

Bachelor thesis 2021

Differences in individualism vs. collectivism in regards to persuasion knowledge, attitude towards the advertisement and purchase intention in response to different persuasion tactics.

Radboud University Nijmegen, Netherlands
Study degree: International Business Communication
Supervisor: Borana Lushaj
Student: Ida Malwina Nowak
Student number: [REDACTED]
Date and place of submission: 07/06/2021

Abstract:

This paper examines the differences between two cultures (Dutch and Vietnamese), which represent ends of the spectrum in collectivistic/individualistic cultural dimensions, in persuasion knowledge, attitude towards the advertisement, and purchase intentions. This study used the IMI scale to examine persuasion knowledge. Subjects (N = 230) were assigned to fill in the survey in their native tongue. Three groups of participants from both countries were randomly assigned to fill in the survey after viewing one of the three types of advertisements (with reciprocity, scarcity, or neutral appeal). Further findings supported the idea of nationality and type of persuasion tactic to be the influencing factor on persuasion knowledge, attitude towards the advertisement, and purchase intention. Given the limitations, further research is needed to understand the interaction of nationality vs types of persuasion tactics.

Keywords: Persuasion knowledge, IMI scale, collectivism, individualism, attitude towards advertisement, purchase intention, persuasion tactic, reciprocity, scarcity

1. Introduction

In 21st century it is obvious that persuasion is not just an element of human communication process, but also a constant part of everyday life due to an increased amount of advertising. We are in fact surrounded by messages trying to make us do something – buy a new product, get involved, go to vote or change ourselves according to current trends or companies' financial strategies. It became unavoidable, as well as a commonly used tool. As a consequence, people had to develop and pass on an ability to recognize when, how and why others are trying to influence them (Friestad & Wright, 1994). Like any culture-related skills and mechanisms, it, too, may differ in terms of expressions, activation thresholds or the content of the cognitive scripts acquired during socialization. The same can be said about persuasion techniques used either in daily communication or persuasion communication used by various corporate and/or political subjects. This paper will focus on exploring the extent to which cross-cultural differences in persuasion knowledge (or PK) are visible in cases when two commonly known persuasion tactics are used: 'scarcity' and 'reciprocity' tactics in advertising message constructed especially for this study. Furthermore, the issue of those differences affects the persuasion knowledge (IMI), purchase intention and attitude towards the add within the individual/collectivistic dimension.

1.1 Background

The persuasion knowledge model (or PKM) used in this study was developed by Friestad and Wright (1994) as an attempt to bridge a visible gap in persuasion studies that tended to ignore the persuasion knowledge people possess and use in persuasion episodes. In their studies found main elements emerged: 'target' – a recipient of a persuasion tactic, 'agent' – a person who is responsible for the persuasion attempt, 'attempt' – an act of persuasion itself and afore mentioned 'persuasion episode' – the directly observed action of that attempt. What is important here is the fact, that the target possesses a certain knowledge of how the attempts are constructed, which in consequences let them not only identify the persuasion script but also react to it – they 'cope' with it. The authors of the model stress the fact that persuasion knowledge is acquired not only through one's lifespan but the cultural knowledge can influence it as well, therefore people's PK will be shaped both by their individual experiences and cultures they were acculturated to.

Cultural background can alter a way persuasion knowledge works in individual circumstances. According to Masuda & Nisbett (2001) culture can affect the way people

perceive stimuli. In their study, Japanese people described contextual information and relationships from a wildlife picture in a more detailed way than American respondents. It might be based of different culture values that are the inner core of culture itself (Dodd, 1998). Different researches developed cultural dimensions to categorize differences. According to both Hofstade et al. (2011) and House et al., (2004) one of the dimensions that define cultural characteristics is the individualism/collectivism dimension. This dimension describes the degree to which people in a society are integrated into groups' (Hofstede et al., 2011). The characteristics of this dimension have been further explored in later research. The collectivistic/individual dimension has its roots in historical background of a society because the more isolated cultures always had more 'tight' relationships between people and that results in their collectivistic mindset contrary to more open societies with 'loose' relationships (Triandis, 2001). Bochner's (1994) research on Malaysian and British society supported the hypothesis that people in collectivistic societies have more of their concept of 'self' absorbed by the group they belong to. For example, self-cognitions are more anchored in collectivistic cultures (Bochner, 1994) which may affect the self-confidence in individual decision-making that is crucial in coping with persuasion. Data analysis by LeFebvre and Franke (2013) indicates that people have different decision-making style based on their cultural background. They claim that people from individualistic cultures make more rational decisions, they are independent in their decision making, therefore, are less likely to be influenced. People from collectivist cultures were more dependent because they were used to relying on other people. According to Kongsompong et al.'s (2009) research, people from collectivistic cultures are experiencing a high level of social influence that affects their buying decisions. This finding further supports the assumption that people from collectivistic cultures prefer to rely on public opinion rather than make their judgements Therefore, it can be assumed that persuasion knowledge may differ in different cultural settings that is explained further in the introduction.

1.2 Literature review

Persuasion knowledge has been measured in various ways. Ever since Friestad & Wright (1994) introduced the PKM various authors researched persuasion knowledge. Ham et al. (2015) collected 89 articles and analysed how persuasion knowledge has been measured in those studies. The results have shown that authors of different papers used various rating scales. For instance, Boush, Friestad, and Rose (1994) created a scale to measure the perceived impact of television advertising across various psychological aspects of persuasion (i.e., attention, cognition, affects, memory, and beliefs). According to their paper 'the higher the persuasion

knowledge means the greater control of how the target can cope with the persuasion attempt, not necessarily the more resistant s/he will be to persuasion' (Ham et al., 2015, p. 34). Therefore, this scale lets one measure coping process instead of self-control against persuasion. Obermiller and Spangenberg (1998) introduced a scale that measures ad scepticism. It was a nine-item scale made up of Likert-style statements, ad scepticism is similar, more narrowed down to negative responses concept, compared to persuasion knowledge. Bearden, Hardesty and Rose (2001) introduced a scale that measured consumers' confidence in persuasion tactics, it was a six-item scale that was created through interviews, surveys, and statistical analyses (Bearden, Hardesty and Rose 2001). Campbell (1995) introduced another way of measuring persuasion knowledge. She created a six-item scale to measure the Inference of Manipulative Intent (IMI) to measure respondents' recognition of a hidden persuasion intent which can be understood as PK. It contains 6 uni-dimensional questions that were used several times in further advertising research, for instance, agents' persuasion intent to make respondents feel guilty (Cotte, Coulter, and Moore, 2005) or children's situational PK (Rose, Merchant and Bakir, 2012). The IMI questions allow to measure PK in various advertising research therefore it will be used in this study as an independent variable.

