

# What Is Known About Native Advertising in Editorial Contexts? A Descriptive Literature Review

Nicoleta-Elena APOSTOL, PhD

Interdisciplinary School of Doctoral Studies  
University of Bucharest, Romania  
E-mail: nicoleta.apostol2@gmail.com

**Abstract.** *This article synthesizes the outcomes of native advertising, in particular, pertaining to the custom (or editorial-style) format, which represents the main focus of empirical studies. Native advertising formats are increasingly adopted as an alternative to display advertising, including the editorial-style, which is considered the most controversial. A descriptive literature review was undertaken, underpinned by a transparent procedure. Thirty-seven empirical articles published between 2003 and March 2020 in advertising, journalism, marketing and business journals were reviewed. Data regarding key-findings, native advertising type and the proximal source were extracted. The findings are presented thematically, to emphasize outcomes for consumers, advertisers and publishers (or broadcasters). Based on the results, which demonstrate the limited recognition of native content as advertising, the reduced effectiveness of the format – alongside the complications for consumers, and the blurring of editorial and promotional practices – can be inferred.*

**Keywords:** Native advertising; Sponsored content; Masked marketing; Journalism; Literature review.

## Introduction

Native advertising refers to paid messages which are embedded in digital environments, that is, at first sight they are hardly distinguishable – if at all – from the “natural” context that surrounds them. The “nativeness” of ads manifests through their design, content or both, mimicking that of the hosting platform (Kim, Choi, & Kim, 2019), and as such Internet users should not be able to discard them automatically, either because they developed banner blindness or through installing ad-blocks.

Native advertising is part of the masked marketing family, encompassing communications that camouflage their (originating) commercial source, their commercial purpose or both (Petty & Andrews, 2008, 7). When native ads are disclosed – most of the time through the application of a label containing expressions such as “sponsored content” or “partner content” – they dissimulate their persuasive and selling intent by taking the form of adjoining media formats, such as feature articles, blog posts, social media messages, podcast segments. When there is no disclosure, these communications conceal their originating source in order to give the impression of independent statements, unaffected by the expectations of a sponsor.

In comparison to native advertising, in traditional advertising all the variables of advertisement recognition – sponsorship disclosure, message, context (Wojdyski & Evans, 2019, 2) – converge towards informing consumers about the commercial nature of the communication. Native advertising mixes practices of custom media and ambient promotional communication (Matteo & Dal Zotto, 2015, 176) and benefits from the development of digital platforms, which – though their capabilities – allow advertisers to reach consumers in unconventional ways. Native advertising is related to other masked or covert promotion techniques such as product placement, branded entertainment, astroturfing (fake reviews, followers, views and likes), celebrity and influencer marketing (Skiba, Petty, & Carlson, 2019; Wojdyski & Evans, 2019).

In the digital advertising industry, native advertisements are categorized as: (i) in-feed and in-content units, embedded in terms of design within the publisher’s feed or content; (ii) content recommendation ads, which do not appear mixed with the publisher’s content but below or alongside it (as in the case of the previous types, they can involve direct buy or are programmatic, i.e. automated buying through software and algorithms); (iii) custom content (also known as native, branded or sponsored content), generally crafted by the publisher at the advertiser’s request (Interactive Advertising Bureau, 2019, 12-14). Wojdyski (2016a, 8-18) has developed an overlapping typology which focuses on the consumers’ experience with the ads: sponsored content, when the advertisement matches the editorial style of the publisher (look and tone), competing for the audience’s interest; sponsored hyperlink listings, redirecting to the advertiser’s page or a publisher’s subpage, which benefit from the publisher’s referral but they do not contain original content;

sponsored social media posts, advertisements that appear in the social media feed, and by clicking on posts consumers access the advertiser's page.

From the native advertising spectrum, it is custom content which has stirred controversies, specifically in the context of news publications, which are expected to act as impartial sources of information (Carlson, 2015). Editorial-style native advertising is closely associated with advertorials (Matteo & Dal Zotto, 2015, 176-177), but one of the key-distinctions is that the latter format is not written by the publisher's team, but it is provided by the client or their agency (Sirrah, 2019). With the advent of sponsored content, publishers have become distributors as well as producers of advertisements, and no longer focus exclusively on the creation of editorial content (i.e. content driven by journalistic, artistic, expert considerations or independent opinions). Editorial-style native advertising has been critiqued from the journalistic standpoint (e.g., Levi, 2015), as well as from the consumer perspective (e.g. Campbell & Grimm, 2018), and it has been called the "black sheep" of the marketing family (Taylor, 2017).

The other types of native advertising have been less discussed, given that their embeddedness is bounded to the design component, yet they remain problematic for consumers. The similarity – in form, content or both – of the paid and unpaid messages on publishers' platforms impedes consumers to engage with the advertisement with their skepticism defenses activated and compels them to occupy their attention and time with commercial offerings they would otherwise ignore (Skiba, Petty, & Carlson, 2019).

In Europe, the sum allocated to native advertising is projected to grow by 156% by 2020, and to amount to 52% of digital display advertising (Enders Analysis, 2016). In the USA, in 2018, 66 percent of advertisers regularly included native advertising in their budgets; 25 percent of the native ads were sponsored social media posts, 20 percent were programmatic buys appearing in a network of websites, 19 percent were direct buys in publishers' content feed, 18 percent was custom or sponsored content, and 17 percent were native videos on video-only platforms (Advertisers Perceptions, 2018, 3).

With the growth of the budgets allocated to native advertising, the frequency of sponsored content will most likely increase, despite its problematic character. This is due to the fact that custom content allows news publishers to diversify their revenue stream (Lynch, 2018), and they are actively involved in attracting and cooperating with advertisers (Sirrah, 2019), including launching content studios which function like advertising agencies and employ former journalists (Feng & Ots, 2018). Advertising professionals are cautious when it comes to sponsored content placed on news platforms, since it runs the risk of being unwelcomed by news users and generate in-chain negative effects, from the media outlet to the brand (Harms, Bijmolt, & Hoekstrap, 2017, 7). Overall, professionals of the communication field – journalists, advertising and public relations practitioners – agree that native

advertising “raises ethical concerns” (Schauster, Ferrucci, & Neill, 2016, 1). Given the incomplete and unequal professionalization of the field – according to the classic professionalization theories (Freidson, 1994) – it seems difficult to implement professional-based solutions, such as the creation of joint codes of ethics for the practice of native advertising (Ikonen, Luoma-aho, & Bowen, 2017).

## Objective

Since native advertising encompasses the interests of multiple parties, this review seeks to answer the following question: what are the outcomes of native advertising for its main actors, namely consumers, advertisers and publishers? It tackles this through a descriptive synthesis of the research on native advertising. While traditional literature reviews are based on scholars’ discretion and are guided by their theoretical focuses (Jesson, Matheson, & Lacey, 2011, 15), a descriptive literature review adequately provides a comprehensive view on the current state of research (Fink, 2014, 199). A transparent literature review based on the best evidence available is useful for scholars, and it can also inform the choices of professionals concerned with native advertising, as it represents an alternative to industry reports, which are not expected to conform to academic rigor and, consequently, can prioritize specific interests.

