ABSTRACT

This thesis explores language as an ethnic ad-targeting cue in the context of group categorization. A sample of non-Spanish speaking Americans was exposed to TV advertisements for known American brands. Conditions manipulated ad language (English or Spanish) and the prevalence of language in the ad (High or low prevalence). Results showed that when presented with an ad in Spanish, non-Spanish speaking Americans associated the advertised brand less with the US. Contrary to industry assumptions, this finding supports the notion that when brands increase their likelihood of association to a particular kind of specific consumer group (such as the case of Ethnic advertising), they might be doing so at the cost of partial disassociation to a different kind of consumer. The present study offers important implications to professionals attempting to advertise mainstream brands to ethnic groups and in particular, to professionals advertising American brands to Hispanic consumers.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

“Ethnic” self-awareness is a temporary state when a person is sensitive to ethnic information and occurs when a person self-categorizes using visual or verbal cues that draw attention to ethnicity (Forehand & Deshpande 2001). Generally speaking, people tend to like and favor brands that are congruent with their self-concepts (Escalas & Bettman 2005; Jamal & AlMarri 2007). One way advertisers have tried to appeal to particular individuals is through the use of ethnicity during the market segmentation process. Ethnically-targeted advertisements have become standard practice and are usually welcomed by ethnic groups (LaFerle & Lee 2005) as companies increasingly spend more money using marketing tactics trying to target specific consumer minorities (Forehand & Deshpande 2001; Wentz 2011a; 2011b). In-language advertising is one of such effective tactics that also tends to be appreciated by the targeted group (Koslow, Shamdasani & Touchstone 1994). However, the same associations created by the use of targeted group categorization cues in an in-group can also have many negative effects when non-targeted groups are exposed to the same message (Klein, Ettenson & Morris 1998; Mackie, Gastardo-Conaco & Skelly 1992; Aaker, Brumbaugh & Grier 2000).

There seems to be the widespread assumption that messages targeted and clearly catered for a particular group will just be “ignored” by all other unintended audiences (Aaker, Brumbaugh & Grier 2000). However, it is important for brands to consider that this may not be the case. There haven’t been many serious attempts to look at advertisements targeted through ethnic cues as they are received from the “opposite” (non-targeted groups) perspective; fewer still that look specifically at language.
The present study pioneers the exploration of language as an ethnic-targeting cue for ads in the context of group categorization. This thesis builds upon existing research, looking at advertising messages as they are processed by out-groups. Consistent with literature, results seem to suggest that the use of Spanish in in-language targeted advertising causes non-Spanish speaking Americans to associate the advertised brand less with the US than if they had heard the same ad in English. Considering our complex and increasingly diverse media landscape, findings hint at meaningful implications to advertising professionals catering brand messages to different audiences; highlighting important considerations in the context of multi-cultural advertising.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Brand Personality and Concept of Self through Brands

Aaker (1997) defines brand personality as a “set of human characteristics associated with a brand” used by consumers to express their sense of self, both actual and ideal (p347). Similar to personality, the theory of self-image refers to “the way a person perceives himself, to a set of characteristics, personal features, roles and values, etc. that the person attributes to himself, evaluates –positively or negatively- and recognizes as being part of himself” (Achouri & Bouslama 2010, p4). Achouri and Bouslama (2010) posit that keeping market share is tied to the level of faithfulness consumers have towards brands. They urge companies to go beyond communicating an “image” expressed by brand personality and instead to build towards a “relationship” between brand and consumer.

Previous literature has shown that people use brands to help them define who they are and what kind of people they are. People tend to like (and subsequently purchase) brands that are congruent with their sense of self and attributes they relate to themselves (Escalas & Bettman 2005; Jamal & AlMarri 2007). For example, Jamal and AlMarri (2007) indicate that brands serve to maintain or enhance self-concepts and that self-image congruence can influence many of a consumer’s behaviors such as satisfaction, preferences, or purchase intention; encouraging positive word of mouth and positive brand associations.

The congruence between brand personality and a consumer’s self-image is a key concept when marketing to specific consumers. Different elements such as a commercial
actor's physical appearance, age, haircut, language or even words used can act as "cues" in advertisements to unconsciously help people judge what brands are congruent with their sense of self and which ones are not. This knowledge has been used by advertisers for a while: by consciously putting cues in an ad, people from the target group (target market) identify better with a message source and are more likely to like a product and buy it (Aaker, Brumbaugh & Grier 2000; Jamal & AlMarri 2007). Generally speaking, the closer the brand’s image is to a consumer’s image of self, the higher the purchase motivation (Sirgy 1985; 1982).

Additionally, brands can also be conceptualized as a message source that helps define in-group membership. For example, Escalas and Bettman (2005) focus on reference groups as a source of brand meaning. This is because brand personality makes brands symbolic and through perceived congruence, can attach meaning to their use or ownership. They propose that consumers form self-brand connections in the act of purchasing to construct their self-concepts and measured brand-self connections for in-group consistent and inconsistent brands in participants with different levels of independence. Their results indicate that the image of a brand consistent with an in-group typically results in higher self-brand connections and is moderated by brand symbolism; the more symbolism, the stronger the effect. On the other hand, out-group brands detract from brand-self connections in independent consumers. The same ID processes that leads to a connection with an in-group associated brand, will likely lead to the rejection of an in-group incongruent brand. In short, consumers will likely prefer brands with images compatible with their perception of self: cues signaling an in-group, or congruence between brand personality and their self-perception can result in positive associations towards the brand and have positive effects on satisfaction, preference, and future purchase intentions.
(Achouri & Bouslama 2010; Escalas & Bettman 2005; Jamal & Al-Marri 2007). By the same token, when images are consistent with an out-group, self-brand connections are lower than if they were inconsistent with an out-group (Escalas & Bettman 2005; Jamal & Al-Marri 2007).

2.2 Ethnicity and Group Categorization Effects

One thing worth noting before talking about ethnicity and categorization effects is the commonplace misuse of the term “attitude” in related past literature. The scope of the attitude construct is broad and its definitions and interpretations are many. However, attitudes are a separate topic; since the focus of this thesis is on brand associations and not brand attitudes, the concise definition provided by Ajzen (2001) should suffice for the purposes of drawing a distinction between the two terms. Ajzen (2001) defines the term attitude as a “summary evaluation of a psychological object captured in attribute dimensions” (p.28). The present research is concerned instead with associations, which simply refer to the degree to which one concept is connected (i.e. associated) to another concept, describing a relationship. In other words, attitudes in this context refer to specific kinds of associations such as positive-negative, good-bad, etc, whereas associations are just connections and do not imply directionality or specific evaluations like an attitude might.

The distinction between the two concepts is drawn here because past literature tends not to do so and often incorrectly uses both terms interchangeably. In fact, most of the past research reported in this lit review for context, actually refers to relevant results that are more akin to associations than attitudes. That said, results from past research will be reported here using the same terms originally chosen by their respective sources.
“Ethnic” self-awareness is defined by Forehand and Deshpande (2001) as a temporary state when a person is sensitive to ethnic information (p336-337). This sensitivity depends on the consumer’s level of cultural distinctiveness, or how strongly oneself identifies as an ethnic member and is said to predict attitudes towards multicultural advertising. The more individuals form their sense-of-selves by contrasting their in-group differences to an out-group majority, the more they are likely to use their own personal identities as a reference point when evaluating targeted messages (Johnson & Grier 2011). For example, the more pride that is taken in one’s ethnicity, the more affinity people are likely to have for a brand community related to that specific ethnicity because the brand will be seen as highly congruent not only with the group, but by extension with the self (Quinn & Devasagayam 2005). Ethnic self-awareness can occur when a person self-categorizes using “ethnic primes”, defined as visual or verbal cues that draw attention to ethnicity (p338). Many authors support the notion that exposure to an ethnic prime increases the chances that participants would mention ethnicity in their self-descriptions and respond more favorably to ads corresponding with their ethnicity (Forehand & Deshpande 2001). This indicates that ethnic groups, when activated thinking through cues, can serve as effective in-groups. For example, Fujioka (2005) conducted a study featuring emotional TV news stories: Mexican American participants’ rated Mexican American news as more arousing and entertaining than American ones. Li, Tsai and Soruco (2012) found that all other utilitarian aspects being equal, Hispanic consumers not only perceived brands to be more or less “Hispanic” but were actually swayed to purchase brands on the basis of how close their brand names were to their cultural orientation.
These associations can also have negative effects. Klein, Ettenson and Morris (1998) conducted a study where Chinese students explicitly expressed an unwillingness to purchase Japanese products due to their country’s historical animosity towards Japan, while Klein (2002) asserts that “animosity toward a foreign nation is related to choices between foreign goods” (p345). Jamal and AlMarri (2007) found that brands used by in-groups enhanced consumers’ self-brand connections, whereas brands used by out-groups detracted from such connections. One example of this effect can be found in Mackie, Gastardo-Conaco and Skelly (1992). In their experiment, a group of students were given two-sided cards with positions on an issue marked as either belonging to an in-group or an out-group, with strength of arguments also manipulated. When students knew the position of the in-group they belonged to, they accepted their in-group position without question regardless of argument strength. On the other hand, even strong appeals to an out-group position produced almost no attitude change.

Cultural stereotyping refers to reducing the complexity of an individual to a few characteristics that then are extracted and used to describe other members of the entire culture as well (Hinner & Freiberg 2010). This process is known as group categorization. The extent of group categorization can be seen through many domains; “Merely categorizing a stimulus as an in-group or an out-group member has a host of important cognitive, motivational, and behavioral sequelae” (Bernstein, Young & Hugenberg 2007 p706). For example, Hinner and Freiberg (2010) discuss how people usually focus on just a limited number of characteristics on a face in order to process it with as little effort as possible. This is because the mind usually feels the need to simplify information to a manageable level. This particular process leads to a phenomenon known as the cross-race-effect; referring to people usually
being able recognize faces of their own race better (Chance, Turner & Goldstein 1982; Bernstein, Young & Hugenberg 2007). Although not immediately evident, Cross-race-effect is relevant to our topic because they suggest ethnicity as a natural criterion for group categorization. Chance, Turner and Goldstein (1982) carried out an experiment using Caucasian children; they would ask them to look at photo portraits and remember them. The results showed that recognition for Caucasian faces was superior as compared to Asian faces among the subjects.

