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Abstract

Studies have provided empirical evidence for the use of easy and difficult English slogans in advertisements in non-English-speaking countries. Some studies have argued that the use of English as a foreign language in international advertising is mainly symbolic, while others argue that comprehension of an English utterance in advertisements increases the evaluation of the ad. Previous studies have either found a significant positive effect or a non-significant effect for the use of English in advertisements. However, these studies have not taken into account the effect of slogan difficulty on native language equivalents. Also, little is known about the effects of actual language proficiency in both the foreign language and the native language on advertisement evaluation. Additionally, studies have not yet considered the effects of slogan familiarity on the underlying objectives of an advertisement. This study empirically investigated the effects of easy and difficult English or native language equivalent slogans on perceived slogan difficulty, slogan appreciation, product attitude, and purchase intention of Dutch consumers. A total of 123 Dutch consumers participated in this mixed factorial design experiment. Sixty Dutch participants judged three easy and three difficult English slogans and 63 Dutch participants judged three easy and three difficult native language equivalents. Also, slogan familiarity and perceived slogan difficulty were used as measures of processing fluency. Findings indicated a significant main effect of slogan difficulty on perceived slogan difficulty, slogan appreciation, product attitude, and purchase intention. Easy slogans were perceived as easier than difficult slogans and appreciated better, which resulted in a more favorable attitude towards the product and a higher purchase intention subsequently. Slogan language had a significant main effect on the appreciation of the slogans, with English slogans receiving higher appreciation than native language equivalents. Actual language proficiency – English and Dutch – turned out to have a significant main effect on product attitude and purchase intention. Participants with high actual language proficiency scores had a more negative attitude towards the product and a lower purchase intention than participants with lower actual language proficiency scores. High rates of slogan familiarity turned out to increase slogan appreciation, product attitude, and purchase intention.
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**Introduction and theoretical framework**

Internationally expanding markets and growing globalization require internationally oriented companies to adjust communication strategies with their stakeholders. An important communication strategy when communicating with consumers is advertising (Hornikx, Van Meurs, & De Boer, 2010). Companies face a strategic choice between standardization and adaptation when they decide to launch an advertisement globally. A frequently used standardization tool is language. The English language is the leading linguistic tool in international advertising (Bhatia & Ritchie, 2006) and the most frequently used foreign advertising language in non-English speaking countries (Piller, 2003). Frequent use of English by companies to communicate with customers has been demonstrated in both television and print advertising worldwide (Bhatia, 1992; Griffin, 1997; Piller, 2000).

The effects of the use of the English language to communicate with non-native English-speaking consumers have been considered in light of the underlying aims of the use of English in advertisements: creating a positive attitude towards the product and high purchase intention (Hendriks, Van Meurs, & Poos, 2017). Many studies (Hendriks et al., 2017; Hornikx et al., 2010; Nederstigt & Hilberink-Schulpen, 2018) have measured preference of the English advertisement over native language equivalents for easy slogans. Till date, studies have not incorporated the effects of actual language proficiency – in both English and the native language – processing fluency, and slogan familiarity. This study aims to provide empirical evidence for the use of English slogans in international advertising compared to the native language equivalent. Also, the effects of slogan difficulty of English slogans and Dutch slogans are taken account. Lastly, the effects of – actual and perceived – language proficiency and processing fluency are measured.

*English in international advertising*

Advertisements in EFL countries, countries in which English is a foreign language, contain English utterances for a variety of reasons. A recurrent motivation for the use of English is the presumed prestige the English language carries (Takashi, 1990). Also, English in product advertising is thought to enhance the product image (Takashi, 1990). The use of English, and other foreign languages, is also assumed to attract the consumers’ attention because it deviates from what is expected (Domzal, Hunt, and Kernan, 1995; Piller, 2000).

The English language is usually not associated with the countries to which the language is related, like the United States and the United Kingdom (Piller, 2003). This makes the use of English as a foreign language different from the use of other foreign languages in international advertising. French and German are, for example, often associated with cosmetics and technology respectively.

A recurring argument in favor of the use of foreign languages in advertising is that actual comprehension of an utterance in a foreign language is not a requirement for an advertisement to be successful. Instead, the foreign language is often deliberately chosen to convey a symbolic meaning (Ray, Ryder, and Scott, 1991; Piller, 2003; Kelly-Holmes, 2005). A commonly used quote by Piller (2001, p. 163) is the following: “even if the audience does not understand the denotational message of the English […] they will recognize the message is English, and they will activate their stereotypes about English.” Stereotypes that are attached to the English language are expected to be transferred onto the advertised product. Prior to Piller’s (2001) statement, Kelly-Holmes (2000) argued that comprehension of foreign language utterances in international advertising is not a prerequisite for an advertisement to be successful. Foreign languages are not merely used to distribute product information, but also employ associations consumers have with the particular language. Additionally, Kuppens (2010) has observed utterances in advertising that supposedly sound English but carry no meaning other than a symbolic one. This observation suggests that the use of foreign languages in international advertising as a symbol is its most important function.

Marketers assume that European consumers understand English words, phrases, and slogans in advertisements and commercials (Raedts, Roozen, Peeters, Dupré, and Ceuppens, 2016). However, research shows that a substantial part of non-English-speaking European consumers is not able to correctly understand or translate English slogans used in advertising (Endmark, 2016; Gerritsen, Gijsbers, Korzilius, & Van Meurs, 2000; Gerritsen, Korzilius, Nickerson, Nederstigt, Starren, Van Hooft, Van Meurs, Crijns, 2010). Gerritsen et al. (2000) found that this applies to Dutch consumers. Research among sixty Dutch consumers showed that 82% claimed to understand English, of whom 76% thought they would be able to translate the English slogans to Dutch. However, only 36% of the participants were able to do so correctly. Marktorschungsinstitut YouGov (2016) carried out a similar experiment commissioned by branding agency Endmark in Germany. A small majority of the participants admitted they did not understand the English slogans. However, only 28% of the participants were able to correctly translate the slogan from English to German.

In conclusion, the use of English in international advertising is said to be primarily symbolic and activate stereotypes among consumers. Non-English-speaking European consumers are not always able to correctly translate English slogans to their native language, but the question remains whether this is a prerequisite for an advertisement to be successful.
**Standardization versus adaptation**

In international advertising, advertising language is considered a tool of standardization. When companies standardize advertisements, they use a uniform advertising campaign (Onkvisit & Shaw, 1987; Hornikx & Van Meurs, 2015). Standardization of advertisements offers companies a variety of benefits. It gives companies the opportunity to develop a global corporate brand image that is similar for all international markets (Hornikx et al., 2010) and is more affordable than adaptation (De Pelsmacker, Geuens, & Van Den Berg, 2008). If the English language is taken as a basis for standardization, the local language can be taken as a basis for adaptation. To date, a relatively small number of studies has compared the use of English in advertisements to the use of the consumer’s mother tongue (Shoham, 1996; Gerritsen et al., 2007; Krishna & Ahluwalia, 2008; Hornikx et al., 2010; Micu & Coulter, 2010; Nederstigt & Hilberink-Schulpen, 2018).

Gerritsen et al. (2007) found barely any differences between the effects of the use of English or the consumers’ mother tongue – Dutch, German, or Spanish – on advertisement evaluation. Three out of the four advertisements tested showed no significant main difference between English and the local language, suggesting that the participants viewed English as a neutral advertising language (Piller, 2003).

A study by Krishna and Ahluwalia (2008) compared English, Hindi, and mixed English-Hindi advertisements for two different types of products: necessity and luxury products. Results showed that the language chosen in advertisements is especially important for multinational companies (MNCs). MNCs cannot copy local firms when choosing an advertising language. Micu and Coulter (2010) compared English and Romanian advertisements in relation to advertisement attitude among Romanian consumers. Their study provided empirical evidence that English advertisements were better appreciated than Romanian advertisements when it promoted an MNC product. No significant difference was found between English and Romanian advertisements when the advertisement promoted a product from a local company.

In conclusion, studies have found mixed empirical results for the use of the English language in advertising in non-English-speaking countries. However, slogan language is not the sole variable that influences the attitude of consumers towards the advertisement. In the next section, the effects of processing fluency and slogan difficulty will be discussed.
Processing fluency and slogan difficulty

Earlier research showed that people base their judgments on rational decision-making processes and declarative information (Higgins, 1996). This implies that consumers weigh pros and cons and subsequently integrate information through a rational calculus to make decisions or judgments (Song & Schwarz, 2009). However, other studies have shown that judgments are not solely based on rational processes but also on experiential information (Slovic & Peters, 2006; Zajonc, 1980). The most important element of experiential information that influences judgment and decision-making is processing fluency.

Processing fluency is a metacognitive experience, which is the feeling that complements cognitive processes such as the effortlessness of processing new stimuli (Schwarz, 2004). Processing fluency affects multiple judgments, of which preference (Zajonc, 1980; 1998) is most relevant to this study. Song and Schwarz (2009) found that stimuli that were processed disfluently were perceived as more risky than stimuli that were processed fluently. Although their study focused on the judgment of risks, it adds empirical evidence to the notion that information that is easily processed is perceived more positively than information that is more difficult to process. Processing fluency in international advertising might therefore not only be impeded by the use of a foreign language, but also by different levels of complexity within a language – whether this be foreign or not.

A few studies have argued that comprehension has a significant positive effect on slogan appreciation. (Gerritsen et al., 2000; Hornikx et al. 2010; Hornikx and Starren, 2008, Hendriks et al., 2017). Hornikx et al. (2010) ran two analyses that showed a correlation between slogan appreciation and slogan difficulty. They used six English slogans that were characterized by two different levels of complexity – difficult and easy – and asked participants to indicate their appreciation of the slogan and preference for the slogan language used. Additionally, Hornikx et al. (2010) tested the effect of slogan comprehension. Their study showed that difficult English slogans were significantly less appreciated than easy English slogans and subsequently evoked a larger preference for the native language equivalent. Also, difficult English slogans were less well understood than easy English slogans. The effect of actual comprehension of the English slogan was more important than the effect of perceived comprehension of the English slogan.

The results by Hornikx et al. (2010) therefore support earlier findings by Gerritsen et al. (2000), who measured comprehension by means of participants’ transcriptions of six partly or completely English television commercials. Gerritsen et al. (2000) concluded that better comprehension of English slogans increased the appreciation of English slogans in advertisements. Hornikx and Starren (2008) also found evidence for a relationship between appreciation and
comprehension. Their research focused on the effects of the French language in Dutch advertisements. Easy French slogans were better understood and more appreciated than difficult French slogans. Both Horniks and Starren (2008) and Hornikx et al. (2010) used slogan difficulty as a measure of slogan comprehension.

