

Cross-cultural differences in Persuasion Knowledge

The effect of the individualist/collectivist cultural dimension on the recognition of persuasion intent and the role of persuasion strategy/agent type.

Bachelor's Thesis

Yannick Frijters

S1019520

Study: International Business Communication

Supervisor: Borana Lushaj

Abstract

In this study, the main topics were purchase intention and inference of manipulative intent (IMI). IMI is the feeling that appears when a consumer believes he or she is being persuaded in an inappropriate or unfair way. Purchase intention is the willingness to buy a product or service. The objective of the study was to research what effect the recognition of the persuasion strategies scarcity and reciprocity has on the inference of manipulative intent and purchase intention of people from an individualistic and a collectivistic culture. This led to the research question “To what extent does the recognition of the persuasion strategies scarcity and reciprocity influence differently the inference of manipulative intent and purchase intention of people from individualistic and collectivistic cultures?”. In order to answer this research question, an experiment was conducted with 115 participants from the individualistic Netherlands and 115 participants from the collectivistic Vietnam. The results showed that participants who recognized a persuasion tactic noticed more inferences of manipulative intent than participants who did not recognize a persuasion tactic at all. On average, people from a collectivistic culture witnessed more inferences of manipulative intent after being shown an ad than people from an individualistic country. Furthermore, participants from the individualistic Netherlands witnessed fewer inferences of manipulative intent than the Vietnamese participants and scored higher on purchase intention. Therefore, it is likely to say that a low amount of inferences of manipulative intent results in high purchase intention and vice versa.

Key words: *inference of manipulative intent, purchase intention, reciprocity, scarcity, individualism, collectivism.*

1. Introduction

In all types of advertising, the ultimate goal is persuading the consumer to buy a certain product or service (Danciu, 2014). In order to accomplish this, marketers use a lot of different strategies. Some give major discounts to stand out from competitors, others use different persuasion strategies. However, since there are so many advertisements being publicised, consumers start to recognize certain patterns in them. They start recognizing particular persuasion strategies in these commercials. The ability to recognize, interpret, evaluate and remember these persuasion attempts, is defined as persuasion knowledge (Friestad & Wright, 1994). Friestad and Wright propose that persuasion knowledge is ‘‘a set of interrelated beliefs about (a) the psychological events that are instrumental to persuasion, (b) the causes and effects of those events, (c) the importance of the events, (d) the extent to which people can control their psychological responses, (e) the temporal course of the persuasion process, and (f) the effectiveness and appropriateness of particular persuasion tactics’’ (p. 6). The development of persuasion knowledge starts developing during childhood, when fundamental insights about mental events and social encounters appear together with increasing information-processing capabilities (Roedder 1981; Roedder & Whitney, 1986). This development starts around the age of six, by the development of a coherent conceptualization of mental events (Wellman, 1992), and develops increasingly during adolescence by the growth of general information-processing, judgment skills and the awareness of topic-knowledge limits (Keating, 1990). Persuasion knowledge determines how people cope with persuasion attempts by others. Besides, it determines the creation and execution of own persuasion attempts (Friestad & Wright, 1999). Since the persuasion knowledge of individual consumers keeps changing over time, driven by all sorts of new information and experiences, advertisers keep trying new persuasion tactics, hoping that consumers have not yet obtained knowledge of that specific tactic (Friestad & Wright, 1994). Therefore, advertisers are sometimes so limited that they are being forced to craft a persuasion attempt that is already known by consumers with high persuasion knowledge, but seen as an intelligent choice of persuasion tactic, hoping for a positive brand-attitude. (Friestad & Wright, 1994).

In general, consumers do not like recognizing manipulative intent. Research shows that consumers lower their brand evaluations after taking notice of being subjected to covert marketing for example (Wei et al., 2008). In addition, people are less likely to respond to a marketing strategy after recognizing ulterior motives behind the marketing campaign (Kim & Lee, 2009). This skeptic response to the advertisement leads to a lower willingness to buy something from the brand (Obermiller et al., 2005). For marketers, it is very useful to obtain a clear vision on the effect of persuasion attempt recognition and thus on the reaction towards certain persuasion tactics by possible customers. In that way, advertisers know what persuasion strategies to avoid in their advertisements. Therefore, this study is of great importance for people in the marketing sector.

There are several ways to persuade people. In order to categorize all types of social influence strategies, Cialdini (1987) came up with six persuasion principles in which every type of persuasion finds its spot. The six principles Cialdini came up with were reciprocity, consistency & commitment, consensus, liking, authority and scarcity. All of these persuasion

principles affect people in a certain way. Cialdini explains one of these principles, the reciprocity principle, as a social rule that works in a way that people receive something from someone, such as a gift or a good service. Since humans have the tendency to return good deeds, they will feel obligated to repay the sender of this gift with something else. An example of this is a free food sample at the supermarket. Another principle is the scarcity principle. When something is scarce and thus difficult to possess, people automatically think that it is of higher quality than something that is easier to possess. When something turns from easily accessible to scarce, people feel as if they have lost freedom, and since people react more actively to potential loss than to potential gain, people are likely wanting to possess the scarce item quickly (Cialdini, 1987). An example of this principle is an advertisement promoting a limited edition of a product.

Persuasion is the main goal of advertising (Danciu, 2014). Since there are a lot of companies who advertise globally, it is important to keep in mind the preferences certain cultures have, so that consumers from most cultures will respond positively towards the advertisements. Hofstede (2003) designed a system with six cultural dimensions as a tool to categorize cultures. One of those dimensions is the Individualism-Collectivism dimension. According to Hofstede, people from individualistic cultures tend to look after themselves and their own family. People from collectivistic cultures however, tend to think more about society as one group and will thus put other people first. According to Hui and Triandis (1986), Collectivism is defined as ‘‘manifested in one’s consideration of the effects of own decision on others, sharing of material resources, sharing of less tangible resource, willingness to adopt others’ opinions, worry about self-presentation and loss of face, belief in correspondence of outcomes with others, and the feeling of involvement and contribution in others’ lives’’ (p. 244). Individualism is defined by Hui and Triandis as ‘‘the subordination of the goals of the collectivities to individual goals, and a sense of independence and lack of concern for others’’ (p. 245). According to Hofstede’s model (2003), an example of an individualistic country is The Netherlands and an example of a collectivistic country is Vietnam.

In prior research, Orji (2016) investigated whether the responsiveness towards the six persuasion principles of Cialdini (1987) differed by cultural background. The sample consisted of 355 participants from either Asia or North-America. In order to assess the response of the participants to Cialdini’s strategies, the Susceptibility to Persuasive Strategies Scale (STPS), designed by Kaptein et al. (2012) was used. The responses were measured with a 1-7 Likert scale. The results showed that collectivistic cultures liked five of six persuasion strategies more than individualistic cultures and that individualistic cultures only preferred the scarcity appeal more than their collectivistic counterparts. In other words, people from collectivistic cultures are more likely to be persuaded than people from individualistic cultures. This supports the findings of Han and Shavitt (1994), who found that cultural differences between individualistic and collectivistic countries play an important role in persuasion processes. In this study, only the scarcity and reciprocity principles will be looked at.

