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Abstract:

Brands and slogans are an integral part of companies’ marketing communication. Most companies have a slogan that communicates their expertise or what differentiates them from their competitors. When creating slogans it is vital to know how different elements, such as brand strength and the type of slogan influence the consumers’ attitude towards a slogan.

Therefore, the aim of this study was to investigate if the strength of a brand influences the attitude towards a slogan. Furthermore, it was studied if the type of slogan affects the attitude towards slogans.

Because of their strong interplay, brands and slogans have to be studied together. Nevertheless, past research has focused mostly on recall and recognition of slogans and not investigated thoroughly the effect of the brand strength on consumer attitude towards slogans. Therefore, this kind of research was needed. Dahlén and Rosengren found that slogans of strong brands were more liked than slogans of weak brands. However, they did not look at the characteristics of the slogan. Thus, an extension of their study was performed.

An experimental study with 60 subjects was carried out. Each subject filled in a questionnaire with four brand-slogan combinations. Half of the subjects responded on slogans combined with their own brand and the other half of the subjects responded to a questionnaire with false brand-slogan combinations.

The results of this study contradicted past research. The findings showed that slogans of strong brands are not more liked than slogans of weak brands. However, the attitude towards the slogans of strong brands was found to be more stable than the attitude towards slogans of weak brands. Therefore, the findings suggest that brand strength has some effect on the attitude towards slogans. However, its effect is not as large as the earlier study suggests. The results from this study in combination with the thorough literature review can help marketers to plan their slogans even better and create slogans that fit their strategy.
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1 INTRODUCTION

The term slogan derives from the Scottish Gaelic word sluagh–ghairm, which means battle–cry (Kohli, Leuthesser & Suri 2007:415, Aboulian & McBride 2007:359). The term battle–cry defines well the important role of slogans in the fierce competition of consumers’ attention. The slogan is a way for companies to communicate who they are and differentiate from their competitors. Slogans are designed to present a company’s or product’s benefits compared with the competitors and assist in marketing the company or their products (Dowling & Kabanoff 1996:63). Some famous slogans are for example Nike’s "Just Do It", McDonald’s “I´m lovin’ it” and Coca Cola’s “The real thing”. Companies need to know what their slogan communicates and does not communicate as they are one of the few things that consumers remember from an ad (Teas & Grapentine 2002:35). A badly planned slogan can negatively influence on the brand or give more value to your competitors than yourself. Slogans are important to study as they form an integral part of companies’ communication. New slogans are usually created when a new product is launched or if a company wants to improve its image. The thing that distinguishes slogans from the company name and the logo is that slogans can be changed, unlike the company name that cannot easily be changed and the company logo that is often only modified if changed at all (Kohli et al. 2007:415–416).

Slogans can be called taglines, positioning lines, positioning themes, power lines and catchphrases (Cone 2008; Teas & Grapentine 2004). The word used in this paper is slogan, because most authors use that word. Generally, slogans can be divided into two groups, those that promote the company, “Nokia – Connecting People”, and those that promote a particular product, “M&M’s – melts in your mouth, not in your hand”. Most slogans tend to promote a product (Teas & Grapentine 2004:267). In this study slogans that promote a company will be studied.

Slogans have been studied widely during the last decades as they are an important part of companies’ communication and an important tool when trying to create good image for a product or a company. Researchers have through the years put a lot of emphasis on recall, recognition and memory processes that consumers use when recalling slogans (Katz & Rose 1969; Reece, Vanden Bergh, & Li 1994; Rosengren & Dahlén 2006). Language in slogans has been a popular research object as well (Fuertes–Oliveira, Velasco–Sacrístán, Arribas–Bano, & Samaniego–Fernández 2001; Hornikx,
van Meurs & de Boer 2010). Moreover, many authors have studied slogans from a strategic point of view and tried to identify what constitutes a successful slogan (Kohli et al. 2007; Reece, Vanden Bergh & Li 1994; Dahlén & Rosengren 2005). Nevertheless, some parts have been neglected when it comes to slogans. First of all, slogans and brands appear mostly together in advertisements. Despite this most studies do not even consider how the brand influences the consumers’ attitude towards the slogan. Many studies about how the different types of slogans influence the consumer attitude towards slogans have also been carried out (Lagerwerf 2002, Bradley & Meeds 2002). However, no studies have simultaneously investigated how the brand strength and the type of slogan influence on the attitude towards slogans. Thus, there exists a clear research gap in this research field. Therefore, it is important to study simultaneously how the brand strength, weak or strong brand, and the type of slogan, polyseymous or simple, influence the consumers’ attitude towards slogans.

1.1. Research problem

Brand strength has been found to affect positively the attitude towards slogans. Dahlén and Rosengren (2005:151) discuss that slogan learning may be influenced by the brand so that slogans of well-known brands are more preferred than slogans of weaker brands. In their empirical study Dahlén and Rosengren (2005:160) found that brand equity affected the preference of slogans; slogans of strong brands are more liked than slogans of weaker ones. In other words, the slogans of strong companies are brand-driven, i.e. the brand affected more the slogan than the slogan affected the brand. On the other hand, the attitude towards less-known companies are slogan-driven, the slogans affected more the brand than the brand affected the slogan (ibid.). Several other studies have also indicated that brand strength influences positively on attitude towards slogans. Keiser (1975:40) discussed that the slogans of well-known and strong brands are more easily remembered than those from weaker brands. Consumers remember better the content of ads from familiar brands than from unknown brands; which leads to that slogan of strong brands become more liked than slogans of weak brands. These studies indicate that brand strength is an element that influences the consumers’ attitude towards slogans. But also, the type of slogan is an important element to study when investigating the attitude towards slogans.

Three factors are believed to affect the effectiveness of brand slogans: the recipient’s personality, the meaning of the slogan, and the context in which the slogan is seen or
heard (Dimofte & Yalch 2007a:515). For this study, the meaning of the slogan is particularly interesting. Studies have indicated that the type of slogan affects the attitude towards the slogan. Therefore, the type of slogans is important to study when investigating the consumers’ attitude towards slogans. There are many different kinds of slogans: polysemous, simple, unambiguous, explicit, implicit, humorous, and generic slogans. The two types of slogans compared in this study were simple slogans and polysemous slogans. Studies indicate that keeping it simple does not work anymore; slogans must be created to stand out (Macklin 1985:32–34; Bradley & Meeds 2002:613). Thus, polysemous slogans are important to study. Polysemous slogans are phrases that by definition need to have at least two meanings. Polysemous slogans with easily recognizable ambiguity have been found to be more preferred than slogans with only one meaning (Dimofte & Yalch 2007a:520–521; Lagerwerf 2002:257). Therefore, the main focus in this paper will be put on polysemous slogans. Slogans that are mainly interpreted as having one meaning, simple slogans, were chosen so that comparison between simple and polysemous slogans could be made.

Slogans and brands appear most often together and they should be studied together because of their strong interrelationship. However, most studies have neglected the effect of the brand on the attitude towards the slogan. Only one study (Dahlén & Rosengren 2005) has looked at the brand strength and how it influences the attitude towards slogans. Moreover, studies (Dimofte and Yalch 2007a; Lagerwerf 2002, Puntoni, Schroeder & Ritson 2010) that have investigated polysemous slogans have ignored to investigate how the brand strength could influence the attitude towards slogans. Therefore, a study that takes both of these parts in consideration is needed. This study extends the study by Dahlén and Rosengren (2005), but with a slightly different focus. First, unfamiliar slogans from a not heavily advertised category will be used, whereas Dahlén and Rosengren used slogans from a heavily advertised category. Second, merely the effect of the brand strength on the attitude towards the slogan will be studied, while Dahlén and Rosengren also looked at the how slogans influence the attitude towards the brand. Third, the influence of the type of slogan on the consumer attitude towards slogans will also be studied; this part was not studied at all by Dahlén and Rosengren.
1.2. Aim

The aim of this study is to investigate if the strength of a brand explains consumers’ attitude towards polysemous slogans compared with simple slogans. Is the slogan perceived differently when it is combined with a strong brand compared with a weaker brand? In other words the primary aim is to investigate whether there is a causal relationship between brand strength and the attitude towards the slogan. The effect of the slogan on attitude towards the brand is not studied.

The secondary aim is to identify how the type of slogan influences the attitude towards the slogan. This gives marketers information about whether some type of slogan suits better for strong brands than for weak brands. This paper will give insights for marketers that help them in planning of slogans.

This study contributes to theory by increasing our knowledge of consumer reactions to polysemous slogans and has managerial implications for companies that use, or consider using, brand slogans.

1.3. Explaining key terms

In this part the key terms in this thesis are explained and justified. The key terms are; brand strength, type of slogan, polysemous slogan, ambiguity, and simple slogan. Brand strength can be assessed by looking at factors such as market share, store presence, growth, etc. (Kapferer 2008:143). For this study, it was more suitable to perform a pilot study where the perceived brand strength was tested. This was done so that companies could be divided into strong and weak brands. The words strong brand and weak brand were chosen to describe brand strength similarly as in the studies by Dahlén and Rosengren (2005:153), and Broniarczyk and Gershoff (2003:164).

Two types of slogans are studied in this paper, polysemous slogans and simple slogans. First of all, it is vital to know the difference between the words polysemous slogan and the words ambiguous slogan and ambiguity. Polysemous slogans are slogans with at least two possible meanings. Furthermore, when discussing polysemous slogans it is expected that the polysemy in the slogan is intended and planned by the company. On the other hand, the word ambiguity or ambiguous slogan is used when discussing from the consumers’ point of view how they interpret slogans. The word ambiguity means that the word has a “quality of being open to more than one interpretation” (Oxford Reference Online, 2012). Some authors use the words as synonyms, but there is a small
difference in the meaning of the words. Polysemous slogan is the main term in this paper as one can expect that most companies plan the polysemy in their slogans. The definition “simple slogan” is used in this paper for slogans that are mostly interpreted as having only one meaning. Authors (Bradley and Meeds 2002; Lagerwerf 2002) have also used the word unambiguous, but that word is not used since it assumes that the slogan has only one meaning. The term simple is more suitable for this thesis as it does not limit the amount of possible interpretations as much as the word unambiguous slogan.

1.4. Delimitations

This study focuses on the effect of brand strength on the attitude towards slogans. The slogan’s effect on the brand is beyond the scope of this study. For this study, the goal was to identify a sample where the subjects are homogenous. Students from business schools were deemed suitable for this study as they are expected to not be familiar with slogans from the publishing business and they are used to fill in questionnaires. The word subject is typically used in experiments for the respondents; therefore this term was used also in this paper. The study is limited to only one line of business, the publishing business, which means that the results might not be generalizable for other lines of businesses. Slogans from this line of business were chosen as the slogans had to be unfamiliar for at least most of the subjects so that the experiment with the manipulated brand-slogan combinations was possible. The study was designed to resemble a real-life situation where a consumer sees a slogan for the first time. Therefore, heavily advertised slogans were excluded from this study. In addition, clear differences between weak and strong brands had to exist in the line of business that would be studied. The pilot study supported the choice of slogans and companies from the publishing business. The companies in the study belonged to the publishing business even if the strong brands also have other operations and the weak brands focus mainly on printing services.

1.5. Structure of the paper

The theoretical framework will be presented in chapter 2. Slogans will be defined and slogans will be discussed by looking at studies from different research fields such as; linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, slogans, branding, advertising language, consumer research and consumer behavior. The main focus in the theoretical part will
be put on the subchapters 2.4 to 2.6 about advertising language, brands and slogans and polysemous slogans. In chapter 3 the method and the study will be presented and justified. In the following chapter the results of the will be discussed. Finally, the findings will be analyzed and the managerial and theoretical implications will be reported.
2 SLOGANS – A COMMUNICATIVE MARKETING TOOL

The theoretical part is built in a top-down way. The first subchapters 2.1 to 2.3 are an introduction to the topic of slogans. There will be general discussion about what slogans are and findings from different research fields are reported to highlight issues that marketers and companies must take in consideration when planning slogans. After this, the main issues in this thesis; language in slogans, polysemous slogans, and brands and slogans are will be discussed. The hypotheses are presented at the end of this chapter.

2.1 Defining Slogans

Slogans are defined by Cone (2008: xiii) as “a memorable phrase expressing an idea, purpose or claim”. Slogans differ from body text because they appear alone while body text in an ad is like any running text (Fuertes–Olivera et al. 2001:1297). This makes slogans easier to see and remember. Typically, slogans are placed after the company name in the head line or at the bottom of an ad (Dowling & Kabanoff 1996:64; Lagerwerf 2002:246). The slogan needs to be in a large font and have a focal point in the advertisement. If the slogan is hidden in a corner with a small font, it cannot communicate its message to the recipients (Cone 2008:128). The length of a slogan is most often between three and five words (Dowling & Kabanoff 1996:64).

The words in slogans are one of the most repeated and essential words that companies use in their marketing communications (Dowling & Kabanoff 1996:63–64). The strength of slogans is that they can summarize a marketing campaign in a short sentence (Keller 2008:150). Slogans are used to influence consumers both rationally and emotionally. The rational information in slogans can be; descriptions of operations, desired position, competitive advantage, or other benefits that the company can provide. The emotional message is more about creating positive associations towards the company (Dowling & Kabanoff 1996:74). Slogans have also been called hooks or handles because they capture the brand essence and express what makes the brand special (Keller 2008:150; Kohli et al. 2007:416; Mitchell, Macklin & Paxman 2007:200). Slogans must not be too common, hollow or complicated. Slogans should not either contain difficult corporate information that is completely uninteresting for consumers (Mitchell et al. 2007:217). A slogan has both internal and external outcomes for a company. Many slogans give promises that consumers expect the company to
keep. A bank with a slogan “the bank with a smile” is expected to meet its customers in this way. Therefore, employees must internalize the values and promises that the slogan communicates (Kapferer 2008:104).

2.1.1. Using slogans

There are several reasons for using slogans. Most slogans can have many goals and can be interpreted in many ways. Dowling and Kabanoff (1996:65) present typical reasons for using slogans:

- ask for customer action – Mitsubishi: "Please consider"
- differentiate a brand – Arthur Andersen: "All accounting firms are not alike"
- explain a name – ANA: "All Nippon Airways"
- explain a field of operations – Alison: "Hotels and Resorts"
- identify with a consumer group – SAS: "The business airline of Europe"
- identify with a societal concern – Siemens Power Generation: "Committed to the future"
- make a promise – Lexus: "Without compromise"
- provide a call to action – Nike: "Just do it"
- provide a reason to buy – BMW: "The ultimate driving machine"
- remind about a corporate vision – Audemars Piguet: "The master watchmaker"
- rent the image of a region – Rolex: "Of Geneva"
- rent the image of a company – Bain & Company: "Deutsche Bank Group"
- state a distinctive competence – 3M: "Innovation"
- state a strategy – Xerox: "The document company"

There are many different kinds of slogans: polysemous (Just Do It – Nike), explicit (Valtra Power Partner – Valtra Oy Ab), implicit (Think different - Apple), humorous (Do you....Yahoo!? –Yahoo), and generic slogans (Never Underestimate the Power of Soup – Campbell’s). Other slogans have the brand name in it (“It's Miller time!”). Wordplay is also typical in slogans (Wii would like to play – Nintendo). Slogans can belong to many groups at the same time; implicit slogans are for example most often seen as polysemous. It is important to know the different types of slogans and in what kind of situations and for what kind of companies they are suitable. Moreover, the slogans can be categorized according to the language in them, for example the use of super–attributes as quality, best and leader are typical for companies. A recent study
showed that the most common words in slogans are: you, your, we, world, new, more, good, better and best (Adslogans 2001). These are probably not the best words to use for differentiation. Accordingly, Hampf and Lindberg–Repo (2011:5) suggest that the use of words such as “first,” “best,” and “the most beautiful” do not appeal anymore to the consumers.

Slogans are not merely used by companies. Politicians have used through the years catchy slogans in their campaigns. Political slogans are a bit different from commercial slogans as they emphasize a goal or belief whereas commercial slogans state benefits or qualities in a product or service (Cone 2008: xiii). The most famous political slogan is probably “I have a dream” that Martin Luther King used in his speeches. This slogan has all the ingredients that a successful slogan needs. One of the main tasks of slogans is to provide continuity between the different advertising campaigns and enable incidental learning about the brand or the company (Dowling and Kabanoff 1996:64). The slogan “I have a dream” communicates continuity and hope. If Martin Luther King would have said “I have a 5-year plan”, nobody would have listened. Slogans that are open for several interpretations are effective as the recipients can make their own interpretation of the slogan. The message in this slogan was meaningful to all African-Americans at that time and motivated them to rise against the injustice.

