.56, SD = 0.84). Table 3 presents the means, standard deviations, and number of respondents on attitude towards logo in all verbal anchoring conditions.

Table 3.   Number, means, and standard deviations of respondents on attitude towards logo in all conditions (1 = low, 7 = high)

Condition	n	M	SD
No verbal anchoring	46	5.56	0.84
Incomplete verbal anchoring	51	5.66	0.82
Complete verbal anchoring	40	5.14	0.76
Total	137	5.47	0.84

A two-way ANOVA was done with condition (i.e. level of verbal anchoring) and nationality as factors, to measure attitude towards the organization. The analysis found that condition did not have a significant main effect on attitude towards the organization (F (2, 131) = 0.21, p = .811). Similarly, nationality did not have a significant main effect on attitude towards the organization (F (1, 131) = 0.07, p = .798). Furthermore, the interaction between the two factors was also not significant (F (2, 131) = 0.10, p = .907). This means that neither the level of verbal anchoring, nor the nationality of respondents influenced the attitude of participants towards both organizations.

A two-way ANOVA was conducted with condition and nationality as factors, to measure perceived core value fit between the organizations and their logos. The analysis discovered a significant main effect of nationality on perceived core value fit (F (1, 131) = 5.47, p = .021). However, condition was not found to have a significant main effect on perceived core value fit (F (2, 131) = 2.07, p = .130). Moreover, the interaction between the two factors was also not found to be significant (F (2, 131) = 0.35, p = .703). On average, Hungarian respondents (M = 5.33, SD = 0.98) provided higher evaluations on perceived core value fit in all three conditions, compared to Dutch respondents (M = 4.98, SD = 0.70). Table 4 presents the number, means, and standard deviations of Hungarian and Dutch respondents on perceived core value fit in all verbal anchoring conditions.

Table 4. Number, means, and standard deviations of Hungarian and Dutch respondents on perceived core value fit in all conditions (1 = low, 7 = high)

Condition	Hungarian		Dutch	
	n	M (SD)	n	M (SD)
No verbal anchoring	24	5.36 (0.92)	22	5.01 (0.64)
Incomplete verbal anchoring	28	5.55 (1.06)	23	5.05 (0.70)
Complete verbal anchoring	22	5.03 (0.90)	18	4.84 (0.78)
Total	74	5.33 (0.98)	63	4.98 (0.70)

A two-way ANOVA was conducted with level of verbal anchoring and nationality as factors, to measure participants' intention to donate. The analysis showed that level of verbal anchoring had no significant main effect on intention to donate (F (2, 131) = 0.31, p = .733). Similarly, nationality had no significant main effect on participants' intention to donate (F (1, 131) = 2.20, p = .140). Furthermore, the interaction between the two factors was also not found to be significant (F (2, 131) = 1.72, p = .183). This means that neither level of verbal anchoring, nor nationality influenced the intention of participants to donate to the measured charity organizations.

Conclusion and discussion

The aim of this study was to investigate how different levels of verbal anchoring (no, incomplete, or complete) in logos of non-profit organizations influence attitude towards logo and organization, perceived core value fit, intention to donate, and whether nationality (Dutch and Hungarian) also plays a role in this respect. Findings suggest that attitude towards logo was higher in case of incomplete verbal anchoring, compared to complete- and no verbal anchoring, regardless of nationality. In terms of attitude towards organization, no significant differences were discovered between the conditions and between the two nationalities. However, perceived core value fit was evaluated higher by Hungarian respondents in all three verbal anchoring conditions. Finally, intention to donate was not influenced by condition, nor by nationality.

