Radboud University 25-08-2017

Hearing vs reading: the effectiveness of vividness of the message and English language proficiency on consumer response in Anglophone video commercials.

Master Thesis

Tim Renes s4059026

Supervisor: Dr. A. van Hooft

Second reader: Dr. B. Planken

Abstract

Video commercials have long been a central medium for marketing and selling products. Strategies for increased effectiveness of video commercials have logically been a focal point for marketers. One of these strategies is known as the use of vividness in the message in a commercial. This study's literature goes further into how vividness of the message may be used to increase a commercial's effectiveness in consumer response. It also includes the experience of vividness between different levels of language proficiency.

This study focuses on the effects of Vividness of the message (VOTM) and English language proficiency (ELP) on Consumer response in Anglophone video commercials. VOTM was coded into two levels, namely high VOTM (oral anchoring and delivery of the message) and low VOTM (written anchoring and delivery of the message). Consumer response was measured by Attitude towards the ad, Attitude towards the brand, and Brand purchase intention. The dependent control variable Perceived vividness of the message (P-VOTM) was added to measure the experience of VOTM. Native speakers of English and Dutch non-native speakers of English were shown both one orally anchored and one written anchored Anglophone commercial. After each commercial, a questionnaire was used to measure Consumer response and P-VOTM.

The results for the study showed little to no significant main effect of VOTM on Consumer response. ELP did show a significant effect for P-VOTM, as native speakers of English scored significantly higher on average. This gives credence to the literature that states an individual tends to experience his or her native language more vividly than one's second language. A significant effect of the control variable Product on P-VOTM implies that the current scope of VOTM in current literature may be expanded upon in the future.

1. Introduction

Since the turn of the twenty-first century, the media landscape has changed dramatically. Print publications have made way for an increasing amount of digital publications and advertisers have gained a new ground in audio-visual advertising on the internet and social media, circumventing the TV model. Since the effectiveness of video advertisements is essential for most companies (if effective, an advertisement spurs on consumers to buy the product), scientific studies of effective advertising strategies can be of use for companies. The current research will emphasise such a strategy, namely vividness (Belch and Belch, 2001). This strategy entails the use of vividness of the message in audio and video (Kisielius and Sternthal, 1984; Nisbett and Ross, 1980) to make a product more appealing. The rise of online video websites like Youtube comes with countless possible hours of Anglophone video consumption and accompanying advertisements (also in the English language) to push in this new media frontier. Video advertising has thus become a booming business since the 2000s (Jarboe, 2011). With the increase of usable sensory channels (i.e. auditory on top of visual channels) through the shift from text/print to audio/video, advertisers are met with dilemmas such as "would our slogan in this video advertisement be better received by (non-)native English speaking consumers through reading or hearing it?".

Within the theoretical frameworks of vividness and English language proficiency, this thesis is to determine whether or not there is an effective difference between written and oral verbal anchoring of metaphors in Anglophone advertising. In addition, it measures whether or not a participant's proficiency in English may have a significant influence on said result. The thesis tries to add to the scientific body of vividness, and the effects of native/non-native English proficiency on consumer response. Ultimately, the main aim for the thesis is to determine if the higher vividness of oral anchoring compared to the lower vividness of written anchoring in Anglophone video commercials influences consumer response among native and non-native speakers of English.

Additional relevance can be attributed to a focus on video advertising research instead of print, as video advertising is increasingly more common in the current multimodal media climate, yet remains less researched in the academic sense. Most studies are currently limited to the use of print, whereas this study surrounds video advertisements. Current research also

focuses on mostly which foreign language combinations are used, but not in the way said language is presented (e.g. written or spoken).

2. Theoretical framework

When it comes to defining vividness, it is simply the expression of how vivid a commercial is experienced by the consumer. In Krishnamurthy and Sujan (1999) vividness is defined as the strength with which a commercial or advertisement has evoked “concrete”, “vivid”, “clear”, and “imageful” imagery. Though that may cover a broad definition, Keller and Block (1997) offer a seemingly more concrete and generally understandable definition, as their measurements include how vivid, personal, concrete, easy to imagine, easy to relate, and easy to picture the advertisement is. In essence, vividness in this study will be defined along the measurements proposed by Keller and Block (1997).

The main dependent variables fall under the umbrella-term Consumer response. The components of Consumer response will be defined by Bergkvist, Eiderbäck, and Palombo (2012), who used Bergkvist and Rossiter's (2009) values Attitude towards the Ad, Attitude towards the Brand, and Brand purchase intention. These dependent variables are the measures by which this study attempts to determine the Consumer response to Vividness of the message in video commercials. To match the research question to the aim of the study, English language proficiency is added as a Between Subject Factor.

2.1. Vividness of the message (VOTM)

The first variable that was examined is video commercial’s Vividness of the message (VOTM) and its effects on Consumer response to said video commercials. From the advent of modern advertising until the present, the visual metaphor has been an trusted medium for advertisers to convey their messages. In print advertising, for example, the visual metaphor has been used to communicate the key selling point of a product (Rossiter and Bellman, 2005; Rossiter, 2008). Bergkvist et al (2012) poses that verbal anchoring may encourage receivers to appreciate metaphors. Whether or not a metaphor is anchored orally or textually may have significant consequences on the attitudes of consumers, as the level of vividness may vary between deliveries.

The vividness of combined audio and video impulses have been assumed to be positively related to persuasiveness (Kisielius and Sternthal, 1984; Nisbett and Ross, 1980). Belch and Belch affirm this, stating that such higher Vividness of the message allows

commercials to "[convey] a mood or image for a brand as well as to develop emotional or entertaining appeals that help make a dull product appear more interesting" (Belch and Belch, 2001, p. 355). Furthermore, results by Appiah (2006) show that audio/video testimonials causes participants to identify more strongly with customer testimonials, rate advertised products more favourably, and were more likely to purchase featured products. In contrast, the same results showed that static written text/picture testimonials scored lower on all these aforementioned measures. The supposed higher VOTM of audio and video would improve the participants' response to testimonials compared to the lower VOTM of static text and pictures. Tomasello (2003) remarks that may be because the use of auditory language skills may be the preferred way to generally comprehend language: infants experience spoken language before they encounter written language and they experience spoken language in an affective, purposeful, interactive, and ultimately more vivid context. As such, audio combined with video commercials may be considered more vivid than written text combined with video commercials in this study.

These aforementioned results and assumptions for VOTM can be attributed to the Availability-Valence theoretical framework by Kisielius and Sternhal (1984), which assumes that VOTM influences the extent of people's willingness to pursue cognitive elaboration. "Availability" describes the access an individual may have to the information in his short term memory and addresses the individual's ability to recall information. This will not be further addressed in this thesis. The focus for this study lies with the "Valence" part of the framework. According to the "Valence" framework, elaborative audio-visual cues as coined by Kelley (1989) stimulate the available information, giving it a greater influence on a participant's decision-making (Appiah, 2006; Nisbett and Ross, 1980; Taylor and Fiske; 1978). According to Kelley (1989) this may be due to the more intensive need for elaboration for an audio-visual medium compared to that of a textual-pictorial medium, as its ability for attentional cues makes appeals to the direction of the participant's attention. This means that video with sound is more positively effective on Consumer response in advertising than pictures with written text, but that leaves room for measuring the effects of video combined with either written text or audio. Kerr (1990) adds that in that case the resulting cognitive load (i.e. appeal on the human attention and cognition) is higher, because the combination of moving images and sound compared to still images forces the participant to pay more

attention and be more alert to the content.

Though the higher cognitive load may force a participant to be more alert, the influence of VOTM on Consumer response in commercials may be theorised in another way. In the case of video commercials, comprehension possibly plays a role in the consumer's appreciation of oral or textual anchoring. When brought back to the essentials, video commercials are combinations of audio and visual cues. As results of experiments performed by Duncan (1980) show, it is essentially easier to consume and elaborate upon a combination of audio and video cues than on separate sequences of audio or video. Ergo, a video with oral anchoring will be not only contain a higher VOTM than written anchoring, but the message will be easier to consume and elaborate upon as well. Greene (2014) reviews cognitive study results in which subsequent spoken words, for instance, interfere in the encoding of the words that precede them: auditory information interferes with adjacent auditory information, akin to music drowning out one's speech or vice versa. Likewise, visual information interferes with adjacent visual information, e.g. text and other visuals. This is may be related to results that imply that auditory information is processed more slowly than visual information (Tavalossi, 1998; Darwin, Turvey, and Crowder, 1972; Haber and Standing; 1969). Compared to visual information, audio information will essentially take longer to access the "mutual convergence zone" where all types of sensory information are cognitively processed in the brain (Siegelbaum and Hudspeth, 2000). This cognitive process would likely cause a more positive influence of audio combined with video (i.e. a higher VOTM) compared to written text combined with video (i.e. a lower VOTM) in the results of this study.

