Cultural Differences in Russian and English Magazine Advertising: A Pragmatic Approach

Emily Kay Furner
Brigham Young University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd
Part of the Linguistics Commons

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation
https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/6730
Cultural Differences in Russian and English Magazine Advertising:

A Pragmatic Approach

Emily Kay Furner

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Don William Chapman, Chair
Matthew J Baker
Jennifer Bown

Department of Linguistics and English Language
Brigham Young University

Copyright © 2018 Emily Kay Furner
All Rights Reserved
ABSTRACT

Cultural Differences in Russian and English Magazine Advertising:
A Pragmatic Approach

Emily Kay Furner
Department of Linguistics and English Language, BYU
Master of Arts

Many American companies looking to increase sales and achieve growth targets consider expanding the reach of their product lines to other countries. However, expansion on a global scale often requires much trial and error as English-speaking companies try to market their goods to a foreign audience. In order to ease this process, localization experts are often hired to “localize” or change advertisements in order to make them more culturally relevant to consumers. Because the field of localization is relatively new, there is little research done on the degree and extent to which advertisements are localized.

The purpose of this study is to explore the cultural differences in advertising between Russia and the United States of America. Two different samples of print magazine advertisements were taken from beauty magazines published in Russia and America to determine how much, if any, localization is occurring in Russian media. In order to compare the different advertising strategies of Russia and the United States, 235 non-localized Russian advertisements and 128 localized advertisements were coded for several different pragmatic features that Simpson (2001) included in his “reason” and “tickle” advertising framework. The results were then analyzed through content analysis and Chi-square statistics to find what pragmatic features are characteristic of localized and non-localized Russian ads.

The study found that non-localized Russian advertising places more emphasis on reason-based persuasion strategies—most notably celebrity endorsement and extensive listing of reasons to buy a particular product. Localized Russian advertising, in contrast, uses more tickle-based persuasion tactics such as metaphor and implicature. 80% of localized Russian advertisements had little to no change in their advertising text from the English version of the advertisements, which means that the rate of localization in Russian advertising is currently low. Low rates of localization and differing persuasive techniques among the two samples signify the need for better cultural awareness in international marketing campaigns.
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CHAPTER ONE: Introduction

In today’s global economy, eight out of the ten top advertising firms in the world are headquartered outside the United States (Frith & Mueller, 2010). This concentration of advertising power outside the United States means that, more and more frequently, people are designing advertisements for a demographic, language, or even nation that they are not part of (Earley & Mosakowski, 2000). Because of this situation, “advertising gaffes” occur often due to mistakes in cross-cultural communication. As early as the 1980s, these advertising cross-cultural failures have burdened marketers. For example, when Parker Pens tried to market their fountain pen ink to Latin America customers with the slogan “Prevent embarrassment—use Parker Ink”, many Latin Americans thought the slogan had to do with birth control. Apparently, the Spanish word Parker chose to use for “embarrassment” embarazo, actually meant “pregnancy” (Copeland & Griggs, 1985). More recently, companies such as IKEA, General Motors, and Electrolux have all experienced the failure of products due to poor cross-cultural advertising, and their failures have caught the attention of the global market (Ulvydiene, 2013). Among these blunders, of particular note is IKEA’s decision to name one of its products in their children’s furniture department “Fartfull” (Zhu, 2010). “Fartfull” in Swedish means “mobile”, but unfortunately, IKEA failed to think about how English-speaking countries would interpret the new product’s name. Cross-cultural communication mistakes of these kind, from slogans, promotional images, to even product names, happen frequently in the global market that we live in.

Maneuvering cross-cultural communication can be frustrating for companies that want to expand their brands into new markets. Many in the marketing industry have been quick to point out the hardships of expansion when other cultures and customs are unfamiliar. Łopaciuk and Łoboda’s (2013) study found:
At present most … are focusing on expanding their presence in the BRIC’s [Brazil, Russia, India, and China]. Their main challenge is, however, how can they make their brands relevant to shoppers in the markets where consumers’ habits and cultures differ so much from what the companies are familiar with. (p. 1080)

With such an increased focus on globalization and world-wide sales figures, the marketing industry is fraught with situations where companies do not understand fully the consumers they are targeting. One of the basic fundamentals in marketing theory is that advertisers, in order to be successful, must know how to appeal to a consumer’s needs (Gass & Seiter, 2014). However, when companies do not understand what those needs are, billions of marketing dollars are wasted in ill-fated attempts to sell products that have not been adapted to a specific market.

In order to avoid the cross-cultural communication failures of their competitors, several companies are hiring localization experts who, in essence, catch cultural errors in advertising before the advertisements go live. Advertisements that have been localized by these localization experts are changed from the original version of the advertisement to include new text, visuals, and colors that will appeal to a specific demographic within a country (Valdes Rodriguez, 2016). For example, Xie and Zhang (2013) found in a localization study of images that skin care advertisements originating in the US will contain images of tan models and mentions of “bronze” or “sun-kissed” skin, while an equivalent, localized skin care advertisement changed for a Chinese demographic will contain images of white or extremely light-skinned models and use language such as “bright” or “shining” skin (pp. 546). However, since the marriage of the localization and marketing industry is relatively new, there is still debate amongst industry leaders on the best techniques for changing advertisements in order to effectively appeal to a new target audience (Wroblewski, 2015).
Of linguistic significance in this ongoing debate is the decision every localization expert needs to make concerning the pragmatic structure of an advertisement. Noted linguist Paul Simpson (2001) pragmatically characterized advertisements into two different types: “reason” advertising, which persuades through giving logical reasons to buy a product, and “tickle” advertising, which persuades through appealing to humor and emotion (pp. 593). Many subsequent studies have used Simpson’s “reason” and “tickle” framework to prove that the pragmatic structure of an advertisement is culture-dependent and that different countries have different accepted structures for certain product types (Kim, 2007; Reihani and Rasekh, 2012; Fernandez, 2013). One major problem with these studies, however, is the lack of reliability in their data. All studies that utilize Simpson’s (2001) “reason” and “tickle” framework work with qualitative data and make judgements based on the researchers’ sole intuitions. Reihani and Rasekh (2012) even point out that “the lack of precedent in the methodology in carefully analyzing advertising strategies and their discourse features all dictate caution both in interpretation and generalization of the findings” (pp. 191). In today’s global marketing community, research based on intuitions alone is not likely to inspire change in a business’s localization practices.

Even though many linguists claim to use Simpson’s (2001) “reason” and “tickle” framework to make generalizations about a certain country’s advertising climate, linguists have failed to use this framework to compare advertisements from more than one country: studies so far have only been limited to using the framework within the context of a single country’s advertising discourse and comparing the results to Simpson’s (2001) original, dated study that only outlined “tentative steps towards the development of a theoretical model” (Simpson, 2001, pp. 589). A “reason”- and “tickle”-based comparison of American advertising strategies with
another foreign nation’s that utilizes two samples of ads taken from the same time period and that contain similar content has not yet been conducted. Collecting these advertisement samples would require the identification of localized texts and non-localized native texts, something that was not on the industry’s radar until fairly recently.

With the recent trend of global marketing, the question stands as to whether or not localization experts should not only change the texts and images of advertisements, but also change the pragmatic structure of the advertisements to reflect cultural norms in the target country’s advertising discourse. Comparing localized text of advertisements from different areas of the world can yield important linguistic insights into how culture affects not only the language of persuasion, but also the structure of these localized, global advertisements.

The purpose of this study is to use the pragmatic methods of Simpson’s “reason” and “tickle” framework to compare the text of different English and Russian magazine advertisements. While there have been studies that analyze different language devices of advertisements, such as neologisms and compounding (Cruz Garcia, 2016), there have not been studies that compare how different target audiences from different countries affect the pragmatic structure that these language devices exist in. This study will attempt to fill this gap by analyzing cultural differences in the pragmatic structures of advertising language from advertisements published in Russia and the United States.

**Research Questions**

This research will compare and contrast localized Russian advertisements (created by international marketers) with non-localized Russian advertisements (created by Russian marketers) through the lens of Simpson’s (2001) reason and tickle pragmatic framework. During the study, two samples of magazine advertisements taken from American and Russian beauty
magazines have been coded for certain pragmatic features to determine whether localized and
non-localized ads use similar persuasive techniques to sell products to a female Russian
demographic. The results of this research will allow me to answer the following research
questions:

1. How reliable is Simpson’s “reason” and “tickle” framework in categorizing
   individual advertisements?

2. How does localization in advertisements affect the different pragmatic structures (i.e.
   “reason” advertising vs. “tickle” advertising) found in American and Russian
   magazine print advertising?

3. Are there specific discourse variables within Simpson’s (2001) framework that
   characterize non-localized Russian advertisements in magazines?

By analyzing both English and Russian versions of magazine advertisements, I hope to be able to
find and describe differences between ads geared toward an American audience and ads geared
toward a Russian audience. Linguists will be able to gain important insights about the
relationship between culture and localization from this study of Russian and American magazine
advertisements.
CHAPTER TWO: Literature Review

Even before localization became a necessary part of advertising companies, linguists have been interested in the language of advertising. Advertising is a unique context in which to study linguistic phenomenon because the text that is included in advertisements is always chosen to fulfill a persuasive goal. In this chapter, I present a review of previous literature related to localization and the characterization of “reason” and “tickle” advertising. Before proceeding with a discussion of specific studies that touch on these topics, I first define several terms that relate to the current research. These definitions are followed by an overview of localization studies with a linguistics perspective. Pragmatics within the field of advertising discourse is also discussed as a means of analyzing persuasive language within genres. Finally, Simpson’s (2001) framework for categorizing advertisements is explained in order to serve as a background for the subsequent chapters of this thesis.

Terminology and Concepts

Persuasive Discourse

The analysis of persuasion frequently begins with Aristotle. For Aristotle, persuasion was a high art that comprised three different components: logos (logic), ethos (credibility) and pathos (emotion). In his book, Rhetoric, Aristotle writes:

There are, then, these three means of effecting persuasion. The man who is to be in command of them must, it is clear, be able (1) to reason logically, (2) to understand human character and goodness in their various forms, and (3) to understand the emotions—that is, to name them and describe them, to know their causes and the way in which they are excited. It thus appears that rhetoric is an offshoot of dialectic and also of ethical studies.
Aristotle’s definition of persuasion and rhetoric has been invoked throughout the ages in numerous fields of study, and scholars in the present day view appeals to reason and emotion as an integral part of persuasive discourse. Fields such as writing, pedagogy, public speaking, advertising, history, and politics all widely study persuasion and its effects on men and women.

Within linguistics, persuasion was most notably defined by Lakoff (1982), who stressed the non-reciprocal process of persuasion. He stressed that “By ‘persuasion’ I mean the attempt of one party to change the behavior, feelings, intentions or viewpoint of another by communicative means...Communicative means may be linguistic or non-linguistic (say, gestures), but they are abstract and symbolic” (p. 28). Lakoff (1982) clearly defined advertising as a type of persuasive discourse, and many scholars have further studied language through a persuasive discourse lens (Bell, 1991; Hermerén, 1999; Al-Olayan & Karande, 2000; Bhatia, 2014). This study will use Lakoff’s (1982) definition of persuasion to investigate the linguistic appeals advertisers make in their attempt to sell products through print magazine advertisements.

**Pragmatics**

Pragmatics is the study of how communicative messages, context, speaker intent, and recipient understanding all interact in a certain situation (Green, 1989). When a person communicates with someone else, that person’s message will have both a *denotative* meaning (what the words mean through strict dictionary interpretation) and a *connotative* meaning (how the words could be interpreted through the details and context of a situation). In order to study a message from a pragmatic standpoint, there are several accepted theories used for analyzing the pragmatics of a given utterance. Grice (1975) postulated the theory of Cooperative Principle, which states that every conversation is governed by a set of principles that act as norms to enhance communication. People generally try to maximize the exchange of information during
communication and, under the Cooperative Principle, there are four principles that aid in this exchange. These principles comprise the following:

Conversational Maxims (quoted from Kim, 2007, and taken from Grice, 1975, pp. 45-46)

Maxim of Quantity

1. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purpose of the exchange).

2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Maxim of Quality

1. Do not say what you believe to be false.

2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Maxim of Relation

1. Be relevant.

Maxim of Manner

1. Avoid obscurity of expression.

2. Avoid ambiguity.

3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).