Hendriks et al. (2017) researched the effects of easy and difficult English slogans in Dutch advertisements. Their main finding indicated a significant relation between slogan comprehension and advertisement evaluation. Difficult English slogans were significantly less appreciated than easy English slogans. The effects of slogan difficulty did not only significantly influence the attitude towards the slogan and ad, but also affected the underlying aims of the use of English in advertisements. Easy slogans created a more positive attitude towards the product and higher purchase intention than difficult slogans. Hendriks et al. (2017) therefore concluded that the use of a foreign language in advertising is more than just a symbol.

Results by Gerritsen et al. (2000), Hornikx et al. (2010), and Hendriks et al. (2017) can be explained by Sperber and Wilson’s (1995) relevance theory. The relevance theory stresses the importance of a balance between richness of information that the recipient is able to receive from the message and the cognitive effort it takes to do so. Resentment may arise if the recipient feels that he or she is unable to understand the message in the other language. However, it is not clear yet whether resentment of the language also leads to a negative attitude towards the advertisement and the brand (Sperber & Wilson, 1995).

Results by Gerritsen et al. (2000), Hornikx and Starren (2008), Hornikx et al. (2010) and Hendriks et al. (2017) are in contrast with results by Raedts et al. (2016), who showed that slogan difficulty did not significantly influence the attitude of the consumer towards the product and/or advertisement. Raedts et al. (2016) have not found a significant main effect for the use of English in international advertising. However, their results showed that perceived comprehension of an English slogan is more important for the effectiveness of the advertisement than actual comprehension, as consumers will get frustrated and go away when they realize they do not understand a message in a foreign language (Domzal et al., 1995).

Processing fluency is therefore shown to significantly influence judgment. In advertising, slogan difficulty can interfere with the appreciation and judgment of slogans. Hendriks et al. (2017) found empirical proof that this consecutively affects the underlying aims of the chosen slogan. However, Raedts et al. (2016) did not find an effect of slogan difficulty on attitude towards the advertisement. The observed inconsistencies among scholars imply that further research on the effects of slogan difficulty is relevant.
Language proficiency

Many studies have ascribed the comprehension of slogans as a precondition to slogan difficulty and slogan language. However, whether or not a slogan is correctly understood does not merely depend on the difficulty and language of the slogan, but also on the language proficiency of the recipient. Till date, only one study has focused on the question whether consumers’ language proficiency influenced the effectiveness of the language used in the advertisement (Nederstigt & Hilberink-Schulpen, 2018).

Nederstigt and Hilberink-Schulpen (2018) looked at whether foreign language proficiency of Dutch consumers influenced the effectiveness of the advertisement and compared it to the effectiveness of the same advertisement in the consumers’ native language. In their experiment, they asked participants to self-assess their proficiency in German – presumably widely spoken by Dutch consumers – and Spanish – presumably less frequently spoken by Dutch consumers. Results showed that advertisements with Spanish slogans, in which Dutch consumers were not proficient, scored higher than German slogans, even though Dutch consumers held reasonable degrees of German language proficiency. Also, Dutch participants did not favor Dutch slogans over Spanish slogans.

Results of the previous study are therefore relevant in the context of the current study, as Dutch consumers are expected to have an even higher knowledge of English than German. A vast majority of Dutch consumers, 90%, are able to hold a conversation in English, compared to an average European 38% (Eurobarometer 386). The English language is omnipresent in Dutch secondary school systems, higher education, and the media. Dutch people hold the best non-native English proficiency according to the EF English Proficiency Index by Education First (2017). It is therefore assumed that the best understood foreign language of Dutch consumers is English.

Previous studies have used self-assessed proficiency scores (Hendriks et al., 2017; Nederstigt & Hilberink-Schulpen, 2018, Raedts et al., 2016) or levels of slogan comprehension (Hornikx et al., 2010) as a measure of language proficiency and as part of demographical data. However, Onna and Jansen (2006) provided empirical evidence that Dutch participants produced higher assessments of their English language proficiency than the actual test results did. The effects of these high self-evaluations on perceived slogan difficulty, slogan appreciation, product attitude, and purchase intention are still unknown. Additionally, the actual language proficiency of the foreign language and the native language has never been taken into consideration before.
Slogan familiarity and mere-exposure effect

Although the use of English in international advertising is seen as a ‘foreign’ language, the question remains whether it is still deemed foreign after consumers have been exposed to it more than once. This section elaborates on the effects of slogan familiarity and the mere-exposure effect this creates.

Repeated exposure to stimuli consequently results in a more positive evaluation of the assessed stimuli. This phenomenon is known as the mere-exposure effect (Zajonc, 1968). Mere-exposure effects occur in a variety of fields and influence a wide variety of measures (Bornstein, 1989). The mere-exposure effect has demonstrated that familiarity can directly affect the evaluation of attitudinal objects (Bornstein, 1989; Zajonc, 1968). Garcia-Marques and Mackie (2001) provided empirical evidence for a significant effect of familiarity on persuasive information processing. They found that familiar information does not receive the same amount of scrutiny as unfamiliar information. Additionally, familiarity is thought to be the basis of truth judgments, and therefore affects the perceived quality of persuasive arguments (Sawyer, 1981). Familiar arguments are perceived as more truthful than unfamiliar arguments.

Moreover, a study by Alter and Oppenheimer (2008) demonstrated that familiarity and processing fluency are often two intertwined concepts. In three different studies, they showed that the valuation of money was higher for familiar currencies than for foreign currencies. This subsequently generated higher purchasing power for familiar currencies. Additionally, they provided empirical evidence that processing fluency serves as an informative cue even when it does not form a relevant judgment measure.

The effects of repeated exposure on advertisement evaluation have been researched before (Alter & Oppenheimer, 2008; Bornstein, 1989; Garcia-Marques & Mackie, 2001; Tom et al., 2007; Zajonc, 1968). Cox and Cox (1988) examined the effects of exposure on the evaluation of simple and complex advertisements. Repeated exposure had a significant positive effect on the appreciation of difficult advertisements but did not significantly affect the appreciation of easy advertisements. Cox and Cox (1988) used the advertisement layout as a measure of complex and simple advertisements (e.g. simple advertisements only depicted two images, whereas complex advertisements depicted many images that were randomly distributed across the ad). A study by Tom, Nelson, Srzentic, and King (2007) demonstrated that the mere-exposure effect is one of many non-conscious processes that increase preference of an advertisement and the attitude towards the advertised product.

However, none of these studies have specifically focused on the effect of slogan familiarity. Also, the effect of mere-exposure on purchase intention has not been accounted for yet. Therefore, the current study fills the gaps in familiarity research with regard to slogans and purchase intention.
Aim of the current study and research questions

This study builds on earlier studies by Hornikx et al. (2010), Hendriks et al. (2017), and Raedts et al. (2016) and aims to provide clarity on the effects of slogan language, both foreign and native, and slogan difficulty on the perceived difficulty of the slogan, the appreciation of the slogan, attitude towards the advertised product, and purchase intention of Dutch consumers. Following Hendriks et al. (2017), multiple dependent variables, viz. perceived slogan difficulty, slogan appreciation, product attitude, and purchase intention are taken into account:

RQ1: What is the effect of native language equivalents (adapted) of English advertisements (standardized) on the perceived difficulty of the slogan, slogan appreciation, attitude towards the product, and purchase intention of Dutch consumers?

RQ2: What is the effect of slogan difficulty on the perceived difficulty of the slogan, slogan appreciation, product attitude, purchase intention, actual comprehension, and perceived comprehension of Dutch consumers?

Additionally, this study adds two new elements to the existing literature. To date, there are no studies that have compared language proficiency in the foreign language to the language proficiency in the native language and the effect language proficiency exerts on perceived slogan difficulty, appreciation of the slogan, attitude towards the product, and purchase intention. Previous studies have taken the levels of slogan comprehension and self-assessed proficiency in the foreign language as a measure of language proficiency. In addition, to the best of our knowledge, no studies have yet identified the actual language proficiency levels of the participants by means of a qualified test. Because Onna and Jansen (2006) argue that the Dutch self-assess their English language proficiency higher than results of actual language proficiency tests show, the effects of actual and perceived proficiency levels in both the foreign language – English – and the native language – Dutch – are accounted for. The third research question is therefore:

RQ3: What is the effect of language proficiency – actual and perceived – on the perceived difficulty of the slogan, slogan appreciation, product attitude, purchase intention, actual comprehension, and perceived comprehension of Dutch consumers?

Finally, the effects of processing fluency on slogan appreciation, product attitude, and purchase intention are measured. Familiarity has been shown to have a significant positive effect on
evaluation in other domains. Therefore, slogan familiarity and perceived difficulty are used as measures of processing fluency in this study. Advertisements are used that have already been released. Hence, there is a chance that people are already familiar with the advertisement and the accompanying slogan. The final research question is therefore:

RQ4: What is the effect of slogan familiarity and perceived difficulty on slogan appreciation, product attitude, and purchase intention of easy and difficult slogans of Dutch consumers?

Additionally, empirical studies by Krishna and Ahluwalia (2008), Lin and Wang (2015), and Micu and Coulter (2010) have provided evidence for an effect of foreign language use for MNC product advertisements only. The majority of previous studies have not used slogans by MNCs (Hornikx et al., 2010; Raedts et al., 2016; Hendriks et al., 2017; Nederstigt & Hilberink-Schulpen, 2018). Therefore, this study uses MNC slogans exclusively.
Method
In the current study, six English slogans and the Dutch equivalents were rated on perceived difficulty, slogan appreciation, product attitude, and purchase intention. Three of these slogans were pre-tested as “easy” and three slogans were pre-tested as “difficult.” Additionally, the effect of language proficiency and slogan familiarity on the dependent variables was measured.

Materials
Six original advertisements were used in this experiment (see Table 1). The advertisements were selected on the basis of the following four criteria: (1) the advertisements had to contain an English slogan, brand name, and an image of the advertised product, (2) the slogans had to be perceived as either easy or difficult, (3) the original English slogans did not contain alliteration, parallelism or any other stylistic literary device that would not be translatable to Dutch, and (4) the original advertisements had to be for products by MNCs (cf. Krishna & Ahluwalia, 2008; Micu & Coulter, 2010; Lin & Wang, 2015). Till date, Gerritsen et al. (2000) are the only study that has taken real life advertisements as the basis of their study. Geuens and De Pelsmacker (2017) argue that in order to create realistic advertising stimuli, brand names and brand logos have to be shown. Adobe Photoshop CC 2018 was used to recreate the original advertisement with Dutch slogans (for an example, see Figure 1). The order in which the advertisements were displayed was randomized.

