

THE OTHER MEANING OF FLUENCY

Content Accessibility and Language in Advertising to Bilinguals

Ryall Carroll and David Luna

ABSTRACT: This research investigates how ad content influences which language should be used in advertisements targeting bilingual individuals. The authors argue that the influence of ad content on language appropriateness is due to processing fluency: Some concepts are more accessible in one language than in the other, which leads to more positive ad evaluations when the ad is written in that language. The results of three studies provide the basis for a Word Accessibility/Fluency framework to study the interaction of language and ad content with respect to ad evaluations. This framework operates at the nonconscious level. Once conscious attention is brought to language, other factors such as language schemas take over ad evaluations.

Today in the United States, almost 20% of the population does not speak English at home, and about half this population is bilingual (Shin and Bruno 2003). In fact, many, if not most, of the world's consumers speak more than one language (Grosjean 1982; Hoffman 1991). In an effort to understand this growing bilingual market, advertisers have just begun to discover the effectiveness of a variety of different approaches (Dimofte, Forehand, and Despardé 2004). However, advertising researchers have not fully explored the impact that different languages can have on message processing.

In recent years, there has been greater focus on language research in advertising and consumer behavior. For example, Koslow, Shamdasani, and Touchstone's (1994) sociolinguistic-based research investigated U.S. Hispanics' response to the use of Spanish in advertising. The results suggest that, in general, advertisers should consider the connotations of each language; that is, the associations linked to a language that Luna and Peracchio (2005) call *language schemas*. Koslow, Shamdasani, and Touchstone (1994) thus began to consider the potential impact of language use on ad evaluations. More recent research by Noriega and Blair (2008) has shown that language choice influences the types of thoughts that bilinguals generate in response to an advertisement. Those thoughts can then influence brand evaluations.

Our research extends the preceding articles by exploring ad content factors that should guide language choice in advertising to bilingual markets to maximize ad evaluations. This

paper explicitly investigates how the use of different languages can influence the accessibility of certain concepts. Luna and Peracchio (2001) suggested, but did not test, that knowledge could be more accessible in one language than in another and did not examine whether accessibility might depend on the ad content's domain (e.g., family versus work domains). We test and show how certain words can have greater accessibility in bilinguals' nonnative language than in their native language and vice versa. We theorize that this differential is based on bilinguals' everyday use of each language. We then suggest that writing ads in the language in which their content is most accessible can lead to higher evaluations of the advertisement due to processing fluency.

Noriega and Blair (2008) argued that use of consumers' native language in an ad could lead to self-referent processing and positive evaluations. We suggest a different process that can influence ad evaluations without the mediation of self-referencing. Our hypothesized processing fluency explanation is in line with recent research in bilingual processing by Luna, Ringberg, and Peracchio (2008) in that it reflects the cognitive links that language possesses with certain domains or content areas. We extend that research by examining the effect of those links on ad evaluations, developing a World Accessibility/Fluency framework to study bilingual processing of advertising. With this framework, we contribute to the processing fluency literature (Jacoby and Dallas 1981; Reber and Schwarz 1999; Reber, Winkielman, and Schwarz 1998; Schwarz 2004). Bilinguals' language use has not yet been discussed in the fluency literature. Our research shows how language selection in communications with bilinguals has

Ryall Carroll (Ph.D., Baruch College) is an assistant professor of marketing, Peter J. Tobin College of Business, St. John's University, Jamaica, NY.

David Luna (Ph.D., University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee) is a professor of marketing, Zicklin School of Business, Baruch College, City University of New York (CUNY).

The research was conducted as part of a Ph.D. dissertation by the first author and supported by a grant from the CUNY Graduate Center.

processing fluency implications. Our findings are therefore breaking new ground in the processing fluency area as well as the psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic area.

In summary, the results of our inquiry will help advertisers design more effective communications strategies to target bilingual populations. We show that certain advertising appeals, based on positioning and content, need to use bilingual consumers' native language to target them, while other advertising appeals need to use bilingual consumers' nonnative language. Study 1 shows how the everyday use of a language in a given content area (e.g., Spanish in the family content area) can lead to greater accessibility of words in that language when the words belong to that content area (e.g., for Spanish-English U.S. Hispanic bilinguals whose native language is Spanish, the Spanish "mamá" may be more accessible than the English "mom"). In Study 2, we show that ads can lead to higher evaluations in one language over another depending on the ads' content. More specifically, for Spanish-English Hispanic bilinguals in the United States, we find that when an ad is shown in Spanish (English) and the ad's content belongs to a domain most associated with the Spanish-language (English-language), ad evaluations are higher than when the same ad is in English (Spanish). In Study 3, we investigate the boundary conditions of processing fluency as the driver of those results. That study shows that if bilingual consumers become conscious of the existence of language-specific domains, they activate language schemas (Luna and Peracchio 2005) and eliminate the nonconscious effect of accessibility on ad evaluations.

Taken together, our studies suggest that the language of an ad can affect the accessibility of the ad's information. When the ad content is more accessible, consumers experience processing fluency. This processing fluency then results in a positive affective reaction to the ads, unless consumers are made aware of this process. If that happens, other factors like language schemas will take over ad evaluations.

CONTENT AREA AND LANGUAGE

Research in sociolinguistics has examined the various factors that account for bilingual individuals' choice of language in particular situations (Fishman 1964, 1965, 1968, 1971; Goebel 2005; Nishimura 1993). By observing the interactions of multilinguals in different speech communities, ethnographers have been able to uncover underlying patterns that dictate the proper use of a language at a particular time and place (e.g., Coulmas 2005; Goebel 2005; Nishimura 1993; Yeh, Chan, and Cheng 2004). Markedly, the proper use of a language is so ingrained into a multilingual that the appropriate language is usually chosen unconsciously with no extra time or effort (Grosjean 1982).

