The effect of using stereotypical and non-stereotypical landscapes in tourism advertisements.

Iris Faassen

S4791746

First supervisor: Dr Ulrike Nederstigt

Second assessor: Dr Laura Speed

MA International Business Communication

MA Thesis

Radboud University

2019-2020

Radboud Universiteit

Abstract

The issue of mass tourism and the negative consequences it has on touristic hotspots have been important issues receiving increasing attention. Initiatives have been trying to reduce the stream of tourists to hotspots like Amsterdam and Barcelona. Focusing on less familiar landscapes might reduce this stream of mass tourism. This study examines the use of stereotypical and non-stereotypical landscapes in tourism advertisements, its recognition and the effect it has on the evaluation of these advertisements. In an online experiment, 109 Dutch participants evaluated six advertisements. For three types of holiday, a beach holiday, an active holiday and a city trip, the participants were shown one stereotypical and one non-stereotypical landscape. The results showed that non-stereotypical landscapes were less recognized than stereotypical landscapes and that recognition had a significant effect on the evaluation of the advertisements. In general, participants preferred the stereotypical landscapes over the non-stereotypical landscapes, especially when the advertisement matched the holiday motivation of the participant. For advertisements that did not match the preferred type of holiday, the non-stereotypical landscape often received a more positive evaluation than the stereotypical landscape. For offices of tourism who wish to portray and promote holiday destinations that are less familiar to potential tourists, the key is to create knowledge and familiarize the tourist with the non-stereotypical landscape. More knowledge might lead to better recognition and a potential visit as end-goal. According to the findings of this study, one single advertisement with a non-stereotypical landscape is unlikely to achieve a better distribution of tourists and a reduction of mass tourism. However, a large promotion campaign based on these non-stereotypical landscapes could work to reduce mass tourism and create more familiarity with alternative touristic sites.

Keywords: tourism advertising, mass tourism, landscape stereotypes, recognition

The effect of using stereotypical and non-stereotypical landscapes in tourism advertisements.

Over the years, tourism has changed globally into the phenomenon of mass tourism. The popular hotspots attract more and more tourists every year. Besides the positive effects on a country's economy because of the large expenditure of tourists, the stream of mass tourism is also leading to increasingly more critique and problems, as cities, for example, can no longer function under the large pressure of tourists. Cities, regions and countries are becoming more aware of the importance of sustainable tourism and are trying to spread the stream of tourism to lower the impact it has on the destination. For example in Amsterdam, day trips are promoted to Bloemendaal and the countryside of North-Holland, to reduce the number of tourists in Amsterdam and consequently reduce the pressure on the city centre.

Advertisements that attract tourists often include the most known and stereotypical landscapes and architecture or activities of a particular region or country. Whereas stereotypes about people and habits are often exaggerated from reality, are stereotypical landscapes often the reality. Stereotypical landscapes are likely used as tourists might easily recognize the touristic destination that is promoted. Imagine commercials with green grass-covered mountains during Austrian summer, the little white and blue houses on the Greek islands or the Dutch windmills, all very recognizable sceneries. However, when spreading the stream of tourists, it is important to focus on the less known and less stereotypical landscapes and activities of a country or region. The goal would be to create more awareness of other noteworthy activities and touristic attractions.

Insights into the use of landscape stereotypes can be highly interesting for ministries and offices of tourism to see if non-stereotypical landscapes could attract tourists to the less familiar touristic destinations. These institutions are constantly promoting destinations and with knowledge on the functioning of stereotypes in advertisements, these promotions could turn out to be more efficient. This study aims to test the use of national stereotypes in tourism advertisements, its effects on the advertisements and whether consumers recognize the portrayed landscapes.

1. Theoretical framework

1.1. Advertising and COO

An advertisement can be defined as any paid means of communication whose sender is known to the receiver. The goal of advertising is to persuade the receiver into buying a certain product or

service. Advertisements for foreign-based products often use cues to stress the country-of-origin (COO) of the products. For many of these advertisements, the portrayed COO is often not the actual country of manufacture but likely used for the positive associations that consumers might have concerning the portrayed COO. These associations are then linked to the advertised product (Aichner, 2014). The COO is a signal for product quality and directly influences purchase intention (Koschate-Fischer, Diamantopoulos, & Oldenkotte, 2012). To illustrate, Grand'Italia is a brand that, based on its name, could be considered to be originating from Italy, yet the brand is Dutch and its products are produced in the Netherlands (GB Foods, 2020). The name, Grand'Italia, could evoke associations about Italian holidays and good Italian food. These positive thoughts are then linked to Grand'Italia's products and their product quality (Piller, 2003).

The use of a brand name that is easily linked to a particular country, is one of the eight strategies Aichner (2014) describes to use COO-markers to evoke corresponding feelings and thoughts between the product and its COO. Roughly, these strategies can be divided into three types. The first concerns the use of (foreign) language, like the brand name Grand'Italia, or SwissAir. The second type of strategies focuses on the use of national flags and symbols, which are, alongside language, cues that explicitly depict the COO (Aichner, 2014). In contrast, the third type consists of implicit strategies that use stereotypical people, landscapes or architecture. These strategies indirectly inform the consumer on the COO, by elaborating on consumers' prior knowledge and existing beliefs concerning the characteristics and behaviour of certain national groups (Hilton & von Hippel, 1996). Therefore, stereotypes connect the product to its perceived COO, copying the existing associations one has of the country to the advertised product. As this strategy makes use of existing knowledge, establishing the link between the product and COO could go wrong if one does not have this prior knowledge or does not recognize the country or stereotypes.

The above strategies to indicate the COO (Aichner, 2014) and their effects (Koschate-Fischer et al., 2012) are essentially related to product advertisements, in which the product and the country are two different constructs. In contrast to product advertisements, tourism advertisements promote a country that is both the product and the COO. The distinction between the construct of the product and the construct of the COO is, therefore, less demarcated. Due to this difference in construct explicitness between regular product advertisements and tourism advertisements, the findings on product advertising are possibly limited in generalizability to tourism advertisements.

1.2. Stereotypes

Stereotypes can function as COO-markers but differ from other types of COO-markers, like the markers discussed above, the use of national flags, symbols and language, which are merely used in advertisements to highlight a certain origin. In contrast, stereotypes are also used outside advertisements, for example in communication. They are a "set of mental representations of the world around us" (Gilman, 1985, p. 16), i.e., standardized images concerning habits, people or countries. Most of the stereotypes exist about people and their social role within a particular group, like Germans and Irish liking to drink beer or African Americans who are considered to be noisy and musical (Madon et al., 2001). The construction of stereotypes is both an individual and a collectivistic process. Collectivistic as individuals learn and copy stereotypes that others already have, however individual experiences also play a significant role in the construction of stereotypes (Augoustinos & Walker, 1998). A distinction should be made between stereotypes, which are the representations of groups, and stereotyping, which is the cognitive activity of applying stereotypes (Augoustinos & Walker, 1998). There are different approaches to what stereotypes are and how they are used. Firstly, based on the social categorization theory, stereotypes are cognitive schemas that categorize individuals into groups, to simplify reality. This categorization is based on individuals' most salient and recognizable features, which are cognitively stored in the mind and then linked to a particular group (Augoustinos & Walker, 1998; Macrae, Milne, & Bodenhausen, 1994). For scenery, this is likely to function similarly based on key features of the region. Furthermore, stereotypes can be looked at in light of the self-categorization theory, which states that stereotypes are true psychological representations of the characteristics of the inter-group. Moreover, stereotypes could also be seen as social and ideological representations of individuals and groups (Augoustinos & Walker, 1998). Augoustinos and Walker (1998) state that the central idea of all theories includes the categorization of people and countries in how they are socially perceived. Landscape stereotypes could most logically be seen in light of the social categorization theory, focusing on the key features and associated activities.

Stereotypes play a significant role in first impressions of people considered different from the in-group members, as these are often constructed using stereotypical thoughts, which are found to be involved when forming social relations (Pickering, 2001). Stereotypes also have a crucial role in the construction of first impressions since they guide one's behaviour and cognition. If these stereotypes change from being a guideline into the primary reason for acting in a certain way or

when the generalizations are expressed publicly, the act of stereotyping changes from being a justified guideline into an unjustified negative act (Beeghly, 2015), including discrimination and prejudice. Stereotyping people and their habits often seem to be placed in a negative light. The combination of stereotypes and social categorization can lead to a tendency for ingroup preference and outgroup bias (Tajfel, 2001). The outgroup members are then considered to be more homogenous than they are in reality (Linville & Jones, 1980). That is to say, they are considered to be all the same, which is the central idea of stereotyping. Often, the stereotype itself is not bad, but the way it is used in society is (Beeghly, 2015; Schneider, 2005). One could argue that the main cause of the unjustified use of stereotypes lies in the neglection of people as individuals and merely seeing them as part of a social group.

