

Made in Germany, sold in the Netherlands: COO-markers, brand familiarity and the effectiveness of advertisements.

To what extent is effectiveness of an advertisement influenced by brand familiarity and the number of COO-markers present in the ad?

Bachelor Thesis, International Business Communication
Radboud University, Nijmegen
K.A. Warlicht (s1009580)

Dr. B.J.H. Hilberink-Schulpen
Dr. L.J. Speed

Abstract

Several studies have already looked into the effects of COO markers, but with mixed results. Some argue that markers do not define purchasing behaviours, whereas others argue that markers influence product evaluations. There are other aspects that may influence the effects of COO markers, such as brand familiarity, however the moderating effects remain unclear.

This study aimed to assess to what extent the effectiveness of advertisements is influenced by brand familiarity and the number of COO-markers in the advertisement. A total of 16 advertisements differing in number of COO markers, product category and brand familiarity were rated by Dutch consumers. Effectiveness was measured in terms of attitude towards the advertisement, attitude towards the brand and purchase intention.

Results showed no significant effects of either brand familiarity or number of markers for the clothing advertisements. For chips, number of markers seemed to only have an influence on attitude towards the ad. Also, the familiar chips brand was liked more than the unfamiliar. For neither product category significant interaction effects were found.

Thus, the results seem to suggest that markers do not increase the effectiveness of advertisements, as significant results were only found for chips and only for attitude towards the advertisement. Interestingly, familiarity also only seemed relevant for chips advertisements. Future research should examine these differences between product categories further and examine the effects of other combinations of COO markers. The results also imply that perhaps research can be done into the confounding effects of other extrinsic cues.

Introduction

Product variety is exponentially increasing, resulting in an expanding competition and product choice. Due to this variety, consumers are relying less on intrinsic product cues, and more on extrinsic cues to make purchase decisions (Aichner, 2014). An intrinsic product cue refers to any product characteristic inherent to the product, while an extrinsic product cue is not fundamental to the product itself but rather externally attributed (Lee & Lou, 1996; Teas & Agarwal, 2000). An extrinsic product cue that has been found to be used consistently to try to enhance purchase behavior is the Country of Origin (Al-Sulaiti & Baker, 1998). This characteristic is often interpreted by consumers as a signal of quality based on previous stereotypes, and consequently directly affects the likelihood of purchase (Aichner, 2014).

Consumers may come across advertisements including COO references without being aware of the inferences organizations try to stimulate. Companies such as PizzaHut and Coca-Cola refer to a specific country of origin in some of their ads, in order to try to evoke positive associations and increase sales (see Figure 1). Previous research has already investigated the effects of such COO markers, but the possible moderating effect of brand familiarity is unclear. It may be different for consumers to make certain associations for brands they are already familiar with, than for brands they have no prior knowledge of. Possibly, a moderating effect of brand familiarity will result in different marketing strategies for established versus upcoming brands. Thus, the following research will investigate the effect of COO alongside brand familiarity.



Figure 1: Examples of Advertisements using COO markers (left: Reference to tower of Pisa, right: American Flag).

Oftentimes, the term ‘Country of Origin’ is used alongside product ethnicity, however the two cannot be substituted for each other. According to Usunier and Cestre (2007), product ethnicity is based on country–product associations that consumers make with either a product or a country as the initial stimulus. Thus, product ethnicity is a stereotypical association of a

generic product type with a particular country of origin. These stereotypical associations are made for an entire product category and can either be based on products being linked to a country because of its location, climate or natural resources, or countries being linked to a product category because they are known to be the place of invention and development, the place of transformation and use, or the home to a brand associated with the country through its language (Leclerc, Schmitt, & Dubé, 1994).

The Country of Origin effect builds on this concept, by stating more specifically that the image that a consumer has about the Country of Origin in general, is transferred to the product itself. Thus, when consumers have a positive image of a particular country, they will likely evaluate the product more positively due to those associations (Roth & Romeo, 1992; Verlegh & Steenkamp, 1999). If consumers have certain attitudes towards a country, these positive stereotypes could be reflected onto the advertised product (Hornikx, van Meurs & Hof, 2013). Thus, whereas product ethnicity focusses on two-way associations between country and product category, the country of origin effect highlights the more general associations made by the consumer to a specific country and the conscious link advertisers try to make to evoke such associations.

There are several ways companies try to evoke the country of origin effect in their advertising. Aichner (2014) distinguishes eight different strategies that can be used to communicate the COO (see table 1). These strategies can stand alone, but they can also be used in combination in order to try to maximize the associations and effects. Two types are distinguished: explicit and implicit strategies. Implicit strategies revolve around indirect associations, rather than specifically mentioning the COO. Explicit strategies, however, directly communicate the country of origin.

Table 1. COO strategies (Aichner, 2014)

Strategy name	Strategy type	Communication complexity
1. 'Made in ...'	Explicit	Low
2. Quality and origin labels	Explicit	Low
3. COO embedded in the company name	Explicit	Low
4. Typical COO words embedded in company name	Implicit	Medium
5. Use of the COO language	Implicit	Medium/High

6.	Use of famous or stereotypical people from the COO	Implicit	Medium/High
7.	Use of COO flags and symbols	Explicit/Implicit	Low/Medium
8.	Use of typical landscapes or famous buildings from the COO	Implicit	Medium

One of the strategies proposed by Aichner (2014) is ‘Use of the COO language’ as a country of origin marker. This strategy is often used as research has shown. Piller (2001) for example found that nearly 75% of German television commercials used a foreign language such as English, French or Italian, with English as the most frequently used language. However, it is argued that the use of English cannot be seen as a COO marker, because English is considered a global language (Alden, Steenkamp & Batra, 1999; Kelly-Holmes, 2000). On top of this, English is rarely used to express specific stereotypes (Piller, 2003; Gerritsen et al., 2007). In order for language to take on the role of a COO marker, there needs to be a clear link between the language and a specific country. Therefore, in this study only foreign languages other than English will be used as COO markers.

Previous studies have reported mixed results regarding the effectiveness of COO markers in advertisements. For example, Leclerc, Schmitt and Dubé (1994) researched the effects of country-of-origin information in relation to foreign branding. Their experiments showed that foreign branding (i.e., foreign pronunciation of the brand name) and the addition of COO-information did not affect attitudes towards the advertisement or the perceived quality. Foreign branding in itself did affect the attitude towards the brand name and the brand in its totality, but this effect was not found for COO markers. On top of this, incongruent information relating to foreign branding and COO-information diminished the effects of foreign branding. Similarly, Cameron and Elliot (1994) found that a congruent COO may affect the perceived quality of a product, but that this is only true when there are no other cues present to interpret quality. Thus, although COO may possibly have an effect standing on its own, studies suggest that it may not be an effective tool to use in combination with other indicators. These findings are relevant as later research has examined the degree to which COO markers actually defined the purchase choices of consumers. Holdsworth, Insch, Kemp and Knight (2010) found that the addition of a COO marker did not significantly affect the purchasing behavior of UK consumers. A total of 251 consumers were asked their reason for purchase, and only 5.6% of participants named the COO as a factor. This effect was not only found in the UK, but also for German consumers. Balling, Prefeta and Roosen (2012)

researched the importance of COO for consumer decisions and found that it did not affect purchase decisions for 80% of consumers. Although both studies researched the effects specifically for food purchases, the small effects on consumers' choices remain interesting to note.