One of the main factors influencing language choice is the subject matter, or content area, that the bilingual parties are

discussing. Some of the main content areas that consistently arise in multilingual communities and influence language choice are friends and family, work, school, religion, and government. The content areas of friends and family and religion are commonly spoken in the bilinguals' native language. The content areas of work, school, and government are commonly spoken in the nonnative language. Because people tend to move to areas where they have family or people they know, for many bilinguals, the native language becomes the language of their home life or of the community in which they live. The use of the native language in these content areas can be the result of a bilingual having learned to discuss a content area in a particular language or may simply occur because the use of the nonnative language in that content area would be considered strange or inappropriate based on the norms of that language community (Grosjean 1982). This would suggest that bilinguals learn from an early age to deal with certain content areas in a particular language, and that there is probably a greater ease with which a bilingual can discuss certain content areas in a particular language over another. Our research is the first to test and show the interaction of language and content area in advertising.

LANGUAGE IN ADVERTISING

A Sociolinguistic Perspective

Consumer research following a sociolinguistic approach has explored the question of what language should be used in advertising targeting bilinguals who belong to a minority culture. For instance, Koslow, Shamdasani, and Touchstone's (1994) research indicated that, in general, advertisers should use a mixture of the minority language and the majority language, and that attitudes toward ads using only the minority language will be the lowest (versus bilingual or majority-language ads). We extend Koslow, Shamdasani, and Touchstone's (1994) findings by uncovering conditions in which ads using only the minority language will actually have higher evaluations. In addition, whereas Koslow, Shamdasani, and Touchstone (1994) explained their results based on bilinguals' language and perceptions of the advertiser, we mainly consider the typical use of a language in different content areas as a determiner of attitudes toward ads.

Noriega and Blair (2008) showed that the language chosen when advertising to bilinguals influenced the types of thoughts that are generated in response to the advertisement. The authors found that a native-language advertisement is more likely to elicit thoughts about family, friends, home, or homeland. These thoughts about family, friends, home, or homeland in turn led to more positive attitude measures and behavioral intentions. Noriega and Blair (2008) proposed that the positive attitude measures are a result of self-referent processing,

which facilitates positive thoughts and memories, and results in positive attitudes toward the brand (Stayman and Unnava 1997). We extend Noriega and Blair's (2008) findings by uncovering not only conditions in which the native-language ads elicit higher evaluations but also conditions under which nonnative-language ads can elicit higher evaluations. In addition, while Noriega and Blair (2008) explained their results based on bilinguals' self-referencing, we consider the typical use of a language in different content areas, and the resulting accessibility of knowledge about those content areas in that language (Luna, Ringberg, and Peracchio 2008), as a determinant of attitudes toward ads.

A Psycholinguistic Perspective

In Luna and Peracchio's (2001) psycholinguistic research, bilinguals' recall for advertisements was influenced by the language in which the bilingual was most proficient. Their results were explained by the Revised Hierarchical Model, or RHM. The RHM model describes how bilingual individuals process words corresponding to two languages. The model suggests that the meaning of words processed in bilinguals' most proficient language is more easily processed than the meaning of words in their less proficient language. Luna and Peracchio's (2001) findings show that, while this is generally true, that main effect is moderated by ad design factors, like the use of congruent pictures. Although not directly addressed in that research, the findings imply that the meaning of a word may be more accessible in bilinguals' most proficient language. In our research, we focus on the issue of knowledge accessibility. That is, we argue that words will be more accessible when the language in which they are coded is the language typically used to discuss a particular content area. Thus, we investigate in detail Luna and Peracchio's (2001) implicit claim that some languages may be more accessible than others by examining the differential accessibility of words in one language versus another depending on the content area. Hence, we introduce the notion that language accessibility depends on the domain being discussed, a notion not considered by Luna and Peracchio (2001). Also, while Luna and Peracchio (2001) showed a difference in recall as a result of language use, we examine ad evaluations.

Language and Knowledge Accessibility

Accessibility is defined as the activation potential of available information (Higgins 2000). There are two types of accessibility: temporary, which is a short-term readiness or activation potential of a construct, and chronic, which is generally a result of frequent exposure to a stimulus (Higgins, King, and Marvin 1982). In the present research, we are concerned mainly with chronic or long-term accessibility. In a market-

ing context, Luna, Ringberg, and Peracchio (2008) suggest that language is intricately linked to cognitive structures, so the use of a particular language can lead to the increased accessibility of some concepts, including certain personality, or identity, traits. However, that study stops short of showing how such increased accessibility influences ad evaluations. We build on that study by examining the effect of accessibility on ad evaluations, showing the relevance of this phenomenon for advertisers.

A psycholinguistic study by Gardner et al. (1987) demonstrated that individuals' response times in lexical decision tasks were a reflection of their familiarity with the word. In that study, three groups of respondents with three different expertise areas were faster to respond to words corresponding with their expertise over other subjects and over words that did not correspond with their expertise (Gardner et al. 1987). These results are due to the expert's chronic accessibility, repetition and exposure to words in their field of interest due to that vocabulary in their daily life. We suggest that, similar to experts, bilinguals are more familiar with certain words in a particular language. Therefore, one could conclude that those words should result in faster response times in a lexical decision task in that language.

In a lexical decision task, respondents are shown strings of letters on a computer screen and instructed to identify whether each string is a word or a nonword as fast and as accurately as possible. A nonword is a string of letters that does not make a word. An example of a nonword is "fersfte," since "fersfte" is not a word in English or in Spanish. An example of a word is "tree" since this is an English word. If, in fact, bilinguals generally discuss certain content areas in a particular language, words in that language would result in faster response times than in another language. In conclusion, increased accessibility for words in a particular content area in a given language should manifest itself in lexical decision tasks, such that more accessible words should result in faster response times.

STUDY 1

The goal of Study 1 is to uncover whether, for bilinguals, words pertaining to specific content areas are more accessible in one language than in other languages. As discussed earlier, increased accessibility could result in processing fluency, which then leads to higher ad evaluations when the language matches the language typically used to discuss the content area of the ad as opposed to when it mismatches that language. Previous word accessibility studies (Gardner et al. 1987) suggest that if a content area is more accessible in a particular language, response times in a lexical decision task for words relating to that content area will be faster in that language than in another language.