2.1.2. Criticism towards slogans

The criticism addressed towards slogans has been mostly about that slogans are seen as unnecessary wordplay that only takes up place next to the company logo. (Trout 2008:47–48); Dowling & Kabanoff 1996:64). It has been criticized that many slogans have a low recall (Dowling & Kabanoff 1996:64). Many slogans are criticized just to plod along and not bringing any value to the company, they just exist but they do not do any good. Moreover, slogans have been accused of being overrated and forgettable as consumers are exposed to much more ads than a few decades ago. Critics state that slogans are not as relevant as before. (Warren 2006:8–10) Even though slogans have been criticized, companies seem to believe in the power of slogans and see them as a valuable asset. This is supported by the fact that companies register an increasing number of slogans every year. (Dowling & Kabanoff 1996:64) For example, in Finland the amount of registered slogans has increased substantially in the past decades (Iskulauserekisteri 2012).
2.2. Creating competitive slogans

A successful slogan must differentiate the company from its competitors and position the company. Otherwise the slogan easily ends up as a meaningless set of words. A company must know the essence of the product and what the company really is about to be able to create effective slogans. A company can differentiate itself with the slogan by emphasizing leadership, heritage, attributes, and production methods in the slogan (Trout 2008:47–48). Differentiation is easier in some lines of businesses where the products are heterogeneous, such as cars and breakfast cereals, and harder in businesses where products are very homogenous, such as gasoline or bottled water (Kohli et al. 2007:416). Consumers easily confuse slogans of companies in heavily advertised lines of businesses where the products are similar to each other and where companies tend to use slogans with similar linguistic and associative features (Katz & Rose 1969:25; Dahlén & Rosengren 2005:155). The most successful slogans communicate an original thought, which differentiates them distinctly from their competitors (Cone 2008:142).

The cluttered environment is a problem for the marketers. How can consumers’ attention be attracted as they are exposed to more ads through more channels than never before? The amount of messages is so big that consumers easily confuse different companies’ communication efforts. Consumers do not always succeed to match a brand and a slogan correctly. This mismatching might lead to that a competitor might draw benefits from another company’s slogan (Keiser 1975:38). In Finland only a few companies have the possibility to use vast sums on marketing and focus on the quantity of advertising. However, a recent study in the automobile industry indicates that huge marketing might not lead to enhanced memorability of slogans. The automobile industry is the most heavily advertised category in the United States, but it has not succeeded to produce any of the 15 most memorable slogans in recent advertising (Bernstein 2000). Companies should forget the traditional view of quantity of advertising and focus instead on the quality of advertising. As markets and consumers change rapidly brands have to change as well. As earlier mentioned slogans are the key to this problem thanks to the communicative ability of slogans. Slogans are a unique tool, which serves as a “bridge between a brand’s legacy and its evolving image” (Kohli et al. 2007:416). Hampf and Lindberg–Repo (2011:5) recommend that slogans should be integrated into companies marketing campaigns as the traditional marketing has lost ground to communication strategies and PR.
2.2.1. Three M’s of slogans

The three M’s of slogans help to remember the essential goals of slogans. Slogans must be; meaningful, motivating and memorable. A slogan needs to have a meaning for the target audience to be successful. An example of a meaningful slogan can be the slogan from Sega “Welcome to the next level”, which refers directly to every players goal to manage a level and come to the next level. A meaningful slogan speaks at the same about the brand and appeals to the consumer. Moreover, this slogan speaks to each players desire to advance in the game and on the same time it communicates that the company evolves (Till & Heckler 2010:50–53). Slogans can be seen as clichéd, dated and pointless if they do not mean anything for the consumers (Mitchell et al. 2007:214).

A slogan needs to motivate consumers to buy the products of the brand. The slogans must be persuading and make consumers feel that they can relate with the slogan. The motivation to process the message has to do with the complexity of the ad. Complex language in advertisements might affect negatively on consumers’ motivation to interpret and read a slogan (Jae 2011:158). Consumers have less motivation to interpret difficult messages than simple ones. Only those that are interested in the category seem to have the motivation to process and interpret complex ads (Chebat, Gelines-Chebat, Hombourger, & Woodside 2003:617–619; Lowrey 1998:202). These studies indicate that complex ads should be used only in small niches where the consumers are engaged in the products and services.

Third, a slogan needs to be memorable to succeed. Repetition has proven to affect memorability in a positive way (Till & Heckler 2010:50–53; Rosengren & Dahlén 2006:265). The studies about the influence of repetition has revealed insights on the effect on memory, but the influence of repetition on attitudes has not been discussed (Law 2002:377). Some slogans that are repeated too much might have a finite life–span when they become over–used. This was the case for overly–used slogan “Whassup” from Budweiser. On the other hand the life span can be very long for some slogans (Mitchell et al. 2007:210). For example, the slogan of DeBeers slogan from 1948 “Diamonds are forever” is widely used still today. However, the amount of repetition might not have an effect on slogan memorability if the message is not interesting for the audience. The interest could come from the linguistic devices in the slogan or the product itself (Reece, Van den Bergh & Li 1994:53). Linguistic devices that can be used to increase memorability of a slogan are for example humor, metaphors, and puns.
Several authors (Djafarova 2008; Mcquarrie and Phillips 2005; Krishnan & Chakravarti 2003) have found that puns, metaphors and humor increase the memorability of a slogan. Humor is used in ads as it is seen to have a persuasive effect and lead often to positive attitudes towards a slogan (Lagerwerf 2002:250). A slogan with moderate humor may enable better recall than a slogan that focuses simply on the humor (Krishnan & Chakravarti 2003:242). Nevertheless, humor is merely one tool to increase the interest for a slogan and brand. Even though authors agree that recognition and recall are important when assessing the effectiveness of a slogan, one must remember that recognition and recall does not necessarily mean that a person likes the slogan. The main point is to remember that a slogan will not bring any added value for the company’s image if it is not interesting for the audience.

**2.2.2. Ways to improve the memorability of a slogan**

Companies do not have to reinvent the wheel when creating slogans. The company simply has to figure out how to communicate their core competence in a way that attracts consumers (Trout 2008:53). Slogans that create discussion can be fruitful as the marketing effort does not cost much. The goal would be to create a slogan that people talk about and newspapers write about. This could be achieved for example with irritating or controversial slogans. For example, the city of Fruita wanted to create a slogan to encourage tourism to the city. The slogan they came up with was WTF, which was an abbreviation of Welcome To Fruita. The slogan was eventually ditched after getting complaints. However, the slogan lived on after stores started to sell t-shirts and use the slogan. Moreover, this slogan achieved to do something that most slogans fail to do: catch the attention of people (Huffington Post 2012). Another way to catch the consumers’ attention could be to place ads with slogans in unanticipated places. This would lead to increased processing and might improve the memorability of the slogan (Rosengren & Dahlén 2006:275). Similarly, the use of exaggerated claims can be fruitful. Consumers do not judge exaggerated claims as not credible, even if consumers are able to recognize them as not true. Consumers also rate brands as better when combined with an exaggerated claim rather than a factual claim. The explanation to this might be that consumers’ first impression of an exaggerated claim is positive. When the consumer continues to process the claim he recognizes it as not true, but the positive first impression stays (Cowley 2006:733).
Studies indicate that jingles improve memory for advertising slogans and that the correct brand–slogan association was higher for those slogans that included music, rhyme or jingles. However, the effect of jingles might not be that clear after all; otherwise all companies would use them (Cone 2008:128; Yalch 1991:273–274). The use of jingles has decreased steadily since the highpoint in the 1950’s. Some reasons for this is that clients do not demand jingles anymore in their advertisements and that marketers do not give enough time for jingles to get the maximum effect out of them (Cone 2008:164). Mitchell et al. (2007:214) discuss that companies can add sounds to a slogan to create additional associations to the slogan which makes the slogan more memorable. By presenting a slogan with a sound that is typical in everyday situations, i.e. a door slamming can make the slogan easier to remember.

2.3. Consumers and slogans

Consumers do not read slogans and try to learn them by heart. Therefore, repetition is needed to get consumers to remember the messages (Reece et al. 1994:44). The effect of repetition is smaller in markets where the clutter is bigger. In a cluttered environment, consumers are distracted from seeing and hearing slogans. A consumer cannot process the message in a slogan if he is distracted from receiving it (Lowrey 1998:189). In markets where the clutter is big, repetition might even make the consumer match the slogan falsely with another brand. However, familiarity is seen to benefit from repetition, which indicates that strong brands can focus more on quantity of advertising, while the weaker and unknown brands must catch the attention with the message in the slogan (Reece et al. 1994:44).

Consumers can match brands and slogans with three different memory processes: cued retrieval, constructive memory, or pure guessing (Rosengren & Dahlén 2006:264; Pham and Johar 1997:257). Rosengren and Dahlén (2006:264–267) studied the memory processes consumers use when retrieving information about slogans. They found that consumers use cued retrieval when they are assured that they know the slogan. When the slogan is less familiar, and the consumer is uncertain on which company’s slogan he is looking at, the consumer starts to use existing knowledge and try to retrieve the memory of the slogan. This is called constructive memory. The memory process is called pure guessing when the consumer does not have a clue which company the slogan belongs to. The results indicated that cued retrieval is brand-driven while the constructive process seems to be slogan-driven. This infers that
companies that are underdogs or new companies that are unfamiliar can influence the memory of their brand name with the help of slogans more than a well-known company. The problem is still that slogans of unknown brands are more easily mismatched by consumers since they typically have to use constructive memory to retrieve the correct brand. Rosengren and Dahlén (2006:265–274) suggest that companies could overcome mismatching by using variations of the slogan. A well-known company with an already achieved consumer-base and in a category with only a few competitors and can expect that the most of the consumers use cued retrieval as a memory process. It is important for marketers to know how consumers’ match a slogan with a brand. This knowledge helps them to know in which situations mismatching can occur and how to create slogans that consumers will not mismatch (ibid.).

The consumer's prior knowledge of a product category has been found to affect the attitude towards advertising messages. Consumers with extensive and prior knowledge of a product category and the companies in it prefer slogans that do not explain too much, while consumers with less knowledge prefer more explanation. For example, consumers with extensive knowledge of MP3’s preferred the slogan “easy menu navigation” than the slogan “select song by artist, title, or category (Hong & Sternthal 2010:302–309). Hong and Sternthal (2010:309–310) suggest that different messages must be created when creating slogans for consumers with prior knowledge and for those who have not.

A study of social uses of advertising showed that consumers remember and use slogans from ads. The slogans were used in daily conversations and in conversations about advertisements. People talk more about slogans that are linked to an everyday topic, such as weather, traffic jams, or just typical everyday situations like coming home from work feeling tired. Humor is found to make slogans more talked about. Companies should try to get people to talk about their ads and share them with friends. Companies should try to create catchy slogans that people start using in social context as people believe more in what their friends say than what companies say. Slogans stick into people’s minds and become a part of daily phrases (Mitchell et al. 2007:200-214). This was the case for the Finnish mobile network supplier DNA’s slogan “Elämä on”, which means “Life is” that people started to use in everyday speech. If a slogan is useful or appropriate in everyday situations, then people will start to use it. Nevertheless, this is a two-sided question as slogans that are used widely in social context can become very annoying.
The effect of demographics on slogan recall has not revealed significant results in past research. According to Katz and Rose (1969:25) correct slogan recall is not influenced by the gender. Keiser’s study (1975:42) gave some indications that male’s would identify slogans better than females, but no significant results were found to support this statement. Dahlén and Rosengren (2005:153) discuss that slogan learning and evaluation has more to with the content and message in the slogan rather than demographics of consumers.

2.4. Language and messages in slogans

Slogans are from a comprehension point of view typically simple or fairly complex (Lowrey 1998:190). If the message is interesting, then slogans of unfamiliar brands can succeed and be remembered as well. The repetition of the brand is not as important as the content of the message (Reece et al. 1994:53). Texts can have many different interpretations since people use and interpret language in different ways. There seems to be always a small difference in what we mean and what we say (Fuertes–Olivera et al. 2001:1292). It has been found that the English language suits well for wordplay and ambiguity in slogans, because of its wide vocabulary and that many words carry multiple meanings (Djafarova 2008:268). A study performed in the Netherlands showed that English is preferred in slogans more than Dutch when the English was easy to understand. English and Dutch are equally preferred when the English in the slogans is difficult to understand (Hornikx, Van Meurs & de Boer 2010:184).

Marketers should aim to create advertising language that persuades the consumers to buy products rather than language that pushes them to buy. In this way consumers feel that they have made the choice for themselves (Fuertes-Olivera et al. 2001:1293). Copywriters use several different styles in slogans for persuasion and attracting the attention of consumers. These are for example: alliteration, repetition of letters, assonance, unpredictable spellings, implicit comparison, polysemy, ambiguity, different dialect, metaphors, etc. (Fuertes-Olivera et al. 2001:1295). Hedges are a linguistic tool that has been widely used in slogans. Marketers use hedges to emphasize indirect associations of the qualities of a product and make the sentence more open for interpretations (Fuertes-Olivera et al. 2001:1299–1300). Well-known examples of slogans that use hedges are Nike’s “Just do It” and Carlsberg’s “Probably the best beer in the world”.

Several studies indicate that slogans with ambiguity, word play and creativeness are more preferred and easier to remember (Dahlén and Rosengren 2005:153, Rosengren & Dahlén 2006:265). The most typical types of wordplay found in slogans are: self-reference, alliteration, parallel construction, metaphor and a well-known phrase (Reece et al. 1994:51). Linguistic variables in an advertisement such as wording, sentences, and paragraphs influence consumers’ memory, perceptions and attitudes of the advertisement (Lowrey 2002:569). For example, asserted claims have been found to be more easily remembered than implied claims. On the other hand consumers are more self-confident that they have remembered the slogan correctly when they have seen a slogan with an implied claim. Implied claims in slogans are more unusual, which leads to that this kind of slogans stand out better while asserted claims are so normal that they do not stand out at all (Harris, Trusty, Bechtold & Wasinger 1989:93–94).

The language in advertising is often planned by marketers in such a way that the messages in them can be understood and interpreted for audiences with different backgrounds. It is hard to create an ad or a slogan that everyone would like. To persuade the consumers the advertisers have to come up with new ideas all the time. One effective strategy to persuade consumers through the years has been the use of puns in advertising. A pun is a figure of speech that expresses a few meanings within one sentence. Puns are used as slogans have to be short and space is often constrained in advertisements. Short slogans are more memorable than long ones. The pun should not be too hard to interpret as it may lead into negative outcomes. A pun can be seen as a tool to add humor in the slogan or as a puzzle that the receiver must solve. (Djafarova 2008:49–51)

Wordplay is a rhetorical device used to attract and maintain the interest of a consumer. Wordplay is widely used in advertising. Metaphors are one type of polysemous slogans that use implicit claims to present in a figurative way. The real message in metaphors has to be interpreted and understood based on the context (Mcquarrie & Phillips 2005:8). Mcquarrie and Phillips (2005:17) found that metaphorical claims in ads result in positive attitudes towards the brand. Ads where the metaphorical claim is supported by a picture that supports the claim will further add to positive inferences, such as more positive brand attitude, better recall of ad headlines (Mcquarrie & Mick 1992; Mcquarrie & Phillips 2005:17). Visual figures seemed to have stronger influence on the consumers’ attitudes than verbal figures. The findings in this study supported the
common belief that the strength of metaphors lies in the lack of constraints that indirect claims have (ibid.).

Many authors (Macklin 1985:32–34; Bradley & Meeds 2002:613) discuss that keeping it simple does not work anymore to attract the consumers’ attention. Bradley and Meeds (2002:595) studied how surface–structure transformations affected people’s comprehension, recognition, recall, and attitudes towards slogans. The results in their study were against the common view that ad copies should be kept as simple as possible. The results indicated that there was no difference in the comprehension of slogans with passive voice and active voice. Active voice showed still higher levels of recognition among the consumers (Bradley and Meeds 2002:613; Chebat et al. 2003:604). Bradley and Meeds (2002:615) suggested that reasonable complexity in slogans is more engaging for consumers because they have to think more what the ad is about and in this way make the slogan more memorable. Consequently, the slogan should not be too difficult to interpret since one of the main goals with slogans is to convey a message so the slogan should not be too difficult to understand.

Dowling and Kabanoff (1996) identified different categories for slogans and what kind of categories are the most in common. By knowing the most typical messages for slogans companies can create a slogan that suits them. A company can choose a “safe” slogan that belongs to the same category as the competitors’ slogans or create a completely different slogan. Dowling and Kabanoff (1996:69–71) found that strength was the most used message theme in slogans. The strength category included slogans with words as sure, strength, master, most, etc. Strength was followed by active (settling, making, moving, etc.) positive (confident, advancement, better) and general economic themes (economic roles, commerce, business, trade, etc.). The message themes that were least preferred included proper names and passive orientation. When the messages themes were grouped into bigger categories it was found that half of the slogans were somewhat ambiguous. Dowling and Kabanoff (1996:73) reported that there is not a relationship between the companies’ operations and the messages in their slogans. The authors explain that this is reasonable and even expected because one of the main goals of slogans is differentiation.

