



University of Twente
Enschede - The Netherlands

**The Effects of Desirability for Control and Controllability in
Online Advertisements on Consumer Attitude**

Ruth Esther Cespedes
University of Twente

Supervisors:

Joyce Karreman

Peter DeVries

2007

Abstract

This research examines the degree of controllability in online advertisements that would optimize their influence on users, depending on their desire for control. Eighty students enrolled in the Faculty of Communication and Behavioral Sciences, in Twente University, The Netherlands, participated for one course credit. The experiment had a 2 (Controllability: high vs. low) x 2 (Desirability for Control: high vs. low) between participants design. It was expected the participants were more positively influenced by high controllable ads, and that high controllable ads influence more positively people with a higher desire of control, while ads with a lower controllability influence strongly people with a lower desire for control. High controllable advertisements have not demonstrated to have more positive effects in consumer attitude. Moreover, high controllability in an ad does not always influence more positively people with a higher desire for control, as well as low controllability in an ad does not always influence more positively those with lower desire for control. However, it has been found that participants with a higher desire for control were more open to knowing the brand and exploring the ad. Moreover, it was found that when a product is not familiar to the consumer, they prefer a lower controllable version of the online advertisement. Finally, that people with a higher desire for control are more interested in forwarding the online ad to acquaintances, becoming more easily advocates of the brand.

Acknowledgments

First of all, I would like to thank my parents, for helping me in each step of my education and spiritual growth. To my family in The Netherlands, Kobus and DeVries, people who have given me unconditional affection and care. To my boyfriend Martijn, for being my inspiration and my constant support.

I would also like to thank Joyce Karreman and Peter DeVries, my thesis supervisors, for the advice and support in the development of this research. I extend my gratitude also to each one of the professors of the master New Media Research and Design, who provided me guidance in previous stages of the development of this thesis. Finally, I would like to thank the students who have participated in the experiment, whose help was precious for completing this investigation.

Table of Contents

List of abbreviations.....	5
Introduction.....	6
Research Problem.....	8
Theory.....	10
Marketing.....	10
<i>Formats of Connected Marketing</i>	10
<i>Word-of-mouth marketing</i>	10
<i>Buzz marketing</i>	12
<i>Viral Marketing</i>	14
<i>Characteristics of Viral Marketing</i>	16
<i>Interactivity</i>	16
<i>Controllability</i>	18
Consumers.....	21
<i>Desirability for Control</i>	21
Consumer Behaviour.....	22
<i>Attitude toward the online advertisement</i>	22
<i>Attitude toward the brand</i>	23
<i>Purchase Intention</i>	24
<i>Brand Recommendation</i>	26
Method.....	27
<i>Participants</i>	27
<i>Materials</i>	27
<i>Design</i>	28
<i>Procedure</i>	30
Results.....	31
Conclusion and Discussion.....	35
Future Research.....	38
References.....	39
Appendix.....	45

List of Abbreviations

A_{tb}: Attitude toward the Brand

A_{ta}: Attitude toward the Advertisement

M: Mean

SD: Standard Deviation

Introduction

Nowadays, new ways of marketing are impacting consumers. These new forms are characterized for being interactive, and they have worked successfully in marketing. However, it is not known yet if they work for all types of consumers. Does the degree of Desirability for Control influence the effect of interactive online marketing? There are some suggestions in literature; however, no research has been done until now.

According to Smith (1956), before the creation of e-commerce, one of the primary methods firms used to meet the needs of consumers was to divide the overall heterogeneous market into smaller segments; in this way, individual desires and needs were satisfied through providing the clients with products personalized to their needs. Employing this marketing tactic, there was a vast spectrum of products that fit more precisely consumers' needs, which also led to the creation of large super-stores, which variety of products match more consumers. Years later, this marketing strategy gave birth to what is currently known as E-commerce, which is a clear effort of the companies trying to match consumers' preferences and firms' product offerings without increasing the burden of the consumer (Godek and Yates, 2005). These advances facilitated the interactive nature of the Internet, which makes two-way, real-time communication between firms and consumers economically practical (Hoffman and Novak, 1996).

While several authors argue about the true meaning of *Interactivity*, it is undeniable that *User Control* or *Controllability* is one of the elements that appear frequently in interactivity literature (McMillan and Hwang, 2005). In the field of Marketing, Controllability is changing the way we experience the brand, interacting with online advertisements or with promotional software, or merely playing with a website created by the brand's marketers, in order to learn and

desire a brand through entertainment (Jensen, 1998). In online advertisements and promotional software, diverse levels of controllability could be found, which range from a low controllable video, to a highly customizable website. Moreover, this wide variety is not found only in interactive promotion material, but also in the consumers who will experiment with it. According to Burger (1979), people could be classified with a scale, depending on their desire to control diverse events and circumstances in their lives: *high desire for control* or *low desire for control*. These differences in users' personalities raise controversy over which type of interactivity, high or low controllable, would be the more adequate for the users, depending on their personality traits (Liu and Schrum, 2002). This question, as well as other related problems, will be investigated in the present research.

According to Hwang and McMillan (2005), controllability is one of the elements that define the degree of Interactivity. While interactivity acknowledges the user "participate in modifying the format and content of a mediated environment in real time" (Deighton, 1996), controllability is "characterized by voluntary and instrumental action that directly influences the controller's experience" where "users are able to customize the information flow and jump from one location in the network to another" (Liu & Schrum, 2002). Besides, there is a discussion amongst authors over which level of interactivity and, therefore, controllability suits users in a more optimum way. Liu and Schrum (2002) declare that controllability or "active control" is positively related to user cognitive involvement, to user learning, and to user satisfaction. However, they also corroborate that interactivity may not always be the best marketing solution. Personal factors (e.g. personality traits), and situational factors would define also the involvement of the user with the online advertisement or website, and its consequent effectiveness. Other authors, as Ariely (2000), found that controllability influences positively user learning and memory. On the other hand, Bezjian-Avery, Calder and Iacobucci (1998) obtained that higher interactivity caused the participants to avoid information and interaction with the websites.

The above is summarized below in one phrase, the research problem.

Research problem:

There is insufficient insight over which degree of Controllability in online ads is more effective on users depending on their level of Desirability for Control

The aim of this research is to study the relation between controllability and consumer behaviour, discovering the impact of a certain degree of controllability on the users, depending on their personality traits. Some authors, as explained above, have defended the latter relationship. As personality traits is a wide subject, the personal variable of Desirability for Control has been chosen for this investigation. The research objective is summarised below in one phrase:

Research objective:

This research aims to explain the degree of controllability that would optimise the influence of online advertisement on users, depending on their desire for control.

In order to accomplish the above research objectives, the following main research question is formulated:

Main research question (MRQ):

What is the effect of the degree of Controllability of online ads on users, and to what extent does this effect depend on their level of Desirability for Control?

In order to answer this main research question, the following sub questions are proposed:

RQ1:

In which way does the degree of controllability influence on consumer behaviour in users with high or low desire for control?

RQ2:

In which way does the degree of controllability influence word-of-mouth over the online advertisement and product, considering users' type of desire for control?

There are some compelling reasons that justify the selection of this research topic. First of all, in Psychology and Communication Science several researches are developed every year; however, is also important to produce investigations that relate both sciences, as being both considered Behavioural Sciences. That would allow future researchers to learn about the importance of linking both fields to obtain complementary and valuable information. Another reason is the fact that there was no sufficient data that might indicate vast empirical investigation done by scholars over the relationship between consumer's Desirability for Control (or other relevant psychological trait) and state-of-the-art online marketing. Some empirical investigation was found, as for example Phelps et al. (2004) who examine consumer responses and motivations to pass along viral e-mail. Finally, for Interface designers, as well as for marketers, it would be a helpful tool to have guidelines that describe concrete characteristics of successful interactive marketing and how to produce the desired word-of-mouth. In literature, we could find several guidelines for making accessible and usable interfaces, which might give us an introduction to the production of interactive promotional material. However, there is not yet a deep insight over these topics.