Method

An experiment was conducted in which one factor was manipulated between-subjects, content area–language match (versus mismatch). Half the respondents were exposed to words in which the language matched the language generally used in the word's content area, and the other half was exposed to words in which the language mismatched the language of the word's content area. Respondents were assigned randomly to either the matched or mismatched conditions. All respondents were exposed to words in both languages, but all words shown to every respondent were in the same content area–language matching condition. This was done to control for potential language proficiency issues. Since each group was asked to perform a task in both languages, the respondents' potentially greater proficiency in one language over another was offset by their random assignment to one of the two conditions. Thus, one group was asked to perform word recognition tasks on English words matching the English-language content area, and also perform word recognition tasks on Spanish words matching the Spanish-language content area. The other group was asked to perform word recognition tasks on English words not matching the English-language content area and on Spanish words not matching the Spanish-language content area.

Stimuli

The content areas of (1) work and (2) friends and family were chosen since a great deal of advertising is centered on these areas compared with other areas, like government or religion, studied in the sociolinguistic literature (e.g., Fishman 1964). The study consisted of 47 words (14 work-related words, 14 friends and family-related words, and 19 random practice words) and an additional 47 nonwords. The lists of words were pretested in focus groups to ensure that they met the following two criteria: that they were either work-related or friend and family-related words, and that the Spanish words were common to the different dialects of Spanish that the respondents spoke. For example, job, boss, and hire were used for the work content area; family, dad, and friend were used for the friend and family content area; shoe, door and apple were used as random practice words. For a complete list of words used as stimuli, see the Appendix.

Word frequency and word length can be correlated with reaction times in lexical decision tasks. The higher the frequency of a particular word in a language, the faster the word recognition will be (Harley 2001). To ensure that word frequency was not a factor in the analysis, English and Spanish average word frequencies were matched using their average frequency rate per million words (Davies 2006; Francis, Kučera, and Mackie 1982). Word length was used as a covariate in the analysis because longer words can lead to slower reaction times

(Basnight-Brown and Altarriba 2007) and the Spanish words used in this study were sometimes longer than their English equivalent.

Procedure

A lexical decision task was used to measure word accessibility. More accessible words result in faster recognition times in a lexical decision task. The study was conducted using computer software that recorded reaction time and accuracy of the word recognition task. Each respondent sat in front of a computer and was given instructions to identify words from nonwords. If the text on the screen was a word (e.g., "tree"), the respondents were instructed to press the letter Q on the keyboard with their index finger. If the text on the screen was a nonword (e.g., "fersfte"), they were instructed to press the letter P on the keyboard with their index finger. After the respondents indicated a word or nonword by pressing the letter Q or the letter P, respectively, a blank screen appeared for three seconds prior to the next word or nonword being presented. Respondents were told to try their best to correctly identify the words and the nonwords as fast and as accurately as possible. Respondents were then shown a few of the words and nonwords for practice. After the practice trials, respondents were told that the practice was over and the real study would now begin. To avoid effects due to nervousness, however, the next six words and nonwords were still practice and were not recorded as part of the study. The order of the words and nonwords, English and Spanish blocks, and match versus mismatch assignment were randomized. After performing the word and nonword trials, respondents filled out demographic and language fluency scales. Finally, they completed a manipulation check and were dismissed.

Respondents

A total of 30 English-Spanish bilinguals participated in the study. Respondents were Hispanic students in a Northeastern University. There were 13 males and 17 females. All respondents were highly proficient in both languages, scoring above 3.50 on a self-administered 5-point, 22-item language proficiency scale adapted from Luna and Peracchio (2001). The respondents were of various national origins (Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the United States). Respondents were paid \$10 for their participation in the study.

Manipulation Check

To verify that content area and language corresponded with our expectations, respondents were asked to answer questions about their language use. The respondents rated their language use on a seven-point scale where 1 = never and 7 = always.

When asked what language was spoken at home, Spanish was the dominant answer (Spanish $M = 5.93$ versus English $M = 4.03$; $t[29] = 4.57, p < .001$). When asked what language was spoken at work, English was the dominant answer (English $M = 6.30$ versus Spanish $M = 3.17$; $t[29] = -8.39, p < .001$). When asked what language was used to speak with family and friends, Spanish was the dominant answer (Spanish $M = 5.87$ versus English $M = 3.67$; $t[29] = 5.32, p < .001$).

Results and Discussion

Following established procedures for analyzing lexical decision task reaction times (Lemhöfer and Dijkstra 2004), only reaction times for correct decisions were considered. The overall error rate was less than 1%. Furthermore, reaction times that laid more than two standard deviations away from both the item and the respondents' mean (for the given condition) were considered outliers and were discarded from the analysis (accounting for an additional 5.71%). In total, 6.66% of the data were excluded.

A linear mixed effects model (Hair et al. 2006) revealed a significant interaction effect for language and content area, including word length as a covariate, $F(1, 878) = 37.01, p < .001$. Since these content areas could easily be mapped on to traditional male/female gender roles, particularly for Hispanic respondents, we tested for gender effects. Gender did not have main or interactive effects on evaluations ($F_s < 1$), so we did not include it in further analyses. The planned contrasts showed that when a word is shown in Spanish and the word belongs to the Spanish language content area, the word is recognized faster than the same word shown in English (family and friend words in Spanish $M = 637.78$ versus family and friend words in English $M = 695.38$; $F[1, 875] = 4.06, p < .05$). Also confirming expectations, when a word is shown in English and the word belongs to the English language content area, the word is recognized faster than the same word shown in Spanish (work words in English $M = 643.61$ versus work words in Spanish $M = 825.37$; $F[1, 875] = 40.49, p < .001$). With word frequency and length both being accounted for, we can conclude that, indeed, words written in the language typically used in the word's content area are more accessible than words written in the other language.

