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INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION INCLUDING PURPOSE OF STUDY

At the very beginning of this thesis, it seems worthwhile to briefly outline its background and possible contribution to the managerial world, so to speak its purpose.

Undeniably, and contrarily to previous decades, the world of today has become a truly global and technologically connected one. As a consequence, not only did digital advertising gain more prominence over the last couple of years, and is still doing so at an accelerating pace, but also did overcoming the obstacles of doing marketing in different countries. Because of this, cultures have become much more important for companies.

Here in particular, companies need to tailor their advertisements to the various cultural norms and values that different countries exhibit, as the way of perceiving and understanding information and communication may vary accordingly. In other words, companies would have to try to find the right balance between standardizing advertisements and customizing advertisement for the different countries, cultures respectively, in which they operate.

A recent example that evidently demonstrates the concurrent nature on this topic can be found in the Swedish furniture giant IKEA’s advertising campaigns in the Middle East. In 2012, IKEA decided to alter their catalogue analogously to what they perceived as cultural norms in Saudi Arabia (Malik, 2012). This meant that the company, although using virtually the same catalogue as in Sweden, retouched all pictures of women. Traditionally, women in Saudi Arabia are not used in advertisements frequently or at least appear very infrequently in advertisements only when wearing something that covers most of their body. Furthermore, this alteration of the catalogue to Saudi Arabian norms did provoke indignant reactions in IKEA’s home country Sweden, as the removal of women in the catalogue may have been perceived as an offense against domestic values. This is evident in a statement of Sweden’s equality minister, who said that “…for IKEA to remove an important part of Sweden’s image and an important part of its values … is completely wrong” (Sabuni quoted in, Quinn, 2012).

Another example for a similar practice would be Starbucks, who also entered the Saudi Arabian market a while ago. However, instead of using their mermaid logo there, they used only a crown floating on water, in order to adapt to the special features of Saudi Arabian society (McAteer, 2015).
Consequently, those businesses believe that cultures need to be analyzed when doing product promotion in the foreign countries as well as in the domestic realm. This point seems to be one worth exploring further and more in depth.

Turning to technology, the second part of this thesis aims to be a synthesis between the realm of culture and digital advertising. It is worth noting that it is not only rapidly changing, but also contributing to the acceleration of the process of globalization. Thus, companies have no choice but to engage with different cultures today. They must adapt to the new and different information technologies that were developed over the last decade in order to keep up with their competitors in their respective markets. With these developments in technology, the notion of companies to broaden their advertising techniques has changed drastically. Digital marketing has increased decisively and has helped make company’s advertising efforts more efficient and effective, through prominence and usage. In the heart of this lies what is called ‘programmatic advertising’, a new type of promoting products and services by using and analyzing the data that users publish online to customize ads. Said differently, programmatic advertising enables the marketer to conduct individual campaigns and target specific groups of people or individuals.

Moreover, through programmatic advertising, the scope of advertising became a much wider one, since virtually all platforms like Facebook, Google or Yahoo!, offer companies space for their global ads. In a nutshell, through the practice of programmatic advertising, any user on the internet can be reached at the right time with the right content, which completely omits the cost of spreading losses for companies. Estimating that worldwide, according to the statistics platform Statista, about 3.5 billion people use the internet regularly, and therefore almost half the world’s population is theoretically accessible via programmatic advertising (Statista, 2018). Hence, programmatic advertising is not just a new feature of internet technology but is also an opportunity for companies to access new markets in new countries with different cultural backgrounds.

However, in order to use this technological tool and benefit from its omitting of spreading loss and its capability to target practically all internet users throughout the globe, one would need to know how to use it and how it is perceived in different cultural contexts. Despite the importance of this topic, it has not yet been explored. Hence, this thesis has the purpose of helping to fill this literature gap and bridge the current academic canyon that lies between cross-cultural communication studies and digital advertising. It will do this by seeking to update or enrich the ‘Lewis Model of Cross-Cultural Communication’ with a cultural analysis of millennials’ perception of programmatic advertising in the 21st century.
B. DEFINITION OF KEY WORDS

Before any deeper and profound analysis of the correlation between inter- or cross-cultural communication and programmatic advertising is possible, there is a need to define the key terms of the topic in light of the purpose of this thesis. Those key terms are: Advertising, programmatic advertising, the Lewis Model of Cross-Cultural Communication and millennials.

Today, advertising has become omnipresent in the life of people in the 21st century. No matter whether people go for a walk in the city center, stay in their own apartment and watch TV, listen to the radio or browse through a catalogue, exposure to advertising is inevitable. Even when only wanting to use the internet on one’s smartphone or when surfing with one’s laptop, it is impossible not to come across the promotion of some companies’ services or products. Nevertheless, as much as there may be a large amount of diversity of channels that may be used for advertising, there is a multitude of different ways in which the ads themselves can be done. This may range from simple slogans to music or pictures and videos in order to trigger a reaction from people. Moreover, ads many include actual information like basic features and uses of a product or service, its price and its advantages or benefits for the user.

However, while the field of advertising is generally broad and since a total elaboration of the topic would exceed the possibilities of this thesis, this paper will adopt and subsequently use the generic definition of advertising established by Cluley, a student of the University of Nottingham, in his book “Essentials of Advertising”. In the book, he pointed out that any advertising, no matter which channel is used for transmission or whether it targets emotion or reason, is in its very core an attempt to change people’s demand for a service or a product using communication (Cluley, 2017: 3). This definition implies that any advertising may be treated as some sort of communication. Thus, advertising would always be about transmitting some kind of message, usually through visual or auditory channels, but sometimes also through gustatory and olfactory channels. For instance, when being offered to try products in supermarkets or beer in pubs, this type of advertising tries to evoke a feeling of need within someone. So, if advertisement is connected to communication, any advertisement must also be linked to cross-cultural communication, at least in a sense that even if done only domestically, cultural peculiarities would have to be taken into account.

In addition to this, Cluley argued that advertisement practices are subject to continuous change and evolvement due to three factors: alterations of consumer behavior, shifts or
advancements in media technology, by the means of advertising, and changes of markets and cultures (Ibid.: 4).

Progressing now further to a brief elaboration of the advertising sub-discipline of programmatic advertising, one may claim that it was the first two of these factors, alterations of consumer behavior and shifts or advancements in media technology that initially gave rise to it. Those changes may have been the development of computer technology and smartphones, which in turn resulted in consumers altering their behavior insofar that they started to spend multiple hours per day, at least in Western societies, surfing and browsing through the internet in general and through social media in particular.

It is this that enables programmatic advertising to perform the task that makes it so revolutionary and ground breaking; to show the right ads to the right consumer at the right time. Generally speaking, programmatic advertising works through analyzing consumer data to create a direct adaption of the advertisements to the potential needs and wishes of people possible. In the background of this, companies compete for advertisement space in an auction format called Real-time Bidding, in short RTB, through which spaces, people respectively, are assigned to those who are willing to pay the most for it. Furthermore, and this is another aspect that makes programmatic advertising particularly attractive for companies, is that most platforms that offer it, like Google AdWords, which manages the advertisement space of the search engine Google, will not charge companies for merely showing their ads. Rather, the payment policy of such platforms like Google AdWords is that they will only then charge a company for showing their advertisements if customers actually reacted to them (Google AdWords, 2018). In other words, and applied to the example of Google, a company who seeks to show advertisements on the search engine’s result page will only pay for it if people are in fact clicking on it or viewing it, in case of a video. Thus, if for instance compared to doing huge poster advertisement campaigns, in which one has to pay for them in any case, programmatic advertising constitutes a ground-breaking increase in targeting efficiency for marketers, which may even make it the dominant form of advertisement in the future.

Therefore, exploring this topic through the lens of cross-cultural communication studies seems to be a goal that is worthwhile pursuing. This thesis chose to do so within the theoretical framework of the Lewis Model of Cross-Cultural Communication. Richard Lewis, born 1930, British linguist who later started to focus on cross-cultural communication. Moreover, he claims on his company’s website that he has not merely visited and partially worked in over 120 countries throughout his life, but also became fluent in 10 languages before the age of 30 (CrossCulture, 2018). The impressions that Lewis gathered from different
cultures were due to his extensive engagement through linguistics, working, and travelling abroad, while also being influenced by Schopenhauer’s philosophy of human experience as the predominant source of knowledge. From these, he developed his model of intercultural communication.

