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Abstract

Logos are an extremely important means for organisations to communicate their distinctive identities to the outside world, and, if effective, they can improve an organisation’s image and can even influence customer behaviour. While much research on corporate logos and their design elements has been carried out, very little research to date has focused on the effects of verbal elements in logos or on the logos of non-profit organisations specifically. The present study therefore explored to what extent verbal anchoring in the logos of non-profit organisations influences logo appreciation, perceived core value fit, and intention to donate. The logos of three different charities – CliniClowns, SOS Children’s Villages, and UNICEF – containing varying degrees of verbal anchoring were presented to 115 Dutch respondents in a questionnaire, and questions about logo appreciation, perceived core value fit, and intention to donate were asked for each of the logos. The results show that an increased level of verbal anchoring had a positive effect on logo appreciation for the CliniClowns logo, but not for the other two logos, and not on perceived core value fit or intention to donate for any of the logos. The study also found that there were differences in logo appreciation, perceived core value fit, and intention to donate between all three non-profit organisations. All in all, this study has demonstrated a need for more research on the effects of verbal anchoring in logos, and future research should also investigate where the differences between organisations lie when it comes to the effectiveness of verbal anchoring in logos.
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Introduction

In today’s fast-paced world that confronts people with large amounts of information at any given time, it has become more important and also more difficult than ever for organisations to be distinguishable from their competitors and to communicate their distinctive identity to the outside world. Customers often have difficulties telling brands apart, and logos are generally used to solve this problem and as a means to make an organisation identifiable and recognisable (Park, Eisingerich, Pol, & Park, 2013; Foroudi, Melewar, & Gupta, 2014). Some logos, for example Apple’s apple, Nike’s swoosh or McDonald’s golden arches, are so well-known that they are almost instantly recognised by people all over the world, and many companies go to great lengths to protect their logos (Hughes, 2008). According to Dandridge, Mitroff and Joyce (1980), an organisation’s logo is “the externalized and concrete visual sign that an organization chooses or designs to convey its distinctive inner character to the outer environment and to itself” (p. 77) and is supposed to represent the entire organisation.

Most research surrounding logos to date has specifically focused on corporate logos, which have been of significant importance to companies for decades and are considered to be at the very core of corporate identity (see Foroudi, Melewar, & Gupta, 2017 for a discussion of the extensive literature on corporate logos). Logos can improve a company’s image (Foroudi et al., 2014), and researchers have found that good brand logos can positively influence customer brand commitment and a firm’s financial performance (Park et al., 2013). They can also play a role in influencing purchase intentions both positively and negatively, depending on whether there is a fit between the brand logo design, the brand, and the customer’s needs at the time of purchase (Fajardo, Zhang, & Tsiros, 2016).

While a great amount of research has been carried out on corporate logo creation and corporate logo components, such as colour, typeface, design, and corporate name, as well as their effects on consumers (see Foroudi et al., 2017 for an extensive literature review), relatively little attention has been paid to the effects of the use of verbal elements in logos. Logos can consist of visual elements alone, the organisation’s name alone, or can be a combination of visual and verbal elements (Doyle, 2011; Keller, 2013). Barthes (1977) described how linguistic messages in images facilitate the correct identification of the elements contained in an image and guide viewers in their interpretation of the image. He called this specific function of linguistic messages in images anchorage, in research often referred to as verbal anchoring.
According to Alba and Hutchinson (1987, as cited in Phillips, 2000), verbal anchoring can make images more comprehensible, which then results in less explanation being needed for the interpretation of an image. Phillips (2000) conducted a study on verbal anchoring in advertisements containing pictorial metaphors and compared ads with no headline to ads with an incomplete headline hinting at the meaning of the pictorial metaphor and to ads with a complete headline that explicitly explained the pictorial metaphor. She found that a higher level of verbal anchoring (i.e., the completeness of the headline) resulted in better comprehension of the ad and the metaphor contained in it. However, at the same time an increased level of verbal anchoring affected ad liking negatively, as people did not have to put as much energy or effort into deciphering the meaning of the metaphor anymore, which in turn resulted in a less positive emotional response. A similar study confirmed that more verbal anchoring (i.e., complete headlines) in advertisements with pictorial metaphors increases comprehension of the ad and makes an ad more effective, as consumers are presented with a clear message and do not have to interpret the ad by themselves (Bergkvist, Eiderbäck, & Palombo, 2012). McQuarrie and Phillips (2005) also found that the meaning of pictorial metaphors in ads without headlines is more open to interpretation than that of pictorial metaphors in ads with accompanying headlines; when presented with pictorial metaphors with verbal anchoring, people were less likely to draw their own inferences from the ads, and relied more on the explanation provided. The results from previous studies on verbal anchoring in advertisements provide interesting insights, but cannot be generalised to logos because advertisements generally focus on one aspect of a specific product and on one selling point, whereas logos, as defined earlier, represent an entire brand or organisation to the outside world and are about more than one product or one aspect of an organisation.

