

---

## **An Empirical Study on the Impact of Brand Loyalty in Remembering Slogans**

---

*Submitted 02/01/20, 1<sup>st</sup> revision 23/02/20, 2<sup>nd</sup> revision 28/03/20, accepted 15/05/20*

Paulo Duarte Silveira<sup>1</sup>, Susana Galvão<sup>2</sup>

**Abstract:**

**Purpose:** *This paper examines the influence of brand loyalty on the individuals' capacity to recall and recognize brand slogans.*

**Design/Methodology/Approach:** *Empirical quantitative research, gathering data via an online questionnaire among 370 costumers of three telecom B2C service providers in Portugal.*

**Findings:** *In general terms, the influence of brand loyalty on the ability of the customers to recall and recognize slogans was not verified.*

**Practical implications:** *For a brand interested in raising its slogan awareness, either by recall or recognition, the level of marketing efforts should not vary according to the customer loyalty degree.*

**Originality/Value:** *The study contributes to the analysis of an influence not yet explored in the previous studies dedicated to improving slogans' effectiveness.*

**Keywords:** *Slogans, brand loyalty, recall, recognition.*

**JEL codes:** *M31, M37.*

**Paper type:** *Research article.*

**Acknowledgements:** *The authors are grateful and acknowledge the cooperation of the respondents and the funding support of Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal. CEFAGE-UE has the support from Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (grant UID/ECO/04007/2013) and FEDER/COMPETE (POCI-01-0145-FEDER-007659).*

---

<sup>1</sup>*College of Business Administration-Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal, Setúbal, Portugal, and CEFAGE-UE, Évora, Portugal. ORCID 0000-0003-2703-3008.*

*E-mail: [paulo.silveira@esce.ips.pt](mailto:paulo.silveira@esce.ips.pt)*

<sup>2</sup>*College of Business Administration and CICE (Centro de Investigação em Ciências Empresariais)-Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal, Setúbal, Portugal.*

*E-mail: [susana.galvao@esce.ips.pt](mailto:susana.galvao@esce.ips.pt)*

## 1. Introduction

According to Qu *et al.* (2020), in today's over and cluttered communicated society, the information that is not sufficiently attention-grabbing will lose communication value. Knowing that slogans are short phrases that convey descriptive or persuasive information about brands (Keller, 2008), they can play an important role in communication actions. In other words, if managed effectively slogans have a direct and positive impact on brand perception (Cheema *et al.*, 2016), improving brand image, including brand recall, brand trust and brand recognition (Tsauro *et al.*, 2020).

By that, it is essential to ensure that slogans are designed to have the highest potential to be noticed. It is known that to be identified and to function subsequently, slogan information must activate the corresponding mental unit in the perceptual human system (Sternberg and Sternberg, 2016). However, there is an academic lacuna regarding the prerequisites of the slogan's effectiveness (Qu *et al.*, 2020). Previous studies on slogans' effectiveness have been mostly devoted to examining slogan characteristics that are more probable to improve the slogan remembrance. Séraphin *et al.* (2017) report that slogans that personalize the message and focus on a differentiated feature will allow better positioning. However, given that marketing is about establishing mutual positive relations with customers, it is possible to consider that external factors like brand loyalty might also impact slogan effectiveness. To bridge this research gap, this study's purpose is to analyze the influence of brand loyalty on the effectiveness of slogans, using empirical quantitative evidence.

## 2. Problem Setting

Oliver (1999) defines brand loyalty as a deeply held commitment to rebuy or repatronize a preferred product or service consistently in the future, thereby causing repetitive same brand purchasing, despite situational influences and marketing efforts, having the potential to cause switching behaviors. Brand loyalty is different from repeated purchasing behavior (Jacoby and Kyner, 1973), because in repeated purchasing only the behavior of rebuying is important, regardless of the consumer's degree of commitment towards the brand (Bloemer and Kasper, 1995). Therefore, brand loyalty encompasses behavioral and attitudinal dimensions (Chaudhuri and Hoibrook, 2001; Dick and Basu, 1994). The behavioral dimension of brand loyalty consists of repeated willingness to purchase the brand, while the attitudinal dimension consists of the level of dispositional commitment of some unique value associated with the brand (Chaudhuri and Hoibrook, 2001). Such a consumer's commitment to the brand might induce several marketing benefits, such as reduced marketing costs, more new customers, greater trade leverage, a favorable word-of-mouth, resistance among loyal consumers to competitive strategies (Dick and Basu, 1994).