This Lewis Model of Cross-Cultural Communication splits the globe in three cultural extremes in which all countries, cultures respectively, lie. Those three extremes, one may think of them as anchor points of a matrix of culture, were named “linear-active”, “multi-active” and “reactive” by Lewis. Linear-active cultures are those in which people “plan, schedule, organize, pursue action chains [and] do one thing at a time” (Lewis, 2006: XVIII). Multi-active cultures are those in which people “do many things at once [and are] planning their priorities not according to a time schedule, but according to the relative thrill or importance that each appointment brings with it” (Ibid.: XVIII). Finally, reactive cultures are those in which people “prioritize courtesy and respect, listen quietly and calmly to their interlocutors, and react carefully to the other side’s proposals.” (Ibid.: XIX). However, it is important to note here that no country can be considered as being purely linear-active or multi-active or reactive, as these are rather rough characterizations. Therefore, one could for instance say that a country or culture is very linear-active but can also exhibit some multi-active or reactive tendencies. Moreover, it is also to bear in mind that these cultural types are merely averages and may not be true for each and every individual in a country, as there may not only be regional variances, but also individuals with different attitudes.

The key term that this thesis seeks to define is millennials. In their 1991 book “Generations: The History of America's Future, 1584 to 2069”, William Strauss and Neil Howe invented the term “millennials” in order to name the generation of people born between 1980 and 2000 (Howe and Strauss, 1991: 297). This generation is of special interest for this thesis, as it is the first generation of digital natives. In other words, the people born between 1980 and 2000, especially those closer to 2000, are those who grew up with computer technology and in a rapidly digitalizing world. Therefore, they constitute this and their current age of 18-38 is a very good sample for the purpose of this thesis. Hence, this thesis chose to analyze empirically whether Lewis’ findings on cultural dimensions, with regard to programmatic advertising, are still valid for millennials in the 21st century.
C. SUMMARY OF THE EXPERIMENT

Before progressing to the literature review, this thesis will briefly summarize the experiment it conducted. In order to test the validity of the thesis question, a short survey was developed. The survey contained a variety of open and close ended questions to identify different factors that would give us information about the participants and their cultural backgrounds as well as their existing knowledge of programmatic marketing and programmatic advertising. Before the survey was sent out, some hypotheses about what the outcome of this quantitative research could be were established. Inter alia, one of our main hypotheses was that there would be a correlation between the cultural dimensions of Lewis' and the perception of programmatic advertising.

The first couple of questions were aimed to create a profile of the person, to distinguish their cultural background. Thus, people were asked what their nationality is, if they were influenced by other cultures during their life, how they rate the importance of family, what they distinguish themselves as according to Lewis’s model, and more. To see if they knew about programmatic marketing, we asked closed ended questions that were more direct, and asked them to give ratings of their perceptions of it, such as would you be comfortable if your country had programmatic marketing, how comfortable are you with it in general, and so on.

To reach our target group of millennials, each of the authors shared it on our social media for a little over a week. Within a few days, it was possible to collect enough surveys from different countries globally. In the end, not enough sufficient evidence was found that the Lewis model dimensions were relevant to millennials due to underrepresentation of the reactive and multi-active cultural dimensions, the presence of high-context countries such as China and Senegal, and a low sample size. Another result was that there was not enough correlation between each linear-active participant and their answers to some questions that should have been correlated. This thesis will go more into detail about this in the findings in the research section.

This thesis concluded that if there had been a better representation of cultures with a larger sample size, more conclusive findings may have been possible. We had difficulty collecting responses from several backgrounds, especially reactive cultures. Our analysis on each question can be found in part C and D of the research section. More information regarding hypotheses and the data collection itself can also be found in the research section, but under part A and B. Furthermore, a complete synthesis of all the information of this thesis can be found in the conclusion which will outline the obtained results.
Overall, this literature review aims at exploring the existing academic works that surround the topics of interest for the research part of this thesis. In order to do so, this literature review will be separated into several parts, each of which will engage with one aspect of the research topic. Moreover, it will combine some of these aspects as this will show best the theoretical framework this thesis builds upon and as this will be the best way to identify the existing gaps in current academic literature that this paper will subsequently aim to fill with the research it conducted.

The different aspects of the topic that this literature review will engage with are: the evolvement of cultural communication, the interplay of culture and traditional advertising, mainstream culture and the target group of millennials, programmatic advertising as a special discipline of advertising and eventually, programmatic advertising and the Lewis model. Thus, this literature review will start with a very general perspective and will, after continuously narrowing down, specifying, and defining, arrive at the research and literature gap that this paper seeks to fill; whether the Lewis model needs to be updated with regard to programmatic advertising and millennials or not.

A. THE EVOLVEMENT OF CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION

Although culture and cultural differences may have been a topic of interest and study for social scientists for centuries, it took until the late 1950s for it to be explored academically within the context of communication studies. Thus, if one had to pick a precise starting point for the academic field of cross-cultural communication and intercultural communication it would certainly be the publication of Edward T. Hall’s book “The Silent Language” in 1959. Hall, who initially was an anthropologist with a huge interest in Native American culture, while being aware of the rather heterogeneous nature of the concept, developed the idea that all culture would be communication and all communication would be culture (Hall, 1959, 218). Put differently, Hall maintained that culture would also be a form of communication and that any information, or any message that humans receive could only be viewed and understood through a culturally biased lens. Additionally, based on a study of the evolution of
languages on the British Isles, Hall also argued that culture and as a consequence how cultures communicate, is not constant over time, but are rather subject to change and alteration (Ibid, 227). Although none of this may sound ground breaking or revolutionary, these two ideas of Hall were not merely the basis on which he built his theories of high and low-context cultures and of the culturally different perception of time, but also laid the foundation for the whole field of intercultural communication, as communication and especially changing patterns in communication can be analyzed and therefore also treated academically.

After Hall’s first book, the realm of cultural communication remained a quiet one for about another 15 years. So, although Hall’s and other social scientists’ ideas about cross-cultural communication may have been discussed and analyzed, there were no key publications by major scholars of the academic field during that time. Even Hall himself concentrated his efforts on elaborating the correlations of culture and architecture rather than communication studies with his books “The Hidden Dimension” in 1966 and “The Fourth Dimension in Architecture: The Impact of Building on Behavior” in 1975. This changed in 1976 when Hall’s second book on intercultural communication, “Beyond Culture”, was published, which gave the academic field of cross-cultural communication a real kick-off. In this book, Hall developed for the first time outlined and clearly defined cultural categories, in order to group countries, cultures respectively, according to their specific types of communication. The first of these two cultural dimensions was concerned with the perception and organization of time, while the other one approached the subject of contextualization of information. For the perception of time, Hall distinguished between two archetypes: a monochronic one, for cultures in which people focus on schedules, segmentation and promptness and a polychronic one for cultures in which people were characterized by doing several things at the same time (Hall, 1976: 17). The other cultural category that Hall outlined in his book was on whether the context, the circumstances and the way in which information is transmitted, is relatively more or less important than the plain and objective meaning of the message itself. Therefore, while in communication in high-context cultures, most of the information can be gathered from the context in which an interaction takes place. It is exactly the opposite in low-context cultures, where most of the information is said clearly and explicitly.

Acknowledging that his monochronic/polychronic work was not fully complete, Hall published “The Dance of Life” in 1983. Here, he furthered his examinations on how differing cultures had equally different perceptions of time. After devoting thousands of hours to recording human interactions in both controlled settings and public spaces, Hall began to see
the term “time” as misplaced. He instead opted for the word “rhythm” to depict how people interact with one another. With every new site of observation and every differing test subject, patterns began to emerge along cultural lines. Participants of polychronic cultural backgrounds were much more accustomed to repetition and reveling in past experiences, while monochronic people avoided previous experiences (Hall, 1983: 161).

Both of these categories are of importance for this thesis not just because of their significance as the first fully-developed models of cultural communication, but also as the two categories that Hall outlined seem to coincide with some parts of the Lewis model. In a nutshell, when Lewis defined his linear-active category, he may have been inspired by a combination of the monochronic and low-context cultural dimensions, while his multi-active category seems to have been inspired by the polychronic and high-context classes. An example underpinning this would be German culture, which is one of the anchor countries of Lewis’ linear-active type and which is also very monochronic and has a very low importance in the context of communication in Hall’s theory.

