

Radboud University



Bachelor thesis 2020-21

A marked effect?

An exploration into the effect of multiple COO markers and brand familiarity on an advertisement's effectiveness.

Radboud University Nijmegen, Netherlands
Study programme: B.A. International Business Communication (IBC)
Supervisor: Dr. B. J. H. Hilberink-Schulpen
Second reader: Dr. L. J. Speed
Student: James Robertson
Student number: s1007279
Date and place of submission: 15-01-2021, Nijmegen

Abstract

Given the abundance of country-of-origin markers in advertising, there is an immediate economic requirement for enterprises to base their marketing strategies on concrete research.

The overarching aim of this experiment was to investigate the influence of the multiple use of country-of-origin markers and brand familiarity on an advertisement's effectiveness. The effectiveness of an advertisement was measured with: attitude towards an advertisement, attitude towards a brand and purchase intention. The results showed partially significant results for advertisement's containing alimentation products. The results overall deviated from the predictions made in the literature review.

However the research question could not be confirmed as the results failed to yield concrete evidence. Practical implications as a result of this study are that a large amount of future research needs to be conducted for further contribution to the globalized marketing industry.

Key words: Country-of-origin, marker, advertisement, effectiveness, brand, familiarity, attitude

Introduction



Figure 1. Giovanni Rana Advertisement

The type of advertisement depicted above (*Figure 1*) is often created by companies promoting their product. The advertisement shows the *tricolore* of green, red and beige/white as a visual representation to remind consumers inexplicitly of the Italian Flag. As Italy is unanimous to its world-renowned cuisine, this advertisement has used a notion known as a country-of-origin marker (COO) to remind consumers of the product's Italian origin. Upon further inspection of this advertisement, numerous other COO markers can be observed. The angle of the ravioli stack is not unintentionally made to seem as if ravioli can defy gravity, this angle is yet another COO marker and is a representation of a famous Italian landmark namely "The leaning tower of Pisa". The brand's name "*Giovanni Rana*" coincides with a common Italian first name, therefore yet another COO marker. Finally, the topography and aesthetics of the slogan "Real Italian" emphasise the products authenticity through the use of bold letters. As observed, upon close inspection, this advertisement withholds numerous connections to Italy – the product's country of origin. However, if a consumer has previous exposure to Giovanni Rana, do they need to rely on the COO markers found in this advertisement?

Brand familiarity reflects the extent of a consumer's direct or indirect experience with a brand (Alba & Hutchins, 1987). In the context of the advertisement in *figure 1*, this means that if a consumer is familiar with the brand "*Giovanni Rana*" then the effectiveness of the

COO markers in the advertisement may be influenced. Perhaps, previous knowledge of the brand or advertisement offers you enough conscious or sub-conscious data to shift your purchase intention or brand attitude entirely. If brand familiarity is low or non-existent to the consumer, how will then the COO markers affect your consumer habits? These questions will be explored in this research.

Theoretical Framework

A Country-of-origin marker is defined to as being a significant cue in consumer choice behaviour as it has a significant effect on consumer product evaluation (Schooler, 1965) and is important in buying decisions (Beverland & Lindgreen, 2002). Previous research of the country of origin effect is extensive today, however it began its path with a first study conducted by Schooler in 1965. The study was presented to part-time students in Guatemala and used fictitious product labels from four Central American countries, namely Mexico, Costa Rica, El Salvador and in the country of the conducted research Guatemala. Schooler (1965) concluded that the country-of-origin effect does exist as an entity but did not conduct an investigation into the strength or direction of such country-of-origin effects. Further research conducted by Schooler (1971) concluded that females tended to evaluate products higher than males when the advertisement contained COO markers. While in the COO research domain, Schooler's (1965) research would be described as being simplistic by many, he planted the seed of COO research.

COO markers are often confused with the concept of product ethnicity, to reinstate: COO markers are significant cues placed within an advertisement to draw consumers to the origins of the product. Whereas product ethnicity is the universally shared stereotypical relations of products and countries, based on a globally shared perception that a country's "know-how" and reputation relative to the product's design, branding or manufacture with a specific COO (Usunier & Cestre, 2007). While COO markers and product ethnicity are similar in nature, they do fundamentally differ from each other and this study focusses on COO markers.

COO markers can be placed in advertisements by companies in a multitude of approaches. Aichner (2014) refers to these approaches as strategies. As according to his research these eight strategies can be categorised with the typology: explicit/implicit and regulated/unregulated.

The eight strategies (Aichner, 2014, pp. 84-91) are:

“Strategy I: “Made in...” is referred to as the most frequent and easiest strategy. For example, “Made in France” is simply written on a product’s packaging.

Strategy II: “Quality and origin labels” This strategy is used to ensure a product’s credibility and origin protection. European examples of this strategy include: Champagne (sparkling wine, France), Gruyère (cheese, Switzerland) and Jenever (liquor, The Netherlands).”

Strategies I and II are referred to as *regulated* strategies. Meaning if misused, legal repercussions could apply, potentially landing companies in an array of predicaments.

Enterprises often use a combination of regulated strategies with a range of unregulated strategies. The following strategies are described as *unregulated* strategies (Aichner, 2014, pp 84-91.).

“Strategy IV: “Typical COO words embedded in a company name”. For example, Nippon Oil, A Japanese oil producer. The word “nippon” (Japan in Japanese) is commonly associated with Japanese culture.

Strategy V: “Use of a COO language”. For instance, “Audi” the car manufacturer placing its slogan “Vorsprung Durch Technik” (lead by technology) in its advertising campaigns aimed at the British market.

Strategy VI: “Use of famous or stereotypical people from the COO”. For instance, placing Mozart on Austrian chocolate packaging to reinforce the brand’s heritage.

Strategy VII: “Use of flags and symbols”. For example, a Dutch yoghurt company placing a Dutch flag on its packaging with the intention of positively impacting consumers with the brand’s Dutch production origins.

Strategy VIII: “Use of typical landscapes or famous buildings from the COO” For instance, the Swiss chocolate brand Toblerone placing the Matterhorn (a famous and recognisable Swiss mountain) on the product’s packaging.”

