



Bachelor thesis

The role of self-control in the effectiveness of brand placement disclosures

Sanne Melis, s4207483

Nijmegen, 01-06-2015

Supervisor: Dr. Loes Janssen

Communication and Information Sciences

Radboud University Nijmegen

sanne.melis@student.ru.nl

0616630127

Abstract

Including brands and branded products in TV-content and movies is becoming increasingly common. This practice is called brand placement. The European Union permits brand placement, but only as long as brand placement disclosures are shown. The purpose of brand placement disclosures is to make viewers aware of sponsored content and their persuasive intent. However, previous studies have found mixed results regarding the effects of brand placement disclosures on brand evaluation and little previous research has examined the effects of self-control in this context. In an experimental study, the extent to which self-control moderates the effect of brand placement disclosures on brand evaluation was investigated and the hypotheses that people with high self-control resources would evaluate a brand less positively after being exposed to a disclosure whereas people with low self-control resources would not evaluate a brand any differently were tested. Analyses did not show a significant interaction effect of self-control and disclosure on brand attitude. A significant interaction effect of self-control and disclosure was discovered on purchase intention. People with low self-control resources have a higher purchase intention, but only in the absence of a brand placement disclosure. Practical implications and suggestions for further research are discussed.

James Bond drinks Heineken. Tom Cruise wears Ray Ban sunglasses in Top Gun. When turning on the TV nowadays or when watching a movie, viewers are confronted with brands or branded products on a regular basis. The inclusion of brands in TV-programs or movies is called brand or product placement (Van Reijmersdal, Neijens & Smit, 2009). Brand placement is very popular among advertisers, as it offers several advantages compared to traditional forms of advertising (Van Reijmersdal, Neijens & Smit, 2007). However, brand placements are used in a noncommercial media content, which makes it harder for viewers to recognize brand placements as a form of advertising (Boerman, Van Reijmersdal & Neijens, 2012). Therefore, the European Union has regulated the practice of product placement, allowing them only when they are disclosed to the viewers (Audiovisual Media Services Directive, 2010). The purpose of these brand placement disclosures is to help viewers realize the persuasive intent of brand placements. Previous research has indicated that disclosures directly lead to the recognition of brand placements as advertising (Boerman et al., 2012). Furthermore, previous research has indicated that brand placement disclosures affect brand evaluation (Boerman et al., 2012; Boerman, Van Reijmersdal & Neijens, 2014; Wei, Fischer & Main, 2008; Dekker & Van Reijmersdal, 2010). The circumstances, under which this effect occurs, however, are not clear, as previous research has discovered mixed results. The purpose of the present study is therefore to investigate the circumstances under which brand placement disclosures have an effect on brand evaluation.

Literature review

Nowadays, large sums of money are spent on incorporating brands into editorial media content (Van Reijmersdal et al., 2009). Brand placement refers to any kind of audiovisual commercial communication that incorporates a branded product or a mentioning thereof in a television program or movie in exchange for payment or any other form of compensation (Audiovisual Media Services Directive, 2010). It can be seen as a paid attempt to persuade viewers without identifying the sponsor (Balasubramanian, Karrh & Patwardhan, 2006). Brand placements can occur at different levels, from a simple background prop to the product being integrated in the storyline (Yang & Roskos-Ewoldsen, 2007).

In recent years, brand placements have become increasingly common. A content analysis of brand placement on Dutch television conducted by Smit, Van Reijmersdal and Neijens (2009) revealed that almost 10% of all the programs broadcasted on RTL4, SBS6 en NL2 incorporated brand placements, with human-interest programs, soap operas, games and quiz

shows being popular genres. Furthermore, a fifth of the sponsored programs on Dutch television were brand-integrated programs, which means that the brands featured in the content were related to the script. Brand placement offers several advantages for advertisers compared to traditional advertising (Van Reijmersdal et al., 2007). Because brand placements are embedded in editorial content, advertisers can avoid the problem of viewers skipping traditional commercials. In addition, the branded products are presented in a natural and credible setting, which could work in favor of the brand as it might stimulate positive associations.

Effects of brand placement

Previous research has found several positive effects of the use of brand placements on brand evaluation, choice behavior and brand memory (Matthes, Schemer & Wirth, 2007; Van Reijmersdal et al., 2007; Yang & Roskos-Ewoldsen, 2007). The fact that brand placements have a positive effect on brand evaluation could be explained through the principal of the mere exposure effect. A mere exposure effect implies that being exposed repeatedly to a particular stimulus can result in a positive evaluation of that stimulus, even though people are unaware that they were exposed to it (Matthes et al., 2007). A study conducted by Matthes et al., (2007) showed that being confronted frequently with a brand placement can have a positive effect on viewers' brand evaluations, even when they do not recall seeing the brand. Similar results were found by Van Reijmersdal et al. (2007), who investigated the effects of exposure to brand placements in television programs on brand image. Regardless of brand recall, the respondents had a more positive image of the brand after exposure. Brand placements can also influence the choice behavior of viewers. A previous study showed that viewers who were exposed to a brand placement in a movie were more likely to afterwards choose that brand than viewers who were not confronted with the brand (Yang & Roskos-Ewoldsen, 2007). The same study indicated that the simple presence of a brand in the movie increased the viewers' implicit brand memory.

However, even though brand placements appear to have numerous positive effects for advertisers, in most cases the source and persuasive intent of brand placements is not very apparent for the viewer because they are used in noncommercial media content. Differentiating between editorial and commercial content is therefore not easy for viewers. Because of that, viewers may not process the persuasive message as critically as they would if they were confronted with a traditional form of advertising (Boerman et al., 2012). Public policy analysts have therefore raised the suggestion that such subtle or hidden promotional strategies could deceive or misinform consumers. They have asked for disclosures in order to make consumers aware of product placements (Bennett, Pecotich & Putrevu, 1999).

Brand placement disclosures

In 2009, the European Union regulated the practice of product placement with an Audiovisual Media Services Directive, in order to make consumers aware of the hidden influence of product placement. This directive permits product placements as long as they are disclosed to viewers (Audiovisual Media Services Directive, 2010). The purpose of disclosures is to make viewers aware of sponsored content and raise awareness of advertising and its persuasive intent (Boerman et al., 2012). In Europe, the PP symbol was introduced in order to inform viewers about programs that contain product placements (Tessitore & Geuens, 2013). In order to prevent confusion, product placements need to be clearly disclosed at the beginning and at the end of a television program, as well as when a program continues after an advertising break (Audiovisual Media Services Directive, 2010).

Effects of brand placement disclosures

Several previous studies have investigated the effects of brand placement disclosures and have found effects on persuasion knowledge and on brand attitude. Persuasion knowledge refers to a general understanding of persuasion and to an individual's knowledge on how to deal with persuasion attempts (Friestad & Wright, 1994). After being confronted regularly with marketing tactics, consumers become more conscious about persuasion attempts. This helps them recognize when and how marketers try to persuade them. The Persuasion Knowledge Model presumes that people's persuasion knowledge continues developing throughout the life span (Friestad & Wright, 1994). Confronting viewers with disclosures is enough to activate the use of persuasion knowledge (Campbell, Mohr & Verlegh, 2012). A study conducted by Boerman et al. (2012) has shown that disclosures can result in the activation of both conceptual and attitudinal persuasion knowledge. When conceptual persuasion knowledge is activated, viewers who have been confronted with a disclosure can differentiate better between commercial and editorial content than viewers who were not confronted with a disclosure. The activation of conceptual persuasion knowledge can furthermore lead to the activation of attitudinal persuasion knowledge. Attitudinal persuasion knowledge includes critical feelings such as skepticism and disliking towards a persuasion attempt. Being exposed to disclosures can directly lead to the recognition of advertising and its persuasive intent, which can lead to a critical attitude towards the advertising (Boerman et al., 2012).