First, The Netherlands and Hungary were compared in terms of tolerance of ambiguity. Surprisingly, no significant difference was discovered between the examined countries in this respect, which seems to contradict previous research, as well as Hofstede's uncertainty avoidance dimension. According to Hofstede's (1980) work, The Netherlands and Hungary seem to differ on the dimension of uncertainty avoidance. Moreover, previous research has found that uncertainty avoidance and tolerance of ambiguity are two closely related concepts (Furnham & Ribchester, 1995). Thus, the two countries were anticipated to show a difference in terms of their tolerance of ambiguity as well, however this was not the case. A possible explanation of this may be that Hofstede's cultural dimensions are somewhat obsolete. Consequently, it can be assumed that nowadays differences between the two countries are not that significant anymore.

Regarding attitude towards logos, it was found that overall, participants provided higher evaluations on attitude towards logos with incomplete verbal anchoring, compared to the two other conditions. However, no significant difference was discovered between Dutch and Hungarian respondents, therefore it can be concluded that nationality did not affect attitude towards logos. These results support the findings of Bresciani & Del Ponte (2017), who discovered that logos with an icon and company name are more attractive than logos that only include a company name or an icon. Additionally, Bresciani & Del Ponte (2017) emphasized that differences in logo evaluations are not attributed to nationality, only the level of verbal anchoring.

Regarding attitude towards organization, no significant differences were discovered between the three verbal anchoring conditions. Similarly, this study found no significant differences between the two nationalities. Therefore, it can be concluded that neither level of

verbal anchoring, nor the nationality of respondents influenced their attitude towards the measured organizations. These findings are in contrast with Kohli, Thomas, & Suri (2013), who discovered that slogans may increase brand associations and attitudes towards organizations. In addition, these results contradict previous findings, which suggested that familiarity with logos may increase positive attitudes towards organizations (Janiszewski & Meyvis, 2001). Since the majority of respondents indicated that they recognized both logos, these contrasting findings were rather surprising.

Furthermore, with regard to perceived core value fit, it was discovered that on average, Hungarian respondents provided higher evaluations in all three verbal anchoring conditions, compared to Dutch respondents. Therefore, no effect of verbal anchoring condition was discovered. This is contrary to the findings of Bergkvist, Eiderbäck & Palombo (2012), who found that a complete headline results in more positive brand communication effects, compared to moderate headlines or ads without headlines. Moreover, these findings are in contrast with previous research, which suggested that logo design may influence the way in which the core characteristics of an organization are communicated and perceived by the public. (Foroudi, Melewar, & Gupta, 2017).

Lastly, findings indicated that neither level of verbal anchoring, nor nationality influenced the intention of participants to donate to the examined organizations. These results seem to contradict findings of previous research by Fajardo et al. (2016), who suggested that verbal anchoring showed an effect on purchase intent. In addition, findings are in contrast with the study by Kashif et al. (2015), who discovered that culture seems to influence intention to donate. However, since the two countries did not differ in terms of their tolerance of ambiguity, this cultural aspect could not be considered and therefore these findings could not be compared.

A limitation to this study could be that only two nationalities were compared. It may be possible that those huge cultural differences between The Netherlands and Hungary – as suggested by Hofstede (1980) – are much smaller today or may not even exist anymore. Furthermore, this research only included two logos of non-profit organizations, thus the results cannot be generalized to the entire population of charities. In addition, some Hungarian participants were unfamiliar with the logo of WWF, which may have distorted their responses. Consequently, future research should compare different – and supposedly more culturally distinct – nationalities, as well as logos of different non-profit organizations.

The results of this research have several implications that can be helpful for future practice. Since no significant difference was discovered between The Netherlands and Hungary in terms of their tolerance of ambiguity, the presupposed cultural differences could be

disregarded in this respect. This suggests that logos with the same conditions may be applied in both countries. However, condition was found to be significant regarding attitude towards logo. Furthermore, it was found that participants showed higher attitude towards logos with incomplete verbal anchoring (i.e. logo and name of organization), compared to logos with the other two conditions. This implies that using slogans along with the logo or only the logo by itself may not be as effective as displaying the name of the organization along with the logo when an organization aims to increase attitude towards their logo.

References

Bergkvist, L., Eiderbäck, D., & Palombo, M. (2012). The Brand Communication Effects of Using a Headline to Prompt the Key Benefit in Ads with Pictorial Metaphors. *Journal of Advertising*, *41*(2), 67-76.