Given the lack of research on verbal anchoring as a whole and in logos especially, this study aims to research the effects of verbal anchoring in logos. It will focus on the logos of non-profit organisations instead of corporate logos, as the logos of non-profit organisations have not been the focus of any studies known to the author, even though non-profit organisations play an important role in the world. Roughly 30% of people worldwide donate money to charities, and the Netherlands ranked seventh in donating money in the World Giving Index 2014, with 70% of the Dutch population donating money to charities (Charities Aid Foundation, 2014). This makes non-profit organisations and their logos an interesting and worthwhile subject to study.
Specifically, this study will investigate how different levels of verbal anchoring in the logos of non-profit organisations influence logo appreciation, the perceived fit between an organisation’s core values and its logo, as well as people’s intention to donate to the non-profit organisation at hand. Van Hooft, Wiskerke and Brink (2007) write that companies increasingly do not only want their logos to represent the company itself and its products, but also want them to convey the firm’s core values to consumers. In a small exploratory study using the logos of Chanel, Texaco, and McDonald’s, however, they found that consumers were very often not able to infer a company’s self-ascribed core values from the logo and instead associated the different logos with the respective company’s products. Another study found that, on average, corporate logos were moderately successful at communicating company values to consumers (Das & Van Hooft, 2015). Overall, little research has been done about logos’ abilities to communicate an organisation’s core values to the outside world or about the perceived fit between an organisation’s core values and its logo, and existing studies have, again, focused on corporate logos rather than the logos of non-profit organisations. A fit between logo and core values is arguably even more important for non-profit organisations than it is for corporations, considering that the former depend on people’s willingness to donate their money and time to them. An organisation’s logo is often the first thing that people come in contact with when encountering previously unknown organisations, and a logo that matches and conveys core values may positively influence the first impression a potential donor has of a non-profit organisation. The importance of an effective logo that communicates core values, fits those values, and helps organisations stand out can therefore not be understated.

In terms of the effects of verbal anchoring on logo appreciation, it has been shown that as far as unknown brands are concerned, logos that consist of both an icon and a brand name are considered as more attractive and recognisable than logos that only consist of visual elements (Deneçli, 2015; Bresciani & Del Ponte, 2017). Foroudi et al. (2017) also state that adding the brand name to a company’s logo is most likely beneficial to the logo’s perceived attractiveness. But in this area, too, very little research covers how the combination of visual and verbal elements in logos affects logo appreciation or perceived attractiveness (see also Bresciani & Del Ponte, 2017) and, again, existing research only takes corporate logos into account and often focuses on unknown brands. For this reason, the present study will examine whether the level of verbal anchoring in non-profit logos has an effect on logo appreciation.
Finally, this study also aims to look at how verbal anchoring in the logos of non-profit organisations influences people’s intention to donate money to the organisation in question. As mentioned earlier, previous research on corporate logos has shown that logo design can influence customers’ purchase intentions both positively and negatively (Fajardo et al., 2016), which is why it seems natural to focus on intention to donate money where non-profit organisations are concerned. Since most non-profit organisations depend on people who donate their time and money to them for their continued existence, it would be interesting to see how logo design can contribute to encouraging people to donate money.

Previous studies examining intention to donate have mostly focused on internal factors such as donors’ personality traits, gender, role identity, and attitude towards monetary donation that influence donor behaviour (see White, Poulsen, & Hyde, 2017 and Ahn, Sura, & An, 2018 for discussions of this). It has been found that women in developed countries are more likely to donate money than men, with the opposite being the case for transitioning and developing countries (Charities Aid Foundation, 2014; White et al., 2017). Furthermore, role identity as a donor and personality traits such as conscientiousness and agreeableness have been shown to positively predict donating behaviour (White et al., 2017), much like attitude towards monetary donations and moral norms (Van Der Linden, 2011). Generally speaking, people who have donated money in the past are more likely to donate money again (Van Der Linden, 2011; Kashif, Sarifuddin, & Hassan, 2015) and the belief that other people donate money to charities as well can also positively predict someone’s intention to donate (Kashif et al., 2015). Some recent studies have taken a closer look at online donor behaviour and willingness to donate via social network sites (e.g. Shier & Handy, 2012; Ahn et al., 2018), but no studies known to the author have investigated the impact of external factors and how the logos of non-profit organisations and the level of verbal anchoring contained in them can influence the intention to donate money. Considering how many people all over the world, and especially in the Netherlands, donate money to charities, it will be interesting to examine how non-profit organisations can positively influence people’s intentions to donate through their logos, especially since marketing is often a complex and difficult task for non-profit organisations to begin with (Kashif et al., 2015).

In a nutshell, little research to date has paid attention to verbal anchoring in logos in general and to the logos of non-profit organisations in particular, which is why the purpose of this study is to investigate the effect verbal anchoring in the logos of non-profit organisations has
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on logo appreciation, perceived core value fit, and intention to donate. The following research questions will therefore be answered:

RQ1: To what extent does verbal anchoring in the logos of non-profit organisations influence logo appreciation?

RQ2: To what extent does verbal anchoring in the logos of non-profit organisations influence the perceived fit between the logo and the organisation’s core values?

RQ3: To what extent does verbal anchoring in the logos of non-profit organisations influence intention to donate?

The results of this research will add new insights to the existing theory about logos and the effects of verbal anchoring, and will also make it possible to give practical advice to non-profit organisations and charities regarding effective logo design.

Methodology

Materials

The two independent variables in the study at hand were the degree of verbal anchoring in the logos of non-profit organisations and the type of organisation. Type of organisation was included as an additional independent variable to be able to see whether possible differences in logo appreciation, perceived core value fit, and intention to donate could indeed be attributed to the level of verbal anchoring or whether there were also differences between the different organisations. Based on Phillips (2000), who used three levels of verbal anchoring in her study on verbal anchoring in advertisements (no headline, incomplete headline, complete headline), it was decided to also use three levels of verbal anchoring in this study: the logo without verbal elements (no verbal anchoring), the logo in combination with the organisation’s name (moderate verbal anchoring), and the logo in combination with the organisation’s name and most recent slogan (high verbal anchoring). Slogans were chosen to be used because they have the ability to communicate a relatively specific and more detailed message about an organisation than names and logos can (Kohli, Leuthesser, & Suri, 2007), making them a suitable element to use to achieve a higher level of verbal anchoring. Additionally, slogans are usually used by
organisations to capture and convey their essence, core message, and attitude (Kohli, Thomas, & Suri, 2013).