Aichner's (2014) study was conducted relatively recently, therefore there is yet to be a large quantity of further use or criticism into his model. This current research will use Aichner's (2014) model as a backbone when it comes to COO strategy choice and hopes to further validify or criticise his research.

While Aichner (2014) makes these eight strategies known in his research. Hornikx, Van Meurs, van den Heuvel and Janssen (2020, pp.36) have furthered his research model by adding an additional strategy. For the sake of the study at hand, this additional strategy will be referred to as Strategy IX.

“Strategy IX: “Referencing to a COO or its inhabitants” This strategy makes a direct connection of a product having a link to a country. An example of this strategy is a British cheddar cheese company making the reference: “Real British Cheddar”.

The number of COO markers and brand familiarity may determine the effectiveness of an advertisement. There has been an overwhelmingly large amount of previous research into the effect of COO markers on an advertisement's effectiveness. Haarmann (1984;1989) is regarded as being one of the first linguists to place a foreign language in an advertisement, in search of an effect. In his research, he placed foreign language segments (cf. strategy V, Aichner (2014)) into mass advertising campaigns in Japan. The foreign languages he explored were German, French, English and Spanish. His main conclusions revealed that certain languages when matched to certain products in terms of their effectiveness demonstrate the concept of product congruency. Haarmann's (1984) reasearch paved the way in terms of COO markers' use in advertising. Furthermore, a meta-analysis largely based on empirical observations illustrated a significant effect of the use of COO markers on the perceived quality of the product, but only a small influence on product attitude and purchase intention (Verlegh & Steenkamp, 1999).

In congruence with that Peterson and Jolibert's (1995) meta-analysis found that the origin country of a product serves as a stronger predictor for quality perceptions than for purchase intention. While previous studies have shown that the specific COO of a product affects consumers' evaluations of a product (Hornikx et al., 2020), these studies showed an array of mixed results leaving open the need to explore the in-depth the effectiveness of COO advertising when multiple COO markers are added.

In their recent research Hornikx et al. (2020) explored to what extent COO markers are used in magazine advertisements, among other hypotheses. The sampling frame in their research was the magazine *Cosmopolitan*. While they only chose a single magazine as their

sample, the variety of advertisement items placed in the magazine was extensive from cars to sanitary pads. Additionally, the sampling frame was various editions of the magazine from The Netherlands and Spain. Their results revealed that from the advertisements analysed, 35.97% contained one or more COO marker. Within the 35.97% of advertisements containing COO markers, 29.10% contained multiple COO markers. This explicitly highlights the importance of research into the multiple use of COO markers, which could have a potential impact on the global marketing industry, an industry with an estimated value of €1.44 trillion (Forbes, 2019). Thus, enterprises can reap capital by applying a strong research-based and effective COO strategy to their future advertisement campaigns. This study intends to not only offer insight into future marketing research but could also potentially serve as guidance to marketers and international corporations globally.

Furthermore, regarding the independent variables for the present study, Koschate-Fischer, Diamantopoulos and Oldenkotte (2012) research contained three experiments using an array of highly and less familiar brands with favourable and unfavourable COO markers according to the advertised product's congruency, the results revealed that a favourable COO is a major benefit to an advertisement's effectiveness and that it directly affects the likelihood of consumer purchasing potential.

As previously stated, a second variable that influences the effectiveness of an advertisement is familiarity with a brand. Previous research, specifically focused on how brand familiarity effects an advertisement's effectiveness reveals that end-users of a specific product with pre-existing brand familiarity, are more likely to draw on this existing brand knowledge, attenuating the consequence of attitude towards the specific advertisements on attitude towards the brand (Campbell & Keller, 2003).

Additionally, research on brand familiarity in combination with the use of COO markers hints to the idea that consumers who withhold low product familiarity in the end rely more on stereotypical biases, this occurs because a low level of brand familiarity implies that individuals have a reduced stored knowledge about a product and therefore they have to trust broader stereotypical information about COO markers to create reasoning (Rios, Riquelme, E.H, & Abdelaziz, 2014). Heimbach, Johansson and MacLachlan (1989) displayed conflicting results, that people who consider themselves familiar with a brand are more inclined to let COO cues intrude their evaluations. The polarized difference in the results of these two studies means predictions for the effect of COO markers in this study are difficult to make, highlighting the relevance and direct need of this paper.

A large research gap prevails in terms of the effect of multiple COO markers and brand familiarity. While Aichner (2014) reveals that companies utilise an array of strategies to convey their country of origin and Hornikx et al. (2020) showed that multiple COO markers are used in about a third of COO advertisements, only a scarce minority of studies have researched the effect of multiple COO markers on advertisement effectiveness in combination with brand familiarity (Heimbach et al., 1989; Rios et al., 2014). The following research question is therefore posed:

“To what extent is the effectiveness of an advertisement influenced by the number of explicit country of origin markers and brand familiarity?”

As previously stated, Aichner (2014) and Hornikx et al. (2020) offer this research an array of 9 distinct COO markers. As an extension to these markers, Aichner (2014) states that COO markers can either be described as explicit or implicit. An example of an explicit COO strategy is strategy I, “Made in...”, as the COO is mentioned directly, for example, “Made in Taiwan” or “Made in India” (Aichner, 2014). He also notes that the explicit COO markers fall into a low-level category, in terms of communication complexity. The result for this study at hand is to choose explicit COO markers with the intention of maintaining low communication complexity, to reduce the amount of potential statistical noise. Hornikx et al. (2020) furthermore reveal that the most commonly used COO strategies throughout previous research are explicit.

Taking the recommendations from Hornikx et al. (2020) and Aichner (2014) into account, the three explicit COO strategies chosen for this study are:

- 1) Strategy I – Made in...
- 2) Strategy III – Country-of-origin embedded in name
- 3) Strategy VII – Use of symbols and flags

As foreign language is used in strategy III, it is therefore vital to consider which language/countries to use. English language is commonly referred to as the “lingua franca”, meaning that people around the globe use English as a means of communication when conversing in their mother tongue is not an option. Hornikx et al. (2020) discuss in their paper how English is the most frequently used language in advertising in non-English speaking countries. Furthermore, as stated by Alden, Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M., & Batra (1999, p.77) “one

way for a brand to communicate GCCP (Global Consumer Culture Positioning) is to use English words, written and/or spoken, in its communications.”. The implications for this study means that when strategy I (made in...) is implemented, English will be used. This use of English language must not be perceived as a COO marker related to an English speaking country, but as a consequence of a more a globalised world in which we live. This study will be conducted on Dutch consumers using a selection of Spanish products.

