



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

Research Commons

<http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/>

Research Commons at the University of Waikato

Copyright Statement:

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

The thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of the thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from the thesis.



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

**How Favourable Attitudes are Formed when the
Semantic Associations of a Logotype are Congruent
with Brand Personality**

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
of
Master of Computer Graphic Design
at
The University of Waikato
by
Emily J. Mikaere

February 2011

© 2011 Emily J. Mikaere

Abstract

This thesis explores how favourable attitudes are formed when the semantic associations of a logotype are congruent with brand personality. By analysing the attitude response to varying brands sets, the findings from this thesis indicate that congruency within the underlying connotations of the logotype and brand personality did in fact produce positive responses in both attitude and aesthetics.

Through the congruency research in this thesis, several influential factors affecting the attitude formation process towards a brand have been found. These factors include varying degrees of font appropriateness effectiveness, the over-powering effect of semantic associations and how underlying consumer behaviour tendencies affect purchasing decisions.

The methodology for this project drew on two surveys completed by approximately 200 participants. Two logotypes and two brand slogans are cross-paired with each other resulting in four "brand" variants containing congruent and incongruent brand elements. Findings from this thesis emphasise the importance of underlying semantic associations in typography, as well as bringing a fresh perspective for graphic designers, typographers and type designers to assist their future work with successful logotype design.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my appreciation to the following faculty members of the University of Waikato for their tremendous effort, guidance and support throughout the journey of this thesis:

Thesis Advisors

Nicholas Vanderschantz and Claire Timpany

To all of the participants who helped me with the surveys conducted in Chapter 3, your time and effort is gratefully acknowledged.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my husband and our two boys for your support, understanding and encouragement through the completion of this thesis.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	6
I.1 Key Research Findings and Opportunities.....	6
I.1.1 Typography.....	6
I.1.2 Semiotics.....	8
I.1.3 Branding.....	8
I.2 Scope.....	9
I.3 Definitions	10
II. Literature Review	13
II.1 Introduction	13
II.2 Typography	13
II.2.1 Type History and Classification.....	14
II.2.2 Elements of Typography.....	15
II.2.3 Typography and Brand Visual Identity.....	18
II.2.4 Summary	22
II.3 Semiotics	22
II.3.1 Background of Semiotics.....	23
II.4 Brands	31
II.4.1 History of Branding.....	31
II.4.2 Semiotics and Brands.....	33
II.4.3 Persuasion and Brand Preference.....	35
II.4.4 Typeface Connotation and Brand Choice	39
II.5 Summary of the Literature.....	43
III. Original Research	45
III.1 Aim	45
III.2 Hypothesis.....	46
III.3 Methodology.....	46
III.3.1 Font Selections, Brand Slogan Development & Creating the Logotypes.....	46
III.3.2 Pre-testing for Affirmation of Semantic Associations of Logotypes and Slogans	48
III.3.3 The Creation of the Brand Attitude Surveys	51
III.4 Results.....	53
III.4.1 Reassuring Results	53
III.4.2 Pleasing Results	55
III.4.3 Proportional Results.....	57
III.4.4 Positive, Undecided & Negative Attitude Response Comparative.....	61
III.5 Summary of Findings	64
III.5.1 Findings Exploration	65
IV. Conclusion.....	71
IV.1 Overview.....	71
IV.2 Hypothesis Response.....	73
IV.3 Further Research.....	74

List of figures

Figure 1: Semantic Differential Pre-test Survey	50
Figure 2: Brand Set Box Example.....	52
Figure 3: Congruent Brand Attitude Survey	85
Figure 4: Incongruent Brand Attitude Survey	86

List of tables

Table 1: Semantic Differential Pre-test Survey Results	51
Table 2: Reassuring Congruent - Overall	54
Table 3: Reassuring Incongruent - Overall	55
Table 4: Pleasing Congruent - Overall	56
Table 5: Pleasing Incongruent - Overall.....	57
Table 6: Positive Comparative	58
Table 7: Positive Attitude vs. Purchasing Decision	59
Table 8: Positive Attitude vs. Purchasing Decision	60
Table 9: Positive Attitude vs. Aesthetic vs. Purchasing Decision.....	60
Table 10: Reassuring Congruent Attitude Response Comparative	62
Table 11: Reassuring Incongruent Attitude Response Comparative.....	62
Table 12: Pleasing Congruent Attitude Response Comparative	62
Table 13: Pleasing Incongruent Attitude Response Comparative.....	63

I. Introduction

It has long been understood that typefaces carry a semantic association or personality of their own. A multitude of feelings can be conveyed through a typeface, including those expressing joy, seriousness, or even fright. Certain typefaces are even considered more appropriate for certain design applications, such as using an italicized, elegant script typeface for a jewelry company advertisement (Walker et al., 1986). This thesis intertwines these concepts of typeface connotation and font appropriateness by analysing the attitude formation towards a brand when the semantic association of the logotype is congruent with the brand's personality.

Wheeler states in *Designing Brand Identity: A Complete Guide to Creating, Building and Maintaining Strong Brands*, that successful brand identity programs embody how a brand would like to be perceived by consumers. He goes on to say a brand identity should express the unique vision, goals, values, voice and personality of the organization (2006). A logo or logotype is the cornerstone to every brand identity system (Lupton, 2004); therefore, understanding the semantic associations of the typeface used to create the logotype is also essential in creating an identity system that truly represents a brand effectively.

I.1 Key Research Findings and Opportunities

I.1.1 Typography

Typography is the foundation of word-driven advertising and has the potential to influence a consumer's motivation, opportunity and ability to process brand information. Unfortunately for advertisers, the field lacks significant research on the effects of typography in a persuasive context. According to McCarthy and Mothersbaugh, there are several limitations of prior research in this field. Not only was prior research conducted before advances in typographic technology (McCarthy & Mothersbaugh, 2002), the research was mainly focused on typeface characteristics

independent of others, by-passing the interaction effects inherent in typographic variables (Schriver, 1997).

The area surrounding typography deserves much more research attention due to its pivotal role in the profitability of design for corporations as well as its importance as a key universal theory of design. Further research involving brand impressions and corporate identity would allow corporations to select typefaces that will receive positive design responses (Henderson et al., 2004). Researchers and practitioners alike benefited from the typeface semantic association research of Childers and Jass (2002). By uncovering that typefaces convey unique associations independent of the words they represent, Childers and Jass provided empirical research from a marketing perspective addressing typeface semantic effects. They achieved this by examining the semantic nature of typography and typeface cues within advertising.

The effect semiotics has on logotype success is a lightly researched area. This thesis will supply advertisers and designers with an additional source of empirical based research to assist them in creating effective and favourable logotypes. The research of typography and semiotics, as a role in advertising and consumer contexts, however has begun to gain some speed in the eyes of marketing-consumer researchers. The term “typeface semantics” penned by researchers Childers and Jass (2002) has entered the spotlight due to the effect it has on brand names, logos, advertising copy and packaging. All of these marketing elements are essentially conveying covert messages through the choice of typeface they use. As an example, elegant fonts give the feeling of elegant brands (Doyle & Bottomley, 2006). The investigation in this thesis into the important semantic effects of typography on logotypes in particular will contribute to the growing knowledge base of typography in corporate branding.

In 2003, the legal case of Davidoff vs. Gofkid granted brands the power to invoke ‘unfair advantage’ and ‘detriment’ against other brands using similar fonts and typefaces in similar product categories (as cited in Thangaraj, 2004). These types of legal arguments have brought the importance of typography in corporate branding to the forefront and it is now a well-known tool in the marketing toolbox. Thus far, there is little empirical research for organizations to rely on when investing in typography. Minamiyama believes that the right typography is capable of boosting corporate as

well as product identities on a scale not yet quite appreciated (2005). The battle between art form and science was made abundantly clear when market researcher John Thangaraj (2004) from Bond University stated, “Organisations investing hundreds of thousands of dollars may wish for more substantial evidence than the creative instinct of a graphic artist as to what may or may not work in the marketplace” (p.5).

I.1.2 Semiotics

Semiotics, the study of signs, saw groundbreaking work from key semioticians such as Saussure, Barthes, Eco and Peirce throughout the late 1960’s through the early 1990’s. Different semantic concepts and organizational methods were discussed, contemplated and reviewed in many published works. In the late 1990’s into the millennium, work appeared from Marcel Danesi tackling the subject of branding from a semiotic perspective, helping semiotics become relevant and more tangible. Simply put, Danesi proclaimed that a brand is a sign in the semiotic sense (2006). Although the subject of semiotics is well researched, this thesis briefly explores logotype semantic associations, an area very few have approached.

I.1.3 Branding

The hypothesis of this thesis seeks to analyse attitude formation towards brand sets. In the widely researched subject of branding, new buzz is being created by the concept of emotion in regard to consumer behaviour (Heath 2001). Typically, it is thought that advertising and marketing work by means of rational persuasion, however the newer more controversial thought is that advertising can work through the subconscious (Heath, 2001). Rational persuasion is the accepted norm, but in 1988, Langmaid & Gordon used hypnosis to explore the subject of advertising and the subconscious (as cited in Heath, 2001).

This thesis will only skim the topic of emotion and psychology within branding and will not begin to fully explain the vast subject of consumer behaviour and persuasion. The research presented in Chapter 3 will, however, explore how logotypes can influence brand attitude and more specifically how appropriate logotype design can evoke a desired tone and feeling in the consumer.

I.2 Scope

Chapter 2 of this thesis will begin with a review of literature, comprised of the three principal subject areas of the research: typography, semiotics and branding. The first section will look at an overview of typography and how typography is more than simply a means to deliver a message. Typography carries with it tone and emotion and evokes these feelings within the reader. The researcher explores the elements of typography, history and classification. Although the research discusses in brief the role of readability and legibility in section II.2.2.1, an extensive review of literature on this subject is outside the scope of the research since the original research pertains only to single word logotypes rather than bodies of text.

Research has shown that type has a personality of its own. Because of this, certain typefaces are more appropriate for certain applications than others. Font appropriateness studies by Poffenberger and Franken (1923) and Schiller (1935), among others, will be reviewed. While the researcher appreciates that other aspects of typography application such as hierarchy, colour, size, line spacing and placement on the page all affect the viewers perception and reaction to the typographic design in addition to the semantic associations of the typeface, the analysis of these modifications is outside the scope of this research.

To further investigate how a typeface comes to have its own personality or exterior feelings, the review of the subject of semiotics is imperative. In the second section of the literature the researcher will review a background of this “science of interpretation”, exploring thoughts from theorists on the subject as well as basic terminology of denotation and connotation. Also within this section is how semiotics relates to typography. Within the research reviewed on typeface connotation is the argument of whether or not typeface has the capability to have meaning separate from the written word. This dialogue, together with a review of semiotics analysis methods, leads into the ideas of symbolism, particularly consumer attachment to symbols within branding.

There are several areas of semiotics that are beyond the scope of this research. More specifically, the area of semiotics that involves studying representations, what signs

are ‘standing for’ or representing, as well as the philosophical theorising on the role of signs in the construction of reality. Additionally, syntagmatic and paradigmatic analysis of signs are not discussed within this thesis due to their use mainly on bodies of text and film and television.

The third section of the literature review will review a portion of branding. This final section joins together the previous topics of typography and semiotics and reviews how the subjects intertwine and affect each other. Wheeler’s (2006) report that letterforms can be modified to express appropriate personality and to convey the positioning of the company is an example of this cohesiveness. The subject of branding is a vast topic with an endless number of facets to explore. Branding topics such as the financial value of brands, the social value of brands, brand strategy, brand experience, brand protection and brand architecture are just a few topics that are out of the scope of this research. What will be covered however, is a brief background and history of branding, and an investigation into consumers’ emotional response to brands as well as the focus and effects of congruency within the marketing elements of a brand.

Chapter 3 of this thesis will review a study conducted in Hamilton, New Zealand at the University of Waikato that examines the connection between the relationship of semantic associations of logotypes and successful brand visual identity construction. The methodology for this project will draw on two surveys completed by approximately 200 participants. Two logotypes and two brand slogans will be pretested to confirm semantic associations, and then will be cross-paired with each other resulting in four "brand" variants.

I.3 Definitions

Throughout this thesis several terms have been used to assist in explaining the process of the original research. This section will define the terminology in order to clarify use and avoid any confusion or ambiguity within this research.

Two of the more significant terms used are ‘congruent’ and ‘incongruent’. When used in this document, ‘congruent’ is referring to the ‘semantic associations’ that are in

agreement with each other or the harmony of the two associations. Likewise, the term ‘incongruent’ refers to the ‘semantic associations’ that are incompatible with each other, or not in line with each other.

‘Semantic associations’ is a term used by Childers and Jass in their study on the effects of typeface semantic associations on brand perceptions and consumer memory in 2002. It is widely used in this study to define the ideas or feelings that are evoked in a person in addition to something’s literal or primary meaning. Chapter 3 of this study explores the ‘semantic associations’ of logotypes and brand slogans. The term ‘connotation’ when used in this thesis has a very similar meaning to ‘semantic association’.

Another term widely used is ‘logotype’. A logotype is defined by Lupton (2004) as lettering used to create a distinctive visual image and depict the name of a brand in a memorable way. Due to the fact that the typeface used to create a logotype has often been modified from its original form, the ‘semantic associations’ of a logotype could vary from that of the typeface used to create it.

Outlined in further detail in Chapter 3, the researcher created two surveys to perform original research in an attempt to answer the hypothesis. There are several terms used to describe the creation and analysing process of these surveys that are important to clarify. The first terms are ‘pleasing’ and ‘reassuring’. These terms originated from the typographic framework designed by Henderson et al. (2004) in their journal article *Impression Management Using Typeface Design*. The goal of the article was to develop empirically based guidelines to help managers select typefaces that affect strategically valued impressions. The term ‘impression’ is used in a manner similar to the way the researcher uses ‘semantic association’ in this thesis. The guidelines were constructed by a process involving selecting a sample of typefaces and having professional graphic designers and advertisers rate the typefaces on selected design characteristics. Henderson et al. (2004) then identified a list of strategically relevant impressions and had consumers respond to the typefaces on the impression measures. Lastly, Henderson et al. proceeded to perform a cluster analysis which revealed six semantic response profiles. The two typeface profiles chosen by the researcher to assist in the creation of the logotypes were the ‘pleasing’ profile and the ‘reassuring’

profile. In their research, the ‘profiles’ are also referred to as ‘clusters’ by Henderson et al. (2004) since they are groupings found through a statistical cluster analysis. Further explanation and elaboration of these semantic association ‘profiles’ or ‘clusters’ are described in III.3.1, the research methodology section.

The ‘pleasing’ and ‘reassuring’ profile guidelines allowed the researcher to choose typefaces with pre-determined semantic associations produced by the research of Henderson et al. (2004) to create the logotypes used in the research. However, as stated earlier, the semantic associations could be different for the logotype compared to the typeface, so it was imperative to test and confirm the semantic association by the use of a semantic differential survey. Testing was also performed on the brand slogans created by the research to confirm the semantic associations as well. The second portion of the original research involved creating four ‘brand sets’. A ‘brand set’ is the term used in this thesis in reference to the combination of a logotype and a brand slogan.

Findings from this research intend to show how consumers have more favourable attitudes towards a specific brand when the semantic associations of the branding slogan and a logotype are congruent with each other. Furthermore, having congruency between the two marketing elements will enhance and support the brand vision accurately. It is anticipated that the findings from this thesis will not only emphasise the importance of underlying semantic associations in typography, but will also bring fresh views for graphic designers, typographers and type designers to assist their future work with successful logotype design.

II. Literature Review

II.1 Introduction

In this literature review, three main subjects will be covered: typography, semiotics and branding. These three key areas of research are central to this thesis topic. First and foremost, typography will be covered. A brief overview of typographic history and classification will be reviewed to create a base of knowledge surrounding the media vehicle of this thesis, the logotype. Individual elements of typography will be defined as well and the effects that they have on readability. Brand visual identity elements, specifically logotypes, will be studied, as will font appropriateness and the relationship between typography and brands.

Semiotics is the second major area of research to be covered, which naturally follows the subject of font appropriateness. A background of the field of semiology will be covered first, before a closer look at the two key concepts within semiotics, denotation and connotation. Often, semiotics is used as an analysis tool, therefore it is important to see how this analysis occurs. Subsequent to this investigation will be a review of the literature surrounding the areas of typeface semantic associations and semiotics in relation to brands. A key component to this thesis is understanding the effects of congruency. Therefore, literature involving semiotic congruency will be reviewed as well.

The final area of research is the topic of branding. After a brief history and background of branding, two main areas will be of focus. The first focus will be the link between typeface semantic association and font appropriateness on brand choice. The second focus will be consumer behaviour, more specifically, how brand choice and preferences are formed, including cognition science and the emotion-driven consumer choice.

II.2 Typography

There are several ways to define typography. Solomon (1986) defines typography as the art of mechanically producing letters, numbers, symbols, and shapes through an

understanding of the basic elements, principles, and attributes of design. Childers and Jass (2002) describe typography as “the art or skill of designing communication by means of the printed word” (p.2). The argument of whether or not typography is an art or a science continues; however, it is nonetheless a complex craft. White (2005) summed up the importance of typography as a fundamental design principle when he said, "Visuals get you to look, but type delivers message and meaning, tone of voice and feeling, hierarchy and importance, explanation and clarity" (p.5). Minamiyama states that when used and chosen properly, typography enables the message to encompass and communicate the ideals of the communicator. Typography does not just deliver the message; it adds something extra to it as well, creating a tremendous impact (2005).

The work of a typographer is somewhat delicate. It is important for typographic design not to overpower. Like musicians, composers and authors, typographers must as a rule do their work and disappear (Bringhurst, 2002). Lupton (2004, p.63) states, "Although many books define the purpose of typography as enhancing the readability of the written word, one of design's most humane functions is, in actuality, to help readers *avoid* reading". To gain further insight into the vast world of type, the following paragraphs offer a brief history of typography to support the understanding of classification as well as technical components of type and proven design tactics.

II.2.1 Type History and Classification

A focal point of this thesis looks at how semantic associations are formed through type. Often, typefaces with similar characteristics are grouped into semantic clusters or profiles as Henderson et al. (2004) did in their research. Typographic history provides a basic understand of how general type classification systems came to be as well as semiotic type profiles.

