

PAWEŁ CHLIPALA
TOMASZ OLCHAWA

ATTITUDES OF INTERNET USERS TO NATIVE ADVERTISING: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Abstract. The article examines the affective responses of selected groups of internet users to native advertising. The aim of the study is to identify these responses and compare the evaluations expressed by different user groups distinguished on the basis of psychographic criteria, namely their fields of interest. Accordingly, three groups were identified: individuals oriented towards marketing communication, public speaking, or legal issues. The empirical study was conducted using an online survey focused on perceptions of various online and offline promotional tools, with particular emphasis on the form and content of native advertising. The findings indicate that all respondents disliked this advertising format. The Kruskal–Wallis ANOVA test revealed statistically significant differences between the groups, while the analysis of the coefficient of variation demonstrated consistency of assessments within each group. The results contribute to a deeper understanding of audience responses to native advertising and may support the adjustment of marketing strategies to users' preferences and expectations.

Keywords: native advertising; native advertising perception; native advertising attitudes

INTRODUCTION

The issue of potential audiences' attitudes to native advertising appears to be an important and timely cognitive problem. Native advertising is a modern and innovative marketing communication tool, yet awareness of it among consumers remains limited (Hübner et al., 2025). Although interest in native advertising is increasing, research on audiences' attitudes to it is still far from

Dr hab. PAWEŁ CHLIPALA, Associate Professor at Kraków University of Economics, Department of Marketing; correspondence address: Katedra Marketingu UEK, ul. Rakowicka 27, 31-510 Kraków, Poland; e-mail: chlipalp@uek.krakow.pl; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2496-8617>.

Mgr TOMASZ OLCHAWA, Doctoral Student at Kraków University of Economics; correspondence address: Szkoła Doktorska UEK, ul. Rakowicka 27, 31-510 Kraków, Poland; e-mail: t.olchawa@tuta.io; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9953-6491>.

complete (Kumar, Srivastava, and Sivaramakrishnan, 2025). The attitudes of audiences to native advertising may determine its popularity and effectiveness. Examining them in the context of perceptions of other promotional tools aligns with current research trends in contemporary marketing communication.

Native advertising is a subtle form of online advertising that integrates seamlessly with the environment in which it appears (Harms et al., 2017). This tool is designed to deliver an advertising message to the user while avoiding the appearance of a typical advertisement and blending into the aesthetics of the surrounding content (Sharethrough, 2015). The form of native advertising varies depending on where it is displayed, but it most often takes the form of an advertising tile consisting of a thumbnail, headline, and disclosure label. An example of such a native advertising tile is presented in Figure 1. Despite the term “advertising”, native advertising only partially resembles traditional advertising. Its non-standard form incorporates elements of public relations, product placement, and content marketing (Chlipała and Olchawa, 2021).

Figure 1. Sample native advertising widgets accompanying online editorial content



Note. The widgets appeared alongside a piece of news at <https://sport.interia.pl/pilka-nozna/ekstra-klasa/news-grosicki-uciszyl-stadion-lecha-riposta-w-drugiej-polowie-i-d,nId,22432741> (Interia Sport, accessed 19.10.2025).

The article presents the results of a study on the attitudes of selected groups of internet users towards native advertising, identified based on a psychographic criterion – their subject of interest. Due to the existing research gap, the analysis focused primarily on affective attitudes and attitudes towards native advertising in relation to other promotional tools. The aim of the study was to identify attitudes towards native advertising and examine the consistency and diversity of these attitudes among different groups of internet users.

1. THE STATE OF RESEARCH ON ATTITUDES TO NATIVE ADVERTISING

An analysis of the current state of research on attitudes to native advertising shows that it primarily focuses on the three main components of attitudes discussed in the literature (Marody, 1976; Hogg and Vaughan, 2005): cognitive, affective, and behavioral. Most existing studies concentrate on only one of these components.

Research on attitudes to native advertising addresses various cognitive aspects, mainly related to the accurate identification of native advertising messages. The dominant issue directly influencing attitudes is the recognizability and perception of native advertising, typically examined through surveys and experimental studies. Empirical findings show that users often have difficulty identifying native advertising and distinguishing it from journalistic content (Cockrell, 2019; Hoofnagle and Meleshinsky, 2015; Lazuskas, 2015; Pasandaran and Mutmainnah, 2020; Wan, 2024). Only 7–10% of internet users correctly identify native content as advertising (Amazeen and Muddiman, 2018; Amazeen and Wojdyski, 2018). Moreover, native advertising is harder to recognize than the banner ads from which it evolved (Tutaj and van Reijmersdal, 2012; Howe and Teufel, 2014). The format is also only marginally identifiable among Polish internet users (Chra chol-Barczyk, 2018). In the context of native advertising perception, the role of advertising labels is frequently emphasized, as clearer labeling contributes to improved recognition of native messages (Contently, 2016; Evans et al., 2017; Lim et al., 2021).