Purchase intention, attitude towards the advertisement and attitude towards the brand will serve as the dependent variables of this study and are therefore referred to as the advertisements' effectiveness. Attitude towards an advertisement can be referred to as a predetermined manner of responding to a particular advertising stimulus throughout a certain exposure event (Lutz, 1975). Purchase intention is referred to by Lu (2014) as a consumers eagerness to purchase a certain product in a specific situation or at a certain time. Li, Daugherty & Biocca (2013) state in their paper-based previous research that the most commonly used conative measure in advertising effectiveness research is the intention to purchase something. Therefore, attitude towards the advertisement and brand as well as purchase intention serve as indicators for the overall effectiveness of an advertisement. Finally, Mehta (2000) reveals that consumers who demonstrate more positive attitudes towards advertising are more likely to be persuaded by the advertising they encounter.

Method

Materials

The first independent variable “COO marker/s” will be operationalised by placing a single, combination or absence of COO strategies (Aichner, 2014) into different versions of static print advertisements (four levels: no COO marker, strategy I (Made in...), strategy III (COO embedded in name) or strategy VII (Use of symbols or flags)). The various COO strategies will be implemented in distinctive ways. In the clothing advertisements, strategy VII (Use of symbols or flags) will be implemented by placing the colours of the Spanish flag behind the logo whereas in the advertisements for chips a bull and a matador can be found in the background. (Figure 2).



Figure 2. Example of an advertisement containing 3 COO markers (strategies: I, III and VII) ¹

The second independent variable of “brand familiarity” will be operationalised by showing participants a brand they are either familiar with or not familiar with. A set of two pre-tests with Dutch L1 speakers were conducted to establish which brands are best suited for the questionnaire regarding the independent variable brand familiarity. The sample sizes were 21 participants for the familiar brands pre-test and 15 participants for the second unfamiliar brands pre-test. Different samples were used for each pre-test to ensure reliability. The familiar brands were Pringles, Zara, Desigual, Mango, Estrella Damm, Stradavarius and Aldofo Domingo. These were decided by the researchers as commonly known chosen Spanish brands.

The unknown brands were Noon, MeiOliver, Ruffles, FritRavich CrunChips. These brands were randomly selected and decided as being unknown due to none of the conductors of this experiment recognising them.

The gender distribution of the pre-test for the unfamiliar brands was 55.6% who identified as men and 43.8% who identified as women. The gender distribution for the familiar brands was 55.6% who identified as men and 43.3% who identified as women.

¹ N.b., the appendix contains a diagram exhibiting the form in which COO markers were placed into all advertisements

Brand un/familiarity was measured using the questions: “Please indicate to what extent you are familiar with this brand?”, “I have already bought something from this brand” and “Where do you think this brand comes from?” with a follow up question on the third question of “How sure are you of your choice?”.

After finding that the first two questions correlated highly positively with each other ($r(22) = .79, p < .001$), the means of question 1 and question 2 were computed together taking the brand as the reference. Next, brand familiarity was assessed using a repeated measures analysis of variance. This repeated measures univariate analysis of variance for brand familiarity with within-subject factor brand showed a significant main effect ($F(4.97, 104.43) = 41.57, p < .001, \eta^2 = .664$), due to the fact that the assumption of sphericity was violated, the F -value was calculated with Huynh-Feldt. It was found that Pringles ($M = 3.81, SD = .58$) and Zara ($M = 3.36, SD = .81$) were the most familiar brands. Therefore, these two brands were chosen as the stimulus material for brand familiarity.

In a similar vein, for brand unfamiliarity the first two questions also correlated strongly positively with each other ($r(15) = .85, p < .001$). A repeated measures univariate analysis of variance for brand unfamiliarity with within-subject factor brand found that It was found no statistically significant main effect ($F(4, 11) = 1.43, p = .289$), due to the fact that the assumption of sphericity did not apply, the F -value was calculated with Pillai’s trace. Therefore, the brands FritRavich ($M = 1.03, SD = .13$) and Noon ($M = 1.03, SD = .13$) were chosen as the least familiar based on the descriptive statistics. These two brands were the stimulus material for brand unfamiliarity.

Furthermore, the experiment was completed in Dutch to avoid the anchor contraction effect (ACE). The ACE states that when reporting one’s own emotions towards a certain stimulus in a foreign language, we tend to do so in a more emotionally intense way than in our own native language (De Langhe, Puntoni, Fernandes & van Osselaer, 2011).

Subjects

The population of the study were native Dutch L1 speakers residing in The Netherlands. The sampling method used was convenience sampling. Participants were filtered out of the questionnaire if they failed to complete it entirely, if their native language was not Dutch, if they were below 16 years of age or if they didn’t agree to the terms and conditions. A total of 349 participants were acquired and for the analysis a total of 253 participants were left.

Within the 253 participants, 89 (35.2%) identified as male and 164 (64.8%) identified as female. The most frequently occurring completed education level (as according to the Dutch

education system) was University (34.4%) followed closely by Highschool (34.0%) then HBO (22.1%) and MBO (9.5%). The participants had a mean age of approximately 29 years ($M = 28.58$, $SD = 13.03$) and 21 years was the most frequent respondents age. The youngest participant was 16 years old and the oldest was 79, the age range of the participants was 63 years. The context variable gender was equally distributed across all eight conditions ($X^2(7) = 8.58$, $p = .284$), education level and brand familiarity ($X^2(3) = .61$, $p = .893$), education level and number of COO markers ($X^2(9) = 10.11$, $p = .341$), and age ($F(7, 104.55) = .51$, $p = .513$).

Design

The study contains a 2 (brand familiarity: known - unknown) x 4 (number of COO marker: No COO marker – one COO marker – two COO markers – three COO markers) between-subjects design, resulting in eight conditions. The dependent variables are attitude towards the advertisement, attitude towards the brand and purchase intention. The independent variables are brand familiarity and number of COO markers. Each participant will be exposed to a randomly assigned combination of 2 of the 8 conditions.