In other research, Campbell (1995) explored how the use of attention-getting tactics in advertising makes consumers infer that the advertiser is attempting to manipulate the audience. In the research, 126 psychology students participated. In this 2x2 between-subjects design, participants were asked questions about a television ad they were shown. In total, there were four of these television ads, but every participant got randomly assigned to one of them. Before conducting this research, Campbell created and tested a six-item scale of

inferences of manipulative intent (IMI), which contained attribution statements ranging from 1 (completely agree) to 7 (completely disagree) and a 7-point semantic differential scale ranging from 1 (fair) to 7 (unfair). According to Campbell, inferences of manipulative intent are defined as “consumer inferences that the advertiser is attempting to persuade by inappropriate, unfair, or manipulative means” (p. 228). The results, based on measured ad attitudes, brand attitudes and purchase intentions, showed that the balance between the personal benefits and investments in the ad of the consumer and the advertiser functions as a mediator of the relationship between the attention-getting tactics and the inferences of manipulative intent. Campbell concluded that if there is created an imbalance between the consumer’s perception of the personal and advertiser’s investments and benefits, inferences of manipulative intent will be evoked. Furthermore, Campbell concluded that when there is an inference of manipulative intent, the persuasiveness of the advertisement decreases. Friestad and Wright (1994) designed a model of how persuasion knowledge influences people’s responses to persuasion attempts, which is called the Persuasion Knowledge Model (PKM). This model is divided into two sides. On the one side, we have the so called ‘target’, the people whom another party tries to persuade. On the other side, we have the party that is identified as being responsible for the persuasion attempt, also called the ‘agent’. When the agent tries to persuade the target, we speak of a ‘persuasion attempt’. When the target reacts to this attempt, it copes with it in a certain way. Therefore, this action by the target is called ‘persuasion coping behaviour’. The coping behaviour and the persuasion attempt together form a so called ‘persuasion episode’. In addition, in this model, both the agent and the target have three types of knowledge: ‘topic knowledge’, ‘persuasion knowledge’ and knowledge of the opposite side: the agent has ‘target knowledge’ and the target has got ‘agent knowledge’. This model offers an insight in consumer and advertiser’s behaviour. Therefore, it can be very useful for examining target and agent persuasion knowledge. In order to know what effect persuasion knowledge has on the effectiveness of one specific persuasion strategy, Aguirre-Rodriguez (2013) examined the effect of consumer persuasion knowledge on the persuasiveness of the scarcity appeal. In a sample of 93 undergraduate students of a university, participants were shown advertisements with either a demand-related scarcity appeal (such as ‘in popular demand’) or a supply-related scarcity appeal (such as ‘supplies are limited’), and had to answer questions about them. Afterwards, the participants were tested on their persuasion knowledge activation. The effects were measured by a nine-item, summed to form a single index, advertising scepticism scale ($\alpha = .87$) by Obermiller and Spangenberg (1998) and a ten-item, summed to form a single index, psychological reactance scale ($\alpha = .82$) by Hong and Faedda (1996). The investigation concludes that supply-related scarcity appeals are mostly seen as a source of information instead of a persuasion attempt. This is since people believe that the marketers are in close contact with their suppliers and thus just inform the costumers. In contrary, demand-related scarcity appeals are mostly associated to claims marketers make as a persuasion attempt (Aguirre-Rodriguez, 2013).

While it is known that individualistic cultures and collectivistic cultures respond differently to the persuasion strategies scarcity and reciprocity (Orji, 2016) and that these attention-getting tactics may evoke inferences of manipulative intent, which lowers the evaluation of the advertisement (Campbell, 1995), it is still unknown whether inferences of manipulative intent have a different effect on people from an individualistic culture than on people from a collectivistic culture. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine the effect that the recognition of the persuasion strategies scarcity and reciprocity has on the

inference of manipulative intent and purchase intention. In addition, the purpose is also to research whether this effect is different for people from the individualistic country The Netherlands and the collectivistic country Vietnam.

This leads up to the following Research Question (RQ):

RQ: To what extent does the recognition of the persuasion strategies scarcity and reciprocity influence differently the inference of manipulative intent and purchase intention of people from individualistic and collectivistic cultures?

In order to form an answer on the research question, the following sub-questions (SQ) had to be answered: SQ1: What effect does the recognition of a persuasion strategy have on the inference of manipulative intent of consumers? SQ2: Is there a difference in the inference of manipulative intent of people from the individualistic Netherlands and collectivistic Vietnam after recognizing the persuasion tactics scarcity and reciprocity? SQ3: To what extent does the degree of inferences of manipulative intent have an effect on the Purchase Intention of people from the individualistic Netherlands and the collectivistic Vietnam.

For SQ1, the hypothesis (H1) was that the inference of manipulative intent would increase after the recognition of a persuasion strategy. This was expected since the research of Campbell (1995) showed that the recognition of attention-getting advertising tactics might evoke inferences of manipulative intent. For SQ2, it was expected (H2) that the responses towards the advertisement of Dutch participants would differ from the responses towards the advertisement of Vietnamese participants after recognizing the scarcity and the reciprocity tactic. This was since, in the research of Orji (2016), it was shown that people from collectivistic cultures responded differently to the reciprocity and scarcity appeal than people from individualistic cultures. However in Orji's research, it was not investigated whether the inference of manipulative intent differed between cultures after recognizing the persuasion strategies, it was likely that, because the two cultures differed in their reaction to the mentioned strategies, there would be a difference in the inference of manipulative intent as well.

Finally, for SQ3, the expectation (H3) was that a high degree of inferences of manipulative intent would decrease the purchase intention of both Dutch and Vietnamese people. This was since, according to Kim and Lee (2009), when a consumer believes to recognize certain persuasive motives behind a marketing campaign, a response to this marketing strategy will be less likely to happen. This increase in ad skepticism results in a lower willingness to purchase a product from the brand (Obermiller et al., 2005).

Methodology

2.1 Materials

In order to investigate the effect that the recognition of persuasion attempts has on people from an individualistic culture on the one hand and people from a collectivistic culture on the other hand, an experiment has been conducted. In the experiment, participants have been shown an image of an orange juice advertisement and were asked various questions about it. Orange juice was chosen as a subject since it is a global product which is thus consumed over all types of cultures.

In this research, the independent variables were Persuasion Tactic (scarcity, reciprocity, none) and Cultural Dimension (individualism and collectivism). The stimulus materials of the research were the different versions of the advertisement participants have seen. These versions can be found in the appendix. One advertisement did not contain an explicit persuasion tactic, another ad contained the scarcity persuasion tactic and an ad contained the reciprocity persuasion tactic. The text on all these different versions of the ads were first written in English and were then translated to Dutch and Vietnamese, since only the Dutch and Vietnamese language have been used on the ads in this research.

To assess whether the manipulations of the advertisements were effective, a pre-test has been conducted. The pre-test was based on research by Gaube, Fischer, Windl and Lerner (2020), who pre-tested Cialdini's persuasion principles (1987), including reciprocity and scarcity, on participants. The test was open for a time-window of three days. Via social media, the participants were asked to participate. After accepting the request, they have been informed about the two persuasion strategies. The respondents received a questionnaire where per persuasion tactic, five different advertisements were shown. In other words, participants were shown a total of ten advertisements, where five advertisements contained a scarcity appeal, for example 'Limited Edition', and five advertisements contained a reciprocity appeal, such as including a coupon for a free bottle of orange juice. The neutral ad was excluded. In the test, participants had to rate the consistency and compatibility of the advertisements to the tactics of Cialdini (1987). Therefore, a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (completely inconsistent) to 7 (completely consistent), was used to measure the rating. The advertisements that have been used in the experiment were determined by the outcome of this pre-test. In order to pre-test whether the persuasion strategy was perceived to be scarcity or reciprocity, a manipulation check has been included. In this check, participants were asked whether they experienced the used tactic as the scarcity or reciprocity strategy.