Few researches focused on measuring the relationship between the high persuasion knowledge and reaction to persuasive attempts. As mentioned earlier the Boush et.al's (1994) paper confirmed the hypothesis that the more knowledge the target has about tactics the higher the greater control of how the target can cope with the persuasion attempt. Moreover, the awareness of those tactics is dependent on personal experience that comes with age and self-confidence (trust in ones' judgement) (Boush, 1994). It is more challenging to successfully use persuasion tactics on individuals with higher self-esteem (Bearden, Hardesty & Rose, 2001). Therefore, when speaking of persuasion knowledge, we mean the confidence in the personal judgement and the ability to cope with persuasion tactics and the persuasion attempt (Friestad & Wright, 1994). These claims were later supported in further studies. Hardesty et al.'s (2007) results imply that consumers with more familiarity with pricing strategies had more objective knowledge. Furthermore, age had a positive correlation with persuasion knowledge as well as the objective and subjective pricing tactics. This study concludes that when experience is strong, the relationship between objective and subjective pricing strategy persuasion awareness becomes weaker. Campbell's (2000) study claims that persuasion knowledge is activated when the target draws an inference that agent is trying to persuade them by using persuasion tactics. According to this study the obvious persuasion attempt will be noticed by both cognitively

busy and unbusy people. When their motive is less accessible the PK is less likely to be activated by a busy person however it can still be activated by a unbusy person. According to Campbell (2000) this recognition will result in a less sincere perception of an agent. Research from Aguirre-Rodriguez (2013) introduces the idea that persuasion may trigger PK depending on the tactic that was used, study implies that Supply-Related Scarcity Appeals triggers less PK activation than Demand-Related Scarcity Appeals. Therefore, just like in Campbell's (2000) study less persuasion recognition the more positive was the response, SRS appeals positively affected belief and behaviour. Both researches claim different relation between PK and persuasion. In a previous study Campbell (1995) claimed that the perception of inferences of manipulative intent (IMI) may lower persuasiveness of an advertisement, while Aguirre-Rodriguez (2013) suggested that increasing of perceived persuasion may lead to increased activation of persuasion knowledge. Moreover, in Panic's (2013) study PK was not triggered by an advergame, because it did not affect the persuasive outcome in children's behaviour. From the studies cited above, it can be concluded that correlation between persuasion knowledge and persuasion does not have a clear direction but it can be significantly different.

While measuring persuasion knowledge in individualistic/collectivist dimensions it is crucial to explore the tactics that work on both ends of this spectrum. A study by Orji (2016) mentioned six different tactics on persuasion in a cross-cultural context developed by Robert Cialdini. First, the 'reciprocity' tactic is focused on peoples' natural feeling of obligation to return a favour to people they feel indebted to. This tactic has been thoroughly described in Andrew's (2014) study, where this phenomenon is explained through people's natural understanding of the 'give and take' balance that is socially expected. The key to the effectiveness of this tactic is for an agent to ensure that the target knows about the high value of the 'gift' that they offer. Next is the scarcity tactic, where people feel pressured to purchase products with a short supply. The 'deadline' tactic bases on the idea that people like things that may soon no longer be available (Cialdini, 2006). In research from Aguirre-Rodriguez (2013) scarcity was divided into two categories; supply-related scarcity and demand-related scarcity to measure advertising appeal persuasiveness. In this study, the supply-related scarcity tactic did not evoke persuasion tactic recognition and created positive reactions contrary to demand-related scarcity. Therefore, this tactic may activate persuasion knowledge depending on which type of scarcity will be used in the ad. Another tactic mentioned in this study is the 'authority' tactic, in this method targets feel more inclined towards products recommended by experts in the product field. The fourth tactic is called 'commitment and consistency and is based on

human's tendency to hold on to products and behaviours they know simply to avoid the feeling of dissonance. 'Liking' is another tactic that is based on the likelihood of being persuaded easier by someone likeable, since attractiveness and praise can influence the effectiveness of manipulation. The last tactic described was the 'consensus' tactic, according to this study people are likely to follow the behaviours of others surrounding them rather than initiate a new behaviour. According to the results of Orji (2016), collectivist cultures are more likely to respond positively to the majority of those tactics. This implies that collectivist cultures are on average easier to persuade than individualistic cultures. The biggest gap in effectiveness was witnessed in 'authority, 'consensus' and 'liking'. Collectivist cultures are known for their in-group closeness, therefore following behaviours and feeling more secured while imitating familiar effects, as well as, basing their opinion of likeable famous/attractive people and the experts is a part of this groups' characteristic and explains the results. The only tactic mentioned in this study that had a slightly more positive effect on individualistic cultures was 'scarcity', this result can be explained by individualists need of feeling original and owning a product or having an experience that not accessible to everyone and can make them feel unique (Orji, 2016), which is in line with a DRS appeal according to Aguirre-Rodriguez (2013). In a study by Khaled et al (2006), five collectivist-focused persuasion strategies had been introduced; group opinion, group surveillance, disapproval conditioning, deviation monitoring, and group customisation. 'Group opinion' strategy that is based on a fact that people from collectivist society maybe be more inclined to rely on the opinion of other members of their group supports the idea that they are more sensitive to those three tactics.

Not only persuasion tactics but also the overall attitude towards the advertisement may differ depending on one's cultural background. Pollay et al. (1990) proved that ad attitude differed between an American people (individualistic society) and East Asian people from China, S.Korea and Taiwan (collectivistic societies). Chinese people had the most favourable attitude towards advertisements while US citizens had the least positive. These differences could be based on multiple factors like; diversity in advertising intensity, executional styles, norms of acceptability in advertising and cultural backgrounds (Durvasula et al., 1993). Durvasula et al. (1999) did a study comparing ad attitude between India and Singapore, both countries are culturally close to each other however they differ from each other on individualistic/collectivistic dimension. According to this study Singaporean people had a more positive attitude towards the ad than Indian citizens. However, in this study, the results were hypothesized to be influenced by the economic situation of those countries rather than the

culture itself. Therefore, while comparing ad attitude across countries it is crucial to take the economic situation and media exposure into consideration. Moreover, Dutta-Bergman (2006) proved that demographic and lifestyle factors contribute to the attitude towards advertising that is why it is key to collect demographic data while comparing the ‘attitude towards the ad’. Therefore, it can be expected to see the difference in results while comparing two culturally different societies not only because of the cultural factor but the overall lifestyle citizens in a particular countries have. Another important element that can be influenced by cultural background is the purchase intention. Peña-García et al. (2020) measured purchase intention between the Columbian subsample and the Spanish subsample. This study claims that results were related to the indulgence cultural dimension, the less indulgent a culture is the more acceptable are unplanned purchases. However, just like in the previously mentioned study about an attitude towards advertisement, purchase intention may be hard to separate cultural differences excluding the economic situation in a country when analysing purchase intention.

To conclude, this paper will focus on exploring the extent to which cross-cultural differences in persuasion knowledge are visible while using the ‘scarcity’ and reciprocity’ tactics. We will further explore the way those differences affect the recognition of persuasive intent, attitude toward the product and brand within the individual/collectivistic dimension. Therefore, a research questions and hypothesis are the following:

RQ1: In terms of PK coping in response to 'scarcity' and 'reciprocity' persuasion tactics, to what extend do people in individualistic and collectivistic cultures differ from each other?

RQ2: Will PK moderate the effect of persuasiveness on PI and Aad?

H1: Persuasion knowledge will be triggered by the persuasive tactics.

H2: There will be a difference in IMI comparing individualistic culture (Dutch) and collectivistic culture (Vietnamese) in reciprocity and scarcity appeal.

H3: Attitude towards the ad will differ within the individual/collectivistic dimension in reciprocity and scarcity appeal.