Instruments

The dependent variables of this study are purchase intention, attitude towards the brand and attitude towards the advertisement.

Attitude towards the advertisement was measured on a three-point semantic differential scale. The scales anchors are pleasant/unpleasant, likable/unlikable, interesting/ boring, tasteful/tasteless, artful/artless, and good/bad (Spears & Singh, 2014). The reliability of “attitude towards the advertisement” comprising six items was poor: $\alpha = .59$

Attitude towards the brand was measured on a seven-point semantic differential scale. The scales are anchored by unappealing/appealing, bad/good, unpleasant/pleasant, unfavourable/favourable, and unlikable/likable (Spears & Singh, 2014). The reliability of “attitude towards the brand” comprising five items was poor $\alpha = .35$

Purchase intention was measured on a three-point semantic differential scale. The scales anchors are: never/definitely, definitely do not intend to buy/definitely intent, very low/high purchase interest, definitely not buy/definitely would buy it, and probably not/probably would

buy it (Spears & Singh, 2014). The reliability of “purchase intention” comprising five items was poor: $\alpha = .46$ ²

Procedure

The online questionnaire was made using the programme Qualtrics between the months of October and November 2020. Potential participants were invited personally to participate via clickable links sent through social media platforms such as Facebook, WhatsApp, Instagram or via email. The Qualtrics survey was designed specifically to ensure that participants are equally and randomly divided across the 8 survey conditions. Upon opening the link, participants were informed of their rights, anonymity and a non-informative description of what the study entailed. The participant could then choose if they agreed or disagreed to complete the questionnaire. Participants had to then respond to an array of questions regarding their demographics (gender, age, education level). The participants were exposed to a total of two advertisements, one containing a chip brand and the other containing clothing. Upon viewing each advertisement, the participant was asked a set of questions regarding their attitude towards the advertisement, attitude towards the brand and purchase intention. The participant was then thanked for their participation regardless of which condition they had been exposed to. On average, it took participants approximately 15 minutes to complete the experiment.

Statistical Treatment

The data was analysed using the IBM statistical programme SPSS. Firstly, three paired samples *t*-tests were conducted to show that the two product types (chips and clothing) differed significantly for all dependent variables. Furthermore, a total of six independent two-way univariate analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted to establish a causal relationship between the number of COO markers and brand familiarity and the possible interaction between purchase intention, attitude towards the advertisement and attitude towards the brand. Albeit, not reported, a further analysis to investigate a potential effect of gender was conducted.

²Although the Cronbach α were poor, it is beyond the scope of this bachelor thesis to take further measures to ensure adequate internal consistency.

Results

Before carrying out the ANOVAs, it had to be made sure that the dependent variables differed significantly between the two product types (chips, clothing). A paired samples *t*-test found that there was a significant difference between chips and clothing for purchase intention ($t(252) = -3.75, p < .001$). Participants had higher purchase intentions for the clothing advertisement ($M = 3.85, SD = 1.23$) than for the chips advertisement ($M = 3.43, SD = 1.47$). Furthermore, a paired samples *t*-test found a significant difference for product type for attitude towards the advertisement ($t(252) = 8.47, p < .001$). The clothing ad ($M = 4.31, SD = 1.02$) triggered a more positive attitude towards the advertisement than the chips ad ($M = 3.49, SD = 1.11$). Lastly, a paired samples *t*-test revealed a significant difference for product type for attitude towards the brand ($t(252) = -4.08, p < .001$). The clothing ad ($M = 4.38, SD = 1.06$) elicited a more positive attitude towards the brand than the chips ad ($M = 3.99, SD = 1.22$).

A two-way univariate analysis of variance with brand familiarity (2 levels: familiar, unfamiliar) and number COO of markers (4 levels: no marker, 1 marker, 2 markers, 3 markers) (2 levels: familiar, unfamiliar) as between subject factors showed a significant main effect of number of COO markers on attitude towards the advertisement (chips) ($F(3, 245) = 9.45, p < .001, \eta^2 = .104$). The Levene's test showed that the assumption of homogeneity of variance was violated³.

To disentangle the direction of this main effect, a post-hoc test revealed that irrespective of the brand familiarity, adding 2 COO markers ($M = 3.69, SD = 1.12$) led to a significantly ($p = .002$, Bonferroni correction) more positive attitude towards the advertisement compared to having no COO markers ($M = 3.01, SD = .92$) in the ad at all. Furthermore, adding three COO markers ($M = 3.93, SD = 1.24$) also triggered a significantly ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction) higher attitude towards the advertisement than inserting no COO markers at all ($M = 3.01, SD = .92$). Lastly, adding three COO markers ($M = 3.93, SD = 1.24$) led to significantly ($p = .005$, Bonferroni correction) higher attitude towards the advertisement compared to one COO marker ($M = 3.29, SD = .91$). There were no further significant differences concerning the attitude towards the advertisement (for chips) between adding one COO marker and adding no marker ($p = .802$), between adding one COO maker and adding two COO markers ($p = .217$) or between adding 2 markers and adding 3 markers ($p = 1.00$) to an advertisement.

³Levene's assumption of homogeneity of variance has been violated. However, accounting for this violation was beyond the scope of this bachelor thesis.

Brand familiarity was found to have a no significant effect on the attitude towards the advertisement (Chips) ($F(1, 245) = .80, p = .795$). The interaction between brand familiarity and number of COO markers was also not significant ($F(3, 245) = .13, p = .944$).