A crucial point to make is the dynamic nature of stereotypes that address people and their habits, as research has shown that stereotypes are not always robust to change (Gilman, 1985; Karlins, Coffman, & Walters, 1969; Madon et al., 2001). The Princeton trilogy, a set of studies on stereotypes, was originally performed by Katz and Braly (1933) and later revised by Gilbert (1951), Karlins and colleagues (1969) and Madon and colleagues (2001). The studies focused on stereotype content and the degree of agreement between Princeton students concerning the stereotypes they assigned to certain ethnic and national groups. In the first study by Katz and Braly (1933), a large agreement in content between these stereotypes was found, this was later confirmed by Gilbert (1951). But in Gilbert's study (1951), the degree of agreement of the assigned stereotypes had increased, which meant that the national groups were more often confronted with their stereotype. A revised study by Karlins et al. (1969) found opposing results. This study revealed that the content of the stereotypes had changed, but the consensus had not.

Several years later, Madon et al. (2001) again revised the Princeton study, including more stereotypical attributions for the 10 national and ethnic groups. Findings revealed that the content of the national stereotypes had changed over time, the participants were likely to assign one of the renewed attributes to the national and ethnic groups, which were generally more favourable. Furthermore, the consensus on these stereotypical thoughts had also changed. The degree of agreement between the participants was higher in Madon et al.'s study in 2001 as compared to the first study in 1933 by Katz and Braly. This meant that national and ethnic groups were more often confronted with the stereotypical thoughts others had concerning their behaviour, yet these

thoughts were more positive than in previous studies, as the attributions were more favourable (Madon et al., 2001).

This shift in content and consensus of stereotypes was seen in a timeframe of 60 years. Therefore, it is plausible that these stereotypes have once again changed in the past 20 years, due to further technological and social development and the rise of mass media. Certainly, compared to 1933, consumers nowadays have more cross-cultural contact and are therefore more familiar with other national or ethnic groups. As a result of this increased familiarity and contact, stereotypes could change in content (Pettigrew, Tropp, Wagner, & Christ, 2011). Moreover, interpersonal contact is likely to influence stereotyping on a more individual level, possibly leading to a lower degree of agreement.

Madon et al. (2001) also found a difference in assigned stereotypes between participants from European American and non-European American origin. Out of the ten different national and ethnic groups, merely three received a similar stereotype from both samples, Germans, Irish and Americans. The other national and ethnic groups were given different stereotypes by the European American and non-European American sample. This illustrates that nationality matters when assigning stereotypes.

The Princeton studies focused on the dynamism of stereotypes that address people and their habits. In contrast, tourism advertisements use landscapes which only change little over time. This would mean that stereotypes addressing landscapes and sceneries are robust to change. It could be said that not the stereotype of the landscape is changing, yet the thoughts that are linked to these landscapes change. Moreover, tourism itself has changed over the years. Several decades ago, one holiday per year was the norm, whereas nowadays, this is rather the exception than the norm. In general, tourism has grown (CBS, 2017a), flights have become cheaper and tourists retrieve more knowledge about all kinds of destinations by using the internet.

1.3. Effectiveness of stereotypes

Stereotype content can differ across cultures and nations (Madon et al., 2001) and therefore could influence the effectiveness of using stereotypes in advertisements (Heslop & Papadopoulos, 1993; Narayana, 1981). Besides being dependent on nationality, the content might also be largely dependent on the interaction and familiarity with the stereotyped object (Chattalas, Kramer, & Takada, 2008). Familiarity on an individual level could be highly influential on the stereotype that

is assigned. Personal positive experiences are likely to lead to a more favourable stereotype, whereas negative experiences could lead to more negative and possibly also discriminating stereotype. Spain might be a good example to illustrate the effect of familiarity with a country and what stereotype content is expected. For adult Dutch tourists, Spain is likely to be considered perfect for a sun-drenched and relaxing vacation, alternating with city trips for a more culturally-focused vacation. Yet, young adults visit Spain more for its festivities and parties. For both groups, the stereotypical image of a holiday in Spain is generally one that includes the sun. However, the Sierra Nevada mountains, located in the south of Spain, are a perfect destination for a hiking and trekking holiday. Spain is possibly not considered often for a hiking vacation for its warm climate. Besides the famous Camino de Santiago, Dutch tourists might not even be familiar with the ample offer of trails throughout the country. Therefore, the Dutch view of a stereotypical holiday in Spain might not include a hiking-vacation. Hence, Dutch tourists might not expect an advertisement to be focused on hiking and trekking. A hiking-vacation advertisement is therefore likely to be less effective for Dutch tourists than a sun-vacation advertisement. The familiarity with the stereotype could influence the effectiveness and evaluation of an advertisement.

As stated, stereotype content could influence the effectiveness of its use and consequently might influence the consumers' evaluations of the advertised product or destination. Moreover, personal motivation for a vacation possibly also influences the effectiveness of an advertisement. Advertisements on relaxing vacations will not be as effective for tourists who prefer an active vacation as for tourists who prefer a passive beach vacation. Effectiveness of the advertisement is likely to be measured with perceived product quality, attitudes towards the advertisement and country and visit and information intention. The penultimate, visiting intention, is likely to be similar to purchase intention (See Verlegh & Steenkamp, 1999 for an overview).

1.4. Tourism advertising

Most studies have focused on advertisements that link countries to certain tangible products. A different type of advertising is tourism advertising, in which the product and associated country are similar. These types of advertisements promote 'products', which are holidays and touristic destinations. An example of a tourism advertisement is a commercial broadcasted by the Turkish

Ministry of Culture and Tourism[1] to promote Turkey as a holiday destination for future tourists. The product that is promoted is Turkey. At the same time, Turkey is also the advertiser. Tourist advertisements are likely to use stereotypical imagery to promote a destination. Any stereotypical thought about a country, here Turkey, is directly linked to the country seen as a holiday destination, i.e. a Turkish holiday which is the 'product'. Commercials like the Turkish one, promote a country or region in general, in contrast to advertisements that are distributed by a particular hotel chain, travel agency or specific location.

Countries and regions invest in tourism advertising as it has shown to be positively influencing the visits to a particular country. During these visits, tourists spend money on accommodation, living and activities. In 2019, Dutch tourists spent up to 90 euros a day during their vacations in Europe (CBS, 2018). More visits thus lead to higher revenues in the tourist sector, which in turn favours the country's economy. The consumers' choice for a particular destination is likely to depend on the image one has about that country, the activities that are offered and the motivation to go on vacation. According to the Dutch central office for statistics (CBS), the three favourite activities and reasons to go on a vacation abroad are the beach, visiting cities and activities like hiking and mountain biking (CBS, 2018). Furthermore, in 2017, Dutch tourists were likely to be found in the top 6 European vacation destinations: Germany, France, Spain, Italy, Belgium or Greece (CBS, 2017b). This trend was expected to continue in 2020 (TUI, 2019)[2]. Some countries are more popular for certain types of vacation than others. For example, Spain is a country that is particularly known for its beaches and Mediterranean climate. Belgium or Austria, on the other hand, are possibly more known among tourists who enjoy an active holiday with hiking and mountain biking. And Germany and the UK are likely more popular for city trips to Berlin or London. Offices of tourism are likely to use tourists' holiday motivations in the promotion of their country. Many of the tourism advertisements, therefore, use typical and recognizable scenes, like the Spanish sea and beaches and the Austrian mountains. Using images of the most known hotspots possibly attracts tourists to these hotspots, which could lead to an increase of mass tourism. To prevent this, countries regularly offer supplementary activities that are less stereotypical. For example, a holiday at the Costa Brava in Spain can be a perfect combination of relaxing at the

[1] English version of the commercial: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P6lt7PKTk7I
[2] This was the expectation prior to the Covid-19 pandemic. Due to the outbreak of the virus, governments highly discouraged travelling.

beach and going on city trips to Girona or lesser-known cities like Pals or Llafranc. A holiday in Spain is then a combination of a stereotypical beach holiday and city trips, which means that tourism offices could use multiple stereotypes in their advertisements to attract tourists. The question rises whether offices of tourism should focus on one familiar activity and landscape or use a larger variety of activities the destination has to offer.

The goal of tourism advertising is not merely stimulating visits to a particular destination, it also includes introducing the location as a potential holiday destination and creating a positive destination image (Bojanic, 1991). The awareness of a location as a possible holiday destination and the positive image that is associated with it could then lead to a preference for a particular location with an actual visit as end-goal (Bojanic, 1991; Kim, Hwang, & Fesenmaier, 2005). This is especially important for less stereotypical destinations that need promotion for tourists to become familiar with them. Kim and colleagues (2005) also found that potential tourists who requested information about a particular destination were three times more likely to visit the holiday destination. This direct link between information request and the number of visits can be of high importance for offices of tourism who wish to decrease mass tourism by promoting less stereotypical destinations.