In the twentieth century, outside factors continued to influence the creation of new typefaces causing an ever-changing landscape of type design. Within the span of 500 years, type design underwent a radical shift from brush-like organic strokes of old style to bolder simpler patterns (Samara, 2006). Graphic Design evolved rapidly as industrialization and the explosion of advertising swept through the western world

(White, 2005). Advertising as a new form of communication led to new kinds of typography. Big bold typefaces were designed by distorting the anatomical elements of classical letters. Nevertheless, the growth of mass consumption caused printing quality to suffer, as the public was hungry for cheap printing and cheap books (Lupton, 2004). By the 1920's the Bauhaus School opened, marking the birth of graphic design as a separate academic discipline (White, 2005; Samara, 2006). Herb Lubalin, a prominent American graphic artist said, "The realization came to many of us in the early '50s that type was not just a mechanical means of setting words on a page. It was, rather, a creative and expressive instrument" (White, 2005, p.186).

Typography has grown and developed alongside art, politics, literature and science, and therefore has been directly influenced by all of these associations. Many have attempted to create a system to classify type into categories. Traditionally, type designers used historical references as the basis of the design process. However, this even brings about issues due to a certain amount of stylistic overlap from period to period (Samara, 2006). Bringhurst's (2002) thought on classification is that letterforms are not only objects of science but belong to the realm of art. They change over time just as music, painting and architecture do. Due to the nature of typography, all type classification systems are subject to argument and exception (White, 2005). Where Spiekermann (2003) prefers Adobe's official type classification, Bringhurst (2002) classifies type chronologically and by art movement. There are even manuals that define type style by mood.

Despite new classifications appearing over the past several decades, there are basic categories that remain constant (Samara, 2006). White's (2005) system is simple and broken into eight categories, some of which have sub-categories of their own. Serif consists of Old Style, Traditional, Modern and Slab Serif. San Serif typefaces are Grotesques and New Grotesques, Geometrics and Humanists. The six remaining categories are Script, Glyphic, Blackletter, Monospaced, Decorative and Symbols (White, 2005).

II.2.2 Elements of Typography

It is important to review typeface anatomy and typeface design because it is these attributes that give the very essence to the personality of a typeface or logotype.

Typefaces themselves have four major qualities, commonly referred to as the ‘elements’ of type. These are line, weight, orientation and size. Line is the basic element of type that gives each character its form and style. The weight of a typeface refers to its thickness in relation to the volume of white area its letters displace with ink. Orientation is the vertical position of the typeface that, for example, can be either upwards or slanting (White, 2005; Bringhurst, 2002, Lupton 2004). Childers and Jass (2002) observe that every typeface in existence today is created through the use of a distinctive mix of these four elements.

Two other properties that have an important effect on typography are leading and line length. Leading refers to the amount of vertical space between lines of type. It is the principle on which the concepts of single and double spacing are based. Line length on the other hand, refers to the distance between the right and left margins in the text (Schriver, 1997).

When discussing typography, it is also useful to understand the technical components that make up type. A single glyph of a typeface has several anatomic parts. The *ascender* is the vertical extension above the body of a letter, as in “b.” The *descender* is the vertical extension below the body of a letter, as in “p.” The height of lowercase letters excluding ascenders and descenders, as in “x”, is referred to as the *x-height*. A few other important terms are the *aperture*, the pocket of contained space found within some letters, as in “e, a g, and p.” and *stem*, the main vertical stroke of a letter, as in “L”. The letterforms in all typefaces vary by only six aspects, case, weight, contrast, width, posture and style. (White, 2005; Bringhurst, 2002; Lupton, 2004; Samara, 2006).

II.2.2.1 Readability

Part of using type well entails an understanding of readability and legibility. Spiekermann and Ginger state that, “Sometimes it is best just to follow the rules, rules must be learnt first before you start to break them” (Spiekermann & Ginger, 2003, p.40). White adds that (2005) legibility is central to typography. He also pointed out that, after all, the purpose of typography is for it to be read. These two concepts, together with a historical and structural knowledge base of type, will allow a designer to present information as visibly, as efficiently and as memorably as possible (White,

2005). The topic of readability and legibility has been one that many scholars have touched on before. In alignment with Lupton's statement that one of design's functions is to help readers *avoid* reading, White (2005) says, "while readers read type, they do not 'see it'. Typographic design should only register in the reader's subconscious, but designers must both read and see type" (p.29). When selecting a typeface for a particular job it is important to consider readability and legibility as well. Spiekermann and Ginger (2003) state that although scripts are nice choices, it is important to consider that they are not appropriate for long spells of reading.

In 2001, Gump surveyed a sample of students and faculty on their perceptions of readability for 10 different typefaces. Gump found that a majority of the respondents rated Engravers' Gothic (the small capitals typeface) as easy to read. This contradicts Tinker (1963) who found that readers prefer lowercase letters and that all uppercase letters retard reading speed. Stopke and Staley (1994) also agreed with Tinker that lowercase letters are more conversational and easier to read.

II.2.2.1.a Leading, Tracking and Kerning

It is important to know as designers what to 'see' when we examine a typographic form. The common thread on this topic in readings from Bringhurst, Tinker and White is that legibility is mainly affected by the sculpted empty space between and around typographic letters (Bringhurst, 2002). Tinker (1963) states that the white space within the letter outline, and size were the most important factors for increased legibility. "Poor typography results from only concentrating on the letterforms. The 'Not letterform' stuff is just as important" (White, 2005, p.15). In this quote, White is referring to the space surrounding letters, between characters, words, and lines, in other words, kerning, tracking and leading.

Leading is the space between the descenders of line and the ascenders of the next (White, 2005). Excessively tight leading makes text appear overly dense and hampers effective reading (Schriver, 1997, p.260). Tracking is adjusting the overall letter and word space in a line or paragraph (White, 2005). In a normal text face in a normal size, the word space should be a quarter of an "em". Another rule regarding tracking by Bringhurst is that one should not letterspace (track) the lowercase without a reason

- it hampers legibility. He also states that headings are the exception to this rule, but adds they are kind of a cliché of postmodern typography (Bringhurst, 2002). Finally, kerning is removing or adding space between specific letter pairs to achieve optimal consistent letterspacing (White, 2005). These three concepts are key because typography should be signaled by cues, spatial cues being one of them (Lupton, 2004). These slight adjustments to typographic form all contribute to the personality, which is vital within a brand visual identity system.

II.2.3 Typography and Brand Visual Identity

Typography is a key component of creating a brand visual identity system. It assists in achieving the ultimate goal of a brand's visual identity system: to accurately express the company's vision, goals, values, voice and personality. The identity system is the symbol of the value and services the brand offers. Therefore, it is extremely important for the identity system to embody how the brand hopes to be perceived (Wheeler, 2006). Mollerup (1997) states that the part of a company's corporate identity that is visual is generally referred to as the visual identity. There are several elements to a brand's visual identity system: logo, picture style, layout and colours. However, typography has the ability to link together all communication as the common denominator (Minamiyama, 2005).

Due to the complex concept of brands as symbols (which will be discussed further in section II.4.2 Semiotics and Brands), logotype or trademark creation has become a critical decision point for a brand. The design of a trademark now exceeds simply creating aesthetically pleasing images; it involves incorporating the internal culture of a brand as well as considering the consumer's perception of the brand (Morgan, 1999). As Wheeler (2006) suggests in his book *Designing Brand Identity*, typography has the ability to be a powerful force in building an effective brand identity program. He goes on to say that when the typography [of a brand identity] has a unique personality and inherent legibility it helps create a unified and coherent image of the brand.

II.2.3.1 Logotype

In this thesis, the focus is on logotypes and wordmarks within a brand's visual identity system. It is important to take note of how a logotype is differentiated from other trademarks and to clear up definitions due to incorrect slang terms used in the

field today. The term ‘logotype’ and its shortened form ‘logo’ come from the Greek *logos*, meaning word (Mollerup, 1997). Often the term “logo” is used in a situation where “trademark” is more technically correct. A trademark is defined as any symbol that distinguishes the products of one company from those of another (Danesi, 2008). The function of a trademark is identification (Mollerup, 1997).

An emblem, pictorial mark and an abstract or symbolic mark are all trademarks that are pictorially-based. They could be literal or a symbol that conveys a big idea (Wheeler, 2006). Although this study will not be looking at connotations of these particular trademark types, they sometimes have typographic counterparts, otherwise known as a signature line to the symbol. Due to the fact that the pictorial symbol could interfere with the connotation of the signature line, the research in this thesis specifically surrounds logotypes and wordmarks.

Wordmarks, letter logos and logotypes are very similar in characteristic in that they could be both a freestanding acronym and a company name or product name in a determined font, which may be standard, modified or entirely redrawn. Unlike wordmarks, logotypes specifically are often combined with a symbol (Wheeler, 2006). To avoid confusion, the term logotype to represent all three typographic trademark types will be used from this point forward.

Logotypes use lettering to create a distinctive visual image and depict the name of a brand in a memorable way (Lupton, 2004). Within the category of logotypes are “alphabetic logotypes”. An example of this style is the stylized “M” in McDonalds or the “VW” trademark for Volkswagen. An “acronymic logotype” is one that is comprised of the initials of a brand name (Danesi, 2008). A logotype is a widely used type of trademark. One of the most famous logotypes is the Coca-Cola trademark. Danesi (2008) suggests that it is perhaps the effectiveness of combining the brand name with the visual, which taps into two forms of memory, the verbal and the eidetic that makes a logotype a successful and therefore a popular choice for a brand identity emblem.

The modification of the letterform in a logotype is an extremely important component in creating a highly effective trademark. Typographic letterforms can be modified to

express appropriate personality, and to convey the positioning of the company (Wheeler, 2006). In addition to portraying symbolic meaning, modifying a typeface within a logotype has another purpose: it allows a specific type treatment to be recognizable. The characteristics specific to a particular brand can then be repeated and allow a brand to have ownership of the type treatment (White, 2005).

Bringhurst (2002) states that the nature of logotypes, the modification of a typeface, pushes the use of typography in the direction of hieroglyphics, which tend to be looked at rather than read. The connotations of typography and logotypes will be discussed in depth in the following sub-chapter, but it is important to note now that the meaning of a logotype is up for interpretation based on cultural symbolic reasoning (Danesi, 2008).

II.2.3.2 Typeface Appropriateness

Choosing one typeface over another is a decision that needs careful consideration, with many factors coming into play. Message, the medium and audience all determine font appropriateness. White (2005) states that putting the reader's needs first is always the right decision when determining appropriateness. In addition to the reader's needs, White adds that semantics, knowing your client, passing fashion and reproduction variables also need to be taken into consideration (White, 2005).

In *Type Style Finder: The Busy Designer's Guide To Choosing Type*, Samara (2006) says that it is helpful to visualize objects or places related to the subject matter of the text as inspiration when determining the appropriateness of a typeface. It is an intuitive reality for designers that there are particular typefaces that are more suitable for a particular job, but there have been several empirical studies done on the appropriateness of typeface to support this as well. Saltz outlines the example that rounded shapes and lighter weights might convey a more feminine touch for the feminine products and brands. The weightier and more squared off and "muscular" in appearance suit products for the male demographic (2009).

Poffenberger and Franken (as cited in Doyle & Bottomley, 2004) did some of the first studies on appropriateness in 1923. Many researchers going forward have used that

research as a foundation for their work. In their study, they asked people to rank order the appropriateness of 29 fonts for each of five ‘commodities’ and five ‘abstract qualities’. The experiment showed that fonts most appropriately represented the commodity cluster of autos, building and coffee when they were emboldened, simple and easy-to-read (e.g. Cheltenham Bold, Century Bold). These in turn were associated with the qualities of ‘cheapness’, ‘economy’, and ‘strength’. The other two commodities, ‘jewelry’ and ‘perfume’, were most appropriately represented by fonts that were italicized, scripted, ornate (e.g. Caslon Old Style Italic; Typo Slope), and these in turn were associated with the qualities of ‘luxury’ and ‘dignity’. Poffenberger and Franken concluded that “differing typefaces do vary in appropriateness and that judges are able to ‘feel’ this appropriateness or lack of appropriateness” (as cited in Doyle & Bottomley, 2004, p.1).

10 years later Schiller did a very similar study. The findings were very similar with the exception of a change in the automobile category. Over the course of those 10 pivotal years in history in the 20’s, the auto industry had changed dramatically. In the 30’s there was more demand for luxury and people realized that in the long run economy was more profitable. This showed us that a shift in values comes with time (Schiller, 1935).

Much later, the subject of font appropriateness was approached again when Brumberger (2003) examined the awareness and impact of typeface appropriateness. This study reviewed the discussions around the role of typeface appropriateness in readers’ interactions with a print document. There were two studies performed by Brumberger (2003). The first study took three different typefaces under the descriptors of Elegant, Direct and Friendly and combined them with Professional, Violent and Friendly text passages. The results showed Arial (direct typeface) as generally more appropriate regardless of text persona, Bauhaus (friendly typeface) appropriate for friendly text passage and CounselorScript, the elegant typeface, was rated as the least appropriate typeface for overall use, but more appropriate for professional text than the other two. The findings were very similar to those of Poffenberger and Franken (1923) and Schiller (1935), in that a typeface whose persona matched closely with that of the text was seen as more appropriate for that text.

The second study used the same combinations of typeface and text passage but this time the subjects were asked to rate each text passage on a list of attributes. Osgood's semantic differential scale was used to measure the results, which will be discussed in detail in the following sub-chapter. Data indicates that in this study, the visual personality of a text did not have a large impact on readers' perception of its verbal personality. It was possible, however, that the text passage had very strong persona and the typeface was unable to overpower it. It is important to note now that this finding contradicts that of the assimilation theory of Doyle and Bottomley (2004), which will be reviewed in depth further ahead. Nonetheless, the overall data from the Brumberger study supports their original hypothesis that readers are aware of typeface and text matches or mismatches (Brumberger, 2003).

II.2.4 Summary

White articulated that by understanding how type has come to be and how it has progressed through time, the designer will then have the confidence to break the rules, therefore improving the reader's experience (2005). As Childers and Jass (2002) stated, every unique typeface is created through the use of a distinctive mix of the four elements: line, weight, orientation and size. Each typeface has the capabilities to encompass and communicate the ideals of the communicator in a different way. These slight alterations in design allow for differing typefaces to vary in appropriateness or lack of appropriateness in design applications (Poffenberger & Franken, 1923). Semiotics is what allows us to envision a personality within a typeface. Without this analysis method it would be difficult to determine appropriateness. The following section of this study introduces our second major topic of research, semiotics.

II.3 Semiotics

Before the first line or even a word is read of a magazine cover, business card or a classified ad, a first impression has been formed in our mind (Spiekermann and Ginger, 2003). Section II.3, Semiotics, will discuss the concept of *how* the analysis of the impression occurs. Semiotics is important because it can help us not to take 'reality' for granted as something having a purely objective existence. It teaches us that reality is a system of signs (Chandler, 2007). Through studying semiotics it is

appreciated that information or meaning is not found in the dictionary. Chandlers' (2007) position is that "meaning is not 'transmitted' to us - we actively create it according to a complex interplay of codes or conventions of which we are normally unaware (para.26). Semiotics provides us with the tools for understanding how we encode and decode meaning from the representations we make (Danesi, 2008). Although it could be said that semiotics is the science of interpretation (Danesi, 2008), it is not considered a true science (Danesi, 2006).

II.3.1 Background of Semiotics

There are three main theorists within semiotics. The Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure is considered the founder of semiotics. For Saussure, 'semiology' was 'a science' which studies the role of signs as part of social life. Secondly, American philosopher, Charles Peirce said 'a sign...is something which stands to somebody for something in some respect or capacity'. Another prominent theorist was C.W. Morris. He developed behaviourist semiotics, and also devised a threefold classification of semiotics from Peirce; *semantics*, *syntax* and *pragmatics*. *Semantics* is the relationship of signs to what they stand for, whereas *syntax* is the formal or structural relationship between signs. More precisely, *syntax* is a system that determines how words are combined to form phrases and sentences. Lastly, the relation of signs to interpreters is called *pragmatics*.

A more modern theorist, Umberto Eco (as cited in Chandler, 2007, para.5) very broadly stated, "Semiotics is concerned with everything that can be taken as a sign. Semiotics involves the study not only of what we refer to as 'signs' in everyday speech, but also of anything that 'stands for' something else. In a semiotic sense, signs take the form of words, images, sounds, gestures and objects".

Saussure created a two-part model of the sign. A signifier, the form that the sign takes and the signified, the concept it represents (Chandler, 2007). Saussure stressed that sound and thought (or the signifier and the signified) were as inseparable as the two sides of a piece of paper. In other words, each triggers each other.

In relation to the model of the sign is the term opposition. It is a comparison of two forms to determine if they are differentiated significantly. An example of this is, night

versus day or good versus evil. The concept of opposition underlines the fact that signs have value only in relation to other signs (Danesi, 2008). Chandler (2007) uses the example of the individual word such as 'tree'. He states that the word does have some meaning for us, but its meaning depends on its context in relation to the other words with which it is used. According to Danesi (2006), the extraction of appropriate meaning from a sign or text is subject to the individual, but also involves meaning within a specific situation. This is called the act of classification.

Chandler, author of *Semiotics for Beginners*, has taken both Saussure and Pierce's model of signs and combined them to create a very useful reference for differing 'modes of relationship' between sign vehicles and their referents. Chandler describes three different modes. The 'symbolic' mode is when the signifier does not resemble the signified but which is fundamentally arbitrary or purely conventional - so that the relationship must be learnt: e.g. language in general (plus alphabetical letters, words), numbers, traffic lights (Chandler, 2007). Danesi (2006) adds to this by stating that most signs fall under this category of the symbol form.

The second mode is the 'iconic' mode. This is a mode in which the signifier is perceived as resembling or imitating the signified. An example of this would be when the signifier recognizably looks, sounds, feels, tastes, smells or possesses similar qualities of the signified (Chandler, 2007). Danesi (2006) identifies an icon as a sign that simulates, replicates, reproduces and imitates properties of its referent in some way. An example of an icon would be a portrait by an artist or a perfume scent of vanilla.

The final mode is the 'indexical' mode. This is when the signifier is not arbitrary but is directly connected in some way (physically or causally) to the signified. The connection can be observed or inferred. Some examples of this would be medical symptoms such as pain or a rash, a 'signal' like a phone ringing, or personal 'trademarks' such as handwriting (Chandler, 2007). Another example of the 'indexical' mode would be pointing a finger or words such as here, there, up and down (Danesi, 2006).

Danesi (2006) outlines three other types of signs not covered in Chandler's assimilated model. 'Symptom' is a bodily sign that is indicative of physical states or conditions. 'Signal' is a bodily emission such as a sound or movement. And finally 'name' is a sign that stands for a person, place, and brand. In addition to the classification of types of signs, the philosopher St. Augustine distinguished between signs found in nature and conventional ones. St. Augustine coined the term 'semion', which is a sign produced by nature. Conventional types of signs are those created by humans (Danesi, 2008).

