

Bachelor's thesis 2019-2020

Verbal anchoring in non-profit organisation's logos: a start of a better world?

*A study on the response of (potential) Dutch and French donors on
verbal anchoring in the logos of non-profit organisations and the
differences between those cultures.*

Radboud University Nijmegen
Faculty of Arts
Director: Dr. A. van Hooft
Evaluator: Dr. L. Speed
Date: 24 January 2020
Words: 7423 (including tables)

Radboud University



1. Abstract

This research intended to measure the effects of the level of verbal anchoring in logos on the perception and response of potential donors of non-profit organisations. This was measured while comparing two countries: The Netherlands and France. In total, 203 participants took part in the online questionnaire. Three versions (no verbal anchoring, incomplete verbal anchoring, complete verbal anchoring) of the logos of *Unicef*, *Red Cross* and *Doctors without Borders* were used to measure the recognition of the logo, logo attitude, perceived fit between the organisation's core values and the logos, and the intention to donate for the cause. The results show that no significant differences in high/low context culture were found and that recognition and perceived fit between core values and logos were highest for logos with brand name and slogan. This version scored best as well for intention to donate, but only for the French nationality. However, there are also some limitations, such as inconsistent logo design for the two countries. In conclusion, marketers should hold into account the level of verbal anchoring in the logo of a non-profit organisation to receive more donations, but there are of course more factors to be researched that can influence this.

Keywords: logos, recognition, attitude, intention to donate, core values, non-profit organisations, verbal anchoring

2. Introduction

Present-day, living in a society with large amounts of information disposable at any given time, it becomes harder for non-profit organisations to distinguish themselves from their competitors in the mind of consumers. Corporate Identity Management (CIM) is one way to distinguish an organisation in the minds of consumers. A corporate identity is an organisation's desired image; the communication about an organisation to her stakeholders. CIM manages this image by communicating consistent behaviour and implementing or maintaining visual systems (Simões, Dibb & Fisk, 2005, p. 153). Three of the components of corporate identity are the organisation's name, the slogan and the logo, also referred to as 'organisational symbolism' (Dandridge, Mitroff & Joyce, 1980). The logo is particularly very important for non-profit organisations. Next to the fact that it is seen as the root and the main element of the corporate (visual) identity (Balmer, as cited in Foroudi, 2017, p. 7), it is also the case that the intangible nature of a non-profit organisation's offerings make a strong logo indispensable for service organisations (Berry, as cited in César Machado, Vacas-de-Carvalho, Costa & Lencastre, 2012, p. 2). However, while building a strong logo is essential to a non-profit organisation and its identity, not much research has been done on this topic.

It was chosen to research this in the context of non-profit organisations, because this type of organisations currently need all the help they can get to raise more money for charity. This is shown by an annually decreasing number of donors around the world. Even the donating scores of the 20 western countries who donate most bounce back (Charities Aid Foundation, 2018). Kashif, Sarifuddin & Hassan (2015) demonstrate this struggle for non-profit organisations. There is a tough competition, demanding customers, a lack of trust and a lack of marketing experts in this sector.

A possible solution for this problem could be adding verbal anchoring in the logos of non-profit organisations since verbal anchoring improves the comprehension of the logo. This comprehension, in turn, improves the attitude towards the logo (Phillips, 2000). The positive attitude towards the logo can, ultimately, account for a higher purchase intention and possibly a higher intention to donate (Jun, Cho & Kwon, as cited in Bresciani & Del Ponte, 2017).

Despite possibly being the saving factor for this type of organisation, no research has yet investigated whether the use of verbal anchoring in logos is effective

for a non-profit organisation. This study intends to fill this research gap through an online experiment which focuses on the effects of verbal anchoring in the logos of three international non-profit organisations (*Doctors without Borders*, *Red Cross* and *Unicef*) on logo recognition, attitude towards the brand, perceived fit between the core values and the logo, and the intention to donate for the cause.

However, if adding a verbal component were a suitable solution to the lack of donors, would it be possible to standardise the chosen logo internationally or would different cultures need a different approach in order to raise more money for charity?

Hall (1976) already noted that the meaning created by context, i.e. 'the information surrounding an event', depend on one's culture. He stated that cultures can be compared on a continuous scale, ranging from a low (LC) to a high context culture (HC). HC/LC communication style is one of the many cultural dimensions by which culture can be conceptualised. A low context culture is a one with an explicit and direct communication style, in that the mass of the information is embedded in the message, while individuals from a high context culture communicate implicitly and indirectly, i.e. most of the information in a message is unsaid. In the current study, two different cultures will be compared: the Netherlands, a northern European country with a low context culture, and France, a Mediterranean country with a high context culture (Hall, 1976). Since high context cultures mostly pay attention to nonverbal cues instead of spoken words, it was expected that French participants will prefer logos without verbal anchoring, while for the Dutch participants with their direct and explicit communication style, it was expected that they prefer logos with (moderate) verbal anchoring.

Functions of logos

Logos of non-profit organisations fulfil multiple functions. For example, there is evidence that a logo provides recognisability (Gray & Balmer, 2000) and that it increases the familiarity with an organisation (Henderson & Cote, 1998). According to Zajonc (1968), people tend to prefer things that are familiar to them (mere-exposure effect), so this increase in familiarity is very useful for people's preference for non-profit organisations. Also, familiarity can create a positive image of, for example, a non-profit organisation in the minds of consumers (Olins, 1990) since familiar information is

easier to process. This ease leads to a feeling of liking (Pandelaere, Millet & Van den Bergh, as cited in Torres, Machado, Vacas de Carvalho, Velden, van de & Costa, 2019). As stated before, this feeling of liking can in turn lead to a higher purchase intention and possibly a higher intention to donate (Jun et al., as cited in Bresciani & Del Ponte, 2017). The forming of a (positive) attitude is thus an important factor to hold into account for this research.