Aside from cognitive load and cognitive processing, a major difference between audio and written text is the availability of the message itself. A reader has access to the entire message, but a listener has access to a relatively smaller amount of the message due to factors such as limits to memory and listening efficiency (Danks, 1980). It must be noted that this definition of "availability" differs from the one proposed by Kisielius and Sternhal (1984): the former applies to availability to memory, whereas Danks' (1980) definition concerns the ability to reread written text compared to the inability to relisten to audio. Verlaan, Pearce, and Zeng (2017) pose that this discrepancy in availability may be remedied by limiting the amount of text that the listener is required to process. Verlaan et al (2017) continue: in the case of video commercials, a way to try to equalise and control text availability during the

reading test is to not have the written text available during question answering post-commercial. Schaffner and Schiefele (2013) also state that written text availability may not be an issue per se, as grade 8 and 9 students without written text access performed equal or even better on longer audio passages compared to their fellow students with access to the written text. This echoes results in Schroeder (2011), where written text availability had no effect on high school students' Reading Comprehension scores for short narrative texts. Verlaan et al (2017) add that, using relatively short text passages (oral or written) will further equalise the availability between oral and written textual cues.

When an ad has higher VOTM, it tends to become a lot more effective at gaining attention and being persuasive, whether it be due to a higher cognitive load or ease of consumption. The above information concerns the effects of VOTM within the consumer's native language, which is only a part of this thesis proper. This study aims to bridge the gap between vividness and proficiency by comparing and contrasting the effects of vividness in video commercials on Consumer response in both L1/NSE (native speakers of English) and L2/DNNSE (Dutch non-native speakers of English) contexts.

2.2. English language proficiency (ELP) and its effects on VOTM and Consumer response

When it comes to the appreciation of VOTM and Consumer response, a commercial must first be understood. Though appreciation does not solely depend on comprehension of the metaphor, comprehension remains a prerequisite for any level of appreciation (Van Mulken et al, 2014). This is where a difference in understanding and subsequently Consumer response of the commercial between NSE (native speakers of English) and DNNSE (Dutch non-native speakers of English) respondents may occur. In contrast to the way infants learn L1 according to Tomasello (2003), they generally start to learn L2 in a more written, textual and less vivid context (Perfetti, 1987; Watson and Olson, 1987). Logically, this would imply that DNNSE respondents with an L2 proficiency of the English language will experience that language in a less vivid manner than their L1, while NSE will experience it as being more vivid.

In this study's more specific context regarding NSE and DNNSE participants, Consumer response through oral and written anchoring may show different results between the two proficiency groups. One reason for this may be the level of comprehension of the

higher VOTM (oral anchoring), as results by Gerritsen et al (2000; 2010) show that only 36% of Dutch individuals understand the English presented in auditory fashion. When isolated by a high education level, this percentage changes to 42% and even 93% with added textual aid. On one hand, this discrepancy of comprehension (and thus appreciation) between added and absent text may prove to be an essential precedent for the upcoming results of this study.

On the other hand, De Mooij (1994) states it is commonly understood that higher educated and young EU citizens have a more than functional level of English proficiency. In addition, the Netherlands is ranked second place on the list of the English Proficiency Index (Education first, 2016). In Eurobarometer (2012), 57% of Dutch nationals self-report that they are proficient enough to listen to the news on television or radio, while an almost equal 56% report the same for newspaper and magazine articles. This grants further credence to Caplan et al's (2016) results implying that there is a positive relation between both listening and reading proficiency. These findings, combined with a lack of discrepancy between reading and listening skills in the data provided by Eurobarometer (2012) and Education First (2016), would imply that the difference in Consumer response to oral and written anchoring between NSE and DNNSE might be smaller than initially expected.

The effect of ELP is thus still a contested factor in the Consumer response to VOTM. The research question thus becomes:

> *To what extent does Consumer response in Anglophone video commercials significantly depend on VOTM and ELP?*

2.3. Hypothesis formulation

As mentioned above, VOTM positively influences Consumer response. This means that a commercial presented with a higher VOTM (oral anchoring) would arguably be more effective than a commercial presented with a lower VOTM (written anchoring). More vivid materials tend to grab the consumer's attention and are mostly more effectively processed.

> *H1: Visual metaphors accompanied by higher VOTM (oral anchoring) will have a significantly higher effect on Consumer response (Attitude towards ad, Attitude towards brand, and Brand purchase intention) than lower VOTM (written anchoring)*

for NSE (native speakers of English) and DNNSE (Dutch non-native speakers of English) participants.

ELP may prove to be a differentiating factor when it comes to Consumer response. This may be due to the lack of vividness in L2 learning compared to L1 learning. DNNSE individuals also tend to comprehend spoken English on television at a minimum and maximum average of 36% and 57% respectively, excluding extra textual aid i.e. availability of the written message.

H2: Visual metaphors accompanied by higher VOTM will have a significantly higher effect on Consumer response than lower VOTM for NSE than for DNNSE participants.

Dutch individuals tend to understand televised spoken English in a similar manner as they understand written English. Even for highly educated Dutch individuals, however, comprehension tends to rise dramatically when written textual aids are added to commercials. Even if DNNSE participants may express a more positive response to oral anchoring, the entire English language as an L2 may be experienced less vividly in general. Combined with the precedent of influence of textual aids on English comprehension, this could possibly result in a more positive Consumer response to lower VOTM (written anchoring) among DNNSE participants compared to NSE participants.

H3: Visual metaphors accompanied by lower VOTM will have a significantly higher effect on Consumer response for DNNSE than for NSE participants.

3. Method

3.1. Materials

The gathered materials have similar product categories and metaphors to those in Bergkvist et al's (2012) print advertisements. This study's video commercials for Kapal Api coffee and ZipLoc plastic bags were chosen for their similar product categories (coffee and plastic bags). The messages of the two commercials ("extra strong coffee" and "effective closure for fresher food") are also taken from Bergkvist et al's (2012) materials.

In addition, both commercials are centred around a juxtaposition metaphor, which Bergkvist et al (2012) also used for their coffee and plastic bag advertisements. The visual metaphors differ from Bergkvist et al (2012), but they fit with the messages used in the oral and written anchoring. The metaphor for Kapal Api makes coffee a more heavy object able to knock over a fully-grown running human, while Bergkvist et al's (2012) metaphor for Mambocino turns coffee into a solid object. The metaphor for Ziploc makes plastic bags a life preserver for ingredients, while Bergkvist et al's (2012) metaphor for Onezip makes plastic bags a guarded gateway to ingredients through a physical slide lock.

The Kapal Api commercial was originally an Indian commercial with a simultaneous written and spoken message at the end (Appendix, 7.2). This audio was cut and replaced with the aforementioned messages. The commercial starts out with a man intensely walking around a corner. He is running through an alleyway, accompanied by a loud brass-centric soundtrack. The music resembles the score of an action movie. The protagonist jumps over an obstacle, and continues to run. He runs near a cook, who is throwing some coffee out of a cup. A loud thud occurs as the hero is hit with the coffee. The coffee knocks him over and he falls into some random rubbish that was lying nearby. What follows is the anchoring, "Kapal Api. Extra strong coffee.", which can be found in the appendix (Appendix, 7.1).

The Ziploc commercial was originally an (American) English commercial with a spoken and written message (Appendix, 7.2). The voice-over throughout the commercial was replaced by a musical score (Appendix, 7.2) to make the structure more akin to the Kapal Api commercial. The written message was replaced with the aforementioned anchoring (Appendix, 7.1). The commercial starts out with a collection of vegetables that are arranged to form a face. As the vegetable start to become brown and less fresh, the face appears to frown and become less energetic. Then the Ziploc bag is introduced, showing that vegetables inside

the bag remain hydrated and fresh. The commercial ends with the vegetable face smiling in a Ziploc bag. What follows is the anchoring, “Ziploc. Effective closure for fresher food.”, which can be found in the appendix (Appendix, 7.1).

The resulting materials consist of two modified video commercials, one for each product category. Both commercials were modified into one high VOTM (orally anchored) and one low VOTM (written anchored) version, resulting in four commercials in total. The video commercials for Kapal Api and ZipLoc are both approximately 30 seconds long and similarly structured. Both start out with the visual metaphor and narrative, and end with a window of 2 to 3 seconds for the anchoring to occur. At the end of each commercial, a black rectangle was placed in the upper-right hand corner of the frame, which became the placement for the written anchoring for both commercials. The written text was added for those commercials. For the oral anchoring, the black rectangle was left devoid of written text. All audio recordings for the oral anchoring have been provided by the same professional voice actor in a standard RP (received pronunciation) accent, which should exclude any influences from different accents or dialects on the oral anchoring. The black rectangle, text, and oral anchoring were each edited to take up the last 2 to 3 seconds of the commercials. For a visual representation of the commercials, screenshots and URLs have been included in the appendix.