H4: Purchase intention will differ within the individual/collectivistic dimension in reciprocity and scarcity appeal

2.Methodology

2.1 Material

We've chosen tactics that were hypothesized to show significant differences. Two tactics chosen to be researched are 'scarcity' and 'reciprocity'. The two independent variables will be cultural dimensions and persuasion tactics. To test that we created custom ads that manipulate both tactics separately. To achieve clear responses without previously created bias and attitude we decided on creating an orange juice ad for a non-existing brand. Ads were presented in a native advertisement form with a picture and text. Before testing the persuasion knowledge in both contexts, we did a pre-test. The pre-test ensured us that manipulation in 10 self-made advertisements was correct by asking people to review consistency of the tactic use in the advertisements. We presented a complex check by first explaining used tactics and then asking participants to evaluate which tactic has been used in the ad. Participants rated ads on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 (completely inconsistent) to 7 (completely consistent). There were 22 participants who completed the pre-test survey. As a result of the pre-test, advertisements for the survey were selected for the final survey. For reciprocity tactic the first ad has been chosen (M=5.36) and for scarcity tactic the second proposed ad (M=4,82) has been voted as most accurate.

2.2 Subjects

To investigate the response to different persuasion tactics in a cross-cultural context we have chosen two cultures that represent the individualistic and collectivist dimension. According to Hofstede's research Netherlands has a very high score of 80 points on the individualist scale, while Vietnam has a low score of 20 points which indicates that it is a collectivist culture. Therefore, this research was proceeded between native respondents from these two countries. Subjects from Vietnam and Netherlands were recruited through social-media, therefore it was the voluntary response sample. There were 230 completed survey responses that were valid, 115 Dutch participants and 115 Vietnamese participants. Majority of participants had BA degree (53,5%), only 7,4% of subjects did not have a higher education degree. Youngest participants were 18 and oldest 66 years old with the mean age of 27. There were 154 women (67%) and 75 men (32,2%) and 1 other (0.4%).

2.3 Design

The study contained a between-subjects design with three by two design. The independent variables are two cultures; Dutch and Vietnamese and ad type. The dependent variables are IMI, attitude towards the ad and purchase intention.

2.4 Instruments

Responses on ads were analysed with quantitative data. To do that we have decided to use three measurements. We used the IMI (The Inference of Manipulative Intent) scale developed by Campbell (1995), which helped to examine the persuasion knowledge of subjects. Another scale used to measure responses will be 'attitude toward the ad' and the 'purchase intention' measurement. The Cronbach's alpha was measured to ensure the reliability of scales. Cronbach's alpha for IMI scale showed reliability of .87 and .90 for Aad scale, both considered a good reliability. The original version of the survey was written in English; however, subjects were responding in the survey translated to their native tongue. To ensure that translation is linguistically accurate we asked native speakers to translate them to Dutch and Vietnamese using the back-translation method which involves two sets of native speakers doing translation separately and then comparing it till they find a middle-ground (Brislin, 1976).

2.5 Procedure

The questionnaire was distributed on an online platform in two language versions (Vietnamese and Dutch). Next, subjects who were willing to participate in the survey filled in their age, gender, nationality and education level. Further, subjects were randomly assigned to ads with endorsed scarcity, reciprocity or to a control group. Subjects answer on three scales; IMI, Aad, and PI. Finally, subjects responded to manipulation check questions. During a distribution process a bug occurred in which answers to one of the questions in Dutch version wasn't answered. As a result, Dutch version had to be repeated with new subjects. The error that occurred might have resulted in heterogeneity of variance. To equalize number of subjects some Vietnamese participants were randomly removed.

2.6 Statistical testing

Data has two independent variables and multiple dependent variables to estimate how the mean of a quantitative variable change according to the levels of both dependent and independent variables the measurement will be done through a two-way ANOVA tests for H2, H3 and H4. Moreover, one-way Anova was conducted to answer H1.

3.Results

To test the first hypothesis that persuasion knowledge will be triggered by persuasive tactics the One-way Anova was conducted. The aim of this test was to compare the effects of IMI on persuasion tactics and the neutral ad. There was a significant effect of persuasion tactics on IMI at $p < .05$ level [$F(2, 227) = 4.6, p = .011$]. Because there was a significant effect, post-hoc test was conducted to assess the difference between three tactics. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's test indicated that the mean score for reciprocity appeal ($M = .42, SD = .50$) and scarcity appeal ($M = .42, SD = .50$) was significantly different than neutral appeal ($M = .63, SD = .49$), however reciprocity appeal was not significantly different than scarcity appeal. As a result, IMI was triggered by ads with reciprocity and scarcity tactics, therefore first hypothesis was supported.

Table 1. M, SD and N of persuasion tactics effect on IMI

Ad type	N	M	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Reciprocity	76	4.74	1.18	.13
Scarcity	78	4.71	1.26	.14
Neutral	76	5.37	.91	.10
Total	230	4.94	1.17	.08

To test second hypothesis that, there will be a difference in IMI comparing individualistic culture (Dutch) and collectivistic culture (Vietnamese) in reciprocity and scarcity appeal, the Two-way Anova was conducted. The Levine's test showed that variances of the group were not equal ($F(5, 226) = 7.949, p < .001$). The two-way ANOVA examined the effect of nationality and ad type on IMI. The main effects of Nationality were significant at $F(1, 224) = 6.632, p < .001$, and the main effects of Ad type were significant at $F(2, 224) = 2.234, p = .006$ but their interaction was not significant at $F(2, 224) = .201, p = .628$. Neutral advertisement led to a higher IMI for Dutch participants ($M = 5.65, SD = .84$) than Vietnamese participants ($M = 5.09, SD = .91$). Reciprocity tactic led to a higher IMI for Dutch participants ($M = 5.31, SD = .94$) than Vietnamese participants ($M = 4.17, SD = 1.14$). Scarcity tactic led to a higher IMI for Dutch participants ($M = 5.25, SD = .91$) than Vietnamese participants ($M = 4.18, SD = 1.35$).

Table 2. *M, SD and N of Nationalities and Ad types effect on IMI*

Ad type	Nationality	M	Std. Deviation	N
Reciprocity	Dutch	5.31	.94	38
	Vietnamese	4.17	1.14	38
	Total	4.74	1.18	76
Scarcity	Dutch	5.25	.91	39
	Vietnamese	4.18	1.35	39
	Total	4.71	1.26	78
Neutral	Dutch	5.65	.84	38
	Vietnamese	5.09	.91	38
	Total	5.37	.91	76
Total	Dutch	5.40	.91	115
	Vietnamese	4.48	1.21	115
	Total	4.94	1.17	230

Next, two-way Anova was conducted to measure interaction between Attitude towards the ad in two nationalities and different ad types. The third hypothesis stated that attitude towards the ad will differ within the individual/collectivistic dimension in reciprocity and scarcity appeal. The main effects of Nationality were not significant at $F(1, 224) = 1,362, p = .356$, the main effects of Ad type were significant at $F(2,224) = 18,240, p = .004$ and their interaction was not significant at $F(2, 224) = .122, p = .962$. Neutral appeal led to a higher attitude towards the ad ($M = 5.10, SD = 1.28$) than reciprocity ($M = 4.50, SD = 1.28$) and scarcity ($M = 4.49, SD = 1.21$) appeal.

