Abstract

Objective: Determining how and in what way the brand communicates in retail outlets and how the different parameters affect the product’s communication and perception is a key part of business strategy. Identifying how the brand name is perceived is a fundamental phase of an SME’s marketing strategy for products in new markets.

Methodology: This paper describes a theoretical analysis model of the components of a brand that influence its communication and affect the consumers’ perception at sales outlets.

Results: The model was able to clarify the relevant external factors, especially those associated with environmental and cultural factors. A cross-sectional examination was able to indicate the visual, acoustic and marketing components of the brand that should be analysed to clarify its communicational strengths in new cultural environments.

Limitations: The brand analysis model is implemented by means of a specially designed survey and allows the graphic aspects to be selected, besides pointing out the graphic and phonetic aspects of the brand’s weaknesses and strengths in new markets.

Practical implications: This study is expected to be useful to both graphic designers and marketing departments in that it provides a shared reference point for both these specialist areas to assist in precision tuning of the brand’s graphic, phonetic and marketing variables by means of shared points of analysis.
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文章摘要

研究目的：能够确定品牌如何及以什么途径在其陈列架上传达其品牌信息，分辨出不同参数如何影响其品牌信息的传达及顾客对其产品的感知，对各企业来说是个关键。能够指出顾客如何感知品牌，是中小企在新市场当中，策划市场营销及销售策略中一个基本阶段。

分析方法：我们在本研究中设计了一个理论性的分析模型，来分析一些会影响品牌信息传达及影响消费者在销售点对品牌的感知的品牌组成部分。

研究结论：结果指出该模型能辨别出哪些是相关的外在因素，尤其是跟环境因素及文化环境有关的因素。横测试让我们能说明那些组成部分用来分析品牌视觉、品牌听觉，以及一些应进行分析的市场营销组成部分，展示在新文化环境下品牌传播的基石。

研究限制：本品牌分析模型应该通过使用设计问卷，并提供图像调节来套用，同时用来决定品牌形象或语音在目的地国家的优势与弱势。

实际应用：本研究能为图像设计师及企业的市场营销部提供一个包含两方面专家观点的参考，并能提供有关调节品牌的图像、语音及市场营销的准确分析。

关键词：品牌、市场、文化、知觉图、购买意图。
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1. Introduction

The strong competition in today’s global economy, in which an ever higher number of products are processed or manufactured in other countries, has made many SMEs, traditionally focused on producing and distributing goods for local or national markets, consider the possibility of extending their products to international markets in order to become more competitive.1

Analyzed reports suggest that many companies have made occasional sales in other markets, in many cases with wholesalers, without considering the brand name as a strategic factor that consolidates the company’s and the product’s brand image, as well as the its intangible value. However, converting a nationally known brand name into an international one is not without its risks if perceptive aspects and other relevant variables that can influence sales such as variations in the cultural environment or language are not previously analysed.

Authors such as Aaker & Joachimsthaler (2012) claim that “the classic system of brand management is usually limited to a relevant market within the country itself”. However, this model is not able to deal with the complexities involved in the consumption of the product, which in many cases must focus on a global perspective and multiple products and markets.

In a brand-focused product management model, communication must be both internal and external and the strategic drivers are no longer sales and production quotas, but the identity of the brand itself. Many companies have never considered this model even when their objectives are to internationalise their products.

In the production context many companies hire designers to develop a packaging that communicates the corporative identity and brand image, and in general most designers base their work on their previous experience and intuition (Orth & Malkewitz, 2008). However, this may not be enough when the designs have to communicate in linguistically and culturally different countries, since a great number of parameters must be taken into account when developing a communicatively efficient brand for marketing in different cultures.

Some international companies have recently evolved from an operative brand identity model to a relational brand identity model (Gobé, 2005), i.e. from a manufacture-based model to a brand-based client-relations model. This model change clearly involves the effect of human economic dynamics based on the relational model, which promotes communications and makes contact with stakeholders easier, favouring a much more fluid and human internal-external dialogue. To this must be added the factors of consumer mobility, greater access to macro-regional and global communication media, plus the increasingly globalised international distributors (Cerviño, 2002).