In order to ensure ecological validity, the logos of three existing and well-known international non-profit organisations, CliniClowns, SOS Children’s Villages, and UNICEF, were used in the experiment. The logos of these organisations in particular were chosen because all three charities focus on helping humans, and especially children, who find themselves in less than fortunate circumstances. Choosing non-profit organisations with a similar focus and target group reduces the possibility that people’s opinions of a certain charity’s work, a focus on humans compared to a focus on animals, for example, influence the results and that respondents have a negative attitude towards one of the organisations specifically. The logos of CliniClowns, SOS Children’s Villages and UNICEF also do not differ from each other too much in terms of the colours and typefaces used, which is important because vastly different colours can lead to different associations and attitudes towards the logos (Madden, Hewett, & Roth, 2000), and vastly different typefaces (e.g. handwritten versus machine-written) can have the same effect (Schroll, Schnurr, & Grewal, 2018). Lastly, all three organisations clearly state their core values on their websites, which was necessary for this research in order to be able to examine the perceived fit between an organisation’s core values and logo. Their most recent Dutch slogans were ‘Kracht der verbeelding’ (CliniClowns, 2019), ‘Zonder liefde kan een kind niet groeien’ (SOS Kinderdorpen, 2019), and ‘Voor ieder kind’ (UNICEF, 2019).

Three versions of each logo (no verbal anchoring, moderate verbal anchoring, high verbal anchoring) were created for the purpose of this study, resulting in nine different experimental stimuli. In addition to the nine stimuli, a filler image was used in the questionnaire to avoid carryover effects between question blocks. The filler image, of which three versions with three different levels of verbal anchoring were created as well, was a black stylised bunny either by itself, with one word (‘rabbit’) written next to it, or with one word (‘rabbit’) and a made-up slogan (‘cause bunnies are the best’) written next to it. The logos were presented to the participants of the experiment in an online questionnaire of which three different versions existed. In each version of the questionnaire, the logos of all three non-profit organisations were always presented in the same order (UNICEF, CliniClowns, SOS Children’s Villages). Table 1 presents an overview of the different versions of the logos and the filler image used in this research. A bigger depiction of the logos can be found in the appendix.
### Table 1. The different versions of the logos (experimental stimuli) used in this study and the different versions of the filler image

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No verbal anchoring</th>
<th>Moderate verbal anchoring (name)</th>
<th>High verbal anchoring (name and slogan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CliniClowns</strong></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="CliniClowns" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="CliniClowns" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="CliniClowns" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOS Children’s Villages</strong></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="SOS Kinderdorpen" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="SOS Kinderdorpen" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="SOS Kinderdorpen" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNICEF</strong></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="UNICEF" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="UNICEF" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="UNICEF" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Filler image</strong></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Filler image" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Filler image" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Filler image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subjects

A total of 148 people filled in the questionnaire. Since this research wanted to focus on the responses of Dutch people to the logos of non-profit organisations and on respondents between 18 and 65 years (the working population), some selections were made. After filtering out those who were over 65 years old, who had negative associations with one or more of the logos, or whose nationality was not Dutch, 115 participants remained (age: $M = 30.04$, $SD = 14.04$, range 18-64; 45.2% female; 22.6% of participants failed to report their age and 21.7% failed to report their gender). It was initially intended to also filter out respondents who had not made a charitable donation in the past five years because research has shown that people who have donated money to charities once are more likely to donate again than those who have not previously donated (Van Der Linden, 2011; Kashif et al., 2015), but this would have resulted in...
too few usable answers. Of all respondents, 60% had made a charitable donation in the past five years (21.7% failed to provide an answer), 24.3% had donated to UNICEF specifically, 11.3% had donated to CliniClowns and 8.7% to SOS Children’s Villages. Of the participants who filled in the first version of the questionnaire, which contained no verbal anchoring, 94.3% said that they recognised UNICEF’s logo, compared to only 31.4% who recognised the logo of CliniClowns and 5.7% who recognised that of SOS Children’s Villages. For the second version of the questionnaire, which contained moderate verbal anchoring, all respondents said that they recognised UNICEF’s logo, compared to 85% who recognised the CliniClowns logo and 45% who recognised the SOS Children’s Villages logo. For the third version of the questionnaire, which contained high verbal anchoring, all respondents again recognised UNICEF’s logo, 85% recognised CliniClowns’ logo, and 47.5% recognised that of SOS Children’s Villages. The majority of participants of this study had either gone to a vocational university (Dutch HBO, 27.8%) or to a university (Dutch WO, 33%); 21.7% of respondents failed to indicate their educational level. The first version of the questionnaire was filled in by 35 participants and the second and third version were each filled in by 40 participants. There was no relation between version of the questionnaire and gender ($\chi^2 (2) = 1.56, p = .459$) or version of the questionnaire and age ($F (2, 86) < 1$). There was a significant relation of medium strength between version of the questionnaire and educational level ($\chi^2 (6) = 14.24, p = .027, \phi_c = 0.28$). The first version of the questionnaire was filled in by relatively more participants who had gone to a vocational university (51.9%) than was the case for the third version (16.7%). This was, however, not further taken into account in the following statistical analyses.