Research has shown that increasing the ease of processing of a target within an ad can result in the metacognitive experience of processing fluency (Jacoby and Dallas 1981; Reber and Schwarz 1999; Reber, Winkielman, and Schwarz 1998), leading to a preference for the ad. Therefore, Study 2 tests whether ads that use the appropriate language for the content area will receive higher evaluations than ads that do not use the appropriate language for the content area. More specifically, for Spanish-English bilinguals in the United States, we predict that when an ad is shown in Spanish and

the ad's content is typically discussed in Spanish (i.e., friends and family category), ad evaluations will be higher than when the same ad is in English. Similarly, when an ad is shown in English and the ad's content is typically discussed in English (i.e., the work category), ad evaluations will be higher than when the same ad is in Spanish.

STUDY 2

The goal of Study 2 is to uncover whether an ad's content area determines the language that will be more effective for ads targeting bilinguals. We assess whether the differences in accessibility of words in one language over another that we found in Study 1 translate into differences in ad evaluations.

Method

An experiment was conducted in which two factors were manipulated between-subjects: language (English or Spanish) and content area (work or friends and family). All materials were randomly presented in either English or Spanish, depending on the language condition.

Stimuli

The study material consisted of three print ads: a cell phone ad that had a front and side profile of a cell phone with the name of the cell phone above it and ad text below it; a furniture store ad that had the name of the furniture store above images of multiple pieces of furniture with the ad text below it; and last, an Internet provider ad that had an image of the globe with the name of the Internet service provider on top and ad text at the bottom. None of the ads' images or text contained explicit cultural cues. The ads were pretested in focus groups to ensure that they were realistic and understandable, and that the Spanish words were common to the different variants of Spanish that potential respondents might speak. All advertisements were written in English and translated into Spanish by a fluent native speaker. Then they were back-translated to ensure accuracy of the translation. Every respondent saw the same advertisement with at most five words changed across conditions. The changed words had the effect of manipulating the content area of the advertisements from a friends and family ad to a work-related advertisement and vice versa (see the Appendix for the text of all three ads).

Respondents

A total of 56 English-Spanish bilinguals in a Northeastern university participated in the study, of which 18 were male and 38 female. All respondents were highly proficient in both languages, scoring above 3.50 on a self-administered 5-point,

22-item language proficiency scale adapted from Luna and Peracchio (2001). All respondents had at least a high school diploma. The respondents were of various different national origins (Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the United States). Respondents received course credit for their participation.

Procedure

Respondents each received a booklet titled "Advertising Survey." Included in the booklet were the three experimental ads and several filler ads. Respondents were told they would be asked for their opinion about several new ads that would be used for different products or services. The respondents were told that the survey was anonymous and that it was important that they thought about and reported their candid opinions of the ads. The order of the ads was varied. Respondents were randomly assigned to each experimental condition and asked to view the advertisements one at a time. After viewing each ad, they were asked to provide ad evaluations on a series of scales. Ad evaluations were collected on a seven-point, five item scale (dislike very much/like very much, very bad/very good, very unpleasant/very pleasant, not at all satisfactory/very satisfactory, very unfavorable/very favorable), where higher scores meant more favorable evaluations. An ad evaluation index was formed for each advertisement by averaging responses to the evaluation scales ($\alpha = .96$). After viewing all the ads, respondents filled out demographic and language fluency scales. Finally, respondents completed a check to confirm that they typically used English (Spanish) in work (friends and family) situations and were dismissed. To ensure that respondents did not guess the purpose of the study, they were asked to write what they thought the study was about. No respondent guessed the purpose of the study.

Results and Discussion

To verify that the language typically used by our respondents in the two content areas corresponded with our expectations, respondents were asked to answer questions about their language use. Respondents rated their language use on a seven-point scale where 1 = never and 7 = always. When asked what language is spoken at home, Spanish was the dominant answer (Spanish $M = 5.75$ versus English $M = 4.32$; $t[55] = 4.04$, $p < .001$). When asked what language is spoken at work, English was the dominant answer (English $M = 6.17$ versus Spanish $M = 3.69$; $t[55] = -7.34$, $p < .001$). When asked what language was used to speak with family and friends, Spanish was the dominant answer (Spanish $M = 5.96$ versus English $M = 3.68$; $t[55] = 6.64$, $p < .001$).

The main results were analyzed as a 2 (language: Spanish or English) \times 2 (content area: work or friends and family) ANOVA (analysis of variance). The goal of this study was to

find out whether ad evaluations would be higher when the ad's language was the same as the language typically used in the content area to which the ad belonged. Respondents' gender did not have main or interactive effects on evaluations ($F_s < 1$), so we did not include it in further analyses. The evaluation index yielded a two-way interaction between language and content area, $F(1, 52) = 10.33$, $p < .01$. The results confirm the expectations. When an ad was shown in Spanish and the ad's content area was associated with the Spanish language, the ad evaluation was higher than the same ad in English (friends and family ads in Spanish $M = 4.74$ versus friends and family ads in English $M = 3.91$; $F[1, 25] = 5.39$, $p < .05$). Also confirming expectations, when an ad was shown in English and the ad's content area was associated with the English language, the ad evaluation was higher than the same ad in Spanish (work ads in English $M = 5.21$ versus work ads in Spanish $M = 4.66$; $F[1, 27] = 4.95$, $p < .05$).

The results of Study 2 extend Luna and Peracchio (2001) and Luna, Ringberg, and Peracchio (2008) by showing an impact of language accessibility on ad evaluations. They also extend Koslow, Shamdasani, and Touchstone (1994) and Noriega and Blair (2008) by showing that minority-language (i.e., Spanish) ads can result in higher evaluations than majority-language (i.e., English) ads in some situations and vice versa. Our results indicate that advertisements are evaluated more positively when the ad's language matches the language in which the content area of the ad is typically discussed.