Besides the function of recognition and the establishment of attitudes, logos have another important function. According to Olins (1990), they can communicate the core values of an organisation, and they provide identification and affinity with the organisation (p. 9). It is unquestionably important to convey these core values since they are 'the crucial element of identity', because they can determine behaviour (Simões et al., 2005, p. 163). However, van Hooft, Wiskerke and Brink (2007) already demonstrated with their experiment in which the logos of Texaco, McDonald's and Chanel were used, that the recognition of the logos was not the problem, but that the logos failed to communicate the actual core values of the companies. The participants did not recognise the values the organisations wanted to express, not even when they could choose from a list of values. From the organisation's point of view, it may not be effective if consumers do not understand the meaning of the logo or create a meaning that is undesired themselves (Ward & Gaidis, as cited in Phillips, 2000). So the question arises if the use of verbal anchoring improves the recognition of the actual core values of a non-profit organisation, which the current research attempts to give an answer to.

Theoretical framework

Visual elements and verbal anchoring

Barthes (1964) was the first to write about the relationship between words ('anchorage') and images. He states that a visual symbol can have multiple interpretations and does not necessarily have a meaning on its own, but that its meaning can be given by the context in which the visual is placed or is present. This means that verbal anchoring can be explained as a written text which helps to

understand and describe what we see better as it leads the reader in a certain direction. This might be needed in a logo, for that a brand name and/or slogan might be able to explain better what the logo represents and what its intended meaning is. Recognition of a logo could arguably thus be facilitated by a certain level of verbal anchoring. Verbal anchoring possibly also guides the consumer into finding the intended core values of the organisation in the logo, because verbal cues reduce the amount of elaboration required to interpret it by providing a link to stored knowledge (Barthes, 1964; Alba & Hutchinson, 1987). Kardes (as cited in Phillips, 2000) confirms this by noting that the probability of understanding the intended meaning increases when the amount of effort required to interpret a message decreases. Therefore, comprehension of images and visual messages may be facilitated by verbal anchoring.

However, a limited amount of studies focusses on the relationship between verbal anchoring and logos and the effects of this relation. The findings and limitations of the studies that did research this relationship, will be discussed below.

Studies on the effect of the use of verbal anchoring

Bergkvist, Eiderbäck and Palombo (2012) realised a study with 136 Swedish students about the completeness of the headline in an unknown English advertisement and found that more positive brand communication effects were found with a complete headline than with an incomplete or no headline. There was no significant effect of the level of verbal anchoring on attitude towards the ad, but there was on comprehension, beliefs about the brand and attitude towards the brand. Phillips (2000) confirmed this with his study, which demonstrated that the comprehension of an advertisement increases with some level of verbal anchoring. Comprehension, in turn, increased the attitude towards the ad.

Above mentioned studies state that some level of verbal anchoring accompanying a visual metaphor provokes more positive responses among consumers than a visual metaphor on its own. However, these studies were conducted in an advertising context. These results cannot be generalised to logos, because advertisements only have one message, the unique selling point, while a logo tries to communicate multiple messages, namely the core values of an organisation (Olins, 1989). Therefore, more research is needed for verbal anchoring in logos.

Park, Eisingerich, Pol and Park (2013) are some of the researchers who did a study about logos. They indicated that logos in combination with a brand name offer more brand benefits than just brand names alone. However, this study did not investigate the option of a visual symbol alone, so it cannot be said whether this option would bring across even more brand benefits. Bresciani and Del Ponte (2017) showed that a visual symbol as a logo alone is less attractive than logos composed of a visual image with a brand name. Deneçli (2015) supplemented this with the finding that logos with a brand name have an advantage for an unknown brand in terms of brand preference to logos without a brand name.

In sum, most studies about verbal anchoring in logos indicate that it would be better for the attitude towards the logo to use verbal anchoring in a logo. However, none of the studies above focused on attitudes towards logos of non-profit organisations. The outcomes of the above-mentioned studies in which the focus lies on corporate organisations that have as goal to make profit, cannot be generalised to organisations that focus on intangible services which are fed by donations.

Cross-cultural differences

An important question for internationally active non-profit organisations is whether to use the strategy of standardising and using the same logo in each country they operate in, or to adapt it to the culture in question. Some researchers state that a cultural approach would not be necessary, for example because logos can transcend language barriers by communicating visually (Kohli & Suri, 2002).

However, Madden, Hewett and Roth (as cited in Torres et al. 2019) state that "it is critical for multinational companies to consider cultural differences when developing single brand strategies with an international appeal" (Madden et al., as cited in Torres et al., 2019, p. 317). Kashif et al. (2015) also state that culture probably influences the intention to donate. This is why the cultural approach should be kept in mind; the knowledge that an individual uses for laying connections in any branding activity comes from the culture in which they live (McQuarrie & Mick, 1999). Their meanings are formed by their cultural framework. This was already stated by Eco (1979), who noted that there are no pure icons with fixed meanings, but that everything is understood

from someone's cultural context. This could mean that people from different cultures interpret logos differently, depending on the type of culture they live in. Another example of cross-cultural differences is from Torres et al. (2019). They found that the responses of consumers to different types of natural logo designs depend on cultural dimensions, and that positive effects of organic logo designs are higher in countries that score high on the uncertainty avoidance dimension of Hofstede (1980).

Even though it is of such importance to consider different cultures when researching internationally active organisations these days, only a few studies about logos include a cross-cultural aspect and the ones that do, do not focus on the differences between cultures with regard to the effects of verbal anchoring in logos.

Because of the lack of cross-cultural research about the effect of the use of verbal anchoring in logos, the aim of the current study is finding out whether there is a difference between consumers of a high-context culture like France and consumers of a low-context culture like the Netherlands in terms of preference for logos with (moderate) or without verbal anchoring. By means of these results, it can be argued whether a strategy of adaptation is needed or not.

The main research question will be:

To what extent does the level of verbal anchoring in logos of non-profit organisations influence the perception and response of (potential) donors, and how does this vary between Dutch and French donors?

An answer will be given to this research question by means of 4 sub-questions:

RQ1: To what extent does the level of verbal anchoring in logos of non-profit organisations influence logo recognition, and how does this vary between Dutch and French donors?

RQ2: To what extent does the level of verbal anchoring in logos of non-profit organisations influence the perceived fit between organisation's core values and logos, and how does this vary between Dutch and French donors?

RQ3: To what extent does the level of verbal anchoring in logos of non-profit organisations influence logo appreciation, and how does this vary between Dutch and French donors?

RQ4: To what extent does the level of verbal anchoring in logos of non-profit organisations influence the intention to donate, and how does this vary between Dutch and French donors?