1.5. Research questions

Since it appears that no research has yet been performed on the effect of national landscape stereotypes in tourism advertisements, this study aims to do so. The first goal of this study addresses the recognition of landscape stereotypes as such. It could be hypothesized that the stereotypical stereotypes are recognized more often than the non-stereotypical ones. This will be answered in the first research question:

RQ1: To what extent does the Dutch consumer recognize stereotypical and non-stereotypical landscapes in tourism advertisements?

A second goal is to examine whether the use of national landscape stereotypes influences the evaluation of tourism advertisements. A distinction is made between stereotypical and non-stereotypical landscapes of the vacation that is portrayed in the advertisements. Some countries are likely to be preferred more for certain motivations and types of holiday. For example, beach vacations in Spain, hiking in Belgium or Austria, or city trips to Germany or the United Kingdom. It might be hypothesized that the stereotypical landscapes lead to a more positive evaluation of the

advertisements than the non-stereotypical landscapes, due to familiarity with the landscape and the activities to which this landscape is linked. The preference for a certain type of holiday is also likely to influence the evaluation of the advertisements, at least for the visit intention. It could be considered that those preferring an active vacation are less likely to have a high visit intention towards the beach advertisements and vice versa. To provide further insight, the following research question is posed.

RQ2: To what extent do national landscape stereotypes and preferred type of holiday influence the evaluation of tourism advertisements by Dutch consumers?

A third research question concerns the influence of the recognition of national stereotypes on the effectiveness of the advertisements. A higher recognition might lead to a more favourable evaluation because the consumer knows the country that is portrayed and is familiar with the activities that are offered in this particular country. A third research question is posed:

RQ3: To what extent does the recognition of national landscape stereotypes have an effect on the evaluation of the advertisements?

Answers to these questions provide valuable insights into whether using non-stereotypical sceneries could help in distributing the stream of mass tourism. If the evaluation of the lesser-known and non-stereotypical landscapes is positive, advertisements focusing on these landscapes could be highly suitable to decrease mass tourism and spread the stream of tourists.

2. Method

To test whether portraying national landscape stereotypes in tourism advertisements influenced the effectiveness of the advertisements, an experiment was carried out. Utilizing an online questionnaire, participants were shown different advertisements and had to answer subsequent questions.

2.1. Materials

Three independent variables were incorporated in the experiment: type of holiday preferred, type of advertisement and stereotypicality. The first independent variable, type of holiday preferred, was divided into three categories. According to the CBS data (2018), there are several motivations for Dutch tourists to go abroad. Based on these data, a beach holiday, an active holiday and a city trip were selected for the experiment. These were also tested in the pre-test, which

showed a relatively homogeneous division of the preference for one of the three types. The second variable, type of advertisement, also consisted of these same three categories, a beach advertisement, a mountain advertisement, and a city advertisement.

The third independent variable, the stereotypicality, was divided into stereotypical and non-stereotypical. Stereotypical stereotypes were those considered recognizable for a particular country. Non-stereotypical stereotypes were those considered less standard for a particular country. To define the stereotypical and non-stereotypical locations that were linked to particular countries, a pre-test was carried out. This test consisted of three parts. In the first part, the participants were asked about their holiday preferences, habits and patterns. In the second part, the participants were asked about the most and least ideal countries to spend a summer vacation that is either focused on relaxation at the beach, activities in the mountains or a city trip. In the third part, the participants were asked to guess the country that was portrayed in the pictures. In total, the participants saw six pictures; one stereotypical and one non-stereotypical beach; one stereotypical and one non-stereotypical mountain; and one stereotypical and one non-stereotypical city. See Appendix A for the results of the pre-test. Based on these outcomes, the countries most recognized and most often mentioned as either the most or least ideal holiday destination were selected for the experiment. The stereotypical combinations were beach – Spain; mountains – Austria, city – UK. The non-stereotypical combinations were beach – UK; mountains – Spain; city – Austria.

Subsequently, six advertisements were made by using pictures from the internet. The advertisements included textual information that allowed the consumer to recognize the advertisements as such. See table 1 for the slogans used in the advertisements. The textual information was presented in Dutch, to prevent disclosure of the advertised country. Besides, including a foreign language would work as a COO-marker, which is not the goal of the current study. No other information was presented in the advertisements that could provide information on the advertised country, like advertiser or information regarding duration or price. In figure 1, the advertisements for the expected and non-expected beach holiday are displayed. See Appendix B for all the advertisements.

Table 1.   Overview of the slogans used in both the stereotypical and non-stereotypical advertisements.

Advertisement	Dutch slogan	English translation
Beach holiday	Geniet en ontspan aan de kust.	Enjoy and relax at the beach.
Mountain holiday	Ontdek de ruige natuur.	Discover the rugged nature.
City trip	Ontdek de bruisende stad.	Discover the vibrant city.

Figure 1, Advertisements for (a) an expected beach vacation in Spain and (b) an unexpected beach vacation in the UK.

2.2. Subjects

In total, 109 participants participated in the experiment of which 25 (23%) were men and 84 (77%) were women. Their mean age was 34.58 (SD = 14.48), with a minimum of 18 and a maximum of 65. Majority of the participants had a university degree (48; 43%), 38 participants (35%) had a degree at a university of applied sciences. The remaining 24 participants (22%) had a low education level (high school and/or MBO). The distribution of participants between the three types of holidays preferred was equal regarding their gender (χ_2 (2) = 6.09, p = .048), their age (F (2,106) = 2.10, p = .127) and level of education (χ_2 (2) = 6.46, p = .596).

Furthermore, an indication was given on how often per year participants went on holiday. 20 participants (18%) said to go 0 to 1 time a year, the majority said to go 2 to 4 times a year (80; 73%), and 9 participants (8%) stated to go 5 to 7 times a year.

2.3. Design

The experiment had a 3 (Type of advertisement: beach, city trip, mountains) by 2 (Stereotypicality: stereotypical, non-stereotypical) by 3 (Type of holiday preferred: beach, city trip, mountains) mixed design. The participants saw all six advertisements, one stereotypical and one non-stereotypical for each type of advertisement (beach, city trip, mountains). The participants were asked about their type of holiday preferred and could either chose between a beach vacation, a city trip or an active holiday in the mountains.

2.4. Instruments

The effectiveness of the advertisements was measured in an online questionnaire based on the following dependent variables: recognition of the stereotype, attitude towards the advertisement, attitude towards the country, information request and visiting intention. The questionnaire was in Dutch, the native language of the participants.

The recognition of the stereotype was measured by using two step-by-step questions. By using an open question, participants were asked to name the country they saw in the advertisements. If the answer was incorrect, a follow-up question was asked using a drop-down list with twelve European countries to choose from: France, Spain, Italy, Germany, Greece, Austria, Denmark, UK, Belgium, Portugal, Croatia and Norway. This resulted in detailed information on how the stereotype was recognized: correct the first time (open question), the second time (drop-down list) or incorrect.

The attitude towards the advertisement was measured using six semantic differentials on a scale from 1 to 5, based on Nederstigt and Hilberink-Schulpen (2018). A statement 'This advertisement is…' was followed by the 'not original – original', 'not interesting – interesting', 'boring – fascinating', 'not nice – nice', 'unprofessional – professional', and 'not attractive – attractive'. The reliability of attitude towards the advertisement comprising six items was good. For each advertisement a separate Cronbach's alpha was calculated: all $\alpha > .88$, see Appendix C, Table C1 for all αs. Consequently, the separate mean scores of the six items were combined to compound the variable attitude towards the advertisement for each advertisement separately, that was used in further analyses.

The attitude towards the country was measured by using five semantic differentials on a scale from 1 to 5, also based on Nederstigt and Hilberink-Schulpen (2018). The statement 'The country

in the advertisement is…' was followed by 'not interesting – interesting', 'boring – fascinating', 'not nice – nice', 'not attractive – attractive', and 'ugly – beautiful'. The reliability of attitude towards the country comprising five items was excellent. For each advertisement a separate Cronbach's alpha was calculated: all α > .95, see Appendix C, Table C2 for all αs . Consequently, the separate mean scores of the five items were combined to compound the variable attitude towards the country for each advertisement separately, which was used in further analyses.

Information request reflected the consumers' intention to ask or search for additional information about the type of vacation that is portrayed in the advertisement. The intention to ask for additional information was measured using four statements on a 5-point Likert scale: 'I would search for additional information…' 'online', 'in brochures', 'from a travel agency', 'on social media'. The statements were anchored by 'completely disagree – completely agree'. The reliability of information request comprising four items was average. For each advertisement a separate Cronbach's alpha was calculated: all α > .69, see Appendix C, Table C3 for all αs. Since only for the mountain advertisements, α was .69, the separate mean scores of the four items were nevertheless combined to compound the variable information request for each advertisement separately, that was used in further analyses.