The next step in this analysis is to more directly investigate the processes that are driving the higher evaluations for Spanish ads in the friends and family content area and English ads in the work content area.

STUDY 3

The results of Study 2 indicate that higher evaluations are obtained when the language used in the ad matches the language typically used to discuss the content area of the ad. We theorize that this occurs because knowledge relevant to the ad content is more accessible in the language typically used in that content area. This increased accessibility could then lead to fluency effects when individuals construct their evaluations.

The Role of Processing Fluency

Mere exposure research has shown that recent and repeated exposure to a target renders the target more readily accessible in memory; in turn, this increased accessibility enhances the ease with which people identify and recognize the target in subsequent encounters (Jacoby and Dallas 1981). This process is referred to as processing fluency. This processing fluency is a metacognitive experience that accompanies individuals' thought processes. These metacognitive experiences can then

be used as information. Individuals may draw on this information for judgments and decision making (Schwarz 2004). Enhanced processing fluency can then be misattributed to liking, resulting in a preference for the recognized target (Bornstein 1989; Jacoby, Kelley, and Dywan 1989; Reber, Winkielman, and Schwarz 1998).

Processing fluency can positively influence judgments of a target without being a result of repeated exposure. That is, manipulations other than repeated exposure such as changes in the figure-ground contrast (Reber, Winkielman, and Schwarz 1998), use of different colors (Reber and Schwarz 1999), and other physical features (Jacoby and Dallas 1981) can also lead to fluency and positive affect, which then can influence target object evaluations positively. Therefore, if the target (e.g., brand name, logo, ad) can be more easily processed, the metacognitive experience of processing fluency can result in a more favorable attitude toward the target (Lee 2004). Because individuals usually cannot distinguish clearly between the different sources of affect they experience at any given time, they may misattribute their current mood to the object they are judging (Schwarz and Clore 1983, 1996).

In sum, the use of certain languages can increase the accessibility of knowledge related to some content areas. We theorize that such accessibility can result in fluency effects for ads that use the appropriate language for their content area.

Study 3 also tests the boundary conditions of the fluency effect as hypothesized thus far. To do this, we bring respondents' attention to their use of different languages in different situations, thus creating awareness of the process underlying the fluency effect. Fluency effects are based on an automatic, unconscious process. By bringing the process to consciousness, the fluency effect disappears (Reber and Schwarz 1999). For example, Lee and Shavitt (2009) used blurry text to create a lack of fluency, and then asked respondents to evaluate the stimuli. In one of their experimental conditions, they directed respondents' attention to the print manipulation. That condition gave the respondents an explanation for the lack of fluency they were experiencing. As a result of this awareness, respondents in the blurry/aware condition did not use the lack of fluency of the text as a metacognitive cue to evaluate the stimuli.

In our case, by bringing attention to the process and allowing individuals to elaborate on the possible existence of a match between language and content area, not only will the effect of fluency disappear, but individuals' responses will be affected by conscious-level phenomena such as elaboration on language schemas (Luna and Peracchio 2005). Language schemas are the associations that speakers of a language have developed over time to a language. Such associations include the speakers' perceptions of the vitality and status of the language, and of the occasions in which it is used. We hypothesize that if we bring respondents' attention to the perceived appropriateness of us-

ing a language in different situations, thus bringing salience to sociolinguistic processes, consumers will elaborate on the use of language in the ads, activate their language schemas, and provide responses consistent with those schemas. Because the overall schemas for the Spanish language in the United States are tinted with negative associations (feelings of inferiority and marginalization), especially in a marketing setting (Koslow, Shamdasani, and Touchstone 1994; Luna and Peracchio 2005), we would expect that in the United States, English ads would be liked more than Spanish ads, even when the ads' content area is related to friends and family.

Therefore, in Study 3 we manipulate respondents' levels of awareness of the existence of language-specific content areas. If respondents are aware of how some languages are used in certain content areas with greater frequency than others, their awareness of the process should offset fluency effects and the resulting evaluations will be influenced by elaboration on language schemas. This would show the boundary conditions of our Word Accessibility/Fluency framework.

Method

Design and Procedure

This study was a 2 (language: Spanish or English) \times 2 (attribution cue condition: cue present or absent) between-subject design. The same cover story and set of instructions from Study 2 were used in this study. The order of the filler and target advertisements in the questionnaire was varied.

In the attribution cue present condition, the first page after the instructions asked respondents to answer questions about their language use. These questions are the same questions used in the two prior studies to measure language use in different content areas. Respondents rated their language use on seven-point scales where 1 = never and 7 = always. The scales asked what language respondents spoke at home, at work, and with family and friends. These questions directed respondents' attention to the languages used in the different domains, thus implicitly providing an explanation for the sense of difficulty/ease they may have in processing the ad text. It is therefore expected that this information about their language use will create a condition in which respondents will not use metacognitive difficulty/ease as a cue for inferring ad disliking/liking. Instead, their awareness of linguistic issues in everyday life will lead them to rely on language schemas to evaluate the ads. In the cue-absent condition, respondents were asked the same questions, but only after reading and evaluating the ads.

We used two of the ads from Study 2 (cell phone ad and furniture store ad) in addition to two new ads (watch ad and coffee ad), for a total of four ads. The new watch ad featured a picture of a watch with the brand name above it and text

below it. The coffee ad had an image of a cup of coffee on a table with text below it (for the text of each ad, see the Appendix). Only friend and family ads were used in this study. The study focuses on the friends and family content area because it is used much more frequently than the work content area in advertising specifically targeting U.S. Hispanics (Roberts and Hart 1997; Singh and Bartikowski 2009). In addition, this study tests whether English ads can result in higher evaluations than Spanish ads due to the activation of language schemas. This cannot be tested with work ads, which are generally evaluated higher in English than in Spanish. We need a domain that would generally be evaluated higher in Spanish than in English; that is, friends and family. The order of the ads was varied. Respondents were asked to view the advertisements one at a time. After viewing each advertisement, respondents were asked to provide their ad evaluations. Similar to Study 2, ad evaluations were collected on a seven-point, five-item scale, where higher scores meant more favorable evaluations ($\alpha = .94$). After viewing all the advertisements, respondents filled out demographic and language proficiency scales.