The translation of the questionnaire and ads from English to Dutch and Vietnamese was done following the 'Decentering and Back-Translation' method, first suggested by Werner and Campbell (1970), but later improved by Brislin (1976). In this method, there first had to be a forward translation of the written text on the ads from English to Vietnamese and Dutch, performed by a native speaker of Dutch for the Dutch translations and a native speaker of Vietnamese for the Vietnamese translations. Both of these native speakers were not allowed to take part in the experiment. Then, a so called Expert Panel Back-Translation had been done, where for each language, a bilingual expert checked the translation and another independent bilingual expert translated the content back to the original language. Finally, per language, a group of respondents took part in this pre-test of the research. Every language group got divided into groups of 10 people who either saw the ad with the reciprocity tactic, the scarcity tactic or the one without any explicit persuasion tactic.

2.2 Subjects

The participants contained people from the individualistic country The Netherlands and from the collectivistic Vietnam (Hofstede, 2003). These participants had to be native speakers of the language of their country. There was no age limit. The participants could be either male or female. In total there were 230 participants, equally distributed in 115 Dutch participants and 115 Vietnamese participants. These participants consisted of 75 males, 154 females and one person with 'other' gender. The age of the participants ($M = 26.73$, $SD = 9.93$) had a range of 48, differing from 18 to 66 years old. The most frequent educational level of the participants

was a bachelor's degree. Based on the ad the participants were shown, they got divided into three groups: the reciprocity group, the scarcity group and the neutral group. All groups got equally divided by nationality, so that half of every group was Dutch and the other half was Vietnamese. The reciprocity group consisted of 76 participants, the scarcity group consisted of 78 participants and the neutral group consisted of 76 participants.

2.3 Design

Since participants from the collectivistic and individualistic cultures were both either be shown an ad containing the scarcity persuasion tactic, the reciprocity persuasion tactic or a neutral ad without a persuasion tactic, a 2x3 between subjects design was used. There were namely two different culture groups, divided into three different groups which have only been shown one of the three versions of the ad.

In order to study one variable at the time, a control group was assigned. This group has not been exposed to a manipulated version of the advertisement, but to the version without an explicit persuasion tactic.

2.4 Instruments

The dependent variables of this study were the inference of manipulative intent (IMI), attitude towards the advertisement (Aad) and purchase intention (PI). For the purpose of measuring these dependent variables, the IMI (Inference of Manipulative Intent) measurement scale by Campbell (1995) has been used. This six-item scale measured the results of both a 7-point Semantic Differential scale, ranging from 'fair' to 'unfair', and a Likert scale, ranging from 1 (completely agree) to 7 (completely disagree). According to factor analysis, the scale was unidimensional. (Cronbach's alpha: = .90)

2.5 Procedure

In order to collect results, an online questionnaire was distributed. This questionnaire has been shared with an online link on social media platforms, so that it could be filled in by as much people as possible from the target group. The participants were kindly asked to take part in the research via an online text, attached to the link of the online questionnaire. The respondents did not receive a reward for their cooperation.

Since the questionnaire had been answered online, it was an individual experiment. Besides, the participants might not be influenced by each other, thus for the progress of the investigation it was necessary that the questions were answered individually. Furthermore, respondents were specifically not told about any of the persuasion tactics. Since the major part of the investigation was about recognition of persuasion tactics, it was of great importance that respondents did not have any clue about the tactics. After the experiment, participants have not been debriefed about the research.

While all participants received the same questions, they were shown other versions of the ad. First of all, the Vietnamese participants only saw the ad with Vietnamese text and the Dutch participants only saw the ad with Dutch text. One group of Vietnamese participants was shown the ad manipulated by the scarcity persuasion tactic, another Vietnamese group was shown the ad manipulated by the reciprocity persuasion tactic and the last Vietnamese group was shown the original ad, not manipulated by any persuasion tactic. The Dutch participants have also been divided into these three types of groups. The groups who were shown the original advertisement formed the control group.

After having obtained more than 200 responses, a mistake in the consistency scales was detected. One of the Likert-scales in the Dutch questionnaire was a 6-point scale, where all the other Likert-scales were 7-point scales. Therefore all the responses were not valid anymore and a new Dutch questionnaire had been made with the correct 7-point scale. In order to obtain enough responses, the questionnaire was again distributed online via social media platforms and the whole distribution process had to be redone.

2.6 Statistical Treatment

In these statistical tests, Cultural Dimension was a nominal independent variable with two levels (individualism, collectivism), Persuasion Tactic was a nominal independent variable with three levels (scarcity, reciprocity, none), Inference of Manipulative Intent was an interval dependent variable, Attitude towards the Advertisement was an interval dependent variable and Purchase Intention was an interval dependent variable. Since there were two independent variables, containing two and three levels, and the dependent variables were interval, the statistical tests that have been conducted were two-way ANOVAs.

Results

In order to answer the research question, multiple tests have been conducted. Before presenting the findings of these tests, it is important to stress the matter that a high score on the IMI-scale means that few inferences of manipulative intent have been evoked and thus, a low score on the IMI-scale means that many inferences of manipulative intent have been evoked.

First, to check whether the proposed reciprocity and scarcity ad manipulations were consistently interpreted correctly, two one-way analysis of variance have been conducted. A one-way analysis of variance showed a significant effect of ad type on reciprocity consistency (Reversed Reciprocity Manipulation) ($F(2, 227) = 5.11, p = .007$). Participants that were exposed to an advertisement containing a reciprocity tactic ($M = 4.26, SD = 1.82$) were shown to have a higher score on the reciprocity tactic manipulation scale than participants that were exposed to an advertisement containing a neutral tactic ($p = .013$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 3.43, SD = 1.72$) and to an ad containing a scarcity tactic ($p = .025$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 3.50, SD = 1.79$).

Table 1. Reciprocity consistency check

Ad type	Reciprocity	Scarcity	Neutral
	$N = 76$	$N = 78$	$N = 76$
	$M (SD)$	$M (SD)$	$M (SD)$
	4.26 (1.82)	3.50 (1.79)	3.43 (1.72)

Another one-way analysis of variance showed a significant effect of ad type on scarcity consistency (Reversed Scarcity Manipulation) ($F(2, 227) = 3.84, p = .023$). Participants that were exposed to an advertisement containing a scarcity tactic ($M = 4.35, SD = 2.03$) were shown to have a higher score on the scarcity tactic manipulation scale than participants that

were exposed to an advertisement containing a neutral tactic ($p = .020$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 3.46$, $SD = 1.85$) and to an ad containing a scarcity tactic ($p = .259$, Bonferroni-correction).

Table 2. Scarcity consistency check

Ad type	Reciprocity	Scarcity	Neutral
	$N = 76$	$N = 78$	$N = 76$
	$M (SD)$	$M (SD)$	$M (SD)$
	3.79 (2.13)	4.35 (2.03)	3.46 (1.85)

Consequently, a two-way analysis of variance with the type of advertisement (Ad_type) and reciprocity consistency (Reversed Reciprocity Manipulation) as factors did not show a significant main effect of type of advertisement on the IMI-score (IMITotal) ($F(2, 209) = 2.75$, $p = .066$). Reciprocity consistency was also not found to have a significant main effect on the IMI-score ($F(6, 209) = 1.25$, $p = .285$). Furthermore, the interaction effect between type of advertisement and reciprocity consistency was not statistically significant ($F(12, 209) < 1$).