## Method

In order to identify relevant studies, the bibliographical databases Scopus and Web of Science were consulted. Two searches were run on each database using the key-words “native advertising” and “sponsored content”. The choice for “native advertising” and “sponsored content” emerged by using the search engine Google Scholar, which indicates that these were the most used terms in the scholarly articles. A second search strategy included the reference list of the articles identified in the first stage and related papers on the publisher’s database. The literature search covers the English language studies published (and available online, full-text) until March 2020.

So as to select studies, a few inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied. Since the focus of the review is the outcomes of native advertising, to be eligible, the studies had to examine attitudinal effects, i.e. changes in the participants’ evaluations, generated by the exposure to native formats. Consequently, papers that solely surveyed perceptions on the practice of native advertising without presenting participants ad stimuli were excluded. In terms of research design, both quantitative and qualitative studies were considered. All types of native advertising were included, provided they were hosted in editorial contexts, i.e. their proximal source were publishers (or broadcasters). Thus, an exclusion criterion was any

research focused on native advertising in social media contexts and other proximal sources that do not create content (e.g., search-platforms, see Sahni & Nair, 2019), but merely distribute it. Content appearing in social media feeds is less likely to generate confusion regarding the originating source and the commercial nature of the message, since it is not camouflaged in other media formats and it does not leverage their credibility, expertise or autonomy (Wojdynski & Evans, 2019). This decision was also supported by the findings of Jung and Heo (2019), which show that consumers are familiar with the native advertising format they encounter on social media.

Other excluded papers were those examining the practice of editorial content sponsorships, that is, when brands or organizations sponsor certain news stories or website sections without interfering with the content that is being published (e.g., Rodgers, 2007). Furthermore, the review did not include studies on advertorials, which share similarities with editorial-style native advertising, but the format is perceived as advertising (Kim, Pasadeos, & Barban, 2001).

The eligible studies are organized chronologically, and data extraction includes: (i) key-findings; (ii) type of native advertising; (iii) proximal source (see Table I).

## Results

This review includes 37 articles, published between 2003 and March 2020. In 32 articles the research focus is custom (editorial-style) native advertising, while the other findings are mainly related to the in-feed type. The majority of the studies have an experimental design, examining disclosure recognition and/or attitudinal effects on constructs such as advertisement credibility, publisher credibility, attitudes toward the brand, purchase intent. Mostly, the experiments were embedded in online surveys and in some cases were carried in laboratory settings, including eye-tracking methods (Wojdynski *et al.*, 2017; Windels & Porter, 2019). There are a few qualitative studies, using the think aloud technique, followed up by in-depth interviews (Jiang *et al.*, 2017), and combining usability testing with semi-structured interviews (Krouwer, Poels, & Paulussen, 2019a). Becker-Olsen's research (2003) also had a qualitative component, in the form of the follow-up interviews with part of the survey's respondents.

The qualitative findings provide insights on consumers' experience with native advertising, while the quantitative studies indicate the convergence of a few patterns, mostly based on the editorial-style format and having news publishers as proximal source. In 28 of the studies, the participants were exposed to stimuli either drawing on native advertising published on real news websites, or containing native ads manipulated on webpages that mimicked the design of existing or fictitious journalistic platforms. Other specified proximal sources were an informational website for college students, a magazine, television programs and blogs.

Table 1. Extracted data

Author(s)	Key-findings	Type of NA	Proximal source
Becker-Olsen, 2003	Sponsored content led to more positive company attitude and purchase intention than did banner ads. Sponsored content generated more cognitive elaboration and consumers' focus was placed on company credibility, category leadership, quality of the content, while in banner advertising the focus was on product attributes and offering. Hosting news websites experienced the greatest attitudinal benefit when no advertising was present.	Custom content (article)	Informational web community (frictitious)
Boerman, van Reijmersdal, & Neijens, 2012	Independently of disclosure duration, 52% of participants did not recall seeing a disclosure. The increased disclosure time lead to more critical attitudes towards the sponsored content and, as an indirect effect, to less favorable brand attitude. Disclosure, regardless of the duration, enhanced viewers' recall of the brand.	Custom content (video)	TV program (real)
Tutaj & van Reijmersdal, 2012	Sponsored content is associated with higher informational and amusement compared to banner advertising. Understanding the persuasive and selling intent is lower for the sponsored content than for the banner ad. The banner triggered higher levels of ad skepticism. Understanding the persuasive and selling intent of the advertiser led to higher level of irritation.	Custom content (article)	News organization (real)
Boerman, van Reijmersdal, & Neijens, 2014	Disclosure enhances recognizing the content as advertising when is displayed prior to or concurrent with the sponsored content (vs. the disclosure placed at the end of the sponsored content). Recognizing the sponsored content as advertising elicited critical processing of the content and less favorable brand attitudes.	Custom content (video)	TV program (real)
Hwang & Jeong, 2016	A disclosure containing the expression "honest opinions" led to greater source credibility and more favorable message attitudes (vs. a "simple" disclosure). The positive effect of "honest opinions" disclosure was noticed among participants with high skepticism vs. participants with low skepticism. Participants with high skepticism had more favorable brand attitudes when the message was two-sided (containing also negative information), while the one-sided message induced more favorable brand attitudes among the low skepticism participants.	Custom content (article)	Blog (frictitious)
Sweetser, Ahn, Golan, & Hochman, 2016	Despite the recognition of sponsored content, the sponsorship did not negatively affect perceived relationships with the brand. Favorable preexisting attitudes toward the brand led to greater perceived utility of the native advertisement. Perceived information utility is correlated with higher advertisement attitudes and brand attitudes.	Custom content (article)	News organizations (real)

<p>Van Reijmersdal, Fransen, van Noord, Opree, Vandenberg, Reusch, van Lieshout, &amp; Boerman, 2016</p>	<p>The disclosure (vs. the absence of disclosure) activated consumers' cognitive and affective resistance strategies. In the first study (vs. the second one), the disclosure condition did not lead to diminished brand attitudes and purchase intent. In the second study, decreased brand attitudes and purchase intent were associated with a high involvement product and explicit pro arguments for the branded product.</p>	<p>Custom content (article)</p> <p>Blog (fictitious)</p>
<p>Wojdynski, 2016b</p>	<p>Logo presence and visual prominence (e.g. font size) increased ad recognition; yet, overall, almost 70% of participants did not notice the disclosure. The participants recognizing the article as advertising (vs. those who did not) had lower perceptions of article quality and attitudes toward the sponsor and decreased likelihood of sharing the content.</p>	<p>Custom content (article)</p> <p>News organization (real)</p>
<p>Wojdynski &amp; Evans, 2016</p>	<p>The most effective disclosures consisted in using the words "advertising" or "sponsored" (study 1), and in positioning them within the story vs. top and bottom positions (study 2). However, only 7% of participants in study 1 and 18% in study 2 understood that the content was a form of advertising.</p>	<p>Custom content (article)</p> <p>News organizations (real)</p>
<p>Wu, Huang, Li, Bortree, Yang, Xiao, &amp; Wang, 2016</p>	<p>Participants exposed to the priming of NA were more likely (93.7%) to indicate that the article they had viewed was advertising (vs. those who were not exposed to the priming). Participants exposed to the priming message perceived the article as less credible, but the priming did not affect perceived content quality and liking of the NA content.</p>	<p>Custom content (article)</p> <p>News organizations (real)</p>
<p>Hyman, Franklyn, Yee, &amp; Rahmati, 2017</p>	<p>Only 37% of participants exposed to NA understood that they were seeing paid content. 48% of respondents thought the content represented the views of the brand owner vs. 21% who attributed the views to the hosting platform vs. 20%. - to both parties vs. 12% - didn't know how to answer. 22% of participants misidentified news (editorial) content as advertising.</p>	<p>Custom content (article)</p> <p>News organizations (real)</p>
<p>Iversen &amp; Knudsen, 2017</p>	<p>Participants were not more likely to perceive an article as an advertisement if it explicitly stated the sponsor alongside the disclosure "sponsored content" (vs. just the label "sponsored content"). Participants subjected to NA with explicit partisan source (vs. those exposed to editorial content) reported reduced trust in political news.</p>	<p>Custom content (article)</p> <p>News organization (real)</p>
<p>Jiang, McKay, Richards, &amp; Snyder, 2017</p>	<p>65% of participants allocated attention to NA. 48% recognized NA in the first attempt. 50% of participants were neutral or indifferent towards NA, indicating appreciation for its less intrusive character or understanding of the publisher's business model. 23% of participants had negative attitudes towards NA, reinforced by the fact that they did not recognize its commercial nature. 17% of participants had positive attitudes towards NA, appreciating the "clever" placement of ads and their "helpful" content. The identification of NA was facilitated mainly by brand elements, such as logos (63%), and by disclosures (55%).</p>	<p>Custom content (article)</p> <p>Content aggregator and news organization (real)</p>