**Design**

As mentioned, there were three versions of the questionnaire. The first version included the logos of all three charities without any verbal anchoring, the second version included all three logos in combination with the respective organisation’s name (moderate verbal anchoring), and the third version included all three logos with the respective organisation’s name and most recent slogan (high verbal anchoring). The study therefore utilised a 3 x 3 mixed design, as all participants saw the logos of all three organisations (within factor), but were only exposed to one level of verbal anchoring (between factor).
Instruments

Participants filled in one of the three versions of the questionnaire, which did not differ from each other in terms of the questions asked, but only contained logos and filler images with different levels of verbal anchoring. The language used in the questionnaire was Dutch. In the first question block of the questionnaire, respondents were shown all three logos one at a time and where asked to indicate for each logo whether they knew the logo (yes/no) and whether they had positive, neutral or negative associations with the logo. This question block was followed by a question about the filler image, where participants were asked to indicate whether they had positive, neutral or negative associations with the image.

In the second question block, all three logos were again shown one at a time and five seven-point semantic differentials (‘good’ – ‘bad’, ‘like’ – ‘dislike’, ‘high quality’ – ‘low quality’, ‘distinctive’ – ‘not distinctive’, ‘interesting’ – ‘uninteresting’) were used to measure logo appreciation for each logo (based on Henderson & Cote, 1998). The same five seven-point semantic differentials were afterwards used for the filler fragment. The reliability of the five items for the three different organisations was on average good (\(\alpha = .81\)). A composite variable for logo appreciation containing those five items was created for each of the organisations, and was used in the statistical analysis.

Perceived core value fit was measured in the third question block with three (UNICEF) or four (CliniClowns, SOS Children’s Villages) 7-point Likert scales respectively introduced by ‘To what extent do you think the following values fit the logo?’ and anchored by ‘not at all – absolutely’. The logos were shown one after another again and for each logo, the core values stated by the respective organisation on its website were presented to the participants and were used to measure core value recognition (based on Van Hooft et al., 2007). Those core values were ‘diversity and inclusion, integrity, commitment’ for UNICEF (UNICEF, 2008), ‘honesty, creativity, professionalism, connectedness’ for CliniClowns (CliniClowns, 2018), and ‘professional, inspired, proactive, collaborative’ for SOS Children’s Villages (SOS Kinderdorpen, 2017). The same question was subsequently asked about the filler image. Four values from Schwartz and Sagie’s (2000) value list, ‘freedom, pleasure, loyalty, enthusiasm’, were randomly chosen to be included in this filler question. The reliability of UNICEF’s core values was acceptable (\(\alpha = .71\)), the reliability of CliniClowns’ core values was good (\(\alpha = .89\)), and the reliability of SOS Children’s Villages’ core values was questionable but still acceptable.
(\(\alpha = .69\)). A composite variable describing the perceived fit between the organisation’s logo and core values was therefore created for each charity for the statistical analysis.

Lastly, intention to donate was measured with two 7-point Likert scales, one introduced by ‘I am willing to donate money to this organisation’ and anchored by ‘untrue – true’, and the other introduced by ‘I will donate money to this organisation’ and anchored by ‘strongly disagree – strongly agree’ (based on Fishbein and Ajzen, 2010, as cited in Hoeken, Hornikx, & Hustinx, 2012). Again, all three logos were shown one after the other. The reliability of the two items for the three different organisations was on average good (\(\alpha = .83\)), and a composite variable for intention to donate was created for each organisation for use in the statistical analysis.

At the end of the questionnaire participants were asked to indicate their age, gender, nationality, and level of education and were asked whether they had donated to any charity in the past five years (yes/no) and whether they had donated to UNICEF, CliniClowns, or SOS Children’s Villages before in particular (yes/no). The complete questionnaire can be found in the appendix.

**Procedure**

This study was conducted in November 2018. In order to find participants, the four researchers approached family members, friends, and acquaintances both personally and via social media such as WhatsApp or Facebook and also shared Facebook posts containing the link to the online Qualtrics questionnaire. Upon clicking the link, participants were directed to a start page where they were informed that they would be taking part in a study designed by four undergraduate students about the logos of non-profit organisations and that their personal data would be processed anonymously and would only be used for the purpose of this study. They were then randomly assigned to one of the three versions of the questionnaire. All participants filled in the questionnaire individually on their laptops or mobile devices. Completing the questionnaire took about five minutes.

**Statistical treatment**

In order to answer the first research question, a two-way univariate analysis of variance with between-subjects and within-subjects factors (repeated measures) was carried out. To interpret the significant interaction effect that was found, a one-way multivariate analysis of
variance, of which the different univariate analyses were used, a two-way univariate analysis of variance with within-subjects factors only, and several Bonferroni post hoc tests were used. For the second research question, a two-way univariate analysis of variance with between-subjects and within-subjects factors (repeated measures) was carried out, as well as a two-way univariate analysis of variance with within-subjects factors only and Bonferroni post hoc tests to interpret the significant interaction effect that was discovered. For the third research question, a two-way univariate analysis of variance with between-subjects and within-subjects factors (repeated measures) and Bonferroni post hoc tests were used. Levene’s test of equality of error variances was not significant for any of the conducted analyses (where relevant) and is therefore not mentioned separately in the reporting of the various statistical tests.