Research conducted by Van Reijmersdal, Tutaj & Boerman (2013), however, showed that brand placement disclosures do not appear to result in critical attitudes. Viewers who were made aware of disclosures, before, after or during the placement, were not more skeptical than respondents who were unaware of a disclosure.

Previous research has also found effects of brand placement disclosures on brand attitude. These studies, however, show varying results. Research carried out by Boerman et al. (2012) showed that the timing of disclosures could influence the effects of product placement on brand attitude. Results indicated that when a disclosure is shown before or during a product placement, the content of the brand placement is primed, which leads to sufficient processing time. Because of that, viewers recognize the product placement as advertising and are able to process it more critically, which has a negative effect on brand attitude. This effect does not occur when the disclosure was shown after the placement. Similar results were found by Boerman et al. (2014). Their research also indicated that disclosures have a negative effect on brand attitude when the disclosure was shown before or simultaneous to the product placement in television content. Wei et al. (2008) found similar results for radio shows with disclosures having a negative effect on brand attitudes. However, a study that investigated different types of disclosures did not find any effects of disclosures on brand attitude (Dekker & Van Reijmersdal, 2010). Examining the effects of brand placements disclosures on brand evaluation can provide relevant information for today's practice, as it could on the one hand inform advertisers who are forced to include disclosures whether these disclosures lead to negative brand attitudes and on the other hand inform opponents of brand placement whether brand placement disclosures are an effective way of making consumers aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement.

Self-control

As previous research has indicated varying results, with some studies finding effects of brand placement on brand evaluations whereas others did not, the effects of brand placements are not conclusive. Therefore, more information is needed about the circumstances under which disclosures affect brand evaluations. An interesting factor that could provide more insight in the effects of brand placement disclosures is self-control, which can be defined as the ability of individuals to successfully regulate their own thoughts, feelings and behavior (Burkley, 2011). Self-control is a deliberate and conscious form of self-regulation that can help match an individual's responses to standards such as values and social expectations (Baumeister, Vohs & Tice, 2007). The amount of self-control a viewer has could influence the way they respond to a brand placement disclosure.

Several studies have indicated that self-control resources are limited. When an individual performs self-regulation activities such as making decisions or avoiding mistakes, these resources of self-control are reduced. This is often referred to as ego depletion (Reinecke, Hartmann & Eden, 2014). Once these resources are depleted, self-control on subsequent tasks

becomes harder, even when tasks are unrelated (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven & Tice, 1998; Hoffmann, Vohs & Baumeister, 2012). Research conducted by Burkley (2008) showed that people need to have sufficient self-control resources in order to resist persuasion. When these self-control resources are depleted, it becomes more difficult to resist persuasion attempts. Resisting social influences is challenging when people do not have the necessary self-control resources (Burkley, Anderson & Curtis, 2011). People might have enough self-control resources to resist an initial social influence, but resisting a subsequent influence is harder as self-control resources decrease (Burkley et al., 2011).

People are often exposed to brand placement disclosures when they have reduced self-control resources (Gillespie, Joireman and Muehling, 2012). Most people watch TV during primetime hours, which are between 8 pm and 11 pm. It can therefore be assumed that most of the viewers will have spent a substantial amount of their self-control resources during their daily activities, including work, before they watch TV and therefore before they are confronted with brand placement and brand placement disclosures. As a result of low self-control resources, resisting persuasive intents of brand placements might be difficult. Self-control is therefore an interesting and relevant factor when investigating the influence of brand placement disclosures as several previous studies to date have shown that in order to resist persuasion, an individual needs to have the necessary self-control resources (Burkley, 2008; Burkley et al., 2011; Baumeister et al., 1998; Hoffmann et al., 2012).

Campbell et al. (2012) pointed out the need to include individual differences such as individual differences in persuasion knowledge and relationship with the brand when examining the effects of disclosures. Van Reijmersdal et al. (2013) also suggested to examine the role of viewer characteristics in the effects of disclosures, such as age and level of education. Individual differences might affect the ability or motivation of people to notice unwanted persuasion attempts (Campbell et al., 2012). When individuals are presented with product placements in for example a movie, some might be better at or can more easily detect these placements than others (Matthes, Wirth, Schemer & Kissling, 2011). After being exposed to a brand placement disclosure, individuals with low self-control resources might find it more difficult to resist the influence of brand placements than individuals with high self-control resources. Individuals with high self-control resources might evaluate a brand more differently after being confronted with a disclosure compared to individuals with low self-control resources.

Examining the role of self-control might lead to more insight into how brand placement disclosures affect brand evaluations. So far, not a lot of research has been conducted on self-control as individual difference in the context of brand placement disclosures. As the practice of using brand placement is becoming increasingly common (Smit et al., 2009) and self-control resources can play a significant role regarding the mindset with which people watch TV and movies (Gillespie, Joireman and Muehling, 2012) and therefore brand placement and brand placement disclosures, it is important and relevant to gain more information about this process. The present study aims to make a contribution to this understudied area by investigating the extent to which self-control moderates the effects of brand placement disclosures on brand evaluation. As for the practical relevance of this study, people are oftentimes exposed to brand placement disclosures when they have low self-control. If results of the present study indicate that disclosures have little effect on people with low self-control, a possible conclusion could be that brand placement disclosures are not very useful. The research question of the study is as follows:

RQ1: To what extent does self-control moderate the effect of a brand placement disclosure on brand evaluation?

This research questions leads to the following two hypotheses:

H1: People with high self-control will evaluate a brand less positively after being exposed to a brand placement disclosure.

H2: People with low self-control will not evaluate a brand more or less positively after being exposed to a brand placement disclosure.

The hypotheses were tested in an experimental study. Factors underlying the interaction effect of brand placement disclosures and self-control that could have an effect on brand evaluations are brand memory and persuasion knowledge. These factors were also investigated in the study.

Method

Materials

The respondents all watched the same clip from the movie ‘The Proposal’ that included brand placement for Starbucks. The clip was 3:28 minutes long and showed the Starbucks brand three times. The first time, Starbucks was shown for 30 seconds, when Andrew, one of the lead characters in the movie, picked up two cups of coffee on his way to work and carried them to the office. The brand was shown a second time for 15 seconds when Andrew entered his office building while still holding the cups. Attention was drawn to the coffee cups - and therefore to Starbucks - when Andrew spilled one of the cups all over a colleague who blocked his way. The third time, when Starbucks appeared for 1:30 minutes, Andrew handed the coffee cup to his boss Margaret. Margaret placed the cup on her desk, with the Starbucks logo turned to the camera while they discussed work. Attention was drawn to the coffee cup again when Margaret wondered why there was a phone number of a woman written on her cup. Andrew then admitted that he drinks the same kind of coffee as his boss, in case he spilled hers. The entire conversation took place while Margaret held up the cup with the Starbucks logo, again clearly visible for the viewers.