4. Be orderly.

In conversation, meaning can be conveyed by either the following or flouting of these maxims. If the maxims are followed, information is conveyed clearly. However, if the maxims are flouted, all speakers know that the maxims have been deliberately broken, and, as such, the participants are clued into the fact that the speaker is invoking a connotative meaning through implication. Thus, speakers can infer through these maxims the intended meaning of language.
Though Grice’s theory of Cooperative behavior has generally been accepted in the linguistic community, there is another theory that, when combined with Gricean maxims, enhances the pragmatic understanding of a situation. Brown & Levinson’s (1987) research into politeness add insight into situations where people break the Cooperative Principle. Politeness theory centers on the fact that, in social situations, people want to preserve their self-image, or “face”, to others (pp. 61). At times, people make linguistic choices to not impose on others and to instead preserve a community of likeability, freedom of action, and appreciation. The linguistic choices that people make to influence a situation can be classified into positive politeness strategies (expressing solidarity) and negative politeness strategies (increasing distance between speaker and receiver to preserve status). In advertising, ads often will enact both positive and negative politeness strategies to help consumers feel that, even though the ads act as a request to buy a product, the consumers’ agency is preserved. Brown & Levinson’s (1987) politeness theory and also Grice’s (1975) maxims will be used in this study to analyze how advertisers are trying to communicate messages to their target consumers.

Localization

The term “localization” is claimed by various fields, such as economics, medicine, and biology, to denote different meanings and concepts. However, in general, “localization” can be defined as “the action or fact of making something local in character, or of adapting something for a local audience or market.” (Localization). Within linguistics, the concept of “localization” can actually be found through several different phrases in the discipline, including the terms “communicative translation”, “cross-cultural communication” or just straight “cultural transplantation” to discuss the issue of localizing texts (Wroblewski, 2015).
Though many may think that “translation” and “localization” are two words that represent the same function, many scholars make a distinction between the two terms, and some even add a third term “globalization” into the mix. Translator and localization specialist Bert Esselink (1998) perhaps defined the distinctions between these terms the best:

Globalization […] is typically used in a sales and marketing context, i.e., it is the process by which a company breaks free of the home markets to pursue business opportunities wherever their customers may be located. Translation is the process of converting written or displayed text or spoken words to another language. In localization, translation is not a word-for-word “global replacement” process. It requires accurately conveying the total meaning of the source material into the target language, with special attention to cultural nuance and style. (3)

Thus, localization is, in addition to the lexical translation of a text, a process that involves considering the cultural implications for how every component of a given message will be received by the new audience. This emphasis on cultural understanding is the basis of the definition of “localization” that this study will use for analysis.

The Need for Cultural Understanding

Some in the business world question the need for localization—are cultures really so different that advertisements need to undergo a localization process to be successful? In order to explore differences across cultures, Hofstede (1984) polled various IBM workers in forty different countries to understand how culture impacts work-related values. From his empirical data, the Hofstede Cultural Dimensions framework, a framework based on four dimensions of culture, was created to explain the incredibly stark differences between the cultures of different countries. Though the model has undergone changes as time has progressed—the model now contains six
dimensions instead of just four—it is regarded as the oldest and most reliable framework to compare cultures (Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv & Sanders, 1990; Yates & Cutler, 1996; Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). This framework, though not without its critics, has been cited in scholarly articles over 50,000 times on GoogleScholar as a key method for comparing different cultures.

When comparing the differences between the United States and Russia across the Hofstede Cultural Dimensions Model, the differences in cultural values are stark. From the data in Figure 1 (below), it is apparent that the two countries differed across all categories by a score of at least 25, with the biggest difference coming from the Long Term Orientation (a difference of 55) dimension of the model. With such large differences in culture, the need for the localization of both the images and text in advertisements is not only evident, but vital to the success of international marketing campaigns.

Figure 1: Hofstede Comparison of Russian and American Cultural Values
Localization and Linguistics

It is no surprise that linguistics would integrate so well into the study of localization. As more and more advertising gaffes are committed by international companies, interest in how the text of advertisements is translated and localized has become greater as linguists collect samples of advertisements for analysis. Cross-cultural communication also comes into the mix as audiences interpret the ads directed towards them. Martin (2007) found that international advertisers increasingly are using English for brand names in localized French advertising because the younger French population think that English is a “cool” language. Saeedfar and Afghary (2012) demonstrated the direct importance of localization as they discuss how translated advertisements need to be changed in order to be more relevant to the people of Iran. Localization studies frequently mention the need for editing advertisements to the culture of a specific demographic.

Localization Studies Using Beauty Magazines

One of the most popular mediums in which to look for localization differences among advertisements is a women’s fashion or beauty magazine. Since the ideals of beauty significantly change according to country and nationality, international fashion and beauty magazines have to highly localize their content in order to appeal to several different regional demographics (Machin & Leeuwen, 2005). For example, Xie and Zhang (2013) noted that in Asian markets, the ideal skin tone is viewed as “white” and “pale”, while the ideal skin tone in America is viewed as “tan”, “bronzed”, or “sun-kissed”. Xie and Zhang coded skin beauty advertisements taken from the US and Chinese editions of Cosmopolitan and Vogue magazine for model skin color and product descriptions. The study found that the US edition of Cosmopolitan featured models with significantly darker skin tones than the Chinese edition. While this study focused more on the visual differences that localization can produce in advertisements, Iglikova (2013)
looked at the differences in health content among the US, British, and Bulgarian editions of *Cosmopolitan* magazine and concluded that there are large distinctions in the way that health topics are treated among the three nations. Cultural differences can be found in advertisements from different parts of the world. The problem is that, so far, these differences have only been studied in the light of images or lexical comparisons. There has been little to no research on the effect localization has on other aspects of magazine advertisements, such as pragmatic structure.

**Genre Studies Investigating Advertising Structure**

Even though the language of advertising has been identified as having a unique linguistic context, there is surprisingly little research devoted to pragmatic structures within advertising. This could be due to the fact that linguists who want to study advertising do not have access to large, freely available samples (or corpora) of advertisements. One of the largest corpora to claim a sub-genre of advertising is the *British National Corpus* (BNC) (Aston & Burnard, 1998; Burnard, 2007). However, on examining the documents that make up this section of the BNC, it is clear that the advertisements included in this section of the corpus come from brochures and pamphlets, longer documents which share more qualities with books than with magazine ads. Therefore, if a researcher wanted to look at advertisements that were only one page in size or smaller, the BNC would not fulfill the scope of the research area.

Since large-scale corpora are not available to research advertising, several linguists have made small-scale self-built corpora by collecting their own samples of advertisements to study the language of advertising. One of earliest scholars to build a corpus of advertising was Paul Bruthiaux. Bruthiaux created a corpus of classified ads taken from newspapers and analyzed the ads for register variation in linguistic structure and syntax (Bruthiaux 1996). He found that certain registers of classified ads had more elaborate linguistic structures than others, but overall,
classified ads had minimal linguistic structure due to space constraints. Conner & Upton (2003) created a corpus of direct mail advertisements. In order to have the corpus be as real as possible, the corpus was created by having people just save all of the “junk mail” that they received in a given period. The data from the corpus enabled the duo to create linguistic profiles of each mail genre that they identified from their research according to a multi-dimensional analysis framework. Zarei & Darani (2013) created a corpus of spam emails that advertised different products and analyzed the structure of those emails according to a rhetorical move framework. Self-made corpora of advertisements have focused on specific genres within advertising in order to draw conclusions about the underlying structure of advertisements. All of these genre studies mentioned explored the structure of advertisements through a similar method of data collection. However, these studies did not have a consistent framework for analyzing the advertisements they found.

**Pragmatics of Advertising Discourse**

Analyzing genre features of advertising through corpus studies and other methods is important, but without a framework to explain the bigger picture of how these features create effects in consumers, valuable insights will be lost. Certain features of advertising, such as phonology, morphology, lexical innovation, and syntax, have all been studied in detail (Cook, 1992; Bell, 1999; Goddard, 2001; Luján-García, 2015; Myers, 1994; Anca & Elena, 2015; and Vestergaard & Schroeder, 1985), however, this study will focus on combining the pragmatic features of advertising in order to learn about the persuasive goals of advertisements. Leech (1966) was one of the first linguistics to propose a framework for the goals of advertisements. He theorized that there were four main categories that an advertisement must address in order to be successful.
Leech’s components for persuasive advertisements (1966, p. 27)

1. It must draw attention to itself. (Attention value)

2. It must sustain the interest it has attracted. (Readability/listenability)

3. It must be remembered, or at any rate recognized as familiar. (Memorability)

4. It must prompt the right kind of action. (Selling power)

Leech’s framework inspired many works which further refined his ideas, including Hardin (2001) and Simpson (2001). While Hardin (2001) condensed Leech’s framework from four components into three, Simpson (2001) took a different approach altogether. Using some of the same pragmatic features that Leech identified, Simpson changed the focus of Leech’s framework from the goals of an advertisement to instead an advertisement’s function.

_A Framework for Analyzing Advertising Function_

Simpson’s work built off of a scholar named David Bernstein. Drawing on his former experiences as a professional copywriter for advertising, Bernstein (1974) first proposed that advertisements could be categorized into two distinct categories based on their marketing function: “reason” advertising and “tickle” advertising. However, Bernstein’s work lacked a linguistic foundation, and it would take almost thirty years before Simpson (2001) took Bernstein’s (1974) “reason” and “tickle” distinction and provided it with the missing linguistic principles needed for pragmatic analysis. Simpson (2001) used several existing frameworks within linguistics to examine how a distinction between “reason” and “tickle” advertising could be defined through pragmatics. Simpson discusses Grice’s (1975) theory of cooperative behavior (maxims), Brown & Levinson’s (1987) politeness theory, Sperber & Wilson’s (1986) relevance theory, and Halliday’s (1994) systemic-functional framework to define how linguistic components such as directness might make up the distinction between “reason” and “tickle”
advertising. Even though Simpson (2001) proposed a pragmatic framework for analyzing an advertisement’s function, he did not formalize his framework.

The formalization of a pragmatically-based “reason” and “tickle” framework would become the goal of Kim (2007). In her extensive dissertation on “reason” and “tickle” advertising, Kim operationalized Simpson’s proposed framework by coming up with six main categories of discourse-pragmatic features (based on Cook, 1992; Delin, 2000; Hardin, 2001; and Simpson, 2001) that, when combined, could be used to label a given advertisement as either “reason” or “tickle”. In general, “reason” advertisements “enhance and highlight the primary motives for buying the product and provides a simple, direct, and unequivocal message that is easy to decipher and does not require complex inferencing on the part of the prospective buyer” (Kim, 2007, pp. 27). On the other hand, “tickle” advertisements “[do] not observe the criteria for reason advertising (the expressing of clear and unambiguous reasons to buy) and places emphasis on engaging the inferencing faculties of the reader to ‘figure out’ what is promoted” (Kim, 27). Kim successfully used her version of Simpson’s (2001) framework to analyze over 250 American print magazine advertisements for discourse features. However, Kim did not provide a measure of reliability for her “reason” and “tickle” framework, as Reihani & Rasekh (2012) pointed out. This study will attempt to provide through content analysis statistically measurable results that can attest to the reliability of Kim’s (2007) pragmatic variables.

“Reason” and “Tickle” in Other Languages

Since Simpson’s (2001) study, numerous scholars have used the “reason” and “tickle” framework to analyze the pragmatic function of advertisements. In recent years, most scholars citing Simpson’s (2001) research have used the framework to research advertising in various languages besides English. For example, Pop (2009) took the “reason” and “tickle” framework
and applied it to Romanian advertisements for IT products. Politis & Kakavoulia (2010) adopted the same framework and explored the “tickle” advertising strategies of radio ads in Greek. Martínez-Camino & Pérez-Saiz (2012) added further distinctions to the “reason” and “tickle” framework in order to apply it to television broadcasts in Mexico. While the present study follows the current research trend of applying the “reason” and “tickle” framework to a new or different language—in this case, Russian—this study is also unique in that localized advertisements will be discussed in light of how a specific advertisement’s “reason” or “tickle” structure might change due to the localization process. Even though several scholars have presented research on how Simpson’s (2001) “reason” and “tickle” framework can be culturally adapted into another language, no one has specifically looked at the effects of the framework on messages that need to be understood by multi-lingual audiences from different nations and cultures. Promoting a message to a world-wide audience that is understood equally by all is the challenge presented to international businesses every day, and that challenge is what this study will attempt to ultimately provide an answer for.