Theory

Marketing

Kirby and Marsden (2006) created the term *Connected Marketing* as an umbrella for three types of state-of-the-art online marketing: Word of mouth marketing, Buzz marketing and Viral marketing. One of the most important characteristics of these three marketing techniques is that they offer to the user diverse levels of controllability, or diverse controllability granularities. These three types of marketing will be explained, in order to understand the difference between them, and the use of one of them in the experiment.

Formats of Connected Marketing

Amongst others, the most used execution types are the following: (a) Images, (b) Jokes, (c) Quiz promotions, (d) *Advergames*, (e) Digital video clips, (f) E-cards, (g) Interactive microsites, (h) Alternate Reality Games (ARGs) and (i) Interactive CD ROMs.

Word-of-mouth marketing

Word of mouth, in marketing and communication literature refers to interpersonal communications about *commercial* entities (Dichter, 1966). A more complete definition of *word of mouth*, and used by several authors that write about this topic, is the one given by Arndt (1967), which was one of the earliest researchers in Word of Mouth influence on consumer behaviour. The author characterized word of mouth as “oral, person-to-person communication between a receiver and a communicator whom the receiver perceives as non-commercial, regarding a brand, product or service” (p. 164) (Arndt, 1967; Nyilasy, 2006, p. 164).

Nyilasy (2006) gives an interesting analysis of this definition, giving a more profound explanation of this concept. The author considers that Arndt’s definition

consists of three essential parts. First, word of mouth is interpersonal communication, differentiating this concept from mass communication, or impersonal channels of communication. To this characteristic, Nyilasy adds that the code of this type of communication is language, a tangible form of communication. Second, the content of word of mouth communication from a marketing perspective is commercial. The message is about commercial entities, products, product categories, brands and marketers, or even their advertising. Third, Nyilasy explains that even though the content of word of mouth communication is commercial, the communicators are not motivated commercially, or at least they are perceived not to be. The author emphasizes that they do not talk about the brands because they are employed by the company, or receive any incentives from it. Moreover, Nyilasy remarks that is enough that the communicator is perceived to be *unbiased*, but not necessarily they have to be so. In this case, perception is reality. This detail is mentioned because, as Nyilasy explains, certain marketers mask their agents as non-commercial sources or information while being financially motivated.

Several authors coincide on the existence of two types of word of mouth: positive word of mouth and negative word of mouth. Blodgett, Grandbois and Walteres (1993) mention that the basic premise of marketing is that marketers should strive to create customer satisfaction. Full implementation of this concept requires that marketers should also strive to solve customer dissatisfaction. Dissatisfaction with products leads to a redress seeking behaviour (e.g. asking for a refund or a change of the product). Complainants that feel that they have received justice, get involved into positive word of mouth. On the other hand, when customers feel that they have not received justice with the dissatisfying experience, they engage in negative word of mouth (Blodgett, Grandbois and Walters, 1993). Moreover, several investigations have been done regarding to the way that word of mouth works and spreads in social relations. Nyilasy (2006) revises several studies and offers a first observation: most studies dealing with word of mouth focus on either the communicator or the receiver side of the interaction. The author affirms that researchers over word of mouth look at two

different facets of word of mouth. One group investigates the acquisition and processing of product-related information (receiver-oriented studies), while the other examines information provision (communicator-oriented studies). Nyilasy affirms that the distinction between input (receiver) and output (communicator) word of mouth lies in the psyche of the communicator and receiver. In other words, while both activities are interrelated and cannot be conceptualized without one another, the mental process of each one of the agents is different.

Buzz marketing

In several online journals, the terms of *word of mouth marketing*, *buzz marketing* and *viral marketing* are considered to have the same meaning. However, each of them carries a different significance. Marsden (2006) describes buzz marketing as “the promotion of a company or its products and services through initiatives conceived and designed to get people and *the media* talking positively about that company, product or service”. Here the author makes an important remark, which differentiates this concept, with the concept given over *word of mouth marketing*. To describe the latter, Marsden employs the same description of buzz marketing, without including “the media”. This is because the intention of marketers when employing buzz marketing, is reaching the actual and future consumers, and the media as well (Kirby, 2006). Rosen (2005) underlines the power of word of mouth, compared to buzz or viral marketing. The author affirms that buzz and viral marketing are designed to create noise in the marketplace on the theory that if enough people hear the noise, they will talk about it. However, what people usually talk about are the methods themselves, rather than the products. Rosen alleges that buzzing and going viral can contribute to the awareness of a product, but generally they do not cause people to share information, opinions, or ideas about the product, the company, or the brand that is supposed to be at the centre of the buzz. The author adds that they both create energy around the event or method of marketing itself, but that they rarely deliver genuine word of mouth. They just cause a commotion (Balter and

Butman, 2005). Thomas (2004) describes buzz marketing as the amplification of initial marketing efforts by third parties through their passive or active influence.

Allard (2006) clarifies the myths and promises of buzz marketing, explaining also which activities are included in buzz marketing. The author affirms that buzz marketing uses a special “hook”, event, or promotion to get consumers and the media talking about a campaign, which makes it different from other types of marketing, as for example, viral marketing, word of mouth marketing or evangelist marketing. These methods are used when applying buzz marketing, because, according to Allard, each type of marketing is modelled for a special need. The author affirms that buzz marketing is utilized when there is a need of driving brand awareness, using a weak endorsement. In other words, is important to relinquish a degree of control of the message so it spreads within consumer networks. Rosen (2005) explains that only so much buzz can be generated in an industry at any particular point in time: “therefore, when left alone, most new products and ideas encounter objection or indifference in their industries; there is no buzz. The industry raises its head, mutter to itself and gets back to its usual business. However, when buzz is employed, it suffers an interesting transformation through the process” (p. 96).

Thomas (2004) explains that innovations should follow an adoption cycle, which is the main frame that authors use in order to explain the spread of this type of marketing. The author alleges that innovators are the first ones in adopting novelties, and in turn, they influence early adopters. Thomas recommends that marketing professionals should, in this first step, contact the innovators, through client databases and recognizing who were the first ones in adopting certain innovations; and then, offer them their product to be the first ones on trying them out. In the case that the brand and product are new, and there is no database to count on, Thomas recommends finding the innovators through a *litmus test* of propensity of innovation. There are other techniques used by marketers to contact the innovators. The author explains that the next step of the spreading of buzz is when the innovators pass information over this new product to their social network; they pass an *uncodified buzz*. Thomas assures

that, with the Internet, the word of mouth continues. With the use of blogs, e-mail, personal websites, list servers, chat groups and consumer rating sites, the ideas are disseminated and the product starts to be known by other consumers.

Rosen (2005) gives another approach of how buzz marketing spreads. The author mentions that researchers who study communication refer to a “two step flow model”. This means that information flows from mass media to network hubs and from the hubs to the rest of the population. In order to understand this theory, is necessary to understand the meaning of *hubs*. Network hubs are individuals who communicate with more people about a certain product than the average person does. Researchers have traditionally referred to them as “opinion leaders”. In industry they are called “influencers”, “lead users”, or sometimes “power users”. Rosen affirms that the nature of network hubs may differ from industry to industry. The author also underlines the importance of reaching not only the *mega hubs* or media, because is already well known how to reach them. What books do not discuss vastly is how to go about reaching the millions of regular hubs who can spread news about a product. A lot of information about products is spread also over the Internet, provoking another type of information flow. The two-step model has been carelessly assumed by countless companies over the years, thinking that the communication process between a company and potential customers as a linear process. But networks are not linear or predictable. People talk to each other unpredictably. People do not rely on any one source of information, whether it be their friends, the media or manufacturers.

Viral Marketing

Kirby (2006) makes a difference between viral marketing and viral advertising. In order to explain viral marketing, Kirby cites Wilson (2000):

“Viral marketing describes any strategy that encourages individuals to pass on a marketing message to others, creating the potential for exponential growth in the message’s exposure and influence. Like viruses,

such strategies take advantage of rapid multiplication to explode the message to thousands, to millions". (p. 88)

Kirby explains that some other definitions of viral marketing affirm that this activity is any marketing action that accelerates and amplifies word of mouth in the digital domain. However, the author argues that this definition is still broad, because it includes several other activities of online marketing. The author explains that viral advertising has another meaning, and includes creating contagious advertising messages or material that get passed from peer to peer in order to increase brand awareness. Kirby adds that viral advertising is often used when the product itself does not have a "wow" factor that can generate buzz. Thus, the message or the creative agent could be made contagious.