In the context of customer engagement principles, customers are thought to make proactive contributions to brand interactions, rather than act as passive recipients of brand-related cues (Hollebeek, 2011). In fact, under the social exchange theory, customers are predicted to reciprocate positive thoughts, feelings and behaviors toward an object upon receiving specific benefits from the brand relationship (Hollebeek, 2011). This means that it might be expected that customer-focused constructs, like loyalty, might influence the brand marketing performance and components, where slogans fit into. The rationale behind is that a deeper commitment to the brand might raise the consumer's attention towards the brand communications and, consequently, lead to a higher probability of remembering the communications components. In that context, we propose that a higher level of brand loyalty towards a certain brand will increase the probability of customers remembering the slogan of that brand. Therefore, we expect that a higher brand loyalty evokes a higher recall and recognition of the slogan. By that, the following research hypothesis were established:

*H1: Behavioral/purchase brand loyalty is positively related to slogan recall.*

*H2: Attitudinal brand loyalty is positively related to slogan recall.*

*H3: Behavioral/purchase brand loyalty is positively related to slogan recognition.*

*H4: Attitudinal brand loyalty is positively related to slogan recognition.*

### **3. Research Methods**

An empirical quantitative study was conducted, gathering primary data via an online questionnaire, analyzing three brands of telecom service-providers (brands later identified as X, Y, and Z). This industry was chosen due to its competitive branding landscape, since it is dominated by the three brands studied and they all have used their slogans in the verbal and written advertising.

To obtain the responses, a two-stage sampling was used, combining the convenience technique and the snow-ball technique. In total, 370 real customers from the selected brands were considered. The variables measured with the questionnaire were:

- Slogan recall (spontaneous) for each brand - measured by the question "What is the actual slogan for brand X?". The answers were later coded in the categories, totally correct slogan, partially correct, incorrect and does not know. The correct slogan recognition rates were not high, which is coherent with Katz and Rose (1969) study - brand X correct recall was 20%, brand Y was 7% and brand Z was 20%.

- Slogan recognition (assisted) for each brand - four possible slogans were presented and the subjects had to choose only one. The possibilities included the brand actual slogan, an older slogan, the oldest slogan, and a competitor slogan. The slogans' recognition rates were much higher than the recall rates, for all brands: brand X correct recognition rate was 37%; brand Y was 67% and brand Z was 78%.

- Purchase dimension of brand loyalty - was measured with the two items used by Chaudhuri and Hoibrook (2001). "I will buy this brand the next time" (variable

named purchase loyalty A); “I intend to keep purchasing this brand” (variable named purchase loyalty B). The items were measured with the previously mentioned Likert scale. The coefficient alpha for brand X was .883, for brand Y was .913 and brand Z was .917.

- Attitude dimension of brand loyalty – measurement based on the items of Chaudhuri and Hoibrook (2001). “I am committed to this brand” (variable named attitude loyalty A); “I would be willing to pay a higher price for this brand” (variable named attitude loyalty B). Both items were measured with the Likert scale, and the coefficient alpha for brand X was .676, for brand Y was .779 and brand Z was .721.

#### 4. Findings

Table 1 provides descriptive statistics for the variables used to measure each dimension of brand loyalty, crosstabed with the slogan recall rates for each brand. Table 2 is similar but presents results for slogan recognition. We then developed a model using the logistic regression Forward:LR to evaluate the influence of the independent variables of loyalty on correctly recalling and recognizing the slogans.