Summary

In this literature review, several key concepts relating to pragmatics and advertising were presented so as to aid further discussion presented in later chapters of this study. The terms persuasive discourse, pragmatics, and localization were defined in order to give necessary context to this study. Several studies exploring localization from a linguistics perspective were provided to illustrate how researchers have explored the realm of cross-cultural communication in contexts such as advertising. A few specific studies delving into the localization of beauty magazine advertisements were also brought up to explain how there is an absence of pragmatic-focused localization studies; instead, current localization studies are normally based on imagery
or lexis. Finally, Simpson’s (2001) “reason” and “tickle” framework was explained in order to present the reader with a foundation to understand the linguistic theories mentioned in this study.
CHAPTER THREE: Methodology

This study compares and contrasts localized Russian advertisements with non-localized Russian advertisements through codifying and quantifying pragmatic features of the ads. The methodology used for this research is modeled after Hardin’s (2001) study involving the presence or absence of certain pragmatic features and techniques in Spanish television advertisements and also Kim’s (2007) study investigating discourse variation in American magazine advertisements. Reihani and Rasekh’s (2012) study of “reason” and “tickle” advertising in Iranian magazines was also consulted for this chapter. However, as these studies do not include any information about the interrater reliability testing of coding schemes for the pragmatic features used in the “reason” and “tickle” framework, additional methodology is presented in the following chapter (Chapter 4) in order to contribute to pragmatic research in this field by establishing a reliable coding schema for these variables. This methodology is based on Neuendorf ‘s (2017) research in content analysis. The chapter will proceed as follows: first, the sampling process of the magazines will be discussed in order to provide the context for the data used in this study. Then, the variables for the analysis in Chapters 4 and 5 will be defined and thoroughly explained so as to build a framework for the discussion of pragmatic features that characterize Russian advertising. Finally, the question of subjectivity and how the described pragmatic features contributed to an advertisement’s overall designation of “reason” or “tickle” is addressed.

Deciding the Content and Size of the Sample

As advertising is a broad domain, I have narrowed the scope of this thesis to print magazine advertisements. Print magazine advertisements are static (just words on a page, instead of commercials or videos with spoken words), easily attainable, and are known within linguistic
research for being localized (Cao & Zhenmal, 2014; Chen & Machin, 2014; Iglikova, 2013, Xie & Zhang, 2013). Past linguistic studies in the field of magazine localization have mainly focused on women’s fashion magazines since these types of magazines are widely distributed in several languages, and these magazines also typically have large amounts of localization (Hoffman, 2010). Thus, the research sample needed to contain advertisements from multiple women’s fashion magazines that were published in both English and Russian on a monthly basis.

In order to find what magazines to include in my sample, I looked at data from TNS-Russia, a Russian media group that is similar to the media-tracking Nielsen Group in the US. TNS-Russia keeps track of the circulation numbers of the top one hundred magazines that are read in Russia on a monthly basis. From their list of the top one hundred Russian magazines, the top ten women’s magazines from the list were considered as possible sources of data for the study. Those magazines are listed below in Table 1 (TNS-Russia, 2015). Once the shortlist for Russian magazines was determined, the next consideration was to find out what magazines on the list were published in both Russian and English. Since this project focused on localization, magazines that were published in both the source language (English) and the target language (Russian) were needed so that the different advertisements could be compared for linguistic trends. Thus, Caravan of Stories, Burda, Good Advice, Psychologies, and Oops! were excluded from the sample since all of these magazines do not publish an English version of their magazine content. After excluding the non-English magazines, only five magazines were left: Cosmopolitan, Good Housekeeping, Glamour, Vogue, and Elle. Out of these five magazines, Good Housekeeping was also excluded from the sample, since this magazine’s median reader’s age was over ten years older than all of the rest of the magazines within the potential candidate
list (Hearst Corporation, Good Housekeeping, 2015). This was a significant difference that I feared would affect the language and content of that magazine’s advertisements.

Table 1: TNS-Russia’s Top Women’s Magazines in Russia from May–Oct 2015, sorted by Russian circulation numbers (shown in 1000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magazine Title*</th>
<th>Circulation in Russia (1000s)</th>
<th>Circulation in Moscow (1000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cosmopolitan</td>
<td>4100.4</td>
<td>719.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravan of Stories</td>
<td>3456.8</td>
<td>1014.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burda</td>
<td>2076.4</td>
<td>300.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Housekeeping</td>
<td>1400.6</td>
<td>242.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glamour</td>
<td>1299.2</td>
<td>253.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Advice</td>
<td>1182.6</td>
<td>322.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vogue</td>
<td>894.7</td>
<td>257.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologies</td>
<td>744.2</td>
<td>215.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oops!</td>
<td>644.7</td>
<td>191.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elle</td>
<td>606.2</td>
<td>185.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Russian magazine titles have been translated into the American equivalent.

After I removed Good Housekeeping from the potential candidate list, Cosmopolitan, Glamour, Vogue, and Elle were the only magazine candidates left. From this list, I began searching for back issues of these magazines. Obtaining copies of Glamour, Vogue, and Elle was relatively easy. However, obtaining back issues of the Russian edition ofCosmopolitan proved to be extremely difficult due to similarities between the Russian and Ukrainian versions of the magazine. After several failed attempts to order Russian versions of Cosmopolitan (only Ukrainian versions were available online), I decided to exclude this magazine from my sample.

In conclusion, after analyzing several women’s fashion magazines, the English and Russian versions of Glamour, Vogue, and Elle magazines were included in the final sample for this project. All of these magazines have similar content, comparable target demographics, and a top ten ranking in Russian circulation data.

Before collecting the data, the sample size for the project also needed to be determined. The sample originally was going to have a specific number of advertisements (around 600
advertisements). However, after taking the genre limitations of the data into account—the typical print magazine varies the number of ads that they sell in a given month—I decided instead to not focus on a predetermined number of individual advertisements. This decision parallels Kim (2007) and also follows the rationale of Lacy, Riffe, and Randle (1998) who determined that the sample size of for an academic study based on print magazine data should be founded on a year-long sample of each magazine in question. Furthermore, including a full year’s worth of magazines in my completed sample would minimize the effect of holiday advertising on the data.

After deciding how many advertisements to sample, the time period the advertisements came from also had to be determined. I chose to take my magazines from the 2016 publishing year since it was the most current year of data at the time of the corpus creation and sampling process. Thus, the sample contains data beginning from the January 2016 editions of the selected magazines and ending with the December 2016 editions in the data sample.

**Evaluating the Magazines**

In order to ensure that the selected magazines were similar to each other, I referenced the media kits of each magazine to determine the circulation, audience, advertising options, etc. of each magazine (Hearst Corporation, *Elle*, 2015; Conde Nast, *Glamour*, 2015; Conde Nast, *Vogue*, 2015). Media kits are put together by a magazine’s publisher to let advertisers know what demographics their ads would reach if they bought advertising space in a specific issue of the magazine. The data below in Table 2 and Table 3 reflect the findings of this media kit analysis.

**Table 2: Audience Analysis of Russian *Glamour, Vogue* and *Elle* magazines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Glamour</th>
<th>Vogue</th>
<th>Elle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>1,299,200</td>
<td>894,700</td>
<td>606,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price of Full-Page Ad*</td>
<td>795,000</td>
<td>840,000</td>
<td>760,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Prices are shown in Russian rubles; Audience Age and HHI not reported for Russian magazines*
Table 3: Audience Analysis of English *Glamour*, *Vogue* and *Elle* magazines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Glamour</th>
<th>Vogue</th>
<th>Elle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>2,348,000</td>
<td>1,267,754</td>
<td>1,101,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience Age</td>
<td>33.5 years median</td>
<td>38.3 years median</td>
<td>37.9 years median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price of Full-Page Ad*</td>
<td>$260,751</td>
<td>$196,535</td>
<td>$176,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader Household Income*</td>
<td>$61,827</td>
<td>$62,394</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Prices are shown in US Dollars

After careful analysis, the magazines appeared to be comparable to each other. Even though the circulation numbers are considerably larger or smaller depending on the magazine title, the general demographic figures indicate that the median age of all of the magazines is about thirty-five years old and that the readership as a whole are in the same spending category across the three magazines. The Russian magazines did not release demographic information for their magazines, but since these editions are overseen in part by their English counterparts, it seems reasonable that the demographic figures should be about the same across international editions.

Additionally, I also compared the total number of advertisements contained in the magazines in order to ensure that the magazines were comparable in advertising content. The results of this analysis are below in Tables 4 and 5. Even though the Russian edition of *Glamour* was the lowest in advertisement number among the three Russian magazine editions, it was relatively close to the other Russian magazines. The discrepancy of the number of advertisements in the English edition of *Glamour* compared to the English editions of *Vogue* and *Elle* is probably due to the fact that the price of a full-page ad in *Glamour* was almost $70,000 more than the other two magazines.
Table 4: Total Number of Advertisements in Sampled Russian Magazines, by month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Glamour</th>
<th>Vogue</th>
<th>Elle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Ads</strong></td>
<td><strong>607</strong></td>
<td><strong>832</strong></td>
<td><strong>916</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Total Number of Advertisements in Sampled English Magazines, by month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Glamour</th>
<th>Vogue</th>
<th>Elle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Ads</strong></td>
<td><strong>881</strong></td>
<td><strong>1410</strong></td>
<td><strong>1400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selecting Product Categories

Many reason and tickle linguistic studies separate advertisements within their respective samples into high- and low-involvement goods to add additional insight into pragmatic functions. High-involvement goods are characterized by a complex decision-making process that consumers make before purchasing the product; high-involvement goods are normally more expensive or harder to justify in a consumer’s mind, while low-involvement goods are goods that require low
effort on the part of the consumer to decide to buy them (Gass & Seiter, 2014). For example, Kim (2007) only collected advertisements for her sample that fell into the following three product categories: car advertisements (high-involvement), prescription medication (medium-involvement), and snack foods (low-involvement). Reihani and Rasekh’s (2012) also chose to separate their sample into these categories: packaged foods (low-involvement) and home appliances (high-involvement). However, this study departs from Kim (2007) and Reihani and Rasekh (2012)’s methodology and does not exclude advertisements from the sample size due to involvement category. The reason for this departure is two-fold: first, since this study is focused on localized advertisements, the sample size for advertisements is already significantly restricted to ads that appear in both the English and Russian versions of the selected magazines. If the sample was further restricted, there would not be enough data for full statistical analysis. Second, because this study deals with advertising in two different cultures, it is hard to prove that the consumer involvement level of a particular good is equal in both countries. For example, a perfume in the United States might be considered a medium-involvement good, but that same perfume, through pricing or increased branding, might be considered a high-involvement good in Russia. Kim (2007) and Reihani and Rasekh (2012) both only analyzed advertisements from one culture and, therefore, were able to take product category into account during their sampling.

Even though this study did not consider product categories, there were other factors that affected the inclusion or exclusion of an advertisement in the sample. One major factor that excluded many potential advertisements was advertisement size. In order to be consistent with other studies dealing with advertising, only advertisements that were at least 1/4 of a page or bigger were included in the sample. Another factor was repetition of an advertisement. If any
advertisement was repeated (in a subsequent issue or an issue of a different magazine), only the first instance of the advertisement was included in the sample.

**Collecting the Data**

After I decided to include the English and the Russian versions of the 2016 editions of *Glamour*, *Vogue*, and *Elle* advertisements in my corpus, copies of each magazine needed to be obtained to extract the data. I used three different methods to obtain my texts for the data collection process. The first method was printed copies of the magazines from libraries. The English versions of both *Glamour* and *Vogue* magazines were sampled through this method. The Russian versions of these magazines proved to be harder to find, since most libraries do not carry extensive Russian collections. Because of this, two different online websites were used to get the additional magazines needed for the study: issuu.com, a website where users can upload pdfs of their favorite magazines; and magzter.com, a for-profit website where users can download high-quality pdf copies of magazine back issues after purchase.

