Radboud Universiteit

Damn, that's appealing!

A study on the effectiveness of Dutch and English swear words in advertisements targeted at young Dutch audiences.

Master's Thesis International Business Communication

Student name: Ceciel Huiberts

Student number: 4502612

Date: 22-02-2021

Supervisor: Dr W.F.J. Van Meurs

Assessor: Dr B.C. Planken

Radboud University, Faculty of Arts, Nijmegen, Netherlands

CIW

English Statement of Own Work

The undersigned

Ceciel Huiberts s4502612,

Master's student at the Radboud University Faculty of Arts,

declares that the assessed thesis is entirely original and was written exclusively by himself/herself. The undersigned has indicated explicitly and in detail where all the information and ideas derived from other sources can be found. The research data presented in this thesis were collected by the undersigned himself/herself using the methods described in this thesis.

Place and date: 22-02-2021

Signature: X

Abstract

An experimental study explored differences in the effectiveness of the use Dutch and English swear words in beer advertisements (ads) targeted at young Dutch audiences. A total of 148 highly-educated, Dutch participants, aged between eighteen and thirty years old participated in the experiment. The experiment had a mixed design with two levels of the between-subjects factor language used (Dutch (L1)/English(L2)) and three levels of within-subjects factor swear word used (‘Damn’ - ‘Verdomme’/‘Crap’ - ‘Kak’/ ‘Ass’ - ‘Reet’). The participants were randomly assigned to one of the two conditions (English swear words/Dutch swear words). They were asked to rate three advertisement within their condition, all containing a different swear word. They were asked to rate the advertisements on language associations, perceived shock, perceived emotionality, attitude towards the ad, purchase intention and recall of the ad, perceived dynamism, likeliness to encounter the ad in real life. Results showed only one significant between-subjects difference for the different language groups (L1/L2). Dutch swear words achieved significantly higher ratings for perceived shock than the English swear words as was expected according to previous research (DeWaele, 2004). This higher perceived shock, however did not significantly influence the variables used to measure effectiveness of the advertisements (attitude towards the ad, purchase intention and recall of the ad). Between-group differences for these variables were non-significant, indicating that in the advertising context created for the experiment, there was no significant difference between the use of Dutch or English swear words concerning advertising effectiveness. The study explored various correlations between the dependent variables and provided indications that English swear words could potentially outperform Dutch swearwords in terms of advertising effectiveness, if it is used in the right context, under the right circumstances. It is advised that these relationships between the dependent variables are further explored in future research.

1. Introduction

In the ever-changing, fast-paced society that we live in today, consumers are confronted with a multitude of advertisements. This information overload makes it gradually harder for advertisers to get through to the consumer. Marketers are taking increasingly more extreme measures to stand out, constantly evolving new techniques.

The arsenal of marketing tools is constantly expanded with new tools and techniques, ranging from introducing visual elements to musical cues, to using certain words, etc. In recent years, the process of globalization has influenced the development of tools, resulting in materials made completely in a foreign language, or the inclusion of foreign language elements in brand names, product names, or copy (Krijgsman, 2018). The use and effects of this marketing technique have been widely researched and seem to have become an accepted part of the marketing landscape. It is said to positively influencing consumer attitudes through associations with certain languages as well as building salience within the mind of the consumer by introducing a foreign element (Haarmann, 1986; Hornikx & Van Meurs 2020; Piller, 2003).

Where some marketers introduced foreign language to the media landscape, others chose a more controversial path, focussing techniques like shock marketing techniques, which proves especially efficient in catching consumer attention and influencing recall of advertisement if it used for the right product category and the right target group (Belch & Belch, 2004; Mortimer, 2007; Dahl et al., 2003).

Thus, both techniques have been praised for the different effects that they might have. Nonetheless, criticism can be found for both techniques as well. With foreign languages use being criticized for; “tokenism” (Conradie & Van Niekerk, 2015), “fake multilingualism” (Kelly-Holmes, 2005), and “linguistic appropriation” (Hill, 2008) and swear word use being criticized for being less effective for younger generations (Urwin & Venter, 2014) and being needlessly shocking (Third SectorMainNet, 2019), marketers continued their search for a more effective marketing tool. This search eventually resulted in a synthesis of both the concept of foreign language use and the use of swear words: the use of foreign-language swear words.

This technique has been witnessed in various countries across the world (Adriaans, 2013; Edwards, 2012) and has also made its appearance in the Dutch marketing landscape in recent years (Jan Rijdt Rond, 2016; Lindblom Den Haag, 2016). The majority of the examples found utilize English as a second language (L2) in a first language (L1), namely Dutch, marketing context. However, though the technique is being used more frequently, only little is known about how effective the technique is and in what contexts it is most appropriate to be used. It is no surprise that

the use of foreign language swear words has been largely untouched by researchers, as there is still much debate about the potential benefits, appropriateness, and negative effects of either the use of foreign languages (Conradie & Van Niekerk, 2015; Kelly-Holmes, 2005) or shock advertising on their own (Urwin & Venter, 2014). Nevertheless, one might wonder if the use of foreign language swear words could benefit from the positive effects that both foreign language display and the use of swear words as shock marketing have to offer, especially for younger audiences, who find both techniques appealing (Dahl et al., 2003; Gerritsen et al., 2000).

To provide a look into the workings of this marketing tool, the current study aims to examine whether this tool could be effective by looking at the differences between the use of Dutch (L1) and English (L2) swear words in a Dutch marketing context. This comparison ensures that the effect of foreign language use on the advertising effectiveness of the use of swear words, in general, could be isolated, thus providing one of the first empirical studies exploring the synthesis of the use of a foreign language and use of swear words. The following research question will be investigated:

To what extent is the use of an English swear word in a Dutch advertising context, more effective as an advertising technique than the use of monolingual shock advertising for local companies advertising to a young Dutch audience?

By conducting this experiment the current study aims to provide marketers a look into how foreign language display and the use of swear words influence each other.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1 The use of foreign languages in advertising

Consumers are confronted with enormous amounts of information every day and to stand out in that overflow of information, marketers often have to get creative when creating their marketing messages (Lasn, 2000; Urwin & Venter, 2014). One of the techniques that has become increasingly more prominent in the advertising landscape over the past decades is the use of foreign languages (Piller, 2001). This phenomenon has resulted in foreign languages appearing in brand names, product names, fully foreign language ads and slogans, and mixed foreign and native language ads and slogans all over the world. This use of foreign languages in advertising has been widely researched in the fields of business communications (Ahn & La Ferle, 2008; Hornikx et al., 2010; Krishna & Ahluwalia, 2008), and various areas of linguistics (Domzal et al., 1995; Haarmann,

1989; Piller, 2003). This provides the current research with a broad range of knowledge to build upon.

The phenomenon of Foreign Language Display has been defined as follows "the appropriation of words or phrases from another language [...] used within one's own social group" (Eastman & Stein, 1993 p.189). The power and appeal of this marketing technique have been attributed to various socio- and psycholinguistic claims which have been extensively researched (Hornikx & Van Meurs, 2015).

Four psycholinguistic claims, concerning the comprehensibility of foreign languages, the associations they evoke, and their ability to stimulate recall, have been identified to explain the appeal of foreign language display in advertising.

The first claim states that there is a difference between a first and second language when it comes to comprehensibility. First languages are claimed to be understood better than second languages. The concept that underlies this notion is the Revised Hierarchical Model (RHM) (Dufour & Kroll, 1995; Kroll & De Groot, 1997). According to this model, words and their corresponding meanings are represented at two levels: the lexical and conceptual level. The link between these levels is stronger in a person's mind for a first language than a second language. This suggests that more cognitive effort is necessary when foreign language elements are processed (Dufour & Kroll, 1995; Kroll & De Groot, 1997).

Based on this RHM and the Conceptual Feature Model (CFM) by de Groot (1992) it can be claimed that foreign languages evoke different associations than first languages. The CFM explains that first and second language words can link to similar concepts, but some concepts uniquely link to certain translation equivalents (Luna & Peracchio, 2002).

Sociolinguistic research provides more evidence for possible positive effects that these associations might have on advertising effectiveness. Various researchers state that foreign language use can evoke certain associations linked to the country in which the language is typically spoken (Domzal et al. 1995; Gerritsen et al. 2007; Haarmann, 1984, 1989; Hornikx et al. 2013; Hornikx et al., 2007; Kelly-Holmes, 2000, 2005; Piller, 2001, 2003; Ray et al. 1991). An example of this the use of French in perfume advertisements to evoke a sense of 'femininity' (Haarmann 1989; Piller 2003; Ray et al. 1991; Kelly-Holmes 2005). A certain language can thus evoke favorable associations in specific contexts, which could lead to more positive effects on attitude towards the advertisement, brand, or product as well as purchase intention (Ringsberg et al., 2010).

It is also claimed that the use of foreign languages attracts more attention than the use of a first language. Foreign language display in the function of attracting attention has been researched

by various scholars (Domzal et al., 1995; Piller, 2001; Thoma, 2013). The attention attraction feature of foreign language display has mostly been researched on a theoretical basis (Domzal et al., 1995; Petrof, 1990; Piller, 2001), but Thoma provided evidence based on eye-tracking for German consumers in his research in 2013. The Markedness model by Myers-Scotton (1993) further supports this assumption by stating that foreign language lexical items in a first language context are more salient in the minds of the reader, as they are unexpected within the context of an L1 and therefore draw more attention (Ahn & La Ferle, 2008).

Lastly, it has been said that increased recall that can be a consequence of the use of foreign languages. The claim about an increase in recall is based on the findings of the RHM. Domzal Domzal, Hunt and Kernan (1995) explained that due to the deeper procession of the foreign language words they are more readily remembered than translation equivalents in first languages. This claim has been substantiated by several researchers (Ahn & La Ferle, 2008; Petrof, 1990). However, Dufour and Kroll (1995) and Kroll and De Groot (1997) in their research, claimed foreign language elements lead to lower recall than first language items, because more cognitive effort is needed to link the lexical to the conceptional level for second language words. The results seem to be dependent on the position of the foreign language element, for example in the copy, the brand name (Ahn & La Ferle, 2008), or slogan (Raedts & Dupré, 2015). Furthermore, comprehension of a word might play a role as well, with some researchers finding positive results for simple foreign phrases (Raedts et al. 2016) and others supporting the idea that more complex words lead to better results on recall (Petrof, 1990).

The question of the role of comprehension is also relevant in the field of sociolinguistics. It has been claimed that the second language element does not have to be understood to evoke associations or be distinctive from their context (Haarmann, 1989; Kelly-Holmes, 2005; Piller, 2003). However, some studies have detected more positive effects for less complex foreign language elements (Gerritsen et al., 2000; Hendriks et al., 2017; Hornikx et al., 2010). It seems that these differences are rather small and it can therefore be claimed that comprehension plays only a minor role in achieving effectiveness (Hornikx & Van Meurs, 2015).

The use of foreign languages can thus have complex effects that could potentially influence some of the most important factors of advertising effectiveness, attitude towards the advertisement, purchase intention, and recall (Brown & Stayman, 1992).

2.2 The use of English in advertising

The current research will focus on the use of English as a foreign language in intrasentential code-switching, thus the use of two different languages within one sentence. This type of ad is more frequently used than fully second language ads in a first language 'umfeld', making it a more relevant phenomenon to investigate (Gerritsen et al. 2007; Raedts et al., 2015). English is also the most frequently used language in advertising in the Netherlands according to (Gerritsen et al., 2007), who encountered it in 208 out of 325 investigated ads (64%).

The use of English is a unique phenomenon in the theory on foreign language display in ads. According to Alden, Steenkamp and Batra (1999), the use of English foreign languages in advertising is part of an advertising language strategy called Global consumer culture positioning (GCCP). It entails that the use of English "identifies the brand as a symbol of a given global culture" (Alden et al., 1999, p. 77).

English, unlike other languages used in advertisements, is rarely associated with a specific country or concepts related to a certain country (Hornikx et al. 2020). Rather, the use of English is often related to principles of "internationalism", "prestige", "modernity" and "success" (Krishna & Ahluwalia 2008; Lin & Wang, 2016; Zhiganova, 2016; Bhatia & Ritchie, 2004). Although several scholars have encountered this effect and linked it to better attitudes towards advertisements than first languages (Micu & Coulter, 2010), others have found no significant evidence for the presence of such associations. Research by Planken, Van Meurs, & Radlinska (2010) that the absence of these effects can be explained by the widespread use of English in specific countries.

Furthermore, the use of the English language in advertisements could provide a way to reach a younger audience, as English is often associated with an energetic and young lifestyle (Gerritsen et al., 2000) (Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, 2020). Gerritsen (1995) indicated that younger people often have more positive attitudes towards the use of English in advertising than older people. This is related to the concept of language dynamism (Kristiansen, 2001) which has been researched mainly in relation to the use of accents. The idea denotes that speakers are associated with certain traits based on the language, accent, words they use. These traits either relate to 'superior' excellence which is often related to 'professional' and 'ambitious' and 'dynamic/modern' excellence which is related to traits such as 'cool' and 'energetic' (Grondelaers & Van Gent, 2019). According to Kristiansen (2001), where older people would rate the use of established languages and accents as 'good' and the modern use of accent or language-mixing as 'bad', for younger audiences, this distinction has changed. They have developed 'two' standards of language use with superior excellence being more important in school and business, whereas dynamic excellence is

becoming more important in the media (Kristiansen, 2001). It could therefore be said that the mixing of an L1 and English appeals more to the values of dynamic speakers (e.g., modern, hip, trendy, cool) which could be beneficial when marketing to a young audience.

Although it has been proven in several studies that English is commonly associated with concepts of 'success', 'globalism', 'modernity' and 'prestige', there is still much inconclusive research on the specific effects of the use of English in first language advertising in comparison to the use of a first language in advertisement, let alone the effect of the use of English on swear words. This provides a clear knowledge gap that could be narrowed with the help of the current research.

2.3 Shock advertising

Shock advertising is another marketing technique that has been said to be a promising method to break through the clutter of information that consumers face each day (Dahl et al., 2003). It provides the second half of the synthesis of marketing techniques that is the focus of the current research.

The power of shock advertising lies in the way it violates norms and thus becomes a salient piece of information in the mind of the consumer, which can lead to increased recall and recognition (Mortimer, 2007; Dahl et al., 2003; Picktong & Broderick, 2005; MacInnis et al., 1991). This idea has been supported by Dahl, Frankenberger and Manchandra (2003) who determined that shock appeal led to better recall, and better recognition, than fear and information appeal in public policy advertisements. However, Cavazza and Guidetti, (2014) conducted similar research for political discourse and did not find a similar effect.

The norm violations can be caused by displaying content violating moral or social norms, by evoking a reaction of physical senses and violating customs or laws (Dahl et al., 2003). This provides marketers with much creative freedom, but they need to take into account the sometimes strict conventions of advertising which are guarded by organizations such as the Dutch Advertising Standards Authority (Reclame Code Commissie) (Westrop et al., 2018). It is therefore wise to focus on an 18+ target group. Dahl et al. (2003) did indicate that shock advertising is especially useful to reach a younger audience. According to them, young people are believed to be more rebellious, thus, more accepting of a norm breach (Dahl et al., 2003). This also relates to the idea of dynamism, as mentioned in the previous section as the violation of norms could be interpreted as 'cool' and 'tough'.

Further research on shock appeals in advertising indicated various positive as well as negative effects of the use of shock on advertising effectiveness. Research by Dens, de Pelsmacker and Janssens (2008), found a negative effect of shock appeal on attitude towards the advertisement. Other scholars indicated that both appeals of a sexual nature and violent nature had a more positive effect on the attitude towards advertisements than the use of non-shock appeals (Pope et al., 2013; Severn et al., 1990; Söderlund & Dahlén, 2010). Studies on the effect of shock appeals on purchase intention provide mixed results. Some found no effect of shock advertising on purchase intention (De Pelsmacker & van den Bergh, 1996; Vézina & Paul, 1997), while others did found negative effects as consumers did not want to buy a product from a company using the technique (Phau & Prendergast, 2001). Thus as data on the subject of the effectiveness of swear words is inconclusive, there is much to gain from more research in this field of study.

2.4 Swear words as shock advertising

The use of swear words is a norm violating shock advertising technique that can be encountered on numerous occasions in all sorts of advertising (RTL Nieuws, 2018). This is also the cause in the Netherlands (RTL Nieuws, 2019, lampdirect.nl, 2019). The current study focussed on the use of swear words in advertising as it is a shock advertising technique that, when used in the right context, for the right audience, and with the right product can provide positive effects for advertisements (Baker & Broadus, 2014; Westerholm, 2017).

Swear words can best be defined as “the use of taboo language with the purpose of expressing the speaker’s emotional state and communicating that information to listeners” (Jay & Janschewitz, 2008 p. 268). Swearing relates strongly to emotions of which the most common ones “are anger, frustration, humor, pain, surprise and sarcasm” (Vingerhoets et al., 2013, p. 291). Swear words are often referred to as taboo.

The offensiveness or tabooness of a swear word is determined by childhood processes during which one is explicitly taught that some words are acceptable and others are not. This is often caused by authority figures like caretakers, teachers, religious figures, or general societal norms (Jay, 2009). Offensiveness is often also dependent on the semantic referent category to which a word belongs, such as religious/supernatural swears, the scatological swears, the sex organ, and sexual activities swears, and family-related swears (Ljung, 2011). Some cultures or people are more sensitive to certain categories.

Although swearing has become a common occurrence in the advertising landscape, globally and in the Netherlands (Lindblom Den Haag, 2016; Neleman Wijn n.d.), research on the subject of

the use of swear words in advertising is inconclusive about its effectiveness. As mentioned before the shock mechanism has been shown to have different effects in various researches, positively and negatively influencing recall, attitude towards the ad, and purchase intention. Negative effects are often attributed to the feeling of shock, which, has proven to cause offense on the side of the consumer. However, one is often quick in deeming the use of swear words as bad and shocking (Jay, 2009) when this is not always the case. Although a swear word might invoke shock, this shock is not necessarily interpreted as negative by the consumer. Depending on the offensiveness of the swear word, whether it is a personal insult aimed at the consumer and the motive for its use. As Kathleen Mortimer (2007) showed in her research, there are several motives for using swear words in advertising: emphasis, intimacy/trust, personality, or humor. These motives could indeed evoke shock, but Mortimer makes a distinction between surprise and shock. Surprise, in this case, is a less offensive form of shock, which can cause salience within the mind of the consumer, but does not offend the consumer and therefore does not carry the same negative associations as swear words used to express anger or frustration (Mortimer, 2007; Jay, 2009). Shock, therefore, does not necessarily cause negative attitudes for the receiver, depending on swear word choice and motive for use.

2.5 Language differences in the use of swear words

As swear words are highly individual, emotional, and context-dependent, they are one of the most complex linguistic subjects, especially in a multilingual context (DeWaele, 2004). Where swear words in one's L1 can often be found inappropriate for a certain context or audience, L2 swear words are often perceived as less emotional, less inappropriate, and less offensive to the receiver. This phenomenon can be explained by a difference in language competence (DeWaele, 2004; Fägersten, 2012; Harris et al., 2003). The difference in language competence is the result of language acquisition at a young age. Harris et al. state that, a person acquires their first language during childhood, from their parents which can be categorized as an emotional process and therefore leads to stronger emotionality for first languages (Dewaele, 2004, 2010). Early research by Dewaele (Dewaele, 2004, 2010) showed that this difference in emotionality could be noticed even after a second language is fully mastered as multilingual often still rate their first language words higher on a scale of emotionality than their second language. However, later research on his part indicated the opposite result, with second language items being rated as higher in emotionality than first language items. Within the research area of advertising Puntoni, de Langhe and van

Osselaer (2008), found that participants perceived advertising slogans as more emotionally intense in their L1 than L2.

When it comes to differences between swear words in various languages Jay and Janschewitz (2008) found no evidence for any increased offensiveness due to increased emotionality between first and second language items. However, Ayçiçegi and Harris (2004), did find a significant effect for recall when using two different language swear words. They found that recall of swear words in L2 is higher than in L1 (Ayçiçegi & Harris, 2004).

Thus, within the limited amount of research on the specific subject of swear word use in different languages, results are inconclusive and leave much room for further research.

