A MULTIVARIATE STUDY OF REACTIONS TO TELEVISION COMMERCIALS

JAMES RANDLE RUSSELL

121100303030301065



HHES: -





# RETURNING MATERIALS: Place in book drop to remove this checkout from your record. FINES will be charged if book is returned after the date stamped below.

يەر بىر رايا



Accepted by the faculty of the Department of Advertising, College of Communication Arts, Michigan State University, in partial fulfillment for the requirements of the Master of Arts degree.

Director of Thesis

#### ABSTRACT

## A MULTIVARIATE STUDY OF REACTIONS TO TELEVISION COMMERCIALS

#### By

James R. Russell

The purpose of this research was to examine the relationship between liking a television commercial and being persuaded by it. The composition of that liking or disliking was also studied along with other variables which could affect the communication situation.

Eight hypothese were formulated, the primary one proposing that the persuasibility of a commercial can be predicted from its likeability. Persuasibility was measured by purchase inclination, and likeability for each commercial was defined by an index of the respondent's attitude toward the commercial. Other important elements of the communication of advertising were also measured, such as media use habits, brand preference, and attitudes toward advertising in general.

Students from Michigan State University were selected randomly to participate in the laboratory study. Each student viewed thirteen commercials and rated each of them, along with providing other information. Multiple regression was utilized to analyze the predictive accuracy of the likeability measures on persuasibility.

The findings indicate that the persuasibility of a commercial can be predicted from its likeability, but that the relative importance of all the elements composing the likeability measure vary greatly. Impact, interest, and meaningfulness of the commercial appear to account for much of the variance in the prediction of persuasion. Further study on these specific elements of commercial likeability is proposed.

#### A MULTIVARIATE STUDY

## OF REACTIONS

### TO TELEVISION COMMERCIALS

By

James Randle Russell

### A THESIS

## Submitted to Michigan State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

### MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Advertising College of Communication Arts

1974

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGM	IENTS	Page
CHAPTER 1:	INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2:	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	7
	INTRODUCTION	8
	REACTIONS TO ADVERTISEMENTS IN GENERAL	8
	TELEVISION COMMERCIAL REACTIONS	12
	COMMUNICATION MESSAGES IN GENERAL	15
	ADVERTISING AS A MESSAGE FORM	17
	METHODOLOGIES AND DESIGNS	23
CHAPTER 3:	THE PROBLEM AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE	27
	HYPOTHESIS	28
	ASSUMPTIONS	31
	LIMITATIONS OF THE SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM	31
CHAPTER 4:	METHODS AND PROCEDURES	33
	THE LABORATORY AS A DESIGN	34
	THE CHOICE OF TELEVISION AND COMMERCIALS	35
	THE QUESTIONNAIRE	36
	COLLECTING THE DATA	37
	TREATING THE DATA	38
	DESIGN OF ANALYSIS	40
CHAPTER 5:	RESULTS	41
CHAPTER 6:	DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY	49
	INTRODUCTION	50
	LIKEABILITY AND PERSUASIBILITY	50
	LIKEABILITY AND BRAND PREFERENCE	55
	LIKEABILITY AND ATTITUDES TOWARD ADVERTISING	57
	LIKEABILITY AND OTHER FACTORS	60
	THE PERSUASIBILITY MEASURES: PAST AND FUTURE	62
	SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS	63
APPENDIX A:	QUESTIONNAIRE	65
APPENDIX B:	CODEBOOK	71
APPENDIX C:	INDEXES COMPUTED	75
APPENDIX D:	COMMERCIALS UTILIZED IN THE STUDY	77

•

.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT.)

.

APPENDIX E: COMMERCIAL TOTALS	91
APPENDIX F: VARIABLES, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS	93
APPENDIX G: CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS	95
BIBLIOGRAPHY	98

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful for the excellent guidance and assistance of Dr. John Simpkins, who also served as an able advisor while attending Michigan State. I will always admire both his knowledge and patience which I needed so much to complete this task.

I also wish to thank my wife and friend, Jennifer, who had to suffer the same tribulations as I in completing this thesis. Her closeness and understanding made the going much easier.

# CHAPTER 1

.

# INTRODUCTION

The advertising research community has been plagued for decades with the problems of measuring advertising effectiveness and relating advertising and purchase behavior. In seventy-five years advertising has evolved from a simplistic notion of "selling the product" to an advanced science of communication based on behavioral research. To give a better perspective and provide a background for this thesis, it may be helpful to retrace the advertising and marketing doctrines that have prevailed during this century.

In the early 1900's the function of advertising was to gain the reader's attention with cleverness, and thereby sell the product through a persuasive 1 message. The "old inspirational method," as it was called, dominated the advertising world until the mid-1920's, when "the research method" was coined. 2 Many large advertising agencies had research departments earlier than that, but their functions were limited indeed. A sign of the changing times came in 1927, when James O'Shaughnessy, an executive secretary of the American Association of Advertising Agencies, said, "Copy is no longer a matter of pure inspiration. It is becoming more and more a message based on tested 3 and proved facts."

Despite this revelation, research of the 1930's was focused on the product being advertised rather than the consumer of that product. The purpose of market research for the advertiser was stated to be "... to reach the people who are potential buyers of his (the advertiser's) product; to deliver the message that will influence them; to secure a response that will increase the flow of his goods." This economic definition of market research failed to be utilized by the advertising community to any great extent. A typical advertising textbook of that period was remarkably unusual if it

contained even one or two chapters on research.<sup>5</sup> The Hotchkiss text of 1940 went on to make a remarkable admission concerning human behavior: "Human beings are less constant and predictable in their behavior than guinea pigs - much less so than vegetables or minerals." There at least was a new notion that consumers were somewhat different than Pavlov's dogs. This is the first hint in advertising that repetition alone may not be sufficient to produce desired sales.

More importance was placed on the consumer later in the 1940's, but certainly little headway was being made. Advertising and selling functions remained inseparably linked. Market research and advertising testing were added in advertising texts as a second thought, stuck in the last couple chapters, with little evidence that a connecting link with advertising 7 strategy was necessary or desireable.

In 1950 Lucas and Britt published the first text on advertising research, but it was desperately lacking in the acknowledgement that the consumer was anything more than a passive participant in the decision-making process. The two authors concerned themselves with motives but little with communication effects. They did not examine what the consumer brought with him to an advertising situation (predisposition), but assumed rather that there was some similarity in the mass of consumers.

This short-sighted view changed drastically in the 1950's, when various behavioral scientists (Lazersfeld, Hovland, and others) discovered many components of consumer attitude that could affect behavior. Another leader in this new endeavor, Joseph Klapper, put it this way: "The effect of communication is almost always a result of a host of variables, rather than merely the 9 result of a message reaching an audience through a medium." Terms such as selective exposure, selective perception, and predisposition were

developed by these researchers. Unfortunately, the advertising community was slow in accepting this change.

One can easily see this evolving change in S. Watson Dunn's three 10 editions of advertising textbooks. In the 1961 edition, Dunn lists various new developments in advertising, one of which is "the increasing use of communication concepts in formulating creative strategy". By the 1969 edition, he develops this into a consumer behavior reference, and stresses the importance of coordinating the marketing mix and communication. In the 1974 edition, Dunn devotes over 140 pages to communication alone, and another 100 pages to consumer behavior and market research. Here, in an incredibly short span of 15-20 years, advertisers have changed their philosophy of consumers from a passive to an active agent.

Another catalyst in this recent history and development was the blooming of a new field in 1965 and 1966 called consumer behavior. Researchers pooled the knowledge of such diverse fields as sociology, anthropology, psychology, and communication theory with existing marketing and advertising ideas. In just a few years this new field would move from a simplistic model of consumer 11 behavior (the famous AIDA model: Attention-Interest-Desire-Action ) to complex consumer behavior models with numerous variables. These new models reflect the added knowledge gained since the 1950's.

These developments in advertising and market research have altered the nature of such research. In analyzing any communication situation (including advertising, of course) <u>all</u> relevant variables should be examined, if possible. This thesis is an attempt to isolate and observe certain of these variables which may affect reactions to television commercials. Furthermore, the elusive link between these reactions and purchase behavior will be examined as an element of persuasibility. Specifically, reactions can be studied on the basis

of various categories. For instance, apart from merely liking or disliking a commercial, an individual may react to the commercial from a production or technical viewpoint; he may react to varying degrees depending on his interest in the product being advertised; he may react to the overall impact of the commercial; and so on. The possible explanations of the situation seem endless, and, indeed, perhaps they are. But as this historical introduction has shown, progress can be made in delineating certain variables which play important roles in the process of communication. By examining television commercials in the light of previous communications research, it is hoped that a clearer definition of problems and variables will surface.

The study of these types of variables, and reactions to commercials in general, can be of extreme importance to the advertiser and to the consumer. An acknowledgement by the advertiser that the consumer is an active participant in the audience, rather than simply a massive blob, will surely lead to more creative approaches. This can be achieved only when information is known about the communication process so that better decisions can be made for the consumer. This means not merely a more efficient expenditure of advertising dollars, but perhaps a more tolerable level of advertising for the consumer. This thesis is a step in that direction.

FOOTNOTES - Chapter 1

6.

1 Frank Presbey, The History and Development of Advertising, Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Doran, and Company, Inc., 1929, page 525. 2 Ibid., page 527. Ibid., page 528. 4 George Burton Hotchkiss, An Outline of Advertising, New York: The MacMillan Company, 1940, revised edition, page 148. 5 In fact, the Hotchkiss text had exactly 48 of 600 pages on research, of which 26 pages dealt with product research. 6 Ibid., page 151. A good example here is Harry P. Bridge's text, Practical Advertising, written in 1949. 8 Darrell Blaine Lucas and Steuart Henderson Britt, Advertising Psychology and Research, New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950. Joseph T. Klapper, "What We Know About the Effects of Mass Communications: The Brink of Hope", Public Opinion Quarterly, Winter, 1957-1958, page 455. 10 S. Watson Dunn, <u>Advertising</u>: <u>It's Role in Modern Marketing</u>, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, editions 1, 2, 3, 1961, 1969, and 1974. 11 A good summary of the more simple models can be found in an article presented to the American Marketing Association by Conrad R. Hill in 1972, entitled, "Delineating the Components of Attitude for Improved Pre-Test Measures of Advertising".

CHAPTER 2

## REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

.-----

------

#### INTRODUCTION

In an attempt to organize an orderly literature review, considering the massive amount of available studies in this field, the review is divided into three major areas. The first, reactions to advertisements in general, will be examined, followed by reactions to television commercials, a division of advertising. The second area to be explored will be communication messages in general, with the tie-in of advertisements as a message form. In the third area of review, the various methodologies and designs that have been utilized in other studies dealing with this theme will be summarized. This organization structure re-emphasizes the importance and basis for this paper: advertising research comes under behavioral and communication research, rather than an independent body of knowledge.

