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#### Abstract

This experiment investigated the effects of COO markers and brand familiarity on the effectiveness of advertisements. This effectiveness was measured by means of three components: the attitude towards the advertisement, the attitude towards the brand and the purchase intention. This was tested using an online questionnaire that was filled in by Dutch participants ( $N=253$ ). Respondents were randomly assigned two advertisements from either the familiar chips brand Pringles, the unfamiliar chips brand Frit Ravich, the familiar fashion brand Zara or the unfamiliar fashion brand Noon, containing zero, one, two or three COO markers. The results showed that for the chips brands, the attitude towards the advertisement was influenced by the number of COO markers. When using two or three markers, the attitude was higher than when using no or one marker. The attitude towards the brand and the purchase intention for the chips brands were influenced by brand familiarity: the familiar brand led to a higher attitude and purchase intention than the unfamiliar brand. No significant interaction effect was found. For the fashion brands, there were no significant effects of COO markers or brand familiarity regarding the effectiveness of the advertisement. Therefore, the conclusion can be made that brand familiarity does influence the effectiveness of advertisements in terms of attitude and purchase intention, whereas COO markers did not influence the effectiveness.
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## Introduction

In a globalizing world, effective advertisements and marketing strategies are becoming increasingly important. A frequently-used strategy is the use of country-of-origin markers (COO markers). Products are linked to a particular country by means of these COO markers.

Figure 1 is an example of an advertisement that contains COO markers. The jam in the ad is a brand from the Netherlands, but uses the French brand name "Bonne maman", to connect the product with France. The jam, which is considered to be a French product, is supported by the French sentence "J'aime" which is French for "I like/love" and also sounds like the word jam. Furthermore, the landscape on the background makes the viewer of the advertisement think of France.


Figure 1: The advertisement, retrieved from https://www.bonnemaman.nl/

The country-of-origin (COO) of a product is considered to be an important aspect in advertisements and influences the product evaluation (Aichner, 2014). The country-of-origin definition often used and also used in this study is as follows: "the country of origin of a product is an extrinsic product cue, an intangible product attribute, that is distinct from a physical product characteristic" (Peterson and Jolibert, 1995, p.884). Country of origin is often confounded with product ethnicity. The differences between these two phenomena are explained by Usunier and Cestre (2007). According to their research, product ethnicity is a globally shared stereotypical association between a certain product and a country, based on different aspects, such as the reputation of the country in terms of design or manufacturing quality (Usunier and Cestre, 2007). For instance, having the same associations about a product across different countries; French and Dutch people both think German cars are reliable and French perfume is of high quality. The COO is influenced by this product ethnicity, which means the product ethnicity determines the effect of the COO marker. A frequently made misinterpretation is that product ethnicity and COO are considered to be on the same level (Usunier and Cestre, 2007). This research examines the effects of COO
markers, and not the effects of product ethnicity. As mentioned before, COO markers are an important aspect in advertising. Aichner (2014) defined eight different ways of implementing COO markers in a print advertisement. According to Aichner, the most frequently used strategy is the use of the phrase "Made in...". This is the easiest strategy to communicate the COO of a product, since the COO is explicitly mentioned and consumers do not need to think of words or slogans to link the product with the country, like in other strategies. In addition, the use of this "Made in" label is obligatory in most countries around the world (Aichner, 2014). The other strategies, as stated by Aichner (2014), are divided into explicit and implicit strategies. The explicit strategies are, along with the already mentioned "Made in" label, are: quality and origin labels, COO embedded in the company name and typical COO words embedded in the company name. The implicit strategies are: typical COO words embedded in the company name, use of the COO language, use of famous or stereotypical people from the COO, the use of COO flags and symbols and the use of typical landscapes or famous buildings from the COO (Aichner, 2014.) .

An important goal of advertising is to favorably influence the attitude towards a product to make consumers buy the product. This attitude towards a product seems to be influenced by the attitude towards the advertisement (James, 2011). Previous research (Aichner, 2014; Peterson and Jolibert, 1995) has shown that COO markers can be an effective and successful tool to influence this attitude. Country-of-origin of a product influences the evaluations of the product, leading to more positive thoughts if the image of the particular country is favorable towards the consumer (Hornikx, van Meurs, van den Heuvel and Janssen, 2020). Generally, consumers evaluate products more positively when the products are made in a country that is known for high-quality products (Leclerc, Schmitt and Dubé, 1994). When there is a strong COO present, the product is considered to be of high quality, which enhances the likelihood the product gets purchased (Leclerc et al., 1994). For instance, perfume from France, cars from Germany and watches from Switzerland are considered to be of high quality, just because of their country of origin (Aichner, 2014). In addition, products that are related to or congruent with the country of origin, such as the products mentioned above, will result in better product evaluations, a better product attitude and a higher purchase intention than incongruent, non-related products, such as cars from China or cosmetics from Mexico (Hornikx, van Meurs and Hof, 2013).

So, research has shown that using COO markers could be beneficial, but are they also actually used? Research conducted by Hornikx et al. (2020) showed that COO markers are frequently used in real life; out of 750 advertisements from Cosmopolitan magazine, 36\%
contained at least one country-of-origin marker, which stresses the importance of COO markers in advertising. In addition, out of these advertisements with COO markers, 30\% contained multiple COO markers within a single advertisement. Does only a single marker enhance the COO-effect, or could using more COO markers be even more effective? It is already known that COO markers are able to influence the effectiveness of the advertisements in terms of attitude towards the product and advertisement and purchase intention (Aichner, 2014; Peterson and Jolibert, 1995). However, there is also research known that found no effect of COO markers. A study by Obermiller and Spangenberg (1989) found that when the COO was a less developed country, the attitude towards the product was considerably less favorable than when the COO was a highly developed country. In addition, when a product and a country are incongruent and do not match with each other, the use of COO in advertisements is not effective (Hornikx et al., 2013). For instance, their research found that Dutch tomatoes (an incongruent product for the Netherlands) led to a lower product attitude and lower purchase intention than Spanish tomatoes (congruent product for Spain). Furthermore, the effects of COO markers might be dependent on their context and therefore only exist under certain conditions (Peterson and Jolibert, 1995). Johansson, Douglas and Nanoka (1985) investigated the effects of COO on automobile brands. Ten brands of automobiles were selected from three different countries: America, Germany and Japan. The participants had to rate the different car brands on their attributes, such as price, driving comfort, and styling. The results showed that COO did not affect the general rating of the automobile, only some specific attributes. Furthermore, the familiarity influenced the evaluation of the automobiles, but did not result in more favorable results. Concluding, the COO had an effect on the rating of automobiles, but it did not influence the rating consistently positive or negative. (Johansson et al., 1985).