Author(s)	Key-findings	Type of NA	Proximal source
Krouwer, Poels, & Paulussen, 2017	Disclosure recognition <i>per se</i> did not lead to negative ad evaluations, but increased brand presence did. When participants did not notice any disclosure and brand presence was high, skepticism and negative evaluations of the ad and advertiser increased. Disclosure recognition had a negative effect on the evaluation of the news publication when brand presence was high.	Custom content (article)	News organization (real)
Wojdyski, Bang, Keib, Jefferson, Choi, & Malson, 2017	The disclosure characterized by increased visual prominence (e.g. font size, text background contrast), combined with highly explicit language regarding sponsorship led to an advertising recognition rate of 40%. The disclosure inserted into the article (middle position) led to increased likelihood of attention (73% of participants fixating their visual attention on it) vs. the top disclosure (40%) and the top fixed (“sticky”) disclosure (36%). Visual attention to the disclosure (fixation within the area of the disclosure) led to advertising recognition as the outcome; only 40% of the participants who viewed the disclosure correctly identified the article as advertising.	Custom content (article)	News organization (real)
Amazeen & Muddiman, 2018	NA recognition triggered negative attitudes toward legacy and (slightly more) towards digital-only publishers (vs. when participants were exposed to the same content labeled as news article). Participants were more likely to recognize NA on a digital site (67%) than when it was on legacy media (41%). An interruptive message alert about the sponsored content led 65% of participants to recognize NA (vs. those who were not forewarned, with 50% recognition rate).	Custom content (article)	News organization (real and fictitious)
Amazeen & Wojdyski, 2018	Only 9% of the participants exposed to NA recognized the content as advertising. Disclosure with high visual prominence and explicit language increased the odds of recognition, less so the presence of a logo (3.66 vs. 3.01 vs. 1.64 times more). More educated and younger participants were more likely to recognize NA. Recognizing the content as advertising triggered the decline of publisher’s credibility. Participants recognizing the content as NA reported more positive evaluations of journalism ( <i>sui generis</i> ) and less favorable attitudes toward advertising ( <i>sui generis</i> ).	Custom content (article)	News organization (real)
Campbell & Evans, 2018	A companion banner triggers the same levels of recognition of NA as a “standard” (text) disclosure. Perceived sponsorship transparency mitigated and, in some cases, partially reversed negative indirect effects of disclosure and companion banner advertising (i.e. decreased brand attitude and attitude toward the publisher, lowered organizational credibility and sharing intention). This finding applies to both familiar and unfamiliar brands.	Custom content (article)	News organization (real)



Han, Drumwright, & Goo, 2018	Higher media trust lowered perceived deceptiveness of native content and its indirect effects were reduced ad skepticism, ad irritation and ad avoidance.	Custom content (article)	News organization (real)
Whittle & Xue, 2018	Video NA benefitted from more favorable ad attitude than text/image NA, being perceived as more entertaining, enjoyable and persuasive. There were no significant effects in perceived ad trust or brand interest. NA embedded in news content was perceived as more trustworthy than NA embedded in entertainment content.	Custom content (article and video)	News organizations, TV programs (real)
Amazeen, 2019	Participants with a greater motivation to consume news for informational content (vs. participants more interested in entertainment content) were more likely to perceive the content as advertising. Participants were more likely to perceive the commercial nature of NA when it had a hard news orientation, independently of their informational news use motivation levels. Participants evaluated NA less favorably when it was on hard news topics because it was easier to grasp its commercial nature. Participants exposed to a news article that was revealed to be NA were more likely to find a subsequent political news article to be less credible (vs. participants exposed to a soft news article that was revealed to be NA). Despite the disclosure, 56% of participants failed to recognize the NA content as advertising. Participants who did not recognize the content as advertising while being in the non-disclosure condition were more likely to perceive that the advertiser had a manipulative intent (vs. the participants who recognized the commercial nature despite being in the non-disclosure condition). The same participants reported lowered evaluations in terms of sharing intention, brand attitudes and purchase intention. Overall, participants who perceived greater manipulative intent were less likely to engage with the ad message.	Custom content (article)	News organization (real)
An, Kerr, & Jin, 2019	NA generated higher click-through rates (8% for native ads vs. 3.5% for display ads), 83% of participants reported that, at least once, they had unintentionally clicked on NA thinking it was a news article. Display ads resulted in greater brand recognition (15% for native vs. 31% for display). NA received less attention than display ads when placed in the same position on the webpage. NA had a significantly negative impact on website trustworthiness, and in study 1 (vs. study 2) this happened only when participants clicked on the native advertisement.	Custom content (article)	Without
Arlberg & Schwartz, 2019	The perceived quality of a media outlet associated with high-quality content (vs. the one associated with low-quality content) was damaged by the publication of declared NA. Disclosed NA content activated affective resistance strategies to the advertiser's persuasion intent, the effect being stronger in the case of the news media outlet associated with high-quality journalism.	In-feed	News organization (fictitious)
Bachmann, Hunziker, & Rüedy, 2019		Custom content (article)	News organizations (real)