For each brand, the model fits the observed data since, in the brand recalling models, the brand X model Hosmer and Lemeshow test which is  $X^2_{HL}(8)=3.921$ ,  $p=0.864$ , for brand Y is  $X^2_{HL}(7)=5.207$ ,  $p=0.635$  and for brand Z is  $X^2_{HL}(7)=0.340$ ;  $p=1$ . Considering the brand recognition models, these models also fit the observed data, given the Hosmer and Lemeshow test values: brand X model  $X^2_{HL}(8)=4.004$ ,  $p=0.857$ , brand Y model  $X^2_{HL}(7)=2.770$ ,  $p=0.905$ , and brand Z model  $X^2_{HL}(8)=4.430$ ,  $p=0.816$ . Given that the logistic regression Forward:LR models fits the observed data, the analysis of the relation of loyalty on slogan recall was made, having reported that no independent variable considered in the models has shown predictable power over the slogan recall in brand X ( $G^2(16)=13.386$ ;  $p=0.644$ ;  $R^2_{CS}=0.089$ ;  $R^2_N=0.0.122$ ). The same is noted for brand Y ( $G^2(16)=16.136$ ;  $p=0.444$ ;  $R^2_{CS}=0.189$ ;  $R^2_N=0.290$ ) and also for brand Z ( $G^2(16)=22.382$ ;  $p=0.131$ ;  $R^2_{CS}=0.280$ ;  $R^2_N=0.463$ ). These results are confirmed by  $X^2_{Wald}$  ‘s tests for brands X, Y and Z, shown in detail in Tables 3, 4 and 5. Therefore, neither purchase loyalty nor attitude loyalty presents significant statistical effects on the Logit of slogan recall probability.

**Table 1.** Descriptive measures of loyalty items by slogan recall

Item*	Brand X Slogan Recall		Brand Y Slogan Recall		Brand Z Slogan Recall	
	correct	not correct**	correct	not correct**	correct	not correct**
I will buy this brand the next time (purchase loyalty A)	$\bar{x}=2,87$ $s=1,55$	$\bar{x}=2,69$ $s=1,33$	$\bar{x}=2,50$ $s=1,37$	$\bar{x}=2,40$ $s=1,25$	$\bar{x}=3,68$ $s=1,29$	$\bar{x}=3,15$ $s=1,31$
I intend to keep purchasing this brand (purchase loyalty B)	$\bar{x}=3,52$ $s=1,53$	$\bar{x}=3,13$ $s=1,52$	$\bar{x}=2,58$ $s=1,46$	$\bar{x}=2,50$ $s=1,47$	$\bar{x}=4,02$ $s=1,13$	$\bar{x}=3,51$ $s=1,44$
I am committed to this	$\bar{x}=2,60$	$\bar{x}=2,49$	$\bar{x}=2,24$	$\bar{x}=2,08$	$\bar{x}=3,28$	$\bar{x}=3,03$

brand (attitude loyalty A)	s=1,48	s=1,52	s=1,48	s=1,38	s=1,46	s=1,50
I would be willing to	$\bar{x}$ =1,66	$\bar{x}$ =1,54	$\bar{x}$ =1,90	$\bar{x}$ =1,52	$\bar{x}$ =2,14	$\bar{x}$ =2,06
pay a higher price for	s=1,109	s=0,92	s=1,37	s=0,96	s=1,27	s=1,34
this brand (attitude						
loyalty B)						

Note: \* max=5; min=1 / \*\* not correct= incorrect + does not know

Source: Authors' calculations.

Table 2. Descriptive measures of loyalty items by slogan recognition

Item*	Brand X Slogan Recognition		Brand Y Slogan Recognition		Brand Z Slogan Recognition	
	correct	not correct**	correct	not correct**	correct	not correct**
I will buy this brand the next time	$\bar{x}$ =2,89 s=1,419	$\bar{x}$ =2,63 s=1,352	$\bar{x}$ =2,35 s=1,302	$\bar{x}$ =2,51 s=1,155	$\bar{x}$ =3,32 s=1,358	$\bar{x}$ =3,03 s=1,184
I intend to keep purchasing this brand	$\bar{x}$ =3,43 s=1,523	$\bar{x}$ =3,08 s=1,524	$\bar{x}$ =2,50 s=1,520	$\bar{x}$ =2,51 s=1,375	$\bar{x}$ =3,73 s=1,362	$\bar{x}$ =3,20 s=1,432
I am committed to this brand	$\bar{x}$ =2,60 s=1,527	$\bar{x}$ =2,45 s=1,511	$\bar{x}$ =2,14 s=1,478	$\bar{x}$ =2,00 s=1,203	$\bar{x}$ =3,16 s=1,496	$\bar{x}$ =2,78 s=1,439
I would be willing to pay a higher price for this brand	$\bar{x}$ =1,56 s=1,022	$\bar{x}$ =1,57 s=,931	$\bar{x}$ =1,53 s=1,013	$\bar{x}$ =1,60 s=,990	$\bar{x}$ =2,10 s=1,327	$\bar{x}$ =2,00 s=1,340

Note: \* max=5; min=1 / \*\* not correct= incorrect + does not know

Source: Authors' calculations.