Since 2002, viral marketing has developed in various ways. For instance, Kirby (2006) affirms that the development and increasing adoption of digital technologies (as broadband) have enabled people to enjoy richer online content, making the Internet a medium for activities such as entertainment. Another way mentioned is that brands have noticed that in order to reach their objectives they must invest more realistic budgets in the strategic planning and implementation of viral marketing campaigns. The authors adds that marketers have learned that is necessary to be more creative in their use of digital media, in order to stand out from all other advertisers who produce a viral campaign. Finally, Kirby mentions that viral marketing is a technique that also helps generating sales.

There are some characteristics of nowadays' consumers that have made necessary the development of viral marketing techniques. A reason that Kirby explains is that people have learned to avoid a lot of marketing communications. Here the author does not refer only to pop-up blocking technologies, but also to the fact that consumers tend to avoid visual advertising (as billboards or TV advertising), mobile advertising, etc. Secondly, consumers are more involved than ever before in controlling communications and message delivery at a global level, thanks to the rise of digital media. Another characteristic that triggered the use of viral marketing is the realization of brands that "the most powerful selling

of products and ideas takes place not marketer to consumer but consumer to consumer” (Gladwell, 2000).

Kirby states that viral marketing gives power to the consumer, not utilizing a traditional top-down or marketing-to-consumer approach, but giving the consumer a brand personal experience. Moreover, the author alleges that one of the reasons consumers find viral marketing campaigns appealing is because the campaigns tend to be non-interruptive, so they enable consumers to choose to interact proactively with a communication. Non-intrusiveness has demonstrated to be an appreciated quality of online resources, which produces consumer *empowerment* (Gauzente, 2001). Kirby also points that viral marketing can be tracked, which could also supply with accountability data over the ROI (Return on Investment). Moreover, viral campaigns have no fixed cut-off point (the point where awareness has been reached), so they can provide an ever-increasing ROI. Furthermore, the author assures that viral marketing could be used if the brand, product or service has no compelling “wow” factor. Then this factor is created around the viral campaign agent.

Characteristics of Viral Marketing

Interactivity

Stone et al. (2005) explain that *Human-computer Interaction (HCI)* is the study of how humans interact with computers systems. They sustain that HCI is a broad term that “covers all aspects of the way in which people interact with computers”. They add that people come in contact with an increasing number of computer-based technologies; some of these technologies are used directly (as for example a laptop) and some other systems less directly, as for example, in a *kiosk* or a supermarket cashier. The authors explain that, when users *interact* with a computer system, they do so via a *user interface (UI)*. These two concepts are directly related, as they together vary depending on the technology used (e.g. the interface in a digital watch is with buttons, and the microwaves have dials or *touchpad* of buttons). As the *user interface* differs, the *interaction* differs too.

Interactivity is a concept that has been defined in books for some decades, and, as McMillan and Hwang (2002) affirm, it has been used mainly as a synonym for *new media* such as the World Wide Web. They insist in the importance of this term adding that advertising practitioners and researchers use the phrase “*interactive advertising*” in order to describe Internet or Web-based advertising. Teo et al. (2003) developed a compilation of the most relevant functions that interactivity has received in literature, while analysing their importance in diverse science fields; Ghose and Dou (1998) mention that interactivity has an important role in maintaining a good relationship with customers in online firms; Newhagen and Rafaeli (1996) opine that interactivity when implemented appropriately is instrumental in differentiating successful from failing websites; interactivity is a key technological capability for anyone trying to make sense of vast amounts of online data (Jakobovits, 1997). As it is observable, there are several functions that authors give to interactivity.

The definition of Interactivity used in this research is the one by Liu and Schrum (2002): “The degree to which two or more communication parties can act on each other, on the communication medium, and on the messages and the degree to which such influences are synchronized” (p. 54). This definition has been chosen because it covers three main elements observed in literature: Two-way communication, Active Control and Synchronicity. However, there is not yet a consensus over the definition of this concept. McMillan and Hwang (2002) compiled several definitions given to interactivity in literature, in order to develop a scale for perceived interactivity. One of their most relevant conclusions was that, even though interactivity has been defined using multiple processes, function and perceptions, three elements appear frequently in the interactivity literature: *direction of communication*, *user control*, and *time*. These elements are similar to the elements found by Liu and Schrum mentioned previously. McMillan and Hwang state “these elements hold promise for the exploration of perceived interactivity on the web because they serve as umbrella for many other elements considered important in interactivity by their experiment participants, diverse authors and interviewees” (p. 126). Amongst these three elements, *User*

Control or *Controllability* is the one that will take place in the investigation, as a key element for Interactivity, and for influencing brand image and purchase intention in consumers that experience the brand online.

Controllability

Liu and Schrum (2002) have a complete definition of controllability:

“(Controllability is) the voluntary and instrumental action that directly influences the controller’s (user) experience. The Internet features a network of linked contents (Hoffman and Novak, 1996), which is a parallel, non-linear structure. In controlling such a non-linear structure, users are able to customize the information flow and jump from one location in the network to another. In contrast, the linearity of a medium such as television makes it possible for a person to watch television without taking any action except to switch channels once in a while. Although he/she has some control, the control is not absolutely necessary and does not effectively change his/her viewing experience”. (p. 54, 55)

Controllability has been chosen as a main research area because, from the three elements that compose Interactivity, only Controllability and Two-way Communication are present. And from these two concepts, Controllability is the most mentioned characteristic by authors who studied and defined interactivity (McMilan and Hwang, 2002). Furthermore, Liu and Schrum analysed diverse online marketing tools, in order to classify them according to their degree of controllability. The following is their classification:

Higher level of control: Websites, including Internet Presence Sites (ISP’s), online stores and web communities, banner advertising.

Lower level of control: E-mail newsletters, pop-up advertising, and unsolicited e-mail. Videos are added here, due to the limited controls that they offer (e.g. play and stop).

Some authors have investigated over the beneficial effects of high controllability in online advertising. Ariely (2000) developed an experiment where conditions were manipulated, offering the participants a high controllable version of a shopping website and a low controllable one. The result was that “greater control of information was generally associated with better memory and learning” (p. 12). Ariely (2000) makes an analysis of the advantages of a high degree of controllability in psychology. The author quotes Kleinmuntz and Schkade (1993,1994) stating, “information control allows consumers to deal with information systems that better fit their individual informational needs and are more flexible”. The author also cites Klayman (1988) who examined how control over the learning environment influences subjects’ ability to learn probabilistic relationship among attributes, finding that participants who designed their own learning environments were better learners and had a better command of the environment’s underlying structure than people with a fixed learning environment. Ariely cites also Kuhn and Ho (1980), whose research found that children who were given the possibility of choosing the games they wanted to engage (high controllability) had a better ability of creating new reasoning strategies compared with the fixed option (low level of control) and control subjects.

Considering the latter findings in psychology, Ariely suggests that information control is beneficial because it provokes heterogeneity between consumers and heterogeneity within consumers over time. Heterogeneity between consumers means that each consumer could pick the information that best suits their needs. Heterogeneity within consumers means that when a user is offered with diverse type of controls and information, he could constantly change his information needs through information search. In other words, while controlling their information intake and manipulating controls, the personal needs of information keeps continuously changing.