Table 1 Easy and difficult English slogans used in the main experiment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Slogan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Subway</td>
<td>Eat fresh!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gillette</td>
<td>The Best a Man Can Get</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Wide Fund</td>
<td>For a living planet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td>The Greatest Tragedy is Indifference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dunlop</td>
<td>Accelerate your soul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evian</td>
<td>Your natural source of youth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to select three easy and three difficult English slogans and equivalent Dutch translations of these slogans a pretest was carried out. In this pretest, 24 native speakers of Dutch (age $M = 30.13$, $SD = 14.11$, range 20 – 56; education ranged from higher general continued education to university) judged twenty different slogans from the following product categories: food and beverages, beauty, gadgets, cars, clothing, and NGOs (see Appendix A). Thirteen participants ($M = 29.62$, $SD = 13.92$) judged the original English slogans on difficulty, comprehensibility, and familiarity. Eleven participants ($M = 30.73$, $SD = 14.98$) judged the Dutch equivalents of the English slogans, on perceived slogan difficulty. Perceived slogan difficulty was measured on a seven-point Likert scale: “easy – difficult”. Additionally, participants were asked to indicate whether they
were comprehended the slogan and whether they were familiar with the slogan. Slogan comprehension was measured on a seven-point Likert scale: “I find the slogan to be: very unclear – very clear” and “I am not familiar – familiar with the slogan.”

Six slogans were selected for the main experiment based on the perceived difficulty of the original English slogan. The three English slogans that were considered the easiest “Eat fresh!”, “The Best a Man Can Get”, and “For a living planet” and the three slogans that were considered most difficult “The Greatest Tragedy is Indifference”, “Accelerate your soul”, and “Your natural source of youth” were included in the main experiment (see Table 2). Although slogan selection was based on the original English slogans, Dutch equivalents of the easy English slogans were perceived as easier than the Dutch equivalents of the difficult English slogans. Means and standard deviations for all pre-test slogans can be found in Appendix A and B.

Table 2 Means and standard deviations of pretest participants’ evaluations of the difficulty of the original English slogan and the manipulated Dutch equivalent used in the main experiment (1 = very difficult, 7 = very easy).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy English slogans (n = 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway - Eat fresh</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillette - The Best a Man Can Get</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF - For a living planet</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult English slogans (n = 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross - The Greatest Tragedy is Indifference</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunlop - Accelerate your soul</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evian - Your natural source of youth</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch equivalents of the easy English slogans (n = 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway - Eet vers</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillette - Het beste dat een man kan krijgen</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF - Voor een levende planeet</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch equivalents of the difficult English slogans (n = 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross - De grootste tragedie is onverschilligheid</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunlop - Versnel je ziel</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evian - Uw natuurlijke bron van jeugd</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1 Example of the original English Evian advertisement, containing a slogan, brand name, and the advertised product, and the manipulated Dutch equivalent.

Subjects
A total of 123 (57.7% female, age: $M = 28.35$, $SD = 11.65$) Dutch participants completed the main experiment. Of the 123 participants, 51.2% filled out the Dutch version of the questionnaire ($N = 63$; 68.3% female; age $M = 29.49$, $SD = 12.98$, range 18 – 63) and 48.8% filled out the English version of the questionnaire ($N = 60$; 46.7% female, age $M = 27.28$, $SD = 10.13$, range 18 – 56). Education levels ranged from vocational training to university; the majority of the participants had completed a university of applied sciences degree (33.3%) or a university degree (29.3%). Education was equally distributed over the two different versions of the questionnaire ($\chi^2(7) = 8.84, p = .265$). Another Chi-square test showed a significant relation between slogan language and gender ($\chi^2(1) = 5.87, p = .015$). Participants who had judged the Dutch slogans were significantly more female (68.3%) than participants who judged the English slogans (46.7%). An independent samples t-test did not show a significant difference between the ages of the participants who evaluated the Dutch and English slogans ($t(121) = 1.05, p = .296$).

An independent samples t-test showed a significant difference between the self-assessed proficiency scores of the participants who evaluated their Dutch or English proficiency ($t(96,592) = 2.55, p = .012$). Participants rated their self-assessed proficiency of the Dutch language ($M = 5.98$, $SD = 0.64$) significantly higher than their self-assessed proficiency of the English language ($M = 5.58$, $SD = 1.05$). An independent samples t-test showed a significant difference between the Dutch and English LexTALE %correct scores ($t(112,576) = 5.66, p < .001$). The Dutch LexTALE
%correct scores ($M = 88.81, \ SD = 10.60, \ range \ 51.25 \ – \ 100.00$) were significantly higher than the English LexTALE %correct scores ($M = 76.48, \ SD = 13.33, \ range \ 47.50 \ – \ 100.00$). Following the LexTALE %correct scores, it can be concluded that the average CEF level of the English language of the sixty Dutch participants was upper intermediate (B2). The average CEF level of the Dutch language of the 63 participants turned out to be upper and lower advanced (C1 and C2), as shown in Table 3.

**Table 3** Relation between general language proficiency levels as indicated by LexTALE %correct scores and CEF level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEF Level</th>
<th>CEF Description</th>
<th>LexTALE %correct score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 &amp; C2</td>
<td>Upper &amp; lower advanced</td>
<td>80% - 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/proficient user</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Upper intermediate</td>
<td>60% - 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 and lower</td>
<td>Lower intermediate and lower</td>
<td>Below 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lemhöfer and Boersma (2012)

Despite familiarity differences among the advertisements, there is a general trend for all advertisements that shows that participants were most familiar with the brand, followed by the product, and least familiar with the slogan (see Table 4). Use of the advertised product was low for all product advertisements used in the experiment.

**Table 4** Means and standard deviations for brand, product, and slogan familiarity ($1 = \text{unfamiliar} \ - \ 7 = \text{familiar}$), and product use ($1 = \text{never} \ - 7 = \text{often}$) ($N = 123$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brand familiarity</th>
<th>Product familiarity</th>
<th>Slogan familiarity</th>
<th>Product use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M \ SD$</td>
<td>$M \ SD$</td>
<td>$M \ SD$</td>
<td>$M \ SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway</td>
<td>6.34 1.02</td>
<td>6.05 1.48</td>
<td>4.45 2.17</td>
<td>2.82 1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillette</td>
<td>6.37 0.95</td>
<td>5.87 1.60</td>
<td>5.62 1.64</td>
<td>3.28 2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNF</td>
<td>6.38 0.93</td>
<td>6.20 1.10</td>
<td>4.38 1.69</td>
<td>2.45 1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunlop</td>
<td>4.99 1.82</td>
<td>4.07 1.81</td>
<td>1.86 1.36</td>
<td>1.50 1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td>6.22 1.04</td>
<td>5.83 1.19</td>
<td>2.44 1.57</td>
<td>2.28 1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evian</td>
<td>5.95 1.27</td>
<td>5.87 1.37</td>
<td>2.90 1.80</td>
<td>2.81 1.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Design**

The experiment had a mixed factorial design with as between-subject factor slogan language and within subject factor slogan difficulty. Both were two level variables, viz. English and Dutch as slogan language and easy and difficult as slogan difficulty. Participants evaluated three easy slogans and three difficult slogans in either Dutch or English. Afterwards, participants filled out the LexTALE and self-assessed proficiency tests in either Dutch or English. The questionnaire with English slogans was slightly longer than the questionnaire with Dutch slogans, because it contained extra translation exercises for every advertisement. Participants were unaware of the different levels
of slogan difficulty and slogan language. The easy and difficult slogans were randomly represented and the participants did not have access to both conditions of the questionnaire (Table 5).

### Table 5 Questionnaire design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Slogan language</th>
<th>LexTALE language</th>
<th>Self-assessed proficiency</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English to Dutch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instrumentation**

Four different dependent variables were measured in this study: perceived slogan difficulty, slogan appreciation, product attitude, and purchase intention. Additionally, perceived slogan comprehension of English slogans, actual slogan comprehension of English slogans, and slogan familiarity was measured.

**Perceived slogan difficulty** was measured on a three-item seven-point Likert scale (based on Maes, Ummelen, and Hoeken, 1996). Participants were asked to indicate whether or not they thought the slogan was “easy – difficult”, “incomprehensible – comprehensible”, and “complicated – simple.” The reliability of perceived slogan difficulty comprising three items for easy slogans ($\alpha = .88$) and difficult slogans ($\alpha = .84$) was good.

**Slogan appreciation** was measured on a three-item seven-point Likert scale (based on Holbrook, 1981). Participants were asked to indicate if they found the advertisement “bad – good”, “ugly – beautiful”, “unattractive – attractive”. The reliability of slogan appreciation comprising three items for easy slogans ($\alpha = .86$) and difficult slogans ($\alpha = .86$) was good. Through the use of back-translation, the original English scales were translated to Dutch in the following way: “Ik vind de slogan [slogan] van [merknaam]:” “slecht – goed”, “lelijk – mooi”, and “onaantrekkelijk – aantrekkelijk”.

**Product attitude** was measured on a four-item seven-point Likert scale (based on Hornikx and Hof, 2008). Participants were asked to indicate if they found the product to be “bad – good”, “boring – engaging”, “not original – original”, “not interesting – interesting.” The reliability of product attitude comprising four items for easy slogans ($\alpha = 82$) and difficult slogans ($\alpha = 82$) was good.

**Purchase intention** was measured on a three-item semantic differential scale (based on Hornikx and Hof, 2008). Participants were asked to indicate if “This product” “I never want to buy – I certainly want to buy”, “I do not recommend to my friends – I definitely recommend to my friends”, “is really something for me – really nothing for me.” The reliability of purchase
intention comprising three items for easy slogans was good ($\alpha = .80$). The reliability of purchase intention comprising three items was questionable for difficult slogans ($\alpha = .69$). The reliability of purchase intention of difficult slogans ($\alpha = .69$) was accepted because of the quality of the of the other scales (seven out of eight are “good”, which makes it cumbersome to report individual items for just one variable) (Van Wijk, 2000).

