

The Role of Self-control in the Effectiveness of Brand Placement Disclosures

Bachelor Thesis

Lieke van Dillen, s4210530

lieke.van.dillen@student.ru.nl

0650436156

Theme 11: Loes Janssen

Radboud University Nijmegen

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

Abstract

Today, the inclusion of branded products in the content of a film or television programme is becoming quite common. This application is called brand placement. It is obligatory to mention the usage of brand placement, which is done by means of disclosures: statements or symbols that help viewers to recognize the persuasive intent of the placement as sponsored content. Disclosures are proposed to influence viewers' evaluations of the placed brand. However, mixed results of brand evaluations in response to disclosures were found. This study was therefore conducted to investigate under which circumstances disclosures affect brand evaluations. It was expected that people with non-depleted self-control would evaluate the brand less positively when exposed to a disclosure, and that people with depleted self-control would not evaluate the brand more or less positively when exposed to a disclosure. The level of self-control of participants and the presence of a disclosure were manipulated using a two-factorial design. In an online web-survey, 148 participants were asked to answer several questions after taking part in a proverb task and watching a film fragment with brand placement. Results indicated no significant interaction effect of self-control and disclosure on brand attitude. However, an interaction effect of self-control and disclosure was discovered for purchase intention. In the absence of a disclosure, people with depleted self-control resources had a higher purchase intention. This study shows that self-control is probably not the explanation for the mixed results concerning brand evaluation in response to disclosures.

Keywords: brand placement, disclosures, self-control, brand attitude, purchase intent

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

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

James Bond is drinking Heineken beer in the identically named film. This inclusion of a brand in the content of a film or television programme is a form of advertising and is called brand placement or product placement (Smit, Van Reijmersdal, & Neijens, 2009). Due to the fact that viewers might not unconsciously be exposed to brand placement for ethical reasons, disclosures to warn the viewer for advertising were made obligatory (Audiovisual Media Services Directive, 2010). Among viewers, disclosures lead to recognition of the placement as sponsored content (Boerman, Van Reijmersdal, & Neijens, 2014). The question raises whether recognition of the sponsored content consequently leads to altered brand evaluations, since mixed results have been found on the effects of disclosures on brand evaluations (Bennet et al., 1999; Boerman et al., 2014; Dekker and Van Reijmersdal, 2010). This study is therefore conducted to clarify under which circumstances disclosures affect brand evaluations.

Background

Brand placement or product placement involves including branded products in the content of a film or television programme (Audiovisual Media Services Directive, 2010; Cain, 2011; Smit, Van Reijmersdal, & Neijens, 2009). Examples of brand placement are a scene in a James Bond film where Bond is drinking Heineken beer or candidates in *The Voice* that are eating a Twix candy bar during the television show. Brand placement is a persuasive communication strategy which is implemented by marketers more regularly these days. Brand placement appears to be an attractive source of income for marketers behind the brand (Van Reijmersdal, Neijens, & Smit, 2007; Wenner, 2004).

Since advertising blocks have become less effective due to the fact that viewers avoid commercials, sponsors had to apply another form of promoting brands (Smit et al., 2009). Brand placement appears to reduce the fact that consumers skip commercials as the persuasive intent is embedded in the editorial content (Van Reijmersdal et al., 2007; Wenner, 2004). Brand placement occurs in films and human interest programmes, but also in soaps, games, quizzes and entertainment programmes (Smit et al., 2009). The most frequently used form of brand placement is visual presentation of the branded product. Brands are usually prominently placed on the screen, which means that the brands are shown for a long period of time, in the foreground and clearly visible being used by actors (Smit et al., 2009). In general, brand placements have a positive effect on brand recall and attitude towards the brand (Bressoud, Lehu, & Russel, 2010; Gupta & Lord, 1998; Law & Braun, 2000; Van

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

Reijmersdal et al., 2007) Especially prominent, central and longer shown brand placements positively influence the attitude of viewers towards the brand (Bressoud, et al., 2010; Gupta & Lord, 1998; Law & Braun, 2000; Van Reijmersdal et al., 2007; Wenner, 2004).

Brand placement disclosures

Brand placement appears to be an effective strategy to persuade viewers to like the brand, since the persuasive intent may not be clear due to the integration of the placement in the content of television programmes or films (Dekker & Van Reijmersdal, 2010). However, consumers should not unconsciously be exposed to brand placements due to ethical reasons (Lee, 2008; Nebenzahl, & Jaffe, 1998). According to the Audiovisual Media Services Directive (2010), sponsored programmes need to conform with several requirements which imply that consumers must be informed of the sponsorship agreement. Therefore, broadcasters are obliged to mention that a programme contains brand placement. Without mentioning, consumers may not be aware that the placed product is a paid commercial insert (Audiovisual Media Services Directive, 2010; Boerman, Van Reijmersdal, & Nijens, 2014).

To ensure ethical communication about sponsored content, disclosures were made obligatory by the EU in 2009 (Audiovisual Media Services Directive, 2010). Disclosures may help consumers to recognize brand placement as promotion or advertisement. Disclosures can appear in several forms, such as *“This program contains paid advertising for The story for this episode has been developed in conjunction with ..., and the program contains in-program advertisements from ...”* (Commercial Alert 2008, p. 13, as cited in Cain, 2011). Furthermore, the European ‘PP’ symbol for product placement can serve as a warning for brand placement (Tessitore & Geuens, 2013). Disclosures have to be shown at the start and end of television programmes, and after commercial breaks (Audiovisual Media Services Directive, 2010). They must at least inform consumers about the sponsored content and raise awareness of the persuasive goal of advertising (Boerman et al., 2014; Cain, 2011).

Effects of disclosures on persuasion knowledge

Recent studies have focused on the question whether disclosures reach their goal of making consumers aware of the fact that brand placement is a form of advertising. It was shown that disclosures make consumers aware of the persuasive attempt of brand placement, as they help consumers access their persuasion knowledge (Boerman et al., 2014). Persuasion knowledge includes people’s personal knowledge about the goals and tactics persuasion agents use and about how they can deal with those persuasion attempts skilfully (Friestad &

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

Wright, 1994). This results in the fact that people are more sceptically towards advertisements and may consequently disbelieve, dislike and avoid advertising (Rotfeld, 2008). According to the Persuasion Knowledge Model, people's persuasion knowledge continues developing throughout life (Friestad & Wright, 1994). The use of persuasion knowledge is activated when viewers are exposed to disclosures (Campbell, Mohr, & Verlegh, 2012). Consumers who were confronted with a disclosure appeared to be better in distinguishing commercial and editorial content than consumers who were not confronted with a disclosure. This is also known as conceptual persuasion knowledge. Consequently, consumers who were exposed to disclosures were perceived to have more distrust of the sponsored content, which means they had higher attitudinal persuasion knowledge. Consumers therefore showed more critical feelings towards the sponsored content after being exposed to disclosures (Boerman, Van Reijmersdal, & Nijens, 2012).