Table 3. Variables in the binary logistic equation for brand X slogan recall

Variable	B	S.E.	$X^2_{Wald}$	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
puchaseloyalty A			4,242	4	,374	
puchaseloyalty A(1)	-1,783	,969	3,385	1	,066	,168
puchaseloyalty A(2)	-1,282	,740	3,004	1	,083	,277
puchaseloyalty A(3)	-1,152	,830	1,928	1	,165	,316
puchaseloyalty A(4)	-,886	,890	,990	1	,320	,412
puchaseloyalty B			2,657	4	,617	
puchaseloyalty B(1)	1,228	1,036	1,406	1	,236	3,416
puchaseloyalty B(2)	,766	,801	,915	1	,339	2,152
puchaseloyalty B(3)	,785	,884	,789	1	,374	2,192
puchaseloyalty B(4)	1,269	,918	1,912	1	,167	3,557
attitudeloyalty A			5,000	4	,287	
attitudeloyalty A(1)	,671	,782	,736	1	,391	1,957
attitudeloyalty A(2)	,524	,678	,598	1	,439	1,689
attitudeloyalty A(3)	-,766	,703	1,189	1	,276	,465
attitudeloyalty A(4)	-,294	,824	,127	1	,721	,745
attitudeloyalty B			2,729	4	,604	
attitudeloyalty B(1)	,338	,559	,366	1	,545	1,402
attitudeloyalty B(2)	-,612	,648	,891	1	,345	,542
attitudeloyalty B(3)	,960	1,157	,689	1	,407	2,611
attitudeloyalty B(4)	,233	,961	,059	1	,809	1,262
Constant	-,405	,411	,974	1	,324	,667

Note: \* rejection of the null hypothesis for p=.05

Source: Authors' calculations.

**Table 4.** Variables in the binary logistic equation for brand Y slogan recall

Variable	B	S.E.	X <sup>2</sup> <sub>Wald</sub>	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
puchaseloyalty A			4,372	4	,358	
puchaseloyalty A(1)	1,608	1,622	,984	1	,321	4,995
puchaseloyalty A(2)	-,442	1,288	,118	1	,731	,643
puchaseloyalty A(3)	-3,740	2,348	2,536	1	,111	,024
puchaseloyalty A(4)	17,855	12071,627	,000	1	,999	56804494,180
puchaseloyalty B			5,347	4	,253	
puchaseloyalty B(1)	-2,805	2,280	1,513	1	,219	,060
puchaseloyalty B(2)	-1,055	1,382	,582	1	,445	,348
puchaseloyalty B(3)	3,080	2,397	1,651	1	,199	21,756
puchaseloyalty B(4)	-19,571	12071,626	,000	1	,999	,000
attitudeloyalty A			3,010	4	,556	
attitudeloyalty A(1)	,729	2,208	,109	1	,741	2,072
attitudeloyalty A(2)	2,167	1,535	1,994	1	,158	8,734
attitudeloyalty A(3)	-,326	1,927	,029	1	,866	,722
attitudeloyalty A(4)	,766	2,008	,145	1	,703	2,151
attitudeloyalty B			3,470	4	,482	
attitudeloyalty B(1)	-19,933	15985,213	,000	1	,999	,000
attitudeloyalty B(2)	-1,228	1,239	,981	1	,322	,293
attitudeloyalty B(3)	2,397	1,859	1,661	1	,197	10,985
attitudeloyalty B(4)	-38,811	19014,740	,000	1	,998	,000
Constant	-,988	,480	4,237	1	,040*	,372