On a similar note, Bernstein, Young and Hugenberg (2007) conducted two studies investigating the extent to which categorizing people as in-group vs. out-group members is “sufficient to elicit a pattern of face recognition analogous to that of the cross-race-effect, even when perceptual expertise with the stimuli is held constant” (p706). For both studies, recall performance improved for characters recognized as part of an in-group. This is to say that just the social-cognitive mechanism of out/in-group categorization is enough to elicit performance differences. Similarly, MacLin and Malpass (2001; 2003) manipulated hairstyles in racially ambiguous faces. The same face was perceived and remembered differently by just changing the hair. More importantly, this change in hairstyle seemed to be enough to boost recall from members of the respective “in-group” the hairstyle represented.

Levin (1996) initially rejected the notion that difficulty in recognizing faces from other races was due to a lack of experience with the “foreign” features because systematically manipulating facial typicality appeared to provide no tangible increase in performance. He suggested that unlike same-race faces, faces from other races appeared to have a particular “race feature” that was coded, immediately identifying them when looked at. He later asserted
that the deficit occurred because people tend to emphasize the information in faces that indicates race first, instead of focusing on individuating information (Levin 2000). In other words, just like with brand-self categorization, the phenomenon of performing worse at distinguishing faces from a perceived different race (CRE effect) is not due to lower skill, lower familiarity or less practice at recognizing features described as different, but rather due to the inherently different way people usually think about those faces as being “others” by default (Bernstein, Young & Hugenberg 2007).

2.3 Hispanics in the US

The Hispanic population in the US has grown both in numbers and influence, to the point where marketers recognize the advantages of capturing them as loyal consumers. The US census bureau estimated that around 35.3 million Hispanics lived in the US in 2000, but for the last 10 years the Hispanic population grew at four times the normal rate (compared to rest of the population) Currently it is estimated that 50.5 million US residents are of Hispanic or Latino origin (Ennis, Rios-Vargas & Albert 2011). Hispanics are clearly not going away and estimates indicate that the segment will continue to grow for the foreseeable future. Latinos are no longer a sub-segment of American economy, the per capita income of U.S. Hispanics in the US is higher than Brazil, India, China or Russia; all coveted BRIC countries (Nielsen 2012).

As the net purchasing power of this ethnic segment has increased with its exponential size, it is important for marketers to recognize the great potential in tapping into this continually growing market. Speaking in general terms, utilizing principles from basic concepts such as target marketing, ethnic targeting generally results in positive brand attitudes among
the targeted group (Forehand & Deshpande 2001; Fujioka 2005; Koslow, Shamdasani & Touchstone 1994). Furthermore, a cross-cultural survey of several ethnic groups in the US revealed that ethnically-targeted advertisements are no longer considered highly inaccurate and may be even welcomed by some consumer minorities (LaFerle & Lee 2005). This suggests the perfect reciprocal relationship where it’s in the best interest of marketers to reach minority consumers in specialized ways and where minority consumers in turn, actually welcome these efforts as well.

2.4 Marketing to Hispanics

Advertisers are increasingly recognizing that advertising to multi-cultural segments of the population is not a “one size fits all” thing. It is not enough to merely use the same mainstream campaigns as templates. Companies are increasingly spending more money trying to target specific consumer minorities such as Hispanics: the use of ethnically targeted media is on the rise (Forehand & Deshpande 2001; Wentz 2011a; 2011b).

Hispanics are increasingly being recognized as a coveted and profitable market. For example during the 2008 Obama/McCain presidential race, 30 million dollars were spent just in Spanish in-language advertising (Wentz 2011b). Politics are far from the only area of expenditure. Advertising Age reports that expenditure for Hispanic media has been up 8.4% to $6.8 billion during 2010, compared to only 6.5% for all U.S. media (Wentz 2011a).

Over the years, marketers have tried tapping into the Hispanic consumer market by using cultural “cues” to target “ethnicity” as a marketing variable. This targeting has been shown “implicitly by its frequent use in advertising and explicitly by a wealth of prior research
that documents positive consumer response to advertising that features similar-ethnicity actors or spokespeople” (Forehand & Deshpande 2001, p336). For example, the restaurant chain Denny’s recently decided to launch a bi-lingual campaign using Hispanic-looking actors after realizing how important the Hispanic demographic was in their consumer population, calling Latinos “the chain’s fastest-growing customer segment” (Lukovitz 2012).

A more recent approach is the costly alternative of running separate advertising campaigns in the native language of the desired target group. Speech accommodation refers to the alteration of speech styles to match different social situations, including accents (Simard, Taylor & Giles 1976; Giles 1973). Simard, Taylor and Giles (1976) addressed accommodating speech specifically in a bi-lingual setting and found that it has positive effects when it’s seen as a way to break down cultural barriers. In their experiment they had participants evaluate each other’s disposition as they carried conversations in different languages. The authors found that more favorable attitudinal change occurred if participants thought their counter-parts were choosing to communicate with them in their language as a voluntary show of good will, as opposed to told (or pressured) to communicate in that language.

Similar results by Koslow, Shamdasani and Touchstone (1994) suggest that some Hispanics value in-language advertising, not for the communication potential, but for what the act itself signifies: Hispanic consumers may interpret the use of in-language ads to mean that the advertised brand must care about their ethnicity and respects their heritage. Corroborating this view, Experian Simmons indicates that 57% of Spanish-dominant respondents (and 29% of English dominant Hispanics) agree that hearing an ad in Spanish makes them feel like their
heritage is being respected and that they are being appreciated as costumers (as reported in Wentz 2011a).

As more specific forms of ethnically targeted media appear (such as Hispanic specific channels, radio stations or ethnic magazines) the use of in-language advertising has become increasingly prevalent (Wentz 2011b; Stilson 2011; Stelter 2011; Lukovitz 2012; Vega 2012; O'Keefe 2008). For example Hulu is adding a special TV section to their paid version with Univision TV shows exclusively in Spanish in an effort to draw more paying Latino customers. Rival Telemundo is working on two Youtube Telenovela clip channels to promote viewership (Stelter 2011). More recently, Salma Hayek was chosen as a spokeswoman for the new bi-lingual “Got milk?” campaign (Vega 2012). “…Hispanics have become such important consumers, that it's significant that a majority of Spanish-dominant adults -- and a significant number of English-dominant ones -- like Spanish labeling on products and feel more loyalty to companies that respect their culture by advertising in Spanish” (Wentz 2011a).

This situation poses a problem, however. If tactics such as in-language advertisements are commonly used to better reach multi-cultural segments, what about the rest of the native population that doesn’t speak anything but English? Following this line of thought: are brands that use in-language ads to better reach an ethnic group, running the risk of alienating those whose in-group identification is different from their target?

2.5 Animosity towards Hispanics

Despite the widespread use of ethnic advertising and the continued increase of the Hispanic population in the US, it is clear that Hispanic culture (with its prevalence and historical
context) often elicits negative stereotypes is not yet considered “mainstream” or inherently part of the official “American” culture by a vast number of American Anglos. For example Garcia (2013) reports how former Republican Arizona state senator Russell Pearce continually uses derogatory terms such as “wetback” in his push to introduce legislation outlawing the use of Spanish in federal documents (a measure that contradicts the protection clauses for the Native Mexican Californians described in the Guadalupe-Hidalgo treaty). Similarly, the Guardian reports that America still struggles with racism, pointing at AP survey results during 2011 where 52% percent of non-Hispanic whites expressed anti-Hispanic attitudes (Harris 2012). Authors Koslow, Shamdasani and Touchstone (1994) go as far as to suggest that some Hispanic negative stereotypes are so prevalent that they may even affect members of the Hispanic in-group themselves when they pose that while “minority language usage may have a positive effect through the perceived cultural sensitivity of the advertiser, it may also have a direct negative effect on affect toward the advertisement due to language-related inferiority complexes (p577)”.

Janus (2011) describes results from a 2007 Gallup poll where 45% of respondents indicated that immigration to the US should be reduced after the influx of Hispanics to the country in recent years, suggesting that many Americans were clearly anxious about the demographic transformation. On the other hand, Flanagan and Green (2011) point out how the immigration debate has brought to surface assumptions about Hispanic workers as “illegal” and taking jobs intended for non-Hispanic Americans. Building on this topic, Stone-Romero and Krueger (2009) indicate that while Hispanics make up more than 20% of the total service occupations in the country, there is still a lot of unfair discrimination in the workplace:
“According to the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the total number of individual discrimination charge filings increased slightly from 80,680 in 1997 to 82,792 in 2007... in general, about 34.9% to 37.3% of all discrimination charges were based on race (p105)”. The notion of Hispanics somehow “displacing” non-Hispanic Americans has also surfaced in other ways. One example is the controversial Californian Proposition 227, aimed at limiting the amount and length of bi-lingual instruction in public schools and promoting American acculturation of minorities through language (California Proposition “227” 2012). Since then, similar initiatives have arisen in other states; such as Oregon’s measure 58 (Clegg 2008) or Missouri’s Constitutional Amendment 1. The last, since English-only education is already the case in the state, criticized by some as an attempt to cash in on anti-immigrant sentiment (Kander 2008, and Top 10 Ballot Measures 2013).

From a branding perspective, animosity towards a particular ethnic group by the general population is relevant because the place to which a particular brand is associated to can be an important facet of a consumer’s relationship with a brand (Swaminathan, Page & Gurhan-Canli 2007). Swaminathan, Page and Gurhan-Canli (2007) define a “brand’s country-of-origin connection” as the extent to which a brand can be used to express an individual’s patriotic national identity. Whereas Shimp and Sharma (1987) share the concept of American consumer ethnocentrism and define it as the beliefs held by American consumers about the morality and appropriateness of buying products considered foreign (p.280). The authors pose that the act of buying foreign products can be seen as unpatriotic. Similarly Russell and Russell’s (2010) focus on the associations between brands and stereotypical traits from a particular country. The authors pose that the strength to which a brand is unconsciously associated with a country can
cause the brand to suffer when there is pre-existing animosity towards the associated country. Indeed, associations between brands and countries are relevant to a brand because there are many instances where animosity towards a country can directly impact dispositions towards a product associated with it. This can be particularly true in nations with a strong patriotic identity such as the US, where individuals are more likely to purchase products over foreign ones as an act of patriotism (Hong & Wyer 1990; Maheswaran 1994). For example Chavis, and Leslie (2005) report that the French opposition to the Irak war during early 2003 triggered consumer reticence towards buying French products. Conservative estimates report that the consumer boycott cost French wine companies a 26% decrease in weekly sales at its peak and a subsequent 13% sales decrease for a further 6 months (Chavis & Leslie 2005).

