
The Influence of Brand Effect on Slogan's Memorability

Submitted 23/05/19, 1st revision 28/06/19, 2nd revision 17/08/19, accepted 20/10/19

Paulo Duarte Silveira¹, Paulo Bogas²

Abstract:

Purpose: The main aim of this article is to examine the influence of consumers' brand effect on their ability to remember brand slogans.

Design/Methodology/Approach: An empirical quantitative study was carried out via an online questionnaire, analyzing 370 real costumers of three telecom B2C service providers in Portugal.

Findings: The results tend to indicate to not corroborate the positive influence of brand effect on brand slogan memorability. However, it was also found evidence to raise doubts on the absence of the relationships, since some components of brand effect had a positive impact on slogan recognition in some of the brands studied.

Practical implications: Brands might consider focusing on other dimensions besides brand effect, if their aim is to increase brand and slogan awareness. However, since some contradictory results were verified, managers should not view that implication as a golden rule for management and branding decisions.

Originality/Value: The main contribution of this study is to shed a light on a relation not yet sufficiently explored in previous studies related to slogan's effectiveness.

Keywords: Slogan, brand love, brand effect, brand recall, brand recognition.

JEL Codes: M31, M37.

Paper type: Research article.

Acknowledgements:

Authors acknowledge the support from the affiliation institutions Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal and CEFAGE-UE. CEFAGE-UE has financial support from Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (Grant UID/ECO/04007/2013) and FEDER/COMPETE (POCI-01-0145-FEDER-007659). Authors are also grateful to the anonymous participants in the study.

¹Corresponding author, College of Business Administration-Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal, Setúbal, Portugal, and CEFAGE-UE, Évora, Portugal, paulo.silveira@esce.ips.pt.

²College of Business Administration-Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal, Setúbal, Portugal, paulo.bogas@esce.ips.pt

1. Introduction

A marketing slogan is a motto or short sentence designed to encapsulate the beliefs, appeals and/or distinctive traits of an entity. Slogans can be used by brands, firms, companies, institutions or individuals. Usually, they are short, simple and try to be catchy and memorable. Slogans have been present for a long time, inasmuch as they began to be used during the Middle Ages in Europe as passwords to ensure proper recognition of individuals at night or in the confusion of battles (Denton Jr., 1980). On the same way, slogans have been largely used in branding and advertising since the industrial revolution and the emergence of marketing concept and techniques.

However, somehow surprisingly, academic research on slogans is not abundant. There are several non-academic reports about slogans, usually identifying what makes a good slogan, but most of them lack enough evidence to support the conclusions. For example, Foster (2001) identifies twenty-one desirable characteristics a slogan should have, but there is no testing to examine/prove that those are the adequate characteristics.

Some previous academic studies have described slogans characteristics, but not many have analyzed their efficacy or relations with other constructs (e.g. Coimbra, 2018; Miller and Toman, 2015; Reece *et al.*, 1994). However, there is some scientific research available on the effects of slogans, and they point to the direction that slogans are an important component of the identification and image of a brand or product (Abdi and Irandoust 2013; Boush 1993; Dahlén and Rosengren, 2005). That is particularly true if slogans are used consistently in time and space, in the way that such consistency and repetition improves the slogan memorability on the individuals. By that, is acceptable to use slogan memorability as one of the possible ways to examine slogans' efficacy, as several previous studies have already done (Briggs and Janakiraman, 2017). The empirical researches on slogans memorability have mostly used slogans' intrinsic characteristics to explain slogan recall and/or recognition. Those research options leave a door open for other possible explanations on what makes a slogan memorable, namely external variables besides slogans intrinsic characteristics. So, given the importance of external constructs on the consumer-brand relationship, like satisfaction and loyalty, we propose that there might be external factors besides slogan characteristics that impact the slogan remembrance. More particularly, we direct the research effort to emotional constructs, namely to brand effect. Therefore, this study examines if brand effect has an influence in the consumers' ability to remember brand slogans. More specifically, we expect that brands with higher consumers' effect tend to have higher slogan recall and recognition.