#### REACTIONS TO ADVERTISEMENTS IN GENERAL

Advertising research has been concerned historically with reactions 1 to advertisements as a measure of "effectiveness", however defined. Plummer identifies four levels of consumer response, which provides a useful beginning for reviewing the literature.

- (1) the unconscious level
- (2) the immediate perceptual level
- (3) the retention or learning level
- (4) the behavior level

Thus reactions can be analyzed from any one or more of these four levels of consumer response, depending on the purpose and goals of the research, or 2 perhaps, the definition one has for effectiveness. Lavidge and Steiner attempted to develop an admittedly simple model incorporating all these levels of response, called AIDA. The acronym stands for attention, interest, desire, and action; this series of activities represents the decision-making process of the consumer, and involves each level of Plummer's. Obviously, the model stresses the importance of advertising in the process, particularly at the attention level. Since this model was introduced in the 1950's, it has been expanded a great deal, as a host of other, more complex variables were found to effect the consumer. Today all consumer behavior models (such as those of Andreason and Engel) have incorporated some part of their model with reactions to advertising.

Now that a brief theoretical background has been introduced in this area, it is important to examine more what exactly advertising effectiveness has historically been defined to be. Chapter 1 traced the changes in this facet in this century, but many elements of measurement linger. A leading market 3 and advertising research company summarizes the use of the above models and the possible measures of advertising effectiveness:

> "By far the majority of advertising research designs in use today - both the old and the new - attempt to evaluate ad effectiveness by measuring one or more of the following stepwise effects which can result from exposure to advertising.

- 1- The name of the product is communicated and remembered.
- 2- Sales messages are communicated and remembered.
- 3- Attitudes toward the product change, or are reinforced.
- 4- Inclination to purchase changes, or continues.
- 5- Sales are achieved, or maintained."

Most advertisers feel that the closer the advertising test measure can come to the bottom of the ladder, the more ideal, and useful, the test design. Often this has frustrated researchers, since sales effects are achieved for a host of reasons, only one of which may be advertising. Additionally, there is a problem of measuring short-range or long-range goals, which may be quite different, both in scope and purpose.

Sales, if that in fact is the desired measure of advertising effectiveness, can be measured by various indexes or audits (e.g., Nielsen store checks), if one realizes that the result may be tarnished by other variables. Coupon tests and wave studies over time are subject to similar inaccuracies. An alternative measure of short-range goals has been the measurement of purchase inclination or purchase intent. A well-known method in this regard is the Scwerin test of brand preferences. Typically, people are ushered into a theater setting and asked to fill out a questionnaire indicating their brand preferences on several items. They are told that this is for a grand prize drawing following the show they are about to see, and in order to make the one lucky winner the happiest, the grocery cart the winner will receive will be filled only with her most favored brands. The people then are exposed to a 30- or 60-minute film, interspersed with advertisements for brands included in the grocery cart. Afterward, the viewers are told that the questionnaires they filled out earlier had been misplaced, and that they need to fill it out once more. Any change in brand preference is then attributed to the commercials. This then serves as one measure of the effectiveness of an advertisement, a measure of purchase inclination. Obviously, the theater technique has decided shortcomings as a measure of purchase intent, not the least of which is the vast difference between viewing at home and viewing in a forced exposure setting. Also, the measure of brand switching may be for different reasons, totally apart from the advertising. For instance, a respondent may like a certain brand better as a free prize, but is unwilling to pay a high price for it in the store. Additionally, other research tends to cast doubts upon the possibility that a single ad

can alter purchase inclination or brand preference so completely. Other designs similar to this type are simulated shopping areas, where after viewing a program and commercials, people are asked to select products. Again, this method has many of the same questionable problems as with the Schwerin technique.

Many researchers have attempted to improve on the self-reporting type 4 of purchase inclination measurement. Thomas Juster of Princeton has examined purchase intent for several years. He has found in a series of studies that there is a large predictive accuracy of subjective purchase probabilities over buying intentions in the cases of products with high value. In other words, in the case of automobiles or household durables, predicting purchase can be most successful if the respondent is given a wide range of choices of probable purchase, and that there are small differences between alternate choices. Juster has found in scale development that inclination to buy is best measured when the possible choices for purchase are slight and not 5 6 definite. Gruber and Axelrod further explored the scaling system of Juster with items of lesser value and could not explain as much of the variance between probable purchase and actual purchase. It seems the products of lesser cost are also of lesser importance when determining purchase inclination and probability of purchase.

Another method concerned with purchase inclination is utilized by the 7 Telpex TV Check Test, more about which will be discussed later. This type of question is widely used and attempts to measure immediate reactions of an inclining nature right after the commercial. This type of inquiry might go,

> "Now that you have seen this commercial, would you say you might be (a) a little more likely to buy the product; (b) a little less likely to buy the product; or (c) quite definitely neither more or less likely to buy the product?"

This form of self-reporting is meant to discover whether the consumer is

"leaning" toward purchasing the product advertised, immediately following a commercial. It remains unclear how valid the association between these results and actual purchase is, but certainly, it would be very short-range, if a correlation does exist.

#### TELEVISION COMMERCIAL REACTIONS

To focus this review somewhat, television commercials and reactions to them can be examined as a part of the entire realm of all of advertising. It is surprisingly difficult to find many examples of pre-test or post-test research designs on television commercials. It seems most commercial research companies conceal their testing procedures well, and one is left with a small group of tests primarily by academicians. Many of these techniques are recall measures used in a post-test situation, while many others are reaction profiles used primarily in pre-test designs. A variety of tests attempt to measure consumer reaction physically or physiologically, using everything from measuring pupil dilation to galvanic skin response. Wells and Leavitt, however, recent leaders in television commercial testing, initiated a call for a return of the consumer opinion in advertising. Their paper (written in 1971) had a stated purpose of recognizing the importance of consumer opinion about commercials, in spite of the alleged subjective bias involved. They pointed out that consulting consumers directly about ads can be helpful in an immediate fashion in checking communication results.

Three examples of research studies using bipolar scaling techniques for measuring reactions to television commercials have been developed in the 9 past ten years. In 1964 William Wells developed an EQ (Emotional Quotient) scale composed of twelve statements about a commercial. He expanded this EQ

scale through several stages, using a thesaurus, and finding which words respondents selected to describe ads. He ended up with 26 semantic differential scales and tested various ads, having housewives use the scales to describe the ads. He analyzed the data using factor analysis to find three clusters of scales: attractiveness factor (typified by adjectives such as "attractiveunattractive", "fascinating-boring"); meaningfulness factor ("important-unimportant", "honest-dishonest"); and a vitality factor ("lively-lifeless", "new, different-common, ordinary"). In another study he used the scales to predict recall scores and found that the "meaningfulness" scales were the best predictors.

A second study by Clark Leavitt in 1970 resulted in similar findings in 11 rating television commercials. Starting with a list of 525 possible words to describe commercials, he reduced this unweidy total to 45 through the following process. Commercials were shown to subjects who could then check as many or as few adjectives as they wished to portray their feelings about a commercial they had just seen. Various types and stages of testing and a factoring of results left the 45 words. Seven factors were found, four of which accounted for most of the variance: the energetic factor, the personal relevance factor, the sensual factor, and the familiarity factor. The energetic and sensual factors were similar to the attractiveness cluster in Wells' study described earlier, and the personal relevance factor closely resembled the meaningfulness factor.

The two researchers combined with another colleague in a third study involving yet more adjective pairs and commercial ratings. Similar to the preceding studies, a series of steps were taken to distill a number of profile scales from a large pool of words. In an attempt to predict recall, a personal relevance factor was again prominent in the prediction. Some of the adjectives in this relevance factor were again the same as the earlier studies - "important, meaningful, valuable." 13.

10

12

Not all research of television commercials has been limited to bipolar adjectives, however. In a study that has been mentioned earlier in the discussion of purchase measures, the Telpex TV Check Test offers a different approach. This study, by two British researchers, Caffryn and Rogers, explored the effects of successful American and British commercials on British 13 audiences. The study involved twelve commercials, six American and six British, nearly all of which had won prizes at international festivals, and were all accepted as reaching a high level of creative achievement. The twelve commercials were each tested separately through what is termed the Telpex TV Check Test. In this type of test, seven questions were used to explore the reactions to each commercial. Four questions are standardized and set out to evaluate the commercial in terms of "impact, acceptance/contextual, acceptance/personal, and persuasion." Normally, the other three questions are specifically written for each commercial tested, to probe certain areas. For this particular study, all seven questions were identical, the other three evaluating the commercial in terms of "interest/welldoneness, likeability, and repetition". The sample consisted of 100 British adults for each commercial, giving a total sample of 1200. When results for all twelve commercials were analyzed, there were distinct differences between the responses to American and British commercials. Reactions to American commercials were more extreme and more entertaining, while the British commercials were a little more effective in terms of persuasion. The Telpex Test appears to be an excellent tool for probing television commercial reactions. In contrast with the bipolar scaling tests described earlier, the test itself has a more natural and more easily understood format, and appears to be of more interest to the respondent. The test also has the advantage of securing a more evaluative response without forcing the respondent to answer as an expert, as often happens asking eval-

uations about specific audio or visual elements. In an abbreviated format the test appears to evaluate all elements of a commercial. IJ.

#### COMMUNICATION MESSAGES IN GENERAL

As indicated several times already, communication research has added a great deal to the mass of knowledge associated with advertising research. Advertising can be viewed as a form of communication message, so there is much of this sort of research which relates to the problem here. The studies of Lazersfeld, Hovland, Schramm, and others, all have elements of mass communications effects that are helpful in understanding communication.

A well-researched component of communication is that of source credibility and attitude change. By manipulating variables of the source, message, and medium, the reaction of the receiver can be observed; thus, many of these studies are experimental in design. Aronson and Golden have examined source 14 credibility associated with opinion change, particularly experimenting with various aspects of that credibility, finding both relevant and irrelevant 15 Hovland, Janis, and Kelly discovered general relevance factors conditions. 16 of the source, such as intelligence, responsibility, honesty, and sincerity. In both of these studies, credibility of the source is defined in terms of expertness and/or trustworthiness of the source. In the Aronson and Golden study mentioned before, the two researchers looked at the effects of various conditions of the source, some relevant and some irrelevant to the situation. They used a four-celled design to test their hypothesis that a greater change in the opinion of the audience will be attained if attributed to a source having high credibility. The researchers had Negro and Caucasian speakers

talk to a class of sixth-graders on education, and they were portrayed as either engineers or dishwashers. The relevant condition here was employment or occupation, and the irrelevant condition, race. However, the result was that both relevant and irrelevant aspects of credibility were important. determinants of opinion change. Similarly, Aronson and others found in 1963 that once again greater opinion change results when attributed to a highly 17 credible source. Here the phenomenon of discrepancy was examined along with credibility. They found that increasing discrepancy (the extent of discrepancy between the opinion advocated by the communicator and the precommunication opinion of the recipient) resulted in greater opinion change, but only to a point; as the discrepancy becomes extreme, opinion change declines.