However, there is also a multitude of research that reinforces that if consumers have a positive image of a country, this will in turn influence the consumers' evaluation of a product (e.g., Roth & Romeo, 1992; Verlegh & Steenkamp, 1999). Verlegh and Steenkamp (1999) performed a quantitative meta-analysis to systematically combine data from several studies in order to determine the effects of COO markers on perceived quality, attitude, and purchase intention. Their analysis showed a grand average effect size of 0.39, which means that the country of origin effect has a substantial influence on consumers' product evaluations. Perceived quality seems to be affected most, but there is also an effect for attitude towards the product or purchase intention. The effects influence consumers' perception either positively or negatively, depending on the association made to the specific country. Thus, implementing COO markers seem to be beneficial only if the country is chosen thoughtfully. More specifically, Verlegh and Steenkamp (1999) found that consumers infer judgments of product quality from specific beliefs about a country's products, but also from more general characteristics. For example, a consumers' view of the country's economy, workforce and culture may also influence their attitudes and perception.

Koschate-Fischer, Diamantopoulos and Oldenkotte (2012) found a similar effect of COO markers. They conducted three complementary experimental studies into the effects of COO on willingness to pay, including COO markers of favorable country images and less favorable country images. They found that consumers are willing to spend more money on products with a COO with a favorable country image than for products with a COO with a less favorable country image. This confirms the notion that the addition of a COO marker in an advertisement in itself is oftentimes not enough, but that the country image must be taken into account in order to fully take advantage of the country of origin effect. Marketers should be aware of this, and consciously link their product or brand to a country of origin that will positively influence attitudes of consumers. Hence, the current study aims to look into the effects of COO markers in relation to a neutral product category and country of origin, meaning that the product is not typically linked to certain stereotypes and/or product ethnicity.

Although scientific research has studied the possible positive effects of COO markers on effectiveness, it is important to know if and how these strategies are actually used by

marketers in practice. Thus, Hornikx, van Meurs, van den Heuvel and Janssen (2019) studied the frequency in which brands actually employ the strategies proposed by Aichner (2014). An analysis of 750 ads showed that 36% of the total number of ads contained at least one COO marker. This highlights the frequency in which marketers still make use of the COO construct in spite of mixed results found in previous studies and emphasizes its relevance for further research. More specifically, Hornikx et al. (2019) also studied the occurrence of the specific types of COO markers. A content analysis showed that ‘COO embedded in the company name’ and ‘Use of COO language’ were used most often. The ‘quality and origin labels’ were not found in any of the sample materials, and the stereotypical ‘Made in..’ was only found in 0.55% of the cases. Thus, not all markers are used equally in practice. Due to the high occurrence of ‘COO embedded in company name’ (29.64%), the current study will look further into the effects of this explicit COO strategy, along with other explicit strategies.

The study also looked into the occurrence of multiple COO markers within one advertisement. Aichner (2014) had already implied that different strategies are often used in combination with each other, and that most companies combine two or more COO strategies. Hornikx et al. (2019) found empirical evidence for this claim. More specifically, their sample showed that ads that contained COO markers often only included one COO marker (70.9%), but the use of more than one marker was also found (29.1%). However, no literature to date has systematically looked at the effect of using multiple COO markers in one advertisement. Therefore, the current study will examine this effect. Does an advertisement that contains more than one reference to the COO enhance the effectiveness of that specific advertisement?

As mentioned earlier, another variable that influences the effectiveness of an advertisement is familiarity with the brand. Brand familiarity is defined as “a unidimensional construct that is directly related to the amount of time that has been spent processing information about the brand, regardless of the type or content of the processing that was involved” (Baker et al., 1986, p. 638). Thus, it relates to the number of times a consumer is exposed to the brand. According to the mere exposure effect, an affect towards a certain object arises as a result of repeated stimulus exposure (Zajonc, 1968). This means that the more often a consumer has come into contact with a certain product or brand, the higher the chance of a strong affect. More specifically, according to the mere exposure effect previous exposure can create a positive association at a later point in time (Zajonc, 2001). Thus, the more exposure to a brand, the more the brand will also be able to make consumers’ attitude towards the brand more positive. This particular notion of a more positive attitude following more exposure suggest that brand familiarity in itself creates a more positive attitude toward

the brand. Taking brand familiarity into account when researching marketing effects may thus be of the essence, as familiarity could result in an overall higher attitude for familiar brands than for unfamiliar brands irrespective of the marketing technique.

Laroche, Kim and Zhou (1996), have studied the effects of brand familiarity on purchase intention. They conducted a survey on the selection of cough/cold syrup medications, and investigated the familiarity with different brands, the attitude towards the brand, the confidence towards the brand and the purchase intention. In doing so, they found that brand familiarity significantly affected the attitude towards the brand. Also interesting was that brand familiarity influenced confidence in the brand, suggesting that a consumers' confidence toward a brand may result from their prior experience or even exposure to the brand. All in all, brand familiarity influenced purchase intention via a more positive attitude towards the brand as well as more confidence in the brand. Previous research has even looked into the effect of brand familiarity as a moderator between COO markers and effectiveness of the advertisement (e.g., Roy & Bagdare, 2015; Koschate-Fischer et al., 2012). For example, Rao and Monroe (1988) suggested that when a consumer is unfamiliar with the advertised brand it may not be possible to rely on intrinsic cues, thus relying more on extrinsic cues such as COO markers. However, when consumers are familiar with the brand, it is more likely that they would use according intrinsic cues and knowledge along with the COO information. This would suggest that COO markers may not have an as strong effect for familiar brands as it has for unfamiliar brands. The current study will thus differentiate between familiar and unfamiliar brands in order to further research the different effects that markers may have. In doing so, the current study may be able to confirm that the of implementation of COO markers as a marketing strategy may be more relevant for unfamiliar brands than for familiar brands.

Tse and Gorn (1993) examined consumers' evaluations in an experiment with country of origin (positive or negative) and global brand name (internationally known or new) as independent variables. Participants were asked to rate the expected performance of a stereo system based on the COO and global brand name information. Then, they listened to an unfamiliar rock song on the disc player and were again asked to evaluate the stereo system. Thus, the experiment also took product experience into account. They found a significant effect of COO across attribute level and overall product evaluations. On top of this, although the COO effect remained significant after product experience, the effect did decline. Consumers also rated brands that were already known to them higher than unfamiliar brands. However, after product experience this difference declined and was no longer significant.

These results confirm the previous notion that consumers rely more on extrinsic cues, such as COO markers, when brand related information is not available. More importantly, whereas the effects of a global brand name almost dissipated after product experience, the country of origin effect had an effect even after product experience. This may imply that a strong COO association in advertising may exceed possible advantages known brands have over unknown brands.

In sum, prior research has looked into both the country of origin effects as well as brand familiarity as factors influencing consumers' attitudes and effectiveness of advertisements. However, it remains unclear to what extent the effects of brand familiarity may also affect the relation between number of origin markers and effectiveness of the advertisement. Tse and Gorn (1993) found that consumers rely more on extrinsic cues, such as COO markers, when brand related information is not available. However, this was only studied for a 'positive' or 'negative' COO, and did not take the number of markers consumers were provided with into account even though Aichner (2014) suggested stronger effects of the country of origin effect when a multitude of markers are used in advertising. On top of this, Hornikx et al., (2019) found that this tactic is also empirically used. Thus, the relevance and effectiveness of this tactic is important to study for marketers as it would give them new insights into whether their marketing efforts and tactics are useful. Although previous research has already suggested COO markers becoming more influential when a brand is unfamiliar to the consumer, it remains unclear whether it may have a different effect when a multitude of markers is used in comparison to a single marker or even no marker. Thus, the research question this study aims to answer is:

RQ: To what extent is effectiveness of an advertisement influenced by brand familiarity and the number of COO-markers present in the ad?

Method

Materials

The 4x2 between-subjects design consisted of two independent variables, namely ‘number of COO markers’ and ‘brand familiarity’.