My goal for the first sample analyzed in this study was to find pairs of advertisements, one in the source language (English), and another in the target language (Russian), that advertised the same product. This sample was termed the *localized* sample. In order to create this sample, each issue of the selected magazines was sampled by month and language. The results of the sample were tracked in an index that highlighted matches of English and Russian advertisements for the same product. The corresponding image files of matching advertisements were put into a folder for the localized advertising samples. The index was also reviewed for any Russian companies that potentially could have bought advertisements in both the Russian and English versions of the magazines. This review ensured that the localized sample would only contain advertisements that did not originate in Russia.
My goal for the second sample was to find advertisements in the Russian editions of the magazines that were ads created for Russians by Russians: in essence, I needed to compare my first sample of localized ads with non-localized, Russian advertisements. As the magazines were sampled for non-localized advertisements, a separate index of Russian companies that had bought advertisements was made. These companies were almost always easily identifiable through the company’s website address (websites in Russia end with .ru instead of .com). However, if there was a question as to whether or not a company was Russian, a Google search was enough to determine where a company was founded to ensure that only Russian advertisements were included in the non-localized sample.

For each advertisement in either the localized or non-localized samples, a text file was created where organizational information such as magazine title, publication month, magazine language, and company name was kept track of. The text of each advertisement was also transcribed with a program called TextEdit which kept track of how many words each advertisement contained. While I transcribed all of the English advertisements for this study, I paid native Russian speakers to transcribe the Russian advertisements since their familiarity with the language enabled them to transcribe screenshots faster. For an example of an advertisement from the non-localized sample and its respective plain text file, please see Figures 2 and 3 below.
Figure 2: Screenshot of a Thierry Mugler Perfume advertisement, *Glamour* Jan 2016 Russian

Figure 3: Screenshot of a Plain Text File

```xml
<Magazine: Glamour Russia>
<Issue: Jan 2016>
<page: 7>

ANGEL
ОСТЕРЕГАЙТЕСЬ АНГЕЛОВ
Thierry Mugler
джорджия мэй джаггер
ОТКРОЙТЕ ВСЕЛЕННУЮ АРОМАТОВ THIERRY MUGLER НА САЙТЕ RU.MUGLER.COM
реклама
```
Framing the Variables for Analysis

For this study, the variables described in Simpson (2001) and Kim (2007) were used to analyze each advertisement for discourse and pragmatic features. These variables were:

1. Presence of Conjunctive Adjuncts (and their Russian equivalents), as defined by Simpson (2001) and quoted in Kim (2007); see Figure 4 for an example

   **Conditional:** [positive] if…then, in the event of, when

   [negative] otherwise, if not

   **Casual:** so, then, because, as a result, that’s why

   **Purposive:** in order to, so that you can, to [verb]

Figure 4: Screenshot of an Olay Luminous advertisement, *Elle* June 2016 English
The advertisement contains a casual conjunctive adjective “so” that implies to consumers that if they use the product, their skin will look younger: “So your skin won’t show your age.”

Conjunctive adjectives are typically seen only in “reason” advertisements.

2. Problem-Solution Discourse Structure; see Figure 5 for an example

**Problem/Solution or Situation/Problem/Solution**

Figure 5: Screenshot of a Biore Charcoal Strips advertisement, *Glamour* September 2016

The advertisement contains a problem-solution structure where the problem, here referred to as “dirty little secrets”, is the dirt and oil many women get in the pores of their skin that cause
blackheads and other acne. The solution is to use Biore’s Charcoal Pore Strips to cleanse the pores and remove the blockage. Problem-Solution structures normally denote “reason” ads.

3. Number of Words per Advertisement; see Figure 6 for an example

Figure 6: Screenshot of a Gucci clothing advertisement, *Vogue* November 2016 English

The advertisement only has two words. Smaller word counts are a distinctive feature of “tickle” advertising in this framework.

4. Negative and Positive Politeness Strategies, taken from Kim (2007) and based on Brown & Levinson (1987); See Figures 7 and 8 for examples

**Negative Politeness Strategies:**

- Lists of easy-to-decipher reasons and/or benefits to buy a product that allow the consumer to make up their mind without being imposed upon
- Hedges that mitigate face-threatening and minimize imposition (example: perhaps, possible, sort of, and modal verbs)
Use announcers and authorities to convey information to impersonalize the consumer.

Nominalizations, passive voice, and general statements

Figure 7: Screenshot of a Simple skin cleanser advertisement, *Glamour* February 2016 English

![Simple Skin Cleanser Advertisement](image)

This advertisement uses two different negative politeness strategies to motivate the consumer to buy the product. First, the ad appeals to an authority by including the “Best of Beauty Award Winner” badge to the right of the product. Second, the ad has a bulleted list of short, easy reasons to buy the product so the consumer can instantly understand the advantage of using the product. Negative politeness strategies denote “reason” advertising.
Positive Politeness Strategies:

Attendance to reader’s interests, wants, needs, and approval

Situations that evoke a feeling of a face-to-face conversation

Personal address, colloquial phrases, etc. (elements that evoke solidarity and shared experiences and values)

References to common ground

Jokes, flattery, promises, and gifts

Rhetorical questions or other forms of invitation and suggestion

Figure 8: Screenshot of an Essie nail polish advertisement, *Glamour* September 2016 English

This advertisement employs several different positive politeness strategies. The quote at the top of the ad contains both an invitation and a joke through the sense of word play. All of the nail
polish names at the bottom left are colloquialisms and puns on Japanese culture. Positive politeness strategies normally denote “tickle” advertising.

5. Presuppositions and Conventional Implicature; see Figure 9 for an example

Figure 9: Screenshot of a Clinique skin care advertisement, *Elle* June 2016 English

This advertisement has the phrase “There’s nothing superficial about Moisture Surge”, which has the implicit assumption that some other skin care products are superficial and don’t work. Also, the product name “Moisture Surge” implies that more moisture on your skin is a good thing, or that, if you use the product, you have dry skin. Presuppositions are a feature of “tickle” advertising.

6. Conversational Implicature (through the flouting of Gricean maxims), as interpreted by Kim (2007) and described by Hardin (2001); see Figure 10 for an example

**Quantity:** Ellipsis, Repetition, Lack of Information

**Quality:** False Assertions, Metaphor, Hyperbole/Understatement, Irony

**Relation:** Avoidance, Non-Relevance, Implied Relations/Comparisons
Manner: Rhetorical Questions, Ambiguous Statements, Vagueness, Obscure Language, Euphemism, Redundancy, Excessive Verbosity, Novelty

Figure 10: Screenshot of a Valentino accessories advertisement, *Vogue* May 2016 English

This advertisement flouts the Gricean maxim of manner and quality. Typically, accessory advertisements will include the product name for each product shown in the ad. However, the advertising copy on this ad lists only one product name for both products, “ROCKSTUD UNTITLED”. The products are not directly named and consumers who want to buy the particular products will need to do further research in order to look them up. Furthermore, the person holding both of the products is never fully seen; the model is obscure except for an arm and hand. Models in beauty magazines almost always are shown with their face, so the absence of the model’s body and head in this ad is intentionally vague. Flouting Gricean maxims is a feature of “tickle” advertising.
Categorization of “Reason” and “Tickle”

By analyzing these linguistic variables, the overall advertising strategy of either “reason” or “tickle” was assigned to each advertisement in both the localized and non-localized samples of advertisements. While this process of assigning “reason” and “tickle” to every advertisement was somewhat subjective—rarely would an advertisement fall completely into one category or another—great care was used in evaluating an advertisement according to the above variables. Subjectivity in this study was minimized by the explicitness of the criteria used to label the advertisements (as discussed above). Furthermore, subjectivity was also minimized by conducting a statistical analysis of the resulting data to find a reliability threshold for the framework (see Chapter 4: Content Analysis for more information).

As this study is a linguistics-based pragmatic study, I did not attempt to keep track of the different types of visual imagery that appeared in the advertisements, though, in other fields of study such as communications, this type of data is important and valuable. Visual imagery was outside the scope of my research questions—excepting, of course, when it was clear that an advertisement’s image fell into the category of a violated Gricean maxim—and, as such, it was not included in my analysis.

Advertisements within the localized ads sample were separated into the categories of original source language (English) and target language (Russian), and then the English and Russian versions of the ads were compared side-by-side to see if companies ever changed advertising strategies during the process of localization. This comparison was based on different levels of localization change: mere direct translation, changes in phrasing and/or cultural references, and finally, changes in persuasive strategy. These levels were based on the pragmatic variables that were assigned to each advertisement through content analysis. After the
comparison within the localized sample was completed, the localized Russian ads were compared with the non-localized Russian ads through counts of specific pragmatic features to see if localization caused a difference in advertising strategies. Variables related to “reason” and “tickle” advertising were further analyzed to look for possible patterns in overall Russian cultural advertisement strategy.
CHAPTER FOUR: Content Analysis

Previous studies in “reason” and “tickle” research freely admit the problems with classifying advertisements in qualitative ways. In fact, in one of the latest “reason” and “tickle” studies, Reihani and Rasekh (2012) point out that, while “reason” advertising is somewhat easy to pick out, “tickle” advertising, by its nature of including metaphors and implicature, is frustratingly difficult to operationalize via discourse characteristics. In support of this notion, at the end of her methodology section, Kim (2007) added the following caveat:

Given that discourse analysis of advertising language draws heavily on the explication of linguistic functions and meaning and requires a systematic accounting of our intuition about the straightforwardness or indirectness of texts (not to mention the non-linguistic and contextual data), it is difficult to conduct empirical investigations that reliably quantify inferences . . . At the forefront of any discourse analyst’s concerns are questions regarding how to deal with subjectivity as well as how to consistently remain methodical and principled in the handling of data and the analysis. The present study of advertising discourse shares such concerns of subjectivity and quantifiability with other discourse studies. (p. 74)

From this and many other pragmatic studies, the common complaint that many scholars receive is the field’s inability to code data with consistency. Because of this inherent problem with qualitative data, this study strives to mitigate the problems of unreliable qualitative data in “reason” and “tickle” research through the application of content analysis methods (Budd, Thorp, & Donohew, 1967; Krippendorf, 2013). Content analysis is one of the fastest growing methods for analyzing media in communication studies, and therefore, is a good fit for the magazine data set included in this study (Neuendorf, 2017). This study will significantly contribute to the field
of pragmatics through demonstrating interrater reliability and the testing of coding schemes relating to “reason” and “tickle” advertising. The following chapter will attempt, through content analysis, to answer the first research question of the study:

RQ 1: How reliable is Simpson’s “reason” and “tickle” framework in categorizing individual advertisements?

**Codebook Design**

After looking at studies that provided codebooks for pragmatic decisions and consulting Neuendorf’s (2017) *Content Analysis Guidebook*, I designed six separate codebooks (one per feature) that both identified and provided examples of the pragmatic features of “reason” and “tickle” advertising that I was interested in. Each codebook was designed to code for nominal data (i.e. categories that are mutually exclusive). Together, these six codebooks constituted my “coding scheme” for the project. Each codebook was given an alphabetic variable (Codebook A, Codebook B, Codebook C, etc.) and the corresponding coding sheet contained a list of numbers followed by the six letters used as variables for the codebooks.

**Coder Selection**

Because such great emphasis is placed on validity and the reliability of data in content analysis, coders should be interchangeable, or, in other words, the same results from the coding process should be attainable regardless of who codes the data. With this in mind, I chose to select a native English speaker who recently graduated from college as my coder for the English advertisements within the data set. She had no previous linguistics background or pragmatics training. Since Neuendorf (2017) states that, for the study of content in a specific language, the coder chosen for the coding process should be fluent in the target language, I employed a native Russian speaker originally from St. Petersburg for the Russian advertisements in the data set. My
Russian coder also had no linguistics background other than her training in English as a second language. I acted as the second coder for both the English and the Russian data sets.

**Coding Process**

In order to stay true to the content analysis approach, Neuendorf’s (2017) coding processes step-by-step guide was consulted and followed during every step of the coding process. Several coding sessions, including a pilot study at the beginning of the process, were held in order to (1) train the coders on the codebook, (2) engage in a consensus-building discussion, (3) revise the codebooks, (4) practice and retrain on the revised codebooks, and (5) code sub-samples of the data for reliability purposes.