To do so, the next section of the paper presents the theoretical background, leading to the research question and statistical hypothesis to be tested. Next, we move to the methods section, describing the research methodology, procedures, data gathering technique and sample used. Reporting and analyzing the results will be the section

after the methods. The paper finishes with final remarks and conclusions, pointing out managerial implications and further research avenues.

2. Problem Statement

Most previous research on slogans have been made with one of four directions: describing slogans' semantic characteristics; understanding what makes slogans likeable; analyzing relations with other constructs, such as purchase intentions; examining what makes a slogan memorable. Focusing on this last research direction, the majority of these studies differentiate between media exposure/spending and the effect advertising campaigns have on brand recall and brand recognition; and the intrinsic characteristics of slogan design which might help on reinforcing the brand image (Galí *et al.*, 2017; Briggs and Janakiraman, 2017). Most of the studies on this research stream have used slogans' characteristics as explanatory variables (e.g. slogan length or slogan "age") of slogan recall and/or recognition (Hodges *et al.*, 2016; Stewart and Clark, 2007; Dowling and Kabanoff, 1996). However, given the well-established importance of long-term relationships in marketing, there might be other external constructs related to the relationship theme that explain slogans efficacy.

Simply satisfying consumers in a functional and utilitarian way is not enough for continuing success in the marketplace (Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006). That might be one of the reasons why individuals' emotional responses and effect is well established and accepted as an important field, with particular interest to marketing and advertising (Edell and Burke, 1987; Holbrook and Batra, 1987). In fact, cognitive activities in the human brain are greatly influenced by emotions (Morse, 2006). In this context, Damásio *et al.* (1996) developed the hypothesis of somatic markers, stating that, in addition to the rational component, in human decisions there is an automated brain mechanism that supports decisions through previous emotional experiences. That is, in a certain situation experienced, the brain registers it, marking a somatic state (positive or negative) and the brain will eventually regain its association with this somatic marker, thus supporting future decisions in emotional aspects. So, emotional responses have crucial importance in decision making and in guiding behaviours (Bechara and Damásio, 2005). This fact is also true in consumers' decisions (Pawle and Cooper, 2006), reflecting the importance of consumers' emotions on managing marketing actions and tools.

Moreover, in the context of modern advertising discourse, brand slogans nowadays tend to have more implicit promises (Coimbra, 2018), many of them with emotional appeals. Such promises can provide an important supplemental role in building and cultivating brands (Miller and Toman, 2016). Therefore, slogans might play a part in building and reinforcing brand equity. By that, is important to understand what makes a brand slogan effective. Since the 90's, research on branding has strongly been dedicated to analyzing brand-consumer relationship through constructs such as brand trust, brand commitment or brand loyalty (Cerag and Wesford, 2006).

However, these constructs ignore many other potentially valuable relationship forms (Pan, 2019), including brand love and brand affect.

Brand love is the degree of passionate emotional attachment a satisfied consumer has for a particular tradename, which includes passion for the brand, attachment to the brand, positive evaluation of the brand, positive emotions in response to the brand, and declarations of love for the brand (Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006). Brand love is different from brand effect. Considering that brand loyalty encompasses an attitudinal dimension on the level of dispositional commitment of some unique value associated with the brand (Chaudhuri and Holbrook, 2002), is possible to deduce that brand effect is related to this attitudinal dimension of brand loyalty, and can be defined as the brand's potential to elicit a positive emotional response in the average consumer as a result of its use (Chaudhuri and Holbrook, 2002). Research on consumer-brand relationships through effective constructs such as brand love, brand passion and brand attachment indicate that they can influence consumer behavior in a deeper way (Albert *et al.*, 2013). Given that, those kinds of consumer-brand linkages have important outcomes, including brand loyalty, positive word-of-mouth, and willingness to pay (Bairrada *et al.*, 2018). Brand effect has long played a decisive role in marketing and customer satisfaction (Oliver, 1997) and, based on the previous rationale, is possible to expect that brand effect might also be positively related to brand loyalty and word-of-mouth (Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen, 2010), and have other positive outcomes, namely an increased willingness to pay a price premium and forgiveness of brand failures (Batra *et al.*, 2012).