This research emphasis on the source of communication messages is by no means the only area studied. Various message forms and the medium utilized has been another important area of communication research. Marshall McLuhan, probably the most widely known of communcation philosophers, introduced a new concept in 1966, "The medium is the message". Much research has shown that credibility of a message is affected in many ways by the medium utilized; yet, the primary focus of research recently has been in that sector so long ignored, that of the audience. Research began to show that the audience is anything but an inactive mass, that people remember communications in a highly selective way. Klapper's book in 1960 brought an end to the era of taking communication effects for granted, and the idea of controlling communication effects by manipulating variables in the message and source is dependent first on the audience. Klapper sees communication as operating through mediating factors, such as group membership, selective exposure, and defense mechanisms, such that mass communication is only a controlling agent of communication 20 change.

If advertising can now be viewed as a component of communication, then the summary of research mentioned above has an impact when looking at television commercials in particular as an advertising form and as a message form. Krugman made the distinction that television advertising is viewed as non-21 sensical and unimportant by much of the audience. This is a form of learning without involvement where the full perceptual impact of the message is delayed. Thus the link between low involvement advertising communication and high involvement communication is that advertising seeks gradual shifts in perception, followed by attitude change at some time; high involvement, on the other hand, will have a more dramatic conflict of ideas at the conscious level of 22 attitudes and opinions that precedes changes in overt behavior.

Weilbacher makes the link more complete as he describes and lists three 23 factors he believes effect a consumer's response to an advertisement.

"First is the content of the advertisement itself. Second are the various characteristics of the individual consumer: his sex, his age, his intelligence, his affluence, his consumption style, his innate predisposition to buy particular classes of goods, his feelings about advertising, the way in which he has learned or trained himself to defend his senses and perceptions from mass communication assault, whether he is alert and inquiring or dull and sickly, and so on and so on. The third and final factor affecting the consumer's response to an advertisement is his past history of exposure to the same advertisement or advertisements that are so similar as to be perceptually equivalent."

To examine the effects of advertising, then, attempts have been made to control as many of these factors as possible. In this manner each component of the advertising and its audience can be examined as to its importance and relevance. Thus the remaining section of this part of the literature review examines these separate phenomena as they have been studied. Specifically,

media use habits, attitudes toward advertising, and brand preference have been singled out for further discussion from the maze of variables Weilbacher lists. These include elements of life style, psychographics, and behavioral aspects of the consumer, all omnipresent in today's literature.

The use of media habits data in segmentation studies and multivariate analysis has been a relatively new technique. It is an important component of life style, simply because time with the media is often a significant portion of the hours in a day. Television alone accounts for an average of six hours a day. Even college students devote a surprising amount of time to television; a recent study at Michigan State revealed the average was almost 24 two hours a day, and 44.1% watched more than two hours each day.

Bauer and Greyser conducted an extensive research report for the American Association of Advertising Agencies concerning the consumer's judgement of 25 advertising. In a nationwide sample of almost 2000 households, they found a number of interesting surprises. Of interest here are their findings on media use and reactions to both advertising and advertisements. Later in this section this study will be referred to again with brand preference studies.

Bauer and Greyser make two legitimate, yet conflicting, assumptions or 26 possible hypothesis concerning ad exposure and media use:

> 1- An individual's reaction may be a direct and immediate function of the advertisements to which he was exposed. Thus a person spending a high proportion of his time with a medium known to contain many annoying advertisements would report many annoying advertisements. If this exposure pattern continues for a long time, he might develop a generalized critical attitude toward advertising and become sensitive to annoying advertisements. Therefore, his attitude toward both advertising and specific advertisements will be highly critical.

2- On the other hand, constant exposure with a medium might inoculate a person so that he develops a tolerance for annoying advertisements, and thus be less critical.

The results were somewhat ambiguous, similar to the assumptions above. In short, "high users of radio and TV are considerably more likely to report 27 a higher than usual proportion of annoying ads." The pattern is uneven, however, for the print media. In Table 1 below, the relationship of total media exposure and ad categorization is given, again from the Bauer and Greyser study.

Table 1Total Media Exposure and Ad Categorization

Total Media Exposure		Ad Catego	ry		
	Annoying	Enjoyable	Informative	Offensive	
Low	20%	36%	40 <b>%</b>	47	
Medium	22%	36%	38%	4%	
High	25%	33%	37%	5%	

There is a slight difference shown, with those who use media to a greater degree finding ads slightly more annoying and less enjoyable.

They went further to explore the relationship of media exposure and attitudes toward advertising in general: "The suggestion is fairly strong that while media exposure is a factor in the type of ads one reports as having seen or heard, this circumstance bears no patterned relationship to his long-29 run overall attitude toward advertising."

This leads into the next section considered of importance: how a consumer perceives advertisements as it relates to his overall attitude toward advertising. Bauer and Greyser also looked at this factor in the same study previously 30 mentioned, and these are their conclusions:

"Attitudes toward 'advertising' are definitely related to reactions to 'advertisements'. This is not only generally true, but applies to reactions to ads for individual products as well. The tendency to report favorable reactions to ads is strongest for the group with favorable overall attitudes, the mixed and indifferent groups are next, and the people unfavorable to advertising report the lowest proportion of enjoyable and informative ads, although still over half."

Here "advertising" is distinguished from "advertisements" in that the former includes attitudes toward the nebulous word concerning all segments of the business that the consumer may have attitudes toward; the latter, on the other hand, is a set of attitudes toward a single advertisement or commercial. Obviously, there is a part-whole issue here, and it would be easy to explain away this effect without looking at it. But it is of importance to know that some people will rate ads considerably lower than others simply because of the medium - that they are advertisements. This, then, is yet another predisposition that the consumer brings to the advertising communication situation. It appears that selective exposure works to such a degree that measurement of this variable is important.

The third variable that researchers have felt is important in studying reactions to advertisements is the effect of brand preference. Reactions vary with respect to whether or not the brand advertised is the preferred brand. Several studies could be referred to here as evidence of this effect, but the Bauer and Greyser study is the most clearly illuminating of any. (It may seem to the reader at this point that too much emphasis is being given to one source, but Bauer and Greyser conducted by far the most complete study concerning advertising in this decade.)

The conclusions in this regard are, in short: "Specifically, product

use and brand preference emerge as correlates of considerably greater interest 31 in and favorability toward advertisements for such products and brands." Table 2 from the study plainly shows the importance of brand attitude in reacting to advertisements of that brand.

Table 2 Bran	d Attitude	and Advertisement		Categorization	
	Annoy- ing	Enjoy- able	Informa- tive	Offen- sive	Number of Ads
My favorite brand: I prefer it over all others	7%	49%	44%	-	1371
A brand I like better than most others	9%	49%	41%	1%	1315
A brand I like abo as well as any others	ut 19%	43%	36%	2%	1724
A brand that will do if nothing els is available	e 47%	24%	25%	47	498
A brand I wouldn't buy	62%	13%	11%	14%	<b>363</b> 、
No Opinion		•			311
All Users of Produ In Ad	ct 19 <b>%</b>	42 <b>%</b>	37%	2%	5582
All Advertisements	23%	36%	36%	5%	9325

Bauer and Greyser summarize their findings concerning brand preference in the following way: "There can be no doubt that people are likely to give more attention to ads for brands they prefer. Moreover, when they do give attention to ads, they are likely to evaluate more favorably the ads for 33 their preferred brands...." 21.

32

James Mullen has analyzed this brand preference phenomenon from a 34 slightly different perspective. He studied the principle of congruity 35 proposed by Osgood and Tannenbaum as it would relate to television commercials. The principle is as follows: when two or more concepts are related by assertion, changes in attitudinal evaluation are made in the direction of increased congruity with the existing frame of reference. In other words, a favorable attitude toward a product would tend to move toward a favorable attitude of the television commercial for that product.

A summary to this point would be helpful in clarifying what research has determined to be of sufficient and measureable importance in the analysis of advertising reactions.

- 1) Response to an advertisement is a function of
  - a) the ad itself
  - b) various characteristics of the consumer
  - c) past history of exposure
- Media use habits are important components of life style, but their exact overall relationship to advertising reactions is not clear.
- Attitudes toward advertising are related to attitudes toward advertisements.
- Brand preference is a correlate of favorability toward advertisements for such brands.

## METHODOLOGIES AND DESIGNS

The nature of communication is that it is by definition a systems 36 concept. In this regard most studies have relied on multivariate analysis to deal with the problem. Plummer has proposed that advertising research be based less on one-way transmission models of communication and more on multivariate studies with the emphasis on receivers' contributions to 37 communication outcomes. He notes three unique aspects of advertising as a form of communication that call for such an approach:

- 1) the repetitive nature of advertising over time
- the highly competitive nature of the environment where messages exist (clutter)
- 3) the role advertising plays in culture

Thus advertising should be viewed as "a process that incorporates both the 38 messages and the receivers, with major emphasis on the viewers' perspectives".

This in fact has been the case in the last twenty years. Research has been conducted primarily in experimental designs, lab studies, and field studies, depending on the desired controlling effects by the researcher. Examples of these designs cited already in the study are the Wells and Leavitt work with factor and cluster analysis, Caffryn and Rogers with the Telpex test, and Bauer and Greyser's mighty field study.

In addition to the development of overall designs, specific measuring devices and scales were needed to deal with these new complexities. Juster's work on purchase inclination and prediction has already been mentioned. In the area of brand and product preferences, Kevin Clancy and Robert Garsen examined a wide variety of scales to more accurately measure brand preference. Their research on the advantages and disadvantages of monadic and comparative preference scales has been helpful in improving measurement tools. The results of their studies were that if a brand can be shown with others, with an additional device to measure the relative strength of that brand choice, the consumer is more likely to respond as he feels, and lessens the chance of yes saying and nay saying.

In summary the most popular tool for analyzing social science data has been the multivariate design, since it allows the best isolation and measurement of each variable alone and in combination with others.