Each coding session was held in a quiet room with minimal distractions. During a coding session, the codebook would be presented and training would be given to independent coders on the original codebook (or later iteration of the revised codebook). Sample advertisements were then presented, coded, and then discussed to make sure that the codebooks’ categories were understood. If needed, the codebook would be revised to account for specifics in the data that had not been addressed by the codebook. Following this process, the two coders would code a 10% sub-sample of the advertisements by viewing screenshots of advertisements on separate laptops and writing down the corresponding codes on a blank coding sheet. A 10% sub-sample is often quoted as the minimum number required to test reliability (Neuendorf, 2017). Notes were also kept by both coders in the case of questions, confusion, or suggestions to help in the revision of the codebooks. Results were compared after the task was complete and, normally, a discussion would commence about any coding difficulties. The coding session was then concluded. After each session, Cohen’s kappa, a statistic used to provide a scale of data reliability between two coders, was calculated in order to see how reliable the coders’ results were. If the data was
determined to not be reliable, the codebook was revised in order to establish validity and to try
the process again. To see the final version of the codebook scheme that this process produced,
please refer to Table 8 at the end of this chapter.

**Coding Results**

For this study, I conducted four rounds of coding for each language data set. For both the
localized advertisements and the non-localized Russian advertisements, a pilot study, followed
by three more rounds of coding, were performed in order to achieve the desired results for
reliability. The results of each round of coding are presented below in Tables 6 and 7.

Table 6: Reporting Cohen’s Kappa for English Coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codebook</th>
<th>Pilot Study</th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2*</th>
<th>Round 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Conjunctive Adjuncts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Negative Politeness</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Problem/ Solution Structure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Positive Politeness</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Implicature</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Violation of Gricean Maxims</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Between Round 1 and Round 2, the codebook received extensive revisions (the revisions from
the pilot study to Round 1 were much less rigorous), which is probably why Cohen’s kappa went
significantly down in three categories between Round 1 and Round 2.

Table 7: Reporting Cohen’s Kappa for Russian Coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codebook</th>
<th>Pilot Study</th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Round 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Conjunctive Adjuncts</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Negative Politeness</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Problem/ Solution Structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Positive Politeness</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Implicature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Violation of Gricean Maxims</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohen’s kappa is a statistic that typical ranges from 0.00 (agreement only according to chance)
to 1.00 (perfect agreement). According to Landis and Koch (1977), the cutoff scale for Cohen’s
kappa’s reliability can be interpreted according to the following values:
0.21-0.40 Fair agreement  
0.41-0.60 Moderate agreement  
0.61-0.80 Substantial agreement  
0.81-1.00 Near Perfect Agreement  

From these statistical criteria, it can be stated that, after four rounds of coding, the use of the final codebook produced from this study should generate near perfect agreement with an English data set between two coders. For a Russian data set, the use of the final codebook will generate either substantial agreement or near perfect agreement for two Russian-speaking coders. I do think, however, that if I could have hired another native Russian speaker to be the second rater for the Russian data set, instead of having myself (with my L3 Russian abilities) act as the second coder, the reliability and Cohen’s kappa would have been near perfect in all of the categories for the Russian data set. Having myself act as the second coder for both the localized sample and the non-localized, Russian sample was a necessary limitation of my study due to project funding constraints, but I know that my language abilities are not native and, due to culture differences, my native Russian coder and myself disagreed at points on some coding aspects (this was most evident in negative politeness and the violation of Gricean maxims). I consider it to be a strength that, in spite of our cultural differences and language abilities, the final codebook still produced data in the upper two tiers of statistical reliability. Running this experiment again with native speakers only acting as coders is an area for future research that could further substantiate the findings in this paper.  

After the codebook was determined to be reliable, only one coder was needed thereafter to code the rest of the data. The remaining 60% of the advertisements in each sample were coded by myself according to the codebook criteria. Additionally, the previous 40% of advertisements
that had been coded in the first rounds of coding (each 10% subsample that had been coded in the process of creating and revising the codebooks) were revisited to make sure that all of the advertisements were coded in a consistent manner using the same criteria for each pragmatic category.

Summary

In this chapter, content analysis was used to check the reliability of Simpson’s “reason” and “tickle” framework in categorizing individual advertisements. A statistical analysis using Cohen’s kappa proved that the framework can be used to reliably code data for the different pragmatic features used in this research. When the coding is done by two independent native language speakers, researchers can expect near perfect agreement in the interrater reliability of the data. The resulting codebooks from this study can be used by future studies in “reason” and “tickle” research to avoid the inherent problems with classifying qualitative data that frequent linguistic studies in the field of pragmatics.
Table 8: Thesis Codebooks (Final Version)

A. Conjunctive Adjuncts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Title</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctive Adjuncts</td>
<td>• The text of the advertisement contains some of the following words that denote a conditional attitude: [positive] if…then, in the event of, when [Russian: если тогда, если то, в случае, когда, тогда] [negative] otherwise, if not [Russian: если не]</td>
<td>1. If you want to get rid of your wrinkles, then use Wrinkle-Be-Gone. 2. When you want to feel young again, our skin cleanser can help. 3. Is acne a problem on your otherwise beautiful face? 4. Use SkinGlow so you can have that healthy, radiant skin. 5. Life is busy and your body deserves a break. That’s why we created Breakfree, our new skincare line. 6. In order to keep your teeth white, use OralClean three times a day. 7. Enter now to see if you are the winner of free skincare products for a year! 8. For a new look, try our edgy new eye liner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The text of the advertisement contains some of the following words that denote a causal relationship: so, then, because, as a result, that’s why [Russian: затем, потому что, в результате, вот почему, иначе, а то, в противном случае, чем…тем]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The text of the advertisement contains some of the following words that denote a purposive attitude: in order to, so that you can, to [verb], for [Russian: чтобы, так чтобы, для]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None Present</td>
<td>• The text of the advertisement does not contain any of the above words.</td>
<td>1. Our new line of lipstick will make your lips feel poppin’. 2. Luxury jewels, all the time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Negative Politeness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Title</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Negative       | *Negative politeness allows the consumer to stay unimpeded in their decision-making process and preserves status and distance between the advertiser and the consumer. It shows up most often in these situations:*  
- Lists of easy-to-decipher reasons and/or benefits to buy a product that allow the consumer to make an informed decision of whether or not to buy the product  
- Hedges that mitigate face-threatening (example: perhaps, possible, sort of, and modal verbs)  
- Uses announcers and authorities to convey information  
- Nominalizations (turning verbs into nouns)  
- Passive voice  
- General statements (statements that can’t be proven) | 1. Our new moisturizer can hydrate your skin, smooth wrinkles, and heal scars within two weeks of use.  
2. Perhaps you need more radiance in your life.  
3. Voted #1 Skincare product in America  
4. Our new product will be the best decision for your longevity.  
5. Your pimples will be taken care of.  
6. The best skincare on the market. |
| Politeness     |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                               |
| None           | *Text does not contain negative politeness strategies; or alternatively, the ad does not contain enough text to determine one way or the other.*                                                                 | 1. This new hairspray is our most secure yet.                                                  |
C. Problem/Solution Structure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Title</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Problem/Solution    | • The advertisement contains a framework within the advertisement’s text where a problem is identified and a solution is proposed | 1. Itchy scalp? Our new nourishing vitamin conditioner can chase that itchiness away.  
2. On average, 30% of American women cut their legs while shaving every week. Use the new Infinity razor for a clean, no-hassle shave. |
| None Present        | • The advertisement does not contain a problem/solution structure.          | 1. Our new lip balms come in 50 different shades so you can have the variety you need.  
2. Our nature skincare is made with ingredients that have been sourced naturally. |
D. Positive Politeness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Title</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Positive Politeness | Positive politeness expresses solidarity (unity) with the consumer and the wish to have consumers’ values approved. It shows up most often in these situations:  | • #loveyourbody  
|                  | • References to hashtags  
|                  | • Use of Personal Pronouns  
|                  | • Attendance to reader’s interests, wants, needs, and approval  
|                  | • Situations that evoke a feeling of a face-to-face conversation  
|                  | • Personal address, colloquial phrases, etc. (elements that evoke solidarity and shared experiences and values)  
|                  | • References to common ground  
|                  | • Jokes, flattery, promises, and gifts  
|                  | • Rhetorical questions or other forms of invitation and suggestion  | • How are you feeling about your body?  
|                  | None Text does not contain positive politeness strategies; or alternatively, the ad does not contain enough text to determine one way or the other. | 1. This new hairspray is very secure. |
**E. Presuppositions/Implicature:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Title</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong Presupposition/Implicature</td>
<td>Common knowledge or previous knowledge is referenced in the advertisement’s text and the audience needs to understand it in order to get the full meaning of the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak Presupposition/Implicature</td>
<td>No previous knowledge/little previous knowledge needed to understand the meaning of the statements in the advertisement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brush like your dentist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Our new blow dryer has super-sonic technology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For this category, please assume that the ad is a fashion/beauty-related company and that they are trying to sell you a product. This is previous knowledge that readers of the magazine would already know as they look at these ads.
F. Violation of Gricean Maxims:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Title</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Violation  of Gricean Maxims | **Quality** is where the speaker strives to say what they know to be true. So the advertisement contains true, factual information that can be taken literally. In order to violate this maxim, the speaker talks about things that they lack evidence about or they say deliberately false or semi-true statements. Quality is violated most often with these strategies:  
• False Assertions  
• Metaphor  
• Hyperbole/Understatement  
• Irony  
• General statements (statements that can’t be proven) | 1. Our new shampoo is what you have been missing your whole life.  
2. You want a new Chevy Malibu.  
3. The best skincare on the market.  
4. Increase your lash curl by 55%.  
5. Not only is our skin crème rejuvenating, relaxing, and calming, but it also has a softening effect.  
7. The new, big, complete package in a makeup kit.  
8. It’s not just a razor, it’s a Gilette.  
9. Listen more, love more, buy more Tiffany and Co jewelry. |
| | **Quantity** is where the speaker strives to give just enough information for the situation required. So the advertisement contains enough information for the reader to know what product the company is advertising and does not confuse the reader with more information than needed to decide to buy the product. In order to violate this maxim, the speaker gives too much or too little information. Quantity is violated most often with these strategies:  
• Ellipsis  
• Repetition  
• Lack of Information | |
| | **Manner** is where the speaker tries to avoid being ambiguous. Instead, the speaker is brief, orderly, and clear in what they are saying. The advertisement says everything in the most direct manner possible. In order to violate this maxim, the speaker is superfluous and disorganized or unclear in their speech. Manner is violated most often with these strategies:  
• Rhetorical Questions, Ambiguous Statements, Vagueness  
• Obscure Language/ Euphemism  
• Redundancy  
• Excessive Verbosity  
• Novelty | |
| | **Relation** is where the speaker strives to be relevant and on topic in a given situation. The advertisement contains information that is related to the product they are trying to sell. In order to violate this maxim, the speaker goes off topic or avoids the subject | |
Relation is violated most often with these strategies:

- Avoidance
- Non-Relevance
- Implied Relations/Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No violation</th>
<th>No Gricean maxims are violated by the text of the ad or the advertisement does not contain enough text to tell if any maxims are violated.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. This eyeliner contains iron.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Blank Coding Sheet</th>
<th>Sample Completed Coding Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  A.</td>
<td>1 A. Conjunctive Adjuncts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>B. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>C. Problem/Solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>D. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>E. Strong Presupposition/Implicature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>F. Violation of Gricean maxims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  A.</td>
<td>2 A. Conjunctive Adjuncts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>B. Negative Politeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>C. None present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>D. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>E. Weak Presupposition/Implicature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>F. No violation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  A.</td>
<td>3 A. None present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>B. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>C. None present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>D. Positive Politeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>E. Weak Presupposition/Implicature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>F. Violation of Gricean Maxims</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE: Data and Analysis

In this chapter, the data will be presented as follows: first, an overview of the two samples that were collected (localized, \(N=128\); and non-localized advertisements, \(N=235\)) will be discussed. The analysis will then proceed according to the study’s last two research questions:

RQ 2: How does localization in advertisements affect the different pragmatic structures (i.e. “reason” advertising vs. “tickle” advertising) found in American and Russian magazine print advertising?

RQ 3: Are there specific discourse variables within Simpson’s (2001) framework that characterize non-localized Russian advertisements in magazines?

The English and Russian advertisements within the localized sample of advertisements will be compared through the different features of “reason” and “tickle” advertising to address the second research question. Next, to address the third research question, the localized Russian advertisements will be compared with the non-localized Russian sample to weigh the differences of localization on advertising in Russian magazines. The specific pragmatic features of “reason” and “tickle” advertisements in the non-localized Russian sample will also be reviewed in order to provide an overall characterization of advertising strategies that Russian companies use so that American companies can be more aware of the advertising culture of Russia.