2.5. Brands and slogans

Three key elements in the brand identity are: the brand name, the logo and the slogan/s. Slogans are important when creating strong brands as they can be changed
and modified while brand names cannot be changed and logos can be merely modified or updated to stay current (Kohli et al. 2007:415–416). Cone (2008:127) recommends that slogans should be created to last. Therefore, a slogan should be planned well when it is created. Nevertheless, companies change slogans for several reasons. The most typical reasons are, for example, changing demographics of target group, changes in consumers’ values, new market situation, repositioning of a product, or trouble with an earlier slogan. Badly-planned changes might confuse consumers and lead to a weakened brand image (Mathur & Mathur 1995:60). An example of a slogan that went terribly wrong was Nivea’s ad in 2011 with the slogan “Re-civilize yourself”. An African-American man stands in the advertisement and the big slogan just sounds completely wrong. This slogan created a lot of discussion and it was accused to be racist. Nivea was forced to pull out the ad shortly after it was published (Washington Post, 2012). The slogan is the easiest brand element to change, which gives flexibility to manage slogans according to Kohli et al. (2007:416). However, changing a slogan might not be an easy task for marketers. First, a company must consider what the slogan contribution to the brand equity is and evaluate whether a new slogan is needed or not. For example, some slogans become so strong that the company cannot change the slogan. This was the case for Timex and their slogan “Takes a licking and keeps on ticking”. Moreover, a company must reflect what attributes or benefits they want to add to a new slogan. In the same time, the company must try to retain some of the attributes of the old slogan, so that the new slogan does not contradict with the image of the company (Keller 2008:154). The study by Mathur and Mathur (1995:63) indicated that the change of slogans often lead to higher market values for the companies. If it was this easy then all companies would change their slogans constantly.

Dahlén and Rosengren (2005:160) carried out an empirical study to investigate the effect of brand strength on the attitude towards slogans. Dahlén and Rosengren found that slogans of strong brands are more liked than slogan of weak brands. Therefore, Dahlén and Rosengren (ibid.) suggest that strong brands should try to achieve unique slogans that smaller companies cannot copy or get benefits from. Dahlén and Rosengren (2005:162) recommend that slogans of strong brands should be spelled “brand X tastes great” rather than “brand X is a great tasting beer”. On the other hand weaker brands that are more affected by the slogans should try to create more generalized slogans. This could be done by including the product category for the marketed product in the slogan. For weak brands Dahlén and Rosengren (ibid.) suggest a generalized slogan “dark beer tastes great” rather than “brand X’s dark beer tastes...
great” (ibid.). This suggestion seems quite strange. Kolsarici and Vakratsas (2010:1078) have a differing point of view and propose that generic messages may be more effective when used by brands that dominate their particular market. Kolsarici and Vakratsas (2010:1078–1087) discussed that brand advertising messages are often more effective than generic advertising messages. A generalized slogan by a small company can easily “drown” in the clutter. Generic messages can be useful and effective in the earlier stages in the life cycle, because of their informational value to consumers that are not familiar with the products (ibid). The suggestion by Kolsarici and Vakratsas (2010) seem more reliable than the statement by Dahlén and Rosengren (2005) as strong companies have the possibility to advertise more and make the generalized slogan more seen by the consumers. Furthermore, the suggestion by Kolsarici and Vakratsas is backed up by one of the most successful generic campaigns that was launched by the successful company Campbell’s. Their slogan “Never Underestimate the Power of Soup” managed to increase sales of their soups remarkably (Kolsarici & Vakratsas 2010:1078).

Two main tasks of successful marketing communication are that “consumers remember and value the message content, and they attribute the message content to its intended source (Pham & Johar 1997:249). An essential requirement for a successful slogan is that the brand and the slogan are accurately matched together by the consumers. If a slogan is not associated to its host, it is useless to the company (Rosengren & Dahlén 2006:265). Some people remember a slogan others do not. Keiser (1975:40) found that brand and slogan awareness have a significant and positive relationship, which indicated that the slogans of well-known and strong brands are more easily remembered than those from weaker brands. Similarly, Kent and Allen (1994:103) state that consumers remember better the content of ads from familiar brands than from unknown brands. In heavily advertised categories it is even harder for unknown brands to catch the attention of consumers. Law (2002:376) report that consumers confuse messages of different companies when there is a weak tie between the slogan and the brands. Thus, consumers confuse more easily the messages of weak brands than strong brands. Dahlén and Lange (2005:486) state that advertising for weak brands and strong brands differ from each other remarkably. Strong brands benefit from recall and joint ads with weaker brands, while weak brands do not benefit from recall. Dahlén and Lange (2005:486) suggest that strong brands should create slogans that would persuade consumers to compare the strong brand with a weaker one, whereas weak brands should avoid any comparison with stronger brands. Rosengren and Dahlén (2006:275) propose annoying slogans as a way to get consumers to remember the
slogans. The irritating slogans would be easier to remember as they stand out from typical slogans and make them harder to generalize. Annoying slogans could be used particularly for mature brands as the interest for the brand would probably increase again (Rosengren & Dahlén 2006:275).

Authors agree that slogans are useful in building brand equity. Slogans create and maintain the brand identity and furthermore provide continuity throughout advertising campaigns (Rosengren & Dahlén 2006:263; Keller 2008:150). Marketers who fail to take the advantage of all the possibilities that slogans offer lose an effective tool for creating brand image and brand awareness (Kohli et al. 2007:420). If you look at a brand as a source, then the slogan is the tool that communicates what the source is about. A slogan helps the consumer to know what the company stands for and offers. Without a slogan, a company’s consumers would probably know less about the brand and would have harder to create associations towards the brand (Keller 2008:7).

Additionally, the slogan helps in the recognition of the brand name (Dowling & Kabanoff 1996:63–64). Keller (2008:51) argues that it is good to pair a brand with a slogan that makes it easier for the consumer to associate the brand with the right category and recognize the intended target group. It is more important for weak brands to emphasize category links in their marketing than for stronger brands. The slogan does not have to explicitly say the category; it can be emphasized by giving clues that help the consumer to recognize the right category (ibid.). This kind of study was carried out by Misra and Jain (1971:581–585).

Misra and Jain (1971:581–585) investigated how the recall of a brand name was influenced by the type of brand name and type of slogan. The brand names were divided into fitting and unfitting brand names in their study. The fitting brand names were those that included a clue about the product category in the brand name and the unfitting did not have any clue. The slogans in their study were divided into qualified and unqualified slogans. The criterion for to be labeled as a qualified was that slogan included the fitting brand name in it and a short message that emphasized a benefit of using the product. The unqualified slogans included only an implicit message. Fitting brand names were found to be recalled easier than the unfitting brand names. However, Misra and Jain (1971:584) failed to prove that there exists a difference between qualified and unqualified slogans.
2.5.1. Creating slogans for brand extensions

When a company plans to create a brand extension it must take care that the brand extension fits to the existing advertising slogan. Brand extensions that are similar to the company’s other offerings tend to be welcomed more positively than extensions that do not fit the company’s image. In some lines of business it can be important to choose a very specific slogan that focuses on your expertise. For example a company that concentrates merely on foods and products for babies can state in their slogan that they are for babies. Slogans that highlight product advantages can still limit the market either implicitly or explicitly. A company with the slogan “All we make is good copiers” can have difficulties if it suddenly wants to start scanners or screens for computers (Boush 1993:68). Boush (1993:76) found that the wording in slogans influence if a brand extension is accepted or not. In the study the word “quality” appeared to be the safe alternative that can be used for many different kinds of extensions. On the other hand the word “quality” is used so frequently in slogans that it might not be good word to use for differentiation. The words “nutrition” and “spiciness” on the other hand seemed to limit more the possible brand extension than the more open word “quality”.

When planning what words to use in slogans companies must analyze how the words can be interpreted. A replication of Boush’s study was made by Pryor and Brodie (1998:497–508). Their study came to the same conclusion as the earlier study but did not provide as significant findings as Boush did. Pryor and Brodie (1998:503) suggest that slogans with explicit and tangible attributes should be used if a company plans a brand extension similar to the products/services already offered by the company. More abstract slogans, with words like “quality”, should be used if the brand extension is different from the offerings that the company provides.

The managerial implications of these studies are that companies must consider what their slogans are saying and what they want to say. A slogan that binds the company to one category can hinder the company from extending its business to other categories. On the other hand a slogan that limits the company to one particular category is a way to focus on your excellence. Companies should choose a more generic slogan that does not limit them if they are unsure how they want to evolve in the future. A company must know its own position and its goals to be able to plan an appropriate slogan for themselves. A great example of this is Avis that had the courage to position itself visibly as number two with the slogan “We Try Harder”. This was a risky tactic, but it worked (Håkansson 2004:110–116). Another good example of positioning with the help of a slogan is Pepsi. They positioned themselves wisely as the soda for younger consumers.
with their slogans “Pepsi Generation” and “Pepsi Challenge” and managed simultaneously to communicate that Coca Cola is for older consumers (Håkansson 2004:98–99).

### 2.6. Polysemous slogans

Polysemous slogans can be described as an advertising message that has multiple meanings. The basic rule for advertising polysemy is that there must exist at least two separate interpretations for the same message. There are different polysemous messages: for example synchronic and diachronic polysemy. Synchronic polysemy is, for example, when a polysemous ad is interpreted differently by different groups of consumers. Cultural differences can lead to synchronic polysemy. Diachronic polysemy has more to do with how an individual can interpret a polysemous message in different ways. The first time she might see one thing and the second time another thing. (Puntoni et al. 2010:51–52)

Marketers can use polysemy in their advertisements for several reasons. Purposeful polysemy can be an excellent way to attract two different audiences simultaneously. The message must be created in a way that both audiences can interpret the message in a desired way. Purposeful polysemy must be based on the target market and the company’s positioning. Purposeful polysemy is used for several reasons; 1) to target many segments with one message, 2) positioning, 3) to increase the effectiveness of a message, or 4) to communicate sensitive issues (Puntoni et al. 2010: 52–58). Lagerwerf (2002:258) points out that an ambiguous slogan does not catch better the consumer’s attention, but it has the ability to increase the interest of the slogan when the consumer’s attention has already been caught. The positive effect of slogans with dual meanings is that consumers need more processing to access the message that might increase the memorability of the slogan (Lagerwerf 2002:246; Dimofte & Yalch 2007b:50). Mason et al. (2003:1333) report that ambiguous or complex language lead to higher brain activation than unambiguous language. The higher the complexity in the advertisement is, the higher the brain activation. The risk with ambiguous slogans is that slogans where the ambiguity is not recognized will be less liked by the consumers, as the slogan seems to make no sense (Lagerwerf 2002:258).

Polysemous statements include metaphors, puns, analogies, and other rhetorical devices that allow multiple interpretations. Polysemous slogans can include both a figurative meaning and a literal meaning. This kind of style is widely used in slogans
(Dimofte & Yalch 2007a:515). Dimofte and Yalch (2007a:516) give an example of a polysemous phrase: “Some cars are snails”. This phrase is literally false but figuratively true. The meaning that a company wants to communicate is often figurative; the literal meaning comes merely as a by-product. Often one meaning is more obvious and visible, whereas the other meaning is to some extent “hidden” and more challenging to access (Dimofte & Yalch 2007b:49). Marketers have a clear goal how they want a polysemous slogan to be perceived and interpreted. Still, the outcomes of the consumer’s interpretations are various. Most consumers will probably interpret the message as the company intended, but when it comes to polysemous messages other interpretations occur often. Theoretically, all ads can be interpreted as ambiguous. However, in polysemous ads the possible outcomes and interpretations are numerous. Even if a polysemous slogan includes several meanings, practically one meaning is always more apparent than the other (Puntoni et al. 2010:51–56).

Consumers interpret polysemous slogans differently; some only see the literal meaning while for others the figurative meaning is more apparent (Dimofte & Yalch 2007b:51). Some might see the polysemey and like it. Others might not understand a polysemous slogan and think it is just odd. Consumers can deal with ambiguous language in advertisements in different ways. One alternative is to simply choose to interpret one meaning and reject the others. Another way is to simultaneously interpret several meanings (Mason, Just, Keller & Carpenter 2003: 1319) Lagerwerf (2002:249) explained the process of slogan interpretation in the following way; when a consumer sees a slogan he starts to understand and get an impression what the ad and slogan is about. If the slogan does not fit the context the consumer starts to analyze further the slogan to find clues what the slogan communicates. If the consumer come up with the solution and understands the meaning of the slogans the consumer has a clearer picture about the product/company than if he would have seen a slogan with a single meaning. Polysemous slogans can be divided into two categories; slogans with an open–ended and with closed interpretation (Lagerwerf 2002:249). The slogans with a closed meaning usually have one or two possible interpretations whereas open-ended slogans can have various different interpretations.

Dimofte and Yalch (2007a:520–521) used a slogan with a negative secondary meaning in their study to see if different people perceived the slogan in different ways. The study showed that people who have to think a bit longer on the slogans tend to prefer polysemous slogans rather than literal slogans. People who think faster did not have
any difference between attitudes towards literal and polysemous slogans. Dimofte and Yalch found that different people interpret ads in different ways. They also discussed that the negative secondary meaning in the slogan “Raising the bar” led to a more negative image of the slogans for subjects that think faster than the ones that did not interpret the slogans as fast (ibid.).

Polysemous slogans include rhetorical devices that can be either easy or difficult to understand (Puntoni, Schroeder & Ritson 2010:51). Lagerwerf (2002:257) found that slogans where the ambiguity is recognized are more appreciated than slogans where it is not. This finding implies that slogans should not be too difficult to interpret. The study also showed that consumers like better unambiguous slogans that are seen as ambiguous, rather than unambiguous slogans that are seen as unambiguous. Consumers seem to prefer ambiguous slogans before unambiguous slogans, even when the consumer interprets the slogan falsely as ambiguous (ibid.). Advertisements with complex language should not include too much additional information as it increases the cognitive workload and reduces in that way the ability to evaluate the strength of the attitude toward the advertisement (Jae 2011:157).

2.7. Hypotheses

Earlier studies imply that the strength of a brand affect the attitude towards a slogan (Dahlén & Rosengren 2005). This study seeks new insights to existing literature by investigating how the attitude towards simple and polysemous slogans is affected by the strength of a brand. This has not been done earlier. The effect of the slogan on the brand will not be studied. Dahlén and Rosengren (2005) studied the attitude towards slogans of strong and weak brands, without discussing how the type of slogan affects the attitude towards the slogan.

Hypotheses 1a, 1b, and 1c examine the effect of the brand strength on the attitude towards simple and polysemous slogans. Hypotheses 2a, 2b, and 2c investigate the influence of the type of slogan on the attitude towards slogans of weak and strong brands. Furthermore, hypothesis 3 scans the interpretation of the ambiguity in the slogans. Finally, the suitability of slogans is examined in the hypothesis 4.

The following hypotheses are created according to findings and suggestions by different authors. To help the readers grasp the hypotheses about the attitude towards slogans, figures were constructed to illustrate what the results might look like.
2.7.1. *H1abc: The effect of brand strength on the attitude towards slogans.*

The first hypothesis is the most important one in this study since it tests whether brand strength has an effect on the attitude towards slogans. One of the main findings in the empirical study by Dahlén and Rosengren (2005:160) was that the slogans of strong brands are more liked than the slogans of weak brands. Furthermore, Kent and Allen (1994:103) discuss that consumers remember better the content of ads from familiar brands than from unknown brands. Even if memory of a slogan is not the same as the attitude towards a slogan, it is believed that memory affects the attitude towards a slogan positively. In the focal study, it is expected that the subjects have little or no prior knowledge of the weak brands in this study. Therefore, it is hypothesized:

**H1a: Consumers will have a more positive attitude towards slogans of strong brands than slogans of weak brands.**

Hong and Sternthal (2010:302–309) discuss that consumers with less knowledge of a product category or company prefer more explanation in the companies’ communication. This could mean that consumers have difficulties making interpretations about simple slogans due to the lack of knowledge of the company. Simple slogans focus many times only on the strength of the brand or some positive attribute related to the brand. But without a clue that helps the consumer to identify the correct category a simple slogan can be identified as somewhat strange when combined with a weak brand. On the other hand, consumers already know to which category well-known brands belong to so they do not need to communicate to which line of business they belong to with their slogan. Thus; it is hypothesized:

**H1b: For simple slogans, the attitude towards the slogan is more positive for strong brands than for weak brands.**

The next hypothesis is a trickier one. The studies that have investigated polysemous slogans have not discussed the effect of brand strength on the attitude towards them. However, earlier research (Bradley & Meeds 2002; Lagerwerf (2002:257) about polysemous slogans suggest that polysemous slogans are more liked than simple slogans. The difference between the attitude towards the slogans of weak and strong brands might be smaller if the attitude towards the slogan is influenced strongly by the ambiguity in the slogan. Still, the brand strength is believed to influence the attitude towards the slogans and lead to a more positive attitude when polysemous slogans are
combined with a strong brand. Therefore, the hypothesis 1c expects that the attitude towards polysemous slogans is more positive for strong brands than for weak brands. However, it is expected that the difference might not be as large in this case as in H1b. The hypothesis follows:

**H1c: For polysemous slogans, the attitude towards the slogan is more positive for strong brands than for weak brands.**

The hypotheses H1a, H1b and H1c are illustrated and summarized in Figure 1, on a fictive scale.
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*Figure 1   Hypothesized effect of brand strength on attitude towards slogans*

### 2.7.2.  **H2abc: The effect of the type of slogan on the attitude towards slogans**

The effect of different types of slogans on the attitude towards slogans has not been widely studied. Most studies have merely focused on if simple and polysemous slogans influence the attitude towards the slogan. Previous studies have not considered if the type of slogan influences differently on the attitude towards the slogan when combined with a weak or strong brand. H2a tests if the attitude towards simple and polysemous slogans differs, whereas H2b and H2c screen the differences between simple and polysemous slogans when compared with weak or strong brands.

