

Appendix 1

Case description: Images of logo and interior space of the selected cases

The Bank (B)	Code of the Logo	Logo	Code of the Space	Space
B-1	L-1		S-1	
B-2	L-2		S-2	
B-3	L-3		S-3	
B-4	L-4		S-3	

Appendix 2

Data analysis: codification for identifying the aesthetic principles (objective perspective) from the visual aesthetic aspect of logo and interior space through images

Table (---) Description and analysis of images for logo (content= typeface)

Logo		Balance			Proportion			Novelty			Familiarity			Contrast			clarity		
		shape	color	content	shape	color	content	shape	color	content	shape	color	content	shape	color	content	shape	color	content
B-1	L-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
B-2	L-2	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
B-3	L-3	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1
B-4	L-4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Codification		Principle Exist =1 Principle does not exist = 0																	

Table (---) Description and analysis of images for Interior space (content= furnitures, messes, volumes)

Interior Space		Balance			Proportion			Novelty			Familiarity			Contrast			clarity		
		shape	color	content	shape	color	content	shape	color	content	shape	color	content	shape	color	content	shape	color	content
B-1	S-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
B-2	S-2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
B-3	S-3	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1
B-4	S-4	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1
Codification		Principle Exist =1 Principle does not exist = 0																	

Table (---) Description and analysis of Correspondence\ value from images for Logo and Interior space

Case #		Balance			Proportion			Novelty			Familiarity			Contrast			clarity		
		shap e	colo r	conten t	shap e	colo r	conten t	shap e	colo r	conten t	shap e	colo r	conten t	shap e	colo r	conten t	shap e	colo r	conten t
B-1 NCB	L-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	S-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
	C-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
	Correspondence value	1			1			0			0			0 with contrast in color			1		
B-2 ALJ	L-2	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
	S-2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
	C-2	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
	Correspondence value	1			1 with proportion in shape and color			1 with Novelty in shape and content			0			0with contrast in color			1		
B-3 ANB	L-3	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1
	S-3	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1
	C-3	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1
	Correspondence value	1			1			0			1			0			1		
B-4 SAB B	L-4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	S-4	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1
	C4	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1
	Correspondence value	1			1			0			0 with familiarity in content			0 with contrast in color			1		
Codification		C1 Principle Exist in all characteristic's = 1 Principle does not exist in all characteristic's = 0 Exist in 2/3 characteristic's = 1 Principle does not exist in 2/3 characteristic's = 0																	

Appendix 3

Data analysis: codification for identifying the aesthetic appraisal from the visual aesthetic aspect of logo and interior space through images

Table (---) Description and analysis of responses interviewer's for logo

Cases		Responses interviewer's (said yes)			
Logo		Complexity	Ambiguity	Novelty	Familiarity
B-1 	L-1/ responses	0	3	4	14
	Value of stimulus	Low value	Low value	Low value	High value
	Codification	0	0	0	1
	Perceptual	Complexity is not perceived at all	Ambiguity is not perceived	Novelty is not perceived	Familiarity is perceived strongly
	Identification	Complexity is identified hardly	Ambiguity is identified hardly	Novelty is identified hardly	Familiarity is identified Easily
B-2 	L-2/ responses	11	7	6	12
	Value of stimulus	High value	Low value	Low value	High value
	Codification for comparison	1	0	0	1
	Perceptual	Complexity is perceived	Ambiguity is not perceived	Novelty is not perceived	Familiarity is perceived strongly
	Identification	Complexity is identified easily	Ambiguity is identified hardly	Novelty is identified hardly	Familiarity is identified Easily
B-3 	L-3/ responses	13	11	14	7
	Value of stimulus	High value	High value	High value	Low value
	Codification for comparison	1	1	1	0
	Perceptual	Complexity is perceived	Ambiguity is perceived	Novelty is perceived	Familiarity is not perceived
	Identification	Complexity is identified easily	Ambiguity is identified easily	Novelty is identified easily	Familiarity is identified hardly
B-4 	L-4/ responses	2	6	9	12
	Value of stimulus	Low value	Low value	High value	High value
	Codification	0	0	1	1
	Perceptual	Complexity is not perceived at all	Ambiguity is not perceived	Novelty is perceived	Familiarity is perceived strongly in Logo
	Identification	Complexity is identified hardly	Ambiguity is identified hardly	Novelty is identified easily	Familiarity is identified Easily