Results

Logo appreciation

The main purpose of this study was to investigate whether verbal anchoring in the logos of non-profit organisations has an effect on logo appreciation, perceived core value fit, and intention to donate. The first research question set out to explore to what extent verbal anchoring in the logos of non-profit organisations influences logo appreciation.

A repeated measures analysis for logo appreciation with level of verbal anchoring as between-subject factor and type of organisation as within-subject factor showed a significant main effect of level of verbal anchoring ($F(2, 98) = 3.13, p = .048$) and a significant main effect of type of organisation ($F(2, 196) = 33.55, p < .001$). These main effects were qualified by a significant interaction effect between level of verbal anchoring and type of organisation ($F(4, 196) = 5.54, p < .001$).

Univariate analyses showed that the difference in logo appreciation between the three levels of verbal anchoring was only found for CliniClowns ($F(2, 98) = 9.87, p < .001$). When there was no verbal anchoring, the CliniClowns logo was appreciated less ($M = 3.27, SD = 1.51$) than when there was moderate verbal anchoring ($p = .001$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 4.40, SD = 1.25$) or when there was high verbal anchoring ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 4.55, SD = 1.05$). There was no difference in logo appreciation for CliniClowns between moderate and high verbal anchoring ($p = 1$, Bonferroni-correction). There was no difference in logo
appreciation between the different levels of verbal anchoring for UNICEF ($F(2,98) = 1.15, p = .320$) and for SOS Children’s Villages ($F(2, 98) < 1$).

The difference in logo appreciation between the three types of organisation was found among all levels of verbal anchoring. When there was no verbal anchoring ($F(1.76, 56.34) = 22.52, p < .001$), UNICEF’s logo ($M = 5.10, SD = 0.97$) was appreciated more than the logo of CliniClowns ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 3.27, SD = 1.51$) and the logo of SOS Children’s Villages ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 4.21, SD = 1.01$), which was in turn appreciated more than the CliniClowns logo ($p = .014$, Bonferroni-correction).

For moderate verbal anchoring ($F(2, 68) = 9.96, p < .001$), UNICEF’s logo ($M = 5.36, SD = 1.03$) was again appreciated more than the logos of CliniClowns ($p = .003$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 4.40, SD = 1.25$) and SOS Children’s Villages ($p = .001$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 4.23, SD = 1.33$). There was no difference in logo appreciation between CliniClowns and SOS Children’s Villages ($p = 1$, Bonferroni-correction).

For high verbal anchoring ($F(2, 64) = 11.24, p < .001$), UNICEF’s logo ($M = 5.00, SD = 1.04$) was appreciated more than the logo of SOS Children’s Villages ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 3.98, SD = 1.21$). There was no difference between the logos of UNICEF and CliniClowns ($p = .057$, Bonferroni-correction), and CliniClowns and SOS Children’s Villages ($p = .079$, Bonferroni-correction). Table 2 displays the means and standard deviations for logo appreciation for each organisation and each level of verbal anchoring.

### Table 2. Means and standard deviations for logo appreciation for each organisation and each level of verbal anchoring (1 = low, 7 = high)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNICEF</th>
<th>CliniClowns</th>
<th>SOS Children’s Villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M (SD)$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$M (SD)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No verbal anchoring</td>
<td>5.10 (0.97)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.27 (1.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate verbal anchoring</td>
<td>5.36 (1.03)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.40 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High verbal anchoring</td>
<td>5.00 (1.04)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.55 (1.05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second research question investigated to what extent verbal anchoring in the logos of non-profit organisations influences the perceived fit between an organisation’s logo and core values. A repeated measures analysis for perceived core value fit with level of verbal anchoring as between-subject factor and type of organisation as within-subject factor showed no significant main effect of level of verbal anchoring ($F(2, 91) = 2.44, p = .093$), but a significant main effect of type of organisation ($F(1.77, 161.31) = 39.34, p < .001$). This main effect was qualified by a significant interaction effect between level of verbal anchoring and type of organisation ($F(3.55, 161.31) = 8.36, p < .001$).

The difference in perceived core value fit between the three types of organisation was found among all levels of verbal anchoring. When there was no verbal anchoring ($F(1.64, 44.25) = 22.17, p < .001$), the perceived core value fit was better for UNICEF ($M = 5.36, SD = 1.00$) compared to CliniClowns ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 3.20, SD = 1.70$) and compared to SOS Children’s Villages ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 4.11, SD = 1.00$). There was no difference in perceived core value fit between CliniClowns and SOS Children’s Villages ($p = .071$, Bonferroni-correction).

For moderate verbal anchoring ($F(2, 66) = 22.45, p < .001$), the perceived core value fit was again better for UNICEF ($M = 5.36, SD = 0.93$) compared to CliniClowns ($p = .003$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 4.54, SD = 1.25$) and compared to SOS Children’s Villages ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 4.12, SD = 1.00$). There was no difference in perceived core value fit between CliniClowns and SOS Children’s Villages ($p = .055$, Bonferroni-correction).