The commercials were found on the website Youtube.com. They were edited to include the messages as provided by Bergkvist et al. (2012). This entails no change in product category and the advertising message. The commercials mostly deviate from Bergkvist et al. (2012) in that they consist of moving visuals and audio instead of static print advertisements. The resulting edited commercials are both 30 seconds long, with mostly music and non-oral sound (music and sound effects), with the last 2 to 3 seconds dedicated to a product shot combined with the brand name and the advertising message (through either written or oral anchoring). Their short time span of 30 seconds makes them ecologically valid for both television and video streaming websites e.g. Youtube, as these two media often feature commercials of similar length. Aside from the rough editing (e.g. the black rectangle), the original commercials are real commercials and are thus viable to be regarded as such.

A test was run among 10 Dutch students to ensure that the commercials remained understandable in message, audible in speech, and readable in on-screen fonts.

3.2. Subjects

A total of 106 participants participated in the study. 55% (58) of the participants were native speakers of English (NSE), whereas 45% (48) participants were Dutch non-native speakers of English (DNNSE). All participants were either highly educated or currently in higher education. A Chi-square test showed there was no significant relation between the different levels of education and the version of the questionnaire (χ^2 (3) = .19, p = .979), indicating that all versions of the questionnaire had participants with a comparable level of education. Another Chi-square test showed that there was no significant relation between gender and the the version of the questionnaire (χ^2 (3) = .19, p = .698). A one-way ANOVA showed there was no significant relation between age and the version of the questionnaire (F (3, 102) < 1), indicating that age was equally distributed among all versions of the questionnaire. The population samples were comparable amongst the questionnaires.

3.2.1. NSE Participants (Native speakers of English)

Of the NSE participants, 48% (28) were female, while 52% (30) were male. 78% (45) lived in the United Kingdom, 21% (12) lived in the United States, and 1% (1) lived elsewhere. 74% (43) was of British nationality, 21% (12) was a United States citizen, and 5% (3) had another nationality. 50% (29) had finished a University Bachelor, 26% (15) had finished a University Master, 21% (12) had finished an otherwise post-secondary (non-trade school) education, and 3% (2) had only finished secondary education. 40% (23) was enrolled for a University Bachelor, 17% (10) was enrolled for a University Master, 12% (7) was a PhD candidate, and 3% (2) was enrolled for another form of post-secondary education. 28% (16) was no longer enrolled for any form of education. The age range was 20 to 34 years of age, with the mean at 25.09.

For the NSE participants, a Chi-square test showed there was no significant relation between gender and the version of the questionnaire (χ^2 (3) = 5.06, p = .167), indicating that gender was equally distributed among the English versions of the questionnaire. Another Chi-square test showed there was no significant relation between education level and the version of the questionnaire (χ^2 (3) = .07, p = .995), indicating that education level was equally distributed among the English versions of the questionnaire. A one-way ANOVA showed

there was no significant relation between age and the version of the questionnaire (F (3, 54) < 1), indicating that age was equally distributed among the English versions of the questionnaire. The population samples were comparable amongst the questionnaires.

3.2.2. DNNSE Participants (Dutch non-native speakers of English)

Of the DNNSE participants, 56% (27) were female and 44% (21) were male. 94% (45) lived in the Netherlands, while 6% (3) lived elsewhere. 96% (46) had the Dutch nationality, and 4% (2) had another nationality. 50% (24) had finished secondary education, 25% (12) had finished a University Bachelor, 15% (7) had finished a University Master, 8% (4) had finished post-secondary (non-trade school) education, and 2% (1) had finished trade school. 48% (23) was enrolled for a University Bachelor, 25% (12) was enrolled for a University Master, 2% (1) was a PhD candidate, and 6% (3) was enrolled for post-secondary (non-trade school) education. 19% (9) was no longer enrolled for any form of education. The age range was 19 to 32 years of age, with the mean at 23.23.

For the DNNSE participants, a Chi-square test showed there was no significant relation between gender and the version of the questionnaire (χ^2 (3) = 4.37, p = .224), indicating that gender was equally distributed among the Dutch versions of the questionnaire. Another Chi-square test showed there was no significant relation between education level and the version of the questionnaire (χ^2 (3) = .50, p = .919), indicating that education level was equally distributed among the Dutch versions of the questionnaire. A one-way ANOVA showed there was no significant relation between age and the version of the questionnaire (F (3, 44) < 1), indicating that age was equally distributed among the Dutch versions of the questionnaire. The population samples were comparable amongst the questionnaires.

3.3. Design

The experiment was a mixed design. Vividness of the message (VOTM), the Within-Subject Factor, was a nominal variable with two levels, namely high VOTM (commercial with oral anchoring) and low VOTM (commercial with written anchoring). The Between Subject Factor English Language Proficiency (ELP) was a nominal variable with levels NSE (Native

speakers of English) and DNNSE (Dutch non-native speakers of English). The resulting design was a 2x2 factorial design.

3.4. Instruments

The dependent variables measured were the constructs Attitude towards ad, Attitude towards brand, and Brand purchase intention. The scales for the constructs used were provided by Bergkvist and Rossiter (2009). These were the basis for a questionnaire. In addition, Perceived vividness of the message, scale by Keller and Block (1997), was added as a control. All scales were Likert-based. See Table 1 for a more comprehensive description of the instruments and measures of this study.

Table 1. Instruments and measures

Construct	Question	Answer Scale	Source
Attitude towards ad	Thinking about the ad for /BRAND/, which of the following statements best describes your feeling about the ad?	One item on a seven-point scale: • 1 disliked it extremely • 1 quite disliked it • 1 disliked it slightly • 1 neither liked it nor disliked it • 1 liked it slightly • 1 quite liked it • 1 liked it extremely	Bergkvist and Rossiter (2009)
Perceived vividness of the message (P-VOTM) (control variable)	Here are six questions on how you perceive the ad for /BRAND/. Select the alternative that best fits with your view.	Six items on a seven-point scale: • not vivid - vivid, • not personal - personal, • not concrete - concrete, • not easy to imagine - easy to imagine, • not easy to relate to - easy to relate to, • not easy to picture - easy to picture	Keller and Block (1997)

Attitude towards the brand	Thinking about the /BRAND/ /PRODUCT CATEGORY/, which of the following statements best describes your feeling about /BRAND/?	One item on a seven-point scale: • I think it is extremely bad • I think it is quite bad • I think it is slightly bad • I think it is neither good nor bad • I think it is slightly good • I think it is quite good • I think it is extremely good	Bergkvist and Rossiter (2009)
Brand purchase intention (BPI)	Below you will find four pairs of adjectives. Indicate how well one or the other adjective in each pair describes the likelihood that you would try /BRAND/ if you were to buy /PRODUCT CATEGORY/.	Four items on a seven-point scale: • Unlikely - Likely • Probable - Improbable • Uncertain - Certain • Impossible - Possible	Bergkvist and Rossiter (2009)

3.4.1. Reliability

Reliability was measured for both the Perceived vividness and Brand purchase intention scale matrices. Cronbach's Alpha for internal consistency of the scale matrices was acceptable. Reliability for P-VOTM varied from $\alpha = .82$ to $\alpha = .88$ across the four variants of commercial treatments. Reliability for BPI varied from $\alpha = .75$ to $\alpha = .90$ across the four variants of commercial treatments.

3.5. Procedure

Participants were mainly approached through the social network of Facebook and Prolific. Prolific is an Oxford-affiliated firm specialising in finding participants for studies and vice versa. Prolific was mainly used for the NSE participants. Before they were allowed to participate in one of the four English questionnaires, they were subjected to Prolific's filtering process. This process contained the following filters:

Table 2. Prolific Participant filtering

Filter	Effect
First language	Participants with the response “English” as their first language
Age range	Participants older than 18 years and younger than 35 years.
Current education level (if student)	Participants that are studying for Undergraduate degree (BA/BSc/other), Graduate degree (MA/MSc/MPhil/other), or Doctorate degree (PhD/MD/other)
Highest education level	Participants that have finished College/A levels, Undergraduate degree (BA/BSc/ other), Graduate degree (MA/MSc/MPhil/ other), or Doctorate degree (PhD/MD/other)
Previous studies	Participants that participated in any of the questionnaires were not allowed to take part in another.

As Table 2 illustrates, the Prolific filters limited participation to highly educated native speakers of English. DNNSE participants were mostly approached through Facebook, due to their scarcity on Prolific’s platform. A total of five DNNSE participants were approached through Prolific. DNNSE participants were subjected to similar filters, though their minimum current education level was stretched to HBO (University of Applied Sciences) institutions. These DNNSE participants are described as being enrolled for “post-secondary education” in the Subjects paragraph.

Participants could take part in the experiment via an online questionnaire through Qualtrics. They were randomly divided over one of two variants of the questionnaire in their first language i.e. Dutch or English. Each variant featured two separate commercials (stimuli). These were each counterbalanced with another variant with the inverted order of stimuli, which created a total of four questionnaires per language. As the Table 3 shows, stimuli for questionnaire 4 counterbalanced those for 1 and stimuli for questionnaire 3 counterbalanced those for 2.