Based on previous research, multiple numbers of COO markers were evaluated. Hornikx et al. (2019) previously found that 64.03% of advertisements did not contain any COO markers, 25.50% contained a single COO marker, 8.72% had two markers, and 1.48% had three markers. Only 0.27% of advertisements showed four markers, hence this condition was not evaluated in the current study. Thus, a total of three different markers are selected to be included in the study.

Hornikx et al. (2019) found that ‘COO embedded in the company name’ is the most frequently used strategy in advertisements. Aichner (2014) identified this strategy as being explicit. Because explicitness versus implicitness is not under scrutiny in the current study no distinction was made, and solely explicit measures were implemented. The three explicit measures that were found in empirical research, were (1) Made in...., (2) COO embedded in the name, and (3) Flags and symbols. As per the findings of Hornikx et al. (2019), the strategies were divided over the conditions to fit with the likelihood of being used empirically. COO embedded in the name was found to be most commonly used, namely 29.64% of markers, and thus used in the condition containing a single marker. Flags and symbols (1.39% of markers) were added when a second marker was present in the condition, and similarly “made in ...” (0.55% of markers) was added when three markers were present.

Prior knowledge about a brand may moderate the effects of COO markers on effectiveness (Roy & Bagdare, 2015). The current study distinguished whether participants are already familiar with the brand or whether they are not familiar yet. Thus, an existing brand was compared to an unexisting brand. In order to ensure an accurate comparison between a familiar and unfamiliar brand, two separate pretests were conducted. Firstly, familiar brands were pretested. Several internationally selling Spanish brands were chosen based on researchers’ familiarity and were then tested to confirm a general familiarity with the brands. The first pretest was conducted among a total of 21 subjects, of which 57.1% was male and 42.9% was female. The mean age of the participants was 25.90 years old ($SD = 10.60$), ranging from 19 to 57. Participants’ highest completed education level varied from ‘*Middelbare School*’ (42.9%), to ‘*HBO*’ (23.8%) and ‘*Universiteit*’ (33.3%). They were asked to rate seven Spanish brands on a five-point scale, on whether they were aware of them and

whether they had bought something of the brand before. These two questions were taken together to form a scale pertaining '*familiarity*'. A correlation was computed as a reliability measurement, which showed a significant correlation between awareness and previous experience ($r(21) = .782, p < .001$). A repeated measures ANOVA showed that this level of familiarity differed significantly across the brands ($F(6, 15) = 37.80, p < .001, \eta^2 = .94$). Participants seemed to be most familiar with Pringles ($M = 3.81, SD = 0.58$) and Zara ($M = 3.36, SD = 0.81$).¹ A post-hoc Bonferroni test showed that Pringles differed significantly from all other brands; Desigual, Estrella, Stradivarius and Aldolfo Dominguez ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-correction) and significantly from Mango ($p = .009$, Bonferroni-correction). Pringles did not differ significantly from Zara ($p = .265$, Bonferroni-correction). Similarly, the post-hoc Bonferroni also showed significant differences between Zara and Desigual, Estrella and Aldolfo Dominguez ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-correction), and from Stradivarius ($p = .012$, Bonferroni-correction). However, Zara did not differ significantly from Mango ($p = .099$, Bonferroni-correction). All in all, Pringles and Zara were taken for further analysis as they showed the highest means, which also differed significantly from most other brands. For Pringles, only one participant (4.8%) was able to accurately name the country of origin. However, 33.3% of the participants was able to accurately name the COO of Zara. To be able to generalize across product categories, both product types were used for the experiment.

Subsequently, a second pretest was conducted in order to find unfamiliar brands pertaining to the same product categories as Pringles and Zara, namely clothing and chips. These product categories are neutral and are not typically linked to certain stereotypes and/or product ethnicity, which may otherwise have influenced the results. The second pretest was conducted among a total of 15 participants, of which 56.3% was male and 43.8% was female. The mean age of the participants was 26.88 years old ($SD = 11.93$), ranging from 19 to 57. Participants' highest completed education level varied from '*Middelbare School*' (31.3%), to '*HBO*' (31.3%) and '*Universiteit*' (37.5%). They were asked to rate three existing Spanish clothing brands and three existing Spanish chips brands, these were expected to be unknown to Dutch natives since these brands are not present in the Dutch market. They rated on a five-point scale, on whether they knew the brands and whether they had bought something of the specific brand before. Again, these two questions were taken together to form a scale pertaining '*familiarity*'. A correlation was computed as a reliability measurement, which showed a significant correlation between awareness and previous experience ($r(15) = .85, p <$

¹ Means and Standard Deviations for the other variables can be found in the appendices (Appendix A)

.001). A repeated measures ANOVA showed that the level of familiarity did not differ significantly across the brands ($F(4, 11) = 1.43, p = .289, \eta^2 = .34$). As the mean scores for all the brands were relatively low for familiarity (all means < 1.50), the two lowest scoring brands were chosen nonetheless. Regarding the chips brands, participants were least familiar with Frit Ravich ($M = 1.03, SD = 0.13$). For clothing brands, both Mei Olivier ($M = 1.03, SD = 0.13$) and Noon ($M = 1.03, SD = 0.13$)² also received the exact same score. Ultimately, Noon was decided upon due to its closer similarity in style, brand name and logo to Zara.

All in all, sixteen different advertisements were created, that were divided over eight conditions (see Figure 2, Figure 3 and Appendix B). Participants saw a clothing advertisement and a chips advertisement for either a familiar brand (Zara/Pringles) or an unfamiliar brand (Noon/Frit Ravich), with either no marker, one marker, two markers or three markers.

The *clothing* advertisements for both familiar and unfamiliar brands contained the same image and slogan as a base. To embed the COO into the company name both brand names were accompanied by the word “moda”. The addition of a Spanish word within the company name was expected to evoke the COO effect. The Spanish flag was used to visualize “Flags and Symbols”, and “Made in Spain” was added to comply to the other two markers, as can be seen in figure 2.



Figure 2: Stimulus material for clothing advertisements with a total of three markers (left: familiar, right: unfamiliar).

For the *chips* advertisements, the base of the advertisement contained the same image of two illustrated people fighting over a bag of chips, accompanied by a slogan. To embed the COO into the company name, Spanish sounding prefixes and suffixes were used (e.g., Las

² Means and Standard Deviations for the other variables can be found in the appendices (Appendix A)

Pringles and Fritos Ravichos). To embed flags or symbols, the illustrations of regular people fighting were exchanged for illustrations of a classic Spanish bullfighter along with a bull. 'Made in Spain' was added to comply with the third and final marker (see figure 3).



Figure 3: Stimulus material for chips advertisements with a total of three markers (left: familiar, right: unfamiliar).

Subjects

A total of 349 people participated in the study. However, after data cleaning for finishing survey, native language, participants' age (>16) and permission to use their data, the analyses were run for a total of 253 participants. Non-probability sampling was used, in which only Dutch students were selected to ensure the effect of foreign language was minimized. Additionally, a quota sample was set in advance, with respondents then selected based on a snowball sample. Respondents were contacted by means of an online message (social media channels such as Facebook and WhatsApp). The participants were distributed randomly, with conditions presented evenly over the participants. All conditions were distributed to 30 to 34 participants.

All participants included in the study had Dutch as their first language. The majority of the participants was female (Female = 64.8%, Male = 35.2%), and their completed education levels differed from 'Middelbare School' (34.0%), 'MBO' (9.5%), 'HBO' (22.1%), to 'Universiteit' (34.4%) The mean age of the participants was 28.58 years old ($SD = 13.03$), ranging from 16 to 79.