3. Method

3.1 Materials

The independent experimental variable in this study is the level of verbal anchoring (nominal measurement level). The level of verbal anchoring has been operationalised in three conditions: the logo as a visual image only (no verbal anchoring), the logo with the non-profit organisation's name (incomplete verbal anchoring), and the logo with the name of the non-profit organisation and a slogan (complete verbal anchoring). The visual image is a consistent factor as it stays the same for every version.

The logos for the experiment are of 3 different international non-profit organisations, operating in both the Netherlands and France. Selection criteria for the non-profit organisations were that their logos have both a Dutch and a French name of the organisation (if translatable), and a separate icon as logo so that only the slogan had to be manipulated for the complete verbal anchoring version. The organisations had to have a Dutch and a French slogan. Another criterion is that the core values of the non-profit organisations had to be mentioned on their website.

It was chosen to use known companies for this study, with the reason that the slogans did not have to be created. With known companies, the existing slogans could be used to ensure ecological validity. Also, it was expected that known logos can be used without problems since past experiences of non-profit organisations would probably not weigh as much in the level of appreciation of a brand as it does with other companies which goal is to make profit. It was not of importance for this study which type of design (color, typeface, shape, etc.) the logos had. Although it was not possible to completely control for previous judgments on part of the participants, no organisations with recent scandals could be used since this would arguably have a negative effect on the appreciation of an organisation. The non-profit organisations should be in a general, non-provocative sector (e.g. no religion or politics). The logos of *Unicef* (www.unicef.org), *Red Cross* (www.rodekruis.nl/en/) and *Doctors without Borders* (www.artsenzondergrenzen.nl) met these demands and were used as stimuli.

Three versions were created for each organisation's logo (no verbal anchoring, incomplete verbal anchoring, complete verbal anchoring), which was done for both the French and the Dutch logos of the organisations (see tables 1 and 2). This resulted in

6 different versions. The 3 logo versions for *Unicef* could be found online. The current slogans for *Red Cross* and *Doctors without Borders* were asked via the organisations' Facebook and put in the versions for complete verbal anchoring manually. The Dutch slogan was translated to French for *Doctors without Borders*. Unfortunately, the original Dutch and French logo designs of *Red Cross* and *Doctors without Borders* were not alike, but they were still used in the experiment.

Table 1. The logos of *Unicef*, *Red Cross* and *Doctors without Borders* for the three versions of the Dutch questionnaire



















	Unicef	Red Cross	Doctors without Borders
No verbal Anchoring			
Incomplete verbal anchoring			
Complete verbal anchoring			

Table 2. The logos of *Unicef*, *Red Cross* and *Doctors without Borders* for the three versions of the French questionnaire

	Unicef	Red Cross	Doctors without Borders
No verbal anchoring			
Incomplete verbal anchoring			
Complete verbal anchoring			

3.2 Subjects

There were no specific selection criteria to let the participants take part in the study. To make the target group most easily reachable for the researchers, the only criterion was that the participants were students, so from the ages 18 to 35. This means that an amount of 250 participants took part voluntarily, of which 47 did not finish the questionnaire. Of the 203 who did finish it, there were 8 who did not fill all the demographic questions. However, since they did complete the rest of the questions, they are included in the analysis. Of these 203 final participants, there were 69 men (34%) and 126 women (62,1%).

107 of the participants were French (52,7%) and 96 were Dutch (47,3%). Of the French participants, 34 were men (31,8%) and 68 were women (63,5%). 5 did not mention their gender (4,7%). For the Dutch group, there were 35 men (36,5%) and 58 women (60,4%). 3 did not mention their gender (3,1%). A Chi-square test showed no significant relation between gender and nationality ($X^2(1) = .39, p = .530$). Men and women are equally distributed in the nationalities.

The mean of the participants' ages is 21,46 years old, the median is 21 and the standard deviation is 2,77. A one-way analysis of variance showed a significant effect of age on nationality ($F(1, 188) = 4.84, p = .029$). The age of Dutch participants ($M = 21.93, SD = 2.79$) was higher than of French participants ($M = 21.05, SD = 2.75$). The participants' ages are not equally distributed per nationality. However, the groups are still comparable since it concerns an irrelevant difference in means of 0.88 years. A one-way analysis of variance showed no significant effect of age on condition ($F(2, 187) < 1$). The participants' ages were equally spread in the three versions of logos ($p = 1.000$, Bonferroni correction).

Furthermore, of the 195 participants who filled in the question about their level of education, the largest group filled in university as education level (40,9%). However, a Chi-square test showed no significant relationship between education and condition ($X^2(8) = 8.07, p = 4.27$). The five different levels of education are equally distributed in the three conditions.

Another Chi-square test showed a significant relation between education and nationality ($X^2(4) = 49.53, p < .001$). This means that the level of education was not equally distributed in the two nationalities. Most of the Dutch participants had 'university (bachelor)' as their level of education (61,3%), as did the French participants (59,8%). This is not a problem since the target group was students.

In addition, 61 of all participants (30%) took part in the version without verbal anchoring in the logos of the non-profit organisations, 74 in the version with incomplete verbal anchoring (36,5%) and 68 in the version with complete verbal anchoring (33,5%). For the version without verbal anchoring, 32 participants were Dutch (52,5%) and 29 were French (47,5%). 31 Dutch participants (41,9%) took part in the version with incomplete verbal anchoring, while for the French participants this number was 43 (58,1%). The last version, the one with complete verbal anchoring, consisted of 33 Dutch (48,5%) and 35 French participants (51,5%). A Chi-square test showed no significant relation between condition and nationality ($X^2(2) = 1.56, p = .458$). The two nationalities are equally distributed in the three conditions.

For the version without verbal anchoring, 19 participants indicated to be male (31,1%), 40 answered to be female (65,6%) and 2 did not answer this question (3,3%). The version with incomplete verbal anchoring consisted of 28 males (37,8%), 42 females (56,8%) and 4 did not answer this question (5,4%). The version with complete

verbal anchoring in the logos consisted of 22 males (32,4%), 44 females (64,7%) and 2 did not answer this question (2,9%). A Chi-square test showed no significant relation between gender and condition ($\chi^2(2) = 1.04, p = .596$). Men and women are equally distributed in the three conditions.