Boush, D. M. (1993). How advertising slogans can prime evaluations of brand extensions. *Psychology & Marketing*, *10*(1), 67-78.

Bresciani, S., & Del Ponte, P. (2017). New brand logo design: customers' preference for brand name and icon. *Journal of Brand Management*, 24(5), 1-16.

Buttle, H., & Westoby, N. (2006). Brand logo and name association: It's all in the name. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 20, 1181–1194.

Dahlén, M., & Rosengren, S. (2005). Brands affect slogans affect brands? Competitive interference, brand equity and the brand-slogan link. *Journal of Brand Management*, *12*(3), 151-164.

Das, H. & Hooft, A.P.J.V. (2015). A Change will do you good: Paradoxical effects of higher degrees of logo change on logo recognition, logo appreciation core values fit, and brand attitudes. In George Christodoulides & Anastasia Stathopoulou (Eds.), *Bridging the Gap. Proceedings of the 14th international Conference on Research in Advertising*. London: European Advertising Academy / Birkbeck School of Business Economics and Informatics / University of London. (Digitale uitgave). doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.1860.0804

Fajardo, T. M., Zhang, J., & Tsiros, M. (2016). The contingent nature of the symbolic associations of visual design elements: The case of brand logo frames. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *43*(4), 549-566.

Foroudi, P., Melewar, T. C., & Gupta, S. (2017). Corporate logo: history, definition, and components. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, *47*(2), 176-196.

Furnham, A., & Marks, J. (2013). Tolerance of ambiguity: A review of the recent literature. *Psychology*, *4*(09), 717-728.

Furnham, A., & Ribchester, T. (1995). Tolerance of ambiguity: A review of the concept, its measurement and applications. *Current psychology, 14*, 179-199. doi: 10.1007/BF02686907

Henderson, P. W., & Cote, J. A. (1998). Guidelines for selecting or modifying logos. *Journal of marketing*, *62*(2), 14-30.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Cultural consequences: International differences in work-related values.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (Vol. 5). Sage.

Janiszewski, C., & Meyvis, T. (2001). Effects of brand logo complexity, repetition, and spacing on processing fluency and judgment. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *28*(1), 18-32.

Jun, J. W., Cho, C. H., & Kwon, H. J. (2008). The role of affect and cognition in consumer evaluations of corporate visual identity: Perspectives from the United States and Korea. *Journal of brand management*, *15*(6), 382-398.

Kashif, M., Sarifuddin, S., & Hassan, A. (2015). Charity donation: intentions and behaviour. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, *33*(1), 90-102.

Kim, M. J., & Lim, J. H. (2019). A comprehensive review on logo literature: research topics, findings, and future directions. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 1-75.

Kohli, C., Leuthesser, L., & Suri, R. (2007). Got slogan? Guidelines for creating effective slogans. *Business Horizons*, *50*(5), 415-422.

Kohli, C., Thomas, S., & Suri, R. (2013). Are you in good hands?: slogan recall: what really matters. *Journal of Advertising Research*, *53*(1), 31-42.

Lauriola, M., & Levin, I. P. (2001). Relating individual differences in attitude toward ambiguity to risky choices. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, *14*(2), 107-122.

Liu, S., Volcic, Z., & Gallois, C. (2014). *Introducing intercultural communication: Global cultures and contexts*. Sage.

Machado, J. C., de Carvalho, L. V., Costa, P., Lencastre, P. (2012). Brand mergers: examining consumers' responses to name and logo design. *Journal of Product and Brand Management, 21(6)*, 418-427. doi: 10.1108/10610421211264900

Madzar, S. (2005). Subordinates' information inquiry in uncertain times. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 5*(3), 255-274.

McLain, D. L. (2009). Evidence of the properties of an ambiguity tolerance measure: The multiple stimulus types ambiguity tolerance scale–II (MSTAT–II). *Psychological reports*, *105*(3), 975-988.