Considering the prevalence of the still negative stereotypes surrounding Hispanics and the active consequences these beliefs can have on interactions with this ethnic group and brands associated with them, it is important to consider the possible impact that advertising that cueing Hispanic-ethnicity can have on the average non-Spanish speaking American (consciously or not) since Latinos in general (and by extension Latino culture, including language) may not be included in their default, unconscious “in-group” associations.

2.6 Literature Gap

There is currently no formal “body of knowledge” connecting categorization effects and the use of ethnic cues in an advertising setting. In fact, there haven’t been many serious attempts to look at advertisements targeted through ethnic cues as they are received from the “opposite” perspective. Multiple studies have looked at the effectiveness of ethnic targeting in
advertising, or at the effects of ethnic cues in increasing brand attitudes (Forehand & Deshpande 2001; Fujioka 2005). However, little research has been done regarding the potential negative impact of in-language ethnic communications to the Native “English-speaking only” majority of the American population. There seems to be the widespread assumption that messages targeted and clearly catered for a particular group will just be “ignored” by the unintended audiences (Aaker, Brumbaugh & Grier 2000). However, it is important for brands to consider that this may not be the case.

Only recently have the effects of targeting cues have been evaluated from the perspective of a clear out-group. For example El Hazzouri, Carvalho and Main (2010), carried a series of experiment where participants were given a gift-wrapping task. The authors found evidence that when a product or activity is associated with an out-group, people strive to perform incompetently when they are carrying the task or evaluating the products thought to be associated with said groups. However, perhaps the most relevant finding to this issue was made by Aaker et. al (2000). They executed a series of three experiments in which members of ethnic and minority groups were systematically exposed to messages altered to cater specifically to only one of the other groups before capturing their ad attitudes. Their results highlighted reduced levels of persuasion in the majority due to perceived source-dissimilarity and hinted at a potential feeling of “exclusion” in non-targeted minority groups when the ads they were exposed to were targeting an out-group.

Language in particular, has been a largely un-addressed topic in the context of non-targeted groups evaluating targeted advertising. If a clear categorizing cue such as a foreign language unequivocally implies that a brand is being targeted to a particular group, then the
next logical step would be to assume that the same cue also clearly sends the message to the rest of the population: "this product is for them, therefore not you". This is a largely unexplored possibility which the present study intends to address: it is very possible that the use of Spanish in targeted advertisements, as a cue for ethnicity, may in fact also impact brand associations for the non-targeted, non-Hispanic American consumers.

2.7 Insights derived from Literature

After reviewing past research and the concepts of brand personality, conceptualizing self through brands and in-group / out-group categorization, relevant literature can be summarized as follows: First, brands are used as reference points for self expression to both express the self and define what “me” is, and by extension, who “people like me” are as well. People tend to prefer brands that are congruent to their perception of self, identify better with message sources that they perceive similar and consequently, are prone to prefer products that are perceived as “similar” to them (Escalas & Bettman 2005; Jamal & AlMarri 2007; Aaker, Brumbaugh, & Grier 2000). Additionally, while images or attributes that communicate a relationship with an in-group are generally positive, messages related to out-groups (such as words in another language, haircuts, colors from a rival university, etc), tend to be processed differently and carry a host of negative consequences. For example: reduced affinity, reduced loyalty, reduced preference, reduced likeliness to be persuaded by a message, reduced attention, reduced recall and categorical thinking (Jamal & AlMarri 2007; Wyer 2010; Achouri & Bouslama 2010; Escalas & Bettman 2005; Bernstein, Young & Hugenberg 2007; Levin 1996; 2000; MacLin & Malpass 2001; 2003).
Since the use of Hispanic language has been incorporated in advertising as a positive ethnic cue relating to a “Hispanic in-group”, it then stands to reason that “non-members” of that group would interpret that “Hispanic in-group cue” instead as an “out-group” cue for them. By the same token, this would implicitly communicate that the product or brand being advertised is for “others” and therefore subject to in-group / out-group processing bias. Consistent with past literature this would mean that while highly beneficial to boost attitudes, attention and memory for members of a Hispanic in-group, the presence of Spanish language in ads could also be detrimental and detract from current brand-relationships for non-Hispanics. In other words, it is posited that language behaves like any other group categorization cue: the use of Spanish in ads could indirectly cue people that don’t speak the language to associate the brand more with Hispanics and less with themselves. Furthermore, if language behaves like any other categorization cue for ethnicity, the more prevalent in the ad, the stronger the potential association with the respective group should be.

2.8 Hypotheses

Overall then, the research question to be addressed by this thesis is whether Spanish in-language advertising can act as an out-group categorization cue, negatively affecting existing brand associations among non-Spanish speaking Americans?

There are many ways to look at brand associations. As illustrated by previous literature, the first important consideration relates to perceptions regarding the place where a particular brand is perceived to be from. The first hypothesis addresses the relationship between a brand and a perceived associated country:
**H1**: American consumers that don’t speak Spanish, when exposed to an ad in Spanish, will be less likely to associate the advertised brand with the US than if they had seen the same ad in English.

Another important consideration is the specific cultural meanings attached to brands. Li, Tsai and Soruco (2012) look at the “ethnic” dimension of brands and suggest that brands are commonly used among ethnic minorities as symbols for cultural identity by being associated with values and traits of particular cultural groups. In their study, they develop a perceived brand "Hispanicness/Americanness" scale and look at the level of association between specific products and their perceived association to Hispanic culture. Addressing this relevant brand dimension, the second hypothesis posits:

**H2**: American consumers that don’t speak Spanish, when exposed to an ad in Spanish, will be more likely to qualify the advertised brand as Hispanic rather than American, than if they had seen the same ad in English.

The last dimension relevant to brand associations is the relationship between a brand and the identity of an individual. Traditionally, this topic has been researched extensively: people tend to identify and respond better to a message source that is congruent with their perceptions of self (Escalas & Bettman 2005; Jamal & AlMarri 2007; Aaker, Brumbaugh, & Grier
2000; Fournier 1994; Sirgy 1985; 1982). Therefore, consistent with previous literature, the last hypothesis posits:

**H3:** American consumers that don’t speak Spanish, when exposed to an ad in Spanish, will be less likely to associate the advertised brand with themselves than if they had seen the same ad in English.

Finally, an important thing to consider is that the use of language in advertising is not simply a matter of momentary activation; it’s a constant. Language can be differently prevalent in an advertising message. If we consider the Spanish language as a Hispanic cue, it is posited that the more prevalent and obvious that this cue is in an ad, the stronger its potential to influence categorization processes and brand associations. Because of this, the following interaction effects between language and its prevalence in an ad are predicted:

**H4:** American consumers that don’t speak Spanish, when exposed to an ad in Spanish, will be less likely to associate the advertised brand with the US the more prevalent that the Spanish language is in the ad.

**H5:** American consumers that don’t speak Spanish, when exposed to an ad in Spanish, will be more likely to qualify the advertised brand as Hispanic rather than American, the more prevalent that the Spanish language is in the ad.
**H6:** American consumers that don’t speak Spanish, when exposed to an ad in Spanish, will be less likely to associate the advertised brand with themselves the more prevalent that the Spanish language is in the ad.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Respondents

Participants for this study were university students from two different undergraduate classes in a large Midwest University in the United States. A total of 459 students initially participated in the study. No restrictions were placed on recruitment: the students were simply informed that the study would be looking for their opinions on American TV ads and invited to participate in exchange for course credit.

3.2 Stimuli selection

Six TV advertisements from existing American brands were used as stimuli. The brand selection process occurred according to three main criteria: brand familiarity among the population, pre-existing brand attitudes (addressed below), and video quality (minimum of 640x480). On top of the previous mentioned three, the two experimental ads selected for the language and language prevalence manipulations were also required to fulfill two extra criteria: In order to work with the language manipulation, the selected paired English-Spanish ads would be required to be identical in all other respects but language. The language prevalence manipulation on the other hand, required both selected experimental brands to have different amounts of language prevalence. Language prevalence was operationalized in this study as word count both spoken and written. The word count excluded elements such as logo, brand names, product names, logo lockups, and numbers; which were taken to transcend language
barriers. The first pair of the brands selected would therefore have to have a high word count and the second a low one, both of them with identical matching ads in Spanish.

The reasoning behind the first criterion follows that attitude change does not occur in a vacuum. For example, someone exposed to a Spanish ad for a brand that they are completely unfamiliar with, would have no other source of information but the ad with Hispanic cues to make judgments about the brand. Therefore, we cannot measure changes in perceptions for a brand that is previously unknown to a participant since there would be no pre-existing associations at all. Because of this, only real brands (brand leaders in their respective categories), were included in the process for stimuli selection (better chance to be recognized by participants).