39

1 Joseph T. Plummer, "A Theoretical View of Advertising Communication". Journal of Communication, Volume 21, December 1971, page 318. Robert C. Lavidge and Gary A. Steiner, "A Model for Predictive Measurement of Advertising Effectiveness", Journal of Marketing, October 1961, pages 59-62. Burke Marketing Research, Day-After Recall Technique, unpublished. Thomas F. Juster, Anticipations and Purchases, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1964. Alan Gruber, "Purchase Intent and Purchase Probability", Journal of Advertising Research, Volume 10, Number 1, pages 23-27. Joel N. Axelrod, "Attitude Measures That Predict Purchase", Journal of Advertising Research, Volume 8, Number 1, March 1968, pages 3-17. John Caffyn and Nigel Rogers, "British Reactions To TV Commercials", Journal of Advertising Research, Volume 10, Number 3, June 1970, pages 21-27. William D. Wells, Clark Leavitt, and Maureen McConville, "A Reaction Profile for TV Commercials", Journal of Advertising Research, Volume 11, Number 6, December 1971, page 11. 9 William D. Wells, "EQ, Son of EQ, and the Reaction Profile", Journal of Marketing, Volume 28, Number 4, pages 45-47. 10 Wells, op. cit., pages 47-52. 11 Clark Leavitt, "A Multi-Dimensional Set of Rating Scales for Television Commercials", Journal of Applied Psychology, Volume 54, Number 5, October 1970, pages 331-333. 12 Wells, Leavitt, and McConville, op. cit., pages 11-15. 13 Caffyn and Rogers, op. cit., pages 21-27. 14 Aronson, Turner, and Carlsmith, "Communicator Credibility and Communicator Discrepancy As Determinants of Opinion Change", Journal of Abnormal Psychology, Volume 67, pages 31-36. 15 Elliot Aronson and Burton W. Golden, "The Effect of Relevant and Irrelevant Aspects of Communicator Credibility on Opinion Change", Journal of Personality, Volume 30, Number 2, June 1962, pages 135-246. 16

C.I. Hovland, I.L. Janis, and H.H. Kelley, <u>Communication</u> and <u>Persuasion</u>, New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1953.

17 Aronson and Golden, op. cit., pages 135-146. 18 Marshall McLuhan, Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966. 19 Joseph Klapper, The Effects of Mass Media, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960. 20 Ibid., page 5. 21 Herbert E. Krugman, "The Impact of Television Advertising: Learning Without Involvement", Public Opinion Quarterly, 1965. 22 Ibid. 23 W.M. Weilbacher, "What Happens to Advertisements When They Grow Up", Public Opinion Quarterly, Volume 34, Number 2, Summer 1970, pages 218-219. 24 "Ownership and Use of the Mass Media By On-Campus Student Residents At MSU", March 1974, Television/Radio Department. 25 R.A. Bauer and Stephen Greyser, Advertising in America; The Consumer View, Boston: Harvard University, 1968. 26 Ibid., page 249. 27 <u>Ibid</u>., page 254. 28 <u>Ibid</u>., page 256. 29 <u>Ibid.</u>, page 258. 30 <u>Ibid</u>., page 324. 31 <u>Ibid</u>., page 282. 32 <u>Ibid</u>., page 289. 33 Ibid., page 289. 34 James J. Mullen, "The Congruity Principle and Television Commercials", Journal of Broadcasting, Volume 7, Number 1, Winter 1962-63, pages 35-42. 35 Charles E. Osgood, The Measurement of Meaning, Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1957. 36 Krugman, op. cit. 37 Plummer, op. cit., page 315. 38-<u>Ibid.</u>, page 316. 39 Kevin J. Clancy and Robert Garsen, "Why Some Scales Predict Better",

Journal of Advertising Research, Volume 10, Number 5, October 1970, pages 33-38.

CHAPTER 3

### THE PROBLEM AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE
The primary problem of the study can be simply stated: What relation exists between liking a television commercial and the likelihood of future purchase of the product advertised? Additional subquestions to be examined involve what composes an individual's liking or disliking of a commercial. How are media use, attitudes toward commercials in general, and brand preference related to the liking of a commercial? It is expected that much can be learned in exploring these relationships of reactions to commercials concerning both persuasibility and likeability of television advertising.

#### **HYPOTHESES**

# HYPOTHESIS 1: The persuasibility of a television commercial can be predicted from its likeability.

Persuasibility in this study is defined as whether a respondent is more or less likely to purchase the product advertised after having seen the commercial. Admittedly, this type of subjective measure of persuasion has liabilities, but it does seem to measure an inclination or possible purchase expectation. Also, the respondent has the option of answering that he is neither more or less likely to purchase the product, a third possible response that does not force an answer where there may not be one. The likeability of a commercial is defined as the index of the respondent's overall attitude toward the commercial. This index includes general likeability, impact, interest, acceptance, repetition (would like to see again), and welldoneness, or an artistic measure of the advertisement. Thus for each respondent there will be a likeability score and a persuasibility score for every commercial shown. Multiple regression will be the statistical technique utilized to then test this prediction hypothesis. HYPOTHESIS 2: The more times a commercial has been seen, the less is its likeability. د ر .

By examining the number of previous exposures to a certain commercial, one can obtain a "seen-before" type of measure. This then can be compared to the commercial's likeability score for each respondent, and a determination can be made through correlation techniques whether commercial familiarity is associated with lower likeability.

HYPOTHESIS 3: Media use is positively related to an individual's

likeability scores for selected advertisements.

This hypothesis says that as an individual uses the media to a greater extent, he is more apt to react positively toward television commercials. Media use is defined as an index of the total hours spent each day with television, radio, newspapers, and magazines. This total will be compared with a respondent's mean likeability scores across all commercials. This is somewhat in conflict with the previous hypothesis, since a high media user would have a greater opportunity to see more commercials, which would lower the likeability. However, this hypothesis takes into account the effect of selective exposure and perception; perhaps a media user develops a resistance to commercials. The relationship of this hypothesis and the earlier one will also be of interest.

HYPOTHESIS 4: The likeability scores of those respondents who prefer the brand advertised will be greater than the scores of those respondents who do not prefer the brand advertised.

For each commercial there are two distinct and separate groups of respondents: those who prefer the brand advertised in the commercial, and those who prefer an alternative brand. This hypothesis says that there will be a significant difference between the two mutually exclusive groups, and that those who prefer the brand advertised will also prefer the commercial.

- HYPOTHESIS 5: A respondent's likeability of a specific commercial can be predicted from his attitudes toward television commercials in general.
- HYPOTHESIS 6: Semantic differential scales are better predictors of commercial likeability than Likert scales.
- HYPOTHESIS 7: Of the three clusters of semantic differential scales (attractiveness, meaningfulness, and vitality), meaningfulness is the best predictor of likeability.

These three hypotheses are concerned with the relationship of an individual's likeability scores across all commercials tested and his attitudes toward television commercials in general. This latter measurement is obtained from responses to both Likert scaling items and semantic differential items concerning television commercials. The hypotheses propose that not only can likeability scores be predicted from these two measures, but also that semantic differential scales can predict likeability of specific ads to a greater degree than the Likert Scales. Furthermore, these semantic differential scales include three different types of adjective pairs, and it is expected that commercials' overall meaningfulness is more highly correlated with likeability than either attractiveness or vitality.

HYPOTHESIS 8: There is a relationship between those respondents who report having been persuaded by commercials in the past and those who report being persuaded by the test commercials.

Once again the respondents can be divided into two groups initially, those who report having been persuaded by commercials in the past and those

who have not, or at least persuaded to a lesser degree. After all the commercials have been shown, another measure of persuasibility can be taken according to this recent measure. One would expect that persuasibility to television commercials will appear as some sort of trait and that a relationship would exist.

## ASSUMPTIONS

A basic assumption that has been made which concerns the entire study, is the presumption that the commercial likeability scores do reflect the subjective feeling in each respondent about the particular commercial shown. In arriving at the scores or indexes, the assumption was made that each of the factors measured in liking a commercial are to be weighed equally. That is, for example, that welldoneness and impact are thought about equally by the respondent. Another possibility is that the respondent never thinks about any of the rating measures utilized, a danger that exists in any research.

A primary assumption was mentioned earlier - that of persuasibility being equated with probability of purchase. Practically any other type of measure as an alternative would require a before-after design, which was not feasible for this study. A simulation of a brand selection process following the commercials would seem entirely too artificial and would be open to a host of additional problems.

## LIMITATIONS OF THE SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM

At least two important areas of advertising research are omitted by the scope of the problem. The first is recall, an area of research that has dominated much of the literature in recent years. Many of the theories on the effects of advertising stress the importance of recall in affecting a purchase decision. It should be pointed out that a segment of the likeability index is associated with recall, the notion of impact. Presumably, the greater the impact of the commercial, the greater the recall. However, further investigation into this area is beyond the scope of this study.

A second interesting area not under examination here is the notion of salience. A tenet of advertising has been that a commercial is liked better by those in the "target" audience, or those who the manufacturer feels are purchasers of his product. This group is termed highly salient, while those not intended for the message are of low salience. An excuse for irritating advertising has historically been that the critic was not in the target audience, so that he was not expected to glean much from the message. To test such a salience hypothesis for validity, it would be necessary to assess the intended audience for each commercial and try to match respondents in this way into groups of high and low salience. In this study college students are the subjects and tend to be more homogeneous than the population as a whole. Their ages are similar; life styles are similar; and certainly advertisers speak to them as a group. It would be difficult indeed to divide them into groups for purposes of comparing scores in this respect.

CHAPTER 4

## METHODS AND PROCEDURES

#### THE LABORATORY STUDY AS A DESIGN

The design utilized in this study is an expost facto lab study, where one is concerned with describing relations and interactions among numerous variables. The laboratory experiment has several advantages, particularly when dealing with multivariate analyses. First of all, most variables can be isolated or controlled. Manipulation of one or more independent variables is more easily accomplished than in a field study. Operational definitions can be specified and adhered to a greater degree, and the precision of measurements can be controlled.

Despite this high internal validity of the lab experiment, it is a design wrought with other problems, particularly the lack of external validity. Often there is an artificiality of the experimental research situation, which prevents any generalization to other situations. Great care must be taken in analyzing results from lab studies for this reason.

The lab study was selected keeping these considerations and qualifications in mind, along with the realization of restraints in time, cost, and feasibility. Of prime importance in this study (and others involving television commercials) is the desire to closely approximate the actual viewing exposure as much as possible. Any overt manipulation by the experimenter would undoubtedly be met with suspicion, and hopes of realism would be dashed. A major problem of past advertising research has been the "expert" respondent: the person who answers questions as he feels an expert would answer them. The questionaire, which will be discussed later, attempted to minimize that possibility.

#### THE CHOICE OF TELEVISION AND COMMERCIALS

Another decision that had to be made was the choice of medium in which to test. As for as technical problems are concerned, magazines or newspapers have a distinct advantage over television or radio. Ads are easily accessible for testing, and a great selection would be available. However, television combines the audio and visual elements to a much greater degree, enabling the respondent to react in a communication situation to more stimuli. Also, as pointed out in Chapter 2, television is an important part of the media consumption habits of most people, including college students. Television commercials have become a way of American life, becoming material for comedy routines, idle chatter, and cocktail parties. So despite the added technical problems that were encountered with the medium, television commands the most interest and attention from the public.

Several conditions had to be considered in selecting the commercials to be tested. It was felt that there should be no more than 12-15 total commercials, since subjects are likely to tire easily, and ratings could lose validity. Among this total number of commercials, and in order to test the brand preference hypothesis, the commercials had to be grouped by product categories for the total of twelve commercials. And, in order to obtain a fair sampling of everyday commercials, they should be selected at random on a typical viewing day.