Therefore, it is known that COO markers are not effective by definition, and that their effectiveness might be dependent on the context and the congruence between the country and product. However, no research has been conducted yet whether using multiple COO markers within a single advertisement increases the effectiveness of this advertisement. Therefore, this research is going to examine whether the number of COO markers influences the effectiveness of the advertisement.

Aichner (2014) stated that most companies combine multiple COO strategies in advertising, but Hornikx et al., (2020) found the opposite: in their content analysis, although $30 \%$ of the advertisements did contain multiple COO markers, $70 \%$ of the advertisements contained only one single COO marker. When multiple COO markers were used, the results
showed that most of the times two COO markers were used in a single advertisement (Hornikx et al., 2020). However, their study only examined the frequency of occurrence of the different COO markers, and did not examine its effectiveness. Therefore, the question remains how many COO markers are necessary in order to create the most effective advertisement. The current research looked at the effects on advertisement effectiveness using one single COO marker compared to using multiple COO markers.

Besides the effects of COO markers on the effectiveness of advertisement, this research is going to examine the effect of brand familiarity on advertisement effectiveness. It is already known that COO markers can influence the effectiveness of the brand, but does the familiarity of the brand affect this effectiveness as well? Brand familiarity concerns a consumer's direct and indirect experience with a brand (Kent and Allen, 1994). In addition, brand familiarity is about intrinsic components of a product, such as size and functions of products (Lee and Ganesh, 1994). Campbell and Keller (2003) argued that the prior familiarity with an advertised brand might influence the effectiveness of the communication, and they found that advertisements of unfamiliar brands are less effective than familiar brands because the unfamiliar brands are more likely to be forgotten faster. Participants in this study were to watch a television program with three breaks where advertisements were shown and then were asked questions about the advertisements shown in the breaks, followed by questions regarding brand recall, brand attitude and advertisement attitude. Participants were asked their familiarity with the brands that were shown in the program, prior to seeing the actual advertisement. Subsequently, the participants had to indicate how well they remembered the brand for each advertisement. Results showed a higher attitude towards the advertisement and towards the brand for familiar brands compared to unfamiliar brands and that the advertisement for the familiar brand was remembered better than the unfamiliar brand (Campell and Keller, 2003). Since products from familiar brands are remembered better, it might be difficult for unfamiliar brands to make consumers remember their product information well, resulting in a competitive advantage in terms of advertising for the familiar brands (Kent and Allen, 1994). Usunier and Cestre (2007) found that the familiarity with a brand or product influences the use of COO as an informational cue. Their research found that consumers with high familiarity base their product evaluation on the strength of actual product characteristics, whereas consumers with low familiarity make greater use of COO markers (Usunier and Cestre, 2007). In addition, research from Lee and Ganesh (1994) found that consumers who have little familiarity of a brand are more likely to use extrinsic cues in order to assess the quality of a product, because they possess little intrinsic information about
the product. However, "highly familiar consumers' knowledge of market-based information about the product class allows them to relate extrinsic information to product quality" (Lee and Ganesh, 1994, p. 24). Therefore, the use of COO is likely to be done by consumers with both low familiarity and high familiarity, rather than moderate familiarity consumers.

Thus, taking the previous literature into account and knowing that the effectiveness of the number of COO markers in an advertisement, combined with the difference between familiar and unfamiliar brands, has not been studied before, the following research question has emerged:

To what extent do the familiarity of a brand and the number of COO markers present influence the effectiveness of an advertisement, in terms of attitude towards the ad, attitude towards the product, attitude towards the brand and purchase intention?

In addition, it is expected that the advertisements containing COO markers were more effective than the advertisements without COO markers, since lots of previous research (e.g. Aichner, 2014; Leclerc et al., 1994) showed that COO markers enhance the perceived quality of the product, which increases the likelihood the products are purchased. Furthermore, it is expected that the advertisements for familiar brands are more effective than the advertisements for the unfamiliar brands, based on previous research by Campbell and Keller (2003), who found that familiar brands were remembered better than unfamiliar brand and that these familiar brand led to an increase in attitude towards the product and towards the brand.

The most interesting and unique part of the current study was examining whether COO markers and familiarity influence one another: does combining these variables boost the effect of either familiarity of the brand or number of COO markers regarding the effectiveness of the advertisement? Is there a greater effect when using a familiar brand with multiple markers? It is expected that familiar brands will enhance the effectiveness of advertisements, and it is known that COO markers can have a positive beneficial effect on the effectiveness of advertisements, whereas other research claims there is no effect. In addition, Lee and Ganesh (1994) found that consumers with either high or low brand familiarity are able to use COO markers to assess product quality, the interesting part in this research is finding out whether advertisements from familiar or unfamiliar brands influence the advertisement effectiveness when using one COO marker, multiple COO markers or no COO markers.

The current research used advertisements that contain several COO strategies, as defined by Aichner (2014). The COO markers that were used in this experiment are the "Made in" label, COO embedded in the company name and use of COO flags/symbols. Content analysis from Hornikx et al. (2020) showed that the explicit strategy "COO embedded in the company name" was most frequently used. Therefore, since explicitness and implicitness are not under scrutiny in the current research, only the explicit strategies as defined by Aichner (2014) were chosen in the current research.

Lastly, it needs to be emphasized that when the COO markers require the use of foreign language, English in advertisements is hardly seen as country of origin for England or the USA, since the use of English is rarely related to express specific English stereotypes (Piller, 2003; Gerritsen et al., 2007) and probably due to the fact that English is considered a global language (Alden, Steenkamp, and Batra, 1999). Therefore, the current research did not use English as a COO marker.

## Method

## Materials

The independent variables that are used in this experiment are: the number of COO markers in an advertisement, namely; no COO marker, one COO marker, two COO markers and three COO markers, and the familiarity of the brand, distinguishing between an advertisement from a familiar and an unfamiliar brand. Prior to conducting the actual experiment, two pre-tests were conducted for selecting the brand names. To test which brands were considered the most and least familiar among Dutch participants, several brands were selected. These pre-tests were conducted to make sure the brands that were considered familiar and unfamiliar in the research, were actually proven to be familiar or unfamiliar. The two brands that were considered the most familiar and unfamiliar among the participants, were used in the actual experiment. The pre-tests contained one inclusion criterium: the participants had to be Dutch native speakers. The participants were approached online and filled in the pre-test voluntarily, without any kind of reward. Firstly, a pre-test was conducted to examine which brand was considered to be most familiar and could therefore be used in the real experiment. In total, 21 participants filled in this pre-test; 12 of whom ( $57.1 \%$ ) were males. The age of the respondents ranged from 19 to 57 years ( $M=25.90, S D=10.59$ ). Furthermore, the participants were asked to indicate their highest completed educational level. For $42.9 \%$ this was 'Middelbare school' (secondary education), for $23.6 \%$ this was 'HBO' (Higher
professional education) and $33.3 \%$ completed 'Universiteit' (university). In Table 1, the demographics for the respondents of the pre-test can be found.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the participants in the pre-test

| Age - years (SD; range) | 25.90 | $(10.59 ; 19-57)$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender - \% male ( $n$ ) |  | 57.1 | $(12)$ |
| Education - \% ( $n$ ) |  |  |  |
|  | Secondary education <br> Higher professional <br> education <br> University | 42.9 | $(9)$ |
|  |  | 33.3 | $(5)$ |