In order to evaluate the role that self-control plays when it comes to brand evaluation, all of the respondents were asked to participate in a small exercise prior to watching the clip. This exercise consisted of 15 well-known Dutch proverbs, with one word missing from each one. Half of the participants were asked to complete the gaps and form grammatically correct sentences without using the letter ‘e’ (Janssen & Fennis, n.d.). The aim of not using the letter ‘e’ was to achieve self-control depletion. As the participants were confronted with well-known phrases, not being allowed to use the letter ‘e’ required self-control resources as they likely had to suppress the urge to fill in the first word that came to mind. As these words that first came to mind likely contained the letter ‘e’, the participants had to instead come up with other suitable solutions. The other half of the respondents were presented with the same 30 sentences, but were allowed to use the letter ‘e’ in order to form grammatically correct sentences. After the participants completed the exercise, their current mood was examined in order to make sure that the exercise did not have an impact on the mood with which the participants approached the rest of the questionnaire. To check the current mood of the participants, a 7-point semantic differential was used. The differential was introduced by the statement ‘Describe how you feel right now, at this moment’ and anchored by ‘very negative – very positive’. After they completed the self-control exercise, half of the respondents watched

the clip with a brand placement disclosure. The disclosure consisted of the phrase ‘This fragment includes product placement [PP]’, in white, all capital letters on a black background, making it easily readable. The disclosure was shown at the beginning of the clip for six seconds. The other half of the respondents watched the same clip, but without the disclosure.

Participants

In total, 173 participants took part in the study. Of these 173 participants, 75.14% were female. The average age was 29.56, with a range of 60 (18 to 78) and a standard deviation of 13.04. Of the participants, 170 people were Dutch (98.27%) and three people indicated to either have the German or Brazilian nationality (1.73%). Regarding their highest education level, wo was for 77 participants (44.51%) the highest education level, hbo for 55 (31.79%), mbo for 21 (12.14%), vwo for 7 (4.05%) and havo for 10 (5.78%) of the participants. A Chi-square test showed no significant relation between version and gender ($\chi^2(3) = 6.48, p = .09$). Men and women were equally distributed over the four conditions. A one-way analysis of variance showed no significant effect between age and the four versions ($F(3,115) < 1$).

After careful consideration, 31 participants were removed from the sample for multiple reasons. Those 31 participants had either not followed the instructions of the self-control exercise correctly, had taken more than an hour to complete the survey, which indicated that they had taken breaks in between or they had indicated that they had seen a brand placement disclosure when in fact there was none. The removal of respondents led to one of the conditions only consisting of 26 participants, but due to time restrictions it was not possible to recruit additional respondents. Subsequently, all the analysis were performed with a total of 142 participants.

Research design

The experimental study used a 2x2 design: self-control depletion vs. no depletion and with brand placement disclosure vs. without brand placement disclosure. A between-subject design was used with each participant being presented with either the version of the clip that contained a brand placement disclosure or the version of the clip that did not contain a brand placement disclosure as well as with either the version of the exercise that led to self-control depletion or the version of the exercise that did not lead to self-control depletion.

Instruments

The independent variables in this study were self-control and disclosure, the dependent variables were brand evaluation, brand memory and persuasion knowledge.

Brand memory. First of all, brand memory was measured, which included brand recall and brand recognition. Brand memory was an important factor because it showed whether the participants remember seeing the brand. Even when participants do not remember seeing the brand, asking questions about it could provide useful information. Brand recall was measured by asking participants the following question: ‘Did you see brands in this fragment? If so, indicate below which brand(s) you have seen.’ The participants could either answer ‘no’ or ‘yes, namely,...’. If answered ‘yes, namely...’, there was room for the participants to write down all the brands they recalled seeing (Russell, 2002).

Brand recognition was measured using a shortened version of the Memory Characteristics Questionnaire (Johnson, Foley, Suengas, & Ray, 1988, in Law & Braun, 2000). The participants were presented with the following statement: ‘A list of brands is displayed below. Indicate which brand(s) you have seen in the fragment.’ In addition to Starbucks, the list included eleven brands that were not shown in the clip. These fillers were head & shoulders, Rolex, Nike, Dolce & Gabbana, Garnier, Sony, Vitamin Water, Peugeot, Chanel and Apple. These brands were chosen, as their inclusion in the clip seemed likely and plausible. In the clip, the lead female character was first shown running on a treadmill, which is why Nike and Vitamin Water were chosen. As she is likely to take a shower afterwards, head & shoulders and Garnier were included in the list. Later on, she is seen wearing nice clothes while carrying an expensive looking handbag, so Rolex, Dolce & Gabbana and Chanel seemed plausible brands. The clip ends with a scene in her office, where a computer can be seen on her desk, which is why Sony and Apple were included. Participants were asked to indicate which of the products they had seen while watching the clip. They also had the option to indicate that they had not seen any of the aforementioned brands.

Brand evaluation. The questionnaire measured brand evaluation, which included brand attitude and purchase intention. Brand attitude can be helpful in predicting consumer behavior and purchase intention indicates a consumer’s conscious plan to buy a product (Spears & Singh, 2004), making them both important factors of brand evaluation. Brand attitude was measured using five 7-point semantic differentials (Matthes et al., 2007). The differentials were introduced by the statement ‘In my opinion, this brand is:’ and anchored by ‘friendly – unfriendly’, ‘positive – negative’, ‘appealing – unappealing’, ‘interesting – uninteresting’ and ‘attractive – unattractive’. The reliability of brand attitude comprising seven items

was excellent: α : .92. Purchase intention was measured using one 7-point semantic differential (Spears & Singh, 2004). The differential was introduced by the question ‘How likely is it that you will buy a product from Starbucks in the upcoming month’ and anchored by ‘very likely – very unlikely’.

Persuasion knowledge. Furthermore, the questionnaire measured persuasion knowledge, as persuasion knowledge gives an indication as to whether the participants were able to recognize the brand placement as advertising. Conceptual persuasion knowledge was measured using two 7-point Likert scales. The scales were introduced by the statements ‘The clip included advertising’ and ‘The inclusion of Starbucks in the clip is advertising’ and were anchored by ‘strongly agree – strongly disagree’. Conceptual persuasion knowledge also included persuasive intent and selling intent, which were measured using six 7-point Likert scales anchored by ‘strongly agree –strongly disagree’. The scales were introduced by the statements ‘Starbucks is featured in the clip in order to inform the consumer’, ‘...to sell Starbucks products’, ‘...to get consumers to like the brand’, ‘...to entertain the consumer’, ‘...to stimulate the sales of Starbucks’, ‘...to influence the consumer’. The statements ‘Starbucks is featured in the clip in order to inform the consumer’ and ‘...to entertain the consumer’ acted as fillers and were not included in the analysis. The reliability of conceptual persuasion knowledge comprising six items was good: α : .86.