The visiting intention measured the consumers' intention of travelling to the advertised country. Three statements on a 5-point Likert scale on the general visiting intention included 'I intend to visit the advertised country in the near future', 'I can imagine spending my next holiday in the advertised country' (based on Matzler, Strobl, Stokburger-Sauer, Bobovnicky, & Bauer, 2016), 'I would love to spend my next holiday in the advertised country'. The statements were anchored by 'completely disagree – completely agree'. The reliability of visiting intention comprising three items was good. For each advertisement a separate Cronbach's alpha was calculated: all α > .86, see Appendix C, Table C4 for all αs . Consequently, the separate mean scores of the three items were combined to compound the variable visiting intention for each advertisement separately, that was used in further analyses.

Moreover, the questionnaire included questions on holiday habits, regarding the frequency of holidays spent abroad and which of the three types of holiday was preferred, a beach vacation, a city trip or an active holiday. The questionnaire ended with some questions on demographics asking about age, gender and education level.

2.5. Procedure

Participants were recruited through the personal network of the researcher, by either a personal approach or via social media. A URL directed the participants to the online questionnaire, that started with a consent form and a short explanation concerning its content. The participants were explained they would see six advertisements followed by 18 evaluative questions for each advertisement. After evaluating the advertisements, the participants were asked which type of holiday they preferred choosing from either a city trip, a beach vacation or an active vacation in the mountains. The final questions concerned the frequency of holidays spent abroad and general information on demographics, namely age, gender and level of education. Filling out the online questionnaire took about 10 to 15 min. During the questionnaire, it was not possible to return to any previous questions. After completion of the questionnaire, the purpose was disclosed to the participants. The participants did not receive any incentive.

When analysing the data, it appeared that many participants were confused by the first question on recognition as often a specific location was answered whereas it was the country in general that was asked for. Therefore, if the participant correctly guessed the specific location, this was also counted as a correctly recognized location at the first attempt.

2.6. Statistical treatment

To answer the research questions, repeated measures analyses were used for each dependent variable. When an interaction effect occurred, separate repeated measures were performed to disentangle the interaction. Furthermore, Chi-square tests were used for the stereotype recognition data as well as univariate tests of variance to see which effect the recognition had on the evaluative outcome variables.

3. Results

3.1. Recognition of the country

A Chi-square test showed a significant relation between recognition of the country and stereotypicality ($\chi_2 (2) = 214.61, p < .001$). The advertisements with a stereotypical landscape were more often recognized correctly at the first attempt (76.1%) than advertisements with a non-stereotypical landscape (23.5%). Vice versa, advertisements with a non-stereotypical landscape were more often recognized incorrectly (56.9%) than advertisements with a stereotypical landscape

(7.6%). A correct recognition at the second attempt did not contribute to the significant relation between recognition and stereotypicality. See table 2 for the observed counts and percentages.

The data was later split based on type of holiday. A Chi-square test showed a significant relation between recognition and stereotypicality for the city trip advertisements (χ_2 (2) = 100.74, $p < .001$). The city advertisements with a stereotypical landscape were more often recognized correctly at the first attempt (94.5%) than the non-stereotypical landscape (28.4%). Vice versa, the city trip advertisements with a non-stereotypical scenery were more often recognized incorrectly (28.4%) or correctly in a second attempt (43.1%) than the stereotypical scenery was guessed incorrectly (0.9%) or correctly in a second attempt (4.6%). A Chi-square test showed a significant relation between recognition and stereotypicality for the beach advertisements (χ_2 (2) = 97.00, $p < .001$). The beach advertisements with a stereotypical landscape were more often recognized correctly at the first attempt (83.5%) than advertisements with a non-stereotypical landscape (22.9%). Vice versa, the non-stereotypical landscape was recognized more often incorrectly (67.0%) than the stereotypical landscape (4.6%). A correct recognition at the second attempt did not contribute to the significant relation between recognition and stereotypicality for the beach advertisements. A Chi-square test showed a significant relation between recognition and stereotypicality for the active holiday advertisements (χ_2 (2) = 75.02, $p < .001$). The stereotypical mountain landscape was more often recognized correctly at the first attempt (50.5%) and the second attempt (32.1%) than the non-stereotypical landscape (19.3%; 5.5% respectively). Vice versa, the non-stereotypical landscape was more often recognized incorrectly (75.2%) than the stereotypical landscape (17.4%). See table 2.

3.2. Attitude towards the advertisement

3.2.1. Main analysis

A repeated measures analysis for attitude towards the advertisement with as within subjects factors type of advertisement and stereotypicality and as between subjects factor type of holiday preferred showed no significant main effect of stereotypicality (F (1, 106) = 1.11, $p = .294$), nor of type of holiday preferred (F (2, 106) < 1). However, there was a significant main effect of type of advertisement (F (1.94, 205.63) = 28.98, $p < .001$), since the assumption of sphericity was violated, the F-value has been reported with Huynh-Feldt. Furthermore, the interaction between stereotypicality and type of holiday preferred was not significant (F (2, 106) =

Table 2. Observed counts and column percentages (between brackets) of the recognition of the stereotypical and non-stereotypical scenery that was portrayed in the advertisements.

		Recognition		
		First attempt correct	Second attempt correct	Incorrect
Stereotypical	Total	249 (76.1%)	53 (16.2%)	25 (7.6%)
	City	103 (94.5%)	5 (4.6%)	1 (0.9%)
	Beach	91 (83.5%)	13 (11.9%)	5 (4.6%)
	Active	55 (50.5%)	35 (32.1%)	19 (17.4%)
Non-stereotypical	Total	77 (23.5%)	64 (19.6%)	186 (56.9%)
	City	31 (28.4%)	47 (43.1%)	31 (28.4%)
	Beach	25 (22.9%)	11 (10.1%)	73 (67.0%)
	Active	21 (19.3%)	6 (5.5%)	82 (75.2%)

Note: 0 cells (0.0%) have an expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.00

1.85, $p = .162$). However, significant interactions were found between type of advertisement and type of holiday preferred (F (3.88, 205.65) = 3.59, $p = .008$), as well as between type of advertisements and stereotypicality (F (2.00, 212.00) = 23.00, $p < .001$), both again reported with Huynh-Feldt. All these significant effects were qualified by a three-way interaction between type of advertisement, stereotypicality and type of holiday preferred (F (4.00, 212.00) = 2.47, $p = .46$), which was again reported with Huynh-Feldt. To interpret this three-way interaction, separate repeated measures analyses were run for each type of holiday preferred. See table 3 for means and standard deviations.

Table 3. Mean and standard deviations (between brackets) of the attitude towards the advertisement for the different versions of the advertisements per preferred type of holiday (1 = most negative, 5 = most positive)

		Beach holiday N = 40	Active holiday N = 40	City trip N = 29
Stereotypical	City	3.21 (.86)	2.83 (.81)	3.30 (.77)
	Beach	2.73 (.83)	2.30 (.79)	2.56 (.83)
	Mountain	3.15 (.91)	3.54 (.70)	3.49 (.62)
Non-stereotypical	City	2.88 (.88)	2.75 (.83)	2.95 (.60)
	Beach	3.01 (1.08)	3.35 (.96)	3.07 (.72)
	Mountain	3.18 (1.17)	3.30 (.94)	3.24 (.97)

3.2.1.1.Beach holiday as preference

The repeated measures analysis for attitude towards the advertisement with stereotypicality and type of advertisements as within subjects factors for the data of the beach preference showed no significant main effects for advertisement (F (1.78, 69.51) = 3.09, p = .057) and stereotypicality (F (1, 39) < 1). A significant interaction effect was found between stereotypicality and type of advertisement (F (2, 78) = 3.63, p = .031). To disentangle this interaction, the data was split based on the different advertisements. However, none of the repeated measures analyses came to significant results for the city advertisements (F (1, 39) = 3.66, p = .063), nor for the beach advertisements (F (1, 39) = 2.55, p = .118), nor for the mountain advertisements only (F (1, 39) < 1). See table 3.

3.2.1.2. Active holiday as preference

The repeated measures analysis for attitude towards the advertisement with stereotypicality and type of advertisement as within subjects factors for the data of the active preference showed a significant main effect of stereotypicality (F (1, 39) = 6.23, p = .017), as well as for type of advertisement (F (2, 78) = 26.36, p < .001). These main effects were qualified by an interaction effect (F (2, 78) = 16.66, p < .001). Additional analyses were carried out to interpret this interaction. The repeated measures analysis for the city advertisements revealed no significant main effect of stereotypicality (F (1, 39) < 1), nor did the repeated measures analysis for the mountain advertisements (F (1, 39) = 2.41, p = .129). The repeated measures analysis for the beach advertisements revealed a significant difference (F (1, 39) = 29.16, p < .001). The non-stereotypical beach led to a higher attitude towards the advertisement (M = 3.35) than the stereotypical beach (M = 2.30). See table 3.