SMEs have mostly designed their brands for local markets, in many cases excluding future expansion to international markets, and these designs are not usually

---

(1) Data inferred from different ICEX reports, including the CECO Manual de Internacionalización and the Informa D&B’s 2017 Exports Report.
based on a rigorous study to determine the linguistic, cultural, religious or educational aspects to be considered. This means that there may be a number of uncertainties that should be taken into account.

Different authors have analysed and defined relevant internal and external factors for the creation of international brands and new markets, such as the possibility of reducing costs, the concentration level of the business activity, the management's organisational structure, business strategy, the economic, legal and social environments, the market structure or environmental factors (de Chernatony, Alliburton & Bernath, 1995; McCarthy & Perreault, 2002; Lashban, Hayes, Zinkhan & Balazs, 2002; Kuvykaite & Mascinskiene, 2010). However, they do not study in depth how these external factors associated with existing brands can be developed for their acceptance in international markets.

Some studies analyse the linguistic aspects or the degree of standardisation of international brands (Chan y Huang, 1997; Czinkotay Ronkainen, 2007; Jain, 1989), while others analyse the characteristics for the design of a brand or its formal perception by consumers (Dondis, 1992; Henderson & Cote, 1998; Kohliy Suri, 2002; Adir & Pascu, 2012; Machado, Vacas de Carvalho & Patricio, 2015), or more specifically, the special contribution of colour (Caivano, 1998; Biggam, 2012), corporate branding (Chan & Lin, 2010) or the brand itself (Conejo & Wooliscroft, 2015). Other studies focus on the country of origin or the brand origin (Plumer, 1985; Mrugank & Chiranjeev, 1996; Aaker, 2011).

However, few studies deal with the communicative and symbolic characteristics and the different dimensions of the brand when it is to be introduced into new markets, or in other words, the variables that could be found in the brand perception and the reactions it could produce from culturally or linguistically different consumers.

In this context the aim of this work was to justify the importance of analysing the different components contained in the national brand related to the name and the graphic and typographical form of the logotype and its marketing. A model is proposed that can be used by SMEs to analyse their brands, taking these components into account and enabling them to decide whether it is suitable for use in international markets.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. Background

Products compete in the market place and the brand is their graphic, written and phonetic representation that introduces them and sometimes also the company itself. Priority should therefore be given to a previous analysis of a national brand that is going to compete in new markets.

We know that decisions to buy are based on the symbolic and perceptive messages that a brand transmits to the consumer. This means that their different external
factors should be considered (de Chernatony et al., 1995; Kuvykaite et al., 2010), especially those related to environmental factors, such as religion, language, education, economics and technology (Alashban et al., 2002).

Table 1. Internal and external business factors as analysed in different studies

| Internal Company Factors | Authors | External Factors | Authors |
|--------------------------|---------|-----------------|---------|
| Demand Factors:          | De Chernatony et al. (1995) | Economic Environment | Jain (1989) |
| – How to reduce costs    |         |                 | Alashban et al. (2002) |
| – Degree of concentration of company activities |         |                 | Kuvykaite et al. (2010) |
| – Product Category       | Alashban et al. (2002) | Contextual: religion, language, education and technology | Alashban et al. (2002) |
| – Company Strategy       | Kuvykaite et al. (2010) |                 |         |
| – Management Organisational Structure |         | Market structure |         |
| – Budget for brand design | De Chernatony et al. (1995) | Cultural context (social context) | Alashban et al. (2002) |
|                          | Alashban et al. (2002) |                 |         |
|                          | Kuvykaite et al. (2010) | Legal context |         |

The external factors are vitally important since they can vary considerably from country to country and may influence the efficient communication of the brand message to the target market.

Three aspects of these factors are of special importance in our study: language, education, religion, which also includes culture as regards customs, traditions and symbols.

Language is important when introducing a brand to new markets. Cerviño (2002) specifies three requisites of the brand name that should be evaluated: its phonetics, morphology and semantics. Alashban (2002) maintains that names that are difficult to pronounce are difficult to remember. A name should be harmonious and sound pleasant to the ear (Chan y Huang, 1997). And if a customer finds it difficult to pronounce a name he will probably go for a rival product (Alashban et al., 2002).