Given that previous research suggests that emotional appeal is a predictor of advertisement recall (Morais *et al.*, 1999), we expect that slogan recall (and recognition) might as well be predicted by emotional appeals. Against the research highlighted previously on emotional branding and slogan memorability, we propose that brand effect is a predictor of slogan recall. So, the research question established for this study is: “*does brand effect influence slogan memorability?*”. We divided this question in two research objectives: i) to examine if brand effect influences the brand slogan recall; ii) to examine if brand effect influences the brand slogan recognition. Given the literature review, on both research objectives we expect a positive relation between the constructs under study. Therefore, the research hypothesis established are:

H1: Brand affect has a positive influence on the brand slogan recall.

H2: Brand affect has a positive influence on the brand slogan recognition.

3. Methodological Issues

To perform a statistical analysis of the hypotheses presented, we carried-on a quantitative study. The data was collected with a structured questionnaire, administrated online. Valid responses were obtained from 370 costumers of three telecom B2C service-providers in Portugal (brands X, Y and Z). Two sampling

techniques were used, combined: convenience sample and snow-ball sample. The variables used on the questionnaire to test the hypothesis were:

- Slogan recall: for each one of the three brands, we measured the variable using the open question “What is the actual slogan for brand...?”. This was done separately for each brand.
- Slogan recognition: for each brand, we presented four possible alternative slogans, asking the consumers to identify which one of them was the correct actual slogan for each brand. The options included the actual slogan of the brand, an older slogan, the oldest slogan, and a competitor slogan. The procedure was repeated separately for each brand.
- Brand affect was measured with three items used by Chaudhuri and Holbrook (2002): “I feel good using this brand” (variable from now on named “affect A”); “This brand makes me happy” (variable named “affect B”); “This brand gives me pleasure” (variable named “affect C”). Each item was measured with a five point-options Likert scale, ranging from “Totally agree”, “Partially agree”, “Neither agree nor disagree”, “Partially disagree” and “Totally disagree”. The Coefficient alpha for brand affect in brand X was .835, for brand Y was .867 and brand Z was .862.

4. Results

4.1 Slogan Recall Results

The three brands studied used brand slogans consistently in most of their advertising actions during the period of the study. The slogan recall rates observed in this study were coherent with Katz and Rose (1969) study, in the way that they are not considered high rates: brand X correct recall was 20%, brand Y was 7% and brand Z was 20%. In a previous step to examine the relation between brand affect and slogan recall, a crosstable with descriptive statistics was made, relating the brand affect items with the slogan recall rates for each brand, which is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive measures of brand affect items by slogan recall

Item ¹	Brand X Slogan Recall		Brand Y Slogan Recall		Brand Z Slogan Recall	
	correct	not correct ²	correct	not correct ²	correct	not correct ²
I feel good using this brand (affect A)	$\bar{x}=3,68$ $s=1,17$	$\bar{x}=3,34$ $s=1,23$	$\bar{x}=3,27$ $s=1,28$	$\bar{x}=2,90$ $s=1,29$	$\bar{x}=4,14$ $s=0,96$	$\bar{x}=3,66$ $s=1,22$
This brand makes me happy (affect B)	$\bar{x}=3,37$ $s=0,97$	$\bar{x}=3,02$ $s=1,00$	$\bar{x}=3,67$ $s=1,11$	$\bar{x}=3,34$ $s=1,22$	$\bar{x}=3,48$ $s=0,97$	$\bar{x}=3,21$ $s=1,07$
This brand gives me pleasure (affect C)	$\bar{x}=3,05$ $s=1,12$	$\bar{x}=2,81$ $s=1,07$	$\bar{x}=3,06$ $s=1,39$	$\bar{x}=2,74$ $s=1,24$	$\bar{x}=3,45$ $s=1,07$	$\bar{x}=3,14$ $s=1,15$

Note: ⁽¹⁾ max=5 and min=1; ⁽²⁾ not correct= incorrect + does not know

Source: Own Elaboration.