Table 3. Questionnaires and Stimuli

Questionnaire	Stimulus 1	Stimulus 2

1	Kapal Api commercial with high VOTM	Ziploc commercial with low VOTM
2	Kapal Api commercial with low VOTM	Ziploc commercial with high VOTM
3	Ziploc commercial with high VOTM	Kapal Api commercial with low VOTM
4	Ziploc commercial with low VOTM	Kapal Api commercial with high VOTM

The online questionnaire started with an introductory page detailing the following experiment and a guarantee of anonymity for all participants. The next step was the first commercial (Stimulus 1), followed by a list of questions measuring Attitude towards the ad, Perceived vividness, Attitude towards the brand, and Brand purchase intention. Written text availability would normally have been an issue, but it was likely negated by the brevity of the message and its absence during the questionnaire (Schaffner and Schiefele, 2013; Schroeder, 2011; Verlaan et al, 2013).

Next, the participants were asked to complete a "spot the differences" task as a distraction. They were given thirty seconds to determine the amount of differences between the two pictures on their screen. After thirty seconds, they were directed towards the next page with a multiple choice question regarding the amount of differences.

Next up was the second commercial (Stimulus 2), followed by another list of questions measuring Attitude towards the ad, Perceived vividness, Attitude towards the brand, and Brand purchase intention.

Lastly, participants were asked to fill out background questions regarding gender, age, first language, nationality, country of residence, whether they were currently a student, and their highest level of finished education. If they were currently a student, the questionnaire would ask two additional questions regarding their current level of education and and for how many years they had been enrolled. DNNSE participants had the possibility of leaving their e-mail address behind to have a chance at winning a Bol.com-coupon. NSE participants and DNNSE participants approached through Prolific were able to click a hyperlink at the end of the questionnaire. This link allowed them to collect their financial compensation through the Prolific programme. Taking part in the experiment took approximately 5 to 6 minutes. If NSE participants answered anything else than "English" as their first language, their data was

omitted from the study post-questionnaire. The same policy was applied to DNNSE participants if they answered anything else than “Dutch” as their first language.

3.6. Statistical treatment

Firstly, a repeated measures analysis with Within-Subject Factor Product (control variable) and Between-Subject Factor ELP was used for Consumer response (Attitude towards ad, Attitude towards brand, and Brand purchase intention) and Perceived vividness of the message (P-VOTM). Next, a repeated measures analysis with Within-Subject Factor VOTM and Between-Subject Factor ELP was used for Consumer response and for P-VOTM (as a control for the consumer experience of VOTM). Lastly, additional ANOVAs were used to determine possible remaining effects of VOTM and ELP between the commercials.

4. Results

Table 4 contains the measured means and standard deviations of the study. All resulting means from analyses that follow (Attitude towards the ad, Perceived vividness of the message, Attitude towards the brand, and Brand purchase intention) can be found in this table.

Table 4. Means and standard deviations (in brackets) for Attitude towards the ad, Perceived Vividness, Attitude towards the brand, and Brand purchase intention (1 = lowest, most negative score, 7 = highest, most positive score) (N = 106)

	Attitude towards the ad	Perceived vividness of the message	Attitude towards the brand	Brand purchase intention
Vividness	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
DNNSE (N = 48)				
High	4.88 (1.20)	4.20 (1.10)	4.69 (1.11)	3.93 (1.44)
Low	4.69 (1.32)	4.19 (1.06)	4.58 (1.30)	4.07 (1.36)
Kapal Api (high)	5.08 (1.04)	3.80 (1.12)	4.16 (1.11)	3.20 (1.29)
Kapal Api (low)	4.65 (1.50)	3.78 (1.10)	4.30 (1.46)	3.62 (1.57)
Ziploc (high)	4.65 (1.34)	4.65 (0.91)	5.26 (0.81)	4.73 (1.15)
Ziploc (low)	4.72 (1.17)	4.57 (0.87)	4.84 (1.11)	4.49 (0.98)
NSE (N = 58)				
High	4.88 (1.51)	4.67 (1.44)	5.02 (1.37)	4.77 (1.37)

Low	4.71 (1.63)	4.54 (1.06)	4.90 (1.39)	4.87 (1.36)
Kapal Api (high)	4.62 (1.47)	4.13 (1.30)	4.34 (1.20)	4.11 (1.13)
Kapal Api (low)	4.97 (1.59)	4.41 (1.19)	4.72 (1.36)	4.66 (1.42)
Ziploc (high)	5.14 (1.53)	5.21 (1.40)	5.69 (1.20)	5.43 (1.29)
Ziploc (low)	4.45 (1.66)	4.67 (1.38)	5.07 (1.41)	5.08 (1.28)

4.1. Attitude towards the ad

A repeated measures analysis for Attitude towards the ad with Within Subject Factor Product and Between Subject Factor English language proficiency (ELP) showed no significant main effect of Product on Attitude towards the ad (F (1, 104) < 1). This means that there was no significant difference in participants' Attitude towards the ad between the Kapal Api and Ziploc commercials. ELP had no significant main effect on the Attitude towards the ad either (F (1, 104) < 1). This means that the neither NSE nor DNNSE participants held a significantly more or less positive Attitude towards the ad. There was also no significant interaction effect between Product and Proficiency (F (1, 104) < 1).

A repeated measures analysis for Attitude towards the ad with Within Subject Factor Vividness of the message (VOTM) and Between Subject Factor ELP showed no significant main effect of VOTM on Attitude towards the ad (F (1, 104) = 1.01, p = .318, η^2 = .010). This means that there was no significant difference in effect between high VOTM (orally anchored) and low VOTM (written anchored) on the participants' appreciation of the ad. ELP also showed no significant main effect (F (1, 104) < 1): NSE and DNNSE participants did not significantly like one mode of vividness over the other. There was also no significant interaction effect between VOTM and ELP (F (1, 104) < 1).

4.2. Perceived vividness of the message (P-VOTM) (control variable)

A repeated measures analysis for P-VOTM with Within Subject Factor Product and Between Subject Factor ELP showed a significant main effect of Product on P-VOTM (F (1, 104) = 28.16, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .213$). This means that there was a significant difference in participants' experience of vividness between the Kapal Api ($M = 4.06$, $SD = 1.20$) and Ziploc ($M = 4.79$, $SD = 1.20$) commercials. ELP had a significant main effect on P-VOTM as well (F (1, 104) = 8.76, $p = .030$, $\eta^2 = .045$). NSE participants found both the Kapal Api ($M = 4.27$, $SD = 1.24$) and Ziploc ($M = 4.94$, $SD = 1.40$) ads to be significantly more vivid compared to the DNNSE participants, who scored significantly lower for both Kapal Api ($M = 3.79$, $SD = 1.10$) and Ziploc ($M = 4.60$, $SD = 1.24$). There was no significant interaction effect between Product and ELP (F (1, 104) < 1). Levene's Test was significant for the Ziploc (F (1, 104) = 6.96, $p = .010$). This lessens the strength of these tests, but addressing that further goes beyond the scope of this thesis.

A repeated measures analysis for P-VOTM with Within Subject Factor VOTM and Between Subject Factor ELP showed no significant main effect of VOTM on P-VOTM (F (1, 104) < 1). ELP had a significant main effect (F (1, 104) = 8.76, $p = .030$, $\eta^2 = .045$). NSE scored significantly higher for both high ($M = 4.67$, $SD = 1.44$) and low Vividness ($M = 4.54$, $SD = 1.28$). The DNNSE scored significantly lower for high ($M = 4.20$, $SD = 1.10$) and low ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 1.06$) vividness. There was no significant interaction effect between VOTM and ELP (F (1, 104) < 1).

4.2.1. P-VOTM between NSE participants

A one-way ANOVA for P-VOTM of the Kapal Api commercial with as Between Subject Factor VOTM showed no significant effect for VOTM (F (1, 56) < 1) for NSE participants.

A one-way ANOVA for P-VOTM of the Ziploc commercial with as Between Subject Factor VOTM showed no significant effect for Vividness (F (1, 56) = 2.15, $p = .148$) for NSE participants.

4.2.2. P-VOTM between DNNSE participants

A one-way ANOVA for P-VOTM of the Kapal Api commercial with as Between Subject

Factor VOTM showed no significant main effect for VOTM (F (1, 46) < 1) for DNNSE participants.

A one-way ANOVA for Perceived vividness of the Ziploc commercial with as Between Subject Factor VOTM showed no significant main effect for VOTM (F (1, 46) < 1) for DNNSE participants.

4.2.3. P-VOTM between NSE and DNNSE participants

A one-way ANOVA for P-VOTM of the Kapal Api commercial with high VOTM with as Between Subject Factor ELP showed no significant main effect for ELP (F (1, 52) < 1).

A one-way ANOVA for Perceived vividness of the Kapal Api commercial with low VOTM with as Between Subject Factor ELP showed no significant main effect for ELP (F (1, 50) = 3.86, p = .055).