As has been demonstrated in the literature review, several authors (Macklin 1985:32–34; Bradley & Meeds 2002:613) discuss that slogans must be created to stand out and
keeping it simple just does not work anymore. Consumers seem to prefer polysemous slogans before simple slogans, even when the consumer interprets the slogan falsely as having multiple meanings (Lagerwerf 2002:257). Thus, it is assumed that the difference between the attitude towards simple and polysemous slogans can be significant. Consequently, the hypothesis stands:

**H2a: Polysemous slogans are more liked than simple slogans.**

As discussed earlier, Dahlén and Rosengren (2005:160) denoted that slogans of strong brands were more liked than slogans of weak brands. In other words the slogans of strong companies were brand-driven, i.e. the brand affected more the slogan than the slogan affected the brand. This finding could indicate that the attitude towards slogans of strong brands might be quite stable. If the brand is strong then the slogan will be rated as good because it belongs to the strong brand no matter the characteristics of the slogan. Thus; it is hypothesized:

**H2b: There is no significant difference in the slogan attitude of strong brands when combined with a polysemous slogan or a simple slogan.**

Dahlén and Rosengren (2005:160) proposed that the attitude towards less-known companies were slogan-driven; the slogans affected the brand more than the brand affected the slogan. This could mean that the weak brands have to plan their slogans even better since it can affect their brand strongly. The fact that polysemous slogans give more information for the recipient supports also that weak brands could benefit from using polysemous slogans. The recipient will probably like a slogan of a weak brand more if the slogan increases the recipient’s knowledge of the brand. Therefore, it is anticipated that polysemous slogans would suit better for weak brands. This leads to the next hypothesis:

**H2c: The attitude towards slogans of weak brands is more positive when combined with a polysemous slogan than a simple slogan.**

The hypotheses H2a, H2b and H2c are illustrated and summarized in Figure 2, on a fictive scale.
2.7.3. **H3: Ambiguity interpretation**

The ambiguity interpretation is vital to study to assess what effect the brand strength has on the interpretation of slogans. The hypothesis number three has to do with the ambiguity in the slogans. Jae (2011:157) discussed that increased cognitive workload reduces the ability to evaluate the strength of the attitude toward the advertisement. In this study it is assumed that knowledge of the strong brand could negatively affect the ability to interpret the ambiguity in the slogans. The fact that consumers do not know the weak brands might force them to use more energy to interpret slogans combined with a weak brand. Therefore, consumers might see slogans of weak brands as more ambiguous than slogans of strong brands. However, consumers might have problems interpret slogans of unfamiliar and weak brands when the slogan is simple if they lack knowledge of the weak brand. Therefore, it is assumed that simple slogans are interpreted as more ambiguous when combined with a weak brand. Thus, the next hypothesis stands:

**H3: Slogans of weak brands are seen as more ambiguous than slogans of strong brands.**

A fictive illustration of the hypothesized interpretation of the ambiguity in slogans is presented in figure 3.
2.7.4. **H4: Suitability of slogans**

The final hypothesis has to do with suitability of slogans, which has not been directly investigated earlier. Misra and Jain (1971:582–585) used a 1–6 scale to test appropriateness of a slogan in their study to categorize the slogans into qualified and unqualified slogans. They found that slogans that included clues to the company’s own line of business were seen as more suitable than slogans that did not include these clues. It can be also argued, that polysemous slogans could be seen as more suitable since they have several meanings. In this way the consumer can have easier to understand the slogan and how it fits with the brand name. Hence, it is hypothesized that:

**H4: Polysemous slogans are more suitable for both weak and strong brands**

A fictive illustration of the hypothesized suitability of slogans is presented in figure 4.
Summary

The theoretical part summarizes the findings from the most important slogan studies and creates a comprehensive literature review of slogan research. The main emphasis was put on studies about polysemous slogans and on studies that have taken the brand in consideration when investigating the attitude and the interpretation of slogans. Past research has found that demographics of consumers do not affect the attitude towards slogans (Katz and Rose 1969:25; Keiser 1975:42). Past research has also tried to get answers to what elements influence the attitude towards slogans. Most authors agree that polysemous slogans would be more liked than simple slogans (Bradley & Meeds 2002; Lagerwerf 2002, Puntoni et al. 2010). It has also been discussed that wording and the message influence the memorability and the attitude towards slogans (Djafarova 2008; Lowrey 2002, Reece et al. 1994). The brand strength has also been found to influence the attitude towards slogans. (Dahlén & Rosengren 2005). However, as the effects of brand strength and type of slogan on the attitude towards slogans have not been studied together, a study to investigate this need to be carried out. In the next chapter, I will discuss how the study was carried out.
3  METHOD

The chapter starts with a comparison of the focal study with the study by Dahlén and Rosengren (2005), as many parts of the research design are adapted from that study. Next, discussion of the research design will be reported. After that, the sample will be presented and justified, followed by the pilot study and main study. The main study is carried out as an experiment. To conclude, the quality of the research is discussed.

3.1. Comparison to the study by Dahlén and Rosengren

The interplay between brands and slogan has not been widely studied. Dahlén and Rosengren (2005:152) tried to fill this gap by examining how brand strength affects the attitude towards the slogan when matched correctly or incorrectly. As earlier mentioned, slogans of strong brands were found to be more liked than slogans of weak brands. However, the slogans of weak brands had a bigger influence on the brand than the slogans of strong brands according to Dahlén and Rosengren (2005:160). This indicates that weak brands would have better possibilities to improve their image with the help of slogans than strong brands. Dahlén and Rosengren (ibid.) concluded that brand strength is an important factor that influences the attitude towards slogans. This paper aims to extend the study by Dahlén and Rosengren (2005). The study by Dahlén and Rosengren was chosen as it investigated an area that is interesting for both academia and practitioners. Furthermore, it was evaluated that their study had some major drawbacks that might have influenced their results. For example, Dahlén and Rosengren used slogans from the beer industry, which is a heavily advertised category. In their study 81.9 per cent of the slogans of strong brands were correctly matched by the subjects while 29.9 per cent of the slogans of weak brands were matched correctly (2005:158). The slogans of the strong brands benefited from the fact that they could be matched more easily than the slogans of weak brands. Therefore, a category where the slogans of strong brands are not as easily recognized was chosen for this study. The slogan’s effect on the brand was also investigated by Dahlén and Rosengren (2005) with a second study. However, this was beyond the scope of the thesis.


3.2. Research design

The planning of the research design started with the reading of past literature about slogans and comparing research designs used by other authors. The study that was particularly interesting was a study by Dahlén and Rosengren (2005). As discussed in the previous subchapter, their study had some limitations in the research design. Therefore, it was chosen to extend the study by Dahlén and Rosengren (2005). Many parts were adapted directly or modified from the research design used by Dahlén and Rosengren (2005). Also parts from other research were adapted for the focal study. After the research topic was chosen and the literature review written, the hypothesis creation and the planning of the research method started. A deductive approach was used as the hypotheses were derived from theory (Robson 2011:18).

It was also assessed that a quantitative experimental method was best suited for the purpose of this study as the goal was to identify causal directions of brand strength and type of slogan on the consumer attitude towards slogans. A quantitative method was used as the goal was to achieve generalizable results. A quantitative method was also used by Dahlén and Rosengren (2005) which supported the selection of the research method. Furthermore, the idea that the type of slogan had to be considered when investigating the effect of brand strength came from studies that investigated polysemous slogans (Lagerwerf 2002, Dimofte & Yalch 2007a). The focal study was chosen to be carried out as a similar experiment as in the study by Dahlén and Rosengren (2005). In their study the slogans were matched both with their own brand name and with a competing brand name. In this way the attitude effect of the brand strength could examined.

When a clear picture about what was going to be investigated and how it was going to be investigated was achieved, the search for sources of data started. It was planned that an experiment with two strong brands and two weak brands from the same line of business would be carried out. With this design, it would be possible to create two questionnaires that would not be too long to answer, while providing the necessary information to answer the aim of this thesis. Other designs were considered but they would have resulted in a greater number of questionnaires and thus a larger sample, since each treatment group should include 20-30 subjects.

Slogans from the same line of business were chosen to get data that could be compared more reliably. Another criterion was that distinct differences had to exist between weak
and strong brands. The goal was to identify slogans from a line of business that is not heavily advertised. This was chosen as a criterion so that the subjects would not be affected by the familiarity of the slogan. The goal was to use slogans that subjects would have been exposed to as little as possible. Slogans of multi-national companies and slogans from highly-advertised categories, such as beers, soft drinks, and cars were excluded to achieve this. This was a key issue since the slogans are matched falsely in the main study. Furthermore, it was planned that two of the slogans in the experiment had to be polysemous and the two other slogans should be simple slogans. In this way it was possible to investigate if the type of slogan has an impact on the attitude towards a slogan.

It was assessed that the most difficult source of data to find was the polysemous slogans from the same line of business. Therefore, the search for sources of data started with the polysemous slogans. Polysemous slogans were examined from the website for registered slogans in Finland (Iskulauserekisteri, 2012). These slogans form a good sample; companies have seen these as a valuable asset and have wanted to register them. By using an existing and relevant sample the sample is not biased by the researcher. The register includes all registered slogans in Finland since 1959. Because of the large number of slogans only slogans registered after the year 2000 were included in the sample. The number of registered slogans was 446 from the beginning of 2000 to the end of 2011.

Most of the slogans in the register were in Finnish, which indicates that consumers in Finland are exposed mostly to slogans in Finnish. Therefore, slogans in Finnish were chosen for this study. Moreover, it is easier for the subjects to answer the questions in the inquiry when the slogans are in Finnish. The amount of polysemous slogans was big, but only those with a clear polysemy and at least two meanings were chosen. Moreover, the chosen slogans had to have a polysemy that should be easy to recognize and interpret. This choice is justified by the fact that subjects tend to answer inquiries in fast pace. In order to have enough time to understand the ambiguity, it has to be quite clear. Moderately difficult slogans were chosen for my study as reasonable complexity in slogans has been found to be more engaging for consumers (Bradley & Meeds 2002:615). Publishing slogans were finally chosen for the study. These are described next.
3.2.1. Publishing business slogans

The only line of business where two polysemous slogans were found was the publishing business. The polysemous slogans with a clear ambiguity that were found were; “Painavaa palvelua” – Loimaan Kirjapaino Oy and “Paino oikeilla asioilla” – Forssan Kirjapaino Oy. Both of these slogans were registered and have a multiple meaning that is easily recognized. The slogan “Paino oikeilla asioilla” means in English; 1) the emphasis on the right things and 2) the print (office) on the right things. “Painavaa palvelua” means; 1) printing service or 2) heavy service. Translations of the slogans used in this study can be found in Appendix 1. Both of these slogans can be interpreted as wordplay or puns. For example the slogan “Paino oikeilla asioilla” is a quite common phrase in the Finnish language and it is probably chosen because of its category link and positive secondary meaning. Neither of Loimaan Kirjapaino Oy and Forssan Kirjapaino Oy was listed on the stock and they were not that familiar for me. In this stage, these companies were assumed to be weak.

Next, the goal was to identify strong brands from the publishing business and the slogans of these brands. It was considered that strong brands could be found by looking at companies from the publishing business that were listed on the Helsinki Stock Exchange. Three companies from the publishing business were listed; Sanoma Oyj, Alma Media Oy and Talentum (Kauppalehti 2012). After this, the list for registered slogans was screened again to see whether these companies had any registered slogans. Sanoma Magazines Oy, that is an affiliate company for Sanoma Oyj, had two registered slogans ”Kun elämä on parhaimmillaan” (when life is at its best) and ”Elämää - ei sen vähempää” (Life – nothing less than that). No registered slogan was found for Alma Media, but a slogan “Tieto Elämään” (Knowledge for Life) was displayed on their webpage (Alma Media, 2012). Talentum was excluded from the main study as no slogan could be found for the company. The slogans of the strong brands differed of the slogans of the weak brands as the message in them did not have any link to the printing business, whereas the slogans of Forssan Kirjapaino Oy and Loimaan Kirjapaino Oy have a clear category link. Additionally, the slogans of the strong brands seemed to be simple and have merely one meaning.

3.2.2. Publishing business companies

The publishing business forms a good line of business to study since there is significant differences between weak and strong brand and the slogans are not heavily advertised.
The publishing business companies chosen for this study were Sanoma Magazines Oy, Alma Media, Loimaan Kirjapaino Oy and Forssan Kirjapaino Oy. The strong brands were Sanoma Magazines Oy and Alma Media while the weak brands were Loimaan Kirjapaino Oy and Forssan Kirjapaino Oy. The companies do not only differ from each other in brand strength. The weaker brands focus merely on their main expertise, printing services whereas the strong brands also have a broader area of expertise. However, the brands could be compared as all of the brands publish newspapers and magazines. Both of the weak brands have changed their names after taking their slogans in use. Forssan Kirjapaino Oy has changed its name to Forssa Print and Loimaan Kirjapaino Oy now belongs to Priimus Group Oy (Forssa Print, 2012; Priimusgroup Oy, 2012). However, the old names were used in this study because the slogans were registered for the earlier brand names. Alma Media publishes several newspapers and acts as a network supplier for many well-known web sites in Finland (Alma Media, 2012). Sanoma Magazines Oy is the leading publisher of magazines in Finland and also provides communication services for companies. The company is also an affiliated company for Sanoma Oyj (Sanoma Magazines Oy, 2012). The fact that the strong companies work on a broader area was not seen as a problem since the main goal was to see if the strength of the brand influences the attitude towards a slogan. The sources of data can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1 Sources of data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand and slogan</th>
<th>Assumed brand strength</th>
<th>Type of slogan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanoma Magazines Oy</td>
<td>Strong brand</td>
<td>Simple slogan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kun elämä on parhaimmillaan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loimaan Kirjapaino Oy</td>
<td>Weak brand</td>
<td>Polysemous slogan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painavaa palvelua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma Media Oy</td>
<td>Strong brand</td>
<td>Simple slogan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tieto Elämään</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forssan Kirjapaino Oy</td>
<td>Weak brand</td>
<td>Polysemous slogan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paino oikeilla asioilla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3. Pilot study

A pilot study was conducted to get further evidence about the brands and slogans used in this study. First, the brand strength of the companies had to be investigated (see Appendix 2) and secondly more information on how consumers interpret the chosen
slogans was needed to determine if the slogans of weak brands were polysemous and the slogans of the strong brands simple (see Appendix 3).

The pilot study was performed in the lobby of Hanken School of Economics in Vaasa 21.2.2012. The total number of subjects was 21. One subject was excluded from the final sample because of insufficient knowledge in Finnish, so 20 responses were analyzed. A small sample was justified as the sample provided consistent and expected results about the strength of the brands. Van Teijlingen, Rennie, Hundley and Graham (2001:293–294) discuss that it is important to carry out and report the results of pilot studies in research. Pilot studies help researchers to test the adequacy of the research instruments and gather preliminary data. Furthermore, pilot studies provide information about possible outcomes of the study.

Brand strength can be tested by looking at factors such as market share, store presence, growth, etc. (Kapferer 2008:143). For this study, it was more suitable to perform a pilot study where the perceived brand strength was tested. The companies were chosen for the pilot study so that they would differ in brand strength and familiarity. Two assumed weak brands, Loimaan Kirjapaino Oy and Forssan Kirjapaino Oy, and three assumed strong brands, Alma Media, Sanoma Magazines Oy and Talentum, were chosen for the pilot study. Talentum was excluded after the pilot study as a slogan for the company was not found. Based on the results, those with a significant difference in brand strength were chosen for the main experiment. Subjects were asked to grade different brands on a 1–5 scale, with questions about perceived brand strength, brand image, familiarity etc. The pilot study supported that adequate brands and slogans were chosen for this study.

Brand strength was measured in the pilot study with three questions about brand image, brand strength and familiarity. This scale for perceived brand strength had an excellent internal consistency, with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .974. This indicated that this scale was appropriate for assessing the perceived brand strength for brands. After checking the reliability of the scale the differences between weak and strong brands were examined. The answers from the subjects were transformed into one new variable perceived brand strength. An independent samples t-test (see Table 2) was performed to check that the brands were correctly divided into the assumed strong and weak brands. There was a significant difference between the weak (M=1.38, SD=.58) and strong brands (M=3.3, SD= 1.28; t (54.43) = -8.60, p=.00, two-tailed). This supported the assumption that Loimaan Kirjapaino Oy and that Forssan
Kirjapaino Oy were weak brands and Alma Media and Sanoma Magazines Oy were strong brands.