2.6 Research gap

The specific use of L1 and L2 swear words has not been researched when it comes to advertising. However, following the findings by researchers investigating the use of different languages in advertising (e.g. Bhatia & Ritchie, 2004; Krishna & Ahluwalia 2008; Lin & Wang, 2016; Zhiganova, 2016), swear words in advertising (Baker & Broadus, 2014; Westerholm, 2017; Mortimer 2007) and research on L1 and L2 emotionality in advertising (Puntoni et al., 2008), one could form an idea about how the use of L1 compared to L2 swear words can influence the effectiveness of an advertisement. Therefore the current study focussed on the research question:

To what extent is the use of an English swear word in a Dutch advertising context, more effective as an advertising technique than the use of monolingual shock advertising for local companies advertising to a young Dutch audience?

To build upon the research that was already available concerning swear word use in different languages and swear words in advertisement, the current study continued with experiments aimed towards a young, "student" population. Aside from previous providing information about this target group, there were also strong indications in research on both English as foreign language display and the use of shock marketing on the suitability of this particular target group for both of these effects.

Also, regarding foreign language display, the current research focussed on the use of English language in advertisement for local businesses in a local market. As the use of English has been researched mostly in relation to its use by multinationals. It might be worthwhile looking into why Dutch brand would use English in their ads, as this trend has also been noted in the Dutch

marketing landscape with English words appearing in product texts (Remia, n.d.), brand names (Old Amsterdam, 2020) and slogans (Over CoolBest, 2020) for Dutch brands.

The research question was explored with the help of several hypotheses based on the theories described in the theoretical framework. The hypotheses are ordered by element of advertising effectiveness; attitude towards advertisement, purchase intention, and recall, respectively.

2.6.1 Language associations

The effects on attitude towards ad as defined by the synthesis of the two marketing tools are dependent upon the language associations of 'modernity', 'internationality ' and 'success', which are expected to be evoked by the use of English within the sentence (Krishna & Ahluwalia, 2008; Lin & Wang, 2016; Piller, 2001). To determine whether these language associations are positive for the English advertisements, the hypothesis below was formulated.

H1: An advertisement using an English swear word will evoke a higher rating for associations related to modernity, internationality, and success than an advertisement using a Dutch swear word.

However, as the target group in the current study is expected to have a high proficiency in English (Bonnet, 2002), due to them being exposed to the language for at least four years in high school, it is expected that language associations the ad will not be influenced by the proficiency of English.

H1a: There is no significant correlation between language associations and English proficiency for advertisements using English swear words

In the case of swear word use, perceived shock is the element that could influence the attitude towards the advertisement. As the perceived shock is part of the notion of emotionality, it is important to examine both the group difference between variable of emotionality and perceived shock.

As people experience stronger emotions with their first language than their second language it would be plausible to conclude that emotionality will be lower for the English swear word group. DeWeale (2004) stated that languages learned in an instructive setting, do not carry the same

emotional load as languages learned in childhood. As most Dutch children start learning English in high school, we assumed that the emotionality is significantly lower for the English language.

H2: The use of an advertisement using English swear words will be evaluated as being significantly lower in perceived emotionality than the use of a Dutch swear word.

As shock is also determined by emotional load of a word (Mohammadi, 2020), it was hypothesized that perceived shock, like perceived emotionality, was stronger for an L1 swear words than L2 swear words.

H3: The use of an English swear word in an advertisement will result in a significantly lower perceived shock than the use of a Dutch swear word.

H3a: There is a significant correlation between the variables perceived emotionality and perceived shock for both the use of Dutch and English swear words.

The attitude towards the advertisement is also expected to be influenced by the perceived dynamism of the advertiser, as the evaluation of the advertiser could cultivate positive feelings towards the advertisement (Goldsmith et al., 2000). Dynamism was expected to derive from both the use of swear words, which is considered cool and rebellious (Dahl et al., 2003), as well as the use of the English language, which is associated with modernism (Krishna & Ahluwalia, 2008; Piller, 2001). The use of L2 swear words is expected to benefit similarly from the effects of dynamism as the use of L1 swear words. Therefore the following hypothesis has been formulated

H4: The use of an English swear word in an advertisement will not evoke a significantly different rating of perceived dynamism of the advertiser than the use of a Dutch swear word.

The relationships between language associations and dynamism, as well as the relationship between perceived shock and dynamism, will be examined. Therefore the following hypotheses were established:

H4a: There is a significant correlation between the variables language associations and perceived dynamism of the advertiser for advertisements using English swear words.

H4b: There is a significant correlation between the variables perceived shock and perceived dynamism of the advertiser for both advertisement using Dutch and advertisement using English swear words

Following the hypothesis that associations with the concepts of 'modernity', 'internationality ' and 'success' would be more positive for the English swear words, it can be expected that attitude towards the advertisement is also more positive for the English swear words. Although Micu and Coulter (2010) found that the effects of English language associations on attitude towards the advertisement were more positive for global than local firms, findings by Lin and Wang (2016) indicated that globally primed consumers do experience positive attitudes when encountering English. As the notion of modernism and globalism seems to appeal more to younger audiences and they are more globally primed due to exposure to English language through various kinds of media it is hypothesized that these associations with English will lead to a better attitude towards the ad.

In addition, the relationship between perceived shock and attitude towards the advertisement was believed to be positive as the construction of the materials for the study ensured that only mild and medium swear words were included in the advertisement (Jay, 2009), which were used with a motive of emphasis (Mortimer, 2007), in an informal setting (Jay, 2009). This would assure that the shock that was perceived would not be a shock based on offense, but a shock based on surprise, thus it would not lead to negative attitudes for the young target group. It is expected to lead to more identification with the advertiser for both languages English swear words and Dutch swear words (Mortimer, 2007). Younger audiences are expected to swear more often, thus they are likely to identify with advertisers who do the same in the expected informal context (Jay, 2009).

However, as language associations are expected to be more positive for English words and perceived shock is expected to be higher for Dutch words, the two effects might counteract each other out, leading to a similar value for attitude towards the ad.

Dynamism was also expected to affect attitude towards the advertisement as a positive evaluation of the advertiser could lead to a positive evaluation of the advertisement. However, as both the use of swear words and the use of foreign language are expected to benefit equally from the effects of dynamism it is expected that it will not cause any differences in the evaluation of attitude towards the advertisement between L2 and L1 swear word use.
Therefore the following hypothesis was established:

H5: There is no significant difference between attitude towards the advertisement for either advertisements using Dutch or English swear words.

To fully understand how the variables interact with each other the following hypotheses were established to explore possible correlations between variables:

H5a: There is a significant correlation between the variables language associations and attitude towards the ad for advertisements using English swear words.

H5b: There is a significant correlation between the variables perceived shock and attitude towards the ad for both advertisements using English and advertisements using Dutch swear words.

H5c: There is a significant correlation between the variables perceived dynamism of the advertiser and attitude towards ad for both advertisements using English swear words and advertisements using Dutch swear words.

2.6.2 Purchase intention

In the current research, it is assumed that purchase intention is directly related to attitude towards the advertisement (Goldsmith et al., 2000). This means that as the positive language associations evoked a more positive attitude towards the advertisement, purchase intention was expected to follow this trend as attitude towards the advertisement has proven to be a predictor for purchase intention (Goldsmith et al., 2000). It seems that it can assume that a more positive attitude towards an advertisement leads to a better and more attractive display of the product and leads to a higher purchase intention (La Ferle & Choi, 2005).

In addition, a higher value of perceived shock would also lead to a more positive attitude towards the advertisement, thus consequently it would lead to a higher purchase intention. However, as has already been established, the perceived shock was expected to be significantly higher for Dutch swear words, while language associations were expected to be significantly higher for English words. The effects of perceived shock and language associations cancel each other out, therefore the following hypothesis was formulated:

H6: There is no significant difference between purchase intention for either advertisements using Dutch or English swear words.

Once again, to fully understand how the variables interact with each other the following hypotheses were established to explore possible correlations between variables.

H6a: There is a significant correlation between the variables attitude towards the advertisement and purchase intention in general.

H6b: There is a significant correlation between the variables language associations and purchase intention for advertisements using English swear words

H6c: There is a significant correlation between the variables perceived shock and purchase intention for both advertisement using Dutch and English swear words.

2.6.3 Recall

For both marketing techniques, foreign language display and shock marketing, increased recall has been mentioned as an important benefit for the marketers utilizing them. For foreign language display, an increase of recall is expected to be caused by the distinctiveness of the foreign language element in a Dutch context, as explained in the markedness model (Myers-Scotton, 1993), in combination with the increased cognitive effort to process second language items according to the RHM. (Dufour & Kroll, 1995; Kroll & De Groot, 1997)

For the effects concerning shock advertising increased recall is believed to be caused by the perceived shock (Mortimer, 2007; Dahl et al., 2003; Picktong & Broderick). Under H3, the potential effect of language used on perceived shock was already examined. This would mean that, due to the shock being lower for English advertising, the recall effects that can be attributed to the principle underlying shock advertising, would also be lower or even neutralized. This would mean that recall with regard to shock is predicted to be higher for Dutch swear words.

When these two predictions were combined the resulting hypothesis was formulated as follows:

H7: There is no significant difference between the measured recall for the use of English and Dutch swear words in advertisements.

Once again, to fully understand how the variables interact with each other the following hypothesis was established to explore possible correlation between variables. The effect of the RHM will be explored by examining the relationship between recall and proficiency as the theory involving the RHM states that language competence influences how L2 elements are processed (Petrof, 1990). As we expect a significant difference between the processing of L1 and L2 elements:

H7a: There is a significant correlation between the variables English proficiency and recall for advertisements English swear words.

The relationship between shock and recall will also be explored:

H7b: There is a significant correlation between the variables shock and recall for both advertisements using English swear words and advertisement using Dutch swear words.

3. Method

The current study attempted to test the hypotheses through an experiment consisting of three parts: evaluation of mock advertisements, questions on demographic information and control variables, and an unaided advertisement recall assignment. These three parts were included in one Qualtrics questionnaire.

3.1 Materials

The main experiment employed two questionnaires (L1/L2) to which participants were randomly assigned. Both questionnaires showed three different ads containing a swear word. Participants of the experiment either encountered three ads with an English swear word or three ads with a Dutch swear word.

Materials were created carefully paying attention to the intended target group, controlling for the effects of layout, the effects of the swear words used, and the realism of the ads.

The process of making the materials was divided into three parts, determining an appropriate product for the advertisement, determining the layout of the advertisement, and determining which swear words could be used in the intended context.

3.1.1 Product

As, swear words are considered highly emotional and controversial in use (DeWaele, 2004; Westrop et al., 2018), the fit between target group, product, and marketing technique had to be carefully considered. A product for consumers aged 18 years and up would therefore be considered more appropriate for the practice. In addition, swear words are also considered more appropriate in informal situations (Jay & Janschewitz, 2008; Johnson & Lewis, 2010; Kapoor, 2016), thus a product that is often used in such environments, a low-involvement product had to be used (Westerholm, 2017).

Furthermore, to avoid any positive effects due to congruence for either the Dutch or English swear words, giving one an advantage over the other, a product that is not congruent with either of these languages/countries was selected (Hornikx & Van Meurs, 2017; Usunier & Cestre, 2007).

Beer was the product that matched these criteria best. Beer was often used by a younger target group (Ruigrok Netpanel, 2019), in informal situations like a bar or at home, it was also identified as a low-involvement product (Westerholm, 2017) and it was not significantly congruent with either the English or Dutch language (Hornikx & Van Meurs, 2017; Usunier & Cestre, 2007).

3.1.2 Layout

Initially, six beer advertisements were created with the same design elements: one-color background with a vignette, a visual of a beer glass, a visual of an ingredient, and a blurred logo and slogan. The designs for the advertisements were based on Dutch beer ads by Heineken, Bavaria, and Hertog Jan. All of the mentioned elements varied for each advertisement. A ‘drink-responsibly’ seal (“NIX 18" in Dutch) was added to all advertisements to provide a more authentic experience for the participants. These design elements differed per ad (e.g., different background color, a different type of beer glass, a different ingredient shown) (see Appendix A for the designs).

These six ads were featured in a pretest where they were rated on the attitude towards advertisement that they evoked and the perceived likeliness that participants would encounter the ads in a real advertising setting. The detailed results for the pretest can be found in Appendix B, but a summary will be given below in section 3.2.

3.1.3 Swear word selection

The advertisements for the experiment required three pairs of swear words consisting of translation equivalents. The selection of the swear words was done with much care as incorrect translation could influence differences between the results for the L1 and L2 groups.

The first part of the selection was based on selecting the L2 words. To select advertising appropriate words, the offensiveness needed to be mild to medium (Jay, 2000), the swear words would have to appropriate in the situation that the slogan of the ad described (Baker & Broadus, 2014) and the word needed to be utilized within the context advertisement with the same motive (e.g. for humorous or emphasis purposes) (Jay & Janschewitz 2008; Mortimer, 2007).

The offensiveness of the English swear words was determined by looking at several studies that were conducted among English native speakers (Jay, 1992; Janschewitz, 2008; McEnery, 2006). Based on the indexes from these studies, a selection of taboo words that has similar taboo/ offensiveness ratings in both British and American English, country-specific lexical items (e.g., 'wanker', 'tosser') were not taken into consideration for the main experiment as English was treated as a global language.

Words with strong or very severe offensiveness ratings were excluded from the selection as the use of strong and very strong swear words could risk legal action taken by institutions such as: De bond tegen Vloeken and Stichting Reclame Code (Westrop et al., 2018). By looking at ratings on the 1- 9 scale by Jay (2000) and the mild to very strong scale by McEnery (2006), the mild and medium swear words were selected. This initial selection resulted in a selection of 12 possible words: 'ass', 'asshole', 'bastard', 'bitch', 'crap', 'damn', 'fuck', 'son-of-a-bitch', 'shit', 'tit', 'twat', and 'whore'.

To further narrow down this selection it was examined which words could be designated as English instead of borrowed words that had been integrated into Dutch society and taken on a new or slightly different meaning in the L1 (e.g., 'shit' or 'fuck') (Gerritsen et al., 2007; Raedts et al., 2015). Using procedures described by Raedts, Dupré, Hendrickx, and Debrauwere (2015), the words were for having entries in the Dutch dictionary. The words 'bitch', 'fuck', and 'shit' had entries in the Dutch Van Dale dictionary and were deleted from the selection. Swear words containing these words (e.g., the words son-of-a-bitch) were also excluded as it included a borrowed word. The words hell, tit and bastard were also excluded due to their Dutch translations equivalent being very close in spelling (respectively hel, tiet, and bastaard). This could potentially influence the perception of foreignness of these words as the conceptual links as described by the RHM will already be stronger for words one can easily recognize (Dufour & Kroll, 1995; Kroll & De Groot, 1997; Kroll & Stewart, 1994). After this selection, the words: 'ass', 'asshole', 'crap', 'damn', 'twat', and 'whore' remained.

As the English words would be used in a L1 context, a check was done to see which of the words from the remaining selection were commonly used by L1 speakers in the Netherlands.

Marketers would be more likely to employ L2 swear words that resonate with their intended audience, instead of using swear words the L2 speakers would rarely encounter. The L2 words were cross-referenced with a corpus study on Twitter swear words for speakers of Flemish and Dutch by Zenner and Ruette (2018). The final selection included the words: ‘ass’, ‘crap’, and ‘damn'. These three words would be included in the slogans for the advertisements for the L2 questionnaire and subjected to pretesting.

The L1 translation equivalents for the selected L2 swear words were selected based on similar offensiveness ratings by native speakers of Dutch and swear words categories. By comparing the ratings by native speakers of English for the L2 words and Dutch for the L1words it was ensured that the emotional and offensiveness weight of the words were similar in their respective languages and cultures.

The selected English words ‘ass’, ‘crap’, and ‘damn' all belong to a specific semantic referent category. According to Timothy Jay (2009) words from the same referent categories often carry similar offensiveness ratings. Following his categorization of swear words, we found that ‘ass’, ‘crap’, and ‘damn’ belong to the following categories sexual/disgusting objects, disgusting objects, and profane or blasphemous, respectively. Since Dutch and English are cognate languages, and accordingly, many linguistic similarities can be detected (Dekeyser et al., 1999), Dutch and English swear word translations mostly refer to the same categories. Therefore we looked for translations within the referent categories that were found for the L2 swear words.

Common translations for the L2 words were searched for in the translation section of Dutch dictionary Van Dale (Ass, n.d.; Crap, n.d.; Damn, n.d) and the translation websites linguee.com (DeepL GmbH., n.d.) and context.reverso.net (Reverso Technologies Inc., n.d.), which compare translations from millions of websites. The following swear words were found per L2 word within the same semantic referent categories: ‘ass’ = ‘reet’, ‘kont’, 'aars'; ‘crap’ = ‘stront’; ‘schijt', ‘kak'; ‘damn' = ‘verdomd’, ‘godverdomme', 'verdomme'. As no offensiveness ratings by Dutch speakers were available for these words, a pretest had been used to decide which one of the three L1 translations per word would eventually be included in the experiment (see section 3.2).

Next, the slogans for the advertisements were established. The motive for use of swear words within the slogans for the advertisements was determined to be emphasis. Thus the swear words would be used to emphasize the message in the advertisement. According to Kathleen Mortimer (2007), either an emphasis or humor motive for use of swear words would evoke shock, without evoking a feeling of offense. The motive of emphasis was chosen. Taking into account the

motive of emphasis, the following slogans for a Dutch beer advertisement were devised for the English swear words:

1. Damn! wat smaakt dit goed.
2. Crap! Is het bier alweer op?
3. Liever gezond dan lekker? Mijn ass!

3.2 Pretest

As a final step to determine which advertisement layouts and L1 translation equivalents for the English swear words should be used in the main experiment, a pretest was conducted. The pretest was filled in by 23 participants who matched the subject requirements for the main experiment (18-30 years old, student or recent graduate, minimum highest education level VWO or HAVO).

The test consisted of three parts: the rating of attitude towards different, slogan-less advertising designs (six designs); the rating of offensiveness of different swear words out of context (three groups of three swear words with the same meaning); and the rating of the appropriateness of the use of these swear words within a chosen context (three groups of three sentences).

A summary of the pretest will be provided here, a detailed explanation of the design of the test and the statistical treatment can be found in Appendix B.

The first part of the pretest provided information on which advertisement layouts would provide a uniform base in their effect on attitude towards the ad and likeliness to be encountered in daily life. By asking the participants questions about their attitude towards the advertisement and their perceived likelihood of encountering the advertisement in real-life, it could be determined which designs were similar in attitude towards ad, but also close enough to real-life advertising to ensure the main experiment would be able to provide practical implications. Three ads were selected which proved to significantly differ from the other ads in attitude towards the ad (Appendix B, section 1.1.1) and perceived likelihood to be encountered (Appendix B, section 1.1.2), but did not differ significantly from each other.

The second part of the test provided offensiveness ratings for the different swear word translations that were provided: ‘verdomd’, ‘godverdomme’, ‘verdomme’ (for ‘damn’), ‘stront’, ‘schijt’, ‘kak’ (for ‘crap’), ‘reet’, ‘kont’, ‘aars’ (for ‘ass’). Per translation group, the three words were compared to each other in terms of offensiveness rating, but they were also compared to the original ratings (Jay, 1992) for their English translation equivalent by native speakers of English. For all three L2 words, for both damn and ass, one translation equivalent was significantly different

from the others and significantly closer in rating to their respective L2 equivalents. For ‘crap’ all words rated similarly close to each other and the offensive rating by Jay (1992).

A last part of the test determined which of the translations was rated most appropriate for within the context of a sentence (Sentence fit). The sentences were modeled after the slogans that would be used in the main experiment to ensure the fit was good for the slogans. For all three translation groups, there was now a clear distinction between which translations were best suited to be compared to the English words. The selected translations scored significantly higher in sentence fit. The final word pairs were determined as follows (Dutch follows English); ‘Damn’ - ‘Verdomme’, ‘Crap’ - ‘Kak’, ‘Ass’ - ‘Reet’. The final advertisement materials can be found in Appendix C.

See Table 1. for the definitive slogans per language and Appendix C for the final advertisements.

Table 1. The chosen swear words and slogans in English and Dutch

	Advertisement 1	Advertisement 2	Advertisement 3
English	Damn! wat smaakt dit goed.	Liever gezond dan lekker? Mijn ass!	Crap! Is het bier alweer op?
Dutch	Verdomme! wat smaakt dit goed.	Liever gezond dan lekker? Mijn reet!	Kak! Is het bier alweer op?