Criterion number two addresses the concerning possibility that changes in brand associations might be difficult to detect with just a single exposure. A single-exposure could be unlikely to sway self-report one way or the other if significantly strong pre-existing attitudes already existed (particularly with already well loved or hated brands). Batra, Ahuvia and Bagozzi (2012) discuss a related phenomenon in their recent work about “love brands” (describing deep emotional attachment and loyalty towards a brand beyond the product or service offered). Among other tell-tale characteristics to spot a love brand they mention: “the belief that the brand provided intrinsic rather than extrinsic rewards”, “a feeling of passion” and “an emotional bond” (“brand love prototype”, p3). Taking this into account, the chosen brands had to both be “well known” enough to the sample (pre-requisite of minimal familiarity resulting in some form of pre-existing attitudes) and also be unlikely candidates for “love brands” (reducing the risk of immutable/strong brand perceptions among participants). Using
the work of Crowley, Spagenberg and Hughes (1992) and Voss, Spagengberg and Grohmann (2003), a list was compiled of household product categories that on the one hand are considered very useful /“utilitarian” (and therefore more likely to have been encountered by American participants in their homes at some point), but on the other hand are not considered “hedonic” and likely providers of satisfaction through “affective value” (Batra & Ahtola 1990 in Voss, Spagengberg & Grohmann 2003, p. 159). Examples of utilitarian product categories include: cooking oil, inexpensive pens, paper towels, dish detergent, luggage, alkaline batteries, disposable diapers and kitchen materials (all of which scored quite low in the hedonism scale but comparatively high in the utilitarian realm).

A pool of thirteen advertisements that matched the product categories addressed above was created. The initial pool consisted of advertisements for: inexpensive pens and writing utensils (Bic, Post-it), alkaline batteries (Energizer, Rayovac), disposable baby diapers (Pampers, Huggies), detergent and kitchen materials (Gain, Tide, Bounty, Ariel, Clorox, Mr. Clean, Pam). This initial pool was combed to select the brands that best fulfilled each of the four criteria mentioned above. The advertisements for Huggies disposable diapers, Energizer alkaline batteries, Pampers disposable diapers and Tide cleaning products were selected as “filler” stimuli (to be displayed before and after the ads with the manipulations) for best fulfilling most of the criteria mentioned initially.

On the other hand, finding the two brands for the language and language prevalence manipulations proved very troublesome: only the ad for Scott paper towels was initially able to fulfill all the previous three requirements and also have a high language prevalence with an identical bilingual counterpart. The chosen commercial advertises a rewards program by Scott
and features a woman driving around town looking at street signs to a merry song (Tris3ct 2012). The woman uses her streets-marts everyday to get “better value” (such as getting the perfect parking spot) and concludes with a voice-over suggesting the many advantages of the Value-sense Scott program. With a total word count of 85 words, this ad was perfect for the high language prevalence manipulation (42 words spoken by an off-screen narrator, 14 words spoken by the background music singer and 29 written words on screen).

Since an additional low language prevalence experimental brand was needed, a new search for ad stimuli was conducted (this time prioritizing the bilingual counterpart criterion first). Out of this search, ads for Kohler, Comcast and Brother printers were found with an available identical bi-lingual ad counterpart. Kohler was unlikely to be a love brand, its ads were available in high quality video, it’s a leader in its product category, had an advertisement in Spanish that was identical in all aspects but the language used to its English counterpart, and had a very low overall language prevalence. Even though not originally in the product categories described by Crowley, Spagenberg and Hughes (1992) and Voss, Spagengberg and Grohmann (2003), out of the three candidates, only Kohler was able to match all the original criteria plus the necessary requirements for the two manipulations. With a total word count of just 26, the Kohler ad featured energetic screen color changes starring the new Kohler Flipside showerhead (26 written words, word-less music and no narrator). The commercial shows all the different features and positions the new showerhead can adopt through motion and color to the beat of an energetic song (eFaucets 2012). The selected advertisements were put together in two pairs of three ads: Energizer/Scott/Pampers as Conditions one and two and Tide/Kohler/Huggies as Conditions three and four (Please see Figure 1 and Figure 2).
3.3 Pretest

The brands initially selected as potential stimuli (Tide, Pampers, Energizer, Huggies, Scott, and Kohler) were pre-tested for overall familiarity and to ensure they were not regarded as overly hedonic, matching the product categories by Crowley, Spagenberg and Hughes (1992) and Voss, Spagengberg and Grohmann (2003). Two additional hedonic brands were also included for comparison (Apple and Coke) and scales were standardized to eight label points. The pretest took the form of a questionnaire divided into four parts (see Appendix C for the full questionnaire used in the pre-test).

The data collection for the first pre-test was conducted in a mid-west college campus. Participants varied greatly in race and age and consequently so did their responses. Since the study focuses on perceptions by non-Hispanic Americans and the full experiment was scheduled to run with a student population, that non-student data were discarded. Another round of data collection for the pre-test was done, this time with a pool exclusively consisting of non-Hispanic American college students. Seventeen students initially participated in the second pre-test round. Unfortunately, one participant answered less than half the questionnaire and his data were dropped for a total of sixteen.

The first part of the questionnaire addressed hedonic and utilitarian properties of all brands, one at a time. The hedonic dimension consisted of three items borrowed from the Hedonic scale by Crowley, Spagenberg and Hughes (1992). The Utilitarian scale was also comprised of three items, two of which were borrowed from the Utilitarian scale by Voss, Spagengberg and Grohmann (2003). The expectation was that most brands selected would
score relatively well in Utilitarianism, while not being too high in Hedonism. Both brand Hedonism and Utilitarianism scales were found reliable, with high Cronbach’s alpha reliability scores across all brands (Please see Table 2 for a complete list by brand). Scores behaved as expected: Utilitarianism means were in the upper part of the range, while most brands scored slightly above average in the Hedonism range, with Apple not surprisingly being the exception (Please see Table 3 for a complete list by brand). The second part of the questionnaire addressed familiarity with the brand and asked this question for each of the eight brands pretested: “How familiar are you with the brand ____? As expected, all scores but three fell in an average range (Please see Table 4 for a list of Brand familiarity descriptives). The evident exceptions were Coke (M=7.7, SD=.60) and Apple (M=7.5, SD= 1.03); both of which were described as very familiar with higher means than average. On the other hand, Pampers scored low, with a lower than average mean (M=4.5, SD=2.42). This was found surprising given the amount of potential exposure to the brand in general. Even though American college students (Pre-test sample) are not expected to be in the market for diapers, Pampers is a leader in its category; having a continuous presence in shelf in all major retailers and in TV advertising.

3.4 Conditions

The experiment consisted of a 2x2, between participants design manipulating language (Spanish, English) and language prevalence (High, Low), with a total of four conditions. Each condition in turn consisted of a pod of ads for three different brands. The three brands (and the ads themselves) used in the first two conditions are identical with only the language component changing between conditions (C1: ScottEnglish and C2: ScottSpanish). Similarly the
three brands advertised in the last two conditions are also the same with only the language of the middle ad changing between conditions (C3: KohlerEnglish and C4: KohlerSpanish). In other words, depending on the condition assigned, participants saw one of two possible “ad-pods” (high-low language prevalence) with the language of the middle ad that they would see being in either English or Spanish (Figure 2).

3.5 Procedure

Data were collected using MediaLab. The experiment was conducted over the course of twenty days in a computer laboratory. In an effort to avoid priming participants to ethnicity, a team of native-English speaking American experimenters was trained to interact with participants during data capture (welcome and log in participants, as well as give instructions or answer questions). After participants had entered responses and finished a session, their responses/data were recorded and were identifiable only by participant number assigned.

Upon arrival to the test site, participants were randomly assigned to one of the four possible conditions C1, C2, C3 or C4. They were told they would be asked for their opinions regarding advertisements. Participants watched a pod of three thirty second TV advertisements back-to-back. Then participants were asked to fill out a short questionnaire consisting of two separate sections. The first part assessed participant’s brand associations with several concepts, while the second part captured demographic information (age, gender, country of birth, parents country of birth) and asked to answer questions regarding whether or not they were minimally proficient in Spanish (See Appendix A). Finally, participants were thanked for their participation, debriefed regarding the actual purpose of the study and dismissed.
3.6 Measures

The questionnaire used five main scales measuring five main associations: brand-country association, perceived brand "Hispanicness/Americanness", brand-self concept connection, ad-to-brand connection and brand familiarity. The last two scales were included only to validate results and their items were analyzed separately from the main statistical analysis. The individual items or questions in the questionnaire that constituted each scale can be found in Appendix B.

The Brand-country association scale (scale one) was comprised of four different items. The first item was taken from Russell and Russell’s 2010 (p417) “strength of stereotypic brand–country associations”, with item 18 added as a complement to said scale to ensure “things American” was interpreted as culture (eg: possessing traits akin to American culture) and not merely in what country is the brand sold (“country-of-origin”). Finally, question two was taken from “Brand country-of-origin connection” by Swaminathan, Page and Gurhan-Canli (2007).

The scale “perceived brand Hispanicness/Americanness” (scale two) was comprised of three items directly taken from Li, Tsai and Soruco’s (2012) scale of the same name. Meanwhile, the explicit “brand-self concept connection” scale (scale three) was comprised of two main parts and has a total of eight items. First, the entire five items of the brand-self concept connection scale by Fournier (1994) were included. Second, three more items were added to complement the questions asked by Fournier’s scale (1994), while item ten was added as a reverse coded question (expressed in a negative statement) expected to corroborate results from other items in the present scale.
Ad-to-brand connection was a two item validation scale (scale four). The scale was included to account for the unlikely possibility that some participants could have been familiar with a brand but believed the ad (stimuli) they watched was unrelated to the advertised brand. In this scenario, it is posited that brand associations captured would be a direct result of previously held brand attitudes and unaffected by stimuli exposure; making them useless for analysis. In other words, if participants watched an ad that they believed was unrelated to the brand, then all the questions they answer later in the questionnaire about the brand would be useless. The first item in this scale was designed to act as a counterpart to the question added to the brand country-of-origin connection scale (Swaminathan, Page & Gurhan-Canli 2007). The wording has been altered so that it refers to a brand-to-ad relationship rather than a brand-to-country relationship. Additionally, question twelve was designed to act as a counter-part for the first item in the brand-self concept connection scale (Fournier 1994) mentioned above.

Finally, “brand familiarity” was a two item validation scale (scale five) to account for the possibility that despite positive pre-test results, some participants may still be un-familiar with the brand advertised in the stimuli. In such a case, data from these participants would be unusable and discarded. This is because if participants didn’t have a pre-existing knowledge of the brand as “American” and they saw it advertised in Spanish, it would be logical for them to think it was a Hispanic brand.