In conclusion, all the participants are equally distributed in the groups, which means that the groups are comparable.

3.3 Design

The design of the experiment in question was a between-subjects design since the participants only saw one of the three versions of the three organisations' logos (no verbal anchoring, incomplete verbal anchoring or complete verbal anchoring). It was a 3 (level of verbal anchoring) x 2 (culture/nationality) design.

3.4 Instruments

The first dependent variable is the recognition of the logo (nominal measurement level), which was measured by one yes/no question about whether they recognised the logo.

The second dependent variable is the attitude towards the logo (ordinal measurement level), which was tested with the use of five seven-point semantic differential scales like in the research of Phillips (2000), with the question "Wat vind je van dit logo?" (What do you think of this logo?) with possible answers such as 'niet leuk / leuk' (not nice / nice) and 'niet onderscheidend / onderscheidend' (not differentiating / differentiating). The reliability of 'attitude towards the logo' comprising 5 items was good: $\alpha = .87$ (*Unicef*), $\alpha = .85$ (*Red Cross*) and $\alpha = .89$ (*Doctors without Borders*). Consequently, the mean of all five items was used to calculate the compound variable attitude towards the logo, which was used in further analyses.

The third dependent variable for this research is the perceived fit between the core values and the logo (nominal measurement level), for which a part of the research of van Hooft et al. (2007) was taken as an example. The participants first had to name the associations they had with the logos to see whether they spontaneously attached certain core values to the logos, which was an open question. Afterward, they assessed the fit between the actual core values of the organisations and the logos by means of one seven-point Likert scale with the question "In hoeverre vind je onderstaande kernwaarden passen bij dit logo?" (To what extent do you think these

core values fit with this logo?), without them knowing that these were the actual core values. The 5 actual core values of *Unicef* were: 'care', 'respect', 'integrity', 'trust' and 'accountability' (Unicef, n.d.). The 7 actual core values of the *Red Cross* were: 'humanity', 'impartiality', 'neutrality', 'independence', 'voluntary service', 'unity', and 'universality'. (Rode Kruis, n.d.). The 3 actual core values of *Doctors Without Borders* were: 'independent', 'neutral', and 'impartial' (Doctors without Borders, n.d.). The reliability of perceived fit between the core values and the organisation's logo comprising 5 (*Unicef*) / 7 (*Red Cross*) / 3 (*Doctors without Borders*) items was good: $\alpha = .84$ (*Unicef*), $\alpha = .85$ (*Red Cross*) and $\alpha = .89$ (*Doctors without Borders*). Consequently, the mean of all items was used to calculate the compound variable perceived fit between core values and logos, which was used in further analyses.

The fourth and last dependent variable that this research included is the intention to donate for the cause (ordinal measurement level). For this variable, an adapted version of the questionnaire of Kashif et al. (2015) was used. One item with a 7-point Likert scale (strongly agree - strongly disagree) was used for the statement 'Ik ben bereid om geld te doneren aan deze non-profit organisatie' (I am prepared to donate money to this organisation).

The context variable is culture (nominal measurement level). For the present study, an adapted version of the scale of Richardson and Smith (2007) was used to assess the cultures of the Dutch and French participants; specifically, the level of LC/HC communication style was looked into. The scale consisted of 9 questions that had to be answered on a 7-point Likert scale, according to how much the participants (dis)agreed with the statements. The scale ascended from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The reliability of 'high-low context culture' comprising 9 items was not acceptable: $\alpha = .63$. Consequently, one item was not included in the calculation (item 1). The reliability of 'high-low context culture' comprising 8 items was not acceptable: $\alpha = .67$. However, according to Briggs and Cheek (1986), a Cronbach's alpha lower than .70 may be accepted when the inter-item correlation is between .20 and .40. The inter-item correlation for culture was .201, so in this case, the Cronbach's alpha is acceptable: $\alpha = .67$.

An independent samples t-test showed no significant difference between Dutch and French participants with regard to high-low context culture ($t(191) = .45, p = .651$). Dutch participants ($M = 4.38, SD = .75$) were shown to have relatively the same high/low context culture as French participants ($M = 4.43, SD = .84$) (see table 3). This means that culture cannot be an explanation for the possible differences in results between the Dutch and French group of participants. From now on, these two groups will thus not be discussed in terms of the variable culture, but in terms of 'nationality'.

Table 3. Amount of participants, mean and standard deviation for the context variable Culture for the Dutch and French group of participants

	Nationality	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
QHL	Dutch	93	4.38	.75
	French	100	4.43	.84

At the end of the questionnaire, some demographic questions about the participant were asked.

The questionnaires (see appendix) were in the participants' native language (Dutch or French) to control for any misunderstandings of questions. The Dutch questionnaire was translated to French by one of the researchers and checked by a French native speaker.

3.5 Procedure

Since this study used an online questionnaire in Qualtrics for the experiment, the study took place entirely online. This study was conducted in November/December 2019. The participants were recruited in the close circles of the researchers. To get a sufficient amount of participants, the technique of snowball sampling was used in which existing participants recruited new individuals from their network. At the beginning of the experiment, participants read specific instructions about the research and that they had all the time they needed to fill in the questionnaire, and that there were no wrong answers. They were notified that the experiment was done completely anonymously and that their data would not be used for purposes other than the investigation. They

were informed that they were able to withdraw from the experiment at any point. The questionnaire consisted of the logos of the three non-profit organisations, followed by the questions about the logos. Each participant was randomly assigned to one version of the three logos. This was the same version for each logo (only visual images, only visual images with brand names, or only visual images with brand names and slogans). The participants did not get any form of reward, except for a 'thank you' from the researchers. They were not debriefed after the experiment. This questionnaire took on average 11 minutes and 38 seconds and was done individually.

3.6 Statistical treatment

To answer the research question, several tests were used to answer the main research question. Two-way ANOVAs were used for the dependent variables intention to donate, perceived fit between core values and logos, and attitude towards the logo. However, for recognition this was not possible because Levene's test was significant, so a Chi-square was done for recognition of the logo. Furthermore, an independent samples T-test was used to measure the difference between Dutch and French participants in terms of high-low context cultures. All data was processed in SPSS.