II.3.1.1 Denotation, Connotation and Myths

In semiotics, denotation and connotation are terms describing the relationship between the signifier and its signified. Denotation is the sign's 'literal' meaning (Chandler, 2007). A sign encodes something that is observed, perceived, felt or thought. Danesi explains this as that which denotes, or calls attention to, at a primary level. He uses the example of a house as a *structure to live in* versus the connotative meaning of the house *roared with laughter* (Danesi, 2006).

While Saussure always put the focus on denotation, a theorist by the name of Roland Barthes brought attention to the importance of connotation. By 1973 Barthes (as cited in Chandler, 2007, para.3) had come to the conclusion that "denotation is not the first meaning, but pretends to be so." In other words, denotation is the one that establishes the meaning and often closes the reading.

The term 'connotation' is used to refer to the 'personal' associations (ideological, emotional etc.) of the sign. These associations often relate to the reader's class, age, gender or ethnicity (Chandler, 2007). Danesi (2006) states that connotation is the meaning-making and meaning-extracting mode in the production and understanding of most signs and texts. Signs are more open to interpretation in their connotations than their denotations (Chandler, 2007). As once said by Fiske (as cited in Chandler, 2007), "denotation is what is photographed, connotation is how it is photographed" (sec.9, para.3).

Connotation and denotation are often described in levels of meaning or signification. The three orders of signification are not always the same depending on the theorists,

but they are often described in the following manner. The first (denotative) order of signification is seen as primarily representational and relatively self-contained. The second (connotative) order of signification reflects 'expressive' values, which are attached to a sign. In the third (mythological or ideological) order of signification the sign reflects major culturally variable concepts underpinning a particular worldview - such as masculinity, femininity, freedom, individualism. This third view often is viewed as being similar to a metaphor (Chandler, 2007).

In addition to orders of signification, the terms denotation and connotation also cover at least four main conceptual distinctions, the first being *logical*. This is when the connotation is identical with the content, and the denotation is another name for the referent. The second distinction is called the *stylistic* distinction, where denotation is to be part of the content that is 'one-to-one' with the referent. The connotation is identified with what remains of the content when denotation is deducted. *Semiotical* distinction is when the denotation is a relation between the expression and content. The connotation in turn relates to two signs or two units of expression and content in a particular way. Lastly is what Eco refers to as the *connotation distinction or contextual implication*. This occurs with denotation is less indirect than connotation with which the content is given (as cited in Department of Semiotics, 2008).

There are ways of creating different connotations of the same signified. Changing the form of the signifier does this. For example, adjusting the style or tone may involve different connotations, such as when using different typefaces for exactly the same text (Chandler, 2007). The following section addresses this relationship between type and semantics further in depth.

II.3.1.2 *Typeface Semantic Associations*

A semiotic meaning goes beyond consciousness, evoking sense and feeling. For this reason, understanding these meanings is a powerful way to enhance identity. Through font shape and characteristics, typography contains a subtle message or soft power, operating in the realm of the subconscious (Minamiyama, 2005). Van Rompay (2009) refers to findings from the design, art and advertising fields that suggest that the typeface is not only perceived in terms of its appearance but also of the symbolic connotations they hold. Typefaces have the ability to amplify the emotional weight of

the text. Therefore, choosing the correct typeface is essential to creating the correct tone of the message and enhancing the believability of the text (Saltz, 2009).

Thangaraj (2004) adds that different typefaces or fonts carry different connotations and can have differing influences on the readability, assimilation, interpretation, and impact of the words and concepts they represent. Despite the studies to date, Mackiewicz (2005) suggests that only a modest number of research examines typeface personality or semantic associations. He suggests that further research is needed concerning why people assess typefaces to have different personalities since there is only data to support that people *just do* differentiate. The following section will consist of a review of the literature surrounding typeface connotation.

The concept surrounding the ‘personality’ of a typeface is somewhat divided. Determined by scaling-based analysis methods in information design and marketing and conceptual judgment in the field of psychology, the conclusion is drawn that the visual characteristics of verbal material possess semantic characteristics. Samara (2006) supports this theory by adding that a typeface’s innate abstract shapes and details carry *some* messages with them. A key contribution from psychology in this subject is that typeface semantic associations are triggered prior to the denotative meaning of the verbal stimulus (Childers & Jass, 2002). This finding will be explored further in this thesis when the subject of branding and emotion-driven consumer choice is discussed.

Through the use of the semantic differential in their experiments, Walker et al. (1986) and Henderson et al. (2004) both revealed that typefaces do possess specific semantic qualities and that, in fact, individuals are capable of perceiving consistent meaning of their connotations. A study by Lewis and Walker (1989) suggests that it is the visual property of words processed early on which results in the creation of connotations separate from the nature of the actual verbal material.

In the same study, Lewis and Walker (1989) also explored the subject of typographic allusion, bridging readability and legibility of typography to font appropriateness. They were able to conclude that there are behavioural consequences to font-word pairings. Lewis and Walker showed that an inconsistency between a typeface meaning

and a word's meaning results in longer reaction times in inconsistent conditions. They demonstrated this by looking at the reaction times to a simple classification task when the word 'tortoise' was presented in Palatino Italic rather than Cooper Black. Lewis and Walker suggest that word and visual form are two separate routes to meaning. They state that since form and word are always presented simultaneously, form has the ability to prime the word, therefore accessing meaning approximately as fast as the word does.

Doyle and Bottomley (2009) present a contrasting concept that if it is true that different typefaces generate their own connotations then every written word originates two meanings. They go on to show through their experiments that readers are affected by the 'transfer of meaning' or connotation from the typeface that the name or product was presented in. Doyle and Bottomley conclude that there is a general assimilation between the meaning of the word and the meaning of the typeface and that this can be expected since typeface and word rarely occur apart and are almost always treated as one.

In the journal article, *How to use five letterforms to gauge a typeface's personality: a research-driven method*, Mackiewicz (2005) states that typeface anatomy contributes to typeface personality. They go on to say that people also associate typefaces with the context in which they are often seen - which lends to their tone. This aligns Mackiewicz with Doyle and Bottomleys' theory of assimilation of meaning as discussed earlier. Spiekermann and Ginger (2003) add to the subject by stating that the choice of typeface can manipulate the meaning of the word.

Childers and Jass (2002) indicate that typeface semantic associations were formed in three ways: consistent use of a specific font in a particular situation, direct relations with the perceptual qualities of the type, and abstract connotations. They also refer to studies that show that individuals are capable of perceiving consistent meaning in typefaces shown by results of ratings of typefaces on semantic differentials.

As suggested by McCarthy and Mothersbaugh (2002), it is the variations in the control features of type (serifs, line weight etc.) that create differences in semantic associations. In addition to design qualities such as stroke weights and contrasts

creating semantic associations, typefaces used commonly in advertising or pop-culture conjure up associations as well. Gothic blackletters commonly evoke horror or fantasy because they have been widely used in this genre (Samara, 2006). The findings of Brumberger discussed earlier stated that typeface persona did not have a significant impact on reader's perception of text persona. This varies slightly from the opinions of Spiekermann and Ginger (2003) who believed that a first impression is created before the first line is read.

In 1957, Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum developed a technique called the semantic differential for the systematic mapping of connotations or 'affective meanings'. This technique has since been used regularly as a way to rate and describe typefaces by locating the 'semantic space' in three dimensions (Chandler, 2007). Osgood's three dimensions of connotative meaning are: *evaluation* (good, pleasant, beautiful, happy), *potency* (strong, hard, rugged, potent, tough), and *activity* (active, fast, young, lively) (Tannenbaum et al., 1964). This concept is often referred to as the acronym EPA.

As gathered from the data studied, it is shown that typefaces have the ability through their semantic space to specifically influence particular meanings. Walker, Smith, and Livingston (1986) demonstrated that subjects were able to identify semantic qualities associated with a particular style of typeface. Tannenbaum, Jacobson, and Norris (1964) performed a study that linked the standard physical characteristics of Serif–Sans Serif, Roman–italic, and upper–lower case to the typeface semantics measured using Osgood's EPA findings. What they discovered was that the italicized fonts were more active but less potent, upper-case were more potent than lower-case, but Serif and sans-serif typefaces did not differ in terms of EPA (Tannenbaum et al., 1964).

In a study a few years later, Kasti and Child (1968) surveyed forty college students on the influence of typeface variables (angular vs. curved, bold vs. light, simple versus ornate, serif versus sans-serif) on opinion of emotional meaning. They found that moods such as sprightly, sparkling, dreamy, and soaring tend to be matched to curved, light, ornate, and perhaps sans-serif type; while moods such as sad, dignified, and dramatic are matched to angular, bold, and perhaps serif type.

II.2.2.1.a Creating Associations through Typeface Design Characteristics

The characteristics of a typeface often reveal a particular kind of tone and provide distinct physical presence in a design that may connote feelings, whether it be fast or slow, aggressive or elegant, cheap or reliable (Samara, 2006). Many researchers have identified how to apply this accepted knowledge that in fact, different typefaces or fonts carry different connotations. Davis and Smith (1933) say extreme size, condensation, boldness, family style and italics are most forceful factors in type for expressing and feeling tone.

In *Type Style Finder* (2006), Samara created 43 type style categories, sorted by mood, concept, time frame, and age group and gave an overview of design characteristics that created an appropriate association in type. Although the differences from one typeface to the next may appear quite subtle, the overall differences can affect a typeface's feeling and therefore the associations it may evoke in an audience. The differences in the details of a letterform such as the serif shape, ductus (line, weight and direction in which each line is drawn), modulation and joint variation all contribute to the personality of a typeface.

II.3.1.3 Semiotic Analysis

Semiotics is inherently intertwined with the elements of advertising and marketing because it allows us to analyse messages as structured wholes and investigates hidden, connotative meanings (Chandler, 2007; Danesi, 2008). It was briefly referenced in the previous section that Osgood et al. created a technique called the semantic differential that allows one to study and draw out subconscious meanings in a statistical fashion. To expand further, the framework is set on a 7-point scale with opposing adjectives at either end about a specific concept, is it good or bad, weak or strong. When analyzed statistically, the semantic differential brings forward any general patterns on a particular subject (Danesi, 2008).

Despite the range of interpretation of signs, research using the semantic differential has shown that although the connotations of specific concepts are subject to personal interpretation and subjective perceptions, the range of variation is rarely accidental. Experiments that use the semantic differential framework show that connotation is

controlled by culture (Danesi, 2006). Another more simple method of inquiry used in semiotics is a series of questions to get at the meaning of something, such as who or what created the sign or how does the sign deliver its meaning (Danesi, 2008).

There are three principles of semiotic analysis to bear in mind no matter which method is used. The first being that all meaning bearing behaviours and forms of expression has ancient roots no matter how modern they appear to be. Secondly, sign systems influence people's notions of what is "normal" in human behaviour. And finally, specific systems of signs in which one has been reared influence ones worldview (Danesi, 2006).

Danesi, author of *Message, Signs and Meanings* (2004), states that the world is saturated with images of all kinds of signs. Danesi believes a basic knowledge of semiotics can help people filter, deconstruct and think critically about the world around us. One of the most common signs people encounter throughout their lives is a brand. In a semiotic sense, it stands for something other than itself in some meaningful or meaning-bearing way.

II.4 Brands

It is important to gain an overview of branding itself before we review brands as symbols within the context of semiotics. The overview will include a brief history of branding: however, the scope of this research does not require an in depth look into subjects such as brand strategy, brand experience and brand architecture.

Following the brief background, the researcher will then be able to assess semiotics and branding and how they intertwine with a key component of this research, typographic semantic associations.

II.4.1 History of Branding

The word "brand" comes from the Germanic root meaning "burn". The word is used literally when referring to "branding" an animal, to indicate an owner, or figuratively when the attributes of a product that make a lasting impression in a customer's mind are discussed (Danesi 2006, Healy 2008). The most likely original named product was

in 1882 when Harley Proctor named his white soap, "Ivory Soap" and later introduced the slogan into advertising, referring to Ivory Soap in all his promotional literature "99 and 44/100% pure". He came to realize that a slogan was an effective memory-aiding device because it is an elaboration of the brand name. By simply labeling products with descriptive or colourful names, manufacturers soon found that sales of the products increased significantly (Danesi 2006).

Brands are one of the most important modes of communication in the modern media society (Danesi, 2006). From the 1920's onward, advertising and public relations agencies started building a bridge between brands and consumer perception. Business and psychology joined forces and began to develop an "image-making" business. Brands became the focus of advertising, linking the brand to a particular image, both rhetorical and visual. The course of consumerist society changed drastically and has never been the same since (Danesi 2006).

The term brand today no longer is used just to refer to a specific product line, but also to the company that manufactures it and to the social image that the company wishes to convey of itself and of its products (Danesi, 2006). Anything can be a brand - products, services, organizations, places, even people. A brand is also a promise of satisfaction to the consumer. A brand is sometimes referred to as an unwritten contract between the seller and buyer, or a performer and an audience, an event and those who experience it and so on (Healy, 2008).

Healy (2008) states that when a brand is successful, it has the ability to reinforce a good reputation, encourage loyalty, assure quality and convey a perception of greater worth, allowing a product to be priced higher and grant the buyer a sense of affirmation and entry into an imaginary community of shared values.

Coca-cola was one of the first brands to carve out for itself a "brand image" as it has come to be known. "Brand image" can be defined as the opinion or concept of the product that is held by the public, especially as filtered through the mass media (Danesi, 2006). Bedbury stated that Coca-Cola's total market value is more an emotional quantity than a physical one. Hard assets like bottling plants, trucks, raw materials, and buildings are not as important to Coke - or to Wall Street, for that

matter - as the consumer goodwill that exists around the world toward the brand (as cited from Danesi, 2006). Brand personality is closely related to brand image. Brand personality is defined by the unique values and characteristics that are created by the core concepts of the brand as well as by how consumers view the brand. The brand personality gives the brand clear and distinctive characteristics (Minamiyama, 2005).

Branding adds a dimension to products that was absent from the marketplaces of the past. The more 'cultural meaning' (or 'connotative meaning') that can be built into a brand, the more likely the brand will become socialised (spread into the social mindset). The cultural meaning of brands is, in a phrase, 'mental constructs'. In other words, it is the culturally-shaped image that comes to mind when brands are referred to (Danesi, 2006).

II.4.2 Semiotics and Brands

Semiotics is often used within advertising and marketing as an analysis tool.

Advertising and marketing elements can be interpreted at two levels – a surface level (signifier level – as discussed in section II.3.1 above) and an underlying one (signified level – as discussed in section II.3.1 above) (Danesi, 2008). As stated by Elliot (1998), a product's first order is to satisfy the consumer's mere physical need, but after that the mind enters the realm of symbolic meaning of goods. Belk (as cited in Elliot, 1998) suggests that the contemporary theory of consumer behaviour recognizes that the consumer does not make consumption choices solely from products' utilities but also from their symbolic meanings.

From a consumer behaviour standpoint, it is important to note that semiotics is not able to firmly establish why something sells; it is only able to suggest reasoning. Similarly, the interpretation of a brand name or a logo is only one of many possible interpretations (Danesi, 2008). There are two functions of symbolic meanings of products and brands; *social-symbolism*, which is symbols that help construct the social world, and *self-symbolism*, those that work inward to construct our self-identity. Elliot states that consumption is central to supplying meaning and values for the creation of a consumer's personal and social world. Therefore, brands are recognized as a major source for these symbolic meanings (Elliott, 1998). McCracken (as cited in

Elliott, 1998) adds that brands are often used as symbolic resources for the construction and maintenance of a personal identity.

II.4.2.1 Consumer Attachment to Symbols

Blank, Massey, Gardner, & Winner (as cited in Van Rompay, 2009) suggest that symbolic meanings are defined as properties that consumers perceive in products that are not literally part of the product appearance. Aaker (as cited in Van Rompay, 2009) adds that brand characteristics and a brand's character or personality go hand in hand. Brand choice is more than simply choosing one product over another: adhering to particular brands creates a statement about an individual's value system (Hannam, 2009). Elliott expands on this subject by stating the creation of a consumer's self-identity or value system often involves the purchasing of products, services or media. Dittmar (1992) suggests that "material possessions have a profound symbolic significance for their owners, as well as for other people and the symbolic meanings of our belongings are an integral feature of expressing our own identity and perceiving the identity of others" (p.3).

According to Elliott (1998), the extraction of symbolic meaning from consumer behaviour is a powerful motivational force. O'Shaughnessy (as cited in Elliot, 1998) adds that the function of emotion perhaps makes up for the insufficiency of reason as well as helping the consumer effectively construct an identity to communicate to others.

II.4.2.2 Congruity Effects

Being able to analyse design elements through semiology is useful, but it is the application and combination of signs that will determine the end result or meaning. Saussure says 'everything depends on relations'. No sign makes sense on its own but only in relation to other signs (Chandler, 2007).

Lewis and Walker (as cited in McCarthy & Mothersbaugh, 2002) propose that typeface semantic associations are actually accessed prior to the activation of the meaning of the word itself. They go on to suggest a concept called *semantic priming*, which is essentially congruity between the denotative meaning of the text and the connotative meaning of the typeface. Lewis and Walker state that this theory could

assist word recognition therefore positively effecting persuasion through the ability to process brand claims.

Danesi (2008) stressed the importance of having the signifiers within a trademark complement each other in order to deliver congruent meanings about a brand. Van Rompay (2009) presented the data that shows if symbolic meanings are connoted through various marketing elements of a brand identity, they create a more effective impression for a product or brand when there is congruence in terms of the underlying theme. When meanings found in various marketing elements across a brand are incompatible or do not support the brands value system, a negative attitude can be formed. Hekkert and Van Wieringen (as cited in Van Rompay, 2009) suggest that design-conscious consumers may be better equipped to deal with incongruencies and may appreciate design outside of the norm.

II.4.3 Persuasion and Brand Preference

Advertising is a platform to establish a product in the marketplace. It showcases how a product can satisfy various emotional, social and other human needs. Advertising has become a widespread communication tool that is now used by anyone wishing to make public statements (Danesi, 2006). There are two schools of thought in advertising, the first being that advertising works through rational persuasion. The newer more controversial thought is that advertising can work through the subconscious (Heath, 2001). Rational persuasion is the accepted norm, but in 1988, Langmaid & Gordon used hypnotism to explore the subject of advertising and the subconscious. More evidence on this subject is just being discovered now, creating more buzz on trying to influence consumer's emotions (as cited in Heath, 2001).

According to Heath (2001), our intuition is often what makes the final decision when choosing products when competing brands satisfy our needs at the basic and rational level. It is now proven by psychologists that intuition acts as a gatekeeper for any decision.