These criteria were met, but certian problems surfaced in obtaining the commercials. It was generally impossible to tell whether a commercial would be thirty or sixty seconds long initially, so a mixture of lengths

was the result. Ideally, all commercials should be identical in length to control another possible variable. (Note: In analyzing the results, no significant differences were found in commercial likeability scores as a function of length.) The thirteen commercials finally selected are listed and described in Appendix D. The four product categories selected were beer, motorcycles, carbonated beverages, and headache remedies. Each product category except carbonated beverages contains three different brands. Two additional commercials were added that were apart from a category. This served two functions: it tended to disguise the purpose of commercial selection, and the two commercials provided additional variance across the thirteen commercials.

#### THE QUESTIONNAIRE

After the thirteen commercials were taped, the two-part questionnaire, which can also be found in Appendix A, was completed. The first part of the questionnaire deals with media habits, brand preferences, attitudes toward advertising, and come persuasibility questions, all to be filled out prior to showing the commercials. The second part of the questionnaire is completed following the commercials.

Questions 1 through 5 of Part I are questions concerning media habits, so that a media index can be compiled from this information for each respondent. Question 6 is a sex question, the only demographic variable measures, in which the respondent is to select the brand of those in the product class he prefers, and the relative strength of this preference on a 1-5 scale. This is an attempt to separate those of strong preferences (or brand loyal persons) from non-loyal, weak preferences. In analyzing results, only those questions regarding the products of which commercials were shown were actually utilized (Questions 7, 8, 13, and 16). All other brand preference questions are in the questionnaire simply to disguise the purpose. Questions 18-27 are a group of ten semantic differential scales, rating the attribute "television commercials" on a scale of 1 through 7. The adjective pairs were randomly alternated. Questions 28-33 are similar rating scales on television commercials in general, but utilizing Likert scaling techniques. Questions 34 and 35 are inquiries regarding persuasion in the past as a direct consequence of advertising.

Part II of the questionnarie reasks eight questions for each of the thirteen commercials. Question 1 is a seen-before measure; Question 2 is a measure of impact; Question 3 is a like-dislike measure; Question 4 is a liking question on the repetitive aspects of the commercial; Question 5 asks two questions welldoneness and interest; Question 6 is an acceptance measure or how well the commercial made its points; Question 7 is a persuasion measure from the respondent's view; and, finally, Question 8 is a persuasion measure of those other than the respondent. All eight questions comprise the basis for rating each of the thirteen commercials. The composition of an index will be explained later.

#### COLLECTING THE DATE

A random sample of 67 undergraduate and graduate students at Michigan State University were selected to participate in the study. Three separate days were selected, in the summer of 1974, to conduct the 45-minute sessions, in order to work out time schedule conflicts. Approximately 8-12 subjects were tested at a time, since 12 was considered the maximum number of respondents who could view the television monitor easily. When each session began, both parts of the question-

naire were distributed, with a cover notice attached that explained the study (also included in Appendix A.) Subjects were instructed to complete Part I by answering directly on the questionnaire and to await further instructions upon completion of that section. This took an average of 8-10 minutes, after which the respondents were told to separate the two pages of Part II. The following instructions were given:

> "In a few moments you will see 13 different commercials on various products. Some of these commercials you may have seen before; others, perhaps not. After each commercial is shown, I would like for you to rate the commercial by answering the 8 questions on the answer sheet provided. (Example cited and demonstrated) Please view these commercials as you normally would view them; do not try to be advertising experts. Are there any questions?"

Following the question and answer period, the first commercial was shown on the video tape recorder and TV monitor. Upon its completion, each respondent answered the eight questions in Part II of the questionnaire. After all respondents were finished with Commercial #1, the second commercial was shown and rated, and so on for all thirteen commercials. After these thirteen evaluations were completed, answer sheets and questionnaires were collected. Subjects were thanked and dismissed.

#### TREATING THE DATA

A complete codebook can be found in Appendix B, but of more importance here is how the data was treated in developing certain indexes, scales, and scores. A summary can be found in Appendix C.

The media use index was calculated in the following manner. Question 1 of Part I proved undiscriminating, since 65 of 67 respondents had a television set in their room. Questions 2 through 5, however, were useful in

developing the index. The coded response to Question 2, concerning the amount of time spent watching television was weighted by a factor of 2. It was felt that the television viewer is exposed to far less advertisements per hour than any of the other media. The time with the other media remained as is, and the index was merely a summation in total hours.

The brand preference part of the study presented quite different problems. One problem that was expected was the possibility of some brands being much more popular than others. This tended to give a variety of different base sizes for each brand. For example, so few respondents preferred Anacin as a headache remedy, yet many preferred Excedrin. This large discrepancy in base sizes caused some difficulty in analysis. To compound the problem was the strength of preference question. Now the cells for analysis became even smaller, since the division had to be made between strong and weak preferences. The small sample size made it impossible to make the preference strength dichotomy as planned, and only use the brand preferred. A larger sample and perhaps a smaller list of brands could have helped alleviate the situation.

The ten semantic differential scales in Questions 18-27 were divided into three clusters following an earlier study by Wells mentioned in Chapter 2. Questions 18, 19, 20 and 25 were assigned the "attractiveness" label; Questions 21, 22, 23 and 26 were given the "meaningfulness" label; and, Questions 24 and 27 were the "vitality" scales. In the analysis these labels are used as predictors of commercial likeability.

Commercial likeability was defined in terms of a "commercial liking score". A score was obtained from Questions 2 through 6 of Part II for each commercial and for each subject. Thus, each respondent had 13 scores, and each commercial had 67 scores. Therefore, the higher the commercial liking score, the more the commercial likeability. Both terms are equivalent.

खा | स्ट ग्रि. . ::-

1

200 200

#### DESIGN OF ANALYSIS

Hypotheses 1, 5, 6 and 7 all deal with the prediction of certain variables, and consequently, multiple regression will be the statistical technique used in analysis. Specifically, stepwise addition regression will produce a Multiple R that must be significant at the .05 alpha level.

Hypotheses 2 and 3 are correlation hypotheses which will be evaluated by using the Pearson test, and again, must be significant at the .05 alpha level.

Hypothesis 4, a difference hypothesis, will be evaluated by utilizing a t-test at the .05 alpha level.

The final hypothesis is concerned with whether a relationship exists between variables, and it is best evaluated using the chi-square technique, once again significant at the .05 alpha level.

# CHAPTER 5

.

41.

# RESULTS

The first hypothesis, concerned with the prediction of a commercial's persuasibility from its likeability (or commercial liking score), was tested with two measures of persuasion. The first measure, defined as the level of persuasion of the respondent himself, was whether he was more or less likely to buy the product after having seen the commercial (Question 7). The alternative measure, defined as how the respondent thought others' persuasion might be after having seen the commercial, is Question 8. The first persuasion measure is labeled Persuasibility (Self) in Table 1; the second measure is labeled Persuasibility (Others) in Table 2.

In both cases Hypothesis 1 is accepted using a step-wise addition regression. Multiple R's of .75 for Persuasibility (Self) and .44 for Persuasibility (Others) were calculated. Both of these values exceed the critical value (.38) of the multiple correlation coefficient for five variables and an n=60 at the .05 alpha level.

In both Table 1 and Table 2, the dependent variable persuasion is at the top, and the five measures of commercial likeability are listed at the side. A full explanation of exactly what these measures include can be found in Chapter 4 and the questionaire in Appendix A.

# Table 1. The Prediction of Persuasibility (SELF)

By Commercial Likeability

## Persuasibility (SELF)

	Multiple R	r <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> Change	
Impact	.703*	.494	.494	
Interest/ Welldonness	.745*	.555	.061	
Repetition	.747	.559	.004	
Like-Dislike	.751	.563	.004	
Acceptance	.752	.565	.002	

Table 2. The Prediction of Persuasibility (OTHERS)

By Commercial Likeability

# Persuasibility (OTHERS)

	Multiple R	$R^2$	R <sup>2</sup> Change
Acceptance	.344*	.119	.119
Like-Dislike	. 390	.152	.033
Reptition	.419	.176	.024
Impact	.435	.189	.013
Interest/ Welldoneness	.435	.190	.001

\* significant at .05 level

Hypothesis 2, the expected inverse relationship of likeability and the number of times a commercial has been seen, is accepted on the basis of an r = .268, significant at the .05 level. The critical value for n = 60is .25. (Note: The correlation is positive due to the coding procedure as explained in Appendix B. Also, all correlations can be examined in Appendix G.)

Hypothesis 3, concerning the relationship of likeability and media use, is not confirmed. The value of the calculated "r" (-.02) was not significant. No relationship between those variables was found in this study.

Hypothesis 4, that likeability scores of those who prefer the brand advertised will be greater than those who do not prefer the brand advertised, is rejected on the basis of only 5 of 11 t-tests being significantly greater for the brand-preferred group. However, the likeability scores were higher for the brand-preferred group over the other group, or non-preferrers, in 10 of the 11 instances. Table 3 summarizes the results of the tests computed for Hypothesis 4. Each product group includes three different brands, except the carbonated beverages with two.

# Commercial Likeability

# Difference Tests Between Preferred and Non-Preferred Groups

.

BEER	010	<u>d Milv</u>	raukee		Pabst		Schlitz			
	N	<u>x</u> 8	Std Dev	N	x S	td Dev	N	<u>x</u> S	td Dev	
Prefer	8	2.88	.83	19	2.28	.40	9	3.22	.51	
Non-Prefer	59	2.85	.78	48	2.22	,36	58	2.48	.56	
Difference	-	.03	.05		.06	.04	-	.74	.05	
-	t =	.099		<u>t =</u>	.583		<u>t =</u>	3.70*		
HEADACHE										
REMEDY	A11	ka-Sel	tzer	E	xcedri	n		Anaci	n	
	N	x S	Std Dev	 N	X S	td Dev	N	x S	td Dev	
Prefer	6	3.30	.36	20	1.84	.25	2	2.50	.01	
Non-Prefer	61	2.93	.27	47	1.73	.42	65	1.79	.33	
Difference	-	.37	.09	-	.11	.17	-	.71	.32	
-	t =	3.08	<u>t</u>	<u>t =</u>	1.11		<u>t =</u>	2.96*		
MOTOR-										
CYCLES		Yamaha	1	S	uzuki			Honda		
	N	<u>x</u> 5	Std Dev	N	<u>x</u> S	td Dev	N	<u>x</u> S	td Dev	
Prefer	14	3.69	.26	6	2.33	.44	29	2.50	.40	
Non-Prefer	53	3.44	.52	61	2.48	.71	38	2.11	.43	
Difference	-	.25	.26	-	15	.27	-	.39	.03	
-	t =	1.74	<u>k</u>	<u>t =</u>	.487		<u>t =</u>	3.90*		
CARB.										
BEVGES.	]	Pepsi		F	aygo					
	N	<u>x</u> 8	Std Dev	N	x S	Std Dev				
Prefer	14	3.30	.62	4	3.55	.13				
Non-Prefer	53	3.16	.53	63	3.16	.88				
Difference	-	.14	.09	_	.39	.75				
-	t =	.820		<u>t =</u>	.870					

45.