Respondents

A total of 79 English-Spanish bilinguals participated in the study. There were 29 males and 50 females. All respondents were students at a Northeastern university, highly proficient in both languages, scoring above 3.50 on the same scale used in Studies 1 and 2. The respondents were of various different national origins (Mexico, Dominican Republic, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Honduras, and the United States). Respondents received course credit or were paid for their participation.

To ensure that respondents did not guess the purpose of the study, they were asked to write any thoughts or comments about what they thought the study was about. No respondent was able to guess the purpose of the study.

Manipulation Check

We manipulate respondents' level of awareness of the existence of language-specific content areas. Therefore, after evaluating the ads, at the end of the study, respondents were asked two manipulation check questions: "While reading the ads, how conscious were you that all the ads were friend and family related?" and "While reading the ads, how conscious were you of the language you would normally use to discuss friend and family related topics?" These questions used a nine-point scale, where higher scores meant more awareness ($\alpha = .71$). In the attribution cue present condition, the awareness was higher than in the cue-absent condition (cue present $M = 6.66$ versus cue absent $M = 5.85$; $t[77] = 2.13$, $p < .05$).

Results and Discussion

When respondents were asked which language was spoken at home, Spanish was the dominant answer (Spanish $M = 6.00$ versus English $M = 4.68$; $t[78] = 6.65$, $p < .001$). When asked which language was spoken at work, English was the dominant answer (English $M = 5.97$ versus Spanish $M = 4.09$; $t[78] = -6.37$, $p < .001$). When asked which language was most used to speak with family and friends, Spanish was the dominant answer (Spanish $M = 6.15$ versus English $M = 4.71$; $t[78] = 6.67$, $p < .001$).

A repeated-measures ANOVA, with the different ads as a within-subject replication, yielded a two-way interaction between language and attribution cue, $F(1, 75) = 72.61$, $p < .001$. Similar to Studies 1 and 2, we tested but found no main or interactive effects for gender ($F_s < 1$), so the variable was not included in the analyses. In the conditions in which the attribution cue was absent, the results replicated the results of Study 2: When ads were shown in Spanish, given the ads' content area was strongly linked to the Spanish language, ad evaluations were higher than the same ads in English (friend and family ads in Spanish $M = 4.78$ versus friend and family ads in English $M = 4.27$; $F[1, 37] = 4.33$, $p < .05$).

In the cue-present condition, however, where questions directed respondents' attention to the languages used in the different domains, we obtained the expected reverse effect of language: English ads were given higher evaluations than Spanish ads (friend and family ads in Spanish $M = 4.18$ versus friend and family ads in English $M = 5.90$; $F[1, 38] = 277.59$, $p < .001$). This can be explained by the notion of language schemas (Luna and Peracchio 2005) and the observation that Spanish is associated with feelings of inferiority and marginalization, especially in a commercial context (Koslow, Shamdasani, and Touchstone 1994). Our cue manipulation made respondents aware of the domain-specificity of language use. This awareness wiped out the fluency effect and led respondents to elaborate on language schemas (Luna and Peracchio 2005). As a result, respondents scored Spanish ads lower because they do not associate that language with positive feelings, at least in the context of marketing communications.

Our study succeeded in eliminating the ad evaluation superiority of matching, versus mismatching, ad language to content area. These results suggest that when respondents are aware of how some languages are used in certain content areas with greater frequency than others, their awareness of the process offsets any potential fluency, or lack of fluency, effects due to the ad's language. They are then subject to the effects of other sociolinguistic effects, such as the effect of language schemas. Overall, the results support the fluency explanation for the effect of matching ad language to content area on ad evaluations.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Our studies demonstrate that the interaction of advertisements' content and language is relevant for advertising evaluations in a bilingual market. The studies also uncover the process through which language and ad content interact—our Word Accessibility/Fluency framework. Specifically, in Study 1 we show that words that match the language typically used in a content area are more accessible. In Study 2, we find that when ad language and ad content area are matched (versus mismatched) according to the norms of language use—for example, when the text is in English and the content area of the ad is work—the advertisement receives higher evaluations. This leads to our theory that writing an ad in the language typically used in its content area leads to higher evaluations through processing fluency. In Study 3, we eliminate the language-driven difference in ad evaluations by making consumers aware of the existence of language-specific content areas. Thus, our studies identify processing fluency as a cause of the interactive effect of language and content area in advertising effectiveness.

The results of Study 3 provide a basis to theorize about the boundary conditions of the Word Accessibility/Fluency framework. Fluency effects are nonconscious (Schwarz 2004). As soon as consumers are made aware of the process—in our case, merely by asking respondents to think about their own use of language—fluency effects disappear. When that happens, conscious-level processes take over ad evaluations. In Study 3, we observe a reversal of the fluency results. We explain that reversal via Luna and Peracchio's (2005) notion of language schemas. This distinction between conscious and nonconscious processing is promising for future research. For instance, our framework could be investigated further to examine different variables that operate at conscious and nonconscious levels. Code switching seems to influence evaluations at the conscious level (Luna and Peracchio 2005; Luna, Lerman, and Peracchio 2005), whereas ad content accessibility, and perhaps other factors, do so at the nonconscious level.

Our results have clear practical implications for advertisers. Each bilingual speech community has language norms that dictate the proper use of each language for particular content areas. We show that it is important to carefully consider which language to use depending on the target audience. Since it is of utmost importance for advertisers to show that they understand and have common interests with their consumer base, this research illustrates that understanding the language usage of a community may be a critical first step. In general terms, the language of an ad should match the language typically used in the content area the ad refers to. At the same time, this research suggests that if a given language is preferred over another in a particular campaign, the positioning of the

brand and the content of the ads should be carefully crafted to ensure that they are easily accessible in that language.