A key finding from Zajonc (as cited in Elliot, 1998) states that preference for a product is first based on an emotional response to the product. Then the consumers

will justify it to themselves cognitively afterwards. This “emotional choice” is formed almost instantly and holistically. As stated earlier, Elliott’s position is that the formation of preference may be determined by deriving symbolic meaning from the product or brand and using it in the creation of a consumer’s personal identity construction. This type of non-rational preference can tend to drive out further rational evaluation once formed. Wilson & Schooler (as cited in Elliott 1998) say that this type of emotion based decision-making and un-biased reasoning may appear to be detrimental, but evidence shows that thinking about preferences can lead to more optimal choices and satisfaction.

II.4.3.1 Emotional Response to Brands

In 1988, Frijda (as cited in Elliot, 1998) created a set of eleven laws in order to describe the phenomena of emotional response to events. Two of these laws are relevant to this study, the Law of Concern and the Law of Closure. The Law of Concern relates to emotions that arise in response to events that are important to an individual’s goals, motives or concern. Therefore, hidden behind every emotion is an individual’s disposition to prefer certain states of the world. This supports the concept mentioned prior that consumers make an emotion-driven choice that help construct and maintain their identity.

The second law worth noting is the Law of Closure. According to Frijda, (as cited in Elliott, 1998) this particular law could be considered the essential feature of emotion. This law refers to the absoluteness of feeling and thinking and how it tends to be reflected in behaviours and overrides other concerns. Elliott adds (as cited in Elliott, 1998) that in consumer behaviour this law is relevant because it describes the desire for the consumption of an object and how that desire causes complete absorption in the shopping experience.

II.2.2.1.a Emotional-Driven Choice

Emotions are very important in consumer choice. As stated by McCarthy and Mothersbaugh (2002), negative emotions about an advertisement due to incongruent elements (e.g. inconsistent fonts and sizes) could indirectly affect a consumer’s motivation to purchase by creating negative emotions regarding the product or brand, causing avoidance behaviours.

Emotions are often not regarded when purchasing household goods. According to Heath (2001), emotional justification seems inappropriate for such a mundane purchase. A rational explanation, such as, “I needed powder to wash my clothes” is a statement that appears more logical. Heath (2001) goes on to explain that *somatic markers* create those instinctive choices we make, without even knowing it. Damasio (as cited in Heath, 2001) defines *somatic markers* as an emotional stimulus that ‘marks’ the event forever and encourages instinctive behaviour.

According to Elliott (1998) the traditional and accepted model of consumer behaviour assumes that cognitive activity occurs first and is then followed by an emotional evaluation, resulting in the formation of an attitude. In 1982, Zajonc (as cited in Elliott, 1998) made a proposal regarding this model that was completely unorthodox. He said that emotion is an altogether separate non-cognitive processing system and is the primary influence on the development of preferences and something which actually precedes cognition.

In 1988, Mittal (as cited in Elliott, 1998) took three of Zajonc's defined characteristics of emotions and created a model of “Affective Choice Mode.” This model can be applied to products which have symbolic meaning and are often expensive. Mittal suggests that a consumer that makes an emotion-based choice is unable to separate out individual attributes, and simply form an overall impression. The model also suggests that the emotion-based choice is self-focused and unable to be verbalized. Zajonc (as cited in Elliott, 1998) uses the example that a car labeled “too flashy” reflects the values and personality of the consumer more than any actual attribute of the car. Zajonc proposed that emotional judgments are made almost instantaneously and often rely on non-verbal channels of communication because they reflect more basic subjective feelings.

II.4.3.2 Cognition Science

Where Zajonc discusses non-cognitive response, Wheeler (2006) defines the sequence of cognition. Perception analysis shows how individuals recognize and interpret sensory stimuli. Shape is seen first, then colour and finally content. He goes on to state that reading is not necessary to identify shapes, but identifying shapes is necessary to read.

Heath (2001) states that in the context of advertising, active processing is rarely used. Instead, 'automatic' or 'shallow' processes are used which allow the ability to operate at semi-conscious or even subconscious levels. This type of processing is known as implicit memory. According to Heath, implicit memory operates automatically without knowing. There have been tests that show this type of learning is even more durable in the memory than conventionally encoded memory. This piece of information is perhaps why advertising can be so effective as part of a brand campaign. Heath makes note of the fact that although implicit learning cannot determine our conscious powers or choices, it is capable of recording many perceptions and concepts and stores them over long periods of time (Heath, 2001).

Implicit memory has been used in studies on logos in relation to brand choice. One study reviewed by Hannam (2009) showed that subjects would process a logo without realizing they saw it, creating the potential to influence their brand choice through subtle exposure. The study concluded that by repeatedly exposing people to a brand or elements of a brand, such as the logo, each subsequent exposure would be easier to process cognitively. This act in turn would lead a consumer to choose the brand later on. This research by Hannam is in alignment with the remarks of Buttle and Raymond (2003) who say that high familiarity promotes efficient cognitive processing. Reber et al. (as cited in Van Rompay, 2009) also agree that with repeated exposures, stimuli can be more easily processed and in turn create an increased liking. Similarly, Monahan, Murphy and Zajonc (as cited in Van Rompay, 2009) suggested that familiarity leads to improved preference.

A series of experiments by Buttle and Westoby (2006) use a measurement tool called Repetition Blindness (RB). The goal was to measure implicit association of logos and brand names. RB is a phenomenon that occurs when two items are rapidly presented along with repeated dimensions (e.g. semantic, visual) resulting in only one of the items being perceived. Buttle and Westoby (2006) found that as long as a consumer had the chance to see the name of a logo, then the logo-name learning process occurred rapidly.

II.4.4 Typeface connotation and brand choice

Semantic associations are the connotations that consumers derive about the text or brand that go beyond the text's actual semantic content. In the context of typography, consumers' associate ornate fonts with elegance, therefore they perceive the brand as elegant or stylish (McCarthy & Mothersbaugh, 2002). Semantic associations may be set in motion through one or more of three paths to meaning, including through consistent use in a particular situation, through a direct relation with the perceptual qualities generated by the visual patterning of the stimulus, and/or through associations with abstract connotative dimensions (Childers & Jass, 2002).

In 2002, Childers and Jass examined the semantics of typography in the advertising context. They investigated the situations under which typeface cues in advertising serve as influential cues for consumers in forming perceptions of brands, and also looked at the effect of typeface semantic associations to consumer memory for advertised brand claims. Through the evidence from these two experiments, they were able to conclude that typefaces convey meanings that have the potential to significantly influence important marketing constructs. These associations influence how consumers perceive brands, as well as, significantly influence consumer memory for brand benefits (Childers & Jass 2002).

In a similar context, the work of McCarthy and Mothersbaugh (2002) also focused on the effects of typeface semantics on brand preferences. First, they developed a proposed model of how typography may affect persuasion. Part of the model was then empirically tested by an investigation of how common typeface characteristics may influence ability to process advertising copy. They were able to conclude that typography can have a significant effect on the consumer's ability to read advertisement copy. The findings also indicated that not only is typography capable of affecting consumer ability to process advertisement-based brand information, but that the effects of various typographic characteristics are highly tied together.

A key finding to point out is that the extent to which a typeface brings about semantic associations may be affected by consumers' processing style. Visually-oriented people may be more sensitive to the visual aspects of typography than more verbally oriented people (McCarthy & Mothersbaugh, 2002). Design messages must be seen,

so the focal point must startle. Subsequently, something must be readable. If something is readable, it might be read. If it might be read, it might be remembered (White, 2005).

In 2004, researchers Henderson, Giese and Cote developed a set of empirically-based guidelines to improve the ability of organizations to choose typefaces that affect impressions of their brands. This investigation set out to determine the design dimensions that best capture differences among typefaces, the response dimension they generate, and how design and response dimensions are related. Through their research they were able to determine that design dimensions were strongly related to the impressions created by the typeface, and may affect a company's financial performance (Bloch 1995, Hertenstein & Platt 2001; Hutton 1997; Wallace 2001 as cited in Henderson et al., 2004). They achieved this by analysing the relationship between visual characteristics of typeface and typeface semantics (Henderson et al., 2004). The guidelines created by Henderson et al. are used in the researcher's original research, chapter 3, as a framework for pre-determining typeface semantic associations.

II.4.4.1 Font Appropriateness on Brand Choice

The first principle of typography is that it exists to honour its content (Bringhurst, 2002). Bringhurst states that there are three concepts to considering when choosing an appropriate typeface. It is important to choose a good quality type as well as one that will be a good typeface for readability. The type must also be sympathetic to the theme (2002). Even when the designer has touched upon the most appropriate typeface for the job, once it is surrounded with white space or other elements it can change the entire look of the design (Spiekermann & Ginger, 2003).

Over the years, there have been specific typefaces designed for specific industries or jobs. Spiekermann and Ginger state in their book '*Stop Stealing Sheep and Find Out How Type Works*', that there are newspaper typefaces that try to be so 'normal' you do not even notice you are reading them, type for phone books, classified ads, and Bibles and then typefaces for food products that suggest different flavours and qualities (2003). In fact, a majority of typography on food packaging is often altered and hand-lettered to express the vast array of tastes and promises. Spiekermann and

Ginger (2003) also say that without these unwritten rules of font appropriateness, we, the consumer, would not know what to buy or order.

In 2004, Doyle and Bottomley investigated how font, as an important aspect of a brand's visual identity, can enhance its strength and build its market share. Their research showed that people chose brands more often if they appeared in a typeface that was appropriate for the product category of the brand. In the study they performed, consumers chose chocolates from a box having an appropriate font rather than one having an inappropriate font on 75% of occasions. Through this study, they also discovered no relationship between gender and the chosen font or product. For example, females did not prefer the more feminine script font.

This particular study touched on not only font choice but name choice as well. They noted that marketers must pay close attention to both of the choices. Especially when creating cross-product brand identity, they found it is important to look at the entire portfolio of products the brand entails since one font must be appropriate for all. It may be wiser to select a slightly sub-optimal font that can travel across categories rather than selecting one that is perfect for one product but not another (Doyle & Bottomley, 2004).

II.4.4.2 Typeface Connotation and Appropriateness on Brand Choice

In 2006, Doyle and Bottomley continued their research to investigate a missing link in the field. They looked at how styles of lettering (i.e., fonts) can differ in their appropriateness for describing certain types of brands and products. They used the Osgood dimensions of evaluation, potency, and activity (EPA) to measure the semantics of fonts and product categories. What they discovered was that if typeface and product lay in the same region of (EPA) space, the typeface was considered more appropriate for that product, and the product was chosen more often. It is also important to take note that an obvious association between font and product may also improve a brand's chance of being considered, but these combinations occur infrequently and may not be the most appropriate font choice. For example, the font "snowdrift" may initially seem to be a great font choice for a frozen food transportation company, but it may restrict brand direction if the company chooses to branch out into say general grocery transportation as well (Doyle & Bottomley, 2006).

II.2.2.1.a Typeface and Brand Profitability

By choosing what to pay attention to, consumers have the ability to shape the information economy. Nevertheless, it is the role of a designer to help them make satisfying choices (Lupton, 2004). Mollerup states in his book *Marks of Excellence* (1997) the economy of a company can be positively affected by a design programme. Improving internal and external identification can increase company sales as well as improve employee motivation and performance (Mollerup, 1997).

A report on the impact of the Helvetica typeface on top-selling brands also stated that it is clear that corporations and designers now understand the potential of a logo, although it is hard to make a direct link between a typeface and a company's annual revenue (Jana, 2007). Greg Silvermann, global practice leader in analytics for Interbrand, disagrees. He suggests that within the last two years, it has become possible to estimate the impact a logo will have on revenue (Hannam, 2009).

In "With Type" by Rogener, Pool, and Packhauser (1995), a fervent argument is made for unique but consistent typefaces as a crucial element of corporate branding. Rogener et al. describes the fonts used by IBM, Mercedes, Nivea, and Marlboro as instantly recognizable internationally, and imply that the significant investment by such companies in design and copyright of trademarked fonts is worthwhile. For example, Rogener et al. discuss the Nivea Bold typeface developed in 1992 by Gunther Heinrich at advertising agency TBWA in Hamburg, Germany, for skincare brand Nivea, and claim that the Nivea Bold typeface has effectively embodied the Nivea brand's 'pure and simple' product philosophy. They link the font directly to profitability and Nivea's worldwide product category market share of 35% (Rogener, Pool & Packhauser, 1995).

Design and marketing *EzineInc.com* reports that American shoe company White Mountain Footwear paid BrandEquity International almost \$100,000 to re-design its 21-year-old typeface, with a resultant 20% increase in sales in the first and second years following the redesign. BrandEquity designer David Froment was quoted as saying the redesign's impact was "nothing short of miraculous" (Raz, 2002).

II.5 Summary of the Literature

Typography, semiotics and branding are the three interrelating subjects for this research. Through exploring the rich history of typography and the anatomy and structure of typeface, it is worth noting that type does more than simply deliver a message, it carries within it the tone, feeling and meaning (White, 2005). The application of typefaces as trademarks was surveyed, specifically the variety relevant to this thesis, logotypes. To review, Lupton (2004) stated that logotypes use lettering to create a distinctive visual image and to depict the name of a brand in a memorable way.

Subsequent to this was the review of semiotics, the study of signs. A key finding to note is that of Barthes, (as cited in Chandler, 2007) which states that even though connotation is the “second-order” it is generally apparent first. Danesi (2006) touched on a key position of semiotic meanings. He also states that connotations are powerful because they are beyond consciousness and they evoke sense and feeling. Scholars who explored typeface semantic associations also studied this concept of conveying emotion. Childers and Jass (2002) confirmed that typefaces convey unique [semantic] associations independent of the words they represent.

Finally, the area of branding was reviewed. The focus surrounded consumer persuasion and brand preference as well as branding in relation to the previous subjects, semiotics and typography. The empirical studies of Doyle and Bottomley on font appropriateness, and those of Henderson et al. as well as McCarthy and Mothersbaugh all lend support to Wheeler’s (2006) statement that letterforms can be modified to express appropriate personality and to convey the positioning of the company.

It is also important to note within the realm of branding the findings surrounding emotions and symbolic attachment. It was Zajonc (as cited within Elliott, 1998) who suggested that people form a preference first based on emotional response and then justify it to themselves cognitively. Relative to this concept was the statement from Mittal (as cited within Elliott, 1998) who claimed emotion-based choice is holistic, self-focused and unable to be verbalized. It was mentioned prior that semantic

associations evoke emotion. Therefore, the statement by Belk (as cited in Elliot, 1998) that consumers rely heavily on a product's symbolic meaning as well as the utility it offers when making product and brand choices is noteworthy.

A study by Van Rompay in 2009, titled *Symbolic Meaning Integration in Design and its Influence on Product and Brand Evaluation* presented the data that shows how symbolic meanings connoted across different elements of consumer products create a more favourable first impression of product and brand when there is congruence in terms of the underlying theme. In their study, they specifically looked at the three-way interaction and product attitude between advertising slogan, product shape, and the participant's need for structure severity.

Van Rompay's study as well as the congruency-based studies on appropriateness by Doyle and Bottomley surrounds an opening in research that is needed. McCarthy and Mothersbaugh proposed a model of how typography may affect persuasion, but did not test it. They did however; perform a study that indicates that typography can have a significant effect on the consumer's ability to read advertising copy. Similarly, in a study by Childers & Jass in 2002, it was hypothesized that typeface semantic associations will affect the formation of brand perceptions. As stated prior, the findings indicated that typeface could alter the meaning of the message or brand when the typeface in an advertisement was consistent with message. In their investigation, a print advertisement was utilized as the marketing context.

There has been no specific literature describing the congruency between the semantic associations of logotypes and a brand's personality. In particular, there is no literature describing (or no research examining) the consumer response, in particular the formation of favorable attitudes, to such congruency. Therefore, the following chapter will explore congruency between semantic associations of logotypes and brand personality through empirical study.

III. Original Research

III.1 Aim

Researchers Doyle & Bottomley (2006) touched on logotypes when they studied font-product congruity. Their study found that when typeface was considered more appropriate for a product category, the product was chosen more often. However, missing from the literature review in Chapter 2 was an expansive number of research surrounding logotypes. Van Rompay's (2009) congruity research is important for the reason that it investigated congruency across marketing elements, yet the focus was on advertising slogan and product shape and is only minimally useful in aiding the designers and marketers in the creation logotypes.

The discussions in the research of McCarthy & Mothersbaugh (2002) touched on how typography may affect persuasion, but their study indicated only that typography could have a significant effect on the consumer's ability to read advertising copy, leaving the need for more research around consumer persuasion. Also in 2002, Childers & Jass hypothesized in their research that typeface semantic associations will affect the formation of brand perceptions. Their research solely concentrated on the advertising copy in print advertisements, still leaving opportunities to look more specifically at the affects of logotype semantic associations. This absence of focus in these studies discussed above has led to the need for more research to explore the attitudes formed when the semantics associations of logotypes are congruent with a brand's personality.

Brand personality is defined by the unique values and characteristics that are created by the core concepts of the brand as well as how consumers view the brand. The brand personality gives the brand clear and distinctive characteristics (Minamiyama, 2005). Due to the complex nature of this concept, a brand slogan is used as a simplified representation of the brand personality in the surveys created for the original research. By definition, a brand slogan is a word or phrase used to express a characteristic position or stand or goal to be achieved (Merriam-Webster, 2011). An

effective advertising slogan can state the benefits of the product or service, set itself apart from competition and adopt a distinct ‘personality’ of its own, all within a few short words.

III.2 Hypothesis

The literature and research presented by Van Rompay (2009), Childers and Jass (2002), Henderson et al. (2004), McCarthy and Mothersbaugh (2002) and Doyle and Bottomley (2006) led the researcher to hypothesise that consumers will have more favourable attitudes towards a specific brand when the semantic associations of the branding slogan and a logotype are congruent with each other.

III.3 Methodology

The experiment for this study is largely based on the experiment conducted by Van Rompay et al. in 2009. The effects of ‘advertising slogan-product shape’ incongruence were studied as a result of consumers’ tolerance for information ambiguity. Van Rompay et al. (2009) note that there is lack of understanding of the manner in which congruence impacts attitude formation and created an experimental study to gain further insight. This experiment conducted for this study does not include examining the consumer ‘need for structure’ as Van Rompay did in addition cross-pairing advertising slogan and product shape.

The original research for this thesis surrounds the creation of two different Likert scale surveys to gather data on the participants’ brand attitudes. The first survey is a congruent pairing of [logotype-brand slogan] and the second survey is an incongruent pairing of [logotype-brand slogan].

III.3.1 Font Selections, Brand Slogan Development & Creating the Logotypes

Prior to the creation of the brand attitude surveys, two logotypes under the same product name within the same product category were created using two different typefaces that conveyed distinctive semantic associations. The product category chosen for this experiment was *tea*. Tea was chosen as an appropriate category due to its ability to have several diverse brand positioning options under the same product category.