**Note:** \* rejection of the null hypothesis for p=.05

**Source:** Authors' calculations.

**Table 5.** Variables in the binary logistic equation for brand Z slogan recall

Variable	B	S.E.	X <sup>2</sup> <sub>Wald</sub>	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
puchaseloyalty A			,839	4	,933	
puchaseloyalty A(1)	17,950	49807,370	,000	1	1,000	62435888,953
puchaseloyalty A(2)	19,451	16735,635	,000	1	,999	280081490,367
puchaseloyalty A(3)	20,837	16735,635	,000	1	,999	1120383935,781
puchaseloyalty A(4)	2,328	19456,646	,000	1	1,000	10,253
puchaseloyalty B			,145	4	,997	
puchaseloyalty B(1)	21,203	40192,970	,000	1	1,000	1615474864,509
puchaseloyalty B(2)	1,341	21866,129	,000	1	1,000	3,824
puchaseloyalty B(3)	,718	21866,129	,000	1	1,000	2,051
puchaseloyalty B(4)	38,605	21866,128	,000	1	,999	58318330358766672
attitudeloyalty A			,106	4	,999	
attitudeloyalty A(1)	-,263	28598,187	,000	1	1,000	,768
attitudeloyalty A(2)	-19,154	14072,883	,000	1	,999	,000
attitudeloyalty A(3)	-18,834	14072,883	,000	1	,999	,000
attitudeloyalty A(4)	-18,668	14072,883	,000	1	,999	,000
attitudeloyalty B			1,530	4	,821	
attitudeloyalty B(1)	-1,670	1,595	1,096	1	,295	,188
attitudeloyalty B(2)	-,212	1,476	,021	1	,886	,809
attitudeloyalty B(3)	-22,181	9923,686	,000	1	,998	,000
attitudeloyalty B(4)	-21,078	9923,686	,000	1	,998	,000
Constant	,000	1,000	,000	1	1,000	1,000

**Note:** \* rejection of the null hypothesis for p=.05

**Source:** Authors' calculations.

To triangulate the previous results, we compared the groups of individuals who correctly recalled the slogans with the individuals who did not correctly recall the slogans. This procedure was used for each independent variable, separately for each brand, analyzing if there would be rejections of the null hypothesis of the median test, meaning that slogan recall would be significantly higher in the group that correctly recognized it. The respective results are coherent with our previous findings, confirming that in none of the independent variables (i.e., loyalty) the slogan recall was significantly higher in the group that correctly recalled the slogan. So, taking in consideration the previous results, H1 and H2 were rejected.

**Table 6.** *U and Median tests of slogan recall*

Item	Brand X Slogan Recall		Brand Y Slogan Recall		Brand Z Slogan Recall	
	Sig. <i>U</i> *	Sig. Median Test	Sig. <i>U</i> *	Sig. Median Test	Sig. <i>U</i> *	Sig. Median Test
I will buy this brand the next time	,343	,799	,163	,694	,101	,590
I intend to keep purchasing this brand	,348	,509	,251	,838	,071	,223
I am committed to this brand	,265	,173	,328	,950	,481	,835
I would be willing to pay a higher price for this brand	,456	,889	,257	,939	,082	,551

**Note:** \* exact sig. 1-tailed applying Mann-Whitney test | \*\* rejection of the hypothesis for  $p=.05$ .

**Source:** Authors' calculations.

Analyzing the slogan recognition instead of slogan recall, the results do not show predictable power of the independent variables for brand X ( $G^2(16)=17.526$ ;  $p=0.352$ ;  $R^2_{CS}=0.066$ ;  $R^2_N=0.090$ ). The same is noted for brand Y ( $G^2(16)=11.857$ ;  $p=0.754$ ;  $R^2_{CS}=0.061$ ;  $R^2_N=0.084$ ) and for brand Z ( $G^2(16)=20.075$ ;  $p=0.217$ ;  $R^2_{CS}=0.077$ ;  $R^2_N=0.122$ ). Consequently, in a global manner, no significant relation emerged between loyalty and slogan recognition. The results are also confirmed by  $X^2_{Wald}$  's tests for brands X, Y and Z, presented in Tables 7, 8 and 9. Therefore, the purchase loyalty and attitude loyalty are not significantly associated to correctly recognizing the slogans.

**Table 7.** *Variables in the binary logistic equation for brand X slogan recognition*

Variable	B	S.E.	$X^2_{Wald}$	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
puchaseloyalty A			,115	4	,998	
puchaseloyalty A(1)	,097	,586	,028	1	,868	1,102
puchaseloyalty A(2)	-,070	,504	,019	1	,890	,933
puchaseloyalty A(3)	-,102	,594	,030	1	,863	,903
puchaseloyalty A(4)	-,014	,668	,000	1	,984	,987
puchaseloyalty B			4,517	4	,341	
puchaseloyalty B(1)	-,211	,698	,092	1	,762	,810