Moreover, these first categories of culture gain special importance when viewed in the light of Clifford Geertz’ ideas on culture. Inevitably, one could say now that it does not really matter whether or not one culture belongs to one or another category since one may argue that in reality people would or at least could act consciously differently anyway and without the bias of culture. This however was rendered impossible by Geertz, who, although being mainly an anthropologist and thus not strictly belonging to the field of intercultural communication, had a considerable influence on the field of study through his 1973 book “The Interpretation of Cultures”. This was the case as the book did not only emphasize the importance of culture for human life and the well-functioning of society, but also stated that one may not escape one’s cultural lens, as all the information that humans obtain from culture is absolutely needed to bridge the gap between what our body tells us and what we really need to know for being a properly functioning human being in a highly complex modern society (Geertz, 1973: 50). Hence, cultural categories, if they are accurate, are of even higher importance for the study of communication.

After Hall, at the beginning of the 1980s, there was another scholar who started to focus on dividing cultures into different dimensions, namely the Dutchman Geert Hofstede. However, contrary to Hall, Hofstede did so with a focus on the corporate or organizational environment of people, as he first developed his dimensions through an analysis of IBM working culture in different countries. Although he later added two more dimensions, namely long-term orientation and indulgence versus restraint, Hofstede initially identified four different cultural
categories in relation not only to corporate and business life, but also to people's ordinary everyday social life. Those categories were: power distance, individualism versus collectivism, masculinity versus femininity and the uncertainty avoidance index. Power distance describes whether individuals accept and reinforce inequality, for instance in decision making. So, it signified to which degree a superior has more power than its subordinates and to which degree they accept this (Hofstede, 1980: 65). The individualism versus collectivism category describes whether a culture has a collective nature, so whether the integration into a bigger network, or taking one's own responsibility and doing one's own tasks is relatively more important for people (Ibid.: 148). The masculinity versus femininity index describes whether values which are, according to Hofstede, traditional feminine, like family and solicitude, are more important in a society, or values that are, according to him, associated with masculinity, like competitive behavior are valued more (Ibid. 176). Here it seems important to note in order to avoid misunderstandings that this dimension has nothing to do with the actual situation of women in a country. For instance, countries where women have only a very limited amount of rights, like in Iran or Egypt, score a lot lower on masculinity that countries like the Austria or the United Kingdom, where women's rights are fully respected (Hofstede-Insights, 2018). The fourth dimension that Hofstede identified, uncertainty avoidance, describes the extent to which people of a culture are willing to work in order to avoid risk, so if they rather like to stick to rigid schedules and plans, or have modifiable and interpretative rules (Hofstede, 1980: 110).

Some years after Hofstede identified his first four dimensions, Michael Harris Bond, a cross-cultural social psychologist from the Chinese University of Hong Kong and several other scholars around the world conducted a survey on traditional Chinese Values in 22 cultures. This study underpinned the validity of three of Hofstede's cultural dimensions; the fourth was not tested in a proper way, and also showed some evidence for another dimension that did not yet exist in Hofstede's work: long term versus short term orientation (Bond, 1988: 1010). After a careful analysis of it, Hofstede adopted this dimension in his theories and incorporated it into his later books on cultural communication. There he defined this dimension as the dichotomy between the fostering of virtues oriented towards future rewards, like perseverance and thrift, which represents long term orientation, and the fostering of virtues related to the past and the present, like respecting of tradition, preservation of face and fulfilment of social obligations, which represents short term orientation (Hofstede et. al. 2010: 239). These findings were then reproduced by Hofstede and Minkov in what further demonstrated their validity (Hofstede and Minkov, 2010: 3).
The last dimension of Hofstede, indulgence versus restraint, was initially developed by Minkov in his 2007 book, “What Makes Us Different and Similar: A New Interpretation of the World Values Survey and Other Cross-Cultural Data” but was also soon adopted by Hofstede as one of the now six cultural dimensions. Overall, indulgence describes the tendency to allow oneself a relatively free gratification of basic and natural human desires related to enjoying life, while restraint refers to a conviction that such gratification needs to be curbed and regulated by strict norms (Hofstede et. al. 2010: 281). Thus, those who score high on indulgence have a higher tendency to fulfil their desires with the objective of enjoying life and having fun. However, this is not to confuse with a culture of hedonism.

Overall, in the light of this thesis, the ideas of Hofstede are important to keep in mind not only because they mark the first time that cultural communication encountered with business studies, as the cultural dimensions originally came from a study conducted within IBM, but also because the three dimensions model of Richard Lewis may at least to some extent built on it. In other words, as there are some correlations between Lewis’s ideas and Hofstede’s theories, it seems very likely that the former was partially inspired or built upon the latter’s findings and theories. One dimension that seems to have inspired Lewis could be the dimension of individualism versus collectivism, as all countries, or at least many countries that are characterized as individualistic are also described as multi- or linear-active, while those countries who are rather collectivist, like many Asian countries, are also seen as very reactive. Another possible source of inspiration for Lewis may have been uncertainty avoidance, since there is a certain similarity between this category and the linear-active category, as both are characterized by sticking strictly to plans and schedules. This is evident in the characterization of Germany and Switzerland, both being considered some of the most linear-active countries by Lewis while also ranking very highly on uncertainty avoidance according to Hofstede. However, some multi-active countries like France and Italy, as well as some reactive countries like Japan score quite high in uncertainty avoidance. Thus, the correlation between being linear-active and avoiding uncertainty may not be as strong as the description of both by the respective theorists may suggest. The last cultural dimension of Hofstede that seems to be linked with the Lewis model is long-term orientation. While virtually all countries that score very high on long term orientation, like China, Japan and South Korea are considered reactive, multi-active and linear-active countries may not express any tendency. Hence, although the category was only adopted later and was not one of the initial ones, it may have served as an inspiration for Lewis when he developed his ideas of linear-active, multi-active and reactive cultures.
At this point of the literature review and especially after describing the findings of Hall and Hofstede, it also seems to be sensible to mention at least the most prominent critiques of these theories that will subsequently serve as a basis for the later explanation of the Lewis Model of Cross-Cultural Communication. The very first critique of Hofstede's initial four dimensions was the one of McSweeney, who argued that only studying IBM would not have been a valid form of approaching such a topic, since all findings would be necessarily biased through the organizational culture of IBM and would thus not be representative for the respective national cultures (McSweeney, 2002: 96). Furthermore, he critiqued that Hofstede's findings, due to ultimately only being averages, would lack any actual meaning in people's daily life, since the theoretical presupposition of a uniformity of culture that is necessary to make for averages to be representative, may not really be a realistic one in practice (Ibid. 100). In other words and put into a simple example: if half the people of a country would score high on masculinity and the other half the people score very low, the average would be a medium masculinity score, although no one in this country actually scores medium on masculinity. It is not to say that this would always be the case or that this example would not be very simplistic, but it describes the critique in principle very accurately; averages are a potential source of errors as they ignore the inner diversity of the object that is the subject of analysis.

Another contrarian to Hofstede's concepts, Phillipe d'Iribarne saw the use of a few factors to determine cultural differences as flawed. After spending his formative years in Morocco, his return to France brought with it the realization that Europe had a completely inaccurate idea of how Northern African countries' values differed. Seeing Hofstede's dimensions as the root cause of this oversimplification, Iribarne believes that when examining societies “we find holistic visions of societal life in which values are admittedly not absent, but the key concern then becomes finding a way to reconcile those that conflict, more or less, in practice” (Iribarne, 2012: 86). Other academics have already approached this issue of oversimplification by utilizing more dimensions, the most noteworthy being the LESCANT model. Developed by David Victor in the mid-1990s, the acronym stands for Language, Environment and Technology, Social Organization, Contexting, Authority Conception, Nonverbal Behavior, and Temporal Conception (Victor, 1997: 14). While the model has obvious influences from Hofstede's (i.e. power distance and authority conception), LESCANT goes beyond the internal dimensions previously relied upon and covers a wider array of factors.