Table 1: Results of the two-way ANOVA (number COO markers and brand familiarity x attitude toward the advertisement CHIPS)

Brand familiarity	Number COO markers	Mean (<i>M</i>)	Standard Deviation (<i>SD</i>)	Number of participants (<i>N</i>)
Unfamiliar	No markers	3.13	1.02	30
	1 marker	3.35	.98	32
	2 markers	3.70	.96	31
	3 markers	3.97	1.19	31
	Total	3.54	1.08	124
Familiar	No markers	2.89	.81	32
	1 marker	3.23	.83	30
	2 markers	3.68	1.25	33
	3 markers	3.89	1.30	34
	Total	3.43	1.14	129
Total	No markers	3.01	.92	62
	1 marker	3.29	.91	62
	2 markers	3.69	1.12	64
	3 markers	3.93	1.24	65
	Total	3.49	1.11	253

A two-way analysis of variance with brand familiarity (2 levels: familiar, unfamiliar) and number of COO markers (4 levels: no marker, 1 marker, 2 markers, 3 markers) as between subject factors showed a significant main effect of brand familiarity on attitude towards the brand (chips) ($F(1, 245) = 43.55, p < .001$). Irrespective of the amount of COO markers, the unfamiliar brands ($M = 3.51, SD = 1.05$) triggered a significantly less positive attitude towards the brand compared to the familiar brands ($M = 4.45, SD = 1.20$). Number of COO markers was not found to have a significant main effect on attitude towards the brand (chips) ($F(3, 245) = 1.38, p = .248$). The interaction between brand familiarity and number of COO markers was also not significant ($F(3, 245) = .68, p = .565$).

Table 2: Results of the two-way ANOVA (number COO markers and brand familiarity x attitude towards the brand (CHIPS))

Brand familiarity	Number COO markers	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)	Number of participants (N)
Unfamiliar	No markers	3.11	1.12	30
	1 marker	3.51	1.01	32
	2 markers	3.71	1.17	31
	3 markers	3.71	.80	31
	Total	3.51	1.05	124
Familiar	No markers	4.36	.97	32
	1 marker	4.51	1.00	30
	2 markers	4.51	1.45	33
	3 markers	4.43	1.34	34
	Total	4.45	1.20	129
Total	No markers	3.75	1.21	62
	1 marker	3.99	1.12	62
	2 markers	4.12	1.37	64

3 markers	4.09	1.17	65
Total	3.99	1.22	253

A two-way univariate analysis of variance with brand familiarity (2 levels: familiar, unfamiliar) and number of COO markers (4 levels: no marker, 1 marker, 2 markers, 3 markers) as between subject factors showed a significant main effect of brand familiarity on purchase intention (chips) ($F(1, 245) = 6.07, p = .014$). Irrespective of the amount of COO markers, the familiar brands ($M = 3.65, SD = 1.49$) triggered a significantly higher purchase intention compared to the unfamiliar brands ($M = 3.20, SD = 1.42$). Number of COO markers was not found to have a significant main effect of purchase intention (chips) ($F(3, 245) = .98, p = .404$). The interaction between brand familiarity and number of COO markers was also found to be not significant ($F(3, 245) = .49, p = .693$).

Table 3: Results of the two-way ANOVA (number COO markers and brand familiarity x purchase intention (CHIPS))

Brand familiarity	Number COO markers	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)	Number of participants (N)
Unfamiliar	No markers	3.02	1.55	30
	1 marker	3.08	1.34	32
	2 markers	3.28	1.47	31
	3 markers	3.40	1.38	31
	Total	3.20	1.42	124
Familiar	No markers	3.56	1.41	32
	1 marker	3.71	1.53	30
	2 markers	3.36	1.44	33
	3 markers	3.97	1.56	34
	Total	3.65	1.49	129
Total	No markers	3.30	1.49	62

1 marker	3.38	1.46	62
2 markers	3.32	1.44	64
3 markers	3.70	1.49	65
Total	3.43	1.47	253

A two-way univariate analysis of variance with brand familiarity (2 levels: familiar, unfamiliar) and number of COO markers (4 levels: no marker, 1 marker, 2 markers, 3 markers) as between subject factors showed a statistically insignificant main effect of brand familiarity on attitude towards the advertisement (clothing) ($F(1, 245) = .13, p = .722$). Number of COO markers was also found to have no effect on attitude towards the advertisement (clothing) ($F(3, 245) = .50, p = .681$). The interaction between brand familiarity and number of COO markers was also not significant ($F(3, 245) = .92, p = .433$).

Table 4: Results of the two-way ANOVA (number COO markers and brand familiarity x attitude towards the advertisement (CLOTHING))

Brand familiarity	Number COO markers	Mean (<i>M</i>)	Standard Deviation (<i>SD</i>)	Number of participants (<i>N</i>)
Unfamiliar	No markers	4.22	.98	30
	1 marker	4.37	.92	32
	2 markers	4.33	1.08	31
	3 markers	4.21	.84	31
	Total	4.28	.95	124
Familiar	No markers	4.49	1.03	32
	1 marker	4.42	1.05	30
	2 markers	4.04	1.25	33
	3 markers	4.38	.99	34
	Total	4.33	1.09	129

Total	No markers	4.36	1.01	62
	1 marker	4.39	.98	62
	2 markers	4.18	1.17	64
	3 markers	4.30	.92	65
	Total	4.31	1.02	253

A two-way univariate analysis of variance with brand familiarity (2 levels: familiar, unfamiliar) and number of COO markers (4 levels: no marker, 1 marker, 2 markers, 3 markers) as between subject factors showed no main effect of brand familiarity on attitude towards the brand (clothing) ($F(1, 245) = 1.40, p = .238$). Number of COO markers was also found to have no main effect on attitude towards the brand(clothing) ($F(3, 245) = .71, p = .548$). The interaction between brand familiarity and number of COO markers was also not significant ($F(3, 245) = .02, p = .996$).

Table 5: Results of the two-way ANOVA (number COO markers and brand familiarity x attitude towards the brand (CLOTHING))

Brand familiarity	Number COO markers	Mean (<i>M</i>)	Standard deviation (<i>SD</i>)	Number of participants (<i>N</i>)
Unfamiliar	No markers	4.40	.89	30
	1 marker	4.38	.75	32
	2 markers	4.22	.98	31
	3 markers	4.23	.88	31
	Total	4.30	.87	124
Familiar	No markers	4.59	1.10	32
	1 marker	4.56	1.19	30
	2 markers	4.33	1.45	33
	3 markers	4.37	1.12	34

	Total	4.46	1.22	129
Total	No markers	4.50	1.00	62
	1 marker	4.45	.98	62
	2 markers	4.28	1.24	64
	3 markers	4.30	1.01	65
	Total	4.38	1.06	253

A two-way univariate analysis of variance with brand familiarity (2 levels: familiar, unfamiliar) and number of COO markers (4 levels: no marker, 1 marker, 2 markers, 3 markers) as between subject factors showed no effect of brand familiarity on purchase intention (clothing) ($F(1,245) = .87, p = .353$). Number of COO markers was also found to have no effect on purchase intention (clothing) ($F(3,245) = .92, p = .431$). The interaction between brand familiarity and number of COO markers was not significant either ($F(3,245) = .11, p = .956$).