Table 3. Effect of ad type and reciprocity consistency on the IMI-score

Ad type	Reciprocity	Scarcity	Neutral
	$N = 76$	$N = 78$	$N = 76$
	$M (SD)$	$M (SD)$	$M (SD)$
Totally inconsistent	31.71 (6.63)	32.27 (6.13)	33.80 (4.50)
Inconsistent	29.00 (6.46)	26.67 (10.02)	32.60 (6.75)
Slightly inconsistent	28.82 (6.18)	29.09 (5.63)	28.33 (7.23)
Neutral	26.54 (6.57)	27.60 (7.45)	31.75 (3.47)
Slightly consistent	28.93 (6.77)	26.56 (4.25)	33.86 (4.67)
Consistent	25.77 (9.38)	27.30 (8.87)	32.92 (4.80)
Totally consistent	30.67 (6.86)	31.50 (4.66)	30.00 (0)
Total	28.43 (7.11)	28.29 (7.57)	33.21 (5.48)

Then, a two-way analysis of variance with the type of advertisement (Ad_type) and scarcity consistency (Reversed Scarcity Manipulation) as factors did show a significant main effect of type of advertisement on the IMI-score (IMITotal) ($F(2, 209) = 5.45$, $p = .005$). Participants who were displayed the neutral ad ($M = 32.21$, $SD = 5.48$) were shown to have a higher score on the IMI-scale than participants who were displayed the reciprocity ($M = 28.43$, $SD = 7.11$) or the scarcity ad ($M = 28.29$, $SD = 7.57$). Scarcity consistency was also found to have a significant main effect on the IMI-score ($F(6, 209) = 2.59$, $p = .019$). Participants who labelled the shown ad as ‘Totally inconsistent’ with the scarcity strategy ($M = 33.27$, $SD = 5.52$) appeared to have scored higher on the IMI-scale than participants who labelled the shown ad as ‘Totally consistent’ with the scarcity tactic ($M = 29.29$, $SD = 6.97$). The

interaction effect between type of advertisement and scarcity consistency was not statistically significant ($F(12, 209) < 1$).

Table 4. Effect of ad type and scarcity consistency on the IMI-score

Ad type	Reciprocity <i>N</i> = 76 <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Scarcity <i>N</i> = 78 <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Neutral <i>N</i> = 76 <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
Totally inconsistent	33.07 (6.15)	31.30 (6.63)	35.17 (2.86)
Inconsistent	29.31 (8.78)	24.83 (7.25)	33.20 (4.51)
Slightly inconsistent	29.30 (4.79)	32.67 (2.08)	30.00 (7.52)
Neutral	25.80 (8.20)	27.20 (8.63)	30.43 (4.16)
Slightly consistent	24.33 (6.82)	28.25 (5.33)	31.13 (6.98)
Consistent	25.94 (6.53)	28.33 (8.42)	31.70 (5.98)
Totally consistent	28.50 (5.73)	29.20 (8.92)	31.67 (1.53)
Total	28.43 (7.11)	28.29 (7.57)	33.21 (5.48)

Next, a two-way analysis of variance with the type of advertisement (Ad_type), reciprocity consistency (Reversed Reciprocity Manipulation) and nationality as factors showed a significant main effect of type of advertisement on the IMI-score (IMITotal) ($F(2, 189) = 4.00, p = .020$). For the type of advertisement, the means (*M*) and standard deviations (*SD*) were the same as in the prior two-way analysis of variance. Nationality was also found to have a significant main effect on the IMI-score ($F(1, 189) = 19.92, p < .001$). The Dutch participants scored higher on the IMI-scale ($M = 32.40, SD = 5.45$) than the Vietnamese participants ($M = 26.87, SD = 7.29$). Reciprocity consistency however, did not have a significant main effect on the IMI-score ($F(6, 189) = 1.28, p = .269$). The interaction effect between type of advertisement, reciprocity consistency and nationality was statistically significant ($F(11, 189) = 2.00, p = .031$). Post hoc analyses using the Bonferroni post hoc criterion for significance only indicated that the IMI-score was significantly higher for participants who were shown the neutral ad ($M = 32.21, SD = 5.48$) than for participants who were shown either the reciprocity ad ($M = 28.43, SD = 7.11$) or the scarcity ad ($M = 28.29, SD = 7.57$).

Table 5. Effect of ad type, reciprocity consistency and nationality on the IMI-score

Nationality	Dutch <i>N</i> = 115 <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Vietnamese <i>N</i> = 115 <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Total <i>N</i> = 230 <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)

Reciprocity	Totally inconsistent	32.25 (9.00)	31.00 (3.00)	31.71 (6.63)
	Inconsistent	32.67 (1.16)	26.80 (7.50)	29.00 (6.46)
	Slightly inconsistent	31.63 (4.62)	21.33 (0.58)	28.82 (6.18)
	Neutral	32.40 (5.13)	22.88 (4.36)	26.54 (6.57)
	Slightly consistent	30.11 (6.21)	27.17 (7.76)	28.93 (6.77)
	Consistent	33.00 (5.44)	19.57 (7.37)	25.77 (9.38)
	Totally consistent	33.00 (9.64)	29.50 (5.75)	30.67 (6.86)
	Total	31.84 (5.66)	25.03 (6.83)	28.43 (7.11)
Scarcity	Totally inconsistent	31.90 (6.33)	36.00 (0)	32.27 (6.13)
	Inconsistent	33.33 (5.43)	20.00 (9.15)	26.67 (10.02)
	Slightly inconsistent	30.14 (6.36)	27.25 (4.19)	29.09 (5.63)
	Neutral	33.14 (2.80)	22.75 (6.84)	27.60 (7.45)
	Slightly consistent	28.00 (2.58)	25.40 (5.23)	26.56 (4.25)
	Consistent	21.00 (0)	28.00 (9.11)	27.30 (8.87)
	Totally consistent	33.00 (0)	31.00 (5.57)	31.50 (4.66)
	Total	31.49 (5.46)	25.10 (8.08)	28.29 (7.57)
Neutral	Totally inconsistent	35.25 (2.61)	28.00 (7.07)	33.80 (4.50)
	Inconsistent	32.45 (7.44)	32.78 (6.26)	32.60 (6.75)
	Slightly inconsistent	31.25 (5.56)	26.00 (8.12)	28.33 (7.23)
	Neutral	34.20 (2.17)	30.64 (3.44)	31.75 (3.47)
	Slightly consistent	35.20 (4.87)	30.50 (2.12)	33.86 (4.67)
	Consistent	35.40 (3.44)	31.38 (5.07)	32.92 (4.80)
	Totally consistent	0 (0)	30.00 (0)	30.00 (0)
	Total	33.89 (5.04)	30.53 (5.45)	32.21 (5.48)
Total	Totally inconsistent	33.18 (5.80)	30.83 (4.71)	32.68 (5.59)
	Inconsistent	32.83 (6.01)	26.48 (9.40)	29.65 (8.44)
	Slightly inconsistent	31.00 (5.24)	25.25 (5.90)	28.77 (6.11)
	Neutral	33.24 (3.35)	26.00 (6.13)	28.80 (6.29)
	Slightly consistent	31.06 (5.71)	27.00 (6.14)	29.35 (6.14)
	Consistent	33.00 (5.78)	26.67 (8.64)	28.78 (8.29)
	Totally consistent	33.00 (7.87)	30.00 (5.08)	30.86 (5.84)
	Total	32.40 (5.45)	26.87 (7.29)	29.63 (7.00)