However, although being aware of these potential critiques and errors, this paper will continue to use the idea of cultural categories as these critiques may be neglected. Preliminary, the first
critique of McSweeney could have been a valid one, but as Hofstede and others have managed to reproduce the same results in various other studies in other contexts, it seems very unlikely that the results were initially biased through the narrow sample of IBM (Hofstede, 2002: 1358). Concerning the second criticism, that averages would not draw an accurate picture of reality, this thesis will also take the standpoint of Hofstede's response to this critique, especially because this paper desires to use the same methodology on the findings of Lewis. This standpoint was that although one may have to admit that averages fail to really show the individual's picture, all or almost all survey-based research is grounded on the generalization of individual responses and does still show various valuable insights (Ibid. 1360).

Before this paper will now turn to the model of Richard Lewis, it will briefly introduce two more scholars who together developed another theory of cultural communication. These scholars are the British Cambridge University associate Charles Hampden-Turner and the Dutch-French Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam professor Alfonsus Trompenaars. The reason why this paper explores the work of these two theorists is because in their 1993 book, 'Riding the Waves of Culture' Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner developed another model of national culture differences, which may have also served as an inspiration for Lewis when he developed his model and which is even more based on a management and business context than Hofstede's model. A third reason why there is a need to explore Trompenaars' and Hampden-Turner's work is because contrarily to Hofstede, they focused more, like Lewis, on behavior and less on the values of people.

In total, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner developed seven different cultural categories, one more than Hofstede. The dimensions are universalism versus particularism, individualism versus communitarianism, neutral versus affective, specific versus diffuse, achievement versus ascription, sequential versus synchronic and internal control versus external control. The first dimension, universalism versus particularism, describes whether an individual treats rules and norms as universal. For instance, some abstain from crossing the street at red light even when there are no cars around, or whether an individual tends to believe that everything needs to be adapted to each particular situation (Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars, 1997: 31). The second dimension, individualism versus communitarianism, denotes whether individuals are more oriented towards the self, or towards the achievement of common or group goals (Ibid.: 50). The third dimension, neutral versus affective, refers to whether people openly show their emotions and expect an emotional response, or rather hide them and do not transmit them openly (Ibid.: 69). However, this does not intend that neutral cultures would be
cold-hearted, unfeeling or emotionally repressed while emotional cultures would always be kind-hearted and open. Specific versus diffuse, the fourth dimension, outlines the degree to which we engage with others in specific fields of life and sole levels of personality, or diffusely in multiple areas of our lives and several levels of personality at the same time (Ibid.: 81). Put differently, this dimension signifies for instance whether people separate the private and the working sphere or not. The fifth dimension concerns the way in which cultures accord status, so whether our social status comes from what people are doing, so their skills, or from what people are, so their gender, age or race (Ibid.: 102). The sixth dimension, sequential versus synchronic, addresses the management and perception of time, so whether it is viewed as sequential and therefore a series of events happening after another, or synchronic therefore with the past, present and future all being interrelated with each other. (Ibid.: 120). The last dimension, internal control versus external control, denotes whether one desires to control nature and the environment, or whether one believes that it is nature that controls people (Ibid.: 141).

As stated above, these ideas of Trompenaars and Hampden–Turner may have also influenced Lewis' in the development of his model. With respect to this, especially the dimensions of universalism versus particularism and neutral versus affective seem to stand out. While universal thoughts, so the absolute adherence of rules and norms, seem to be an element of reactive and linear-active cultures, multi-active cultures seem to tend more towards particularism. However, the other dimension, neutral versus emotional is even more present in Lewis model. When it comes to emotions, reactive cultures are the most neutral, linear-active cultures are somewhat neutral and finally multi-active cultures openly show emotions, according to Lewis. Thus, there seems to be a strong correlation between Trompenaars' and Hampden – Turner’s dimensions and Lewis ideas.

The last aspect of Trompenaars' and Hampden–Turner’s theory that is of importance for this thesis is that even though most of their dimensions may correlate with those of Hofstede, some of their findings are in contradiction with the results and ideas of Hofstede. An example for this would be that while Hofstede characterizes Germany as a rather individualistic culture, the country scores high on communitarianism, which is characterized very similarly to collectivism, on Trompenaars’ and Hampden–Turner’s scale (Doh and Luthans, 2012: 125–126). Another example for this would be France, which also scores high on communitarianism on Trompenaars’ scale, while in Hofstede’s scale it is even more individualistic than Germany (Ibid.: 125-126). But why is this important for the purpose of this thesis? It is because it shows that findings may change over time and due to the context in
which research is conducted. Hence, there is also a need to update the findings of Lewis in the current context of 2018 and as it is a new prominent feature of marketing, in the context of programmatic advertising.

Since this paper has now elaborated the evolution of cultural communication with respect to business studies up to Richard Lewis, it will now turn to the model of culture that it chose to analyze and potentially update. As mentioned in the introduction, Richard Lewis, who developed the Lewis-Model of Cross-Cultural-Communication, was primarily a linguist and entrepreneur. Furthermore, according to Ott, Lewis did not develop his model through conducting large sample surveys, like Hofstede and Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, but rather through his personal reflections and observations over decades as chairman of a multinational company and as a linguist (Ott, 2011: 432). However, even though Lewis himself did not establish his model through extensive quantitative research efforts, scholars like Ott have shown that when other academic's studies are combined, there is sufficient empirical evidence for Lewis model present (Ibid.: 435). Overall, it is this rather empirically loose and general framework that makes it so attractive to work with the Lewis model of Cross-Cultural-Communication since it gives one the opportunity, as Ott did in her 2016 article with a game theory based analysis of bargaining, to combine and enrich it with various further aspects, as the whole model eventually rather consists of reflections and a mixture of stereotypes than something that was ultimately determined by the responses of thousands of individuals (Ott, 2016: 54). So, in the end, it is this flexibility that made this thesis choose the Lewis model of Cross-Cultural-Communication, rather than Hofstede's, Trompenaars' or Hall's models of cultural communication as they are relatively more rigid theoretical concepts and allow less for interpretation than this model. Thus, this thesis believed that when programmatic advertising and cultural communication is combined for the very first time, it would be better to do so with the Lewis model of Cross-Cultural-Communication and not the more inflexible frameworks of Hall, Hofstede or Trompenaars.