Author(s)	Key-findings	Type of NA	Proximal source
Harms, Bijmolt, & Hoekstra, 2019	Participants responded more favorably (ad attitude) to banner advertising and reported higher ad credibility vs. NA. Understanding the persuasive intent of advertising (which was greater in the case of banner advertising) had positive and significant direct brand effects (brand interest and purchase intentions), beside indirect effects (i.e. ad attitude and ad credibility).	Custom content (article)	Not specified
Kendrick & Fullerton, 2019	75% of students majoring in marketing communications recognized disclosed NA when asked directly "Is this an ad?". 23% of them misidentified a news story as advertising.	Custom content (article)	News organization (real)
Kim, Choi, & Kim, 2019	Participants exposed to the NA formats (vs. display advertising) had more favorable attitudes towards the ad, towards the brand and purchase intention. The effect of NA on attitude towards the ad, towards the brand and purchase intention is stronger in situations of high consumer involvement (i.e. perceived consistency between the information and a particular goal of a media user), than in situations of low involvement. Ads with native design had more positive effects in a low (vs. high) involvement situation.	In-feed, paid search, promoted listings, and in-ad	News organization (real)
Kim, Youn, & Yoon, 2019	Participants' evaluations of NA were lowered when it was placed on the same page with a banner ad (in terms of perceived fit, ad credibility, brand attitudes and click intention). Participants' evaluations of banner advertising were significantly more favorable for ad credibility when placed in proximity to NA (vs. solo placement).	Custom content (article)	News organizations (real)
Krouwer, Poels & Paulussen, 2019a	Participants had neutral or positive attitudes regarding the fact that the news app contained NA. When participants assumed that the NA was created by the advertiser or the advertising department, their trust in the news app was not impacted negatively. The possible involvement of journalists in producing the ad content harmed the trust in the news app.	Custom content (article)	News organization (real)
Krouwer, Poels & Paulussen, 2019b	Disclosures containing more details increased ad recognition up to almost 76%. Brand recall increased with more detailed disclosures; they also led to higher credibility of advertisers and news media website. The disclosure focused on the authorship increased the news website's credibility, while the disclosure about the importance of advertising for the business model of news media led to higher credibility of the advertisers.	Custom content (article)	News organization (fictitious)
Lee, Lee, & Kim, 2019	A prominent level of disclosure increased skepticism towards the content and led to ad recognition (vs. a low level of disclosure). On both websites (with high and low credibility), a prominent level of disclosure made no significant difference in the perceived deceptiveness of NA.	Custom content (article)	Magazine (fictitious)

Li & Wang, 2019	<p>Brand mentions placed in primary locations (e.g. headline, lead) and sponsor-affiliated sources (vs. third-party sources) in NA led to increased ad recognition.</p> <p>Brand mentions placed in primary locations had no significant impact on message credibility or media credibility, but the use of sponsor-affiliated sources decreased the credibility of the message; due to the fact that they facilitated ad recognition, they lowered the credibility of the media platform.</p>	Custom content (article)	News organizations (real)
Saenger & Song, 2019	<p>Congruity between NA topic and brand image enhanced brand attitude in the case of informational vs. entertaining ad content.</p> <p>Entertaining NA content with high brand image congruity increased perceptions of deceptiveness.</p> <p>Informational NA was associated with higher advertising value (vs. entertaining NA), provided there was congruity between the ad content and the brand image.</p> <p>Perceived advertising value increased brand trustworthiness and brand attitude.</p>	In-feed	News organization (real)
Wen, Kim, Wu, & Doodoo, 2019	<p>In the first study (which elicited a great level of perceived mental effort vs. study 2), participants in the high cognitive load condition were less likely to recognize the commercial nature of NA.</p> <p>The explicit disclosure was effective in increasing ad recognition (vs. an implicit disclosure) only in the case of the participants in the low cognitive load condition.</p> <p>In the second study (which induced a moderate level of perceived mental effort vs. study 1), the explicit disclosure triggered increased ad recognition also amongst participants in the high cognitive load condition.</p>	Custom content (article)	News organization (real)
Windels & Porter, 2019	<p>Banner advertising attracted more attention, while NA attracted faster visual attention (likely due to the prime locations closer to the center of the screen).</p> <p>Participants took longer to recognize native ads vs. banner ads. Participants with higher advertising skepticism did not recognize NA more frequently.</p>	In-feed	News organizations (real)
Zhou & Xue, 2019	<p>Endemic in-feed advertisements received higher rating on source expertise and were associated with stronger purchase intention, but participants reported more favorable attitude toward linked (external) in-feed advertisements.</p> <p>Endemic in-feed advertisements generated stronger brand interest (vs. linked in-feed advertisements), but only for the high-reputable news website.</p>	In-feed	News organizations (real)
Pasandaran & Mutmainnah, 2020	<p>Participants activated their news schema instead of advertising schema when exposed to NA. Overall, 23% of the participants could recognize NA. 50% participants were able to recognize commercial NA and around 10% of them identified political and social NA.</p>	Custom content (article)	News organizations (real)

The data collected from the 37 articles underwent a thematic synthesis to answer the review question. Three themes were derived, which distinguish the outcomes of native advertising in relation to its main actors: consumers, advertisers and publishers (broadcasters).

### *Consumer outcomes*

The reviewed data show consistently that most of the time consumers are not aware of the commercial nature of the native advertisement placed in editorial contexts. Ad recognition involves two stages: noticing the sponsorship disclosure and, then, processing its meaning and understanding that it is a paid message, which represents the interests of a sponsor.

When embedded in news contexts, native ad recognition ranges from nine percent (Amazeen & Wojdyski, 2018) to up to 40 percent in the case of disclosures which brought some improvements to the “standard” label; specifically, combining greater visual prominence with explicit language, i.e. using “advertising” or “sponsored” (Wojdyski *et al.*, 2017), thus, avoiding ambiguous labels such as “brand voice”, “presented by”, which tend to be popular amongst publishers. Recognition of native advertising remains partial also in goal-directed researches, in which participants were instructed to identify ads: 48 percent in a context that implied naturally browsing through websites (Jiang *et al.*, 2017), and 70 percent when they had to click on ads displayed on screen for a limited amount of time (Windels & Porter, 2019). When native ads leverage the television program format, 48 percent of consumers recall the sponsorship disclosure, which was placed in the corner of the screen for three or six seconds (Boerman, van Reijmersdal, & Neijens, 2012).

Although some type of disclosure labels attracts increased visual attention on webpages, they do not necessarily influence the participants’ understanding that the content they are seeing is a form of advertising (Wojdyski & Evans, 2016). An efficient method, leading up to 75 percent ad recognition, was to include a detailed disclosure, explaining native advertising in terms of authorship or contribution to the business model of publishers (Krouwer, Poels & Paulussen, 2019b). Other employed procedures were the priming of consumers with a definition of native advertising – almost 94 percent rate of ad recognition (Wu *et al.*, 2016) – and showing an interruptive message alert which forewarned about the sponsored nature of the article, promoting a 65 percent recognition rate (Amazeen & Muddiman, 2018).

The demonstrated effectiveness of these measures indicates the high degree of signaling required for native advertising recognition in editorial contexts. An exception is represented by younger and more educated consumers, who perform better when it comes to identifying the persuasive intent of native ads (Amazeen & Wojdyski, 2018), given their greater exposure to digital technologies and the culture surrounding it. Kendrick and Fullerton (2019) show that 75 percent of students in marketing communication fields identified correctly native content as

advertising, while Pasandaran and Mutmainnah (2020) indicate that this capacity increases to up to 60 percent in the case of 4th year students majoring in journalism, but remains low overall (23 percent).