In addition, a two-way analysis of variance with the type of advertisement (Ad_type), scarcity consistency (Reversed Scarcity Manipulation) and nationality as factors showed a significant main effect of type of advertisement on the IMI-score (IMITotal) ($F(2, 191) = 5.78, p = .004$). In terms of the type of advertisement, means and standard deviations were the same as for the two prior two-way analyses of variance. Nationality was also found to have a significant main effect on the IMI-score ($F(1, 191) = 17.25, p < .001$). In terms of nationality, the means and standard deviations are the same as for the nationality variable in the two-way analysis of variance above. Scarcity consistency did not have a significant main effect on the

IMI-score ($F(6, 191) < 1$). Furthermore, the interaction effect between type of advertisement, scarcity consistency and nationality was also not statistically significant ($F(9, 191) < 1$).

Table 6. Effect of ad type, scarcity consistency and nationality on the IMI-score

Nationality		Dutch	Vietnamese	Total
		$N = 115$	$N = 115$	$N = 230$
		$M (SD)$	$M (SD)$	$M (SD)$
Reciprocity	Totally inconsistent	33.07 (6.15)	0 (0)	33.07 (6.15)
	Inconsistent	32.88 (5.22)	23.60 (10.83)	29.31 (8.78)
	Slightly inconsistent	30.43 (4.72)	26.67 (4.62)	29.30 (4.79)
	Neutral	33.00 (4.24)	21.00 (6.25)	25.80 (8.20)
	Slightly consistent	27.67 (6.66)	22.67 (6.83)	24.33 (6.82)
	Consistent	30.00 (0)	25.67 (6.66)	25.94 (6.53)
	Totally consistent	29.50 (10.61)	28.17 (4.79)	28.50 (5.73)
	Total	31.84 (5.66)	25.03 (6.83)	28.43 (7.11)
Scarcity	Totally inconsistent	32.75 (5.70)	25.50 (9.19)	31.30 (6.63)
	Inconsistent	28.50 (6.14)	23.00 (7.41)	24.83 (7.25)
	Slightly inconsistent	32.67 (2.08)	0 (0)	32.67 (2.08)
	Neutral	26.50 (2.12)	27.38 (9.74)	27.20 (8.63)
	Slightly consistent	29.00 (5.77)	26.00 (3.61)	28.25 (5.33)
	Consistent	34.78 (3.42)	23.50 (7.80)	28.33 (8.42)
	Totally consistent	31.75 (7.36)	27.50 (10.10)	29.20 (8.92)
	Total	31.49 (5.46)	25.10 (8.08)	28.29 (7.57)
Neutral	Totally inconsistent	35.80 (2.66)	32.00 (1.41)	35.17 (2.86)
	Inconsistent	34.44 (3.43)	32.18 (5.17)	33.20 (4.51)
	Slightly inconsistent	30.80 (8.41)	29.00 (7.35)	30.00 (7.52)
	Neutral	0 (0)	30.43 (4.16)	30.43 (4.16)
	Slightly consistent	33.00 (6.23)	28.33 (7.66)	31.13 (6.98)
	Consistent	34.67 (6.66)	30.43 (5.71)	31.70 (5.98)
	Totally consistent	32.50 (0.71)	30.00 (0)	31.67 (1.53)
	Total	33.89 (5.04)	30.53 (5.45)	32.21 (5.48)
Total	Totally inconsistent	33.82 (5.24)	28.75 (6.55)	33.27 (5.52)
	Inconsistent	32.71 (4.98)	27.33 (8.34)	29.84 (7.42)
	Slightly inconsistent	31.00 (5.58)	28.00 (5.97)	30.05 (5.74)
	Neutral	29.75 (4.65)	27.50 (7.79)	27.91 (7.28)
	Slightly consistent	30.52 (6.19)	25.60 (6.81)	28.47 (6.19)
	Consistent	34.38 (4.11)	25.88 (7.18)	28.23 (7.49)
	Totally consistent	31.37 (6.39)	28.00 (7.25)	29.29 (6.97)
	Total	32.40 (5.45)	26.87 (7.29)	29.63 (7.00)

Finally, a two-way analysis of variance with the type of advertisement (*Ad_type*), nationality and the categorized IMI-score (*IMITotal_Cat*) as factors showed a significant main effect of the categorized IMI score on purchase intention (PI) ($F(1, 218) = 8.73, p = .003$). The participants that had an IMI score under the median of 31 points, marked by the category number '0', had a lower purchase intention ($M = 3.05, SD = 1.32$) than the participants that scored above the median on the IMI-scale, marked by the category number '1' ($M = 4.02, SD = 1.66$). Nationality was also found to have a significant main effect on the purchase intention ($F(1, 218) = 12.71, p < .001$). In terms of nationality, the Dutch participants scored higher on purchase intention ($M = 4.15, SD = 1.34$) than their Vietnamese counterparts ($M = 3.03, SD = 1.64$). The type of advertisement did not have a significant main effect on purchase intention ($F(2, 218) = 2.04, p = .132$). The interaction effect between type of advertisement, the categorized IMI scale and nationality was also not statistically significant ($F(2, 218) = 1.52, p = .221$).

Table 7. Purchase Intention

IMI-scale category		Category 0	Category 1	Total
		<i>N = 103</i>	<i>N = 127</i>	<i>N = 230</i>
		<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
Dutch	Reciprocity	3.08 (1.44)	4.54 (1.14)	4.08 (1.40)
	Scarcity	3.38 (1.04)	3.92 (1.50)	3.74 (1.37)
	Neutral	3.80 (0.84)	4.76 (1.09)	4.63 (1.10)
	Total	3.33 (1.18)	4.44 (1.28)	4.15 (1.34)
Vietnamese	Reciprocity	2.81 (1.36)	4.00 (1.41)	3.16 (1.46)
	Scarcity	2.56 (1.05)	3.08 (2.39)	2.72 (1.57)
	Neutral	3.63 (1.57)	2.79 (2.04)	3.21 (1.85)
	Total	2.93 (1.37)	3.19 (2.03)	3.03 (1.64)
Total	Reciprocity	2.90 (1.37)	4.38 (1.23)	3.62 (1.50)
	Scarcity	2.83 (1.11)	3.66 (1.84)	3.23 (1.55)
	Neutral	3.67 (1.44)	4.04 (1.77)	3.92 (1.67)
	Total	3.05 (1.32)	4.02 (1.66)	3.59 (1.59)

Conclusion & Discussion

In terms of the effect persuasion strategy recognition has on the inference of manipulative intent of consumers (SQ1), the findings showed a higher IMI-score for participants that were shown the neutral ad, then for participants that were either shown the reciprocity or scarcity ad. Since it is the case that a high score on the IMI-scale equals a small amount of inferences of manipulative intent, it can be concluded that advertisements containing a persuasion tactic evoke more inferences of manipulative intent than advertisements without any persuasion

strategy. Furthermore, participants who labelled the scarcity ad correctly as ‘Totally inconsistent’ appeared to have a significantly higher score on the IMI-scale than participants who marked it correctly as ‘Totally consistent. In other words, people who do not recognize a persuasion strategy witness fewer inferences of manipulative intent than people who fully recognize a persuasion strategy in an ad. These findings correspond with the first hypothesis (H1), expecting that the inference of manipulative intent will increase after the recognition of a persuasion strategy.