3.7 Questionnaire modifications

After the questions for the different scales to be used in the questionnaire had been determined, several modifications were made to said items. First, many studies have shown
that some people tend to respond to agree/disagree questions by just agreeing with whatever is being asked, no matter the assertion (Saris, Krosnick & Schaeffer 2005). In this regard, most questions used in the questionnaire were originally phrased as a statement expressed in the first person. However, according to Housley, Claypool, Garcia-Marques, and Mackie, (2010) the use of first person can activate familiarity and in-group thinking. This can happen even when merely reading a statement phrased such as “I believe that...” (Brunyé, Ditman, Mahoney, Augustyn & Taylor, 2009). In-group thinking as previously mentioned, has consequences that have the potential to bias and distort participant answers. Therefore, in an effort to reduce acquiescence and in-group thinking, all statement items were re-phrased from first person statements into question form (ex: from “I like Scott” to “Do you like Scott?”).

The second modification consisted of homogenizing the number of answers to eight label points per item (enabling later statistical comparison as items in the same scale). Most items in the original questionnaires had either 5 or 7 label points, so all scale items could have been homogenized to match either of those two numbers. However, Churchill and Peter (1984) suggest that the more scale points used, the more reliable the scale. This suggests that using seven points would be a better choice than using five by default since it is the larger number. Brown, Copeland and Millward (1973) suggested the use of “balanced rating scales” exclusively, meaning to have the same number of positive vs. negative points in a scale to avoid biased results (an impossibility with a seven point scale). By settling on eight points for all items in the questionnaire, both suggestions are attended to.

All eight points in the scale were given labels based on equally sized units (equal intervals) to increase validity, as suggested Schriesheim and Novelli (1989) and by Krosnick
(1999, p544). The labels given also followed Rohrmann’s advice (2007): verbal labels were positioned at the extremes where they seemed to be rated consistently. Additionally, the label points’ orientation was switched from the positive label points being on the left, to the positive label points being on the right of the range. This can help make up for the “left side bias” by Mathews (1929), Holmes (1974), Friedman, Friedman and Gluck (1988).

Next, all label points were construct specific as advised per Saris, Krosnick and Schaeffer (2005, p31). Initially most scale point label extremes were the typical strongly agree/disagree. However, once the question format was changed from an assertion to a question, pretesting showed that some scale points did not fit the scale “question” format. Scale responses were changed from the traditional “I strongly agree/disagree”, to full-point label responses with matching words such as “It really DOES/DOES NOT” (see Apendix A for the exact wording of all label points used). Finally, participants were reassured about keeping answers confidential, thinking carefully and were reminded about taking all the time needed for their answers, both which according to Krosnick (1999, p545-546) increase answer accuracy.

3.8 Summary

Participants were assigned to one of four different conditions and viewed a pod of three TV advertisements (brands and language depending on condition). Participants were then asked to complete a short questionnaire capturing their association between brands and several concepts. Finally they were asked for demographic information and proficiency in the Spanish language before they were debriefed and dismissed (Figure 1).
3.9 Expectations

The experimental model was designed to manipulate language and prevalence of language as Independent variables. Consistent with literature and the proposed hypotheses, American participants reporting no Spanish language proficiency upon hearing a Spanish ad, were expected to show weaker associations (compared to similar participants hearing the English ad counterpart) between the brand and the US, American culture and themselves. Similarly, the more prevalent that the Spanish language was in the ad, the more likely they were expected to associate the advertised brand with Hispanics and the less they were expected to associate the advertised brand with the US and with themselves.
4.1 Scale Reliability

To estimate reliability, the internal consistency of the different scales used in the experiment was tested using Cronbach's Alpha. *Brand-country association* was comprised of four items and it was considered reliable (a= .757) similarly to "*perceived brand Hispanicness/Americanness*" (a= .907). Additionally, the *brand-self concept connection* was comprised of a total of eight items and was also found reliable (a= .833). Finally, both the "Ad-to-brand connection" validity scale (a= .794) and the "Brand familiarity" validity scale (a= .821) appeared highly reliable. As previously mentioned, despite pre-test results of high familiarity, these two last scales were included to account for the possibility of participants being unfamiliar with the tested brands or believing the ad stimuli to be unrepresentative of the brand it stands for.

After careful consideration, item number ten ("Do you "not care" about the brand SCOTT? ") was deleted from Scale 3 *brand-self concept connection*. Even though the scale already had an acceptable reliability level, the distribution of many of the participant’s answers within this scale were usually all grouped together at the same points in the scale, except for item ten (with answers often found on the opposite side of the scale). In other words, several participants were answering very consistently for all other items in this scale, but when they reached this one item they provided an answer that contradicted all previous items in the scale. Since this was the only question in the entire questionnaire framed as a double negative, it seemed very possible that participants were quickly reading the wording of the item and not
noticing that this was the only question that was asked in the negative. To avoid further issues, item ten was dropped from the scale for all participants in all conditions. After the elimination of item ten from the scale, the “Brand-self concept connection” scale increased its reliability to (a= .897).

**4.2 Final sample size**

A total of 459 students initially participated in the study. Out of this initial amount, five students did not complete the demographic portion of the questionnaire that would enable their classification for later analysis and were dropped. Data from another five participants had to be dropped when portions of these participants’ answers were overwritten due to a clerical error. Similarly, data from eight more cases were excluded from analysis because the lead experimenter (of Latin origin) had to conduct the session after a last-minute emergency by the scheduled experimenter. This was thought to be less than desirable due to the possibility of said experimenter’s Latin accent priming participant responses. The remaining four hundred and forty one cases were used for statistical analysis (age M= 20.43, 264 female and 177 male).

This study looks at how Hispanic advertising affects those outside of the target market compared to Hispanics, making Americans who don’t speak Spanish the focus of this study. To this end, data cases were filtered to include only Americans that spoke no Spanish (ANS: target group) N=234. There was a surprising number of Non-American participants that spoke no Spanish (INS: International group, N=112) in the sample. Since the results for Internationals that spoke no Spanish are interesting but not directly relevant to the focus of this study, their results were not reported in the results section of this paper but can be found included in Appendix D.
Similarly, analyzing results for Americans that spoke Spanish and Internationals who spoke Spanish (N=89) would have been interesting for comparison purposes. Sadly these other two groups had too few cases per condition and were not relevant to the scope and focus of this study. Only responses from the ANS target group were taken into account for the main statistical analysis reported in this study (See Table 1 for the detailed sample sizes).
CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS

5.1 Brand-country association scale

Hypothesis one predicted that when American participants that don’t speak Spanish are exposed to an ad in Spanish, they would be less likely to associate the advertised brand with the US than if they had seen the same ad in English. Similarly, Hypothesis four predicted that when American participants that don’t speak Spanish are exposed to an ad in Spanish, they would be less likely to associate the advertised brand with the US the more prevalent that the Spanish language is in the ad.

The brand-country association scale measured how much the given brand was associated with the US. Scores on this scale were analyzed using a 2 (language: English, Spanish) x 2 (language prevalence: high, low) between-participants ANOVA (See Table 5). Supporting Hypothesis one, a significant main effect was found for the language factor (See Figure 3), F(1,234)= 8.76, p< .003, n_p^2=.036. This implies that participants exposed to an ad in English (M= 5.64, SD=.96), were more likely to associate the brand with the US than participants exposed to the ad in Spanish (M= 5.17, SD=1.15).

Further supporting Hypothesis one, there was a significant language prevalence main effect (See Figure 4), F(1,234)= 6.38, p< .012, n_p^2=.027. Results suggest that participants exposed to the higher language prevalence ad (M= 5.62, SD=1.00) tended to associate the brand with the US more than participants exposed to the lower prevalence brand (M= 5.22, SD=1.12). There were no significant interaction effects, F(1,234)= 2.07, p= .151, n_p^2=.009.
5.2 Perceived brand "Hispanicness/Americanness" scale

Hypothesis two predicted that when American participants that don’t speak Spanish are exposed to an ad in Spanish, they would be more likely to qualify the advertised brand as Hispanic rather than American, than if they had seen the same ad in English. Similarly, Hypothesis five predicted that when American participants that don’t speak Spanish are exposed to an ad in Spanish, they would be more likely to qualify the advertised brand as Hispanic rather than American, the more prevalent that the Spanish language is in the ad.

The perceived brand "Hispanicness/Americanness" scale assessed the associations between a brand and Hispanic culture. A 2 (language: English, Spanish) x 2 (language prevalence: high, low) between-participants ANOVA was used to analyze results in this scale. Neither the main effect for language prevalence (F(1,234)= 0.38, p= .846, \(\eta^2_p=.000\)), nor the main effect for language (F(1,234)= 3.45, p> .064, \(\eta^2_p=.015\)), were found significant. However the last one came close to significance at P>.06 and describes an interesting relationship between participants that watched the ad in English and the likelihood that they would describe the brand as a product for Hispanics (See Figure 5). Finally, there were no significant interaction effects, F(1,234)= 0.69, p>.405, \(\eta^2_p=.003\). Please refer to Table 6 for the complete perceived brand "Hispanicness/Americanness" Scale analysis.

5.3 Brand self-concept connection scale

Hypothesis three predicted that when American participants that don’t speak Spanish are exposed to an ad in Spanish, they would be less likely to the associate the advertised brand with themselves than if they had seen the same ad in English. Similarly, Hypothesis six
predicted that when American participants that don’t speak Spanish are exposed to an ad in Spanish, they would be less likely to associate the advertised brand with themselves the more prevalent that the Spanish language was in the ad.

The brand self-concept connection scale measured participants’ associations between brands and the self and was analyzed using a 2 (language: English, Spanish) x 2 (language prevalence: high, low) between-participants ANOVA. Neither the language factor (F(1,234)= 1.01, p>.315, \(\eta_p^2=.004\)) nor the language prevalence factor (F(1,234)= 0.63, p>.427, \(\eta_p^2=.003\)) were found significant. There was no interaction effect between, F(1,234)= 0.00, p>.936, \(\eta_p^2=.000\). Please refer to Table 7 for the complete Brand self-concept connection scale analysis.