3.2.1.3. City trip as preference

The repeated measures analysis for attitude towards the advertisement with stereotypicality and type of advertisement as within subjects factors with the data for a city preference showed no significant main effect of stereotypicality (F (1, 28) < 1). Yet, a significant main effect was found for type of advertisement (F (2,56) = 12.64, p < .001), as well as a significant interaction effect (F (2,56) = 7.39, p = .001). Additional analyses were carried out to interpret this interaction. The repeated measures analysis with stereotypicality and type of advertisement for the city advertisements revealed a significant main effect of stereotypicality (F (1, 28) = 7.06, p = .013). The attitude towards the stereotypical city was higher (M = 3.30) than towards the non-stereotypical

city ($M = 2.95$). The repeated measures analysis for the beach advertisements also showed a significant effect of stereotypicality (F (1, 39) = 4.65, p = .040). The non-stereotypical beach led to a higher attitude towards the advertisement ($M = 3.07$) than the stereotypical beach ($M = 2.55$). The repeated measures analysis for the mountain advertisements did not show a significant effect of stereotypicality (F (1,28) = 2.01, p = .167). See table 3.

To summarize, the three-way interaction between type of advertisement, type of holiday preferred and stereotypicality is thus caused by a difference in attitude between the preferred types of holiday and the advertisements. The attitude towards the advertisement of those preferring a beach vacation did not differ between the advertisements. The attitude of those preferring a city trip was higher for the stereotypical city than for the non-stereotypical city, however lower for the stereotypical beach than for the non-stereotypical beach and equal for the mountain advertisements. The attitude towards the advertisement of those preferring an active vacation also did not differ, except for the beach advertisement, for which the non-stereotypical beach led to a higher attitude than the stereotypical beach.

3.2.2. Influence of recognition on attitude towards the advertisement

A one-way analysis of variance showed no significant effect of recognition of the country that was portrayed in the advertisement on the attitude towards the advertisement (F (2, 651) < 1). See table 4 for the means and standard deviations of the evaluation in function of the recognition.

Table 4.   Mean and standard deviations (between brackets) of the evaluation of the advertisements in function of recognition (1 = most negative, 5 = most positive)

	Recognition		
	First attempt correct N = 326	Second attempt correct N = 117	Incorrect N = 211
Attitude towards the ad	3.04 (.90)	3.13 (.92)	2.99 (.94)
Attitude towards the country	3.81 (.89)	3.66 (.92)	3.48 (1.01)
Information request	2.50 (.85)	2.48 (.85)	2.48 (.86)
Visiting intention	2.99 (1.00)	2.86 (.97)	2.71 (.95)

3.3. Attitude towards the country

3.3.1. Main analysis

A repeated measures analysis for attitude towards the country with as within subjects factors type of advertisement and stereotypicality and as between subjects factor type of holiday preferred showed that there were no significant main effects of stereotypicality (F (1, 106) = 3.63, p = .060), type of advertisement (F (2, 212) < 1), and type of holiday preferred (F (2, 106) = 2.55, p = .083). Moreover, no significant interactions were found between stereotypicality and type of holiday preferred (F (2, 106) = 2.92, p = .058), nor between stereotypicality and type of advertisement (F (1.96, 207.32) < 1), which is reported with Huynh-Feldt, due to the violation of the assumption of sphericity. However, a significant interaction was found between type of holiday preferred and type of advertisement (F (4, 212) = 2.98, p = .020), which was qualified by a three-way interaction between stereotypicality, type of advertisement and type of holiday preferred (F (3.91, 207.32) = 7.19, p < .001), which is also reported with Huynh-Feldt. To interpret this three-way interaction, separate repeated measures analyses were run for each type of holiday preferred. See table 5 for means and standard deviations.

Table 5.   Mean and standard deviations (between brackets) of the attitude towards the country for the different versions of the advertisements per preferred type of holiday (1 = most negative, 5 = most positive)

		Beach holiday N = 40	Active holiday N = 40	City trip N = 29
Stereotypical	City	3.81 (.99)	3.55 (.85)	3.91 (.70)
	Beach	3.96 (.89)	3.66 (.93)	3.58 (.92)
	Mountain	3.15 (1.18)	4.16 (.72)	3.82 (.67)
Non-stereotypical	City	3.25 (1.04)	3.90 (.81)	3.55 (.87)
	Beach	3.44 (1.19)	3.98 (.82)	3.64 (.65)
	Mountain	3.58 (1.03)	3.72 (.97)	3.57 (.90)

3.3.1.1. Beach holiday as preference

The repeated measures analysis for attitude towards the country with stereotypicality and type of advertisements as within subjects factors for the data of the beach preference showed a significant main effect of type of advertisement (F (2, 78) = 3.27, p = .043), yet no significant main effect of stereotypicality (F (1, 39) = 3.64, p = .064). A significant interaction effect was also found (F (2, 78) = 6.25, p = .003). Additional analyses were carried out to interpret this interaction effect.

The repeated measures analysis for the city advertisements revealed a significant main effect of stereotypicality (F (1, 39) = 7.16, p = .011). The attitude towards the stereotypical city (M = 3.81) was higher than towards the non-stereotypical city (M = 3.25). The repeated measures analysis for the beach advertisements also showed a significant effect (F (1, 39) = 4.92, p = .032). The stereotypical beach (M = 3.96) led to a higher attitude towards the advertisement than the non-stereotypical beach (M = 3.44). The repeated measures analysis for the mountain advertisements also showed a significant effect of stereotypicality (F (1, 39) = 4.55, p = .039). The non-stereotypical mountain (M = 3.58) led to a higher attitude than the stereotypical mountains (M = 3.15). See table 5.

3.3.1.2. Active holiday as preference

The repeated measures analysis for attitude towards the country with stereotypicality and type of advertisement as within subjects factors for the data of the active holiday preference showed no significant main effect of stereotypicality (F (1, 39) < 1), nor for type of advertisement (F (2, 78) = 1.81, p = .170). Yet, there was a significant interaction (F (2, 78) = 6.36, p = .003). Additional analyses were carried out to interpret this interaction. The repeated measures analysis for the city advertisements revealed a significant main effect of stereotypicality (F (1, 39) = 5.24, p = .028). The attitude towards the non-stereotypical city (M = 3.90) was higher than towards the stereotypical city (M = 3.55). The repeated measures analysis for the beach advertisements showed no significant main effect of stereotypicality (F (1, 39) = 3.19, p = .082). The repeated measures analysis for the mountain advertisements did reveal a significant main effect of stereotypicality (F (1, 39) = 7.23, p = .010). The attitude towards the stereotypical mountain (M = 4.16) was higher than towards the non-stereotypical mountain (M = 3.72). See table 5.

3.3.1.3. City trip as preference

The repeated measures analysis for attitude towards the country with stereotypicality and type of advertisement as within subjects factors for the data of the city trip preference showed no significant main effect of type of advertisement (F (1.67, 47.21) < 1), due to the violation of the assumption of sphericity, the F-value was reported with Huynh-Feldt. A significant main effect was found for stereotypicality (F (1, 28) = 4.44, p = .044). The attitude towards the stereotypical ads (M = 3.77) is higher than towards the non-stereotypical ads (M = 3.59). There was no significant interaction between stereotypicality and type of advertisement (F (2, 56) = 1.27, p = .289). See table 5.

To summarize, the three-way interaction between type of advertisement, type of holiday preferred and stereotypicality is thus caused by a difference in attitude between the preferred types of holiday and the advertisements. Those preferring a city trip did not differ in their attitude towards the country. The attitude towards the country for those preferring a beach vacation was higher for the stereotypical city advertisement and the stereotypical beach advertisement as compared to the non-stereotypical city and non-stereotypical beach, respectively. In contrast, the non-stereotypical mountains led to a higher attitude than the stereotypical mountains. The attitude towards the country for those preferring an active holiday was higher for the stereotypical mountain than towards the non-stereotypical mountain, lower for the non-stereotypical city than for the stereotypical city and there was no difference between the beach advertisements.

3.3.2. Influence of recognition on attitude towards the country

A one-way analysis of variance showed a significant effect of recognition of the country that was portrayed in the advertisement on the attitude towards the country (F (2, 651) = 8.11, $p < .001$). The attitude towards the country was significantly higher for participants who guessed the country correctly at the first attempt ($M = 3.81$, $SD = .89$) than for those who did not recognize the country ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 3,48$, $SD = 1.01$). There was no difference between the attitude towards the country of those who guessed the country correctly at the second attempt and who guessed it correctly at the first attempt ($p = .378$, Bonferroni-correction) or did not guess the country correctly ($p = .299$, Bonferroni-correction). See table 4 for means and standard deviations.

3.4. Information request
3.4.1. Main analysis

A repeated measures analysis for information request with as within subjects factors type of advertisement and stereotypicality and as between subjects factor type of holiday preferred showed no significant main effects for stereotypicality (F (1, 106) < 1) and type of holiday preferred (F (2, 106) = 1.23, $p = .297$). Yet, there was a significant main effect of type of advertisement (F (2, 212) = 5.72, $p = .004$). Moreover, a significant interaction was found between type of advertisement and type of holiday preferred (F (4, 212) = 3.66, $p = .007$), as well as between type of advertisement and stereotypicality (F (1.90, 201.49) = 3.90, $p = .024$), since the assumption of sphericity was violated, the F-value was reported with Huynh-Feldt. The interaction between stereotypicality and

type of holiday preferred was not significant (F (2,106) = 2.07, p = .131). The significant effects were qualified by a significant three-way interaction between stereotypicality, type of advertisement and type of holiday preferred (F (3.80, 201,49) = 4.12, p = .004), also reported with Huynh-Feldt. To interpret this three-way interaction, separate repeated measures analyses were run for each type of holiday preferred. See table 6 for means and standard deviations.