In a second step to access the hypnotized relation, the logistic regression Forward:LR was used to examine the influence of the independent items of brand affect on correctly recalling the slogans. For each brand, the model fits the observed data, since for brand X $X^2_{HL}(8)=9.209$; $p=0.325$; for brand Y $X^2_{HL}(6)=2.214$; $p=0.899$; and for brand Z $X^2_{HL}(8)=2.503$; $p=0.962$.

The results reveal that no independent variable considered in this model has predictable power over the slogan recall in brand X ($G^2(12)=13.668$; $p=0.322$; $R^2_{CS}=0.081$; $R^2_N=0.111$). This is also verified for brand Y ($G^2(12)=11.798$; $p=0.462$; $R^2_{CS}=0.142$; $R^2_N=0.227$) and for brand Z ($G^2(11)=16.765$; $p=0.115$; $R^2_{CS}=0.200$; $R^2_N=0.333$). These results are also verified using X^2_{wald} 's tests in brands X, Y and Z, as shown in detail in Tables 2, 3 and 4.

Table 2. Logistic regression variables in equation for brand X slogan recall

Independent Variable	B	S.E.	X^2_{wald}	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
affect A			3,008	4	,556	
affect A(1)	1,105	1,196	,853	1	,356	3,020
affect A(2)	,940	,977	,927	1	,336	2,560
affect A(3)	,283	1,031	,075	1	,784	1,327
affect A(4)	,710	1,061	,447	1	,504	2,033
affect B			3,274	4	,513	
affect B(1)	-,225	1,401	,026	1	,873	,799
affect B(2)	1,087	1,008	1,162	1	,281	2,964
affect B(3)	1,280	1,031	1,543	1	,214	3,597
affect B(4)	1,417	1,146	1,530	1	,216	4,125
affect C			8,583	4	,072	
affect C(1)	,018	,925	,000	1	,984	1,018
affect C(2)	-1,259	,703	3,208	1	,073	,284
affect C(3)	-,294	,801	,135	1	,714	,745
affect C(4)	-1,297	,971	1,786	1	,181	,273
Constant	-1,474	,751	3,857	1	,050	,229

Source: Own Elaboration.

A final step to examine the hypothesis established was using U and Median tests, as shown in Table 5. The respective results point to no differences on recalling slogans in each of the brand affect items analyzed, in all brands.

Table 3. Logistic regression variables in equation for brand Y slogan recall

Independent Variable	B	S.E.	X ² _{Wald}	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
affect A			3,418	4	,490	
affect A(1)	1,854	1,875	,978	1	,323	6,384
affect A(2)	,542	1,727	,098	1	,754	1,719
affect A(3)	-2,097	2,471	,720	1	,396	,123
affect A(4)	-,091	2,309	,002	1	,969	,913
affect B			4,216	4	,378	
affect B(1)	-19,805	40192,970	,000	1	1,000	,000
affect B(2)	,090	1,289	,005	1	,944	1,095
affect B(3)	-,067	1,277	,003	1	,958	,935
affect B(4)	-2,954	1,739	2,884	1	,089	,052
affect C			3,500	4	,478	
affect C(1)	-19,200	25748,872	,000	1	,999	,000
affect C(2)	-,149	1,590	,009	1	,925	,862
affect C(3)	3,069	2,306	1,771	1	,183	21,528
affect C(4)	1,844	2,441	,571	1	,450	6,322
Constant	-1,791	,877	4,166	1	,041*	,167

Notes: (*) rejection of the null hypothesis for p=.05

Source: Own Elaboration.