A Chi-square test showed that gender was evenly distributed across the conditions ($\chi^2(7) = 8.583, p = .284$). A second Chi-square test showed that education level was also evenly distributed across the conditions ($\chi^2(21) = 17.218, p = .698$). Similarly, a F-test showed that age was evenly distributed across the conditions ($F(7, 245) = .79, p = .596$).

Design

To examine how effective advertisements with COO markers are, a 4x2 experimental between-subjects study was used. An experiment was set up, whereby a different number of COO markers was embedded into the ad (no marker, 1 marker, 2 markers, 3 markers), for both a familiar and an unfamiliar brand. Each participant evaluated two advertisements of the same condition, one clothing advertisement and one chips advertisement. Familiarity and number of markers were between-subject factors, whereas product category (clothing/chips) was a within-subject factor.

Instruments

The current study aimed to determine the effectiveness of advertisements. This effectiveness was measured by taking the following variables into account: Attitude towards the ad, Attitude towards the brand, and Purchase Intention.

Attitude towards the ad was measured on a six-item, 7- point semantic differential scale anchored by pleasant/unpleasant, likable/unlikable, interesting/ boring, tasteful/tasteless, artful/artless, and good/bad (Spears & Singh, 2004). The current study translated the scales to Dutch in order to prevent an anchor contraction effect among the Dutch participants. The Dutch translations resulted in: Ik vind deze advertentie – prettig/onprettig, aangenaam/niet aangenaam, interessant/saai, smaakvol/smakeloos, artistiek/niet artistiek, en goed/slecht. The reliability of ‘*attitude towards the ad*’ comprising of six items was good for clothing ($\alpha = .81$), and also good for chips ($\alpha = .81$). Thus, the means of all six items were used to calculate the compound variables ‘attitude towards the clothing ad’ and ‘attitude towards the chips ad’, which were used in further analyses.

Attitude towards the brand was measured on a five-item, 7- point semantic differential scale anchored by unappealing/appealing, bad/good, unpleasant/pleasant, unfavorable/favorable, and unlikable/likable (Spears & Singh, 2004). Again, the anchors were translated to Dutch resulting in: Ik vind dit merk – niet aantrekkelijk/aantrekkelijk, slecht/goed, niet prettig/prettig, niet gunstig/gunstig, en niet aangenaam/aangenaam. The reliability of ‘*attitude towards the brand*’ comprising of five items was good for clothing ($\alpha = .87$), and also good for chips ($\alpha = .89$). Thus, the means of all five items were used to calculate the compound variables ‘attitude towards the clothing brand’ and ‘attitude towards the chips brand’, which were used in further analyses.

Purchase intention was measured on a five-item, 7- point semantic differential scale. The scale was anchored by never/definitely, definitely do not intent to buy/definitely intent, very low/high purchase interest, definitely not buy/definitely buy it, and probably not/probably buy it (Spears & Singh, 2004). The anchors were translated into Dutch and answered the following statement: 'In hoeverre bent u geïnteresseerd in dit product'. The Dutch translations of the anchors resulted in: nooit kopen/zeker kopen, zeker niet van plan/zeker van plan, geen interesse om te kopen/ interesse om te kopen, zeker niet kopen/zeker kopen, en waarschijnlijk niet kopen/waarschijnlijk kopen. The reliability of 'purchase intention' comprising of five items was good for clothing ($\alpha = .89$), and excellent for chips ($\alpha = .90$). Thus, the means of all five items were used to calculate the compound variables 'purchase intention clothing' and 'purchase intention chips', which were used in further analyses.

Procedure

Participants were recruited via online messages. They were asked to fill in an online questionnaire via Qualtrics. They were briefly informed about the procedure and time. Participation was voluntary, and participants were able to stop the experiment at any given time. Before taking part in the study, participants had to consent to the anonymous use of their data. Participants were not told what the exact aim of the experiment was, due to validity reasons. There was no extra incentive to motivate participation. Participants were not debriefed about the purpose of the study afterwards.

Firstly, participants were asked to fill in a number of demographic details, namely mother tongue, gender, age and level of education. Afterwards, they were given a brief introduction into the procedure of the study. They were informed that they would be given two different advertisements, on which they had to answer some questions. Participants were made aware that there were no good or wrong answers to any of the questions, but that the researchers were simply interested in their opinion and views.

Participants were randomly assigned to one of the eight conditions. Thus, no participant was purposefully directed to a certain condition, in order to ensure validity. These conditions all consisted of one clothing advertisement and one chips advertisement to evaluate, differing in number of markers (0/1/2/3) and brand familiarity (familiar/unfamiliar).

After the respondents were exposed to the advertisement, a questionnaire was presented asking them about their attitudes towards the ad, attitudes toward the brand and

purchase intentions by using several Likert-scales. The questionnaire was the same for all eight conditions and took approximately 5 minutes to complete.

Statistical treatment

The variables attitude towards the ad, attitude towards the brand, and purchase intention were analyzed using two-way ANOVA with number of COO markers and brand familiarity as between subject factors. These analyses were done separately for clothing and chips, due to the significant differences found in the repeated measured test with product type as within-subject factor.

Results

The main purpose of this study was to research to what extent the effects of brand familiarity may also affect the relation between number of origin markers and effectiveness of the advertisement. Here, the effectiveness of the advertisement was measured in terms of attitude towards the ad, attitude towards the brand and purchase intention.

Firstly, two different product categories were included as a within-subjects factor to ensure generalizability. A paired samples t-test was conducted to analyze whether the scores of the dependent variables differed between clothing and chips. The test showed significant differences for attitude towards the ad ($t(252) = 8.47, p < .001$), as well as for attitude towards the brand ($t(252) = 4.08, p < .001$) and purchase intention ($t(252) = 3.75, p < .001$).

As the product categories differed significantly in their results, they were analyzed separately in order to determine the differences within these product categories more specifically. Thus, attitude towards the advertisement, attitude towards the brand and purchase intention were analyzed for the chips advertisements and for the clothing advertisements.

Attitude towards the advertisement

A two-way Analysis of Variance for *chips advertisements* for attitude towards the advertisement with number of markers and familiarity as between subject factors showed no significant main effect of familiarity ($F(1, 245) = 0.80, p = .373, \eta^2 = .00$). However, there was a main effect of number of markers on attitude towards the ad ($F(3, 245) = 9.45, p < .001, \eta^2 = .10$). The test did not show a significant interaction between number of markers and familiarity ($F(3, 245) = 0.13, p = .944, \eta^2 = .00$). Table 2 shows all means and standard deviations for the attitude towards the chips advertisements. The assumption of equality of variance for the F-tests has been violated due to the fact that Levene's test was significant.³ A post-hoc Bonferroni test compared the means for number of markers independent from brand familiarity. The pairwise comparison showed that the use of three markers ($M = 3.93, SD = 1.11$) resulted in a significantly higher attitude towards the advertisement than the use of no markers ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 3.01, SD = 0.92$) and than the use of one marker ($p = .005$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 3.30, SD = 0.91$). However, three markers did not result in a significantly higher attitude than two markers ($p = 1.000$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 3.01, SD = 0.92$). In addition, the pairwise comparison also showed that

³ It is beyond the scope of this bachelor's thesis, to use alternative statistics.

attitude for the use of two markers ($M = 3.01$, $SD = 0.92$) only differed significantly from the attitude for the use of no markers ($p = .002$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 3.01$, $SD = 0.92$), and not for one marker ($p = .211$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 3.30$, $SD = 0.91$). And on top of this, the attitude for the use of one marker ($M = 3.30$, $SD = 0.91$) did not differ significantly from the attitude for the use of no markers ($p = .853$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 3.01$, $SD = 0.92$).