We extend Luna and Peracchio's (2001) work by investigating bilingual language processing beyond message recall. That is, we consider ad evaluations and uncover the underlying process driving the evaluations results (i.e., the Word Accessibility/Fluency framework), thus extending the current understanding of bilingualism's language processing effects on communication. We also build on Koslow, Shamdasani, and Touchstone's (1994) findings, uncovering conditions in which minority-language ads have superior evaluations (when ad language matches content area), therefore uncovering additional antecedents to effective communication with bilinguals. In addition, we extend Noriega and Blair's (2008) findings, by suggesting that minority-language advertisements are more likely to elicit thoughts about family, friends, home, or homeland because of the increased accessibility of such concepts in the minority language. We also suggest that majority-language advertisements are more likely to elicit thoughts about school, government, or work because of accessibility. Noriega and Blair (2008) propose that positive attitude measures are a result of the family, friends, home, or homeland thoughts leading to self-referent processing. We suggest that positive attitudes toward the ad can also be a result of the accessibility of the ad's content in a particular language, resulting in processing fluency.

In addition, we contribute to the processing fluency literature (Jacoby and Dallas 1981; Reber and Schwarz 1999; Reber, Winkielman, and Schwarz 1998; Schwarz 2004). Our research addresses a variable leading to fluency that had not yet been discussed in that literature: language use. We show how the everyday use of a language in a content area can lead to greater accessibility of words related to that content area in that language. This greater accessibility results in processing fluency effects, which lead consumers to experience an affective metacognitive state that influences ad evaluations. In essence, this research shows how language selection in communications with bilinguals has processing fluency implications, which, prior to this research, had not been discovered.

For this research, we used content areas that yielded relatively consistent results across language communities. For most language communities, the minority language is one that is used at home and with friends, and the majority language is associated with work. In our research, the minority language was Spanish and the majority language was English. Future research may look at other language communities in which this is not the case.

With the vast amount of sociolinguistic research done on the use of language in different contexts or content areas, it is surprising how little the marketing literature addresses the area. This research fills that void and also integrates prior sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, and the growing literature on processing fluency to explain language domains' impact on

ad responses. This further understanding of the process that underlies bilinguals' reactions to ads belonging to different content areas will be a significant help to consumer researchers and advertisers involved with this growing market.

REFERENCES

- Basnight-Brown, Dana M., and Jeanette Altarriba (2007), "Differences in Semantic and Translation Priming Across Languages: The Role of Language Direction and Language Dominance," *Memory and Cognition*, 35 (5), 953–965.
- Bornstein, Robert F. (1989), "Exposure and Affect: Overview and Meta-Analysis of Research, 1968–1987," *Psychological Bulletin*, 106 (September), 265–289.
- Coulmas, Florian (2005), *Sociolinguistics: The Study of Speakers' Choices*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, Mark (2006), "Corpus del Español," available at www.corpusdelespanol.org (accessed April 12, 2006).
- Dimofte, Claudiu V., Mark R. Forehand, and Rohit Deshpandé (2004), "Ad Schema Incongruity as Elicitor of Ethnic Self-Awareness and Differential Advertising Response," *Journal of Advertising*, 32 (4), 7–18.
- Fishman, Joshua A. (1964), "Language Maintenance and Language Shift as a Field of Inquiry," *Linguistics*, 9, 32–70.
- (1965/2000), "Who Speaks What Language to Whom and When?" *La Linguistique*, 1 (2), 67–88.
- (1968), "Sociolinguistic Perspective on the Study of Bilingualism," *Linguistics*, 39, 21–49.
- (1971), "The Sociology of Language," in *Advances in the Sociology of Language*, Paris: Mouton, 217–404.
- Francis, W. Nelson, Henry Kučera, and Andrew Mackie (1982), *Frequency Analysis of English Usage: Lexicon and Grammar*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Gardner, Michael K., E. Z. Rothkopf, R. Lapan, and T. Lafferty (1987), "The Word Frequency Effect in Lexical Decision: Finding a Frequency-Based Component," *Memory and Cognition*, 15 (1), 24–28.
- Goebel, Zane (2005), "An Ethnographic Study of Code Choice in Two Neighborhoods of Indonesia," *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 25 (1), 85–107.
- Grosjean, François (1982), *Life with Two Languages*, London: Harvard University Press.
- Hair, Joseph F., Bill Black, Barry Babin, Rolph E. Anderson, and Ronald L. Tatham (2006), *Multivariate Data Analysis*, New York: Prentice Hall.
- Harley, Trevor (2001), *The Psychology of Language: From Data to Theory*, New York: Hove.
- Higgins, Tory E. (2000), "Category Accessibility," in *Encyclopedia of Psychology*, Alan Kazdin, ed., Washington, DC: Oxford University Press, 48–49.
- , Gillian A. King, and Gregory H. Marvin (1982), "Individual Construct Accessibility and Subjective Impression and Recall," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43 (July), 35–47.
- Hoffman, Charlotte (1991), *An Introduction to Bilingualism*, New York: Longman.
- Jacoby, Larry L., and Mark Dallas (1981), "On the Relationship Between Autobiographical Memory and Perceptual Learning," *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 110 (September), 306–340.
- , Colleen M. Kelly, and Jane Dywan (1989), "Memory Attributions," in *Varieties of Memory and Consciousness: Essays in Honour of Edvel Tulving*, Henry L. Roediger and Fergus I. M. Craik, eds., Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 391–422.
- Koslow, Scott, Prem N. Shamdasani, and Ellen E. Touchstone (1994), "Exploring Language Effects in Ethnic Advertising: A Sociolinguistic Perspective," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20 (March), 575–585.
- Lee, Angela (2004), "The Prevalence of Metacognitive Routes to Judgment," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 14 (4), 349–355.
- Lee, Kyoungmi, and Sharon Shavitt (2009), "Can McDonald's Food Ever Be Seen as Healthy? Metacognitive Experiences Affect the Perceived Understanding of a Brand," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 46 (2), 222–233.
- Lemhöfer, Kristin, and Ton Dijkstra (2004), "Recognizing Cognates and Interlingual Homographs: Effects of Code Similarity in Language-Specific and Generalized Lexical Decision," *Memory and Cognition*, 32 (4), 533–550.
- Luna, David, and Laura A. Peracchio (2001), "Moderators of Language Effects in Advertising to Bilinguals: A Psycholinguistic Approach," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28 (September), 284–295.
- , and ——— (2005), "Sociolinguistic Effects on Code-Switched Ads Targeting Bilingual Consumers," *Journal of Advertising*, 34 (2), 43–56.
- , Dawn Lerman, and Laura A. Peracchio (2005), "Structural Constraints in Codeswitched Advertising," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32 (December), 416–423.
- , Torsten Ringberg, and Laura A. Peracchio (2008), "One Individual, Two Identities: Frame-Switching Among Biculturals," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35 (August), 279–293.
- Nishimura, Miwa (1993), "Language Choice and In-Group Identity Among Canadian Niseis," *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 3 (1), 97–113.
- Noriega, Jamie, and Edward Blair (2008), "Advertising to Bilinguals: Does the Language of Advertising Influence the Nature of Thoughts?" *Journal of Marketing*, 72 (September), 69–83.
- Reber, Rolf, and Norbert Schwarz (1999), "Effects of Perceptual Fluency on Judgments of Truth," *Consciousness and Cognition*, 8 (September), 338–342.
- , Piotr Winkielman, and Norbert Schwarz (1998), "Effects of Perceptual Fluency on Affective Judgments," *Psychological Science*, 29 (1), 45–48.
- Roberts, Scott D., and Stanley H. Hart (1997), "A Comparison of Cultural Value Orientations as Reflected by Advertisements Directed at the General U.S. Market, the U.S. Hispanic Market, and the Mexican Market," *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 5 (1), 91–100.
- Schwarz, Norbert (2004), "Metacognitive Experience in Consumer Judgment and Decision Making," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 14 (4), 332–348.
- , and Gerald L. Clore (1983), "Mood, Misattribution, and Judgments of Well-Being: Informative and Directive