Effects of disclosures on brand evaluation

Disclosures lead to recognition of the brand placement as sponsored content (Boerman et al., 2014). Since disclosures cause critical processing of brand placements and mitigate their persuasive effects, they are thus likely to influence viewers' evaluations of placed brands (Boerman et al., 2014). For the reason that marketers use brand placements to make viewers like the brand, it is relevant to find out whether viewers do indeed evaluate the placed brands differently in response to brand placement disclosures.

Several studies have looked at the effects of disclosures on evaluations of placed brands, but results appear to be mixed. Bennet, Pecotich, and Putrevu (1999) and Dekker and Van Reijmersdal (2010) found that disclosures did not have any effect on the likeability of placed brands. Campbell, Mohr, and Verlegh (2013) found similar results in their study. They proposed that attitudes towards the brand for disclosures before the placement were as high as for placements without disclosure (Campbell et al., 2013). Van Reijmersdal, Tutaj and Boerman (2013) also found that disclosures did not lead to more critical attitudes towards the brand. However, other studies did find effects of disclosures on brand evaluations. Boerman et al. (2014) reported that 6-second disclosures led to more critical attitudes towards the brand placement than 3-second disclosures. This would suggest that 6-second disclosures provide sufficient processing time, which enables viewers to gain critical attitudes, since a high level of attention and processing is needed to activate attitudinal persuasion knowledge (Petty et al., 1981; Bennet et al., 1999; Boerman et al., 2014). Besides the duration of disclosures, disclosure timing also appears to affect attitudes towards the sponsored content. Attitude

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

towards the brand is negatively influenced for disclosures shown prior to or concurrent with the sponsored content, after the recognition of sponsored television as advertising has been stimulated (Boerman et al., 2014). Consumers recognize content as advertising and can process it critically when disclosures are shown prior to or concurrent with brand placements. This consequently leads to more negative attitudes towards the brand (Boerman et al., 2014). It emerges that some studies reported effects of disclosures on brand evaluations and other studies did not. Results concerning the effect of disclosures on brand evaluations thus appear to be mixed, which implies that disclosures do not always cause negative attitudes towards the brand placement.

The role of self-control

Since disclosures do not always influence brand evaluations, the present study is conducted to clarify under which circumstances disclosures affect brand evaluations of the placed product. The effectiveness of disclosures might be dependent on the cognitive state of the viewer when exposed to the disclosure. A meaningful factor which can possibly give more insight in the effects of disclosures is self-control, since self-control appears to be an important factor in the process of offering resistance towards persuasion (Burkley, 2008). Self-control generally refers to “the ability to effectively regulate, oftentimes with much effort, one’s thoughts, feelings, and behaviour” (Vohs & Baumeister, 2004, as cited in Burkley, Anderson, & Curtis, 2011).

Various studies have reported evidence for the regulatory strength model of self-control (Baumeister, Vohs & Tice, 2007; Muraven & Baumeister, 2000). Self-control appears to be a limited resource. Several researchers have proposed that after taking part in a self-controlling task, people’s self-control was lowered in following self-controlling tasks (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven, & Tice, 1998; Burkley et al., 2011; Fennis, Janssen, & Vohs, 2009; Inzlicht & Schmeichel, 2012). This phenomenon is often referred to as ego depletion (Baumeister et al., 2007; Burkley et al., 2011; Inzlicht & Schmeichel, 2012). Ego depletion is also explained by the fact that temporary changes in motivation and attention due to a previous self-control act lead to short-term caused impairments in following tasks (Inzlicht & Schmeichel, 2012).

In order to offer resistance against persuasive attempts of brand placements, people must own self-control resources. Without self-control, people become sensitive to being influenced by those persuasive attempts (Burkley, 2008). Burkley (2008) and Wheeler, Briñol, and Hermann (2007) found that arguing against persuasive messages required active

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

control processes and therefore reduced subsequent resistance against persuasive attempts. Furthermore, counterargument appeared to be a self-regulatory process that can be undermined when self-regulatory resources have previously been diminished (Wheeler et al., 2007). Thus, due to depleted self-control, people are more easily persuaded by brand placements as their ability to resist the persuasive messages is reduced. It is therefore expected that people with depleted self-control will respond differently to a disclosure than people with non-depleted self-control.

Self-control and entertaining media use

People are most frequently exposed to disclosures when they are in a state of depletion (Gillespie, Joireman, & Muehling, 2012). It appears that people most regularly watch television during prime-time hours, which is between approximately 7 and 11 pm (Gillespie et al., 2012). People's self-control resources are more depleted at the end of the day, because people then have taken part in several daily tasks requiring self-control (Baumeister, Heatherton, & Tice, 1994). Even when tasks are unrelated, self-regulation on subsequent tasks becomes more difficult once self-control resources are depleted (Hofmann, Vohs, & Baumeister, 2012). Gillespie et al. (2012) reported that when watching television during prime-time hours, people's ability to regulate their behaviour is diminished as they already regulated their behaviour during the day. Besides the fact that people have less self-control resources at the end of the day, they are also less motivated to offer resistance against the persuasive attempts of brand placements. People will therefore be more likely to take part in activities that do not ask for self-control, such as indulging in entertaining media (Reinecke, Hartmann, & Eden, 2014). Since people most regularly watch television in a state of depletion, their ability and motivation to offer resistance in response to disclosures might be diminished, which will consequently influence their brand evaluations.

Therefore, it is interesting to include self-control in studies investigating the effects of disclosures on brand evaluations. The effects of disclosures on viewers have been extensively researched (Boerman et al., 2014; Bennet et al., 1999; Campbell et al., 2013). Disclosures appear to cause persuasion knowledge (Boerman et al., 2014), but disclosures do not always negatively influence brand evaluations (Bennet et al., 1999; Boerman et al., 2014; Dekker and Van Reijmersdal, 2010). Little research has been done on the mental condition of viewers when exposed to disclosures and their ability to process disclosures. Self-control can be a relevant factor for the process of offering resistance, since viewers need self-control to resist a persuasive attempt (Burkley, 2008). As people watch television most regularly in a state of

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

depleted self-control, they might not be able or might not want to offer resistance against brand placements after being exposed to disclosures. They will therefore be persuaded more easily than people with non-depleted self-control (Gillespie et al., 2012), which will possibly also affect their brand evaluations. Since the effect of self-control has not yet been integrated in studies investigating the effect of disclosures on brand evaluations, the aim of this study is to investigate whether self-control affects the process of evaluating brand placement disclosures. This study is also conducted to explore why inconsistent results concerning the effects of disclosures on brand placement evaluations were found.

The focus on self-control in this study is driven by both practical and theoretical considerations. From a practical perspective, this study will explore whether brand placement disclosures are actually useful. As viewers are often exposed to disclosures in a state of depletion, disclosures might have little effect on those viewers. If disclosures appear to have little effect, it might not be necessary to expose viewers to disclosures. From a theoretical perspective, research on self-control and the persuasive effect of disclosures will give insight in the circumstances under which brand placement disclosures affect brand evaluations. It will show how the effectiveness of brand placement disclosures is affected by the cognitive state, more specifically the level of self-control, of viewers.