A one-way ANOVA for P-VOTM of the Ziploc commercial with high VOTM with as Between Subject Factor ELP showed no significant main effect for ELP (F (1, 50) = 2.77, p = .102).

A one-way ANOVA for P-VOTM of the Ziploc commercial with low VOTM with as Between Subject Factor ELP showed no significant main effect for ELP (F (1, 52) < 1).

4.3. Attitude towards the brand

A repeated measures analysis for Attitude towards the brand with Within Subject Factor Product and Between Subject Factor ELP showed a significant main effect of Product on Attitude towards the brand (F (1, 104) = 28.54, p < .001, η^2 = .215). Ziploc (M = 5.23, SD = 1.20) scored significantly higher than Kapal Api (M = 4.40, SD = 1.28). ELP had no significant main effect on Attitude towards the brand (F (1, 104) = 5.43, p = .085, η^2 = .028). There was no significant interaction effect between Product and ELP (F (1, 104) < 1).

A repeated measures analysis for Attitude towards the brand with Within Subject Factor VOTM and Between Subject Factor ELP showed no significant main effect of VOTM on Attitude towards the brand (F (1, 104) < 1). ELP also had no significant main effect (F (1, 104) = 3.02, p = .085, η^2 = .028). There was no significant interaction effect between VOTM

and ELP (F (1, 104) < 1).

4.3.1 Attitude towards the brand, by product

A one-way ANOVA for Attitude towards the brand of Ziploc with as Between Subject Factor VOTM showed a significant main effect for VOTM (F (1, 104) = 5.56, p = .020). Participants in general liked the Ziploc brand significantly better after the high VOTM commercial (M = 5.50, SD = 1.06) than after the low VOTM commercial (M = 4.96, SD = 1.27).

A one-way ANOVA for Attitude towards the brand of Kapal Api with as Between Subject Factor VOTM showed no significant main effect for VOTM (F (1, 104) = 1.25, p = .265).

4.4. Brand purchase intention (BPI)

A repeated measures analysis for Brand purchase intention (BPI) with Within Subject Factor Product and Between Subject Factor ELP showed a significant main effect of Product on BPI (F (1, 104) = 42.86, p < .001, η^2 = .292). Participants showed a significantly higher intention to purchase for Ziploc (M = 4.96, SD = 1.23) than for Kapal Api (M = 3.94, SD = 1.44). ELP also had a significant main effect on BPI (F (1, 104) = 17.94, p < .001, η^2 = .147): NSE participants scored significantly higher for both Kapal Api (M = 4.38, SD = 1.30) and Ziploc (M = 5.25, SD = 1.06). DNNSE participants scored significantly lower for both Kapal Api (M = 3.40, SD = 1.43) and Ziploc (M = 4.60, SD = 1.06). There was no significant interaction effect between Product and ELP (F (1, 104) = 1.10, p = .296, η^2 = .010).

A repeated measures analysis for Brand purchase intention with Within Subject Factor VOTM and Between Subject Factor ELP showed no significant main effect of VOTM on BPI (F (1, 104) < 1). ELP had a significant main effect on BPI (F (1, 104) = 17.94, p < .001, η^2 = .147). NSE participants were significantly more likely to purchase the brand in both high (M = 4.77, SD = 1.37) and low (M = 4.87, SD = 1.36) VOTM contexts. DNNSE participants scored significantly lower for high (M = 3.93, SD = 1.44) and low (M = 4.07, SD = 1.36) VOTM. There was no significant interaction effect between VOTM and ELP (F (1, 104) < 1).

4.4.1. BPI between NSE participants

A one-way ANOVA for BPI of the Kapal Api commercial with as Between Subject Factor VOTM showed no significant main effect for VOTM (F (1, 56) = 2.60, p = .112) for NSE participants.

A one-way ANOVA for BPI of the Ziploc commercial with as Between Subject Factor VOTM showed no significant main effect for VOTM (F (1, 56) = 1.10, p = .300) for NSE participants.

4.4.2. BPI between DNNSE Participants

A one-way ANOVA for BPI of the Kapal Api commercial with as Between Subject Factor VOTM showed no significant main effect for VOTM (F (1, 46) = 1.03, p = .316) for DNNSE participants.

A one-way ANOVA for BPI of the Ziploc commercial with as Between Subject Factor VOTM showed no significant main effect for VOTM (F (1, 46) < 1) for DNNSE participants.

4.4.3. BPI between NSE and DNNSE participants

A one-way ANOVA for BPI of the Kapal Api commercial with high VOTM with as Between Subject Factor ELP showed a significant main effect for ELP (F (1, 52) = 7.70, p = .008). NSE participants (M = 4.11, SD = 1.13) scored significantly higher than DNNSE participants (M = 3.20, SD = 1.29).

A one-way ANOVA for BPI of the Kapal Api commercial with low VOTM with as Between Subject Factor ELP showed a significant main effect for ELP (F (1, 50) = 6.20, p = . 016). NSE participants (M = 4.66, SD = 1.42) scored significantly higher than DNNSE participants (M = 3.62, SD = 1.57).

A one-way ANOVA for BPI of the Ziploc commercial with high Vividness with as Between Subject Factor ELP showed a significant main effect for ELP (F (1, 50) = 4.17, p = . 046). NSE participants (M = 5.43, SD = 1.29) scored significantly higher than DNNSE participants (M = 4.73, SD = 1.15).

A one-way ANOVA for BPI of the Ziploc commercial with low Vividness with as Between Subject Factor ELP showed a significant main effect for ELP (F (1, 52) = 4.17, p = .

046). NSE participants (M = 5.08, SD = 1.28) scored significantly higher than DNNSE participants (M = 4.49, SD = 0.98).

5. Conclusion and discussion

The aim of the study was to research to what extent an Anglophone video commercial's Vividness of the message combined a consumer's English language proficiency has a significant effect on Consumer response (Attitude towards the ad, Attitude towards the brand, and Brand purchase intention) to said commercial (*To what extent does Consumer response in Anglophone video commercials significantly depend on VOTM and ELP?*). The results of the study will be discussed in light of existing literature and the hypotheses. The dependent control variable Perceived vividness of the message will also be discussed. Due to the significant effects of Product (control variable) for Perceived vividness of the message (F (1, 104) = 28.156, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .213$), Attitude towards the brand (F (1, 104) = 28.536, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .215$), and Brand purchase intention (F (1, 104) = 42.856, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .292$), additional analyses were conducted to control for these effects.

Hypothesis 1 (H1) cannot be considered verified by the results. For Attitude towards the brand was first of all no significant effect measured for any of the independent variables, be it Vividness of the message or English language proficiency. This does not only falsify H1: it also stands in contrast with Appiah (2006), where the higher VOTM of audio/video testimonials scored higher in Consumer response than the lower VOTM of static text/picture testimonials. The main difference would be that this study used video in both commercials, while only switching between static text and audio for the message. A possible explanation for these results could be that the video aspect raises a commercial's VOTM to such a degree that the difference between an audibly spoken and written message becomes negligible. In addition, the commercials with lower VOTM were not completely devoid of sound. They both had music and other sounds in the time preceding the message. This forms another alternative explanation: the aforementioned cognitive load (Kerr, 1990) of a video's moving images and miscellaneous sounds may negate the difference between the oral and written anchoring of a message. The medium of video may be considered vivid in itself, and so no level of VOTM in this study may have ever had a significant main effect.

VOTM had no significant effect on Attitude towards the brand, similar to Attitude towards the ad. ELP also had no significant effect. There was a significant effect of VOTM for the Ziploc commercial. The version with a higher VOTM received a significantly more positive response overall than the version with a lower VOTM. This is the only result yet that

would support H1, but the result is meagre in the context of the study. This is due to the same effect not extending to the Kapal Api commercial. There is a possibility that the high VOTM was implemented more effectively for Ziploc, or that the message itself was more vivid.

The limited scope of VOTM used in this thesis may also account for these asymmetrical results between the two commercials. Throughout the results VOTM had no significant effect on the Perceived vividness of the message (P-VOTM) both between and within the language groups. This shows that the difference between spoken and written anchoring of the message for video commercials may not be the deciding factor in what Vividness of the message entails. Vividness of the message may thus be measured on more than just the spoken or written anchoring of a message. Given the fairly broad definitions of the scales provided by Krishnamurthy and Sujan (1999) and Keller and Block (1997), the use of oral and written anchoring may be too narrow a definition for VOTM. It is likely that the VOTM in this study was determined by other aspects of the commercial which remained unconsidered and outside the scope of the experiment. One of these may be the use of comedy and humour. The Kapal Api commercial was centred around an intentional moment of physical comedy (a man falling down after being struck by coffee) just before the anchoring occurred, while Ziploc did not contain such an intentional comedic scenario. As results by Chung and Zhao (2015) show, Consumer response and memory are both significantly positively affected by humour in commercials. English language proficiency also had a significant effect on P-VOTM, which could be due to the consumer experience of the commercial's language between the two groups. The NSE participants experienced the commercials to be more vivid than DNNSE participants. These results affirm the existing literature in the native and non-native experience of vividness of a language (Tomasello, 2003; Perfetti, 1987; Watson and Olson, 1987). The NSE participants may have experienced the commercials as more vivid due to their L1 upbringing in English and learning the language in a more vivid context than the DNNSE participants.