In general, Lewis objective was to create categories of culture in order to prevent misunderstandings of all kinds and to predict the behavior and reaction of different cultures to various different stimuli (Lewis, 2003: 67). Thus, Lewis came up with three different cultural archetypes, a linear-active, a multi-active and a reactive one. Generally speaking, linear-active cultures are those in which people are task oriented, stick to schedules, are thorough planners and have a linear, or in the words of Hall, monochronic perception of time (Ibid.: 70). Additional characteristics of linear-active people may include being very punctual, rarely interrupting others in conversations, and not being openly emotional in conversations (Lewis,
A full description of all characteristics that Lewis assigned to linear-active cultures can be found in Table 1 below. Countries with very linear-active cultures are the German speaking countries and the Scandinavian countries, as well as the Anglo-Saxon countries. According to Lewis, multi-active cultures are those in which people tend to do multiple things at one time while usually not being very good or strict in following precise and planned schedules and while being rather relationship oriented than task oriented (Lewis, 2003: 72). Other characteristics of multi linear cultures may be, much in Hall’s sense again, a rather polychromic conception of time, an open showing of feelings, so emotions are not hidden from others, and frequent interrupting in conversations (Lewis, 2006: 34). Again, a full description of all features that Lewis assigned to multi-active countries can be found in Table 1 below. Countries with a very multi-active culture are the Latin American, Arabian, Sub-Saharan African and Mediterranean countries (Ibid.: 33). The last cultural type that Lewis identified was the reactive one. People from reactive cultures prefer listening, rarely initiate a discussion or an action, and usually wait for the others to establish their position to which they then can react (Lewis, 2003: 73). Furthermore, people in reactive cultures may try to avoid losing face at all cost, may react to other’s schedules and timetables, and may generally receive most information in conversations not from explicit, but rather implicit sources (Lewis, 2006: 34). A full list of characteristics of reactive people is also shown in the table below (Lewis, 2006: 33). According to Lewis, very reactive cultures are the East Asian cultures of Japan, China, Taiwan and Singapore, but also those of Finland and Turkey, although the latter two also have linear-active and multi-active tendencies when reacting (Ibid.: 38).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINEAR-ACTIVE</th>
<th>MULTI-ACTIVE</th>
<th>REACTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTROVERT</td>
<td>EXTROVERT</td>
<td>INTROVERT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATIENT</td>
<td>IMPATIENT</td>
<td>PATIENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUIET</td>
<td>TALKATIVE</td>
<td>SILENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINDS OWN BUSINESS</td>
<td>INQUISITIVE</td>
<td>RESPECTFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIKES PRIVACY</td>
<td>GREGARIOUS</td>
<td>GOOD LISTENER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANS AHEAD METHODICALLY</td>
<td>PLANS GRAND OUTLINE ONLY</td>
<td>LOOKS AT GENERAL PRINCIPLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOES ONE THING AT A TIME</td>
<td>DOES SEVERAL THINGS AT ONCE</td>
<td>REACTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKS FIXED HOURS</td>
<td>WORKS ANY HOURS</td>
<td>FLEXIBLE HOURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUNCTUAL</td>
<td>NOT PUNCTUAL</td>
<td>PUNCTUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMINATED BY TIMETABLES AND SCHEDULES</td>
<td>TIMETABLE UNPREDICTABLE</td>
<td>REACTS TO PARTNER'S TIMETABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPARTMENTALIZES</td>
<td>LET'S ONE PROJECT INFLUENCE ANOTHER</td>
<td>SEES WHOLE PICTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STICKS TO PLANS</td>
<td>CHANGES PLANS</td>
<td>MAKES SLIGHT CHANGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STICKS TO FACTS</td>
<td>JUGGLES FACTS</td>
<td>STATEMENTS ARE PROMISES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GETS INFORMATION FROM STATISTICS, REFERENCE BOOKS, DATABASE, INTERNET</td>
<td>GETS FIRST-HAND (ORAL) INFORMATION</td>
<td>USES BOTH FIRST-HAND AND, RESEARCHED INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB-ORIENTED</td>
<td>PEOPLE-ORIENTED</td>
<td>PEOPLE-ORIENTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMOTIONAL</td>
<td>EMOTIONAL</td>
<td>QUIETLY CARING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKS WITHIN DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>GETS AROUND ALL DEPARTMENTS</td>
<td>CONSIDERS ALL DEPARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOLLOW CORRECT PROCEDURES</td>
<td>PULLS STRINGS</td>
<td>NETWORKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTS FAVORS RELUCTANTLY</td>
<td>SEEKS FAVORS</td>
<td>PROTECTS FACE OF OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELEGATES TO COMPETENT</td>
<td>DELEGATES TO RELATIONS</td>
<td>DELEGATES TO RELIABLE RELATIONS PEOPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETES ACTION CHAINS</td>
<td>COMPLETES HUMAN TRANSACTIONS</td>
<td>REACTS TO PARTNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIKES FIXED AGENDAS</td>
<td>INTERRELATES EVERYTHING</td>
<td>THOUGHTFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIEF ON TELEPHONE</td>
<td>TALKS FOR HOURS</td>
<td>SUMMARIZES WELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USES MEMORANDA</td>
<td>RARELY WRITES MEMOS</td>
<td>PLANS SLOWLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPECTS OFFICIALDOM</td>
<td>SEeks OUT (TOP) KEY PERSON</td>
<td>ULTRA-HONEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISLIKES LOSING FACE</td>
<td>HAS READY EXCUSES</td>
<td>MUST NOT LOSE FACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFRONTS WITH LOGIC</td>
<td>CONFRONTS EMOTIONALLY</td>
<td>AVOIDS CONFRONTATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In contrast to the models of Hofstede, Hall, and Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, the Lewis Model of Cross-Cultural Communication does not consist of dimensions in which one can be either on one or the other side of a line but allows for a combination of all factors in one visual representation. Thus, all three types of culture can be combined and a triangle, as shown below, can be obtained (Lewis, 2006: 42).

![Cultural Types: The Lewis Model](image)

This triangle shows and lists where the different countries, cultures respectively, are in terms of their cultural characteristics. It is in this triangle, or rather in the table above that this thesis would like to locate the perception of programmatic marketing.
B. CULTURE AND ADVERTISING

As this thesis has now outlined its intercultural communication part and has furthermore established a general theoretical framework for further cross-cultural analysis, this paper will continue by briefly elaborating the cultural influence on advertising. Thus, it will attempt to build a first bridge from the rather anthropological discipline of cross-, or intercultural communication, to the field of marketing and advertising. This is of relevance for the purpose of this thesis because it demonstrates and underpins its core presupposition that cultural differences and particularities need to be taken into account when doing advertising in different countries. This importance of considering the cultural background of the people to whom advertisements are shown has been demonstrated in many contexts and many works and can thus be seen rather as a fact. An example of where this was demonstrated would be Ran Wei’s and Jing Jiang’s study which concluded, through analyzing high-tech product advertisements in the United States and China, the best approach for the advertising of such products would be one that is localized in its execution, so one that is accustomed to the local culture of people (Jiang and Wei, 2005: 850). In other words, their study confirmed that even when there is a uniform product, in their case a Nokia mobile phone, and there is global theme of “connecting people” (Ibid.: 850) in all advertisements in the United States as well as in China, there is still a need to adapt to each respective culture with the content of the ad itself. Another example that underpins that culture needs to be considered when doing advertising is the research of Blankson et. al. who applied Hofstede’s dimensions to Sub-Saharan African culture in the context of advertising in order to make recommendations to marketers. They argued that in Sub-Saharan Africa, due to the special culture of the region and contrarily to many Western countries, rather relationship centered and quality of life promoting advertisements should be used (Blankson et. al. 2013:197). Once more, this study gave evidence to the thesis that culture needs to be considered when doing advertising. Before proceeding further, this paper seeks to give a third example of why culture is important when it comes to advertising in general and why it may subsequently be important when it comes to internet advertising in particular. This third study that this thesis wants to mention is a study of Grierson and Mortimer, who analyzed service advertising in different cultures in general, and in the United Kingdom and in France in particular. They concluded that the influence of culture on how advertisements are perceived is even bigger in service advertising than in product advertising, what their study of these advertisements in the United Kingdom and in
France underpinned, as even these two very similar European countries exhibited cultural differences in service advertisement perception (Grierson and Mortimer, 2010: 159).

Hence, as this paper has shown with these three studies, culture needs to be considered when doing any kind of advertising. As programmatic advertising is also a form of advertising, it would necessarily be subject to being viewed through a cultural lens too.

**C. CULTURE AND MILLENNIALS**

This study has chosen millennials, so people born between 1980 and 2000 as target group, because it is this age group that is exposed to programmatic advertising the most. This is the case because, according to Statista, 99% of all people between the age of 18 and 29, and 96% of people aged between 30 and 49, are using the internet on a regular basis (Statista, 2018). As a consequence, they must also be exposed to programmatic advertising the most.

However, using millennials as the target age group also leads to a question that seems to be crucial to ask. Since this paper outlined that cultures are not uniform so far, is the culture of millennials even representative for their respective county, or is it already a blurred one due to increasing globalization and internet usage?

The evidence gathered from various papers does suggest that this is not the case. Much rather, millennials are described in contrast to the preceding generations, the boomers and generation X, as being more conventional and pragmatic, when it comes to a number of work-related issues (Lindquist, 2008:57). This would mean that there could hardly be a big difference between millennials and all other generations in terms of culture in general and working culture in particular. This hypothesis is further supported by a study conducted by Maloney et al., which analyzed intergenerational differences of skilled workers. The study found that there were only few meaningful differences among generations as millennials more similar than different to other generations when it came to their beliefs and values in a working context (Maloney et. al., 2010: 303). Again, this supports this thesis' standpoint that millennials can be used as a sample since they are not culturally different to their peers from other generations due to growing up with the internet.