3.3 Design

The study had a mixed design with two levels of the between-subjects factor language used(L1/L2) and three levels of within-subjects factor swear word used (‘Damn’ - ‘Verdomme’/‘Crap’ - ‘Kak’/ ‘Ass’ - ‘Reet’). This design entails that two groups of Dutch participants were either exposed to three ads containing a Dutch slogan with a swear word or ads containing a Dutch slogan with an English swear word.

3.4 Subjects

3.4.1 Selection criteria

The current study was conducted among students and recent graduates (aged 18 - 30) from universities and universities of applied science in the Netherlands. This selection was based on time limitations for the research as well as previous studies, which also focussed on this particular population (Dewaele 2015; Fägersten, 2007; Janschewitz 2008; Jay 2009). Although most research focuses on students only, one could suggest that recent graduates (graduated for less than five years)

will not immediately change their swearing behavior drastically after their graduation as it is a product of a life-long psychological and cultural process (Jay 1992). Therefore the current study also included the group of graduates that have not been graduated for more than five years. As of 2019, the age group ranging from 18 - 30 years is also the segment of the Dutch population that is responsible for the largest share of beer consumption, 52% (Ruigrok NetPanel, 2019). This means that this age group is also one of the main target audiences for beer advertising, providing a good fit with the chosen product.

By choosing a sample group consisting of Dutch university and university of applied sciences students and recent graduates, the study was able to control for several important factors that contribute to the successful application of foreign language display and shock advertising. Dutch students at universities and universities of applied sciences all have a basic grasp of the English language due to their high school education, which, in the Netherlands, includes at least four years of English language studies. The Dutch authority on conducting the final exams for high school stated that HAVO students have an understanding of English ranging from B2 to C1 level, based on their grade, VWO student's levels range from B2 to C2, and VMBO is B1 level at its best. (College voor Toetsen en Examens, 2018, 2019, 2020).

It can therefore be concluded that most foreign language display can be evaluated successfully in both complex and simple settings by Dutch students of the HAVO and VWO level, as they have an understanding of both languages and can be assumed to be bilingual consumers (Butler & Hakuta, 2006). Moreover, as swearing behavior and evaluation are said to be determined by age and level of education (Hamilton, 1989; Jay, 2009), the chosen sample group can be expected to be similar in distribution of both swearing behavior, attitude towards swearing, and age. This selection ensured that individual differences between participants were kept to a minimum, so the effects of manipulations could be observed more clearly.

3.4.2 Distributions

For this study, Dutch consumers aged 18 to 30 years were approached for the main experiment. In total, 169, participants completed the questionnaire. Of these 169 participants, 21 participants were excluded from the data before analysis as they did not meet the conditions that were set for the population (e.g., they had been graduated for more than 5 years, they were above 30, they had a mother tongue other than Dutch, they had a nationality other than Dutch).

Among the rejected participants were several people who indicated that they never consumed beer. As this could lead to inaccurate readings of purchase intention these participants were excluded from the experiment.

In addition, students who indicated that they had an educational level of either 'elementary school', 'VMBO', 'MAVO' and 'MBO' were also excluded as it is to be believed that their English proficiency is not on the same level as English proficiency for higher educated people. Several participants indicated that their highest education was 'HAVO', 'VWO' or 'Gymnasium' the choice was made not to exclude these participants as they are believed to have a sufficient English proficiency. By making these distinctions, it could be ensured that participants in the current study had a similar minimal level of English (cf. College voor Toetsen en Examens, 2018, 2019, 2020).

The results for 148 participants were analyzed in the sections below.
The mean age was 23.49 (SD = 2.70; range 18 - 30); 60.1% of participants were female, 37.2% were male, and a residual 2.7% either preferred not to indicate their sex or identified as 'different'.

The education level for the participants that were included in the analyses ranged from 'HAVO' to 'University'. Of these participants, most were currently enrolled as a student (62.8%) while others had already completed an education. Most of the participants had indicated that they had either finished or were currently enrolled in a university program (62.8%) In total, all 148 participants had indicated that they had a Dutch nationality and had Dutch as their mother tongue. A total of 93 participants indicated that they were currently a student (62,8%), while 37.2% stated that they were not currently pursuing an education, but had done so in the past five years.

The participants were asked to assess their English proficiency. The level of English among participants was measured as above average (average being set at a value of 4, the midpoint of the scale) (M = 6.25, SD = 0.79) (t (147) = 34.63, $p < .001$).

A check was included to see whether all participants consumed beer and thus were potential targets for a beer ad. Most participants indicated that they were regular consumers (49.3%), 25.7% of participants rated their beer consumption as 'often', 20.3% stated that they drank beer rarely and 4.7% indicated that they 'always' drank beer. The use of the product was as being above average (corresponding with the value of 3, the middle point of the scale) (M = 3.15, SD = 0.79) (t(147) = 2.28, p = .024).

The questionnaire also included questions on the use of swear words and attitude towards swear words to determine whether evaluations could be influenced by the participant's experiences with swear words. Swear word use was rated on a 7-point scale of frequency (1 = never, 7 = often). The participants rated their own frequency of swearing as being above average (corresponding with

the value of 4, the middle point of the scale) (M = 4.83, SD = 1.372) ($t(147) = 7.37$, $p < .001$). Attitude towards swearing was also rated on four items consisting of 7-point Likert scales (1 = completely agree ,7 = completely disagree) and indicated a significantly above average tolerance of swearing (M = 5.78, SD = 1.068) ($t(147) = 20.24$, $p < .001$).

The two versions of the questionnaire (English swear words/Dutch swear words) were distributed as follows: Version 1 (English swear words) was distributed among 72 participants (48,6%), version 2 (Dutch swear words) was filled out by 76 participants (51.4%).

No significant relationships were found between the different versions of the questionnaire and English proficiency ($t(146) = 1.07$ $p = .286$); gender ($\chi2(3) = 4.69$ $p = .196$); student status ($\chi2(1) = 1.22$, $p = .270$); education level ($\chi2(4) = 8.59$ $p = .072$); the age of the participants ($t(146) = .09$, $p = .928$) and swearing behavior (Levene's test showed unequal variances, $F = 4.88$, $p = 0.03$) ($t(145.67) = .328$).

Beer consumption ($t(146) = 2.38$, $p = .019$) and attitude towards swearing ($t(146) = 2.52$, $p = .013$) were unequally distributed across the groups.

3.5 Instruments

The dependent variables in the current study were attitude towards the advertisement, purchase intention, language associations, perceived shock, perceived emotional intensity of the ad, perceived likelihood of encountering the ad, perceived dynamism of the advertiser, and recall. These eight dependent variables were mostly measured on semantic differential scales. All scales were provided in Dutch in the Qualtrics questionnaire (Appendix D.). For each scale, the average alpha was calculated with a Fisher's Z transformation for averaging coefficients (Corey et al., 1998).

Attitude towards the advertisement was measured with five 7-point semantic differential scales taken from Hornikx and Hof's study (2008). The scales were preceded by the statement: 'How would you evaluate the ad shown above', followed by 'Not nice-Nice'; 'Boring-Engaging'; 'Not original-Original'; 'Not attractive-Attractive'; and 'Not interesting-Interesting*'*. ($\alpha = .90$)

Purchase intention was measured with the help of three 7-point semantic differentials (Hornikx & Hof, 2008) following the statement: 'This product': 'I never want to buy-I certainly want to buy'; 'I do not recommend to my friends-I recommend to my friends'; 'Is really something for me-really nothing for me'. The overall reliability of this scale was good. ($\alpha = .92$)

Language associations were measured using three 7-point scales following the question: 'How strongly do you associate the advertisement with the following concepts'. The chosen

concepts were 'modern', 'success' and 'international' as described as associated with the English language by Piller (2001). The scales were adapted from research by Krishna and Ahluwalia (2008) and ranged from 1 (= strongly associated) to 5 (= not at all associated). The reliability of this scale was acceptable. (α = .78)

Perceived shock was rated on two, three 7-point scales anchored at 1 (= completely agree) to 7 (= completely disagree). The scales, based on the scale of shock used by Dahl et al. (2003) followed three statements: 'I find this advertisement shocking', 'I find this advertisement startling', and 'I find this advertisement obscene'. The reliability of this scale was acceptable. (α = .76)

Perceived dynamism of the advertiser was included in the survey to see whether shock advertisement with L1 or L2 swear words appealed more to the desire for dynamism that a younger audience has (Grondelaers & Van Gent 2019). It was measured with scales adapted from research by Grondelaers and Van Gent (2019), who listed traits that are commonly associated with dynamic people and organizations The traits that were adapted for the current research were 'hip', 'trendy', and 'modern'. these traits were rated on a 7-point Likert scale following the statement 'I think the advertiser who made this ad is [hip/trendy/modern]' (1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree). The traits that were adapted for the current research were 'hip' 'trendy' and 'modern'. The reliability for this scale of dynamism was very good. (α =.92)

Perceived emotional intensity of the ad was measured on one 7-point semantic differential scale adapted from Dewaele and Moxsom-Turnbull (2019). After seeing an advertisement, participants were asked to rate 'how emotional' they rated the advertisement (1= not at all emotional and 7 = very emotional).

Perceived likelihood of encountering the ad was included as a variable to check whether the audience believed there was an equal chance of encountering L1 or L2 swear words in advertisements in their daily life. It was measured in the way that the pretest measured the likelihood of encountering the ad. The variable was measured on a 7-point Likert scale following the question 'How likely would you rate the chance of encountering this advertisement in your daily life? (1 = Very unlikely, 7 = very likely).

Recall was measured through an unaided open-ended question asking the participant to write down the swear word they saw in the advertisements. This technique was previously used in research by Lerman and Garbarino (2002) and Baack, Wilson and Till (2008) with brand names, but since the salient item in the ads for the current research is a swear word, it was decided to focus the question on the swear word. The questions were "which swear word was used in the first advertisement you saw", "which swear word was used in the second advertisement you saw" and

"which swear word was used in the third advertisement you saw". The answers were coded with either a 1 (= correct) or a 0 (= incorrect) by two independent coders. Answers that were given in the wrong order were counted as incorrect. The maximum score was for mean recall per participant 1, the minimum score was a 0. The interrater reliability was very good k =1.00, $p < .001$. The recall questions were asked after several pages of demographic questions, which functioned as a distraction.

In addition to these variables, background information was asked from the participants to perform manipulations checks and verify whether the audience were potential members of the intended target group.

All participants were asked to rate the words that they encountered in their ads again at the end of the questionnaire. The measure called o*ffensiveness of swear words out of context* was included to be able to check whether the offensiveness ratings as they were obtained in the pretest (Appendix B) were still valid for the main experiment. The variable was measured on the same two 9-point semantic differential scales that were used in the pretest. These scales were based on a one-item scale used by Timothy Jay (1992), which was amended with another item derived from research by Bousfield, (2008), Culpeper (2012), and Haugh (2013) (see Appendix B, section 1.2.1 for more information). The scales were preceded by the question "what do you think of the word [swear word]?", the scales ranged from 1 (= not offensive at all; not rude at all) to 9 (= Very offensive; very rude). The reliability of the scale was calculated using the Spearman-Brown Coefficient (r_{SB}), as it only included two items (Eisinga et al. 2013). The reliability of the scale was good for all the words included (damn r_{SB} = .93; crap r_{SB} = .77; ass r_{SB} = .85; verdomme r_{SB} = .88; kak r_{SB} = .83; reet r_{SB} = .83)

A variable of *sentence fit* was also included in the questionnaire to check whether translations that were used in the slogans were perceived as being appropriate. Even though the swear words were already tested within a similar sentence structure in the pretest, it was imperative to also check the sentence fit for the current research, to eliminate any doubt whether the translations were experienced as inappropriate for the chosen slogans by the participants in the main experiment. Sentence fit was measured with the statement "'verdomme (or kak, or reet)' is an appropriate translation for the word 'damn (or crap, or ass)' in the following sentence". The statement was followed by a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (= completely agree) to 7 (= completely disagree).

The participants were asked to assess their proficiency for four levels of language skill "speaking skill", "reading skill", "writing skill" and "listening skill" in English on four 7-point

semantic differentials scales ranging from 1 (= very bad) to 7 (= very good) *(*based on Hendriks et al., 2017). The reliability of this proficiency scale was very good (α = .93).

To ensure that there were no significant differences in swearing behavior, which could be a cause of differing reception of the ads, a question concerning daily swearing behavior was included in the questionnaire. The question "How often do you use swear words on a daily basis?" was followed by a 7-point Likert scale of frequency ranging from 1 (= never) to 7 (=very often).

In addition to the evaluation of swearing behavior, *attitude towards swearing* was also measured. This variable was measured on four 7-point Likert scales, designed specifically for the current research, as previous scales either included many items testing situational appropriateness (Kapoor, 2014) or the scales were not significantly clarified and reported in the academic writing (Coyne et al., 2011). The new scale was based on the contextual questions (Kapoor, 2014), but shortened to four items as to not lengthen the questionnaire any further. Both the different contexts (Jay & Janschewitz, 2008; Kapoor, 2014) and receiver-sender factors (Bousfield, 2007; Culpepper, 2011; Haugh, 2013) were taken into account when developing the items. The questions: "I find it acceptable when I swear in public", "I find it acceptable when I swear in a private situation", "I find it acceptable when others swear in public", "I find it acceptable when others swear in a private situation" were all followed by a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (= completely agree) to 7 (= completely disagree). The reliability of the scale was asses with the help of a factor analysis. The results of the factor analysis are displayed in Table 3.

A principal component analysis with oblimin rotation revealed a one-factor solution (see Table 3 for the loadings on the component), explaining 69.18% of the variance. The factor was *attitude towards swearing* and its Cronbach's alpha was found to be good (α = .85).

Table 3. Results of the principal component analysis with oblimin rotation

	Attitude towards swearing
Item 1 (I find it acceptable when I swear in public)	.87
Item 2 (I find it acceptable when I swear in a private situation)	.84
Item 3 (I find it acceptable when others swear in public)	.81
Item 4 (I find it acceptable when others swear in a private situation)	.81
Eigenvalues	2.77

% of variance	69.18
α	.85

Product engagement was evaluated to ensure that all participants of the study were part of the potential target group and thus used the product. The use of product was measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5 with the following labels (1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = regularly, 4 = often, 5 = always).

An open-question manipulation check was put into place just after the participants had rated the advertisements. The open-ended question was as follows: 'what do you think the aim of this experiment was?'.

Demographic questions concerning age, gender, education level, nationality, mother tongue, swearing behavior were also included.

3.6 Procedure

To conduct the experiment an online questionnaire was created using the online program Qualtrics. Potential participants for the experiment were approached through online channels such as Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp, LinkedIn, and SurveySwap. The participants were invited to fill out the questionnaire.

The questionnaire could be filled in at any time and place as long as the participant had internet access. Participants received clear instructions on confidentiality, participation requirements, the voluntariness of filling in the experiment and possibilities to withdraw from the research or ask questions and file complaints (see Appendix D). Basic instructions on how to fill in the different components of the questionnaire were given throughout the experiment.
In addition, two gift cards (worth €25,-) were raffled amongst participants who wanted to participate in a raffle. They could leave their email and indicate which gift card (i.e., bol.com, Zalando, Coolblue, etc.) they would like to receive in case they won. On average, filling out the questionnaire took approximately 10 to 15 minutes.

3.7 Statistical treatment

Firstly, several manipulation checks were done to determine whether the manipulations functioned as intended. The open-ended questions that the participants filled in were checked for

any indication that they suspected a translation-related swear word study. Three separate t-tests were used to determine the difference between the offensiveness ratings for the Dutch words from the pretest and the main experiment to check whether similarity in offensiveness for English and Dutch words, as rated by native speakers, were still guaranteed to be the same. Three one-sample t-tests were conducted by looking at the differences between the evaluations for sentence fit and the average value of 4 (mid-point of the scale), to determine whether the translations used in the experiment were still found to be appropriate within their sentence context.

The A two-way multivariate repeated measures analysis was conducted to determine the effects of within-subjects factor swear word used and the between-subjects factor language used on attitude towards ad, purchase intention, shock, language associations, recall, perceived emotionality, perceived dynamism, and perceived likelihood of encountering the ad. The results for likelihood of encountering ad were not hypothesized, but they were examined as an additional check whether participants expected to encounter one of the variants (L1/L2) more than the other and thus provide an indication of whether the practical application of the use of either one of the two methods is considered more appropriate than the other in daily life.

According to the Shapiro-Wilk test, the assumption of normality was violated for several of the dependent variables, parametric tests were conducted. This approach was chosen as the Central Limit Theorem contends that for sufficiently large group sizes with ($n > 30$) normality can be assumed (Kotz, 2006).

The analysis was followed by eight separate two-way univariate repeated measures with Bonferonni-corrected alpha to determine which dependent variables differed significantly from each other and to determine whether there were any significant interactions between the language that was used and the swear word that was used. These tests were used to test the main hypotheses of the study: H1, H2, H3, H4, H5, H6, and H7.

According to Levene's test, the assumption of equal variances was violated for the results for language associations measured for the second advertisement ($F = 15{,}24$, $p < .001$) and the results for perceived emotionality for advertisement 1 ($F = 4{,}59$, $p = .034$) and 2 ($F = 3{,}98$, p = .0,05). These variables were treated similar to the others as the group sizes (L1 $n = 76$ /L2 $n = 72$) did not differ more than the maximum recommended ratio of 1.5 (76/72 = 1.06) (Pitch & Stevens, 2016).

No significant interactions were found for any of the dependent variables, one significant between-subjects effect was found and multiple significant within-subjects were found.

The significant between-subjects results for the two-way univariate repeated measures with Bonferonni-corrected were further explored with independent t-tests, to explore which swear words caused the significant differences between the groups.

Significant within-subjects results for the two-way univariate repeated measures analysis were examined using a one-way univariate repeated measures analysis for both language groups with pairwise comparison. These results were not the primary focus of the current research so they were only briefly described in the results section. They will be explored extensively in Appendix E.

Expected relationships of dependent variables with language associations, perceived emotionality and perceived shock, perceived dynamism, and language proficiency were examined by looking at correlation coefficients. The correlations analyses were conducted using Pearson's r. These analyses were used to test the sub hypotheses: H1a, H3a, H4a, H4b, H5a, H5b, H5c, H6a, H6b, H6c, H7a, and H7b.

Lastly, three independent samples t-test was conducted to determine the differences between the offensiveness of English and Dutch swear words used in the two groups (L1/L2) out of slogan context.

4. Results

4.1 manipulation checks

Several manipulation checks were put into place to ensure that the manipulations in the current study functioned as expected. Two checks were meant to check whether the results from the pretest (e.g., offensiveness ratings, sentence appropriateness of swear words) were still valid after the swear word translations were included in the main experiment. One check was used to determine whether any participants had been aware of the aim of the study

Firstly, a check was included in the questionnaire to ensure that offensiveness ratings of the Dutch swear word translations in the main experiment were similar to the ratings that were obtained in the pretest.

Secondly, the sentence fit of the swear word equivalent pairs was checked. In the pretest, it had been determined that the three selected swear words ('verdomme', 'kak', and 'reet') were appropriate translations within sentence context (see Appendix B). Three independent one-sample t-tests, based on a value of four (the middle point of the scale), were conducted to check whether the translations were evaluated as being above average. The t-tests showed that all translations were

rated significantly above average for sentence fit; 'verdomme' (M = 4.65, SD = 1.88) (t(147) = 4.19, p <.001), 'kak' (M = 5.29, SD = 1.47) (t(147) = 10.67, p <.001), 'reet' (M = 5.23, SD = 1.64) (t(147) = 9.14, p <.001).

Thirdly, the offensiveness ratings for L1 words from the pretest were compared to the offensiveness ratings for L1 words from the main experiment. Three independent t-test were conducted. The test for 'verdomme' showed that the pretest offensiveness (M = 2.72, SD = 1.54) was significantly lower than the main experiment offensiveness (M = 5.03, SD = 1.08), (t(97) = 4.92, p <.001). Th test for 'kak' showed no significance between pretest (M =3.41 , SD =1.72) and main experiment offensiveness (M =3.70 , SD =1.94) (t(97) = 0.63, p <.001). The test for 'reet' also showed no difference for offensiveness between pretest (M = 4.72, SD =1.68) and main experiment ratings (M= *4.83*, SD = 1.96) *(*t(97) = 0.25, p <.001).