Liu and Schrum developed a framework of controllability effects, from theory and research in cognitive, social and personality psychology. They indicate, “active control is positively related to user cognitive involvement” (p. 18). In other words, that active control requires that the users are cognitively active

and making decisions. They add that “by engaging users in an active dialog, higher interactivity should lead users to higher user involvement” (p. 18) and that “active control is positively related to user learning” (p. 19). With the last proposition, the authors arrive to the conclusion that a high cognitive involvement could produce a better learning. They also affirm that user learning could be enhanced by high controllability through self-efficacy: “the active control dimension of interactivity enables users to control their own communication experiences, which potentially leads to higher self-efficacy beliefs” (Gist and Mitchell 1992; Tafarodi, Milne, and Smith 1999). Liu and Schrum also propose “active control is positively related to user satisfaction” (p. 20). With this last statement, they explain that controllability could increase user satisfaction. They quote: “The feeling of being in control has been found to lead to increased self-efficacy beliefs (Gist and Mitchell 1992; Tafarodi, Milne, and Smith 1999), less stress (Amirkhan 1998) and higher satisfaction (Judge, Bono, and Locke 2000). Lack of control, however, produces stress and lower perceived competency (Amirkhan 1998; Judge, Bono, and Locke 2000). By giving users the power to control their online experiences actively, interactivity can enhance users' self-efficacy beliefs and lead to higher satisfaction” (p. 19,20). Some previous research has been made regarding to the relationship between characteristics of user's personality and how much controllability or which type of controllability a user interface should have. Norman (1994) declares that an important psychological aspect of people's comfort with their activities comfort with their activities—all of their activities, from social relations, to jobs, to their interaction with technology—is the feeling of control they have over these activities and their personal lives.

Finally, as it was before mentioned, Liu and Schrum (2002) have written over Controllability and Desirability for Control. Desirability for Control (Burger, 1979) is explained as a motivational factor that might circumscribe the effect of high controllability as an advantage in online advertising. Users' desire for control might vary, as it is a personality trait, which might provoke that users not always prefer a high or low controllable interface.

Consumers

Desirability for Control

Burger and Cooper (1979) studied the psychological construct of Desirability for Control and elaborated a popular scale, which is still used nowadays. In their research paper *The Desirability of Control*, Burger and Cooper state that Desirability for Control is the desire of control the event's in one's life (p. 382). Besides, they affirm that not all subjects react identically to issues of personal control, adding, "if a desire for control over events is an important psychological dimension, then individual differences in the motivation for control should help account for variation in human behaviour" (p. 382). The authors also make a description of subjects with high desire for control and low desire for control:

"Persons high in the desire for control can be described as assertive, decisive, and active. They generally seek to influence others when such influence is advantageous. They prefer to avoid unpleasant situations or failures by manipulating events to ensure desired outcomes. These persons usually seek leadership roles in group situations. A person low in the desire for control is generally non-assertive, passive, and indecisive. These persons are less likely to attempt to influence others and may prefer that many of their daily" decisions be made by others" (p. 283).

Liu and Schrum (2002) claim that desire for control might circumscribe the effectiveness of the use of high controllable interfaces in online advertising, because users differ in this personality trait, and therefore, is possible that individuals with *high desire for control* might feel more comfortable experimenting with *high controllable advertisements*. This hypothesis is stated by the authors, but not proved through an experiment. Other factors are also mentioned as possible drawbacks for the success of the use of high controllability in advertising. Based on past work over this topic, and literature, Burger and Cooper developed a twenty-item questionnaire. After an analysis, it proved to

have maximum internal consistency and reliability. These items propose several daily situations (e.g. I try to avoid situations where someone else tells me what to do) , where the respondent should answer in a 7-point Likert scale with their personal preference. The scale range from “the statement does not apply to me at all” to “the statement always apply to me”. This scale is further used in this research. (see Appendix).

Consumer Behaviour

Kotler (1999) explains that through doing and learning, people acquire beliefs and attitudes. These will influence their buying behaviour. People, as the authors state, have diverse attitudes towards diverse aspects of life, as for example, religion and music. Kotler affirms, “Attitude describes a person’s relatively consistent evaluations, feelings, and tendencies toward and object or idea. Attitudes put people into a frame of mind of liking or disliking things, of moving towards or away from them” (p. 150). The author adds that attitudes are difficult to change, “a person’s attitudes fit into a pattern, and to change one attitude may require difficult adjustments in many others. Thus, a company should usually try to fit its products into existing attitudes rather than attempt to change attitudes” (p. 150).

Attitude toward the online advertisement

In this research, the focus is on online advertisements, which could be classified as *connected marketing*. The advertisements utilized are characterized for being online, in the shape of microsites and videos, whose degrees of controllability vary. Therefore, it is important to understand the meaning of *attitude toward the website*, which is one of the variables of this empirical investigation. Mackenzie, Lutz and Belch (1986) define attitude toward the website as a “predisposition to respond in a favourable or unfavourable manner to a particular advertisement stimulus during a particular exposure situation”, and also, it has been demonstrated to be an indicator of advertising effectiveness. Haley and Baldinger (1991) found that how viewers liked an ad was the best

single predictor of sales effects (Chen and Wells, 1999). The semantic scale used in this research is based on the one created by Bezjian-Avery, Calder & Iacobucci (1998) in order to test the likeability of online advertisements. The survey created asked the participants to rate the ad in a 7-point Likert Scale, (e.g. rate the advertisement in these dimensions: not persuasive-persuasive) (see Appendix). Viral marketing admits the creation of highly-interactive online ads, that allow the user experiment with the brand and the product. It also admits lowly-interactive ads, that give the user only a few selection of commands. Both types aim influencing the consumer's attitude toward the ad, trying to turn the user into a potential consumer, through offering modern online interfaces. Also, offers entertainment and information, trying to seduce the consumer through the online commercial. If the user has a positive attitude towards the viral ad, is possible that will forward it to acquaintances, and start a recommendation network.

Attitude toward the brand

Attitude toward the brand is the opinion of consumers toward a product determined through market research. The *brand attitude* will tell what people think about a product or service, whether the product answers a consumer need, and just how much the consumer wants the product. Knowledge of brand attitude is very helpful in planning an advertising campaign (*answers.com*, accessed on 4/7/07). Mittal (1990) cite Mitchell and Olson (1981), who proposed that *attitude toward the advertisement* is a significant predictor for *attitude toward the brand*. They defended their conclusion giving the following statements stating: "a straightforward classical conditioning effect, that is, likeability of the ad is transferred automatically (without conscious processing) to the brand". They also affirm that "the consumer deems the ad itself to be an attribute of the brand, so that a belief about the brand being likeable contributes to the attitude toward the brand just as others brands beliefs do". Finally, they mention that "the attitude towards the advertisement measure acts as a substitute for relevant but unmeasured brand beliefs". (p. 209)

Mittal (1990) quotes also Fishbein (1963), affirming that his framework of attitude requires that all of the consequences of an act be measured to predict attitude toward the act: “paraphrased, it requires that, to predict brand attitudes, one must assess all benefits sought from a brand—whether they be utilitarian or image-related” (p. 210). They explain that the utilitarian motive relates to a consumer's need to manage his or her physical environment, including body functions. The image motive relates to the need of a person to manage positively one's social and psychological environment. This aim encompasses things that will help one to live out one's self-concept, as well as express it to others. In other words, in order to define if the consumer would have a positive or negative attitude towards the brand is necessary to know his/her needs regarding the product, both utilitarian and image needs.

Viral online ads, as any other online ad strategy, looks for persuading the potential consumer. When the perception of a user toward a brand changes positively, or when a positive attitude appears from the beginning in the case of new products, there is a great possibility that that user will become a consumer. Bezjian-Avery, Calder & Iacobucci (1998) created a scale to measure the attitude toward a product, after exposing their participants to online advertisements and applying them a survey to measure their attitude toward the online ad. Based on their survey to test the attitude toward the product, a scale was created for this research, in order to measure the attitude toward the brand. A 7-point Likert scale was employed, asking the participants about their opinion over the brand presented in the online ad (e.g. What is your opinion about the brand K-Swiss? Boring—Interesting).