However, one may argue now that the studies presented so far were all geared towards a working environment analysis and not a private environment one, as the perception of advertising would certainly be considered a private activity. Therefore, this paper will present two more studies that underpin the validity of this hypothesis in a private environment. The first one of these studies is the one of Hanson-Rasmussen and Lauver, who investigated
environmental responsibility beliefs of millennials in correlation with Hofstede's four initial cultural dimensions. What they found for these beliefs about the environment, which is definitely not an issue that belongs to the work sphere, is that the millennials from their target countries China, USA and India where giving the answers that had been predicted by their respective country's score in Hofstede's dimensions (Hanson-Rasmussen and Lauver, 2018: 17). Hence, for these countries, one may assume that the culture of millennials does not decisively differ from the mainstream culture of a country. The last study that this paper wants to mention is the one of Debevec et. al., who analyzed by using Hofstede's dimensions, if, due to the watershed events of the late 20th and early 21st century, so probably the internet and the increasing globalization, millennials in Sweden, the United States and New Zealand would have the same culture and found out that millennials of those cultures still differed way more than they were similar in any way (Debevec et. al., 2013: 3). Thus, once again this paper demonstrated that millennials do have the same culture than people from other generations and are thus valid samples when it comes to the survey on programmatic marketing and culture.

D. WHAT IS PROGRAMMATIC ADVERTISING?

So far, this thesis was mostly about culture, almost completely neglecting its second part, programmatic advertising. However, while there is plenty of literature on cross-cultural and intercultural communication, as well as on conventional advertising, the topic of programmatic advertising, or real time bidding as it is sometimes called, is one that was rather neglected by academic scholars so far. Nevertheless, there is a small number of scholars who treated this topic academically and who analyzed it from different points of view, like from a game theoretic and microeconomic one, or from a computer science one. With this thesis, there will also be an analysis from a cultural communication point of view added to this. In general, this part of the literature review aims to first define what programmatic advertising is and how it works and will treat related topics like privacy concerns and efficiency in a second step.

Over the last couple of years, marketing experienced a revolution, as the rise of the internet allowed for the development of a marketing technique that can overcome the ills of traditional advertising, especially its spreading losses. This revolution was the development of programmatic advertising, which is the practice of customizing ads on the internet for each recipient. According to Celis, today, the big players in the online advertising market such as
Google, Facebook and Yahoo!, would generate a substantial part of their revenues through selling blank spaces on their sites to agencies that perform programmatic advertising (Celis et. al., 2014: 2927). So how does this customization work? According to Chen and Rabelo, the process of programmatic advertising could be best split into three sub parts, bidding, where advertisers offer a platform a certain ad and a certain amount of money which they would be willing to pay to the platform each time the ad is clicked on, ranking, where the platform ranks all the potential ads, and clicking, when the advertiser finally clicks on the ad (Chen and Rabelo, 2017: 175). The personalization is possible through the fact that platforms like Facebook or Google already have a lot of information about their users and can thus match each user with the ads that match their key words. Overall, this whole procedure may be best explained and demonstrated in all its facets by an example: Consumer X, who liked a lot of sports sites on Facebook, goes on a Facebook page with an empty space where Facebook could show an ad. Immediately Facebook registers this and through an algorithm, matches potential ads due to their keywords with consumer X. Now, Castillo states, usually a second-price auction among all potential ads starts and bids are computed by algorithms that include each bidder's optimal strategy as well as parameters such as how well consumer X matches the target group of the ad (Castillo et al., 2015 :888). Finally, the ad of the company which is willing to pay the most and which also matches best to consumer X is eventually shown to him in real time, the reason why this form of advertising is called real time bidding. While this example is a huge simplification of the process of real time bidding, of how data is actually analyzed, and of how bidding processes are eventually carried out and assessed, it is absolutely sufficient for the purpose of this thesis since it targets cultural aspects of programmatic advertising and does not seek to elaborate on technological or game theoretical features of programmatic advertising.

Now, this thesis will turn itself to efficiency and programmatic marketing, which will also be later analyzed in the survey. Korula et. al. argued that without any doubt, programmatic advertising increases efficiency for firms, so advertisers, as their ads are only shown to those who match their target group, include former customers and those who previously visited the company’s site as well, resulting in a higher effectiveness of each ad, and furthermore an increase of efficiency of advertising (Korula et. al., 2016 :32). From the perspective of a consumer, one may see this accordingly. Even people who may not adopt an informational view of advertising, such as those who believe that ads are there to manipulate people, may hardly deny an efficiency increase. For those who believe that ads are there for information, people are only shown information about products and services that are actually interesting
for them, which arguably is more efficient than when they have to sort everything according to their interest. For those who believe in the manipulation of advertisements, programmatic advertising would also be an efficiency increase, as they are now manipulated towards buying products and services they like, instead of stuff that they do not need anyway. Thus, there is also an increase of efficiency there.

Coming now to the other topic that this paper will analyze through a cultural lens, programmatic advertising is also linked to privacy concerns. The core essence of programmatic advertising, as Dasdan states, is what makes it so different from all other forms of advertising, is to show ads only to those individuals that are the most likely to respond to the ad (Dasdan et. al. 2016: 38). However, in order to find out who is the most likely to respond to the ad, a lot of different variables need to be taken into account. In order to do this, platforms like Facebook and Google use the formation of cookies, or the information that people published on your social media profiles in order to see to which ads someone matches best. Hence, one may see one's privacy rights violated as those platforms may use everything that one does online in order to compute whether one is a better recipient for sports advertising or for games.

**E. PROGRAMMATIC ADVERTISING AND THE LEWIS MODEL**

Before this paper continues onto its empirical part, it must address a few more characteristics of programmatic advertising and the Lewis model. This literature review has shown that there has not yet been much research on programmatic advertising in general and none on programmatic advertising and intercultural communication in particular. Furthermore, as this literature review showed that all cultural models need to be updated over time, the Lewis model especially needs to be updated as it does not yet account for any technical features of today's society. Since it is a very inclusive model, the empirical part of this paper seeks to update or enrich the Lewis Model of Cross-Cultural Communication by analyzing its correlations with programmatic advertising.
EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

A. HYPOTHESES

Before this thesis went to analyzing its research, it made a few assumptions as to the results of its findings. Having prior knowledge of the Lewis Model and its categorizations of different cultures, the authors of this paper decided to highlight some of the main, differentiating characteristics of each category. Due to programmatic advertising's rather invasive nature to build consumer profiles, a person's capability to trust and the time it takes them to do so will be crucial in their acceptance of the platform. If the consumer does not view the efficiency of programmatic algorithms as outweighing the extent to which it must use their personal data to do so, then the likelihood of them accepting it is slim to none.

Breaking down the three categories that Lewis defined (multi-active, linear-active, and reactive), each one has several defining characteristics that will play a major role in their perception of programmatic advertising. Multi-active people place a great deal of emphasis on relationships, feelings before facts, and loyalty. Their reliance on strong relationships and loyalty are indicators that trust is an important factor to them. This quality could make them hesitant to using the new, semi controversial methods of programmatic.

Linear-active people, on the other hand, are much more task-oriented people in general. They value, above all else, facts, planning, products, timeliness, institutions, and law. Most people who fall under this category live much more structured lifestyles than the other two. They are highly logical in their approach to most situations and are extremely job-oriented.

Lastly, reactive cultures are considered the most bashful of the three. They value intuition, courtesy, their networks, and the collective harmony of their environment. Their orientation towards others tends to be in the common interest of everyone involved. They rarely confront others and tend to conceal their emotions in an attempt to not lose face, which is one of their most important values.

Out of the cultures that Lewis outlined, we hypothesize that linear-active cultures will be the most receptive to programmatic due to their admiration for efficiency. Multi-active cultures will be the most hesitant due to the practice's unsettled reputation. While the importance of face will influence reactive cultures, they will fall between the two in their acceptance.
**B. DATA COLLECTION**

To gather information for the questions, the authors designed a survey and distributed it across their various social media accounts. While it was clarified that people who fall under the classification of millennial (born between 1980-2000) should be the only ones who answer our survey, the fact that the authors used their own social media accounts further helped ensure reaching the target audience. After leaving the survey open for a little over a week, 71 responses have been collected that we deemed as matching the millennial profile we needed to research.

In total, the survey consisted of 24 questions. The first seven questions were designed to both build a profile of the subject (while maintaining their anonymity) and weed out any prior biases. For our surveys to yield any data that we can use to deduct pertinent information from, we needed to make sure that our subjects were accurate representations of the culture they supposedly represented. If they had been highly influenced by, say, Japan and Germany, then their resulting answers would be very difficult to decipher.

After that, the next ten questions were designed to gauge whether the respondents truly have the characteristics of someone from a certain culture background. For example, just because someone responds that they were born and raised in Germany does not automatically make them linear-active. While it predisposes them to a certain mindset that does not mean that it is guaranteed that they will fall in line with their country’s culture. It is possible for that German to actually exhibit more traits of someone who is multi-active or reactive just because they behave in a unique way in their daily life.