Table 4. Logistic regression variables in equation for brand Z slogan recall

Independent Variable	B	S.E.	X ² _{Wald}	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
affect A			,215	4	,995	
affect A(1)	40,89	49226,132	,000	1	,999	574490206178352
affect A(2)	39,58	40109,179	,000	1	,999	155489470488609
affect A(3)	39,76	40109,179	,000	1	,999	186585297880040
affect A(4)	40,11	40109,179	,000	1	,999	262720401858391
affect B			1,614	4	,806	
affect B(1)	-	56782,226	,000	1	1,000	,000
affect B(2)	-	28420,717	,000	1	,999	,000
affect B(3)	-	28420,717	,000	1	,999	,000
affect B(4)	-	28420,717	,000	1	,999	,000
affect C			1,202	3	,752	
affect C(2)	-	28302,076	,000	1	,999	,000
affect C(3)	-	28302,076	,000	1	,999	,000
affect C(4)	,895	30519,950	,000	1	1,000	2,447
Constant	-,405	,913	,197	1	,657	,667

Notes: (*) rejection of the null hypothesis for p=.05

Source: Own Elaboration.

Table 5. *U and Median tests of slogan recall*

Item	Brand X Slogan Recall		Brand Y Slogan Recall		Brand Z Slogan Recall	
	Sig. U^1	Sig. Median Test	Sig. U^1	Sig. Median Test	Sig. U^1	Sig. Median Test
I feel good using this brand	,440	,637	,409	,920	,068	,260
This brand makes me happy	,108	,297	,338	,197	,453	,786
This brand gives me pleasure	,337	,357	,429	,689	,275	,754

Notes: ⁽¹⁾ exact sig. 1-tailed applying Mann-Whitney test; ^(*) rejection of the null hypothesis for $p=.05$. In such variables, the recall was significantly higher in the group that correctly recalled the slogan

Source: Own Elaboration.

4.2 Slogan Recognition Results

Besides analyzing slogan recall, the slogan recognition was also assessed. As expected, the slogan recognition rates were higher than the recall rates, which is again similar to previous studies (Katz and Rose, 1969): brand X correct recognition rate was 37%; brand Y was 67% and brand Z was 78%.

Using the same steps followed with the slogan recall analysis, the first phase to examine the relation between brand affect and slogan recognition was calculating descriptive statistics for that relation. The respective data is presented in Table 6.

Table 6. *Descriptive measures of brand affect items by slogan recognition*

Item ¹	Brand X Slogan Recognition		Brand Y Slogan Recognition		Brand Z Slogan Recognition	
	correct	not correct ²	correct	not correct ²	correct	not correct ²
I feel good using this brand	$\bar{x}=3,57$ $s=1,149$	$\bar{x}=3,31$ $s=1,263$	$\bar{x}=2,91$ $s=1,362$	$\bar{x}=3,02$ $s=1,130$	$\bar{x}=3,87$ $s=1,118$	$\bar{x}=3,35$ $s=1,356$
This brand makes me happy	$\bar{x}=3,30$ $s=,967$	$\bar{x}=2,97$ $s=1,005$	$\bar{x}=3,34$ $s=1,219$	$\bar{x}=3,43$ $s=1,213$	$\bar{x}=3,33$ $s=1,007$	$\bar{x}=3,03$ $s=1,213$
This brand gives me pleasure	$\bar{x}=2,99$ $s=1,107$	$\bar{x}=2,77$ $s=1,072$	$\bar{x}=2,67$ $s=1,261$	$\bar{x}=2,94$ $s=1,232$	$\bar{x}=3,26$ $s=1,135$	$\bar{x}=3,00$ $s=1,165$

Notes: ⁽¹⁾ max=5 and min=1; ⁽²⁾ not correct= incorrect + does not know

Source: Own Elaboration.

Regarding the analysis of the hypothesized influence of brand affect on correctly recognizing the brands' slogans, the findings are similar to the slogan recall analysis. Again, for each brand, the model also fits the observed data, since for brand X

$X^2_{HL}(7)=4.635$; $p=0.704$; for brand Y $X^2_{HL}(8)=11.742$; $p=0.163$; and for brand Z $X^2_{HL}(7)=3.856$; $p=0.796$.