According to the Persuasion Knowledge Model, awareness of the commercial nature of a message is key to shaping attitudes to advertising (Friestad and Wright, 1994). Failure to recognize native advertising as such leads to negative attitudes to both the publisher and the advertiser (Contently, 2015; Wojdyski and Evans, 2016; Wojdyski, 2016; Stallone, 2020). Users tend to interpret the inability to recognize native advertising as a deliberate attempt at manipulation (Soontae et al., 2019), which negatively affects purchase intentions (van Reijmersdal et al., 2016; Evans et al., 2017; Zhou and Xue, 2019; Soontae et al., 2019). Conversely, greater recognition mitigates negative attitudes to this advertising format (Campbell and Evans, 2018), and native ads that are clearly labelled are evaluated more positively by users (Amazeen and Wojdyski, 2018).

In the context of attitudes toward native advertising, researchers often examine the perceived credibility of the message, which is shaped by the level of trust in both the brand and the website on which the message appears

(Huang et al., 2016; Contently, 2016; Lacko, Machackova, and Slavík, 2024). However, brand credibility can be undermined by insufficient disclosure of the advertising nature of native content (Hwang and Jeong, 2018). Compared to traditional forms of advertising, native advertising tends to inspire lower levels of trust (O’Neil and Eisenmann, 2017). Nevertheless, a specific type of native advertising that directs users to a page within the publisher’s domain (endemic native ads) tends to be perceived as more trustworthy (Zhou and Xue, 2019). At the same time, native advertising is often perceived as unreliable among teenagers (Zimand-Sheiner et al., 2019).

Studies on attitudes to native advertising often take into account viewers’ associations with this advertising format. Respondents describe native advertising as convenient, intriguing, and non-aggressive, yet at the same time misleading, annoying, and time-consuming (Kip and Ünsal, 2019). Although users express aversion towards such content, they also recognize that publishers rely on it to generate revenue that lets them publish information free of charge (Newman et al., 2015). Young internet users in Poland associate native advertising with intrusive and biased messages, interaction with which may result in their computers becoming infected with viruses (Chračhol-Barczyk, 2018).

Attitudes and positive associations depend on the type of content used – users prefer informational rather than entertaining content, especially when it concerns useful products (Mikyong et al., 2019). Attitudes to native advertising may also depend on the product’s industry sector (Trbušić, Maleš, and Šikić, 2024). Favorable associations, enhanced credibility, and stronger engagement with native advertising are additionally influenced by its alignment with the context of the webpage on which it appears, as well as by the needs of the audience (IAB and Edelman Berland, 2014; Lee et al., 2016; Sweetser et al., 2016; Huang and Yoon, 2021).

A review of existing research on attitudes to native advertising shows that most studies emphasize cognitive and behavioural components. Examining all aspects of native advertising comprehensively would certainly enhance the exploration of audience responses; however, it is a highly complex task and requires substantial resources. In the absence of comprehensive studies on attitudes to native advertising, it is therefore reasonable to focus on an area that clearly constitutes a research gap – namely, affective attitudes to this promotional tool.

An assessment of the current state of research in native advertising makes it possible to identify key areas of scholarly interest, including studies focused on the effectiveness of native advertising, audience recognition of such messages, and issues related to message credibility. Given the specific nature of native

advertising, ethical considerations represent an important topic addressed by many researchers. Nevertheless, the credibility of native advertising should also be examined within a broader comparative context by contrasting it with other promotional tools – an aspect that is nonetheless still underexplored in the literature.

2. DESIGN OF THIS STUDY ON AFFECTIVE ATTITUDES TO NATIVE ADVERTISING

The subject of this study on attitudes to native advertising was the recipients' emotional attitudes and attitudes to this and other promotional tools. Our research concerned both declarative and actual attitudes, manifested in responses to specific native advertising messages. We conducted an online survey, which was the optimal choice, as the internet is precisely the vehicle of such advertising. The online survey made it possible to reach selected groups of respondents with diverse interest profiles. Three groups of internet users were selected for the study, and contact was initiated through private messages sent via the LinkedIn social network. The groups included professionals focused on marketing-related topics, public speakers, and lawyers. A limitation of the sampling strategy was that it focused on recipients of native advertising who use LinkedIn; however, this approach made it possible to assemble relatively homogeneous groups of respondents within each category and to obtain sample sizes sufficient for conducting statistical analysis.