It is suggested that it is a matter of time until consumers include native formats in their “advertising schema” (Wojdyski & Evans, 2019, 8), but until they become experienced with native formats, they will feel deceived by this practice. This feeling is triggered by realizing *a posteriori* that they were shown commercial messages (An, Kerr, & Jin, 2019; Jiang *et al.*, 2017), regretting that they did not promptly activate their persuasion knowledge defenses. On the other side of the spectrum, when consumers encounter an explicitly disclosed native ad after being engaged in an intensive reading of articles with no persuasive or selling intent, they feel manipulated because ostensible non-commercial messages are leveraged for advertisers’ benefit (Wen *et al.*, 2019). Perceived deceptiveness is also associated with native ads that provide entertaining – instead of informational – content on topics that are highly congruent with the brand, consumers feeling that these are self-serving attempts to disguise commercial messages instead of genuine efforts to entertain consumers (Saenger & Song, 2019).

Beside disclosures *per se* and demographics, individuals’ recognition of native ads can be hampered by their available cognitive resources (Wen *et al.*, 2019). For instance, they can be limited when they are in situations of media multitasking, or in physical environments that require one’s attention. The interest in consuming entertainment content decreases the chances of perceiving the commercial nature of native advertising, given the similarities in terms of topics between soft news and content produced for brands in editorial contexts (Amazeen, 2019). Native ads with hard news orientation have been studied less, and although employing the hard news approach for promoting brands can facilitate ad recognition (Amazeen, 2019), it remains unclear if consumers would be able to show the same recognition of the persuasive intent of messages sponsored by organizations which are not associated with specific brands. In the case of native ads sponsored by political or state-based organizations (Pasandaran & Mutmainnah, 2020), the audiences’ ability to recognize the content as advertising is diminished given that this kind of organizations is regularly covered in the hard news sections.

### [Advertiser outcomes](#)

What has contributed to understanding the effects of native advertising is its comparison to banner advertising. Native ads can lead to more favorable attitudes towards the sponsoring company and even to higher purchase intention, because their personalized content allows consumers to perceive brands as an expert source of information, through which they can learn new things, while banner ads are focused on specific product attributes and offerings (Becker-Olsen, 2003). Since consumers are primarily drawn by the content, their understanding

of the persuasive and selling intent of the message is diluted or not actualized, experiencing less irritation than in the case of banner advertising (Tutaj & van Reijmersdal, 2012). Thus, native ads perform better when it comes to their perceived utility and amusement, but the appreciation of the format comes with a diminished understanding of its content as advertising (Harms, Bijmolt, & Hoekstra). When consumers do recognize the persuasive intent of the content, they rate it more negatively (in terms of content quality, attitudes towards the sponsor and likelihood of sharing it) than consumers who did not understand the same message as a marketing technique (Wojdyski, 2016).

This is not to say that for advertisers it would be favorable to seek the concealment of the marketing nature of the message. Indeed, sponsored content loses its credibility when the point of reference is unpaid content, strictly dependent on editorial decision making (Lee, Lee, & Kim, 2019; Wu *et al.*, 2016). Yet, the consumers' relationship with the brand or the sponsoring organizations is not impacted negatively when the sponsoring company employs native advertising (Sweetser *et al.*, 2016). Sponsorship disclosure is necessary not only for avoiding deceptiveness – affecting consumers' "choice or conduct regarding a product/service" through non-transparent, misleading practices (Skiba, Petty, & Carlson, 2019, 8) –, but also for enhancing brand recall (Boerman, van Reijmersdal, & Neijens, 2012). The likability of the ads was not affected by taking measures to emphasize sponsorship transparency, i.e. the priming of consumers with a definition of native advertising (Wu *et al.*, 2016). Also, a detailed disclosure emphasizing the role of advertising for the economic functioning of the news organization increased the credibility of the advertiser (Krouwer, Poels & Paulussen, 2019b).

However, when the native advertisement becomes brand-centric, such as when the brand is mentioned multiple times within the text (Krouwer, Poels, & Paulussen, 2017) or there are explicit pro brand arguments (Van Reijmersdal *et al.*, 2016), consumers become increasingly skeptical towards the message, i.e. their resistance strategies to cope with commercial offerings are activated, as in the case of "regular" ads. The worst-case scenario for advertisers is when the disclosure has a diminished visibility while there are multiple references to the brand: the content sounds like an advertisement, but the sponsoring doesn't appear to be acknowledged, and, as such, the consumers are left with the sensation that they have been manipulated (Krouwer, Poels, & Paulussen, 2017).

When compared to display advertising, native ads that do not involve sponsored content perform better, since they are congruent with the hosting platform (Kim, Choi, & Kim, 2019). However, when the native advertisement is custom content, banner advertising generates more positive ad attitude (Harms, Bijmolt, & Hoekstra, 2019; Kim, Youn, & Yoon, 2019). Ad attitude refers to consumers' cognitive and emotional responses to an ad, manifesting through their approval (or lack thereof) towards it. When the two formats were used to advertise for different products,

less favorable responses emerged for the editorial-style native advertising, both when it was juxtaposed with banner advertising (Kim, Youn, & Yoon, 2019), and when placed by itself (Harms, Bijmolt, & Hoekstra, 2019). Likewise, Amazeen and Wojdyski (2018) found that after being exposed to native ads, consumers had decreased attitudes toward advertising as an institutionalized practice. Another study (Zhou & Xue, 2019) provides additional support in this direction by showing that the linked in-feed native format (which redirects to the advertiser's website and thus is more easily recognizable as advertising) was associated with more positive ad attitude than the endemic in-feed format (hosted on a publishers' subpage).

At the same time, the attitude towards the ad, as well as the purchase intent, depends not only on the ad *per se*, but varies in relation to the consumer: consumers will report more favorable attitudes when there is a perceived congruity between the content of an ad and their information goals, which doesn't make them feel that the native ad is wasting their cognitive capacity (Kim, Choi, & Kim, 2019). Stimulating purchase intent and generating brand interest have additional variables, such as the type of product advertised and the publisher's reputation (Zhou & Xue, 2019).

Click-through rates are higher for native ads than for display advertising, and this is because consumer mistaken them for editorial content (Aribarg & Schwartz, 2019). While their higher click-through rates sound promising for advertisers, native ads are not conducive to increased brand recognition; in fact, its effectiveness is double for display ads (Aribarg & Schwartz, 2019). As the authors show, banner ads – due to their format, which facilitates advertising recognition – attract more attention than native ads (see also Windels & Porter, 2019), contributing to consumers' recalling of the advertised brand.

### *Publisher (broadcaster) outcomes*

When native advertising is hosted in editorial contexts, the main issue for the proximal source is the decrease of credibility. Consumers visit sources for editorial content because they consider them reliable and having the expertise required to meet their specific needs or interests (in matters of information and/or entertainment). When they recognize the persuasive intent of the message, they realize that the selection methodology they were expecting – and taking for granted – from the proximal source has been breached (Wojdyski & Evans, 2019, 3). They understand that they are exposed to information which was not selected for its merits, but because it was paid to reach them. As such, publishers' credibility and the attitudes toward them decreased when consumers encountered editorial-style native advertising on their platforms (Amazeen & Muddiman, 2018; Amazeen & Wojdyski, 2018). A similar effect was triggered by in-feed native advertising: consumers felt compelled to click on the ads thinking they were going to read editorial content, and after they discovered that it was advertising, they considered the publisher less trustworthy (Aribarg & Schwartz, 2019).