puchaseloyalty B(2)	,360	,558	,417	1	,519	1,433
puchaseloyalty B(3)	,677	,602	1,267	1	,260	1,969
puchaseloyalty B(4)	1,290	,670	3,713	1	,054	3,633
attitudeloyalty A			3,574	4	,467	
attitudeloyalty A(1)	,782	,550	2,020	1	,155	2,186
attitudeloyalty A(2)	-,362	,499	,526	1	,468	,696
attitudeloyalty A(3)	-,079	,497	,025	1	,873	,924
attitudeloyalty A(4)	,073	,609	,014	1	,905	1,076
attitudeloyalty B			4,255	4	,373	
attitudeloyalty B(1)	-,277	,445	,388	1	,533	,758
attitudeloyalty B(2)	-,919	,486	3,571	1	,059	,399
attitudeloyalty B(3)	-,497	,742	,448	1	,503	,608
attitudeloyalty B(4)	,314	,945	,110	1	,740	1,368
Constant	-,830	,280	8,783	1	,003*	,436

*Note:* \* rejection of the null hypothesis for  $p=.05$

*Source:* Authors' calculations.

**Table 8.** Variables in the binary logistic equation for brand Y slogan recognition

Variable	B	S.E.	$X^2_{wald}$	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
puchaseloyalty A			2,595	4	,628	
puchaseloyalty A(1)	-,720	,705	1,044	1	,307	,487
puchaseloyalty A(2)	-,397	,605	,432	1	,511	,672
puchaseloyalty A(3)	,310	,796	,152	1	,697	1,364
puchaseloyalty A(4)	,271	1,319	,042	1	,837	1,311
puchaseloyalty B			2,521	4	,641	
puchaseloyalty B(1)	,438	,819	,286	1	,593	1,550
puchaseloyalty B(2)	,037	,717	,003	1	,959	1,038
puchaseloyalty B(3)	,284	,947	,090	1	,764	1,329
puchaseloyalty B(4)	-1,232	1,135	1,178	1	,278	,292
attitudeloyalty A			4,600	4	,331	
attitudeloyalty A(1)	-,051	,804	,004	1	,949	,950
attitudeloyalty A(2)	-,341	,665	,262	1	,609	,711
attitudeloyalty A(3)	-,795	,978	,660	1	,416	,452
attitudeloyalty A(4)	2,082	1,412	2,176	1	,140	8,022
attitudeloyalty B			,744	4	,946	
attitudeloyalty B(1)	-,561	,679	,685	1	,408	,570
attitudeloyalty B(2)	-,154	,566	,075	1	,785	,857
attitudeloyalty B(3)	-,425	,956	,198	1	,657	,654
attitudeloyalty B(4)	-,554	1,484	,139	1	,709	,574
Constant	,943	,268	12,421	1	,000*	2,567

*Note:* \* rejection of the null hypothesis for  $p=.05$

*Source:* Authors' calculations.

**Table 9.** Variables in the binary logistic equation for brand Z slogan recognition

Variable	B	S.E.	$X^2_{wald}$	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
puchaseloyalty A			2,630	4	,621	
puchaseloyalty A(1)	-,927	1,114	,693	1	,405	,396
puchaseloyalty A(2)	-1,235	,820	2,269	1	,132	,291
puchaseloyalty A(3)	-,885	,995	,792	1	,373	,413
puchaseloyalty A(4)	-,925	1,075	,741	1	,389	,396

puchaseloalty B			2,515	4	,642	
puchaseloalty B(1)	1,500	1,405	1,139	1	,286	4,482
puchaseloalty B(2)	1,095	,881	1,544	1	,214	2,989
puchaseloalty B(3)	1,332	,963	1,914	1	,167	3,790
puchaseloalty B(4)	1,484	1,038	2,042	1	,153	4,409
attitudeloalty A			4,423	4	,352	
attitudeloalty A(1)	1,196	1,176	1,035	1	,309	3,307
attitudeloalty A(2)	-,495	,621	,634	1	,426	,610
attitudeloalty A(3)	,099	,679	,021	1	,884	1,104
attitudeloalty A(4)	,752	,814	,852	1	,356	2,121
attitudeloalty B			3,883	4	,422	
attitudeloalty B(1)	,713	,710	1,010	1	,315	2,041
attitudeloalty B(2)	,544	,506	1,154	1	,283	1,723
attitudeloalty B(3)	-,683	,690	,980	1	,322	,505
attitudeloalty B(4)	,139	,957	,021	1	,884	1,149
Constant	1,054	,410	6,614	1	,010*	2,869