For the difference in inference of manipulative intent between people from an individualistic and collectivistic country after recognizing one of the persuasion strategies (SQ2), it was found that for all ad types, people from the collectivistic Vietnam scored lower on the IMI-scale than people from the individualistic Netherlands. Therefore, it can be concluded that people from a collectivistic culture generally witness more inferences of manipulative intent than people from an individualistic culture after watching an ad. Since there were no significant effects between nationality and reciprocity or scarcity consistency, it is not possible to conclude anything about the intercultural difference in IMI after recognizing scarcity or reciprocity. Despite that, the other findings still correspond with H2, expecting that there is a difference in responses towards the ad between Vietnamese and Dutch participants.

Regarding the effect IMI has on the purchase intention on people from the Netherlands and Vietnam (SQ3), the results showed that for both countries, people with an IMI-score above average had a lower purchase intention than people with an IMI-score below average. Concluding, the higher the degree of inferences of manipulative intent, the lower the purchase intention. Besides, since the findings demonstrate that participants from the Netherlands had a significantly higher score on purchase intention than their Vietnamese counterparts, it can be concluded that after being shown an ad, the purchase intention of people from an individualistic culture is higher than the purchase intention of people from a collectivistic culture. This conclusion corresponds completely with the hypothesis (H3), were it was expected that the willingness to purchase a product would be decreased after the recognition of persuasive motives in an advertisement.

The fact that the recognition of a persuasion strategy increases the inferences of manipulative intent can be explained by the prior research of Campbell (1995), which showed that the recognition of an attention-getting advertising strategy will likely evoke inferences of manipulative intent. The findings of Campbell (1995) are further supported by other findings of this research, showing that participants who totally recognized a persuasion strategy witnessed more inferences of manipulative intent than participants who did not recognize a persuasion strategy at all. In addition, the type of ad that evoked the least inferences of manipulative intent was the neutral ad, which did not contain any persuasion tactic. However, the differences in inferences of manipulative intent between people from collectivistic and individualistic cultures cannot be explained. For all types of ads, Dutch participants witnessed fewer inferences than Vietnamese participants. This does not correspond with the research of Orji (2016), were it was shown that people from individualistic countries preferred the scarcity appeal more than people from collectivistic countries and that collectivistic people preferred the reciprocity appeal more than individualistic people. It is difficult to say if the results are representative for all collectivistic and individualistic cultures. Perhaps Vietnamese people are earlier annoyed by specific persuasive intent than people from other collectivistic countries. Furthermore, the decrease in purchase intention after recognizing a persuasion tactic can be explained by the fact that persuasion tactic recognition evokes ad skepticism

(Kim & Lee, 2009) and that an increase in ad skepticism results in a lower willingness to purchase the product (Obermiller et al., 2005).

In this study, there were a few limitations. Since there was no significant interaction effect between nationality and ad type on IMI-score, it was not possible to conclude what persuasion strategy was preferred by which nationality. As a result, it was not possible to answer SQ2 in its completeness. Furthermore, the experiment was only attended by people from one individualistic and one collectivistic country. Therefore, the results might not be representative for all collectivistic or individualistic countries. Another possible limitation is the fact that after gathering the data, the scarcity and reciprocity manipulation check scales have been reversed and recoded. This has been done in order to make all positive or consistent results, such as 'Totally consistent', a high score on the scales and to make all negative or inconsistent results a low score on the scales. However no major differences have been detected, there could be negligible deviations in the results. Besides, the used six-point IMI-scale was the same as Campbell (1995) used to measure inferences of manipulative intent. Nevertheless, the Campbell study has been conducted many years ago, thus there is a chance that the scale is not up to date anymore with the ads that are being broadcasted nowadays. Therefore it might be an option to form a new scale with adjusted or more questions.

The findings showed that no matter which advertisement is been displayed, people from an individualistic culture witness fewer inferences of manipulative intent than people from a collectivistic culture. However, this research does not investigate why that difference in IMI appears. Therefore, it would be recommendable to conduct future research on why people from collectivistic cultures witness more inferences of manipulative intent after being shown an ad than people from individualistic cultures. In addition, it would be interesting to collect a sample of people from multiple collectivistic and individualistic countries, so that the investigation will be more representative for the two cultures.

References

- Aguirre-Rodriguez, A. (2013). The effect of consumer persuasion knowledge on scarcity appeal persuasiveness. *Journal of Advertising*, 42(4), 371-379.
- Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, 1(3), 185-216.
- Campbell, M. C. (1995). When attention-getting advertising tactics elicit consumer inferences of manipulative intent: The importance of balancing benefits and investments. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 4(3), 225-254.
- Cialdini, R. B. (1987). *Influence* (Vol. 3). Port Harcourt: A. Michel.
- Danciu, V. (2014). Manipulative marketing: persuasion and manipulation of the consumer through advertising. *Theoretical and Applied Economics*, 21(2), 591.
- Friestad, M., & Wright, P. (1994). The persuasion knowledge model: How people cope with persuasion attempts. *Journal of consumer research*, 21(1), 1-31.
- Friestad, M., & Wright, P. (1999). Everyday persuasion knowledge. *Psychology & Marketing*, 16(2), 185-194.
- Gaube, S., Fischer, P., Windl, V., & Lerner, E. (2020). The effect of persuasive messages on hospital visitors' hand hygiene behavior. *Health Psychology*, 39(6), 471.
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online readings in psychology and culture*, 2(1), 2307-0919.
- Han, S. P., & Shavitt, S. (1994). Persuasion and culture: Advertising appeals in individualistic and collectivistic societies. *Journal of experimental social psychology*, 30(4), 326-350.
- Hong, S. M., & Faedda, S. (1996). Refinement of the Hong psychological reactance scale. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 56(1), 173-182.
- Hui, C. H., & Triandis, H. C. (1986). Individualism-collectivism: A study of cross-cultural researchers. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, 17(2), 225-248.
- Kaptein, M., De Ruyter, B., Markopoulos, P., & Aarts, E. (2012). Adaptive persuasive systems: a study of tailored persuasive text messages to reduce snacking. *ACM Transactions on Interactive Intelligent Systems (TiiS)*, 2(2), 1-25.
- Keating, D. P. (1990). Adolescent thinking.
- Kim, Y. J., & Lee, W. N. (2009). Overcoming consumer skepticism in cause-related marketing: The effects of corporate social responsibility and donation size claim objectivity. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 15(4), 465-483.
- Obermiller, C., & Spangenberg, E. R. (1998). Development of a scale to measure consumer skepticism toward advertising. *Journal of consumer psychology*, 7(2), 159-186.
- Obermiller, C., Spangenberg, E., & MacLachlan, D. L. (2005). Ad skepticism: The consequences of disbelief. *Journal of advertising*, 34(3), 7-17.