Table (---) Description and analysis of responses interviewer's for Interior space

Cases		Responses interviewer's (said yes)			
Interior Space		Complexity	Ambiguity	Novelty	Familiarity
B-1 	S-1	12	6	11	9
	Value of stimulus	High value	Low value	High value	High value
	Codification for comparison	1	0	1	1
	Perceptual	Complexity is perceived	Ambiguity is not perceived	Novelty is perceived	Familiarity is perceived strongly in Logo

	Identification	Complexity is identified easily	Ambiguity is identified hardly	Novelty is identified easily	Familiarity is identified Easily
B-2 	S-2	6	5	1	11
	Value of stimulus	Low value	Low value	Low value	High value
	Codification for comparison	0	0	0	1
	Perceptual	Complexity is not perceived at all	Ambiguity is not perceived	Novelty is not perceived	Familiarity is perceived strongly in Logo
	Identification	Complexity is identified hardly	Ambiguity is identified hardly	Novelty is identified hardly	Familiarity is identified Easily
B-3 	S-3	0	2	11	11
	Value of stimulus	Low value	Low value	High value	High value
	Codification for comparison	0	0	1	1
	perceptual	Complexity is not perceived at all	Ambiguity is not perceived	Novelty is perceived	Familiarity is perceived strongly in Logo
	Identification	Complexity is identified hardly	Ambiguity is identified hardly	Novelty is identified easily	Familiarity is identified Easily
B-4 	S-4	10	13	10	7
	Value of stimulus	High value	High value	High value	Low value
	Codification for comparison	1	1	1	0
	perceptual	Complexity is perceived	Ambiguity is perceived	Novelty is perceived	Familiarity is not perceived
	Identification	Complexity is identified easily	Ambiguity is identified easily	Novelty is identified easily	Familiarity is identified hardly

Codification of stimulus value according responses interviewer's for logo and interior space		
Value of stimulus	Number of respondents (from 16)	Codification
Low value	0-7	0
Average value	8	- Neutralized
High value	9-16	1

Code	Deduction
1	perceptual logo Or space aesthetics through look and feel from image is perceived strongly and were identified Easily
0	perceptual logo Or space aesthetics through look and feel from image is perceived but were identified hardly

Cases		Responses interviewer's (said yes)				
Case #		Complexity	Ambiguity	Novelty	Familiarity	Observations
B-1 NCB	Responses/ L-1 	0	3	4	14	Complexity is not perceived at all in logo design but ambiguity and novelty are perceived weekly; so those aesthetics are hardly identified visually. However, familiarity is identified easily in Logo
	Codification	0	0	0	1	
	Responses/ S-1 	12	6	11	9	
	Codification	1	0	1	1	According to the interviewees perception regarding the structural properties of the interior space in terms of complexity in logo, it was clear that there was no complexity. However, in terms of interior space, 12 designers (75%) considered the complexity as a stimulus, which indicate there is no correspondence in terms of complexity in the structural properties of both logo and interior space.
	C-1	0	0	0	1	
	Correspondence\ value	Correspondence das not exist (with specifics comments)	Correspondence das not exist (with specifics comments)	Correspondence das not exist (with specifics comments)	Correspondence exist	
B-2 ALJ	Responses /L-2 	11	7	6	12	Complexity and familiarity are easily identified by designer (respectively 11 et 12 perceived it) However Novelty, Ambiguity were hardly identified
	Codification	1	0	0	1	
	Responses /S-2 	6	5	1	11	
	Codification	0	0	0	1	Complexity, Ambiguity, Novelty are not perceived and identified hardly in design space. While familiarity has a high value (identified by 11 designers) and were easily identified.
	C-2	0	0	0	1	
	Correspondence\ value	Correspondence das not exist (with specifics comments)	Correspondence das not exist (with specifics comments)	Correspondence das not exist (with specifics comments)	Correspondence exist	
B-3 ANB	Responses /L-3 	13	11	14	7	Novelty, Ambiguity and Complexity are strongly perceived and easily identified by designers in this logo case. Familiarity is hardly identified only 7 from 16 designer had perceived it
	Codification	1	1	1	0	
	Responses /S-3 	0	2	11	11	
	Codification	0	0	1	1	Complexity and Ambiguity are not perceived and hardly identified by designers in this space case. Familiarity and Novelty are strongly perceived and easily identified by designers in this space case.
	C-3	0	0	1	0	
	Correspondence\ value	Correspondence das not exist	Correspondence das not exist	Correspondence exist	Correspondence das not exist	