Finally, VOTM had no significant effect on Brand purchase intention (BPI). This finally concludes that the Vividness of the message (based on oral versus written anchoring) has had no significant influence on Consumer response (comprised of Attitude towards the ad, Attitude towards the brand, and Brand purchase intention) in this study, which ultimately falsifies H1.

Another explanation for the results could be provided by Greene (2014). His review included the theory that imagery interferes with adjacent imagery as sound interferes with adjacent sound (Greene, 2014). The sound of the high VOTM in a commercial may have experienced interference from other sounds e.g. music and sound effects. The visible text message of the lower VOTM in the commercials may also have received interference from the imagery surrounding it. The audio/visual format itself may have caused interference with both types of anchoring, mostly negating the difference between high and low VOTM. Due to the dual nature of modern video (i.e. it being both a visual and an auditory medium), this study's different levels of VOTM may have made too little of a difference.

Hypothesis 2 (H2) can also not be considered verified by the results, except for a few exceptions. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, ELP did not have any significant effect on Attitude towards the ad or Attitude towards the brand. The exception lies with BPI. There are some results for BPI that do give some credence to H2. When compared, the NSE participants showed a higher BPI for both commercials with the higher VOTM. The NSE participants did however also score higher for the commercials with the lower VOTM. This may be due to the more vivid experience of the English language for the NSE participants as mentioned in the paragraph for P-VOTM in light of H1 (Tomasello, 2003; Perfetti, 1987; Watson and Olson, 1987). There is ultimately no real systemic effect measured for the VOTM proper, as the results are more related to the participants' level of ELP.

A possible explanation may be provided by Verlaan et al (2017), as results of the study may be more in line with their findings: short availability of the message tends to equalise the results between groups. Since participant pool passed the demographic tests (i.e. no significant difference in age, education level, or gender) both within and between the two populations (See Subjects in Method), the results reinforces notions by Verlaan et al (2017) and Schaffner and Schiefele (2013) and that there may be no essential difference in scoring for either spoken (high VOTM) or written (low VOTM) anchoring of the message. This theory may explain why the results have not been significant.

Hypothesis 3 (H3) cannot be verified by the results, and may in a few cases be considered falsified. Not only are the results insignificant for Attitude towards the ad and Attitude towards the brand, the results for BPI actually falsify H3 due to NSE participants scoring significantly higher on the low VOTM commercials. As described in the paragraphs

for H2, the results are more related to the participants' level of ELP, as NSE participants score significantly higher for all commercials regardless of the level of VOTM.

In the end, all three hypotheses can be considered mostly falsified by the results. Aside from a few isolated significant effects regarding Attitude towards the brand and Brand purchase intention, there is no substantial evidence for an effect on Consumer response by Vividness of the message. ELP did have significant effects, but this did not seem to have been related to the VOTM of any commercial. Product had a significant effect on almost all of the dependent variables. This seems to be one of the general tendencies throughout the study. This implies that the commercial for Ziploc may have generally been more effective in scoring higher in Consumer response than the Kapal Api commercial, regardless of VOTM. It was simply the "better" and more liked commercial. It was also perceived to be significantly more vivid. This implies that the Ziploc commercial contained yet unmeasured aspects to make the commercial more vivid than the Kapal Api commercial. Another general tendency was that native English speakers gave higher scores in general to any of the commercials, whether with high VOTM and low VOTM.

Limitations and further research

The first limitation of this study is the scope of VOTM. As the results discussion above may show, there were hardly any significant effects found regarding Vividness of the message. While it may have been possible that this was due to the control variable Product, the VOTM scores for Consumer response did not show anything of interest. BPI had some small significance, but the effect was only isolated to one commercial. As the results for P-VOTM show, VOTM did not significantly influence the consumers' experience of vividness of the commercial, while Product did have a significant effect. This implies that there were other factors of the commercials that influenced the experience of vividness unrelated to the type of verbal anchoring. Further research could look into what other factors may constitute Vividness of the message, aside from the type of anchoring. Humour, due to its previously measured effect on Consumer response (Chung and Zhao, 2015), may very well be a worthy addition to the research of vividness, should it have significant effect on P-VOTM in future studies.

The second limitation is the fact that this commercial was not tested as a "genuine commercial". The pre-test did not include whether or not participants thought that the commercial was real, which may have influenced results. As an addition to the second limitation, the third limitation is the video editing skills used to make the commercial. The black rectangle (See Materials in Method) used to mask possible background text and to form placement for the written anchoring was not used merely by choice. It was mostly a way to edit the video effectively within the skill level available. This could further break the illusion of watching an actual commercial, which may have influenced the results. Further research could look into the effects of VOTM in more seamlessly edited videos.

The third limitation is the omission of comprehension as a measure. As part of the literature of this study covers cognition (Tavalossi, 1998; Darwin, Turvey, and Crowder, 1972; Haber and Standing; 1969; Siegelbaum and Hudspeth, 2000), comprehension could have been added to the design, but was left out to limit the scope of the thesis. Comprehension may be the missing link between VOTM and Consumer response, as comprehension is considered the prerequisite for appreciation (Van Mulken et al, 2014). Comprehension was assumed as a necessary requirement for the study a priori, which is also why participants were screened to be higher educated. The higher rate of English language proficiency in both NSE and higher educated DNNSE would imply comprehension. In a larger scale experiment, comprehension itself may thus be a relevant addition as a dependent (control) variable.

The fourth limitation is the omission of a possible third level for for the current VOTM, consisting of simultaneous oral and written anchoring of the message. While there may not have been a measurable difference in Consumer response between the two current levels, a certain third level may yield different results. Learning through listening seems to be further enhanced when accompanied by a redundant text message that matches the oral message (Moreno and Mayer, 2002). This would imply that redundancy (simultaneous written and oral anchoring) of the message may be more effective than merely delivering the message in either audio or text. Further research could look into wether or not this redundancy of simultaneous anchoring yields a more positive Consumer response. It may also be researched if it achieves a higher Perceived vividness of the message.

The fifth limitation concerns the sample pool of participants. The current sample consisted of highly educated individuals between 18 and 35 years of age to ensure comparable

samples between the DNNSE and NSE populations. A different sample pool (or pool with more diversity in education and age) may yield different and significant results between e.g. lower educated NSE and lower educated DNNSE participants. This is based on Gerritsen et al's (2000; 2010) results, in which only 36% of Dutch individuals understand the English presented in a spoken manner. The high education level of this participant pool was chosen to prevent as many interfering factors as possible. A pool including lower educated DNNSE participants may show different results. Such DNNSE participants may score significantly lower than their higher educated counterparts, as stated in the literature by De Mooij (1994). Future research may take these demographic differences into account. In addition, English language proficiency could also be measured within the populations. ELP could be measured through self reporting or through a pre-experiment English proficiency test for both NSE and DNNSE participants.

The sixth limitation concerns the environment of the experiment. Since participants took part in the experiment through an online form, surroundings were different for all participants. This leaves the possibility that they may have been distracted during any point in the questionnaires (including the commercials). According to Bilandzic and Busselle (2011), a narrative experience may be threatened by external distractions (e.g. hunger or environmental noises). Future research may take extra care in ensuring the same experimental setting (most likely within a laboratory) for all participants. This may prevent possible effects created by distractions.

The current study did not provide many significant effects within its own parameters. Additional research could still build further on the results of this study. It stands in a high contrast with the expected results provided by Appiah (2006) and the reasoning of Kisielius and Sternthal (1984) and Nisbett and Ross (1980). This may imply that the body of work regarding vividness in advertising and video commercials needs to be expanded to more fully understand the broader scope of a commercial's Vividness of the message. Further research could more specifically search for other aspects of VOTM aside from oral or written anchoring. It could then analyse the effects of such aspects of VOTM on persuasion and Consumer response, and the effects of language proficiency on the experience of VOTM. The study did verify the significant difference in experience of VOTM (measured in P-VOTM) of the English language for NSE and DNNSE. An individual's L1 tends to be experienced as

more vivid than an L2. An individual tends to initially learn the L1 in a more vivid and exclusively oral context compared to an L2, which is often learned in a less vivid, more written context (Tomasello, 2003; Perfetti, 1987; Watson and Olson, 1987). DNNSE may have a relatively high ELP (especially when they are higher educated) compared to other non-native speakers of English. Nevertheless, their non-nativeness may stand in the way of experiencing the English language as vividly as NSE. As such, Anglophone commercials may never be as effective on DNNSE than it may be on NSE. As it stands, the body of research surrounding vividness and language proficiency in advertising still has many facets to explore. This study will hopefully be of use in said future research.