**5.4 Ad-to-brand connection scale**

Scale four is a validation scale assessing Ad-to-brand associations. Scores on this scale were analyzed using a 2 (language: English, Spanish) x 2 (language prevalence: high, low) between-participants ANOVA (See Table 8). There was a significant language main effect (F(1,234)= 17.41, p<.000, \(\eta_p^2=.069\)); suggesting that participants associated ads more with the brands they represented when the ads were in English (M= 5.72, SD=1.15), than when they were in Spanish (M= 4.96, SD=1.58). This relationship is illustrated by Figure 6. There was no main language prevalence effect, F(1,234)= 0.13, p>.719, \(\eta_p^2=.001\). Similarly, there was no significant interaction effect, F(1,234)= 2.38, p>.124, \(\eta_p^2=.010\). Please refer to Table 8 for the complete Ad-to-brand connection scale analysis.

**5.5 Brand familiarity scale**
Scale five was a validation scale designed to measure familiarity with a brand and it was similarly analyzed using a 2 (language: English, Spanish) x 2 (language prevalence: high, low) between-participants ANOVA (Please see Table 9). There was a significant language prevalence main effect, (F(1,234)= 8.78,p< .003, n_p²=.036). As illustrated by figure 7, this suggests that when an ad used language more heavily (M= 5.25, SD=1.52), participants reported more familiarity than when it was not (M= 4.46, SD=1.70). On the other hand, participants did tend to report more familiarity with the Brand when the advertisements were in English. However, this language factor effect was found non-significant, F(1,234)= 0.951, p> .331, n_p²=.004. Finally, there was no significant interaction effect, F(1,234)= 1.41, p> .235, n_p²=.006.


CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION

6.1 General discussion

To summarize, brands are commonly used as tools for self-expression. People tend to prefer brands that are congruent to their perception of self, identify better with message sources that they perceive similar and consequently, are prone to prefer products that are perceived as “similar” to them (Escalas & Bettman 2005; Jamal & AlMarri 2007). From a branding perspective, attributes that communicate a relationship with an in-group are generally positive, while messages related to an out-group usually carry a host of negative consequences. (Escalas & Bettman 2005; Jamal & AlMarri 2007; Wyer 2010; Achouri & Bouslama 2010; Bernstein, Young & Hugenberg 2007; Levin 1996, 2000; MacLin & Malpass 2001; 2003).

Advertising tactics designed to cater to a specific group, tend to be effective among the targeted group (LaFerle & Lee 2005; Koslow, Shamdasani & Touchstone 1994). However, there haven’t been many serious attempts to look at targeted advertisements as they are received from the “opposite” perspective of the non-target group. This thesis explored the possibility that by using cultural cues, the use of Spanish language in ads could be detrimental and detract from current brand-relationships for non-Hispanics. Participants were exposed to a group of three advertisements where ad language and ad language prevalence were manipulated. A questionnaire was used to measure associations between brands and different concepts.

When exposed to an ad in Spanish, participants reported significantly weaker associations between the brand and the US in both high and low language prevalence conditions. Additionally, despite a general lack of significance, it is relevant to note that overall, all non-significant results tended to fall in the expected directions: participants did tend to
report weaker associations between a brand and Hispanic culture whenever an ad was in English in both high and low language prevalence conditions and also generally reported weaker associations between the brand and self whenever the ad was in Spanish in both high and low language prevalence conditions as well.

On this topic, other note-worthy points of discussion were the results from the ad-to-brand connection and brand familiarity scales. It seemed that the more words an English ad had, the stronger the reported association between an ad and brand (and the weaker the association was for an ad in Spanish). There might be a possibility that the significant language factor effect found could be amplified by the more prevalent use of the language cue; its directionality depending on the in-group the language is a cue for. At the moment however, this interaction was not found significant and further research is needed to support it. Results from Scale five were similarly interesting. Scale five’s purpose was to ensure that participants were reporting on a brand not completely unfamiliar to them. Additionally, while language effects were not significant for scale five, participant responses did seem to align once more with the hypotheses’ expectations: when exposed to ads in Spanish, participants tended to report less brand familiarity than when the ad was in English. The implications of this are very interesting and would be a great area for future research to address.

In conclusion, the present work builds upon existing research, looking at the categorization effects of targeted advertising messages as they are processed by out-groups. However, this thesis’ main theoretical contribution consists in pioneering the exploration of language as an ethnic-targeting cue for ads in the context of group categorization. On the one hand, significant results validated Hypothesis one: when presented with a Spanish ad, non-
Spanish speaking Americans tend to associate the advertised brand less with the US. Similarly, the brand that advertised using language more prominently was usually associated more with the US than the brand which wasn’t. On the other hand, the general lack of overall significance throughout several conditions was one of the main concerns that had arisen during the experiment design; the possibility that a single exposure would not be enough to significantly sway pre-existing brand associations one way or another. This was to be expected with research that ventures into new and unexplored domains. It is unusual that any one study provides a concrete answer to all questions it poses since academic knowledge is in essence a gradual, cumulative process. However, even though most participant responses were very encouraging (leaning in the predicted directions), as it stands the current results do not provide sufficient basis to support most of the predicted effects. It is hoped that future research might provide more concrete answers to most of the questions and possibilities posed in the present work.

6.2 Managerial Implications

The present study offers specific managerial implications to professionals interested in advertising American brands to Hispanic consumers. To a lesser degree, findings will also be useful to professionals around the world advertising mainstream brands to particular ethnic groups. Results suggest that language can be a useful tool for advertisers to target a particular ethnicity, since it can act as an ethnic cue in certain contexts. Contrary to industry assumptions, a portion of the findings seem to support the notion that when brands increase their likelihood of association to a particular kind of consumer group, they might be doing so at the cost of
partial disassociation to a different kind of consumer. Consistent with previous literature, catering a message to a specific ethnicity through the use of ethnic cues (such as language) will very likely favor self-categorization mechanisms between the brand and the particular group in question. Since consumers are expected to show preference for brands congruent with their in-group perceptions, this in turn is expected to reflect positively for the brand. On the other hand, audiences not included in the “in-group” addressed by the message cues, will associate the brand with what for them is “an out-group”. While this is not necessarily a bad thing, it is an important consideration when doing brand planning and segmenting a consumer population.

Overall, it is hoped that the findings in the present study will aid advertising professionals dealing with catering brand messages to different audiences. Instead of blindly trying to appeal to as many population segments as possible, awareness of these results can help planners working on brand strategy. Armed with this knowledge, planners can weigh the pros and cons of possibly gaining an advantage with a particular kind of audience at the cost of being disassociated with another one.

6.3 Concerns and Limitations

There were several concerns in the process of this study. The first one was the need to take only individual items from the used scales as opposed to incorporating the entire set of items for all of the scales. The reduction of the total amount of items per scale was done in the interest of time. Including every item in all of the scales used would have increased the questionnaire size by +400%. The inclination of participants to start satisficing in their responses due to fatigue was a big concern when considering the length of the questionnaire.
Nonetheless, scale reduction was considered disadvantageous because this makes it impossible to reliably compare the results to those of previous studies who used said scale, since in effect it’s not the “same scale” anymore. The high reliability showed by all of the scales used after reduction however (Cronbach’s alpha scores), is reassuring in this respect.

A second area of concern was the direction of evaluations for the second scale. Unlike the Brand-country Association scale (which measures associations between a brand and the United States), the items taken from Li, Tsai and Soruco’s Perceived brand "Hispanicness/Americanness" scale (2012) measure associations between a brand and the Hispanic culture. Since the experimental design already manipulates ad language and the evaluation range goes from “American” to “Hispanic”, this scale works out very well with this study particularly because data were not meant to be compared between scales (all scales were analyzed separately). That said, this is not ideal; all scale labels should reflect associations in similar directions unless the question is reverse coded on purpose.

The language prevalence manipulation was a cause for concern. The intention was to reduce uncertainty to the point where the IV (language prevalence) would be the only difference between conditions. However, given the difficulty of finding stimuli that adequately matched all criteria, this was not practically possible. We have to consider other differences between the chosen experimental ads that might act as confounding factors. For example, college students might consider the brand Kohler to be less relevant than Scott. Since Kohler sells bathroom equipment and its products are somewhat costly, despite reported familiarity it’s improbable that many college students have purchased any of their products in the past (which is not true for Scott). On this topic, an obvious difference in the language prevalence
manipulation was the amount of channels language was relevant for in the two ads: beyond the amount of total words, the Scott ad stimuli included a voice-over, music with lyrics and Spanish on-screen words. On the other hand, the stimuli ad for Kohler only used Spanish on-screen words and a word-less background song. It is possible that with language as a manipulation, associations are not only driven by the amount of times that a cue is used but also the channels (verbal or written) through which the cue is communicated.

Although not directly under the experimenter’s control, there is also the issue of ad comprehensibility despite the language barrier. The lack of language used in the Kohler stimuli that made it so perfect for a low language prevalence manipulation, also made its message very easy to understand since its message (showcasing a new showerhead) did not have to rely on communication through language. On the other hand, not being fluent in the language that the Scott condition was in, meant not being able to follow the main message of the ad which might make it harder to relate to the brand. Future research should address this distinction and investigate whether comprehensibility for ads in a foreign language might be a factor driving the shift in associations beyond the amount of the language cue used.

6.4 Future Research

Exposing people to stimuli that might not be considered usual can raise objections about novelty effects in participant responses. Similarly, participants suspecting an experiment’s “real” objective (they were told the study was after opinions regarding American TV ads) might bias their later explicit responses. Particularly since this study addresses topics that might be
considered socially sensible, it might be advisable for future research in this area to compliment explicit measures with implicit ones.

Furthermore, there were some concerns regarding the language prevalence manipulation. Future research might focus not only on differentiating between the different channels that language as a cue can be manipulated on (written, oral or even the background music) but also focus on the level of potential “comprehensibility” of a foreign “in-language” ad despite not being familiar with the language. Compared to watching an ad in a foreign language and not understanding at all, being able to follow an ad in a foreign language could potentially ameliorate feelings of exclusion by an out-group audience (and consequently impact brand associations).