- Functions of Affective States," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45 (3), 513–523.
- , and ——— (1996), "Feeling and Phenomenal Experiences," in *Social Psychology: Handbook of Basic Principles*, E. Tory Higgins and Arie W. Kruglanski, eds., New York: Guilford, 433–465.
- Shin, Hyon B., and Rosalind Bruno (2003), "Language Use and English-Speaking Ability: 2000," available at www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/c2kbr-29.pdf (accessed May 12, 2010).
- Singh, Nitish, and Boris Bartikowski (2009), "A Cross-Cultural Analysis of Print Advertising Targeted to Hispanic and Non-Hispanic American Consumers," *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 51 (2), 151–164.
- Stayman, Douglas M., and H. Rao Unnava (1997), "New Directions in Research on Self-Referencing," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 24, Merrie Brucks and Deborah J. MacInnis, eds., Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 73–74.
- Yeh, Hsi-nan, Hui Chan, and Yuh Cheng (2004), "Language Use in Taiwan: Language Proficiency and Domain Analysis," *Journal of Taiwan Normal University: Humanities and Social Science*, 49 (1), 75–108.

APPENDIX

English, family and friends	-	Spanish, family and friends	English, work	-	Spanish, work
companion	-	<i>compañero</i>	salary	-	<i>salario</i>
grandparent	-	<i>abuelo</i>	job	-	<i>trabajo</i>
friendship	-	<i>amistad</i>	industry	-	<i>industria</i>
house	-	<i>casa</i>	business	-	<i>negocio</i>
children	-	<i>niños</i>	promotion	-	<i>promoción</i>
family	-	<i>familia</i>	hire	-	<i>contratar</i>
friend	-	<i>amigo</i>	fired	-	<i>despedido</i>
brother	-	<i>hermano</i>	employment	-	<i>empleo</i>
sister	-	<i>hermana</i>	interview	-	<i>entrevista</i>
daughter	-	<i>hija</i>	organization	-	<i>organización</i>
son	-	<i>hijo</i>	raise	-	<i>aumento</i>
dad	-	<i>papá</i>	career	-	<i>carrera</i>
mom	-	<i>mamá</i>	occupation	-	<i>ocupación</i>
party	-	<i>partido</i>	boss	-	<i>jefe</i>

Advertisement Text Used in Study 2

Ad 1: "The size of the new Slixis allows you to carry it anywhere. Never again will you miss that important call from your friend or family (coworkers or boss)."

Ad 2: "The Axia Furniture for all of your home (office) furniture needs. Let Axia Furniture be your furniture source for large or for small families (companies). Axia Furniture ensuring comfort in homes (the workplace) for over 75 years . . ."

Ad 3: "The future of Internet service is here. InstaNet is a cheap and reliable way to surf the Internet. Whether it is to email friends (your boss) or play games (complete a project) with your friends (coworkers), let InstaNet be your Internet source."

Advertisement Text Used in Study 3

Ad 1: "The size of the new Slixis allows you to carry it anywhere. Never again will you miss that important call from your friend or family (coworkers or boss)."

Ad 2: "The Axia Furniture for all of your home (office) furniture needs. Let Axia Furniture be your furniture source for large or for small families (companies). Axia Furniture ensuring comfort in homes (the workplace) for over 75 years . . ."

Ad 3: "The only problem with this watch is that you no longer have an excuse for being late when meeting your friends (coworkers)."

Ad 4: "Next time your family (boss) is driving you crazy at home (work), treat yourself to one of the world's finest coffees. Brink Brand Coffee can help make family (work) time an enjoyable time . . ."

Copyright of Journal of Advertising is the property of M.E. Sharpe Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.