		(with specifics comments)	(with specifics comments)		(with specifics comments)	(69%) perceived ambiguity as a stimulus in the structural properties of interior space. Correspondence das not exist. In terms of novelty as a stimulus, most interviewees perceived it as such for both logo and interior which shows a high correspondence level between them: Correspondence exist. The logo was perceived as familiar by 7 of the interviewees responses (44%) while 11 found it as such (67%).
B-4 SABB	Responses /L-4 	2	6	9	12	Complexity and ambiguity are considered as not perceived in logo design. Only 2 and 6 designers identified it respectively; so those aesthetics are hardly identified visually. However, novelty and familiarity are identified easily in Logo
	Codification	0	0	1	1	
	S-4/ Responses 	10	13	10	7	Complexity, ambiguity and novelty are strongly identified in design space (10, 13, 10 designers perceived it). However, familiarity is not easily identified.
	Codification	1	1	1	0	
	C4	0	0	1	0	
	Correspondence\ value	Correspondence das not exist (with specifics comments)	Correspondence das not exist (with specifics comments)	Correspondence exist	Correspondence das not exist (with specifics comments)	Only 2 of the interviewees (13%) perceived complexity as a stimulus when looking at the logo. Regarding the interior, however, 10 designers (63%) perceived complexity as a stimulus. This indicate that complexity was used as stimulus in the structural properties of interior space and has a high value. Visual correspondence das not exist between logo and space. In terms of ambiguity , 13 of the interviewees perceived the interior as ambiguous (81%), while only 6 designers (38%) perceived it as such in the case of the logo. This means that ambiguity was used as a stimulus for the interior space, but not the logo: Correspondence das not exist Regarding novelty as a stimulus in the structural properties of both logo and interior space, interviewees agreed that novelty was used as a stimulus for both elements. 12 of the interviewees (75%) perceived familiarity as a stimulus when observing the logo in contrast to the case of the interior where only 7 of the interviewees (44%) perceived familiarity as a stimulus. This means that familiarity was only used as a stimulus in the structural properties of the logo, but not necessarily in the interior.

Table (---) Description and analysis of Correspondence\ value from responses interviewer's for logo and Interior space: **aesthetic appraisal**

Codification Table (---) Codification of correspondence value according aesthetic principles for logo and interior space features				
	Codes	Correspondence	Meaning	Deduction
Principle perceived as stimuli in logo (L)	1	1	Correspondence exist	perceptual logo and space aesthetics through look and feel from image has correspondence and were identified Easily in both Logo and space
Principle perceived as stimuli in space (S)	1			
Principle perceived as stimuli in logo (L)	0	0	Correspondence das not exist	perceptual logo and space aesthetics through look and feel from image has not correspondence and were identified hardly in in both Logo and space
Principle perceived as stimuli in space (S)	0			
Principle perceived as stimuli in logo (L)	0	0	Correspondence das not exist (with specifics comments)	perceptual logo and space aesthetics through look and feel from image has not correspondence but somewhere was identified by low number of
Principle perceived as stimuli in space (S)	1			
Principle perceived as stimuli in logo (L)	1			
Principle perceived as stimuli in space (S)	0			
Principle perceived as stimuli in logo (L) or in space (S)	-	1	Correspondence exist (with specifics comments)	
Principle perceived as stimuli in logo (L) or in space (S)	Neutralized			
	1			
Principle perceived as stimuli in logo (L) or in space (S)	-	0	Correspondence das not exist (with specifics comments)	
Principle perceived as stimuli in logo (L) or in space (S)	Neutralized			
	0			