**Table 2 Testing for differences in brand strength**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Values</th>
<th>Summarized mean for weak brands</th>
<th>Summarized mean for strong brands</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand strength</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second part of the pilot study the slogans were tested to determine if the chosen polysemous slogans were perceived to have many meanings whereas the chosen simple slogans were perceived to have only one meaning. Subjects were asked to interpret the number of meanings in the slogans (see Appendix 3). The findings showed differences between the slogans (see Table 3). “Painavaa palvelua” was perceived as polysemous by 19 of 20 subjects and “Paino oikeilla asioilla” by 15 of 20 subjects. The slogan by Sanoma Magazines Oy was perceived as the most simple one, with 17 subjects interpreting it as having only one meaning. The slogan by Alma Media “Tieto Elämään” got the biggest spread in the answers. The big spread might be a result that the slogan is open for several interpretations. However, this slogan is still treated as simple as most subjects saw it as having only one meaning. The pilot study supported that the brands and slogans were correctly divided into strong and weak brands and in simple and polysemous slogans. The slogans of the weak brands were seen as polysemous and the slogans of the strong brands were interpreted as more simple.

Based on the pilot study, the slogan with the clearest polysemy was “Painavaa palvelua”, and the one that was seen as the simplest one “Kun elämä on parhaimmillaan”. These slogans were matched with each other’s brand names in the main study. In other words, the attitude towards these slogans was tested both with a correct brand-slogan link and with a false brand-slogan link. Correspondingly, the fact that Sanoma Magazines Oy (M=3.52) had the highest mean and Loimaan Kirjapaino Oy (M=1.22) had the lowest mean score in brand strength, supported the decision of comparing these two brands. The same manipulation will be done with Alma Media’s slogan (M=3.08) and Forssan Kirjapaino Oy’s (M=1.55) slogan.
Table 3 Slogan pretest of number of meanings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Sanoma Oy</th>
<th>Magazines</th>
<th>Sanoma Magazines Oy</th>
<th>Alma Media</th>
<th>Forssan Kirjapaino Oy</th>
<th>Loimaan Kirjapaino Oy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slogan</td>
<td>Kun parhaimillaan</td>
<td>Elämää ei vähempää</td>
<td>sen Elämäään</td>
<td>Tieto</td>
<td>Paine oikeilla</td>
<td>Painavaa palvelua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One meaning</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two meanings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than two meanings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4. The main study

Experiments are studies that are performed in an abstract environment, where the researcher controls certain elements. The goal in experimental studies is to achieve causal relationships between the elements studied (Charness, Gneezy & Kuhn 2012:1). The researcher manipulates one or more variables in experiments and tries to control all other variables (Robson 2011:94). The manipulation in this study was the switch of the brands combined with the slogan. This was done to see if the brand strength influences the attitude towards slogans. The members were chosen to each of the groups randomly as suggested by Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009:142).

Each subject was exposed to only one treatment in this experiment, correct brand-slogan link or false brand-slogan link. This meant that each respondent evaluated four brand-slogan combinations, two with strong brands and two with weak brands. Those who answered the questionnaire with the correct brand-slogan combination evaluated two strong brands combined with a simple slogan and two weak brands combined with a polysemous slogan. On the other hand the subjects that answered the questionnaire with the false brand-slogan combinations evaluated two strong brands combined with a polysemous slogan and two weak brands combined with a simple slogan. The manipulation of the brand-slogan combinations made it possible to compare the attitude towards the same slogan when combined with a strong brand or a weak brand. Also the effect of type of slogan could be compared as the slogans were combined with both strong and weak brands.
All slogans were tested both with their own brand name; weak brand-polysemous slogan, strong brand-simple slogan (see Appendix 4) and with a false combination; weak brand-simple slogan and strong brand-polysemous slogan (see Appendix 5). For example, the slogan “Paino oikeilla asioilla” that belongs to Forssan Kirjapaino Oy, was tested as if it would belong to the more known brand Alma Media—“Paino oikeilla asioilla” in the other inquiry. This was done to examine whether the strong brands boost the attitude toward a slogan and result in a more positive attitude towards the slogan. Subjects that identify the switch of slogans are excluded from the sample. The study was performed as a cross-sectional study so the results of this study relate to the consumer’s attitude at a particular time (Saunders 2009:155).

In this type of study, causal estimates are obtained by analyzing the data of those exposed to one experimental condition compared with the data from those exposed to the other experimental condition (Charness et al. 2012:1). Many parts of the earlier slogan research are integrated into this study. The brands were labeled in the same way as in the studies by Dahlén and Rosengren (2005:153) and Broniarczyk and Gershoff (2003:164) in strong and weak brands. Furthermore, research scales were adapted from past studies to increase the reliability of the study (Bradley & Meeds 2002; Dahlén & Rosengren 2005, Misra & Jain 1971). All subjects completed a 4-page questionnaire that measured their attitude towards slogans. One brand-slogan combination was evaluated per page. All questions were measured on a 7-point scale, where 1 was the lowest value and 7 the highest value. Half of the subjects answered questionnaires were the slogans were presented with their own slogan and the other half of the subjects answered on questionnaires where the slogans were matched with a competing brand name. Subjects were informed that the questionnaire is about slogans and for a master’s thesis. No other information was given to avoid researcher bias.

### 3.5. Questionnaire design

Measures were constructed to capture the attitude towards the slogan (question 1-3), ambiguity interpretation (questions 4-6), suitability of slogan to the brand (questions 7-8), familiarity of brand (question 9) and familiarity of a slogan (question 10).

Existing scales from earlier research were used as suggested by Robson (2011:312). Similar scales were used so that the results of this study could be more easily compared with the earlier studies. Another strength of the use of existing scales is that the scales have already been tested by others and been proven valid. The attitude towards the
slogan was measured on a 7-point scale consisting of three items, as suggested by Dahlén and Rosengren (2005:157). These questions were adapted from their study and translated into Swedish. The attitude scale measured the subjects’ attitude towards slogans. No clear scale for ambiguity could be found. Therefore, the scale for ambiguity was modified from past research (Bradley and Meeds 2002; Lagerwerf 2002, Puntoni et al. 2010). The level of ambiguity in the slogans was tested on a three-item 7-point scale to investigate whether consumers interpret the slogans differently when combined with a weak or strong brand. This scale was also used for testing that the slogans were correctly divided into simple and polysemous slogans. The suitability of slogans had been tested with a one-item scale by Misra and Jain (1971:580–585). A two-item scale was created based on their study to fit my study purpose.

Brand strength was not tested in the main study as subjects could have guessed the purpose of the study. However, question 9 about brand familiarity was a control question that would indicate whether the strong brands are more familiar than the weak brands. Clear differences in this question would support that there were significant differences between the weak and strong brands. Question 10 was as well an important control question as it gave indications how familiar the students were with the slogans. If the students were familiar with the slogans’ then the assumption that unfamiliar slogans are used was violated. A couple of filler questions were asked in the questionnaire to get some more information about how the subjects interpreted the slogans and their attitude towards them. It lasted approximately 10 minutes to fill in the questionnaire. A longer survey could have been too long for the subjects and could have affected the results negatively. The questionnaires can be found in Appendix 5 and 6. Table 4 presents all questions in the questionnaire and indicate from which studies they were adapted or modified.
### Table 4 Questionnaire design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>Slogan attitude</td>
<td>bad/good slogan</td>
<td>Scale 1–7</td>
<td>Dahlén &amp; Rosengren (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>Slogan attitude</td>
<td>unfavorable/favorable slogan</td>
<td>Scale 1–7</td>
<td>Dahlén &amp; Rosengren (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>Slogan attitude</td>
<td>dislike/like slogan</td>
<td>Scale 1–7</td>
<td>Dahlén &amp; Rosengren (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>Ambiguity</td>
<td>unambiguous/ambiguous slogan</td>
<td>Scale 1–7</td>
<td>Modified from Lagerwerf (2002) and Puntoni et al. (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>slogan easy to interpret/difficult to interpret</td>
<td>Scale 1–7</td>
<td>Bradley &amp; Meeds (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6</td>
<td>Ambiguity</td>
<td>one possible meaning/open to different interpretations</td>
<td>Scale 1–7</td>
<td>Modified from Lagerwerf (2002) and Puntoni et al. (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>unsuitable/suitable for the company</td>
<td>Scale 1–7</td>
<td>Misra and Jain (1971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>illogical/logical for the company</td>
<td>Scale 1–7</td>
<td>Own question modified to examine suitability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 9</td>
<td>Brand familiarity</td>
<td>brand unfamiliar/familiar</td>
<td>Scale 1–7</td>
<td>Dahlén &amp; Rosengren (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 10</td>
<td>Slogan familiarity</td>
<td>slogan unfamiliar/familiar</td>
<td>Scale 1–7</td>
<td>Dahlén &amp; Rosengren (2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.6. Sampling and data collection

The sampling method chosen was convenience sampling (Robson 2011:275), since business school students were chosen as study subjects. However, students form a good sample and they are used widely in studies with slogans (Dahlén & Rosengren 2005; Rosengren & Dahlén 2006). Moreover, students are good subjects as they have knowledge of the terms that are used in this thesis and used to fill in inquiries. Students can be expected to know the strong brands from the publishing business as they most likely read newspapers and magazines on a regular basis. People with extensive knowledge of the publishing business were not plausible, since the switch of slogans...
would not have been possible with people that are familiar with slogans in the publishing business.

The data were collected by distributing questionnaires directly to students during March and the beginning of April. The data could not be collected by posting the slogans on a web site for several reasons. The main problem was that the mismatch would not have been possible to carry out as subjects could have searched for the slogans and identified the mismatched slogans. Moreover, it would have been difficult to control who answered the questionnaire. Therefore, the data were collected by handing out questionnaires. Due the limited time and the fact that data were collected face-to-face made it difficult to reach a large sample. However, in experiments smaller samples are adequate. Mertens (2004:149) suggests as a rough rule of thumb that each of the groups in the sample has to include at least fifteen subjects in experimental studies where causal differences between groups are investigated. The total sample of 60 subjects, thirty subjects per treatment, was statistically large enough to provide information about students’ attitude towards slogans.

Subjects were recruited in the lobby and the library of Hanken School of Economics in Helsinki. The population consisted of 36 men and 24 women aged 19 to 33. One subject informed that she does not speak Finnish so she was excluded from the sample. Most of the subjects, 86.7%, had Swedish as their mother tongue and the rest had Finnish as their mother tongue. Most of the subjects (96.7%) were students of Hanken School of Economics, two subjects left that question unanswered, but they were still included in the sample. It took approximately ten minutes to answer the questionnaire. The data were collected during the weeks’ 12–15 in the spring 2012. The subjects evaluated 4 slogans each, which would yield in 240 slogan evaluations, 120 with a correct brand-slogan combination and 120 with a false combination. However, seven subjects failed in some way to fill in the whole questionnaire or left some questions unanswered, which reduced the total amount of slogan evaluations. No outliers were removed as the attitude towards the slogans can vary significantly between the subjects. Even if it was not asked, many subjects commented after they had filled in the questionnaire that the questionnaire was about bilingual differences in interpretation of slogans. This indicated that the subjects did not guess the purpose of the study. The last question in the questionnaire measured if the subject pays attention to slogans. 75 per cent of the subjects assessed that they pay attention at least sometimes attention to slogans.
Twelve subjects did not answer this question. Only three subjects mentioned that they
do not pay attention to slogans.

3.7. Quality of research

Reliability and validity need to be considered when discussing the results in a study.
Reliability has to do with how consistent the studied variables are in what is intended to
measure. The study is considered reliable if the study would have been repeated and
the same results would be achieved (Hair et al. 2010:3-4). However, Hubbard and
Vetter (1996:159–161) discuss that studies that try to extend or replicate studies many
times find contradicting results. Hubbard and Vetter (ibid.) report that 54 per cent of
the extension studies conflicted with the original study when the extension study was
carried out by independent researchers. On the other hand, only 9.7 per cent of the
findings were conflicted when a researcher extended their own work. Therefore, it can
be difficult to justify the generalizability of the results when different authors come to
different conclusions even if the same research scales are used.

Several factors, where taken into consideration to achieve as reliable results as possible.
First, the reliability of the measures was achieved by using tested measures from earlier
studies as recommended by Robson (2011:312). Using existing measures that have been
proved consistent and relevant by other authors improve the reliability of this study.
Secondly, multiple items for each construct were used to strengthen the reliability and
validity of the study as suggested by Diamantopoulos, Sarstedt, Fuchs, Wilczynski &
Kaiser 2012:446). Diamantopoulos (ibid.) recommend further that constructs with at
least four items would be used to give a reasonable comparative validity. However, the
authors discuss that for small sample sizes fewer than 50 subjects; single-item
constructs can have the same predictive validity as full scales. This indicates that the
two and three-item scales have been appropriate for this study, because of the small
sample size. Single-item constructs were used in the main study to confirm the
differences in the brand strength and to check that the slogans used were not familiar
for the subjects.

All the constructs in this study had a good internal consistency with Cronbach’s alpha
coefficients above .7. Values above .7 are seen as acceptable according to Pallant
(2010:100). Thus, it was concluded that the scales in this study were reliable. The scale
for the attitude towards a slogan had a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .859, which is a
bit lower than the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .957 in the study by Dahlén and
Rosengren (2005). This could be explained by that the words could not be translated directly and that Dahlén and Rosengren had a bigger sample in their study. The item with the lowest correlation with the scale was the question 2 that had to be translated into “wake interest” (väcka intresse). The original item in the study by Dahlén and Rosengren (2005:157) was unpleasant/pleasant. However, the three first questions seemed to measure the same thing. Therefore, all items were accepted in the construct measuring the attitude towards slogans. As the Cronbach’s alpha was high the requirement of internal consistency was met. Therefore, the data from the questions 1-3 could be transformed into a new variable that measured the attitude towards the slogan. The scale for ambiguity interpretation was planned to include the questions 4-6. However, the question 5, about the complexity interpretation did not correlate with the other questions regarding the ambiguity interpretation of slogans. It was also assessed that this question did not measure the same thing that the questions 4 and 6 did. Therefore, question 5 was excluded from the ambiguity interpretation construct. Thus, only the questions 4 and 6 created the new variable for ambiguity interpretation. The Cronbach’s alpha can be calculated only for constructs with at least three items. Therefore, a Cronbach’s alpha could not be calculated for the ambiguity interpretation, instead it was measured if the questions correlate with each other. A Pearson correlations test \( r=0.585, p=0.00 \) showed that the questions 4 and 6 correlated significantly with each other. The questions 7 and 8 that measured the suitability of slogans correlated also significantly with each other \( r=0.800, p=0.00 \)

A typical problem in studies is participant errors that occur during the data collection. Robson (2011:86) discusses that that the week day or the time of the year can influence the results in some studies. Nevertheless, it was assumed that issues like weekday, time of the day or mood will probably not affect the participants’ answers in this study as attitude towards slogans should not be not be that strongly correlated with the mood of the subject. Third, a common participant bias is that subjects guess the purpose of the study which affects their answers (Robson 2011:86). This was minimized by distracting the subjects with a question about bilingualism in the beginning of the questionnaire. In this way at least some of the subjects believed that the study was about differences between slogan interpretation of unilingual students and bilingual students.

Validity can be discussed by checking if the measures used in the study are adequate for the study and can be used to explain the phenomenon correctly. (Hair et al. 2010:3-4)
The internal validity in the study was improved by the fact that the questionnaire was based on several earlier studies. For example, the questions regarding the attitude towards slogans have been used in earlier studies. However, the content validity in this study can be criticized. The “content validity depends on the extent to which an empirical measurement reflects a specific domain of content” (Carmines and Zeller 1979:20). As polysemous slogans were compared with simple slogans it would have been best to compare different kind of polysemous slogans, not only polysemous slogans with moderate complexity. This would have increased the content validity and has to be done if generalizable results are the goal. Nevertheless, for this study it was appropriate to use similar polysemous slogans so that they could be compared more easily.
4 RESULTS

The results of the empirical study are presented in this chapter. The quantitative data were analyzed using IBM SPSS statistics 19. All questions in the focal study were measured on a 7-point scale. First, the tests for the basic assumptions are reported. Next, the results of the hypotheses are reported one by one. In the end of the chapter, the summary of all the hypotheses is presented.

4.1. Basic assumptions

First, tests were performed to check that adequate brands and slogans were chosen for this study. A paired samples t-test verified (see Table 5) that significant differences in the ambiguity interpretation between simple (M=4.04, SD=1.12) and polysemous slogans (M=4.45, SD=1.14; p=.060) existed. Polysemous slogans were interpreted as more ambiguous than simple slogans on a 90% confidence interval. This provided further evidence that adequate simple and polysemous slogans were chosen for the study. The difference in measurement compared with the pilot study led to less clear differences, which will be discussed further in the discussion part of the thesis. Nonetheless, it can be assumed that the slogans were correctly divided into simple slogans and polysemous slogans.