- Orji, R. (2016, April). Persuasion and Culture: Individualism-Collectivism and Susceptibility to Influence Strategies. In *PPT@ PERSUASIVE* (pp. 30-39).
- Roedder, D. L. (1981). Age differences in children's responses to television advertising: An information-processing approach. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 8(2), 144-153.
- Roedder, J.D. and Whitney, J.C. (1986), "The development of consumer knowledge in children: a cognitive structure approach", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 12, pp. 406-17.
- Wei, M. L., 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.
- Wellman, H. M. (1992). *The child's theory of mind*. The MIT Press.
- Werner, O. & Campbell, D.T. Translating, working through interpreters, and the problem of decentering. In R. Naroll & R. Cohen (Eds.), *A handbook of method in cultural anthropology*. New York: American Museum of Natural History, 1970, 398-420.

Appendix

Dutch ads

Neutral ad

Text: "100% Biological orange juice. 0% Added sugars. Delivered at your place."



Scarcity ad

Translated text: ‘‘Psst.. This month we are working with artists to give our bottles a colourful make-over. Only in the month April.’’



Reciprocity ad

Translated text: ‘‘Happy juice hour! Every 10th order is on us. Let’s say cheers to that!’’



Vietnamese ads

Neutral ad

Translated text: “100% Biological orange juice. 0% Added sugars. Delivered at your place.”



Scarcity ad

Translated text: “Psst.. This month we are working with artists to give our bottles a colourful make-over. Only in the month April.”



Reciprocity ad

Translated text: ‘Happy juice hour! Every 10th order is on us. Let’s say cheers to that!’



BA Thesis questionnaire Dutch version

Start of Block: Introduction

Q1 Beste participant, bedankt dat je mee wilt helpen in ons onderzoek! Dit experiment wordt uitgevoerd als deel van de Bacheloropleiding International Business Communication aan de Radboud Universiteit. Dit onderzoek kijkt naar jouw reacties op een gegeven advertentie. Er zijn geen goede of foute antwoorden. Het invullen van deze vragenlijst zal ongeveer 5 tot 10 minuten in beslag nemen. Je kan op elk gegeven moment stoppen zonder hier reden voor op te geven. De informatie die wordt verzameld blijft volledig anoniem, en alleen voor onderzoeksdoeleinden worden gebruikt. Als je geïnformeerd wil worden over de resultaten van dit onderzoek, laat dan je emailadres achter aan het einde van de vragenlijst.

Q2 Ik geef toestemming om mee te doen aan het onderzoek.

Ja (2)

Nee (3)

Skip To: End of Survey If Ik geef toestemming om mee te doen aan het onderzoek. = Nee

End of Block: Introduction

Start of Block: Background check NL

Q3

Wat is je leeftijd?

Q4 Wat is je sekse?

- Man (1)
 - Vrouw (2)
 - Anders (3)
-

Q5 Wat is je hoogst afgeronde of huidige opleidingsniveau?

- Verplicht onderwijs (7)
- MBO (9)
- HBO (10)
- WO bachelor (11)
- WO master (12)
- PHD (13)

End of Block: Background check NL

Start of Block: Main body

Q6 Bekijk en lees de onderstaande advertentie aandachtig en ga daarna door naar de vragen.

Q7 Bekijk en lees de onderstaande advertentie aandachtig en ga daarna door naar de vragen.

Q8 Bekijk en lees de onderstaande advertentie aandachtig en ga daarna door naar de vragen.

Q9 De manier waarop deze advertentie mensen probeert te overtuigen lijkt mij acceptabel.

	Helemaal mee eens (1)	Eens (2)	Enigszins mee eens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Enigszins mee oneens (5)	Oneens (6)	Helemaal mee oneens (7)
(1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q10 De adverteerder probeert de doelgroep te manipuleren op manieren die mij niet bevallen.

	Helemaal mee eens (1)	Eens (2)	Enigszins mee eens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Enigszins mee oneens (5)	Oneens (6)	Helemaal mee oneens (7)
1 (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q11 Ik vind de advertentie storend omdat het er de schijn van heeft dat de adverteerder de doelgroep op ongepaste wijze probeert te beïnvloeden of te sturen.

	Helemaal mee eens (1)	Eens (2)	Enigszins mee eens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Enigszins mee oneens (5)	Oneens (6)	Helemaal mee oneens (7)
1 (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q12 Ik vind deze advertentie niet bezwaarlijk; de adverteerder probeert overtuigend te zijn zonder overdreven manipulatief te zijn.

	Helemaal mee eens (1)	Eens (2)	Enigszins mee eens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Enigszins mee oneens (5)	Oneens (6)	Helemaal mee oneens (7)
1 (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q13 Wat er in deze advertentie gezegd en getoond wordt is eerlijk.

	Helemaal mee eens (1)	Eens (2)	Enigszins mee eens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Enigszins mee oneens (5)	Oneens (6)	Helemaal mee oneens (7)
(3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q14 Ik vind de advertentie

	Ze er oneerlijk (1)	Oneerlijk (2)	Redelijk oneerlijk (3)	Neutraal (4)	Redelijk eerlijk (5)	Eerlijk (6)	Ze er eerlijk (7)
4 (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q15 Ik vind de advertentie

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Onaangenaam	<input type="radio"/>	Aangenaam						
Slecht	<input type="radio"/>	Goed						
Vreselijk	<input type="radio"/>	Prettig						

Q16 Hoe waarschijnlijk is het dat jij dit merk zult kiezen?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Heel onwaarschijnlijk	<input type="radio"/>	Heel waarschijnlijk						

Q17 De volgende vragen gaan over de tactiek die is gebruikt in de advertentie, daarbij worden de volgende definities gehanteerd:

Schaarste: mensen hechten meer waarde aan dingen die moeilijk verkrijgbaar zijn. Dit ligt aan de populaire gedachte dat minder verkrijgbare opties van betere kwaliteit zijn.

Reciprociteit: van nature voelen mensen zich verplicht een gunst terug te doen. Wordt er dus een overtuigend verzoek gedaan waarbij de ontvanger zich verschuldigd voelt naar de persoon, dan is de ontvanger eerder geneigd het verzoek na te komen.

Q18 Welke tactiek was zichtbaar?

Schaarste

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Duidelijk	<input type="radio"/>	Nauwelijks						

Q19 Welke tactiek was zichtbaar?

	Reciprociteit							
	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Duidelijk	<input type="radio"/>	Nauwelijks						

End of Block: Main body

Start of Block: Block 3

Q20 Bedankt voor het invullen van de enquête! Als u de resultaten van dit onderzoek wil ontvangen, laat dan hieronder uw e-mail achter. De resultaten worden naar u toegestuurd wanneer het onderzoek voltooid is.

End of Block: Block 3

BA Thesis questionnaire Vietnamese version

Start of Block: Introduction

Q1 Cảm ơn bạn vì đã tham gia hoàn thành khảo sát này! Thí nghiệm này là 1 phần của chương trình Cử nhân Truyền Thông Doanh Nghiệp Quốc Tế của trường đại học Radboud tại Hà Lan. Nghiên cứu này sẽ khảo sát phản hồi của bạn đối với 1 quảng cáo nhất định. Không có câu trả lời nào là đúng và sai. Do hạn chế kĩ thuật của phần mềm, nếu cần thiết, bạn có thể bấm nút quay lại để xem lại quảng cáo. Thời gian ước tính để hoàn thành bản khảo sát là 5 phút.