6. References

Appiah, O. (2006). Rich Media, poor Media: The impact of audio/video vs. text/picture testimonial ads on browsers' evaluations of commercial web sites and online products. *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, *28*(1), 73-86.

Belch, G. E., and Belch, M. A. (2003). Advertising and promotion: An integrated marketing communications perspective. New York, NY: The McGraw-Hill.

Bergkvist, L., and Rossiter, J. R. (2009). Tailor-made single-item measures of doubly concrete constructs. *International Journal of Advertising*, *28*(4), 607-621.

Bergkvist, L., Eiderbäck, D., and Palombo, M. (2012). The brand communication effects of using a headline to prompt the key benefit in ads with pictorial metaphors. *Journal of Advertising*, *41*(2), 67-76.

Bilandzic, H., & Busselle, R.W. (2011). Enjoyment of films as a function of narrative experience, perceived realism and transportability. *Communications*, *36*, 29-50.

Chung, H., and Zhao, X. (2015). Humour effect on memory and attitude: moderating role of product involvement. *International journal of advertising, 22*(1), 117-144.

Danks, J. (1980). Comprehension in listening and reading: Same or different. *Reading and understanding*, 1-39.

Darwin, C. J., Turvey, M. T., and Crowder, R. G. (1972). An auditory analogue of the Sperling partial report procedure: Evidence for brief auditory storage. *Cognitive Psychology*, *3*(2), 255-267.

De Mooij, M. K., and Keegan, W. J. (1994). *Advertising worldwide*. New York, NY: Prentice Hall.

Duncan, J. (1980). The locus of interference in the perception of simultaneous stimuli. *Psychological review*, *87*(3), 272.

Education First. (2016). EF English Proficiency Index 2015.5. Retrieved March 15, 2017 from http://www.ef.nl/epi/.

Eurobarometer, S. 386. (2012). Europeans and their languages. *European Commission*. Retrieved March 15, 2017 from http://ec.europa.eu/.

Gerritsen, M., Korzilius, H., Van Meurs, F., and Gijsbers, I. (2000). English in Dutch commercials: Not understood and not appreciated. *Journal of advertising research*, *40*(4), 17-31.

Gerritsen, M., Nickerson, C., van Hooft, A., van Meurs, F., Korzilius, H., Nederstigt, U., Starren, M., and Crijns, R. (2010). English in product advertisements in non-English-speaking countries in Western Europe: Product image and comprehension of the text. *Journal of Global Marketing*, *23*(4), 349-365.

Greene, R. L. (2014). *Human memory: Paradigms and paradoxes*. London, England: Psychology Press.

Haber, R. N., and Standing, L. G. (1969). Direct measures of short-term visual storage. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *21*(1), 43-54.

Jarboe, G. (2011). *YouTube and video marketing: an hour a day*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Kapal Api. (n.d.). *Betul-betul kaw: Kapal Api commercial* [Television commercial]. Retrieved March 15, 2017 from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D7VoRbAEwc0.

Keller, P. A., and Block, L. G. (1997). Vividness effects: A resource-matching perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research, 24*(3), 295-304.

Kelley, C. A. (1989). A Study of Selected Issues in Vividness Research: the Role of Attention and Elaboration Enhancing Cues. *NA-Advances in Consumer Research, 16*. 574-580

Kerr, S. T. (1990). Wayfinding in an electronic database: The relative importance of navigational cues vs. mental models. *Information Processing and Management*, *26*(4), 511-523.

Kisielius, J., and Sternthal, B. (1984). Detecting and explaining vividness effects in attitudinal judgments. *Journal of Marketing Research 21*(1), 54-64.

Krishnamurthy, P., and Sujan, M. (1999). Retrospection versus anticipation: The role of the ad under retrospective and anticipatory self-referencing. *Journal of Consumer Research, 26*(1), 55-69.

Moreno, R., & Mayer, R. E. (2002). Verbal redundancy in multimedia learning: When reading helps listening. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 94*(1), 156-163.

Van Mulken, M., van Hooft, A., and Nederstigt, U. (2014). Finding the tipping point: Visual metaphor and conceptual complexity in advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, *43*(4), 333-343.

Nisbett, R. E., and Ross, L. (1980). *Human inference: Strategies and shortcomings of social judgment*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Perfetti, C.A. (1987). Language, speech, and print: Some asymmetries in the acquisition of literacy. In R. Horowitz and S.J. Samuels (Eds.), *Comprehending oral and written language* (pp. 355–369). New York, NY: Academic.

Rossiter, J. R. (2008). Defining the necessary components of creative, effective ads. *Journal of Advertising*, *37*(4), 139-144.

Rossiter, J. R., and Bellman, S. (2005). *Marketing communications: Theory and applications*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Schaffner, E., and Schiefele, U. (2013). The prediction of reading comprehension by cognitive and motivational factors: Does text accessibility during comprehension testing make a difference? *Learning and Individual Differences, 26*, 42–54.

Schroeder, S. (2011). What readers have and do: Effects of students' verbal ability and reading time components on comprehension with and without text availability. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 103*, 877–896.

Siegelbaum, S. A., and Hudspeth, A. J. (2000). *Principles of neural science* (Vol. 4, pp. 1227-1246). E. R. Kandel, J. H. Schwartz, and T. M. Jessell (Eds.). New York, NY: McGraw-hill.

Tavalossi, N. T. (1998). Language in multimedia: Interaction of spoken and written information. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *25*(1), 26-37.

Taylor, S. E., and Fiske, S. T. (1978). Salience, attention, and attribution: Top of the head phenomena. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, *11*, 249-288.

Tomasello, M. (2003). *Constructing a language: A usage-based theory of language acquisition.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Verlaan, W., Pearce, D. L., and Zeng, G. (2017). Revisiting Sticht: The Changing Nature of the Relationship Between Listening Comprehension and Reading Comprehension Among Upper Elementary and Middle School Students Over the Last 50 Years. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 56*(2), 176-197.

Watson, R., and Olson, D.R. (1987). From meaning to definition: A literate bias on the structure of word meaning. In R. Horowitz and S.J. Samuels (Eds.), *Comprehending oral and written language* (pp. 329–354). New York, NY: Academic.

Ziploc. (1994). *The art of freshness: 1994 Ziploc commercial* [Television commercial]. Retrieved March 15, 2017 from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kUrf5UR1RQE.

7. Appendices

7.1. The edited commercials

Kapal Api, high VOTM (oral anchoring)

Kapal Api, low VOTM (written anchoring)

Ziploc, high VOTM (oral anchoring)

Ziploc, low VOTM (written anchoring)

7.2. The original commercials and materials

Kapal Api commercial (original):

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D7VoRbAEwc0

Ziploc commercial (original):

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kUrf5UR1RQE

Music edited into Ziploc commercial:
URL: https://www.audioblocks.com/stock-audio/triumphant-classical-piano-music.html

7.3. English questionnaire

Dear participant,

First of all, thank you very much for participating in this experiment. This research consists of two commercials. Each commercial is followed by a questionnaire. There is also "spot the differences" task. The entire experiment should take about 5 minutes to complete.First we will ask some personal information, like sex and age. Don't worry: your data will not be shared with third parties. Your anonymity will be guaranteed.When you are ready, feel free to continue to the next page using the button below.If you have any questions or remarks, you can contact [e-mail address].

Sincerely,

Tim Renes

COMMERCIAL 1

Below you will find a commercial. Please click the Play icon to watch it. After watching the commercial, please continue to the next page.

QUESTIONS COMMERCIAL 1

Thinking about the ad for Kapal Api, which of the following statements best describes your feeling about the ad?

I disliked it extremely (1)

I quite disliked it (2)

I disliked it slightly (3)

I neither liked it nor disliked it (4)

I liked it slightly (5)

I quite liked it (6)

I liked it extremely (7)

Here are six questions on how you perceive the ad for Kapal Api. Select the alternative that best fits with your view.

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Not vivid(1)								Vivid
Not personal (2)								Personal
Not concrete (3)								Concrete
Not easy to imagine (4)								Easy to imagine
Not easy to relate to (5)								Easy to relate to
Not easy to picture (6)								Easy to picture

Thinking about the Kapal Api coffee, which of the following statements best describes your feeling about Kapal Api?

I think it is extremely bad (1)

I think it is quite bad (2)

I think it is slightly bad (3)

I think it is neither good nor bad (4)

I think it is slightly good (5)

I think it is quite good (6)

I think it is extremely good (7)

Below you will find four pairs of adjectives. Indicate how well one or the other adjective in each pair describes the likelihood that you would try Kapal Api if you were to buy coffee.

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Unlikely (1)								Likely
Probable (2)								Improbable
Uncertain (3)								Certain
Impossible (4)								Possible

The following page contains a "spot the differences" task. You will receive 30 seconds to complete the task. After 30 seconds, you will be sent to the next page.

SPOT THE DIFFERENCES (DISTRACTION)

Below are two illustrations. Try to determine the amount of differences between them. You have 30 seconds.