Appendix 4

Data analysis: codification for identifying the aesthetic impression from the visual aesthetic aspect of logo and interior space through images

Table (---) Description and analysis of responses interviewer's for logo

Cases		Responses interviewer's (said yes)				
Logo		Unity	Symmetry	Simplicity	Easy to perceive	Attractive
B-1 	L-1/ responses	7	5	15	14	2
	Value of stimulus	Low value	Low value	High value	High value	Low value
	Codification	0	0	1	1	0
	Perceptual	Unity is not perceived	Symmetry is not perceived	Simplicity is perceived	Logo design is easy to perceive	Logo design is not attractive
	Identification	Unity is identified hardly	Symmetry is identified hardly	Simplicity is identified easily	-	-
B-2 	L-2/ responses	13	7	4	14	3
	Value of stimulus	High value	Low value	Low value	High value	Low value
	Codification for comparison	1	0	0	1	0
	Perceptual	Unity is perceived	Symmetry is not perceived	Simplicity is not perceived	Logo design is easy to perceive	Logo design is not attractive
	Identification	Unity is identified easily	Symmetry is identified hardly	Simplicity is identified hardly	-	-
B-3 	L-3	10	7	12	12	4
	Value of stimulus	High value	Low value	High value	High value	Low value
	Codification for comparison	1	0	1	1	0
	Perceptual	Unity is perceived	Symmetry is not perceived	Simplicity is perceived	Logo design is easy to perceive	Logo design is not attractive
	Identification	Unity is identified easily	Symmetry is identified hardly	Simplicity is identified easily	-	-
B-4 	L-4	11	14	15	14	9
	Value of stimulus	High value	High value	High value	High value	High value
	Codification	1	1	1	1	1
	Perceptual	Unity is perceived	Symmetry is perceived	Simplicity is perceived	Logo design is easy to perceive	Logo design is attractive
	Identification	Unity is identified easily	Symmetry is identified easily	Simplicity is identified easily	-	-

Table (---) Description and analysis of responses interviewer's for Interior space

Cases	Responses interviewer's (said yes)				
Interior Space	Unity	Symmetry	Simplicity	Easy to perceive	Attractive

B-1 	S-1	12	11	3	9	7
	Value of stimulus	High value	High value	Low value	High value	Low value
	Codification for comparison	1	1	0	1	0
	Perceptual	Unity is perceived	Symmetry is perceived	Simplicity is not perceived	Space design is easy to perceive	Space design is not attractive
	Identification	Unity is identified easily	Symmetry is identified easily	Simplicity is identified hardly	-	-
B-2 	S-2/ responses	9	7	11	10	0
	Value of stimulus	High value	Low value	High value	High value	Low value
	Codification for comparison	1	0	1	1	0
	Perceptual	Unity is perceived	Symmetry is not perceived	Simplicity is perceived	Space design is easy to perceive	Space design is not attractive at all
	Identification	Unity is identified easily	Symmetry is identified hardly	Simplicity is identified easily	-	-
B-3 	S-3/ responses	13	13	14	13	10
	Value of stimulus	High value	High value	High value	High value	High value
	Codification for comparison	1	1	1	1	1
	perceptual	Unity is perceived	Symmetry is perceived	Simplicity is perceived	Space design is easy to perceive	Space design is attractive
	Identification	Unity is identified easily	Symmetry is identified easily	Simplicity is identified easily	-	-
B-4 	S-4/ responses	12	13	13	12	8
	Value of stimulus	High value	High value	High value	High value	Neutralized
	Codification for comparison	1	1	1	1	-
	perceptual	Unity is perceived	Symmetry is perceived	Simplicity is perceived	Space design is easy to perceive	-
	Identification	Unity is identified easily	Symmetry is identified easily	Simplicity is identified easily	-	-

Codification of stimulus value according responses interviewer's for logo and interior space		
Value of stimulus	Number of respondents (from 16)	Codification
Low value	0-7	0
Average value	8	- Neutralized
High value	9-16	1