Trong quá trình trả lời, bạn có quyền dừng lại tại bất cứ thời điểm nào mà không phải giải thích lý do. Những thông tin được thu thập trong quá trình này sẽ hoàn toàn ẩn danh. Nếu bạn muốn được thông báo về kết quả của nghiên cứu này, vui lòng để lại email của bạn ở cuối khảo sát này.

Vui lòng cho biết phía dưới rằng bạn muốn tham gia vào nghiên cứu. Bằng việc đồng ý, bạn đã hoàn toàn nắm được đầy đủ thông tin về nghiên cứu này, và bạn muốn tự nguyện tham gia.

Q2 Tôi đồng ý tham gia vào nghiên cứu như đã được mô tả ở trên.

- Đồng ý (1)
- Không đồng ý (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If Tôi đồng ý tham gia vào nghiên cứu như đã được mô tả ở trên. = Không đồng ý

End of Block: Introduction

Start of Block: Thông tin cá nhân

Q3 Bạn bao nhiêu tuổi?

Q4 Giới tính của bạn là:

- Nam (1)
- Nữ (2)
- Khác (5)

Q5 Trình độ học vấn của bạn:

- Chương trình giáo dục phổ thông (TH, THCS, THPT) (1)
- Cao đẳng (2)
- Đại học (3)
- Cao học (4)
- Tiến sĩ (5)
- Khác (6)

End of Block: Thông tin cá nhân

Start of Block: Dựa vào quảng cáo trên, đánh giá các nhận định sau:

Q6 Dựa vào quảng cáo dưới đây, hãy đánh giá các nhận định sau:

Do hạn chế kỹ thuật của phần mềm, nếu cần thiết, bạn có thể bấm nút quay lại để xem lại quảng cáo. Chúng tôi rất xin lỗi về sự bất tiện này.

.....

Q7 Dựa vào quảng cáo dưới đây, hãy đánh giá các nhận định sau:

Do hạn chế kỹ thuật của phần mềm, nếu cần thiết, bạn có thể bấm nút quay lại để xem lại quảng cáo. Chúng tôi rất xin lỗi về sự bất tiện này.

.....

Q8 Dựa vào quảng cáo dưới đây, hãy đánh giá các nhận định sau:

Do hạn chế kỹ thuật của phần mềm, nếu cần thiết, bạn có thể bấm nút quay lại để xem lại quảng cáo. Chúng tôi rất xin lỗi về sự bất tiện này.

.....

Q9 Quảng cáo này thể hiện sự thuyết phục một cách hợp lý.

	Hoàn toàn đồng ý (1)	Đồng ý (2)	Hơi đồng ý (3)	Không đồng ý cũng không phản đối (4)	Hơi không đồng ý (5)	Không đồng ý (6)	Hoàn toàn không đồng ý (7)
(1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q10 Tôi không thích phương pháp mà nhà quảng cáo sử dụng để tác động lên người xem.

	Hoàn toàn đồng ý (1)	Đồng ý (2)	Hơi đồng ý (3)	Không đồng ý cũng không phản đối (4)	Hơi không đồng ý (5)	Không đồng ý (6)	Hoàn toàn không đồng ý (7)
(1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q11 Tôi không cảm thấy khó chịu với quảng cáo này. Nhà quảng cáo cố gắng có tính thuyết phục và không thao túng quá độ.

	Hoàn toàn đồng ý (1)	Đồng ý (2)	Hơi đồng ý (3)	Không đồng ý cũng không phản đối (4)	Hơi không đồng ý (5)	Không đồng ý (6)	Hoàn toàn không đồng ý (7)
(1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q12 Tôi cảm thấy khó chịu với quảng cáo này bởi vì nhà quảng cáo dường như đang cố gắng kiểm soát đối tượng người tiêu dùng 1 cách không phù hợp

	Hoàn toàn đồng ý (1)	Đồng ý (2)	Hơi đồng ý (3)	Không đồng ý cũng không phản đối (4)	Hơi không đồng ý (5)	Không đồng ý (6)	Hoàn toàn không đồng ý (7)
(1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q13 Nội dung hiển thị của quảng cáo này là chính xác và hợp lý.

	Hoàn toàn đồng ý (1)	Đồng ý (2)	Hơi đồng ý (3)	Không đồng ý cũng không phản đối (4)	Hơi không đồng ý (5)	Không đồng ý (6)	Hoàn toàn không đồng ý (7)
(1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q14 Tôi nghĩ rằng quảng cáo này:

	Rất bất hợp lý (1)	Bất hợp lý (2)	Hơi bất hợp lý (3)	Bình thường (4)	Hơi hợp lý (5)	Hợp lý (6)	Rất hợp lý (7)
(1)	<input type="radio"/>						

Q15 Bạn cảm thấy như thế nào đối với quảng cáo trên?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Khó ưa	<input type="radio"/>	Hài lòng						
Xấu	<input type="radio"/>	Tốt						
Kinh khủng	<input type="radio"/>	Đễ chịu						

Q16 Dựa vào quảng cáo trên, đánh giá nhận định sau:

	Hoàn toàn không có khả năng (1)	Không có khả năng (2)	Hơi không có khả năng (3)	Có thể có hoặc không (4)	Hơi có khả năng (5)	Có khả năng (6)	Hoàn toàn có khả năng (7)
Sau khi xem quảng cáo, bạn có khả năng sẽ lựa chọn mua hàng từ thương hiệu này không? (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q17 Bạn sẽ được yêu cầu đánh giá chiến thuật được áp dụng với quảng cáo vừa xem trong 2 câu hỏi tiếp theo. Vui lòng đọc kỹ định nghĩa chiến thuật và câu hỏi trước khi trả lời.

Giải thích chiến thuật quảng cáo Sự giới hạn/ số lượng có hạn (scarcity): chiến thuật đánh vào tâm lý xem trọng những mặt hàng/ dịch vụ có giới hạn hoặc khan hiếm của người xem/ tiêu dùng Sự đáp lại/ có qua có lại (reciprocity): chiến thuật khiến người xem/ tiêu dùng cảm thấy có nghĩa vụ phải mua hàng/ sử dụng dịch vụ như 1 cách đáp lễ/ đáp lại với nhãn hàng (hai bên cùng có lợi)

Q18 Dựa vào định nghĩa được cung cấp, theo bạn, chiến lược nào đã được sử dụng trong quảng cáo bạn vừa đánh giá?

	Hoàn toàn đồng ý (1)	Đồng ý (2)	Hơi đồng ý (3)	Không đồng ý cũng không phản đối (4)	Hơi không đồng ý (5)	Không đồng ý (6)	Hoàn toàn không đồng ý (7)
Sự đáp lại/ Có qua có lại (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q19 Dựa vào định nghĩa được cung cấp, theo bạn, chiến lược nào đã được sử dụng trong quảng cáo bạn vừa đánh giá?

	Hoàn toàn đồng ý (1)	Đồng ý (2)	Hơi đồng ý (3)	Không đồng ý cũng không phản đối (4)	Hơi không đồng ý (5)	Không đồng ý (6)	Hoàn toàn không đồng ý (7)
Giới hạn/ Số lượng có hạn (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

End of Block: Dựa vào quảng cáo trên, đánh giá các nhận định sau:

Start of Block: Email

Q20 Bạn đã hoàn thành bản khảo sát. Nếu bạn muốn nhận được kết quả của nghiên cứu này, xin vui lòng để lại email phía dưới. Kết quả sẽ được email cho bạn khi nghiên cứu kết thúc.

End of Block: Email