Slogan comprehension of English slogans was measured in two different ways (based on Gerritsen et al., 2000; Hornikx et al., 2010; Raedts et al., 2016). Perceived slogan comprehensibility was measured on a one item seven-point Likert scale: “I am able to translate the slogan [brand name] [slogan] to Dutch”, “completely disagree – very much agree.” The reliability of perceived comprehensibility of easy slogans was questionable ($\alpha = .64$) and the reliability of perceived comprehensibility of difficult slogans was excellent ($\alpha = .91$). Actual slogan comprehensibility was measured with an open question. The open question was posed in the following way: “I would translate the [brand name] [slogan] to Dutch in the following way: …” Answers were coded as incorrect or correct. Answers were coded as incorrect when the participant had not filled out the question or when the participant had failed to correctly translate the main element of the slogan (based on Raedts et al., 2016). Table 6 contains an overview of the six different slogans, their main elements, and examples of correct and incorrect translations. The author and a second coder from Radboud University with a bilingual education background coded the translations. The interrater reliability of the slogan translation of the Subway slogan was almost perfect: $\kappa = .84, p < .001$. The interrater reliability of the slogan translation of the Gillette slogan was satisfactory: $\kappa = .76, p < .001$. The interrater reliability of the slogan translation of the WWF slogan was almost perfect: $\kappa = .97, p < .001$. The interrater reliability of the slogan translation of the Dunlop slogan was almost perfect: $\kappa = .93, p < .001$. The interrater reliability of the slogan translation of the Red Cross slogan was almost perfect: $\kappa = .96, p < .001$. The interrater reliability of the slogan translation of the Evian slogan was satisfactory: $\kappa = .73, p < .001$. 
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Table 6 Coding actual comprehension English slogans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English slogan</th>
<th>Comprehension: correct</th>
<th>Comprehension: incorrect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy slogans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat fresh</td>
<td>Eet vers</td>
<td>Eet verfrissend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Best a Man Can Get</td>
<td>Het beste dat een man kan krijgen</td>
<td>Wat mannen willen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a living planet</td>
<td>Voor een levende planeet</td>
<td>Voor een levendige planeet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult slogans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Greatest Tragedy is</td>
<td>De grootste tragedie is onverschilligheid</td>
<td>De grootste tragedie is verschil/ongelijkheid/onveranderlijk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifference</td>
<td>Versnel je ziel</td>
<td>Gas geven richting uw ziel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerate your soul</td>
<td>Uw natuurlijke bron van jeugd</td>
<td>Jouw natuurlijke kracht van de jeugd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your natural source of youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: underlined words indicate main elements of the slogan

The language proficiency scores of the participants were calculated with two tests: the self-evaluation test by Luna, Ringberg, and Peracchio (2008) and the LexTALE – Lexical Test for Advanced Learners of English – (Lemhöfer & Broersma, 2012).

Self-assessed proficiency was measured as in indication of perceived language proficiency. Participants who judged the English slogans self-assessed their proficiency in English on a four-item semantic differential scale, and participants who judged the Dutch slogans self-assessed their proficiency in Dutch on a four items semantic differential scale, following the statement: “Please indicate your proficiency in [English/Dutch] in reading, writing, listening, and speaking (Luna et al., 2008). The scale ranged from “very bad” to “very good”. The reliability of the four items measuring self-assessed proficiency was good (α = .86).

The LexTALE was used as a measurement of actual language proficiency. Participants decided on sixty different strings of letters whether it was an existing word (yes) or a non-word (no) (see Table 7). In case participants were sure about the existence of a word, without knowing its exact meaning, they could still respond with yes. The LexTALE score was made up of the percentage of correct responses – LexTALE % correct scores – (Lemhöfer and Broersma, 2012) and calculated in the following way:

\[
\text{LexTALE \% correct scores} = \frac{((\text{number of words correct}/40*100) + (\text{number of nonwords correct}/20*100))}{2}
\]
Table 7 English and Dutch items in LexTALE and correct response (y/n):  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English items in LexTALE and correct response (y/n):</th>
<th>Dutch items in LexTALE and correct response (y/n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>platery (practice item; n), denial (practice item; y), generic (practice item; y), mensible (n), scornful (y), stoutly (y), ablaze (y), kermshaw (n), moonlit (y), lofty (y), hurricane (y), flaw (y), alteration (n), unkempt (y), breeding (y), festivity (y), screech (y), savoury (y), plaudite (n), shin (y), fluid (y), spaunch (n), allied (y), slay (y), recipient (y), exprate (n), eloquence (y), cleanliness (y), dispatch (y), rebondicate (n), ingenious (y), bewitch (y), skave (n), plaintively (y), kilp (n), interate (n), hasty (y), lengthy (y), fray (y), crumper (n), upkeep (y), majestic (y), magrity (n), nourishment (y), aberg (n), proom (n), turmoil (y), carbohydrate (y), scholar (y), turtle (y), fellick (n), destripion (n), cylinder (y), censorship (y), celestial (y), rascal (y), purrage (n), pulsh (n), muddy (y), quirty (n), pudour (n), listless (y), wrought (y).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pastitie (practice item; n), scheur (practice item; y), fobisch (practice item; y), markatief (n), laakbaar (y), slaags (y), riant (y), joutbaag (n), doornat (y), woelig (y), paviljoen (y), doop (y), starkatie (n), onledig (y), toeising (y), affiniteit (y), mikken (y), knullig (y), streuren (n), rups (y), paars (y), speven (n), geraakt (y), martelaar (y), ontsteken (n), stagnatie (y), dronkenschap (y), voornemen (y), vertediseren (n), normatief (y), zetelen (y), zolf (n), publiceeklijk (y), vluk (n), compromeet (n), romig (y), getint (y), gelovig (y), nopen (y), kliper (n), geloei (y), retoriech (y), maliteit (n),verspillEng (y), haperie (n), proom (n), fornuis (y), exploitatie (y), acteur (y), hengel (y), flaoen (n), aanhekking (n), kazerne (y), avonturier (y), leurig (n), chagrijnig (y), bretel (y), klengel (n), etaal (n), matig (y), futeur (n), onbekwaam (y), verguild (y).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Lemhöfer and Boersma (2012)

During the final part of the questionnaire participants provided demographical data like gender, age, and highest completed education. Also, product use was measured on a semantic differential scale, “never – often”, following the question “How often do you:” “order a Subway sandwich”;

“use a Gillette razor blade”; “make an effort for the WWF”; “use car or motorbike tires by Dunlop”; “make an effort for the Red Cross”, and “drink Evian water.” Additionally, brand, slogan, and product familiarity was measured on a semantic differential scale. Participants indicated whether they were familiar with the advertised brand, product, and slogan from “very unfamiliar – very familiar.” The complete questionnaire can be found in Appendix C.

Procedure

The questionnaire was administered through the online tool Qualtrics (www.qualtrics.com) on an individual basis on the 23rd of May 2018. Participants were asked through Facebook, WhatsApp Messenger, and word-of-mouth to fill out the questionnaire via an anonymous link. Friends, family, and acquaintances were kindly requested to distribute the questionnaire among their social network. Participants were motivated to take part in the questionnaire because they had the chance to win a twenty euro bol.com gift card if they, optionally, filled out their e-mail addresses at the end of the questionnaire. Prior to starting the questionnaire, participants were informed that the questionnaire was made up of three different parts, being (1) rating advertisements, (2) judging
words, and (3) self-evaluation. Participants were notified that they had to give informed consent before taking part in the questionnaire. All participants had to indicate whether or not they were over eighteen years of age. After giving consent, participants were randomly redirected to either one of the two versions of the questionnaire. Participants who were automatically redirected to version one evaluated the Dutch slogans. They subsequently self-assessed their Dutch language proficiency and filled out the Dutch LexTALE. Participants who were automatically redirected to version two evaluated the English slogans. Participants who evaluated English slogans subsequently self-assessed their English language proficiency and filled out the English LexTALE. Additionally, they translated the English slogans to Dutch. All questions were asked in the participants’ native language Dutch. Completing the questionnaire took roughly ten to fifteen minutes. Participants were not informed about the aim of the experiment.

**Statistical tests**

Repeated measures analyses of covariance were used to analyze the effect of slogan difficulty and slogan language on perceived difficulty, slogan appreciation, product attitude, and purchase intention. Chi-squared tests were performed to account for an equal distribution of education and gender among the two versions of the questionnaire. Independent samples t-tests were executed to account for equal distributions of age, LexTALE %correct scores, and self-assessed proficiency scores among the different groups. Additionally, a paired samples t-test and a chi-squared test were performed to test the effect of slogan difficulty on perceived comprehensibility and actual comprehensibility of English slogans. Lastly, multiple regression analyses were performed to determine the effect of slogan familiarity and perceived slogan difficulty on the dependent variables.
Results

No assumptions – Mauchly’s test of sphericity (only two conditions, therefore sphericity is not an issue (Field, 2013, pp. 561), Box’s Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices (p = .177) – were violated. Levene’s test turned out to be non-significant (all > .05).

A repeated measures multivariate analysis of covariance for perceived difficulty, slogan appreciation, product attitude, and purchase intention with slogan difficulty – easy or difficult – as within-subject factor and slogan language – English or Dutch – as between subject factor showed a significant main effect of slogan difficulty (F(4,116) = 102.33, p < .001, \( \eta_p^2 = .779 \)) and a significant main effect of slogan language (F(4,116) = 6.94, p < .001, \( \eta_p^2 = .193 \)). LexTALE %correct av scores as a covariate was found to have a significant main effect (F(4,116) = 3.21, p = .015, \( \eta_p^2 = .100 \)). Significant univariate effects were not interpreted for self-assessed proficiency because there were no multivariate effects (F(4,116) = 1.58, p = .184). This is in compliance with the guidelines proposed by Rencher and Scott (1990, as cited in Haase, 2011, p. 118).

Manipulation check perceived slogan difficulty

A manipulation check was carried out to check if the participants’ evaluation of the difficulty of the slogans was in accordance with the results of the pre-test.

A repeated measures analysis of covariance with slogan language as between-subject factor, slogan difficulty as within subject factor, and LexTALE %correct av scores as a covariate showed a significant main effect for slogan difficulty on perceived difficulty (F(1,119) = 386.013, p < .001, \( \eta_p^2 = .764 \)). There was no significant main effect for slogan language on perceived difficulty (F(1,119) = 1.913, p = .169) and no significant interaction effect between slogan difficulty and slogan language for perceived slogan difficulty (F(1,119) < 1). LexTALE %correct av scores as a covariate did not have a significant main effect on perceived difficulty (F(1,119) = 1.507, p = .222).