Table 3. *M, SD and N of Nationalities and Ad types effect on Attitude towards the ad*

Ad type	Nationality	M	Std. Deviation	N
Reciprocity	Dutch	4.56	1.20	38
	Vietnamese	4.44	1.37	38
	Total	4.50	1.28	76
Scarcity	Dutch	4.55	1.18	39
	Vietnamese	4.43	1.26	39

	Total	4.49	1.21	78
Neutral	Dutch	5.20	1.13	38
	Vietnamese	4.98	1.42	38
	Total	5.10	1.28	76
Total	Dutch	4.77	1.20	115
	Vietnamese	4.61	1.36	115
	Total	4.69	1.28	230

Next, two-way Anova was conducted to measure interaction between purchase intention in two nationalities and different ad types. The fourth hypothesis stated that purchase intention will differ within the individual/collectivistic dimension in reciprocity and scarcity appeal. The main effects of Nationality was significant at $F(1, 224) = 72,450, p = <.001$, and the main effects of Ad type were significant at $F(2,224) = 18,454, p = .016$, however, their interaction was not significant at $F(2, 224) = 2,647, p = .546$. Neutral advertisement ($M = 3.92, SD = 1.67$) led to a higher PI value than reciprocity ($M = 3.62, SD = 1.50$) and scarcity ($M = 3.23, SD = 1.55$) appeal. Reciprocity tactic led to a higher PI value for Dutch participants ($M = 4.08, SD = 1.40$) than Vietnamese participants ($M = 3.16, SD = 1.46$). Scarcity tactic led to a higher PI value for Dutch participants ($M = 3.74, SD = 1.37$) than Vietnamese participants ($M = 2.72, SD = 1.57$).

Table 4. M, SD and N of Nationalities and Ad types effect on Purchase Intention

Ad type	Nationality	M	Std. Deviation	N
Reciprocity	Dutch	4.08	1.40	38
	Vietnamese	3.16	1.46	38
	Total	3.62	1.50	76
Scarcity	Dutch	3.74	1.37	39
	Vietnamese	2.72	1.57	39
	Total	3.23	1.55	78
Neutral	Dutch	4.63	1.10	38
	Vietnamese	3.21	1.85	38
	Total	3.92	1.67	76
Total	Dutch	4.15	1.34	115

Vietnamese	3.03	1.63	115
Total	3.59	1.59	230

4. Discussion and conclusion

The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of cultural differences in collectivistic/individualistic dimensions on persuasion knowledge, attitude towards advertisement, and purchase intention in response to different persuasion tactics.

Campbell's (1995) study findings implied that PK will be triggered by persuasive tactics. This claim was supported in this study, the mean score for ad with reciprocity tactic and scarcity tactic was significantly lower from the neutral ad. The lower the IMI value the higher persuasion knowledge has been observed. In other words, the reciprocity tactic and scarcity tactic activated PK significantly more. The next finding partly supported the second hypothesis. The main effects of nationality and ad type affected the IMI, however, the interaction of nationality and ad type did not have a significant impact on PK in regards to ads with different tactics. Vietnamese people had a lower IMI value for all types of ads compared to Dutch participants, as a result of reversed IMI scales in data a higher persuasion have been observed in a collectivistic society as hypothesised by Orji (2016). The third hypothesis was again, only partly supported. The ad type was significantly affected the attitude towards the ad; however, nationality and interaction between ad type and nationality did not play a significant role in the results. This outcome is not aligned with results of Pollay et al.'s (1990) study where subjects from a collectivistic culture had an overall better attitude towards advertisement because Vietnamese participants had a similar attitude score to Dutch participants. Fourth hypothesis had a similar outcome, purchase intention was affected by the ad type and the nationality of a subject, however the interaction of those factors was not significant. What is important, is that Dutch participants were more likely to purchase a product than members from collectivistic cultures. Taken together, our findings indicate a strong impact of persuasion tactic type in the ad and nationality of a subject on IMI, attitude toward the ad, and purchase intention, with an exception of the nationality effect on attitude towards the advertisement. The interaction of ad type and nationality does not have the significant impact. In this case, nationality's effect does not depend on the value of ad type variable and conversely, ad type's effect does not depend on the nationality with regards to IMI, aad and pi. In other words, nationality and ad type does have an impact on IMI, aad and pi but those two variables do not

impact the result of one another, simply because the joint effect of ad type and nationality is not statistically higher than the sum of both effects individually.

There are at least two potential limitations concerning the results of this study. A first potential limitation is that the data collection in a Dutch version of a survey had to be repeated due to missing answers in one of the questions. This could have resulted in certain participants re-doing the survey and changing their initial answers. A second potential limitation was comparing two nationalities with very different economic situations. Purchase intention can be affected by the country's economic prosperity (Peña-García et al., 2020), therefore culture is not the only factor that influenced answers. According to CEIC's data in Dec 2020 Vietnam's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per Capita has reached 2,777.000 USD while Netherland's GDP per Capita has reached 52,491.000 USD in the same year. This value is important because it shows the economic output per person and Vietnam with a way lower economic contribution of individuals greatly affects their purchase choices. Moreover, Gross National Product (GNP) which measures the value of goods and services produced by a nation, in Vietnam has reached 249.44 billion USD in 2019, way lower than Netherland's 920.33 billion USD. To limit this difference our study did not include products' prize, however, it did not fully cover this issue.

The present study represents a first attempt to address the connection between persuasive tactics and culture on persuasion knowledge, attitude towards the ad, and purchase intention. In terms of future research, it would be useful to extend the current findings by examining more cultures within the collectivistic/individualistic dimension by including a control group. Countries chosen for this research were on the ends of the spectrum. It could be beneficial to include a culture that is closer to the middle of that spectrum. Moreover, it would be beneficial to include countries with a similar economic situation to measure the extent to which culture and economic situation have an impact on responses. Much work remains to be done before a full understanding of the extent of PK and cultural dimensions. Despite these limitations, the present research contributes to a growing body of evidence suggesting that persuasion tactics and culture affect PK, attitude towards the advertisement, and purchase intention of a product with an exception of the nationality effect on attitude towards the advertisement.

Appendix:

This appendix consist of three parts. Appendix A consist of a pre-test, Appendix B depicts original english verion of survey questions, Appendix C shows the final versions of a survey in Vietnamese and Dutch language verions.

Appendix A:

Default Question Block

Thank you very much for your participation! This questionnaire is conducted as a part of the International Business Communication Bachelor programme at the Radboud University. The survey will examine your responses to 10 advertisements. There are no right or wrong answers. The process will take approximately 5 minutes.

You have the right to stop the questionnaire at any point. The information collected will remain completely anonymous. By filling out this form, you declare that you have been sufficiently informed about the study and that you want to voluntarily participate.

Block 1

What is your age?

What is the highest level of education you have attended?

- Elementary school

- High School

- Secondary Vocational Education

- Higher Vocational Education

- University Bachelor

- University Master

- PHD

- Other

- I prefer not to say

What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Non-binary / third gender
- Prefer not to say

What is your nationality?