The “marketers” group ($n = 170$) consisted of individuals interested in marketing issues, particularly marketing communication. The majority of respondents were women (64%). Most of them had higher education (91%) and lived in cities with a population of over 100,000 (83%). In terms of professional status, most respondents were actively employed (76%), and an additional 18% combined work with studies. When assessing their economic situation, most respondents described it as good or very good (a total of 83.5%).

The “public speakers” group ($n = 130$) included individuals interested in public speaking, as evidenced by their membership in Toastmasters International. In this group, 53% of respondents were men and the majority had higher education (85%), lived in cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants (88%), 76% declared active employment, and about three quarters rated their economic situation as good or very good.

The “lawyers” group ($n = 145$) consisted of individuals working as lawyers or attorneys, or preparing to pursue such a profession. The group had an even

gender distribution. Notably, 84% of respondents were employed, and all had higher education. In addition, the vast majority (83.4%) lived in large cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants, and over 80% described their economic situation as good or very good.

The analysis focused on the dimension, diversity, and consistency of attitudes among specific recipient groups – marketers, speakers, and lawyers – expressed through the research questions and hypotheses.

Our study sought to answer the following research questions:

- Q1. What is the dominant attitude of different groups of internet users to native advertising: positive, negative, or neutral?
- Q2. How do marketers, speakers, and lawyers perceive native advertising in comparison to other offline and online promotional tools?
- Q3. What factors determine the positive or negative perception of native advertising among recipients?
- Q4. To what extent are opinions on native advertising within each recipient group homogeneous?
- Q5. Are the opinions of individual recipient groups regarding native advertising diverse?

We put forward the following hypotheses:

- H1. Negative attitudes to native advertising prevail over positive ones in all audience groups: marketers, speakers, and lawyers.
- H2. The attitudes of the surveyed audience groups to native advertising differ greatly, and these differences are statistically significant.
- H3. Attitudes to native advertising within individual groups of marketers, speakers, and lawyers are internally consistent.

The research questionnaire mainly covered the affective dimension of attitudes. We assumed that respondents might have little knowledge of native advertising, so at the beginning, they were explained how this tool is defined and relevant examples were presented. This ensured that all respondents revealed their attitudes to the same subject. The survey questionnaire focused on attitudes to various online and offline communication tools, including native advertising. Next, the participants were asked to evaluate native advertising depending on its placement in various media. The next step was to examine preferences for native advertising in the context of specific product categories. In addition, participants were asked to respond to statements about the ethical aspects of

native advertising and to take a position on their perception of four sample advertisements with different promotional content.

3. ATTITUDES OF INTERNET USERS TO NATIVE ADVERTISING IN LIGHT OF RESEARCH RESULTS

Tables 1, 5, 6, and 8 present the distribution of attitudes to native advertising among the surveyed groups of internet users – marketers, public speakers, and lawyers. The declared attitudes were examined for overall perception of native advertising, opinions on its credibility and reliability, and responses to selected native advertising content.

Table 1 illustrates the general attitude to native advertising, Table 5 presents opinions on its credibility and reliability, Table 6 shows respondents' attitudes to specific native advertising messages, and Table 8 presents attitudes to native advertising in the context of declared attitudes to other offline and online promotional tools.

Table 1. Attitudes to native advertising:
distribution of respondents' declarations

Attitude	Strongly negative	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Strongly positive
Marketers	15.9	26.5	28.8	22.4	6.4
Public speakers	16.9	30	44.6	7.7	0.8
Lawyers	28.7	35.6	31.5	3.5	0.7

In each group, negative attitudes to native advertising prevail over positive ones. A comparison of strongly negative and negative attitudes with somewhat and strongly positive attitudes shows that over 40% of marketers expressed a negative attitude to native advertising, while one in three expressed a positive attitude. The differences are even greater in the subsequent groups: nearly half of the speakers and over 60% of the lawyers expressed a negative attitude, while one in ten speakers and one in twenty lawyers reported a positive attitude.

The proportions of positive and negative attitudes in individual groups can be interpreted in terms of the specific nature of each profession. For marketers, native advertising is a communication tool, whereas for lawyers, the norms and regulations governing the functioning of this tool are paramount. Marketers with experience in native advertising treat it as one of the essential instruments

of modern promotion and therefore express a more positive attitude toward it than speakers and lawyers.

The lawyers' most critical stance can be explained by ethical concerns related to the use of a promotional form that mimics the sender's style and blends into the contextual message. Properly labelling content as advertising and distinguishing it from informational material is an important aspect of legislative regulations.

The distribution of attitudes indicates differences among the surveyed groups; however, the question of the statistical significance of these differences was raised. To address this, the samples were tested for normal distribution (Table 2).