In addition, it might be valuable to look at this topic in the specific context of aspirational groups. “Not associating” with a group does not always mean having negative feelings towards them by default. However, literature tells us that pre-existing group attitudes aside, just the process of categorizing a brand as belonging to an out-group is generally disadvantageous when compared to a brand associated with an in-group (Escalas & Bettman 2005; Jamal & AlMarri 2007; Klein, Ettenson & Morris 1998; Mackie, Gastardo-Conaco & Skelly 1992; Aaker, Brumbaugh & Grier 2000). It is indeed possible to have positive pre-existing associations to a group that you don’t consider yourself part of at any level. However, strong positive group associations typically tend to be included as part of one’s self conception. For example, if an hypothetical consumer really liked the Vikings team, he/she would be more likely to include that into their self-conception on some level, such as “I am a Viking’s fan”, rather than as an isolated positive association about that particular group. However, it is possible that
a particular out-group might be held in high regard, while not necessarily forming part of that consumer’s idea of self (still being an out-group). Cui Yang, Wang and Liu (2012) hint at a situation where being singled-out as a clear out-group does not directly result in a disadvantage for the brand. They looked at the role of message congruency in the context of group categorization. Their results show that even if a message is culturally incongruent, as long as the in-congruency avoids any direct conflict with salient values of the audience, it can still be persuasive as long as it’s positioned as being originated from a foreign culture.

Another interesting consideration would be investigating the role of familiarity in the categorization process for non-targeted audiences. The seeming predisposition by participants to report differing levels of familiarity with the brand depending on the language of the ad is intriguing and warrants to be looked at in further detail (See Figure 7). The present study treats familiarity as a constant in experiment design and assumes a certain minimum level of it (through pre-test results), without making distinctions for degrees. However, it would not be surprising (even expected) if high familiarity conditions reduced the ability of language, as a categorization cue, to shift pre-existing brand associations. The possibility of familiarity as a moderating effect for language would be an interesting topic for future research and would be very relevant for brand advertising through multicultural channels.

A final consideration came to mind when considering the work of Johnson & Grier (2011). The authors agree that consumers typically evaluate whether a targeted brand message is congruent with a group by comparing that brand identity to that of the self. However, they pose that this is only the case for “distinctive” consumers; meaning those people which distinguish themselves as separate from the understood majority. In line with target/non-target
market effects literature, they suggest that minorities respond favorably to ads targeting them, whereas majority members tend to respond unfavorably to ads targeting minorities. This is a very common perspective but one that presupposes fundamental distinctions between majorities and minorities. However, what is a majority but a “numerous minority?”

Generally speaking, advertising research in the US tends to take a perspective that takes certain cultural elements for granted. Because English is the normative language in the country (and arguably also the industrialized world), most multicultural advertising efforts tend to speak about the relationship between ethnic groups and brands in terms that presuppose English as a default; English tends to be the control condition against which changes are compared to. It is tempting for members of a majority to think about their in-group cues as things that are “normal” and can be taken for granted for society at large. This situation is understandable because alternatives would introduce multiple complications in measurement and because majority-group cues for all practical purposes, would by definition in fact constitute “what is normal” either way. It is important to realize however, that English does not constitute a universal default and it’s only justified in its use for comparison purposes because it’s the language utilized by the “majority” in certain contexts.

Illustrating this point: when we look at the effectiveness of Spanish in-language advertising among Hispanic consumers, we typically don’t attribute associative differences to Hispanics disassociating with the advertisements in English. Rather, it is posed that members of that group are positively associating with the ad as a result of the targeted cultural cues the ad presented (Spanish language). This is a slight but important distinction with many potential implications. If we think about the non-Spanish speaking American majority as a “numerous
minority” and consider the English language to be one of their cultural cues to signal in-group in an ethnically-charged context (just like the language Spanish is for Hispanics), then research results in this context can be looked at under a new light. Perhaps American non-Spanish participants are not disassociating when exposed to a Hispanic message as literature would imply. Instead, maybe since English acts as an in-group categorization cue for that group, they are actually positively associating with the English ad and it just seems like they disassociating to the Spanish one by comparison.

However, there is currently not enough research addressing this subtlety to warrant a shift in perspective just yet. Unfortunately, the burden of proof rests completely on this new perspective simply because its traditional alternative is already backed by existing literature. Either way, the potential is there: the implications for the field of multi-cultural advertising could be huge and would provide a unifying theme to understand ethnic marketing under group categorization theory at a global level. This perspective opens interesting and exciting possibilities for further exploration that should be kept in mind for future research.
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Table 1 – Questionnaire sample sizes by group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Total Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 – Pre-test list of Utilitarian/Hedonic Scale reliability by brands (Cronbach’s Alpha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>HED-C. Alpha</th>
<th>UT-C. Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tide</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coke</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pampers</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energizer</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huggies</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>0.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohler</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 – Pre-test list of Utilitarian/Hedonic scale means by brands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brands</th>
<th>Hedonic Scale Mean</th>
<th>Utilitarian Scale Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tide</td>
<td>5.7083</td>
<td>6.9583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coke</td>
<td>5.6458</td>
<td>5.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pampers</td>
<td>4.7333</td>
<td>7.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>6.2708</td>
<td>6.8958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energizer</td>
<td>5.5778</td>
<td>7.6458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huggies</td>
<td>5.4889</td>
<td>7.7292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>5.5000</td>
<td>7.0417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohler</td>
<td>5.6444</td>
<td>6.8667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4– Descriptives – Pre-test brand familiarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fam.Tide</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>2.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fam.Coke</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fam.Pamp</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>2.421</td>
<td>5.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fam.Apple</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>1.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fam.Energ</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>1.455</td>
<td>2.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fam.Huggies</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>2.442</td>
<td>5.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fam.Scott</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1.328</td>
<td>1.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fam.Kohler</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.999</td>
<td>3.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 - Brand-country association scale two-way ANOVA analysis

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: SCALE1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>21.315a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.105</td>
<td>6.551</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>6548.354</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6548.354</td>
<td>6037.629</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTORLang</td>
<td>9.509</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.509</td>
<td>8.767</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTORPrevalence</td>
<td>6.921</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.921</td>
<td>6.381</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTORLang * FACTORPrevalence</td>
<td>2.247</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.247</td>
<td>2.072</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>253.794</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1.085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7326.875</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>275.109</td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .077 (Adjusted R Squared = .066)
Table 6 - Perceived brand "Hispanicness/Americanness" two-way ANOVA analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>8.129&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.710</td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2776.365</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2776.365</td>
<td>1389.661</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTORPrevalence</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTORLang * FACTORPrevalence</td>
<td>1.389</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.389</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>467.502</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1.998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3423.889</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>475.631</td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .017 (Adjusted R Squared = .004)
Table 7 - Brand self-concept connection scale two-way ANOVA analysis

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>2.188</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3686.151</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3686.151</td>
<td>2341.026</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTORLang</td>
<td>1.598</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.598</td>
<td>1.015</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTORPrevalence</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTORLang * FACTORPrevalence</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>368.454</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1.575</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4320.510</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>370.641</td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .006 (Adjusted R Squared = -.007)
Table 8 - Ad-to-brand connection scale two-way ANOVA analysis

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: SCALE4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>37.741</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.580</td>
<td>6.883</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>6306.948</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6306.948</td>
<td>3450.703</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTORLang</td>
<td>31.830</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.830</td>
<td>17.415</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTORPrevalence</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTORLang * FACTORPrevalence</td>
<td>4.352</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.352</td>
<td>2.381</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>427.688</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1.828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7408.750</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>465.430</td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .081 (Adjusted R Squared = .069)
Table 9 - Brand familiarity scale two-way ANOVA analysis

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>30.540&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.180</td>
<td>3.941</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5462.059</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5462.059</td>
<td>2114.671</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTORLang</td>
<td>2.455</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.455</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTORPrevalence</td>
<td>22.683</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.683</td>
<td>8.782</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTORLang * FACTORPrevalence</td>
<td>3.665</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.665</td>
<td>1.419</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>604.407</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>2.583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6500.250</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>634.946</td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .048 (Adjusted R Squared = .036)
**Figure 1 - Full experimental model**

**STEP 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Prev.</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Condition 1</strong></td>
<td>Energizer, Scott, Pampers</td>
<td>Energizer, Scott(S), Pampers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Condition 3</strong></td>
<td>Tide, Kohler, Huggies</td>
<td>Tide, Kohler(S), Huggies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Prev.</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Condition 2</strong></td>
<td>Energizer, Scott(S), Pampers</td>
<td>Energizer, Scott(S), Pampers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STEP 2**

**Questionnaire**

**STEP 3**

**Nationality / Lang. Proficiency**

**STEP 4**

**Debriefing**
### Figure 2 – Experimental conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Prev.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Condition 1</strong> Energizer, Scott, Pampers</td>
<td><strong>Condition 2</strong> Energizer, Scott(S), Pampers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Prev.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Condition 3</strong> Tide, Kohler, Huggies</td>
<td><strong>Condition 4</strong> Tide, Kohler(S), Huggies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3 – Impact of the factor language in the brand-country association scale
Figure 4 – Impact of the factor language prevalence in the brand-country association scale

Estimated Marginal Means of Brand-country Association (Q0+Q18+Q1+Q2)

Factor Amount of language present in words
Figure 5 – Impact of language factor in “perceived brand Hispanicness/Amercianess” scale

Estimated Marginal Means of Perceived brand "Hispanicness/Amercianess"
(Q15+Q16+Q17)

Factor Language

Estimated Marginal Means
Figure 6 – Impact of the factor language in the ad-to-brand association scale

Estimated Marginal Means of Ad-to-brand connection (Q11+Q12)
Figure 7 – Impact of the factor language in the brand familiarity scale
Appendix A - Experimental questionnaire

PART I
Please circle the number that best fits your opinion regarding the following statements/questions, where the lowest number is “very/strongly agree” (LEFT) and the highest is “not at all/strongly disagree” (TO THE RIGHT).