Norton, R. W. (1975). Measurement of ambiguity tolerance. *Journal of personality assessment*, *39*(6), 607-619.

Phillips, B. J. (2000). The impact of verbal anchoring on consumer response to image ads. *Journal of advertising*, *29*(1), 15-24.

Smith, J. R., & McSweeney, A. (2007). Charitable giving: The effectiveness of a revised theory of planned behaviour model in predicting donating intentions and behaviour. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *17*(5), 363-386.

Torres, A., Machado, J. C., de Carvalho, L. V., van de Velden, M., & Costa, P. (2019). Same design, same response? Investigating natural designs in international logos. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*.

United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF). (n.d.). Retrieved from: https://www.facebook.com/UNICEFMagyarorszag/photos/a.10150595860540814/1015 4253120415814/?type=3&theater

United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF). (n.d.). Retrieved from: https://www.unicef.nl/over-unicef

World Wildlife Fund (WWF). (n.d.). Retrieved from: https://wwf.hu/rolunk/wwf-magyarorszag/

World Wildlife Fund (WWF). (n.d.). Retrieved from: https://www.wwf.nl/wat-we-doen/over-wwf

Appendices

Appendix A

Tolerance of ambiguity scales (McLain, 2009)

1. I don't tolerate ambiguous situations well.
2. I would rather avoid solving a problem that must be viewed from several different perspectives.
3. I try to avoid situations that are ambiguous.
4. I prefer familiar situations to new ones.
5. Problems that cannot be considered from just one point of view are a little threatening.
6. I avoid situations that are too complicated for me to easily understand.
7. I am tolerant of ambiguous situations.
8. I enjoy tackling problems that are complex enough to be ambiguous.
9. I try to avoid problems that don't seem to have only one "best" solution.
10. I generally prefer novelty over familiarity.
11. I dislike ambiguous situations.
12. I find it hard to make a choice when the outcome is uncertain.
13. I prefer a situation in which there is some ambiguity.

Appendix B

Checklist EACH (version 1.6, November 2020)
You fill in the questions by clicking on the square next to the chosen answer □
After clicking, a cross will appear in this square ⊠

1. Is a health care institution involved in the research?
Explanation: A health care institution is involved if one of the following (A/B/C) is the case:

A. One or more employees of a health care institution is/are involved in the research as principle or in the carrying out or execution of the research.
B. The research takes place within the walls of the health care institution and should, following the nature of the research, generally not be carried out outside the institution.
C. Patients / clients of the health care institution participate in the research (in the form of treatment).

⊠ No → continue with questionnaire

□ Yes → Did a Dutch Medical Institutional Review Board (MIRB) decide that the Wet Medisch Onderzoek (Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act) is not applicable?
□ Yes → continue with questionnaire
□ No → This application should be reviewed by a Medical Institutional Review Board, for example, the Dutch CMO Regio Arnhem Nijmegen → end of checklist

2. Do grant providers wish the protocol to be assessed by a recognised MIRB?

⊠ No → continue with questionnaire

□ Yes → This application should be reviewed by a Medical Institutional Review Board, for example, the Dutch CMO Regio Arnhem Nijmegen → end of checklist

3. Does the research include medical-scientific research that might carry risks for the participant?
⊠ No → continue with questionnaire

□ Yes → This application should be reviewed by a Medical Institutional Review Board, for example, the Dutch CMO Regio Arnhem Nijmegen → end of checklist

Standard research method

4. Does this research fall under one of the stated standard research methods of the Faculty of Arts or the Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies?
⊠ Yes → 1. Standard evaluation and attitude research → continue with questionnaire
□ No → assessment necessary, end of checklist

Participants

5. Is the participant population a healthy one?
⊠ Yes → continue with questionnaire

☐ No → assessment necessary, end of checklist → [go to assessment procedure](#)