Attitudinal persuasion knowledge was measured using eleven 7-point Likert scales. The scales were introduced by the statement ‘ In my opinion, the inclusion of Starbucks in the clip is...’ ‘...trustworthy’, ‘...convincing’, ‘...dishonest’, ‘...manipulative’, ‘...nice’, ‘...incredible’, ‘...entertaining’, ‘...misleading’, ‘...acceptable’, ‘...irritating’ and ‘...distracting’ and were anchored by ‘strongly agree - stongly disagree’.Before calculating Cronbach’s α , the items ‘trustworthy’, ‘convincing’, ‘nice’, ‘entertaining’ and ‘acceptable’ had to be recoded. The reliability of attitudinal persuasion knowledge was good: α : .80.

Control variables. Control variables were age, education level, gender, familiarity with the movie, familiarity with the brand, how often the respondents buy something at Starbucks and whether the participants remember seeing the disclosure. Familiarity with the movie and the brand was measured because existing attitudes towards either could influence the responses of the participants. These variables were measured using two 7-point Likert scales anchored by ‘completely unfamiliar - very familiar’. The scales were introduced by the question ‘How familiar are you with the movie?’ and ‘How familiar are you with the brand?’. The frequency with which respondents buy products at Starbucks was measured as it could also indicate an existing attitude towards Starbucks that could affect the responses of the partici-

pants. This variable was measured using one 7-point Likert scale anchored by ‘never - very often’. The scale was introduced by the question ‘How often do you buy something at Starbucks?’. In order to measure whether the participants remember seeing the brand placement disclosure, participants were asked to answer the question ‘Do you remember having seen a brand placement disclosure in the clip?’ using ‘yes’ or ‘no’.

Manipulation check. A manipulation check based on Janssen, Fennis and Pruyn (2010) was conducted for the self-control exercise using four 7-point Likert scales anchored by ‘strongly agree – strongly disagree’. The scales were introduced by the statements ‘The task was difficult’, ‘The task required a lot of effort’, ‘During the task I had to suppress an automatic response’ and ‘During the task I had to exert self-control’. The reliability of the manipulation check was good: α : .88.

Composite means were calculated, as Cronbach’s α was .70 or higher for all scales.

Procedure

The experiment was conducted online. Respondents were invited to participate in the study via a link that redirected them to the survey. Once they had clicked the link, they were randomly assigned to one of the four conditions, watched the clip and answered the questions. Participants were not informed about the purpose of the study in advance in order to avoid influencing them. Participants were thanked for their partaking in the study, assured that there were no wrong answers and that all their details and answers were anonymous and would not be used for any other purpose other than this study. Participants were given the opportunity to contact one of the members of the research team after a certain date if they were interested in receiving the results of the study.

Statistical treatment

In order to evaluate the data collected in the experiment, ANCOVAs were conducted for all variables except brand recall and brand recognition. These two variables were analyzed using logistic regression. Cronbach’s Alpha was calculated for all scales that consisted of more than one item.

Results

Manipulation checks

In order to check whether the manipulation used in the study was successful, an Independent Samples t-test was conducted, with the self-control exercise as the independent variable and self-control as the dependent variable. The manipulation check of self-control was significant ($t(120,76) = 11.18, p < .001$), which entails that the manipulation used in the study was successful. The respondents who completed the self-control exercise without using the letter 'e' were indeed more depleted and had less self-control afterwards ($M = 4.72, SD = 1.42$) than the respondents who were allowed to use the letter 'e' while completing the exercise ($M = 2.29, SD = 1.12$).

An Independent Samples t-test, with the self-control exercise as the independent variable and mood as the dependent variable, was carried out in order to check whether the self-control exercise had an effect on the respondents' mood. The manipulation check of the mood of the respondents was not significant ($t(140) = 1.54, p = .125$), which means that the self-control exercise did not affect the respondent's mood.

Brand attitude, purchase intention, conceptual persuasion knowledge and attitudinal persuasion knowledge were tested with analyses of covariance (ANCOVA). Familiarity with the brand, familiarity with the movie and the frequency with which participants buy products at Starbucks were included as covariates in all the analyses. In addition, logistic regression analyses were conducted for the variables brand recall and brand recognition.

Brand evaluation

In order to test the hypotheses that people with high self-control resources will evaluate a brand less positively after being exposed to a disclosure whereas people with low self-control resources will not evaluate a brand any differently after exposure to a disclosure, two-way analyses of covariance were conducted. Results of an ANCOVA did not reveal a significant effect of self-control ($F(1, 135) < 1$) and disclosure ($F(1, 135) < 1$) on brand attitude. The interaction effect between self-control and disclosure on brand attitude was also not statistically significant ($F(1, 135) < 1$).

The results of an ANCOVA did not expose a significant effect of self-control ($F(1, 135) < 1$) and disclosure ($F(1, 135) < 1$) on purchase intention. However, a marginally significant interaction effect between self-control and disclosure on purchase intention was detected ($F(1, 135) = 3.82, p = .053$). After splitting the data file based on self-control, one-way

ANOVAs were conducted. No significant effect of disclosure on the purchase intention of people with low self-control resources was found ($F(1, 63) < 1$). The effect of disclosure on the purchase intention of people with high self-control resources was also not significant ($F(1, 75) < 1$). Splitting the file based on disclosure, more one-way ANOVAs were carried out. A significant effect of self-control on purchase intention was found in the absence of a brand placement disclosure ($F(1, 67) = 4.33, p = .041$). As can be seen in Table 1, respondents who were not confronted with a brand placement disclosure and who had low self-control had a higher purchase intention ($M = 3.38, SD = 2.08$) than respondents who were not confronted with a brand placement disclosure and had high self-control ($M = 2.44, SD = 1.65$). No significant effect of self-control on purchase intention was found in the presence of a brand placement disclosure ($F(1, 71) < 1$).

Regarding brand evaluation, H1 was not supported, as respondents with high self-control did not evaluate a brand less positively after being exposed to a brand placement disclosure. Brand attitude and purchase intention were not lower for respondents with high self-control resources. H2 however was supported, as it was predicted that respondents with low self-control would not evaluate a brand any differently after being exposed to a brand placement disclosure. This was confirmed because no significant interaction effect of self-control and disclosure was found on brand attitude. A significant interaction effect of self-control and disclosure was found on purchase intention, but self-control only had a significant effect on purchase intention in the absence of a disclosure. When the respondents were not confronted with a disclosure, people with low self-control resources had a higher purchase intention. However, as H2 focuses on the effects of self-control in the presence of brand placement disclosures and no significant effect of self-control on purchase intention was found in said presence, H2 was supported.

Persuasion knowledge

A two-way analysis of covariance did not show a significant effect of self-control ($F(1, 135) < 1$) and disclosure ($F(1, 135) < 1$) on attitudinal persuasion knowledge. The interaction effect between self-control and disclosure on attitudinal persuasion knowledge was also not statistically significant ($F(1, 135) = 1.94, p = .166$).

The results of an ANCOVA did not expose a significant effect of self-control ($F(1, 135) = 1.12, p = .292$) and disclosure ($F(1, 135) = 1.45, p = .230$) on conceptual persuasion knowledge. There was no significant interaction effect between self-control and disclosure on conceptual persuasion knowledge discovered either ($F(1, 135) < 1$).