Easy slogans were perceived as easier (M = 6.07, SD = 0.80) than difficult slogans (M = 4.10, SD = 1.09). Therefore, it can be concluded that the results of the main experiment corroborated the results of the pretest. Means and standard deviations for participants’ evaluation of perceived slogan difficulty can be found in Table 8.
Table 8 Means and standard deviations for perceived slogan difficulty of easy and difficult English and Dutch slogans (1 = very difficult, 7 = very easy).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slogan language</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slogan difficulty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slogan appreciation

A repeated measures analysis of covariance with slogan language as between-subject factor, slogan difficulty as within-subject factor, and LexTALE %correct scores as a covariate showed significant main effects for slogan difficulty on slogan appreciation ($F(1,119) = 76.684, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .392$) and for slogan language on slogan appreciation ($F(1,119) = 9.837, p = .002, \eta^2_p = .076$). There was no significant interaction between slogan difficulty and slogan language for slogan appreciation ($F(1,119) < 1$). LexTALE %correct scores as a covariate did not have a significant main effect on slogan appreciation ($F(1,119) = 3.456, p = .066$).

Easy slogans were significantly better appreciated ($M = 4.95, SD = 1.04$) than difficult slogans ($M = 4.01, SD = 1.01$). Also, English slogans were significantly better appreciated ($M = 4.78, SD = 0.99$) than Dutch slogans ($M = 4.19, SD = 0.98$). Means and standard deviations for participants' evaluation of perceived slogan difficulty can be found in Table 9.

Table 9 Means and standard deviations for slogan appreciation of easy and difficult English and Dutch slogans (1 = low evaluation, 7 = high evaluation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slogan language</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slogan difficulty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Product attitude

A repeated measures analysis of covariance with slogan language as between-subject factor, slogan difficulty as within-subject factor, and LexTALE %correct scores as a covariate showed a significant main effect for slogan difficulty on product attitude ($F(1,119) = 78.27, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .397$). There was no significant main effect for slogan language on product attitude ($F(1,119) = 1.843, p = .177$) and no significant interaction between slogan difficulty and slogan language for product attitude.
LexTALE % correct scores as a covariate had a significant main effect on product attitude ($F(1, 119) = 12.355, p = .001, \eta^2 = .094$).

Participants had a more positive attitude towards products with easy slogans ($M = 5.11, SD = 0.75$) than products with difficult slogans ($M = 4.61, SD = 0.73$). Means and standard deviations for participants’ evaluation of perceived slogan difficulty can be found in Table 10. LexTALE % correct scores were a significant predictor of product attitude for products with easy slogans ($p = .005$). Product attitude of products with easy slogans goes down with .242 for each unit increase of LexTALE % correct scores. Also, product attitude for products with difficult slogans ($p = .001$) goes down with .250 for each unit increase of LexTALE % correct scores.

**Table 10** Means and standard deviations for product attitude of easy and difficult English and Dutch slogans (1 = low evaluation, 7 = high evaluation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slogan language</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slogan difficulty</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purchase intention**

A repeated measures analysis of covariance with slogan language as between-subject factor, slogan difficulty as within-subject factor, and LexTALE % correct scores as a covariate showed a significant main effect for slogan difficulty on purchase intention ($F(1, 119) = 17.569, p < .001, \eta^2 = .129$). There was no significant main effect for slogan language on purchase intention ($F(1, 119) = 3.437, p = .066$). The interaction effect between slogan difficulty and slogan language for purchase intention was not statistically significant ($F(1, 119) < 1$). LexTALE % correct scores as a covariate had a significant main effect on purchase intention ($F(1, 119) = 6.690, p = .011, \eta^2 = .053$).

Easy slogans ($M = 4.77, SD = 0.97$) generated a higher purchase intention than difficult slogans ($M = 4.40, SD = 0.71$). Means and standard deviations for participants’ evaluation of perceived slogan difficulty can be found in Table 11. LexTALE % correct scores are a significant predictor of purchase intention for products with easy slogans ($p = .023$) but not of purchase intention for products with difficult slogans ($p = .063$). Purchase intention of products with easy slogans goes down with .259 for each unit increase of LexTALE % correct scores.
Table 11 Means and standard deviations for purchase intention of easy and difficult English or Dutch slogans (1 = low evaluation, 7 = high evaluation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slogan difficulty</th>
<th>English</th>
<th></th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceived and actual comprehension of English slogans

A paired samples t-test showed a significant difference between perceived comprehensibility of easy slogans and perceived comprehensibility of difficult slogans ($t(59) = 3.06, p = .003$). Perceived comprehensibility of easy slogans ($M= 5.47$, $SD = 1.16$) was shown to be higher than perceived comprehensibility of difficult slogans ($M= 4.98$, $SD = 1.55$). English slogans that were categorized as “easy” based on the pre-test were perceived as significantly easier to comprehend than slogans that were categorized as difficult. However, a chi-square test showed no significant relation between actual comprehensibility of easy slogans and actual comprehensibility of difficult slogans ($\chi^2(9) = 11.18, p = .266$).

Means and standard deviations for perceived slogan comprehensibility and percentage correct scores for actual slogan comprehensibility (Table 12) show a general trend which indicates that high means for perceived slogan comprehensibility also lead to high percentage correct scores of actual slogan comprehensibility – except for “Your natural source of youth.” However, it is beyond the scope of this thesis to further statistically analyze this.
Table 12 Means and standard deviations for perceived slogan comprehensibility and percentage correct scores for actual comprehension of English slogans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Slogan</th>
<th>Perceived slogan comprehensibility</th>
<th>Actual slogan comprehensibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Eat fresh</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Best a Man Can Get</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For a living planet</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Accelerate your soul</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Greatest Tragedy is Indifference</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Your natural source of youth</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slogan familiarity

Because the original English slogans were taken from real life advertisements, there was a likely chance that participants were more familiar with the existing English slogan than with the Dutch equivalent. According to the mere-exposure effect, high familiarity can influence the attitude towards the slogan.

An independent samples t-test showed a significant difference between the English and Dutch Subway slogans with regard to slogan familiarity ($t(121) = 3.21, p = .002$). Participants were more familiar with the English Subway slogan ($M = 5.07, SD = 2.10$) than with the Dutch Subway slogan ($M = 3.86, SD = 2.09$). Another independent samples t-test showed a significant difference between the English and Dutch Gillette slogans with regard to slogan familiarity ($t(121) = 4.50, p < .001$). Participants were more familiar with the English Gillette slogan ($M = 6.25, SD = 1.30$) than with the Dutch Gillette slogan ($M = 5.02, SD = 1.71$). Other independent samples t-tests did not show a significant difference between the English and Dutch WWF, Dunlop, Red Cross and Evian slogans with regard to slogan familiarity ($p > .05$).

A multiple regression analysis showed that the variables entered, slogan familiarity and perceived difficulty, explained 17% of the variance in slogan appreciation for easy slogans ($F(2,120) = 13.74, p < .001$). Slogan familiarity was shown to be a significant predictor of slogan appreciation of easy slogans ($\beta = .31, p = .001$). If slogan familiarity goes up from low (unfamiliar) to high (familiar) the slogan appreciation of easy slogans goes up with .31 SD, given that all other variables are kept constant. Perceived difficulty was also shown to be a significant predictor of slogan
appreciation of easy slogans ($\beta = .20, p = .025$). If perceived difficulty goes up from low (difficult) to high (easy) the slogan appreciation of easy slogans goes up with .20 SD, given that all other variables are kept constant. Another multiple regression analysis showed that the variables entered, slogan familiarity and perceived difficulty, explained 31% of the variance in slogan appreciation for difficult slogans ($F(2,120) = 28.47, p < .001$). Slogan familiarity was shown to be a significant predictor of slogan appreciation of difficult slogans ($\beta = .44, p = .001$). If slogan familiarity goes up from low (unfamiliar) to high (familiar) the slogan appreciation of difficult slogans goes up with .44 SD, given that all other variables are kept constant. Perceived difficulty was also shown to be a significant predictor of slogan appreciation of difficult slogans ($\beta = .23, p = .006$). If perceived difficulty goes up from low (difficult) to high (easy) the slogan appreciation of difficult slogans goes up with .23 SD, given that all other variables are kept constant. The B, standard error and Beta for the dependent variables slogan appreciation of easy and difficult slogans can be found in Table 13.

**Table 13** Regression analyses for slogan familiarity and perceived difficulty as predictors of slogan appreciation of easy and difficult slogans ($N = 123$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slogan familiarity</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived slogan difficulty</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .17$  
$F = 13.74^{***}$  

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .010$, *** $p < .001$

A multiple regression analysis showed that the variables entered, slogan familiarity and perceived difficulty, explained 13% of the variance in product attitude for easy slogans ($F(2,120) = 10.27, p < .001$). Slogan familiarity was shown to be a significant predictor of product attitude of products with easy slogans ($\beta = .38, p < .001$) but perceived difficulty was not ($\beta = .00, p = .977$). If slogan familiarity goes up from low (unfamiliar) to high (familiar) the product attitude of easy slogans goes up with .38 SD, given that all other variables are kept constant. Another multiple regression analysis showed that the variables entered, slogan familiarity and perceived difficulty, explained 15% of the variance in product attitude for difficult slogans ($F(2,120) = 11.90, p < .001$). Slogan familiarity was shown to be a significant predictor of product attitude of products with difficult slogans ($\beta = .39$, .001).
but perceived difficulty was not ($\beta = .04, p = .654$). If slogan familiarity goes up from low (unfamiliar) to high (familiar) the product attitude of difficult slogans goes up with .39 SD, given that all other variables are kept constant. The B, standard error and Beta for the dependent variables product attitude of products with easy and difficult slogans can be found in Table 14.