The following research question will guide this study:

RQ: To what extent does self-control moderate the effect of brand placement disclosures on brand evaluation?

Hypotheses were formulated for this research question:

H1: People with non-depleted self-control will evaluate the placed brand less positively after being exposed to a disclosure.

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

The previous hypotheses will be examined by means of an experiment. Participants will be exposed to film fragment containing brand placement. The presence of a disclosure and self-control will be manipulated to test whether self-control moderates the effect of disclosures on brand evaluation.

Method

Materials

A film fragment was selected, for which a fragment of the film *The Proposal* was used. *The Proposal* was chosen due to the fact that this film can be attractive for both men and women and for all ages. The fragment contained brand placement in the form of Starbucks coffee. Since coffee is a neutral product, this brand placement was not likely to already create certain attitudes towards the placed product. The brand was connected to the plot of the fragment and was prominently placed. The film fragment endured 3.51 minutes. Two different versions of this fragment were developed, which only differed with respect to the presence of a disclosure. One of two versions contained a brand placement disclosure, the other version was realized without a brand placement disclosure. The form of disclosure that was chosen was the following sentence: “This fragment contains product placement [PP]”. The disclosure was placed in the right upper angle of the screen and it was shown for six seconds. The disclosure was presented in white coloured text and in the same font as the subtitles of the fragment.

Prior to exposure to the film fragment, self-control was manipulated based on a task of Janssen and Fennis (n.d.). Half of the participants took part in a self-controlling task and the other half in another, non-self-controlling task. In this task, participants were asked to complete proverbs. All correct words to complete the proverbs contained the letter ‘e’. One group could just fill out the words, while the other group was told they could not use words with the letter ‘e’. Because participants who were told not to use the letter ‘e’ had to suppress an automatic response, as all correct words to complete the proverbs would contain the letter ‘e’, this task was more difficult and would require more effort than the task whereby participants were allowed to use the letter ‘e’. This task resulted in a group of participants with non-depleted self-control (participants who could use words with the letter ‘e’) and a group of participants with depleted self-control (participants who could not use the letter ‘e’).

The materials are included in Appendix A.

Subjects

A total of 173 participants, of which 24.86% was male, took part in this experiment. Most participants were Dutch (170), two participants were German and one participant was Brazilian. The age range of the participants varied between 18 and 78 ($M=29.56$, $SD=13.04$). The education level of the participants ranged from Lower Vocational Education to

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

university. No significant result was shown by the Chi-square test for the gender distribution ($\chi^2(3) = 6.48, p = .09$), which means that gender was equally distributed over the four conditions. For the age distribution, the one-way analysis of variance did not show a significant effect ($F(31, 115) < 1$). This implies that age was also equally distributed over the four conditions. The questionnaires of participants whom it took more than one hour to complete the questionnaire were excluded from the data, since the effect of the manipulation of self-control could be diminished when it took more than one hour to complete the questionnaire. Also, questionnaires of participants who reported to have seen a disclosure but were not exposed to a disclosure were excluded. After excluding those participants, the sample consisted of 148 participants.

Research design

In this study, a 2 (no disclosure/ disclosure) x 2 (non-depleted self-control/ depleted self-control) factorial design was applied. A between-subject design was used, as each participant was exposed to one level of disclosure and one level of self-control.

Instrumentation

After taking part in the self-control task, participants were asked about their mood. This question was added so that it could be measured whether the self-control task affected the mood of participants, which could consequently affect their evaluations of the placed brand. The mood of the participants was measured with the question 'Indicate how you feel at this moment', anchored by 'very negative' – 'very positive' on a 7-point semantic differential. After watching the fragment, participants were asked to answer questions referring to the dependent variables in this study. The dependent variables that were tested were brand memory (consisting of brand recall and brand recognition), brand evaluation (consisting of brand attitude and purchase intent) and persuasion knowledge (consisting of conceptual and attitudinal persuasion knowledge).

Brand memory. Brand memory was measured by two dimensions of brand memory: brand recall and brand recognition. Brand recall was tested by asking the participants the following question: 'Did you see any brands in this fragment? If so, report which brand(s) you saw in the fragment.' (Russell, 2002). Their answer was coded by 0 if they did not recall the brand Starbucks and by 1 if they recalled the brand Starbucks. Brand recognition was measured based on the Memory Characteristics Questionnaire (Johnson, Foley, Suengas, & Ray, 1988, in Law & Braun, 2000). Participants were asked the following question: 'Below is

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

a list of brands. Report which brand(s) you saw in the fragment.’ A list of placed products and fillers was presented to the participants. The products listed were Head and Shoulders, Rolex, Nike, D&G, Garnier, Sony, Vitaminwater, Starbucks, Peugeot, Chanel and Apple. These products were chosen as it was likely they had been part of the film fragment. For example, one main character took a shower in the fragment, which would make the presentation of the brand Head and Shoulders likely. Participants’ answer was coded by 0 if they did not recall the brand Starbucks and by 1 if they recalled the brand Starbucks.

Brand evaluation. Brand evaluation was measured by ten questions relating to two dimensions of brand evaluation: brand attitude and purchase intention. Brand attitude was measured by the statement ‘In my opinion, this brand is...’ followed by five 7-point semantic differentials (‘unfriendly’ – ‘friendly’, ‘negative’ – ‘positive’, ‘not appealing’ – ‘appealing’, ‘uninteresting’ – ‘interesting’, ‘unattractive’ – ‘attractive’) (Matthes et al., 2007). Internal consistency of the scales for brand attitude was excellent ($\alpha=.92$). Composite means were calculated for brand attitude. Purchase intention was measured by the question ‘How likely is it that you will buy a product of Starbucks in the next month?’ followed by a 7-point semantic differential anchored by ‘very unlikely’ – ‘very likely’ (Spears and Surendra, 2004).

Persuasion knowledge. Persuasion knowledge was measured by two different dimensions of persuasion knowledge: conceptual persuasion knowledge and attitudinal persuasion knowledge. Conceptual persuasion knowledge was measured by asking the participants to give their opinion about two statements: ‘In the film fragment, they advertised’ and ‘Showing the brand Starbucks in the film fragment is advertising’. The statements had to be answered on 7-point Likert scales anchored by ‘totally disagree’ – ‘totally agree’. Scales were based on previous research of Ham, Nelson and Das (2015). Conceptual persuasion knowledge was also measured by asking the participants to answer the following question: ‘The brand Starbucks is shown in the film fragment to...’ followed by six statements (‘inform the consumer’, ‘sell the brand Starbucks’, ‘make the consumer like the brand’, ‘entertain the consumer’, ‘stimulate the selling of the brand Starbucks’, ‘influence the consumer’) to which they had to answer on 7-point Likert scales (Ham et al., 2015). The statements ‘inform the consumer’ and ‘entertain the consumer’ were fillers and were not included in the composite measure. Fillers were used so that it would not be obvious from the optional answers what the correct answers would be. Attitudinal persuasion knowledge was measured by asking the participants to answer the following question: ‘Showing the brand Starbucks in the film fragment is ...’ followed by eleven characteristics (‘trustworthy’, ‘convincing’, ‘dishonest’(R), ‘manipulative’(R), ‘nice’, ‘implausible’(R), ‘entertaining’, ‘deceptive’(R),

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

‘acceptable’, ‘annoying’(R), ‘distracting’ (R)). These questions had to be answered on 7-point Likert scales anchored by ‘totally disagree’ – ‘totally agree’. Items with the code (R) were recoded. Internal consistency of conceptual persuasion knowledge ($\alpha=.86$) and attitudinal persuasion knowledge ($\alpha=.80$) was good. Composite means were calculated for both dimensions of persuasion knowledge.