Table 1: Means of persuasion knowledge and brand evaluation as a function of brand placement disclosure and self-control (standard deviations in brackets).

	Disclosure			
	Disclosure (<i>n</i> = 73)		No disclosure (<i>n</i> = 69)	
	Low self-control (<i>n</i> = 39)	High self-control (<i>n</i> = 34)	Low self-control (<i>n</i> = 26)	High self-control (<i>n</i> = 43)
Brand evaluation				
Brand attitude	4.89 (1.04)	5.02 (1.28)	4.97 (.91)	4.86 (1.02)
Purchase intention	2.97 (1.83)	2.68 (1.90)	3.38 (2.08)	2.44 (1.65)
Purchase intention				
Conceptual PK	5.04 (1.20)	5.32 (1.40)	4.85 (1.09)	4.97 (1.32)
Attitudinal PK	3.61 (1.92)	3.36 (.86)	3.34 (.74)	3.48 (.77)

Note: Brand attitude is measured on 7-point semantic differentials ranging from 1 ‘friendly’ to 7 ‘unfriendly’, 1 ‘positive’ to 7 ‘negative’, 1 ‘appealing’ to 7 ‘unappealing’, 1 ‘interesting’ to 7 ‘uninteresting’ and 1 ‘attractive’ to 7 ‘unattractive’, purchase intention was measured on a 7-point semantic differential ranging from 1 ‘very likely’ to 7 ‘very unlikely’, persuasion knowledge is measured on 7-point Likert scales ranging from 1 ‘strongly agree’ to 7 ‘strongly disagree’.

Brand memory

A logistical regression showed a marginally significant effect of self-control on brand recall (Wald (1) = 3.41, $p = .065$). Respondents with high self-control resources had a higher level of brand recall than respondents without low self-control resources ($B = .37$, $p = .065$). A marginally significant effect of disclosure on brand recall was also discovered (Wald (1) = 3.79, $p = .052$). Respondents who were confronted with a brand placement disclosure while watching the clip had a higher level of brand recall than respondents who watched the clip without a brand placement disclosure ($B = .36$, $p = .052$). Additionally, a significant interaction effect between self-control and disclosure on brand recall was found (Wald (1) = 3.84, $p = .05$). In order to interpret the interaction effect, chi-squares were calculated. A Chi-square test showed a significant relation between respondents with high self-control resources and disclosure ($\chi^2(1) = 3.92$, $p = .04$). As can be seen in Table 2, of the respondents who had high self-control and who were confronted with a brand placement disclosure, 79.4% indicated that they had seen Starbucks in the clip. Of the respondents who had high self-control but

did not see a brand placement disclosure in the clip, only 58.1% indicated that they had noticed Starbucks in the clip. A Chi-square test showed no significant relation between respondents with low self-control resources and disclosure ($\chi^2(1) = .71, p = .283$). Of the respondents who had low self-control and who were confronted with a brand placement disclosure, 59% indicated that they had seen Starbucks in the clip, as indicated in Table 2. Of the respondents who had low self-control and did not see a brand placement disclosure, 69.2% indicated that they had seen Starbucks in the clip.

Table 2: Percentages of brand recall as a function of brand placement disclosure and self-control

	Brand recall	
	%	<i>n</i>
High self-control		
Disclosure	79.4%	27
No disclosure	58.1%	25
Total	67.5%	52
Low self-control		
Disclosure	59%	23
No disclosure	69.2%	18
Total	63.1%	41
Total	65.5%	93
Disclosure	68.5%	50
No disclosure	62.3%	43

Results of a logistical regression did not reveal a significant effect of self-control (Wald (1) = 2.16, $p = .142$) and disclosure (Wald (1) = 2.21, $p = .137$) on brand recognition. The interaction effect between self-control and disclosure was also not statistically significant (Wald (1) = 3.02, $p = .082$).

Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the extent to which self-control moderates the effect of brand placement disclosures on brand evaluation. H1 was not supported, as respondents with high self-control resources did not evaluate the brand less positively after being exposed to a brand placement disclosure. They did not have a lower brand attitude or lower purchase intention, which is not in line with expectations, considering that previous research has indicated that people with high self-control resources are better able to resist persuasive attempts (Wheeler, Brinol & Hermann, 2006; Baumeister et al., 2007; Burkley et al., 2011; Hoffmann et al., 2012) and that brand placement disclosures shown before or simultaneous to brand placements result in negative attitudes (Boerman et al., 2012; Boerman et al., 2014).

H2 however was supported, as it was predicted that respondents with low self-control would not evaluate a brand any differently after being exposed to a brand placement disclosure. This was confirmed because, first of all, no significant interaction effect of self-control and disclosure was found on brand attitude. People with low self-control resources did not have a more or less positive attitude towards the brand after they were exposed to a disclosure. However, a marginally significant interaction effect of self-control and disclosure on purchase intention was discovered. People with low self-control resources had a higher purchase intention, but only when they were not exposed to a disclosure. No significant effect of self-control on purchase intention was found in the presence of a disclosure. This study focused on the effects of self-control in the presence of a disclosure, and people with low self-control resources did not have a higher or lower purchase intention after they were exposed to a brand placement disclosure. People with low self-control resources therefore did not evaluate a brand more or less positively after they were exposed to a disclosure and so, H2 was supported. In the absence of a brand placement disclosure, respondents with low self-control therefore probably did not resist the persuasive attempt as much as people with high self-control, which led to a higher purchase intention. This could be explained by the fact that, as shown in previous research, it is harder for people with already low self-control resources to resist subsequent persuasion attempts (Wheeler, Brinol & Hermann, 2006; Baumeister et al., 2007; Burkley et al., 2011; Hoffmann et al., 2012).

Looking at the effects of self-control and disclosure on brand evaluation separately, no effect was found, neither on brand attitude nor on purchase intention. The fact that the amount of self-control did not have an impact on purchase intention, is in contrast with multiple previous studies, which found that once self-control resources are depleted, it becomes harder to

resist a following persuasion attempt (Wheeler, Brinol & Hermann, 2006; Baumeister et al., 2007; Burkley et al., 2011; Hoffmann et al., 2012). The present study did not find a significant effect of disclosure on brand attitude, which is in line with results from previous research, which also did not find any effects of disclosures on brand attitude (Dekker & Van Reijmersdal, 2010). However, research conducted previously has shown that a disclosure that is shown for six seconds prior to or concurrent with a brand placement has a negative impact on brand attitude (Boerman et al., 2012). The disclosure in the present study was shown for six seconds and prior to the brand placement, but did not lead to less favorable brand attitudes.

The present study did not find an effect of disclosure or self-control on persuasion knowledge, which is in contrast with previous research. Previous studies have found that confronting viewers with disclosures is enough to activate the use of persuasion knowledge (Campbell et al., 2012; Boerman et al., 2012), which helps viewers to distinguish between commercial and editorial content and therefore to recognize advertising. In the current study, the disclosure did not have an effect on either conceptual and attitudinal persuasion knowledge. A possible explanation for the lack of results could be that the respondents were confronted with the disclosure while participating in an experiment. They could have been more focused on trying to identify the general goal behind the survey, thinking that maybe the plot of the clip or the actions of the characters would be the main focus of the survey. As a result, the participants might not have activated their persuasion knowledge. If they had watched the movie in a more natural setting, they might have recognized the brand placement more easily, especially in combination with the presence of a disclosure.