The selected familiar brands in this pre-test were: Pringles, Zara, Desigual, Mango, Estrella, Stradivarius and Adolfo Domínguez. Since the COO of the actual research is Spain, these brands were chosen because all these brands are Spanish. The choice for Spanish brands was made because the researchers considered it to be a neutral country, and since the participants in the experiment were Dutch natives, the researchers expected no participants to be biased or have stereotypical ideas about the products and brands. To measure the familiarity of these brands, the participants were asked to what extent they were familiar with the brand, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from $1=$ 'Not familiar at all' to $5=$ 'Very familiar', and whether the respondents had ever bought something of this brand, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from $1=$ 'Never' to $5=$ 'Often'. Together, those scales were used to measure the familiarity of the participants with the brand. The questions can be found in Appendix A. These questions are based on research from Tse and Gom (1993), who state that familiarity is also influenced by whether consumers are likely to buy the product or not. These two questions were taken together to form a scale and in order to measure the reliability, a correlation was computed. This correlation showed a significant positive correlation was between the familiarity and previous purchases for both familiar $(r(21)=.78, p<.001)$ and unfamiliar brands $(r(15)=.85, p<.001)$. This means that when the unfamiliar brands get a little bit less unfamiliar, the consumers have bought something from that brand. To measure the difference in familiarity in the pre-test for familiar brands, a repeated measures ANOVA showed that the
level of familiarity differed significantly across the brands $(F(6,15)=37.80, p<.001)$. The objective of this pre-test was finding the two most familiar brands to choose for the main experiment.

Post hoc tests found that the familiarity for Pringles ( $M=3.81, S D=.58$ ) was not significantly higher than Zara ( $p=.265$, Bonferroni correction; $M=3.36, S D=.81$ ). The familiarity of Pringles was found to be significantly higher than Mango ( $p=.009$, Bonferroni correction; $M=2.81, S D=1.10$ ), Stradivarius ( $p<.001$, Bonferroni correction; $M=2.48, S D$ $=1.02$ ), Desigual ( $p<.001$, Bonferroni correction; $M=2.12, S D=.96$ ) Estrella ( $p<.001$, Bonferroni correction; $M=1.38, S D=.67$ ) and Adolfo Domínguez ( $p<.001$, Bonferroni correction; $M=1.31, S D=.58$ ). Zara was found to have the second highest score ( $M=3.36$, $S D=.81$ ), after Pringles, on familiarity. Post hoc tests found that the familiarity of Zara was marginally higher than Mango ( $p=.099$, Bonferroni correction; $M=2.81, S D=1.10$ ), and significantly higher than Stradivarius ( $p<.012$, Bonferroni correction; $M=2.48, S D=1.02$ ), Desigual ( $p<.001$, Bonferroni correction; $M=2.12, S D=.96$ ) Estrella ( $p<.001$, Bonferroni correction; $M=1.38, S D=.67$ ) and Adolfo Domínguez ( $p<.001$, Bonferroni correction; $M=$ $1.31, S D=.58)$.

Subsequently, a second pre-test was conducted to find unfamiliar brands for the experiment. Since Pringles (chips) and Zara (clothing) were the most familiar brands in the first pre-test, the researchers searched for unfamiliar chips brands and unfamiliar clothing brands to be used in the second pre-test, so the product categories would be the same in both the familiar and unfamiliar condition. The questions of this pre-test can be found in Appendix B. The second pre-test was conducted by the same participants who took part in the first pretest. Their participation in these pre-tests meant that they were excluded from the actual experiment, since they might be biased and possess prior knowledge about the subject. The second pre-test consisted of the following brands for chips; Ruffles, Frit Ravich and CrunChips. For the unfamiliar condition, the clothing brands were: Kusin, Mei Oliver and Noon. The same scales as in the first pre-test were used to measure the familiarity of the participants with the brand. Here, a repeated measures ANOVA showed that the level of familiarity did not differ significantly across the brands $(F(4,11)=1.427, \mathrm{p}=.289)$. Since there was no significant difference, the researchers randomly picked two brand names. Following these results, the main experiment used the chips brands Pringles and Frit Ravich and the clothing brands Zara and Noon. The advertisements were about a chips brand and a clothing brand, the chips advertisement was about the familiar brand Pringles and the unfamiliar brand Frit Ravich, whereas clothing advertisement contained the familiar brand

Zara and the unfamiliar brand Noon. These product categories were chosen because they were considered neutral, everyday products and the researchers wanted their participants to have a certain involvement with the products, therefore the choice has been made not to focus on luxury products.

## Participants

In total, 349 people responded to the online questionnaire. From those 349 participants, 96 were excluded, because they did not completely finish the survey, did not agree to the terms or conditions or were not Dutch native speakers. This led to a total of 253 valid participants, who were used for the main analyses.

Table 2 shows the demographic characteristics of the participants. From the 253 participants, 89 ( $35.2 \%$ ) were male. The age of the participants ranged from 16 to 79 years ( $M$ $=28.58, S D=13.03$ ). In addition, the participants were asked their highest completed level of education. For $34.0 \%$ of the participants, this was 'Middelbare school' (secondary education), for $9.5 \%$ of the participants, this was ' $\mathrm{MBO}^{\prime}$ ' (middle vocational education), for $22.1 \%$ this was 'HBO' (higher professional education) and $34.4 \%$ indicated they had completed 'Universiteit (university).

Table 2. Demographic characteristics.

| Age - years $(S D ;$ range $)$ | 28.58 | $(13.03 ; 16-79)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gender $-\%$ male $(n)$ | 35.2 | $(89)$ |
| Education $-\%(n)$ |  |  |
| $\quad$ Secondary education | 34.0 | $(86)$ |
| $\quad$ Middle vocational education $(\mathrm{MBO})$ | 9.5 | $(24)$ |
| $\quad$ Higher vocational education $(\mathrm{HBO})$ | 22.1 | $(56)$ |
| $\quad$ University | 34.4 | $(87)$ |

As can be seen in Table 2, only $35.2 \%$ of the participants was male and there were differences in the highest completed educational level. A Chi-square test showed no significant relation between the condition of the advertisement (familiar/unfamiliar brand; number of markers) and the gender of the participants $(\chi 2(7)=8.58, p=.284)$. This means that although there were more women than men in the research, the ratio of men and women was similar in all conditions.