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations for attitude towards the chips advertisements, measured on a 7-point Likert (a higher score represents a more positive attitude).

	<i>M (SD)</i>				
	Total (irrespective of markers)	No Marker	1 Marker	2 Markers	3 Markers
Unfamiliar Chips brand	3.54 (1.08)	3.13 (1.02)	3.35 (0.98)	3.70 (0.98)	3.97 (1.19)
Familiar Chips brand	3.43 (1.14)	2.89 (0.81)	2.23 (0.83)	3.68 (1.25)	3.89 (1.30)
Total (irrespective of familiarity)	3.49 (1.11)	3.01 (0.92)	3.30 (0.91)	3.69 (1.12)	3.93 (1.11)

Another two-way Analysis of Variance was conducted, but for *clothing advertisements*. All means and standard deviations for the attitude towards the clothing advertisements can be found in table 3. This analysis showed no significant effects for attitude towards the advertisement with number of markers and familiarity as between subject factors: No significant main effect of familiarity was found ($F(1, 245) = 0.13$, $p = .722$, $\eta^2 = .00$). There was also no main effect of number of markers on attitude towards the ad ($F(3, 245) = 0.50$, $p = .681$, $\eta^2 = .01$), and the test did not show a significant interaction between number of markers and familiarity ($F(3, 245) = 0.92$, $p = .433$, $\eta^2 = .01$).

Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations for attitude towards the clothing advertisements, measured on a 7-point Likert (a higher score represents a more positive attitude).

	<i>M (SD)</i>				
	Total (irrespective of markers)	No Marker	1 Marker	2 Markers	3 Markers
Unfamiliar Clothing brand	4.28 (0.95)	4.22 (0.98)	4.37 (0.92)	4.33 (1.08)	4.21 (0.84)

Familiar Clothing brand	4.33 (1.09)	4.49 (1.03)	4.42 (1.05)	4.04 (1.25)	4.38 (1.00)
Total (irrespective of familiarity)	4.31 (1.02)	1.36 (1.00)	4.39 (0.98)	4.18 (1.17)	4.30 (0.92)

Attitude towards the brand

A two-way Analysis of Variance for *chips advertisements* for attitude towards the brand with number of markers and familiarity as between subject factors showed a significant main effect of familiarity ($F(1, 245) = 43.55, p < .001, \eta^2 = .15$). The attitude towards the familiar brand ($M = 4.45, SD = 1.20$) was significantly higher than towards the unfamiliar brand ($M = 3.51, SD = 1.05$).

However, no main effect of number of markers on attitude towards the ad was found ($F(3, 245) = 1.38, p = .248, \eta^2 = .02$). There was also no significant interaction between number of markers and familiarity ($F(3, 245) = 0.68, p = .565, \eta^2 = .01$). Table 4 shows all means and standard deviations for the attitude towards the chips brands.

Table 4. Means and Standard Deviations for attitude towards the chips brands, measured on a 7-point Likert (a higher score represents a more positive attitude).

	<i>M (SD)</i>				
	Total (irrespective of markers)	No Marker	1 Marker	2 Markers	3 Markers
Unfamiliar Chips brand	3.51 (1.05)	3.11 (1.12)	3.51 (1.01)	3.71 (1.17)	3.71 (0.80)
Familiar Chips brand	4.45 (1.20)	4.36 (0.97)	4.51 (1.00)	4.50 (1.45)	4.43 (1.34)
Total (irrespective of familiarity)	3.99 (1.22)	3.75 (1.21)	3.99 (1.12)	4.12 (1.37)	4.09 (1.17)

Another two-way Analysis of Variance was conducted, but for *clothing advertisements*. All means and standard deviations for the attitude towards the clothing brands can be found in table 5. This analysis for attitude towards the brand with number of markers and familiarity as between subject factors showed no significant effects: No significant main effect of familiarity was found ($F(1, 245) = 1.40, p = .238, \eta^2 = .01$).

There was also no main effect of number of markers on attitude towards the ad ($F(3, 245) = 0.71, p = .548, \eta^2 = .01$), and no significant interaction between number of markers and familiarity ($F(3, 245) = 0.02, p = .996, \eta^2 = .00$).

Table 5. Means and Standard Deviations for attitude towards the clothing brands, measured on a 7-point Likert (a higher score represents a more positive attitude).

	<i>M (SD)</i>				
	Total (irrespective of markers)	No Marker	1 Marker	2 Markers	3 Markers
Unfamiliar Clothing brand	4.30 (1.10)	4.40 (0.89)	4.38 (0.75)	4.22 (0.98)	4.23 (0.88)
Familiar Clothing brand	4.46 (1.22)	4.59 (1.10)	4.56 (1.19)	4.33 (1.45)	4.37 (1.13)
Total (irrespective of familiarity)	4.38 (1.06)	4.50 (1.00)	4.46 (0.98)	4.28 (1.24)	4.30 (1.01)

Purchase intention

A two-way Analysis of Variance for *chips advertisements* for purchase intention with number of markers and familiarity as between subject factors showed a significant main effect of familiarity ($F(1, 245) = 6.07, p = .014, \eta^2 = .02$). The purchase intention for the familiar brand ($M = 3.65, SD = 1.49$) was significantly higher than for the unfamiliar brand ($M = 3.20, SD = 1.42$).

However, no main effect of number of markers on attitude towards the ad was found ($F(3, 245) = 0.98, p = .404, \eta^2 = .01$). There was also no significant interaction between number of markers and familiarity ($F(3, 245) = 0.49, p = .693, \eta^2 = .01$). Table 6 shows all means and standard deviations for the purchase intention of the chips.

Table 6. Means and Standard Deviations for purchase intention of the chips, measured on a 7-point Likert (a higher score represents a higher likelihood to purchase).

	<i>M (SD)</i>				
	Total (irrespective of markers)	No Marker	1 Marker	2 Markers	3 Markers
Unfamiliar Chips brand	3.20 (1.42)	3.02 (1.55)	3.08 (1.34)	3.40 (1.47)	3.40 (1.38)
Familiar Chips brand	3.65 (1.49)	3.56 (1.41)	3.71 (1.54)	3.36 (1.44)	3.97 (1.56)

Total (irrespective of familiarity)	3.43 (1.47)	3.30 (1.49)	3.38 (1.46)	3.32 (1.44)	3.70 (1.49)
-------------------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Another two-way Analysis of Variance was conducted, but for *clothing advertisements*. All means and standard deviations for the purchase intention of the clothing can be found in table 7. This analysis for purchase intention with number of markers and familiarity as between subject factors showed no significant effects: No significant main effect of familiarity was found ($F(1, 245) = 0.87, p = .353, \eta^2 = .00$). The assumption of equality of variance for the F-tests has been violated due to the fact that Levene's test was significant.⁴ There was also no main effect of number of markers on purchase intention ($F(3, 245) = 0.92, p = .431, \eta^2 = .01$), and the test did not show a significant interaction between number of markers and familiarity ($F(3, 245) = 0.11, p = .956, \eta^2 = .00$).

Table 7. Means and Standard Deviations for purchase intention of the clothing, measured on a 7-point Likert (a higher score represents a higher likelihood to purchase).

	<i>M (SD)</i>				
Total (irrespective of markers)	No Marker	1 Marker	2 Markers	3 Markers	
Unfamiliar Clothing brand	3.78 (1.20)	3.91 (1.23)	3.89 (0.90)	3.57 (1.54)	3.74 (1.09)
Familiar Clothing brand	3.92 (1.26)	3.96 (1.38)	4.02 (0.95)	3.68 (1.40)	4.02 (1.27)
Total (irrespective of familiarity)	3.85 (1.23)	3.93 (1.30)	2.95 (0.92)	3.63 (1.46)	3.89 (1.19)

⁴ It is beyond the scope of this bachelor's thesis, to use alternative statistics.