The choice of typefaces for the creation of the logotypes are based upon typographic framework designed by Henderson et al. (2004) in their journal article *Impression Management Using Typeface Design*. The goal of the article was to develop empirically-based guidelines to help managers select typefaces that affect strategically valued impressions. Data collection for their study required four stages. First, they identified appropriate typeface design characteristics and selected a sample of representative typefaces. Second, professional graphic designers and advertisers rated typefaces on the selected design characteristics. Third, they identified a list of strategically relevant impressions. Fourth, consumers responded to the typefaces on the impression measures.

Henderson et al. (2004) then proceeded to perform a cluster analysis, which revealed six semantic response ‘profiles’ or ‘clusters’, two of which were chosen by the researcher to assist in the creation of the two logotypes. The purpose of creating the cluster analysis was to identify different groupings of typefaces with similar semantic associations that could be achieved and available to corporations through a range of commercially available fonts. Through their statistical analysis, six clusters appeared to describe the data the best.

The two typefaces used to create the logotypes for this research study fell under the clusters “pleasing and engaging” and “reassuring”, which will be referred to as cluster 1 and cluster 2 respectively from here forward. The cluster 1 logotype was created with the typeface *Mr. Wade*, a font by an unknown designer that was high on natural and flourish elements as determined by the researchers and supervising lecturers. According to Henderson et al. (2004), Natural and Flourish elements are *curved, organic, slanted, active, serif, with pronounced ascenders and descenders*. The semantic response elements for fonts under this cluster are *liked, warm, attractive, interesting, emotional, feminine, and delicate*.

The cluster 2 logotype was created with *Academy Engraved LET Plain* designed by Vince Whitlock from the Letraset foundry in 1989, which is high on harmony design elements as determined by the researcher and supervising lecturers. Harmony design elements are *uniform, smooth, balanced and symmetrical*. The semantic response

elements for fonts under this cluster are *calm, formal, honest, familiar, uninteresting and unemotional*.

Both logotypes were designed in lowercase, with the first letter of the brand name in capital letter. The brand name, *Belsari*, was chosen due to its ambiguity and unknown qualities, easily pronounceable and not strange or bizarre. Belsari is a small village in India where tea is grown.

In order to pair congruent brand slogans with the two logotypes, it was important to establish a fictitious market segment for each brand that would remain unknown to the participants in the study but would allow the researcher to appropriately develop and assign brand slogans. Cluster 1 logotype was design for a segment that was geared towards the 18-35yr olds, new age thinking, those who want an alternative to popular soft drinks or coffees, love to read and travel and are worldly. Cluster 2 logotype was designed for a segment that have grown up drinking tea, wants to be reassured of the taste and quality and is traditional in mind-set.

Taking into consideration these segmentations as well as the semantic response elements for each cluster, two brand slogans were created by the researcher that were congruent with semantic associations of their logotypes. The “pleasing and engaging” slogan is “Crafted to infuse your senses” which is inline with the descriptive words of cluster 1, *liked, warm, attractive, interesting, emotional, feminine, and delicate*. The “reassuring” slogan is “Like tea used to be” which is inline with the descriptive words of cluster 2, *calm, formal, honest, familiar, uninteresting and unemotional*.

III.3.2 Pre-testing for Affirmation of Semantic Associations of Logotypes and Slogans

The fonts chosen to create both logotypes embodied the design characteristics outlined by Henderson et al. (2004) in the response profiles found through their cluster analysis. However as the researcher chose them, the fonts were not specifically analyzed for semantic associations in the study. The typefaces were also modified slightly to create a unique logotype for each brand. Therefore it was important to perform a pre-test to affirm that the semantic associations of each logotype were in fact inline with the response elements outlined in the Henderson et al. (2004) study



for either cluster. Additionally, the semantic associations of both slogans required pre-testing given that the response profiles in the study by Henderson et al. (2004) was not created for advertising slogans.

Osgood's semantic differential scale was chosen as the method of determining connotative meaning due to its flexibility of use with pictures, words and even non-verbal communication, rather than the framework in Henderson et al. (2004), which is used specifically for typeface connotation analysis (Osgood et al., 1957, Doyle and Bottomley, 2006). However, the adjectives used for the semantic scales were taken from the response variables in Henderson et al. (2004). The adjectives for the pleasing and engaging logotype and slogan were like/dislike, warm/cold, attractive/unattractive, interesting/uninteresting, emotional/unemotional, feminine/masculine and delicate/strong. The adjectives for the reassuring logotype and slogan were calm/not calm, formal/informal, honest/dishonest, familiar/unfamiliar, interesting/uninteresting, and emotional/unemotional.

The layout of the pre-test survey (see Figure 1) consisted of the 2 logotypes and 2 slogans with a semantic differential scale below that the participants would complete for both.

Figure 1: Semantic Differential Pre-test Survey

**Please tick the box which corresponds best to your feeling for each pair of adjectives.
Please fill in every row with your first thought for each pair, there is no right or wrong.**

<div style="text-align: center;">  </div> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Like</td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;">Dislike</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Warm</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Cold</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Attractive</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Unattractive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Interesting</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Uninteresting</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Emotional</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Unemotional</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Feminine</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Masculine</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Delicate</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Strong</td> </tr> </table>	Like	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dislike	Warm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cold	Attractive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unattractive	Interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Uninteresting	Emotional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unemotional	Feminine	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Masculine	Delicate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Strong	<p style="text-align: center;">“Crafted to infuse your senses.”</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Like</td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;">Dislike</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Warm</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Cold</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Attractive</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Unattractive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Interesting</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Uninteresting</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Emotional</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Unemotional</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Feminine</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Masculine</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Delicate</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Strong</td> </tr> </table>	Like	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dislike	Warm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cold	Attractive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unattractive	Interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Uninteresting	Emotional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unemotional	Feminine	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Masculine	Delicate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Strong
Like	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dislike																																																																																																																																				
Warm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cold																																																																																																																																				
Attractive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unattractive																																																																																																																																				
Interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Uninteresting																																																																																																																																				
Emotional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unemotional																																																																																																																																				
Feminine	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Masculine																																																																																																																																				
Delicate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Strong																																																																																																																																				
Like	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dislike																																																																																																																																				
Warm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cold																																																																																																																																				
Attractive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unattractive																																																																																																																																				
Interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Uninteresting																																																																																																																																				
Emotional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unemotional																																																																																																																																				
Feminine	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Masculine																																																																																																																																				
Delicate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Strong																																																																																																																																				
<div style="text-align: center;">  </div> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Calm</td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;">Not Calm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Formal</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Informal</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Honest</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Dishonest</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Familiar</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Unfamiliar</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Interesting</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Uninteresting</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Emotional</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Unemotional</td> </tr> </table>	Calm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Calm	Formal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Informal	Honest	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dishonest	Familiar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unfamiliar	Interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Uninteresting	Emotional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unemotional	<p style="text-align: center;">“Like tea used to be.”</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Calm</td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%;">Not Calm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Formal</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Informal</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Honest</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Dishonest</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Familiar</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Unfamiliar</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Interesting</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Uninteresting</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Emotional</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Unemotional</td> </tr> </table>	Calm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Calm	Formal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Informal	Honest	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dishonest	Familiar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unfamiliar	Interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Uninteresting	Emotional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unemotional																				
Calm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Calm																																																																																																																																				
Formal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Informal																																																																																																																																				
Honest	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dishonest																																																																																																																																				
Familiar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unfamiliar																																																																																																																																				
Interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Uninteresting																																																																																																																																				
Emotional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unemotional																																																																																																																																				
Calm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Calm																																																																																																																																				
Formal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Informal																																																																																																																																				
Honest	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dishonest																																																																																																																																				
Familiar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unfamiliar																																																																																																																																				
Interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Uninteresting																																																																																																																																				
Emotional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unemotional																																																																																																																																				

At the top of the survey was the written instructions, “Please tick the box which corresponds best to your feeling for each pair of adjectives. Please fill in every row with your first thought for each pair, there is no right or wrong.” The researcher randomly approached 40 students on the University of Waikato Campus and asked if they were willing to participate in quick survey.

At the completion of the pre-test survey the results indicated that the logotypes and slogans did in fact connote ‘pleasing’ and ‘reassuring’ tones and warranted moving further with the final brand attitude study. This was determined by “scoring” each individual line from a -3 for the far left box, to +3 for the far right box. An average score was calculated for each line. Table 1 displays these results below.

Table 1: Semantic Differential Pre-test Survey Results

	Pleasing Logotype	Pleasing Slogan
Like/Dislike	-1.94	-1.916
Warm/Cold	-1.77	-1.55
Attractive/Unattractive	-1.756	-1.648
Interesting/Uninteresting	-1.22	-1.16
Emotional/Unemotional	-1.36	-1.41
Feminine/Masculine	-1.88	-1.5
Delicate/Strong	-0.861	-0.805

	Reassuring Logotype	Reassuring Slogan
Calm/Not Calm	-1.66	-2.16
Formal/Informal	-2.33	-1.36
Honest/Dishonest	-1.783	-1.864
Familiar/Unfamiliar	-1.38	-1.77
Interesting/Uninteresting	0.444	0.361
Emotional/Unemotional	1.11	0.25

III.3.3 The Creation of the Brand Attitude Surveys

The brand attitude survey consisted of constructing two separate survey forms by cross pairing the two slogans with the two logotypes, resulting in 4 brand variants. The goal of the hypothesis of this thesis is to determine if the ‘congruent’ brand sets were more ‘favourable’ than the ‘incongruent’ brand sets. The surveys determined the attitudes towards the 4 cross-paired ‘brand sets’ based on 4 statements. Except for the variations discussed, the two surveys were identical (see Appendix, Figure 3 and 4).

The first survey was the ‘congruent brand’, where combination of the ‘pleasing and engaging’ logotype and ‘pleasing and engaging’ slogan were combined as well as the ‘reassuring’ logotype and ‘reassuring’ slogan were combined to create two brand sets,

‘Brand A’ and ‘Brand B’. The two marketing elements were put into boxes to ensure that the participants looked at the elements as a whole brand instead of perhaps only reviewing the logo or the slogan (see Figure 2).

Figure 2: Brand Set Box Example



The second form was the incongruent combination of marketing elements. The pleasing logotype and reassuring slogan were combined as 'Brand A' and the reassuring logotype and pleasing slogan were combined to create 'Brand B'.

Under either brand were 4 identical questions and a 7-point Likert scale. The participants rated their feelings towards the ‘brand set’ for each statement on the scale. A Likert scale is a psychometric scale where the respondents specify their level of agreement to a statement. The surveys used in this research used a 7-point Likert which included the rating points, ‘strongly agree’, ‘agree’, ‘somewhat agree’, ‘undecided’, ‘somewhat disagree’, ‘disagree’ and ‘strongly disagree’. The questions used were based on those of the study in Van Rompay et al. (2009) and adapted to better fit the aim of the research. Question number 2 was altered from “this is a fine brand” to “I would consider purchasing this brand” because it deemed more

appropriate for this study and read more fluidly in the English language. The other 3 questions were “this brand appeals to me”, “this is an attractive brand” and “I feel positive about this brand”.

A short demographic survey was listed below the two brands to determine participant gender, age, occupation and ethnicity for further research in the future. 178 total responses were collected. Participants were told that they were participating in a survey exploring brand attitudes towards 2 fictitious brands of tea. After completion of the questionnaire there was no further involvement by the participants.

At the completion of the surveys, the data was categorized into 3 groups to determine the attitude towards each ‘brand set’. The ‘positive’ group was the respondents who selected ‘strongly agree’, ‘agree’ and ‘somewhat agree’. The ‘undecided’ group was the respondents who selected ‘undecided’, and the ‘negative’ group was ‘somewhat disagree’, ‘disagree’ and ‘strongly disagree’ by comparing these groups against each other, the researcher could determine which ‘brand sets’ were more ‘favourable’ than others.

III.4 Results

There were 82 participant responses for the congruent brand sets and 96 for the incongruent survey. The data collected was analysed statistically in several different manners to gather as many insights into the results as possible. Tables 1-4 show a breakdown of the number of responses per rating for each of the four questions into total responses per attitude rating and the percentage of respondent.

III.4.1 Reassuring Results

For the reassuring congruent brand set (table 2), question number 1 (this brand appeals to me), ‘agree’ was the most common response. Question number 2 (I feel positive about this brand), ‘agree’ was the most common response. Question number 3 (this is an attractive brand), ‘somewhat agree’ was the most common response.

Questions number 4 (I would consider purchasing this brand), ‘agree’ was the most common response.

Table 2: Reassuring Congruent - Overall

	“This brand appeals to me”	%	“I feel positive about this brand”	%	“This is an attractive brand”	%	“I would consider purchasing this brand”	%
Strongly Agree	2	2%	4	5%	0	0%	1	1%
Agree	31	37%	31	37%	20	24%	26	32%
Somewhat Agree	26	32%	21	26%	34	41%	13	16%
Positive Total	59	72%	56	68%	54	66%	40	49%
Undecided Total	11	13%	15	18%	12	15%	21	26%
Somewhat Disagree	6	7%	8	10%	6	7%	12	15%
Disagree	4	5%	3	3%	9	11%	5	6%
Strongly Disagree	2	2%	0	0%	1	1%	4	4%
Negative Total	12	15%	11	13%	16	20%	21	26%

For the reassuring incongruent brand set (table 3), question number 1 (this brand appeals to me), ‘agree’ was the most common response. Question number 2 (I feel positive about this brand), ‘agree’ was the most common response. Question number 3, (this is an attractive brand), ‘agree’ was the most common response. Question number 4 (I would consider purchasing this brand), ‘agree’ was again the most common response.

Table 3: Reassuring Incongruent - Overall

	“This brand appeals to me”	%	“I feel positive about this brand”	%	“This is an attractive brand”	%	“I would consider purchasing this brand”	%
Strongly Agree	10	10%	11	12%	9	9%	12	13%
Agree	30	31%	27	28%	31	32%	31	32%
Somewhat Agree	27	28%	24	25%	22	23%	21	22%
Positive Total	67	70%	62	65%	62	65%	64	67%
Undecided Total	15	16%	19	20%	10	10%	15	16%
Somewhat Disagree	8	8%	11	12%	14	15%	5	5%
Disagree	4	4%	3	3%	8	8%	10	10%
Strongly Disagree	2	2%	1	1%	2	2%	2	2%
Negative Total	14	15%	15	16%	24	25%	17	18%

III.4.2 Pleasing Results

For the ‘pleasing congruent’ brand set (table 4), question number 1 (this brand appeals to me), ‘agree’ was the most common response. Question number 2 (I feel positive about this brand), ‘agree’ was the most common response. Question number 3 (this is an attractive brand), ‘agree’ was the most common response. Questions number 4 (I would consider purchasing this brand), ‘agree’ was again the most common response.

Table 4: Pleasing Congruent - Overall

	“This brand appeals to me”	%	“I feel positive about this brand”	%	“This is an attractive brand”	%	“I would consider purchasing this brand”	%
Strongly Agree	9	11%	8	10%	10	12%	5	7%
Agree	34	41%	30	37%	31	38%	26	32%
Somewhat Agree	15	18%	18	22%	13	16%	25	30%
Positive Total	58	71%	56	68%	54	66%	56	68%
Undecided Total	4	5%	10	12%	10	12%	16	20%
Somewhat Disagree	17	20%	8	10%	13	16%	6	8%
Disagree	3	4%	8	10%	5	7%	3	4%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
Negative Total	20	24%	16	20%	18	22%	10	12%

For the ‘pleasing incongruent’ brand set (table 5), question number 1 (this brand appeals to me), ‘somewhat agree’ was the most common response. Question number 2 (I feel positive about this brand), ‘somewhat agree’ was the most common response. Question number 3 (this is an attractive brand), ‘somewhat agree’ was the most common response. Questions number 4 (I would consider purchasing this brand), ‘undecided’ was the most common response.

Table 5: Pleasing Incongruent - Overall

	“This brand appeals to me”	%	“I feel positive about this brand”	%	“This is an attractive brand”	%	“I would consider purchasing this brand”	%
Strongly Agree	7	7%	8	8%	9	9%	5	5%
Agree	18	19%	24	25%	20	21%	19	20%
Somewhat Agree	34	35%	26	27%	26	27%	19	20%
Positive Total	59	61%	58	60%	55	57%	53	55%
Undecided Total	11	11%	16	17%	16	17%	29	30%
Somewhat Disagree	14	15%	16	17%	17	18%	11	11%
Disagree	10	10%	7	7%	8	8%	10	10%
Strongly Disagree	3	3%	0	0%	1	1%	4	4%
Negative Totals	27	28%	23	24%	26	27%	25	26%

III.4.3 Proportional Results

The data in the tables below is also correlated solely by percentage of respondents versus total surveys. The total number of respondents from ‘somewhat agree’, ‘agree’, and ‘strongly agree’ had been summed to represent the total number of ‘positive’ responses for each question and divided by the total survey number to determine the percentage. The same method was used to determine the average percentage of ‘undecided’ and ‘negative’ responses as well in tables 9-12.

In the reassuring category, in an average of the first three questions, ‘reassuring congruent’ received a higher number of positive responses compared to ‘reassuring incongruent’. However in question 4 (I would consider purchasing this brand), ‘reassuring congruent’ received 19 percentage points less than the incongruent set with a 49% positive response versus a 68% positive response. This created an overall more positive response for ‘reassuring incongruent’ than ‘reassuring congruent’ by 2 percentage points.

In the pleasing category, ‘pleasing congruent’ received a higher positive percentage response in 3 out of 4 of the questions, as well as the overall response, compared to ‘pleasing incongruent’. In question number 2 (I feel positive about this brand), the two brand sets received an equal positive response of 68%. When compared alongside the reassuring brand sets, ‘pleasing congruent’ received the overall highest positive response, and ‘pleasing incongruent’ received the overall lowest positive response.

Table 6: Positive Comparative

	“This brand appeals to me”	“I feel positive about this brand”	“This is an attractive brand”	“I would consider purchasing this brand”	Overall Percentage of Positive Responses
Reassuring Congruent	72%	68%	68%	49%	64%
Reassuring Incongruent	70%	65%	65%	67%	66%
Pleasing Congruent	71%	68%	66%	68%	68%
Pleasing Incongruent	61%	60%	57%	55%	59%

In table 6, the data was correlated by averaging the score for questions 1, 2 and 3 (attitude formation in response to the brand), compared to question 4 (purchasing decision) to look at attitude versus purchasing decisions. Interestingly, ‘reassuring

congruent’ had the highest positive attitude score, yet on average only 49% of the positive responses would purchase. The lowest scored brand set, ‘pleasing incongruent’, also had a significant drop in those that would consider purchasing the brand with only 55% of the responses saying they would consider purchasing the brand. ‘Reassuring incongruent’ and ‘pleasing congruent’ received very similar responses for ‘attitude’ and ‘behaviour’.