Table 5 Testing for differences in type of slogan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Values</th>
<th>Simple slogan</th>
<th>Polysemous slogan</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity of a slogan</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A paired samples t-test was carried out to test if the brands were correctly divided into weak and strong brands. This was done with the data from the question 9 in the questionnaire. The brand familiarity was seen as an appropriate question to test whether a brand was strong or not. There was a significant difference (see Table 6) between the weak (M=1.93, SD=1.24) and strong brands (M=4.38, SD=.170, t (55) = 8.35, p = .00 (2-tailed). Furthermore, an independent sample t-test was performed with the slogans combined with their own brand name to see how familiar the subjects were with the slogans. The slogans of the strong brands (M=2.87) were more familiar than the slogans of the weak brands (M=1.74). However, the means were considerably lower than the middle value 4, which was the value for a quite familiar slogan, which meant
that the slogans were unfamiliar for the subjects. These t-tests gave further support that adequate brands and slogans were chosen for the study.

**Table 6 Testing for brand strength**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weak Brand</th>
<th>Strong brand</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand strength</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2. Hypotheses

Mean comparison t-tests were carried out to test the hypotheses. Hypotheses 1a, 1b, and 1c examine whether the brand strength influences the attitude towards slogans. The following hypotheses 2a, 2b, and 2c test if the type of slogan has an impact on the attitude towards slogans of weak and strong brands. Hypothesis 3 was created to test if the brand strength influences the ambiguity interpretation of a slogan. Finally, the hypothesis 4 tests if the polysemous slogans are seen as more suitable than simple slogans.

#### 4.2.1. Hypotheses about the effect of brand strength on the attitude towards slogans

The effect of brand strength was first measured by looking at all the slogan evaluations to see if brand strength had an overall effect on the attitude towards slogans. Next, it was tested if brand strength influenced the attitude towards simple or polysemous slogans.

**H1a: Consumers will have a more positive attitude towards slogans of strong brands than slogans of weak brands.**

A paired-samples t-test was carried out to test if the slogans of strong brands are more liked than slogans of weak brands. The data for the attitude towards the slogans of strong brands, i.e. the data from both the correct and false brand-slogan combinations, were compared with the data for the attitude towards slogans of weak brands. No significant difference was found between the attitude towards slogans of strong brands (M=4.21, SD=.801) and slogans of weak brands (M=4.23, SD=1.094), t (55) = -.085, p = .933 (2-tailed). The mean scores were almost identical which indicated that brand
strength does not influence the attitude towards slogans (see Table 7). These findings support that H1a is rejected.

**Table 7 Testing for H1a – the effect of brand strength on the attitude towards slogans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Values</th>
<th>Weak Brand</th>
<th>Strong brand</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand strength</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.933</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, it was tested if the standard deviations varied between brands as the standard deviations for weak brands seemed to be much higher than for the strong brands. The variance of weak brands was divided with the variance of the strong brand (Hald 1952:51). The test of differences in the variances revealed a significant difference between weak and strong brands. The F-value 1.864 was higher than cut-off value 1.6. This indicated that the answers on the attitude towards the slogans of weak brands varied significantly more than the attitude towards slogans of strong brands.

**H1b: For simple slogans, the attitude towards the slogan is more positive for strong brands than for weak brands.**

This hypothesis was tested with an independent samples t-test. The effect of brand strength on simple slogans was examined by comparing the attitude towards simple slogans combined with a weak brand with the attitude towards simple slogans combined with a strong brand. The Levene’s test (p=.247) showed that equal variances could be assumed. There was not a significant difference in the attitude towards simple slogans combined with weak (M=4.00 SD=1.07) and strong brands (M=4.17 SD=.83; t (57) =-671, p=.505, two-tailed). Therefore, H1b was rejected. The means and the p-value from H1b are presented in Table 8. Even if the standard deviations of weak brands were higher, the difference was not significant between strong and weak brands as the F-value 1.65 was below the cut-off point of 1.88 (Hald 1952:51).

**Table 8 Testing for H1b – the attitude towards simple slogans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Values</th>
<th>Weak Brand</th>
<th>Strong brand</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple slogan</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**H1c: For polysemous slogans, the attitude towards the slogan is more positive for strong brands than for weak brands.**

This hypothesis was tested with an independent samples t-test. The effect of brand strength on polysemous slogans was examined by comparing the attitude towards polysemous slogans combined with a weak brand with the attitude towards polysemous slogans combined with a strong brand. The Levene’s test (p=.291) showed that equal variances could be assumed. There was not a significant difference (see Table 9) in the attitude towards polysemous slogans combined with weak (M=4.41 SD=1.08) and strong brands (M=4.33 SD=.87; t (55) = -3.32, p=.741, two-tailed). Thus, the H1c was rejected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Values</th>
<th>Weak Brand</th>
<th>Strong brand</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polysemous slogan</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.2.2. Hypotheses about the effect of type of slogan on the attitude towards a slogan**

The effect of type of slogan on the attitude towards the slogan was first examined by looking at all the slogan evaluations, similarly as in H1a, to test if the type of slogan has an effect on the attitude towards slogans. Next, it was tested how the type of slogan influenced the attitude towards strong (H2b) and weak (H2c) brands.

**H2a: Polysemous slogans are more liked than simple slogans.**

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to examine whether polysemous slogans are more liked than simple slogans. This was hypothesized based on findings by past research. The attitude towards the polysemous slogans, both matched with strong and weak brands, were compared with the attitude towards the simple slogans. The mean values were a bit higher for the polysemous slogans, but there was not a significant difference between the attitude towards polysemous slogans (M=4.38, SD=.98) and simple slogans (M=4.06, SD=.91), t (55) = 1.561, p = .124 (2-tailed). Hence, H2a was rejected. Table 10 shows the results of hypothesis H2a.
Table 10  Testing for H2a – the effect of type of slogan on the attitude towards slogans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Values</th>
<th>Simple slogan</th>
<th>Polysemous slogan</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of slogan</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H2b: There is no significant difference in the slogan attitude of strong brands when combined with a polysemous slogan or a simple slogan.**

An independent samples t-test was conducted to examine if the type of slogan, simple or polysemous, influenced the attitude towards strong brands. The Levene’s test (p=.443) showed that equal variances could be assumed. There was not a significant difference between the simple (M=4.17 SD=.83) and polysemous slogans (M=4.33 SD=.87; t (56) = .720, p=.48, two-tailed) when matched with a strong brand (see Table 11). As it was hypothesized, the effect of the type of slogan on the attitude towards slogans of strong brands was not significant. Thus, H2b was supported.

Table 11 Testing for H2b – the attitude towards slogans of strong brands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Values</th>
<th>Simple slogan</th>
<th>Polysemous slogan</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong brand</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H2c: The attitude towards slogans of weak brands is more positive when combined with a polysemous slogan than a simple slogan.**

This hypothesis was tested with an independent samples t-test. The attitude towards weak brands combined with a simple slogan was compared with the attitude towards weak brands combined with a polysemous slogan. The Levene’s test (p=.695) showed that equal variances could be assumed. The mean value was higher for the polysemous slogans, but the difference was not significant. No significant difference between the simple (M=4.00 SD=1.07) and polysemous slogans (M=4.41 SD= 1.08; t (56) =-1.47, p=.147, two-tailed) was found when matched with a weak brand (see Table 12). Therefore, H2c was rejected.
The hypothesis 3 was created to test if the brand strength influences the interpretation of a slogan. The pilot study and the test before the main study showed that the type of slogan has an impact on the interpretation of a slogan.

**H3: Slogans of weak brands are seen as more ambiguous than slogans of strong brands.**

A paired-samples t-test revealed that there was no significant difference in the interpretation of ambiguity in slogans between the weak (M=4.35, SD=1.15) and strong brands (M=4.13, SD=1.14), t (53) = -.989, p = .327 (2-tailed). The mean value for ambiguity interpretation for weak brands was slightly higher, but the difference was not significant. Therefore, the H3 was rejected. Table 13 presents the results from hypothesis 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 13</th>
<th>Testing for H3 – the effect of brand strength on ambiguity interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity interpretation</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data were examined further to see if any differences in the ambiguity interpretation could be found when looking at simple and polysemous slogans separately. Independent sample t-tests were carried out to do this. Brand strength did not influence differently the interpretation of simple or polysemous slogans. The mean values were close to each other (M\text{weak}=4.51, M\text{strong}=4.39) when measuring the effect of brand strength on ambiguity interpretation of polysemous slogans and the difference was not significant (p=.711). However, the means in the ambiguity interpretation were higher for simple slogans when combined with a weak brand (M=4.28 SD=1.03) than
with a strong brand (M=3.85, SD=1.24). Nevertheless, the difference in the ambiguity interpretation was not significant (p=.157).

4.2.4. Suitability of slogans

Suitability of slogans was tested to see if the type of slogan influences the suitability of a slogan. The impact of brand strength was also tested even if it was not hypothesized.

**H4: Polysemous slogans are more suitable for both weak and strong brands**

A paired samples t-test showed that polysemous slogans (M=5.28, SD=.89) were seen as more suitable than the simple slogans (M=4.16, SD=1.09, t (55) = 5.24, p = .00 (2-tailed)). Furthermore, an eta squared statistic was calculated to see how much of the suitability of a slogan was explained by the type of slogan. The eta square statistic (.333) showed a large effect size, 33.3% of the variance in the suitability of a slogan was explained by the type of slogan. Furthermore, independent sample t-tests revealed that polysemous slogans were more suitable than simple slogans for both strong brands (M_{simple}=4.42, M_{polysemous}= 5.01, p=.012) and for weak brands (M_{simple}=3.94, M_{polysemous}=5.48, p=.000). This means that the hypothesis is accepted (see Table 14).

**Table 14** Testing for H4 – the suitability of slogans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Values</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simple slogan</td>
<td>Polysemous slogan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall brand strength</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong brand</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak brand</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, it was tested if the suitability was affected by the brand strength. When further investigating the suitability of polysemous slogans, it was found that polysemous slogans suited better the weak brands (M=5.48) than for strong brands (M=5.01, p=.050) and simple slogans suited better for strong brands (M=4.42) than for weak brands (M=3.94, p=.097). The difference in the effect of the brand strength on suitability of simple slogans was significant on a 90% confidence interval.
A significant difference was also found between the variances of suitability of weak brands and suitability of strong brands as the F-value 2.31 was above the cut value of 1.60 (Hald 1952:51). This means that the suitability of slogans fluctuate more for weak brands than for strong brands. A test of differences in the variances revealed a significant difference between the suitability of simple slogans. The F-value 1.907 was higher than cut value 1.88. This means that the answers on suitability of a slogan fluctuated more for simple slogans combined with weak brands than simple slogans combined with a strong brand.

4.2.5. The open questions

The subjects’ answers on the open questions gave a lot of data about the students’ interpretations of the slogans. The open questions revealed that many of the subjects identified the category link in the slogans “Painavaa palvelua” and “Paino oikeilla asioilla”. The category link was identified both when the slogan belonged to a strong brand and a weak brand. The brand strength did not seem to affect the attitude and interpretations, except for the slogan “Kun elämä on parhaimmillaan”. This slogan was mainly seen as illogical and not suitable when compared with a weak brand. Several subjects mentioned that they did not understand the connection between the slogan and the brand. Subjects also suggested that the slogan would suit better for a travel agency. When combined with a strong brand the attitude towards this slogan was more positive. The slogan “Kun elämä on parhaimmillaan” was associated with a good and positive feeling, when combined with Sanoma Magazines Oy. However, subjects mentioned also for strong brands that the slogan would be more appropriate for a company in another line of business.

The interpretations of the slogan “Painavaa palvelua” could be roughly divided into two groups. Most of the subjects liked the slogan and felt that it communicated heavy and good service. Many of the subjects identified the wordplay and the category link in the slogan and thought that it was funny. Nevertheless, some of the subjects did not like the slogans as much and felt that the word “painavaa” had a negative sound. Subjects explained that the slogan could be interpreted in a negative meaning that it is heavy and difficult to co-operate with this company. The subjects’ interpretations of this slogan were quite comparable when combined with a weak or strong brand.

The comments about the slogan “Tieto Elämään” were very similar when the slogan was combined with a strong brand or a weak brand. This slogan was the one with the
most positive attitudes and the most parallel interpretations in the open questions. The slogan was mostly associated with information and technical literature. Many subjects felt that the company wanted to communicate the importance of the company’s operations with the slogan.

The wordplay and the category link was also identified in the slogan “Paino oikeilla asioilla”. The associations were mostly positive towards this slogan. However, some subjects thought that the word “paino” had a negative ring to it. The brand strength did not seem to have an effect on the interpretations of this slogan.

4.2.6. Summary of the hypotheses

Most of the hypotheses were rejected as no significant differences could be found. H2b was supported as it was hypothesized that the type of slogan would not influence the attitude towards slogans of strong brands. Significant differences were found in the suitability of the slogans, therefore also H4 was supported. Polysemous slogans were seen as more suitable than the simple slogans in this study. The results of the hypotheses are discussed and analyzed further in the next chapter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a: Consumers will have a more positive attitude towards slogans of strong brands than slogans of weak brands.</td>
<td>H1a rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b: For simple slogans, the attitude towards the slogan is more positive for strong brands than for weak brands.</td>
<td>H1b rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1c: For polysemous slogans, the attitude towards the slogan is more positive for strong brands than for weak brands.</td>
<td>H1c rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a: Polysemous slogans are more liked than simple slogans.</td>
<td>H2a rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b: There is no significant difference in slogan attitude of strong brands when combined with a polysemous slogan or a simple slogan.</td>
<td>H2b supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2c: The attitude towards slogans of weak brands is more positive when combined with a polysemous slogan than a simple slogan.</td>
<td>H2c rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: Slogans of weak brands are seen as more ambiguous than slogans of strong brands.</td>
<td>H3 rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: Polysemous slogans are more suitable for both weak and strong brands.</td>
<td>H4 supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 DISCUSSION

This chapter summarizes the key findings and presents the theoretical and managerial implications of the study. Furthermore, the limitations and recommendations for further research are suggested. Throughout the discussion chapter suggestions for future research directions will be given. Finally, a short conclusion of the thesis is reported.

Most of the hypotheses were rejected and it was found that the brand strength did not influence the attitude towards slogans as much as expected. However, some significant differences were found. The brand strength and the type of slogan did not influence on the attitude towards slogans as much as past studies suggest. However, the brand strength seemed to have a positive effect on the consumer attitude towards slogans.

5.1.1. Consumer attitude towards slogans

The results from this study contradicted the ones in the study by Dahlén and Rosengren (2005:160). They found that slogans of strong brands would be more liked than slogans of weak brands. In my study, no significant differences were found between weak and strong brands in the attitude towards slogans. This means that the brand strength and the type of slogan do not seem to influence the attitude towards slogans. It is assumed that the use of familiar slogans might have influenced the attitude for the benefit of strong brands in the study by Dahlén and Rosengren (2005:158). If brand strength does not affect the attitude towards a slogan it means that the attitude towards the slogans has more to do with the characteristics of the slogan rather than external factors. This can be related to the findings by Reece et al. (1994:53). They stated that the interest towards slogans come from the linguistic devices in the slogan or the product itself.

No significant difference was found between the attitude towards simple slogans and polysemous slogans. This contradicts with past research (Bradley & Meeds 2002; Dimofte and Yalch 2007a, Lagerwerf 2002). The mean scores were higher for the polysemous slogans than the simple slogans which could indicate that polysemous slogans are a bit more liked than the simple slogans. Since a significant difference could not be found, it can only be suggested that the type of slogan affects more the attitude towards the slogan than the strength of the brand combined with the slogan.
However, significant differences were found between the standard deviations of strong and weak brands. This leads to the conclusion that the attitude towards strong brands is *more stable* than the attitude towards weak brands. Therefore, it was assessed that brand strength has at least a small effect on the attitude towards slogans. Additionally, the results from H2b indicated that the attitude towards strong brands would not be influenced by the type of slogan. Since the attitude towards slogans of strong brands is not influenced by the type of slogan it indicates that the brand strength has a stabilizing effect on the attitude towards the slogans of strong brands. For strong brands this would mean that the strength of the brand protects the attitude towards the slogans, which leads to a more stable attitude towards the slogans of strong brands. This finding corresponds with the finding by Dahlén and Rosengren's (2005:160) that slogans of strong brands are brand-driven. In other words, the brand has a stronger effect on the slogan than the slogan has on the brand.

Also the open questions supported the contention that the attitude towards the slogans of the strong brands is more stable than the slogans of weak brands. Subjects felt that simple slogans were somewhat illogical when combined with a weak brand. According to Pham and Johar (1997:249) it is vital that consumers can attribute the message content to its intended source, the brand. Since the subjects did not see the connection between the brand and the slogan, the attitude towards slogans of weak brands fluctuated more than the attitude towards slogans of strong brands. Therefore, weak brands have to more carefully consider what kind of slogan they choose for themselves. However, the fact that the attitude of slogans of weak brands varied more might not always be negative, since it could mean that many of the recipients like the slogan a lot.