The Levene's test show that variances for attitude towards the advertisement for clothes was not equal across groups. Therefore, the assumption of variance has not been met⁴.

Table 6: Results of the two-way ANOVA (number COO markers and brand familiarity x purchase intention (CLOTHING))

Brand familiarity	Number COO markers	Mean (<i>M</i>)	Standard Deviation (<i>SD</i>)	Number of participants (N)
Unfamiliar	No markers	3.91	1.23	30
	1 marker	3.89	.90	32
	2 markers	3.57	1.54	31
	3 markers	3.74	1.09	31
	Total	3.78	1.20	124
Familiar	No markers	3.95	1.38	32

⁴ Levene's assumption of homogeneity of variance has been violated. However, accounting for this violation was beyond the scope of this bachelor thesis.

	1 marker	4.02	.95	30
	2 markers	3.68	1.40	33
	3 markers	4.02	1.27	34
	Total	3.91	1.26	129
Total	No markers	3.93	1.30	62
	1 marker	3.95	.92	62
	2 markers	3.63	1.46	64
	3 markers	3.89	1.19	65
	Total	3.85	1.23	253

Albeit not included in the original statistical analyses or part of the research questions, a follow-up univariate analysis of variance was conducted to investigate if gender had an effect on the brand and advertisement attitudes and purchase intention. It was found that for both categories, there were no significant main effects for gender for the attitude towards the advertisement, towards the attitude towards brand, nor for purchase intention.

Conclusion and discussion

The broader scope of this study was to establish a relationship between combinations of COO markers, brand familiarity and their influence on an advertisement's effectiveness. The advertisement's effectiveness was composed of attitude towards the advertisement, attitude towards the brand as well as purchase intention. The expectations of this research were that an effect of COO markers and brand familiarity on attitude towards advertisement, attitude towards the brand and purchase intention would occur. For the chip category: the results did show an effect of using a multiple of two or three COO markers on attitude towards the brand. No influence of brand familiarity on this result was found. However, brand familiarity did influence attitude towards the brand and purchase intention, irrespective of the number of COO markers placed in an advertisement. For the clothing advertisements: no effects were revealed

for the number of COO markers nor brand familiarity on an advertisement's effectiveness. To answer the central question of this paper, multiple COO markers do have a partial effect on an advertisement's effectiveness, but only for alimentation items. The central question with regard to brand familiarity and its effect on an advertisement's effectiveness, a partial effect was found again only in the chip category. This raises the question of product/category matching: that certain products advertisement's effectiveness are indeed impacted by the type of product category in which it falls. In the case of this research, food items. The results of this study offer contribution to COO research and demonstrate the need for further investigation into the use of multiple COO markers on alimentation. It is not plausible to conclude that previous literature could have predicted the results found in this research, as this study is one of the first explorations into the multiple use of COO markers, therefore a vital step into the use of multiple COO research on an advertisement's effectiveness.

The findings that consumers with an already established sense of brand familiarity towards a certain product are more inclined to allow COO markers to affect their evaluations of products (Heimbach, Johansson and MacLachlan, 1989), stands in contradiction to what was discovered in this study. Secondly, Rios, Riquelme, E. H & Abdelaziz (2014) argued that consumers with an undeveloped sense of brand familiarity will result in relying on stereotypical biases in combination with COO markers to create reasoning. The results of this research align with Rios et al.'s (2014) claim, as an effect was found in this research of brand familiarity in the chips category which affected attitude towards the brand and purchase intention. However it must be stated that the overall effect size found in this study was not overwhelming.

Furthermore, Schooler's (1971) research which found that women tended to evaluate foreign products higher than males when COO markers are used in advertising brought no insight to this study, as an analysis showed no effect in either product categories. Additionally, The results of this study displayed a significant effect on attitude towards the advertisement in the chips category when COO markers were present. An unexpected finding (or lack of) occurred in the product category of clothing, not a single analysis showed an effect. This raises suspicion of product/category matching, it could be that multiple use of COO markers does affect an advertisement's effectiveness but only for certain product categories, taking the findings of this study, one could argue that further research into the effect of multiple use of COO markers on food advertisements is required to draw further conclusions.

Finally, Koschate-Fisher, Diamantopoulos & Oldenkotte (2020) make an arguably valid claim that a favourable COO is a major benefit to consumer purchasing potential. Hornikx, van

Meurs, van den Heuvel & Janssen (2020) reiterate this point with their research as approximately a third of the advertisements they researched contained multiple COO markers. Based off the underwhelming results found in this research, one can only conclude that more research into the domain should be pursued.

Limitations

The present study was subject to some limitations. Firstly, the independent variable of brand familiarity, measured if a brand was known to the participant or not, this study however lacks a measurement of the emotion of that brand familiarity or in other words if the brand familiarity withheld is negative or positive. Secondly, the sample size, while being 253 participants, may have not adequately represented the opinions of the entire Dutch population as the vast majority of respondents fell between the age range of 21-25. Thirdly, the Dutch population. This research was carried out exclusively in a Dutch speaking sphere, which means it is only valid to apply the found results to The Netherlands. Furthermore, the Netherlands is a Western culture again not representative of the larger majority of other various cultures that prevail. Another limitation is that the questionnaire was self-reported, resulting in no guarantee that the respondents answered as truthfully as they should have, a commonly occurring problem with self-reported surveys. Bogner, K., and Landrock, U. (2016) describe the acquiesce response bias as being the tendency of participants to respond to a set of questions with a desired response. As a large number of the sample used in this survey were from personal networks, participants may have shaped their responses, especially in the questions about brand familiarity, around what they perceived to be a desired response.