Control variables. Some variables serving as control variables were included in the questionnaire. Participants were asked if they were familiar with the film fragment by the question ‘To what extent were you familiar with the film ‘The Proposal’ prior to watching the fragment’ followed by a 7-point semantic differential (‘not at all familiar’ – ‘very familiar’). Participants were asked if they were familiar with the placed brand by the question ‘To what extent were you familiar with the brand Starbucks prior to watching the fragment’ followed by a 7-point semantic differential (‘not at all familiar’ – ‘very familiar’). Participants were asked to answer the following question: ‘How often do you buy something at Starbucks?’ on a 7-point semantic differential (‘never’ – ‘very often’). If participants were familiar with the film or the brand, they could already have a certain attitude towards the film or brand which might consequently influence their attitude towards the brand. Furthermore, participants were asked ‘Did you see a notification that the programme contained product placement while watching the fragment?’ anchored by ‘yes’ or ‘no’. It was important to measure whether the disclosure was noticed by participants, as persuasion knowledge could only be activated when participants notice the disclosure. Finally, the participants were asked some personal questions about their age, gender, education level and nationality.

Manipulation check. Some questions were included to check whether people who took part in the self-controlling task had found their task more difficult than participants who took part in the non-self-controlling task. These questions served as a manipulation check. The manipulation check for self-control consisted of four 7-point Likert scales anchored by ‘totally disagree’ – ‘totally agree’. Participants were asked to answer the following questions: ‘I thought the task was difficult’, ‘The task took me a lot of effort’, ‘During the task I had to suppress an automatic response’ and ‘During the task I had to control myself’. Scales were based on previous research of Janssen, Fennis and Pruyn (2010). Internal consistency of the scales was good ($\alpha=.88$). Composite means were therefore calculated.

Procedure

Online questionnaires were developed in Qualtrics. The questionnaire started with a short instruction. Participants were told that the study consisted of two parts: a writing task and

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

the film fragment with several questions. Participants were asked not to take a break while taking part in the experiment and were therefore asked to put away their phone and to make sure they were not distracted. Furthermore, it was mentioned that there were no incorrect answers and that their personal point of view was important. This instruction was followed by one of two versions of the self-control task, one of two versions of the fragment and the questionnaire. The experiment was conducted on an individual basis. Potential participants were asked to fill out the questionnaire via Internet and were randomly assigned to one of four conditions. The procedure was identical for all participants. On average, the experiment took 15 minutes. After completing the experiment, participants were acknowledged for their participation and told that if they had any interest in the results of the experiment, they could send an e-mail.

Statistical treatment

All analyses were conducted with SPSS 21.0. Cronbach's α was calculated to measure the internal consistency for all scales. Composite means were calculated for the scales where Cronbach's α was at least adequate (0.70 or higher). A Chi-square test was conducted for gender distribution. Age distribution was tested with a one-way ANOVA. The effects of disclosures and self-control on brand attitude, purchase intent and persuasion knowledge were tested by means of two-way ANCOVA's. Brand recall and brand recognition were examined by means of logistic regression. Independent samples t-tests were calculated to examine the manipulation of self-control and the mood of participants. In addition, one-way ANOVA's and Chi square tests were conducted to analyse interaction effects.

Results

The analyses on conceptual persuasion knowledge, attitudinal persuasion knowledge, brand attitude and purchase intention were done by means of two way analyses of covariance (ANCOVA). Familiarity with the brand, familiarity with the movie and the frequency of buying products at Starbucks were included as covariates in these analyses. Logistic regression analyses were conducted for brand recall and brand recognition.

Manipulation check self-control

An independent samples t-test was conducted to measure whether participants who made the proverb task whereby they were not allowed to use the letter 'e' had more depleted self-control than participants who did not have to control their behaviour in the proverb task. The

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

independent samples t-test for the manipulation check for self-control showed a significant difference between the group of participants with depleted self-control and the group of participants with non-depleted self-control ($t(120,76) = 11.18, p < .001$). The participants with depleted self-control indicated that they felt more depleted ($M=4.72, SD=1.42$) than participants with non-depleted self-control ($M=2.29, SD=1.12$). This implies that the manipulation for self-control was successfully implemented.

Mood

An independent samples t-test was conducted to test whether the mood of participants was influenced by the self-control task. The t-test for the mood of the participants did not show a significant difference between the group of participants with depleted self-control and the group of participants with non-depleted self-control ($t(140) = 1.54, p = .125$). The mood of the participants with depleted self-control ($M=4.94, SD=1.26$) was not better or worse than the mood of participants with non-depleted self-control ($M=5.22, SD=.912$). This presumes that the self-control task did not have any effect on the mood of the participants.

Brand evaluation

Two-way analyses of covariance were conducted to measure whether brand attitude and purchase intent were influenced by the level of self-control and the presence of a disclosure in the film fragment. No significant main effects of self-control ($F(df) < 1$) and disclosure presence ($F(df) < 1$) on brand attitude were found. Between disclosure presence and self-control, no interaction effect was discovered ($F(df) < 1$) for brand attitude.

Also for purchase intent, no significant main effects of self-control ($F(df) < 1$) and disclosure presence ($F(df) < 1$) were found. However, the interaction effect between the disclosure presence and the level of self-control was marginally significant ($F(1, 135) = 3.82, p = .053$). After splitting the data file based on self-control, one-way ANOVAs were carried out. The one-way ANOVA did not show a significant effect of disclosure presence on purchase intent for participants with depleted self-control ($F(df) < 1$). A one-way ANOVA did also not show a significant effect of disclosure presence on purchase intent for participants with non-depleted self-control ($F(df) < 1$). After splitting the data file based on disclosure, more ANOVAs were conducted. The absence of a brand placement disclosure in combination with self-control had a significant effect on purchase intention ($F(1, 67) = 4.33, p < .05$). Participants who were not exposed to a brand placement disclosure and who had depleted self-control had a higher purchase intention ($M = 3.38, SD = 2.08$) than respondents who were

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

not exposed to a brand placement disclosure but had non-depleted self-control ($M = 2.44$, $SD = 1.65$). No significant effect of the presence of a disclosure and self-control on purchase intention was found ($F(1, 71) = .464$, $p = .498$). Hypothesis 1 was therefore not confirmed, since there was no difference in evaluation between people with non-depleted self-control who were exposed to a disclosure and people with non-depleted self-control who were not exposed to a disclosure. Hypothesis 2 was confirmed, as there was no difference between participants with depleted self-control who were exposed to a disclosure and participants with depleted self-control who were not exposed to a disclosure. Table 1 shows the brand attitude and the purchase intent of participants in function of self-control and disclosure presence.