Findings indicated a significant interaction effect of self-control and disclosure on brand recall that revealed a significant relation between high self-control resources and disclosures, but not between low self-control resources and disclosures. People with high self-control resources who have seen a disclosure score higher on brand recall than people with high self-control resources who were not confronted with a disclosure. This is in line with previous research that pointed out that people with high self-control resources are less passive than people with low self-control resources (Baumeister et al., 1998) and that the presence of disclosures leads to increased brand memory (Van Reijmersdal et al., 2013; Boerman et al., 2012). Therefore, respondents who did not watch the clip with a passive mindset and who were exposed to a brand placement disclosure might, as a result, have paid even more attention to it, and were therefore better at recalling the brand than the respondents who did not see a disclosure.

Furthermore, results indicated a main effect of self-control on brand recall. People with high self-control score higher on brand recall than people with depleted self-control resources. A possible explanation for this effect might be that people whose self-control resources are not depleted are better able and more willing to focus on details while watching a movie, and are therefore better at recalling brands. People with depleted self-control resources might not be as focused on details when watching a movie and as a result score lower on brand recall. This is in line with research conducted by Baumeister et al. (1998), who showed that depleted self-control resources result in increased passivity.

The present study also indicated a main effect of brand placement disclosures on brand recall. Respondents who were confronted with a brand placement disclosure while watching the clip had a higher level of brand recall than respondents who did not see a brand placement disclosure. This is in line with previous research that demonstrated that brand placement disclosures increase brand memory (Van Reijmersdal et al., 2013; Boerman et al., 2012). It appears that if viewers are made aware of the presence of brands in movies in the form of brand placement disclosures, they pay more attention to brands, which ultimately leads to increased brand memory.

No effects of self-control and disclosures were found on brand recognition. Self-control and disclosures seem to have an effect on brand recall, but not on brand recognition. This is in contrast with previous research that found significant effects of disclosures on brand recognition (Van Reijmersdal et al., 2013). As self-control resources and disclosures seem to increase brand recall, it could be expected that it would increase brand recognition as well, as with brand recall, respondents had to write down the brands they had seen from memory, whereas with brand recognition, respondents were presented with a list of brands, in combination with their logo's, and simply had to pick the ones they had seen. So in the case of brand recognition, respondents had a visual reminder of the brands they were confronted with in the clip. A possible explanation for the fact that no significant results were discovered for brand recognition could be that the ten brands that acted as fillers in the survey might have confused or distracted the respondents from the actual brand placement that was included.

Research conducted by Bennett et al. (1999) indicated that the presence of a disclosure has a positive effect on brand memory, but that it does not have an impact on how much viewers like the branded products. This is in line with results found in the present study. Disclosures had an effect on brand memory, on brand recall specifically, but not on brand evaluation.

The present study has a few limitations. First of all, the majority of the respondents were female. This could have had an influence on various results, as women might react differently to brand placements than men. Women, for example, might focus more on brands when watching a movie or TV content, which might have had an influence on brand recall. Furthermore, not every respondent interpreted the instructions correctly. A few respondents who had to complete the self-control exercise without using the letter ‘e’ simply left out the letter. For example, instead of coming up with a different word for ‘geld’ they filled in ‘gld’. This led to a few respondents having to be removed from the sample, and as a result, not every condition had the required number of 30 participants. Therefore, caution needs to be exerted in generalizing the results. Additionally, it was difficult to decide what the appropriate amount of time was in which respondents had to finish the questionnaire. It was decided to draw the line at one hour, even though most respondents finished the questionnaire within approximately 20 minutes. A few respondents however had some difficulties with the self-control exercise and needed more time. Because we didn’t want to remove those respondents who really needed more time to complete the exercise and therefore drew the line at one hour, there is also the possibility that the sample includes respondents who did not need more time to complete the exercise, but took breaks while filling in the questionnaire instead of completing it at once as asked in the instructions. Taking breaks while completing the exercise was not desired, as the effect of the self-control exercise could have worn off by the time the respondents returned to filling in the questionnaire.

The findings of the present study have a few practical implications. Since the present study did not find any significant effects of brand placement disclosures on brand evaluation, more insight is needed into the effectiveness of brand placement disclosures. The fact that no significant effects of disclosures on brand evaluation were discovered, shows both advertisers and opponents of brand placement that showing a brand placement disclosure does not automatically imply an effect on brand evaluation. This is good news for advertisers, because it tells them that even when they are obligated to include a disclosure when using brand placement, this does not automatically lead to a negative brand evaluation. For opponents of brand placement, the lack of effect of disclosures on brand evaluation might be an indicator that they need to come up with a different or a better way to inform viewers of the persuasive intent of brand placements, as showing a disclosure, does not, for example, appear to result in lower purchase intention.

The present study provided some insights in the effects of brand placement disclosures on brand evaluation. However, the study only focused on the effects of self-control in combination with disclosures. Further research could include other variables when investigating the effects of disclosures. For example, age or education level could be included as independent variables, or the amount of time someone spends watch TV or movies. Age could be a relevant factor, as previous research has indicated that older viewers are more critical of brand placement (De Gregorio & Sung, 2010). A more critical attitude towards brand placement might also influence the way older people view brand placement disclosures. People with a higher education level might also have a more critical attitude towards brand placement and brand placement disclosures, as Campbell et al. (2012) pointed out that age and education level are known to correlate with persuasion knowledge. Investigating the amount of time someone spends watching TV or movies could be an interesting factor as well, as previous research has indicated that frequent exposure to a brand placement has an effect on brand attitude (Matthes et al., 2007). Being frequently confronted with a brand placement disclosure might therefore also have an effect on brand evaluation, on both brand attitude and purchase intention.

Additionally, future studies could also examine the effect of self-control further, for example by focusing on the timing of the disclosure. The present study showed a disclosure for six seconds at the beginning of the clip, however, the results could be different if the disclosure had been shown simultaneously to the brand placement. When the disclosure is shown at the beginning of the movie, viewers, especially those with low self-control, might have forgotten the disclosure by the time the actual brand placement is shown, as low self-control resources appear to lead to a more passive mindset (Baumeister et al., 1998). Previous research has shown that brand memory is higher when respondents are exposed to a disclosure simultaneously to the brand placement than afterwards (Reijmersdal et al., 2013), so future research could further investigate the effect of timing of disclosures in combination with self-control.

Future research could also examine how people evaluate the brand placement disclosure itself. As there are multiple ways of designing disclosures, this could possibly have an effect on brand evaluation. For example, the disclosure could include more details such as the name of the advertiser or the intention behind showing a particular brand in a particular movie. The majority of the respondents that participated in a study by Tessitore en Geuens (2013) did not know the meaning behind the ‘PP’ symbol. Including the intention behind using brand placement in a movie could make viewers, who do not know the meaning behind the ‘PP’

symbol, aware of the meaning of the symbol or serve as a reminder for those who do know. Furthermore, showing the 'PP' symbol indicates that brand placement is used in the movie or TV content, but it does not reveal the specific brands. Showing the name of the advertiser in the disclosure could help viewers know which brands pay in order to be featured in the movie or TV content, instead of just having a general sense that brands are included.