Sample Details

I categorized the individual advertisements from all of the magazines to ensure that the sample had a good mix of advertisements for makeup, fashion, jewelry, etc. and that one magazine did not have a spike in a certain kind of ad category. Tables 9 and 10 below show the result of this analysis. For the most part, all of the companies that advertised in the magazines were recognizable brands in the fashion/beauty industry and the ad types were balanced across
categories (fashion, skin care, shoes/purses, etc.). In general, the Russian magazines were much more balanced in both page counts and advertisement totals than the English magazines. The English edition of *Vogue* had, by far, a greater number of advertisements included in the localized sample of ads (see Table 9).

Table 9: English Magazine Advertising Category Breakdown (Localized Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertising Category</th>
<th>Glamour</th>
<th>Vogue</th>
<th>Elle</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetic Surgery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underwear</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes/Purses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watches/Jewelry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfume</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makeup</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Products</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Products</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skincare</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV/Media</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Advertisements</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>128</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The explanation for this can be found in the page counts of the English editions of the three magazines. English *Vogue* had the longest page count for almost every monthly issue of the English magazines, and therefore, *Vogue* had the most advertisements among the localized sample. Another reason for the uneven distribution of the ads in the localized sample is that I started the sampling process with *Vogue*, and only the first instance of each advertisement among the three magazines was collected in the sample. This meant that if an advertisement occurred in *Vogue* January, *Vogue* March, *Glamour* February, and *Elle* March, only the first instance of the ad in the *Vogue* January magazine would be included in the sample.
Table 10: Russian Magazine Advertising Category Breakdown (Russian Non-Localized Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertising Category</th>
<th>Glamour</th>
<th>Vogue</th>
<th>Elle</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetic Surgery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underwear</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes/Purses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watches/Jewelry</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfume</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makeup</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Products</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Products</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skincare</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV/Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Advertisements</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>235</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to point out that these numbers do not represent the total number of advertisements that appeared in the magazines in the 2016 publication year. Well over five thousand advertisements appeared in the magazines during this time frame. The numbers in the two samples (localized, \(N=128\); and non-localized advertisements, \(N=235\)) only represent the number of unique advertisements found in the magazines. For example, an advertisement for Gucci Bamboo perfume occurred four times in Elle Russia (January, February, March, and April), three times in Glamour Russia (January, February, and March), and twice in Vogue Russia (January and February), but the ad was only counted once in the localized sample.

It is also important to note that both samples only contained multiple advertisements from a company if the advertisements were for distinctly different products. L’Oreal had three different advertisements included in the final sample of localized ads because all three products (a clay mask, a new lipstick line, and a root concealer hair spray) could be categorized into a different product category (skincare, makeup, and hair products, respectively). Gucci, on the
other hand, only had one advertisement in the final localized sample because all of the
advertisements that Gucci paid for in the 2016 publication year were for the same product type
(clothes) and contained the exact same text every single time an advertisement occurred.

**Localized Sample**

The localized sample contained pairings of advertisements bought by international companies
that advertised the same product in two different cultures. These advertisements ($N=128$) were
analyzed according to the six different codebooks that outlined pragmatic features of reason and
tickle advertising and then, by also taking word count into consideration, assigned an overall
designation of “reason” or “tickle”. For each advertisement pairing, the English version was first
rated with the six different codebooks for each pragmatic feature of “reason” and “tickle”
categories, and then the Russian version was later rated according to the same criteria. The two
advertisements were then compared to see how much the text of the advertisement changed from
the English version to the Russian version, as well as if any of the categories had a change in
reason vs tickle persuasion strategies. To see the results of the “reason” and “tickle” coding of
the localized sample, please refer to Table 11 below.

**Table 11: Number of Advertisements per Pragmatic Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pragmatic Feature Code</th>
<th>English Localized Sample</th>
<th>Russian Localized Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctive Adjuncts</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Politeness</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem/Solution Structure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Politeness</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Presupposition/Implicature</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of Gricean Maxims</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reason Advertisements</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tickle Advertisements</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data above, it is apparent that localization did not affect the total numbers of the
pragmatic features within the “reason” and “tickle” framework. The reason that there were so
few advertisements that changed in their pragmatic features might be that many of the advertisements had few, if any changes. Table 12 summarizes the findings of the localized ad comparison between the original English advertisements and the localized Russian advertisements.

Table 12: Localization Changes in Advertisement Text from English to Russian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Change</th>
<th>Number of Advertisements</th>
<th>Percent of Advertisements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low/None</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These comparisons were made by a study of how many of the original pragmatic variables from the English advertisement changed in the Russian version of the advertisement for each advertisement pairing. Since the pragmatic variables in question were assigned to each advertisement using the criteria found in the codebook created for this study, no additional reliability measures were needed for this process because the codebook had already been tested for reliability using Cohen’s kappa. An assignment of a low/none degree of change to an advertisement pairing indicated that all six of the pragmatic variables did not change when the English advertisement was localized, and the wording of the Russian advertisement remained similar to the original English text. An assignment of a mid-level degree of change to an advertisement pairing indicated that all six of the pragmatic variables did not change when the English advertisement was localized, but the wording of the Russian advertisement differed from the original English text significantly. Finally, an assignment of a high degree of change to an advertisement pairing indicated that at least one of the six pragmatic variables changed when the English advertisement was localized, signifying a shift in the pragmatic function (and the advertising strategy) of the ad.
Low/No Degree of Change

An advertisement pairing was categorized as having a low/none degree of change if the contact information of the ad was merely changed from displaying American cities/addresses/telephone numbers to Russian ones. Additionally, if minor words were added or removed from the text, the advertisement pairing was also assigned this category. To see two different examples of advertisements that represent this category, please see Figures 11 and 12 below.

Figure 11: Example of a Pairing with Low Degree of Change

English: taken from *Elle*, April p. 163. 
Russian: taken from *Vogue*, April p. 79

Here, in Figure 11, the differences from the English ad to the Russian ad are minor. On the left side, the phrase describing the jewelry collection name advertised, “Possession Collection”, is only partially translated into Russian, “Коллекция Possession*” [Collection Possession]. The wording on the right side of the advertisement that accompanies the product website in the English version, “e-boutique on piaget.com” is simplified to just “piaget.com” and the English phone number is removed entirely. On the bottom right, the list of cities containing Piaget
boutiques is replaced instead with three specific addresses of Piaget stores in the Russian area and their respective phone numbers. For pragmatic features, the reason and tickle codes remained the same in both ads: in both languages, the ad does not contain conjunctive adjuncts, does not contain negative or positive politeness, contains no problem/solution structure, requires little to no implicature to be understood, and does not violate any Gricean maxims. The word count decreased slightly in the Russian version (WC=16) due to the Russian version listing only three addresses of stores, while the English version (WC=20) listed six different cities that had Piaget stores. Overall, even with the minimal changes, the advertisement remained “tickle” in both the English and the Russian versions.

Another example of a low/none advertisement pairing is the pairing of advertisements from La Perla (see below). Literally nothing is changed as part of the text. The only two textual elements of the ad, the website on the top left corner and the brand name on the bottom right, remain unchanged going from the English to the Russian version. Since nothing in the text changed, there was no change in the codes assigned to this advertisement among the six different pragmatic features tracked. The word count also remained the same (WC=2). The advertising strategy remained “tickle” in both versions of the ad.
Figure 12: Example of a Pairing with No Degree of Change

English: taken from *Vogue*, January p. 14

Russian: taken from *Vogue*, February p. 50
This type of low/none advertisement pairing with little to no change in the text, and no change in the coding of individual pragmatic features of “reason” and “tickle” advertising, constituted the vast majority of the pairings in the localized sample. Minor changes that advertisers made among this sample include the following:

- Adding/removing telephone numbers
- Adding/removing addresses
- Adding the Cyrillic equivalent of an English product name or designer in fine print
- Adding translations of French, Italian, or English in fine print
- Removing text around websites so just the website remains
- Adding/removing the names of stores where the product can be bought
- Adding/removing hashtags or social media references
- Removing company taglines

All of these changes were classified as low or none because the effort a localizer would need to put into the ad to switch between the different language versions is minimal. Most of these changes could even be done by a worker who doesn’t speak Russian at all. Interestingly, of the 103 (80.5%) ads that fell into the low/none degree of change category, the majority of them (88) used an overall “tickle” strategy to sell their products.

Mid-Level Change

An advertisement pairing was categorized as having a mid-level of change if text was added to the advertisement or existing text was significantly changed that either was more culturally appropriate for a Russian audience, or contained evidence that the new Russian text, though similar to the original English text, was not a direct translation and instead was chosen to appeal to a Russian audience. Mid-level advertisements normally had localized phrases, but these
phrases did not constitute a major redirection of the overall strategy for selling the product. For two advertisement pairings that reflect this category, please see Figures 13 and 14.

Figure 13: Example of a Pairing with Colloquial Phrasing Changes

English: taken from *Glamour*, February p. 27

Russian: taken from *Glamour*, March p. 143

While this advertisement pairing had elements of a low/none change (addition of a website, addition of Cyrillic translations of the English nail polish color names, etc.), the large text on the bottom right is clear evidence of more effortful, localized change in the language. The acronym “OMG” [“Oh my gosh!” or “Oh my God!”] in the English version of the ad was not directly translated for the Russian version. Instead, the colloquial Russian interjection “Oго” [Wow!, or Woah!] was used to replace the English OMG element, so the alliteration of the “g” sound in gel could be kept. Even though the language here was localized, the pragmatic function of the text (positive politeness from a use of a colloquial phrase) remained unchanged, which is why the advertisement pairing did not fall in the “high” change category. For these ads, the coding for
pragmatic features remained the same in both advertisements, though the text of the Russian ad was localized, and an overall advertising strategy of “tickle” was given to both ads.

Figure 14: Example of a Pairing with Cultural Phrasing Changes

English: taken from *Elle*, July p. 57

Russian: taken from *Glamour*, March p. 193

In this example, the main strategy of the advertisement is to display eight different named poses that illustrate how Always pads can protect women when they try to sleep on their periods. The main text in the middle of the advertisement reflects a localized change in the grammatical structure of the sentence (but still conveys the same meaning): the English phrasing of “However you sleep, you’re protected.” is changed to the Russian “В какой бы позе вы ни спали, вы под защитой always” [In whatever pose you sleep, you are under protection]. The addition of the grammatical structures “В какой бы” and the preposition “под” make this translation a highly skilled translation. Additionally, this ad was given a mid-level categorization because some of the pose names in the American ad were changed to make sense to a Russian audience. For
example, one of the pose names in the English ad is “The Doggy Paddler”. That same pose in the Russian ad is titled “Крадущийся тигр” [Crouching Tiger]. Since many Russians do not have a chance to swim as often as Americans due to the colder weather and the lower availability of swimming pools, the English cultural reference to swimming was replaced with a more understandable animal reference in the Russian version of the ad. Another pose in the English ad was named “The Jumping Jack”. However, in the Russian ad, this name was changed to the much simpler “Звезда” [Star]. These changes in the different names of the sleep poses actually affected the coding of the pragmatic features identified in the codebooks. The English pose names constituted a code of Strong Presupposition/Implicature, whereas, the Russian names (changed to animal/shape references) required much less foreknowledge to understand, so the coding of the Russian ad was changed to Weak Presupposition/Implicature. However, since the overall strategy of “reason” did not change in the ad going from English to Russian, this particular pairing of advertisements was given a categorization of mid-level change in localization.

Advertisements that were classified as mid-level localization were given this classification because a native speaker or high-proficiency L2 speaker would need to be consulted in order to make these changes in wording. However, though still an incredible step above the low/no change category, the mid-level changes are still only lexically deep. The three main changes that were found in these advertisements were the following:

Cultural phrasing changes
Grammatical changes
Colloquial lexical Changes
These changes do not constitute a different strategy for selling products to a Russian audience. They only are improvements or changes to make sure that the original, English marketing strategy would not be misunderstood. These changes do not reflect any difference in persuasive techniques of the advertisements.