Purchase Intention

The Marketing Association of Australia and New Zealand (accessed on 4/7/07) describes Purchase Intention Measurement, in order to understand Purchase Intention:

“A form attitude measurement designed to improve the prediction of behaviour from knowledge of attitudes when the aim is to predict a specific

behaviour, such as whether a consumer will purchase a given product. In this case consumer attitude to the (object) product is less appropriate than consumer attitude to the act of purchase of the given product, that is, the consumer's attitude towards performing a particular act in a given situation with respect to a given product”

Santesmases (1991) adds that marketing research is one of the approaches used to explain and predict the demand. What it tries to find is primary information, through a survey, to a sample of potential consumers. The purchase intention is asked, over a product or concrete brand. However, is possible to ask questions over the characteristics and attributes of the product that are more valued and the factors that affect in the buying decision. This information is later utilized to explain and predict the demand. The author clarifies that this method could provide with correct estimates of the future demand, but it has as a main drawback that is based on intentions and they do not always coincide with the real behaviour. LaRoche, Kim and Zhou (1996) affirm over the relation between Purchase Intention and confidence in a product that “A consumer's knowledge confidence about a specific brand will increase as his/her familiarity with the brand increases”. They add that “A consumer's knowledge confidence about a specific brand will positively influence his/her intention to buy the brand”. Finally, they mention that “intention to buy a specific brand will be positively affected by a consumer's attitude toward the same brand and negatively affected by his/her attitudes toward other competing brands in the choice set” (pp. 116,117).

Online viral marketing campaigns are created, as any other marketing strategy, to persuade the user into buying the product, and keep his/her loyalty. In marketing research, purchase intention is investigated in order to understand the success of the advertisements, and to have a preliminary estimate of potential consumers. Generally, this intention is discovered by asking directly to the viewer if he/she would consider buying the product.

Brand Recommendation

Rusticus (2006) affirm that brand advocacy is the one thing that drives business growth. The author quotes the Harvard Business Review, which found that the likelihood that clients, customers or consumers will advocate a brand to their friends and acquaintances will be directly correlated to business growth. In their research amongst a dozen companies, they found that companies with high word of mouth advocacy rate grow fast, while other that do not have high word of mouth advocacy rate would become smaller. Moreover, the author points that brand advocacy was found to be more important than brand image or brand satisfaction, in order to predict growth. Viral online marketing, as explained previously, has as a main intention creating a recommendation network. Therefore, the consumer not only interact with the advertisement, but also pass it along to friends, creating commentaries, empathy, that provoke a desire of purchase. In this research it was important to find out if the participants forwarded the advertising, giving a stronger evidence of enjoying the ad, and in order to discover which degree of controllability would be more persuasive for the user. In this experiment, to find this variable, participants were asked if they would recommend the brand to friends in the future.

After analyzing the presented theoretical framework, the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 1:

High controllable advertisements have more positive effects in consumer attitude compared to Low controllable advertisements.

Hypothesis 2:

Consumers with higher Desirability for Control are more positively affected by highly controllable advertisements, while consumers with lower Desirability for control are more positively affected by lowly controllable advertisements.

Method

Participants

Eighty students enrolled in the Faculty of Communication and Behavioral Sciences, in Twente University, The Netherlands, participated in the experiment for one course credit. Their ages had a Mean of 22,06, while the Standard Deviation was 3,30. The products selected for the experiment, are promoted through marketing campaigns, whose main target are consumers of age group mentioned. Their nationalities were: Dutch (45.0%), German (26,3%) and Other (28,8%). They were asked to choose a language for their experiment, between Dutch and English, where 28.8% of the participants did the experiment in English while 71.2% of the participants did the experiment in Dutch. Dutch and German participants are fluent in Dutch and English language, while the rest of participants were mainly native English speakers.

Materials

The materials utilized for the experiment where the following:

1. Questionnaires developed in *Authorware* software: Surveys were developed using the software Authorware. With this software, the surveys are completed through a computer, while it recollects the results in a Text document. The psychological test “Desirability for Control” consisted of 20 questions, which used a 7-point Likert Scale. The surveys for Attitude toward the Brand and Attitude toward the Ad were made modifying surveys previously used by Bezjian-Avery, Calder and Iacobucci (1998) to measure Attitude toward the website and Attitude toward the brand. They were both a seven-subject affective and cognitive semantical differential scales. The last three

questions, Purchase Intention, Future recommendation of the product and Forwarding of the Advertisement during the experiment, were obtained asking the common one-item question asked in other marketing researches.

2. A Viral Marketing webpage: Two Viral Marketing web pages were selected for the experiment. These web pages were created by the brands' marketing department, in order to promote their products. Both web pages are highly controllable, giving the user many options to select in order to enjoy the music, video or animations presented. The option of forwarding the advertising was included in the survey programme, in order to recreate the way in which these web pages were received in the original marketing campaign: as a forwarded e-mail.
3. A Viral Video: Two videos were selected, which represent the low controllable component of the experiment. They only give the user the basic options of interaction, as playing or stopping the video. These videos were also created by the brands' marketing department. The option of forwarding the video was included in the survey programme, in order to recreate the way in which these videos were received in the original marketing campaign: as a forwarded e-mail.

Design

The experiment had a 2 (Controllability: high vs. low) x 2 (Desirability for Control: high vs. low) between participants design. In order to test the hypothesis, two versions of the experiment were produced. One version had a high controllable Viral Advertisement of Absolut Vodka, and a low controllable Viral Advertisement of K-Swiss Shoes. The second version had a low controllable Viral Advertisement of Absolut Vodka and a high controllable Viral Advertisement of K-Swiss. Half the sample, 40 students, interacted with the first version of the experiment. The other half of the sample interacted with the

second version. Students were assigned randomly to each version of the experiment, assuring that 40 students were assigned into each version.

The order of the products was always maintained for every participant, in both versions of the experiment. The main reason was that shoes are a product consumed by all the participants, because they represent a basic need. On the other hand, vodka is a product that more than does not represent a fundamental need, and therefore, its consumption proportion could not be generalized. The type of manipulation done in this experiment has been based on past work about Desire for Control and Marketing, which contemplated a similar manipulation (Liu and Schrum, 2002). However, the authors explain two types of manipulated done by other researchers: one type is by giving extra control to the user and the other option is by resting control. However, in this experiment, participant have to interact with both types of manipulation, in order to give them both types of control degree, and consequently, discovering significant impressions over them. In both versions, the advertisements of Absolut Vodka and the advertisements of K-Swiss shoes were similar, only the degree of control was manipulated, through offering in the high controllable version a website, and in the low controllable version a video.

The variables managed in this research are the following:

Independent variables

- Controllability of the Advertisement (“High controllable shoes ad/Low controllable vodka ad” and “Low controllable shoes ad/High controllable vodka ad”)
- Desirability for Control (Above the Average/Below the Average).

Dependent variables

- Attitude toward the Advertisement
- Attitude toward the Brand
- Purchase Intention
- Future brand recommendation

- Forwarding of Advertisement

Procedure

The experiment was held in a computer laboratory, where three computers were designated. Participants signed up online for the experiment through a webpage designed by Twente University. They could enter the laboratory in a maximum of three students per turn. The experiment had duration of 30 minutes. Participants began the experiment when the other participants of the same period would appear. They were given a few preliminary indications: using their headphones during the experiment, the approximate duration of the experiment and to navigate within the webpages as they were in their houses or in other comfortable environment.

First, they received more instructions on their computer screen, which explained that the survey would be completed through their laboratory computers, giving them the approximate duration of the experiment and thanking them for their participation. They began with answering a brief demographic test, and the psychological test of Desirability for Control (Burger and Cooper, 1979). Then, they interacted with the first product (K-Swiss shoes) and, when the visualization or interaction was finished, they were offered the possibility of forwarding the ad. After that, they completed a survey over four main topics:

- Attitude toward the advertisement
- Attitude toward the brand
- Purchase Intention
- Future brand recommendation

The next step was to interact or visualize the second product (Absolut Vodka). They were, as well, offered with the opportunity of forwarding the advertisement or going on with the experiment. Afterwards, they answered a survey with the same topics above mentioned. Finally, participants asked three

questions to discover their Purchase Intention, Future recommendation of the product, and Forwarding of the advertisement during the experiment.

Results

Psychological test "Desirability for Control"

In the Desirability for control test participants could score a minimum of 20 points and a maximum of 140 points. There is no further mention in texts over which score is considered to be an indication of "low desire for control" or "high desire for control". Therefore, it has been considered that below 80 points means low desire for control, while above 80 points is interpreted as high desire for control. Participants had a Mean score of 99.98, from which 4 participants scored under or equal to 80 points, while the rest scored above 80 points. In order to avoid unequal samples, the mean score obtained in the test was used as a reference to classify participants into low desire and high desire for control. In other words, 42 participants who scored above than 100 points were considered to have "above average desire for control", while 38 participants who scored less than 100 points were considered to have "below the average desire for control".