Another Chi-square test showed no significant relation between the condition of the advertisement and the educational level of the participants ( $\chi 2(21)=17.22, p=.698$ ). This means that the level of education was similar in each condition. A one-way ANOVA showed also no significant difference between the different advertisements and age $(F(38,214)<1$ This means that there was no significant difference in age between the six conditions of the advertisements. Following these results, the conclusion can be made that all groups were equally distributed regarding gender, level of education and age.

## Design

The experiment was conducted using a $2 \times 4$ between-subjects design: brand familiarity; known - unknown and number of COO markers; No COO marker, one COO marker, two COO markers and three COO markers. Sixteen different advertisements were created; advertisements without a COO marker, with one COO marker, with two COO markers and with three COO markers for Pringles. Zara, Frit Ravich and Noon. In Table 3, the different conditions for the independent variables are shown. Each participant was exposed to a randomly assigned combination of advertisements of 2 of the 8 conditions.

Table 3. Distribution of the independent variables

|  | $\mathbf{1 ~ C O O}$ marker | $\mathbf{2 ~ C O O}$ <br> markers | $\mathbf{3 ~ C O O}$ <br> markers | No COO <br> markers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Familiar brand | 1 COO marker | 2 COO <br> markers | 3 COO markers | No COO |
| Unfamiliar | brarkers |  |  |  |

The independent variable 'number of COO markers in the ad' could be assigned one of four codes (no markers, one marker, two markers, three markers; nominal measurement level) and the variable 'brand familiarity' could be assigned one of two codes (familiar brand and unfamiliar brand; nominal measurement level). The dependent variable 'effectiveness of the ad' is split up into the components: Attitude towards the ad, attitude towards the product, attitude towards the brand and purchase intention.

## Instrumentation

The dependent variable that was measured was the effectiveness of the ad. This effectiveness was measured by means of attitude towards the ad, attitude towards the product, attitude towards the brand, purchase intention. After the participants were shown the advertisements, containing COO markers or not for a familiar or unfamiliar brand, they were asked to answer questions to measure the dependent variable. In total, 16 advertisements were created; each brand was advertised without a COO marker, with one marker, two markers and three markers. The advertisement with only one COO marker had the COO embedded in the company name; Pringles became 'Las Pringles', Zara changed to 'Zara Moda', Frit Ravich became 'Fritos Ravichos' and Noon turned into 'Noon Moda'. Subsequently, when two markers were present, a typical Spanish symbol, a bull and a 'toreador' were inserted in the chips advertisements, and a Spanish flag in the fashion advertisements. The third COO marker was the "Made in Spain" label. Figure 3 shows the Zara advertisement containing three COO markers. The questions that were asked to the participants can be found in Appendix C, all the advertisements can be found in Appendix D.


Figure 3. Zara advertisement with three COO markers; "Made in" label, COO embedded in company name and flag of the COO .

Scales were set up to measure the effectiveness more accurately, focusing on the previously mentioned aspects. These scales were operationalized by means of 7-point Likert scales. Scales were adopted and translated from Spears and Singh (2004). Attitude towards the advertisement was measured by means of six scale items, for instance whether the advertisement was perceived as "pleasant/unpleasant" or "artful/artless". Attitude towards the brand was measured by for instance "appealing/unappealing" and "good/bad". Lastly, the
purchase intention was measured by for instance: "I would definitely/definitely not buy this product" and "I would probably/probably not buy this product". The full scales that were used in the questionnaire can be found in Appendix C. The measurement of reliability of the scales for the chips brands and the clothing brands was done separately. The reliability of attitude towards the chips advertisement comprising six items was good: $\alpha=.81$, for attitude towards the chips brand comprising 5 items was good as well: $\alpha=.87$, and the reliability of purchase intention comprising 5 items was very good: $\alpha=.90$. For the clothing brands, the reliability of the attitude towards the ad comprising six items was good: $\alpha=.81$, the reliability of the attitude towards the brand comprising five items was good: $\alpha=.87$ and the reliability of purchase intention comprising five items was good as well: $\alpha=.89$. Consequently, the composite means could be calculated.

## Procedure

The participants took part in an online questionnaire in Dutch, using the survey program Qualtrics. The participants were contacted via e-mail and social media, by means of a link to the online questionnaire In the social media message and the e-mail, a little message was inserted about the experiment, explaining that students from Radboud University needed the respondents in order to successfully finish their bachelor thesis, and that the researchers were very grateful if people would take some time to fill in the online survey. Before starting the survey, a welcoming word was shown, including an explanation about the survey and the first questions of the questionnaire. In addition, participants were told that the participation was on a voluntarily basis and that the experiment could be stopped at any time, if desired. Subsequently, the participants were shown that the data of this experiment would be anonymously stored and available for other scientific purposes for the next 10 years, according to the guidelines of Radboud University. If a participant were to have any complaints or questions about the experiment, one could contact the thesis coordinator. Lastly, participants had to give consent to participate in the questionnaire. The first questions of the questionnaire were general questions about the characteristics of the participants; age, gender and level of education. All participants conducted the survey individually and followed the same procedure. The participants did not receive any kind of (financial) reward for completing the survey and there was no time limit for the participants to complete the survey. All participants were shown two advertisements, either from a familiar or unfamiliar brand, with or without COO markers. Under normal circumstances, it should take participants between 5 and 10 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

## Radboud University

## Statistical treatment

To analyze the data, a series of two-way ANOVAs and paired sample t-tests was used. To measure the reliability of the scales in the pre-test Pearson's correlation was used and to measure this reliability in the main experiment, a series of Cronbach's alpha was used.

## Results

Before running the main analysis, the differences within the components of the dependent variables were tested. A paired samples t-test showed a significant difference between the attitude towards the chips and clothing advertisement $(t(252)=8.47, p<.001)$, between the attitude towards the chips and clothing brand $(t(252)=4.08, p<.001)$ and between purchase intention for chips and clothing $(t(252)=3.75, p<.001)$. Therefore, the chips advertisements and the clothing advertisements were analyzed separately.

The results of the statistical tests analyzed the effects of the number of COO markers and the familiarity of the brand on the effectiveness of the advertisement are presented. In total, six two-way ANOVAs were conducted.