The last eight questions are the most pertinent to answering this thesis’ question. It is with these that, after having been able to classify each respondent into a certain culture, we would be able to see how each respondent feels about programmatic advertising.

For discussion sake, the results will now be broken down here for each question.

**DATA COLLECTION CONTINUED**

1. **Where were you born (City, Country)?**
   Since we were vaguely familiar with the people participating in our survey, the city aspect of this question hurt the anonymity of the participants. We chose to omit this question due to this and the fact that participant nationality was already addressed in the next question.
2. What is your nationality?

Out of our 71 responses, we received a large proportion of responses from Germany (14), Austria (15), and the United States (17). Therefore, over half of our responses are from theoretically Linear-active cultures. The most likely reason behind this is that our research group is made up of one German, one Austrian, and two Americans. Due to this, our survey may not be as accurate for the multi-active and reactive cultures as we first desired.

3. What year were you born?

For this question, we received a broader spectrum of responses. The most popular years were 1997 (22), 1996 (17), and 1995 (12), most likely attributable to our ages being in this time frame. Overall, though, we received responses from 1982 all the way to 2000. This will give us an accurate sample of how millennials of every age think.

4. Would you say another culture has had a profound effect on your personality besides your own?

Out of our 71 responses, only 23 replied that they did not feel influenced by other cultures.

5. If so, please describe how you became influenced by this culture and how you feel it has changed you:

Those that were influenced by other cultures said they had done so from their family, friends, or social aspects such as television, movies, music, and pop culture. Because of this, they feel it has changed them to be more open-minded, have added values, and taught them new things about themselves and others.
6. Please list the universities you have attended for your higher education:

After a group consensus, the authors of this thesis decided that the information yielded from this question was not relevant to answering our thesis since we were only interested in how participants’ academic backgrounds influenced their knowledge of online marketing.

7. What is your major?

From those surveyed, 37 out of 71 participants (52%) had business related majors, with 6 being marketing majors. All six were familiar with the Lewis Model and five of them distinguished themselves as being linear-active. Other than those that were business majors, some other majors of our participants included educational studies, law, computer science, engineering, and biology.

8. How knowledgeable would you say you are concerning marketing?

For all of this survey’s questions that were posed using a Likert-scale, an answer of five was considered “Extremely” and an answer of one represented “Not at all.” Here, one can see that our sample group has a normal distribution across the five options with a slight leaning towards the experienced. This is a good sign, as it shows that the people we surveyed are representative of an average group of people.
9. Are you already familiar with the Lewis Model on cultural backgrounds?

From those surveyed, 26 out of 71 participants (36%) were familiar with the model and the majority of the participants (64%) were not familiar with the model. 19 out of the 26 participants that were familiar with the model were business majors, including 6 that distinguished themselves as marketing majors. 17 of those participants that were not familiar with the Lewis Model had distinguished themselves as having business related majors.

10. If so, would you consider yourself linear-active, multi-active, or reactive?

From those that participated, 14 distinguished themselves as linear-active (54%), 10 were multi-active (42%), and one was Reactive. Of those that considered themselves linear-active, four are American, three are German, two are Austrian, one is Finnish, one is Dutch, and one is Guatemalan. Of those that considered themselves multi-active, four are German, two are American, two are French, one is Austrian, and one is Brazilian. The one that distinguished themselves as Reactive is German. Participant 35 answered “Yes” to question 9 but answered “I am not familiar” to this question.
11. How important would you say the concept of family is to you?

From those surveyed, 32 out of 71 (45%) ranked the concept of family as a 5, 25 people ranked it 4, eight ranked it as a 3, four as a 2, and two participants as 1. A majority of those than ranked family as 4 and 5 were predominantly Austrian, German, Brazilian, and American. Those that ranked family as a 3 and lower included French and British, with one or two Americans, Austrians, Germans, and Brazilians, as well as one Guatemalan and one Israeli.

12. When at a social event, do you normally introduce yourself or have a mutual friend do it for you?

Of those surveyed, 59 of 71 said that they would introduce themselves and 11 said they would wait for a friend. Of those that said they would wait for a friend, 2 distinguished themselves as being multi-active (two Germans) and one as linear-active (Dutch).
13. When in a disagreement, do you tend to use reason to convince other people or emotion?

From our sample subjects, we recorded 61 out of 71 (85%) of the applicants said they tend to use reason to convince other people, and the remaining 10 said they use emotion. Reason is notably a linear-active feature; however, the large number of reason responses could be attributed to our numerous low-context responders.

14. With your native language, do you believe it is valued more for its eloquence or its efficiency?

With 40 responses of efficiency and 31 for eloquence, this was almost equally split between the two options. Surprisingly enough, our German-speaking pool of subjects was also split equally (15 for eloquence, 16 for efficiency). From that group, we were expecting to receive almost a 100 percent response rate for efficiency.
15. How efficient would you rank your country as a whole?

Again, we see a rather normal distribution of data from our response group. As expected, a majority of the 5 and 4 answers came from people from low-context countries like Germany and Canada. Yet, surprisingly, all three of the 1 answers came from people from the United States and Austria, both of which are notoriously low-context.

16. Imagine yourself giving a group presentation at school, one of your group members is speaking when they give the professor a wrong answer without realizing. You know that if it goes uncorrected, your entire team will lose points. Do you correct them now, after the presentation, or never?

The reasoning behind this question is that Reactive cultures are known for avoiding confrontation at all costs (Cross Culture, 2018), while linear-active cultures are still tied to the concept of losing face as a deterrent for some confrontations. From our responses, it would appear that a majority of our subjects are multi-active in this regard. While only a select few responded with never (indicating Reactive) and more responded with after (to avoid causing a loss of face), 39 said they would confront their team member during.
17. How important would you say planning is in your daily life?

Here, again we see a large portion of our responses leaning towards the right side of the Likert scale. Over 70 percent of our pool said they fall under the 4 or 5 categorizations for being heavily dependent on planning. While multi-active people look at general principles and multi-active people enjoy having a grand outline for their tasks, only linear-active people depend on planning for their everyday lives.

18. Are you already familiar with programmatic advertising?

With our response pool being relatively average in their knowledge of marketing, it is not entirely surprising that less than one-third of responders were familiar with the practice.
19. Have you seen evidence of programmatic advertising being used in your home country already?

- Yes: 84.5%
- No: 15.5%

However, with the prominence of programmatic online, and our generation's near dependence on it everyday use, it is equally unsurprising that nearly 85 percent of our pool recognized the practice after a brief explanation.

20. How programmatic advertising sells your profile to advertisers is by collecting information from your search and purchase history. Do you see this as a potential threat to your privacy? Explain why:

A majority of those that were not business majors wrote that they view programmatic advertising as a potential threat because of several reasons, but the main reason was that advertisers are not compensating them for the information they are using from consumers and they do not want to be influenced by advertisements directed at them. Those that said no were mostly business majors, and their reasoning was that they believe programmatic advertising helps by showing them relevant information, and that everything is public anyway-- nothing is private when it is on the internet.
21. How comfortable would you be with your country fully adopting programmatic online?

The heavy leftward lean in these responses indicate that there are many people who would be uncomfortable with programmatic becoming more prominent online. Across the board, the countries present in our survey were rather randomly dispersed across this spectrum in relation to their cultural background. While all seven of our 5 responses came from extremely linear-active countries (USA, Austria, Germany) with only one being a Reactive nation (Brazil), those same four nations were also present on the other end of the scale; each entering 1’s for their level of comfort with the expansion of programmatic online.

22. Can you think of a way that programmatic could be altered to make it more attractive to you?

While the most common response was “No” with 25 responses, we still received nearly 50 ideas for how the process could be improved. The most common themes were to give consumers the option to choose what programmatic analyzed, the assurance that their data was being protected, and an improvement in the algorithm so the most interesting content for each consumer was truly being presented.

23. Are there areas of your life that you would never be comfortable with seeing this form of marketing?

While 18 people responded that there were no areas of their lives that having programmatic present would make them uncomfortable, many examples were given that would. The most prominent responses were places like television, direct messaging, and intimate areas of their lives.
24. At the end of this survey, would you say that you have an overly positive view of programmatic advertising or a negative view? Why?