Block 2

Please read the following description of the reciprocity advertising tactic and evaluate whether the ad below is consistent or inconsistent with that description:

Reciprocity: People by their nature feel obliged to return a favor and to pay back others. Thus when a persuasive request is made by a person the receiver feels indebted to, the receiver is more inclined to adhere to the request.



To what degree is the ad above consistent with how a reciprocity tactic should be applied?

			1 Completely	2	3	4	5	6	7 Completely
--	--	--	-----------------	---	---	---	---	---	-----------------

			inconsistent						consistent
Reciprocity			Reciprocity 1 Completely inconsistent	Reciprocity 2	Reciprocity 3	Reciprocity 4	Reciprocity 5	Reciprocity 6	Reciprocity 7 Completely consistent

Please read the following description of the reciprocity advertising tactic and evaluate whether the ad below is consistent or inconsistent with that description:

Reciprocity: People by their nature feel obliged to return a favor and to pay back others. Thus when a persuasive request is made by a person the receiver feels indebted to, the receiver is more inclined to adhere to the request.



To what degree is the ad above consistent with how a reciprocity tactic should be applied?

			1 Completely inconsistent	2	3	4	5	6	7 Completely consistent
Reciprocity			Reciprocity 1	Reciprocity 2	Reciprocity 3	Reciprocity 4	Reciprocity 5	Reciprocity 6	Reciprocity 7

			Completely inconsistent						Completely consistent
--	--	--	-------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	-----------------------

Please read the following description of the reciprocity advertising tactic and evaluate whether the ad below is consistent or inconsistent with that description:

Reciprocity: People by their nature feel obliged to return a favor and to pay back others. Thus when a persuasive request is made by a person the receiver feels indebted to, the receiver is more inclined to adhere to the request.



To what degree is the ad above consistent with how a reciprocity tactic should be applied?

			1 Completely inconsistent	2	3	4	5	6	7 Completely consistent
Reciprocity			Reciprocity 1 Completely inconsistent	Reciprocity 2	Reciprocity 3	Reciprocity 4	Reciprocity 5	Reciprocity 6	Reciprocity 7 Completely consistent

Please read the following description of the reciprocity advertising tactic and evaluate whether the ad below is consistent or inconsistent with that description:

Reciprocity: People by their nature feel obliged to return a favor and to pay back others. Thus when a persuasive request is made by a person the receiver feels indebted to, the receiver is more inclined to adhere to the request.



To what degree is the ad above consistent with how a reciprocity tactic should be applied?

			1 Completely inconsistent	2	3	4	5	6	7 Completely consistent
Reciprocity			Reciprocity 1 Completely inconsistent	Reciprocity 2	Reciprocity 3	Reciprocity 4	Reciprocity 5	Reciprocity 6	Reciprocity 7 Completely consistent

Please read the following description of the reciprocity advertising tactic and evaluate whether the ad below is consistent or inconsistent with that description:

Reciprocity: People by their nature feel obliged to return a favor and to pay back others. Thus when a persuasive request is made by a person the receiver feels indebted to, the receiver is more inclined to adhere to the request.



To what degree is the ad above consistent with how a reciprocity tactic should be applied?

			1 Completely inconsistent	2	3	4	5	6	7 Completely consistent
Reciprocity			Reciprocity 1 Completely inconsistent	Reciprocity 2	Reciprocity 3	Reciprocity 4	Reciprocity 5	Reciprocity 6	Reciprocity 7 Completely consistent

Please read the following description of the scarcity advertising tactic and evaluate whether the ad below is consistent or inconsistent with that description:

Scarcity: People tend to place more value on things that are in short supply. This is due to the popular belief that less available options are of higher quality.



To what degree is the ad above consistent with how a scarcity tactic should be applied?

			1 Completely inconsistent	2	3	4	5	6	7 Completely consistent
Scarcity			Scarcity 1 Completely inconsistent	Scarcity 2	Scarcity 3	Scarcity 4	Scarcity 5	Scarcity 6	Scarcity 7 Completely consistent

Please read the following description of the scarcity advertising tactic and evaluate whether the ad below is consistent or inconsistent with that description:

Scarcity: People tend to place more value on things that are in short supply. This is due to the popular belief that less available options are of higher quality.



To what degree is the ad above consistent with how a scarcity tactic should be applied?

			1 Completely inconsistent	2	3	4	5	6	7 Completely consistent
Scarcity			Scarcity 1 Completely inconsistent	Scarcity 2	Scarcity 3	Scarcity 4	Scarcity 5	Scarcity 6	Scarcity 7 Completely consistent

Please read the following description of the scarcity advertising tactic and evaluate whether the ad below is consistent or inconsistent with that description:

Scarcity: People tend to place more value on things that are in short supply. This is due to the popular belief that less available options are of higher quality.



To what degree is the ad above consistent with how a scarcity tactic should be applied?

			1 Completely inconsistent	2	3	4	5	6	7 Completely consistent
Scarcity			Scarcity 1 Completely inconsistent	Scarcity 2	Scarcity 3	Scarcity 4	Scarcity 5	Scarcity 6	Scarcity 7 Completely consistent

Please read the following description of the scarcity advertising tactic and evaluate whether the ad below is consistent or inconsistent with that description:

Scarcity: People tend to place more value on things that are in short supply. This is due to the popular belief that less available options are of higher quality.



To what degree is the ad above consistent with how a scarcity tactic should be applied?

			1 Completely inconsistent	2	3	4	5	6	7 Completely consistent
Scarcity			Scarcity 1 Completely inconsistent	Scarcity 2	Scarcity 3	Scarcity 4	Scarcity 5	Scarcity 6	Scarcity 7 Completely consistent

Please read the following description of the scarcity advertising tactic and evaluate whether the ad below is consistent or inconsistent with that description:

Scarcity: People tend to place more value on things that are in short supply. This is due to the popular belief that less available options are of higher quality.



To what degree is the ad above consistent with how a scarcity tactic should be applied?

			1 Completely inconsistent	2	3	4	5	6	7 Completely consistent
Scarcity			Scarcity 1 Completely inconsistent	Scarcity 2	Scarcity 3	Scarcity 4	Scarcity 5	Scarcity 6	Scarcity 7 Completely consistent

Appendix B:

Questionnaire in English

Thank you very much for your participation!

This experiment is conducted as a part of the International Business Communication Bachelor at Radboud University. The study will examine your responses to a given advertisement. There are no right or wrong answers. The process will take approximately 5-10 minutes.

During the study, you have the right to stop the questionnaire at any point without having to give a reason for doing so. The information collected will remain completely anonymous. If you wish to be informed about the results of this study, then please leave your email at the end of this survey.

Please indicate below that you want to participate in the study. By signing this form, you declare that you have been sufficiently informed about the study and that you want to voluntarily participate.

IMI Scale

The participants will respond to a six-item scale that contains attribution statements with responses ranging from 1 (completely agree) to 7 (completely disagree) and one 7-point semantic differential scale anchored by fair and unfair

2. The way this ad tries to persuade people seems acceptable to me.

- 1 – Completely agree
- 2 – Agree
- 3 – Somewhat agree
- 4 – Neither agree or disagree
- 5 – Somewhat disagree
- 6 – Disagree
- 7 – Completely disagree

3. The advertiser tried to manipulate the audience in ways that I don't like.

- 1 – Completely agree
- 2 – Agree
- 3 – Somewhat agree
- 4 – Neither agree or disagree
- 5 – Somewhat disagree
- 6 – Disagree
- 7 – Completely disagree

4. I was annoyed by this ad because the advertiser seemed to be trying to inappropriately manage or control the consumer audience.