Table 2. Results of Shapiro–Wilk test

Group	<i>n</i>	<i>w</i>	<i>p</i>
Marketers	170	0.911981	0.0000
Public speakers	130	0.854030	0.0000
Lawyers	143	0.855919	0.0000

The Shapiro–Wilk test was used to assess the normality of data distribution. The results indicated that the data in each group deviated significantly from normality ($p < .05$). Therefore, the Kruskal–Wallis test was applied to examine the significance of differences in attitudes (Table 3). The test results revealed that at least one group differed significantly from at least one other group ($p < .001$), so a post hoc analysis was subsequently conducted (Table 4).

Table 3. Results of Kruskal–Wallis ANOVA by ranks test

Group	<i>n</i>	Sum of ranks	Mean rank
Marketers	170	43382.5	222.1912
Public speakers	130	28673.5	210.5654
Lawyers	143	26290.0	183.8462

Table 4. Kruskal–Wallis ANOVA by ranks: post hoc test

Group	Marketers	Public Speakers	Lawyers
Marketers	—	0.060811	0.000003
Public speakers	0.060811	—	0.053838
Lawyers	0.000003	0.053838	—

The analysis revealed statistically significant differences between marketers and lawyers. The test results provided support for Hypothesis 2, which assumes that the attitudes of the surveyed groups to native advertising vary significantly.

Table 5. Opinions on native advertising – distribution of responses

Do you agree with statements:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Marketers					
a	8.2	20.6	5.9	43.5	21.8
b	25.3	38.2	24.1	11.2	1.2
c	4.1	18.3	29.4	32.9	15.3
d	4.1	19.4	27.1	35.9	13.5
Public speakers					
a	0.8	7.7	11.5	50.8	29.2
b	22.3	40.0	33.1	4.6	—
c	0.8	9.2	22.3	40.8	26.9
d	2.3	3.8	37.7	36.2	20.0
Lawyers					
a	5.6	15.4	2.8	48.9	27.3
b	32.9	37.7	23.8	5.6	—
c	7.7	9.8	30.8	32.2	19.5
d	5.6	9.8	24.4	39.9	20.3

Note. a = native advertising is easy to confuse with an editorial (non-sponsored) press article; b = native advertising generally provides reliable information about a product/service; c = native advertising uses overly shocking phrasing; d = native advertising is misleading.

The distribution of opinions on native advertising presented in Table 5 indicated predominantly negative attitudes across all surveyed groups. Most of the marketers (over 65%), the speakers (80%) and the lawyers (over 76%) agreed that native advertising can easily be mistaken for a real (non-sponsored) article. In every group, the majority of respondents agreed with the statement that native advertising uses excessive language. Nearly half of the marketers, more than half of the speakers and over 60% of the lawyers agreed that native advertising is misleading.

In all groups, most respondents disagreed (strongly or somewhat) with the statement that native advertising generally provides reliable information about a product or service. For the marketers, this proportion was nearly 64%, 62% among speakers and nearly 72% among lawyers.

Table 6. Respondents' attitude to selected native advertising messages

Native advertising message	Strongly negative	Negative	Neither negative nor positive	Positive	Strongly positive
Marketers					
a	85.1	12.5	2.4	0	0
b	75	18.4	6	0.6	0
c	69.6	16.1	10.1	4.2	0
d	63.1	21.4	10.7	4.2	0.6
Public speakers					
a	82.3	13.9	3.8	0	0
b	70	23.1	5.4	1.5	0
c	47.7	28.5	20.8	3	0
d	41.5	23.1	28.5	6.9	0
Lawyers					
a	76.2	17.5	5.6	0	0.7
b	72.7	18.9	7	1.4	0
c	58	25.9	15.4	0.7	0
d	57.3	23.8	17.5	1.4	0



REKLAMA
KOSMETYCZNY TRIK * - 30 LAT W 3
DNI* PODBIJA INTERNET. STOSUJ GO
MINUTĘ

a



REKLAMA
ODJĘŁA SOBIE Z TWARZY 20 LAT!
„TEN KREM DZIAŁA LEPIJ NIZ
„BOTOKS”

b



REKLAMA
REWOLUCYJNY SPOSÓB NA SZYBKIE
ODMŁODZENIE SKÓRY –
ZASKOCZYSZ SIĘ!

c



REKLAMA
ZMARSZCZKI? INDIJCZA SZYJA? NIE
MUSISZ Z NIMI ŻYĆ – OTO
ROZWIĄZANIE!

d

Table 6 shows how respondents reacted to four examples of native advertising. Each message differed mainly in the way it was written. Messages A and B were sensational and rather implausible – their promises were exaggerated and, from an ethical and a legal point of view, difficult to justify. Messages C and D, on the other hand, did not raise such concerns or include misleading or unrealistic claims. Across all groups, most respondents viewed the messages negatively, though the level of criticism was not the same in every case. The strongest

disapproval concerned messages A and B – they were more shocking and unreliable. This suggests that respondents were able to recognize and react to exaggerated or manipulative content.