Firstly, a two-way analysis of variance for the chips advertisements with brand familiarity and number of COO markers as between subject factors showed no significant effect of brand familiarity on the attitude towards the $\operatorname{ad}(F(1,245)<1)$. The number of COO markers was found to have a significant main effect on the attitude towards the ad $(F(3,245)=9.45, p$ $<.001$ ). The assumption of equality of variance was violated here because Levene's test was significant. ${ }^{1}$ Attitude towards the advertisement was found to be significantly lower for advertisements without COO markers $(M=3.01, S D=.92)$ than for advertisements with two COO markers, ( $p=.002$, Bonferroni correction; $M=3.69, S D=1.12$ ) and advertisements with three COO markers ( $p<.001$, Bonferroni correction; $M=3.93$, $S D=1.24$ ). In addition, the post hoc test found that the attitude towards the ad was significantly lower for advertisements with one COO marker ( $M=3.29, S D=.91$ ) than advertisements with three COO markers ( $p=$ .005 , Bonferroni correction; $M=3.93, S D=1.24$ ) The interaction between brand familiarity and numbers of COO markers was not statistically significant $(F(3,245)<1)$. In Table 4, the means, standard deviations and $n$ for the attitude towards the ad can be found.

Table 4. Means, standard deviations and n for attitude towards the chips ad in function of brand familiarity and number of COO markers ( $1=$ low, $7=$ high )

| Brand familiarity | Number of COO markers | $M$ | $S D$ | $n$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Unfamiliar | No markers | 3.13 | 1.02 | 30 |
|  | 1 Marker | 3.35 | .98 | 32 |
|  | 2 Markers | 3.70 | .98 | 31 |

[^0]|  | 3 Markers | 3.97 | 1.19 | 31 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Familiar | Total | 3.54 | 1.08 | 124 |
|  | No markers | 2.88 | .81 | 32 |
|  | 1 Marker | 3.23 | .83 | 30 |
| Total | 2 Markers | 3.68 | 1.25 | 33 |
|  | 3 Markers | 3.89 | 1.30 | 34 |
|  | Total | 3.43 | 1.14 | 129 |
|  | No markers | 3.01 | .92 | 62 |
|  | 1 Marker | 3.29 | .91 | 62 |
|  | 2 Markers | 3.69 | 1.12 | 64 |
| 3 Markers | 3.93 | 1.24 | 65 |  |
|  | Total | 3.49 | 1.11 | 253 |

The two-way analysis of variance with brand familiarity and number of COO markers as between subject factors showed a significant effect of brand familiarity on the attitude towards the chips brand $(F(1,245)=43.55, p<.001)$. The familiar brand $(M=4.49, S D=$ 1.20) was shown to lead to a higher attitude towards the brand than the unfamiliar brand ( $M=$ $3.71, S D-1.05$ ). The number of COO markers was not found to have a significant main effect on attitude towards the brand $(F(3,245)=1.38, p=.248)$. The interaction between brand familiarity and numbers of COO markers was not statistically significant $(F(3,245)<1)$. In Table 5, the means, standard deviations and $n$ for the attitude towards the chips brand can be found.

Table 5. Means, standard deviations and n for attitude towards the chips brand in function of brand familiarity and number of COO markers ( $1=$ low, $7=$ high $)$

| Brand familiarity | Number of COO markers | $M$ | $S D$ | $n$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Unfamiliar | No markers | 3.11 | 1.12 | 30 |
|  | 1 Marker | 3.51 | 1.01 | 32 |
|  | 2 Markers | 3.71 | 1.17 | 31 |
|  | 3 Markers | 3.71 | .80 | 31 |


|  | Total | 3.51 | 1.05 | 124 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Familiar | No markers | 4.35 | .97 | 32 |
|  | 1 Marker | 4.51 | 1.00 | 30 |
| Total | 2 Markers | 4.50 | 1.45 | 33 |
|  | 3 Markers | 4.43 | 1.34 | 34 |
|  | Total | 4.49 | 1.34 | 129 |
|  | No markers | 3.75 | 1.21 | 62 |
|  | 1 Marker | 3.99 | 1.12 | 62 |
|  | 2 Markers | 4.12 | 1.37 | 64 |
|  | 3 Markers | 4.09 | 1.17 | 65 |
|  | Total | 3.99 | 1.11 | 253 |

A two-way analysis of variance with brand familiarity and number of COO markers as between subject factors showed a significant effect of brand familiarity on the purchase intention for chips $(F(1,245)=6.07, p=.014)$. The familiar brand $(M=3.65, S D=1.49)$ was shown to lead to a higher purchase intention than the unfamiliar brand $(M=3.20, S D=1.42)$. The number of COO markers was not found to have a significant main effect on the purchase intention ( $F$ $(3,245)<1)$. The interaction between brand familiarity and number of COO markers was not statistically significant $(F(3,245)<1)$ either. In Table 6 , the means, standard deviations and $n$ for purchase intention for chips can be found.

Table 6. Means, standard deviations and $n$ for purchase intention of chips in function of brand familiarity and number of COO markers ( $1=$ low, $7=$ high $)$

| Brand familiarity | Number of COO markers | $M$ | $S D$ | $n$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Unfamiliar | No markers | 3.02 | 1.55 | 30 |
|  | 1 Marker | 3.08 | 1.34 | 32 |
|  | 2 Markers | 3.28 | 1.47 | 31 |
|  | 3 Markers | 3.40 | 1.38 | 31 |
|  | Total | 3.20 | 1.42 | 124 |
| Familiar | No markers | 3.56 | 1.41 | 32 |


|  | 1 Marker | 3.71 | 1.54 | 30 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total | 2 Markers | 3.36 | 1.44 | 33 |
|  | 3 Markers | 3.97 | 1.56 | 34 |
|  | Total | 3.65 | 1.49 | 129 |
|  | No markers | 3.30 | 1.49 | 62 |
|  | 1 Marker | 3.38 | 1.46 | 62 |
| 2 Markers | 3.32 | 1.44 | 64 |  |
| 3 Markers | 3.70 | 1.49 | 65 |  |
|  | Total | 3.43 | 1.47 | 253 |

The following three ANOVAs reflect the results of the advertisements for the fashion brands. A two-way analysis of variance with brand familiarity and number of COO markers as between subject factors showed no significant effect of brand familiarity on the attitude towards the clothes advertisement $(F(1,245)<1)$ and no significant main effect of the number of COO markers on the attitude towards the clothes advertisement $(F(3,245)<1)$. The interaction between brand familiarity and number of COO markers was not statistically significant ( $F$ ( 3 ,
 ad can be found.