Table 1. Brand attitude and purchase intent in function of level of self-control and presence of disclosure (unless stated differently, $n = 148$) (1 = negative evaluation, 7 = positive evaluation)

	Brand attitude		Purchase intent		<i>n</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Non-depleted					
Disclosure	5.02	1.28	2.68	1.90	34
No disclosure	4.86	1.02	2.44	1.65	43
Depleted					
Disclosure	4.89	1.04	2.97	1.83	39
No disclosure	4.97	.91	3.38	2.08	26

Persuasion knowledge

Two-way analyses of covariance were conducted to measure whether conceptual and attitudinal persuasion knowledge were influenced by the presence of a disclosure in de film fragment and the level of self-control of the participants. The two-way ANCOVA did not show a significant main effect of self-control ($F(df) < 1$) or the disclosure ($F(df) < 1$) on attitudinal persuasion knowledge. No interaction effect between the disclosure and self-control was found ($F(df) < 1$) for attitudinal persuasion knowledge. Furthermore, the two-way ANCOVA did not show a significant main effect of self-control ($F(1, 135) = 1.12$, $p = .292$) or the disclosure ($F(1, 135) = 1.45$, $p = .230$) on conceptual persuasion knowledge. No interaction effect between the disclosure and self-control was found for conceptual persuasion knowledge ($F(df) < 1$). Table 2 shows the amount of conceptual and attitudinal persuasion knowledge of the participants.

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

Table 2. The amount of conceptual and attitudinal persuasion knowledge (PK) in function of level of self-control and presence of disclosure (unless stated differently, n = 148) (1 = low PK, 7 = high PK)

	Conceptual PK		Attitudinal PK		<i>n</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Non-depleted					
Disclosure	5.32	1.40	3.36	.86	34
No disclosure	4.97	1.32	3.48	.77	43
Depleted					
Disclosure	5.04	1.20	3.61	.92	39
No disclosure	4.85	1.09	3.34	.74	26

Brand memory

Logistic regression analyses were conducted in order to explore whether brand recall was influenced by the level of self-control of the participants and the presence of a disclosure in the film fragment. The logistic regression test showed a marginally significant main effect for self-control on brand recall (Wald (1) = 3.41, $p = .065$). Participants with non-depleted self-control had a higher rate of brand recall than participants with depleted self-control. Of participants with non-depleted self-control, 67.5% indicated to have seen the brand Starbucks in the fragment. Of participants with depleted self-control, only 63.1% indicated to have seen the brand Starbucks. The logistic regression test also showed a marginally significant main effect for disclosure on brand recall (Wald (1) = 3.79, $p = .052$). Participants who were exposed to a disclosure had higher rate of brand recall than participants who were not exposed to a disclosure. Of participants who were exposed to a disclosure, 68.5% indicated to have seen the brand Starbucks in the fragment. Only 62.3% of participants who were not exposed to a disclosure indicated to have seen the brand Starbucks. The interaction between self-control and the disclosure appeared to be significant (Wald (1) = 3.84, $p = .05$) for brand recall. In order to interpret the interaction effect, Chi squares were conducted. A Chi square test was conducted to test whether there was an effect of disclosure presence (absent vs. present) for participants with non-depleted self-control. The Chi square test showed a significant relation between disclosure presence for participants with non-depleted self-control ($\chi^2 (1) = 3.92, p < .05$). 79.4% of participants with non-depleted self-control who were exposed to a disclosure had reported to have seen the brand Starbucks in the film fragment. Of participants with non-depleted self-control who were not exposed to a

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

disclosure, only 58,1% reported to have seen the brand Starbucks in the film fragment. The Chi square test did not show a significant relation between depleted self-control and disclosure presence ($\chi^2 (q) = 0.71, p = .283$). Table 3 shows the brand recall of participants.

Table 3. Brand recall in function of the level of self-control and the presence of disclosure (unless stated differently, $n = 148$) (percentage indicates percentage of participants who recalled the brand)

	Brand recall	
	%	<i>n</i>
Non-depleted		
Disclosure	79.4	34
No disclosure	58.1	43
Total	67.5	77
Depleted		
Disclosure	59.0	39
No disclosure	69.2	26
Total	63.1	65
Total		
Disclosure	68.5	73
No disclosure	62.3	69

A logistic regression test was conducted in order to explore whether brand recognition was influenced by the level of self-control of the participants and the presence of a disclosure in the film fragment. The logistic regression test did not show a significant main effect for self-control on brand recognition (Wald (1) = 2.16, $p = .142$). The logistic regression test did not show a significant main effect for disclosure on brand recognition (Wald (1) = 2.21, $p = .137$) either. The interaction between self-control and the disclosure also appeared to be not significant (Wald (1) = 3.02, $p = .082$).

Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to clarify under which circumstances brand placement disclosures affect brand evaluations of the placed product. Since previous research had found mixed results on the effects of disclosures on brand evaluations, the aim of this study was to investigate whether self-control moderates the effects of brand placement disclosures. Two

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

hypotheses were formulated. First, people with non-depleted self-control were expected to evaluate the placed brand less positively when exposed to a disclosure than people with non-depleted self-control who were not exposed to a disclosure. Secondly, it was expected that people with depleted self-control would not evaluate the placed brand more or less positively when exposed to a disclosure in comparison with people with depleted self-control who were not exposed to a disclosure.

Although it was expected that people with non-depleted self-control would evaluate the brand less positively after being exposed to a disclosure, hypothesis 1 was not confirmed with respect to brand attitude. Participants with non-depleted self-control did not have a more or less positive attitude toward the brand when exposed to a disclosure. Besides the fact that no interaction effect was found between self-control and disclosure presence, the level of self-control nor the disclosure presence affected brand attitude. The fact that no effect of disclosures on brand attitude was found is in line with previous research of Bennett et al. (1999) and Dekker and Van Reijmersdal (2010), but in contrast with other research of Boerman et al. (2014). These mixed results were expected to be clarified by the level of self-control, but as previously mentioned this effect did not occur in this study. The rejection of hypothesis 1 can be explained by the fact that people do not resist the persuasive attempt of the placed brand as soon as they recognize the placed brand as persuasive attempt. Although people recognize the placed brand as sponsored content, this might not be enough to alter the persuasive effect of the placement. Before a disclosure actually alters people's brand attitude, people need to obtain a certain amount of distrust and scepticism toward the advertising (Boerman et al., 2014). Despite the high persuasion knowledge of participants, the recognition of the sponsored content could thus not have been enough to alter the persuasive effect and consequently the brand attitude of participants with non-depleted self-control. Hypothesis 2, however, was confirmed with respect to brand attitude. The attitude towards the brand of participants with depleted self-control who were exposed to a disclosure was as high as the attitude of participants who were not exposed to a disclosure. Disclosures thus seem to not affect brand attitudes when self-control is depleted.