As shown in Table 7, the evaluations of messages A and B were quite similar across the different groups, with no statistically significant differences. Variations appeared only for messages C and D. These two were less clear-cut, leaving more room for individual interpretation, and people's sensitivity to ethical or social aspects of the content seemed to differ.

Table 7. Differences in assessments of native advertising messages: summary results of Kruskal–Wallis test

Message	Differences between groups	Significant differences (post hoc test)
a	NO ($p = .1150$)	—
b	NO ($p = .8185$)	—
c	YES ($p = .0016$)	marketers \neq public speakers
d	YES ($p = .0001$)	marketers \neq public speakers public speakers \neq lawyers

Respondents interested in marketing communications expressed the most negative attitudes towards native advertising messages. However, this may indicate an ability to distinguish manipulation in messaging and an aversion to such practices.

A summary of the data presented so far shows the attitudes towards native advertising. Both general statements (Table 1), opinions on native advertising (Table 5), and respondents' attitudes towards native advertising messages (Table 6) support Hypothesis 1, which states that negative attitudes to native advertising prevail over positive attitudes in all three groups. This was the case for the general attitude and all statements about native advertising. In each group, negative assessments prevail over positive ones, and the proportion of negative assessments increases with unethical messages.

Attitudes toward native advertising were compared with attitudes toward selected offline and online tools (Table 8). Because each group of internet users had different levels of knowledge and experience with promotional tools, these tools were presented in a simplified, descriptive manner to evoke clear associations with each tool.

Table 8. Attitudes towards native advertising in the context of selected offline and online promotion tools

Indicator	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l	m
Marketers													
Mean	2.82	2.72	3.10	3.46	2.87	3.85	2.77	3.15	3.00	2.98	2.77	2.99	2.65
Me	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
SD	0.94	0.92	0.99	1.07	0.98	1.00	1.17	1.05	0.99	1.16	1.16	0.99	1.20
VR	33.22	33.66	31.90	30.83	34.02	25.83	42.11	33.45	33.04	39.02	41.74	33.20	45.28
Public speakers													
Mean	2.02	2.43	2.45	2.85	2.63	4.08	1.94	2.45	2.11	2.70	2.42	2.62	1.77
Me	2	2	2	3	3	4	2	2	2	3	3	3	1
SD	0.94	1.02	1.14	1.19	0.95	1.06	1.07	0.95	1.09	1.09	0.89	1.06	1.08
VR	46.45	42.03	46.42	41.62	36.20	25.90	55.15	38.83	51.70	40.24	36.64	40.68	60.94
Lawyers													
Mean	2.42	2.40	2.41	3.17	2.71	3.63	2.29	2.33	2.24	2.50	2.13	2.45	1.99
Me	2	2	2	3	3	4	2	2	2	3	2	2	2
SD	0.91	1.01	1.00	1.15	1.01	1.07	1.16	0.96	0.94	1.03	0.90	0.95	0.96
VR	37.81	42.02	41.25	36.32	37.42	29.55	50.65	41.33	42.04	41.02	42.10	39.00	48.54

Note. a = TV commercials; b = sponsored articles in the press; c = product placement in movies and series; d = sponsorship of athletes, actors, popular figures who become brand ambassadors; e = radio advertising; f = sales promotion – freebies, samples, increasing offer value (e.g. buy two, get third half price); g = outdoor advertising (billboards, banners, posters); h = sponsored links in search engines; i = banner ads (small, clickable image with short text promoting a product); j = paid collaboration with influencers (e.g. on Instagram); k = native advertising; l = sponsored articles on portals/blogs; m = video ads (e.g. on YouTube).

Among the surveyed groups of internet users, the majority of respondents reported negative attitudes to native advertising and many other promotional tools. Strongly negative and negative evaluations prevailed for almost all online tools, and for numerous offline tools as well. Exceptions were classic sales promotions (all groups) and sponsorship (marketers and lawyers). The marketers were more likely to respond positively to product placement in films and sponsored search engine links.

The predominance of positive attitudes to sales promotions may reflect the added value they provide in online buying. Sponsorship, as a subtler and less direct form of promotion, also seems to be appreciated. Overall, negative attitudes to promotional tools are unsurprising, as they are often intrusive and disrupt

the reception of content, especially in social media. No significant differences were noted between attitudes to native advertising and other forms of online promotion.

Although native advertising is more contextual and less intrusive than other tools, this does not seem to affect audience attitudes. This may be due to respondents' limited knowledge of native advertising and the nature of the content, which often addresses topics with negative connotations, such as overweight, diseases, or skin aging.