Table 7. Means, standard deviations and $n$ for attitude towards the fashion ad in function of brand familiarity and number of COO markers ( $1=$ low, $7=$ high $)$

| Brand familiarity | Number of COO markers | $M$ | $S D$ | $n$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Unfamiliar | No markers | 4.22 | .98 | 30 |
|  | 1 Marker | 4.37 | .92 | 32 |
|  | 2 Markers | 4.33 | 1.08 | 31 |
|  | 3 Markers | 4.21 | .84 | 31 |
| Familiar | Total | 4.28 | .95 | 124 |
|  | No markers | 4.49 | 1.03 | 32 |
|  | 1 Marker | 4.42 | 1.05 | 30 |


|  | 2 Markers | 4.04 | 1.25 | 33 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total | 3 Markers | 4.38 | .99 | 34 |
|  | Total | 4.33 | 1.09 | 129 |
|  | No markers | 4.36 | 1.01 | 62 |
|  | 1 Marker | 4.39 | .98 | 62 |
|  | 2 Markers | 4.18 | 1.17 | 64 |
| 3 Markers | 4.30 | .92 | 65 |  |
|  | Total | 4.31 | 1.02 | 253 |

Another two-way analysis of variance with brand familiarity and number of COO markers as between subject factors showed no significant effect of brand familiarity on the attitude towards the fashion brands $(F(1,245)=1.40, p=.238)$ and no significant main effect of number of COO markers on the attitude towards the fashion brands $(F(3,245)<1)$. The interaction between brand familiarity and number of COO markers was also not significant $(F(3,245)<$ 1). In Table 8, the means, standard deviations and $n$ for attitude towards the fashion brand can be found.

Table 8. Means, standard deviations and $n$ for attitude towards the fashion brand in function of brand familiarity and number of COO markers ( $1=$ low, $7=$ high $)$

| Brand familiarity | Number of COO markers | $M$ | $S D$ | $n$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Unfamiliar | No markers | 4.40 | .89 | 30 |
|  | 1 Marker | 4.38 | .75 | 32 |
|  | 2 Markers | 4.22 | .98 | 31 |
|  | 3 Markers | 4.23 | .89 | 31 |
|  | Total | 4.30 | .87 | 124 |
|  | No markers | 4.59 | 1.10 | 32 |
|  | 1 Marker | 4.56 | 1.19 | 30 |
|  | 2 Markers | 4.33 | 1.45 | 33 |
|  | 3 Markers | 4.37 | 1.13 | 34 |
|  | Total | 4.46 | 1.22 | 129 |


| Total | No markers | 4.50 | 1.00 | 62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 1 Marker | 4.46 | 1.00 | 62 |
|  | 2 Markers | 4.28 | 1.24 | 64 |
|  | 3 Markers | 4.30 | 1.01 | 65 |
|  | Total | 4.38 | 1.06 | 253 |

Lastly, a two-way analysis of variance with brand familiarity and number of COO markers as between subject factors showed no significant effect of brand familiarity on the purchase intention of the fashion brands $(F(1,245)<1)$, and no significant main effect of number of COO markers on the purchase intention $(F(3,245)<1)$. The assumption of equality of variance was violated because Levene's test was significant. ${ }^{2}$ The interaction between brand familiarity and number of COO markers was not statistically significant $(F(3,245)<1)$. In Table 9 , the means, standard deviations and $n$ for purchase intention for the fashion brand can be found.

Table 9. Means, standard deviations and $n$ for purchase intention for the fashion brand in function of brand familiarity and number of COO markers ( $1=$ low, $7=$ high $)$

| Brand familiarity | Number of COO markers | $M$ | $S D$ | $n$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Unfamiliar | No markers | 3.91 | 1.23 | 30 |
|  | 1 Marker | 3.89 | .90 | 32 |
|  | 2 Markers | 3.57 | 1.54 | 31 |
|  | 3 Markers | 3.74 | 1.09 | 31 |
|  | Total | 3.78 | 1.21 | 124 |
| Familiar | No markers | 3.96 | 1.38 | 32 |
|  | 1 Marker | 4.02 | .95 | 30 |
|  | 2 Markers | 3.68 | 1.40 | 33 |
|  | 3 Markers | 4.02 | 1.27 | 34 |
|  | Total | 3.92 | 1.26 | 129 |
| Total | No markers | 3.93 | 1.26 | 62 |
|  | 1 Marker | 3.95 | .92 | 62 |

[^1]| 2 Markers | 3.63 | 1.46 | 64 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 Markers | 3.89 | 1.19 | 65 |
| Total | 3.85 | 1.23 | 253 |

## Conclusion

After conducting all the analyses for the experiment, interpreting the different variables, the research question; "To what extent do the familiarity of a brand and the number of COO markers present influence the effectiveness of an advertisement, in terms of attitude towards the ad, attitude towards the product, attitude towards the brand and purchase intention?" can be answered. The results showed that for the chips advertisement, the number of COO markers had an effect on the attitude towards the ad. When there were no COO markers present in the advertisement, the attitude towards the ad was significantly lower than when two or three markers were used. Furthermore, when one marker was used, the attitude towards the ad was significantly lower than when three COO markers were used. In addition, the familiarity of the brand positively influenced the attitude towards the brand; the familiar brand showed a higher attitude towards the brand than the unfamiliar brand. The same was found for the purchase intention of chips; advertisements of the familiar brand Pringles led to a higher purchase intention than advertisements of the unfamiliar brand Frit Ravich. The number of COO markers did not influence the attitude towards the brand and the purchase intention. The effect of number of COO markers was not influenced by the familiarity of the brand.

Subsequently, the results for the fashion advertisement did not show any effects. This means that for these advertisements, there were no differences in attitude towards the ad, towards the brand and purchase intention, regardless of whether the brand was familiar or unfamiliar, and the number of COO markers in the advertisement, nor did they influence one and another.

Thus, the answer to the research question is; for chips advertisement, the effectiveness of an advertisement is influenced by the number of COO markers regarding the attitude towards the ad, and by the familiarity of the brand regarding the attitude towards the brand and the purchase intention. Concludingly, multiple COO markers (i.e. two or three) led to a higher attitude towards the advertisement than no or one COO marker. Familiar brands led to a better attitude towards the brand and a higher purchase intention than unfamiliar brands. For advertisements about fashion, neither the number of COO markers nor the brand familiarity significantly influenced the effectiveness of the advertisement.