Another aspect is related to the meaning or translation; Czinkota & Ronkainen (2007) suggest paying attention to the translation, transliteration, clarity and transculturality of the name when evaluating its suitability. Since a direct translation is relatively easy, the biggest problems arise when the name is translated into languages that use ideographic characters. From the semantic perspective, the meaning should be positive and not offensive, obscene or negative in the target market (Cerviño, 2002).

Education is another relevant factor, since customers who are unable to read may have difficulty in recognizing a brand and its conception, and this may influence...
their attitude to the product (Kuvykaite et al., 2010), which suggests the advisability of standardizing the brand in economically similar markets (Jain, 1989). The economic aspect influences the attitude to the brand, since larger variations have been observed when goods are sold in underdeveloped countries (Alashban et al., 2002), while the English found a higher degree of standardization in their exports to developed countries (Michael, 1979).

Ignoring the religious aspect, including social phenomena such as taboos, when creating a brand may lead to many errors in its design and conceptualization (Kuvykaite et al., 2010). Adverse reactions to a product may be caused if the consumers associate a name with some sort of taboo (Grande, 2004).

As we have seen, previous studies that deal with the analysis previous to creating a brand consider many different factors but pay no attention to the many successful existing brands that can be found in the supermarkets in the countries in which they are made.

The study includes concepts directly related to the brand, such as its identity, origin and semiotic aspect, since after analysing the marketing aspects we will deal with the study of the brand as a sign to help in constructing an analysis model that helps the understanding and communication of a brand in new commercial environments.

2.2. The brand and brand identity

The Diccionario Profesional de Marketing defines a brand as: ”Names, drawings, impressions, prints, figures, letters, shapes of products and packaging and any other signs that serve to identify the products (goods or services) of an organisation”.

In this paper we focus on the brand name and on its graphic and typographical expression.

From the communications point of view and that of the relationship between brands and consumers, “...the brand is a set of perceptions in the mind of the consumer and the rest of the stakeholders. Appropriately managed, this set of perceptions generates solid profits in the long term and creates permanent value” (Belío, 2007). Brands are intangible assets for companies (Aaker, 2011; Rao, Agarwal & Dahlhoff, 2004; Morgan & Rego, 2009); they add consumption value by providing meaning (McCracken, 1993) and can generate significant and profound relationships with consumers (Park, Jaworski & MacInnis, 1986; Fournier, 1998; Thomson, MacInnis & Park, 2005; Schau, Muñiz & Arnould, 2009).

Knapp (2001) emphasises the fact that for a brand to be correct and efficient for consumers its visual aspect must be easily converted to a symbol (font, colour and style). Both the brand name and its graphic version are important ways of transmitting the brand identity (Aaker, 2011; Henderson & Cote, 1998; Shimp, 2003; Czellar, 2007). And the logotype design has a large impact on the consumers’ perception, together with the font type and colours that make it up (Foroudi, 2019).

---

(2) Belío refers to the definition given in Building Brands Ltd, 2003: Managing Your Total Brand.
Brand names have been widely studied in the literature (Gardner & Levy 1955; McCarthy & Perreault, 1960; Miller et al., 1971; Collins, 1977; Alba & Hutchinson, 1987; Keller, 1993; Kohli & LaBahn, 1997; Klink 2000; Klink 2001). Other studies concentrate on the effect of colours on brands (Bottomley & Doyle, 2006; Chang & Lin, 2010), or how colour is perceived emotionally and culturally (Heller, 2004).

Many studies help to determine the method of creating effective logotypes or brands from the formal-perceptive perspective (Colman, Wober & Norris, 1995; Henderson & Cote, 1998; Kohli & Suri, 2012; Adîr et al., 2012). Some recent studies analyse the consumers’ effective response to the brand, and expand the scope of the design to other associations, such as its typography and personality (Grohmann, Giese & Parkman, 2013), constructing strong brands as a competitive factor (Wheeler, 2003) or its perception in the holistic communication of the packaging (Orth & Malkewitz, 2008).