Examining data distributions, means, and medians provides a general overview, but it is also important to consider the homogeneity of respondents' attitudes. Hypothesis 3 proposed that attitudes to native advertising within each group (marketers, speakers, and lawyers) would be homogeneous. Using the coefficient of variation, it was found that variability exceeded 40% among the marketers and lawyers, which is considered high. Among the speakers, variability was nearly 37%, interpreted as moderate. These results do not support Hypothesis 3, which shows that attitudes to native advertising are not consistent.

High variability was also observed in the marketers' attitudes to outdoor and video advertising. Nevertheless, their responses to most promotional tools were more consistent than those of the other groups. This is noteworthy because native advertising is particularly controversial among people who have the most experience of this promotional tool.

CONCLUSIONS

In addressing the research questions and hypotheses, our findings point to a predominance of negative attitudes towards native advertising over neutral and positive evaluations. However, internet users do not have uniformly negative attitudes, as respondents' evaluations differ significantly across the three audience groups. Responses within each group are consistent, suggesting that perceptions of native advertising are shaped not only by message form and structure (with ethically noncompliant native ads being perceived more negatively), but also by professional roles, interests, and possibly other psychographic variables. These issues warrant further investigation. Future studies could examine consumer responses to native advertising and other promotional tools based on actual rather than declarative message evaluations, for example through the use of projective techniques.

The results of this study should be interpreted in the context of prior research on native advertising. The present findings indicate generally negative attitudes

toward native advertising, similar to those observed for other forms of online and offline promotion. Comparable perceptions of native and banner advertising were reported by Kim et al. (2018), while other studies suggest that native formats are received more favourably than display or video advertising (IPG Lab and Sharethrough, 2013; IAB and Edelman Berland, 2014; Kantar Millward Brown, 2017).

The negative evaluations identified in this study – regarding misleading and sensational content as well as overall message credibility – are consistent with previous findings. Research by Revel et al. (2021) demonstrated that clickbait-style native content is perceived as unfavorable, unreliable, and misleading, while Harms (2019) similarly reported generally negative perceptions of native advertising among internet users.

The study also offers practical implications for the use of native advertising. Message content and form should be tailored to the preferences and perceptual capabilities of target audiences, and differentiated based on prior audience research. Transparency and compliance with ethical standards are essential conditions for message senders. While aggressive content may increase short-term effectiveness, it can have negative long-term consequences for brand image and corporate reputation and does not support socially responsible communication. An important task for advertisers and creators of native advertising is consumer education aimed at improving the ability to identify native advertising.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amazeen M. A. and 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, no. 2, pp. 176-195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2017.1293488>
- Amazeen M. A. and Wojdowski B. W. (2018), *Reducing Native Advertising Deception: Revisiting the Antecedents and Consequences of Persuasion Knowledge in Digital News Contexts*, *Mass Communication and Society* 22, no. 2, pp. 222-247. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2018.1530792>
- Campbell C. and 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, pp. 17-32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2018.02.002>
- Chrańchol-Barczyk U. (2018), *Reklama natywna i jej implikacja dla konsumentów*, *Handel Wewnętrzny*, no. 4, pp. 139-149.
- Chlipała P. and Olchawa T. (2021), *Reklama natywna – determinanty skuteczności w kontekście założeń marketingu społecznego*, *Marketing i Rynek*, no. 8, pp. 12-21. <https://doi.org/10.33226/1231-7853.2021.8.2>