Finally, as a result of time constraints, having chosen two product categories (clothing and chips) does not offer a larger perspective into an array of different product categories.

Future research

As this study is on the forefront of multiple COO markers and marketing research. Further predictions are that gender may have an effect on one's advertisement evaluation, if the product being advertised is congruent to stereotypical gender categories, for example certain clothing companies being associated to women or men. The need for future research into a wider array of cultures is essential to obtain more concludable results. Moreover, to include a variety of cultures from different continents. The variable of brand familiarity was measured in this research by respondents stating if a brand was familiar or unfamiliar to them. For precision, an extra analysis to determine what is the effect of brand familiarity (positive or

negative) could determine better the effect of brand familiarity on the multiple use of COO markers. Future research should reverse more than one of the poles on the reporting scales (as one pole was reverse in this research) to resolve the potential acquiescent response bias (cf. Johnson, Kulesa, Cho & Shavitt, 2005). Finally, future research should explore a variety of advertisement types. This research focused on print advertising, but future research should also focus on paid search engine advertising, internet advertising, social media advertising as the world is becoming all the more digitalized.

Practical Implications

There is a variety of ways this study's explicit focus could be manifested in instruction. As previously highlighted the worldwide marketing industry has an estimated value of €1.44 trillion (Forbes, 2019), and that Hornikx, van Meurs, van den Heuvel & Janssen (2020) research has highlighted the large presence of COO markers in print advertising – this highlights the immediate economic need of multiple COO marketing research to continue as the world in which we live is becoming more globalized every day. With future research acting upon this research, a large proportion of funds will be saved for enterprise marketing departments when designing international or domestic marketing campaigns that entail foreign products. Hence, this research while not returning overwhelmingly insightful results, provides fruitful grounds for further research into the effectiveness of using multiple COO markers in advertising. While this study used Aichner's (2014) model as a backbone regarding design and implementation of multiple COO markers into advertisements. The small array of significant results makes it harder to further validate his COO strategies model. A direct need for the continuation of research in this field is required to establish concrete advice for the global marketing industry.

References

- Abla, J. W. & Hutchinson J. W. (1987). Dimensions of Consumer Expertise. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13(3), 411-454. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209080>
- Aichner, T. (2014). Country-of-origin marketing: A list of typical strategies with examples. *Journal of Brand Management*, 2(1), 81-93. <https://doi.org/10.1057/bm.2013.24>
- Alden, D., Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M., & Batra, R. (1999). Brand positioning through advertising in Asia, North America, and Europe: The role of global consumer culture. *Journal of Marketing*, 63(1), 75–87. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1252002>
- Baker, W., Hutchinson, J.W., Moore, D. & Nedungadi, P. (1986). Brand Familiarity and Advertising: Effects on the Evoked Set and Brand Preference. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 13, 637-642. Retrieved from <https://www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/6570/volumes/v13/NA-13>
- Beverland, M. & Lindgreen, A. (2002). Using country of origin in strategy: The importance of context and strategic action. *Journal of Brand Management* 10(2), 147-167. <https://10.1057/palgrave.bm.2540112>
- Bogner, K. & Landrock, U. (2016). Response Biases in Standardised Surveys. GESIS Survey Guidelines. Mannheim, Germany: GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences. <https://www.gesis.org/gesis-surveyguidelines/instruments/fragebogenkonstruktion/antworttendenzen/>
- Campbell, M. C., & Keller, K. L. (2003). Brand Familiarity and Advertising Repetition effects. *Journal of Consumer Research*,30(2), 292-304. <https://doi.org/10.1086/376800>
- De Langhe, B., Puntoni, S., Fernandes, D., & Van Osselaer, S. M. J. (2011). The Anchor Contraction Effect in International Marketing Research. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 48(2), 366–380. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.48.2.366>
- Diehl, S., Terlutter, R., & Meuller, B. (2006). International Advertising and Communication. *International Advertising and Communication: New Insights and Empirical Findings*, 419-438. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/3-8350-5702-2_22
- Dimitrioski, Z. (2019). *How much money is in the global marketing industry - More than we believe*. Forbes. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/zarkodimitrioski/2019/02/13/how-much-money-is-in-the-global-marketing-industry-more-than-believed/#7aa12ff417c3>
- Dinnie, J. (2004) Country-of-origin 1965-2004: a literature review. *Journal of Customer Behaviour*, 3(2), 165-213. <https://doi.org/0.1362/1475392041829537>
- Giovanni Rana Pasta (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://justinnegard.com/2015/12/02/giovanni-rana-pasta/>

- Haarmann, H. (1984). The role of ethnocultural stereotypes and foreign languages in Japanese commercials. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 50, 101-121. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1984.50.101>
- Haarmann, H. (1989). Symbolic values of foreign language use: From the Japanese case to a general sociolinguistic perspective. *Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter*.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0388-0001\(91\)90027-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0388-0001(91)90027-X)
- Heimbach, A., Johansson, J., & MacLachlan, D. (1989). Product Familiarity, Information Processing, and Country-Of-Origin Cues. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 16, 460-467. Retrieved from <https://www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/6947/volumes/v16/NA-16>
- Hornikx, J., Van Meurs, F., & Hof, R. (2017). Foreign languages in advertising as Implicit country-of-origin cues: Mechanism, associations, and effectiveness. *Consumer Marketing*, 29(2), 60-73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08961530.2013.780451>
- Hornikx, J., Van Meurs, F., van den Heuvel, J., & Janssen, A. (2020). How brands highlight country of origin in magazine advertising: A content analysis. *Journal of Global Marketing*, 33(1), 34-45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08911762.2019.1579399>
- Johnson, T., Kulesa, P., Cho, Y. I., & Shavitt, S. (2005). The Relation Between Culture and Response Styles. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 36(2), 264-277.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022104272905>
- Koschate-Fischer, N., Diamantopoulos, A., & Oldenkotte, K. (2012). Are consumers willing to pay more for a valuable country image? A study of country-of-origin effects on willingness to pay. *Journal of International Marketing*, 20(1), 19-41.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/23274415>
- Li, H., Daugherty T. & Biocca, F. (2013). Impact of 3-D Advertising on Product knowledge, Brand Attitude, and Purchase Intention: The mediating role of presence. *Journal of Advertising*, 31(3), 43-57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2002.10673675>
- Lu, J. (2014). Are personal innovativeness and social influence critical to continue with mobile commerce? *Internet Research*, 24(2), 243-259.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IntR-05-2012-0100>
- Lutz, R. J. (1975). Changing Brain attitudes through modification of cognitive structure. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 1(4), 49-59. <https://doi.org/10.1086/208607>
- Mehta, A. (2000). Advertising attitudes and advertising effects. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 40(3) 67-72. <https://doi.org/10.2501/JAR-40-3-67-72>
- Peterson, R. A. & Jolibert, A. J. P. (1995). A meta-analysis of country-of-origin effects. *Journal of international Business Studies*, 26(4), 883-900.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490824>
- Rios, E. R., Riquelme, E. H. & Abdelaziz, Y. (2014). Do halal certification country of origin and brand name familiarity matter? *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 26(5), 665-686. <https://doi.org/10.1108/APJML-03-2014-0046>