- 1 – Completely agree
- 2 – Agree
- 3 – Somewhat agree
- 4 – Neither agree or disagree
- 5 – Somewhat disagree
- 6 – Disagree
- 7 – Completely disagree

5. I didn't mind this ad; the advertiser tried to be persuasive without being excessively manipulative.

- 1 – Completely agree
- 2 – Agree

- 3 – Somewhat agree
- 4 – Neither agree or disagree
- 5 – Somewhat disagree
- 6 – Disagree
- 7 – Completely disagree

6. This ad was fair in what was said and shown.

- 1 – Completely agree
- 2 – Agree
- 3 – Somewhat agree
- 4 – Neither agree or disagree
- 5 – Somewhat disagree
- 6 – Disagree
- 7 – Completely disagree

7. I think that this advertisement is

fair

unfair

AAd scale

The participants will respond to three 7-point semantic differential scales anchored by pleasant and unpleasant, bad and good and awful and nice.

Unpleasant X X X X X X X Pleasant

Bad	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Good
Awful	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Nice

PI scale

how likely would you be to choose the brand? Rated from 1 (extremely unlikely) to 7 (extremely likely)

Extremely unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely Likely

Manipulation check question

What tactic did you see?

Scarcity

consistent xxxxx inconsistent

Reciprocity

consistent xxxxx inconsistent

Explanation of the tactics

Reciprocity: People by their nature feel obliged to return a favor and to pay back others. Thus when a persuasive request is made by a person the receiver feels indebted to, the receiver is more inclined to adhere to the request.

Scarcity: People tend to place more value on things that are in short supply. This is due to the popular belief that less available options are of higher quality.

Appendix C:

Khảo sát nghiên cứu thị trường

Start of Block: Introduction

Q1 Cảm ơn bạn vì đã tham gia hoàn thành khảo sát này! Thí nghiệm này là 1 phần của chương trình Cử nhân Truyền Thông Doanh Nghiệp Quốc Tế của trường đại học Radboud tại Hà Lan. Nghiên cứu này sẽ khảo sát phản hồi của bạn đối với 1 quảng cáo nhất định. Không có câu trả lời nào là đúng và sai. Do hạn chế kỹ thuật của phần mềm, nếu cần thiết, bạn có thể bấm nút quay lại để xem lại quảng cáo. Thời gian ước tính để hoàn thành bản khảo sát là 5 phút.

Trong quá trình trả lời, bạn có quyền dừng lại tại bất cứ thời điểm nào mà không phải giải thích lý do. Những thông tin được thu thập trong quá trình này sẽ hoàn toàn ẩn danh. Nếu bạn muốn được thông báo về kết quả của nghiên cứu này, vui lòng để lại email của bạn ở cuối khảo sát này.

Vui lòng cho biết phía dưới rằng bạn muốn tham gia vào nghiên cứu. Bằng việc đồng ý, bạn đã hoàn toàn nắm được đầy đủ thông tin về nghiên cứu này, và bạn muốn tự nguyện tham gia.

Q2 Tôi đồng ý tham gia vào nghiên cứu như đã được mô tả ở trên.

Đồng ý (1)

Không đồng ý (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If Q2 = 2

End of Block: Introduction

Start of Block: Thông tin cá nhân

Q3 Bạn bao nhiêu tuổi?

Q4 Giới tính của bạn là:

Nam (1)

Nữ (2)

Khác (5)

Q5 Trình độ học vấn của bạn:

Chương trình giáo dục phổ thông (TH, THCS, THPT) (1)

Cao đẳng (2)

Đại học (3)

Cao học (4)

Tiến sĩ (5)

Khác (6)

End of Block: Thông tin cá nhân

Start of Block: Dựa vào quảng cáo trên, đánh giá các nhận định sau:

Q6 Dựa vào quảng cáo dưới đây, hãy đánh giá các nhận định sau:

Do hạn chế kỹ thuật của phần mềm, nếu cần thiết, bạn có thể bấm nút quay lại để xem lại quảng cáo.

Chúng tôi rất xin lỗi về sự bất tiện này.



Q7 Dựa vào quảng cáo dưới đây, hãy đánh giá các nhận định sau:

Do hạn chế kĩ thuật của phần mềm, nếu cần thiết, bạn có thể bấm nút quay lại để xem lại quảng cáo.

Chúng tôi rất xin lỗi về sự bất tiện này.



Q8 Dựa vào quảng cáo dưới đây, hãy đánh giá các nhận định sau:

Do hạn chế kĩ thuật của phần mềm, nếu cần thiết, bạn có thể bấm nút quay lại để xem lại quảng cáo.

Chúng tôi rất xin lỗi về sự bất tiện này.



Q9 Quảng cáo này thể hiện sự thuyết phục một cách hợp lý.

Hoàn toàn đồng ý (1) Đồng ý (2) Hơi đồng ý (3) Không đồng ý cũng không phản đối (4) Hơi không đồng ý (5) Không đồng ý (6) Hoàn toàn không đồng ý (7)

Q10 Tôi không thích phương pháp mà nhà quảng cáo sử dụng để tác động lên người xem.

Hoàn toàn đồng ý (1) Đồng ý (2) Hơi đồng ý (3) Không đồng ý cũng không phản đối (4) Hơi không đồng ý (5) Không đồng ý (6) Hoàn toàn không đồng ý (7)

Q11 Tôi không cảm thấy khó chịu với quảng cáo này. Nhà quảng cáo cố gắng có tính thuyết phục và không thao túng quá độ.

Hoàn toàn đồng ý (1) Đồng ý (2) Hơi đồng ý (3) Không đồng ý cũng không phản đối (4) Hơi không đồng ý (5) Không đồng ý (6) Hoàn toàn không đồng ý (7)

Q12 Tôi cảm thấy khó chịu với quảng cáo này bởi vì nhà quảng cáo dường như đang cố gắng kiểm soát đối tượng người tiêu dùng 1 cách không phù hợp

Hoàn toàn đồng ý (1) Đồng ý (2) Hơi đồng ý (3) Không đồng ý cũng không phản đối (4) Hơi không đồng ý (5) Không đồng ý (6) Hoàn toàn không đồng ý (7)

Q13 Nội dung hiển thị của quảng cáo này là chính xác và hợp lý.

Hoàn toàn đồng ý (1) Đồng ý (2) Hơi đồng ý (3) Không đồng ý cũng không phản đối (4) Hơi không đồng ý (5) Không đồng ý (6) Hoàn toàn không đồng ý (7)

Q14 Tôi nghĩ rằng quảng cáo này:

Rất bất hợp lý (1) Bất hợp lý (2) Hơi bất hợp lý (3) Bình thường (4) Hơi hợp lý (5) Hợp lý (6) Rất hợp lý (7)

Q15 Bạn cảm thấy như thế nào đối với quảng cáo trên?