Table 6.   Mean and standard deviations (between brackets) of the information request for the different versions of the advertisements per preferred type of holiday (1 = most negative, 5 = most positive)

		Beach holiday N = 40	Active holiday N = 40	City trip N = 29
Stereotypical	City	2.70 (.84)	2.25 (.91)	2.54 (.77)
	Beach	2.74 (.84)	1.98 (.90)	2.28 (.77)
	Mountain	2.63 (.96)	2.83 (.76)	2.64 (.63)
Non-stereotypical	City	2.54 (.92)	2.31 (.88)	2.51 (.80)
	Beach	2.47 (.84)	2.56 (.84)	2.36 (.78)
	Mountain	2.58 (.90)	2.50 (.79)	2.39 (.69)

3.4.1.1. Beach holiday as preference

The repeated measures analysis for information request with stereotypicality and type of advertisements as within subjects factors for the data of the beach preference showed no significant main effect of advertisement (F (2, 78) < 1), nor a significant main effect of stereotypicality (F (1, 39) = 3.06, p = .088), nor an interaction effect (F (1.78, 69.24) < 1). The latter is reported with Huynh-Feldt, due to the violation of the assumption of sphericity. See table 6.

3.4.1.2. Active holiday as preference

The repeated measures analysis for information request with stereotypicality and type of advertisement as within subjects factors for the data of the active holiday preference showed no significant main effect of stereotypicality (F (1, 39) = 1.09, p = .304). Yet, there was a significant effect of type of advertisement (F (2,78) = 10.95, p < .001) and a significant interaction between stereotypicality and type of advertisement (F (2, 78) = 10.49, p < .001). Additional analyses were carried out to interpret the interaction. The repeated measures analysis for the city advertisements showed no significant main effect of stereotypicality (F (1, 39) < 1). The repeated measures analysis for the beach advertisements revealed a significant main effect of stereotypicality (F (1, 39) = 13.76, p = .001). The information request for the non-stereotypical beach was higher (M =

2.56) than of the stereotypical beach ($M = 1.98$). The repeated measures analysis for the mountain advertisements also showed a significant main effect of stereotypicality ($F(1, 39) = 6.39, p = .016$). The information request of the stereotypical mountain was higher ($M = 2.83$) than of the non-stereotypical mountain ($M = 2.50$). See table 6.

3.4.1.3. City trip as preference

The repeated measures analysis for information request with stereotypicality and type of advertisement as within subjects factors for the data of the city trip preference showed no significant main effect of stereotypicality ($F(1, 39) < 1$), and type of advertisement ($F(1.44, 40.38) < 1$), the latter reported with Greenhouse-Geisser due to the violation of the assumption of sphericity. A significant interaction was found between stereotypicality and type of advertisement ($F(2, 56) = 6.16, p = .004$). Yet, the separate repeated measures analyses did not show significant effects of stereotypicality for the city advertisements ($F(1, 28) < 1$), nor for the beach advertisements ($F(1, 28) < 1$), nor for the mountain advertisements ($F(1, 28) = 2.86, p = .102$). See table 6.

To summarize, the three-way interaction between type of advertisement, type of holiday preferred and stereotypicality is thus caused by a difference in attitude between the preferred types of holiday and the advertisements. Those preferring an active vacation, had a higher information request for the non-stereotypical beach and stereotypical mountain, as compared to the stereotypical beach and non-stereotypical mountains, respectively. Preferences for a city trip or beach vacation did not lead to any differences.

3.4.2. Influence of recognition on information request

A one-way analysis of variance showed no significant effect of recognition of the country on the information request ($F(2, 651) < 1$). See table 4 for means and standard deviations.

3.5. Visiting intention

3.5.1. Main analysis

A repeated measures analysis for visiting intention with as within subjects factor type of advertisement and stereotypicality and as between subjects factor type of holiday preferred showed no significant main effect of type of holiday preferred ($F(2, 106) < 1$), and type of advertisement

(F (2,212) = 1.02, p = .360). However, a significant main effect was found for stereotypicality (F (1, 106) = 7.14, p = .009). Moreover, the interaction between type of advertisement and stereotypicality was not significant (F (2, 212) = 2.08, p = .128). Yet, significant interactions were found between type of advertisement and type of holiday preferred (F (4, 212) = 6.64, p < .001), as well as between stereotypicality and type of holiday preferred (F (2, 106) = 3.41, p = .037). The significant effects were qualified by a three-way interaction between stereotypicality, type of advertisement and type of holiday preferred (F (4, 212) = 7.78, p < .001). To interpret this three-way interaction, separate repeated measures analyses were run for each type of holiday preferred. See table 7 for means and standard deviations.

Table 7.   Mean and standard deviations (between brackets) of the visiting intention for the different versions of the advertisements per preferred type of holiday (1 = most negative, 5 = most positive)

		Beach holiday N = 40	Active holiday N = 40	City trip N = 29
Stereotypical	City	3.05 (1.00)	2.70 (.97)	3.25 (.80)
	Beach	3.42 (1.09)	2.38 (1.05)	2.77 (1.07)
	Mountain	2.70 (.96)	3.55 (.75)	2.97 (.79)
Non-stereotypical	City	2.53 (.87)	2.83 (.86)	2.64 (.87)
	Beach	2.71 (.93)	3.08 (.92)	2.79 (.85)
	Mountain	2.74 (1.08)	2.86 (1.05)	2.80 (.97)

3.5.1.1. Beach holiday as preference

The repeated measures analysis for visiting intention with stereotypicality and type of advertisements as within subjects factors for the data of the beach preference showed a significant main effect of type of advertisement (F (2, 78) = 3.81, p = .026), a significant main effect of stereotypicality (F (1, 39) = 8.74, p = .005), and a significant interaction effect between stereotypicality and type of advertisement (F (1.74, 67.95) = 3.81, p = .033). Additional analyses were carried out to interpret the interaction. The repeated measures analysis for the city advertisements showed a significant main effect of stereotypicality (F (1, 39) = 7.50, p = .009). The stereotypical city advertisement (M = 3.05) led to a higher visiting intention than the non-stereotypical city advertisement (M = 2.53). The repeated measures analysis for the beach advertisements showed a significant main effect of stereotypicality (F (1, 39) = 10.20, p = .003). The stereotypical beach advertisement led to a higher visiting intention (M = 3.42) than the non-

stereotypical beach ($M = 2.71$). The repeated measures analysis for the mountain advertisements showed no significant main effect of stereotypicality ($F (1, 39) < 1$). See table 7.

3.5.1.2. Active holiday as preference

The repeated measures analysis for visiting intention with stereotypicality and type of advertisement as within subjects factors for the data of the active vacation preference showed no significant main effect of stereotypicality ($F (1, 39) < 1$). However, there was a significant main effect of type of advertisement ($F (2, 78) = 10.27, p < .001$), as well as an interaction effect between stereotypicality and type of advertisement ($F (2, 78) = 10.03, p < .001$). The repeated measures analysis for the city advertisements showed no significant effect of stereotypicality ($F (1, 39) < 1$). The repeated measures analysis for the beach advertisements showed a significant main effect of stereotypicality ($F (1, 39) = 11.03, p = .002$). The non-stereotypical beach ($M = 3.08$) led to a higher visiting intention than the stereotypical beach ($M = 2.38$). The repeated measures analysis for the mountain advertisements also revealed a significant main effect ($F (1, 39) = 11.53, p = .002$). The stereotypical mountain ($M = 3.55$) led to a higher visiting intention than the non-stereotypical mountain ($M = 2.86$). See table 7.

3.5.1.3. City trip as preference

The repeated measures analysis for visiting intention with stereotypicality and type of advertisement as within subjects factors for the data of the city trip preference showed no significant main effect of type of advertisement ($F (1.60, 44.90) < 1$), reported with Huynh-Feldt, as the assumption of the sphericity was violated. A significant main effect was found for stereotypicality ($F (1, 28) = 4.79, p = .037$). The stereotypical advertisements ($M = 3.00$) led to a higher visiting intention than the non-stereotypical advertisements ($M = 2.75$). There was no significant interaction between stereotypicality and type of advertisement ($F (2, 56) = 1.78, p = .178$). See table 7.

To summarize, the three-way interaction between type of advertisement, type of holiday preferred and stereotypicality is thus caused by a difference in attitude between the preferred types of holiday and the advertisements. For all participants, the stereotypical advertisements led to a higher visiting intention than the non-stereotypical advertisements. However, the participants who preferred a beach vacation had a similar visiting intention towards the stereotypical and non-

stereotypical mountain advertisements. Whereas for the other participants, the stereotypical mountain advertisement led to a higher visiting intention than the non-stereotypical advertisement.