Table 7: Positive Attitude vs. Purchasing Decision

Average Score of Questions 1,2 & 3	Question 4 (Purchasing Decision)
Reassuring Congruent	69% / 49%
Reassuring Incongruent	66% / 67%
Pleasing Congruent	68% / 68%
Pleasing Incongruent	57% / 55%

To look at whether or not the aesthetics of the brand set affects the attitude or purchasing decision, question 3 (this is an attractive brand) was pulled out and an average of question 1 and 2 was compared with questions 4 in table 7.

Table 8: Positive Attitude vs. Purchasing Decision

	Average of Questions 1 & 2 (Attitude)	Question 4 (Purchasing Decision)
Reassuring Congruent	70%	49%
Reassuring Incongruent	67%	67%
Pleasing Congruent	70%	68%
Pleasing Incongruent	61%	55%

A fourth proportion chart was created in table 8 to show the comparison of the average of questions 1 and 2, versus purchasing decision and the aesthetic attitude towards the brand.

Table 9: Positive Attitude vs. Aesthetic vs. Purchasing Decision

	Average of Questions 1 & 2 (Attitude)	Question 3 (Aesthetic)	Question 4 (Purchasing Decision)
Reassuring Congruent	70%	66%	49%
Reassuring Incongruent	67%	65%	67%
Pleasing Congruent	70%	66%	68%
Pleasing Incongruent	61%	57%	55%

III.4.4 Positive, Undecided & Negative Attitude Response Comparative

Tables 10-12 below outline the positive response percentages for each question of the brand set as well as the ‘undecided’ and ‘negative’ response percentages. In the ‘undecided’ categories there are varying degrees of responses, but in 3 out of 4 brand sets, a significant number of responses were higher than the ‘negative’ response for the question “I would consider purchasing this brand”. Although ‘pleasing incongruent’ had the highest ‘undecided’ response for purchasing behaviour at 30%, the negative response was still significant at a 25% due to the low positive response of 55%, the lowest overall. ‘Reassuring incongruent’ was the only brand set that was relatively similar to the negative response for the fourth question, 16% versus 18% respectively, but had a significant percentage of 20 for the question, “I feel positive about this brand”. Within ‘reassuring incongruent’ and ‘pleasing congruent’ brand sets there is a low percentage of ‘undecided’ responses at only 10% for the question, “this is an attractive brand”.

This data lends to the result that the participants were conclusive and felt strongly about whether or not they appreciated the aesthetic of the brand set. Similar results occur in the ‘pleasing congruent’ and ‘pleasing incongruent’ brand sets for the first question, concluding that the participants generally felt the pleasing logotype appealing.

Also noteworthy is the equal response of 26% ‘undecided’ and 26% ‘negative’ for ‘reassuring congruent’. This large percentage pulled down the ‘positive’ response to 40% causing the ‘reassuring congruent’ brand set to be lower than ‘reassuring incongruent’ in overall participant positive response. That being said, if all of the participants that chose the ‘undecided’ response were to have chosen a ‘positive’ response, ‘reassuring congruent’ would have still been 1 percentage point less than ‘reassuring incongruent.’

Table 10: Reassuring Congruent Attitude Response Comparative

	'This brand appeals to me"	"I feel positive about this brand"	"This is an attractive brand"	"I would consider purchasing this brand"	Overall average percentage
Positive	72%	68%	66%	40%	62%
Undecided	13%	18%	15%	26%	18%
Negative	15%	13%	20%	26%	19%

Table 11: Reassuring Incongruent Attitude Response Comparative

	'This brand appeals to me"	"I feel positive about this brand"	"This is an attractive brand"	"I would consider purchasing this brand"	Overall average percentage
Positive	70%	65%	65%	67%	67%
Undecided	15%	20%	10%	16%	15%
Negative	15%	16%	25%	18%	19%

Table 12: Pleasing Congruent Attitude Response Comparative

	'This brand appeals to me"	"I feel positive about this brand"	"This is an attractive brand"	"I would consider purchasing this brand"	Overall average percentage
Positive	71%	68%	66%	68%	68%
Undecided	5%	12%	12%	20%	12%
Negative	24%	20%	22%	12%	20%

Table 13: Pleasing Incongruent Attitude Response Comparative

	‘This brand appeals to me’	‘I feel positive about this brand’	‘This is an attractive brand’	‘I would consider purchasing this brand’	Overall average percentage
Positive	61%	60%	57%	55%	58%
Undecided	11%	17%	17%	30%	19%
Negative	28%	24%	27%	26%	26%

The researcher also performed an additional analysis of the data that resulted in a breakdown of ‘scores’. The responses were scored from -3 (strongly disagree) to +3 (strongly agree). The higher the score the more favourably the participants viewed each brand set. The average score for all four questions for the ‘reassuring congruent’ brand set was 236. The average score for ‘pleasing congruent’ was 324. The average score for ‘reassuring incongruent’ was 349. The average score for ‘pleasing incongruent’ was 202.

By rating the scale from -3 to +3 and summing the results, the following results were determined for pleasing logotype, pleasing slogan congruent brand set and pleasing logotype, and reassuring slogan incongruent brand set. For question number 1, "this brand appeals to me" the ‘pleasing congruent’ brand set received a score of 87, versus 48 for ‘pleasing incongruent’. Question number 2, "I feel positive about this brand" the ‘pleasing congruent’ brand set received a 78 versus the 68 for ‘pleasing incongruent’. These scores were averaged to 83 versus 58 respectively. ‘Pleasing congruent’ brand set received an 82 in the third question, "this is an attractive brand", where the ‘pleasing incongruent’ received a 57. The fourth and final question, "I would consider purchasing this brand of tea", pleasing congruent received a 77, and ‘pleasing incongruent’ received a significantly lower score of 29.

The scoring of the data as discussed above is not useful when comparing the pleasing brand sets versus the reassuring due to the fact that there were 14 more incongruent surveys completed. It does however show the strength of the positive responses and how strongly they agreed with the pairings.

III.5 Summary of Findings

The original research described in detail in section III.3 set out to answer the researcher's hypothesis, that consumers will have more favourable attitudes towards a specific brand when the semantic associations of the branding slogan and a logotype are congruent with each other. The data collected from the two-part survey process involving a semantic differential scale and a Likert scale showed that the 'pleasing congruent' brand set (pleasing logotype combined with the pleasing slogan "crafted to infuse your senses") was found to be overall more favourable than the 'pleasing incongruent' brand set (pleasing logotype combined with the reassuring slogan "like tea used to be").

Through analysing the data for the 'pleasing' brand sets, two key findings manifested. First, the 'pleasing congruent' brand set overall had the highest positive percentage response of 68%. Second, consistent with the hypothesis, the positive percentage response of the 'pleasing congruent' brand set was a 68% versus a 59% for the 'pleasing incongruent' brand set.

Contrary to the hypothesis, the data from the experiment also revealed that the 'reassuring incongruent' brand set (reassuring logotype combined with pleasing slogan) received a higher overall positive response than the 'reassuring congruent' brand set (reassuring logotype and reassuring slogan) and only 2 percentage points less than the top scoring 'pleasing congruent' brand set. In line with the hypothesis, the data from the 'reassuring congruent' survey received the top positive percentage placement in the 3 attitude base questions (questions 1,2 & 3) but the participants rated the question, "I would consider purchasing this brand" significantly lower, which pulled down the overall score. Therefore, the data collected for all but one question in the 2 surveys followed the researcher's hypothesis that congruency between the semantic associations of the logotype and the brand personality results in more favourable attitudes.

III.5.1 Findings Exploration

There are several areas of discussion resulting from the research presented. The first point aims to discuss which aspect of the brand set - aesthetic of design or congruity with the brand personality - had a stronger impact for favourable brand attitudes. The researcher further investigates the effect of a potential poor slogan on purchasing behaviour as well. The second area of discussion will explore the first area deeper by looking at how poor font appropriateness in the 'pleasing' brand sets was affected more severely than the 'reassuring' brand sets. More specifically, the researcher will investigate what factors contributed to the decrease of 9 percentage points in the participant's attitudes towards the aesthetics of the 'pleasing' logotype when paired with an incongruent slogan. The positive response for the aesthetics also decreased in the 'reassuring incongruent' brand set but only by 1 percentage point. Lastly, the researcher will compare the findings of the 4 cross pairing of logotypes and explore the hypothesis.

III.5.1.1 Influential Factors Affecting Positive Attitude Response

The first point aims to discuss which aspect of the brand set - aesthetic of design or congruity with the brand personality - had a stronger impact for favourable brand attitudes.

'Reassuring congruent' had a relatively high attitude score of 70%, but the lowest purchasing behaviour score (question number 4) of all the brand sets of 40%. When the reassuring logotype was paired with the 'pleasing' slogan, "crafted to infuse your senses" to create an incongruent pairing, the percentage of positive responses for the purchasing behaviour question number 4 did not drop similarly to the 'reassuring congruent' purchasing results. Since the participants generally viewed the aesthetic and the attitude of the 'reassuring' logotype fairly well in both pairings, the data indicates that the slogan, 'like tea used to be' used in the congruent brand set possibly decreased the participants' likelihood to purchase. This possible outcome would suggest that in this particular case neither 'congruity' nor 'aesthetic' of design affected the pairing as much as the slogan.

In the case of the 'pleasing' brand sets, the 'pleasing incongruent' brand with the slogan "like tea used to be" also received a low scoring purchasing behavioural response, which supports an overall possible poor attitude towards the slogan in general. The researcher believes this has led to a poorer response in this category, thus mitigating part of the positive response rate and lowering the potential score. It is assumed that should further testing be pursued with a slogan that better scores in purchasing behavioural responses, then the outcome of this experiment would be stronger in the positive for this hypothesis.

Furthermore, participants also had the least positive response of 57% to the aesthetic (question number 3) of the 'pleasing' logotype when paired with the incongruent slogan. In the case of the 'pleasing congruent' brand set, the aesthetic score stayed in proportion to the scores for the attitude, simply overall lower by 4 percentage points, but the 'pleasing incongruent' brand set drops 13 percentage points to a 55% when asked if they would consider purchasing the brand. The data indicates that in the case of the 'pleasing' logotypes, congruity with the brands' personality significantly affected the positive response from the participants causing the percentage to become the highest overall.

Additionally, more research is needed into attitudes towards the slogan "like tea used to be" separate from the logotype to determine if a general disliking of the slogan is deterring consumers from purchasing or if other factors are influencing this decision. The pre-testing of the reassuring slogan solely determined that the participants viewed it as more 'reassuring' than the 'pleasing'.

Another issue to explore relating to the poor desire to purchase for 'reassuring congruent' is that it was paired with the 'pleasing congruent' on the same page in the 'congruent' survey. Although the participants were verbally told not to compare the two brands, it is possible that after viewing the survey, they instantly formed an opinion about which brand they would choose if they had to. After all, the 'pleasing congruent' brand set did have the highest positive response overall and in the purchasing behaviour question.

Reflecting back to the findings in Chapter 2, Heath (2001) stated that it is intuition which makes the final decision in choosing products when the competing brands satisfy our needs on the basic and rational level. Apart from the purchasing decision, the participants had a generally positive attitude regarding the 'reassuring congruent' brand. The poor purchasing behavioural response could be due to a disliked slogan or an innate comparison of brands when placed next to the favourable 'pleasing congruent' brand. It is possible that the participants made an 'emotional choice', instantly and holistically about the 'reassuring congruent' brand set. In Chapter 2, the researcher referred to Zajonc (as cited in Elliott, 1998) who stated that emotion is an altogether separate non-cognitive procession system and is the primary influence of the development of preferences and actually precedes cognition.

To conclude, in the case of the 'pleasing' brand set, congruency between the semantic associations of the logotype with the brand personality had a significantly stronger impact for creating favourable brand attitudes than the sole attitude towards the aesthetics of the design. Alternatively, neither congruencies or aesthetic design seemed to be able to solely drive favourable brand attitudes in the case of the 'reassuring' brand sets. Exterior elements such as possible poor brand slogan and a comparison of purchasing choice by the participants appears to have influenced the overall attitude formation towards the logotype.

III.5.1.2 Negative Effect of Poor Font Appropriateness

Poffenberger and Franken (as cited in Doyle & Bottomley, 2004) and Schiller, 1935) performed the first empirical research on the topic of font appropriateness. They instituted the concept that different typefaces did vary in their appropriateness for particular industries or occasions and found that consumers were in fact aware of this juxtaposition as well. The second area of discussion surrounding the data found in this thesis intends to explore how poor font appropriateness in the 'pleasing' brand sets was affected by negative attitude formation more severely than in the 'reassuring' brand sets.

The 'pleasing congruent' aesthetic response was similar to the response of both 'reassuring' brand sets, which shows a general positive attitude towards the logotype. However, as mentioned prior, the aesthetic attitude had a decrease of 9 percentage points in the participant's attitudes towards the aesthetics of the 'pleasing' logotype when paired with an incongruent slogan. The positive response for the aesthetics also decreased in the 'reassuring incongruent' brand set but only by 1 percentage point. This lends to the concept that the attitude towards the 'reassuring logotype' is not affected as much by incongruencies as the pleasing logotype.

Where the research of Poffenberger and Franken (as cited in Doyle & Bottomley, 2004) and Schiller, 1935) focused of the appropriateness of typeface style versus industry (italics/jewelry, emboldened/automobile), font appropriateness in this thesis is concerning typeface and brand personality. The attitude response towards the 'pleasing incongruent' brand clearly shows that poor appropriateness was felt by the participants, just as Poffenberger and Franken noted in their work regarding consumers recognizing appropriateness.

As stated prior, the results of the aesthetic attitude towards the 'reassuring incongruent' brand set shows that the participants were not disrupted by the inappropriateness or incongruency like they were with the 'pleasing incongruent' brand set.

One may suspect that "reassuring" qualities in a logotype may be more compelling than other qualities, therefore potentially reducing the negative impact of other brand attributes, an example being an incongruent slogan. This possibility is relevant to a finding by Brumberger (2003) who found through his research that if a text passage had a very strong persona, the semantic associations of the typeface were unable to overpower the meaning of the passage. Perhaps the "reassuring" semantic associations of the logotype in the 'reassuring incongruent' brand set overrode the incongruent pleasing brand slogan, resulting in an equally positive aesthetic response as the 'reassuring congruent' brand set. Therefore, further research is still needed into why the attitude towards the aesthetics of the 'pleasing incongruent' brand set was

affected by the incongruency and ‘reassuring incongruent’ aesthetic seemed to go unscathed.

Schiller’s study on appropriateness (1935) found that a shift in values comes with time, and attitudes towards the automobile industry evolved from cheapness and economy in the 1920’s to luxury in 1930’s. This is relevant to this thesis because of the shift in attitude formation surrounding the ‘reassuring’ brand sets compared to the ‘pleasing’ brand sets. It is possible that the aesthetic attitude towards the ‘reassuring incongruent’ brand set did not suffer because the participants did not view the combination of the ‘reassuring’ logotype and the slogan “crafted to infuse your senses” as inappropriate. Although the ‘reassuring’ logotype and slogan were pre-tested to confirm semantic association, further market research on the value system of the target audience would aid in accurately finding their thoughts on what they consider ‘reassuring’.

An additional point to highlight regarding appropriateness is in reference to the Doyle and Bottomley study from 2004 that investigated how font, as an important aspect of a brand’s visual identity, can enhance its strength and build its market share. In the study they performed, participants chose chocolates from a box having an appropriate font rather than one having an inappropriate font on 75% of occasions.

Doyle and Bottomley’s study explores brand choice and font appropriateness, whereas the topic in this thesis is centred on attitude towards a brand. However, it is important to note that both the research of Doyle and Bottomley in 2004 and this thesis indicate the importance of ‘appropriateness’ and how incongruencies can cause negative attitude and poor brand choice.

III.5.1.3 Hypothesis Analysis and Outcome

The researcher’s hypothesis was that consumers would have more favourable attitudes towards a specific brand when the semantic associations of the branding slogan and a logotype are congruent with each other. The results collected for the 4 brand sets created from 2 logotypes and 2 slogans reveal that consumers did in fact view the

'pleasing congruent' brand set more positively than the 'incongruent' set. In the case of the 'reassuring congruent' brand set, consumers did in fact find the 'reassuring congruent' brand set more appealing, and it felt more positive and attractive than the 'incongruent' pair. However, more respondents would consider purchasing the 'incongruent' brand than the 'congruent' brand, causing the overall average attitude of the 'reassuring' brands to go to the 'reassuring incongruent' pairing.

IV. Conclusion

IV.1 Overview

The objective of this research was to explore whether consumers have more favourable attitudes towards a specific brand when the semantic associations of the branding slogan and a logotype are congruent with each other. The core findings of this thesis indicated that congruency within the underlying connotations of the logotype and brand personality did in fact produce positive responses in both attitude and aesthetics. However, the findings from Chapter 3 indicated that the purchasing behaviour responses were more unpredictable.

Chapter 2 of this thesis encompassed the review of literature from the three correlating subjects of this research – typography, semiotics and branding. In the section II.2.1 Typography, the researcher explored the history of typography and the effects of its evolution on type classification. A key finding in the typographic section that supports the original research in chapter 3 was that type does more than simply deliver a message, it carries within it the tone, feeling and meaning (White, 2005). Understanding how typographic elements evoke emotion and feelings as well as the subject of readability created a cornerstone for II.2.4 Typography, Typography and Brand Visual Identity. Lupton (2004) stated that logotypes use lettering to create a distinctive visual image and to depict the name of a brand in a memorable way. Subsequent was the review of the appropriateness of typeface. A study by Poffenberger and Franken in 1923 set the stage for further exploration on this topic. They concluded that “differing typefaces do vary in appropriateness and consumers are capable of ‘judging’ when a typeface is appropriate for a subject or not” (as cited by Doyle and Bottomley, 2004, p.1).

Feeling, tone and meaning was briefly reviewed in the typographic section. However, in section II.2 Semiotics, further insight was provided into this subject matter. The researcher reviewed a background, which included basic definitions such as denotation and connotation. A key finding noted was that of Barthes, (as cited in Chandler, 2007) who stated that even though connotation is the “second-order” it

generally is apparent first. Danesi (2006) also touched on a key position of semiotic meanings. He suggested they are powerful because they are beyond consciousness and they evoke sense and feeling. Scholars who explored typeface semantic associations also studied this concept of conveying emotion. Additionally, Childers and Jass (2002) confirmed that typefaces convey unique [semantic] associations independent of the words they represent.