1 (1) 2 (2) 3 (3) 4 (4) 5 (5) 6 (6) 7 (7)

Khó ưa

Hài lòng

Xấu

Tốt

Kinh khủng

Dễ chịu

Q16 Dựa vào quảng cáo trên, đánh giá nhận định sau:

Hoàn toàn không có khả năng (1) Không có khả năng (2) Hơi không có khả năng (3) Có thể có hoặc không (4) Hơi có khả năng (5) Có khả năng (6) Hoàn toàn có khả năng (7)

Sau khi xem quảng cáo, bạn có khả năng sẽ lựa chọn mua hàng từ thương hiệu này không? (1)

Q17 Bạn sẽ được yêu cầu đánh giá chiến thuật được áp dụng với quảng cáo vừa xem trong 2 câu hỏi tiếp theo. Vui lòng đọc kĩ định nghĩa chiến thuật và câu hỏi trước khi trả lời.

Giải thích chiến thuật quảng cáo Sự giới hạn/ số lượng có hạn (scarcity): chiến thuật đánh vào tâm lý xem trọng những mặt hàng/ dịch vụ có giới hạn hoặc khan hiếm của người xem/ tiêu dùng Sự đáp lại/ có qua có lại (reciprocity): chiến thuật khiến người xem/ tiêu dùng cảm thấy có nghĩa vụ phải mua hàng/ sử dụng dịch vụ như 1 cách đáp lễ/ đáp lại với nhãn hàng (hai bên cùng có lợi)

Q18 Dựa vào định nghĩa được cung cấp, theo bạn, chiến lược nào đã được sử dụng trong quảng cáo bạn vừa đánh giá?

Hoàn toàn đồng ý (1) Đồng ý (2) Hơi đồng ý (3) Không đồng ý cũng không phản đối (4) Hơi không đồng ý (5) Không đồng ý (6) Hoàn toàn không đồng ý (7)

Sự đáp lại/ Có qua có lại (1)

Q19 Dựa vào định nghĩa được cung cấp, theo bạn, chiến lược nào đã được sử dụng trong quảng cáo bạn vừa đánh giá?

Hoàn toàn đồng ý (1) Đồng ý (2) Hơi đồng ý (3) Không đồng ý cũng không phản đối (4) Hơi không đồng ý (5) Không đồng ý (6) Hoàn toàn không đồng ý (7)

Giới hạn/ Số lượng có hạn (1)

End of Block: Dựa vào quảng cáo trên, đánh giá các nhận định sau:

Start of Block: Email

Q20 Bạn đã hoàn thành bản khảo sát. Nếu bạn muốn nhận được kết quả của nghiên cứu này, xin vui lòng để lại email phía dưới. Kết quả sẽ được email cho bạn khi nghiên cứu kết thúc.

End of Block: Email

Survey in Dutch

Thesis PK questionnaire NL

Start of Block: Introduction

Q1 Beste participant, Bedankt dat je mee wilt helpen in ons onderzoek! Dit experiment wordt uitgevoerd als deel van de Bacheloropleiding International Business Communication aan de Radboud Universiteit. Dit onderzoek kijkt naar jouw reacties op een gegeven advertentie. Er zijn geen goede of foute antwoorden. Het invullen van deze vragenlijst zal ongeveer 5 tot 10 minuten in beslag nemen.

Je kan op elk gegeven moment stoppen zonder hier reden voor op te geven. De informatie die wordt verzameld blijft volledig anoniem, en alleen voor onderzoeksdoeleinden worden gebruikt. Als je geïnformeerd wil worden over de resultaten van dit onderzoek, laat dan je emailadres achter aan het einde van de vragenlijst.

Q2 Ik geef toestemming om mee te doen aan het onderzoek.

Ja (2)

Nee (3)

Skip To: End of Survey If Ik geef toestemming om mee te doen aan het onderzoek. = Nee

End of Block: Introduction

Start of Block: Background check NL

Q3

Wat is je leeftijd?

Q4 Wat is je sekse?

Man (1)

Vrouw (2)

Anders (3)

Q5 Wat is je hoogst afgeronde of huidige opleidingsniveau?

Verplicht onderwijs (7)

MBO (9)

HBO (10)

WO bachelor (11)

WO master (12)

PHD (13)

End of Block: Background check NL

Start of Block: Main body

Q6 Bekijk en lees de onderstaande advertentie aandachtig en ga daarna door naar de vragen.



Q7 Bekijk en lees de onderstaande advertentie aandachtig en ga daarna door naar de vragen.



Q8 Bekijk en lees de onderstaande advertentie aandachtig en ga daarna door naar de vragen.



Q9 De manier waarop deze advertentie mensen probeert te overtuigen lijkt mij acceptabel.

Helemaal mee eens (1) Eens (2) Enigszins mee eens (3) Neutraal (4) Enigszins mee oneens (5) Oneens (6) Helemaal mee oneens (7)

Q10 De adverteerder probeert de doelgroep te manipuleren op manieren die mij niet bevallen.

Helemaal mee eens (1) Eens (2) Enigszins mee eens (3) Neutraal (4) Enigszins mee oneens (5) Oneens (6) Helemaal mee oneens (7)

Q11 Ik vind de advertentie storend omdat het er de schijn van heeft dat de adverteerder de doelgroep op ongepaste wijze probeert te beïnvloeden of te sturen.

Helemaal mee eens (1) Eens (2) Enigszins mee eens (3) Neutraal (4) Enigszins mee oneens (5) Oneens (6) Helemaal mee oneens (7)

Q12 Ik vind deze advertentie niet bezwaarlijk; de adverteerder probeert overtuigend te zijn zonder overdreven manipulatief te zijn.

Helemaal mee eens (1) Eens (2) Enigszins mee eens (3) Neutraal (4) Enigszins mee oneens (5) Oneens (6) Helemaal mee oneens (7)

Q13 Wat er in deze advertentie gezegd en getoond wordt is eerlijk.

Helemaal mee eens (1) Eens (2) Enigszins mee eens (3) Neutraal (4) Enigszins mee oneens (5) Oneens (6) Helemaal mee oneens (7)

Q14 Ik vind de advertentie

Zeer oneerlijk (1) Oneerlijk (2) Redelijk oneerlijk (3) Neutraal (4) Redelijk eerlijk (5) Eerlijk (6) Zeer eerlijk (7)

Q15 Ik vind de advertentie

1 (1) 2 (2) 3 (3) 4 (4) 5 (5) 6 (6) 7 (7)

Onaangenaam

Aangenaam

Slecht

Goed

Vreselijk

Prettig

Q16 Hoe waarschijnlijk is het dat jij dit merk zult kiezen?

1 (1) 2 (2) 3 (3) 4 (4) 5 (5) 6 (6) 7 (7)

Heel onwaarschijnlijk

Heel waarschijnlijk

Q17 De volgende vragen gaan over de tactiek die is gebruikt in de advertentie, daarbij worden de volgende definities gehanteerd:

Schaarste: mensen hechten meer waarde aan dingen die moeilijk verkrijgbaar zijn. Dit ligt aan de populaire gedachte dat minder verkrijgbare opties van betere kwaliteit zijn.