Besides that, in a global manner, the results do not reveal a statistical influence of brand affect on correctly recognizing the respective brand slogan. Albeit, the affect item "I feel good using this brand" might have some predictable power on recognizing the slogan in brands X ($G^2(12)=22.387$; $p=0.033$; $R^2_{CS}=0.078$; $R^2_N=0.105$) and Z ($G^2(12)=21.845$; $p=0.039$; $R^2_{CS}=0.075$; $R^2_N=0.119$). This is explored in Table 7 (brand X) and in Table 9 (brand Z). This is not verified in brand Y ($G^2(12)=17.225$; $p=0.141$; $R^2_{CS}=0.087$; $R^2_N=0.121$).

The other variables of brand affect, "This brand makes me happy" and "This brand gives me pleasure", do not show a predictable influence over slogan recognition, for any of the three brands, observable by X^2_{wald} 's test in brand X (Table 7), brand Y (Table 8) and brand Z (Table 9).

Table 7. Logistic regression variables in equation for brand X slogan recognition

Independent Variable	B	S.E.	X^2_{wald}	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
affect A			4,230	4	,376	
affect A(1)	,931	,759	1,503	1	,220	2,536
affect A(2)	1,088	,614	3,146	1	,076	2,969
affect A(3)	,657	,640	1,054	1	,305	1,929
affect A(4)	,964	,695	1,926	1	,165	2,622
affect B			8,814	4	,066	
affect B(1)	-1,203	,901	1,782	1	,182	,300
affect B(2)	,597	,648	,851	1	,356	1,817
affect B(3)	,916	,686	1,782	1	,182	2,499
affect B(4)	1,235	,806	2,348	1	,125	3,439
affect C			9,002	4	,061	
affect C(1)	,442	,711	,387	1	,534	1,556
affect C(2)	-,931	,540	2,979	1	,084	,394
affect C(3)	-,233	,643	,131	1	,717	,792
affect C(4)	-,790	,813	,946	1	,331	,454
Constant	-1,292	,490	6,944	1	,008*	,275

Notes: (*) rejection of the null hypothesis for $p=.05$

Source: Own Elaboration.

Table 8. Logistic regression variables in equation for brand Y slogan recognition

Independent Variable	B	S.E.	X^2_{Wald}	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
affect A			10,220	4	,037*	
affect A(1)	-1,238	,970	1,629	1	,202	,290
affect A(2)	-1,954	,758	6,655	1	,010*	,142
affect A(3)	-,806	,889	,821	1	,365	,447
affect A(4)	-,524	,947	,306	1	,580	,592
affect B			6.908	4	,141	
affect B(1)	-,815	1,118	,532	1	,466	,442
affect B(2)	1,547	,745	4,309	1	,038*	4,700
affect B(3)	1,041	,741	1,975	1	,160	2,833
affect B(4)	,690	,891	,599	1	,439	1,993
affect C			3,279	4	,512	
affect C(1)	1,109	1,071	1,073	1	,300	3,032
affect C(2)	,022	,681	,001	1	,974	1,022
affect C(3)	-,679	,892	,580	1	,446	,507
affect C(4)	-,616	1,042	,349	1	,555	,540
Constant	1,031	,425	5,888	1	,015*	2,804

Notes: (*) rejection of the null hypothesis for $p=.05$

Source: Own Elaboration.

Table 9. Logistic regression variables in equation for brand Z slogan recognition

Independent Variable	B	S.E.	X^2_{Wald}	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
affect A			7.389	4	,117	
affect A(1)	1,458	1,616	,814	1	,367	4,299
affect A(2)	1,614	1,180	1,871	1	,171	5,024
affect A(3)	2,633	1,241	4,503	1	,034*	13,913
affect A(4)	2,530	1,245	4,130	1	,042*	12,555
affect B			4.801	4	,308	
affect B(1)	,798	1,387	,331	1	,565	2,221
affect B(2)	,551	,759	,526	1	,468	1,735
affect B(3)	1,030	,830	1,539	1	,215	2,801
affect B(4)	-,341	,947	,130	1	,719	,711
affect C			6,095	4	,192	
affect C(1)	-,213	1,685	,016	1	,899	,808
affect C(2)	-1,568	1,179	1,767	1	,184	,209
affect C(3)	-2,024	1,251	2,620	1	,106	,132
affect C(4)	-,697	1,398	,249	1	,618	,498
Constant	,217	,431	,254	1	,614	1,242

Notes: (*) rejection of the null hypothesis for $p=.05$. Own Elaboration.