The impact of publishing native advertising can vary depending on the media source's reputation: a highly-reputable news outlet is more likely to deal with the decrease of the perceived quality of its content than a low-reputable news website (Bachmann, Hunziker, & Rüedy, 2019). In matters of credibility, the impact goes beyond the hosting website when native ads have hard news topics, affecting how individuals relate to news content. Iversen and Knudsen (2017), and then Amazeen (2019) found that after encountering native ads with hard news topics, consumers were less likely to find subsequent political news trustworthy. With the acceptance of native advertising there is the risk of reverse blurring, that is, attributing persuasive and commercial intent to (authentic) news content (Hyman *et al.* 2017; Kendrick & Fullerton, 2019).

When native advertisements contain a high brand presence (Krouwer, Poels, & Paulussen, 2017) and cite sponsor-affiliated sources (Li & Wang, 2019) they damage the publisher's evaluations. While these elements support ad recognition – thus diminishing the risk of misleading consumers – they also generate a “backlash” towards the proximal source because they are incompatible with what people expect when they engage with content in editorial contexts.

The data reviewed indicate that it is safer for publishers' reputation to choose to disclose native advertising transparently, thus indirectly making individuals consent to being exposed to an advertisement. When a native ad is joined by a banner ad for the same product, it benefits from the easily recognizable format of the latter, and, as a consequence, consumers feel less disappointed by the publishers (and by the sponsoring company), and in some cases there is a reversal of the negative attitudes (Campbell & Evans, 2018). A disclosure that not only informs about the commercial nature of the content, but also explains the authorship of the content increases the perceived credibility of the hosting platform (Krouwer, Poels & Paulussen, 2019b). News consumers show acceptance towards native advertising, provided that newsroom journalists – who are responsible for the editorial content – are not involved in the development of the native ads, assuming that they are authored by an advertiser representative or by a separate department within the publishers' quarters (Krouwer, Poels & Paulussen, 2019a). Although they would prefer not to encounter advertising on websites providing information, they understand that its presence is necessary for the survival of the website, so that it can perform its mission (Becker-Olsen, 2003), and allows news publishers to offer their content free of charge (Krouwer, Poels & Paulussen, 2019a).

## Discussion and conclusion

This synthesis reveals a series of concurrences when it comes to consumer, advertiser and publisher outcomes. Firstly, the largest part of the research eligible for the review is centered on editorial-style native advertising, making the findings relevant for this format. The findings on the in-feed format converge with some of



the main patterns associated with the custom format, such as longer time required for ad recognition than display advertising and negative impact on publisher's trustworthiness.

The advantages of sponsored content are associated with the "added value" of the information it can provide consumers, without disrupting the organic experience of the websites of their choice, while generating brand awareness (Harms, Bijmolt, & Hoekstrap, 2017, 8). However, the literature reviewed indicates that custom content is incompletely processed as advertising. The term "processing" is used to convey the "mental activities involving the analysis of encoded information" and, in particular, brand processing is predicated on: (i) the amount of attention; (ii) the extent of semantic processing; (iii) the depth of understanding (MacInnis & Jaworskip, 1989, 5). Adapting these operations to the purpose of the review, it can be argued that the first level of processing is guaranteed, given that most of the findings rely on experiments which require participants to pay attention to specific tasks. The semantic level of processing tends to be impeded: the experiments show that most of the time "standard" (text) sponsorship disclosures, and even the slightly more prominent labels, are likely to pass unnoticed. The third level of processing depends on the consumers' understanding of the practice and/or their capacity to recognize other (advertising) cues. The data show that, with the employment of advertising cues such as brand logos, the ad recognition improves, and a greater impact is produced when consumers perceive that there is a breach from the expected (organic) media format, through the inclusion of sponsor-affiliated sources or using a hard news approach to discuss brands. When consumers encounter these elements, there is a "change of meaning" (Wojdyski & Evans, 2019, 6). They recognize the commercial nature of the message and there are immediate effects: consistently, the tendency to evaluate content less favorably and diminished trust towards publishers. Consequently, the appreciation of the sponsored content is rooted in its passing as organic content, without being surpassed by the content's ability to convey interesting messages or useful information about the brand in a way "that has never been done" (Sirrah, 2019), in order to increase its status in the eyes of the consumer.

When consumers notice and understand the disclosure, they engage with the content as with any form of advertising: they process it more critically, showing various resistance strategies to the advertisers' persuasive intent. Supporting the linear, bottom-up processing of native advertising, starting with sponsorship disclosures that use explicit language and are visually prominent, prevents the likelihood of consumers feeling deceived or manipulated, and having to find "by themselves", though various cues, that they are exposed to commercial messages.

The findings also suggest that it is the proximal, not the sponsoring company, that is negatively affected by the hosting of native advertising. This is understandable given that the proximal source represents the place where the sponsored content is encountered, while the originating source might not be clear to or recalled by consumers. Wu and colleagues (2016, 1505) argue that it has to do with the fact

that consumers are used to seeing companies using media appearances as a way to promote themselves, and thus there is an increased tolerance towards their behavior. Further research should indicate to what degree negative effects are influenced by the type of publisher or platform (journalistic, blog, entertainment, etc.). In data reviewed here, news organizations predominate as a proximal source of native advertising, and they are more likely than other publishers to trigger negative reactions, since they have institutionalized their role around the norm of objectivity and are approached as accountable actors of public communication.

Most theoretical research on native advertising is focused on its relation to consumers and news publishers, while its reference to advertisers has been less discussed. This lack is supplanted by the digital advertising industry's upholding of native formats as a preferable choice for advertisers (e.g. Interactive Advertising Bureau Europe, 2018). Using empirical findings on native advertising, this review suggests that the editorial-style format does not bring substantial benefits to advertisers – in terms of desired communication effects and complementary target-audience actions (see Percy, 2008, 225) – due to its limited processing as advertising. Better sponsorship disclosure can improve brand processing, as well as gaining experience with the format. However, this type of advertising damages the credibility of what are considered the most desirable content partners, i.e. “premium” or highly reputable publishers, which on the long term will transform them into unsuitable business partners for advertisers. Last but not least, the format reduces consumers' advertisement avoidance though a tactic that seeks to diminish their ability to control exposure to advertising (Skiba, Petty, & Carlson, 2019, 12), instead of relying on accepted tactics of traditional advertising, which amount to attracting consumers through expressive advertisements and/or emphasizing the utilitarian attributes of the products.

**Acknowledgements:** This paper has benefited from the financial support of the project “Entrepreneurial Education and Professional Counseling for Social and Human Sciences PhD and Postdoctoral Researchers to ensure knowledge transfer from the field of Social Sciences and Humanities to the Labor Market”, co-financed from European Social Fund through Human Capital Programme (ATrIUM, POCU/380/6/13/123343).

## References

1. Advertisers Perceptions. (2018). *Native, Branded Content & Integrated Marketing Report*. Retrieved on May 14, 2020, from <https://www.advertiserperceptions.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/2018-AP-Native-Report-Exec-Summary.pdf>.
2. Amazeen, M. A., & Muddiman, A. R. (2018). Saving media or trading on trust? The effects of native advertising on audience perceptions of legacy and online news publishers. *Digital journalism*, 6(2), 176-195. doi: 10.1080/21670811.2017.1293488.