### 5.1.2. Ambiguity interpretation

Both the pilot study and the test of ambiguity in the main study supported that polysemous slogans were seen as more ambiguous than the simple slogans. The test of ambiguity in the main study between simple and polysemous slogans was significant only on a 90% confidence interval. The difference was not as clear in the main study as in the pilot study. The fact that the difference was not as big in the main study indicates that the subjects did not interpret the slogans in the same way. It would have been preferable to use slogans with a clearer division in simple and polysemous slogans. However, the pilot study and the focal study supported the choice of the slogans.
The scale for ambiguity could be improved for future studies. It is suggested that studies that measure the ambiguity should use at least two different scales: one of the scales should measure whether the slogan is interpreted to have several meanings and the other scale should measure if the slogans is merely interpreted as unclear. In this way the researcher would get more information about how the slogan is interpreted.

A small but not significant difference was discovered in the ambiguity interpretation of simple slogans between weak and strong brands. Although the difference was not significant in this study it is worth pursuing further in larger studies. In this case, the difference could do with the fact that the students did not understand the meaning of the simple slogans when they belonged to the weak brands. The open questions revealed that the simple slogans, particularly the slogan “Kun elämä on parhaimmillaan”, were interpreted as strange and not suitable when combined with a weak brand whereas the attitude was much more positive when combined with a strong brand. This could mean that the interpretation of a slogan might not always have to do with the characteristics of the slogan; the brand associated might also affect the interpretation of the slogan. Simple slogans can be seen as more ambiguous when combined with a weak brand if the recipient does not understand how the slogan is related to the brand. This can be connected to findings by Law (2002:376). Law reported that consumers confuse messages of different companies when there is a weak tie between the slogan and the brands. As consumers often have less knowledge about weak brands they confuse more easily the messages of weak brands than strong brands.

5.1.3. Suitability

The results of hypothesis 4 allow drawing the conclusion that polysemous slogans are seen as more suitable for companies than simple slogans. This aligns with past research and suggestions by several authors (Macklin 1985:32–34; Bradley & Meeds 2002:613). The type of slogan showed significant differences in the suitability of slogans. The results show that both the brand strength and the type of slogan influence the suitability of a slogan. Polysemous slogans were seen as more suitable than the simple slogans for both strong and weak brands. This can be related to the findings by Dimofte and Yalch (2007a:520–521) and Lagerwerf (2002:257) that slogans with easily recognizable ambiguity are more preferred than slogans with only one meaning.

The simple slogans were seen as more suitable when combined with a strong brand than a weak brand. This had most likely to do with the familiarity of the brand. The
consumers know in which category strong brands belong to and know what they do. A weak brand that is unfamiliar for most of the consumers can have difficulties to use simple slogans. For example, if a consumer does not know about a brand then it is important that the slogan can communicate who the company is and what it does. Simple slogans can seldom achieve this. Therefore, simple slogans suit better for strong brands than for weak brands. Simple slogans use many times superlatives; however it can be difficult for an unfamiliar brand to justify how they can communicate the feeling “when life is at its best” (kun elämä on parhaimmillaan) when the consumers do not even know the brand. How can life be at its best when you do not know the brand associated to the slogan? The suggestion that simple slogans should not be used by weak brands is also supported by the open questions in the questionnaire, where subjects mentioned that the simple slogans do not fit at all to the weak brands.

On the other hand, the suitability of polysemous slogans was higher for weak brands than for strong brands. This is probably a result of the category link in the slogans. The weak brands used the word “paino” and the adjective of the word “paino” (=painavaa) in their slogan, which increased the suitability of these slogans. The wording in the slogans helped the subjects to identify the right category, which led to higher values in the suitability of the polysemous slogans. This finding supports the suggestion by Keller (2008:51) that weak brands should emphasize category links in their slogans. Therefore, weak brands should aim for creating associations to the product or service that they offer.

5.2. Theoretical implications

From a theoretical point of view, it is important to study the effect of brand strength towards slogans. The findings of this study contradicted with the empirical study by Dahlén and Rosengren (2005) where they found that slogans of strong brands are more liked than slogans of weak brands. The findings from this study suggest that brand strength does not influence the attitude towards slogans. The contradicting results might have been a result of the familiarity of the slogan, which led to higher preference of the slogans of strong brands in their study as familiar slogans were used. It is argued, that the effect of the brand strength on the attitude towards slogans could be investigated better with unfamiliar slogans as in this study. The use of fictive slogans could also solve many problems that have to do with the familiarity of a slogan. Familiarity of a slogan is so strongly correlated with the attitude towards the slogan.
that it must be taken into consideration in this kind of research. More studies are needed to test how the brand strength and the type of slogan influence the attitude towards slogans. Further studies must be extensive and investigate brands and slogans from different lines of businesses so that more generalizable results can be achieved. Furthermore, different kinds of simple and different kinds of polysemous slogans must be used to test if the type of slogan influences the attitude towards slogans.

A new finding not discussed in past slogan research was that there was a significant difference in the standard deviations of strong and weak brands when it comes to the attitude towards the slogan and the suitability of a slogan. This indicated that the attitude towards the slogans of strong brands is more stable than the attitude towards the slogans of weak brands. Furthermore, the means for the attitude towards slogans of strong brands were in many cases very close to each other. This was anticipated before the study was carried out. Yet, it was surprising how stable the results were for strong brands. This indicates that consumers more easily accept the slogans of strong brands.

Several factors have to be taken in consideration when studying the effect of brand strength on slogans. Above all, the characteristics of a slogan and the type of slogan have to be considered when studying the effect of brand strength on the attitude towards slogans. The academic community will benefit from the knowledge about how slogans are perceived differently depending on the strength of a brand and different types of slogans.

5.3. Managerial implications

Companies can benefit widely from different kind of slogan research. As mentioned earlier, research has focused widely on the recall and recognition of slogans and on the language in slogans. A lot of knowledge exists already in these areas. However, the effect of brand strength on the consumer attitude towards slogans has not been widely investigated. The results from this study in combination with the thorough literature review can help marketers to plan their slogans even better and create slogans that fit their strategy.

It is argued that different types of slogans need to be created for different kind of companies differing in size, even if significant differences were not found between the attitude towards slogans of weak and strong brands. Small brands should aim for more witty, humorous, controversial or in different ways unique slogans that raise interest.
for the company. Because of smaller marketing budgets and less marketing efforts weak brands need to stand out in their communication. The position as a weak or unfamiliar brand allows the company to take more risks without public criticism, whereas strong brands are constrained to more carefully plan their slogans and cannot take as much risks as weak brands. However, the results indicate that the consumers’ attitude towards the slogans of strong brands are more stable and are not affected as much from different types of slogans. This means that strong brands are freer to choose the type of slogan. The simple slogans suit them as the brand itself is so strong that no category links for example are needed. Polysemous slogans on the other hand suit them as they are quite open for interpretations and do not restrict the image of the brand.

The findings were particularly interesting for the weak brands. The findings indicated that polysemous slogans are more suitable for weak brands. Therefore, weak brands should aim to use polysemous slogans with category links in their marketing rather than simple slogans. The category link helps consumers to identify the line of business were the weak brand operates and increase in that way the interest of the company.

Companies must be careful with words that can have negative loadings. The words “paino” and “painavaa” were included in the slogans of the weak publishing business companies because that the word helps to identify the right category. However, the words were seen to have a negative ring, which seemed to negatively affect the attitude towards the slogans. Therefore, companies should consider carefully on the wording in their slogans and avoid words with negative loadings.

As brand strength did not influence the attitude towards slogans it is concluded that it is the message in a slogan that affects the most the attitude towards a slogan. Several authors discuss that the language, message and wording in slogans affect the memorability and the attitude towards a slogan (Djafarova 2008; Lowrey 2002, Reece et al. 1994). However, it is difficult to draw any conclusion of what type of slogans weak or strong brands should use. Based on the theoretical framework, one can assume that there is not only one way to create successful slogans. It is hard to say that either simple or polysemous slogans suit better for weak or strong brands. Brands have to create a slogan that is suitable for them, as one of the objectives of slogans is to differentiate a brand from its competitors (Dowling & Kabanoff 1996:63). However, to become an effective marketing tool a good slogan should be suitable for a company regardless of the brand strength since many weak brands can expand fast and become a strong brand. As the suitability was influenced by the type of slogan, it is suggested that weak
brands should avoid creating simple slogans if they believe that their consumers do not identify their category. It can be difficult for companies to choose what type of slogan they should choose. If a company cannot choose between a simple and a polysemous slogan, then one solution can be to take two slogans as recommended by Hong and Sternthal (2010:309–310). In this way the company can persuade both consumers with prior knowledge of the brand and those who have not.

5.4. Limitations and further research

There are several potential limitations regarding the methodology used in this study that have to be acknowledged.

First, there are many issues that might affect the validity when conducting experiments. The fact that students were used as subjects might have influenced the results. The sample might not be a valid representation of the whole population as the data were collected only from business school students. The students were randomly given the questionnaires to improve the reliability of the results. For this study it was assessed that a different sample would have most likely lead to similar results. Students are criticized widely as a not reliable source for academic research. Nevertheless, students are commonly used in different kind of research. It is argued that students many times can give more reliable and consistent answers than non-students. Students are used to answer different kinds of surveys and inquiries; this gives them a custom to fill in forms and diminishes the likelihood of misunderstandings. Furthermore, the fact that the questionnaire was quite long supported the choice of students. It would have been time-expensive to collect data from subjects that were not used to fill in forms and researcher bias could have occurred if the whole inquiry would have been explained for each subject.

The fact that slogans from only one line of business, the publishing business, were used limits the generalizability of the results. However, companies in the publishing business were perfectly suited for this study, as significant differences between weak and strong brands could be found and there could be identified both polysemous and simple slogans for these companies. Furthermore, the fact that 3 of the 4 slogans used in this study were registered increased the relevance of the results.

It is noted that the manipulation of the brand-slogan link might have affected the results in this study. Slogans cannot be switched without any errors since the slogans
are planned to fit a company’s own image and strategy. In an effort to increase the validity of the data it was planned that those subjects that identified the mismatch would be excluded. However, none of the subjects could identify the mismatch so all subjects were accepted in the sample. In studies where manipulations are performed the researcher must be careful that her opinions will not bias the results. Therefore, all decisions were supported by statistical data from the pilot study and the main study.

The fact that the slogans were not seen in a natural setting, in ads or on a web page, might have affected the results. This was not possible to carry out in this study since the slogans were tested both with their own brand name and with a competing brand name. The setting where the subjects were exposed only to the brand name and the slogan suited this study since the attitude towards the slogans and the ambiguity and suitability interpretation was the main task of this study. An advertisement could have affected the attitude towards and the interpretation of the slogans as subjects could have based their decision on for example a factor like color or different font that does not give any information for my study purpose.

Moreover, the results might have been influenced by the characteristics of the slogans. It is likely that the category link in the slogans “Paino oikeilla asioilla” and “Painavaa palvelua” affected the subjects’ attitude towards slogans. The polysemous slogans that belong to Loimaan Kirjapaino and Forssan Kirjapaino include the word word “paino” and the adjective of the word paino, “painava”. This may have benefited the weak brands in this study as they had the same word in the brand name, i.e. Forssan Kirjapaino Oy, and in the slogan “Paino oikeilla asioilla”. As the word paino was repeated the category link was easier to recognize. Keller (2008:51) discusses that it is easier for consumers to associate a brand with the right category and recognize the intended target group if the slogan has a category link in it. This can have led to higher values for the weak brands. The effect of the category link was supported by the fact that suitability of the weak brands and these slogans was significantly higher than for the weak brands than the strong brands. It would be interesting to check if the attitude towards the companies would have been different without the clear category link. In future studies polysemous slogans without category links must also be chosen. The problem in this kind of study is that the choice of slogans can always be debated, why a particular slogan was chosen, and why another was not. However, the slogans used in this study were chosen according to many pre-determined criteria. This made the slogans in this study relevant.
A larger sample could have given more reliable results. However, experiments are typically carried out with smaller samples than typical field studies (Mertens 2004:149). It can be argued whether the pilot study was too narrow and whether it gave enough support for the main study. However, the results were consistent and significant and a bigger sample would not have given more reliable results. The sample size in the main study was seen as adequate, even though it could have been larger.

These kinds of experiments are difficult to perform as many different factors can affect the results. The strength of this study is that a control mechanism that verifies the causal directions was built in the research design. In this way, false conclusions about the causal directions were avoided (Robson 2011:89). Additionally, the strength of this study compared with earlier studies is that unknown slogans were used. In this way the subjects’ attitude towards the slogan and the interpretation of the slogan were not affected by prior knowledge of the slogan. The publishing business is not a typical heavily advertised category, which makes that the effect of the slogan familiarity was diminished. Regardless of the limitations, it is considered that the results of this study are valuable and relevant.

It is acknowledged that several issues can have influenced the reliability and validity of this study. However, none of these issues is seen to reduce the reliability of the study as a whole. The findings of this study should be further elaborated in the future with a more extensive study. To get more knowledge in this area of research a similar study with weak and strong brands from different lines of businesses would need to be carried out. This would give more generalizable results. The problem with the chosen method in this study is that even if some suggestions about students’ attitude towards slogans can be given by interpreting the statistical differences between groups, the questions why student’s like or do not like a slogan is left unanswered. Therefore, studies that combine quantitative and qualitative methods are suggested for further research when investigating the influence of brand strength and type of slogan on the attitude towards slogans. Furthermore, an improvement could be that constructs with at least four items would be used as suggested by Diamantopoulos et al. (2012:446).

### 5.5. Conclusion

From a management perspective, these kinds of studies are needed to determine what type of slogan companies should choose for themselves. This paper provides insights for practitioners that can help them in the planning of slogans. By knowing how the
brand strength and the type of slogan influence the attitude towards slogans, companies can create slogans that suit them best. Many examples that are useful to know when planning slogans are presented in the theoretical part. A contribution of this paper is that it provides a comprehensive literature review of slogan research. This was the first thesis on slogans at Hanken School of Economics, which indicates that research in this area is needed. The empirical part gave new insights on how the brand strength influences the attitude towards slogans.

This study showed that the attitude towards slogans might not have to do with the strength of a brand as much as has been believed earlier. The findings of this study contradicted with the findings by Dahlén and Rosengren (2005) that slogans of strong brands are more liked than slogans of weak brands. Slogans of strong brands are not more liked because they belong to a strong brand, but they are protected by the strength of the brand, which leads to a more stable attitude for slogans of strong brands than for slogans of weak brands.

In line with recent research, it has been argued in this thesis that polysemous slogans are more liked than simple ones although the type of slogan did not have a significant effect on the attitude towards slogans. The data gave some indications about the effect of the type of slogan on the attitude towards slogans and these were supported by the open questions in the questionnaire. However, more extensive studies are needed to determine if brand strength or the type of slogan influence the attitude towards slogans.
6 SVENSK SAMMANFATTNING

6.1. Introduktion


Generellt brukar slagord delas in i två grupper, slagord som används för att marknadsföra produkter (M&M’s – melts in your mouth, not in your hand) och slagord som används för att marknadsföra företag (Nokia – Connecting People). De flesta slagorden marknadsför enskilda produkter (Teas & Grapentine 2004). Denna studie kommer dock att fokusera på slagord som marknadsför företag.

Trots att slagord undersökts mycket under de senaste årtiondena så har vissa delar åsidosatts. Tidigare forskning där det undersökts hur styrkan av varumärket påverkar attityden till slagord har åsidosatt hur typen av ett slagord påverkar attityden till slagordet. Dahlén och Rosengrens (2005) empiriska studie kom till slutsatsen att slagord från starka varumärken är mera omtyckta än slagord från svaga varumärken. Problemet i denna studie var enligt min mening att Dahlén och Rosengren använde kända slagord, vilket antagligen påverkade resultaten och gjorde att slagord av starka varumärken var mer omtyckta än slagorden av svaga varumärken. Därför bör forskaren i studier där det undersöks hur varumärket påverkar slagordet använda okända slagord som respondenterna inte direkt känner igen.


6.1.1. Problemområde


betydelse för företaget. Till exempel i Finland har antalet registrerade slagord ökat markant under de senaste årtiondena (Iskulauserkisteri 2012).


6.1.2. Syfte


6.1.3. Avgränsningar och förklaring av de viktigaste termerna

det att resultaten inte är generaliserbara för andra branscher. Förlagsbranschen valdes eftersom ett av de viktigaste kriterierna för denna studie var att slagorden inte skulle vara välkända och därför kunde slagorden inte vara från starkt marknadsförda branscher. Detta var ett viktigt kriterium eftersom slagorden i studien kommer att bli kombinerade både med deras eget varumärke och med ett konkurrerande varumärke.


6.2. Slagord – ett viktigt verktyg för företag

I teoridelen presenteras delar från tidigare forskning inom slagord. Största vikten läggs dock på studier om mångtydiga slagord och forskning där varumärkets betydelse för attityden till slagord även diskuterats.