Besides brand attitude, purchase intention was also measured for the variable brand evaluation. Hypothesis 1 was not confirmed with respect to purchase intention, since participants with non-depleted self-control did not indicate a lower purchase intent when exposed to a disclosure than participants with non-depleted self-control who were not exposed to a disclosure. Hypothesis 2, on the other hand, was confirmed with respect to purchase intent. Participants with depleted self-control did not indicate a higher or lower purchase

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

intent after being exposed to a disclosure than participants with depleted self-control who were not exposed to a disclosure. When self-control is depleted, disclosures do not affect purchase intent. Surprisingly, a different interaction effect than was expected occurred between disclosure presence and self-control for purchase intention. When the disclosure was absent, participants with depleted self-control were more likely to buy a product of Starbucks than participants with non-depleted self-control. Self-control depletion thus causes an increase in purchase intent when no disclosure is shown. Although a different interaction was expected, this result is in line with previous research of Vohs and Faber (2010), who found that humans with depleted self-control were more easily persuaded to buy products than humans with non-depleted self-control.

Given the findings presented above, hypothesis 1 was not confirmed with respect to brand evaluation. Neither brand attitude nor purchase intent were lower for participants with non-depleted self-control when exposed to a disclosure compared to participants with non-depleted self-control who were not exposed to a disclosure. Hypothesis 2, on the contrary, was confirmed for both brand attitude and purchase intent. When self-control is depleted, brand evaluations of participants who are exposed to a disclosure are as high as brand evaluations of participants who are not exposed to a disclosure.

Besides brand evaluation, the variables attitudinal persuasion knowledge, conceptual persuasion knowledge, brand recall and brand recognition were measured. Attitudinal and conceptual persuasion knowledge were not affected by the presence of a disclosure nor the level of self-control of participants. Furthermore, there appeared to be no interaction between disclosure and self-control for both attitudinal and conceptual persuasion knowledge. Attitudinal and conceptual persuasion knowledge were thus equal for participants of all four conditions. These results are not in line with previous research from Boerman et al. (2012), who stated that consumers who were exposed to a disclosure would be better in distinguishing commercial and editorial content and would have more distrust towards the sponsored content. Furthermore, it was expected that the level of self-control would be of influence on the effects of the disclosure, but self-control did not moderate the effects of disclosures on attitudinal and conceptual persuasion knowledge. It thus appears that a disclosure does not raise more awareness of the sponsored content than viewers already had. Explanations for these findings could include the fact that the brand Starbucks played a very central role in the film fragment. Most participants noticed the brand Starbucks in the film fragment and might have thought this was a form of advertising due to the obvious and central presentation of the brand. This can also be concluded from the high scores on conceptual persuasion knowledge.

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

The persuasive intent of the placement might therefore have been clear for most participants and did not result in differences for the different groups of participants. The attitudinal persuasion knowledge might therefore also be equal for participants, as attitudinal persuasion knowledge follows from conceptual persuasion knowledge (Boerman et al., 2012).

Brand recall was affected by the level of self-control. When self-control was depleted, participants' brand recall was lower than when self-control was not depleted. Since temporary changes in motivation and attention due to a previous self-control act lead to short-term caused impairments in following tasks (Inzlicht & Schmeichel, 2012), it was likely that the depletion of self-control would negatively affect brand recall. Brand recall was also affected by the presence of a disclosure. Participants who had been exposed to a disclosure had higher brand recall than participants who were not exposed to a disclosure. Disclosures thus positively affect brand recall, which is in line with previous research of Bennett et al. (1999). An interaction between self-control and disclosure occurred for brand recall. Recall was higher for participants with non-depleted self-control who saw a disclosure than for participants with non-depleted self-control who did not see a disclosure. These results are in line with previous research of Boerman et al. (2012), who stated that brand recall was positively influenced by the presence of brand placement disclosures. For participants with depleted self-control, brand recall was as high for the group exposed to a disclosure as for the group not exposed to a disclosure. Since self-regulation on (unrelated) subsequent tasks becomes more difficult once self-control resources are depleted (Hofmann et al., 2012), this result was in line with previous research and expectations.

Brand recognition was not influenced by self-control nor the presence of a disclosure. Brand recognition of participants was thus not higher or lower after being exposed to a disclosure and also not lower after self-control was depleted. Furthermore, there appeared to be no interaction between self-control and disclosure presence for brand recognition. This is not in accordance with previous research of Boerman et al. (2012) who stated that brand recognition was positively influenced by the presence of brand placement disclosures. These incongruences can be explained by the fact that the brand Starbucks was obviously shown in the film fragment. The number of participant who recognized the brand Starbucks was high: 80.4% of participants recognized the brand. It is therefore possible that some sort of ceiling effect occurred, as it might not have been difficult for participants to choose the brand that was shown in the film fragment from the list of brands in the questionnaire. It is therefore possible that no significant differences between conditions were found.

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

Limitations of this study have occurred on several levels. First, the sample of participants might not have been large enough. In comparison to the other three conditions, a minority of participants was attached to the condition without disclosure and with depleted self-control due to exclusion of unusable data. The data sample might therefore not have been large enough to find significant results.

Another limitation could include the fact that the experiment was done on a self-selection bias (Wright, 2005) as participants were approached to take part in the experiment via Internet. Some participants might therefore be more likely to take part in experiments than others. Our participants might be frequent internet users and might therefore take part in experiments frequently. They might be familiar with experimental designs and could have partially discovered what the purpose of this study was. If participants knew the purpose of the study, they might have given different answers to the questions than when they did not. For instance, when participants were exposed to the disclosure and noticed this disclosure was added to the fragment, they could have thought this was one of the manipulations. They could then have given different answers to questions about for example brand evaluations, as they knew they were manipulated.

Finally, participants might have taken a break after taking part in the self-control task. Effects of the manipulation of self-control might therefore be diminished. Although questionnaires of participants whom it took more than one hour were excluded from this study, it might still be the case that participants stopped for a certain amount of time before completing the rest of the questionnaire. Participation in the experiment was likely to take about 15 minutes, but it took many participants more than 15 minutes. The data sample would have been too small if questionnaires of participants whom it took more than 15 minutes were excluded, so only the questionnaires of participants whom it took more than an hour were excluded. The effects of the depletion of self-control could thus have been diminished, which could consequently have affected the results.