Code	Deduction
1	perceptual logo Or space aesthetics through look and feel from image is perceived strongly and were identified Easily
0	perceptual logo Or space aesthetics through look and feel from image is perceived but were identified hardly

Cases		Responses interviewer's (said yes)					Observations
Case #		Unity	Symmetry	Simplicity	Easy to perceive	Attractive	
B-1 NCB	L-1 / responses 	7	5	15	14	2	Symmetry and Unity have a low value and identified hardly however simplicity is easily identified in logo. Simplicity was perceived by designers and design logo was easy to perceive for majority (14 responses) and not attractive.
	Codification	0	0	1	1	0	
	S-1 	12	11	3	9	7	Symmetry and Unity have a high value and identified easily however, simplicity is hardly identified in space. Design space was easy to perceive for 9 designers but not attractive for majority (9)
	Codification	1	1	0	1	0	
	C-1	0	0	0	1	0	According to the interviewees, 12 designers (75%) found unity in the interior space, while 7 (44%) found so in the logo. 11 designers (69%), in terms of the interior space, perceived symmetry as an aesthetic impression while only 5 designers (31%) believed so regarding the logo. Correspondence is considered as not existing. There is a huge difference in the interviewee's responses regarding the impression of simplicity between the logo and interior. 15 designers (94%) perceived simplicity as an impression when looking at the logo compared to only 3 designers (19%) who thought so in terms of the interior. This indicated a low level of correspondence between aesthetic impression between logo and interior. Correspondence is considered as not existing. While (88%) found the logo easy to perceive, (56%) found the same in the interior. 7 of the interviewee (44%) perceived attractiveness as a stimulus when looking at the image of the interior, while only 2 designers (13 %) confirmed the same when observing the logo. This means that attractiveness was used as a stimulus in the interior to some extent, however, it might not have been considered as such in the logo.
	Correspondence value	Correspondence does not exist (with specifics comments)	Correspondence does not exist (with specifics comments)	Correspondence does not exist (with specifics comments)	Correspondence exist	Correspondence does not exist (with specifics comments)	
B-2 ALJ	L-2/ Responses 	13	7	4	14	3	Symmetry and simplicity have a low value and identified hardly however unity is easily identified in logo. Design logo was easy to perceive for majority (14 responses) and not attractive (only 3designers perceived it attractive)
	Codification	1	0	0	1	0	
	S-2/ Responses 	9	7	11	10	0	Unity and simplicity have a high value and were identified easily however, symmetry is hardly identified in space. Design space was easy to perceive for 10 designers but not at all attractive (0)
	Codification	1	0	1	1	0	
	C-2	1	0	0	1	0	13 of the interviewees (81%) found unity in the logo design, compared to 9 (56%) who found unity in the interior space. Visual correspondence exist. 7 of the interviewees (44%) believed that there was symmetry in both elements as aesthetic impression: same impression was detected but visual correspondence does not exist 11 of the interviewees (69%) got the impression of simplicity when looking at the image of the interior while only 4 designers (25%) thought the same in the case of the logo: Correspondence does not exist 14 of the interviewees (88%) got the impression that the logo was easy to perceive . When observing the image of the interior, 10 designers (63%) thought it was easy to perceive. This indicates a light difference in the level of correspondence in terms of the aesthetic impression between the two elements. A very low percentage was given to both logo and interior space regarding attractiveness as an aesthetic impression: logo (19%), interior (0%).
	Correspondence value	Correspondence exist	Correspondence does not exist (with specifics comments)	Correspondence does not exist (with specifics comments)	Correspondence exist	Correspondence does not exist (with specifics comments)	
B-3 ANB	L-3/ Responses 	10	7	12	12	4	Symmetry have a low value and was identified hardly however unity and simplicity were easily identified in logo . Design logo was easy to perceive for majority (12 responses) and not attractive (only 4 designers perceived it attractive)
	Codification	1	0	1	1	0	
	S-3/ Responses 	13	13	14	13	10	Unity, symmetry, and simplicity had a high value and were easily identified in space. Design space was easy to perceive for the majority (13) designers and attractive for (10) interviewers.
	Codification	1	1	1	1	1	
	C-3	1	0	1	1	1	13 of the interviewees (81%) got the impression of unity when observing the interior space. In addition, 10 designers