Resources

- Audiovisual Media Services Directive (2010). Directive 2010/13/EU of the European parliament and of the council. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/avpolicy/reg/tvwf/index_en.htm on March 14, 2015.
- Balasubramanian, S. K., Karrh, J. A., & Patwardhan, H. (2006). Audience response to product placements. An integrative framework and future research agenda. *Journal of Advertising*, 35, 115-141. doi: 10.2753/JOA0091-3367350308
- Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. M. (1998). Ego depletion: Is the active self a limited resource? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1252-1265. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.5.1252
- Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., & Tice, D. M. (2007). The strength model of self-control. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16, 351-355. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00534.x
- Bennett, M., Pecotich, A., & Putrevu, S. (1999). The influence of warnings on product placements. In B. Dubois, T. M. Lowrey, L. J. Shrum, & M. Vanhuele (Eds.), *European Advances in Consumer Research* (Vol. 4, pp. 193-200). Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Boerman, S. C., Van Reijmersdal, E. A., & Neijens, P. C. (2012). Sponsorship disclosure: Effects of duration on persuasion knowledge and brand responses. *Journal of Communication*, 62, 1047-1064. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01677.x
- Boerman, S. C., Van Reijmersdal, E. A., & Neijens, P. C. (2014). Effects of sponsorship disclosure timing on the processing of sponsored content: A study on the effectiveness of European disclosure regulations. *Psychology and Marketing*, 31, 214-224. doi:10.1002/mar. 20688
- Burkley, E. (2008). The role of self-control in resistance to persuasion. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34, 419-431. doi: 10.1177/0146167207310458
- Burkley, E., Anderson, D., & Curtis, J. (2011). You wore me down: Self-control strength and social influence. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5, 487-499. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2011.00367.x
- Campbell, M. C., Mohr, G. S., & Verlegh, P. W. J. (2007). *Effects of product placement and sponsorship disclosure: A flexible correction approach*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Research in Advertising, Lisbon, Portugal.

- Campbell, M. C., Mohr, G. S., & Verlegh, P. W. J. (2012). Can disclosures lead consumers to resist covert persuasion? The important roles of disclosure timing and type of response. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 23*, 483-495. doi: 10.1016/j.jcps.2012.10.012
- De Gregorio, F., & Sung, Y. 2010. Understanding attitudes toward and behaviors in response to product placement. *Journal of Advertising, 39*(1), 83–96.
- Dekker, K., & Van Reijmersdal, E. A. (2010). Waarschuwingen, beroemdheden en brand placement: De effecten van type waarschuwing en geloofwaardigheid op kijkerreacties. *Tijdschrift Voor Communicatiewetenschap, 38*(4), 320–337
- Fennis, B. M., Janssen, L., & Vohs, K. D. (2009). Acts of benevolence: A limited-resource account of compliance with charitable requests. *Journal of Consumer Research, 35*, 906-924. doi:10.1086/593291
- Friestad, M., & Wright, P. (1994). The persuasion knowledge model: How people cope with persuasion attempts. *Journal of Consumer Research, 21*(1), 1-31.
- Gillespie, B, Joireman, J. & Muehling, D.D. (2012). The moderating effect of ego depletion on viewer brand recognition and brand attitudes following exposure to subtle versus blatant product placements in television programs. *Journal of Advertising, 41*(2).
- Green, M. C., & Brock, T. C. (2000). The role of transportation in the persuasiveness of public narratives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*(5), 701-721. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.701>
- Hofmann, W., Vohs, K. D., & Baumeister, R. F. (2012). What people desire, feel conflicted about, and try to resist in everyday life. *Psychological Science, 23*, 582-588. doi: 10.1177/0956797612437426.
- Janssen, L., & Fennis, B. M. (manuscript under review). Mindless resistance to persuasive communication: Low self-control fosters the use of resistance-promoting heuristics.
- Janssen, L, Fennis, B.M. & Pruyn, A. (2010). Forewarned is forearmed: Conserving self-control strength to resist social influence? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46*(6).
- Johnson, B. K., Ewoldsen, D. R., & Slater, M. D. (2015). Self-control depletion and narrative: Testing a prediction of the TEBOTS model. *Media Psychology, 1-25*. doi: 10.1080/15213269.2014.978872
- Matthes, J., Schemer, C., & Wirth, W. (2007). More than meets the eye: Investigating the hidden impact of brand placements in television magazines. *International Journal of Advertising, 26*, 477-503.

- Matthes, J., Wirth, W., Schemer, C., & Kissling, A. K. (2011). I see what you don't see. The role of individual differences in field dependence-independence as a predictor of product placement recall and brand liking. *Journal of Advertising*, 40, 85-99. doi: 10.2753/JOA0091-3367400406
- Reinecke, L., Hartmann, T., & Eden, A. (2014). The guilty couch potato: The role of ego depletion in reducing recovery through media use. *Journal of Communication*, 64, 569-589. doi: 10.1111/jcom.12107
- Russell, C. A. (2002). Investigating the effectiveness of product placements in television shows: The role of modality and plot connection congruence on brand memory and attitude. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29, 306-318. doi: 0093-5301/2003/2903-002
- Smit, E. G., Van Reijmersdal, E. A., & Neijens, P. C. (2009). Today's practice of brand placement and the industry behind it. *International Journal of Advertising*, 28, 761-782. doi:10.2501/S0265048709200898
- Spears, N. & Singh, S.N. (2004). Measuring attitude toward the brand and purchase intentions. *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 26 (2), 53-65.
- Tessitore, T., & Geuens, M. (2013). PP for 'product placement' or 'puzzled public'? *International Journal of Advertising*, 32, 419-442. doi: 10.2501/IJa-32-3-419-442
- Van Reijmersdal, E. A., Neijens, P. C., & Smit, E. G. (2007). Effects of television brand placement on brand image. *Psychology and Marketing*, 24, 403-420. doi: 10.1002/mar.20166
- Van Reijmersdal, E. A., Tutaj, K., & Boerman, S. C. (2013). The effects of brand placement disclosures on skepticism and brand memory. *Communications*, 38, 127-146. doi: 10.1515/commun-2013-0008
- Wei, M., Fischer, E., & Main, K. J. (2008). An examination of the effects of activating persuasion knowledge on consumer response to brands engaging in covert marketing. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 27(1), 34-44.
- Yang, M., & Roskos-Ewoldsen, D. R. (2007). The effectiveness of brand placements in the movies: Levels of placements, explicit and implicit memory, and brand-choice behavior. *Journal of Communication*, 57, 469-489. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2007.00353.

Bijlage 1: Vragenlijst

Beste deelnemer,

Bedankt dat je wilt deelnemen aan dit onderzoek van de Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen. Het onderzoek bestaat uit twee delen. Als eerste onderdeel maak je een schrijfofdracht. Vervolgens krijg je een fragment te zien uit de film "The Proposal" dat ongeveer drieënhalve minuut zal duren. Hierna volgt een aantal vragen. Om het fragment te kunnen bekijken, dient het geluid op je computer te zijn ingeschakeld.