**Note:** \* rejection of the null hypothesis for  $p=.05$

**Source:** Authors' calculations.

Comparing the groups of respondents who correctly recognized the slogans with the individuals that did not correctly recognize the slogans, some statistically significant differences between those groups were found. In fact, in Table 10 the rejection of the null hypothesis of the median test means that recognition was significantly higher in the group that correctly recognized the slogan. However, those differences were not consistent in all the brands, which poses limitations to a generalization of results. Given all the previous results, both H3 and H4 were rejected.

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

Item	Brand X Slogan Recognition		Brand Y Slogan Recognition		Brand Z Slogan Recognition	
	Sig. <i>U</i> *	Sig. Median Test	Sig. <i>U</i> *	Sig. Median Test	Sig. <i>U</i> *	Sig. Median Test
I will buy this brand the next time	,062	,228	,278	,419	,035**	,023**
I intend to keep purchasing this brand	,024**	,061	,361	,775	,003**	,023**
I am committed to this brand	,183	,857	,264	,743	,033**	,103
I would be willing to pay a higher price for this brand	,370	,842	,381	,433	,239	,338

**Note:** \* exact sig. 1-tailed applying Mann-Whitney test / \*\* rejection of the hypothesis for  $p=.05$

**Source:** Authors' calculations.

### 5. Conclusions

The main contribution of this research was the use of quantitative analysis to understand if there might be a positive impact of brand loyalty in recalling and

recognizing slogans, in order to have empirical evidence to help companies in managing their brand slogans communicating efforts.

The overall conclusion is that such relation was not found. More particularly, behavioral and attitudinal brand loyalty were not positively related to slogan recognition nor to slogan recall, on the contrary to what was hypothesized. These results have practical managerial implications. If slogans contribute to enhance the brand image, marketers might aim to improve the slogan awareness. But, to do so, the results point to the way that it is not advisable to distinguish the degree of marketing efforts between the level or type of customer loyalty. In other words, a customer with a higher level of purchase loyalty should be targeted with not less (neither higher) marketing communications efforts than a customer with a lower level of purchase loyalty. The same applies to attitude loyalty.

Like other studies conducted with samples, this research has limitations, due to the specific characteristics of the individuals considered, as well as the moment of the questionnaire administration. Consequently, different samples should be analyzed, to confirm the results found, namely the non-verified influence of brand loyalty on recalling and recognizing slogans. Studying different brands, business sectors, and regions will contribute to this debate.

## References:

- Bloemer, J.M., Kasper, H.D. 1995. The complex relationship between consumer satisfaction and brand loyalty. *Journal of economic psychology*, 16(2), 311-329.
- Chaudhuri, A., Holbrook, M.B. 2001. The chain of effects from brand trust and brand affect to brand performance: the role of brand loyalty. *Journal of Marketing*, 65(2), 81-93.
- Cheema, F.E.A., Rehman, S., Rehman, M.U. 2016. Do taglines have a positive impact on building the brand perception? A case study on kit kat. *IBT Journal of Business Studies*, 12(1), 52-64.
- Dick, A.S., Basu, K. 1994. Customer loyalty: toward an integrated conceptual framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22(2), 99-113.
- Hollebeek, L. 2011. Exploring customer brand engagement: definition and themes. *Journal of strategic Marketing*, 19(7), 555-573.
- Jacoby, J., Kyner, D.B. 1973. Brand loyalty vs. repeat purchasing behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 1-9.
- Keller, K. 2008. *Strategic Brand Management*, 3rd ed. New Jersey, Prentice Hall.
- Oliver, R.L. 1999. Whence consumer loyalty? *Journal of Marketing*, 63, 33-44.
- Qu, Y., Cao, L., Xu, F. 2020. Design of an attention-grabbing destination slogan using the attenuation model. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2020.100415>.
- Sternberg, R.J., Sternberg, K. 2016. *Cognitive psychology*. Nelson Education.
- Tsaur, S.H., Liao, Y.L., Tsai, C.F. 2020. Analyzing the important implications of tourism marketing slogans and logos in Asia Pacific nations. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 25(4), 355-368.