First advertisement: K-Swiss Shoes

Analyses of Variance were executed to test whether "Desirability for Control" and "Controllability of the Advertisement" had significant effects on consumer attitude. Tests were executed for main effects of the two variables and for interaction effects. Only the significant effects are mentioned.

For the dependent variable "Attitude toward brand" (A_{tb}) there is a significant effect of the independent variable "Desirability for Control", $F(1,76)=6.46$; $p<0.05$; $\eta^2 = 0.08$. Those with low Desirability for Control scored lower in A_{tb} ($M= 4.97$; $SD=0.93$) than those with high Desirability ($M= 5.54$; $SD=0.85$). Therefore, people with a high desire for control had a more positive

attitude towards the brand. Furthermore, for the dependent variable “Attitude toward advertisement” (A_{ta}) there is an almost significant effect of the independent variable “Desirability for Control”, $F(1,76)=3.22$; $p=0,08$; $\eta^2 = 0.04$. Participants with a lower Desire for scored lower ($M=4.85$; $SD=1.00$), than participants with a higher Desire for Control ($M=5.19$, $SD=0.79$). So, participants with a higher desire for control had a more positive attitude toward the advertisement. No other significant main or interaction effects were found.

Table 1 Means and Standard Deviation for Attitude Toward Brand, Attitude Toward Advertisement, Buying Intention and Recommendation of product in the future. Seven-point Likert scale.

	High Controllable Advertisement		Low Controllable Advertisement	
	High Desire for Control	Low Desire for Control	High Desire for Control	Low Desire for Control
Attitude toward the Brand	5.40 (1.01)	4.83 (0.86)	5.55 (0.52)	5.05 (0.99)
Attitude toward the Advertisement	5.16 (0.90)	4.71 (1.19)	5.24 (0.62)	4.93 (0.89)
Buying Intention	3.73 (2.15)	2.64 (1.45)	3.44 (1.97)	3.33 (1.71)
Future brand recommendation	4.04 (2.07)	3.50 (1.51)	3.63 (1.75)	3.50 (1.62)

Twelve participants forwarded the K-Swiss shoes viral advertisement they were presented with, while 68 did not forward it. From these participants, 4 had a “High Controllable shoes ad/Low Controllable vodka ad” version and 8 had the version of “Low Controllable shoes ad/High Controllable vodka ad”. From the 4 participants who had the first version mentioned, they also have a score above the average in the Desirability for Control test. From the 8 participants who had the second version mentioned, 4 have an above the average score in the Desirability for Control test and 4 have a score below the average in the same test. However, a Mann-Whitney U test showed that the independent variable “Desirability for Control” does not have an effect on “Forwarding the Advertisement”, $U=730.000$; $p>0.05$. Furthermore, the independent variable

“Controllability of the ad” does not have an effect on “Forwarding the Advertisement”, $U=720.000$; $p>0.05$

Second advertisement: Absolut Vodka

Analyses of Variance were executed to test for main and interaction effects. The Independent variable “Controllability of the ad” had a almost significant effect on the dependent variable “Attb”, $F(1,76)=3.20$; $p=0.08$; $\eta^2=0.04$. Participants who had the experiment of low Controllability scored higher ($M=5.20$; $SD=0.99$) and ($M=5.57$; $SD=1.33$) than those who had the experiment of high controllability ($M=4.70$; $SD=1.26$) and ($M=4.94$; $SD=1.75$). Therefore, participants who had a low controllable version of the advertisement, had a more positive attitude towards the brand. No other significant effects were found.

Table 2 Means and Standard Deviation for Attitude Toward Brand, Attitude Toward Advertisement, Buying Intention and Recommendation of product in the future

	High Controllable Advertisement		Low Controllable Advertisement	
	High Desire for Control	Low Desire for Control	High Desire for Control	Low Desire for Control
Attitude toward the Brand	4.94 (1.75)	4.70 (1.26)	5.57 (1.33)	5.20 (.99)
Attitude toward the Advertisement	4.47 (1.78)	4.36 (1.37)	4.69 (1.42)	4.88 (1.04)
Buying Intention	4.00 (2.42)	3.92 (2.17)	4.27 (2.27)	3.79 (1.72)
Future brand recommendation	3.81 (2.23)	3.75 (1.82)	4.46 (2.37)	3.79 (1.63)

Twelve participants forwarded the Absolut Vodka viral advertisement they were presented with, while 68 did not forward it. From these participants, four had a “High Controllable shoes ad/Low Controllable vodka ad” and 8 had the version of “Low Controllable shoes ad/High Controllable vodka ad”. From the 4

participants who had the first version mentioned, they also have a score above the average in the Desirability for Control test. From the 8 participants who had the second version mentioned, 4 have an above the average score in the Desirability for Control test and 4 have a score below the average in the same test. The independent variable "Desirability for Control" has an almost significant effect on the dependent variable "Forwarding the advertisement", $U=690.000$; $p=0.09$. However, the independent variable "Controllability of the ad" does not have an effect on the dependent variable "Forwarding the advertisement", $U=690,000$; $p>0.05$.

Conclusion and Discussion

In general terms, the hypotheses proposed could not be verified in this research. High controllable advertisements have not demonstrated to have more positive effects in consumer attitude. Therefore, it is not possible to prove totally the veracity of this hypothesis, due to lack of strong evidences. Moreover, it has been found that high controllable online ads do not necessarily influence more positively people with a higher desire of control, and also that low controllable online ads do not influence more positively people with a lower desire for control. No significant relation between “desirability for control” and “degree of controllability in online ads” has been found in this research.

Even though the hypotheses proposed could not be completely confirmed, some findings could represent a matter of future discussion and research, as well as revision of past concepts in online marketing strategies. First of all, with the K-Swiss shoes ad, the degree of controllability of the advertisement given to the participant did not have a significant effect on the dependent variables. In other words, their personal attitudes towards brand, ad, purchase intention and recommendation of brand in the future were not affected by the degree of controllability encountered.

However, participants responded differently according to their degree of Desirability for Control. People with a desire for control above the average, tended to have a better attitude toward the advertisement (A_{ta}) shown, and attitude toward the brand (A_{tb}). There is, therefore, a possibility that the brand promoted and the appeal of the advertisement are the main causes of the preferences of the respondents. K-Swiss is a brand whose campaigns tend to be directed to a young/young-adult target, and consequently, its ads are filled with colour, action (sports and urban action), and music. Their online commercials tend to present a common image: a difficult situation, several obstacles, where at the end, the consumer of K-Swiss ends up victorious. As well, the brand itself is edgy, uses a modern logo, and has a meaning of youth and action. Burger and

Cooper (1979), as explained previously, describe the personality of a person with high desire for control as “assertive, decisive, and active. They generally seek to influence others when such influence is advantageous. They prefer to avoid unpleasant situations or failures by manipulating events to ensure desired outcomes”. Thus, is possible that users with a high desire for control in the event of their lives, tend to like this type of advertising, and feel more familiarized and involved with it, produced a positive A_{ta} and A_{tb} .

As well, another interesting detail is found. Both A_{ta} and A_{tb} means are very similar within each group of participants with high or low desire for control. In their A_{tb} , participants above the average in Desirability for Control, had an mean of 5.40 and 5.55, while those below the average had a mean of 4.83 and 5.05. In their A_{ta} , participants above the average in Desirability for Control, had a mean of 5.16 and 5.24, while those below the average had a mean of 4.71 and 4.93 . In other words, people who had a positive A_{ta} , had consequently a positive A_{tb} . This leads to cite again Mitchell and Olson (1981) who proposed that *attitude toward the advertisement* is a significant predictor for *attitude toward the brand*.