4. Results

4.1 Recognition

For the dependent variable recognition, two Chi-square tests have been done: one for the Dutch participants and one for the French (see table 4).

A Chi-square test for Dutch participants showed a significant relationship between condition and recognition of logos ($X^2(4) = 10.21, p = .037$). Dutch participants who took part in the version with complete verbal anchoring (75,8%) recognised more often all three of the logos than participants who took part in the version without verbal anchoring (43,8%). The version with incomplete verbal anchoring (67,7%) did not have a significant relation with the other two versions.

A Chi-square test for French participants showed a significant relation between condition and recognition of logos ($X^2(4) = 20.87, p < .001$). French participants who took part in the versions with incomplete (88,4%) or complete verbal anchoring (74,3%) recognised more often all three of the logos than French participants who took part in the version without verbal anchoring (41,4%).

Table 4. Amount of participants, mean and standard deviation for the dependent variable Recognition for the Dutch and French group of participants

		Level of verbal anchoring		
		No	Incomplete	Complete
Mean	Dutch	1.19	1.12	1.08
	French	1.26	1.05	1.10
Std. Deviation	Dutch	.17	.18	.15
	French	.26	.16	.17
Number of Participants	Dutch	32	31	33
	French	29	43	35

4.2 Attitude towards the logo

A two-way analysis of variance with condition (condition) and nationality (Natio_Q) as factors showed no significant main effect of condition ($F(2, 197) < 1$) or nationality ($F(1, 197) = 1.24, p = .268$) on attitude towards the logo (see table 5). The interaction effect between condition and nationality was not statistically significant ($F(2, 197) = 1.17, p = .312$).

Table 5. Amount of participants, mean and standard deviation for the dependent variable attitude towards the logo for the Dutch and French group of participants

Condition	Natio_Q	Mean	Std. Deviation	Number of participants
No verbal anchoring	Dutch	4.97	.66	32
	French	4.84	.97	29
Incomplete verbal anchoring	Dutch	4.68	.92	31
	French	4.95	.95	43
Complete verbal anchoring	Dutch	4.83	.67	33
	French	5.08	.76	35

Attitude was measured on a 7-point scale. The higher the mean, the higher the attitude.

4.3 Perceived fit between core values and logos

A random sample of 10 percent of all answers to the open associations question was taken by two assessors to see if the respondents associated the logo with the actual core values of the organisation themselves. The result of this sample was that no participant had written down an association that corresponded to the actual core values of the organisation. This applied to all conditions.

A two-way analysis of variance with condition (condition) and nationality (Natio_Q) as factors showed a significant main effect of condition on the perceived fit between core values and logos ($F(2, 197) = 5.57, p = .004$). Participants who were shown logos with complete verbal anchoring ($M = 5.42, SD = 0.69$) were shown to perceive a higher fit between core values and logos than participants who were shown logos with incomplete verbal anchoring ($M = 4.93, SD = 1.00$) (see table 6). Nationality was not found to have a significant main effect on the perceived fit between core values and logos ($F(1, 197) < 1$). The interaction effect between condition and nationality was not statistically significant ($F(2, 197) < 1$).

Table 6. Amount of participants, mean and standard deviation for the dependent variable Perceived Fit between Core Values and Logos for the Dutch and French group of participants

Condition	Natio_Q	Mean	Std. Deviation	Number of participants
No verbal anchoring	Dutch	5.32	.62	32
	French	5.14	1.15	29
Incomplete verbal anchoring	Dutch	4.93	.76	31
	French	4.93	1.15	43
Complete verbal anchoring	Dutch	5.36	.67	33
	French	5.48	.72	35

Perceived fit between core values and logos was measured on a 7-point scale. The higher the mean, the higher the perceived fit.

4.4 Intention to donate

A two-way analysis of variance with condition (condition) and nationality (Natio_Q) as factors showed no significant main effect of condition ($F(2, 197) = 1.54, p = .218$) or nationality ($F(1, 197) = 2.13, p = .146$) on intention to donate. The interaction effect between condition and nationality was statistically significant ($F(2, 197) = 4.35, p =$

0.14). A follow-up one-way univariate analysis of variance showed a significant effect of condition on intention to donate for French participants ($F(2, 104) = 4.87, p = .010$), but not for the Dutch participants ($F(2, 93) < 1$). French participants who took part in the version with complete verbal anchoring ($M = 4.65, SD = 1.37$) had a higher intention to donate than French participants who took part in the version without verbal anchoring ($M = 3.57, SD = 1.41$) (see table 7).

Table 7. Amount of participants, mean and standard deviation for the dependent variable Attitude towards the Logo for the Dutch and French group of participants

Condition	Natio_Q	Mean	Std. Deviation	Number of participants
No verbal anchoring	Dutch	4.57	1.10	32
	French	3.57	1.41	29
Incomplete verbal anchoring	Dutch	4.38	1.23	31
	French	4.22	1.35	43
Complete verbal anchoring	Dutch	4.30	1.29	33
	French	4.65	1.37	35

Attitude towards the Logo was measured on a 7-point scale. The higher the mean, the higher the perceived fit.

5. Conclusion and Discussion

The current experiment intended to research the effect of (the level of) verbal anchoring in logos of non-profit organisations (*Unicef*, *Red Cross* and *Doctors without Borders*) on the perception and response of potential donors. This effect was researched by means of four sub-questions about the recognition of the logo, attitude towards the logo, perceived fit between core values and logos, and intention to donate. The results were compared for Dutch and French participants, by means of a high/low context culture scale. Hall (1976) already stated that the Netherlands would have a low context culture, while France would have a high context culture. However, unlike expected, results show that Dutch and French participants do not differ in terms of high or low context culture. One explanation for that no differences were found, could be that the high-low context culture variable is meant by Hall (1976) as a continuous scale, while the two countries in this experiment were labelled as two extremes. Another possibility is that it is due to the globalisation; people, especially younger individuals like in the current experiment, learn different languages and they travel all around the world, so the borders of the different cultures may be fading slowly for this younger generation. Nonetheless, this means culture cannot be the (main) explanation for the difference in results for this research, which is why the two countries and their differences in this research must be approached as 'nationalities' instead of 'cultures'.