		Correspondence exist	Correspondence does not exist (with specifics comments)	Correspondence exist	Correspondence exist	Correspondence exist	(63%) found the same thing when looking at the logo. This indicates that there is a relative level of correspondence between the two elements about aesthetic impression. 13 of the interviewees (81%) found symmetry as an aesthetic impression in the interior in contrast to only 7 designers (44%) who found it in the logo. 14 (88%) got the impression of simplicity when looking at the image of the interior. A very close percentage was the result regarding interviewees' impression of the logo: (75%) representing 12 responses. This means there is a high level of correspondence in terms of simplicity as an aesthetic impression. The percentage of the interviewees who found the logo and the interior easy to perceive was very similar (75%) for the logo, and (81%) for the interior which indicates a high level of correspondence in the aesthetics impression in both elements. 10 of the interviewees (63%) found the interior attractive, while only 4 (25%) found the logo as such. This means there is a low level of correspondence between the two elements in regard to attractiveness as an aesthetic impression.
B-4 SABB	L-4/ responses 	11	14	15	14	9	Symmetry, Unity, simplicity have a high value and were identified easily. However, Design logo was easy to perceive for 12 designers but 9 interviewers thought that design logo was attractive.
	Codification	1	1	1	1	1	
	S-4/ responses 	12	13	13	12	8	Symmetry, Unity, simplicity have a high value and were identified easily however. Design space was easy to perceive for 12 designers but attractiveness was neutralized. Half on interviewers thought that design space was attractive.
	Codification	1	1	1	1	-	
	C4	1	1	1	1	1	There is a convergence in the interviewee's opinion regarding unity as an aesthetic impression in both elements: for logo 11 positive responses (67%) and for interior: 12/ (75%). This indicates a high level of correspondence between the two elements regarding unity as aesthetic impression. Interviewees got the impression of symmetry in both logo: 14 (88%) and interior: 13 (81%). Majority of the interviewees got the impression of simplicity when observing both the logo and the interior space. This tells us that there is a high level of correspondence when it comes to simplicity as an aesthetic impression. Very convergence number of the interviewees found the logo: 14 (88%) and the interior: 12 (75%) easy to perceive which illustrates a high level of correspondence for the two elements. 9 interviewees found the logo attractive however only 8 thought the space attractive, which demonstrates a high level of correspondence between the two elements in terms of attractiveness as an aesthetic impression. Correspondence exists but weakly.
	Correspondence value	Correspondence exist	Correspondence exist	Correspondence exist	Correspondence exist	Correspondence exist weakly	

Table (---) Description and analysis of Correspondence\ value from responses interviewer's for logo and Interior space: aesthetic impression

Codification Table (---) Codification of correspondence value according aesthetic principles for logo and interior space features				
	Codes	Correspondence	Meaning	Deduction
Principle perceived as stimuli in logo (L)	1	1	Correspondence exist	perceptual logo and space aesthetics through look and feel from image has correspondence and were identified Easily in both Logo and space
Principle perceived as stimuli in space (S)	1			
Principle perceived as stimuli in logo (L)	0	0	Correspondence does not exist	perceptual logo and space aesthetics through look and feel from image has not correspondence and were identified hardly in both Logo and space
Principle perceived as stimuli in space (S)	0			
Principle perceived as stimuli in logo (L)	0	0	Correspondence does not exist (with specifics comments)	perceptual logo and space aesthetics through look and feel from image has not correspondence but somewhere was identified by low number of
Principle perceived as stimuli in space (S)	1			
Principle perceived as stimuli in logo (L)	1			
Principle perceived as stimuli in space (S)	0			
Principle perceived as stimuli in logo (L) or in space (S)	-	1	Correspondence exist	
Principle perceived as stimuli in logo (L) or in space (S)	Neutralized		(with specifics comments)	

Principle perceived as stimuli in logo (L) or in space (S)	-	0	Correspondence das
Principle perceived as stimuli in logo (L) or in space (S)	Neutralized		not exist (with
	0		specifics comments)