In totaal duurt het invullen van de vragenlijst ongeveer tien minuten. We willen je vragen om alle onderdelen en vragen van het onderzoek achter elkaar in te vullen en niet tussentijds te pauzeren. We vragen je daarom om gedurende het onderzoek je mobiele telefoon weg te leggen en ervoor te zorgen dat je niet wordt afgeleid. Bij de vragen die je worden gesteld na het fragment zijn geen goede of foute antwoorden mogelijk en gaat het om jouw persoonlijke mening. Je gegevens zullen vertrouwelijk worden behandeld en zullen alleen gebruikt worden voor dit onderzoek.

Maak een grammaticaal correcte zin. LET OP: je mag de letter "e" NIET gebruiken! Gebruik dus alleen woorden waarin de letter "e" niet voorkomt.

1. Na komt zonschijn.
2. stinkt niet.
3. Door de het bos niet meer zien.
4. In leggen alle vogels een ei.
5. Een voor de dorst.
6. Zo als gras.
7. duurt het langst.
8. Melk is goed voor
9. De buiten zetten.
10. Zo gek als een
11. Snoep gezond, een appel!
12. Meedoen is belangrijker dan
13. Als er één schaap over de dam is, volgen er
14. De aanval is de beste
15. De pot verwijt de dat hij zwart ziet.

Of:

Maak een grammaticaal correcte zin.

1. Na komt zonneshijn.
2. stinkt niet.
3. Door de het bos niet meer zien.
4. In leggen alle vogels een ei.
5. Een voor de dorst.
6. Zo als gras.
7. duurt het langst.
8. Melk is goed voor
9. De buiten zetten.
10. Zo gek als een
11. Snoep gezond, een appel!
12. Meedoen is belangrijker dan
13. Als er één schaap over de dam is, volgen er
14. De aanval is de beste
15. De pot verwijt de dat hij zwart ziet.

Geef aan hoe je je nu, op dit moment, voelt:

Heel erg negatief O O O O O O O Heel erg positief

Bekijk het filmfragment op de volgende pagina. Bekijk het volledige fragment, zonder tussentijds te pauzeren, terug- of vooruit te spoelen. Ga na het fragment direct door met het beantwoorden van de vragen.

Fragment

The Proposal (2009)

Je hebt zojuist een fragment uit de film "The Proposal" bekeken. Geef hieronder aan welke gedachten er door je heen gingen tijdens het bekijken van dit fragment.

Heb je in dit fragment merken voorbij zien komen? Zo ja, geef hieronder aan welk(e) merk(en) je in het fragment hebt gezien.

- Nee
- Ja, namelijk...

Hieronder is een aantal merken weergegeven. Geef aan welk(e) merk(en) je in het fragment hebt gezien.

- Head & Shoulders
- Rolex
- Nike
- Dolce & Gabbana
- Garnier
- Sony
- Vitamin water
- Starbucks
- Peugeot
- Chanel
- Ik heb geen van deze merken in het fragment gezien

De volgende vragen hebben betrekking op het merk Starbucks. Geef hieronder aan wat je van dit merk vindt.

Naar mijn mening is het merk Starbucks:

Onvriendelijk Vriendelijk

Negatief Positief

Niet aansprekend Aansprekend

Niet interessant Interessant

Onaantrekkelijk Aantrekkelijk

Niet leuk Leuk

Hoe waarschijnlijk is het dat je de komende maand een product van Starbucks zou willen kopen?

Zeer onwaarschijnlijk Onwaarschijnlijk

Geef aan in hoeverre je het eens bent met de volgende stellingen over het filmfragment dat je zojuist hebt bekeken:

In het fragment werd reclame gemaakt

Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Het tonen van Starbucks in het fragment is reclame
Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Starbucks wordt getoond in het fragment om.....

...de consument te informeren.
Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

...producten van Starbucks te verkopen.
Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

...de consument het merk leuk te laten vinden.
Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

...de consument te vermaken.
Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

...de verkoop van producten van het merk Starbucks te stimuleren.
Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

...de consument te beïnvloeden.
Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind het tonen van het merk Starbucks in het filmfragment:

Betrouwbaar
Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Overtuigend
Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Oneerlijk
Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Manipulatief
Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Leuk
Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Ongeloofwaardig

Helemaal mee oneens O O O O O O O Helemaal mee eens

Vermakelijk

Helemaal mee oneens O O O O O O O Helemaal mee eens

Misleidend

Helemaal mee oneens O O O O O O O Helemaal mee eens

Acceptabel

Helemaal mee oneens O O O O O O O Helemaal mee eens

Irritant

Helemaal mee oneens O O O O O O O Helemaal mee een

Afleidend

Helemaal mee oneens O O O O O O O Helemaal mee eens

Beantwoord de volgende vragen over het fragment uit de film "The Proposal" dat je zojuist hebt bekeken door aan te geven in hoeverre je het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

1. "Ik heb genoten van het verhaal/het fragment."

Helemaal mee oneens O O O O O O O Helemaal mee eens

2. "Terwijl ik het fragment bekeek, kon ik me de gebeurtenissen levendig voorstellen."

Helemaal mee oneens O O O O O O O Helemaal mee eens

3. "Terwijl ik het fragment bekeek, kon ik mijn gedachten er niet goed bij houden."

Helemaal mee oneens O O O O O O O Helemaal mee eens

4. "Terwijl ik het fragment bekeek, ging ik helemaal op in het verhaal."

Helemaal mee oneens O O O O O O O Helemaal mee eens

5. "Terwijl ik het fragment bekeek, was ik me bewust van de dingen die om me heen gebeurden."

Helemaal mee oneens O O O O O O O Helemaal mee eens

In hoeverre was je voorafgaand aan het bekijken van het fragment bekend met de film "The Proposal"?

Helemaal niet bekend Heel erg bekend

In hoeverre was je voorafgaand aan het bekijken van het fragment bekend met het merk Starbucks?

Helemaal niet bekend Heel erg bekend

Hoe vaak koop je iets bij Starbucks?

Nooit Heel vaak

De volgende vragen gaan over de schrijfpdracht die je voorafgaand aan het bekijken van het fragment hebt gemaakt. Geef aan in hoeverre je het eens bent met de volgende stellingen.

“Ik vond de taak moeilijk.”

Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

“De taak kostte me veel inspanning.”

Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

“Tijdens de taak moest ik een automatische respons onderdrukken.”

Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

“Tijdens de taak moest ik controle over mezelf uitoefenen.”

Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Hieronder volgt een aantal algemene vragen:

Ben je een man of een vrouw?

- Man
- Vrouw

Wat is je nationaliteit?

- Nederlands
- Anders, namelijk...

Wat is je leeftijd? ...

Wat is je hoogst genoten opleiding (deze hoeft nog niet afgerond te zijn)?

- vmbo
- havo
- vwo
- mbo
- hbo
- wo

Heb je tijdens het bekijken van het fragment een melding gezien dat het fragment product placement bevat?

- Ja
- Nee

Bedankt voor je deelname aan dit onderzoek! Mocht je interesse hebben in de resultaten van dit onderzoek, dan kun je na 10 juni 2015 een mailtje sturen naar rienne.meijer@student.ru.nl