The first sub-question was about the recognition of the logo. A logo provides recognisability (Gray & Balmer, 2000) which is important for an organisation since this can cause a positive attitude in the long run (Olins, 1990; Pandelaere et al., as cited in Torres et al., 2019). Barthes (1964) stated that there is a relation between words and images, in the way that words facilitate the (correct) interpretation of images. This would mean that words (brand names/slogans) improve the recognition of logos and that recognition would be lower without verbal anchoring. The results of this research are in line with this theory: the recognition was lowest for both nationalities when no verbal anchoring was present in the logo. However, while French participants' recognition was as high for the version with incomplete verbal anchoring as for the version with complete verbal anchoring, Dutch participants most often recognised all three of the logos for the version with complete verbal anchoring. There may thus be stated that recognition is facilitated by verbal anchoring and that Dutch individuals

might often need more verbal anchoring to recognise a logo than French individuals. The small difference between the two nationalities could also be explained by a possible difference in the popularity of the non-profit organisations in France and The Netherlands. If one of the organisations is better known in France than in the Netherlands, Dutch participants will probably automatically need more verbal aid to recognise the logo. Since in current research the three organisations are not investigated separately, this explanation cannot be excluded.

The second sub-question focussed on the attitude towards the logo. It was expected that, at least for Dutch participants, the attitude would be higher with (moderate) verbal anchoring. However, there were no significant differences found for attitude towards the logo. This is in line with the research of Bergkvist, Eiderbäck and Palombo (2012) who also did not find an effect of the use of verbal anchoring on attitude towards the ad. This aspect can thus be compared with an advertisement, even though there is a difference in the amount of messages to be conveyed between an advertisement and a logo. A possible explanation for this finding is that many of the participants could already have known (some of) the organisations and that this influences the attitude towards the logo. It might be hard to judge a logo when one is familiar with the organisation.

The third sub-question was about the difference between French and Dutch participants in terms of the perceived fit between core values and logos. Two tests were done to answer this question. The first one was based on an open question about what the participants' associations are with the logo in question. A random sample found no matches with the answers of the participants and the actual core values of the organisations. This is in line with the research of Van Hooft et al. (2007), in which no participant could recognise the actual core values of the organisations in the logos either. However, the current research took it a little further by holding into account the level of verbal anchoring in the logos as well. This resulted in one significant difference: the perceived fit was higher for the version with complete verbal anchoring than for the version with incomplete verbal anchoring, which means that individuals find the core values of organisations more suitable with the logo when there are a brand name and slogan present in the logo. There was no difference between nationalities for this variable.

The fourth and last sub-question was about the intention to donate for the three

versions and whether this differed between nationalities. The results showed that there is no effect of nationality or condition on the intention to donate, but there was an interaction effect found between nationality and condition for the French participants. French participants who took part in the version with complete verbal anchoring had a higher intention to donate for the non-profit organisations than French participants who took part in the version without verbal anchoring. In this case, it cannot be said that the intention to donate was higher because the attitude towards the complete verbal anchoring logo version was higher like in the research of Jun et al. (as cited in Bresciani and Del Ponte, 2017). There must thus be an alternative explanation. It could, for example, be due to a higher level of trust with more verbal anchoring, or to certain French moral or prescriptive norms.

Limitations and future research

Like in every research, there were some limitations discovered. One of the biggest limitations is that the original designs of the French and Dutch logos of *Red Cross* and *Doctors without Borders* that were used differed substantially, which could have affected the external validity negatively and could have affected the results as well. If this research would be replicated, similar designs would have to be assured. Another limitation related to design is that the slogans of two of the three Dutch organisations were put the logo manually, because no logos with the slogan included could be found online. This may have affected the validity of the design. In addition, the order of the logos in the questionnaires should be randomised for each participant, but this was not done because of a lack of participants/time. Future research should randomise this as well to minimise the carry-on effect. Furthermore, it was chosen to only do this research with students, so the results cannot be generalised to the whole population. It could be interesting to do this experiment with a broader sample in the future. With a broader sample, the possibility of significant results for culture could also be bigger since elderly are not (yet) subject to ongoing internationalisation. Another limitation could be that after the Dutch questionnaire was translated to French, the French questionnaire was not back-translated to Dutch. The French questionnaire was only checked by another French-speaking individual. This may have caused misunderstandings on the part of the participants while filling in the questionnaire and it affects the validity of the questionnaires. In future research, it would be recommendable to translate the

questionnaires to the native languages of the participants as well, but to make extra sure that the translations are correct. Also, the three non-profit organisations were not seen as three separate organisations, but the mean of the three was used for the measurements. Because of this, it was not possible to control for differences in results per organisation. This, in combination with that there was no question present to control for any negative experiences with any of the existing non-profit organisations used, could have resulted in outliers in the answers which could cause unreliable results. An alternative option is to use non-existing non-profit organisations in possible future research, which has the advantages that the designs will be similar since they are self-made and that the possibility of unreliable results due to negative experiences with the non-profit organisation will be ruled out. Furthermore, future research could check for other cultural aspects than high-low context culture to see whether other aspects could influence logo appreciation and intention to donate. Last but not least, it might be interesting to search for why complete verbal anchoring leads to a higher intention to donate for French participants exactly.

Practical implications

The most obvious practical implication is that French marketeers of non-profit organisations should use a brand name and a slogan together with the symbol to maximise the intention to donate for the cause. The results of this research also implicate that, in general, complete verbal anchoring would be best for the recognition of the logo and the perceived fit between the core values of the organisation and the logo in question as well. That there was no demonstrable difference between the two countries in terms of culture could mean that an international strategy of standardisation of the logo can be recommended. However, that there is no demonstrable difference in culture does not necessarily mean that there is no difference between nationalities. Future research is needed to add to the existing theories about verbal anchoring in logos, especially for internationally active non-profit organisations.