Some studies analyse how to generate a positive consumer response to the brand through the logotype from the design and perceptive point of view (Henderson & Cote, 1998; Henderson et al., 2003; Henderson et al., 2004; Klink 2003; Pieters & Wedel, 2004).

Upshaw (1995) considers brand identity to be a synthesis of text, image and the customer’s intention and perception. Schmitt (1997) identifies various factors, including the visual, which involves colour, type, line and form, and states that it provides a visible value and creates a competitive advantage.

Aaker (2011) considers brand identity to be composed of 12 dimensions that are organised around four perspectives: the product itself (its scope, attributes, uses, quality/value, users and country of origin), organization (attributes and local versus global), person (brand personality and customer relations) and symbol. The latter perspective is of great importance since it includes fundamental brand signals such as its graphic construction that are the visual/metaphoric imagery that include its design and heritage, among others. The country of origin is another dimension, since it can be directly expressed in the logotype or anagram.

As a whole, the brand and its identity can be considered as a set of components that have a major global meaning that is managed by marketing attributes or dimensions and graphic and phonetic characteristics. However, few studies join the diverse components together to analyse the brand from the perspective of its acceptance or analysis for introduction into new markets. This paper thus deals separately with each of the relevant components that can be used to build up an analysis model.

2.3. Brand Origin

Mrugank & Chiranjeev (1996) define the brand origin as the place, region or country in which the brand is perceived by the consumers. Plumer (1985) identifies the brand origin with the brand’s personality. Aaker (2011) conceptualises the brand origin as the expanded symbolic dimension to its range of action, since it is within
his vision of the product as a person (brand personality). McCracken (1993) further refines this concept and states that a brand may possess various cultural meanings and orders them into: ethnic, national, social or gender origins. For Mrugank & Chiranjeev (1996) the brand origin can be communicated in a number of ways such as textual advertisements, symbols or by means of the brand itself. Papadopoulos (1993) defines it as product-city images. However, all these authors agree that the brand origin, however it is visualised, can transmit different meanings to consumers through its associated attributes.

It should also be remembered that the brand origin can vary according to where the product is manufactured, and this should be taken into account, since an unfavoured origin may provoke rejection in the consumers of other countries (Mrugank & Chiranjeev, 1996).

2.4. Country of Origin

As a general definition country of origin is associated with “Made in …”, and all the mentioned authors, as well as the extensive literature on the subject, define it as a brand’s associations with the country of origin as reflected in the consumers’ perception of the quality of its products. However, there are certain slight differences of opinion, since Aaker (2011) associates it with the legacy and tradition of countries for a certain class of product, while Mrugank & Chiranjeev (1996) associate it with the products of industrialised countries as opposed to those of developing countries.

D’Astous & Ahmed (1992) give an equal or similar weight to other signals such as brand or price. The local versus global dimension has a direct incidence on environmental factors: e.g. religion, language, education, economy and technology (Alashban et al., 2002).

As regards the brand, the perception of country of origin can influence the decision to purchase, since it can affect the perceived positioning (Adina, Gabriela & Roxana-Denisa, 2015). It can also have a positive or negative bias, since moral and social norms can affect the perception of products based on ethnocentric patterns (Balabanis & Diamantopoulos, 2004). Political, economic or military events can give a positive or negative perception to products (Klein, Ettenson & Morris, 1998).

A brand’s country of origin may be associated with the self-expression criterion by consumers insofar as certain brands may be able to generate feelings of pride, lifestyle or social status (Adina et al., 2015). Emotional connotations can be generated by consumers by through different means such as the media, stereotypes, word of mouth, education and art, besides direct or indirect experiences such as meeting foreigners or travels abroad (Verlegh & Steenkamp, 1999).

The country of origin may affect the perception of the brand (Foroudia et al., 2018) if the latter contains clear connotations of the producing country in its logo or if the consumer has come to know it in his travels or by other means.
2.5. The Brand as Sign

From the semiotic perspective, the brand is a sign. In fact, the word ‘semiotic’ is from the Greek ‘semeion’, which means sign or mark (Beasley, Danesi & Perron, 2000).

For Saussure (1945), all linguistic signs are composed of an arbitrary or analogical relationship between the perceptible material, which he calls the signifier, and the capacity for intelligible representation, which he calls the meaning.