An open-ended question was included in the questionnaire to examine whether any participants suspected the aim of the study, being the comparison of the effects of the use of L1 and L2 swear words. None of the participants indicated that they were aware of this specific aim of the study.

Thus, the manipulation checks indicated that the manipulations were mostly successful, the differing offensiveness rating for 'verdomme' can, however, be a limitation to the study as the shock value for Dutch was likely influenced by the higher perceived shock for the Dutch language group in the main experiment.

4.2 Two-way multivariate repeated measures analysis

Table 4. Means and standard deviations of participants' attitude towards the ad, purchase intention, language associations, perceived shock, recall, perceived emotionality, perceived dynamism and perceived likelihood of encountering the ad (dependent variables) in function of Language of the ad and swear word used.

		Dependent variables							
Language used	Swear word used	Attitude towards the ad	Purchase intention	Language associations	Perceived shock	Recall	Perceived emotionality	Perceived dynamism	Likelihood of encountering the ad
		M (SD)	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*
English n = 72	Damn	3.34 (1.21)	3.88 (1.22)	3.13 (1.33)	2.28 (1.29)	.64 (.48)	2.00 (1.35)	2.95 (1.52)	3.75 (1.75)
	Crap	3.62 (1.25)	3.88 (1.31)	3.23 (1.30)	2.46 (1.15)	.75 (.44)	2.35 (1.32)	3.30 (1.48)	3.72 (1.63)
	Ass	3.30 (1.43)	3.38 (1.38)	2.94 (1.18)	3.30 (1.35)	.85 (.36)	2.81 (1.63)	2.99 (1.44)	2.88 (1.70)

Group mean		3.42 (1.11)	3.08 (1.33)	3.10 (1.08)	2.68 (1.09)	.75 (.32)	2.34 (1.21)	3.08 (1.33)	3.45 (1.41)
Dutch n = 76	Verdomme	3.32 (1.02)	3.62 (1.16)	2.85 (1.14)	2.92 (1.46)	.63 (.49)	2.50 (1.58)	2.75 (1.41)	3.59 (1.65)
	Kak	3.55 (1.21)	3.54 (1.25)	3.00 (.94)	3.50 (1.28)	.79(.41)	2.61 (1.53)	3.40 (1.38)	3.09 (1.59)
	Reet	3.39 (1.38)	3.11 (1.47)	2.75 (1.13)	4.00 (1.48)	.79 (.41)	2.99 (1.91)	3.02 (1.41)	2.88 (1.74)
Group mean		3.42 (.90)	3.06 (1.07)	2.87 (.80)	3.48 (1.07)	.74 (.32)	2.70 (1.44)	3.06 (1.07)	3.19 (1.27)

A two-way multivariate repeated measures analysis for attitude towards ad, purchase intention, perceived shock, language associations, recall, perceived emotionality, perceived dynamism, and perceived likelihood of encountering the ad with swear word used as within-subjects factor and language of swear word as between-subjects factor showed a significant main effect of Language used ($F(8, 139)= 3.69$, $p = .001$ partial $\eta^2 = .18$. There was also a statistically significant within-subjects effect for swear word used $F(16, 131) = 8.25$, $p < .001$ partial $\eta^2 = .50$. The language used by swear word used interaction was statistically insignificant $F(16, 131) = 1.21$, $p =.267$, partial $\eta^2 = .129$. Thus, significant differences were found for the variables between the swear words used (‘Damn’ – ‘Verdomme'; ‘Crap – Kak’; ‘Ass – Reet') as well as between the two language groups (L1/L2). There was no indication for any significant effect between the language used and the swear word used.

To further examine the significant effects between the groups eight separate two-way univariate repeated measures analyses were conducted with a Bonferonni corrected alpha $a = 0.025$. Significant between-subject effects following two-way univariate repeated measures analyses were followed by independent samples t-tests. Within-subjects effects were examined using one-way univariate repeated measures analyses, however, the findings for these analyses will be summarized, as only between-subjects effects were the main focus of the current research (for detailed statistical treatment of the within-subjects effects see Appendix. E)

There was no indication for any significant interaction effects, therefore the insignificant interaction effects were not reported in the following analyses.

4.2.1 The effect of the language choice of swear word on language associations

The two-way univariate repeated measures analysis for language associations with swear word used as within-subjects factor and language used as between-subjects factor, showed no

significant within-subjects effect $F(1.87; 272.16) = 3.69$ $p = .029$ $\eta^2 = .023$. Because the assumption of sphericity was violated the *F*-value was calculated with Greenhouse-Geisser. There was also no significance difference found for between-subjects effect $F(1, 146) = 2.32$, $p = .130$ $\eta^2 = .016$.

Language associations regarding 'modernity', 'globalism', and 'success' were thus found to be similar for both languages, rejecting hypothesis H1, which stated that language associations would be more positive for the English advertisements.

4.2.2 The effect of the language choice of swear word on perceived emotionality

A two-way univariate repeated measures analysis for perceived emotionality with swear word used as within-subjects factor and language used as between-subjects factor showed a significant within-subjects effect $F(1.84; 268.23) = 17.31$, $p < .001$ $\eta^2 = .10$. Because the assumption of sphericity was violated the F-value was calculated with Greenhouse-Geisser. There was no significance difference found for between-subjects effect $F(1, 146) = 2.04$, $p = .155$ $\eta^2 = .014$. Both language groups achieved a similar rating for perceived emotionality in the advertisements pairs. These findings caused a rejection of H2, which predicted a lower perceived emotionality for advertisements English swear words.

Follow-up one-way repeated measures analyses indicated that the L2 advertisement significantly differed from each other in terms of perceived emotionality between swear words $F(1.77; 125.55) = 12.73$ $p < .001$. The *F*-value was calculated with Greenhouse-Geisser as the assumption of sphericity was violated. The same was true for the L1 advertisements. The *F*-value here was also calculated with Greenhouse-Geisser, $F(1.81; 135.77) = 4.37$, $p = .014$. (see Appendix E, section 1 for further analysis).

4.2.3 The effect of the language choice of swear words on perceived shock

The two-way univariate repeated measures analysis for perceived shock with swear word used as within-subjects factor and language used as between-subjects factor showed a significant within-subjects effect $F(1.76; 256.73) = 43.78$ $p < 001$ $\eta^2 = .231$. Because the assumption of sphericity was violated the *F*-value was calculated with Greenhouse-Geisser. There was also a significance effect found for between-subjects effect $F(1, 146) = 20.04$, $p < 001$ $\eta^2 = .121$. Perceived shock was found to be significantly higher for the L1 swear words than the L2 swear words.

The differences between the two language groups were further examined by using three independent samples t-tests. The analyses showed a significant difference of perceived shock

between ‘damn’ (M = 2.28, SD =1.29) and ‘verdomme’ (M = 2.93, SD =1.46) (t(1, 146) = 2.83, p = .005), ‘crap’ (M = 2.46, SD =1.15) and ‘kak’ (M = 3.50, SD =1.28) (t(1, 146) = 5.21, p < .001) and ‘ass’ (M = 3.30, SD =1.35) ‘reet’ (M =4.00, SD =1.48)(t (1, 146) = 3.00, p = .003).

The L1 swear words all had significantly higher perceived shock ratings than their English translation equivalents. This caused H3 to be accepted, as it predicted the perceived shock to be significantly lower for the English swear words.

Follow-up one-way repeated measures analyses found that there were significantly different shock ratings between the swear words used in the L2 groups F(1.54; 109.55) = 34.10 p < .001. The F-value was calculated with Greenhouse-Geisser as the assumption of sphericity was violated. There was also a significant difference between the shock ratings for the swear words used in the L1 group. The F-value here was also calculated with Greenhouse-Geisser F(1.70; 127.14) = 17.49, p < .001. (see Appendix E, section 2 for further analysis).

4.2.4 The effect of the language choice of swear word on perceived dynamism

The two-way univariate repeated measures analysis for perceiver dynamism with swear word used as within-subjects factor and language used as between-subjects factor showed a significant within-subjects effect F(1.90; 277.03) = 10.73, p < .001 η^2 = .068 . Because the assumption of sphericity was violated, the F-value was calculated with Greenhouse-Geisser. There was no significance difference found for the between-subjects effect F(1, 146) < 1 , p = .907 η^2 < .001.

Thus, both language groups rated the advertisements similarly on their associations with ‘modern’, ‘hip’ and ‘trendy’. These findings showed that H4 could be accepted, as it predicted that no significant differences between the language groups would be found for perceived dynamism.

Follow-up one-way repeated measures analyses showed a significant difference for the perceived dynamism between the three L2 swear words F(1.84; 130.72) = 4.35, p = .017. There was also a significant difference for the perceived dynamism between each swear word within the L1 group F(2, 150) = 6.86, p = .001. (see Appendix E, section 3 for further analysis).

4.2.5 The effect of the language choice of swear word on attitude towards the ad

A two-way univariate repeated measures analysis for attitude towards the ad with within-subjects factor swear word used and between-subjects factor language used indicated that there was no significant within-subjects effect F(2, 292) = 3.45 p = .033 η^2 = .023. There was no significant between-subjects effect found F(1, 146) < 1, p = . 996 η^2 < .001.

Thus, in terms of attitude towards the advertisement the two language groups (L1/L2) achieved similar results for all advertisements. These findings were in accordance with H5, which stated that attitude towards the ad would be similar for both language groups.

4.2.6 The effect of the language choice of swear word on purchase intention

The two-way univariate repeated measures analysis for purchase intention with within-subjects factor swear word used and between-subjects factor language used indicated that there was a significant within-subjects effect $F(2, 292) = 17.77$ $p < .001$ $\eta^2 = .11$. There was no significant between-subjects effect found $F(1, 146) = 2.50$, $p = .116$ $\eta^2 = .017$. Both language groups performed similarly in terms of purchase intention for all advertisements, thus H6 was accepted.

Follow-up one-way repeated measures analyses showed that the L2 group showed a significant difference for purchase intention between swear words $F(2; 142) = 11.02$, $p < .001$. The analysis for the L1 group was also shown to have a significant difference among the swear words used. $F(2, 150) = 7.52$, $p = .001$. (see Appendix E, section 4 for further analysis).

4.2.7 The effect of the language choice of swear word on recall

The two-way univariate repeated measures analysis for Recall with swear word used as within-subjects factor and language used as between-subjects factor showed a significant within-subjects effect $F(2, 292) = 10.45$ $p < 001$ $\eta^2 = .07$. There was no significant difference found for between-subjects effects $F(1, 146) < 1$, $p = 872$ $\eta^2 < .001$.

These findings supported H7, which predicted that no significant difference would be found for the use of English and Dutch swear words with regard to recall.

Follow-up one-way repeated measures analyses found that the L2 advertisements differed significantly in terms of recall $F(2, 142) = 6.25$, $p = .002$. The same result was found for the various advertisements within the L1 group. *F*-value here was also calculated with Greenhouse-Geisser $F(1.83; 137.40) = 4.88$, $p = .011$. (see Appendix E, section 5 for further analysis).

4.2.8 The effect of the language choice of swear word on likelihood of encountering the ad

The two-way univariate repeated measures analysis for likelihood of encountering ad with swear word used as within-subjects factor and language used as between-subjects factor showed a significant within-subjects effect $F(1.92; 279.61) = 15.73$, $p < .001$ $\eta^2 = .097$. Because the assumption of sphericity was violated the *F*-value was calculated with Greenhouse-Geisser. There was no significance difference found for between-subjects effect $F(1, 146) = 1.40$, $p = .238$ $\eta^2 =$

.010. These findings were not linked to a hypothesis but did support the idea that the use of English and Dutch swear words are found to be equally appropriate for use in real-life advertising.

Follow-up one-way repeated measures analyses indicated a significant difference in likelihood of encountering the ad between swear words in the L2 group $F(1.61; 114.74) = 13.52$, $p < .001$. Because the assumption of sphericity was violated the *F*-value was calculated with Greenhouse-Geisser. A significant difference in the likelihood of encountering the ad was also found between the swear words used in the L1 group $F(2, 150) = 5.83$, $p = .004$. (see Appendix E, section 6 for further analysis).

4.3 Correlations

Several significant correlations were hypothesized (H1a, H3a, H4a, H4b, H5a, H5b, H5c, H6a, H6b, H6c, H7a, and H7b) for the current study. These relationships were explored using a Pearson's r correlation.

4.3.1 Correlations with language association

Correlations coefficients were examined to explore the relationship between language associations and English proficiency (H1a), perceived dynamism (H4a), attitude towards the ad (H5a), and purchase intention (H6b), for L2 swear words.

The results showed a significant positive correlations between language associations and attitude towards (r (72) = .79, $p < .001$), purchase intention (r (72) = .79, $p < .001$), perceived emotionality (r (72) = .54, $p < .001$) and perceived dynamism (r (72) = .79 $p < .001$). These variables all increased as the associations of the swear word with the concepts of 'modern', 'success' and 'international' increased when the ad contained English swear words (see Table 5).

No significant relation was found between language associations and proficiency. These findings provided support for H1a, which stated that no correlation would be found for language associations and English proficiency, H4a, which predicted a significant correlation for language associations with perceived dynamism, H5a, which predicted a significant relationship between language associations and attitude towards the ad and H6b, which anticipated a significant correlation between language associations and purchase intention.

Tabel 5. Correlation between language associations and English proficiency, perceived dynamism, attitude towards the ad and purchase intention, for L2 swear words

Variable	Language Associations
	EN (*n* = 72)
Attitude towards the ad	.79**
Purchase intention	.79**
Perceived emotionality	.54**
Perceived dynamism of the advertiser	.79**
Proficiency	.012

*$p < .050$, **$p < .010$

4.3.2 Correlations with perceived shock

Relationships between the dependent variables perceived shock and perceived emotionality (H3a), perceived dynamism (H4b), attitude towards the ad (H5b) and purchase intention (H6c), and recall (H7b) were also explored for both language groups (Table 6.).

Tabel 6. Correlation between perceived shock and perceived emotionality, perceived dynamism, attitude towards the ad, purchase intention and recall for both language groups.

Variable	Perceived Shock	
	EN (*n = 72)*	NL (*n* = 76)
Perceived emotionality	.65**	.59**
Perceived dynamism of the advertiser	.51**	.32**
Attitude towards the ad	.47**	.23
Purchase intention	.51**	.32**
Recall of the ad	.17	.02

*$p < .050$, **$p < .010$

The results showed a significant positive correlation between perceived shock and perceived emotionality for the L2 group (r (72) = .65, $p < .001$), as well as the L1 group (r (76) = .59, $p <$

.001). These findings provided support for H3a, as perceived shock was expected to increase when perceived emotionality also increased.

A positive correlation was also found between perceived shock and perceived dynamism for L2 (r (72) = .51, p < .001) and the L1 language group (r (76) = .32, p = .005). These findings supported hypothesis H4b, which predicted that perceived shock would be significantly correlated to perceived dynamism for both language groups.

Mixed results were found for the correlations between perceived shock and attitude towards ad for both groups. A significant positive correlation was found for the L2 group (r (72) = .47, p < .001), but no significant effect was found for the L1 language group (r (76) = .23, p = .050). The attitude towards the ad thus increased for L2 if perceived shock increased, while the two variables in the L1 group we not related to each other. H5b was rejected as it expected a significant relation between perceived shock and attitude towards ad for both groups.

Furthermore ,a significant positive correlation was found for perceived shock and purchase intentions for both the L2 (r (72) = .51 p < .001) and L1 (r (76) = .32, p = .005) group. This means that for both groups the purchase intention increased when the perceived shock increased. This was in agreement with the expectations for H6c, the hypothesis was accepted.

For both groups no significant correlation found between recall and perceived shock, L2 (r (72) = .17, p = .15), L1 (r (76) = .32, p = .005). Thus there was no relationship between the rating of perceived shock and potential recall. Hypothesis H7b, which expected significance for both groups, was rejected.

4.3.3 Correlations with attitude towards the ad

The correlations between attitude towards the ad and perceived dynamism (H5c) as well as purchase intention (H6a) were examined. A positive correlation was found between attitude towards the ad and both the variables perceived dynamism (r (148) = .72, p < .001) and purchase intention (r (148) = .72, p < .001). Both variables increased as attitude towards the ad increased. This supported the hypotheses, which indicated that a significant relationship was expected for both perceived dynamism (H5c) and attitude towards the ad, as well as a significant relationship between purchase intention and attitude towards the ad (H6a).

4.3.4 Correlations with perceived proficiency

The effect of English proficiency on recall (H7a) was examined by conducting a correlation coefficient analysis. A significant correlation between recall and proficiency was found for the L2

group (r (148) = .37, p = .001). Recall increased as English proficiency increased for the L2 swear word group. This supported H7a, which predicted a significant relation between English proficiency and recall.

4.4 Offensiveness of first- and second-language swear words

Lastly, a final check was conducted to see whether the offensiveness scores for the translation differed or remained similar, as was expected after the pretest.

Three independent samples t-test were used to explore the differing offensiveness for Dutch and English swear words out of context.

A first test showed a significant difference between the offensiveness of the swear word 'damn' (M =2.46, SD = 1.58) and 'verdomme' (M = 5.03, SD = 2.09) (Levene's test was significant F = 5.41, p = .021) (t(139.49) = 8.41, p < .001)

A second independent samples t-test showed no significant difference between the offensiveness of the swear word 'crap' (M = 3.44, SD = 1.64) and 'kak' (M = 3.70, SD = 1.94) (t(146) = 0.86, p = .394).

The last independent samples t-test did not find a significant difference between offensiveness for 'ass' (M = 4.44, SD = 1.93) and 'reet' (M = 4.83 SD = 1.96) (t(146) = 1.20, p = .23).

The offensiveness ratings for the translation pairs mostly remained the same, suggesting that, in an out-of-context situation, language differences do no influence offensiveness. 'Verdomme' was rated significantly higher in offensiveness than 'Damn'. This is contrary to the findings of the pretest and it could be an indication that 'verdomme' is a sensitive word for some participants in the current study and its offensiveness could have influenced other results.

5. Conclusion and discussion

5.1 aim and goal of the study

The main aim of the study was to examine the effects of Dutch and English swear words on the effectiveness of advertisements for a young audience (18 to 30 years old). The effectiveness was measured by looking at the attitude towards the ad, purchase intention, recall, and several other variables that were commonly used to measure the effects of the use of either foreign languages or swear words in advertising. These variables consisted of perceived shock, perceived emotionality,

language associations, perceived dynamism. Likelihood of encountering the advertisement was also measured as a means to determine whether both the use of L1 and L2 swear words would be considered acceptable by the consumer.

148 Highly educated, Dutch participants aged between 18 and 30 years old. Participated in an experiment in which they answered a questionnaire about three different Dutch ads for local beer companies containing swear words in either English or Dutch. Other aims of the study were to examine the underlying relations between the dependent variables in the hope to provide somewhat narrow the gap of knowledge about the rather new phenomenon that is the use of foreign language swear words in an L1 context.

5.2 Discussion and conclusion

As could be seen in the results section, the experiment seem to provide little evidence for the idea that the two language groups differ in effectiveness. The results for the main hypotheses (H1, H2, H3, H4, H5, H6 and H7) showed that similar results were found between both language groups for the variables language associations (H1), perceived emotionality (H2), perceived dynamism (H4), attitude towards the ad (H5), purchase intention (H6) and recall (H7). The only variable providing significantly different effects was perceived shock, which was significantly higher for Dutch swear words. This difference in perceived shock (H3), however, did not seem to have any further effect on advertising effectiveness. Other variables remained similar for both groups despite the difference in shock. Based on these results one could conclude that there are no significant differences in the manner in which both technique could be implemented.

The correlation analyses for sub-hypotheses H1a, H3a, H4a, H4b, H5a, H5b, H5c, H6a, H6b, H6c, H7a and H7b, provided some valuable information with which the discrepancies between expectations and outcomes for the main hypotheses could be examined.

Findings showed that although a significantly better rating for language association was expected for the use of L2 swear words, based on previous studies, no such effect was found. Language association rating were similar for both the L1 and L2 language group, providing an indication that the use of English is no longer connected to the concepts of modernism and globalism as its use had become to widespread (Planken et al., 2010), the conscious choice for an incongruent product has led to weaker links with the concepts that English can evoke (Micu & Coulter, 2010), or the fact that swear words use in L1 is rated as similarly ‘modern’ and ‘global' as swear word use in English, due to its appeal to young target groups (Dahl et al., 2003).