*High Level of Change*

An advertisement pairing was categorized as having a high degree of change if the content of the advertisement was changed so much that the reason/tickle strategy of the advertisement was significantly affected. These types of advertisements reflected a deep cultural knowledge of the Russian people and how to sell to them differently as a result of understanding their national values. The most common examples of typical changes in this type of localization category are the following:

- Negative Politeness (list of reasons) to Negative Politeness (use of authority/celebrity)
- Negative Politeness (hedges) to Violation of Gricean Maxims
- Negative Politeness (any) to Positive Politeness (increased solidarity)
- Addition of Problem/Solution Structure
- Addition of Positive Politeness (promises and gifts)

Most of the Russian advertisements in this category kept the original “reason” or “tickle” designation of their English counterpart, but due to entirely different reasons or pragmatic features. However, some advertisement pairings in this category did switch from “reason” to “tickle” or from “tickle” to reason”. For two examples of advertisements that were classified as high change, please see Figures 15 and 16 below.
This advertisement in English is focused on the reasons that Head and Shoulders hair products can improve a person’s hair. The text from the advertisement claims that the “lavender essence and natural extracts” in this product line will give someone “both 100% flake-free and beautiful hair”. It is primarily “reason” based: the consumer is given a list of list of reasons why the product is beneficial (an aspect of negative politeness). However, the Russian advertisement for the same product line utilizes a completely different pragmatic strategy. The Russian advertisement revolves around the actress, Sofía Vergara, who is pictured in the photograph accompanying the text (interestingly, the English ad uses the exact same photograph, but never mentions anything about the person in the photograph, so English audiences just assume that it is
a nameless model). The Russian ad not only mentions the name of the actress four times, but the entire text of the ad is centered around the actress’s use of Head and Shoulders products:

Узнайте, какой шампунь помогает волосам Софии выглядеть восхитительно!

[Find out which shampoo helps Sophia's hair look delightful!]

София Вергара живет на полную – посвящаю себя карьере, путешествует, постоянно пробует новое и получает максимум эмоций! Потный график востребованной и успешной актрисы не помеха тщательному и эффективному уходу за кожей головы. Главный секрет Софии - свобода от перхоти и пышные здоровые локоны. И когда речь идет о красоте и здоровье волос, Она выбирает невероятный объем с Head & Shoulders!

[Sofia Vergara lives life to the fullest – she devotes herself to a career, travels, and is constantly trying new things and getting maximum emotion (as a result)! The sweaty schedule of a popular and successful actress does not interfere with the careful and effective care of her scalp. The main secret of Sofia is freedom from dandruff and lush healthy curls. And when it comes to beauty and healthy hair, she chooses an incredible amount of Head & Shoulders!]

The text of the Russian advertisement uses the use of the actress’s authority (an aspect of negative politeness) to sell the product, whereas the English advertisement does not use any authority figures to sell the product. This shift in the pragmatic features used to sell the product does not affect the main advertising strategy of the ad: the ad was classified as “reason” in both English and Russian. However, since the selling persuasive strategy of the ad changes, this pair of advertisements was classified as reflecting a high localization change because the company had to understand key differences between American and Russian culture in order to make this
switch. Under the Hofstede Cultural Dimensions model, Russia ranks 93 (out of 100) for power distance, an element that “leads to a great importance of status symbols” and the opinion of powerful people in the culture (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). The United States, on the other hand, ranks only 40 (out of 100) in *Power Distance*, meaning that Americans base their decisions not on authorities, but on the merit or evidence presented to them. This deep cultural difference between Russia and America is reflected in the advertising strategy of these two ads: the Russian ad uses a celebrity to sell the product, whereas the American ad lays out several reasons the product will help the consumer, and leaves it to the consumer to make up their own mind (this also taps into the Hofstede value of *Individualism*, of which Americans scored a 91 and Russians only scored a 39).

Figure 16: Example of a Second Pairing with High Change

English: taken from *Vogue*, March p. 218
In the English version of this advertisement, the ad lays out several options for customizing the new Lexus model, “Adative Vairable Suspension” and “20-inch alloy wheels”, as well as features of the car that make it worth buying, “30-MPG combined rating” and “308 total system horsepower”. The ad’s text ends with “Never has luxury been this expressive.” The English version makes it very clear that the car has specific reasons to buy it (a feature of negative politeness) and also violates a Gricean maxim, “Never has luxury been this expressive.” The English version of this ad was classified as “reason” for its overall advertising strategy. The Russian advertisement, however, completely changed the focus of its text. The Russian ad contains several forms of personal address (a feature of positive politeness): “культовый кроссовер Lexus RX нового поколения станет вашим проводником в волнующий мир роскоши” [The cult crossover Lexus RX of the new generation will become your guide to the exciting world of luxury]; and “они создают для вас невероятный стиль жизни – жизни, в которой вы всегда в центре внимания и в центре событий” [They create for you an incredible lifestyle - a life in which you are always the center of attention and in the center of events]. The ad in Russian offers incredible promises of social acceptance and increased status (an additional
feature of positive politeness), whereas the English version does not contain any promises of this kind. Due to this, the Russian ad was classified as “tickle” and is a rare example of an ad that changed its overall advertising strategy going from English to Russian by changing its coding values of pragmatic features.

Out of the 25 advertisement pairings that had either mid- or high-level changes in the wording of the advertisement text, only 13 (barely half) changed their overall advertisement strategy when the ad was localized for a Russian audience. Out of the 13 advertisements that changed strategies, 6 (almost half) changed strategies due to the addition of a celebrity or authority figure. The rest of the advertisement pairings did not change the overall advertising strategy that the ad utilized to sell a product.

**Localization Summary**

The data in this section attempted to answer the following research question:

RQ 2: How does localization in advertisements affect the different pragmatic structures (i.e. “reason” advertising vs. “tickle” advertising) found in American and Russian magazine print advertising?

After a close analysis of the data, it was determined that the overwhelming majority of international advertisements either do not change or complete minimal changes to the Russian versions of advertisements. The pragmatic feature codes of “reason” and “tickle” strategies that were originally assigned to the English versions of the advertisements were rarely affected by the changes made to their corresponding Russian advertisements, even if the changes were categorized as mid- to high-level changes. Additionally, very few advertisements (13 out of 128, or 10.2%) had their overall advertising strategy changed to appeal to the different cultural values
of Russia. From this data, we can determine that the impact of localization on both advertising strategies and pragmatic features is low among international companies.

**Pragmatic Features of the Non-localized Sample**

The non-localized sample contained advertisements ($N=235$) bought by local, Russian companies that advertised Russian products, services, or events in the Russian editions of *Elle*, *Vogue*, and *Glamour*. These advertisements were also analyzed, just like the localized sample, according to the six different codebooks that outlined the pragmatic features that make up the framework for “reason” and “tickle” advertising. After each advertisement was coded, the ad was assigned an overall designation of “reason” or “tickle” by taking into account both the word count of the advertisement and the pragmatic features. To see the results of the “reason” and “tickle” coding of the non-localized sample, please refer to Table 13 below.

Table 13: Number of Advertisements per Pragmatic Category, Non-localized Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pragmatic Feature Code</th>
<th>Russian Non-localized Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctive Adjuncts</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Politeness</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem/Solution Structure</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Politeness</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Presupposition/Implicature</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of Gricean Maxims</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reason Advertisements</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tickle Advertisements</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to find out what, if any, of these pragmatic features were more characteristic of (non-localized) Russian advertisements, I conducted a statistical analysis for each of the above categories. I compared the coding results from the localized Russian advertisements with the non-localized Russian results. Side by side, the comparison is shown in Table 14, along with the calculated percentage of ads in each category (non-localized Russian advertisements, $N=235$; localized Russian advertisements, $N=128$).
Table 14: Comparison of Russian and Localized Russian Ads per Pragmatic Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pragmatic Feature Code</th>
<th>Russian Ads</th>
<th>Localized Russian Ads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctive Adjuncts</td>
<td>41 / 17.4%</td>
<td>27 / 21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Politeness</td>
<td>137 / 58.3%</td>
<td>42 / 32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem/Solution Structure</td>
<td>17 / 7.2%</td>
<td>2 / 1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Politeness</td>
<td>112 / 47.7%</td>
<td>49 / 38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Presupposition/Implicature</td>
<td>7 / 3.0%</td>
<td>11 / 8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of Gricean Maxims</td>
<td>108 / 46.0%</td>
<td>40 / 31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reason Advertisements</td>
<td>94 / 40.0%</td>
<td>26 / 20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tickle Advertisements</td>
<td>141 / 60.0%</td>
<td>102 / 79.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to localized Russian ads, non-localized Russian advertisements had an over 20% difference in the negative politeness, and total reason categories. With this data, I next conducted a Chi-square analysis to see if any of the categories were dependent on each other, or, in other words, if there was any effect of localization on the use of the pragmatic features that Simpson (2001) and Kim (2007) included in their “reason” and “tickle” studies (Preacher, 2001). While I conducted all Chi-square tests at p < .05 since it is regarded as the standard for studies in the behavioral sciences, if p was found to be significant at a lower level than my base of p < .05, it was reported as such (Kline, 2013). The Chi-square test of independence for the number of reason advertisements was significant: $\chi^2 (2) = 13.45$, $p < .0005$. This means that, overall, Russian advertisements are significantly more likely to be reason-based than the localized ads in this sample created for a Russian audience by non-Russians.

**Reason-based Advertising**

Because the Chi-square test for reason advertisements came back as significant, I decided to do further statistical analysis and find out which, if any, of the three “reason” pragmatic features—conjunctive adjuncts, negative politeness, and problem/solution structure—contributed to the Russian tendency for reason-based advertising. After conducting the tests for each of these three categories, the Chi-square test of independence for negative politeness was found to be
significant: $\chi^2 (2) = 21.53$, $p < .0001$. However, the test for conjunctive adjuncts was not significant ($p = .3948$), and the Chi-square test for problem/solution structure could not be conducted due to having a frequency lower than 5 for one of the categories (only 2 out of the 128 localized ads had a problem/solution structure).

Negative politeness allows consumers to stay unimpeded in their decision-making process and status and distance between the advertiser and the consumer. As stated above, the Hofstede Cultural Dimensions model gives Russia a score of 93 (out of 100) for the element of power distance, while the United States was only given a score of 40. From this score, it makes sense that Russian advertisements that are designed for a Russian consumer base by Russians themselves would contain much more negative politeness than the localized, international advertisements since negative politeness is a strategy that reflects power distance. In the codebook that this study used to rate negative politeness, the use of an announcer or authority was one of the sub-categories. The aspect of using celebrity endorsements in Russian advertising was already discussed above in *High Level of Change* section (see Figure X and the accompanying discussion), but it is important to note that this is a significant trend in Russian advertising. Using authorities and putting celebrities’ names in actual print reference (instead of just using their pictures) reflects the power differential that Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov found to be ingrained in Russian society. Out of the entire non-localized Russian sample, 38 different celebrities were used to endorse products. This number did not include other types of authorities, such as scientists or field experts, but if it did, the number would be much higher. The localized advertisements created by international companies used far less celebrities to endorse products, and therefore used less negative politeness and reason-based advertising. International companies do not realize how crucial using celebrity endorsement and other forms of negative
politeness is to selling their products in a Russian market, but if they did, their advertisements would connect better with their target consumers.

**Tickle-based Advertising**

I also conducted Chi-square tests of independence for the features of “tickle” advertising: positive politeness, strong presupposition/implicature, and violation of Gricean maxims. Though positive politeness was not found to be significant (p = 0.0857), both the tests for strong presupposition/implicature and violation of Gricean maxims were significant.

Russian advertisers used strong presupposition/implicature significantly less than international advertisers: \( \chi^2 (2) = 5.544, p < .05 \). Why would Russian companies use weak implicature in advertising more than their international counterparts? Russia was given a score of 95 (out of 100) on another element of Hofstede’s Cultural Dimension model: uncertainty avoidance. *Uncertainty Avoidance* is “the extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by ambiguous or unknown situations and have created beliefs and institutions that try to avoid these” (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). Russians prefer to have a very thorough and complete understanding of the context of a situation before making a decision. When they don’t have that understanding, Russians feel threatened. From this, it follows that Russian advertisements would use weak implicature over strong implicature in selling situations, because local businesses do not want to take the chance that a Russian might not have heard of a cultural reference or similar feature of strong implicature. Using strong implicature would be taking the risk that a Russian would not buy a product because they are not “in” on the joke or reference used—since Russians avoid ambiguity as much as possible, it is easy to imagine that, when Russian consumers do not fully understand an advertisement, they will simply just not by that product, or buy a different brand over the one that used strong implicature in their advertising.
Americans, who scored a 46 in *Uncertainty Avoidance*, have a much higher tolerance for uncertainty and are willing to go to the effort to find out more information if they do not understand something, which explains why the localized advertisements contained more uses of strong implicature. However, this exhibits a need for increased localization of advertising strategies. International companies who continue to use strong implicature in their advertising are in danger of not selling as much product as their local Russian competition, since strong implicature can be off-putting to a Russian consumer base.