\* significant at .05 level (t = 1.671, one-tailed test)

Hypothesis 5, that commercial likeability can be predicted from attitudes toward commercials in general, is accepted on the basis of a Multiple R of .56, where the critical value is .38. Table 4 illustrates the results of two types of scales in predicting commercial likeability: the semantic differential scales and the Likert scales.

> Table 4. Attitudes Toward Commercials and The Prediction of Commercial Likeability

	Com	mercial	Liking Scores
	Multiple R	. R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> Change
Semantic Diff	521*	.272	2.272
Likert	.555	.309	.037

\* significant at .05 level

Hypothesis 6, that the semantic differential scales are superior in the prediction of likeability than Likert scales, is accepted on the basis of the Multiple R comparisons in Table 5. These were computed as two simple regressions, whereas Table 4 was a step-wise multiple regression.

> Table 5. The Comparison of Scaling Techniques In The Prediction of Commercial Likeability

Commercial Liking Scores Multiple R R<sup>2</sup> Semantic Diff. .521\* .272 Likert .499\* .249 \* significant at .05 level

Hypothesis 7, that of the three clusters of the semantic differential scales, the Meaningfulness cluster is the best predictor of commercial likeability, is accepted on the basis of data reported in Table 6. Although the Attractiveness cluster is also significant in the prediction of likeability, it does not explain as much of the variance as does the former cluster (see the  $R^2$  change figures). Attractiveness adds only .06 and Vitality .004 to the explained variance of the Commercial Liking Scores.

> Table 6. The Three Components of the Semantic Differential In The Prediction of Commercial Likeability

> > Commercial Liking Scores

Multiple R	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> Change	Simple R
.497*	.247	.247	.497
.551	.303	.056	.487
.554	.307	.004	.361
	Multiple R .497* .551 .554	Multiple R R <sup>2</sup> .497* .247 .551 .303 .554 .307	Multiple R R <sup>2</sup> R <sup>2</sup> Change   .497* .247 .247   .551 .303 .056   .554 .307 .004

•

\* significant at .05 level

Hypothesis 8, that a relationship exists between past persuasive messages and the persuasiveness of the tested commercials, is rejected. The results of the chi-square tests are reported in Table 7. Only one of the question pairs was significant, liking a commercial in the past and buying the product advertised, and the persuasibility of others (Questions 35 and 8 on the questionnaire in Appendix A).

Dislike Commer Refuse To Buy	cial	1	2	3	4	Total	
Persuasibility (Self)	1	2.63	6.90	10.18	2.29	22	
()	2	2.39	6.27	9.25	2.09	20	Chi-Square = 5.71
	3	2.98	7.83	11.57	2.62	25	
Total		8	21	31	7	67	
Dislike Commer Refuse To Buy	cial	1	2	3	4	Total	
Persuasibility	1	2.39	6.27	9.25	2.09	20	
(Others)	2	3.22	8.46	12.50	2.82	27	Chi-Square = 7.54
	3	2.39	6.27	9.25	2.09	20	
Total		8	21	31	7	67	
Like Commercia	1						
Buy Product		1	2	3	4	Total	
Persuasibility (Self)	1	1.97	7.22	11.16	1.64	22	
	2	1.79	6.57	10.15	1.49	20	Chi-Square = 4.27
	3	2.24	8.21	12.69	1.87	25	
Total		6	22	34	5	67	
Idha Companda							
Buy Product	L 	1	2	3	4	Total	
Persuasibility (Others)	1	1.79	6.57	10.15	1.49	20	
	2	2.42	8.86	13.70	2.02	27	Chi-Square = 14.75
	3	1.79	6.57	10.15	1.49	20	
Total		6	22	34	5	67	

١

\* significant at .05 level, 6 d.f. \*\* critical value, 6 d.f.,  $x^2 = 12.59$ 

# CHAPTER 6

# DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

## INTRODUCTION

As indicated in earlier chapters, there is a danger inherent in studies of this nature when discussing the results. That omnipresent peril is the acceptance of dubious assumptions as fact without reservation, and then compounding the error by builidng on a false foundation. Results in this case are not only faulty but misleading as well. Hopefully, throughout this paper, there have been adequate warnings and indications when prior research results were unavailable, and assumptions were made. With this word of cautious reservation, the discussion can begin.

#### LIKEABILITY AND PERSUASIBILITY

The findings, as reported in Chapter 5, Tables 1 and 2, seem to indicate a relationship between likeability and persuasibility, which along with others, supports the hypothesis that the persuasibility of a television commercial can be predicted from its likeability. In Table 1, the five variables which compose the likeability measure contribute to over half the total variance in the prediction of whether an individual is more or less inclined to purchase the product advertised. Two of these variables, impact and interest/welldoneness, Questions 2 and 5, are significant and account for most of the explained variance. Their importance in the prediction of persuasion allows for further discussion.

Possible responses to the impact question are whether the commercial was powerful, weak, or neither. To aid in the analysis of this question, it is helpful to review the introduction to this question. The phrasing seems

to indicate that the measure is an attention-procuring one: the dramatic qualities of the commercial, and the interest it generates in the viewer. This is an active, rather than passive, response by the viewer; interest and impact both play a role, it would appear. The matter of interest has been found and important variable in most studies of television commercials, as several studies amplified in Chapter 2, particularly those of Wells and Leavitt. It is also supported in the communication research reported in the same chapter: the subject and/or the way it is presented must be of some interest to the receiver to enhance communication effects. Additionally, the interest factor surfaces again in the other question which accounts for another significant part of the variance in predicting persuasibility. In addition ot the presence of the interest factor, clearly the dramatic quality of an advertisement is another aspect involved here. Its importance can be traced similarly to the studies mentioned in Chapter 2, those associated with Wells' measure of vitality and Leavitt's energetic and sensual factors.

The other variable (alluded to in the above paragraph) which was also shown to be a good predictor of persuasibility is the interest/welldoneness factor (Question 5). Notice here again that two areas are explored by the one question: personal interest and the quality of execution. Once more it appears that two overriding variables associated with a persuasibility measure are (1) a measure of interest or personal relevance; and, (2) a measure of dramatic or procedural qualities. Both of these variables are measured in each of the two questions that account for most of the variance, a finding supported by several studies mentioned in Chapter 2.

In observing that two of the five variables contribute to most of the

variance in predicting likelihood of purchase, one is faced logically with three variables that failed (or contributed little) in the prediction. Probably most surprising in Table 1 is the failure of response to Question 3, the liking question, to be of value. If five variables as a whole are defined to be a commercial liking score, or a likeability measure, and as a whole predict persuasibility, why does a simple question concerning liking the commercial do so poorly in this regard? One possible explanation may be the set of responses offered. Most of the questions could be answered with a neutral or middle ground response; Question 3 could not. Perhaps a fifth response of "neither like or dislike" would sharpen this variable. A second feasible explanation is that judging a commercial as weak or powerful (Question 2), or as interesting or well done (Question 5), involve less of a commitment than does Question 3, where a personal judgment seems required. This could be a reluctance to admit actually liking a commercial. A third possibility is that Question 3 is measuring exactly what Questions 2 and 5 are, and that this question adds little to explaining any more variance. As evidence here, a look at Appendix G reveals a correlation of .831 between Questions 2 and 3, and a correlation of .932 between Question 3 and the overall likeability scores. Thus, the addition of the liking variable would not add anything more to the step-wise regression equation, but to say it is unimportant would be incorrect.

The discussion to this point has been centered around Table 1 only; that is, the prediction of "self" persuasion. Table 2, on the other hand, contains the results of predicting the persuasion of "others," as defined by each respondent. This technique is a generalized "other," and it is an attempt to get the respondent to project his views to how others might react to the

stimulus. Often in this way he may reveal certain of his own characteristics that he may hide in direct questioning of himself. In the case of television commercials, it may be thought by many that it is impossible to be persuaded by stupid commercials, yet there is a recognition that some other fool may well be (after all, all that money must be spent for a reason). Question 8, therefore, allows a way out for this type of respondent: the "other" may be whomever the respondent wishes. This particular technique should be kept in mind when analyzing Table 2; for example, other results may have been possible if the question was asked of "your friends."

As Table 2 shows, the prediction of persuasibility of others from likeability is of less accuracy than the persuasibility of self. These respondents as a whole apparently felt that they were different from "others." Only one of the five variables, acceptance (Question 6), is significant, accounting for most of the explained variance in the prediction of the persuasion of others. This is no particular surprise, since the question is prefaced by, "Bearing in mind this was an advertisement, and quite apart from whether you liked it or not...". From here the question deals with the acceptance of contextual aspects of the commercial, or how well it made its points. The question is more one of facts, as opposed to the more attitudinal queries regarding like and dislikes. For this reason, respondents' answers to this question could be used to predict Question 8, or, the persuasion of others; in both cases, respondents are asked to remove themselves from the actual condition of viewing. Also, as one might expect, looking at the results in this light, the interest factor (Question 5) is relatively low in correlation with the persuasion of others (Appendix G). This would seem to re-emphasize

the fact that personal relevance, perhaps by definition, does not relate to the persuasion of a generalized other.

In looking at the persuasion measures overall as they relate to the five variables of likeability, certain observations need mentioning again. First, there is a perceived difference by the respondent when asked about persuasion of self or the persuasion of others. This would seem to support the communication literature in stressing the importance of considering the audience. Clearly respondents see themselves as much different from "other" people. A possible explanation to this is the sample; college students <u>are</u> probably different from their perceived "others", if not in actuality, then at least in perception. Perhaps another study could investigate this question in a group more closely tied to middle class, majority values. A second observation that should be summarized here is the importance of personal relevance and interest in both overall likeability of a commercial and its ability to persuade the viewer.

Of course, despite these important finding, there are additional questions that could be explored. First of all is the basic assumption that the five questions do in fact evaluate a commercial in regard to likeability, Indications are that they do, comparing the results of this study with the results of studies reported in Chapter 2. If it is accepted that the measures as a group evaluate commercials adequately (however that is measured), the added question is whether the individual questions themselves measure what they are alleged to measure, certainly a point for further studies. The impact measure (Question 2) is a puzzling phenomenon, particularly important in this study, yet little is really known about what exactly it measures. What makes a commercial powerful? Is it an attention-getting, attention-holding, fast-moving, loud,

or just what? The variables measured by Question 5 also need further study; two measures are evaluated together, so perhaps one dimension of the two-part question is buried. The coding was done in favor of the interest factor, depressing the welldoneness factor, a questionable decision, and one for additional study.