How many differences between the illustrations did you find?

3 (1)

5 (2)

7 (3)

8 (4)

COMMERCIAL 2

Below you will find a commercial. Please click the Play icon to watch it. After watching the commercial, please continue to the next page.

QUESTIONS COMMERCIAL 2

Thinking about the ad for Ziploc, which of the following statements best describes your feeling about the ad?

I disliked it extremely (1)

I quite disliked it (2)

I disliked it slightly (3)

I neither liked it nor disliked it (4)

I liked it slightly (5)

I quite liked it (6)

I liked it extremely (7)

Here are six questions on how you perceive the ad for ZipLoc. Select the alternative that best fits with your view.

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Not vivid(1)								Vivid
Not personal (2)								Personal
Not concrete (3)								Concrete
Not easy to imagine (4)								Easy to imagine
Not easy to relate to (5)								Easy to relate to
Not easy to picture (6)								Easy to picture

Thinking about the ZipLoc plastic bags, which of the following statements best describes your feeling about ZipLoc?

I think it is extremely bad (1)

I think it is quite bad (2)

I think it is slightly bad (3)

I think it is neither good nor bad (4)

I think it is slightly good (5)

I think it is quite good (6)

I think it is extremely good (7)

Below you will find four pairs of adjectives. Indicate how well one or the other adjective in each pair describes the likelihood that you would try ZipLoc if you were to buy plastic bags.

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Unlikely (1)								Likely
Probable (2)								Improbable
Uncertain (3)								Certain
Impossible (4)								Possible

BIODATA QUESTIONS

Are you male or female?

Male (1)

Female (2)

How old are you?

_____ Age in years (1)

What is your nationality?

British (1)

Irish (4)

United States (3)

Australian (5)

Other (2) _____

What is your first language?

English (1)

Other: (2) _____

What is your country of residence?

United Kingdom (1)

Ireland (3)

United States (4)

Australia (5)

New Zealand (6)

Other: (2) _____

We would like to know your level of education. Are you currently enrolled as a student?

Yes (1)

No (2)

What is the highest level of education you have finished?

Secondary education (1)

Trade school (7)

Post-secondary education (non-bachelor) (2)

Bachelor (BA, BSc, or equivalent) (4)

Master (MA, MSc, or equivalent) (5)

Other: (6) _____

What is your current level of education?

Secondary education (1)

Trade school (7)

Post-secondary education (non-bachelor) (2)

Bachelor (BA, BSc, or equivalent) (4)

Master (MA, MSc, or equivalent) (5)

Other: (6) _____

For which year of your current education are you enrolled?

First year (1)

Second year (2)

Third Year (3)

Other: (4) _____

7.4. Dutch Questionnaire

Beste deelnemer,

Ten eerste, hartelijk dank voor uw deelname aan dit experiment. Dit onderzoek bestaat uit twee reclames. Elke reclame wordt gevolgd door een vragenlijst. Er is ook een "zoek de verschillen"-opdracht. Het hele experiment duurt ongeveer 5 minuten. Als laatste vragen wij u om wat persoonlijke gegevens in te voeren, zoals leeftijd en geslacht. Geen zorgen: uw identiteit blijft geheim. Wij beloven uw anonimiteit te waarborgen.Bent u klaar om te

beginnen? Ga dan gerust door naar de volgende pagina. Klik op de knop hieronder.Voor eventuele vragen of opmerkingen kunt u een e-mail sturen naar [e-mail adres].

Met vriendelijke groet,

Tim Renes

COMMERCIAL 1

Hieronder vindt u een reclame. Bekijk de reclame door op de Play-knop te klikken. Ga na het kijken door naar de volgende pagina.

QUESTIONS COMMERCIAL 1

All u nadenkt over de reclame voor Kapal Api, welke van de volgende stellingen beschrijft het best uw gevoel over de reclame?

Ik vind het helemaal niet leuk (1)

Ik vind het niet leuk (2)

Ik vind het een beetje niet leuk (3)

Ik vind het leuk noch niet leuk (4)

Ik vind het een beetje leuk (5)

Ik vind het leuk (6)

Ik vind het helemaal leuk (7)

Hier zijn zes vragen over hoe u de reclame voor Kapal Api waarneemt. Kies de waarde die het best overeenkomt met uw mening.

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Niet levendig (1)								Levendig

Niet persoonlijk (2)								Persoonlijk
Niet concreet (3)								Concreet
Niet makkelijk voor te stellen (4)								Makkelijk voor te stellen
Niet makkelijk in te leven (5)								Makkelijk in te leven
Niet makkelijk in te beelden (6)								Makkelijk in te beelden

All u nadenkt over Kapal Api koffie, welke van de volgende stellingen beschrijft uw gevoel over Kapal Api het best?

Ik vind het extreem slecht (1)

Ik vind het slecht (2)

Ik vind het enigszins slecht (3)

Ik vind het goed noch slecht (4)

Ik vind het enigszins goed (5)

Ik vind het goed (6)

Ik vind het extreem goed (7)

Hieronder vindt u vier paar bijvoeglijke naamwoorden. Geef aan hoe goed de ene of de andere beschrijving in elk paar de kans beschrijft dat u Kapal Api zou uitproberen als u koffie zou kopen.

Onwaar-schijnlijk (1) Aannemelijk (2) Onzeker (3) Onmogelijk (4)	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	Waarschijnlijk Onaannemelijk Zeker Mogelijk

De volgende pagina bevat een "zoek de verschillen"-opdracht. U krijgt 30 seconden om de taak te voltooien. Na 30 seconden wordt u naar de volgende pagina doorgestuurd.

SPOT THE DIFFERENCES (DISTRACTION)

Hieronder staan twee plaatjes. Probeer het aantal verschillen tussen de plaatjes te vinden. U krijgt 30 seconden.

Hoeveel verschillen waren er tussen de twee plaatjes?

3 (1)

5 (2)

7 (3)

8 (4)

COMMERCIAL 2

Hieronder vindt u een reclame. Bekijk de reclame door op de Play-knop te klikken. Ga na het kijken door naar de volgende pagina.

QUESTIONS COMMERCIAL 2

All u nadenkt over de reclame voor ZipLoc, welke van de volgende stellingen beschrijft het best uw gevoel over de reclame?

Ik vind het helemaal niet leuk (1)

Ik vind het niet leuk (2)

Ik vind het een beetje niet leuk (3)

Ik vind het leuk noch niet leuk (4)

Ik vind het een beetje leuk (5)

Ik vind het leuk (6)

Ik vind het helemaal leuk (7)

Hier zijn zes vragen over hoe u de reclame voor ZipLoc waarneemt. Kies de waarde die het best overeenkomt met uw mening.

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Niet levendig (1)								Levendig
Niet persoonlijk (2)								Persoonlijk
Niet concreet (3)								Concreet
Niet makkelijk voor te stellen (4)								Makkelijk voor te stellen
Niet makkelijk in te leven (5)								Makkelijk in te leven

Niet makkelijk in te beelden (6)								Makkelijk in te beelden

All u nadenkt over ZipLoc plastic zakken, welke van de volgende stellingen beschrijft uw gevoel over ZipLoc het best?

Ik vind het extreem slecht (1)

Ik vind het slecht (2)

Ik vind het enigszins slecht (3)

Ik vind het goed noch slecht (4)

Ik vind het enigszins goed (5)

Ik vind het goed (6)

Ik vind het extreem goed (7)

Hieronder vindt u vier paar bijvoeglijke naamwoorden. Geef aan hoe goed de ene of de andere beschrijving in elk paar de kans beschrijft dat u ZipLoc zou uitproberen als u plastic zakken zou kopen.

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Onwaar-schijnlijk (1)								Waarschijnlijk
Aannemelijk (2)								Onaannemelijk
Onzeker (3)								Zeker
Onmogelijk (4)								Mogelijk

BIODATA QUESTIONS

Bent u een man of een vrouw?

Man (1)

Vrouw (2)

Hoe oud bent u?

_____ Leeftijd in jaren (1)

Wat is uw nationaliteit?

Nederlands (1)

Anders, namelijk: (2) _____

Wat is uw moedertaal?

Nederlands (1)

Anders, namelijk: (2) _____

In welk land woont u?

Nederland (1)

Anders, namelijk: (2) _____

Nu willen we graag weten welke opleiding(en) u volgt of hebt gevolgd. Bent u momenteel student?

Ja (1)

Nee (2)

Wat is uw hoogst afgeronde opleiding?

Middelbare school (1)

MBO (2)

HBO (3)

WO Bachelor (4)

WO Master (5)

Anders, namelijk: (6) _____

Wat is uw huidige opleiding?

Middelbare school (1)

MBO (2)

HBO (3)

WO Bachelor (4)

WO Master (5)

Anders, namelijk: (6) _____

In welk jaar van uw studie zit u momenteel?

Eerste jaar (1)

Tweede jaar (2)

Derde jaar (3)

Anders, namelijk: (4) _____