The third section of the literature review was on the subject of branding. Ranges of topics were explored in this subject including looking at how typography and semiotics are incorporated with branding. The researcher also explored consumer attachment to symbols as well as typeface connotation and brand choice. The empirical studies of Doyle and Bottomley (2004) on font appropriateness, and those of Henderson et al. and McCarthy and Mothersbaugh (2002) all lend support to Wheeler's (2006) statement that letterforms can be modified to express appropriate personality and to convey the positioning of the company.

Findings from Zajonc and Mittal among others (as cited within Elliott, 1998) were reviewed in the section II.3.5 Branding as well. Zajonc stated that when making purchasing decisions, consumers form a preference for a product first based on their own emotional response and then justify the purchase to themselves cognitively. Belk noted that when making purchasing decisions, in addition to the utility a product offers, consumers rely heavily on a product's symbolic meaning. Additionally, the branding section of Chapter 2 included a subsection on congruency and its part in branding. Key studies included Van Rompay's study on the effects of congruency between product shape connotations and brand slogan and the study by Childers & Jass, which used a typeface selection in advertising copy that was congruent with the semantic associations of the product (i.e. casual typeface for casual pants). Both studies found that congruency increased positive attitude formation. This led the researcher to hypothesise that congruency between logotype semantic associations and the brand personality would result in positive attitudes towards the brand.

The review of congruency research was vital in discovering an area that needed more research. To realize how favourable attitudes could be formed through the congruency of the logotype and brand personality, a study was performed as part of the original

research methodology as presented in Chapter 3 of this thesis. The research of Henderson et al. (2004) in their journal article *Impression Management Using Typeface Design* was used as a framework to support the survey created by the researcher. The goal of their article was to develop empirically based guidelines to help managers select typefaces that affect strategically valued impressions.

Using the research by Henderson et al. (2004), two logotypes were created in the 'pleasing' category and 'reassuring' category. The researcher created a fictitious market segment and brand personality and created 2 slogans for the 'pleasing' and 'reassuring' category. After pre-testing of the two logotypes and two brand slogans on a semantic differential scale survey to confirm semantic associations, a Likert scale survey was created by cross pairing the 4 elements into a 'congruent' brand set survey and an 'incongruent' brand set survey. The researcher administered the survey to a total of 178 participants with the results showing that the participants did indeed have more favourable attitudes towards the 'pleasing' brand set when the logotype and slogan were congruent. In the 'reassuring' category, the participants also had more favourable aesthetic attitudes towards the congruent pairing. However, when all 4 questions were scored on an average, the participants had more positive attitudes towards the incongruent 'reassuring' pairing.

IV.2 Hypothesis Response

The findings from this thesis indicate that the original hypothesis - consumers will have more favourable attitudes towards a specific brand when the semantic associations of the branding slogan and a logotype are congruent with each other – can be regarded as accurate. The hypothesis for this new research chapter seems to be proved in that this experiment has shown there are clear advantages to considering the semantic associations of logotypes and purposefully choosing typeface for the logotypes based upon the semantic associations of the brand personality.

The researcher analysed the data by comparing the percentage of positive responses from each of the 4 questions for each survey for the 'congruent' and 'incongruent' brand sets. For each of the 4 questions as well as an overall average of positive response, the 'pleasing congruent' brand set had more favourable attitudes towards the brand compared to the 'pleasing incongruent' brand set. In regards to the

'reassuring' brand set, the overall positive response did not follow the researcher's hypothesis. However, when the questions regarding attitude and aesthetics were individually analysed, the 'reassuring congruent' brand did in fact have more favourable attitudes than 'reassuring incongruent'. A negative response for question number 4 regarding participants that would consider purchasing the 'reassuring congruent' brand caused the outcome of the 'reassuring' brand sets to differ from the researcher's hypothesis. There are a few reasons that could have caused a negative purchasing decision response for 'reassuring congruent'. One reason being a potential for an innate comparison of the other brand set on the same survey sheet, causing the participants to "choose" the other brand and rate the 'reassuring congruent' purchase decision poorly. Another possible reason is a dislike for the brand slogan, "like tea use to be" causing a poor attitude towards the brand set as a whole.

The researcher discovered that considering the semantic associations of the typeface used to create the logotype did in fact affect the participant's attitudes towards the brand sets. That being said, there are many other outside factors such as consumer behaviour, product packaging, brand quality and history to name a few that affect the formation of a consumer's attitude towards a product or brand. The findings showed that congruency seemed to positively affect consumer's opinions but the results were not strong enough to overrule predetermined product preference and purchasing decision tendencies. The subject of brand choice is so large and complex that the findings from this thesis offer one possible way to enhance attitude formation, therefore it is suggested that these findings should be used in conjunction with other marketing strategies in order to receive the best possible outcome and consumer attitude.

IV.3 Further Research

Due to the slight discrepancy in the results based on the hypothesis, in the sector of the purchasing decision question of the "reassuring" brand sets, it is evident that the original research of this thesis leads to further issues and topic areas to be explored and alternative methodology to be experimented. The researcher encourages further research into the idea that brand slogans received poorly by consumers could thwart their purchasing decisions. Expansion of research on the participants attitudes

towards the two slogans used in the study from Chapter 3 would aid in clarification of the influential nature of a brand slogan. Additionally, research into whether or not a well-received slogan can overpower incongruencies within the marketing strategy could assist those rebranding a product.

Furthermore, more research is needed into the vulnerability of ‘pleasing’ logotypes and why consumer’s views and their aesthetic response are more easily changed compared to ‘reassuring’ logotypes. The results from Chapter 3 showed how incongruencies between the semantic associations of logotypes and the brand personality affected the positive responses of the ‘pleasing’ aesthetic questions more so than the ‘reassuring’ aesthetic questions. A study solely looking at whether or not “reassuring” semantic associations in typefaces and logotypes are more reliable and consistent would provide greater insight into logotype design decisions.

Additionally, outside the scope of this thesis was research studying varying consumer insight on brands when two marketing elements are congruent with each other. Although McCarthy & Mothersbaugh (2002) suggested this, further empirical research on enhancing and supporting brand personality through the use of logotype appropriateness would supplement the findings of the original research of this thesis.

References

- Barr, R., Kamil, M. L., & Mosenthal, P. B. (1984). *Handbook of Reading Research* (Vol. 2).
- Bennett, J. (2008). Just Go to Helvetica. *Newsweek*, 151(14), 54. doi:Article
- Bringinghurst, R. (2002). *The Elements of Typographic Style* (2nd ed.). Hartley & Marks.
- Brumberger, E. (2003). The Rhetoric of Typography: The Persona of Typeface and Text. *Technical Communication*, 50(2), 206.
- Brumberger, E. (2003). The Rhetoric of Typography: The Awareness and Impact of Typeface Appropriateness. *Technical Communication*, 50(2), 224.
- Busch, A. (2001). Thinking Inside the Box. *Print*, 55(1), 18. doi:Article
- Buttle, H., & Westoby, N. (2006). Brand Logo and Name Association: It's All in the Name. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 20(9), 1181-1194. doi:10.1002/acp.1257
- Carter, R., Day, B., & Meggs, P. (2007). *Typographic Design: Form and Communication* (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Chandler, D. (2007). *Semiotics for Beginners*. Routledge.
- Childers, T. L., & Jass, J. (2002). All Dressed Up with Something to Say; Effects of Typeface Semantic Associations on Brand Perceptions and Consumer Memory. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 12(2), 93-106.
- Czerniawski, R. D. (1999). *Creating Brand Loyalty the Management of Power Positioning and Really Great Advertising*. New York: AMACOM.
- Danesi, M. (1999). *Of cigarettes and high heels, and other interesting things*. NY, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Danesi, M. (2004). *Messages, Signs, and Meanings*. Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Danesi, M. (2006). *Brands*. Routledge introductions to media and communications. New York: Routledge.
- Danesi, M. (2007). *Why it sells: Decoding the meanings of brand names, logos, ads, and other marketing and advertising ploys*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Davis, R., & Smith, H. (1933). Determinants of feeling tone in type faces. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 17(6), 742-764.
- Dean, D., & Croft, R. (2009). Reason and Choice: A Conceptual Study of Consumer Decision Making and Electoral Behavior. *Journal of Political Marketing*, 8(2), 130-146. doi:10.1080/15377850902813386
- Department of Semiotics. (2008). *Cultural Semiotics*. Retrieved from http://www.filserver.arthist.lu.se/kultsem/semiotics/kult_sem_eng.html
- Dittmar, H. (1992). *The Social Psychology of Material Possessions*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf
- Doyle, J., & Bottomley, P. A. (2004). Font Appropriateness and Brand choice. *Journal of Business Research*, 57, 873-880.
- Doyle, J., & Bottomley, P. A. (2006). Dressed for the Occasion: Font-product Congruity in the perception of logotype. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 16(2), 112-123.
- Doyle, J., & Bottomley, P.A. (2009). The message in the medium: Transfer of connotative meaning from typeface to names and products. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 23(3), 396-409. doi:10.1002/acp.1468

- Elliott, R. (1998). A Model Of Emotion-Driven Choice. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 14(1/3), 95-108. doi:Article
- Elliott, R., & Wattanasuwan, K. (1998). Brand as symbolic resources for the construction of identity. *International Journal of Advertising*, 17(2), 131-144. doi:Article
- Evamy, M. (2007). *Logo*. London, U.K: Laurence King Pub. Ltd.
- Floch, J. (2001). *Semiotics, Marketing, and Communication: Beneath the Signs, the Strategies*. Basingstoke [England]: Palgrave.
- Floch, J., & ebrary, Inc. (2000). *Visual Identities*. London: Continuum.
- Frijda, N. H. (1988). The laws of emotion. *American Psychologist*. Vol. 43(5), 43(5), 349-358.
- Gilbert, K. (2006, August). The Hidden Power of Fonts. *Psychology Today*, 39(4), 30-30.
- Goldsborough, R. (2008). Fun with Fonts: Selection of Typeface Can Get Message Across. *Community College Week*, 20(14), 15. doi:Article
- Grohmann, B. (2008). Does Type Font Affect Consumers' Brand Memory? John Molson School of Business, Concordia University.
- Gump, J. E. (2001). The Readability of Typefaces and the Subsequent Mood or Emotion Created in the Reader. *Journal of Education for Business*, 76(5), 270.
- Hannam, L. (2009). Instantly Recognizable. *Marketing Magazine*, 114(2), 20. doi:Article
- Healy, M. (2008). *What is Branding? Hove, UK: RotoVision SA*.
- Heath, R. (2001). *The Hidden Power of Advertising : How Low Involvement Processing Influences the Way We Choose Brands*. Henley-On-Thames: World Advertising Research Centre.
- Hekkert, P., & Van Wieringen, P. C. W. (1996). Beauty in the Eye of Expert and Nonexpert Beholders: A Study in the Appraisal of Art. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 109(3), 389.
- Hekkert, Paul. (2006). Design Aesthetics: Principles of Pleasure in Design. *Psychology Science*, 48(2), 157.
- Heller, S., & Meggs, P. (2001). *Texts on type: Critical Writings on Typography*. New York, NY: Allworth.
- Henderson, P., Giese, J., & Cote, J. (2004). Impression Management Using Typeface Design. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(4), 60-72.
- Henderson, P. W., & Cote, J. A. (1998). Guidelines for Selecting or Modifying Logos. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(2), 14-30. doi:Article
- Hine, T. (1997). *The Total Package: The Secret History and Hidden Meanings of Boxes, Bottles, Cans, and Other Persuasive Containers* (1st ed.). Boston: Back Bay Books.
- Holland, B. (1999). Look Here. *Billboard*, 111(3), B6. doi:Article
- Jana, Reena. (2007, May 14). For Logo Power, Try Helvetica. *BusinessWeek Online*, 16.
- Janiszewski, C. (2001). Effects of Brand Logo Complexity, Repetition, and Spacing on Processing Fluency and Judgment. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28(1), 18-32. doi:Article
- Kasti, A. J., & Child, I. L. (1968). Emotional Meaning of Four Typographical Variables. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 52(6), 440-446.
- Kathman, J. (2002). Brand Identity Development in the New Economy. *Design Issues*, 18(1), 24-35.
- Keller, K. L. (1993). Conceptualizing, Measuring, Managing Customer-Based Brand

- Equity. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(1), 1-22. doi:Article
- Knutsen, J. (2004). Making Your Mark. *Searcher*, 12(7), 56. doi:Article
- Kostelnick, C., & Roberts, D. D. (1998). *Designing Visual Language: Strategies for Professional Communicators*. Allyn & Bacon.
- Lee, A. Y., & Labroo, A. A. (2004). The Effect of Conceptual and Perceptual Fluency on brand evaluation. *The American Economic Review*, 41(2), 151-165.
- Lewis, C., & Walker, P. (1989). Typographic Influences on Reading. *British Journal of Psychology*, 80(1), 241.
- Lupton, E. (2004). *Thinking with type* (1st ed.). NY, NY: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Mackiewicz, J. (2005). How to Use Five Letterforms to Gauge a Typeface's Personality: A Research-Driven Method. *Journal of Technical Writing & Communication*, 35(3), 291-315.
- McCarthy, M. S., & Mothersbaugh, D. L. (2002). Effects of Typographic Factors in Advertising-Based Persuasion. *Psychology and Marketing*, 19(July-August), 663-691.
- McCoy, K. (2000, Autumn). Information and Persuasion: Rivals or Partners? *Design Issues*, 16(3), 80-83.
- McDonagh, D., Bruseberg, A., & Haslam, C. (2002). Visual Product Evaluation: Exploring Users' Emotional Relationships with Products. *Applied Ergonomics*, 33(3), 231-240. doi:10.1016/S0003-6870(02)00008-X
- Merriam-Webster. (2011). *Dictionary – Thesaurus Merriam-Webster Online*. Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com>
- Meyers, H. M. (2000). Brand Identity Equals Brand Value. *Brandweek*, 41(20), 40. doi:Article
- Meyers-Levy, J., & Sternthal, B. (1993). A Two-Factor Explanation of Assimilation and Contrast Effects. *Journal of Marketing Research (JMR)*, 30(3), 359-368. doi:Article
- Millman, D. (2007). Subtle Tea. *Print*, 61(5), 84-89. doi:Article
- Minamiyama, H. (2007). *World Branding: Concept, Strategy and Design*. Corte Madera, CA: Gingko Press Inc.
- Miranda, C. A. (2006, June 12). The Menu Magician. *Time*, 167(24).
- Mittal, B. (1988). The Role of Affective Choice Mode in the Consumer Purchase of Expressive products. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 9(4), 499-524. doi:10.1016/0167-4870(88)90016-5
- Mollerup, P. (1997). *Marks of Excellence*. New York, NY: Phaidon Press Inc.
- Morgan, C. M., & Levy, D. J. (2002). Psychographic Segmentation. *Communication World*, 20(1), 22. doi:Article
- Neuberg, S. L., & Newsom, J. T. (1993). Personal Need for Structure: Individual Differences in the Desire for Simpler Structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Vol. 65(1), 65(1), 113-131.
- Neumeier, M., & American Institute of Graphic Arts. (2003). *The Brand Gap: How to Bridge the Distance Between Business Strategy and Design: A Whiteboard Overview*. Berkeley, Calif: New Riders Pub.
- Novak, T. P., & MacEvoy, B. (1990). On Comparing Alternative Segmentation Schemes: The List of Values (LOV) and Values and Life Styles (VALS). *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17(1), 105-109. doi:Article
- Osgood, C., Suci, G., & Tannenbaum, P. (1957). *The Measurement of Meaning*.
- Peracchio, L. A., & Meyers-Levy, J. (2005). Using Stylistic Properties of Ad Pictures to Communicate with Consumers. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32(1), 29-

40. doi:10.1086/429599
- Perfect, T., & Askew, C. (1994). Print Ads: Not Remembered but Memorable. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 8, 693-703.
- Petty, R. E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Schumann, D. (1983). Central and Peripheral Routes to Advertising Effectiveness: The Moderating Role of Involvement. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 10(2), 135-146.
- Poffenberger, A., & Fraken, R. (1923). A Study of the Appropriateness of Typefaces. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 7, 312-327.
- Racić, M. (2008). Good Type Gone Bad. *Print*, 62(4), 70-73. doi:Article
- Raz, T. (2002, December 1). Re: Design -- Not just a Pretty Typeface. *Inc.*. Retrieved from <http://www.inc.com/magazine/20021201/24907.html>
- Reber, R. S. (2004). Processing Fluency and Aesthetic Pleasure: Is Beauty in the Perceiver's Processing Experience?, 8(4), 364-382.
- Richins, M. L. (1997). Measuring Emotions in the Consumption Experience. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24(2), 127-146. doi:10.1086/209499
- Roberts, K. (2006). *The Lovemarks Effect: Winning in the Consumer Revolution*. [New York], N.Y: powerHouse Books.
- Rogener, S., Pool, A., & Packhauser, U. (1995). *Branding with Type: How Type Sells*. Mountain View, CA: Adobe Press.
- Ruth, J. A. (2001). Promoting a Brand's Emotion Benefits: The Influence of Emotion Categorization Processes on Consumer Evaluations. *Journal of Consumer Psychology (Lawrence Erlbaum Associates)*, 11(2), 99-113. doi:Article
- Saltz, I. (2009). *Typography Essentials: 100 Design Principles for Working with Type*. Beverly, MA USA: Rockport Publishers.
- Samara, T. (2006). *Type Style Finder*. Gloucester, MA USA: Rockport Publishers.
- Schiller, G. (1935). An Experimental Study of the Appropriateness of Color and Type in Advertising. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 19, 13.
- Schoenwald, M. (2001). Psychographic Segmentation: Used or Abused? *Brandweek*, 42(4), 34. doi:Article
- Schrivver, K. (1997). *Dynamics in Document Design*. IN, US: Wiley Computer Publishing.
- Solomon, M. (1986). *The Art of Typography: An Introduction to Typo.icon.ography*. New York: Watson - Guptill.
- Spiekermann, E., & Ginger, E. (2003). *Stop Stealing Sheep & Find Out How Type Works* (2nd ed.). Berkeley CA: Adobe Press,
- Stopke, J., & Stanley, C. (1994). *An Eye for Type*. Ann Arbor, MI: Promotional Perspectives.
- Swaminathan, V., Stilley, K.M., & Ahluwalia, R. (2009). When Brand Personality Matters: The Moderating Role of Attachment Styles. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35(6), 985-1002. doi:Article
- Tannenbaum, P., Jacobson, H., & Norris, E. (1964). An Experimental Investigation of Typeface Connotations. *Journalism Quarterly*, 41, 65-73.
- Thangaraj, J. (2004). Fascinating Fonts; Is the Power of Typography a Marketing Myth. *Praxis: The Public Relations Resource Centre*, 2(1).
- Tinker, M. (1963). *Legibility of Print*. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.
- Twyman, M. (1982). The Graphic Presentation of Language. *Information Design Journal*, 3, 2-22.
- Van Rompay, T., Pruyn, A. T., & Tieke, P. (2009). Symbolic Meaning Integration in Design and its Influence on Product and Brand Evaluation. *International Journal of Design*, 3(2), 19-26.