3. Amazeen, M. A., & Wojdyski, B. W. (2018). The effects of disclosure format on native advertising recognition and audience perceptions of legacy and online news publishers. *Journalism*, Ahead of print. doi: 10.1177/1464884918754829.
4. Amazeen, M. A. (2019). News in an Era of Content Confusion: Effects of News Use Motivations and Context on Native Advertising and Digital News Perceptions. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, Ahead of print. doi: 10.1177/1077699019886589.
5. An, S., Kerr, G., & Jin, H. S. (2019). Recognizing Native Ads as Advertising: Attitudinal and Behavioral Consequences. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 53(4), 1421-1442. doi: 10.1111/joca.12235.
6. Aribarg, A., & Schwartz, E. M. (2019). Native Advertising in Online News: Trade-Offs Among Clicks, Brand Recognition, and Website Trustworthiness. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 57(1), 20-34. doi: 10.1177/0022243719879711.
7. Becker-Olsen, K. L. (2003). And now, a word from our sponsor—a look at the effects of sponsored content and banner advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, 32(2), 17-32. doi: 10.1080/00913367.2003.10639130.
8. Bachmann, P., Hunziker, S., & Rüedy, T. (2019). Selling their souls to the advertisers? How native advertising degrades the quality of prestige media outlets. *Journal of Media Business Studies*, 16(2), 95-109. doi: 10.1080/16522354.2019.1596723.
9. Boerman, S. C., van Reijmersdal, E. A., & Neijens, P. C. (2012). Sponsorship Disclosure: Effects of Duration on Persuasion Knowledge and Brand Responses. *Journal of Communication*, 62(6), 1047-1064. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01677.x.
10. Boerman, S. C., Van Reijmersdal, E. A., & Neijens, P. C. (2014). Effects of sponsorship disclosure timing on the processing of sponsored content: A study on the effectiveness of European disclosure regulations. *Psychology & Marketing*, 31(3), 214-224. doi: 10.1002/mar.20688.
11. Campbell, C., & Evans, N. J. (2018). The role of a companion banner and sponsorship transparency in recognizing and evaluating article-style native advertising. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 43, 17-32. doi: 10.1016/j.intmar.2018.02.002.
12. Campbell, C., & Grimm, P. E. (2018). The Challenges Native Advertising Poses: Exploring Potential Federal Trade Commission Responses and Identifying Research Needs. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 38(1), 110-123. doi: 10.1177/0743915618818576.
13. Carlson, M. (2015). When news sites go native: Redefining the advertising-editorial divide in response to native advertising. *Journalism: Theory, Practice & Criticism*, 16(7), 849-865. doi: 10.1177/1464884914545441.
14. Enders Analysis. (2016, February 29). *Native Advertising in Europe to 2020*. Enders Analysis. Retrieved on May 14, 2020, from <http://www.endersanalysis.com/content/publication/native-advertising-europe-2020>
15. Feng, S., & Ots, M. (2018). Seeing Native Advertising Production via the Business Model Lens: The Case of Forbes's BrandVoice Unit. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 18(2), 148-161. doi: 10.1080/15252019.2018.1491349.
16. Fink, A. (2014). *Conducting research literature reviews: From the internet to paper*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

17. Freidson, E. (1994). *Professionalism reborn: Theory, prophecy, and policy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
18. Han, J., Drumwright, M., & Goo, W. (2018). Native Advertising: Is Deception an Asset or a Liability?. *Journal of Media Ethics*, 33(3), 102-119. doi: 10.1080/23736992.2018.1477048.
19. Harms, B., Bijmolt, T. H. A., & Hoekstra, J. C. (2019). You don't fool me! Consumer perceptions of digital native advertising and banner advertising. *Journal of Media Business Studies*, 16(4), 275-294. doi: 10.1080/16522354.2019.1640517.
20. Hyman, D. A., Franklyn, D., Yee, C., & Rahmati, M. (2018). Going native: Can consumers recognize native advertising? Does it matter? *Yale Journal of Law and Technology*, 77(19), 79-112. Retrieved on May 14, 2020, from [digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1126&context=yjolt](https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1126&context=yjolt).
21. Hwang, Y., & Jeong, S.-H. (2016). "This is a sponsored blog post, but all opinions are my own": The effects of sponsorship disclosure on responses to sponsored blog posts. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 62, 528-535. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2016.04.026.
22. Ikonen, P., Luoma-aho, V., & Bowen, S. A. (2017). Transparency for sponsored content: Analysing codes of ethics in public relations, marketing, advertising and journalism. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 11(2), 165-178. doi: 10.1080/1553118X.2016.1252917.
23. Interactive Advertising Bureau. (2019). *Native Advertising Playbook 2.0*. IAB. Retrieved on May 14, 2020, from [https://www.iab.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/IAB-Native-Advertising-Playbook-2\\_0\\_Final.pdf](https://www.iab.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/IAB-Native-Advertising-Playbook-2_0_Final.pdf).
24. Interactive Advertising Bureau Europe. (2018, December 7). *Member infographic: Redefining the value of native advertising*. IAB Europe. Retrieved on May 14, 2020, from <https://iab europe.eu/research-thought-leadership/member-infographic-redefining-the-value-of-native-advertising/>.
25. Iversen, M. H., & Knudsen, E. (2017). When politicians go native: The consequences of political native advertising for citizens' trust in news. *Journalism*, 20(7), 961-978. doi: 10.1177/1464884916688289.
26. Jesson, J., Matheson, L. & Lacey, F. (2011). *Doing Your Literature Review: Traditional and systematic techniques*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
27. Jiang, M., McKay, B. A., Richards, J. I., & Snyder, W. (2017). Now you see me, but you don't know: Consumer processing of native advertisements in online news sites. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 17(2), 92-108. doi: 10.1080/15252019.2017.1399839.
28. Jung, A. R., & Heo, J. (2019). Ad disclosure vs. ad recognition: How persuasion knowledge influences native advertising evaluation. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 19(1), 1-14. doi: 10.1080/15252019.2018.1520661.
29. Kendrick, A., & Fullerton, J. A. (2019). Can US advertising students recognize an ad in editorial's clothing (native advertising)? A partial replication of the Stanford "Evaluating information" test. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, Ahead of print. doi: 10.1080/13527266.2019.1655086.
30. Kim, B. H., Pasadeos, Y., & Barban, A. (2001). On the deceptive effectiveness of labeled and unlabeled advertorial formats. *Mass Communication & Society*, 4(3), 265-281. doi: 10.1207/S15327825MCS0403\_02.