- Schooler, R. (1965). Product bias is the central American common market. *The International Executive*, 8(2), 18-19.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/tie.5060080211>.
- Schooler, R. (1971). Bias Phenomena Attendant to the Marketing of Foreign Goods in the U.S. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 2(1), 71-80.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490732>
- Spears, N., & Singh S. N. (2012) Measuring Attitude toward the Brand and Purchase Intentions, *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising*, 26(2), 53-66,
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10641734.2004.10505164>
- Usunier, J. C., & Cestre, G. (2007). Product ethnicity: Revisiting the match between products and countries. *Journal of international marketing*, 15(3), 32-72.
<https://doi.org/10.1509/jimk.15.3.32>
- Verlegh, P. W., & Steenkamp, J. B. E.M. (1999). A review and meta-analysis of country-of origin research. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 20(5), 521-546.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-4870\(99\)00023-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-4870(99)00023-9)

Appendix





Unfamiliar brand - chips

No marker	One marker (COO in company's name)	Two markers (+Flags and Symbols)	Three markers (+Made in)
			





Familiar brand - chips

No marker	One marker (COO in company's name)	Two markers (+Flags and Symbols)	Three markers (+Made in)
			

Unfamiliar brand - clothing

No marker	One marker (COO in company's name)	Two markers (+Flags and Symbols)	Three markers (+Made in)
			

Familiar brand - clothing

No marker	One marker (COO in company's name)	Two markers (+Flags and Symbols)	Three markers (+Made in)
			

Consent form (Dutch)

Allereerst bedankt voor uw bereidheid om deel te nemen aan dit onderzoek. Voordat we beginnen willen wij u eerst informeren over het onderzoek, lees de onderstaande informatie alstublieft door:

INFORMATIE EN TOESTEMMING

U wordt uitgenodigd om mee te doen aan een onderzoek naar verschillende advertenties. Dit onderzoek wordt uitgevoerd door een groep derdejaarsstudenten in het kader van hun bachelor scriptie aan de Radboud Universiteit.

Wat wordt er van u verwacht?

Meedoen aan het onderzoek houdt in dat u een online vragenlijst gaat invullen. De vragen hebben betrekking op uw mening van bepaalde advertenties. Het invullen van de vragenlijst kost ongeveer 5 minuten.

Vrijwilligheid

U doet vrijwillig mee aan dit onderzoek. Daarom kunt u op elk moment tijdens het onderzoek uw deelname stopzetten en uw toestemming intrekken. U hoeft niet aan te geven waarom u stopt. Mocht u dit wel willen, dan kunt u dit doen door een mail te sturen naar b.hilberink@let.ru.nl

Wat gebeurt er met mijn gegevens?

De onderzoeksgegevens die we in dit onderzoek verzamelen, zullen door wetenschappers gebruikt worden voor datasets, artikelen en presentaties. De anoniem gemaakte onderzoeksgegevens zijn tenminste 10 jaar beschikbaar voor andere wetenschappers. Als we gegevens met andere onderzoekers delen, kunnen deze dus niet tot u herleid worden. We bewaren alle onderzoeksgegevens op beveiligde wijze volgens de richtlijnen van de Radboud Universiteit.

Heeft u vragen of klachten over het onderzoek?

Als u meer informatie over het onderzoek wilt hebben of klachten heeft over het onderzoek, kunt u contact opnemen met dr. B. Hilberink-Schulpen (b.hilberink@let.ru.nl).

TOESTEMMING:

Geef hieronder uw keuze aan.

Door te klikken op de knop 'Ik ga akkoord' geeft u aan dat u:

- Bovenstaande informatie heeft gelezen
- Vrijwillig meedoet aan het onderzoek
- 16 jaar of ouder bent

Als u niet mee wilt doen aan het onderzoek, kunt u op de knop 'Ik wil niet meedoen' klikken. De enquête zal dan worden afgesloten.

- Ik ga akkoord (doorgaan met vragenlijst)
- Ik wil niet meedoen

Questionnaire

The questionnaire in its entirety was larger but was comprised of the following three questions.

Q1.1 Ik vind deze advertentie:

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Niet prettig	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Prettig
Niet aangenaam	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Aangenaam
Interessant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Saai
Smakeloos	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Smaakvol
Niet artistiek	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Artistiek
Slecht	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Goed

Q1.2 Ik vind dit merk:

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Niet aantrekkelijk	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Aantrekkelijk
Slecht	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Goed
Prettig	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Niet prettig
Niet gunstig	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Gunstig
Niet aangenaam	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Aangenaam

Q1.3 In hoeverre bent u geïnteresseerd in dit product:

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Ik zou dit product nooit kopen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Ik zou dit product zeker kopen
Ik ben zeker niet van plan om dit product te kopen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Ik ben zeker van plan om dit product te kopen
Ik heb interesse om dit product te kopen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Ik heb geen interesse om dit product te kopen
Ik zou dit product zeker niet kopen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Ik zou dit product zeker kopen
Ik zou dit product waarschijnlijk niet kopen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Ik zou dit product waarschijnlijk wel kopen