- Vila, N., & Ampuero, O. (2007). The Role of Packaging in Positioning an Orange Juice. *Journal of Food Products Marketing*, 13(3), 21-48.
- Walker, P., Smith, S., & Livingston, A. (1986). Predicting the Appropriateness of a Typeface on the Basis of its Multi-Modal Features. *Information Design Journal*, 5, 14.
- Waller, R. (1991). Typography and Discourse. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, Mosenthal, & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research Volume II* (Vol. 2).
- Warde,, B. (1956). On the Choice of Typefaces. In H. Jacob (Ed.), *The Crystal Goblet: Sixteen Essays on Typography*. Cleveland, OH and New York, NY: World Publishing Company.
- Wheeler, A. (2006). *Designing Brand Identity: A Complete Guide to Creating, Building and Maintaining Strong Brands*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- White, A. W. (2005). *Thinking in Type: The Practical Philosophy of typography*. New York, NY: Allworth Press.
- Yates, J. F. (2007). Emotion Appraisal Tendencies and Carryover: How, Why, and...Therefore? *Journal of Consumer Psychology (Lawrence Erlbaum Associates)*, 17(3), 179-183. doi:10.1080/10577400701389755
- Zajonc, R. B., & Markus, H. (1982). Affective and Cognitive Factors in Preferences. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 9(2), 123-131.
- Zhang, Y., Feick, L., & Price, L. J. (2006). The Impact of Self-Construal on Aesthetic Preference for Angular Versus Rounded Shapes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(6), 794 -805. doi:10.1177/0146167206286626

Bibliography

- Bringhurst, R. (2002). *The Elements of Typographic Style* (2nd ed.). Hartley & Marks.
- Brumberger, E. (2003). The Rhetoric of Typography: The Awareness and Impact of Typeface Appropriateness. *Technical Communication*, 50(2), 224.
- Buttle, H., & Westoby, N. (2006). Brand Logo and Name Association: It's All in the Name. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 20(9), 1181-1194.
doi:10.1002/acp.1257
- Chandler, D. (2007). *Semiotics for Beginners*. Routledge.
- Childers, T. L., & Jass, J. (2002). All Dressed Up with Something to Say; Effects of Typeface Semantic Associations on Brand Perceptions and Consumer Memory. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 12(2), 93-106.
- Danesi, M. (2004). *Messages, Signs, and Meanings*. Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Danesi, M. (2006). *Brands*. Routledge introductions to media and communications. New York: Routledge
- Danesi, M. (2007). *Why it sells: Decoding the meanings of brand names, logos, ads, and other marketing and advertising ploys*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Davis, R., & Smith, H. (1933). Determinants of feeling tone in type faces. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 17(6), 742-764.
- Department of Semiotics. (2008). *Cultural Semiotics*. Retrieved from http://www.filsriver.arthist.lu.se/kultsem/semiotics/kult_sem_eng.html
- Dittmar, H. (1992). *The Social Psychology of Material Possessions*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf
- Doyle, J., & Bottomley, P. A. (2004). Font Appropriateness and Brand choice. *Journal of Business Research*, 57, 873-880.
- Doyle, J., & Bottomley, P. A. (2006). Dressed for the Occasion: Font-product Congruity in the perception of logotype. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 16(2), 112-123.
- Doyle, J., & Bottomley, P.A. (2009). The message in the medium: Transfer of connotative meaning from typeface to names and products. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 23(3), 396-409. doi:10.1002/acp.1468
- Elliott, R. (1998). A Model Of Emotion-Driven Choice. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 14(1/3), 95-108. doi:Article
- Gump, J. E. (2001). The Readability of Typefaces and the Subsequent Mood or Emotion Created in the Reader. *Journal of Education for Business*, 76(5), 270.
- Hannam, L. (2009). Instantly Recognizable. *Marketing Magazine*, 114(2), 20.
doi:Article
- Healy, M. (2008). *What is Branding? Hove, UK: RotoVision SA*.
- Heath, R. (2001). *The Hidden Power of Advertising : How Low Involvement Processing Influences the Way We Choose Brands*. Henley-On-Thames: World Advertising Research Centre.
- Henderson, P., Giese, J., & Cote, J. (2004). Impression Management Using Typeface Design. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(4), 60-72.
- Henderson, P. W., & Cote, J. A. (1998). Guidelines for Selecting or Modifying Logos. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(2), 14-30. doi:Article
- Jana, Reena. (2007, May 14). For Logo Power, Try Helvetica. *BusinessWeek Online*, 16.
- Kasti, A. J., & Child, I. L. (1968). Emotional Meaning of Four Typographical

- Variables. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 52(6), 440-446.
- Lewis, C., & Walker, P. (1989). Typographic Influences on Reading. *British Journal of Psychology*, 80(1), 241.
- Lupton, E. (2004). *Thinking with type* (1st ed.). NY, NY: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Mackiewicz, J. (2005). How to Use Five Letterforms to Gauge a Typeface's Personality: A Research-Driven Method. *Journal of Technical Writing & Communication*, 35(3), 291-315.
- McCarthy, M. S., & Mothersbaugh, D. L. (2002). Effects of Typographic Factors in Advertising-Based Persuasion. *Psychology and Marketing*, 19(July-August), 663-691. Merriam-Webster. (2011). *Dictionary – Thesaurus Merriam-Webster Online*. Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com>
- Minamiyama, H. (2007). *World Branding: Concept, Strategy and Design*. Corte Madera, CA: Gingko Press Inc.
- Mollerup, P. (1997). *Marks of Excellence*. New York, NY: Phaidon Press Inc.
- Morgan, C. M., & Levy, D. J. (2002). Psychographic Segmentation. *Communication World*, 20(1), 22. doi:Article
- Osgood, C., Suci, G., & Tannenbaum, P. (1957). *The Measurement of Meaning*.
- Poffenberger, A., & Fraken, R. (1923). A Study of the Appropriateness of Typefaces. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 7, 312-327.
- Raz, T. (2002, December 1). Re: Design -- Not just a Pretty Typeface. *Inc.*. Retrieved from <http://www.inc.com/magazine/20021201/24907.html>
- Rogener, S., Pool, A., & Packhauser, U. (1995). *Branding with Type: How Type Sells*. Mountain View, CA: Adobe Press.
- Saltz, I. (2009). *Typography Essentials: 100 Design Principles for Working with Type*. Beverly, MA USA: Rockport Publishers.
- Samara, T. (2006). *Type Style Finder*. Gloucester, MA USA: Rockport Publishers.
- Schiller, G. (1935). An Experimental Study of the Appropriateness of Color and Type in Advertising. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 19, 13.
- Schriver, K. (1997). *Dynamics in Document Design*. IN, US: Wiley Computer Publishing.
- Solomon, M. (1986). *The Art of Typography: An Introduction to Typo.icon.ography*. New York: Watson - Guptill.
- Spiekermann, E., & Ginger, E. (2003). *Stop Stealing Sheep & Find Out How Type Works* (2nd ed.). Berkeley CA: Adobe Press,
- Stopke, J., & Stanley, C. (1994). *An Eye for Type*. Ann Arbor, MI: Promotional Perspectives.
- Tannenbaum, P., Jacobson, H., & Norris, E. (1964). An Experimental Investigation of Typeface Connotations. *Journalism Quarterly*, 41, 65-73.
- Thangaraj, J. (2004). Fascinating Fonts; Is the Power of Typography a Marketing Myth. *Praxis: The Public Relations Resource Centre*, 2(1).
- Tinker, M. (1963). *Legibility of Print*. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.
- Van Rompay, T., Pruyn, A. T., & Tieke, P. (2009). Symbolic Meaning Integration in Design and its Influence on Product and Brand Evaluation. *International Journal of Design*, 3(2), 19-26.
- Walker, P., Smith, S., & Livingston, A. (1986). Predicting the Appropriateness of a Typeface on the Basis of its Multi-Modal Features. *Information Design Journal*, 5, 14.

- Wheeler, A. (2006). *Designing Brand Identity: A Complete Guide to Creating, Building and Maintaining Strong Brands*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- White, A. W. (2005). *Thinking in Type: The Practical Philosophy of Typography*. New York, NY: Allworth Press.

Appendix

Figure 1: Semantic Differential Pre-test Survey

Please tick the box which corresponds best to your feeling for each pair of adjectives.
Please fill in every row with your first thought for each pair, there is no right or wrong.



 Like <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Dislike Warm <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Cold Attractive <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Unattractive Interesting <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Uninteresting Emotional <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Unemotional Feminine <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Masculine Delicate <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Strong	"Crafted to infuse your senses." Like <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Dislike Warm <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Cold Attractive <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Unattractive Interesting <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Uninteresting Emotional <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Unemotional Feminine <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Masculine Delicate <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Strong
 Calm <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Not Calm Formal <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Informal Honest <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Dishonest Familiar <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Unfamiliar Interesting <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Uninteresting Emotional <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Unemotional	"Like tea used to be." Calm <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Not Calm Formal <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Informal Honest <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Dishonest Familiar <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Unfamiliar Interesting <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Uninteresting Emotional <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Unemotional

Figure 2: Brand Set Box Example



Brand B



Figure 3: Congruent Brand Attitude Survey

Below are two fictitious brands of tea. Taking in consideration both the logo and slogan, please answer each question as best represents your attitude towards these fictitious brands.




Brand A	Brand B
	
<p>1. This brand appeals to me.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> Undecided <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree</p> <p>2. I feel positive about this brand.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> Undecided <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree</p>	<p>1. This brand appeals to me.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> Undecided <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree</p> <p>2. I feel positive about this brand.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> Undecided <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree</p>
<p>3. This is an attractive brand.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> Undecided <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree</p> <p>4. I would consider purchasing this brand of tea.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> Undecided <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree</p>	<p>3. This is an attractive brand.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> Undecided <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree</p> <p>4. I would consider purchasing this brand of tea.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> Undecided <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree</p>
<p>When finished, please complete the participant information section at the bottom of the page.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female Age _____ Occupation _____ Ethnicity (optional) _____</p>	

Figure 4: Incongruent Brand Attitude Survey

Below are two fictitious brands of tea. Taking in consideration both the logo and slogan, please answer each question as best represents your attitude towards these fictitious brands.

Brand A



“Like tea used to be.”


1. This brand appeals to me.

Strongly Agree
 Agree
 Agree Somewhat
 Undecided
 Disagree Somewhat
 Disagree
 Strongly Disagree

2. I feel positive about this brand.

Strongly Agree
 Agree
 Agree Somewhat
 Undecided
 Disagree Somewhat
 Disagree
 Strongly Disagree

Brand B



“Crafted to infuse your senses.”

1. This brand appeals to me.

Strongly Agree
 Agree
 Agree Somewhat
 Undecided
 Disagree Somewhat
 Disagree
 Strongly Disagree

2. I feel positive about this brand.

Strongly Agree
 Agree
 Agree Somewhat
 Undecided
 Disagree Somewhat
 Disagree
 Strongly Disagree

3. This is an attractive brand.

Strongly Agree
 Agree
 Agree Somewhat
 Undecided
 Disagree Somewhat
 Disagree
 Strongly Disagree

4. I would consider purchasing this brand of tea.

Strongly Agree
 Agree
 Agree Somewhat
 Undecided
 Disagree Somewhat
 Disagree
 Strongly Disagree

3. This is an attractive brand.

Strongly Agree
 Agree
 Agree Somewhat
 Undecided
 Disagree Somewhat
 Disagree
 Strongly Disagree

4. I would consider purchasing this brand of tea.

Strongly Agree
 Agree
 Agree Somewhat
 Undecided
 Disagree Somewhat
 Disagree
 Strongly Disagree

When finished, please complete the participant information section at the bottom of the page.

Male Female Age _____ Occupation _____ Ethnicity (optional) _____

Table 1: Semantic Differential Pre-test Survey Results

	Pleasant Logotype	Pleasant Slogan
Like/Dislike	-1.94	-1.916
Warm/Cold	-1.77	-1.55
Attractive/Unattractive	-1.756	-1.648
Interesting/Uninteresting	-1.22	-1.16
Emotional/Unemotional	-1.36	-1.41
Feminine/Masculine	-1.88	-1.5
Delicate/Strong	-0.861	-0.805

	Reassuring Logotype	Reassuring Slogan
Calm/Not Calm	-1.66	-2.16
Formal/Informal	-2.33	-1.36
Honest/Dishonest	-1.783	-1.864
Familiar/Unfamiliar	-1.38	-1.77
Interesting/Uninteresting	0.444	0.361
Emotional/Unemotional	1.11	0.25

Table 2: Reassuring Congruent - Overall

	"This brand appeals to me"	%	"I feel positive about this brand"	%	"This is an attractive brand"	%	"I would consider purchasing this brand"	%
Strongly Agree	2	2%	4	5%	0	0%	1	1%
Agree	31	37%	31	37%	20	24%	26	32%
Somewhat Agree	26	32%	21	26%	34	41%	13	16%
Positive Total	59	72%	56	68%	54	66%	40	49%
Undecided Total	11	13%	15	18%	12	15%	21	26%
Somewhat Disagree	6	7%	8	10%	6	7%	12	15%
Disagree	4	5%	3	3%	9	11%	5	6%
Strongly Disagree	2	2%	0	0%	1	1%	4	4%
Negative Total	12	15%	11	13%	16	20%	21	26%

Table 3: Reassuring Congruent - Overall

	“This brand appeals to me”	%	“I feel positive about this brand”	%	“This is an attractive brand”	%	“I would consider purchasing this brand”	%
Strongly Agree	2	2%	4	5%	0	0%	1	1%
Agree	31	37%	31	37%	20	24%	26	32%
Somewhat Agree	26	32%	21	26%	34	41%	13	16%
Positive Total	59	72%	56	68%	54	66%	40	49%
Undecided Total	11	13%	15	18%	12	15%	21	26%
Somewhat Disagree	6	7%	8	10%	6	7%	12	15%
Disagree	4	5%	3	3%	9	11%	5	6%
Strongly Disagree	2	2%	0	0%	1	1%	4	4%
Negative Total	12	15%	11	13%	16	20%	21	26%

Table 4: Pleasing Congruent - Overall

	"This brand appeals to me"	%	"I feel positive about this brand"	%	"This is an attractive brand"	%	"I would consider purchasing this brand"	%
Strongly Agree	9	11%	8	10%	10	12%	5	7%
Agree	34	41%	30	37%	31	38%	26	32%
Somewhat Agree	15	18%	18	22%	13	16%	25	30%
Positive Total	58	71%	56	68%	54	66%	56	68%
Undecided Total	4	5%	10	12%	10	12%	16	20%
Somewhat Disagree	17	20%	8	10%	13	16%	6	8%
Disagree	3	4%	8	10%	5	7%	3	4%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
Negative Total	20	24%	16	20%	18	22%	10	12%

Table 5: Pleasing Incongruent - Overall

	“This brand appeals to me”	%	“I feel positive about this brand”	%	“This is an attractive brand”	%	“I would consider purchasing this brand”	%
Strongly Agree	7	7%	8	8%	9	9%	5	5%
Agree	18	19%	24	25%	20	21%	19	20%
Somewhat Agree	34	35%	26	27%	26	27%	19	20%
Positive Total	59	61%	58	60%	55	57%	53	55%
Undecided Total	11	11%	16	17%	16	17%	29	30%
Somewhat Disagree	14	15%	16	17%	17	18%	11	11%
Disagree	10	10%	7	7%	8	8%	10	10%
Strongly Disagree	3	3%	0	0%	1	1%	4	4%
Negative Totals	27	28%	23	24%	26	27%	25	26%

Table 6: Positive Comparative

	"This brand appeals to me"	"I feel positive about this brand"	"This is an attractive brand"	"I would consider purchasing this brand"	Overall Percentage of Positive Responses
Reassuring Congruent	72%	68%	68%	49%	64%
Reassuring Incongruent	70%	65%	65%	67%	66%
Pleasing Congruent	71%	68%	66%	68%	68%
Pleasing Incongruent	61%	60%	57%	55%	59%

Table 7: Positive Attitude vs. Purchasing Decision

	Average Score of Questions 1,2 & 3	Question 4 (Purchasing Decision)
Reassuring Congruent	69%	49%
Reassuring Incongruent	66%	67%
Pleasing Congruent	68%	68%
Pleasing Incongruent	57%	55%

Table 8: Positive Attitude vs. Purchasing Decision

	Average of Questions 1 & 2 (Attitude)	Question 4 (Purchasing Decision)
Reassuring Congruent	70%	49%
Reassuring Incongruent	67%	67%
Pleasing Congruent	70%	68%
Pleasing Incongruent	61%	55%

Table 9: Positive Attitude vs. Aesthetic vs. Purchasing Decision

	Average of Questions 1 & 2 (Attitude)	Question 3 (Aesthetic)	Question 4 (Purchasing Decision)
Reassuring Congruent	70%	66%	49%
Reassuring Incongruent	67%	65%	67%
Pleasing Congruent	70%	66%	68%
Pleasing Incongruent	61%	57%	55%

Table 10: Reassuring Congruent Attitude Response Comparative

	'This brand appeals to me"	"I feel positive about this brand"	"This is an attractive brand"	"I would consider purchasing this brand"	Overall average percentage
Positive	72%	68%	66%	40%	62%
Undecided	13%	18%	15%	26%	18%
Negative	15%	13%	20%	26%	19%

Table 11: Reassuring Incongruent Attitude Response Comparative

	'This brand appeals to me"	"I feel positive about this brand"	"This is an attractive brand"	"I would consider purchasing this brand"	Overall average percentage
Positive	70%	65%	65%	67%	67%
Undecided	15%	20%	10%	16%	15%
Negative	15%	16%	25%	18%	19%

Table 12: Pleasing Congruent Attitude Response Comparative

	'This brand appeals to me"	"I feel positive about this brand"	"This is an attractive brand"	"I would consider purchasing this brand"	Overall average percentage
Positive	71%	68%	66%	68%	68%
Undecided	5%	12%	12%	20%	12%
Negative	24%	20%	22%	12%	20%

Table 13: Pleasing Incongruent Attitude Response Comparative

Positive	'This brand appeals to me"	"I feel positive about this brand"	"This is an attractive brand"	"I would consider purchasing this brand"	Overall average percentage
Positive	61%	60%	57%	55%	58%
Undecided	11%	17%	17%	30%	19%
Negative	28%	24%	27%	26%	26%