Although no difference in brand evaluations between participants with depleted self-control who were exposed to a disclosure and who were not exposed to a disclosure and hypothesis 2 was confirmed, there also appeared to be no difference between the participants with non-depleted self-control exposed to a disclosure and not exposed to a disclosure, which led to the rejection of hypothesis 1. More research into this area is therefore needed to clarify the eventual role of self-control in the process of evaluating brand placements. In this study, one specific disclosure was focused on. Disclosures can appear in several forms and with different characteristics and those disclosure characteristics seem to affect their consequences

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

(Liebert, Sprafkin, Liebert, & Rubinstein, 1977; Mason, Scammon, & Fang, 2007, as cited in Boerman, 2014). The characteristics of disclosures are different between and within countries. Some broadcasters only show the PP symbol, while other broadcasters display one of the sentences mentioned in the introduction and others present a similar disclosure as in this study. Also, durations of disclosures may differ. Since previous research has shown that disclosure characteristics have an effect on their consequences (Liebert et al., 1977; Mason et al., 2007, as cited in Boerman, 2014), it might be interesting to set up a similar study with different types of disclosures.

Furthermore, other aspects of the cognitive state can be studied in future research. The role of self-control was examined as a form of cognitive failure, but there appear to be more factors that determine one's cognitive state. Choice, active response and other volition may also draw on a common inner resource (Baumeister et al., 1998). For example, when people are forced to do something this leads to a drop in performance of other unrelated tasks. This effect also occurs when people need to make a meaningful personal decision or when they need to suppress emotion (Baumeister et al., 1998). Since few effects of self-control were found, self-control does not seem to be the declaring factor for the mixed results concerning brand evaluations. However, other forms determining the cognitive state might be.

It might also be interesting to take dispositional self-control into account as a control variable in future studies. Although participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions, the circumstances under which the participants filled in the questionnaire may have varied with respect to time. As the questionnaires were spread among students via the internet, participants could have filled in the questionnaire at any time. It is therefore possible that participants did not all take part in the experiment at the same time of the day. Since self-control is more depleted at the end of the day (Baumeister et al., 1994), participants who filled out the questionnaire in the evening might already have had more depleted self-control than participants who filled it out in the morning. Although the manipulation of self-control was successfully implemented, this might have had an influence on the level of self-control of participants. Participants with the non-self-controlling task who filled out the questionnaire in the evening might namely also have had depleted self-control, but not due to the manipulation of self-control. It would therefore be interesting to include dispositional self-control as a control variable in future studies to make sure participants' level of self-control is only manipulated by the study.

Finally, several other factors could have been of influence on the level of self-control participants had. Self-control depletion can be diminished by various techniques, such as self-

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

affirmation (Schmeichel & Vohs, 2009), self-control practice (Muraven, 2010), and the intake of glucose (Gailliot et al., 2007). Due to these techniques, participants can challenge the effects of self-control depletion. In this study, the usage of these techniques by participants was not taken into account. It would be interesting to set up a similar study and include the use of these techniques as control variable.

Implications of this study relate to both theoretical and practical areas. From a theoretical perspective, this study shows that self-control is probably not the explanation for the mixed results concerning brand evaluation. Taking the limitations of this study and suggestions for further research into account, future research is needed to ensure self-control does not play a role in the process of evaluating brand placement disclosures. From a practical perspective, it might not be necessary to include disclosures in television programmes or films since disclosures do not lead to more persuasion knowledge among viewers. The fact that disclosures do not affect brand attitude and purchase intent is positive for marketers, because disclosures do thus not alter the positive effects of brand placements. Self-control, however, did influence purchase intent when no disclosure was shown. Branding companies could therefore influence consumers more easily to buy their products when their self-control is depleted, and might adapt their marketing strategies to this finding.

References

Audiovisual Media Services Directive. (2010). *Directive 2010/13/EU of the European parliament and of the council*. Retrieved March 2, 2015, from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/LSU/?uri=CELEX:32010L0013>

Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. M. (1998). Ego depletion: Is the active self a limited resource? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 1252-1265. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.74.5.1252

Baumeister, R. F., Heatherton, T. F., & Tice, D. M. (1994). *Losing control: How and why people fail at self-regulation*. Academic Press.

Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., & Tice, D. M. (2007). The strength model of self-control. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *16*, 351-355. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00534.x

Bennett, M., Pecotich, A., & Putrevu, S. (1999). The influence of warnings on product placements. In B. Dubois, T. M. Lowrey, L. J. Shrum, & M. Vanhuele (Eds.), *European Advances in Consumer Research*, *4*, 193-200. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.

Bressoud, E., Lehu, J., & Russell, C. A. (2010). The product well placed: The relative impact of placement and audience characteristics on placement recall. *Journal of Advertising Research*, *50*, 374-385. doi: 10.2501/S0021849910091622

Boerman, S. C., Van Reijmersdal, E. A., & Neijens, P. C. (2012). Sponsorship disclosure: Effects of duration on persuasion knowledge and brand responses. *Journal of Communication*, *62*, 1047-1064. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01677.x

Boerman, S. C., Van Reijmersdal, E. A., & Neijens, P. C. (2014). Effects of sponsorship disclosure timing on the processing of sponsored content: A study on the effectiveness of European disclosure regulations. *Psychology and Marketing*, *31*, 214-224. doi: 10.1002/mar.20688

Boush, D. M., Friestad, M., & Rose, G. M. (1994). Adolescent skepticism toward TV advertising and knowledge of advertiser tactics. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *21*, 165-175. doi: 10.1086/209390

Buijzen, M., van Reijmersdal, E. A., & Owen, L. H. (2010). Introducing the PCMC model: An investigative framework for young people's processing of commercialized media content. *Communication Theory*, *20*, 427-451. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.2010.01370.x

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

Burkley, E. (2008). The role of self-control in resistance towards persuasion. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *34*, 419-431. doi: 10.1177/0146167207310458

Burkley, E., Anderson, D., & Curtis, J. (2011). You wore me down: Self-control strength and social influence. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *5*, 487-499. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2011.00367.x

Cain, R. M. (2011). Embedded advertising on television: Disclosure, deception and free speech rights. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, *13*, 228-238. doi: 10.1509/jppm.30.2.226

Campbell, M. C., Mohr, G. S., & Verlegh, P. W. J. (2013). Can disclosures lead consumers to resist covert persuasion? The important roles of disclosure timing and type of response. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *23*, 483-495. doi: 10.1016/j.jcps.2012.10.012

Commercial Alert (2008), "Comments Before the Federal Communications Commission in the Matter of Sponsorship Identification Rules and Embedded Advertising," MB Docket Number 08-90.

Dekker, K., & Van Reijmersdal, E. A. (2010). Brand placement disclosures to mitigate persuasion: The role of celebrity endorsement and disclosure type. *Journal of Promotion Management*, *19*, 224-240.

Fennis, B. M., Janssen, L., & Vohs, K. D. (2009). Acts of benevolence: A limited-resource account of compliance with charitable requests. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *35*, 906-924. doi: 10.1086/593291

Friestad, M., & Wright, P. (1994). The persuasion knowledge model: How people cope with persuasion attempts. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *21*(1), 1-31.