After polling our subjects on their perception of programmatic marketing at the end of our survey, we received 17 positive responses, 21 neutral responses, and 33 negative responses. Most of those that had negative responses said so because they still believe it is a violation of their privacy, those that had positive responses said that they think programmatic marketing is helpful, and those that are neutral said it has positives and negatives with regards to privacy and shopping.
C. SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS FROM THE SURVEY

Fortunately, we were able to critically analyze 21 of the 24 questions asked during the survey. The ones that were not meaningful in discovering significant findings were removed due to their propensity for outing certain participants' identities. The excluded questions were:

- Where were you born?
- Would you say another culture has had a profound effect on your personality besides your own?
- Please list the universities you have attended for your higher education.

We acknowledged that a majority of those surveyed said that another culture besides their own has had some effect on their personality due to social media, movies, television, friends, or family and instilled knowledge of other values that way. This does not directly relate to Lewis' model, which is more likely to describe a person based on the generalized society that individual is most exposed. However, those that were more likely to be born in one country and move at a very early age without returning can be considered uni-cultural, as they've had more experiences in the latter country and forget values from their home country or learn new values from the country they're living in.

Knowing the universities that each person attended also did not help in discovering significant findings because we aimed to target millennials from all places; universities attended did not matter as much as what they were studying. A majority of those interviewed were not familiar with the Lewis Model, and those that were described themselves as being either linear-active or multi-active. With this information, we had no representation of those that distinguished themselves as being Reactive (one person, 47 were not familiar).

Knowing when they were born helped distinguish if they fell in the millennial range but did not prove anything significant in our search for the validity of the relationship between the Lewis Model descriptors and programmatic advertising. The use of nationality as a variable when comparing other questions provided more significant findings than the question asking about their knowledge on their own cultural background based on the Lewis Model. We can determine that, if brought up by and/or influenced by other cultures from what was listed previously, it affects a person's receptivity of programmatic advertising.
The questions that were helpful in our findings included knowing the nationalities and personal views they had of themselves and of programmatic marketing. An interesting finding came from two correlated questions:

- **Question 12.** When in a disagreement, do you tend to use reason to convince other people or emotion?
- **Question 13.** With your native language, do you believe it is valued more for its eloquence or its efficiency?

Multi-active people were more likely to choose reason/efficiency and emotion/eloquence, whereas the majority of people who distinguished themselves as linear chose reason and eloquence (8 out of 13). Of the 45 that were not familiar with the model, 39 chose reason, with 22 choosing efficiency and 23 eloquence. Although the sample size is not that large, we had expected a correlation of answers between the two questions, as eloquence relates to emotion and efficiency to reason. In addition to this, we predicted that linear-active people were more likely to use reason and efficiency, not eloquence.

From this finding, we can determine that there should be a mix between efficient and eloquent language when advertising by programmatic marketing, as well as a logical connection between the consumer and business, as most people surveyed believe that reason is best when convincing other people. This also showed how what should have been correlated answers between each cultural dimension was actually not correlated. This affected our hypothesis and is highlighted in our conclusion. Two other correlated questions included:

- **Question 17.** Are you already familiar with programmatic advertising?
- **Question 18.** Have you seen evidence of programmatic advertising being used in your home country already?

When asked if familiar with programmatic advertising, a majority of respondents said no. However, when given a brief explanation of it and then asked if they have seen evidence of it being used in their home country, a majority of them said yes that previously said no. From this, we can gather that millennials are subconsciously aware of programmatic marketing being used substantially, even if they are not completely aware of its textbook definition. This is important because of the privacy issues surrounding programmatic marketing; if people are not consciously aware of it, then they would not have a problem and think about their privacy.
being violated or other personal information being used to target them. The following questions ask directly how participants feel about the threat of privacy and if they would be comfortable with their country adopting programmatic marketing.

- Question 20. How programmatic advertising sells your profile to advertisers is by collecting information from your search and purchase history. Do you see this as a potential threat to your privacy? Explain why:
- Question 21. How comfortable would you be with your country fully adopting programmatic online?

Those that were more likely to be comfortable with adopting programmatic marketing in their home country all included people from linear-active countries. They were also more likely to not see programmatic marketing as a threat to privacy. This proved our hypothesis that those from Linear countries would be more open to having programmatic marketing, and we can assume that those from multi-active and reactive countries would not. Interestingly, three of those surveyed that answered 1 for the question, “How efficient would you rank your country as a whole? One being the least efficient, 5 being the most” chose 2, 3, and 5 in regards to how comfortable they would be with their country fully adopting programmatic advertising, one being least comfortable and 5 being most comfortable.

This is important because programmatic advertising is seen to be more efficient and can be associated with businesses in their home country. If they do not see their country as efficient, then it might affect their perception on the efficiency of programmatic advertising. To clarify, if they do not rank their country as efficient and would not be comfortable with their country adopting programmatic advertising, it might be inferred that the lack of efficiency is rooted in their cultural dimensions in a way, since programmatic marketing is seen by business and marketing professionals as highly efficient and the mindset to not implement it may be due to cultural factors or simply having doubts about the form of advertising. Also, an error with this question is that it was not clarified specifically why they thought their country was not efficient. From this, participants that answered may have been thinking about governmental, environmental, or social aspects of the country that they did not see as efficient, instead of business and marketing related tasks. If we clarified more clearly, there would have been less error when attempting to correlate the questions and specify what our participants meant when they ranked their country's efficiency.
Continuing, those that were more likely to not be comfortable with programmatic advertising being adopted also had overly negative views at the end of the survey. Interestingly, they were also less knowledgeable about marketing than those that had positive views of it, and preferred companies to ask them or say specifically that they are taking information from them to be used in marketing, which would also hinder the efficiency and quickness of programmatic marketing.

To find out how our participants feel about programmatic marketing and their privacy, we asked the following questions:

- Question 23. Are there areas of your life that you would never be comfortable with seeing this form of marketing?
- Question 24. At the end of this survey, would you say that you have an overly positive view of programmatic advertising or a negative view? Why?

Those that were surveyed and said they had positive or neutral views of programmatic advertising also were more knowledgeable about marketing and programmatic marketing. Instead of those that had more negative views and believed the threats to their privacy were great, those that had positive views believed that the advertising was helpful in discovering what the users did not know and were hopeful for future developments in advertising programmatically. Overall, there was a large sum of participants that gave examples of what they would not be comfortable with and a mix of people that had positive, negative, and neutral views of programmatic marketing.
CONCLUSION

To see if there was a relationship between millennials' cultural dimensions according to the Lewis model and programmatic marketing, our thesis question was:

With regard to programmatic advertising, are Lewis' findings on cultural dimensions still valid for millennials in the 21st century?

From our limited findings and analysis, we cannot firmly conclude that there is significance between our participants and their cultural dimensions described by Lewis's Cross-Cultural model. Due to our inadequate sample size, most apparent in the underrepresentation of reactive cultures, this thesis should only be considered a pilot study. Based on our linear-active and multi-active responses, though, it is unlikely that there is a significant relationship between their distinguished cultural backgrounds and their perceptions of programmatic. The variety of responses we received from people of the same background was much greater than anticipated.

Since we did not collect any truly significant findings, we realize that there were restraints and errors from having a small sample size. If we obtained more surveys and had more time to collect them over a longer period, then our findings could have been more conclusive. Our sample size groups were also limited, as we had four core groups from Austria, USA, Germany, and Brazil; the first three all being low-context cultures. Because low-context cultures tend to be more individualistic, that also affects their separate perceptions of programmatic marketing. If we had a larger sample size from those countries that are high-context, we would have had more information to work with and draw from. We had little to no representation of millennials from China, Senegal, and France which greatly affected our experiment as well.

Also, some questions that were asked during the survey could have been changed to ask more direct questions about our participants' personality, as we had five questions that supported our findings on their cultural personality. Overall, with a larger sample size and more specific questions regarding cultural dimensions, the experiment would have been more successful in determining a correlation between Lewis's model and programmatic marketing. In the end,
the purpose behind the experiment is a good idea, and if it was more successful with a larger sample size, we believe it could help businesses determine whether or not implementation of programmatic marketing would be successful in their home country, as well as what to implement for consumers if they want to engage in programmatic marketing in the future.
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