References

- Alba, J.W. & Hutchinson, J.W. (1987). Dimensions of Consumer Expertise. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13(4), 411-454.
- Barthes, R. (1964). Rhétorique de l'image. *Communications*, 4, 40-51.
- Bergkvist, L., Eiderbäck, D., & Palombo, M. (2012). The Brand Communication Effects of Using a Headline to Prompt the Key Benefit in Ads with Pictorial Metaphors. *Journal of Advertising*, 41(2), 67-76.
- Bresciani, S., & Del Ponte, P. (2017). New brand logo design: customers' preference for brand name and icon. *Journal of Brand Management*, 24(5), 1-16.
- Briggs, S. R., & Cheek, J. M. (1986). The role of factor analysis in the development and evaluation of personality scales. *Journal of personality*, 54(1), 106-148.
- César Machado, J., Vacas-de-Carvalho, L., Costa, P., & Lencastre, P. (2012). Brand mergers: examining consumers' responses to name and logo design. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 21(6), 418-427.
- Charities Aid Foundation. (October 2018). Retrieved September 22, 2019, from <https://www.cafonline.org/about-us/publications/2018-publications/caf-world-giving-index-2018>
- Dandridge, T. C., Mitroff, I., & Joyce, W. F. (1980). Organizational symbolism: A topic to expand organizational analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 5(1), 77-82.
- Deneçli, S. (2015). The effect of consumers' attitudes towards logos or emblems on brand preference. *Öneri Dergisi*, 11(44), 319-335. 10.14783/od.v11i44.5000080017
- Doctors Without Borders. (June 2018). Values. Retrieved November 7, 2019, from <https://www.doctorswithoutborders.ca/content/values>
- Eco, U. (1979). *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts*. Bloomington, US: Indiana University Press.
- Foroudi, P., Melewar, T. C., & Gupta, S. (2017). Corporate logo: history, definition, and components. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 47(2), 176-196. doi: 10.1080/00208825.2017.1256166
- Gray, J. M., & Balmer, E. R. (2000). Corporate identity and corporate communications: creating a competitive advantage. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 32(7), 256-261.
- Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. New York, US: Anchor Books.

- Henderson, P. W. & Cote, J. A. (1998). Guidelines for Selecting or Modifying Logos. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(2), 14-30.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture and organizations. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 10(4), 15-41.
- Kashif, M., Sarifuddin, S., & Hassan, A. (2015). Charity donation: intentions and behaviour. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 33(1), 90-102. doi: 10.1108/MIP-07-2013-0110
- Kohli, C. & Suri, R. (2002). Creating effective logos: insights from theory and practice. *Business Horizons*, 45(3), 58-64. doi: 10.2501/JAR-53-1-031-042
- McQuarrie, E. F., & Mick, D. G. (1999). Visual rhetoric in advertising: Text-interpretive, experimental, and reader-response analyses. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 26(1), 37-54.
- Olins, W. (1989). *Corporate identity: Making strategy visible through design*. London, UK: Thames & Hudson.
- Park, C. W., Eisingerich, A. B., Pol, G., & Park, J. W. (2013). The role of brand logos in firm performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(2), 180-187. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.07.011
- Phillips, B. J. (2000). The impact of verbal anchoring on consumer response to image ads. *Journal of advertising*, 29(1), 15-24.
- Richardson, R. M., & Smith, S. W. (2007). The influence of high/low-context culture and power distance on choice of communication media: Students' media choice to communicate with professors in Japan and America. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 31(4), 479-501.
- Rode Kruis. (n.d.). De zeven grondbeginselen. Retrieved november 11, 2019, from <https://www.rodekruis.nl/over-ons/de-zeven-grondbeginselen/>
- Simões, C., Dibb, S. & Fisk, R. P. (2005). Managing corporate Identity: An internal Perspective. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 33(2), 153-168.
- Torres, A. Machado, J. C., Vacas de Carvalho, L.; Velden, M. van de, and Costa, P. (2019). Brand logo design: examining consumer response to naturalness. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 24(1), 78-87.
- Unicef. (n.d.). UNICEF's culture. Retrieved November 7, 2019, from <https://www.unicef.org/about/unicef-culture>
- Van Hooft, A.P.J.V., Wiskerke, L.V., & Brink, J. (2007). Het logo: Drager van kernwaarden? *Tekstblad*, 13(1), 18-21.
- Zajonc, R. B. (1968). Attitudinal effects of mere exposure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 9(2), 1.

Appendix A

Bachelor Thesis logos Dutch

Beste deelnemer,

Hartelijk bedankt voor je interesse om deel te nemen aan deze online vragenlijst. Je helpt hiermee zes studenten hun bachelorscriptie met succes af te ronden.

Zometeen zal je drie verschillende logo's te zien krijgen van internationale non-profit organisaties en zal je gevraagd worden hierover wat vragen te beantwoorden. Hierna volgen wat culturele en demografische vragen.

De vragenlijst zal ongeveer acht minuten duren, al mag je alle tijd nemen die je nodig hebt. Je kan alles invullen; er zijn geen goede of foute antwoorden.

Als je aan het einde van de vragenlijst nog vragen hebt, kan je altijd contact met ons opnemen via ... of door te mailen naar de supervisor via a.vanhoof@let.ru.nl.



Het invullen van deze vragenlijst zal geheel anoniem worden gedaan en de gegevens zullen uitsluitend worden gebruikt voor de afdeling Communicatie- en Informatiewetenschappen van Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen. Je mag je, indien gewenst, op elk willekeurig moment terugtrekken uit dit experiment.

Ga je akkoord met de bovenstaande voorwaarden?

- Ja
- Nee
-

Verbal anchoring in non-profit organisation's logos: a start of a better world?

Herken je dit logo?

1.		2.		3.	
4.		5.		6.	
7.		8.		9.	

Wat vind je van dit logo?

Niet leuk	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Leuk
Slecht	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Goed
Lage kwaliteit	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Hoge kwaliteit
Niet onderscheidend	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Onderscheidend
Niet interessant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Interessant

Welke associaties heb je bij het zien van dit logo?

Verbal anchoring in non-profit organisation's logos: a start of a better world?

In hoeverre vind je onderstaande kernwaarden passen bij dit logo? (Unicef)

	1 Helemaal niet	2	3	4	5	6	7 Helemaal wel
Zorg	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Respect	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Integriteit	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Vertrouwen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Verantwoordelijkheid	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Verbal anchoring in non-profit organisation's logos: a start of a better world?