3.5.2. Influence of recognition on visiting intention

A one-way analysis of variance showed a significant effect of recognition of the country on the visiting intention (F (2, 651) = 5.14, p = .006). The visiting intention was higher for participant who guessed the country correctly at the first attempt (M = 2.99, SD = 1.00) than for those who did not recognize the country (p = .004, Bonferroni-correction; M = 2.71, SD = .95). There was no difference between the visiting intention of those who guessed the country correctly at the second attempt and those who guessed the country correctly at the first attempt (p = .670, Bonferroni-correction) or did not guess the county correctly (p = .596, Bonferroni-correction). See table 4 for the means and standard deviations.

4. Conclusion and Discussion

The goal of this study was to investigate the effect of non-stereotypical and stereotypical landscapes used in tourism advertisements. If non-stereotypical landscapes received a positive evaluation, these could be functional for spreading the stream of tourists and decreasing the pressure on touristic hot spots. Essential to this type of approach was that the portrayed landscapes were recognized, which was tested in the questionnaire. Participants were shown six advertisements, three stereotypical and three non-stereotypical landscapes for particular countries and types of holiday. The evaluation of the advertisements was measured using attitude towards the advertisement, attitude towards the country, information request and visiting intention. The following research questions were posed:

RQ1: To what extent does the Dutch consumer recognize stereotypical and non-stereotypical landscapes in tourism advertisements?

RQ2: To what extent do national landscape stereotypes and preferred type of holiday influence the evaluation of tourism advertisements by Dutch consumers?

RQ3: To what extent does the recognition of national landscape stereotypes have an effect on the evaluation of the advertisements?

The analyses on the recognition of the country showed that the stereotypicality significantly influenced the recognition of the landscape. In a comparison between the stereotypical and the non-

stereotypical landscape, it appeared that the stereotypical scenery was more easily recognized by the Dutch participants than the non-stereotypical, less known scenery. This pattern continued when the data was split based on the type of holiday that was advertised. The stereotypical overcrowded beach was correctly recognized as Spain, the green grass-covered mountains were correctly recognized as Austria as was London correctly recognized and linked to the UK. The non-stereotypical landscapes were less often recognized correctly, meaning that the participants had greater difficulty recognizing the Spanish mountains, the Austrian city and the English coast. Since the stereotypical landscapes were highly recognized, one might conclude that this sceneries indeed included a stereotype of the portrayed country and that the participants were highly familiar with the landscapes. This familiarity has likely influenced the content of the stereotype (Chattalas et al., 2008). Moreover, as participants more easily recognized the stereotypical landscapes than the non-stereotypical landscapes, one could say that stereotypes about scenery, similar to those about people, are described in terms of the social categorization theory, as to that the landscape stereotype reflects the most salient and recognizable features of a particular destination (Augoustinos & Walker, 1998; Macrae et al., 1994). In terms of promotion and effectiveness of the advertisement, one could argue whether recognition of the landscape is crucial. The non-stereotypical scenery that, in general, was not recognized correctly, led to a lower visiting intention than the recognized stereotypical landscapes. When advertising non-stereotypical, less familiar destinations, it might be crucial to increase the knowledge about the destination beforehand, so consumers can recognize the advertised locations.

The second aim of this study was to see if personal preference and landscape stereotypes influence the evaluation of the advertisement. In general, the preference for a particular type of holiday led to an equal or more positive evaluation of the corresponding stereotypical advertisement as compared to the corresponding non-stereotypical advertisement. In other words, those preferring a city trip were often more positive towards the expected city advertisement about London as compared to the non-expected city in Austria. Those preferring a beach vacation were more positive towards the Spanish beach as compared to the beach in Dover with its cliff rocks in the background. Lastly, those preferring the active vacation preferred the Austrian mountains over the Spanish mountains. Findings on the visiting intention where highly conclusive as the stereotypical landscapes led to a significantly higher visiting intention than the non-stereotypical landscapes, regardless of the preferred type of holiday. This finding could be explained by the fact

that consumers know what to expect about a certain destination if they have recognized it. Take the advertisement of the stereotypical beach in Spain as an example. By seeing this advertisement, consumers know what to expect of a beach vacation in Spain, they know the weather is good and the offer of sunbeds is large. The advertisement of the non-stereotypical beach in the UK likely does not evokes these feelings of certainty about what to expect, particularly because there might be a bad weather stereotype of the UK in general. Especially for a beach vacation, this is not desirable.

A cautious link could be made with Koschate-Fisher et al.'s (2012) study, who stated that the inclusion of COO-cues in advertisements, led to a higher perceived product quality which, consequently, led to a higher purchase intention. Portraying stereotypical scenery could lead to an increased feeling of certainty about what to expect from a holiday, as the destination is known for it. This increase consequently might have caused the higher visiting intentions for the stereotypical landscapes as compared to the non-stereotypical landscapes. In other words, non-stereotypical landscapes likely do not enthuse and attract potential new tourists. For regions that focus on a more even distribution of the stream of tourists to lower the pressure on touristic hot spots, using advertisements with non-stereotypical landscapes would not work to achieve this with a single advertisement.

Moreover, findings on the evaluative variables, attitude towards the advertisement, attitude towards the country and information request, did not always show significant differences between the stereotypical and non-stereotypical scenery. It appeared that the advertisements that did not correspond with the participant's preferred type of holiday, often led to a more negative evaluation of the expected stereotype and a more positive of the non-expected stereotype, in contrast to the advertisements that do correspond with the holiday preference. Here, the expected stereotype was preferred over the non-expected stereotype. So instead of focusing on the tourists whose preferred type of holiday matches the advertised location, one could focus on the tourists whose preferred type of holiday does not match the destination. For example, a preference for an active holiday led to a higher attitude towards the advertisement of the non-stereotypical beach advertisement than the stereotypical beach advertisement. Likewise, a preference for a beach holiday led to a higher attitude towards the country of the non-stereotypical mountain than the stereotypical mountain advertisement. If active tourists would visit the non-stereotypical beach instead of the stereotypical mountains, or if beach-loving tourists would visit the non-stereotypical mountain instead of the

stereotypical beach, this might help to distribute the stream of tourists more evenly and decrease the pressure and crowds at touristic hot spots. However, tourists possibly will not give up on their preferred type of holiday. Therefore, one could focus on the other activities as a complementary activity. For example, focusing on hiking in the Spanish mountains as a complementary activity to a beach vacation, or a city trip to an Austrian city additionally to a hiking vacation in Austria.

Moreover, the use of stereotypes in the advertisements only limitedly influenced the information request. However, in general, the information request was not particularly high. According to Kim et al. (2005), tourists who requested information about a particular location were more likely to visit this location. To make sure tourists are more likely to visit the non-stereotypical destinations caused by more familiarity and knowledge of this destination, offices of tourism would need to give tourists ample information, as tourists are not likely to look for information themselves. By providing more information, offices of tourism are likely to create a more positive image (Bojanic, 1991), leading to the aimed for end-goal, which are more visits to non-stereotypical destinations. Providing more information could be done by creating advertisements that include more information about the destination, rather than merely presenting a picture of the landscape.

The last research question focused on the potential influence of the recognition of the landscape stereotype on the evaluation of the advertisements. The analyses showed that recognition did not affect the attitude towards the advertisements and the information request. However, attitude towards the country and visiting intention did differ between an incorrect recognition and correct recognition. For both variables, the evaluation was higher when the scenery was recognized at the first attempt than when it was not recognized. This means that recognition is highly important to enlarge visiting intentions and attract tourists. Combining this finding with the fact that the non-stereotypical landscapes were less often recognized, offices of tourism are highly urged to enlarge knowledge about the non-stereotypical destinations to attract more tourists.

4.1. Limitations and further research

The study was subject to some limitations regarding the method. First of all, merely three types of vacations were used. A future study could include more or other types of vacation to test the effects on a broader scale. However, it is important to consider whether all the measured variables in this study are necessary for a replication study. Some personally received feedback stated that

the current study lasted too long. It might be more efficient to conduct the study on paper instead of online. Even though the participants were provided with a digital indication of progress during the experiment, conducting the experiment on paper might simplify checking the progress.

Instead of including more types of vacation, one could also choose to include participants of more nationalities. Stereotype content has shown to be differing across nationalities (Madon et al., 2001) and since the current study only had Dutch participants, the generalizability is rather limited.

A second limitation addresses the attractiveness of the non-stereotypical beach in the UK. In general, consumers already have a negative stereotype of the weather in the UK, which does not favour a beach vacation in the UK. This has led to a slightly invalid comparison between the stereotypical and non-stereotypical beach advertisement. It might be that bad weather regarding rain and cold is more disruptive for a vacation than too warm temperatures.