For Sanders Pierce (2012), from the perspective of the theory of codes or theory of meaning, a sign stands for something for the idea that it produces or modifies. For him, a sign is a mental idea that evokes objects in order to understand reality or communicate something (Niño, 2013). In his model he indicates that the elements that make up the sign are: the object, which is what the sign stands for; the representamen, which transports the sign; and the interpretant, which is the mental relationship, the mental idea, which we establish between the meaning and its object (Vázquez, 2009). The relationship between the three components are fundamental to Morris’s semiotic method (1985) and identify the three principal branches of semiotics: semantics (sign-object), syntactics (sign-sign) and pragmatics (sign-interpretant).

2.5.1. Semiotics of the brand

Aaker & Joachimsthaler (2012) suggest that the brand is a mental concept (mental box), i.e. it does not correspond to a real object, while they give us an approximation to the term, as follows: “A set of assets tied to the name and the symbol of the brand that is added to (or subtracted from) the value provided by the product or service”. For Keller (2003) a brand is a sign that resides in the consumers’ minds. Since, from the semiotic vision the logos (or brands) are part of the system of signs that a company uses to communicate internally and externally with its audiences (Zakia & Nadin, 1987).

Many studies deal with the brand as a sign (Levy, 1959; Mick, 1986; Semprini, 1995; Beasley et al., 2000; Floch, 2001; Batey, 2008; Costa, 2009; Oswald, 2012; Danesi, 2013). Some semantically analyse the effects of the meaning of words in remembering the brand and product preference (Keller, Heckler & Houston, 1998; Lowrey, Shrum & Dubitsky, 2003; Lowrey et al., 2007).

Syntactic analysis, or the sign-sign relationship, concentrates on interpreting the structural and textual meaning of the brand applied to advertising on packages, (e.g. Hoshino, 1987; Klapisch, 1995; Mick et al., 2004, Pieters & Michel, 2004). Finally, the relationship of the sign with the consumer is an important brand interaction, since the sign-interpretant (pragmatic) relationship gives rise to a wealth of meanings.

---

(3) Maximum exponent of semiology, European term for the study of signs. The Swiss linguist conceptualised the fundamentals of this science, especially those referring to linguistic signs.
(4) Peirce, Charles S. (1893-1913), maxim exponent of philosophic pragmatism.
that different consumers may attribute to the brand. The sign can also evoke a great deal of images, either through rhetoric or visual or written metaphors.

According to different semiologists, signs can be classified in different ways, according to how they are distributed and the subject studied. One of the most widely accepted interpretations is that by Pierce (2012), in which (in the chapter headed *Logic is the Art of Reasoning*) he states that that all reasoning is a type of interpretation of signs. He developed a tri-part system divided into nine categories of signs:

- The sign itself (colour and form), synsign (brand name), legisign (brand definition).
- The sign as regards its object: icon, index, symbol.
- The sign in relation to the interpretant: rhema, decisign and argument.

Studies carried out at the Loyola University (2007) in the USA claim that the use of colour is 82% of attracting the attention and 80% of brand recognition. Human beings react directly to colour and shape, which is why graphic designers use colours to improve brand memory (Perry & Wisonm, 2003). Some authors focus on the meaning of colour (Caivano, 1998; Biggam, 2012) and provide meanings other than a synsign, icon, symbol or any other sign it may be related to, emphasizing the idea that colours have different symbolic meanings in different cultures (Joan Costa, 2007) or cultural meanings (Heller, 2004). Their use for corporative branding is dealt with in (Chan & Lin, 2010) or for brands in (Bottomley & Doyle, 2006; Conejo & Wooliscroft, 2015; Kauppinen-Räisänen & Jauffret, 2018). Icons are widely used in brands; Perry & Wisonm (2003) found that people react directly to colour and shape. In this type of sign the shape also has a certain degree of iconicity that may have diverse meanings, even within the same culture, since shapes may be polysemic but may also be metaphoric and include a story or cultural or religious meaning.