- Cockrell C. (2019), *Elaboration Likelihood and Readers' Perception of Native Advertising on News Websites*, PhD thesis, University of Alabama.
- Contently (2016), *Fixing Native Advertising: What Consumers Want from Brands, Publishers, and the FTC*, Contently, 8.12.2016, <https://contently.com/strategist/2016/12/08/native-advertising-study> [accessed 18.10.2025].
- Evans N. J., Phua J., Lim J., and Jun H. (2017), *Disclosing Instagram Influencer Advertising: The Effects of Disclosure Language on Advertising Recognition, Attitudes, and Behavioral Intent*, *Journal of Interactive Advertising* 17, no. 2, pp. 138-149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15252019.2017.1366885>
- Friestad M. and Wright P. (1994), *The Persuasion Knowledge Model: How People Cope with Persuasion Attempts*, *Journal of Consumer Research* 21, no. 1, pp. 1-31. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209380>
- Harms B., Bijmolt T., and Hoekstra J. (2017), *Digital Native Advertising: Practitioner Perspectives and a Research Agenda*, *Journal of Interactive Advertising* 17, no. 2, pp. 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15252019.2017.135751>
- Harms B., Bijmolt T., and Hoekstra J. (2019), *You Don't Fool Me! Consumer Perceptions of Digital Native Advertising and Banner Advertising*, *Journal of Media Business Studies* 16, no. 4, pp. 275-224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16522354.2019.1640517>
- Hogg M. and Vaughan G. (2005), *Social Psychology*, 4th ed., London: Prentice Hall.
- Hoofnagle C. J. and Meleshinsky E. (2015), *Native Advertising and Endorsement: Schema, Source-Based Misleadingness, and Omission of Material Facts*, *Tech Science*, 14.12.2015, <http://techscience.org/a/2015121503>
- Howe P. and Teufel B. (2014), *Native Advertising and Digital Natives: The Effects of Age and Advertisement Format on News Website Credibility Judgments*, *ISOJ Journal* 4, no. 1, pp. 78-90.
- Huang Y., Wu M., Li R., Bortree D.S., Yang F., Xiao A., and 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, no. 12, pp. 1492-1509. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764216666013>
- Huang Y. and Yoon H. J. (2021), *Prosocial Native Advertising on Social Media: Effects of Ad-Context Congruence, Ad Position and Ad Type*, *Journal of Social Marketing* 12, no. 2, pp. 105-123. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSOCM-05-2021-0105>
- Hübner M., Thalmann J., and Henseler J. (2025), *Blending in or Standing Out? The Disclosure Dilemma of Ad Cues of Social Media Native Advertising*, *Frontiers in Psychology* 16, article 1636910. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1636910>
- Hwang Y. and Jeong S. H. (2019), *Editorial Content in Native Advertising*, *Journal of Advertising Research* 59, no. 2, pp. 208-218. <https://doi.org/10.2501/JAR-2018-019>
- IAB and Edelman Berland (2014), *Getting In-Feed Sponsored Content Right: The Consumer View*, IAB, http://www.iab.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/IAB_Edelman_Berland_Study.pdf [accessed 18.10.2025]
- IPG Lab and Sharethrough (2013), *Exploring the Effectiveness of Native Ads*, Medium, 18.06.2013, <https://medium.com/ipg-media-lab/ipg-lab-sharethrough-exploring-the-effectiveness-of-native-ads-de8eb282f042>
- Interia Sport, 19.10.2025, <https://sport.interia.pl/pilka-nozna/ekstraklasa/news-grosicki-uciszyl-stadion-lecha-riposta-w-drugiej-polowie-i-d,nId,22432741>

- Kantar Millward Brown (2017), *AdReaction: Gen X, Y and Z*, IAB, https://old.iabeurope.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/AdReaction-Gen-X-Y-and-Z_Global-Report_FINAL_Jan-10-2017.pdf [accessed 18.10.2025]
- Kim M., Lee J. K., and Lee K.-Y. (2019), *Interplay of Content Type and Product Type in the Consumer Response to Native Advertising on Social Media*, *Asian Journal of Communication* 29, no. 6, pp. 464-482. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01292986.2019.1679852>
- Kip S. M. and Ünsal P. U. (2020), *Exploring Native Advertising in Turkey: Insights from Digital Immigrants and Digital Natives*, *Qualitative Market Research* 23, no. 3, pp. 381-406. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QMR-01-2018-0016>
- Lacko D., Machackova H., and Slavik L. (2024), *Adolescents' Perceptions of the Credibility of Informational Content on Fitness and Dietary Supplements: The Impact of Banner and Native Advertising*, *Journal of Adolescence* 96, no. 8, pp. 1956-1968. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jad.12394>
- Lazer J. (2015), *Article or Ad? When It Comes to Native, No One Knows*, *Contently*, 8.09.2025, <https://contently.com/strategist/2015/09/08/article-or-ad-when-it-comes-to-native-no-one-knows>
- Lee J., Kim S., and Ham C. D. (2016), *A Double-Edged Sword? Predicting Consumers' Attitudes Toward and Sharing Intention of Native Advertising on Social Media*, *American Behavioral Scientist* 60, no. 12, pp. 1425-1441. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764216660137>
- Lim D., Evans N. J., and Primovic M. (2021), *Exploring How Disclosure Works for Listicle-Style Native Advertising: The Role of Persuasion Knowledge, Persuasion Appropriateness, and Supplementary Disclosure Effect of Brand Social Media*, *Journal of Interactive Advertising* 21, no. 1, pp. 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15252019.2021.1921084>
- Marody M. (1976), *Sens teoretyczny a sens empiryczny pojęcia postawy. Analiza metodologiczna zasad doboru wskaźników w badaniach nad postawami*, Warszawa: PWN.
- Newman N., Levy D. A. L., and Nielsen R. K. (2015), *Reuters Institute Digital News Report 2015*, Reuters Institute, https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/sites/default/files/research/files/Reuters%2520Institute%2520Digital%2520News%2520Report%25202015_Full%2520Report.pdf [accessed 18.10.2025]
- O'Neil J. and Eisenmann M. (2017), *An Examination of How Source Classification Impacts Credibility and Consumer Behavior*, *Public Relations Review* 43, no. 2, pp. 278-292. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2017.02.011>
- Pasandaran C. C. and Mutmainnah N. (2020), *Young Adults' Recognition of Native Advertising Disguised as News*, *Young Consumers* 21, no. 1, pp. 91-108. <https://doi.org/10.1108/YC-08-2019-1032>
- Revel M., Tohidi A., Eckles D., Berinsky A. J., and Jadbabaie A. (2021), *Native Advertising and the Credibility of Online Publishers*, Working Paper, PsyArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/8vbup>
- Sharethrough (2015), *Native Advertising*, <https://www.sharethrough.com/advertisers/native-advertising> [accessed 18.10.2025]
- Soontae A., Gayle K., and Jin H. S. (2018), *Consumer Well-Being and Marketing Communications: Recognizing Native Ads as Advertising: Attitudinal and Behavioral Consequences*, *Journal of Consumer Affairs* 53, no. 4, pp. 1421-1442. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joca.12235>
- Stallone V. (2020), *Perception and Recognition of Native Advertising*, Conference Paper, 18th International Conference e-Society, 2-4 April 2020, pp. 27-35. https://doi.org/10.33965/es2020_202005L004
- Sweetser K. D., Ahn S. J., Golan G. J., and Hochman A. (2016), *Native Advertising as a New Public Relations Tactic*, *American Behavioral Scientist* 60, no. 12, pp. 1442-1457. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764216660137>