Another suggestion for further research could focus more in-depth on the consumer's motivations for choosing a particular holiday destination. For example, focus groups could give more insights into the motivations and previous holiday locations participants went to. Combining that information with a questionnaire similar to the current study could provide more in-depth insights into the consumers' behaviour. Likewise, it might be interesting to see what did or did not appeal to the participants in the advertisements that were shown. This could be done for example by using eye-tracking or focus groups. Information on this is highly beneficial for advertisers and offices of tourism to know what aspect of the advertisement appeals to the consumer.

4.2. Practical/Societal relevance

The main findings of the study conclude that recognition of a landscape is essential for a positive evaluation. Furthermore, since non-stereotypical landscapes received a lower visiting intention than the stereotypical landscapes, merely using non-stereotypical landscapes would not suffice to create a better distribution of the spread of tourists. Offices of tourism could best focus on creating more knowledge and familiarity with the non-stereotypical landscapes by, for example, setting up large campaigns with advertisements that disclose the location and provide sufficient information. A higher familiarity likely increases the recognition of the destination. Since recognition has been shown to influence visiting intentions, tourists might consider visiting a non-stereotypical destination when they more easily recognize the location. These visits to non-

stereotypical destinations help distribute the flow of tourists more evenly and decrease mass tourism in the popular touristic hot spots.

References

Aichner, T. (2014). Country-of-origin marketing: A list of typical strategies with examples. *Journal of Brand Management*, *21*(1), 81–93. https://doi.org/10.1057/bm.2013.24

Augoustinos, M., & Walker, I. (1998). The construction of stereotypes within social psychology: From social cognition to ideology. *Theory & Psychology*, *8*(5), 629–652.

Beeghly, E. (2015). What is a stereotype? What is stereotyping? *Hypatia*, *30*(4), 675–691.

Bojanic, D. C. (1991). The use of advertising in managing destination image. *Tourism Management*, *12*(4), 352–355.

CBS. (2017a). Historische reeks van de lange vakanties van Nederlanders, 1969-2016. Retrieved June 12, 2020, from Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek website: https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/cijfers/detail/03770

CBS. (2017b). Zomervakanties 2017. Retrieved March 10, 2020, from Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek website: https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/maatwerk/2018/30/zomervakanties-2017

CBS. (2018). Vakanties van Nederlanders; kerncijfers. Retrieved February 28, 2020, from Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek website: https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/nl/dataset/84363NED/table?ts=1582896853489

Chattalas, M., Kramer, T., & Takada, H. (2008). The impact of national stereotypes on the country of origin effect. *International Marketing Review*, *25*(1), 54–74. https://doi.org/10.1108/02651330810851881

GB Foods. (2020). Grand'Italia helps everyone to be a pasta maestro. Retrieved March 12, 2020, from https://thegbfoods.com/geographies/netherlands

Gilbert, G. M. (1951). Stereotype persistence and change among college students. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *46*(2), 245–254.

Gilman, S. L. (1985). *Difference and pathology*. Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press.

Heslop, L., & Papadopoulos, N. (1993). But who knows where or when: reflections on the images of countries and their products. In N. Papadopoulos & L. Heslop (Eds.), *Product-country Images* (p. 39086). New York, NY: International Business Press.

Hilton, J. L., & von Hippel, W. (1996). Stereotypes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *47*(1), 237–271. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.47.1.237

Karlins, M., Coffman, T. L., & Walters, G. (1969). On the fading of social stereotypes: Studies in three generations of college students. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *13*(1),

1–16.

Katz, D., & Braly, K. (1933). Racial stereotypes of one-hundred college students. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *28*(3), 280–290.

Kim, D.-Y., Hwang, Y.-H., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (2005). Modeling tourism advertising effectiveness. *Journal of Travel Research*, *44*(1), 42–49.

Koschate-Fischer, N., Diamantopoulos, A., & Oldenkotte, K. (2012). Are consumers really willing to pay more for a favorable country image? A study of country-of-origin effects on willingness to pay. *Journal of International Marketing*, *20*(1), 19–41. https://doi.org/10.1509/jim.10.0140

Linville, P. W., & Jones, E. E. (1980). Polarized appraisals of out-group members. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *38*(5), 689–703. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.38.5.689

Macrae, C. N., Milne, A. B., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (1994). Stereotypes as energy-saving devices: A peek inside the cognitive toolbox. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *66*(1), 37–47. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.66.1.37

Madon, S., Guyll, M., Aboufadel, K., Montiel, E., Smith, A., Palumbo, P., & Jussim, L. (2001). Ethnic and national stereotypes: The Princeton Trilogy revisited and revised. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27*(8), 996–1010.

Matzler, K., Strobl, A., Stokburger-Sauer, N., Bobovnicky, A., & Bauer, F. (2016). Brand personality and culture: The role of cultural differences on the impact of brand personality perceptions on tourists' visit intentions. *Tourism Management*, *52*, 507–520. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.07.017

Narayana, C. L. (1981). Aggregate images of American and Japanese products. *Columbia Journal of World Business*, *16*(2), 31–35.

Nederstigt, U., & Hilberink-Schulpen, B. (2018). Advertising in a foreign language or the consumers' native language? *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, *30*(1), 2–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/08961530.2017.1363008

Pettigrew, T. F., Tropp, L. R., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2011). Recent advances in intergroup contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *35*(3), 271–280. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.03.001

Pickering, M. (2001). *Stereotyping: The politics of representation*. Houndmills, Basingstoke,

Hampshire: Palgrave.

Piller, I. (2003). Advertising as a site of language contact. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *23*(2003), 170–183. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190503000254

Schneider, D. J. (2005). *The Psychology of Stereotyping*. Guilford Press.

Tajfel, H. (2001). Social stereotypes and social groups. In M. A. Hogg & D. Abrams (Eds.), *Key readings in social psychology. Intergroup relations: Essential readings* (pp. 132–145). Psychology Press.

TUI. (2019). Populairste vakantiebestemmingen Europa 2020: zonder de massa. Retrieved March 10, 2020, from NBTC-NIPO website: https://www.tui.nl/smile/blog/populairste-vakantiebestemmingen-europa/

Verlegh, P. W. J., & Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M. (1999). A review and meta-analysis of country-of-origin research. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, *20*(5), 521–546.

Appendices

Appendix A – Findings pre-test

Table A1   Most and least ideal European holiday destinations for a beach vacation, a
vacation in the mountains and a city trip (percentage between brackets).

Beach		Mountains/hiking		City trip	
most	least	most	least	most	least
Spain (60%)	Norway (28%)	Austria (52%)	Greece (28%)	Spain (36%)	Greece/ Austria/ Belgium (16%)
Greece (24%)	Belgium (20%)	Norway (24%)	Spain/ Belgium/ Croatia (16%)	Italy (32%)	France/ Germany/ Croatia (12%)
Italy (12%)	UK/ Austria (16%)	Germany (12%)	Italy/ UK (8%)	UK (16%)	Denmark/ UK (8%)

Table A2   Correctly guessed countries according to the presented pictures with percentage
correct between brackets.

Stereotypical			Non-stereotypical		
beach	mountains	city	beach	mountains	city
Spain* (100%)	Austria* (92%)	UK* (100%)	UK* (43%)	Spain* (33%)	Austria* (64%)
Greece (86%)	Norway (67%)	Italy (89%)	Germany (18%)	Italy (6%)	
		Germany (67%)			

Note: * selected combinations for the main experiment.

Frequency holiday

- 20% goes on holiday 0-1 times a year
- 76% goes on holiday 2-4 times a year
- 4% goes on holiday 5-7 times a year

Preference holiday

- Beach: 28%
- Active in mountains: 32%
- City trip: 24%
- Other: 16%

Appendix B – Advertisements used in the experiment

Beach holiday – Stereotypical

Beach holiday – Non-stereotypical

Active holiday – Stereotypical

Active holiday – Non-stereotypical

City trip – Stereotypical

City trip – Non-stereotypical

Appendix C – Scale reliability measures

Table C1   Scale reliability of attitude towards the advertisement for each advertisement separately with six items.

		Cronbach's alpha (α)
Stereotypical	beach	.90
	mountain	.90
	city trip	.91
Non-stereotypical	beach	.95
	mountain	.96
	city trip	.88

Table C2   Scale reliability of attitude towards the country for each advertisement separately with five items.

		Cronbach's alpha (α)
Stereotypical	beach	.96
	mountain	.96
	city trip	.95
Non-stereotypical	beach	.97
	mountain	.96
	city trip	.95

Table C3   Scale reliability of information request for each advertisement separately with four items.

		Cronbach's alpha (α)
Stereotypical	beach	.79
	mountain	.69
	city trip	.79
Non-stereotypical	beach	.73
	mountain	.69
	city trip	.75

Table C4   Scale reliability of visiting intention for each advertisement separately with three items.

		Cronbach's alpha (α)
Stereotypical	beach	.91
	mountain	.89
	city trip	.89
Non-stereotypical	beach	.90
	mountain	.92
	city trip	.86