For high verbal anchoring ($F(2, 62) = 4, p = .023$), the perceived core value fit was better for UNICEF ($M = 4.74, SD = 0.99$) than it was for SOS Children’s Villages ($p = .004$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 4.13, SD = 0.87$). There was no difference in perceived core value fit between UNICEF and CliniClowns ($p = .489$, Bonferroni-correction) or between CliniClowns and SOS Children’s Villages ($p = .790$, Bonferroni-correction). The means and standard deviations for perceived core value fit for each organisation and each level of verbal anchoring are presented in Table 3.
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Table 3. Means and standard deviations for perceived core value fit for each organisation and each level of verbal anchoring (1 = low, 7 = high)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNICEF</th>
<th>CliniClowns</th>
<th>SOS Children’s Villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No verbal anchoring</td>
<td>5.36 (1.00)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.20 (1.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate verbal anchoring</td>
<td>5.36 (0.93)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.54 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High verbal anchoring</td>
<td>4.74 (0.99)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.38 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intention to donate

The last research question investigated to what extent verbal anchoring in the logos of non-profit organisations influences people’s intention to donate money to the organisation in question. A repeated measures analysis for intention to donate with level of verbal anchoring as between-subject factor and type of organisation as within-subject factor showed no significant main effect of level of verbal anchoring ($F(2, 87) = 1.27, p = .285$), but a significant main effect of type of organisation ($F(2, 174) = 15.03, p < .001$). The interaction effect between level of verbal anchoring and type of organisation was not statistically significant ($F(4, 174) = 2.29, p = .062$). Intention to donate was significantly higher for UNICEF (total $M = 3.96, SD = 1.62$) than it was for CliniClowns ($p = .019$, Bonferroni-correction; total $M = 3.51, SD = 1.68$) and for SOS Children’s Villages ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-correction; total $M = 3.04, SD = 1.54$). People were also significantly more willing to donate money to CliniClowns than to SOS Children’s Villages ($p = .048$, Bonferroni-correction). Table 4 shows the means and standard deviations for intention to donate for each organisation and each level of verbal anchoring.
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Table 4. Means and standard deviations for intention to donate for each organisation and each level of verbal anchoring (1 = low, 7 = high)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNICEF</th>
<th>CliniClowns</th>
<th>SOS Children’s Villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M \ (SD)$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$M \ (SD)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No verbal anchoring</td>
<td>4.02 (1.77)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.81 (1.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate verbal anchoring</td>
<td>3.97 (1.69)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.88 (1.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High verbal anchoring</td>
<td>3.88 (1.45)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.73 (1.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.96 (1.62)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.51 (1.68)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion and Discussion

This study has investigated to what extent the degree of verbal anchoring in the logos of non-profit organisations has an effect on logo appreciation, perceived core value fit, and intention to donate. The logos of three different charities, CliniClowns, SOS Children’s Villages, and UNICEF, were presented to the participants of the study with three different levels of verbal anchoring (none, moderate, high).

The first research question (logo appreciation) can be answered by saying that whether verbal anchoring has an effect on logo appreciation appears to be dependent on the type of organisation. When verbal anchoring does influence logo appreciation, more verbal anchoring seems to result in higher logo appreciation, though only up to a certain point. In this study, an effect of verbal anchoring on logo appreciation was only found for CliniClowns, where the CliniClowns logos containing moderate (logo and name) and high verbal anchoring (logo, name, and slogan) were both appreciated more than the logo without any verbal anchoring, but did not differ from each other in terms of logo appreciation. For UNICEF and SOS Children’s Villages, no effect of verbal anchoring on logo appreciation was found. Previous studies have found that the logos of unknown brands are considered as more attractive when they consist of both an icon and a brand name, as opposed to only visual elements (Deneçli, 2015; Bresciani & Del Ponte, 2017), and while CliniClowns is by no means an unknown organisation, its logo was recognised by fewer respondents than the UNICEF logo, especially without verbal anchoring. It is therefore
possible that an increased level of verbal anchoring helped more people recognise the CliniClowns logo, which then could have resulted in higher logo appreciation. This possible explanation would also be in line with the findings of Phillips (2000), McQuarrie and Phillips (2005), and Bergkvist et al. (2012), who have discovered that higher levels of verbal anchoring in advertisements (i.e. more complete headlines) generally lead to a better understanding of the ads and make them more effective. While logos and ads cannot directly be compared to each other and while the findings of studies focusing on advertisements cannot be generalised to logos, the results still point in the same direction. Contradicting this, however, would be the fact that there was no effect of verbal anchoring on logo appreciation for the SOS Children’s Villages logo, even though it was recognised by even fewer respondents than the CliniClowns logo.

The results show that the type of organisation had an effect on logo appreciation as well. UNICEF’s logo was appreciated more than the logo of SOS Children’s Villages across all three levels of verbal anchoring, and was also appreciated more than CliniClowns’ logo when there was no or moderate verbal anchoring, but was appreciated equally when there was high verbal anchoring. The logos of CliniClowns and SOS Children’s Villages were appreciated equally, except when there was no verbal anchoring. In that case, the logo of SOS Children’s Villages was appreciated more than the CliniClowns logo. A possible explanation for these findings would be that UNICEF as an organisation is especially well-known and that (almost) all respondents recognised the logo across all levels of verbal anchoring. The logos of CliniClowns and SOS Children’s Villages were not recognised as often as the UNICEF logo, and people might appreciate a logo more when they immediately recognise it and have seen it often. However, this leaves the question why the logos of CliniClowns and SOS Children’s Villages were appreciated equally for moderate and high verbal anchoring, and why the SOS Children’s Villages logo was appreciated more than the CliniClowns logo when no verbal anchoring was present, as the SOS Children’s Villages logo was recognised by way fewer respondents across all levels of verbal anchoring than the CliniClowns logo.