0. How American is the brand BRAND?
Not at all American  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8 Very American

1. Does the brand BRAND stand up for American values?
It completely DOES NOT  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8 It completely DOES

2. Do you associate BRAND with things that are American?
I completely DO NOT  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8 I completely DO

3. Do you feel like you and BRAND have a lot in common?
I completely DO NOT  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8 I completely DO

4. Do you feel like BRAND’s image is similar in lots of ways to your image of yourself?
I completely DO NOT  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8 I completely DO

5. Does the brand BRAND say a lot about the kind of person you are or want to be?
It completely DOES NOT  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8 It completely DOES

6. Does the brand BRAND remind you of who you are?
It completely DOES NOT  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8 It completely DOES

7. Do you think the brand BRAND is part of yourself?
I completely DO NOT  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8 I completely DO

8. Do you like the brand BRAND?
I completely DO NOT  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8 I completely DO

9. Do you feel very strongly about the brand BRAND?
I completely DO NOT  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8 I completely DO

10. Do you not care about the brand BRAND?
I completely DO NOT  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8 I completely DO

11. Do you think the ad you just watched for BRAND stands for BRAND’s values?
12. Do you think that the ad you just watched for BRAND and the brand BRAND have a lot in common?
I completely DO NOT  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  I completely DO

13. Before watching the ads, how familiar were you with the brand BRAND?
I completely DO NOT  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  I completely DO

14. How extensively have you used SCOTT’s products?
Never  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  Very extensively

15. Do you think the brand BRAND is more popular among Hispanics than among Caucasians?
I completely DO NOT  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  I completely DO

16. Do you think the brand BRAND is more associated with Hispanic culture than American culture?
I completely DO NOT  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  I completely DO

17. Do you think the brand BRAND is more likely to be consumed by Hispanics than by Caucasians?
I completely DO NOT  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  I completely DO

18. Would you consider the brand SCOTT an American brand or a Hispanic brand?
Hispanic Brand  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  American Brand

PART II
Please answer the following questions to the best of your abilities by circling the option that best fits your situation or by writing your answer in the provided space as applicable. If you don’t understand all or parts of the question, please circle the answer “I don’t understand”. Remember that all the information provided is anonymous. There are no “wrong” or “right” answers since this is for data analysis purposes only.

1. What is your age? __________________________

2. What is your gender?  1.male  2.female

3. What country were you born in? __________________________

4. Which country would you say you spent most of your childhood in? __________________________

5. In which country(s) was your father born in? (If you don’t know please write “I don’t know”) Father ________________

6. In which country(s) was your mother born in? (If you don’t know please write “I don’t know”) Mother ________________
Mother_____________

7. Are you Proficient in the Spanish language? (You are considered Proficient if you can overhear a conversation in Spanish and understand the main idea of what is being said). 
0 = Non-Proficient, 1 = Proficient in Spanish.

8. "Si le toco escuchar un anuncio en Español en los ejercicios anteriores, pudo usted entender lo que decía el anuncio?"
   - I don’t understand.
   - Si comprendí
   - Si entiendo el idioma pero no me toco escuchar un anuncio en español

Translation for Spanish questions in Part II:
8. - “If you were assigned to listen to an ad in Spanish in the previous exercise, were you able to understand what the ad was saying? Yes. / Yes I do understand Spanish but I wasn’t played an ad in Spanish. / I don’t understand."
Appendix B – Scales used by item and source

1-Brand-country Association
Strength of stereotypic brand–country associations scale (Russell and Russell’s 2010)
Q0. How American is the brand BRAND?
Added item based on the Strength of stereotypic brand–country associations scale (Russell and Russell’s 2010)
Q18. Would you consider the brand BRAND more of a Hispanic Brand or an American Brand?
Brand country-of-origin connection (Swaminathan, Page and Gurhan-Canli 2007)
Q2. Do you associate BRAND with things that are American?

Added item based on the Brand country-of-origin connection scale (Swaminathan, Page and Gurhan-Canli 2007)
Q1. Does the brand BRAND stand up for American values?

2-Perceived brand “Hispanicness/Americanness”
Perceived brand "Hispanicness/Americanness" scale (Li, Tsai and Soruco 2012)
Q15. Do you think the brand BRAND is more popular among Hispanics than among Caucasians?
Q16. Do you think the brand BRAND is more associated with Hispanic culture than American culture?
Q17. Do you think the brand BRAND is more likely to be consumed by Hispanics than by Caucasians?

3-Brand self-concept connection
Full Brand-self concept connection scale (Fournier 1994)
Q3. Do you feel like you and BRAND have a lot in common?
Q4. Do you feel like BRAND’s image is similar in lots of ways to your image of yourself?
Q5. Does the brand BRAND say a lot about the kind of person you are or want to be?
Q6. Does the brand BRAND remind you of who you are?
Q7. Do you think the brand BRAND is part of yourself?

Added items based on the Brand-self concept connection scale (Fournier 1994)
Q8. Do you like the brand BRAND?
Q9. Do you feel very strongly about the brand BRAND?
Q10. Do you not care about the brand BRAND?

4-Ad-to-brand connection
Counterpart to added item based on the Brand country-of-origin connection (Swaminathan, Page and Gurhan-Canli 2007)
Q11. Do you think the ad you just watched for BRAND stands for BRAND’s values?
Counterpart to added item based on the Brand-self concept connection scale (Fournier 1994)
Q12. Do you think that the ad you just watched for BRAND ad the brand BRAND have a lot in common?

5-Brand familiarity
Q13. Before watching the ads, how familiar were you with the brand BRAND?
Q14. How extensively have you used SCOTT’s products?
Appendix C – Pre-test questionnaire

Section I. Brand dimensions. Please circle a number for each of the 6 dimensions, that best corresponds to your opinion.

Tide detergents are:
- unpleasant
- useless
- disagreeable
- harmful
- awful
- unimportant

Coca Cola beverages are:
- unpleasant
- useless
- disagreeable
- harmful
- awful
- unimportant

Pampers disposable diapers are:
- unpleasant
- useless
- disagreeable
- harmful
- awful
- unimportant

Kohler showerheads are:
- unpleasant
- useless
- disagreeable
- harmful
- awful
- unimportant

Scott Paper Towels are:
- unpleasant
- useless
- disagreeable
- harmful
- awful
- unimportant

Apple electronics are:
- unpleasant
- useless
- disagreeable
- harmful
- awful
- unimportant
unimportant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 important

**Energizer disposable batteries are:**
unpleasant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 pleasant
useless 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 useful
disagreeable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 agreeable
harmful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 beneficial
awful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 nice
unimportant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 important

**Huggies disposable diapers are:**
unpleasant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 pleasant
useless 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 useful
disagreeable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 agreeable
harmful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 beneficial
awful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 nice
unimportant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 important

**Section II.** Brand dimensions. Please circle the number that best applies to your situation

How familiar are you with the brand Tide?
Never heard of it 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Very familiar

How familiar are you with the brand Coca Cola?
Never heard of it 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Very familiar

How familiar are you with the brand Pampers?
Never heard of it 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Very familiar

How familiar are you with the brand Kohler?
Never heard of it 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Very familiar

How familiar are you with the brand Scott?
Never heard of it 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Very familiar

How familiar are you with the brand Apple?
Never heard of it 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Very familiar

How familiar are you with the brand Energizer?
Never heard of it 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Very familiar

How familiar are you with the brand Huggies?
Never heard of it 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Very familiar
# Appendix D - Two-way ANOVA results for non-Spanish speaking Internationals

## Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>SCALE1</td>
<td>22.212&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.404</td>
<td>5.841</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCALE2</td>
<td>14.461&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.820</td>
<td>2.252</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCALE3</td>
<td>2.644&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCALE4</td>
<td>15.415&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.138</td>
<td>2.873</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCALE5</td>
<td>32.861&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.954</td>
<td>3.715</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>SCALE1</td>
<td>2904.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2904.48</td>
<td>2291.44</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCALE2</td>
<td>1586.95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1586.95</td>
<td>741.263</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCALE3</td>
<td>1769.98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1769.98</td>
<td>975.250</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCALE4</td>
<td>2747.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2747.67</td>
<td>1536.44</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCALE5</td>
<td>1618.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1618.68</td>
<td>548.987</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTORPresence</td>
<td>SCALE1</td>
<td>8.281</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.281</td>
<td>6.533</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCALE2</td>
<td>1.953</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.953</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCALE3</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCALE4</td>
<td>1.992</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.992</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCALE5</td>
<td>30.759</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.759</td>
<td>10.432</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTORLang</td>
<td>SCALE1</td>
<td>11.378</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.378</td>
<td>8.977</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE2</td>
<td>10.427</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.427</td>
<td>4.871</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE3</td>
<td>2.038</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.038</td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE4</td>
<td>4.700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.700</td>
<td>2.628</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE5</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| FACTORPresence | SCALE1 | .500 | 1 | .500 | .394 | .531 | .004 |
| FACTORLang | SCALE2 | 2.368 | 1 | 2.368 | 1.106 | .295 | .010 |
| FACTORPresence | SCALE3 | .009 | 1 | .009 | .005 | .944 | .000 |
| FACTORLang | SCALE4 | 5.023 | 1 | 5.023 | 2.809 | .097 | .025 |
| FACTORPresence | SCALE5 | 1.369 | 1 | 1.369 | .464 | .497 | .004 |

| Error | SCALE1 | 139.429 | 110 | 1.268 |
| SCALE2 | 235.497 | 110 | 2.141 |
| SCALE3 | 199.639 | 110 | 1.815 |
| SCALE4 | 196.717 | 110 | 1.788 |
| SCALE5 | 324.334 | 110 | 2.948 |

| Total | SCALE1 | 3396.31 | 114 |
| SCALE2 | 1899.66 | 114 |
| SCALE3 | 2118.85 | 114 |
| SCALE4 | 3276.00 | 114 |
| SCALE5 | 2161.25 | 114 |

<p>| Corrected Total | SCALE1 | 161.641 | 113 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCALE2</td>
<td>249.958</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE3</td>
<td>202.283</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE4</td>
<td>212.132</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE5</td>
<td>357.195</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. $R^2 = .137$ (Adjusted $R^2 = .114$)
b. $R^2 = .058$ (Adjusted $R^2 = .032$)
c. $R^2 = .013$ (Adjusted $R^2 = -.014$)
d. $R^2 = .073$ (Adjusted $R^2 = .047$)
e. $R^2 = .092$ (Adjusted $R^2 = .067$)