Using the same procedure followed for slogan recall, the final step of the statistical analysis for slogan recognition was made using U and Median tests. The correspondent results (Table 10) show some differences on recognizing slogans. The differences were not verified in all brands, neither in all items. For brand X, the differences were found in two variables (with both tests U and Median); in brand Y, no difference was found; and, in brand Z, the differences were found in two variables (only with the U test). However, only on the variable "This brand makes me happy" the differences were common between brand X and brand Z.

Table 10. *U and Median tests of slogan recognition*

Item	Brand X Slogan Recognition		Brand Y Slogan Recognition		Brand Z Slogan Recognition	
	Sig. <i>U</i> ¹	Sig. Median Test	Sig. <i>U</i> ¹	Sig. Median Test	Sig. <i>U</i> ¹	Sig. Median Test
I feel good using this brand	,073	,637	,494	,418	,003*	,232
This brand makes me happy	,001*	,014*	,319	,760	,036*	,088
This brand gives me pleasure	,034*	,033*	,126	,208	,073	,271

Notes: ⁽¹⁾ exact sig. 1-tailed applying Mann-Whitney test; ^(*) rejection of the null hypothesis for $p=.05$. In such variables, the recognition was significantly higher in the group that correctly recalled the slogan

Source: Own Elaboration.

5. Conclusions and Implications

The main research proposition of this study has stemmed from the theory of brand commitment in relationship marketing, applying it to advertising and slogan research. The purpose of this paper was to understand whether there is a positive relationship between brand affect and slogan memorability, measured by slogan recall and recognition.

The results are not straightforward, but they tend to not corroborate the positive influence of brand affect on brand slogan memorability. Those results were verified for slogan recall, but were not totally verified on slogan recognition. In one variable/item of slogan recognition ("I feel good using this brand") the results evidenced some predictable power of the variable on slogan remembrance. Given that, we propose that a research direction is to replicate the study on other samples, in order to validate/not validate the examined relation on different situations and cases. Besides that, just like most other empirical studies on consumers' and individuals' perceptions, the presented study is limited by the stimuli, respondents' characteristics and instrument used. Because of that, replications of the study are again suggested, in order to compare the state-of-the art findings. New studies with the same aim but with other units of analysis might be useful in providing further

insights on the influence of brand affect on remembering marketing slogans. Regarding the managerial practical implications, managers should focus marketing efforts on other dimensions besides brand affect, if they intend to increase brand and slogan awareness. Brand affect is clearly an important dimension if the aim is to foster loyalty, but it did not seem to contribute positively to slogan memorability.

References:

- Abdi, S., Irandoust, A. 2013. The importance of advertising slogans and their proper designing in brand equity. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 2(2), 62-69.
- Albert, N., Merunka, D., Valette-Florence, P. 2009. The feeling of love toward a brand: Concept and measurement. *ACR North American Advances*.
- Albert, N., Merunka, D., Valette-Florence, P. 2013. Brand passion: Antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(7), 904-909.
- Bairrada, C.M., Coelho, F., Coelho, A. 2018. Antecedents and outcomes of brand love: Utilitarian and symbolic brand qualities. *European Journal of Marketing*, 52(3/4), 656-682.
- Batra, R., Ahuvia, A., Bagozzi, R.P. 2012. Brand love. *Journal of marketing*, 76(2), 1-16.
- Bechara, A. and Damásio, A.R. 2005. The somatic marker hypothesis: a neural theory of economic decision. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 52(2), 336-372.
- Bergkvist, L., Bech-Larsen, T. 2010. Two studies of consequences and actionable antecedents of brand love. *Journal of brand management*, 17(7), 504-518.
- Briggs, E., Janakiraman, N. 2017. Slogan recall effects on marketplace behaviors: The roles of external search and brand assessment. *Journal of Business Research*, 80, 98-105.
- Boush, D. 1993. How Advertising Slogans Can Prime Evaluations of Brand Extensions. *Psychology & Marketing*, 10(1), 67-78.
- Carroll, B.A., Ahuvia, A.C. 2006. Some antecedents and outcomes of brand love. *Marketing letters*, 17(2).
- Cerag, A., Wesford, F. 2009. The feeling of love toward a brand: Concept and measurement. *Advances in Consumer Research Volume 36*, eds. Ann L. McGill and Sharon Shavitt, Duluth, MN: Association for Consumer Research, 300-307.
- Chaudhuri, A., Holbrook, M.B. 2002. Product-class effects on brand commitment and brand outcomes: The role of brand trust and brand affect. *Journal of Brand Management*, 10(1), 33-58.
- Coimbra, R.L. 2018. Promessas implícitas: as assinaturas de marca no discurso publicitário. *Forma Breve*, (15), 343-358.
- Damásio, A. Everitt, B., Bishop, D. 1996. The somatic marker hypothesis and the possible functions of the prefrontal cortex. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 351(1346), 1413-1420.
- Denton, Jr, R.E. 1980. The Rhetorical Function of Slogans: Classification and Characteristics. *Communication Quarterly*, 28(2), 10-18.
- Dahlén, M., Rosengren, S. 2005. Brands affect slogans affect brands? Competitive interference, brand equity and the brand-slogan link. *Journal of Brand Management*, 12(3), 151-164.
- Dowling, G.R., Kabanoff, B. 1996. Computer-aided content analysis: What do 240 advertising slogans have in common? *Marketing Letters*, 7(1), 63-75.
- Edell, J.A., Burke, M.C. 1987. The power of feelings in understanding advertising effects. *Journal of Consumer research*, 14(3), 421-433.

- Foster, T.R.V. 2001. The Art and Science of the Advertising Slogan. *Adslogans*.
- Galí, N., Camprubí, R., Donaire, J.A. 2017. Analysing tourism slogans in top tourism destinations. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 6(3), 243-251.
- Hodges, B., Warren, C., Estes, Z. 2016. More Than Words: A Psycholinguistic Perspective on the Properties of Effective Brand Slogans. *Advances in Consumer Research*, Volume 44, eds. Page Moreau and Stefano Puntoni, Duluth, MN: Association for Consumer Research, 478-479.
- Holbrook, M.B., Batra, R. 1987. Assessing the role of emotions as mediators of consumer responses to advertising. *Journal of consumer research*, 14(3), 404-420.
- Katz, M., Rose, J. 1969. Is your slogan identifiable? *Journal of Advertising Research*, 9(1), 21-26.
- Miller, D.W., Toman, M. 2015. An analysis of the syntactic complexity in service corporation brand slogans. *Services Marketing Quarterly*, 36(1), 37-50.
- Miller, D.W., Toman, M. 2016. An analysis of rhetorical figures and other linguistic devices in corporation brand slogans. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 22(5), 474-493.
- Morais, D.B., Backman, K., Backman, S. 1999. Affect intensity as an antecedent of advertisement recall and intentions to purchase a leisure service. *Tourism Analysis*, 4(2), 75-82.
- Morse, G. 2006. Decisions and desire. *Harvard Business Review*, 84(1), 42-51.
- Oliver, R.L. 1997. A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 14, 495-507.
- Pan, S. 2019. Tourism slogans—Towards a conceptual framework. *Tourism Management*, 72, 180-191.
- Pawle, J. and Cooper, P. 2006. Measuring emotion – lovemarks, the future beyond brands. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 46(1), 38-48.
- Reece, B.V., Bergh, B., Li, H. 1994. What makes a slogan memorable and who remembers it. *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising*, 16(2), 41-57.
- Stewart, J. & Clark, M. 2007. The Effect of Syntactic Complexity, Social Comparison, and Relationship Theory on Advertising Slogan. *The Business Review*, Summer, 7(1), 113-118.