6. Will the research be conducted amongst minors (<16 years of age) or amongst (legally) incapable persons?

    ☐ Yes → assessment necessary, end of checklist → [go to assessment procedure](#)

    ☒ No → continue with questionnaire

Method

7. Is a method used that makes it possible to produce a coincidental finding that the participant should be informed of?

    ☐ Yes → assessment necessary, end of checklist → [go to assessment procedure](#)

    ☒ No → continue with questionnaire

8. Will participants undergo treatment or are they asked to perform certain behaviours that can lead to discomfort?

    ☐ Yes → assessment necessary, end of checklist → [go to assessment procedure](#)

    ☒ No → continue with questionnaire

9. Are the estimated risks connected to the research minimal?

    ☐ No → assessment necessary, end of checklist → [go to assessment procedure](#)

    ☒ Yes → continue with questionnaire

10. Are the participants offered a different compensation than the usual one?

    ☐ Yes → assessment necessary, end of checklist → [go to assessment procedure](#)

    ☒ No → continue with questionnaire

11. Should [deception](#) take place, does the procedure meet the standard requirements?

    ☐ No → assessment necessary, end of checklist → [go to assessment procedure](#)

    ☒ Yes → continue with questionnaire

12. Are the standard regulations regarding [anonymity and privacy](#) met?

    ☐ No → assessment necessary, end of checklist → [go to assessment procedure](#)

    ☒ Yes → continue with questionnaire

Conducting the research

13. Will the research be carried out at an external location (such as a school, hospital)?

    ☒ No → continue with questionnaire

    ☐ Yes→ Do you have/will you receive written permission from this institution?

    ☐ No → assessment necessary, end of checklist → [go to assessment procedure](#)

        ☐ Yes → continue with questionnaire

14. Is there a contact person to whom participants can turn to with questions regarding the research and are they informed of this?

  ☐ No → assessment necessary, end of checklist → go to assessment procedure

  ☒ Yes → continue with questionnaire

15. Is it clear for participants where they can file complaints with regard to participating in the research and how these complaints will be dealt with?

  ☐ No→ assessment necessary, end of checklist → go to assessment procedure

  ☒ Yes → continue with questionnaire

16. Are the participants free to participate in the research, and to stop at any given point, whenever and for whatever reason they should wish to do so?

  ☐ No→ assessment necessary, end of checklist → go to assessment procedure

  ☒ Yes → continue with questionnaire

17. Before participating, are participants informed by means of an information document about the aim, nature and risks and objections of the study? (zie explanation on informed consent and sample documents).

  ☐ No→ assessment necessary, end of checklist → go to assessment procedure

  ☒ Yes → continue with questionnaire

18. Do participants and/or their representatives sign a consent form? (zie explanation on informed consent and sample documents.

  ☐ No→ assessment necessary, end of checklist → go to assessment procedure

  ☒ Yes → checklist finished

If you want to record the results of this checklist, please save the completed file.

If you need approval from the EACH due to the requirement of a publisher or research grant provider, you will have to follow the formal assessment procedure of the EACH.

Statement of Own Work

Student name: Patrik Posch

Student number: s1022073

Supervisor: Dr. A.P.J.V. van Hooft

Second assessor: Borana Lushaj

PLAGIARISM is the presentation by a student of an assignment or piece of work which has in fact been copied in whole or in part from another student's work, or from any other source (e.g. published books or periodicals or material from Internet sites), without due acknowledgement in the text.

DECLARATION:

a. I hereby declare that I am familiar with the faculty manual (https://www.ru.nl/facultyofarts/stip/rules-guidelines/rules/fraud-plagiarism/) and with Article 16 "Fraud and plagiarism" in the Education and Examination Regulations for the Bachelor's programme of Communication and Information Studies.

b. I also declare that I have only submitted text written in my own words

c. I certify that this thesis is my own work and that I have acknowledged all material and sources used in its preparation, whether they be books, articles, reports, lecture notes, and any other kind of document, electronic or personal communication.

Signature:

Place and date: Nijmegen, 07.06.2021