Conclusion and Discussion

Conclusion

This study aimed to assess to what extent the effectiveness of advertisements is influenced by brand familiarity and the number of COO-markers present in the ad. Effectiveness was measured in terms of attitude towards the advertisement, attitude towards the brand and purchase intention.

All in all, results showed that the consumers rated food and clothing products differently. Within the product category chips, markers seem to have an influence on attitude towards the advertisement, but they do not influence the attitude towards the brand or purchase intention. Additionally, the familiar chips brand was liked more than the unfamiliar brand, irrespective of number of markers. Purchase intention was also higher for familiar chips brands, than for unfamiliar chips brands. However, for clothing no effects were found either for familiarity or COO markers, and no interaction between these two variables were found.

Thus, the results seem to suggest that markers do not increase the effectiveness of advertisements, as significant results were only found in the chips product category and only for attitude towards the advertisement. Familiarity does not seem to affect the effectiveness of clothing advertisements, but it does influence the effectiveness of chips advertisements. No interactions were found for either product category. Thus, in this experiment the effectiveness of COO markers did not vary depending on familiarity.

Discussion

Number of markers

It was hypothesized that the country of origin effect that is evoked by COO-markers has an influence of consumers' evaluations and thus on advertisement effectiveness. In order to study this, three different markers referring to the COO Spain were included in the advertisements. No conclusive evidence was found to support the hypothesis. Previous research has suggested that the consumer has to have positive associations towards the country of origin for the country of origin effect to be beneficial (Verlegh & Steenkamp, 1999). The current study used product categories and a country of origin that could not be linked through product ethnicity, but had a more neutral stance. However, previous studies have oftentimes connected the effectiveness of COO markers to product-country congruency and positive country images (e.g., Roth & Romeo, 1992; Koschate-Fischer, Diamantopoulos and Oldenkotte, 2012). It was hypothesized that despite the neutral stance of Spain and lack in

stereotypical link between the product categories and country, the COO effect could still have an effect as a consumers' view of the country's economy, workforce and culture may also influence their attitudes and perceptions (Verlegh & Steenkamp, 1999). However, it may be possible that consumers' general associations to Spain were not positive to a degree in which these associations may also have influenced their evaluations. Thus, future research could study the effects of different countries within the same conditions to create a better understanding of the effect of the country of origin in itself.

Another possible explanation for the lack of results for COO markers in the current study is that consumers may use other visual aspects of the advertisements as indicators for for example product quality. The current study made use of markers as a strategy to enhance the baseline advertisement. As this baseline advertisement already included other visual/extrinsic elements, such as product image and slogan, it may be possible that consumers relied more on these aspects to make inferences about the product even when markers were added. As Leclerc, Schmitt and Dubé (1994), for example, already suggested earlier, COO markers may have an effect on its own, but effects may be diminished in combination with other quality indicators. Thus, it is possible that for example the product pictures, logo design, or any other visual aspects may have already formed the viewers views in such a way that the possible influence of markers was diminished. As an effect of markers on unfamiliar brands was not found, future research could look into the interaction between the other extrinsic cues. It may be possible that that markers may only affect specific types of advertisements in which consumers cannot rely on any other extrinsic cues, but need to rely on markers specifically to make further inferences.

The mere design of the current study may also have influenced the results to some extent. The study made use of a specific number of markers (being none, one, two or three) and specific types of markers. The choice of type of markers was based on the most commonly used marker being 'COO embedded in the company name'. As this was an explicit measure, two other explicit types were chosen to minimize possible differences between implicit and explicit types of markers. However, these are not the only markers that can be used in advertising. Hornikx et al. (2019) even found that these are not three types were not necessarily the most frequently used markers. Thus, implementing different markers into a similar design may be interesting, as it may give an insight into the effectiveness of commonly used markers. Similarly, a different order of implementation could be adhered, as this may also influence the consumers (e.g. no participant saw the advertisement with only 'Made in ...' as a marker, but always in combination with the other two types of markers).

Familiarity

For chips, familiarity seemed to affect consumers attitude towards the brand and their purchase intention. This could be explained by the mere exposure effect (Zajonc, 2001), which suggests that a more positive attitude follows after consumers are exposed to a brand or product more. Thus, it could be hypothesized that familiarity in itself creates a more positive attitude towards the brand. This would not apply to the attitude towards the advertisement specifically, as participants of the current research were only exposed to the advertisement once – and thus would not have the opportunity for an affect to arise out of repeated stimulus exposure. Previous research by Laroche, Kim and Zhou (1996) found that brand familiarity can influence purchase intention via a more positive attitude towards the brand. Thus, for chips the findings seem to be mostly in line with previous research.

Tse and Gorn (1993) researched consumers' evaluations in a different context and found that consumers rated brands that were already known to them higher than unfamiliar brands. This is in line with the mere exposure hypothesis of Zajonc (2001). However, this would suggest that the results found for chips should also apply to the clothing advertisements. Yet, no main effects of familiarity were found for clothing on attitude towards the ad, attitude towards the brand, nor for purchase intention. A possible explanation for the difference in chips and clothing for familiarity could be the importance of indicators that cannot be given via a print advertisement. For example, for chips consumers may normally rely on other senses such as smell and taste to enhance their affect towards the brand. When these aspects are not familiar to them via the print advertisement, they rely more on extrinsic cues that are available to them such as the COO markers. However, for clothing consumers may determine their affect more on style and fit, which can more easily be communicated via visual material. Hence, they may be able to rely more on the brand related information that is available to them rather than extrinsic cues. The importance of familiarity may thus change across different product categories. Future research could examine whether the hypothesis that product category influences the effect of familiarity on attitudes and purchase intentions is valid. An experiment could be carried out in which researchers manipulate the product category and the familiarity, to see whether this affects the effectiveness of the advertisement differently.

Interaction

Previous studies have suggested that due to the higher level of product information available to consumers familiar to the brand, extrinsic cues such as COO markers become less determining. However, the current study did not find any significant interactions between number of COO markers and brand familiarity, neither for chips nor for clothes. Thus, this study suggests that markers have an equal influence, or no influence, on the effectiveness on the advertisement for familiar and unfamiliar brands.

Generalizability

This study aimed to generalize results across product categories. Thus, two different product types were chosen and analyzed in order to realize this. However, results showed significant differences between chips and clothing in their evaluations, even though the same strategies by Aichner (2014) were included in the advertisement for both product types. The research materials were designed in order to fit with advertisements found empirically. Both the chips and clothing advertisements were created to fit with the designs of advertisement found in practice for each category. This was done in order to enhance validity but may thus have consequently resulted in a confound for attitude. For example, it may be possible that consumers have a general preference for the advertising style often used in chips ads compared to the style of clothing advertisements.

Future research may take these findings into account. For example, researchers can investigate the possible effects of advertising style as moderating factor. Furthermore, researchers can explore the effects of other product categories that often use markers in practice other than chips and clothing. Perhaps patterns can be found in product categories for which COO markers work more effectively.

All in all, even though this study's findings could not confirm the previously hypothesis, it has resulted in new insights regarding to both COO markers and familiarity. These results could help deepen the research into the effects of country-of-origin markers, as they suggest a more complicated role of product category which needs to be explored. Additionally, the role of product information and extrinsic cues may be interesting in respect to markers, and may even be related again to product category.