From the perspective of information theory the sign is used “to transmit information, to say or indicate to someone something that another person knows and wants others to know” (Eco, 1988). This definition can be synthesized in the following communication structure: source – channel – message – receiver. Shannon & Weaver’s model can be applied to any message, regardless of its meaning. The transmission of information on the signal is therefore determined by the absence or presence of the signal (Areitoio & Areitoio, 2009).

Besides including all the channels in the communication system, Berlo (1984) claims that there are at least four classes of source factors that affect the message and how it is interpreted by the receiver: communication skills, attitudes, knowledge level and socio-cultural system.

---

(5) The theory defined by Shannon & Weaver in 1948 refers to communication systems like the telephone or telegraph. This theory was conceived within the electronic engineering field.
However, graphic communication in the process of designing logos must bear other types of signs in mind, such as acoustics; the *visual brand* has a complementary *acoustic brand*. This channel is really important since in many cases a language may have different pronunciations for the same words, even though the same letters are used. A word or brand may phonetically communicate or imply negative references in the receiving culture.

It is therefore evident that for logos created in different alphabets, the sign received may be confusing to people who live in cultures whose language is based on other types of alphabet, such as Greek, Japanese, Sanskrit or Arab. As it is a highly complex matter to convert a visual signal into an acoustic signal, it is important to have a knowledge of the receiving culture and the receivers’ level of education. We therefore believe that for a brand’s acceptance, consideration should be given to whether the visual or acoustic sign is the more important.

### 3. Proposed Criteria for Theoretical Analysis Model

The proposed model defines the study of the criteria of existing brands to be analysed to determine the degree of acceptance in other cultures, including an analysis of the product name, logo and anagram, to determine whether a local brand can be fully used as a global brand. Language, education and religion, to which we added culture expanded to include customs, traditions and symbols were considered to be external factors.

---

(6) Scheme reproduced by the author based on David K. Berlo’s system (1984).
We began with the supposition that the company had already evaluated and analysed its own internal factors (product category, business strategy, management structure, and brand budget) and external market factors (competition, distribution and consumers). The company should also analyse the external environmental factors most closely related to the brand strategy (language, religion, culture (customs, etc.), education, technology, and economy, besides the legal environment.

Figure 2. Conceptual model for market acceptance of brand in new markets based on the model in Kuvykaite & Mascinskiene (2010)

| Analysis of internal company possibilities: | Market Analysis | Environmental Analysis |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| • Product Category              | • Consumers     | • Culture (customs, traditions and symbols) |
| • Business Strategy             | • Competitors   | • Language             |
| Management Structure            | • Distribution Structure | • Religion             |
| • Brand Budget                  |                 | • Economic Environment |

ANALYSIS OF THE SITUATION

BRAND DECISIONS IN FOREIGN MARKETS

Global Brand vs. Local Brand

Brand-Name Brand-Logo Brand-Symbol

Control of Brand Success in the Market

| Brand Knowledge | Market Penetration | Quality | Associations | Loyalty | Market Quota |
|-----------------|--------------------|--------|--------------|--------|-------------|

Several theoretical studies define the criteria required to create a good brand name, e.g. McNeal & Zeren (1981) and McCarthy & Perreault (2002). In the present study we considered some of the criteria to which we had added cultural and product components, as well as marketing criteria, e.g. brand origin and brand identity.

The study was based on the Morris semiotic method (1985) and allowed us to assess the three sign dimensions: semantics, pragmatics and syntactics, as well as Berlo’s model (1984) modified to analyse the degree of information transmitted (significance) for each of the auditory and visual reception channels.
The detailed breakdown of criteria and components is divided into three analysis components:

- **Linguistic-Phonetic Components** (NAME)
  - **RF-N** *Phonetic Requirements*
    - Easy to read and pronounce
    - Pleasant to the ear, Harmonious
  - **RM-N** *Morphological Requirements*
    - Brief and simple
  - **RSe-N** *Semantic Requirements*
    - Positive, inoffensive, not obscene or negative
    - Easy to understand and memorise
    - Modern and contemporary
  - **ASi-N** *Syntactic Analysis*
    - Analysis of name (typology of linguistic signs (Pierce system))
  - **AP-N** *Pragmatic Analysis*
    - Associations of name with attributes
      (User perception and type of name)
    - Name’s association with product categories
      (User associates name with food products)
• Graphic-Linguistic Components (FORM OF NAME AND SYMBOL/ANAGRAM)
  - **RSe-GL Semantic Requirements**
    - Easy to understand and memorise
      (Graphic and linguistic analysis)
    - Positive, inoffensive, not obscene or negative
      (Religious, cultural or traditional connotations)
  - **RSi-GL Syntactic Requirements**
    - Assessment of appeal (name, colour, typography, symbol)
    - Brand analysis (shape, line, colour, directionality, complexity/simplicity (Pierce system))
    - Attributes associated with brand name
      (Evaluation)
  - **ASi-Di Syntactic Analysis**
    - Brand analysis (shape, line, colour, directionality, complexity/simplicity (Pierce system))
  - **AP-Di Pragmatic Analysis**
    - Associations of design with attributes
      (To define user perception and type of logo)
    - Association of design with product categories
      (User associates design with correct product category)
    - Association of brand with range of products
      (User associates brand with correct range)

• Marketing Components
  - **CM-IM Brand Identity**
    (Whether results agree with present brand identity).
  - **Map of Perception**
    (Assess perceived quality, associations of brand with key attributes and product types. Compare with ages and sex)
  - **CM-OM Brand origin and cultural, religious or traditional associations**
    (Whether it positively or negatively affects the brand and the intention to purchase)
  - Intention to purchase

The proposed analysis model relates external factors (language, culture, religion, education and technology) of a market (F) and the perception/meaning of the brand (M) and how these affect the perception of brand identity and the intention to purchase the product associated with the brand (I).

The components of the brand to be analysed can be simplified in Figure 4, which shows the relationships between environmental, brand and perception factors and intention to purchase (FMIP).

FE1: language
FE2: culture
FE3: religion
Proposed theoretical model for brand name acceptance analysis in new markets

FE4: education
FE5: technology
MC1: linguistic-phonetic component
MC2: graphic-linguistic component
IC1: brand identity component
IC2: brand origin component

Where:
FE (External company factors related to the environment of the target market)
MC (Components of brand to be analysed)
IC (Marketing components that could be affected by the brand perception in relation to the factors of the target market)

Figure 4. FMIP Model (Environmental factors, brand components and marketing components) (Compiled by the author, 2017)

4. Conclusions and Future Lines of Research

This study makes it clear that the graphic, linguistic and marketing aspects of existing brands need to be analysed. When a company introduces its products into new markets, cultural, religious and linguistic factors may affect the consumers’ perception of the brand. If it is associated with the wrong range or category, its origin may affect the intention to purchase, or the perceived quality may be affected by the original design of the brand identity.
It can be concluded that the different factors, components or criteria are defined by regarding the graphic, linguistic and semiotic aspects of the brand as perceived by consumers with common cultural characteristics and criteria based on their technological sophistication, religion and education. The impact of all these variables or external company factors on the brand should be considered. Since the cost of introducing products into new markets is high, the process should be carried out after a preliminary study. In this case we focused on the communications aspect of the brand’s graphic design, phonetics and marketing that can have an impact on effectively conveying the logo, such as the brand’s origin and identity.

The model’s limitations are detected by a quantitative survey (which will be described in a further paper) whose results will be used to determine the positive and negative aspects of the national brand for a given new market. These results will provide information as regards the name, design and marketing aspects and will indicate a method of clarifying whether the name, logo, or anagram need to be modified, or if the general design of the existing brand can be used to sell products in other countries.

However, from the results of the present study it is clear (Foroudi, 2019) that there are certain variables that to date gave not been structured well enough for a detailed analysis before a brand is to be internationalised. The proposed model will therefore be of great assistance to graphic designers in renovating logos, since it considers semiotic-cultural design aspects not often considered in the current graphic styles, mainly as regards colour semiotics and the image syntax connected with shape theory, but not so much with cultural graphic communication.

It would also be useful to determine whether a brand’s logo phonetics are appropriate, since this would suggest solutions to designers, who in the current global context are not usually aware of the existing nuances in different languages.
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