Gillespie, B., Joireman, J., & Muehling, D. D. (2012). The moderating effect of ego depletion on viewer brand recognition and brand attitudes following exposure to subtle versus blatant product placements in television programs. *Journal of Advertising*, *41*, 55-65. doi: 10.2753/JOA0091-3367410204

Gupta, P. B., & Lord, K. R. (1998). Product placements in movies: The effect of prominence and mode on audience recall. *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, *20*, 47-59. doi: 10.1080/10641734.1998.10505076

Ham, C. D., Nelson, M. R., & Das, S. (2015). How to Measure Persuasion Knowledge. *International Journal of Advertising*, *34*(1), 17-53.

Hofmann, W., Vohs, K. D., & Baumeister, R. F. (2012). What people desire, feel conflicted about, and try to resist in everyday life. *Psychological Science*, *23*, 582-588. doi: 10.1177/0956797612437426.

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

Inzlicht, M., & Schmeichel, B. J. (2012). What is ego depletion: Toward a mechanistic revision of the resource model of self-control. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 7*, 450-463. doi: 10.1177/1745691612454134

Janssen, L., & Fennis, B. M. (manuscript under review). Mindless resistance to persuasive communication: Low self-control fosters the use of resistance-promoting heuristics.

Janssen, L., Fennis, B. M., & Pruyn, A. T. H. (2010). Forewarned is forearmed: Conserving self-control strength to resist social influence. *Journal of experimental social psychology, 46*(6), 911-921.

Law, S., & Braun, K. A. (2000). I'll have what she's having: Gauging the impact of product placements on viewers. *Psychology and Marketing, 17*, 1059-1075. doi: 10.1002/1520-6793(200012)17:12%3C1059::AID-MAR3%3E3.0.CO;2-V

Lee, S. (2008). Product placement in the United States: A revolution in need of regulation. *Cardozo Arts & Entertainment Law Journal, 26*, 203–232.

Lee, S. Y. (2010). Ad-induced affect: The effects of forewarning, affect intensity, and prior brand attitude. *Journal of Marketing Communications, 16*(4), 225–237. doi: 10.1080/13527260902869038.

Muraven, M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2000). Self-regulation and depletion of limited resources: Does self-control resemble a muscle?. *Psychological bulletin, 126*(2), 247.

Nebenzahl, I. D., & Jaffe, E. D. (1998). Ethical dimensions of advertising executions. *Journal of Business Ethics, 17*, 805-815. doi: 10.1023/A:1005850812845

Petty, R. E., Ostrom, T. M., & Brock, T. C. (1981). Historical foundations of the cognitive response approach to attitudes and persuasion. In R. E. Petty, T. M. Ostrom & T. C. Brock (Eds.), *Cognitive responses in persuasion* (pp. 5–29). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Quinn, J. M., & Wood, W. (2004). Forewarnings of influence appeals: Inducing resistance and acceptance. In E. S. Knowles & J. A. Linn (Eds.), *Resistance and persuasion* (pp.193–213). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Reinecke, L., Hartmann, T., & Eden, A. (2014). The guilty couch potato: The role of ego depletion in reducing recovery through media use. *Journal of Communication, 64*, 569-589. doi: 10.1111/jcom.12107

Rotfeld, H. J. (2008). The stealth influence of covert marketing and much ado about what may be nothing. *Journal of public policy & marketing, 27*(1), 63-68.

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

Smit, E. G., Van Reijmersdal, E. A. , & Neijens, P. C. (2009). Today's practice of brand placement and the industry behind it. *International Journal of Advertising*, 28, 761-782. doi: 10.2501/S0265048709200898

Tessitore, T., & Geuens, M. (2013). PP for 'product placement' or 'puzzled public'? *International Journal of Advertising*, 32, 419-442. doi: 10.2501/IJa-32-3-419-442

Van Reijmersdal, E. A., Neijens, P. C., & Smit, E. G. (2007). Effects of television brand placement on brand image. *Psychology and Marketing*, 24, 403-420. doi: 10.1002/mar.20166

Van Reijmersdal, E. A., Tutaj, K., & Boerman, S. C. (2013). The effects of brand placement disclosures on skepticism and brand memory. *Communications*, 38, 127-146. doi: 10.1515/commun-2013-0008

Vohs, K. D., & Faber, R. J. (2007). Spent resources: Self-regulatory resource availability affects impulse buying. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33(4), 537-547.

Wenner, L. A. (2004). On the ethics of product placement in media entertainment. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 10, 101–132. doi: 10.1300/J057v10n01_08

Wheeler, S. C., Briñol, P., & Hermann, A. D. (2007). Resistance towards persuasion as self-regulation: Ego-depletion and its effects on attitude change processes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43, 150-156. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2006.01.001

Appendix A

Beste deelnemer,

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

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

Zelf-controle taak

Maak een grammaticaal correcte zin. LET OP: je mag de letter "e" NIET gebruiken!

Gebruik dus alleen woorden waarin de letter "e" niet voorkomt.

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

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

15. De pot verwijt de dat hij zwart ziet.

Maak een grammaticaal correcte zin.

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

Stemming

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

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

Fragment

Versie 1 of 2 disclosure.

Brand memory (herinnering & herkenning)

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

O Nee

O Ja, namelijk ...

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

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

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

Merkevaluatie (attitude & aankoopintentie)

Naar mijn mening is het merk Starbucks:

Onvriendelijk	<input type="radio"/>	Vriendelijk
Negatief	<input type="radio"/>	Positief
Niet aansprekend	<input type="radio"/>	Aansprekend
Niet interessant	<input type="radio"/>	Interessant
Onaantrekkelijk	<input type="radio"/>	Aantrekkelijk
Niet leuk	<input type="radio"/>	Leuk

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

Zeer onwaarschijnlijk Zeer waarschijnlijk

Persuasion knowledge

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

In het fragment werd reclame gemaakt.

Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Het tonen van het merk Starbucks in het fragment is reclame.

Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

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

de consument te informeren.

Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

de producten van Starbucks te verkopen.

Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

de consument het merk leuk te laten vinden.

Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

de consument te vermaken.

Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

de verkoop van producten van het merk Starbucks te stimuleren.

Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

de consument te beïnvloeden.

Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

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

Betrouwbaar Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Overtuigend Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Oneerlijk Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Manipulatief Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Leuk Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Ongeloofwaardig Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Vermakelijk Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Misleidend Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Acceptabel Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Irritant Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Afleidend Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

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

Helemaal niet bekend Heel erg bekend

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

Helemaal niet bekend Heel erg bekend

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

Hoe vaak koop je iets bij Starbucks?

Nooit Heel vaak

Manipulatie check zelfcontrole

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

Ik vond de taak moeilijk.

Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

De taak kostte me veel inspanning.

Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Tijdens de taak moest ik een automatische respons onderdrukken.

Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Tijdens de taak moest ik controle over mezelf uitoefenen.

Helemaal mee oneens Helemaal mee eens

Controle variabelen & algemene gegevens

Ben je een man of een vrouw?

Man

Vrouw

Wat is je nationaliteit?

Nederlands

Anders, namelijk...

Wat is je leeftijd?

[]

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

vmbo

havo

vwo

mbo

hbo

SELF-CONTROL AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCLOSURES

wo

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

Ja

Nee

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