Regarding the forwarding of the ad, there was no significance related to their degree of controllability, or the level of desire for control. However, twelve participants did forward the commercial, which in 8 cases, are the same that forwarded the Absolut Vodka ads. Is possible that the participants forwarded it because they found it attractive or entertaining. Nevertheless, is obvious that the vast majority did not feel interest in forwarding the online commercial. An explanation for this could be that the experiment was held in a non-familiar environment, a laboratory at university. This location does not give as much as freedom as, e.g. inside their houses or dorms.

In the case of the Absolut Vodka viral ad, the degree of controllability of the ad had a significant effect, and not the score above or below average in the Desirability for Control test. Participants had a more positive A_{tb} while interacting with the low controllable version of the ad. A reason to explain this could be that participants were not familiarized with a product as Absolut vodka, whose consumption is not for the masses and does not represent a vital need.

Therefore, it is likely that they did not have the desire of interacting with the ad of a product not familiar to them, and instead, preferred a version of the ad that does not make them select choices. Possibly, consumers do not like to feel intimidated by a brand that offers a long, full-of-choices interactive advertisement the first time they hear over it. They could feel more persuaded if they are offered possibility of discovering the brand, making them feel more familiarized, consumers trusting it and finally provoking a intention of purchase. As LaRoche, Kim and Zhou (1996) mention, “a consumer's knowledge confidence about a specific brand will increase as his/her familiarity with the brand increases” and “a consumer's knowledge confidence about a specific brand will positively influence his/her intention to buy the brand”.

Finally, 8 participants who forwarded the advertisement had a desire for control above the average. According to the statistical test, in the variable “forwarding the advertisement”, the score of the desire for control test had a nearly significant effect. Therefore, is likely that these participants forwarded the ad because they wanted to impact acquaintances, recommend them a product, being the first into letting other possible consumers know. According to the description of Burger and Cooper about the personality of people with high desire for control, is feasible that people with high desire for control feel a larger necessity of being the first ones in passing along a cool website, or recommending a product through a viral video, having thus influence in friends or family.

Future Research

After analyzing the results obtained, it is clear that certain topics could be further investigated. In the experiment, people with a higher desire for control were in general more interested in the brand and advertisement, no matter the degree of controllability. This leads to a question, are people with a higher desire for control more open to discover new brands, as well as watching or interacting with new advertisements?

The second topic is more related to high or low controllability of advertisements. When a product is not massively consumed by the desired target, is necessary a low controllable version of the online ad at first, in order to let the consumer explore the brand and what it offers? This could lead to discovering the needs of knowledge of the desired market about the product and brand that will be sold, and how consumers get familiarized with products through online advertising.

The third and last topic recommended for future investigation is about the personality of the consumer. Are the people with higher desire for control more likely to pass along online advertisements, and in consequence, provoke a viral recommendation network? Through this research, it would be possible to find in which degree this trait of the personality of consumers could be beneficial for an online marketing campaign, and the possibility of turning the consumers into advocates of the brand. A recommendation comes along this last future research topic. The environment where the students were asked to forward the online advertisement was apparently not the most comfortable. A laboratory does not give the privacy to pick contacts and forward them the ads they were exposed to. Therefore, it is recommendable that in a deeper study where viral online ads and its passing along are involved, the participants could complete the experiment in a more private atmosphere. In this way, they could take their time to choose contacts, write a personal message and let them be the ones advocating the brand without pressure.

References

- Allard, S. Myths and promises of buzz marketing. (2006). In J. Kirby, P. Marsden. Connected Marketing. Elsevier.
- Ariely, D. (2000). Controlling the Information Flow: Effects on Consumers' Decision-Making and Preferences. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27, 233-248.
- Arndt, J. (1967). Word of Mouth Advertising. Advertising Research Foundation, 3.
- Balter, D., & Butman, J. (2005). Grapevine: The New Art of Word of Mouth Marketing. Portfolio Hardcover.
- Bezjian-Avery, A., Calder, B., & Iacobucci, D. (1998). New Media Interactive Advertising vs. Traditional Advertising. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 38, 23-32.
- Blodgett, J. G., Granbois, D. H., & Walters, R.G. (1993). The effects of perceived justice on complainants' negative word of mouth behaviour and repatronage intentions. *Journal of Retailing*, 69, 399-428
- Burger, J. M. (1984). Desire for Control, Locus of Control, and Proneness to Depression. *Journal of Personality*, 52, 71-89.

- Burger, J. M., & Cooper, H. M. (1979). The Desirability of Control. *Motivation and Emotion*, 3, 381-393.
- Chen, Q., & Wells, W. (1999). Attitude toward the Site. *Journal of Advertising Research*. 27-37
- Dichter, E. How word of mouth advertising works. (1966). *Harvard Business Review*, 44, 147-166.
- Fishbein, M. (1963). An Investigation of the Relationship Between Beliefs About an Object and the Attitude Toward That Object. *Human Relations*, 16, 233-40.
- Gauzente, C., & Ranchhod, A. (2001). Ethical marketing for competitive advantage on the Internet. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 10.
- Ghose, S., & Dou, W.Y. (1998). Interactive functions and their impacts on the appeal of internet presences sites. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 38, 29-43.
- Gist, M. E., & Mitchell, T. R. (1992). Self-Efficacy: A Theoretical Analysis of Its Determinants and Malleability. *Academy of Management Review*, 17, 183-211.
- Gladwell, M. (2000). *The Tipping Point: How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference*. Little, Brown and Co.
- Godek J. & Yates J. (2005) Marketing to individual consumers online: the influence of perceived control. In P. Haugtvedt, K. Machleit, R. Yalch. *Online*

consumer psychology. (p. 225). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Haley, R., & Baldinger, A. (1991) The ARF Copy Research Validity Project. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 31,11-32.

Haugtvedt, P., Machleit, K., Yalch, R. (2005). *Online consumer psychology: understanding and influencing consumer behavior in the virtual world*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hoffman, D. L., & Novak, T.P. (1996) Marketing in hypermedia computer-mediated environments: Conceptual foundations. In P. Haugtvedt, K. Machleit, R. Yalch, *Online consumer psychology*. (p. 225). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Jakobovits, E.B. (1997). New web sites provide tools for wading through the electronic information deluge. *Scientist* 11, 12.

Jameson, A., & Schwarzkopf, E. (2002). Pros and Cons of Controllability: An Empirical Study. *Adaptive Hypermedia and Adaptive Web-Based Systems: Second International Conference, Spain*, 193-202.

Jensen, Jens F. (1998). Interactivity: Tracing a New Concept in Media and Communication Studies. *Nordicom Review*, 19, 185-204

Kay, J. (2001). Learner Control. *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction*,11, 111–127.

Klayman, J. (1988). Cue Discovery in Probabilistic Environments: Uncertainty and Experimentation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology Learning, Memory, and Cognition*. 14 (2), 317–330.

- Kleinmuntz, D. N., & Schkade, D.A. (1993). Information Displays and Decision Processes. *Psychological Science*, 4 (4), 221–227.
- Kuhn, D., & Ho, V. (1980). Self-Directed Activity and Cognitive Development. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 1 (2), 119–133.
- LaRoche, M., Kim, C., & Zhou, L. Brand. (1996). Familiarity and Confidence as Determinants of Purchase Intention: An Empirical Test in a Multiple Brand Context. *Journal of Business Research* 37, 115-120.
- Liu, Y. & Schrum, L.J. (2002). What is Interactivity and is it always such a good thing? Implications of definition, person and situation for the influence of interactivity on advertising effectiveness. *Journal of Advertising*, 4, 53-64.
- Marsden, P. (2006). Seed to spread: how seeding trials ignite epidemics of demand. In J. Kirby, P. Marsden. *Connected Marketing*. Elsevier.
- McMillan, S. & Hwang, J. (2005). Measures of Perceived Interactivity. In M. Stafford, R. Faber, *Advertising, promotion and new media*. Armonk, N.Y: Sharpe.
- Newhagen, J.E., & Rafaeli, S. (1996). Why communication researchers should study the internet: a dialogue. *Journal of Communication*, 46, 4–13.
- Mackenzie, S., Lutz, R., & Belch, G. (1986). The Role of Attitude toward the Ad as a Mediator of Advertising Effectiveness: A Test of Competing Explanations. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 23, 130-43.