The second research question (perceived core value fit) can be answered by saying that verbal anchoring does not seem to influence the perceived fit between an organisation’s core values and its logo, as no effect of verbal anchoring on the perceived fit between any of the organisations’ logos and core values was found in this study. The two studies known to the author that focused on logos and core value recognition have only explored whether (corporate)
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Logos are successful at conveying a company’s core values, which they are often not (Van Hooft et al., 2007; Das & Van Hooft, 2015), but not on how verbal anchoring affects a logo’s perceived core value fit, so this remains an insufficiently researched area. It might be that text elements such as names and slogans in logos are simply not important to a logo’s ability to convey an organisation’s core values and that visual elements (e.g. colours, shapes) are far more relevant for this purpose. This could be why the degree of verbal anchoring in a logo was not found to have had an effect on the perceived core value fit. More research is therefore needed to explore this topic further and to find out which elements in logos specifically help convey core values and improve the fit between an organisation’s logo and core values.

Unlike the degree of verbal anchoring, the type of organisation did have an effect on the perceived core value fit. The fit between UNICEF’s logo and core values was perceived to be better than was the case for SOS Children’s Villages across all levels of verbal anchoring, and better than was the case for CliniClowns, but only when there was no or moderate verbal anchoring. There was no difference in perceived core value fit between CliniClowns and SOS Children’s Villages across all levels of verbal anchoring. Here, too, it is possible that the degree of familiarity of respondents with the different organisations affected the perceived core value fit. Since most respondents knew UNICEF as an organisation and recognised the logo, it is also possible that they felt the logo matched UNICEF’s core values. The perceived core value fit might also have been better for UNICEF because its logo was generally appreciated more than the other two logos, which could in turn have led to people evaluating the perceived core value fit more positively for UNICEF than for the other organisations. This would also potentially explain why there was no difference in perceived core value fit between CliniClowns and SOS Children’s Villages, as their logos were mostly appreciated – though not recognised – to the same degree.

For the third research question (intention to donate), it can be said that verbal anchoring in logos does not appear to influence people’s intentions to donate to a non-profit organisation, as this study found no effect of verbal anchoring on intention to donate. An earlier study has shown that the design of corporate logos can influence customers’ purchase intentions, which would be the corporate equivalent to charitable giving, both positively and negatively (Fajardo et al., 2016), but the results of the present study appear to not point in the same direction. If there are design elements in the logos of non-profit organisations that can influence people’s intentions
to donate, then, based on the present study, verbal anchoring does not seem to be one of them and future studies would therefore need to examine this further.

The type of organisation, however, was again shown to have an effect. People were more willing to donate money to UNICEF than to CliniClowns or SOS Children’s Villages, and also more willing to donate money to CliniClowns than to SOS Children’s Villages. It is again possible that the degree of familiarity of respondents with the different organisations or the degrees to which the different logos were appreciated influenced the willingness or intention to donate. However, there were also more respondents who indicated that they had donated to UNICEF before (24.3%) than respondents who said they had donated to CliniClowns (11.3%) or to SOS Children’s Villages (8.7%). It might simply be that people are more willing to donate money to an organisation if they have donated to this particular one before, which would explain the differences in intention to donate between the organisations in this study.

In a nutshell, verbal anchoring in the logos of non-profit organisations was only found to have had an effect on logo appreciation for CliniClowns, not for the other two organisations, and no effect on perceived core value fit or intention to donate for any of the organisations. The type of organisation, however, did have an effect on logo appreciation, perceived core value fit, and intention to donate. These findings only partially support Barthes’ (1977) theory, who stated that linguistic elements in advertising images add to the image and guide the viewer’s understanding and interpretation of the image. As mentioned above, advertisements and advertising images are not directly comparable to logos, but the results still point in different directions, since the present study found little evidence for a general effect of text elements in logos.

When interpreting the results, however, one needs to keep in mind that there are a few limitations to this study. Firstly, the logos of only three non-profit organisations were used in the questionnaire, all of which were big, international, and well-known charities. Since the results clearly show that there were differences in logo appreciation, perceived core value fit, and intention to donate between just those three quite similar organisations, and that there were interaction effects between the type of organisation and the level of verbal anchoring, it is very possible that a study using the logos of smaller, lesser known, or even fictitious non-profit organisations would yield different results. The three logos were recognised by respondents to varying degrees, but generally quite often, meaning that many respondents possibly had pre-existing attitudes towards and associations with one or all of the charities used in this research,
which could have influenced the results. Secondly, the respondents who took part in this research were not randomly selected, but were family members, friends, or acquaintances of the four researchers. It was also not possible to filter out respondents who had not donated money to a charity in the past five years. Those people would have been less likely to make a charitable donation than the respondents who had donated in the past five years (Van Der Linden, 2011; Kashif et al., 2015), which could have been an additional factor influencing the answers given to the questions about intention to donate. Lastly, there was a relation between version of the questionnaire and educational level of the participants, with the first version of the questionnaire being filled in by relatively more participants who had gone to a vocational university (51.9%) than was the case for the third version (16.7%). This was not further taken into account in the statistical analyses carried out, but could have theoretically been a factor that influenced the results of this study.