## Discussion

As mentioned in the conclusion, the number of COO markers and the brand familiarity only partly influenced the effectiveness of the advertisements. This research showed that when chips were advertised, using multiple COO markers (i.e. two or three markers) increased the attitude towards the ad. This is in line with previous research conducted by Aichner (2014) and Peterson and Jolibert (1995) who found that the use of COO markers can be an effective and successful tool to influence the attitude. However, the current study showed that this was only the case when advertising chips and using two or three COO markers, the use of one COO marker turned out to be less effective than the use of three COO markers within one advertisement. Hornikx et al. (2020) showed that the majority of advertisements in Cosmopolitan magazine that include COO markers, contained only one COO marker. It could be interesting to investigate in future research whether these advertisements will be more effective when two other COO markers are added. The attitude towards the brand and the purchase intention for chips were influenced by the brand familiarity; familiar brands led to a higher attitude and purchase intention than unfamiliar brands. This coincides with previous research, conducted by Campbell and Keller (2003). According to their research, prior familiarity with a brand increases the effectiveness of the advertisement in general. In addition, Campbell and Keller (2003) showed that the attitude towards the familiar brand was higher than towards the unfamiliar brand. The current research also showed that the purchase intention for chips was influenced by brand familiarity, but the results in the current research showed no evidence that the number of COO markers enhanced the purchase intention. This contradicts with previous research conducted by Hornikx and colleagues (2020) and Aichner (2014), who found that the COO positively influences the product evaluations. A possible explanation for this might be explained by Leclerc and colleagues (1994) who found that the product evaluation is more positive when the products origin from a country which is known for high-quality products. The current research included chips and fashion brands, which are not considered high-quality, luxury products. In addition, Leclerc and co-workers (1994) found that when the COO is strong, there is a greater chance the product gets purchased, since it is considered to be of high quality. Thus, Spain might not be a strong COO for chips and fashion brands, which could have caused the missing effect of COO markers on the purchase intention. In future research, chips and fashion brands with another COO could be tested to show whether the results will be similar to the results of the current research.

## Radboud University

The attitude towards the brand and purchase intention for chips were not influenced by the number of COO markers. A possible explanation for the missing effect could be that chips is incongruent with the country of origin, and therefore does not increase the effectiveness of the advertisement (Hornikx et al., 2103). Another possible explanation could be that the COO markers in the current research were not in the right context, and therefore lost their effects (Peterson and Jolibert, 1995). More drastically, it could be the case that the COO markers are not effective at all, as shown in the automobile study conducted by Johnsson et al. (1985). However, previous research found that using COO markers should positively influence the purchase intention (Aichner, 2014; Peterson and Jolibert, 1995). This effect has not been found in the current research. Therefore, it is interesting for future research whether this effect can be found when advertising other brands than chips and fashion, possibly inclding other countries of origin.

Furthermore, the current research showed no effects of the number of COO markers and brand familiarity on the effectiveness of advertisements about fashion brands. It is not completely clear why those results were not significant at all, but a possible explanation might be that $65 \%$ of the participants were female. The results showed that the attitude towards the ad, the brand and the purchase intention in this research was higher for the fashion brands than for the chips brand. Therefore, it might be the case that women in the experiment were more attracted to clothes, and might have partly neglected the influence of the COO markers.

This study chose to take the explicit strategies as designed by Aichner (2014). In total, Aichner (2014) designed eight strategies of COO markers. In future research, the same variables as in the current research could be investigated, to examine whether the results will be comparable when implicit strategies of COO markers are used, such as the use of celebrities or typical landscapes of the COO in the advertisements. The reason that the current research chose the explicit strategies was based on the content analysis conducted by Hornikx et al. (2020) who found that the explicit strategies are the most frequently used. Therefore, it is interesting to find out whether implicit strategies could influence the effectiveness of advertisements similarly to the explicit strategies.

This study has limitations. Firstly, this experiment only looked at the influence of COO markers and brand familiarity on chips and fashion brands. Those brands were chosen by the researchers because products from these brands are familiar to a large audience, which makes it an everyday product and people tend to have a certain involvement with those products, which is why luxury products were not chosen. However, using other brands and products than used in the current research might have yielded entirely different outcomes. In
addition, participants might have had a prior opinion of the chips and clothing brands, which could have made them biased. This might have influenced their attitude and purchase intention, which also is an interesting aspect to examine in future research. Another limitation is that participants had unlimited time to fill in the questionnaire, resulting in participants who took over 30 hours. These participants probably stepped away from the questionnaire and completed it a day later. This does not necessarily influence the results, but in future research there might be inserted a certain time limit to prevent people from stepping away from the questionnaire.

This research has been conducted to measure the effects of COO markers and brand familiarity on the effectiveness of advertisement. This study found that for a certain product category, these variables do contribute to the effectiveness of the advertisements, which is in line with previous research. However, this is not the case for all brands advertised. In future research, it might be interesting to conduct more analyses including more brands to investigate the effects of those markers and the brand familiarity on more brands than chips and fashion only. Based on the results of this experiment, marketeers of chips brands should include COO markers when trying to enhance the attitude towards the advertisement, possibly resulting in higher purchase intention. This is definitely the case for familiar chips brands, whereas unfamiliar brands are generally remembered less than familiar brands (Campbell and Keller, 2003), which generally makes it more difficult for these unfamiliar brands to distinguish themselves from the familiar brands. On the contrary, marketeers for fashion brands should find another way to effectively advertise their brands, since this research showed that the use of COO markers did not positively influence the effectiveness of the advertisements.
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Appendix A - Pre-test familiar brands

## BA Thesis COO markers pre-test familiar brands

## Bedankt voor uw bereidheid om deel te nemen aan dit onderzoek. INFORMATIE EN TOESTEMMING

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

## Wat wordt er van u verwacht?

Meedoen aan het onderzoek houdt in dat u een online vragenlijst gaat invullen. De vragen hebben betrekking op een tekst waarin een bepaalde ziekte wordt beschreven. Het invullen van de vragenlijst kost ongeveer 5 minuten.

## Vrijwilligheid

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

## Wat gebeurt er met mijn gegevens?

De onderzoeksgegevens die we in dit onderzoek verzamelen, zullen door wetenschappers gebruikt worden voor datasets, artikelen en presentaties. De anoniem gemaakte onderzoeksgegevens zijn tenminste 10 jaar beschikbaar voor andere wetenschappers. Als we gegevens met andere onderzoekers delen, kunnen deze dus niet tot $u$ herleid worden. We bewaren alle
onderzoeksgegevens op beveiligde wijze volgens de richtlijnen van de Radboud Universiteit.
Heeft u vragen of klachten over het onderzoek?
Als u meer informatie over het onderzoek wilt hebben of klachten heeft over het onderzoek, kunt u contact opnemen met dr. B. Hilderink-Schulpen.

## TOESTEMMING:

Geef hieronder uw keuze aan. Door te klikken op de knop 'Ik ga akkoord' geeft u aan dat u:
= Bovenstaande informatie heeft gelezen

- Vrijwillig meedoet aan het onderzoek
- 16 aar of ouder bent.
_Als u niet mee wilt doen aan het onderzoek, kunt u op de knop 'lk wil niet meedoen' klikken. De enquête zal dan worden afgesloten.Ik ga akkoord (doorgaan met vragenlijst) (1)Ik wil niet meedoen (2)

Is Nederlands uw moedertaal?Ja (1)Nee (2)

Wat is uw geslacht?Man (1)Vrouw (2)Zeg ik liever niet (3)

## Wat is uw leeftijd?

Wat is uw hoogst voltooide opleiding ?Basisschool (1)Middelbare school (2)MBO (3)HBO (4)Universiteit (5)

Met de volgende vragen willen we vaststellen hoe bekend bepaalde merken voor u zijn.