- Trbušić D., Maleš D., and Šikić L. (2024), *Obilježja nativnog oglašavanja na najčitanijim hrvatskim internetowym portalima*, *Medijske istraživanja* 30, no. 1, pp. 153-176. <https://doi.org/10.22572/mi.30.1.6>
- Tutaj K. and van Reijmersdal E. A. (2012), *Effects of Online Advertising Format and Persuasion Knowledge on Audience Reactions*, *Journal of Marketing Communications* 18, no. 1, pp. 5-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527266.2011.620765>
- Van Reijmersdal E. A., Fransen M. L., van Noort G., Oprea S. J., Vandenberg L., Reusch S., van Lieshout F., and 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, no. 12, pp. 1458-1474.
- Wan A. (2024), *To Be or Not to Be (an Ad): Advertising Students' Understanding of Instagram In-Feed Native Advertising*, *Journal of Advertising Education* 28, no. 2, pp. 137-158. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098048224126566>
- Wojdyski B. W. (2016), *The Deceptiveness of Sponsored News Articles: How Readers Recognize and Perceive Native Advertising*, *American Behavioral Scientist* 60, no. 12, pp. 1475-1491. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000276421666014>
- Wojdyski B. W. and 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, no. 2, pp. 157-168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2015.1115380>
- Zimand-Sheiner D., Ryan T., Kip S. M., and Lahav T. (2020), *Native Advertising Credibility Perceptions and Ethical Attitudes: An Exploratory Study Among Adolescents in the United States, Turkey, and Israel*, *Journal of Business Research* 116(C), pp. 608-619. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.06.020>

POSTAWY INTERNAUTÓW WOBEC REKLAMY NATYWNEJ – WYNIKI BADAŃ PORÓWNAWCZYCH

Streszczenie

Artykuł koncentruje się na problematyce afektywnych postaw wybranych grup internautów wobec reklamy natywnej. Celem artykułu jest identyfikacja postaw wobec reklamy natywnej oraz zróżnicowania ocen poszczególnych grup internautów. Do badań wyodrębniono trzy grupy internautów, skupionych wokół treści związanych z marketingiem, wystąpieniami publicznymi i problematyką prawniczą. Badanie zostało przeprowadzone za pomocą ankiety internetowej i obejmowało identyfikację postaw respondentów wobec różnych narzędzi promocji używanych online i offline, ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem stosunku badanych do formy i treści reklam natywnej.

Wyniki badań wykazały, że wszystkie grupy internautów wykazały niechęć do reklamy natywnej. Test ANOVA rang Kruskala–Wallisa wykazał, że występują istotne statystycznie różnice grup odbiorców w wyrażanym stosunku do reklamy natywnej. Analiza współczynnika zmienności wykazała niejednorodność ocen każdej z badanych grup odbiorców. Wnioski z badań mogą przyczynić się do lepszego zrozumienia postaw konsumentów wobec reklamy natywnej oraz dostosowania strategii marketingowych do ich preferencji i oczekiwań.

Słowa kluczowe: reklama natywna; percepcja reklamy natywnej; postawy wobec reklamy natywnej