Future research is needed to further explore the influence of verbal anchoring in logos in general, and specifically in the logos of non-profit organisations, on logo appreciation, perceived core value fit, and intention to donate. In this specific study, verbal anchoring was found to have had an effect only on logo appreciation and only for the CliniClowns logo, while the type of organisation was found to have influenced logo appreciation, perceived core value fit, and intention to donate, even though similar organisations with similar logos were chosen for this research. Given that the type of organisation seems to play a significant role, it would be interesting to examine for which types of logos and organisations specifically verbal anchoring can have an effect on logo appreciation, and possibly also on perceived core value fit and intention to donate. Future research should therefore incorporate the logos of more than three (non-profit) organisations, and also of either smaller and lesser known or entirely fictitious organisations. It would also be interesting to compare different types of well-known charities, for example charities that focus on helping humans and charities that focus on animals or the environment, to investigate whether differences occur. Very much in general, more research is needed into the various design elements contained in logos (e.g. verbal anchoring, colour, shapes) and their effects on logo appreciation, perceived core value fit, and intention to donate. It would be useful for non-profit organisations to know which design elements specifically make a logo more effective by increasing logo appreciation or intention to donate, for example. Finally,
future studies should randomly select their participants and should make sure that respondents with different characteristics are evenly distributed across different experimental conditions.

All in all, this study has demonstrated a strong need for more research where the effects of verbal anchoring in logos (of non-profit organisations) are concerned. Based on this study, little practical advice can be given to non-profit organisations regarding effective logo design, as verbal anchoring in logos does not seem to have the same effect for every non-profit organisation and every type of logo, though it can be said that adding an organisation’s name to its logo does not seem to have any negative consequences and might be beneficial. Future research is needed to add to the existing theories about verbal anchoring and logo design, and to make it possible to identify the specific design elements in logos that influence dependent variables such as logo appreciation, perceived core value fit, and intention to donate.
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Appendix

Logos used

CliniClowns

SOS Children’s Villages

UNICEF

Filler image
Complete Questionnaire (Dutch)

Please note: The first version of the questionnaire (no verbal anchoring in the logos and the filler image) is shown here. The other two questionnaire versions are identical as far as the questions are concerned, only the logos and filler images used vary (see above for the different logos and filler images used for each level of verbal anchoring).

_______________________________________________________________

Beste deelnemer,

Deelname aan dit onderzoek is volledig anoniem en uw gegevens zullen uitsluitend worden gebruikt voor dit onderzoek. U heeft de mogelijkheid om te allen tijde te stoppen met het onderzoek. Om deel te nemen aan dit onderzoek dient u minstens 18 jaar oud te zijn.

U krijgt nu een aantal logo's te zien en vervolgens worden hier enkele vragen over gesteld. Het invullen van de vragenlijst duurt ongeveer 5 minuten.

Hartelijk bedankt voor uw deelname!
First question block

In this question block, all three logos were shown and the following questions were asked about each logo before the next logo was displayed:

Q Ben je bekend met dit logo?
   - Ja (1)
   - Nee (2)

Q Welke associaties heb je met dit logo?
   - Positief (1)
   - Neutraal (2)
   - Negatief (3)
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Q Welke associaties heb je met dit logo?
   - Positief (1)
   - Neutraal (2)
   - Negatief (3)

Q Ben je bekend met dit logo?
   - Ja (1)
   - Nee (2)

Q Welke associaties heb je met dit logo?
   - Positief (1)
   - Neutraal (2)
   - Negatief (3)
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Filler

Q Welke associaties heb je met dit logo?

○ Positief (1)
○ Neutraal (2)
○ Negatief (3)

Second question block (shortened version)

In this block, all three logos were shown and the following question was asked about each logo before the next logo was displayed. The same question was then asked about the filler image.

Q Wat vind je van dit logo?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (1)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>7 (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slecht</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vind ik leuk</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lage kwaliteit</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenmerkend</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niet interessant</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Third question block

In this question block, all three logos were shown and a question about each organisation’s core values was asked for each logo before the next logo was displayed.

Q In hoeverre vind je de volgende waarden passen bij dit logo?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Helemaal niet (1)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>Helemaal wel (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversiteit en Inclusiviteit</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integriteit</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betrokkenheid</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q In hoeverre vind je de volgende waarden passen bij dit logo?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waarde</th>
<th>1 (Helemaal niet)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>7 (Helemaal wel)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eerlijkheid</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativiteit</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionaliteit</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbondenheid</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q In hoeverre vind je de volgende waarden passen bij dit logo?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waarde</th>
<th>1 (Helemaal niet)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>7 (Helemaal wel)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionaliteit</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bevlogen</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ondernemendheid</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samenwerking</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Filler**

In hoeverre vind je de volgende waarden passen bij dit logo?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Helemaal niet (1)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>Helemaal wel (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vrijheid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plezier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyaliteit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthousiasme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fourth question block (shortened version)

In this question block, all three logos were shown and the following two questions were asked about each logo before the next logo was displayed.

Q Ik ben bereid om geld te doneren aan deze organisatie.
Onwaar (1)  2  3  Neutraal (4)  5  6  Waar (7)

Q Ik ga geld doneren aan deze organisatie.
Zeer mee oneens (1)  2  3  Neutraal (4)  5  6  Zeer mee eens (7)

Personal Information

At the end of the questionnaire, respondents were asked about their personal information.

Q Wat is je leeftijd?

Q Wat is je geslacht?
  • Man
  • Vrouw
  • Anders

Q Wat is je nationaliteit?
  • Nederlands
  • Anders, namelijk: ________
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Q Wat is je hoogstgenoten opleiding?

- Basisonderwijs
- Voortgezet Onderwijs
- MBO
- HBO
- Universiteit

Q Heb je in de afgelopen 5 jaar gedoneerd aan een goed doel?

- Ja
- Nee

Q Ik heb al eerder gedoneerd aan ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ja (1)</th>
<th>Nee (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unicef</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CliniClowns</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS Kinderdorpen</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>