Geef aan in hoeverre u bekend bent met dit merk.


Ik heb al ooit iets gekocht van dit merk.


Waar denkt u dat dit merk vandaan komt?

3

Hoe zeker bent u van uw keuze?
Helemaal niet

Niet zeker (2)
Neutraal (3)
Zeker (4)
Heel zeker (5)

Ik ben (1)
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## Appendix B - Pre-test unfamiliar brands

## BA Pre-test unfamiliar brands

## Bedankt voor uw bereidheid om deel te nemen aan dit onderzoek. INFORMATIE EN TOESTEMMING

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

## Wat wordt er van u verwacht?

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

## Vrijwilligheid

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

## Wat gebeurt er met mijn gegevens?

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

## Heeft u vragen of klachten over het onderzoek?

Als u meer informatie over het onderzoek wilt hebben of klachten heeft over het onderzoek, kunt u contact opnemen met dr. B. Hilderink-Schulpen.

TOESTEMMING: Geef hieronder uw keuze aan. Door te klikken op de knop 'lk ga akkoord' geeft u aan dat u:

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

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

Ik ga akkoord (doorgaan met vragenlijst)

Ik wil niet meedoen

Is Nederlands uw moedertaal?Ja (1)Nee (2)

Wat is uw geslacht?Man (1)Vrouw (2)Zeg ik liever niet (3)

Wat is uw leeftijd?

Wat is uw hoogst voltooide opleiding ?Basisschool (1)Middelbare school (2)MBO (3)HBO (4)Universiteit (5)

Met de volgende vragen willen we vaststellen hoe bekend bepaalde merken voor u zijn. Geef aan in hoeverre u bekend bent met dit merk


Ik heb al ooit iets gekocht van dit merk.

|  | Nooit (1) | Bijna nooit (2) | Soms (3) | Regelmatig (4) | Vaak (5) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ruffles (1) |  |  |  |  |  |

Waar denkt u dat dit merk vandaan komt?

4

Hoe zeker bent u van uw keuze?
Helemaal niet
zeker (1) $\quad$ Niet zeker (2) $\quad$ Neutraal (3) $\quad$ Zeker (4) zeker (5)

[^3]
## Appendix C - Qualtrics questionnaire

## Questionnaire BA Thesis

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

## INFORMATIE EN TOESTEMMING

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

## Wat wordt er van u verwacht?

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

## Vrijwilligheid

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

## Wat gebeurt er met mijn gegevens?

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

## Heeft u vragen of klachten over het onderzoek?

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

TOESTEMMING: Geef hieronder uw keuze aan .Door te klikken op de knop 'Ik ga akkoord' geeft u aan dat u:

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

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

Ik ga akkoord (doorgaan met vragenlijst)

Ik wil niet meedoen

Is Nederlands uw moedertaal?Ja (1)Nee (2)

## Wat is uw geslacht?

Man (1)Vrouw (2)Zeg ik liever niet (3)Wat is uw leeftijd?
$\qquad$

Wat is uw hoogst voltooide opleiding?Basisschool (1)Middelbare school (2)MBO (3)HBO (4)Universiteit (5)

U krijgt zometeen twee verschillende reclames te zien. Na iedere reclame vragen wiju om een aantal vragen te beantwoorden. Als u de vragen over de eerste advertentie heeft beantwoord, wordt u doorverwezen naar de tweede advertentie.

Bij het beantwoorden van deze vragen zijn wij geïnteresseerd in uw mening. Dit betekent dat er geen goede of foute antwoorden zijn, maar dat wij simpelweg benieuwd zijn wat u van de advertenties vindt.

## Attitude towards the ad:

Ik vind deze advertentie:

|  | 1 (1) | 2 (2) | 3 (3) | 4 (4) | 5 (5) | 6 (6) | 7 (7) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Niet prettig |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | Prettig |
| Niet aangenaam |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  | Aangenaam |
| Interessant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Saai |
| Smakeloos |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Smaakvol |
| Niet artistiek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Artistiek |
| Slecht |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Goed |

## Attitude towards the brand:

Ik vind dit merk:

|  | 1 (1) | 2 (2) | $3(3)$ | 4 (4) | 5 (5) | 6 (6) | 7 (7) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Niet aantrekkelijk | $)$ | ) | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | Aantrekkelijk |
| Slecht |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | Goed |
| Prettig |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Niet prettig |
| Niet gunstig |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Gunstig |
| Niet aangenaam |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Aangenaam |

## Purchase intention:

In hoeverre bent u geïnteresseerd in dit product:

|  | 1 (1) | 2 (2) | 3 (3) | 4 (4) | 5 (5) | 6 (6) | 7 (7) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ik zou dit product nooit kopen | $\bigcirc$ | O | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ | Ik zou dit product zeker kopen |
| Ik ben zeker niet van plan om dit product te kopen | ) | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | Ik ben zeker van plan om dit product te kopen |
| Ik heb interesse om dit product te kopen | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | Ik heb geen interesse om dit product te kopen |
| Ik zou dit product zeker niet kopen | ) | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ | Ik zou dit product zeker kopen |
| Ik zou dit product waarschijnlijk niet kopen | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | Ik zou dit product waarschijnlijk wel kopen |

Appendix D - Advertisements:
Pringles, 0 COO markers

## HET VEGHTEN WAARD



Pringles, 2 COO markers


Pringles, 1 COO marker


Pringles, 3 COO markers

HET VEGHTEN WAARD


Frit Ravich, 0 COO markers


Frit Ravich, 2 COO markers


Frit Ravich, 1 COO marker


Frit Ravich, 3 COO markers


Zara, 0 COO markers


Zara, 2 COO markers


Zara, 1 COO marker


Zara, 3 COO markers


Noon, 0 COO markers


Noon, 2 COO markers


Noon, 1 COO marker


Noon, 3 COO markers



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ It is beyond the scope of this bachelor thesis to use alternative statistics.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ It is beyond the scope of this bachelor thesis to use alternative statistics.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Participants were asked this question for all 7 familiar brands, but for practical reasons, not all of these questions were inserted into the appendix

[^3]:    ${ }^{4}$ Participants were asked this question for all 6 unfamiliar brands, but for practical reasons, not all of these questions were inserted into the appendix