The correlation results relating to H1a indicated that there was no significant relationship between language proficiency and language associations. This provided some evidence that

language competence played no part in whether associations were evoked by a language or not. As the current study worked with very proficient participants, these findings could provide an indication for the fact that, for above-average proficient speakers of English, the use of English is no longer related to concepts of 'foreignness'.

H2 was rejected as it expected to find a significant difference between the perceived emotionality of L1 and L2 swear words. According to previous studies it had been determined that L1 is, even in cases of high proficiency, was often still perceived as being more emotional than an L2. However, the current study found no significant differences in emotionality. Once again this could be an indication that for highly proficient target groups, who, like Dutch students, have been confronted with English on a daily basis through social media and pop culture (Bonnet, 2002), the emotionality of the two languages been developed in a similar way. Mohammedhi (2020) provided evidence that in low-emotional situations, many speakers use their L1 and L2 interchangeably in order to express emotions. As the advertisements were designed with mild swear words used in an informal setting, the advertisement might be considered a low-emotionality situation, speakers would thus find both L1 and L2 swear words similarly emotional. In situations containing stronger swear words or a more offensive motive for the use of swear words, results for emotionality could be different.

H3 predicted that perceived shock would be higher for the use of L1 swear words than L2 swear words. Findings from the analyses supported this analysis. L1 swear words were perceived as significantly more shocking than their English counterpart. This had been hypothesized as an L1 were thought to be more emotional than an L2 (DeWaele, 2004). However, as the results for H2 indicated, the emotionality was similar for both languages. H3a provided evidence that there was a significant positive relationship for both language groups between emotionality and perceived shock, thus one would have expected similar results for these variables. Likeliness of encountering the ad in real life was also similar for both groups, so the difference would likely not be caused by the fact that encountering a Dutch swear word would be more surprising. Offensiveness perception was also ruled out as a potential influence as only the influence for 'verdomme' was significantly higher than the rating for its English counterpart ('damn'), shock was proven to be significantly higher for the L1 words for all three translation pairs. Thus the discrepancy in perceived shock ratings was, most likely, the result of a variable that was not included in the current study. As emotionality and shock/offensiveness are sometimes still used synonymously in swear word research. It is worthwhile to look into the differences between emotionality and shock in future research.

Dynamism, before this study, was mostly used to examine attitudes towards speakers with certain accents (Kristiansen, 2001). It had rarely been examined in a marketing setting and has

never before been used to examine swear words use. In the current research it was used to examine if both the use of L1 and L2 swear words appeal to young audiences similarly, this was expected as previous research indicated that both techniques were appealing to the youth (Dahl et al. 2003; Gerritsen et al., 2000). H4 was supported by the findings of the analyses and thus it was established that perceived dynamism did not differ per language group. Correlations analyses (H4a, H4b) explored whether there were any significant relationships between perceived shock and language associations. Significant positive correlations were observed for both variables, with a strong positive correlation for language associations when L2 words were used, a strong relationship between perceived shock and perceived dynamism for the use of L2 words and a moderately strong relationship between perceived shock and perceived dynamism for L1 words. This could account for the fact that although perceived shock is significantly higher for L1 words, L2 words have the same rating of perceived dynamism. Thus dynamism was present when using either L1 or L2 swear words, indicating that both appeal to a young audience. The stronger effect between perceived shock and dynamism for L2 words, provides an indication that dynamism could be higher in a situation English swear word use leads to shock and is able to evoke language associations.

The attitude towards the ad was expected to be similar for both language groups as Attitude towards the ad (H5), due to higher perceived shock, this being non-offensive shock, produced in an informal situation with the right motive, leading to positive attitude towards the ad for Dutch swear words (Jay, 2009; Mortimer, 2007) and due to better language associations for English swear words (Krishna & Ahluwalia, 2008; Piller, 2001). There were no significant differences found for both language groups concerning attitude towards ad, however, as language associations were similar for both language groups and the higher perceived shock for the Dutch words did not lead to a significant different in attitude towards the ad, the correlations with attitude towards ad were examined closer. H5a, H5b, and H5c, explored the correlations between attitude towards the ad and language associations, perceived shock and dynamism, respectively. H5a was supported by findings, as there was a positive correlation between language associations and attitude towards the ad, this was in line with expectation, but due to similarity in language associations among the groups no effect of this relationship was encountered. H5b examined the relationship with perceived shock, which was only found to be significant and positive for English swear words, for Dutch swear words it was not significant. A positive correlation was found between attitude towards the ad and dynamism, which provided indications that both the use of L1 and L2 swear words could evoke positive attitudes toward the ad due to their high ratings in dynamism and possibility to evoke shock. However, there is evidence that L2 swear words could outperform L1 swear words if language associations can effectively be linked to the words.

Purchase intention was hypothesized to follow the results for attitude towards the ad, as it has been said that purchase intention is reliant on attitude towards ad (Goldsmith et al., 2000; La Ferle & Choi, 2005). The language groups were therefore expected not to differ significantly in purchase intention ratings (H6). This hypothesis was supported by the findings. H6a, H6b and H6c explored the correlations between purchase intention and attitude towards the ad, language associations and perceived shock, respectively. H6a was found to be supported by the analyses in the current research and established that there was a significant positive correlation between attitude towards the ad and purchase intention. This provided evidence for the fact that purchase intention was influence by the use of L1 and L2 swear words similarly to attitude towards the ad. H6b found a significant positive correlation between language associations and purchase intention, this relationship was similar to the relationship between language associations and attitude towards the ad. This provided an indication that, when language associations were effectively evoked by the use of L2 swear words, which was not the case in the current research, the use of L2 swear words could potentially lead to better purchase intention than the use of L1 swear words. H6c found that there were significant positive correlations between the purchase intention and perceived shock for both language groups. The correlations, however, was stronger for the L2 swear words, which could explain why the eventual purchase intention ratings did not differ significantly.

The last hypothesis concerned recall of the advertisement. Recall was hypothesized to be similar for both language groups as the use of foreign languages (Dufour & Kroll, 1995; Kroll & De Groot, 1997) as well as the use of swear words (Dahl et al., 2003; Picktong & Broderick) was said to create salience in the mind of the consumers. This salience was expected to be related to perceived shock in the case of swear words and language competence in case of foreign language display. The groups were hypothesized to have similar recall ratings (H7), this was proven to be true. H7a examined the relationship between recall and proficiency and H7b examined the correlation between recall and perceived shock. H7a was affirmed by the findings of the correlation analyses. It was established that there was a significant positive relation between English proficiency. This provided indications for the idea that higher proficiency could help with processing of information, this is in line with research by Raedts et al. (2016) who also found that better comprehension led to better recall. H7b found no significant correlation between recall and perceived shock for both the use of L2 and L1 swear words. This might be the case as the shock that was conveyed by the swear words in the current study was a shock based on surprise and not on offense.

In conclusion, the current study did not provide direct evidence to determine whether the use of English or Dutch swear words led to increased advertising effectiveness. Looking at the results it

can be established that in case of beer advertising in a local Dutch market, with a young target audience, the advertising effectiveness is similar for the use of English and Dutch swear words. However, even though the current research did not find any significant differences in effectiveness, it did find indications that, under the right circumstances, English swear words could potentially outperform their Dutch counterparts. Based on the stronger correlations that were found for between perceived shock and the other variables for English swear words, it could be hypothesized that, when the same perceived shock is evoked by English swear words, they would achieve higher scores than Dutch swear words with the same score for perceived shock. In addition, language associations were also found to be strongly correlated with several dependent variables. This suggests that, when English swear words do succeed in evoking stronger language associations (e.g. by using regional swear words) than Dutch swear words, they could potentially be even more effective as a marketing tool. Thus, the current study might not have provided strong examples of the power of the use second language swear words as a marketing tool, but it has provided a first look at its underlying mechanisms.

6. Limitations and further research

The current study had several of limitations. Firstly, the current study only made use of mild swear words (McEnery, 2006). Although this was a conscious choice, looking at a broader range of swear word types and offensiveness ratings might provide a better idea of which advertisements are most effective in a multi-lingual setting.

In addition, the current study was focused on a young, highly educated audience with an above-average proficiency in English. It is almost certain that the use of such an ‘elitist’ audience influenced the results of the study. It would be interesting to explore whether the use of L2 swear words is perceived differently by people with a lower education or whether it would have different effects on older consumers.

Thirdly, the current study used beer as a product and even though the chosen target group was identified as being a major target group for beer companies (Ruigrok Netpanel. 2019), it further research could focus on the effectiveness of the use of L1 and L2 swear words for the entire market of beer consumers. Further research could also look into different products that could be more congruent with the English language, in the hope that they can achieve better ratings for language associations and explore the untapped potential that the current study was not able to explore, due to a lack in difference between language association ratings for L1 and L2 swear words.

Furthermore it should be taken into account that the current study took some statistical liberties by assuming normality due to its sufficiently large group sizes with (n > 30) (Kotz, 2006). As well as assuming that the assumption of equal variances was met due to significantly equal sample sizes (L1 *n* = 76 /L2 *n = 72*) (Pitch & Stevens, 2016). The statistical results should therefore be looked at with careful consideration. There were also some unequal distributions among the two participant groups regarding beer consumption ($t(146) = 2.38$, $p = .019$) and attitude towards swearing ($t(146) = 2.52$, $p = .013$). This could have influence the data.

Lastly, further research could focus further investigating relevant relationships that were found between the dependent variables in the current study, studying the relationships independently it could be possible tho establish in which contexts, with which materials, for which products, and for which target groups the synthesis of using swear words and foreign languages could be most effective.

References

Adriaans, N. (2013, November 14). *Kijktip: And fuck me rich!* Adformatie. Retrieved from https://www.adformatie.nl/customer-experience/kijktip-and-fuck-me-rich

Ahn, J., & La Ferle, C. (2008). Enhancing recall and recognition for brand names and body copy. *Journal of Advertising*, 37(3), 107-117

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

Alden, D. L., Steenkamp, J. B. E., & Batra, R. (1999). Brand positioning through advertising in Asia, North America, and Europe: The role of global consumer culture. *Journal of Marketing*, 63(1), 75-87.

Ass. (n.d.). In *Van Dale Online*. Consulted on 8 august 2020, at https://online.vandale.nl/zoeken/zoeken.do

Ayçiçegi, A. & Harris, C. (2004). Brief report bilinguals' recall and recognition of emotion words. *Cognition and Emotion, 18*(7), 977-987. doi: 10.1080/02699930341000301

Baack, D. W., Wilson, R. T., & Till, B. D. (2008). Creativity and memory effects: Recall, recognition, and an exploration of nontraditional media. *Journal of Advertising, 37*(4), 85-94. doi:10.2753/joa0091-3367370407

Baker, B.L. & Broadus, C.J. (2015). The use of swear words in print advertising. In H.E. Spotts (Eds.). *Revolution in Marketing: Market Driving Changes* (pp. 99-104). Cham: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-11761-4_44.

Belch, G. E., & Belch, M. A. (2004). A*dvertising and promotion an integrated marketing communications perspective*. New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin

Bonnet, G. (2002). *The assessment of pupils' skills in English in eight European countries. European project commissioned by the European Network of Policy Makers for the Evaluation of Education Systems.* Retrieved from www.eva.dk/projekter/2002/evaluering-af-faget-engelsk-i- grundskolen/projektprodukter/assessmentofenglish.pdf

Bostrom, R. N., Baseheart, J. R., & Rossiter, C. M. (1973). The effects of three types of profane language in persuasive messages. *Journal of Communication, 23*(4), 461-475. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.1973.tb00961.x

Bousfield, D. (2008). Impoliteness in interaction. *Pragmatics & Beyond New Series*. doi:10.1075/pbns.167

Brown, S. & Stayman, D.. (1992). Antecedents and consequences of attitude toward the ad: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research. 19*. 34-51. doi:10.1086/209284.

Butler, Y. G., & Hakuta, K. (n.d.). Bilingualism and second language acquisition. *The Handbook of Bilingualism*, 114-144. doi:10.1002/9780470756997.ch5

Cavazza, N. & Guidetti, M. (2014). Swearing in political discourse: Why vulgarity works. *Journal of Language and Social Psyhology, 33*(5), 537-547. doi: 10.1177/0261927X14533198.

Crap. (n.d.). In *Van Dale Online*. Consulted on 8 august 2020, at https://online.vandale.nl/zoeken/zoeken.do

College voor Toetsen en Examens. (2018, June 2). *Moderne vreemde talen vwo | syllabus centraal examen 2020* [PDF]. Utrecht: College voor Toetsen en Examens. Retrieved from: https://www.examenblad.nl/examenstof/syllabus-2020-moderne-vreemde-4/2020/f=/mvt_vwo_2_versie_2020_def.pdf

College voor Toetsen en Examens. (2019, June 2). *Moderne vreemde talen vmbo | syllabus centraal examen 2021* [PDF]. Utrecht: College voor Toetsen en Examens. Retrieved from: https://www.examenblad.nl/examenstof/syllabus-2021-moderne-vreemde-3/2021/f=/moderne_vreemde_talen_vmbo_2_versie_2021.pdf

College voor Toetsen en Examens. (2020, July 4). *Moderne vreemde talen havo | Syllabus centraal examen 2021* [PDF]. Utrecht: College voor Toetsen en Examens. Retrieved from: https://www.examenblad.nl/examenstof/syllabus-moderne-vreemde-talen-31/2021/havo/f=/moderne_vreemde_talen_havo_2021_4_versie_nadere%20vaststelling.pdf

Conradie, M., & Niekerk, A. V. (2015). The use of linguistic tokenism to secure brand loyalty: Code-switching practices in South African print advertising. *Language Matters, 46*(1), 117-138. doi:10.1080/10228195.2014.981570

Corey, D. M., Dunlap, W. P., & Burke, M. J. (1998). Averaging correlations: Expected values and bias in combined pearson r's and fisher's z transformations. *The Journal of General Psychology, 125*(3), 245-261. doi:10.1080/00221309809595548

Coyne, S. M., Stockdale, L. A., Nelson, D. A., & Fraser, A. (2011). Profanity in media associated with attitudes and behavior regarding profanity use and aggression. *Pediatrics, 128*(5), 867-872. doi:10.1542/peds.2011-1062

Culpeper, J. (2012). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dahl, D. W., Frankenberger, K. D., & Manchanda, R. V. (2003). Does it pay to shock? Reactions to shocking and nonshocking advertising content among university students. *Journal of Advertising Research, 43*(03), 268-280. doi:10.1017/s0021849903030332

Damn. (n.d.). In *Van Dale Online*. Consulted on 8 august 2020, at https://online.vandale.nl/zoeken/zoeken.do

DeepL GmbH. (n.d.). *Linguee | Dictionary for German, French, Spanish, and more*. Linguee.com. https://www.linguee.com

De Groot, A. M. B. (1992). Bilingual lexical representation: A closer look at conceptual representations. In R. Frost & L. Katz (Eds.), *Orthography, phonology, morphology, and meaning* (pp. 389–412). Amsterdam: Elsevier. doi:10.1016/S0166- 4115(08)62805-8

Dekeyser, X., Tops, G. A., Devriendt, B., & Geukens, S. (1999). *Thinking English grammar: To honour Xavier Dekeyser, professor emeritus*. Leuven: Peeters.

Deweale, J. (2004). The emotional force of swearwords and taboo words in the speech of multilinguals. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 25*(2-3), 204-222. doi: 10.1080/01434630408666529.

Dewaele, J. (2010). "Christ fucking shit merde!" Language preferences for swearing among maximally proficient multilinguals. *Sociolinguistic Studies, 4*(3), 595-614. doi: 10.1558/sols.v4i3.595.

Dewaele, J. (2015). British ‘Bollocks’ versus American ‘Jerk’: Do native British English speakers swear more –or differently- compared to American English speakers? *Applied Linguistic Review, 6*(3), 309-339. doi: 10.1515/applirev-2015-0015.

Dewaele, J., & Moxsom-Turnbull, P. (2019). Visual cues and perception of emotional intensity among L1 and LX users of English. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 17*(4), 499-515. doi:10.1080/14790718.2019.1612902

Dewaele, J. (2016). Thirty shades of offensiveness: L1 and LX users’ understanding, perception and self-reported use of negative emotion-laden words. *Journal of Pragmatics. 94,* 112- 127. doi: 10.1016j.pragma.2016.01.009.

Dens, N., De Pelsmacker, P., & Janssens, W. (2008). Exploring consumer reactions to incongruent mild disgust appeals. *Journal of Marketing Communications, 14*(4), 249–269. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527260802141231

Pelsmacker, P. D., & Bergh, J. V. (1996). The communication effects of provocation in print advertising. *International Journal of Advertising, 15*(3), 203-221. doi:10.1080/02650487.1996.11104652

De Pelsmacker, P., Geuens, M., & van den Bergh, J. (2013). *Marketing communications: A European perspective* (5th ed). Pearson Education Limited.

Domzal, T. J., Hunt, J. M., & Kernan, J. B. (1995). Achtung! The information processing of foreign words in advertising. *International Journal of Advertising, 14*(2), 95-114. doi:10.1080/02650487.1995.11104603

Dufour, R., & Kroll, J. F. (1995). Matching words to concepts in two languages: A test of the concept mediation model of bilingual representation. *Memory & Cognition, 23*(2), 166–180. doi:10.3758/ BF03197219 PMID:7731362

Eastman, C. M., & Stein, R. F. (1993). Language display: Authenticating claims to social identity. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 14*(3), 187-202. doi:10.1080/01434632.1993.9994528

Edwards, J. (2012, April 11). Fail: Unilever's new tagline in Germany is 'F--- the diet'. Business Insider Retrieved from https://www.businessinsider.com/yes-unilevers-new-tagline-in-germany-is-f-the-diet-2012-4?international=true&r=US&IR=T

Eisinga, R., Grotenhuis, M. t., & Pelzer, B. (2013). The reliability of a two-item scale: Pearson, Cronbach, or Spearman-Brown?. *International journal of public health*, *58*(4), 637–642. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00038-012-0416-3

Fägersten, K. B. (2012). *Whos swearing now? the social aspects of conversational swearing*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Ferle, C. L., & Choi, S. M. (2005). The importance of perceived endorser credibility in south korean advertising. *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising, 27*(2), 67-81. doi:10.1080/10641734.2005.10505182

Gerritsen, H., Vries, H. D., & Philippart, M. (1995). The Dutch continental shelf model. *Quantitative Skill Assessment for Coastal Ocean Models Coastal and Estuarine Studies,* 425-467. doi:10.1029/ce047p0425

Gerritsen, M., Korzilius, H., Meurs, F. V., & Gijsbers, I. (2000). English in Dutch commercials: Not understood and not appreciated. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 40(4), 17–31. doi: 10.2501/jar-40-4-17-31

Gerritsen, M., et al. (2007). English in product advertisements in Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and Spain. *World Englishes* 26(3), 291-315. doi: 10.1111/ j.1467-971X.2007.00510.x.

Goldsmith, R. E., Lafferty, B. A., & Newell, S. J. (2000). The impact of corporate credibility and celebrity credibility on consumer reaction to advertisements and brands. *Journal of Advertising, 29*(3), 43-54. doi:10.1080/00913367.2000.10673616

Grondelaers, S., & Gent, P. V. (2019). How "deep" is Dynamism? Revisiting the evaluation of Moroccan-flavored Netherlandic Dutch. *Linguistics Vanguard, 5*(S1). doi:10.1515/ lingvan-2018-0011

Haarmann, H. (1984). The role of ethnocultural stereotypes and foreign languages in Japanese commercials. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 1984*(50). doi:10.1515/ ijsl.1984.50.101

Haarmann, H. (1989). *Symbolic values of foreign language use: From the Japanese case to a general sociolinguistic perspective*. Berlijn: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hamilton, M. A. (1989). Reactions to obscene language. *Communication Research Reports, 6*(1), 67-69. doi:10.1080/08824098909359835

Harris, C. L., Ayçiçeĝi, A., & Gleason, J. B. (2003). Taboo words and reprimands elicit greater autonomic reactivity in a first language than in a second language. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 24*(4), 561–579. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716403000286

Haugh, M. (2015). *Im/Politeness implicatures*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hendriks, B., van Meurs, F., & Poos, C. (2017) Effects of difficult and easy English slogans in advertising for Dutch consumers. *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertisin*g, 38(2), 184-196. doi: 10.1080/10641734.2017.1291384

Hill, J. H. (2008). *The everyday language of white racism*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Hornikx, J. & Hof, R. (2008). De effectiviteit van vreemde talen in productreclame. *Tijdschrift voor Taalbeheersing*, *30*(2), 147-156.