**Table 14 Regression analyses for slogan familiarity and perceived difficulty as predictors of product attitude of easy and difficult slogans ($N = 123$)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slogan familiarity</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived slogan difficulty</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>10.27***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.90***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** $p < .010$, *** $p < .001$**

A multiple regression analysis showed that the variables entered, slogan familiarity and perceived difficulty, explained 9% of the variance in purchase intention for easy slogans ($F(2,120) = 6.98, p = .001$). Slogan familiarity was shown to be a significant predictor of purchase intention of products with easy slogans ($\beta = .32, p = .001$) but perceived difficulty was not ($\beta = .02, p = .844$). If slogan familiarity goes up from low (unfamiliar) to high (familiar) the purchase intention of easy slogans goes up with .32 SD, given that all other variables are kept constant. Another multiple regression analysis showed that the variables entered, slogan familiarity and perceived difficulty, explained 8% of the variance in purchase intention for difficult slogans ($F(2,120) = 6.29, p = .003$). Slogan familiarity was shown to be a significant predictor of purchase intention of products with difficult slogans ($\beta = .32, p = .001$) but perceived difficulty was not ($\beta = -.05, p = .603$). If slogan familiarity goes up from low (unfamiliar) to high (familiar) the purchase intention of difficult slogans goes up with .32 SD, given that all other variables are kept constant. The B, standard error and Beta for the dependent variables purchase intention of easy and difficult slogans can be found in Table 15.
Table 15 Regression analyses for slogan familiarity and perceived difficulty as predictors of purchase intention of easy and difficult slogans (N = 123)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slogan familiarity</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived slogan difficulty</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>6.98**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .010, *** p < .001
Conclusion and discussion

The current study aimed to provide clarity on the effects of the use of English in comparison to the native language in Dutch print advertising on perceived slogan difficulty, slogan appreciation, product attitude, and purchase intention. Also, the study has taken into account the effect of slogan difficulty on the abovementioned dependent variables. Additionally, this study aimed to fill the research gap regarding the effects of actual language proficiency and processing fluency on advertisement evaluation. In doing so, the effect of actual language proficiency on the dependent variables has been measured for the first time. Because existing advertisements were used in this experiment, the effects of slogan familiarity on the dependent variables were accounted for as well.

Slogan language

The first research question concerned the effect of slogan language and whether or not it affected perceived slogan difficulty, slogan appreciation, product attitude, and purchase intention. Results showed that slogan language had a significant main effect on slogan appreciation. The original English slogans were better appreciated than the native Dutch equivalents. However, high slogan appreciation did not translate itself to a more favorable attitude towards the product and higher purchase intention. Also, English slogans were not perceived as more difficult than the native language equivalent. The fact that English slogans were significantly better appreciated than Dutch slogans could be ascribed to the fact that people realized that the Dutch equivalent was a translation of the English original. A native language translation of well-known English slogans might then come across as odd. Additional analyses showed that participants were significantly more familiar with the English Subway and Gillette slogans than with the native Dutch equivalents. However, no significant differences were found between slogan familiarity of the English originals and native language equivalents of the WWF, Dunlop, the Red Cross, and Evian slogans. Therefore, this line of thought only holds partly true.

The results of this study are therefore consistent with previous empirical findings by Gerritsen et al. (2007) and Micu and Coulter (2010), who also did not find significant differences between the effects of English and native language slogans in international advertising. Additionally, this study has extended the previously found results to two new dependent variables: product attitude and purchase intention.
**Slogan difficulty**

The second research question concerned the effect of slogan difficulty. Slogan difficulty was shown to have a significant main effect on perceived slogan difficulty, slogan appreciation, product attitude, and purchase intention. Easy slogans were perceived as easier, better appreciated, and generated a more favorable attitude towards the product and a higher purchase intention subsequently. Results of this study are therefore in line with results by Hornikx and Starren (2006), Hornikx et al. (2010), and Hendriks et al. (2017). Hornikx and Starren (2006) found that easy French slogans were more appreciated than difficult French slogans. Also, participants preferred Dutch slogans when the French slogans were difficult to understand. Results of the current study are in line with Hornikx et al. (2010) who also suggested that companies should ideally use easy slogans instead of difficult slogans. However, Hornikx et al. (2010) suggested that the difficulty of the English utterance was of minor importance. The current study however indicates that the difficulty level of the utterance is more important than the language of the utterance. Following Hendriks et al. (2017) this study has found additional empirical evidence for a significant effect of slogan difficulty on perceived slogan difficulty, slogan appreciation, product attitude, and purchase intention.

Additionally, the present study shows that the effects of slogan difficulty are not limited to the use of a foreign language (as previously demonstrated by Gerritsen et al., 2000; Hornikx et al., 2010; and Hendriks et al., 2017) but also influence the perceived slogan difficulty, slogan appreciation, product attitude, and purchase intention of native language equivalents.

**Language proficiency**

Self-assessed proficiency scores showed that participants self-assessed the proficiency of their native language – Dutch – higher than their proficiency of the foreign language – English. LexTALE %correct<sub>n</sub> scores of the native language Dutch were significantly higher than LexTALE %correct<sub>n</sub> of the foreign language English. Dutch participants had an upper-intermediate (B2) level of English. Results of the LexTALE are therefore in line with the classification of the Netherlands according to Education First (2017), who calculated the CEFR score of the Netherlands as B2 as well, indicating a very high proficiency of English.

No significant multivariate effects were found for self-assessed proficiency on perceived slogan difficulty, slogan appreciation, product attitude, and purchase intention. LexTALE %correct<sub>n</sub> as a covariate had a significant main effect on product attitude and purchase intention. High actual language proficiency generated a less favorable attitude towards the advertised product and a lower purchase intention for products with easy slogans than low actual language proficiency. Higher
actual language proficiency therefore had a significant negative effect on product attitude and purchase intention of products with easy slogans. These results correspond with a more general finding by Ray et al. (1991), who argued that highly educated participants have a more negative towards English in neutral texts than less-well educated participants. More specifically, these results are in line with the results found by Nederstigt and Hilberink-Schulpen (2018), who found that advertisements with slogans in which participants were least proficient were rated higher than advertisements with slogans in which participants were more proficient. New findings of the present study add that it is especially holds true for product attitude and purchase intention.

The current study is based on the assumption that comprehension of a message positively influences the evaluation of the message (Eagly, 1974). It is also assumed that higher language proficiency increases the comprehension of the slogan. However, another line of thought argues that the level of persuasiveness of different languages in advertisement depends on the mental route through which the received information is processed within the Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM). An important distinction can be made between central and peripheral information processing (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). Persuasion via the central route is characterized by a balanced decision-making process that is based on pros and cons. The central route is taken when the recipient understands the actual message of the slogan. Hafer, Reynolds, and Obertynski (1996) and Ratneshwar and Chaiken (1991) argue that lower slogan comprehension unconsciously triggers peripheral processing. If the lower language proficiency indeed makes the slogan more difficult to comprehend, peripheral cues supposedly make the advertisement more attractive than the actual arguments – slogans – that are used. This line of thought could therefore explain the effect of language proficiency on product attitude and purchase intention found in this study.

**Processing fluency**

Slogan familiarity turned out to have a significant positive effect on slogan appreciation, product attitude, and purchase intention for both easy and difficult slogans. This indicates that high slogan familiarity increased the appreciation of the slogan, the attitude towards the product, and the intention to buy the product. Perceived slogan difficulty only had a significant positive effect on the slogan appreciation of difficult slogans. Results of this study therefore provide empirical evidence and underscore the importance of processing fluency in international advertising. This study is therefore in line with previous results found by Cox and Cox (1988) and Garcia-Marques and Mackie (2001) but provides empirical evidence for language as a factor of processing fluency. Cox and Cox (1988) used images as a measure of processing fluency. This study provides empirical evidence that the effect of familiarity likewise holds true for slogans. Also, the current study
provides empirical evidence for a significant positive effect of slogan familiarity on purchase intention, a dependent variable that has not been taken into account before. It also provides empirical evidence to the notion that the mere-exposure effect indeed influences the appreciation of an object.

**Limitations and future research**

An important limitation is the high actual language proficiency of the Dutch participants. LexTALE \%correct indicated high proficiency in English (B2) and Dutch (C1 and C2). Therefore, it is very likely that the non-significant effect of slogan language is particularly applicable to Dutch consumers. Consumers from other countries with lower English proficiency levels might experience a significant main effect of slogan language. Future studies should therefore include countries with significantly lower levels of English proficiency to see whether this assumption holds true.

High language proficiency of the participants relates to a second limitation of this study. The majority of the participants (62.6%) were highly educated. Therefore, this study did not significantly differ from previous studies with regard to participants’ education level. The majority of the studies that focused on the effect of the English language in Dutch print advertising also included highly educated participants. To date, only two studies have considered the evaluation differences of the English language between participants with diverse educational backgrounds (Gerritsen et al., 2000; Smakman, Korzilius, & Van Meurs, 2009). Gerritsen et al. (2000) found more favorable attitudes towards English in advertising among highly educated Dutch participants. Smakman et al. (2009) found no significant differences in attitude towards the advertisement for highly and lower educated participants. An increase in studies on the effect of the English language in print advertising on less well-educated people is relevant as the group makes up a significant part of the Dutch consumer market (Withagen & Boves, 1991).

A third limitation of this study relates to the unequal distribution of gender between the two different versions of the questionnaire. On top of that, two out of six advertisements used promoted stereotypical male products (Gillette razor blades and Dunlop car/motorbike tires), which could have influenced the attitude towards these products and purchase intention. This was purely a coincidence, as the pre-test slogans also contained slogans that promoted stereotypical female products like mascara. Future studies should account for an equal distribution of gender and include gender-neutral products to eliminate gender as a variable.

A fourth limitation is the MNC choice. WWF and the Red Cross do not advertise products such as Subway, Gillette, Dunlop, and Evian but ask for donations instead. Motivations to donate
money for a good cause might be different from motivations to purchase a product for one’s own wellbeing. It would be interesting for future studies to look at motivational differences of consumers between products from non-governmental organizations and MNCs.

A final limitation is the measuring instrument. The Dutch LexTALE test was used as a measure of native language proficiency of Dutch consumers. However, the initial aim of the LexTALE is to determine the proficiency of an L2 language. Therefore, future studies could incorporate tests that are suitable to measure L1 and L2 proficiency.

Theoretical implications
The current study has provided additional empirical insights to the existing literature on international advertising, slogan difficulty, language proficiency and familiarity. The effects of slogan difficulty should no longer only be considered when using foreign languages, but also when native language equivalents are used. Also, the current study has provided empirical evidence for the effect of familiarity in advertising, specifically slogan familiarity. In line with Hendriks et al. (2017) this study is second in providing evidence for an effect of slogan difficulty on slogan appreciation, product attitude, and purchase intention. Finally, the results of this study support earlier findings by Nederstigt and Hilberink-Schulpen (2018) that higher language proficiency negatively affects product attitude and purchase intention.