- Mitchell, A. & Olson, J.C. (1981). Are Product Attribute Beliefs the Only Mediators of Advertising Effects on Brand Attitudes? *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 318-22.
- Mittal, B. (1990). The Relative Roles of Brand Beliefs and Attitude Toward the Ad as Mediators of Brand Attitude: A Second Look. *Journal of Marketing Research*, XXW, 209-219.
- Norman, D.A. (1994). How might people interact with agents? *Communications of the ACM*, 37,68–71.
- Nyilasy, G. (2005). Word of mouth: what we really know –and what we don't. In J. Kirby, P. Marsden. *Connected Marketing*. Elsevier.
- Reichheld, F. (2003). The one number you need to grow. *Harvard Business Review*, 81, 1-11.
- Rosen, E. (2000). *The Anatomy of Buzz: Creating Word of Mouth Marketing*. New York: Doubleday.
- Rusticus, S. (2006). Creating brand advocates. In J. Kirby, P. Marsden. *Connected Marketing*. Elsevier.
- Santesmases, M. (1991). *Marketing, Conceptos y Aplicaciones [Marketing, Concepts and Applications]*. Spain: Piramide.
- Stafford, M. & Faber, R. (2005). *Advertising, promotion and new media*. Armonk, N.Y.
- Smith, W.R. (1956). Product differentiation and market segmentation as alternative marketing strategies. *Journal of Marketing*, 21 (1), 3-8.

Stone D., Jarrett, C., Woodroffe, M., & Minocha, S. (2005). User Interface Design and Evaluation. Morgan Kaufman Publishers.

Tafarodi, R. W., Milne A. B., & Smith, A. (1999). The Confidence of Choice: Evidence for an Augmentation Effect on Self-Perceived Performance. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 1405-1416.

Teo, H., Oha, L., Liua, C., & Weib, K. (2003). An empirical study of the effects of interactivity on web user attitude. *International Journal of Human-Computer studies*, 58, 281-305.

Thomas, E. (2004). Building the buzz in the hive mind. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 4, 64-72.

Williams, F., Rice, R.E., & Rogers, E.M. (1989). *Research Methods and the New Media*. New York: The Free Press.

Wilson, R.F. (2000). The six simple principles of viral marketing. *Web Marketing Today*, 70.1.

Attitude in Marketing. Retrieved 4/7/07, from www.answers.com

Buying Intention. Retrieved 4/7/07, from http://en.mimi.hu/marketingweb/buying_intention.html

Purchase Intention. Retrieved 4/7/07, from <http://www.marketing.org.au/>

Appendix

Testing in English

Pretest

Measurement of the desire for control of the participants

Desirability of Control Scale (by J. Burger & H. Cooper, 1979)

Instructions: Below you will find a series of statements. Please read each statement carefully and respond to it by expressing the extent to which you believe the statement applies to you. For all items, a response from 1 to 7 is required. Use the number that best reflects your belief when the scale is defined as follows

1 = The statement does not apply to me at all

2 = The statement usually does not apply to me

3 = Most often, the statement does no apply

4 = I am unsure about whether or not the statement applies to me, or it applies to me about half the time.

5 = The statement applies more often than not

6 = The statement usually applies to me

7 = The statement always applies to me

___ 1. I prefer a job where I have a lot of control over what I do and when I do it.

___ 2. I enjoy political participation because I want to have as much of a say in running government as possible.

___ 3. I try to avoid situations where someone else tells me what to do.

___ 4. I would prefer to be a leader than a follower.

___ 5. I enjoy being able to influence the actions of others.

___ 6. I am careful to check everything on an automobile before I leave for a long trip.

___ 7. Others usually know what is best for me.

___ 8. I enjoy making my own decisions.

___ 9. I enjoy having control over my own destiny.

___ 10. I would rather someone else take over the leadership role when I am involved in a group project.

___ 11. I consider myself to be generally more capable of handling situations than others are.

___ 12. I would rather run my own business and make my own mistakes than listen to someone else's orders.

___ 13. I like to get a good idea of what a job is all about before I begin.

Finding attitude toward the ad

In your opinion, which characteristics could describe better the interactive advertisement of K-Swiss/Absolut Vodka?

- | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Not persuasive | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | Persuasive |
| Unappealing | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | Appealing |
| Bad | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | Good |
| Unattractive | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | Attractive |
| Not clear | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | Clear |
| Unconvincing | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | Convincing |
| Simple | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | Complex |
| Overall disliking | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | Overall liking |

Finding purchase intention

Would you consider buying K-Swiss shoes/Absolut Vodka?

Not likely Likely

Would you consider recommending the brand K-Swiss/Absolut Vodka to your acquaintances?

Not likely Likely

Have you forwarded the advertisement to any of your acquaintances?

Yes No

Testing in Dutch

Pre-test

Desirability of Control Scale (by J. Burger & H. Cooper, 1979)

Instructies: Hieronder vind je een aantal beweringen. Lees elke bewering zorgvuldig door en geef aan in hoeverre iedere bewering, naar je eigen inschatting, op jou van toepassing is. Je kunt dit doen door de beweringen een score te geven van 1 tot 7. Gebruik het nummer dat, naar je eigen inschatting, het meeste op jou van toepassing is, waarbij de schaal als volgt gedefinieerd is:

1 = Deze bewering is in het geheel niet van toepassing op mij

2 = Deze bewering is normaal gesproken niet van toepassing op mij

3 = Deze bewering is vaker niet dan wel van toepassing op mij

4 = Ik weet niet of deze bewering op mij van toepassing is, of deze bewering is de helft van de tijd op mij van toepassing

5 = Deze bewering is vaker wel dan niet van toepassing op mij

6 = Deze bewering is normaal gesproken van toepassing op mij

7 = Deze bewering is altijd van toepassing op mij

- ___ 1. Ik heb graag een baan waarbij ik veel controle heb over wat ik doe en wanneer ik het doe
- ___ 2. Ik houd me graag met politiek bezig omdat ik graag zoveel mogelijk te zeggen wil hebben over het bestuur van de overheid
- ___ 3. Ik probeer situaties te vermijden waarin iemand anders mij vertelt wat ik moet doen
- ___ 4. Ik zou liever een leider dan een volger zijn
- ___ 5. Ik vind het prettig om de handelingen van andere mensen te kunnen beïnvloeden
- ___ 6. Voordat ik een lange autoreis ga maken, zorg ik dat ik de auto zorgvuldig nagekeken heb.
- ___ 7. Andere mensen weten meestal wat het beste voor mij is
- ___ 8. Ik vind het prettig om mijn eigen besluiten te nemen
- ___ 9. Ik vind het prettig om controle te hebben over mijn eigen lot
- ___ 10. Ik heb liever dat iemand anders de leidersrol neemt als ik met een groepsproject bezig ben
- ___ 11. In het algemeen vind ik dat ik zelf beter in staat ben om situaties af te handelen dan anderen
- ___ 12. Ik zou liever mijn eigen zaak runnen en mijn eigen fouten maken, dan dat ik naar de bevelen van een ander zou luisteren
- ___ 13. Ik wil graag een goed beeld krijgen van wat een baan inhoudt voordat ik begin

Traditioneel modern

b. Finding attitude toward the ad

Welke eigenschappen beschrijven naar jouw mening beter de interactieve advertentie of K-Swiss shoes/Absolute Vodka?

Niet overtuigend Overtuigend
 Niet aansprekend Aansprekend
 Slecht Goed
 Onaantrekkelijk Aantrekkelijk
 Onduidelijk Duidelijk
 Niet overredend Overredend
 Simpel Ingewikkeld
 Niet leuk leuk

c. Finding purchase intention

Zou je overwegen om K-Swiss shoes/Absolut Vodka te kopen?

Onwaarschijnlijk Waarschijnlijk

Zou je overwegen om het merk K-Swiss shoes/Absolut Vodka aan te raden aan bekenden?

Onwaarschijnlijk Waarschijnlijk

Heb je de advertentie naar een of meerdere bekenden doorgemaid?

Ja Nee