Hornikx, J., & Meurs, F. van (2015). Foreign language display in advertising from a psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspective: A review and research agenda. In J. M. Alcántara-Pilar, S. del Barrio-García, E. Crespo-Almedros, & L. Porcu (Eds.), *Analyzing the cultural diversity of consumers in the global marketplace* (pp. 299-319). Hershey: IGI Global.

Hornikx, J., & van Meurs, F. (2016). Foreign languages in advertising as implicit country-of-origin cues: Mechanism, associations, and effectiveness. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 29(2), 60-73. doi:10.1080/08961530.2016.1243996

Hornikx, J., Meurs, F. V., & Starren, M. (2007). An empirical study of readers associations with multilingual advertising: The case of French, Ferman and Spanish in Dutch advertising. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 28*(3), 204-219. doi:10.2167/jmmd482.0

Hornikx, J., van Meurs, F., & de Boer, A. (2010). English or a local language in advertising? The appreciation of easy and difficult English slogans in the Netherlands. *Journal of Business Communication*, 47(2), 169-188. doi: 10.1177/0021943610364624

Jan Rijdt Rond. (2016, 13 april). *Jan rijdt rond - Ik ben je bitch niet [*Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=17nO6E5eW0A

Jay, T. (1992). Cursing in America: A psycholinguistic study of dirty language in the courts, in the movies, in the schoolyards, and on the streets. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Jay, T. (2000). *Why we curse: A neuro-psycho-social theory of speech.* Philadelphia and Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jay, T. & Janschewitz, K. (2008). The pragmatics of swearing. *Journal of Politeness Research, 4,* 267-288. doi: 10.1515/JPLR.2008.013.

Jay, T. (2009). The utility and ubiquity of taboo words. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 4*(2), 153-161. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01115.x

Jay, T., & Janschewitz, K. (2008). The pragmatics of swearing. *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture, 4*(2). doi:10.1515/jplr.2008.013

Kapoor, H. (2014). Swears in context: The difference between casual and abusive swearing. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 45*(2), 259-274. doi:10.1007/s10936-014-9345-z

Kelly-Holmes, H. (2005). *Advertising as multilingual communication*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kelly-Holmes, H. (2000). Bier, parfum, kaas: Language fetish in European advertising. E*uropean Journal of Cultural Studies*, 3(1), 67-82. doi:10.1177/a010863

Kotz, S.,(2006). *Encyclopedia of statistical sciences*. Hoboken, N.J: Wiley-Interscience.

Krijgsman, L. (2018, 13 oktober). *Volkswagen doet Das Auto das om*. AutoWeek. https://www.autoweek.nl/autonieuws/artikel/volkswagen-doet-das-auto-das-om/

Krishna, A. & Ahluwalia, R. (2008). Language choice in advertising to bilinguals: Asymmetric effects for multinationals versus local firms. *Journal of Consumer Research, 35,* 692-705. doi: 10.1086/592130.

Kristiansen, T. (2001). Two standards: One for the media and one for the school. *Language Awareness, 10*(1), 9-24. doi:10.1080/09658410108667022

Kroll, J. F., & De Groot, A. (1997). Lexical and conceptual memory in the bilingual: Mapping form to meaning in two languages. In A. de Groot & J. F. Kroll (Eds.), *Tutorials in bilingualism: Psycholinguistic perspectives* (pp. 169–200). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kroll, J. F., & Stewart, E. (1994). Category interference in translation and picture naming: Evidence for asymmetric connection between bilingual memory representations. *Journal of Memory and Language, 33*(2), 149–174. https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.1994.1008

Lampdirect.nl. (2019, September 3). *Lampdirect | Zakelijk LED & licht* [Video]. Youtube. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1ldJyQesSwo

Lasn, K. (2000). *Culture jam: The uncooling of America*. New York: Quill

Lerman, D., & Garbarino, E. (2002). Recall and recognition of brand names: A comparison of word and nonword name types. *Psychology & Marketing, 19*(7-8), 621–639. https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.10028

Lin, Y., & Wang, K. (2016). Language choice in sdvertising for multinational corporations and local firms: A reinquiry focusing on monolinguals. *Journal of Advertising, 45*(1), 43-52. doi:10.1080/00913367.2015.1085817

Lindblom Den Haag. (2016, 2 november). Stiva tv award - Amstel - Proostnamen [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QbrrpWQJwjQ

Ljung, P. M. (2010). *Swearing: A cross-cultural linguistic study*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Luna, D., & Peracchio, L. A. (2002). Uncovering the cognitive duality of bilinguals through word association. *Psychology and Marketing, 19*(6), 457–476. doi:10.1002/mar.10020

Maclnnis, D. J., Moorman, C., & Jaworski, B. J. (1991). Enhancing and measuring consumers' motivation, opportunity, and ability to process brand information from ads. *Journal of Marketing, 55*(4), 32-53. doi:10.1177/002224299105500403

McEnery, T. (2006). *Swearing in English: Bad language, purity and power from 1586 to the present.* New York: Routledge.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). Common and uncommon ground: Social and structural factors in codeswitching. *Language in Society, 22*(4), 475-503. doi:10.1017/s0047404500017449

Micu, C. C., & Coulter, R. A. (2010). Advertising in English in nonnative English-speaking markets: The effect of language and self-referencing in advertising in Romania on ad attitudes. *Journal of East-West Business, 16*(1), 67-84. doi:10.1080/10669860903558433

Mohammadi, A. N. (2020). Swearing in a second language: The role of emotions and perceptions. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development,* 1-18. doi:10.1080/01434632.2020.1755293

Mortimer, K. (2007). The use of bad language in advertising: The building of a conceptual framework. In K. R. Deans, M. Thyne, & J. Gnoth, (2007). *Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy (ANZMAC)* Conference 2007 (pp. 1593-1600). University of Otago, School of Business, Department of Marketing.

Neleman wijn. (n.d.). Just fucking good wine White Organic. Nelemon.org Retrieved from https://www.neleman.org/recepten/39/just-fucking-good-wine-white-organic/

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Old Amsterdam kaas. (2020, December 23). old.amsterdam. Retrieved from https://old.amsterdam/

Over CoolBest. (2020, June 19). coolbest.nl. Retrieved from https://coolbest.nl/over-coolbest/

Petrof, J. V. (1990). Lutilisation des langues etrangeres comme moyen daugmenter lefficacite de la publicite: Une approche experimentale. *Recherche Et Applications En Marketing, 5*(2), 1-16. doi:10.1177/076737019000500201

Phau, I., & Prendergast, G. (2000). Consuming luxury brands: The relevance of the 'Rarity Principle'. *Journal of Brand Management, 8*(2), 122-138. doi:10.1057/palgrave.bm.2540013

Pickton, D. & Broderick, A. (2005). *Integrated marketing communications.* Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited.

Piller, I. (2000). Multilingualism and the modes of TV advertising. In F. Ungerer (Ed.), *English media texts past and present: language and textual structure* (pp. 263-279). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

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

Pituch, K. A., Stevens, J., & Stevens, J. (2016). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences*. London: Routledge.

Planken, B., Meurs, F., & Radlinska, A. (2010). The effects of the use of English in Polish product advertisements: Implications for English for business purposes. *English for Specific Purposes, 29*(4), 225–242. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2010.06.003

Pope, N. K., Voges, K. E., & Brown, M. R. (2004). The effect of provocation in the form of mild erotica on attitude to the ad and corporate image: Differences between cause-related and product-based advertising. Journal of Advertising, 33(1), 69-82. doi: 10.1080/00913367.2004.10639154

Puntoni, S., de Langhe, B., & van Osselaer, S. M. J. (2009). Bilingualism and the emotional intensity of advertising language. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35, 1012-1025. doi: 10.1086/595022

Raedts, M., & Dupré, N. (2015). De doeltreffendheid van een Italiaanse versus Nederlandse slagzin in een Italiaanse wijnreclame. *Dutch Journal of Applied Linguistics, 4*(1), 39-57. doi:10.1075/dujal.4.1.04rae

Raedts, M., Dupré, N., Hendrickx, J., & Debrauwere, S. (2015). English in television commercials in Belgium, France, Italy, the Netherlands and Spain. *World Englishes, 34*(4), 576-599. doi:10.1111/weng.12161

Ray, N. M., Ryder, M. E., & Scott, S. V. (1991). Toward an understanding of the use of foreign words in print advertising. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing, 3*(4), 69–97. doi:10.1300/J046v03n04_06

Remia. (n.d.). Mayonaise 'black truffle' van Remia - Mayonaise. remia.nl. Retrieved from https://www.remia.nl/producten/mayonaise/mayonaise-black-truffle/

Reverso Technologies Inc. (n.d.). *Reverso Context | Vertaling in context - Duits, Engels, Spaans, Frans, Hebreeuws, Italiaans, Portugees, Russisch, Nederlands, Arabisch, Japans, Pools, Roemeens, Turks, Chinees*. https://context.reverso.net. *https://context.reverso.net/vertaling/*

Rijksuniversiteit Groningen. (2020, September 22). Shoptalk! De verengelsing van de Nederlandse taal. Rug.nl Retrieved from https://www.rug.nl/about-ug/video/archive/2017/shoptalk-de-verengelsing-van-de-nederlandse-taal

Ringberg, T. V., Luna, D., Reihlen, M., & Peracchio, L. A. (2010). Bicultural-Bilinguals. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 10*(1), 77-92. doi:10.1177/1470595809359585

Ritchie, W. & Bhatia, T., (2008). Social and psychological factors in language mixing. 10.1002/9780470756997.ch13.

RTL Nieuws. (2018, February 22). Suitsupply verliest veel volgers met homo-reclame: Ze gaan voor het schokeffect. Retrieved from https://www.rtlnieuws.nl/editienl/artikel/3868681/suitsupply-verliest-veel-volgers-met-homo-reclame-ze-gaan-voor-het

RTL Nieuws. (2019, August 08). Reclame Code Commissie oordeelt over omstreden New York Pizza-poster. RTL Nieuws. Retrieved from https://www.rtlnieuws.nl/economie/bedrijven/artikel/4806381/reclame-code-commissie-bloemkoolpizza-new-york-pizza-campagne

Ruigrok Netpanel. (2019). *National Bieronderzoek 2019* [PDF]. Ruigrok Netpanel.

Severn, J., Belch, G. E., & Belch, M. A. (1990). The effects of sexual and non-sexual advertising appeals and information level on cognitive processing and communication effectiveness. *Journal of Advertising, 19*(1), 14–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1990.10673176

Söderlund, M., & Dahlén, M. (2010). The “killer” ad: An assessment of advertising violence. *European Journal of Marketing, 44*(11/12), 1811-1838. doi:10.1108/03090561011079891

Third SectorMainNet. (2019, 13 september). *Has shock advertising had its day?* Third Sector. https://www.thirdsector.co.uk/shock-advertising-its-day/communications/article/1596258

Thoma, D. (2013). Effects of the use of English in non-English advertising contexts: An eyetracking approach. In C. M. Genest (Ed.), Proceedings: *Conference on Corporate Communication 2013* (pp. 159-168). New York: CCI. Retrieved 23 October 2014 from http://www.corporatecomm.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08Abstracts_Proceedings_CCI_CCC_2013.pdf#page=40

Urwin, B. & Venter, M. (2014). Shock advertising: not so shocking anymore. An investigation among Generation Y. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 5(21), 203-214. doi: 10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n21p203.

Vézina, R., & Paul, O. (1997). Provocation in advertising: A conceptualization and an empirical assessment. *International Journal of Research in Marketing, 14*(2), 177-192. doi:10.1016/s0167-8116(97)00002-5

Vingerhoets, A.J.J.M., Bylsma, L.M. & de Vlam, C. (2013). Swearing: A biopsychosocial perspective. Psihologijske teme, 22, 287-304.

Westerholm, J. (2017). "Damn good coffee" Swear words and advertising. Unpublished Degree Project in English.

Westrop, S., Nordmann, E., Bruce, G., & Scott, G. G. (2018). F*c*book: Swearing impacts impression formation on social media. doi:10.31234/osf.io/wvcsa

Zenner, E., & Ruette, T. (2018). *The borrowability of English swearwords in Dutch: A variationist approach* [PDF]. Leuven: KU Leuven.

Zhiganova, A. V. (2016). The Study of the perception of code-switching to English in German advertising. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 236*, 225-229. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.12.011

Appendix A. Pretest materials

Ad 1

Ad 2

Ad 3

Ad 4

Ad 5

Ad 6

Appendix B. Pretest method and statistical analysi

1. Pretests

A pretest was designed and carried out in order to determine what materials would be used in the main experiment. The test consisted of three parts: the rating of attitude towards different, slogan-less advertising designs (6 designs); the rating of offensiveness of different swear words out of context (3 groups of 3 swear words with the same meaning); and the rating of the appropriateness of the use of these swear words within a chosen context (3 groups of 3 sentences). The test was taken by 23 native-speaking Dutch students or recent graduates from a university (73.91%) and university of applied science (26.09%) background, with an age ranging from 19 to 28 years-old (M = 24.09, SD = 3.09, Range = 9). 10 of the participants were male (43.48%) and 13 participants were female (56.52%).

1.1. Evaluation advertising layout

First, to ensure favoritism or dislike for certain elements in advertisements was eliminated, a group of 23 participants was asked to evaluate six fictional advertisements. To participants were asked to rate their attitude towards the 6 different designs (Appendix A.). The designs had the same layout with a grungy textured, one-color background, a visual of a beer glass, a visual of an ingredient, and a blurred logo and slogan. All of these factors differed for each advertisement. A 'drink-responsibly' seal ("NIX 18" in Dutch) was added to all advertisements to provide a more authentic experience for the participants. The advertisements were randomly ordered for all participants in order to control for practice and boredom effects. The six advertisements were compared to each other by comparing participants' *attitude towards the advertisement (AdAtt)* as well as the participants' *perceived likeness of encountering (LikeEnc)* the advertisement in real-life.

1.1.1 Attitude towards advertisement layouts

The *AdAtt* was measured with five 7-point semantic differential scales. The items were acquired from a study by Hornikx and Hof (2008) in which the reliability for the attitude scale was judged as being good (α = .84). The scales were preceded by the statement: "How would you evaluate the above shown ad" and would consist of the ranges "Not nice-Nice"; "Boring-Engaging"; "Not original-Original"; "Not attractive-Attractive"; and "Not interesting-Interesting" (1 = negative, 7 = positive). In the current study the reliability for the scale was also found to be good (Ad 1, = *.90;* Ad 2, = *.91;* Ad 3, = *.87;* Ad 4, = *.74;* Ad 5, = .90)

The data collected for *AdAtt* (Table 1) was analyzed using a one-way repeated measure univariate analysis of variance with Bonferroni correction.

Table 1. Means and standard deviations of the participants' attitude towards the advertisement versions (AdAtt) shown in the pretest, based on the question; "How would you evaluate the above shown ad? Not nice/Nice; Boring/Engaging; Not original/Original; Not attractive/Attractive and Not interesting/Interesting" (1=negative, 7=positive).-1

Ad version	*M* (*n* = 23)	*SD*
Ad 1	4.89	1.32
Ad 2	4.66	1.41
Ad 3	3.00	1.09
Ad 4	3.50	1.01
Ad 5	2.83	1.29
Ad 6	4.42	1.65

The repeated measure analysis for *AdAtt* with as within subject factor *Advertisement version* showed a significant main effect of *Advertisement version* (F (1.99, 43.78) = 13.95, $p < .001$) on *AdAtt.* Because the assumption of sphericity was violated, the *F*- value was calculated with Greenhouse-Geisser. Pairwise comparison showed that on average, the attitudes towards *Ad 1* (M = 4.88, SD = 1.32) were not significantly better than attitudes towards Ad 2 (p = 1.00, Bonferroni-correction; M = 4.67, SD = 1.41) and Ad 6 (p = .103, Bonferroni-correction; M = 4.42, SD = 1.65). However, the mean attitude scores towards Ad 1 were significantly better than scores towards Ad 3 (p = .001, Bonferroni-correction; M = 3.00, SD = 1.09), Ad 4 (p = .009, Bonferroni-correction; M = 3.50, SD = 1.01) and Ad 5 (p = .001 Bonferroni-correction; M = 2.83, SD = 1.29). In addition, attitude scores concerning Ad 2 (M = 4.67, SD = 1.41) did not differ significantly from those concerning Ad 1 (p = 1.00, Bonferroni-correction; M = 4.88, SD = 1.32) and *Ad 6* (p = 1.00, Bonferroni-correction; M = 4.42, SD = 1.65). The results from attitudes towards Ad 2 did show to be significantly higher than those towards Ad 3 (p = .002, Bonferroni-correction; M = 3.00, SD = 1.09), Ad 4 (p = .028, Bonferroni-correction; M = 3.50, SD = 1.01) and Ad 5 (p = .008 Bonferroni-correction; M = 2.83, SD = 1.29). In conclusion, attitudes towards Ad 3 were shown not differ significantly from Ad 4 (p = 1.00, Bonferroni-correction; M = 3.50, SD = 1.01) and Ad 5 (p = 1.00

Bonferroni-correction; *M* = 2.83, *SD* = 21.29). Attitudes towards Ad 3 (*M* = 3.00, *SD* = 1.09) were, however, significantly lower than those for Ad 1 (*p* = .001, Bonferroni-correction; *M* = 4.88, *SD* = 1.32), Ad 2 (*p* = .002, Bonferroni-correction; *M* = 4.67, *SD* = 1.41) and Ad 6 (*p* = .037, Bonferroni-correction; *M* = 4.42, *SD* = 1.65).

From these result we can conclude that Ad 1, Ad 2 and Ad 6 scored highest when it comes to *AdAtt* and differed significantly from Ad 3, Ad 4 and Ad 5. Thus they were most appropriate to include in the materials for the main experiment.

1.1.2 Likeliness of encountering

The advertisements were also evaluated on the participants' *perceived likeliness of encountering the advertisement* in real-life (*LikeEnc)*. This scale consisted of one 7-point semantic differential scale ranging from "very unlikely - very likely" (1 = negative, 7 = positive) and was preceded by the question: "How likely would you rate the chance of encountering this advertisement in a your daily life?". By evaluating this we could ensure that the chosen advertisement format for the main experiment could be used to draw conclusions that would be relevant to the real-life practice of advertising. The mean ratings and standard deviations can be found in Table 2.

Table 2. Means and standard deviations of likelihood of encountering the advertisements (LikeEnc) shown in pretest, based on the question; "How likely would you rate the chance of encountering this advertisement in a your daily life?" (1 = Very unlikely, 7 = very likely).-1

Ad version	*M* (n = 23)	*SD*
Ad 1	5.61	1.20
Ad 2	5.04	1.52
Ad 3	3.61	1.64
Ad 4	4.00	1.38
Ad 5	3.39	1.44
Ad 6	5.48	1.41

Judging from the data in Table 2, Ad 1, Ad 2 and Ad 6 had the highest scores for *LikeEnc*. To determine whether the differences in evaluation of were significant a Friedman's ANOVA was conducted as the data was collected with a single item scale with non-normally distributed data. The

ANOVA showed that there was a significant difference between the LikeEnc for the different Ad versions ($\chi^2(5) = 45.13$, $p < .001$). To determine which groups differed from each other multiple Wilcoxon Signed-rank tests were conducted as means of pairwise comparison.

The Wilcoxon Signed-rank tests, tested against a Bonferroni-adjusted Alpha level of .003 (= 0,5/15) showed the following results:

Ad 1 (*mdn* = 6.0) showed to be rated as significantly more likely to be encountered than Ad 3 (*mdn*= 3.0), ($Z = 3.65$, $p < .001$); *Ad 4* (*mdn* = 4.0), ($Z = 3.67$, $p < .001$) and Ad 5 (*mdn* = 3.0), ($Z = -3.87$, $p < .001$). Ad 2 (*mdn* = 6.0) was also rated as being more likely to be encountered than Ad 3 (*mdn* = 3.0), ($Z = -3.03$, p = 0.001); and Ad 5 (*mdn*= 3.0), ($Z = 3.07$, $p = .001$). The analyses also showed that Ad 6 (*mdn* = 6.0) was determined to be more likely to be encountered than Ad 3 (*mdn* = 3.0), ($Z = -3.42$, $p < .001$); Ad 4 (*mdn*= 4.0), ($Z = -3.24$, $p = .001$) and *Ad 5* (*mdn*= 3.0), ($Z = -3.42$, $p < .001$).