Practical implications
In line with previous studies by Gerritsen et al. (2000), Hornikx and Starren (2006), Hornikx et al. (2010), and Hendriks et al. (2017), marketers are advised to use easy slogans when they want to approach potential consumers. This can be achieved in two different ways: (1) to pretest slogans on slogan difficulty before they are released, and (2) to ascertain a broad indication of the language proficiency of the target group, as actual language proficiency eventually influences the underlying objectives of an advertising language choice.

New findings show that slogan difficulty is also relevant to native language advertising. Previous studies have solely focused on the effect of easy and difficult slogans in foreign languages. This study showed that native language equivalents also turn out to create significantly different levels of perceived slogan difficulty. Whether marketers opt for standardization or adaptation, results of the current study imply that slogan difficulty should be taken into account in both cases.

In addition, slogan familiarity has turned out to be an important predictor of perceived difficulty, slogan appreciation, product attitude and purchase intention. Marketers are hence advised to create a slogan that consumers can easily familiarize themselves with.
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Appendices

**Appendix A** Slogans used in the pre-test and their Dutch equivalents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>English slogan</th>
<th>Dutch slogan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sprite</td>
<td>Obey Your Thirst</td>
<td>Gehoorzaam je dorst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;M</td>
<td>Melts in your mouth, not in your hands</td>
<td>Smelt in je mond, niet in je hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway</td>
<td>Eat fresh!</td>
<td>Eet vers!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillette</td>
<td>The Best a Man Can Get</td>
<td>Het beste dat een man kan krijgen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’Oréal</td>
<td>Because you're worth it</td>
<td>Omdat je het waard bent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volkswagen</td>
<td>For the love of the car</td>
<td>Uit liefde voor de auto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunlop</td>
<td>Accelerate your soul</td>
<td>Versnel je ziel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nespresso</td>
<td>What else?</td>
<td>Wat anders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evian</td>
<td>Your natural source of youth</td>
<td>Uw natuurlijke bron van jeugd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>Think Different</td>
<td>Denk anders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnum</td>
<td>Life’s all about priorities</td>
<td>Het leven draait helemaal om prioriteiten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanta</td>
<td>More Fanta, Less Serious</td>
<td>Meer Fanta, minder serieus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikon</td>
<td>At the heart of the image</td>
<td>Bij de kern van het beeld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sony</td>
<td>Make believe</td>
<td>Doen geloven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panasonic</td>
<td>Ideas for life</td>
<td>Ideeën voor het leven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>Challenge everything</td>
<td>Daag alles uit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levi’s</td>
<td>Quality never goes out of style</td>
<td>Kwaliteit raakt nooit uit de mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nike</td>
<td>Just do it</td>
<td>Doe het gewoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td>The greatest tragedy is</td>
<td>De grootste tragedie is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indifference</td>
<td>onverschilligheid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>For a living planet</td>
<td>Voor een levende planeet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: slogans in bold have been used in the main experiment*
### Appendix B: Means and standard deviations for pre-test slogans (1 = very difficult, 7 = very easy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Comp</th>
<th>Familiarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprite</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.23 (2.89)</td>
<td>4.00 (1.84)</td>
<td>4.62 (1.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;M</td>
<td>5.85 (1.21)</td>
<td>5.55 (1.37)</td>
<td>5.23 (1.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway</td>
<td>6.69 (0.63)</td>
<td>5.36 (1.80)</td>
<td>6.23 (0.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillette</td>
<td>6.38 (0.96)</td>
<td>5.09 (1.76)</td>
<td>5.85 (1.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’Oréal</td>
<td>6.08 (0.95)</td>
<td>5.73 (1.35)</td>
<td>5.46 (1.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volkswagen</td>
<td>5.08 (1.19)</td>
<td>4.91 (1.87)</td>
<td>4.31 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunlop</td>
<td>4.08 (1.32)</td>
<td>3.45 (1.44)</td>
<td>3.38 (1.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nespresso</td>
<td>6.31 (0.95)</td>
<td>5.82 (1.54)</td>
<td>6.38 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evian</td>
<td>4.46 (1.94)</td>
<td>3.73 (1.01)</td>
<td>4.15 (1.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>6.08 (0.76)</td>
<td>4.73 (1.56)</td>
<td>5.23 (1.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnum</td>
<td>4.77 (1.54)</td>
<td>3.09 (1.51)</td>
<td>3.92 (1.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanta</td>
<td>5.62 (1.61)</td>
<td>4.09 (1.38)</td>
<td>4.46 (1.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikon</td>
<td>5.08 (1.19)</td>
<td>4.27 (1.49)</td>
<td>4.54 (1.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sony</td>
<td>5.00 (1.68)</td>
<td>4.36 (1.29)</td>
<td>3.92 (1.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panasonic</td>
<td>5.23 (1.42)</td>
<td>4.00 (1.55)</td>
<td>4.54 (1.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>5.38 (1.61)</td>
<td>3.91 (1.45)</td>
<td>4.77 (1.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Levi’s</td>
<td>6.08 (1.19)</td>
<td>6.18 (0.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nike</td>
<td>6.23 (1.09)</td>
<td>5.09 (1.38)</td>
<td>6.00 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td>4.00 (2.00)</td>
<td>3.73 (1.62)</td>
<td>4.31 (2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>6.54 (0.60)</td>
<td>5.91 (0.54)</td>
<td>6.38 (0.77)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: brand names in bold have been used in the main experiment.
Appendix C Questionnaire

Beste deelnemer,


Vertrouwelijkheid van de onderzoeksgegevens

De gegevens die we in dit onderzoek verzamelen, zullen door wetenschappers gebruikt worden voor artikelen en presentaties. Natuurlijk maken we deze gegevens volledig anoniem en bewaren we ze volgens de aan de Radboud Universiteit geldende regels. Uitgangspunt is dat de anoniem gemaakte data tenminste 10 jaar ten behoeve van de wetenschappelijke gemeenschap opvraagbaar zijn.

Vrijwilligheid

U doet vrijwillig mee aan dit onderzoek. Daarom kunt u op elk moment tijdens het invullen van de vragenlijst uw deelname stopzetten. Alle gegevens die we bij u verzameld hebben, worden dan definitief verwijderd.

Nadere inlichtingen

Als u graag verdere informatie over het onderzoek wilt hebben, nu of in de toekomst, kunt u contact opnemen met Janou Zweers via janou.zweers@student.ru.nl.

Voor eventuele klachten over dit onderzoek kunt u contact opnemen met:
Margret van Beuningen, secretaris Ethische Toetsingscommissie Geesteswetenschappen
Radboud Universiteit
Postbus 9103
6500 HD Nijmegen
Tel: 024-3615814
m.vanbeuningen@let.ru.nl
TOESTEMMING:

Geef hieronder uw keuze aan.

Door te klikken op de knop ‘Ik ga akkoord’ geeft u aan dat u:
- bovenstaande informatie heeft gelezen
- vrijwillig meedoet aan het onderzoek
- 18 jaar of ouder bent

Als u niet mee wilt doen aan het onderzoek, kunt u op de knop ‘Ik wil niet meedoen’ klikken:
○ Ik ga akkoord
○ Ik wil niet meedoen

Ik vind de slogan ‘eat fresh/eet vers’ van Subway:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moeilijk</th>
<th>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</th>
<th>Makkelijk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onduidelijk</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Duidelijk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingewikkeld</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Simpel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ik vind de slogan ‘eat fresh/eet vers’ van Subway:

Onaantrekkelijk  O O O O O O O  Aantrekkelijk
Slecht           O O O O O O O  Goed
Lelijk           O O O O O O O  Mooi

Ik vind het product:

Slecht           O O O O O O O  Goed
Saai             O O O O O O O  Boeiend
Onorigineel     O O O O O O O  Origineel
Oninteressant   O O O O O O O  Interessant

Dit product:

Wil ik nooit kopen           O O O O O O O  Wil ik zeker kopen
Raad ik niet aan mijn vrienden aan O O O O O O O  Raad ik wel aan mijn vrienden aan
Is niks voor mij            O O O O O O O  Is echt iets voor mij

Ik ben bekend met… (1 = erg onbekend, 7 = erg bekend)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

… het merk            O O O O O O O
… het product        O O O O O O O
… de slogan          O O O O O O O
Ik vind de slogan ‘The Best a Man Can Get/Het Beste Dat een Man Kan Krijgen’ van Gillette:

- Moeilijk: O O O O O O O
- Onduidelijk: O O O O O O O
- Ingewikkeld: O O O O O O O

Ik vind de slogan ‘The Best a Man Can Get/Het Beste Dat een Man Kan Krijgen’ van Gillette:

- Onaantrekkelijk: O O O O O O O
- Slecht: O O O O O O O
- Lelijk: O O O O O O O

Ik vind het product:

- Slecht: O O O O O O O
- Saai: O O O O O O O
- Onorigineel: O O O O O O O
- Oninteressant: O O O O O O O

Dit product:

- Wil ik nooit kopen: O O O O O O O
- Raad ik niet aan mijn vrienden aan: O O O O O O O
- Is niks voor mij: O O O O O O O

- Wil ik zeker kopen: O O O O O O O
- Raad ik wel aan mijn vrienden aan: O O O O O O O
- Is echt iets voor mij: O O O O O O O
Ik ben bekend met… (1 = erg onbekend, 7 = erg bekend)

… het merk
… het product
… de slogan

Ik vind de slogan ‘voor een levende planeet/for a living planet’ van het WNF:
Moeilijk
O O O O O O O
Makkelijk
Onduidelijk
O O O O O O O
Duidelijk
Ingewikkeld
O O O O O O O
Simpel
Ik vind de slogan ‘voor een levende planeet/for a living planet’ van het WNF:

| Onaantrekkelijk | O O O O O O O | Aantrekkelijk |
| Slecht | O O O O O O O | Goed |
| Lelijk | O O O O O O O | Mooi |

Ik vind het doel:

| Slecht | O O O O O O O | Goed |
| Saai | O O O O O O O | Boeiend |
| Onorigineel | O O O O O O O | Origineel |
| Oninterestant | O O O O O O O | Interestant |

Dit doel:

| Wil ik nooit steunen | O O O O O O O | Wil ik zeker steunen |
| Raad ik niet aan mijn vrienden aan | O O O O O O O | Raad ik wel aan mijn vrienden aan |
| Is niks voor mij | O O O O O O O | Is echt iets voor mij |

Ik ben bekend met…(1 = erg onbekend, 7 = erg bekend)

\[
\begin{array}{c c c c c c c}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\end{array}
\]