In hoeverre vind je onderstaande kernwaarden passen bij dit logo? (Rode Kruis)

	1 Helemaal niet	2	3	4	5	6	7 Helemaal wel
Humaniteit	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Onpartijdigheid	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Neutraliteit	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Onafhankelijkheid	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Vrijwillige service	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Eenheid	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Universaliteit	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

In hoeverre vind je onderstaande kernwaarden passen bij dit logo? (Artsen Zonder Grenzen)

	1 Helemaal niet	2	3	4	5	6	7 Helemaal wel
Onafhankelijk	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Neutraal	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Onpartijdig	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Verbal anchoring in non-profit organisation's logos: a start of a better world?

	1 Helemaal niet mee eens	2	3	4	5	6	7 Helemaal mee eens
Ik ben bereid om geld te doneren aan deze non-profit organisatie	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Maak gebruik van onderstaande schaal om aan te geven hoeveel (on)eens je bent met de negen stellingen. Er zijn geen goede of foute antwoorden, je kan gewoon je eerlijke mening aangeven.

	1 <u>Helemaal niet mee eens</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7 <u>Helemaal mee eens</u>
Een spreker mag niet verwachten dat een luisteraar begrijpt wat de spreker bedoelt met een boodschap, tenzij de boodschap heel precies is verwoord.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Men zou de betekenis van een boodschap moeten kunnen begrijpen door tussen de regels door te lezen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Verbal anchoring in non-profit organisation's logos: a start of a better world?

De betekenis van een boodschap draait meer om de context dan om woorden.

Het is belangrijker om een boodschap efficiënt te vermelden dan met veel details.

Een spreker kan ervan uitgaan dat een luisteraar zal begrijpen wat hij/zij echt bedoelt.

Men begrijpt veel dingen uit de context die niet hardop worden gezegd.

Minder woorden kunnen vaak leiden tot een beter begrip van een boodschap.

Je kan vaak meer informatie overbrengen met minder woorden.

Sommige
ideeën
worden
beter
begrepen
wanneer ze
niet hardop
gezegd
worden.



Ik ben een...

- Man
- Vrouw

Wat is je leeftijd?

Wat is je nationaliteit?

- Nederlands
- Anders, namelijk... _____

Wat is je hoogstgenoten opleiding?

- Basisonderwijs
- Voortgezet onderwijs
- MBO
- HBO
- Universiteit

Bachelor Thesis logos French

Cher participant, Chère participante,

Merci de votre intérêt à participer à ce questionnaire en ligne. Vous aidez six étudiants à mener à bien leur thèse de licence.

Vous verrez trois logos différents d'organisations internationales à but non lucratif et il vous sera demandé de répondre à quelques questions à ce sujet. Après, vous sera demandé de répondre quelques questions culturelles et démographiques.

Le questionnaire prendra environ huit minutes, bien que vous puissiez prendre tout le temps dont vous avez besoin. Il n'y a pas de bonnes ou de mauvaises réponses.

Si vous avez des questions à la fin du questionnaire, vous pouvez toujours nous contacter via

Radboud Universiteit





Ce questionnaire sera rempli de manière totalement anonyme et les données ne seront utilisées que pour le département des sciences de l'information et de la communication de l'université Radboud de Nimègue. Vous pouvez, si vous le souhaitez, vous retirer de cette expérience à tout moment.


Est-ce que vous êtes d'accord avec ces conditions?


- Oui
- Non
-


Est-ce que vous reconnaissez ce logo ?


1. 


2. 


3. 


4. 

5. 

6. 

7. 

8. 

9. 

- Oui
- Non

Qu'est-ce que vous en pensez de ce logo ?

Pas joli	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Joli
Mauvais	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Bon
Mauvais qualité	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Bonne qualité
Pas distinctif	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Distinctif
Pas intéressant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Intéressant

Quelles associations avez-vous lorsque vous voyez ce logo ?

Jusqu'à quel point pensez-vous que ces valeurs fondamentales correspondent à ce logo?
(Unicef)

	1 Pas du tout	2	3	4	5	6	7 Entièrement
Soin	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Respect	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Intégrité	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Confiance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Responsabilité	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Verbal anchoring in non-profit organisation's logos: a start of a better world?

Jusqu'à quel point pensez-vous que ces valeurs fondamentales correspondent à ce logo?
(Croix-Rouge)

	1 Pas du tout	2	3	4	5	6	7 Entièrement
Humanité	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Impartialité	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Neutralité	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Indépendance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Service volontaire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Unité	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Universalité	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Jusqu'à quel point pensez-vous que ces valeurs fondamentales correspondent à ce logo?
(Medecins Sans Frontieres)

	1 Pas du tout	2	3	4	5	6	7 Entièrement
Indépendance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Neutralité	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Impartialité	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Verbal anchoring in non-profit organisation's logos: a start of a better world?

	1 Pas du tout d'accord	2	3	4	5	6	7 Entièrement d'accord
Je suis préparé(e) à donner de l'argent à cette organisation à but non lucratif.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Jusqu'à quel point êtes-vous d'accord avec les déclarations suivantes? Il n'y a pas de bonnes ou de mauvaises réponses.

	1 Pas du tout d'accord	2	3	4	5	6	7 Entièrement d'accord
Les locuteurs ne doivent pas supposer que leurs auditeurs comprennent ce qu'ils veulent dire sauf si le message prévu est précisé explicitement.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Même si le message n'est pas spécifié en détail, l'intention d'un locuteur sera rarement mal compris.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Des intentions non explicitement énoncées peuvent être déduites du contexte de la conversation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Il est plus important d'énoncer efficacement un message que de l'énoncer avec beaucoup de détails.

Un locuteur peut supposer que les auditeurs sauront ce qu'il veut vraiment dire.

Les gens comprennent beaucoup de choses qui restent non exprimées.

Utiliser moins de mots peut conduire à une meilleure compréhension.

On peut transmettre plus d'information avec peu de mots.

Il y a des choses qu'on comprend mieux si elles ne sont pas exprimées.

Verbal anchoring in non-profit organisation's logos: a start of a better world?

Je suis un(e)...

- Homme
- Femme

Vous avez quel âge ?

Vous avez quelle nationalité ?

- Française
- Différente : _____

Quel est votre niveau maximal de scolarité ?

- École Primaire
- Collège
- Lycée
- Licence
- Master
-