These results further enforced the results on *AdAtt*, as Ad 1, Ad 2 and Ad 6. Therefore, these three advertisement types were included in the main experiment. Using these three advertisements would ensure that there would be smaller differences between the evaluation of the advertisements within the main experiment and supported the claim that the materials used in the main experiment could be used to draw conclusions about real-life advertising scenarios.

1.2 Swear words translations

To be able to determine the power of language choice of swear words in the main experiment, the words selected for the experiment needed to be as similar as possible in the role, purpose and meaning they had in their native languages. The selected English swear words; *Ass*, *Crap* and *Damn,* thus needed Dutch equivalents that could be used in the same sentence format, had the same literal translations and swear word referent category (e.i. sexual reference, bodily reference, blasphemous reference etc.) as well as similar offensiveness ratings in their native language as rated by native speakers. A study by Timothy Jay (1992) provided a basic mean offensiveness rating for all selected English words. Taking these factors into account would provide the purest translation and would provide the clearest results when comparing the two languages in the main experiment.

For every English swear word (*Ass*, *Crap* and *Damn)*, three possible translations were selected. These translations were carefully chosen by looking at common translations used in dictionaries and

online. To do so different online platforms were used such as: the translation section of Dutch dictionary Van Dale (Damn, n.d; Crap, n.d; Ass, n.d.) and the translation websites linguee.com (DeepL GmbH., n.d.) and context.reverso.net (Reverso Technologies Inc., n.d.). The latter two platforms make use of machine learning to compare millions of webpages, thus showing the most commonly used translations online. The following Dutch swear words were found as a possible translations within the same semantic referent categories: ass = reet, kont, aars; crap = stront; schijt, kak; damn = verdomd, godverdomme, verdomme.

The translations were rated in both an out-of-context (3.1.1.3) and within context setting (3.1.1.4) in order to test their compatibility with the original English swear words and their compatibility with the advertising slogan format.

1.2.1 General Offensiveness scores out-of-context

Offensiveness in an out-of-context setting was measured by determining the general offensiveness for each individual translation. All of the nine translations (3 translations per English swear word) were randomized in order, by doing this we controlled for practice and boredom effects. In addition, we would control for the effect of comparison with the other translation options. The variable *general offensiveness (GenOff)* was measured by using two 9-point semantic differential scales. The first measuring how offensive the individual words were, ranging from 1 (= not offensive at all) to 9 (= Very offensive), thus replicating the rating procedure as used by Timothy Jay (1992) which provided the offensiveness ratings for our English swear words. The second being an addition to the original scale that Jay used. This second item was added to create a more reliable scale to test the *GenOff* in an out-of-context rating situation. This 9-point scale tested rudeness of an expression and ranged from 1 (= not rude at all) to 9 (=Very rude). The scale for rudeness seemed to be a logical addition to the scale used by Jay, because it attempts to consolidate the principles of both the receiver's evaluation of the swear word as well as the speaker's intent when using the word. Especially in an out-of-context situation, evaluations of swear words can often be limited to the experience of the receiver (Culpeper, 2011). By including a speaker-oriented item such as rudeness, which speaks to the notion of intent behind the use of a word (Haugh, 2015), the participant will be forced to consider that side of the practice of swearing as well. By making the participant think about both the speaker's intent as well as the receiver's experience a more uniform notion of how offensiveness can be tested, controlling for individual differences between participants who might be inclined to only approach the question of *GenOff* from either one of these perspectives (Bousfield, 2007; Culpeper, 2011; Haugh, 2013)

The reliability of this two item scale for *GenOff* was determined by calculating the Spearman-Brown Coefficient (r_{SB}) (Eisinga et al. 2013). *GenOff* for all words was measured with two, 9-point semantic differential scales. The scales were preceded by the statement: "How would you evaluate this word?" and would consist of the ranges "Not at all offensive-Very offensive" and "Not rude at all-Very Rude". The scale for *GenOff* proved to be reliable (> .80) for all translations (Godverdomme, r_{SB} = .93; Verdomme, r_{SB} = .93; Verdomd, r_{SB} = .89; Schijt, r_{SB} = .83; Stront, r_{SB} = .84; Kak, r_{SB} = .89; Reet, r_{SB} = .82; Aars, r_{SB} = .89; Kont, r_{SB} = .97).

In the next step, the *GenOff* scores of the different translations per English swear word were compared to each other, as well as the original offensiveness ratings as found by Jay in 1992. By doing so we determined the best translation in terms of *GenOff*. The variable *GenOff* would contribute to creating a proper swear word pair for the Dutch and English swear words that would be used in the main experiment. The results for the evaluations of swear words outside of a context (section 1.2.1) and within context (section 1.2.2) were combined in order to find the most suitable translation for the advertisement material in the main experiment.

1.2.1.1 *General Offensiveness* of translations for *Damn*

The original offensiveness for the English word *Damn* was 2.06 (Jay, 1992 p.143). As we were looking for the best fitting translation for this word we first looked at the descriptive data for the three proposed translations; "Godverdomme"; "Verdomme" and "Verdomd" (table 3).

Table 3. Means and standard deviations of the participants' evaluation of offensiveness (GenOff) of translation for the words Damn, Crap and Ass. Based on the question; "How would you evaluate this word? Not at all offensive/Very offensive and Not rude at all/Very Rude" (1 = positive, 9 = negative).-1

Original word	Translation	*M* (n = 23)	*SD*
Damn	Godverdomme	5.26	1.62
	Verdomme	2.71	1.54
	Verdomd	2.41	1.44
Crap	Schijt	3.65	1.58
	Stront	4.39	2.12
	Kak	3.41	1.72
Ass	Reet	4.72	1.68

Aars	4.09	2.05
Kont	2.74	1.56

As can be seen in Table 3, “Verdomme” (*M* = 2.71, *SD* = 1.54) and “Verdomd” (*M* = 2.41, *SD* = 1.44) are closest in *GenOff* rating to the original offensiveness rating that we encountered for *Damn* (2.06) in research by Timothy Jay (1992). Therefore one of these two options seemed to be a likely choice for the main experiment.

As a Shapiro-Wilk test showed a non-normal distribution, a Friedman’s ANOVA was conducted to evaluate whether the scores for the translations differed significantly. The ANOVA indicated that there were significant difference between the scores of *GenOff* per translations of *Damn*($\chi^2(2) = 32.12$, $p < .001$). The ANOVA was followed by several Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks tests were used to determine which translations were significantly different in GennOff score The results were tested against a Bonferroni-adjusted alpha level of .017 (= 0,5/3). The test indicated that, on average, the *GenOff* for “Godverdomme” (*mdn* = 5.0) was significantly higher than the score for “Verdomd” (*mdn* = 2.0), ($Z = - 4.02$, $p < .001$). A second test indicated that, on average, “Godverdomme” (*mdn* = 5.0) was also rated significantly higher in mean *GenOff* than “Verdomme” (*mdn* = 2.0), ($Z = - 4.02$, $p < .001$). A third test indicated that the mean *GenOff* rating for “Verdomme” (*mdn* = 2.0) was not significantly higher than the score for “Verdomd” (*mdn* = 2.0), ($Z = - 1.51$, $p = .141$).

Thus, with the mean *GenOff* scores closest to the original value for *Damn* (2.06) and proof that they significantly differ from the other translation option (“Godverdomme”), both “Verdomme” or “Verdomd” were considered suitable options as a translation of the word *Damn* in the main experiment.

1.2.1.2 *General Offensiveness* of translations for *Crap*

The original rating for the word *Crap* was 3.37 (Jay, 1992 p.143). The options “Schijt” (*M* = 3.65, *SD* = 1.58) and “Kak” (*M* = 3.41, *SD* = 1.72) have mean *GenOff* scores closest to the original offensiveness value for the word *Crap* (3.37*)* (table 3). Therefore, one of these two options would seem to be a likely choice for the main experiment. To determine this a Friedman’s ANOVA was conducted. This analysis was chosen as the assumption of normality was violated according to the Shapiro-Wilk test. The test indicated that there were no significant differences in *GenOff* scores for

the translations of *Crap* ($\chi^2(2) = 3.06$, $p = .216$). As there were no significant differences measured between the *GenOff* scores for these translations, and all values were close to the original value for *Crap,* the best translation would be selected by looking at the analysis for appropriateness of the swear word within the context of the slogans.

1.2.1.3 *General Offensiveness* of translations for *Ass*

The original offensiveness score for the word *Ass*, as measured by Jay (1992), was 4.77 (p.143). When looking at Table 3, both the word "Reet" ($M = 4.72$, $SD = 1.68$) and "Aars" ($M = 4.09$, $SD = 2.05$) have mean scores similar to the original score for *Ass* (4.77).

A Shapiro-Wilk test indicated that the data for this analysis was not normally distributed. Therefore, a Friedman's ANOVA was conducted. The ANOVA determined that there was a significant difference between the *GenOff* scores for the translations for *Ass* ($\chi^2(2) = 14.99$, $p = .001$). The ANOVA was followed by three post-hoc Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks tests. The data was be tested against a Bonferroni-adjusted alpha level of .017 (= 0.05/3).

An initial Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks showed that the mean *GenOff* for "Aars" (*mdn* = 4.0) was significantly higher than the mean *GenOff* for "Kont" (*mdn* = 2.0), ($Z = -2.85$, $p = .003$). A second test indicated that the mean score for "Reet" (*mdn* = 5.0) was also significantly higher than the score for "Kont" (*mdn* = 2.0), ($Z = -3.56$, $p < .001$). A third test indicated that the mean *GenOff* for "Reet" (mdn = 4.0) was not significantly different from the mean score for "Aars" (*mdn* = 4.0), ($Z = -1.19$, $p = .242$).

As "Reet" and "Aars" did not differ significantly from each other in terms of their *GenOff*, they both seemed viable options for the main experiment. Their appropriateness within context will determine which word has the best fit for the experimental materials (Swear words and their *appropriateness* within context Section 1.2.2).

1.2.2 Swear words and their *appropriateness* within context

In the previous section we discussed how we determined that some translations were better suited as direct translations for their English counterparts than other when it comes to *GenOff*. To further determine which of the chosen translations were appropriate for the intended marketing material in main experiment, a context-appropriateness test was conducted. Before the pretest was conducted several different slogans were created in which both the selected English swear words and several of their Dutch translations could be sensibly and logically inserted. It was ensured that

all three words would have similar functions within the slogans, thus it was determined that all words would function as an expletive. This was decided due to the fact that swear words can have different functions (Stapleton, 2010), which can influence the evaluation of offensiveness. In an advertising setting, use of swear words as expletives would also be more appropriate, as it is least harmful to the receiver and thus evokes less negative emotions while still evoking surprise (Mortimer, 2007). The slogans that were created were as follows; 1. “Damn! Wat smaakt dat goed.”; 2. “Crap! Is het bier alweer op?”; 3. “Liever gezond dan lekker? Mijn ass!”.

The *appropriateness (Appr)* of the different Dutch translations was tested by inserting the words within a context that matched the chosen slogans and comparing their evaluations. For the translations for *Damn* we examined the mean a*ppropriateness* for a fit within the sentence “[Translation]! Wat is dat lekker”. For *Crap* we used the following sentence “[Translation]! Alweer vergeten.”. Lastly, for the translations for *Ass*, we used the sentence “Gelukkig 2020, mijn [translation]!”.

The *Appr* of the translations within the chosen context was tested with the use of three, 7-point, semantic differential scales. These scales were adapted from research by Benson and Risdal (2018). The scales were preceded by the statement “How would you evaluate the sentence” and consisted of the ranges “Very Unnatural - Very Natural ”; “Very Incorrect - Very Correct” (1= negative; 7= positive). A third item was added to the scale as there was a fear that the “Very Incorrect-Very Correct” scale could lead to confusion about whether the question pertained to the correctness of the use of taboo words or the correctness of the sentence in grammatical context. This item ranged from “Absolutely improper Dutch - Absolutely proper Dutch”. The scales proved reliable for nearly all within-context translations. (Godverdomme, = 0.51; Verdomme, = 0.79; Verdomd, = 0.83; Schijt, = 0.95; Stront, = 0.84; Kak, = 0.85; Reet, = 0.87; Aars = 0.75; Kont, = 0.67). Not all scales achieved the minimum level of a 0.7 Cronbach’s alpha value, but the choice was made to keep all the scales as they were used. It was not possible to achieve better reliability through the deletion of one of the items, thus all items were included in the analyses. In addition, the scales with a lower Cronbach’s alpha level would still be acceptable due to the fact that a lower number of items could lead to lower values (Nunnally, 1978). The average value of Cronbach’s alpha for all sentences was = .762, which is sufficiently reliable.

The means and standard deviations for the *Appr* ratings of the swear words used within sentence context can be found below (Table 4).

1.2.2.1 *Appropriateness* for translations of *Damn* within context

Table 4. Means and standard deviations of the participants' evaluation of the Appropriateness (Appr) of the translations for the words "Damn", "Crap" and "Ass". Based on the question; "How would you evaluate the sentence? Very Unnatural /Very Natural; Very Incorrect/Very Correct; Absolutely improper Dutch/Absolutely proper Dutch." (1= negative, 7= positive)-1

Original word	Translation	*M* (n = 23)	*SD*
Damn	Godverdomme	5.35	1.02
	Verdomme	5.84	0.90
	Verdomd	4.90	1.34
Crap	Schijt	3.96	1.63
	Stront	2.97	1.44
	Kak	5.70	1.22
Ass	Reet	4.99	1.57
	Aars	3.96	1.24
	Kont	2.43	0.85

The distribution of data was shown to be non-normally distributed by a Shapiro-Wilk test, therefor a Friedman's ANOVA was conducted. The ANOVA results showed that there were significant differences between the mean *Appr* scores for the translations of *Damn* ($\chi^2(2) = 7.98$, $p = .019$).

A series of Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks tests was conducted as a post-hoc test to determine how the translations differed among each other. The data was tested against a Bonferroni-adjusted alpha level of .017 (= 0,5/3). The first test indicated that the mean *Appr* for "Verdomme" (*mdn* = 6.0) was significantly higher than the mean *Appr* for "Verdomd" (*mdn* = 5.0), ($Z = -2.96$, $p = .002$). A second test showed that "Verdomme" (*mdn* = 6.0) had a significantly higher mean *Appr* score than "Godverdomme" (*mdn* = 5.67), ($Z = -2.15$, $p = .032$). "Godverdomme" (*mdn* = 5.67) was also shown not to have a significantly higher mean *Appr* score than "Verdomd" (*mdn* = 5.0), ($Z = -1.51$, $p = .131$).

When combining these findings with the conclusions from the General Offensiveness scores out-of-context section 1.2.1, we could conclude that "Verdomme" was the most appropriate option for the main experiment. "Verdomme" was very similar to *Damn* in mean *GenOff* score while also being rated higher in mean *Appr* than the other translation options.

1.2.2.2 *Appropriateness* for translations of *Crap* within context

As the distribution of data was not normally distributed according to a Shapiro-Wilk test, a Friedman's ANOVA was conducted to investigate the possible significance difference between the mean *Appr* scores for the translations for *Crap* ($\chi^2(2) = 24.87$, $p < .001$). Various Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks were conducted as a post-hoc analysis in order to compare the individual *Appr* scores for the translations. The data was tested against a Bonferroni-adjusted alpha level of .017 (= 0,5/3). The first test indicated that the mean *Appr* score for "Kak" (*mdn* = 6.0) was significantly higher than the score for "Schijt" (*mdn* = 3.67), (Z = - 3.34, $p < .001$). A second test showed that "Kak" (*mdn* = 6.0) also scored significantly higher in mean *Appr* than "Stront" (*mdn* = 2.67), (Z = - 4.07, $p <$ .001). In a final test "Schijt" (*mdn* = 3.67) also showed to have a significantly higher score of mean *Appr* than "Stront" (*mdn* = 5.0), (Z = - 2.54, p = .011).

Looking at these results "Kak" seemed to be the most appropriate translation to include in the main experiment. In combination with the results from the General Offensiveness scores out-of-context section 1.2.1, we concluded that "Kak" was a fitting translation for *Crap* in terms of *GenOff* as well as *Appr* within the context of the main experiment.

1.2.2.3 *Appropriateness* for translations of *Ass* within context

In this case the Shapiro-Wilk test once again showed that the data was non-normally distributed. Another Friedman's ANOVA was used to determine whether there were any detectable significant differences between the *Appr* scores for translations of *Ass* ($\chi^2(2) = 22.86$, $p < .001$).

Several Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks tests followed the ANOVA in order to compare if the *Appr* scores foe translations significantly differed from one another. These findings were tested against a Bonferroni-adjusted alpha level of .017 (= 0,5/3). The first test indicated that, on average, the *Appr* for "Reet" (*mdn* = 5.33) was significantly higher than the a *Appr* for "Aars" (*mdn* = 3.67), (Z = - 2.73, p = .004). A second test showed that "Reet" (*mdn* = 6.0) also had a significantly higher mean *Appr* score than "Kont" (*mdn* = 2.33), (Z = - 3.98, $p < .001$). A third test showed that "Aars" (*mdn* = 3.67) also had a significantly higher mean score of *Appr* than "Kont" (*mdn* = 2.33), (Z = -3.19, p = .001).

As could be concluded from both the analysis above as well as the analysis in the General Offensiveness scores out-of-context section 1.2.1, "Reet" seemed to be the most appropriate translation option for *Ass*. It was a match for the word *Ass* in terms of mean *GenOff* and had also

been shown to be rated significantly higher in mean *Appr* within the intended context than the other translation options.

1.3 Definitive materials for the current study

With the help of the aforementioned analyses the definitive materials for the main experiment were determined. The two conditions of language choice of swear words (L1/L2) would be using the same three advertisement designs, based on the designs for Ad 1, Ad 2 and Ad 6 which had significantly higher *AdAtt* and *LikeEnc* scores than the other proposed designs (sections 1.1.1 and 1.1.2). These ads would be supplemented with one of three Dutch slogans which included either an English word (in the L2 condition) or a Dutch word (in the L1 condition) of a carefully chosen swear word translation pair. The final translation word pairs were determined by the analyses of the Dutch translations in the section 1.2.1 General Offensiveness scores out-of-context and section 1.2.2 Swear words and their *appropriateness* within context. Almost all chosen translations, except for "Kak" showed *GenOff* scores that were significantly closer to the values of their selected English counterpart than other translation options. In addition they all showed significantly higher *Appr* scores. The final word pairs were determined as follows (Dutch follows English); Damn - Verdomme, Crap - Kak, Ass - Reet. The final advertisement materials can be found in Appendix B.

Appendix C. Materials main experiment

Ad 1 NL

Ad 1 EN

Ad 2 NL

Ad 2 EN

Ad 3 NL

Ad 3 EN

Radboud University

Introduction/Permission

U staat op het punt om deel te nemen aan een enquete over de effectiviteit van marketing technieken in advertenties.

Dit onderzoek wordt uitgevoerd door Ceciel Huiberts, masterstudent International Business Communication aan de Faculteit der Letteren van de Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen.

Wat houdt het onderzoek in?
Het onderzoek bestaat uit een online enquête waarin u vragen gaat beantwoorden over een drietal advertenties. Het betreft hier vragen over uw evaluatie van de advertentie en associaties die u heeft met de advertentie. Daarnaast zal er nog wat persoonlijke informatie worden gevraagd. Er zijn bij alle vragen geen goede of foute antwoorden aangezien wij benieuwd zijn naar uw eigen mening. Het invullen van de vragenlijst zal ongeveer 10 minuten van uw tijd in beslag nemen.

Vrijwilligheid
Deelname aan dit onderzoek is vrijwillig. Daarom is het op elk gewenst moment tijden het invullen van de vragenlijst mogelijk om deelname stop te zetten. De data die tot dat punt verzameld is zal dan definitief verwijderd worden en niet mee worden genomen in verder onderzoek. U kunt tot een week na het invullen van deze vragenlijst uw onderzoeksgegevens laten verwijderen. Dit kunt u doen door een mail te sturen naar : c.huiberts@student.ru.nl

Vertrouwelijkheid van de onderzoeksgegevens
De gegevens die u voor deze enquete invult zullen worden gebruikt voor deze master scriptie. De verzamelde data zal worden geanonimiseerd en op beveiligde wijze worden bewaard volgens de richtlijnen van de Radboud Universiteit. De anonieme data zal ten minste 10 jaar opvraagbaar zijn ten behoeve van de wetenschappelijke gemeenschap.