Yet, these results also give new insights that could be taken into account in the practical field. For example, marketers and advertisers still make use of various markers (Hornikx et al., 2019) across various product categories. However, the current study shows that markers apparently do not work for all and that one strategy cannot be generalized across multiple categories. Moreover, even for chips the number of markers seem to only have an effect on attitude towards the ad, which could then not be translated into a higher attitude towards the brand or a higher purchase intention. As the main goal of advertising remains to increase sales, be it via a positive brand image, including coo markers may not be the best strategy to implement. Future efforts can possibly be better engaged in other strategies.

Bibliography

- Aichner, T. (2013). Country-of-origin marketing: A list of typical strategies with examples. *Journal of Brand Management*, 21(1), 81–93.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/bm.2013.24>
- Alden, D. L., Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M., & 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.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299906300106>
- Al-Sulaiti, K. I., & Baker, M. J. (1998). Country of origin effects: a literature review. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 16(3), 150–199.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/02634509810217309>
- Baker, W., Hutchinson, W., Moore, D., & Nedungadi, P. (1986). Brand familiarity and advertising: effects on the evoked set and brand preference. *NA - Advances in Consumer Research*, 13, 637–642.
<https://www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/6570/volumes/v13/NA>
- Diehl, S., & Terlutter, R. (2006). *International Advertising and Communication*. Deutscher Universitätsverlag.
- Elliott, G. R., & Cameron, R. C. (1994). Consumer perception of product quality and the Country-of-Origin effect. *Journal of International Marketing*, 2(2), 49–62.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1069031x9400200204>
- Gerritsen, M., Nickerson, C., Van Hooft, A., Van Meurs, F., Nederstigt, U., Starren, M., & Crijns, R. (2007). English in product advertisements in Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands and Spain. *World Englishes*, 26(3), 291–315.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971x.2007.00510.x>
- Hornikx, J., van Meurs, F., & Hof, R.-J. (2013). The effectiveness of foreign-language display in advertising for congruent versus incongruent products. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 25(3), 152–165. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08961530.2013.780451>

- Hornikx, J., van Meurs, F., van den Heuvel, J., & Janssen, A. (2019). How brands highlight country of origin in magazine advertising: A content analysis. *Journal of Global Marketing*, 33(1), 34–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08911762.2019.1579399>
- Josiassen, A., Lukas, B. A., & Whitwell, G. J. (2008). Country-of-origin contingencies. *International Marketing Review*, 25(4), 423–440. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02651330810887477>
- Kelly-Holmes, H. (2000). Bier, parfum, kaas: language fetish in European advertising. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 3(1), 67–82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/a010863>
- Kemp, K., Inch, A., Holdsworth, D. K., & Knight, J. G. (2010). Food miles: Do UK consumers actually care? *Food Policy*, 35(6), 504–513. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2010.05.011>
- Koschate-Fischer, N., Diamantopoulos, A., & Oldenkotte, K. (2012). Are consumers really willing to pay more for a favorable country image? A study of country-of-origin effects on willingness to pay. *Journal of International Marketing*, 20(1), 19–41. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jim.10.0140>
- Laroche, M., Kim, C., & Zhou, L. (1996). Brand familiarity and confidence as determinants of purchase intention: An empirical test in a multiple brand context. *Journal of Business Research*, 37(2), 115–120. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963\(96\)00056-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(96)00056-2)
- Leclerc, F., Schmitt, B. H., & Dubé, L. (1994). Foreign branding and its effects on product perceptions and attitudes. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31(2), 263–270. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224379403100209>
- Lee, M., & Lou, Y.-C. (2011). Consumer reliance on intrinsic and extrinsic cues in product evaluations: A conjoint approach. *Journal of Applied Business Research (JABR)*, 12(1), 21. <https://doi.org/10.19030/jabr.v12i1.5833>
- Piller, I. (2001). Identity constructions in multilingual advertising. *Language in Society*, 30(2), 153–186. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047404501002019>

- Piller, I. (2003). Advertising as a site of language contact. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 23, 170–183. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190503000254>
- Profeta, A., Balling, R., & Roosen, J. (2012). The relevance of origin information at the point of sale. *Food Quality and Preference*, 26(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2012.03.001>
- Rao, A. R., & Monroe, K. B. (1988). The moderating effect of prior knowledge on cue utilization in product evaluations. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15(2), 253. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209162>
- Roth, M. S., & Romeo, J. B. (1992). Matching product category and country image perceptions: A framework for managing country-of-origin effects. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 23(3), 477–497. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490276>
- Roy, S., & Bagdare, S. (2015). The role of country of origin in celebrity endorsements: Integrating effects of brand familiarity. *Journal of Global Marketing*, 28(3–5), 133–151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08911762.2015.1073413>
- Spears, N., & Singh, S. N. (2004). Measuring attitude toward the brand and purchase intentions. *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising*, 26(2), 53–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10641734.2004.10505164>
- Teas, R. K., & Agarwal, S. (2000). The effects of extrinsic product cues on consumers' perceptions of quality, sacrifice, and value. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(2), 278–290. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092070300282008>
- Tse, D. K., & Gorn, G. J. (1993). An experiment on the salience of country-of-origin in the era of global brands. *Journal of International Marketing*, 1(1), 57–76. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069031x9300100105>
- Usunier, J.-C., & Cestre, G. (2007). Product ethnicity: Revisiting the match between products and countries. *Journal of International Marketing*, 15(3), 32–72. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jimk.15.3.32>

Verlegh, P. W. J., & Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M. (1999). A review and meta-analysis of country-of-origin research. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 20(5), 521–546.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-4870\(99\)00023-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-4870(99)00023-9)

Zajonc, R. B. (1968). Attitudinal effects of mere exposure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 9(2, Pt.2), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0025848>

Zajonc, R. B. (2001). Mere exposure: A gateway to the subliminal. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 10(6), 224–228. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00154>

Appendix A: Pre-tests

A.2 Means and Standard Deviations Pre-tests

Table 8. Means and Standard Deviations for familiarity Pre-test familiar brands

	<i>M (SD)</i>
	Familiarity
Zara	3.36 (0.81)
Pringles	3.81 (0.58)
Desigual	2.12 (0.96)
Mango	2.81 (1.10)
Estrella	1.38 (0.67)
Stradivarius	2.48 (1.02)
Aldolfo Dominguez	1.31 (0.58)

Table 9. Means and Standard Deviations for familiarity Pre-test unfamiliar brands

	<i>M (SD)</i>
	Familiarity
Ruffles	1.17 (0.41)
Frit Ravich	1.03 (0.13)
CrunChips	1.43 (0.84)
Kusin	1.07 (0.84)
Mei Olivier	1.03 (0.13)
Noon	1.03 (0.13)

A.2 Pre-test Familiar Brands

Bedankt voor uw bereidheid om deel te nemen aan dit onderzoek.

INFORMATIE EN TOESTEMMING

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

Wat wordt er van u verwacht?

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

Vrijwilligheid

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

Wat gebeurt er met mijn gegevens?

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

Heeft u vragen of klachten over het onderzoek?

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

TOESTEMMING:

Geef hieronder uw keuze aan.

Door te klikken op de knop 'Ik ga akkoord' geeft u aan dat u:

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

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

- Ik ga akkoord (doorgaan met vragenlijst)
- Ik wil niet meedoen

Is Nederlands uw moedertaal?

- Ja
 - Nee
-

Wat is uw geslacht?

- Man
 - Vrouw
 - Zeg ik liever niet
-

Wat is uw leeftijd?

Wat is uw hoogst voltooide opleiding?