31. Kim, J., Choi, D., & Kim, H. (2019). *Advertising nativeness as a function of content and design congruence*. *International Journal of Advertising*, 38(6), 845-866. doi: 10.1080/02650487.2018.1535224.
32. Kim, S., Youn, S., & Yoon, D. (2019). Consumers' responses to native vs. banner advertising: moderation of persuasion knowledge on interaction effects of ad type and placement type. *International Journal of Advertising*, 38(2), 207-236. doi: 10.1080/02650487.2018.1451208.
33. Krouwer, S., Poels, K., & Paulussen, S. (2017). To disguise or to disclose? the influence of disclosure recognition and Brand presence on readers' responses toward native advertisements in online news media. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 17(2), 124-137. doi: 10.1080/15252019.2017.1381579.
34. Krouwer, S., Poels, K., & Paulussen, S. (2019a). Exploring readers' evaluations of native advertisements in a mobile news app. *Journal of Media Business Studies*, 16(2), 77-94. doi: 10.1080/16522354.2019.1573396.
35. Krouwer, S., Poels, K., & Paulussen, S. (2019b). Moving towards transparency for native advertisements on news websites: A test of more detailed disclosures. *International Journal of Advertising*, 39(1), 51-73. doi: 10.1080/02650487.2019.
36. Lee, J. K., Lee, K.-Y., & Kim, M. (2019). The Effects of Native Ads on Consumer Brand Engagement: The Moderating Role of Website Credibility. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 25(7), 935-958, doi: 10.1080/10496491.2019.16124941575107.
37. Levi, L. (2015). A "Faustian pact"? Native advertising and the future of the press. *Arizona Law Review*, 57, 647-711. Retrieved on May 14, 2020, from arizonalawreview.org/pdf/57-3/57arizlrev647.pdf.
38. Li, Y., & Wang, Y. (2019). Brand disclosure and source partiality affect native advertising recognition and media credibility. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 40(3), 299-316. [https://doi: 10.1177/0739532919849472](https://doi.org/10.1177/0739532919849472).
39. Lynch, L. (2018). *Native advertising: Advertorial disruption in the 21st-Century News Feed*. New York: Routledge.
40. MacInnis, D. J., & Jaworski, B. J. (1989). Information processing from advertisements: Toward an integrative framework. *Journal of Marketing*, 53(4), 1-23. doi: 10.1177/002224298905300401.
41. Matteo, S., & Zotto, C. D. (2015). Native advertising, or how to stretch editorial to sponsored content within a transmedia branding era. In G. Siegert, K. Förster, S. Chan-Olmsted, & M. Ots, Mart (eds.), *Handbook of media branding* (pp. 169-185). Springer International.
42. Pasandaran, C. C., & Mutmainnah, N. (2020). Young adults' recognition of native advertising disguised as news. *Young Consumers*, 21(1), 91-108. doi: 10.1108/YC-08-2019-1032.
43. Percy, L. (2018). *Strategic integrated marketing communications*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
44. Petty, R. D., & Andrews, J. C. (2008). Covert Marketing Unmasked: A Legal and Regulatory Guide for Practices That Mask Marketing Messages. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 27(1), 7-18. doi: 10.1509/jppm.27.1.7.
45. Rodgers, S. (2007). Effects of sponsorship congruity on e-sponsors and e-newspapers. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 84(1), 24-39. doi: 10.1080/00913367.2003.10639141.

46. Saenger, C., & Song, D. (2019). Fostering beneficial consumer responses to in-feed sponsored articles. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 36(5), 643-654. doi: 10.1108/JCM-12-2017-2475.
47. Sahni, N. S., & Nair, H. S. (2020). Sponsorship disclosure and consumer deception: Experimental evidence from native advertising in mobile search. *Marketing Science*, 39(1), pp. 5-32. doi: 10.1287/mksc.2018.1125.
48. Schauster, E. E., Ferrucci, P., & Neill, M. S. (2016). Native advertising is the new journalism: How deception affects social responsibility. *American behavioral scientist*, 60(12), 1408-1424. doi: 10.1177/0002764216660135.
49. Skiba, J., Petty, R. D., & Carlson, L. (2019). Beyond Deception: Potential Unfair Consumer Injury from Various Types of Covert Marketing. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 53(4), 1573-1601. doi: 10.1111/joca.12284.
50. Sirrah, A. (2019, September 6). *Guide to Native Advertising*. *Columbia Journalism Review*. Retrieved on May 14, 2020, from [https://www.cjr.org/tow\\_center\\_reports/native-ads.php#\\_edn1](https://www.cjr.org/tow_center_reports/native-ads.php#_edn1).
51. Sweetser, K. D., Ahn, S. J. (Grace), Golan, G. J., & Hochman, A. (2016). Native Advertising as a New Public Relations Tactic. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 60(12), 1442-1457. doi: 10.1177/0002764216660138.
52. Taylor, C. R. (2017). Native Advertising: The Black Sheep of the Marketing Family. *International Journal of Advertising*, 36(2), 207-209. doi: 10.1080/02650487.2017.1285389.
53. van Reijmersdal, E. A., Fransen, M. L., van Noort, G., Oprea, S. J., Vandenberg, L., Reusch, S., van Lieshout, F., & Boerman, S. C. (2016). Effects of disclosing sponsored content in blogs: How the use of resistance strategies mediates effects on persuasion. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 60(12), 1458-1474. doi: 10.1177/0002764216660141.
54. Wen, T., Kim, E., Wu, L., & Dadoo, N. A. (2019). Activating persuasion knowledge in native advertising: the influence of cognitive load and disclosure language. *International Journal of Advertising*, 39(1), 74-93. doi: 10.1080/02650487.2019.1585649.
55. Whittle, C., & Xue, F. (2018). Native Advertising on TV: Effects of Ad Format and Media Context. *Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies*, 8(3), 203-214. doi: 10.12973/ojcm/2651.
56. Wojdyski, B.W. (2016a). Native advertising: Engagement, deception, and implications for theory. In R. Brown, V. K. Jones, and B. M. Wang (Eds.), *The New Advertising: Branding, Content and Consumer Relationships in a Data-Driven Social Media Era* (pp. 203-236). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
57. Wojdyski, B. W. (2016b). The deceptiveness of sponsored news articles: How readers recognize and perceive native advertising. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 60(12), 1475-1491. doi: 10.1177/0002764216660140.
58. Wojdyski, B. W., Bang, H., Keib, K., Jefferson, B. N., Choi, D., & Malson, J. L. (2017). Building a better native advertising disclosure. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 17(2), 150-161. doi: 10.1080/15252019.2017.1370401.
59. Wojdyski, B. W., & Evans, N. J. (2016). Going native: Effects of disclosure position and language on the recognition and evaluation of online native advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, 45(2), 157-168. doi: 10.1080/00913367.2015.1115380.

60. Wojdyski, B. W., & Evans, N. J. (2019). The Covert Advertising Recognition and Effects (CARE) model: Processes of persuasion in native advertising and other masked formats. *International Journal of Advertising*, *39*(1), 4-31. doi: 10.1080/02650487.2019.1658438.
61. Wu, M., Huang, Y., Li, R., Bortree, D. S., Yang, F., Xiao, A., & Wang, R. (2016). A tale of two sources in native advertising: Examining the effects of source credibility and priming on content, organizations, and media evaluations. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *60*(12), 1492-1509. doi: 10.1177/0002764216660139.
62. Zhou, L., & Xue, F. (2019). In-Feed Native Advertising on News Websites: Effects of Advertising Format, Website Reputation, and Product Involvement. *Journal of Internet Commerce*, *18*(3), 270-290. doi: 10.1080/15332861.2019.1586361.