6.2.1. Vad är slagord?

Slagord kan definieras på följande sätt “a memorable phrase expressing an idea, purpose or claim” (Cone 2008: xiii). Vanligtvis placeras slagord efter företagsnamnet i övre kanten av en reklam eller skilt från brödtexten längst ner på reklamen (Fuertes–Olivera et al. 2001:1297; Dowling & Kabanoff 1996:64; Lagerwerf 2002:246). Det är viktigt att slagordet skrivs med stor font och att den placeras så att den syns. I annat fall

6.2.2. Språket i slagord

Det finns många olika slags slagord: bl.a. mångtydiga (Just Do It – Nike), entydiga (Valtra Power Partner – Valtra Oy Ab), indirekta (Think different - Apple), humoristiska (Do you...Yahoo!? –Yahoo), och generella slagord (Never Underestimate the Power of Soup – Campbell’s). Vissa slagord har även företagsnamnet inbyggt i slagordet (“It’s Miller time!”). Olika slags ordlekar är även vanliga i slagord (Wii would like to play – Nintendo). De flesta slagorden tillhör flera grupper på samma gång, t.ex. mångtydiga slagord kan oftast också kategoriseras som indirekta. Det är viktigt att känna igen de olika typerna av slagord samt i vilka situationer de passar en själv bäst. Tyngdpunkten i detta arbete läggs på mångtydiga slagord.


6.2.3. Varumärken och slagord

Samspelet av varumärken och slagord har inte undersöks i större utsträckning. Dahlén och Rosengren (2005:152) försökte fylla det här gapet i forskningen genom att undersöka hur varumärken påverkar slagord.


Många studier stöder påståendet att slagord som hör till starka varumärken är lättare att komma ihåg än slagord som hör till svaga varumärken. Det har kommit fram att


**6.2.4. Hypoteserna**

På basis av tidigare forskning skapades följande hypoteser. De tre första hypoteserna 1a, 1b och 1c mäter ifall styrkan av ett varumärke påverkar attityden till ett slagord. De tre följande hypoteserna mäter ifall typen av slagord, enkelt eller mångtydigt slagord, påverkar attityden till slagordet. Hypotes 3 mäter däremot ifall mångtydigheten i slagord påverkas av styrkan av ett varumärke. Och den sista hypotesen mäter lämpligheten av slagord. Alla hypoteser kan ses i Table 16.
Table 16  Hypoteserarna

H1a: Konsumenter har en mer positiv attityd till slagord som hör till starka varumärken.

H1b: Attityden till enkla slagord är mer positiv när slagordet presenteras med ett starkt varumärke.

H1c: Attityden till mångtydiga slagord är mer positiv när slagordet presenteras med ett starkt varumärke.

H2a: Attityden till mångtydiga slagord är mer positiv än attityden till enkla slagord.

H2b: Det finns ingen signifikant skillnad i attityden till slagord av starka varumärken som kombineras med ett enkelt eller ett mångtydigt slagord.

H2c: Slagord av svaga varumärken gillas mera när slagordet är mångtydigt.

H3: Slagord som presenteras med ett svagt varumärke anses som mer mångtydiga än slagord som presenteras med ett starkt varumärke.

H4: Mångtydiga slagord anses som mer lämpliga än enkla slagord för både starka och svaga varumärken.

6.3.  Metod


De flesta av frågorna i enkäten baserade sig på tidigare studier. Frågorna 1-3 i enkäten mätte attityden till ett slagord och var översatta från Dahlén och Rosengrens (2005) studie. Frågorna 4-6 var skapade för att mäta mångtydigheten i slagord. Fråga 5


En pilotstudie genomfördes för att bekräfta att slagorden klassades på rätt sätt i enkla och mångtydiga slagord och för att bekräfta att signifikanta skillnader fanns i styrkan av varumärket mellan de starka och svaga varumärkena. Pilotstudien visade tydliga skillnader mellan både slagorden och varumärkesstyrkan och stödde valet av varumärkena och slagorden.


6.4. Resultat

De flesta av hypoteserna förkastades eftersom inga signifikanta skillnader hittades mellan starka och svaga varumärken samt mellan enkla och mångtydiga slagord. Varken styrkan av ett varumärke eller typen av slagord påverkade signifikant attityden till slagord. H2b accepterades eftersom hypotesen antog att typen av slagord inte skulle påverka attityden till slagord av starka varumärken. Då datamaterialet undersöktes vidare framgick att standardavvikelserna för slagord av starka varumärken och svaga varumärken skiljde sig markant från varandra. Standardavvikelserna för slagord av svaga varumärken var betydligt större än standardavvikelserna för de starka varumärkenas slagord. Skillnaden i standardavvikelserna var signifikant.

Resultaten visade också att slagord av styrkan av ett varumärke inte påverkar hur mångtydigheten i slagord tolkas. Både slagord som hör till svaga varumärken och starka varumärken tolkades som lika mångtydiga. Däremot hittades signifikanta skillnader i hypotes 4 där lämpligheten av slagord mättes. Mångtydiga slagord (M=5,28) upplevdes som mer lämpliga än enkla slagord (M=4,16, t (55) = 5.24, p = .00). Dessutom ansåg respondenterna att enkla slagord passade bättre för starka varumärken än för svaga varumärken (p=.097). Däremot ansågs mångtydiga slagord lämpa sig bättre för svaga varumärken än för starka varumärken (p=.050).

Resultaten från hypotesen finns uppräknade i Table 17.

**Table 17  Resultaten från hypoteserna**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotes</th>
<th>Beskrivning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a</td>
<td>Förkastad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b</td>
<td>Förkastad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1c</td>
<td>Förkastad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a</td>
<td>Förkastad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b</td>
<td>Accepterad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2c</td>
<td>Förkastad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Förkastad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Accepterad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.5. Analys


Eftersom resultaten visade att attityden inte påverkas av varkendera styrkan av ett varumärke eller typen av slagord kan det diskuteras ifall det fanns tillräckligt stora skillnader mellan slagorden i den här studien. Både pilotstudien och experimentet stödde valet av slagorden och varumärkena. Dock kan man säga att en bredare studie med flera varumärken och flera slagord måste genomföras för att få generaliserbara resultat om hur ett varumärke påverkar attityden till ett varumärke.

Ett bidrag till forskning inom slagord är den breda och övergripande teoridelen, som sammanfattar en stor del av den existerande forskningen om slagord. Det här var den första avhandlingen inom Svenska handelshögskolan som undersökte slagord, vilket visar att slagord inte har studerats så mycket som det borde ha gjorts. Slagord är en
viktig del av företagens marknadskommunikation och den här studien ger många råd om vilka saker som måste tas i beaktande då man planerar ett nytt slagord.
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APPENDIX 1  TRANSLATIONS OF SLOGANS

**Kun elämä on parhaimmillaan** (Sanoma Magazines Finland Oy)

"When life is at its best"

**Elämää - ei sen vähempää** (Sanoma Magazines Finland Oy)

"Life – nothing less than that"

**Tieto Elämään** (Alma Media)

“Knowledge for life”

**Paino oikeilla asioilla** (Forssan Kirjapaino Oy)

"The emphasis on the right things", "The print (office) on the right things"

**Painavaa palvelua** (Loimaan Kirjapaino Oy)

"Printing service"," Heavy service"
## APPENDIX 2  PILOT STUDY - TEST OF BRAND STRENGTH AND BRAND FAMILIARITY

Rate the following companies in the publishing business.

### Sanoma Magazines
#### Finland Oy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Brand image (bad/good)</th>
<th>Brand strength (weak/strong)</th>
<th>Familiarity (unfamiliar/familiar)</th>
<th>Have seen or heard (yes/no)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Talentum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Brand image (bad/good)</th>
<th>Brand strength (weak/strong)</th>
<th>Familiarity (unfamiliar/familiar)</th>
<th>Have seen or heard (yes/no)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alma Media Oy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Brand image (bad/good)</th>
<th>Brand strength (weak/strong)</th>
<th>Familiarity (unfamiliar/familiar)</th>
<th>Have seen or heard (yes/no)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Forssan Kirjapaino Oy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Brand image (bad/good)</th>
<th>Brand strength (weak/strong)</th>
<th>Familiarity (unfamiliar/familiar)</th>
<th>Have seen or heard (yes/no)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Loimaan Kirjapaino Oy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Brand image (bad/good)</th>
<th>Brand strength (weak/strong)</th>
<th>Familiarity (unfamiliar/familiar)</th>
<th>Have seen or heard (yes/no)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3  PILOT STUDY – TEST OF AMBIGUITY IN PUBLISHING BUSINESS SLOGANS

Write number of possible meanings in the following slogans. You have three alternatives: a) one meaning b) two meanings c) more than two meanings

1. Kun elämä on parhaimmillaan (Sanoma Magazines Finland Oy)
   a) One meaning b) two meanings c) more than two meanings

2. Elämää - ei sen vähempää (Sanoma Magazines Finland Oy)
   a) One meaning b) two meanings c) more than two meanings

3. Alma media – Tieto Elämään
   a) One meaning b) two meanings c) more than two meanings

4. Paino oikeilla asioilla (Forssan Kirjapaino Oy) 16.6.2010
   a) One meaning b) two meanings c) more than two meanings

5. Painavaa palvelua (Loimaan Kirjapaino Oy)
   a) One meaning b) two meanings c) more than two meanings
Detta datamaterial samlas till en magistersavhandling på Svenska handelshögskolan. Avhandlingen studerar konsumenters uppfattningar om slagord (slogans). Det tar ungefär 5-10 minuter att svara på undersökningen. Tack för ditt deltagande!

Man:     Kvinna:     

Ålder: ___________

Modersmål: ___________

Enspråkig:     Tvåspråkig (svenska-finska):     

Lärroanstalt:_________________

Uttryck din uppfattning om följande slagord i förlagsbranschen. Ringa in det alternativ på den 7-gradiga skalan (1=negativ attityd, 4=neutral attityd, 7=positiv attityd) i som beskriver bäst din uppfattning om slagordet som föregår företagsnamnet (nedan: Kun elämä on parhaimmillaan).

**Kun elämä on parhaimmillaan** – Sanoma Magazines Oy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slagordet är dåligt</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Slagordet är bra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet väcker inte ditt intresse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet väcker ditt intresse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag ogillar slagordet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jag gillar slagordet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är entydigt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är mångtydigt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är lätt att tolka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är svårt att tolka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet har en förutbestämd betydelse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är öppet för olika tolkningar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är olämpligt för företaget</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är lämpligt för företaget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet känns inte logiskt för detta företag</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet känns logiskt för detta företag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag känner mycket dåligt till företaget och dess verksamhet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jag känner mycket väl till företaget och dess verksamhet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag är säker på att jag inte hört det här slagordet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jag är säker på att jag hört det här slagordet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vad tänker du på när du ser slagordet?

Förklara vad du anser att slagordet berättar om företaget?
**Painavaa palvelua** – Loimaan Kirjapaino Oy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slagordet är dåligt</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Slagordet är bra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet väcker inte ditt intresse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet väcker ditt intresse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag ogillar slagordet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jag gillar slagordet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är entydigt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är mångtydigt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är lätt att tolka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är svårt att tolka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet har en förutbestämd betydelse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är öppet för olika tolkningar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är olämpligt för företaget</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är lämpligt för företaget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet känns inte logiskt för detta företag</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet känns logiskt för detta företag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag känner mycket dåligt till företaget och dess verksamhet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jag känner mycket väl till företaget och dess verksamhet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag är säker på att jag inte hört det här slagordet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jag är säker på att jag hört det här slagordet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vad tänker du på när du ser slagordet?**

**Förklara vad du anser att slagordet berättar om företaget?**
**Tieto Elämäen – Alma Media**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slagordet är dåligt</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Slagordet är bra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet väcker inte ditt intresse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet väcker ditt intresse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag ogillar slagordet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jag gillar slagordet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är entydigt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är mångtydigt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är lätt att tolka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är svårt att tolka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet har en förutbestämd betydelse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är öppet för olika tolkningar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är olämpligt för företaget</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är lämpligt för företaget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet känns inte logiskt för detta företag</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet känns logiskt för detta företag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag känner mycket dåligt till företaget och dess verksamhet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jag känner mycket väl till företaget och dess verksamhet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag är säker på att jag inte hört det här slagordet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jag är säker på att jag hört det här slagordet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vad tänker du på när du ser slagordet?

Förklara vad du anser att slagordet berättar om företaget?
**Paino oikeilla asioilla** – Forssan Kirjapaino Oy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slagordet är dåligt</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Slagordet är bra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet väcker inte ditt intresse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet väcker ditt intresse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag ogillar slagordet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jag gillar slagordet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är entydigt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är mångtydigt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är lätt att tolka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är svårt att tolka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet har en förutbestämd betydelse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är öppet för olika tolkningar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är olämpligt för företaget</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är lämpligt för företaget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet känns inte logiskt för detta företag</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet känns logiskt för detta företag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag känner mycket dåligt till företaget och dess verksamhet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jag känner mycket väl till företaget och dess verksamhet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag är säker på att jag inte hört det här slagordet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jag är säker på att jag hört det här slagordet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vad tänker du på när du ser slagordet?

Förklara vad du anser att slagordet berättar om företaget?

Lägger du i allmänhet märke till slagord?
APPENDIX 5  INQUIRY 2 – False combination

Detta datamaterial samlas till en magistersavhandling på Svenska handelshögskolan. Avhandlingen studerar konsumenters uppfattningar om slagord (slogans). Det tar ungefär 5-10 minuter att svara på undersökningen. Tack för ditt deltagande!

Man: □ 
Kvinna: □ 

Ålder: ____________

Modersmål: ____________

Enspråkig: □ 
Tvåspråkig (svenska-finska): □ 

Läroanstalt: ______________

Uttryck din uppfattning om följande slagord i förlagsbranschen. Ringa in det alternativ på den 7-gradiga skalan (1=negativ attityd, 4= neutral attityd, 7=positiv attityd) i som beskriver bäst din uppfattning om slagordet som föregår företagsnamnet (nedan: Kun elämä on parhaimmillaan).

Kun elämä on parhaimmillaan – Loimaan Kirjapaino Oy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slagordet är dåligt</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Slagordet är bra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet väcker inte ditt intresse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet väcker ditt intresse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag ogillar slagordet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jag gillar slagordet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är entydigt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är mångtydigt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är lätt att tolka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är svårt att tolka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet har en förutbestämd betydelse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är öppet för olika tolkningar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är olämpligt för företaget</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är lämpligt för företaget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet känns inte logiskt för detta företag</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet känns logiskt för detta företag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag känner mycket dåligt till företaget och dess verksamhet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jag känner mycket väl till företaget och dess verksamhet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag är säker på att jag inte hört det här slagordet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jag är säker på att jag hört det här slagordet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vad tänker du på när du ser slagordet?

Förklara vad du anser att slagordet berättar om företaget?
Painavaa palvelua – Sanoma Magazines Oy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slagordet är dåligt</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet väcker inte ditt intresse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag ogillar slagordet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är entydigt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är lätt att tolka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet har en förutbestämd betydelse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är olämpligt för företaget</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet känns inte logiskt för detta företag</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag känner mycket dåligt till företaget och dess verksamhet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag är säker på att jag inte hört det här slagordet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Slagordet är bra | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Slagordet väcker ditt intresse | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Jag gillar slagordet | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Slagordet är mångtydigt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Slagordet är svårt att tolka | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Slagordet är öppet för olika tolkningar | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Slagordet är lämpligt för företaget | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Slagordet känns logiskt för detta företag | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Jag känner mycket väl till företaget och dess verksamhet | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Jag är säker på att jag hört det här slagordet | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Vad tänker du på när du ser slagordet?

Förklara vad du anser att slagordet berättar om företaget?
### Tieto Elämään – Forssan Kirjapaino Oy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slagordet är dåligt</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Slagordet är bra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet väcker inte ditt intresse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet väcker ditt intresse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag ogillar slagordet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jag gillar slagordet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är entydigt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är mångtydigt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är lätt att tolka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är svårt att tolka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet har en förutbestämd betydelse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är öppet för olika tolkningar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är olämpligt för företaget</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är lämpligt för företaget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet känns inte logiskt för detta företag</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet känns logiskt för detta företag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag känner mycket dåligt till företaget och dess verksamhet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jag känner mycket väl till företaget och dess verksamhet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag är säker på att jag inte hört det här slagordet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jag är säker på att jag hört det här slagordet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vad tänker du på när du ser slagordet?

Förklara vad du anser att slagordet berättar om företaget?
Paino oikeilla asioilla – Alma Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slagordet är dåligt</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Slagordet är bra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet väcker inte ditt intresse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet väcker ditt intresse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag ogillar slagordet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jag gillar slagordet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är entydigt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är mångtydigt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är lätt att tolka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är svårt att tolka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet har en förutbestämd betydelse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är öppet för olika tolkningar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet är olämpligt för företaget</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet är lämpligt för företaget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slagordet känns inte logiskt för detta företag</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slagordet känns logiskt för detta företag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag känner mycket dåligt till företaget och dess verksamhet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jag känner mycket väl till företaget och dess verksamhet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag är säker på att jag inte hört det här slagordet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jag är säker på att jag hört det här slagordet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vad tänker du på när du ser slagordet?

Förklara vad du anser att slagordet berättar om företaget?

Lägger du i allmänhet märke till slagord?