More importantly, perhaps, is the question of whether the two persuasibility measures do in fact measure persuasion (Questions 7 and 8). As pointed out in earlier chapters, this is an inclination type measure, extremely short-term and open to problems of error and bias. Yeasaying, the desire of the respondent to answer to please the researcher, is a clear problem. Still another important point is the immediacy of the question; no long-term effects can be assumed from such a short-term measure. A before-and-after design would seem necessary to provide a better evaluation of persuasibility, but then one is open to new and equally frustrating problems of measurement and analysis.

### LIKEABILITY AND BRAND PREFERENCE

As pointed out in earlier chapters, there are additional variables effecting the research situation that respondents bring to the study. One of the more important of these is brand preference. It was hypothesized (Hypothesis 4, Chapter 3) that likeability scores should be higher for those who prefer the brand advertised. This notion of favorable pre-disposition resulting in more favorable responses has been demonstrated in political and communication studies by Hovland and examined in the selective exposure literature - in addition to Bauer and Greyser's findings, all reported in

Chapter 2. Still, despite this overwhelming bank of evidence supporting the hypothesis, for this study the hypothesis is rejected on the basis of the data reported in Table 3 of Chapter 5. But before this study is denounced as clearly failing to prove what seems to be both a logical and empirical hypothesis, the results should be examined.

Despite the lack of a majority of significant differences among the eleven commercials, between brand preferrers and non-preferrers in terms of likeability, there clearly is a pattern. Although only five of the eleven t-tests were significantly greater for brand preferrers, ten of the eleven brands had a difference in scores that was in the hypothesized direction. Only for Suzuki motorcycles is the pattern broken, and this result in the opposite direction is not statistically significant either. There does not seem to be a discernible pattern among products or product types as far as the five significant differences are concerned. However, one can examine other factors in explaining the failure of the study to support the hypothesis.

First of all, perhaps more decisive results might have been achieved if the strength of preference scales for each brand could have been utilized. The problem, however, was that the sample size simply did not permit it. There were too many cells created for the relatively small sample, as shown in Table 3. Some brands were woefully meager in preferers (i.e., Old Milwaukee, Alka-Seltzer, Anacin, Suzuki, and Faygo), so that any further division by strength of preference was impossible. Yet clearly, this would seem to be an important variable of brand preference. Obviously, a strong, loyal Schlitz beer drinker differs considerably from a beer abstainer who is forced to randomly select a brand based on some nebulous (if any at all) criterion.

Thus the situation is clouded by tabulating both of these individuals as Schlitz preferers, the small sample size restricting finer distinctions. Perhaps a more selectively drawn, stratified sample would have helped to alleviate some of these difficulties. A similar problem to be dealt with involves the forced response. For instance, a mark of weak preference can mean exactly that, or that the respondent is not knowledgeable concerning that product class. A good example here is a female respondent who may know little about motorcycles; she marks the weak preference for Yamaha. Doesn't she differ from a male respondent who knows about motorcycles, yet considers them all to be almost the same, and he marks a weak preference for Yamaha? There are problems like these that could be ironed out with further study.

A larger sample would also be a blessing regarding the notion that a "target" audience will like a commercial to a greater degree than the "non-target" audience. Indeed, this excuse for substandard advertising has been the response by advertisers, saying that if a commercial is not "aimed" at an individual, he cannot be the judge of good and bad. This test design does not allow for much investigation of this aspect, however, with such a small sample size. For instance, one might expect lower commercial liking scores for females in the instances of beer and motorcycles, but the difference was not significant since one is dealing with such a limited sample.

## LIKEABILITY AND ATTITUDES TOWARD ADVERTISING

Another variable which may influence likeability (and subsequently persuasibility) is a predisposition to advertising in general. This is yet another facet of predisposition and a result of the literature review into

selective exposure and how initial attitudes can affect subsequent behavior (see Chapter 2).

Tables 4 and 5 of Chapter 5 show the results of using two different rating and measurement techniques in the prediction of likeability for each of the thirteen commercials by all respondents. Both the semantic differential and Likert scaling techniques were good predictors of commercial likeability. In comparing the two scales, it appears that the semantic differential scale is superior in explaining more of the variance; however, the difference in the magnitude of the R is not at a significant level. The better precision of the semantic scales could possibly be explained by the apparent ambiguity of certain Likert items in describing facets of television commercials. The former scales, offering bipolar adjectives, supply the advantage of giving the respondent a single attribute on which to judge television commercials in general. Likert scales, on the other hand, seek an agreement or disagreement to a particular opinion statement which may have several interwoven attributes. A look at Questions 28-33 of Part I of the questionnaire (in Appendix A) bears this confusion out. Whereas Questions 28, 29, and 31 deal with primarily single thoughts, the remainder are more complex. For instance, a strong disagreement to Question 30 (Today's commercials are below the national intelligence level) may be interpreted as a favorable attitude toward commercials; yet, the respondent may hold a cynical belief that the national intelligence level is so low that even commercials (as stupid as they are) are not below it. Similarly, other of these questions have a degree of ambiguity which could blur the prediction of likeability scores.

The codebook in Appendix B shows the weights assigned to each scaling

device. The semantic scales were assigned codes easily, the positive attribute given a seven, the negative attribute given a one. But, as shown in the above paragraph, assignment of codes to the Likert scales was not as simple. Further study concerning these Likert items could result in more refined and less ambiguous scales. This could improve the predictability of the scales over the semantic differential, but the results of this study report the opposite.

Yet another interesting part of this question can be examined in looking at various clusters within the semantic differential scales. As reported in Chapter 2, the scales breakdown to three homogeneous clusters (meaningfulness, attractiveness, and vitality), a finding reported by Wells and Leavitt. Of these three clusters, as shown in Table 6 of Chapter 5, the meaningfulness cluster has a much larger  $R^2$  change, explaining the most variance in predicting commercial likeability from attitudes toward commercials in general. This finding is consonant with the earlier study cited above and in Chapter 2. Even though the earlier studies examined individual commercials with the three clusters, results from this study indicate their importance in looking at commercials as a group. Meaningfulness and attractiveness are both significant in predicting commercial likeability, but vitality is not. This follows earlier studies, but it seems in conflict with another finding of this study, where impact was found to be important. Yet the two measures appear not that closely associated; Appendix G reports a correlation between the measures of only .38, whereas one might expect it to be higher. Obviously, the questions must be measuring different aspects of commercials; this is another area that would be interesting to explore.

Another possible explanation of the success of the scales in predicting commercial likeability from predispositions toward television commercials is simply a part-whole explanation. The commercial liking score (or likeability) is an average of thirteen commercials across several questions. The attitude toward television commercials "in general" may in fact include some of these commercials. This would be particularly true if the commercials are typical and were not selected for a special purpose, apart from product class.

In summary, however, it has been demonstrated that commercial likeability can be predicted with some accuracy from the knowledge of predisposition of the respondent. Also, the semantic differential technique is a more precise measure of likeability than Likert scales, and that the meaningfulness cluster explains the most variance within the three semantic clusters.

## LIKEABILITY AND OTHER FACTORS

To this point it has been demonstrated that the dimensions within the commercial itself, brand preferences, and predispositions to commercials, all have an effect on the likeability of commercials. There are still two other factors that may influence the likeability measure that were looked at in this study: media use habits and previous exposure to the commercial. These two hypotheses should be analyzed together, since there is some obvious conflict between the two, which was briefly examined in Chapter 3.

In one respect, media use and commercial exposure could be seen as related variables. As one's use of the television media increases, the number of commercial exposures will likewise increase. Hypothesis 3 here, however, is that it is not a simple positive relation. Perhaps it is possible for a high media

vv.

user to develop a tolerance for commercials. Indeed, the use of a medium to a high degree implies some level of satisfaction with that medium, an implied consent. Following this logic, since commercials are definitely a part of the medium, there must exist a certain favorable attitude toward commercials from the high media consumer. Somewhat paradoxically, then, Hypothesis 2 states that for an individual commercial, as the frequency of exposure increases, the likeability decreases. The results seem to support this latter hypothesis, but do not support Hypothesis 3, the tolerance hypothesis. Interestingly enough, Appendix G reveals that even media use and commercial exposures are not highly correlated (only .22). These results are confusing and somewhat surprising; at any rate they deserve a closer look.

One possible explanation for the somewhat conflicting results is the failure of the self-reporting technique for both media use and commercial exposure. Perhaps some alternative questioning method could produce different results. Another possibility is a third now unknown variable which could explain the confusion but remains hidden. Or, finally, there is the good possibility that despite the logic and "common" sense, no systematic relationship exists between media use, commercial exposure, and commercial likeability. What the study does definitively show is that commercial wearout is a problem; that increased exposure does lower likeability scores.

Since this section concludes the discussion of commercial likeability, perhaps it should be examined in light of the test design. Of obvious importance to the study is the testing unit - each commercial used in the study. Certainly all the relationships discussed in this research are to a certain degree a function of the thirteen commercials tested. Naturally, with a larger
sample of respondents, more commercials could have been chosen and selected, giving a larger and possibly more representative sample of commercials. With only thirteen commercials, there could have been a disproportionate number of new, less-liked commercials; or, older, better-liked commercials, directly affecting at least two of the hypotheses. Perhaps all the ads were above or below average, or even just average, creating fictional differences and forced responses. Despite separating likeability for each commercial, the liking score was to some extent dependent on the others tested; certainly comparisons were made by respondents, although not solicited. Yet another potential problem is the mixture of thirty- and sixty-second commercials. The main question is one of validity: if thirteen other commercials were tested, would the results be similar?

#### THE PERSUASIBILITY MEASURES: PAST AND FUTURE

Hypothesis 8 is a move away from examining the likeability of a commercial and its corresponding persuasibility. The questionnaire gives a self-reported measure of general commercial persuasibility in the past, positively and negatively, and a measure of specific commercial persuasibility for the thirteen commercials tested as a future measure. It was expected that a person persuaded in the past because of a commercial will likely be persuaded by the test commercials. This could be defined as a test for the persuasibility trait, if it does exist. The resultant chi-squares reported in Table 7 of Chapter 5 do not reveal this trait or relationship to exist, except for persuasion (others) and a positive persuasion in the past. This is difficult

to explain, since the other three tests produce no trait of persuasibility. Perhaps the contrasting questioning techniques could have produced this hazy result: Question 34 and 35 are frequency scales, and Questions 7 and 8 are inclination or likelihood scales. Certainly relating past and future action is a difficult task, particularly when a respondent is reluctant to admit to any persuasion by a single commercial. The effect may have been additive, across several commercials for the same brand, or it may have been subconscious. There is no data to support either possibility in this study.

#### SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS

Likeability of a commercial has been empiracally demonstrated to be an important factor in persuasion, but likeability is of itself a complex measure. It encompasses a spectrum of reactions and factors, many of which are predetermined before the commercial is ever seen or perceived, such as brand preference and an individual's overall attitude toward advertising. Once he is exposed to the commercial, other factors come into play, such as previous exposure and numerous properties of the commercial itself (impact, liking, welldoneness, interest, etc.). The total number of variables which affect reactions to commercials are numerous, and this study has explored only a few.