… het merk | O O O O O O O |
… het doel | O O O O O O O |
… de slogan | O O O O O O O |
The Greatest Tragedy is Indifference

De Grootste Tragedie is Onverschilligheid
Ik vind de slogan ‘De Grootste Tragedie is Onverschilligheid/The Greatest Tragedy is Indifference’ van het Rode Kruis:

Moeilijk O O O O O O O Makkelijk
Onduidelijk O O O O O O O Duidelijk
Ingewikkeld O O O O O O O Simpel

Ik vind de slogan ‘De Grootste Tragedie is Onverschilligheid/The Greatest Tragedy is Indifference’ van het Rode Kruis:

Onaantrekkelijk O O O O O O O Aantrekkelijk
Slecht O O O O O O O Goed
Lelijk O O O O O O O Mooi

Ik vind het doel:

Slecht O O O O O O O Goed
Saai O O O O O O O Boeiend
Onorigineel O O O O O O O Origineel
Oninteressant O O O O O O O Interessant

Dit doel:

Wil ik nooit steunen O O O O O O O Wil ik zeker steunen
Raad ik niet aan mijn vrienden aan O O O O O O O Raad ik wel aan mijn vrienden aan
Is niks voor mij O O O O O O O Is echt iets voor mij

Ik ben bekend met…(1 = erg onbekend, 7 = erg bekend)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

… het merk O O O O O O O
… het doel O O O O O O O
… de slogan O O O O O O O
Ik vind de slogan ‘Accelerate your soul/Versnel je ziel’ van Dunlop:

Moelijk: O O O O O O O
Makkelijk

Onduidelijk: O O O O O O O
Duidelijk

Ingewikkeld: O O O O O O O
Simpel

Ik vind de slogan ‘Accelerate your soul/Versnel je ziel’ van Dunlop:

Onaantrekkelijk: O O O O O O O
Aantrekkelijk

Slecht: O O O O O O O
Goed

Lelijk: O O O O O O O
Mooi

Ik vind het product:

Slecht: O O O O O O O
Goed

Saai: O O O O O O O
Boeiend

Onorigineel: O O O O O O O
Origineel

Oninterestant: O O O O O O O
Interestant

Dit product:

Wil ik nooit kopen: O O O O O O O
Wil ik zeker kopen

Raad ik niet aan mijn vrienden aan: O O O O O O O
Raad ik wel aan mijn vrienden aan

Is niks voor mij: O O O O O O O
Is echt iets voor mij
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Ik ben bekend met… (1 = erg onbekend, 7 = erg bekend)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

… het merk 
O O O O O O O

… het product
O O O O O O O

… de slogan 
O O O O O O O

Ik vind de slogan ‘Your natural source of youth/Uw natuurlijke bron van jeugd’ van Evian:

Moeilijk 
O O O O O O O 
Makkelijk

Onduidelijk 
O O O O O O O 
Duidelijk

Ingewikkeld 
O O O O O O O 
Simpel

Ik vind de slogan ‘Your natural source of youth/Uw natuurlijke bron van jeugd’ van Evian:

Onaantrekkelijk 
O O O O O O O 
Aantrekkelijk

Slecht 
O O O O O O O 
Goed

Lelijk 
O O O O O O O 
Mooi
Ik vind het product:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slecht</th>
<th>O O O O O O O</th>
<th>Goed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saai</td>
<td>O O O O O O O</td>
<td>Boeiend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onorigineel</td>
<td>O O O O O O O</td>
<td>Origineel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oninterestant</td>
<td>O O O O O O O</td>
<td>Interessant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dit product:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wil ik nooit kopen</th>
<th>O O O O O O O</th>
<th>Wil ik zeker kopen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raad ik niet aan mijn vrienden aan</td>
<td>O O O O O O O</td>
<td>Raad ik wel aan mijn vrienden aan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is niks voor mij</td>
<td>O O O O O O O</td>
<td>Is echt iets voor mij</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ik ben bekend met... (1 = erg onbekend, 7 = erg bekend)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

... het merk | O O O O O O O |
... het product | O O O O O O O |
... de slogan | O O O O O O O |

Engelse versie:

Ik kan de slogan 'Eat fresh' van Subway vertalen naar het Nederlands:

Heel erg oneens O O O O O O O Heel erg eens

Ik zou de slogan 'eat fresh' van Subway op de volgende manier vertalen naar het Nederlands:

Ik kan de slogan ‘The Best a Man Can Get’ van Gillette vertalen naar het Nederlands:

Heel erg oneens O O O O O O O Heel erg eens

Ik zou de slogan ‘The Best a Man Can Get’ van Gillette op de volgende manier vertalen naar het Nederlands:

Ik kan de slogan ‘For a living planet’ van het WNF vertalen naar het Nederlands:
Heel erg oneens O O O O O Heel erg eens

Ik zou de slogan ‘For a living planet’ van het WNF op de volgende manier vertalen naar het Nederlands:

Heel erg oneens O O O O O O O Heel erg eens

Ik zou de slogan ‘Accelerate your soul’ van Dunlop vertalen naar het Nederlands:
Heel erg oneens O O O O O O O Heel erg eens

Ik zou de slogan ‘Accelerate your soul’ van Dunlop op de volgende manier vertalen naar het Nederlands:

Ik kan de slogan ‘The Greatest Tragedy is Indifference’ van het Rode Kruis vertalen naar het Nederlands:
Heel erg oneens O O O O O O O Heel erg eens

Ik zou de slogan ‘The Greatest Tragedy is Indifference’ van het Rode Kruis op de volgende manier vertalen naar het Nederlands:

Ik kan de slogan ‘Your natural source of youth’ van Evian vertalen naar het Nederlands:
Heel erg oneens O O O O O O O Heel erg eens

Ik zou de slogan ‘Your natural source of youth’ van Evian op de volgende manier vertalen naar het Nederlands:

Deze test bestaat uit ongeveer 60 trials. U krijgt steeds een letterreeks te zien. Uw taak is om te beslissen of dit een bestaand Nederlands woord is of niet. Als u denkt dat het een bestaand Nederlands woord is klikt u op "ja", als u denkt dat het geen bestaand Nederlands woord is klikt u op "nee". Als u er zeker van bent dat het woord bestaat, ook als u niet precies weet wat het betekent, mag u toch met "ja" antwoorden. Maar als u twijfelt of het wel een bestaand woord is, kies dan "nee".
U heeft zoveel tijd als u wilt voor elke beslissing. Dit deel van het experiment duurt ongeveer 5 minuten.

Als alles duidelijk is kunt u het experiment nu starten.

O Start het experiment

pastitie (practice item; n), scheur (practice item; y), fobisch (practice item; y), marokatief (n), laakbaar (y), slaags (y), riant (y), joutbaag (n), doornat (y), woelig (y), paviljoen (y), doop (y), starkatie (n), onledig (y), toetsing (y), affiniteit (y), mikken (y), knullig (y), streuren (n), rups (y), paars (y), speven (n), geraakt (y), martelaar (y), ontpeilen (n), stagnatie (y), dronkenschap (y), voornemen (y), vertediseren (n), normatief (y), zetelen (y), zolf (n), publiekelijk (y), volk (n), compromoot (n), romig (y), getint (y), gelovig (y), nopen (y), kluiper (n), geloei (y), retorisch (y), maliteit (n), verspilling (y), haperie (n), proom (n), fornuis (y), exploitatie (y), acteur (y), hengel (y), flajoen (n), aanhekking (n), kazerne (y), avonturier (y), leurig (n), chagrijnig (y), brezel (y), klengel (n), etaal (n), matig (y), futeur (n), onbekwaam (y), verguld (y).

Note: (y) and (n) were not shown to participants

Deze test bestaat uit ongeveer 60 trials. U krijgt steeds een letterreeks te zien. Uw taak is om te beslissen of dit een bestaand Engels woord is of niet. Als u denkt dat het een bestaand Engels woord is klikt u op "ja", als u denkt dat het geen bestaand Engels woord is klikt u op "nee". Als u er zeker van bent dat het woord bestaat, ook als u niet precies weet wat het betekent, mag u toch met "ja" antwoorden. Maar als u twijfelt of het wel een bestaand woord is, kies dan "nee".


U heeft zoveel tijd als u wilt voor elke beslissing. Dit deel van het experiment duurt ongeveer 5 minuten.

Als alles duidelijk is kunt u het experiment nu starten.
O Start het experiment

platery (practice item; n), denial (practice item; y), generic (practice item; y), mensible (n), scornful (y), stoutly (y), ablaze (y), kermshaw (n), moonlit (y), lofty (y), hurricane (y), flaw (y), alberation (n), unkempt (y), breeding (y), festivity (y), screech (y), savoury (y), plaudate (n), shin (y), fluid (y), spaunch (n), allied (y), slain (y), recipient (y), excape (n), eloquence (y), cleanliness (y), dispatch (y), rebondicate (n), ingenious (y), bewitch (y), skave (n), plaintively (y), kilp (n), intercate (n), hasty (y), lengthy (y), fray (y), crumper (n), upkeep (y), majestic (y), magrity (n), nourishment (y), abergy (n), proom (n), turmoil (y), carbohydrate (y), scholar (y), turtle (y), fellick (n), destription (n), cylinder (y), censorship (y), celestial (y), rascal (y), purrage (n), pulsh (n), muddy (y), quirky (n), padour (n), listless (y), wrought (y).

Note: (y) and (n) were not shown to participants.

O Wat is uw leeftijd?

Wat is uw geslacht?
O Man
O Vrouw
O Anders

Wat is uw hoogst afgeronde opleiding?
O Praktijkonderwijs
O Vmbo
O Havo
O Vwo
O Mbo
O Hbo
O Wo
O Anders
Geef aan hoe goed u bent in de volgende vaardigheden in de Engelse/Nederlandse taal (1 = heel slecht, 7 = heel goed)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Lezen O O O O O O O
Schrijven O O O O O O O
Luisteren O O O O O O O
Spreken O O O O O O O

Hoe vaak… (1 = nooit, 7 = vaak):

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Haalt u een broodje bij Subway? O O O O O O O
Gebruikt u een scheermes van Gillette? O O O O O O O
Zet u zich in voor het WNF O O O O O O O
Gebruikt u auto- of motorbanden van Dunlop? O O O O O O O
Zet u zich in voor het Rode Kruis? O O O O O O O
Drinkt u water van Evian? O O O O O O O