Reciprociteit: van nature voelen mensen zich verplicht een gunst terug te doen. Wordt er dus een overtuigend verzoek gedaan waarbij de ontvanger zich verschuldigd voelt naar de persoon, dan is de ontvanger eerder geneigd het verzoek na te komen.

Q18 Welke tactiek was zichtbaar?

Schaarste

1 (1) 2 (2) 3 (3) 4 (4) 5 (5) 6 (6) 7 (7)

Duidelijk

Nauwelijks

Q19 Welke tactiek was zichtbaar?

Reciprociteit

1 (1) 2 (2) 3 (3) 4 (4) 5 (5) 6 (6) 7 (7)

Duidelijk

Nauwelijks

End of Block: Main body

Start of Block: Block 3

Q20 Bedankt voor het invullen van de enquête! Als u de resultaten van dit onderzoek wil ontvangen, laat dan hieronder uw e-mail achter. De resultaten worden naar u toegestuurd wanneer het onderzoek voltooid is.

End of Block: Block 3

References:

- Aguirre-Rodriguez, A. (2013). The Effect of Consumer Persuasion Knowledge on Scarcity Appeal Persuasiveness. *Journal of Advertising*, 42(4), 371–379. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2013.803186>
- Andrews, M., Leeuwen, V. M., & Baaren, V. R. (2014). *Hidden Persuasion: 33 Psychological Influences Techniques in Advertising* (13001st ed.). Laurence King Publishing.
- Bearden, W. O., Hardesty, D. M., & Rose, R. L. (2001). Consumer Self-Confidence: Refinements in Conceptualization and Measurement. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28(1), 121–134. <https://doi.org/10.1086/321951>
- Bochner, S. (1994). Cross-Cultural Differences in the Self Concept. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 25(2), 273–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022194252007>
- Boush, D. M., Friestad, M., & Rose, G. M. (1994). Adolescent Skepticism toward TV Advertising and Knowledge of Advertiser Tactics. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21(1), 165. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209390>
- Boush, D. M., Friestad, M., & Rose, G. M. (1994). Adolescent Skepticism toward TV Advertising and Knowledge of Advertiser Tactics. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21(1), 165. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209390>
- Brislin, R. W. (1976). Comparative Research Methodology: Cross-Cultural Studies. *International Journal of Psychology*, 11(3), 215–229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207597608247359>
- Campbell, M. C., & Kirmani, A. (2000). Consumers' Use of Persuasion Knowledge: The Effects of Accessibility and Cognitive Capacity on Perceptions of an Influence Agent. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27(1), 69–83. <https://doi.org/10.1086/314309>

- Cialdini, R. B. (2006). *Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion, Revised Edition* (Revised ed.). Harper Business.
- Conger, J. A. C. (1998, May). Conger, J. A. (1998). The necessary art of persuasion. *Harvard Business Review*, 76, 84-97, 76(84–97). <https://hbr.org/1998/05/the-necessary-art-of-persuasion>
- Cotte, J., Coulter, R. A., & Moore, M. (2005). Enhancing or disrupting guilt: the role of ad credibility and perceived manipulative intent. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(3), 361–368. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0148-2963\(03\)00102-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0148-2963(03)00102-4)
- Dutta-Bergman, M. J. (2006). The Demographic and Psychographic Antecedents of Attitude toward Advertising. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 46(1), 102–112. <https://doi.org/10.2501/s0021849906060119>
- de Pelsmacker, P., & Neijens, P. C. (2012). New advertising formats: How persuasion knowledge affects consumer responses. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 18(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527266.2011.620762>
- Durvasula, S., Andrews, J. C., Lysonski, S., & Netemeyer, R. G. (1993). Assessing the Cross-National Applicability of Consumer Behavior Models: A Model of Attitude Toward Advertising in General. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19(4), 626. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209327>
- Friestad, M., & Wright, P. (1994). The Persuasion Knowledge Model: How People Cope with Persuasion Attempts. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209380>
- Gass, R. H., & Seiter, J. S. (2011). *Persuasion, Social Influence, and Compliance Gaining* (6th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.

- Ham, C.-D., Nelson, M. R., & Das, S. (2015). How to Measure Persuasion Knowledge. *International Journal of Advertising*, 34(1), 17–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2014.994730>
- Hardesty, D. M., Bearden, W. O., & Carlson, J. P. (2007). Persuasion knowledge and consumer reactions to pricing tactics. *Journal of Retailing*, 83(2), 199–210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2006.06.003>
- House, R. J. (2004). An overview of the GLOBE research program. *Transformative Organizations: A Global Perspective*, 483.
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>
- Khaled, R., Biddle, R., Noble, J., Barr, P., & Fischer, R. (2006, January). Persuasive interaction for collectivist cultures. In *Proceedings of the 7th Australasian User interface conference-Volume 50* (pp. 73-80).
- Kongsompong, K., Green, R. T., & Patterson, P. G. (2009). Collectivism and Social Influence in the Buying Decision: A Four-Country Study of Inter- and Intra-National Differences. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 17(3), 142–149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2009.05.013>
- LeFebvre, R., & Franke, V. (2013). Culture Matters: Individualism vs. Collectivism in Conflict Decision-Making. *Societies*, 3(1), 128–146. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc3010128>
- Masuda, T., & Nisbett, R. E. (2001). Attending holistically versus analytically: comparing the context sensitivity of Japanese and Americans. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 81(5), 922.

- Obermiller, C., & Spangenberg, E. R. (1998). Development of a Scale to Measure Consumer Skepticism Toward Advertising. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 7(2), 159–186.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp0702_03
- Orji, R. O. (2016, April). *Persuasion and Culture: Individualism–Collectivism and Susceptibility to Influence Strategies*. Personalization in Persuasive Technology Workshop, Persuasive Technology Conference 2016.
- Panic, K., Cauberghe, V., & De Pelsmacker, P. (2013). Comparing TV Ads and Advergimes Targeting Children: The Impact of Persuasion Knowledge on Behavioral Responses. *Journal of Advertising*, 42(2–3), 264–273.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2013.774605>
- Peña-García, N., Gil-Saura, I., Rodríguez-Orejuela, A., & Siqueira-Junior, J. R. (2020). Purchase intention and purchase behavior online: A cross-cultural approach. *Heliyon*, 6(6), e04284. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04284>
- Pollay, R. W., Tse, D. K., & Wang, Z. Y. (1990). Advertising, propaganda, and value change in economic development. *Journal of Business Research*, 20(2), 83–95.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963\(90\)90053-g](https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(90)90053-g)
- Triandis, H. C. (2001). Individualism-Collectivism and Personality. *Journal of Personality*, 69(6), 907–924. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6494.696169>

CIW English

Statement of Own Work

Student name: Ida Malwina Nowak
Student number: XXXXXXXXXX
Study degree: International Business Communication
Supervisor : Borana Lushaj

PLAGIARISM is the presentation by a student of an assignment or piece of work which has in fact been copied in whole or in part from another student's work, or from any other source (e.g. published books or periodicals or material from Internet sites), without due acknowledgement in the text.

DECLARATION:

I certify that this assignment/report is my own work, based on my personal study and/or research and that I have acknowledged all material and sources used in its preparation, whether they be books, articles, reports, lecture notes, and any other kind of document, electronic or personal communication



Signed:

Date: 05.07.2021