Verloting tegoedbonnen
Er worden ook twee tegoedbonnen t.w.v. 25 euro verloot! Om kans te maken op één van deze bonnen heeft u de optie om aan het eind van de enquête uw e-mailadres achter te laten. Uw e-mailadres wordt niet gelinkt aan de ingevulde antwoorden. Aan het eind van het onderzoek zal er een loting plaatsvinden en zal er contact op worden genomen met de winnaars. U bent niet

verplicht je e-mailadres in te vullen.

Vragen of klachten
Voor meer informatie kunt u contact opnemen met Ceciel Huiberts, c.huibert@student.ru.nl
Voor klachten over dit onderzoek kunt u contact opnemen met mijzelf of met:

Mevrouw M. van Beuningen
Secretaris Ethische Toetsingscommissie Geesteswetenschappen
Radboud Universiteit
Postbus 9103 6500 HD Nijmegen
Tel: 024-3615814
m.vanbeuningen@let.ru.nl

TOESTEMMING:
Door te klikken op de knop "ik ga akkoord" geeft u aan dat u aan de volgende eisen voldoet:

- U heeft bovenstaande informatie gelezen
- U doet vrijwillig mee aan dit onderzoek
- U bent ouder dan 18 jaar

Als u niet mee wilt doen kunt u de optie "ik ga niet akkoord" selecteren.

○ Ik ga akkoord
○ Ik ga niet akkoord

In de volgende vragen zal u worden gevraagd naar uw meningen over verschillende advertenties van hetzelfde Nederlandse biermerk. De logo's van het biermerk zijn in de advertenties vervaagd om associaties met het merk te minimaliseren.

Attitude/PurchaseIntention/Associations AD 1 EN

Geef aan op een schaal van 1 tot 7 wat u van bovenstaande advertentie vindt.

Ik vind deze advertentie:

Niet Leuk — Leuk

Saai — Boeiend

Niet origineel — Origineel

Niet aantrekkelijk — Aantrekkelijk

Niet interessant — Interessant

Geef aan op een schaal van 1 tot 7 in hoeverre welke van de volgende opties op u van toepassing zijn na het zien van deze advertentie.

Het kopen van dit product:

Zal ik nooit doen — Zal ik zeker doen

Zal ik niet aan vrienden aanraden — Zal ik wel aan vrienden aanraden

Is helemaal niets voor mij — Is zeker iets voor mij

Op een schaal van 1 tot 7, in hoeverre associeert u deze advertentie met de volgende begrippen?

Modern

Helemaal geen associatie — Sterke associatie

Succes

Helemaal geen associatie — Sterke associatie

Internationaal

Helemaal geen associatie — Sterke associatie

Op een schaal van 1 tot 7, in hoeverre bent u het eens met de volgende stellingen?

Ik vind deze advertentie schokkend

Helemaal mee oneens — Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind deze advertentie verrassend

Helemaal mee oneens — Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind deze advertentie aanstootgevend

Helemaal mee oneens — Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind de adverteerder die deze advertentie heeft geplaatst: Hip

Helemaal mee oneens — Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind de adverteerder die deze advertentie heeft geplaatst: Modern

Helemaal mee oneens — Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind de adverteerder die deze advertentie heeft geplaatst: Trendy

Helemaal mee oneens — Helemaal mee eens

Hoe emotioneel vindt u deze advertentie?

Helemaal niet emotioneel — Heel emotioneel

Hoe waarschijnlijk acht u de kans dat u deze advertentie, zonder vervaagd logo, tegenkomt in het dagelijks leven?

Heel onwaarschijnlijk — Heel waarschijnlijk

Attitude/PurchaseIntention/Associations AD 2 EN

Geef aan op een schaal van 1 tot 7 wat u van bovenstaande advertentie vindt.

Ik vind deze advertentie:

Niet Leuk — Leuk
Saai — Boeiend
Niet origineel — Origineel
Niet aantrekkelijk — Aantrekkelijk
Niet interessant — Interessant

Geef aan op een schaal van 1 tot 7 in hoeverre u van plan bent het product te kopen naar aanleiding van deze advertentie

Het kopen van dit product:

Zal ik nooit doen — Zal ik zeker doen
Zal ik niet aan vrienden aanraden — Zal ik wel aan vrienden aanraden
Is helemaal niets voor mij — Is zeker iets voor mij

Op een schaal van 1 tot 7, in hoeverre associeert u deze advertentie met de volgende begrippen?

Modern

Helemaal geen associatie — Sterke associatie

Succes

Helemaal geen associatie — Sterke associatie

Internationaal

Helemaal geen associatie — Sterke associatie

Op een schaal van 1 tot 7, in hoeverre bent u het eens met de volgende stellingen?

Ik vind deze advertentie schokkend

Helemaal mee oneens — Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind deze advertentie verrassend

Helemaal mee oneens ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind deze advertentie aanstootgevend

Helemaal mee oneens ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind de adverteerder die deze advertentie heeft geplaatst: Hip

Helemaal mee oneens ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind de adverteerder die deze advertentie heeft geplaatst: Modern

Helemaal mee oneens ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind de adverteerder die deze advertentie heeft geplaatst: Trendy

Helemaal mee oneens ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Helemaal mee eens

Hoe emotioneel vindt u deze advertentie?

Helemaal niet emotioneel ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Heel emotioneel

Hoe waarschijnlijk acht u de kans dat u deze advertentie, zonder vervaagd logo, tegenkomt in het dagelijks leven?

Heel onwaarschijnlijk ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Heel waarschijnlijk

Attitude/PurchaseIntention/Associations AD 3 EN

Geef aan op een schaal van 1 tot 7 wat u van bovenstaande advertentie vindt.

Ik vind deze advertentie:

Niet Leuk	○	○	○	○	○	○	○ Leuk
Saai	○	○	○	○	○	○	○ Boeiend
Niet origineel	○	○	○	○	○	○	○ Origineel
Niet aantrekkelijk	○	○	○	○	○	○	○ Aantrekkelijk
Niet interessant	○	○	○	○	○	○	○ Interessant

Geef aan op een schaal van 1 tot 7 in hoeverre welke van de volgende opties op u van toepassing zijn na het zien van deze advertentie.

Het kopen van dit product:

Zal ik nooit doen	○	○	○	○	○	○	○ Zal ik zeker doen
Zal ik niet aan vrienden aanraden	○	○	○	○	○	○	○ Zal ik wel aan vrienden aanraden
Is helemaal niets voor mij	○	○	○	○	○	○	○ Is zeker iets voor mij

Op een schaal van 1 tot 7, in hoeverre associeert u deze advertentie met de volgende begrippen?

Modern

Helemaal geen associatie — Sterke associatie

Succes

Helemaal geen associatie — Sterke associatie

Internationaal

Helemaal geen associatie — Sterke associatie

Op een schaal van 1 tot 7, in hoeverre bent u het eens met de volgende stellingen?

Ik vind deze advertentie schokkend

Helemaal mee oneens — Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind deze advertentie verrassend

Helemaal mee oneens — Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind deze advertentie aanstootgevend

Helemaal mee oneens — Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind de adverteerder die deze advertentie heeft geplaatst: Hip

Helemaal mee oneens — Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind de adverteerder die deze advertentie heeft geplaatst: Modern

Helemaal mee oneens — Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind de adverteerder die deze advertentie heeft geplaatst: Trendy

Helemaal mee oneens — Helemaal mee eens

Hoe emotioneel vindt u deze advertentie?

Helemaal niet emotioneel — Heel emotioneel

Hoe waarschijnlijk acht u de kans dat u deze advertentie, zonder vervaagd logo, tegenkomt in het dagelijks leven?

Heel onwaarschijnlijk — Heel waarschijnlijk

Swear words/Usage/Proficiency

Waar denkt u dat dit onderzoek over ging?

Hoe vaak gebruikt u scheldwoorden in uw dagelijks leven?

Nooit — Heel vaak

In hoeverre bent u het eens met de volgende stellingen:

Ik vind het acceptabel als ik zelf scheldwoorden gebruik in een privé situatie

Helemaal mee oneens — Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind het acceptabel als anderen scheldwoorden gebruiken in een privé situatie

Helemaal mee oneens — Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind het acceptabel als ik zelf scheldwoorden gebruik in het openbaar

Helemaal mee oneens — Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind het acceptabel als anderen scheldwoorden gebruiken in het openbaar

Helemaal mee oneens — Helemaal mee eens

Hoe vaak consumeert u bier?

Nooit — Zelden — Regelmatig — Vaak — Altijd

Graag zou ik u nog enkele vragen willen stellen over uw taalvaardigheid in het Engels. Hieronder volgen een aantal stelling die u naar eigen beoordeling over uzelf kunt invullen.

Mijn spreekvaardigheid in het Engels is:

Zeer slecht — Zeer goed

Mijn leesvaardigheid in het Engels is:

Zeer slecht — Zeer goed

Mijn schrijfvaardigheid in het Engels is:

Zeer slecht — Zeer goed

Mijn luistervaardigheid in het Engels is:

Zeer slecht — Zeer goed

Demographics

Wat is uw leeftijd?

Wat is uw geslacht?

- Man
- Vrouw
- Anders
- Zeg ik liever niet

Wat is uw hoogste (afgeronde of huidige) opleiding?

- Basis onderwijs
- VMBO
- MAVO

- HAVO
- VWO
- Gymnasium
- MBO
- HBO
- Universiteit

Wat is uw moedertaal?

- Nederlands
- Anders, Namelijk:

Wat is uw nationaliteit?

- Nederlands
- Anders, namelijk:

Bent u momenteel student?

- Ja
- Nee

Bent u langer dan 5 jaar afgestudeerd van uw laatste opleiding of gestopt met uw laatste opleiding?

- Ja
- Nee

Memory

Welk scheldwoord werd er gebruikt in de eerste advertentie die u zag?

Welk scheldwoord werd er gebruikt in de tweede advertentie die u zag?

Welk scheldwoord werd er gebruikt in de derde advertentie die u zag?

Swear words rating check EN

Wat vindt u van het woord:

Damn

Totaal niet aanstootgevend — Zeer aanstootgevend

Totaal niet grof — Zeer grof

Wat vindt u van het woord:

Crap

Totaal niet aanstootgevend — Zeer aanstootgevend

Totaal niet grof — Zeer grof

Wat vindt u van het woord:

Ass

Totaal niet aanstootgevend — Zeer aanstootgevend

Totaal niet grof — Zeer grof

Swearword ratings and translations Check

Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

"Verdomme" is een correcte Nederlandse vertaling van het Engelse woord "damn" in de zin:

"Damn! Wat smaakt dat goed."

Helemaal mee oneens — Helemaal mee eens

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

"Kak" is een correcte Nederlandse vertaling van het Engelse woord "crap" in de zin:

"Crap! Is het bier alweer op."

Helemaal mee oneens — Helemaal mee eens

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

"Reet" is een correcte Nederlandse vertaling van het Engelse woord "ass" in de zin:

"Lever gezond dan lekker? mijn ass"

Helemaal mee oneens — Helemaal mee eens

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Tegoedbon

Mocht u mee willen doen aan de loting van de 2 tegoedbonnen (ter waarde van 25,-). Dan kunt u hieronder uw e-mailadres achterlaten. U kunt na het invullen van uw e-mailadres uw voorkeur voor een tegoedbon aangeven.

Uw antwoorden worden niet aan uw e-mailadres gekoppeld, dit dient uitsluitend om contact met u op nemen indien uw de loting wint.

Uw e-mailadres

Voor welke van de onderstaande tegoedbonnen zou u willen ontvangen indien u wint?

Powered by Qualtrics

Appendix E. Within-subjects analysis for dependent variables

1. The within-subjects effects of swear word choice on perceived emotionality

The differences between the swear words used in both languages were further explored with the help of two one-way univariate repeated measures analyses. The analysis for L2 indicated a significant difference for perceived emotionality between swear words $F(1.77; 125.55) = 12.73$ $p < .001$. The *F*-value was calculated with Greenhouse-Geisser as the assumption of sphericity was violated. Pairwise comparison showed a significantly higher emotionality for 'ass' ($M = 2.81$, $SD = 1.63$) compared to 'damn' ($M = 2.00$, $SD = .1.35$) ($p < .001$, Bonferonni correction) and 'crap' ($M = 2.35$, $SD = 1.32$) ($p = .011$, Bonferonni correction). 'Crap' also had a significantly higher perceived emotionality than 'damn' ($p = .044$, Bonferonni correction).

For L1 words there was also a significant difference among the swear words used. The *F*-value here was also calculated with Greenhouse-Geisser $F(1.81; 135.77) = 4.37$, $p = .014$. Pairwise comparison showed that for the Dutch swear words the use of 'reet' ($M = 2.99$, $SD = 1.91$) led to significantly higher perceived emotionality than the use of both 'verdomme' ($M = 2.50$, $SD = 1.58$) ($p = 0.40$, Bonferonni correction) and 'kak' ($M = 2.61$, $SD = 1.53$) ($p = .029$, Bonferonni correction). There was no indication of significant difference of perceived emotionality between the use of 'verdomme' and 'kak' ($p = 1.000$, Bonferonni correction).
Thus, in both language groups the words 'ass' and 'reet' evoked higher emotionality.

2. The within-subjects effects of swear word choice on perceived shock

The differences between the different swear words within each language group were explored with the help of two one-way univariate repeated measures analyses. The analysis for L2 indicated a significant difference for perceived shock between swear words $F(1.54; 109.55) = 34.10$ $p < .001$. The *F*-value was calculated with Greenhouse-Geisser as the assumption of sphericity was violated. Pairwise comparison showed a significantly higher perceived shock for 'ass' compared to 'damn' ($M = 2.29$, $SD = .15$) ($p < .001$, Bonferonni correction) and 'crap' ($M = 2.46$, $SD = 1.15$) ($p < .001$, Bonferonni correction).

For L1 words there was also a significant difference among the swear words used. F value here was also calculated with Greenhouse-Geisser $F(1.70; 127.14) = 17.49$, $p < .001$. Pairwise comparison showed that for the Dutch swear words the use of 'verdomme' ($M = 2.93$, $SD = .17$) led

to significantly lower perceived shock than the use of either 'kak' (M = 3.50, SD =1.28) (p = .015, Bonferonni correction) or reet' (M =4.00, SD =1.48) (p < .001, Bonferonni correction). The use of 'kak' (M = 3.50, SD =1.28) also led to significantly lower perceived shock than 'reet' (M =4.00, SD =1.48) (p = .002, Bonferonni correction).

Thus, the use of the translation equivalent pair ''reet' and 'ass', led to a higher perceived shock than the use of 'kak'-'crap' and 'verdomme'-'damn'.

3. The within-subjects effects of swear word choice on dynamism

The within-subjects effects were further explored with the help of two one-way univariate repeated measures analyses. The analysis for L2 indicated a significant difference for dynamism between swear words F(1.84; 130.72) = 4.35, p = .017. Pairwise comparison showed a significantly higher association with dynamism traits for 'crap' (M = 3.30, SD = 1.48) than for both 'ass' (M = 2.99, SD = 1.44) (p = .018, Bonferonni correction) and 'damn' (M = 2.95, SD = 1.52) (p = .046, Bonferonni correction). There was no significant difference between Dynamism for 'damn' (M = 2.95, SD = 1.52) and 'ass' (M = 2.99, SD = 1.44) (p = 1.000, Bonferonni correction).

For L1 words there was also a significant difference among the swear words used F(2, 150) = 6.86, p = .001. Pairwise comparison showed that for the Dutch swear words the use of 'crap' led to significantly higher association with the traits for dynamism than the use of the word 'verdomme' (p = .004, Bonferonni correction) There were no significant differences registered for dynamism between the use of 'reet' (M =3.02, SD = 1.41) and 'verdomme' (M = .2.75 SD = 1.41) and no significant difference for dynamism ratings for 'reet and 'crap' (p > .065, Bonferonni correction)

4. The within-subjects effects of swear word choice on Purchase intention

The differences among the swear words within each group were further explored with the help of two one-way univariate repeated measures analyses. The analysis for L2 indicated a significant difference for purchase intention between swear words F(2; 142) = 11.02, p < .001. Pairwise comparison showed a significantly lower purchase intention for 'ass' (M = 3.38, SD = 1.38) than 'damn' (M = 3.88, SD = 1.22) (p = .002, Bonferonni correction) and 'crap' (M = 3.88, SD = 1.31) (p < .001, Bonferonni correction). There was no significant difference detected between 'damn' and 'crap' (p = 1.000, Bonferonni correction).

For L1 words there was also a significant difference among the swear words used. F(2, 150) = 7.52, p = .001. Pairwise comparison showed that for the Dutch swear words the use of 'reet' (M = 3.11, SD = 1.47) led to significantly lower purchase intention than the use of both 'verdomme' (M =

3.62, *SD* = 1.16) (*p* = .002, Bonferonni correction) and 'kak' (*M* = 3.54, *SD* = 1.25) (*p* = .006, Bonferonni correction). No significant difference was found for purchase intention between 'verdomme' and 'kak' (*p* = 1.000, Bonferonni correction).

For both languages the last advertisement, containing 'reet' and 'ass', evoked a lower purchase intention than the other two advertisements containing 'kak'-'crap' and 'verdomme'-'damn'.

5. The within-subjects effects of swear word choice on recall

The within-subjects effects were further explored with the help of two one-way univariate repeated measures analyses. The analysis for L2 indicated a significant difference for recall between swear words $F(2, 142) = 6.25$, $p = .002$. Pairwise comparison showed a significantly higher recall for 'ass' (*M* = .85, *SD* = .36) than for 'damn' (*M* = .64, *SD* = .48) (*p* = .002, Bonferonni correction). However, no significant difference was found for recall between ads containing 'crap' and 'damn' or between 'crap' and 'ass' (*p* > .220, Bonferonni correction)

For L1 words there was also a significant difference among the swear words used. *F*-value here was also calculated with Greenhouse-Geisser $F(1.83; 137.40) = 4.88$, $p = .011$. Pairwise comparison showed that for the Dutch swear words the use of 'kak' (*M* = .79, *SD* = .41) led to significantly higher recall than the use of 'verdomme' (*M* = .63 *SD* = .49) (p = .029, Bonferonni correction). No significant difference of recall was found between 'kak' (*M* = .79, *SD* = .41) and 'reet' (*M* =.79, *SD* =.41) as well as between 'verdomme' (*M* = .63 *SD* = .49) and 'reet' (*M* =.79, *SD* =.41) (*p* > .53)

Thus, for the English swear words, the word 'ass' was recalled significantly more often than the words 'crap' and 'damn', while in Dutch 'kak' was recalled significantly more often than 'verdomme', but 'reet' was not recalled significantly more often than either 'kak' or 'verdomme'.

6. The within-subjects effects of swear word choice on likelihood of encountering the ad

The within-subjects effects were further explored with the help of two one-way univariate repeated measures analyses. The analysis for L2 indicated a significant difference for likelihood of encountering the ad between swear words $F(1.61; 114.74) = 13.52$, $p < .001$. Due to the fact that the assumption of sphericity was violated the *F*-value was calculated with Greenhouse-Geisser. Pairwise comparison showed a significantly higher likelihood of encountering the ad for 'ass' (*M* = 2.88, *SD* = 1.70) than both 'crap' (*M* = 3.72, *SD* = 1.63) (*p* < .001, Bonferonni correction)

and ‘damn’ (M = 3.75, SD = 1.75) (p = .001, Bonferonni correction). No significant difference was found between ’crap’ (M = 3.72, SD = 1.63) and ‘damn’ (M = 3.75, SD = 1.75) (p = 1.000, Bonferonni correction)

For L1 words there was also a significant difference among the swear words used $F(2, 150) = 5.83$, p = .004. Pairwise comparison showed that for the Dutch swear words the use of ‘verdomme’ led to significantly higher likelihood of encountering the ad than the use of the word ‘reet’ (M = 2.88, SD = 1.74) (p = .005, Bonferonni correction). There were no significant differences between the words ‘reet’ and ‘kak’ (M = 3.09 SD = 1.59) (p = .824, Bonferonni correction) and ‘kak’ and ‘verdomme’ (p = .095, Bonferonni correction).