Russian advertisers also violated Gricean maxims significantly more than international advertisers: $\chi^2 (2) = 7.423, p < .05$. At first sight, this finding seems to contradict the notion from Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov (2010) that Russians try to avoid uncertainty and ambiguous situations. However, the category of Gricean maxim violations had four different sub-categories, and while violations of manner and relation (two maxims that are in line with avoiding ambiguity and non-relevance) constituted two of the sub-categories within Gricean maxims, Russian advertisements were much more likely to violate one of the two other maxims that this study analyzed. The other Gricean maxims included in this study were quality, where the speaker strives to say only what they know to be true, and quantity, where the speaker strives to give just enough information for the situation to be understood. Where the Russian advertisements differed the most from the localized advertisements was in word count (an aspect of quantity). Many of the advertisements in the Russian non-localized sample were judged to include many more words than necessary to prove their points and sell their products. Instead of giving a list of two to three reasons to buy a product, some Russian advertisements would give four or five. In fact, when comparing the average number of words per advertisement, the Russian non-localized sample had an average of 82.9 words per ad. In comparison, the localized advertisements created
by international companies had an average of only 32.7 words per ad, which was almost 50 less words per ad. Russians are using much more prose on their advertisements, and the last dimension of Hofstede’s Cultural Dimensions model, indulgence, explains why.

The element of *Indulgence* is defined by Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov as “the extent to which people try to control their desires and impulses” (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). Russians earned a score of just 20 (out of 100) on the Indulgence scale, while Americans in comparison scored a much higher 68. Russia’s score was so low on the *Indulgence* scale that it was classified by Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov as a “restrained” culture that is extremely cynical and pessimistic. Advertisers in Russia have to overcome that cynicism somehow, and one of the strategies they use is providing extra reasons and information to buy a product. For example, 17 of the non-localized Russian advertisements gave coupons or other special sale offers to consumers at the bottom of their already reason-filled advertisements. These coupons and sale announcements are an additional reason for Russians to buy a product that might have sounded good before, but, with a 50% discount, sounds even better. The number of localized advertisements created by international advertisers that mentioned any sort of sale/discount/coupon was 0. Russian advertisements are violating the Gricean maxim of Quantity with additions of extra reasons to buy a product to get past the wall of cynicism that exists in high amounts among the Russian people, but international advertisers are not using this strategy in their advertisements.

**Pragmatic Feature Summary**

The data in this section strove to answer the following research question:

RQ 3: Are there specific discourse variables within Simpson’s (2001) framework that characterize non-localized Russian advertisements in magazines?
After a statistical analysis of the data, there were several different pragmatic features in the data set that were associated with Russian advertisements. Russian advertisements were found to use reason-based persuasion techniques to sell their products to a Russian audience. Out of the three main “reason” sub-categories that this study coded for, negative politeness was found to be significantly associated with Russian advertising. Within the parameters of “tickle” advertising, the Russian advertisements that did use a tickle-based strategy to sell their products were found to use weak implicature more than strong implicature, and also to violate Gricean maxims (especially the Quantity maxim). Interestingly, these results fell neatly into the cultural differences that Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov (2010) identify in their Cultural Dimensions research that contrasts Russia with the United States. Because of this, international companies can use this cultural data in order to design advertisements for a Russian consumer base that reflect Russian ideals. If they do this, these international companies will fit into the Russian advertising climate much better than they have been and, as a result, should see a shift towards better profits and growth outlook.
CHAPTER SIX: Conclusion

This thesis began with a discussion of how many corporations fail to market their products successfully in the international marketplace. Even though Western companies are increasingly turning to countries outside America to increase growth, many are finding that advertising expenditures on products for other countries are not yielding the profits they normally would in a domestic market. One of the reasons for this discrepancy is the fact that companies are not localizing their marketing materials to target new consumers with culturally appropriate messages. To survey the localization strategies currently in use in Russia, I sampled over 5,000 print magazine ads from the beauty industry. By analyzing these advertisements for pragmatic features related to “reason” and “tickle” advertising, I was able to capture what advertising strategies are most commonly in use in Russia today. In this conclusion, I will first discuss my three main research questions of the study, and then assess the limitations of my methodology and analysis. After exploring possibilities for future research on this topic, I end my thesis with a few closing remarks.

RQ 1: Reliability

Almost every single researcher who has used Simpson’s (2001) “reason” and “tickle” framework adds a limitation to the end of their study, stating that, because of the nature of pragmatics, it is hard to have reliable data. In order to overcome this major limitation of “reason” and “tickle” studies, I applied content analysis to my data set and used two independent interraters to code the data for the pragmatic features that Simpson (2001) and Kim (2007) define as representative of “reason” and “tickle” advertising. By reporting perfect agreement with a Cohen’s kappa of 1 for the English data set coded by two native English speakers, this study asserts that using a “reason” and “tickle” framework in pragmatic studies can yield replicable results. Because this
framework now has proven validity, it seems plausible that more researchers would choose to use it in the future for advertising analysis, instead of other methods that have not been proven to be valid. Also, this study exhibited a method of how to validate pragmatic, qualitative data sets; researchers should not hesitate to apply this methodology of content analysis to other pragmatic frameworks that have not yet been validated with statistical analysis.

Additionally, this study reported a Cohen’s kappa agreement of “substantial agreement” (0.65 and 0.72) or “near perfect” agreement (0.82 and 1) for all six of the pragmatic features when the codebooks were rated with one native speaker and one high-proficiency speaker of an L2 language. Such application of the codebooks is an important contribution of this research to the field of pragmatics, since previous research into “reason” and “tickle” frameworks has only used native speakers to code data (Reihani and Rasekh, 2012). Researchers can use these codebooks for other languages and, when native speakers of a particular language are scarce, high-proficiency speakers can be used as an alternative method to analyze data (though this is not the ideal) and still expect to have substantial agreement with native speakers.

**RQ 2: Localization**

Since localization is a relatively new industry, there has been little research done into how much localization is actually going on in real-world language situations. This study not only offers insight into how many international advertisements are being localized, but also provides data on the degree to which the text of ads are changed. Over 80% of international advertisers chose to either not change, or minimally change the content of their ads to sell products in Russia, even though the consumer base these companies are catering to has significantly different cultural ideals from Americans (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). This thesis found that barely 10% of advertisements changed their overall persuasive techniques to better fit in with the cultural
ideals of the target market. By reporting such low numbers of localized texts, this study has identified the need for more localization among international companies.

**RQ 3: Pragmatic Features of Russian Advertising**

While several researchers have applied Simpson’s (2001) “reason” and “tickle” framework to other languages besides English, this framework had previously not been applied by scholars to the Russian language (Pop, 2009; Politis & Kakavoulia, 2010; Martínez-Camino& Pérez-Saiz, 2012). Through a statistical analysis, certain pragmatic features within the “reason” and “tickle” framework were found to be significantly characteristic of Russian advertising. Findings showed that the non-localized Russian advertisements overwhelmingly used “reason”-based strategies to sell products within Russia. Specifically, Russian advertisements contained much more negative politeness, weak presupposition/implicature, and violations of Gricean maxims than localized advertisements created by international companies.

By pinpointing the specific pragmatic features that are characteristic of Russian advertising, this study makes an important contribution to the field of localization. Many international companies hire localization experts to aid in the translation and distribution of marketing materials worldwide. Now that the main pragmatic features of Russian advertising have been identified, localization practitioners can use this data to create better advertisements, or modify already-designed advertisements in more culturally-appropriate ways. By creating this cultural “guidebook” of ways Russians advertise, I hope to benefit not only scholars of language and linguistics, but also people working in the industry who might not necessarily be interested in the scholarship of localization. The practical application of this data can be used to boost profits and create better brand images of international companies who previously had misunderstood Russian culture and advertising strategies.
Limitations

One of the strengths in this study’s design is the fact that the focus of two samples was looking at a narrow linguistic domain (print magazine ads from global women’s fashion magazines), and thus it was comparing like-minded advertisements designed for a specific demographic. However, limitations come with this narrow domain. The sampling within this study left out several best-selling women’s fashion magazines in the United States (most significantly *InStyle*) because these magazines simply are not widely distributed in Russia. The magazine options that I could sample from were quite limited because of the specialized nature of the study. Even though the sample only contained three different magazines, the data demonstrated that important linguistic insights dealing with the nature of pragmatic features in localized advertising were still extractable from the data. In the future, I would be interested in expanding the sample to include men’s magazine advertisements, or advertisements for children. I would be interested to see if, by changing the target demographic the advertisements are designed for, or by expanding the sample size to include ten or more magazines, the general trends of Russian, non-localized advertising would still be the same. This holds true for changing not just the demographic, but the industry of the magazines (health and wellness, parenting, cars, weddings, etc.), and the circulation of the magazines (do magazines with smaller circulation numbers have different types of advertising strategies?).

Another limitation of this study was using myself as one of the two interraters of the codebook data. For the English advertisements within the localized sample, this was not as much of a problem since I was dealing with data in my native language. However, for the Russian, non-localized sample, the coding process was, at times, difficult because, even though I have reading and speaking proficiency in Russian, I am not a native speaker of Russian, and therefore...
am not privy the wealth of cultural knowledge and language techniques that native Russian
speakers grow up with. Running this study with two interraters that were both native speakers of
Russian would allow the data to be more reliable and hopefully would yield a higher Cohen’s
kappa value.

One final limitation is the fact that linguistics research is primarily focused on text and
words. However, a large part of any advertisement is the image that the advertiser selects to
market their products. There have been many studies done in the marketing fields about the
localization of images, but studies dealing with localization seem to always either be text- or
image-exclusive. Researchers have not found a way to marry these two main elements of
advertising. By excluding the pictures of the advertisements in this study, the coding of
pragmatic features was only limited to textual elements. Many pictures and images among the
advertisements of the two samples violated Gricean maxims, but little to no research has been
done on the application of Gricean maxims to images (though work has been done on the use of
visual metaphor in advertisements, see Zaltman & Coulter, 1995; Jeong, 2008; Forceville &
Urios-Aparisi, 2009; Mohanty & Ratneshwar, 2015). Applying common pragmatic features such
as Gricean maxims to the fields of advertising, communication, and marketing would be an
interesting way to join these communities together, but as of yet, research is normally not cross-
disciplinary in this regard.

Future Research

Since this study was primarily focused on qualitative data, the study’s focus was more
exploratory in nature and focused only on general trends. The addition of quantitative data to this
field would be interesting primarily because a more quantitative data approach (such as corpus
linguistics) would enable researchers to look for specific treatments of the various “reason” and
“tickle” pragmatic strategies. For example, if a corpus of the magazine advertisement texts was created, a researcher could not only look for personal pronouns (a feature of positive politeness, and therefore tickle advertising), but that researcher could then look at concordance lines and find the top personal pronouns used in Russian advertising. This would enable companies to have a list of the most frequent used words for each pragmatic feature, which they could then use to design future advertisements.

Since this study was focused on localization, product categories were not taken into account when analyzing the data. However, several interesting trends occurred among the data that would be worth further exploration. For example, hair products were always classified as “reason” advertisements by the raters. Skincare products were classified as “reason” 75% of the time. Other product categories, such as clothing and purses, tended to be classified as “tickle”—over 90% of clothing ads in this study were classified as “tickle”. Future research with larger sample sizes could specifically look at the pragmatic features of product categories to find what products are normally marketed with what advertising strategy in Russia. This could also help Western companies as they decide on marketing campaigns for their international products.

**Closing Remarks**

I opened this thesis with the statistic that eight out of the ten top advertising firms in the world are headquartered outside the United States (Frith & Mueller, 2010). The reality of this statistic is that more and more frequently, marketing campaigns are designed on a global basis, meaning that the target consumer, in most instances, is not being catered to on a local level. This research highlights the need for increased localization, not only of lexical items, but of overall advertising strategies. It is not enough to change some wording and expect a product to sell well in an international market. By taking the time to research and understand the local markets of an area,
a business can gain the cultural insights needed to not only fit in, but to succeed in advertising their products to a new target base.
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