- Basisschool
 - Middelbare school
 - MBO
 - HBO
 - Universiteit
-

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

	Helemaal niet bekend	Niet bekend	Neutraal	Bekend	Heel bekend
Zara	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pringles	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Desigual	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mango	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Estrella Damm	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Stradivarius	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Adolfo Domínguez	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ik heb al ooit iets gekocht van dit merk.

	Nooit	Bijna nooit	Soms	Regelmatig	Vaak
Zara	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pringles	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Desigual	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mango	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Estrella Damm	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Stradivairus	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Adolfo Domínguez	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

NOTE: the following question was repeated for each brand (i.e., Zara, Desigual, Mango, Estrella, Stradivarius, Adolfo Dominguez)

Waar denkt u dat dit merk vandaan komt?

Pringles

Hoe zeker bent u van uw keuze?

	Helemaal niet zeker	Niet zeker	Neutraal	Zeker	Heel zeker
Ik ben	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

A.2. Pre-test Unfamiliar Brands

Bedankt voor uw bereidheid om deel te nemen aan dit onderzoek.

INFORMATIE EN TOESTEMMING

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

Wat wordt er van u verwacht?

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

Vrijwilligheid

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

Wat gebeurt er met mijn gegevens?

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

Heeft u vragen of klachten over het onderzoek?

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

TOESTEMMING:

Geef hieronder uw keuze aan.

Door te klikken op de knop 'Ik ga akkoord' geeft u aan dat u:

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

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

- Ik ga akkoord (doorgaan met vragenlijst)
- Ik wil niet meedoen

Is Nederlands uw moedertaal?

- Ja
 - Nee
-

Wat is uw geslacht?

- Man
 - Vrouw
 - Zeg ik liever niet
-

Wat is uw leeftijd?

Wat is uw hoogst voltooide opleiding?

- Basisschool
 - Middelbare school
 - MBO
 - HBO
 - Universiteit
-

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

Geef aan in hoeverre u bekend bent met dit merk

	Helemaal niet bekend	Niet bekend	Neutraal	Bekend	Heel bekend
Ruffles	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Frit Ravich	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Crunchips	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kusin	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mei Oliver	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Noon	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ik heb al ooit iets gekocht van dit merk.

	Nooit	Bijna nooit	Soms	Regelmatig	Vaak
Ruffles	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Frit Ravich	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Crunchips	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kusin	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mei Oliver	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Noon	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

NOTE: the following question was repeated for each brand (i.e., Frit Ravich, CrunChips, Kusin, Mei Oliver, Noon)

















Waar denkt u dat dit merk vandaan komt?

Ruffles

Hoe zeker bent u van uw keuze?

	Helemaal niet zeker	Niet zeker	Neutraal	Zeker	Heel zeker
Ik ben	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Appendix B: Advertisements and Conditions

	No Marker	One Marker	Two Markers	Three Markers
Familiar Chips brand				
Unfamiliar Chips brand				
Familiar Clothing brand				
Unfamiliar Clothing brand				

Appendix C: Online Questionnaire

Allereerst bedankt voor uw bereidheid om deel te nemen aan dit onderzoek.

Voordat we beginnen willen wij u eerst informeren over het onderzoek, lees de onderstaande informatie alstublieft door:

INFORMATIE EN TOESTEMMING

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

Wat wordt er van u verwacht?

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

Vrijwilligheid

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

Wat gebeurt er met mijn gegevens?

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

Heeft u vragen of klachten over het onderzoek?

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

TOESTEMMING:

Geef hieronder uw keuze aan.

Door te klikken op de knop 'Ik ga akkoord' geeft u aan dat u:

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

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

- Ik ga akkoord (doorgaan met vragenlijst)
- Ik wil niet meedoen

Is Nederlands uw moedertaal?

- Ja
 - Nee
-

Wat is uw geslacht?

- Man
 - Vrouw
 - Zeg ik liever niet
-

Wat is uw leeftijd?

Wat is uw hoogst voltooide opleiding?

- Basisschool
 - Middelbare school
 - MBO
 - HBO
 - Universiteit
-

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

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

NOTE: one of the clothing advertisements was first displayed. Which ad was visible depended on the condition the participant was assigned to. To see all ads, see appendix B.

Ik vind deze advertentie:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Niet prettig	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Prettig
Niet aangenaam	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Aangenaam
Interessant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Saai
Smakeloos	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Smaakvol
Niet artistiek	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Artistiek
Slecht	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Goed

Ik vind dit merk:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Niet aantrekkelijk	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Aantrekkelijk
Slecht	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Goed
Prettig	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Niet prettig
Niet gunstig	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Gunstig
Niet aangenaam	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Aangenaam

In hoeverre bent u geïnteresseerd in dit product:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Ik zou dit product nooit kopen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Ik zou dit product zeker kopen
Ik ben zeker niet van plan om dit product te kopen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Ik ben zeker van plan om dit product te kopen
Ik heb interesse om dit product te kopen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Ik heb geen interesse om dit product te kopen
Ik zou dit product zeker niet kopen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Ik zou dit product zeker kopen
Ik zou dit product waarschijnlijk niet kopen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Ik zou dit product waarschijnlijk wel kopen

Page Break

NOTE: one of the chips advertisements was then displayed. Which ad was visible depended on the condition the participant was assigned to. To see all ads, see appendix B.

Ik vind deze advertentie:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Niet prettig	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Prettig
Niet aangenaam	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Aangenaam
Interessant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Saai
Smakeloos	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Smaakvol
Niet artistiek	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Artistiek
Slecht	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Goed

Ik vind dit merk:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Niet aantrekkelijk	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Aantrekkelijk
Slecht	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Goed
Prettig	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Niet prettig
Niet gunstig	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Gunstig
Niet aangenaam	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Aangenaam

In hoeverre bent u geïnteresseerd in dit product:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Ik zou dit product nooit kopen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Ik zou dit product zeker kopen
Ik ben zeker niet van plan om dit product te kopen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Ik ben zeker van plan om dit product te kopen
Ik heb geen interesse om dit product te kopen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Ik heb geen interesse om dit product te kopen
Ik zou dit product zeker niet kopen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Ik zou dit product zeker kopen
Ik zou dit product waarschijnlijk niet kopen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Ik zou dit product waarschijnlijk wel kopen

Page Break

NOTE: All in all, all participants saw one chips and one clothing advertisement (product category as within-subjects factor). They were all assigned to a different condition (between-subjects factors: brand familiarity and number of COO markers). To see the advertisements fully, see appendix B.

Appendix D: Declaration of no Fraud and Plagiarism

Print and sign this *Declaration of no fraud and plagiarism* form and add it as the last appendix in the final version of the Bachelor's thesis that is submitted as a hard copy to the first supervisor.

Student **Kim Warlicht, s1009580**, Bachelor student of Communication and Information Studies at the Faculty of Arts of the Radboud University in Nijmegen, declares the following by signing this form:

a. I hereby declare that I am familiar with the faculty manual (<http://www.ru.nl/stip/english/rules-regulations/fraud-plagiarism/>) and with Article 16 “Fraud and plagiarism” in the Education and Examination Regulations for the Bachelor's programme of Communication and Information Studies.

b. I also declare that I have only submitted text written in my own words and that I have applied the rules of citing, paraphrasing, and referencing according to the Vademecum Reporting Research. I have acknowledged all material and sources used in its preparation, whether they be books, articles, reports, lecture notes, and any other kind of documentation.

c. I certify that this thesis is my own work, and that I have not submitted work that I have previously (in part) submitted for any other examination of this or another educational program without explicit consent of my thesis supervisor.

d. I declare that (my part of) the research data described in the thesis are obtained empirically and processed with integrity and in a scientifically responsible manner.

Place and date: Monday, 11 January 2021 – Woerden, the Netherlands

Signature: K.A. Warlicht