If any single result should be emphasized, it is the fact that the viewer is anything but a passive participant in the communication process of viewing a television commercial. He brings a multitude of attitudes and predispositions to the situation, including preconceived notions and ideas about the product, the brand, advertising, and numbers of other experiences. The implications for the advertiser, therefore, are that he know his audience, and that in certain situations, likeability and persuasibility are closely related. Also, the problem of commercial wear-out is a distinct danger, as both likeability and persuasibility are likely to decline.

Once again, also, the value of future research must be stressed. Suggestions have been made not only in this chapter but in other that certain measurement improvements, sample size changes, and design alterations could be made. More variables must be isolated and examined before reactions to commercials can be more fully comprehended. Specifically, better persuasibility measures need to be discovered that more closely approximate the real world. As more is learned of the communication process, perhaps these answers will become more completely understood. A multivariate study is only the beginning.

# APPENDIX A

•

.

QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this study, developed within the Department of Advertising, is to examine the dimensions of TV commercial evaluations. Part I of the questionnaire is concerned with overall media use, brand preference, and attitudes toward TV commercials in general. After you complete Part I, 13 actual commercials will then evaluate it by answering the 8 questions in Part II. It is important to view the commercials as you would normally view them. Try not to be advertising "experts", but rather answer as honestly as possible. Thank you for your cooperation. 1. Do you have a television set in your room, apartment, or house? Yes No 2. In general, how many hours each day do you watch television? (CIRCLE ONE ONLY) 2 0 5 1 15 25 3 35 4+ In general, how many hours each day do you listen to the radio? (CIRCLE ONE ONLY) 3. 0 <u>ل</u>ح 1 13 2 2<sup>1</sup>2 3 31/2 4+ 4. In general, how many hours each day do you spend reading newspapers? (CIRCLE ONE ONLY) 2 2<sup>1</sup>₂ 3 0 3 1 15 31/2 4+ 5. In general, how many hours each day do you spend reading magazines? (CIRCLE ONE ONLY) 2 0 5 1 15 2<sup>1</sup>₂ 3 31/3 4+ 6. What is your sex? Male Female For the following product classes, please check the brand you actually use or would prefer to use over the others if you had to choose. Also, indicate how strong your preference is for that brand checked. 7. Carbonated Beverages 8. Beer \_\_\_\_ Pepsi-Cola \_\_\_\_ Old Milwaukee Coca-Cola Schlitz 7-Up Budweiser Dr. Pepper Pabst Faygo Stroh's Weak Strong Strong Weak Preference \_\_\_\_\_ Preference \_\_\_\_\_ Preference 9. Gasoline 10. Portable Televisions Shell Sony Mobil Zenith Sunoco General Electric Standard or American RCA Texaco Panasonic Strong Weak Strong Weak Preference \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ Preference Preference Preference 11. Toothpaste 12. Diet Soft Drinks Ultra-Brite Fresca Crest Tab Clcse-Up Diet Pepsi Colgate Diet-Rite Pepsodent Diet 7-up Strong; \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_ Strong \_\_\_\_ Weak Weak

----

PART I

ļ

- 1. Have you ever seen this commercial before on television?
  - 1. Yes, at least 5 times
  - 2. Yes, 1-4 times
  - 3. No, never seen it before
  - 4. Can't remember

2. When you see commercials on TV, sometimes one makes you sit up and watch, perhaps because it is very interesting for you or perhaps because it is dramatic. We call this a strong or powerful commercial. Did you think this commercial was

- 1. A powerful commercial
- 2. A weak commercial
- 3. Neither, just average

3. Did you like this commercial?

- 1. Yes, it was a very good commercial. I liked it.
- 2. Yes, it was a fairly good commercial.
- 3. No, it was not a good commercial.
- 4. No, it was a terrible commercial. I hated it.

4. Sometimes you see a commercial on TV that appeals to you and you like to see it again; at other times you see commercials that you don't really care about or would not like to see again. Which one of the following statements comes closest to how you feel about the commercial you have just seen?

- 1. I would very much rather see this commercial than most others.
- 2. I would prefer to see this commercial again rather than most.
- 3. The commercial wasn't really any different from other commercials; I don't care whether I see this one again or not.
- 4. I would prefer to see most other commercials rather than this one.

5. Here are some statements that different people have made about this conmercial. Which one comes closest to how you feel about it?

- 1. It was well done, and I was very much interested in it.
- 2. It was well done, but it didn't mean much to me personally.
- 3. I didn't like the way they did it, but I was interested in what they had to say.
- 4. It was rather dumb, really I wasn't interested.

6. Bearing in mind this was an advertisement, and quite apart from whether you liked it or not, how well do you think it made its points?

- 1. Very well
- 2. Quite well
- 3. Not very well
- 4. Poorly

7. Now that you have seen this commercial, would you say you might be

- 1. A little more likely to buy the product
- 2. A little less likely to buy the product
- 3. Quite definitely neither more or less likely to buy the product
- 8. Quite apart from how you feel, would you say others might be
  - 1. A little less likely to buy the product
  - 2. A little more likely to buy the product
  - 3. Quite definitely neither more or less likely to buy the product

13. Motorcycles		14. Deodorant	
Kawasaki		Right Guard	
Honda		Dial	
Yamaha		Soft and Dri	
Suzuki		Ultra Ban	
		Sure	
Strong	Weak	Strong	Weak
Preference	Preference	Preference	Preference
15. Coffee		16. Headache Reme <b>dy</b>	
Folgers		Bayer Aspirin	
Hills Bros.		Bufferin	
Max Pax		Alka Seltzer	
Brim		Anacin	
Maxwell Hous	se	Excedrin	
Strong	Weak	Strong	Weak
Preference	Preference	Preference	Preference
20.unpleasant21.honest22.convincing23.unimportant24.lively25.boring26.strong27.new,differePlease indicate whethe28.Some commercials	ent	pleasant dishonest unconvincing important lifeless fascinating weak common, ordinary ee with the following statemen times I like these ads better	nts.
than the program.			
Strongly		Strongly	
Agree		Disagree	
29. I like commercial competing products.	ls in which the product	is compared directly to	
Strongly		Strongly	
Agree		Disagree	
30. Today's televisio			1
	on commerciais are beig	ow the national intelligence.	level.
Strongly	on commerciais are deid	Strongly	level.

31. Deceptive television commercials are in the majority, and even those ads that are not false are exaggerated.

 Strongly
 Strongly

 Agree
 Disagree

32. Television commercials don't have that much effect. People don't pay much attention.

 Strongly
 Strongly

 Agree
 Disagree

33. Television commercials serve as entertainment mainly, unless the product is new.

 Strongly
 Strongly

 Agree
 \_\_\_\_\_\_

Disagree

Please indicate your response to the following:

34. How often have you disliked a TV commercial so much that you refused to ever buy or use the product advertised?

\_\_\_\_ Very often
\_\_\_\_ Occasionally
\_\_\_\_ Seldom
\_\_\_\_ Never

35. How often have you like a TV commercial so much that you decided to buy or use the product advertised?

\_\_\_\_ Very often
\_\_\_\_ Occasionally
\_\_\_\_ Seldom
\_\_\_\_ Never

### APPENDIX B

.

.

### CODEBOOK

Card Column		Field Description	Codes
1-3	(Part I)	Respondent Number	Actual
4		Card Number	Actual
6		1. Have TV?	1=Yes 2=No
7–10		2-5. Hours with media	$1=0-\frac{1}{2}$ hours $2=1-1\frac{1}{2}$ hours $3=2-2\frac{1}{2}$ hours $4=3-3\frac{1}{2}$ hours 5=4+ hours
11		6. Sex	l=Male 2=Female
13		7. Carbonated Beverages	l=Pepsi-Cola 2=Coca-Cola 3=7-Up 4=Dr. Pepper 5=Faygo
14		8. Beer	1=01d Milwaukee 2=Schlitz 3=Budweiser 4=Pabst 5=Stroh's
15		13. Motorcycles	l=Kawasaki 2=Honda 3=Yamaha 4=Suzuki
16		16. Headache Remedy	1=Bayer Aspirin 2=Bufferin 3=Alka Seltzer 4=Anacin 5=Excedrin
18–21		7,8,13,16. Preference Strengths	l=Very Weak 2=Weak 3=Neutral 4=Strong 5=Very strong
23-32		18-27. Semantic Differentials	l=Very Negative 2=Negative 3=Slightly Negative 4=Neutral 5=Slightly Positive 6=Positive 7=Very Positive

Card Column	Field Description	Codes
34-35	28-29. Likert Items	<pre>1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Slightly Disagree 4=Neutral 5=Slightly Agree 6=Agree 7=Strongly Agree</pre>
36-39	30-33. Likert Items	<pre>l=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Slightly Agree 4=Neutral 5=Slightly Disagree 6=Disagree 7=Strongly Disagree</pre>
41	34. Dislike ad, refuse to buy?	l=Never 2=Seldom 3=Occasionally 4=Very Often
42	35. Like ad, buy product?	l=Never 2=Seldom 3=Occasionally 4=Very often
44-45 (Part II)	Commercial Number	Actual
46	1. Senn before?	O=Can't Remember 1=Yes, at least 5 times 2=Yes, 1-4 times 3=No, have never seen before
47	2. Weak or powerful?	l=A weak commercial 2=Neither, just average 3=A powerful commercial
48	3. Like commercial?	l=No, hated it 2=No 3=Yes 4=Yes, liked it
49	4. Like to see again?	l=No, rather see others 2=Don't care 3=Yes 4=Yes, very much
50	5. How do you feel about it?	<pre>l=It was dumb, no interest 2=Well done, but no interest 3=Not well done, but interest 4=Well done, and interest</pre>

.

Card	·	
Column	Field Discription	Codes
51	6. How well made its points?	1=Poorly 2=Not very well 3=Quite Well 4=Very well
52	7. You more or less likely to buy?	l=Less likely 2=Neither 3=More likely
53	8. Others more or less likely?	l=Less Likely 2=Neither 3=More likely

(Repeat for other 12 commercials Columns 44-53)

# APPENDIX C

/

•

# INDEXES COMPUTED

### MEDIA USE INDEX

Index: 2 times (Q2) + Q3 + Q4 + Q5 (of Part I)
Example: Coded responses: Q2=2, Q3=3, Q4=1, Q5=2
Index = 2(2) + 3 + 1 + 2 = 10

#### SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL INDEXES

•

Index:	Sum of Q18 thru Q27, divided by 10
Sub-Indexes	: Attractiveness Index: Q18 + Q19 + Q20 + Q25, divided by 4
	Meaningfulness Index: Q21 + Q22 + Q23 + Q26, divided by 4
	Vitality Index : Q24 + Q27, divided by 2
Example: C	oded responses: Q18=3, Q19=5, Q20=7, Q21=7, Q22=7, Q23=6, Q24=6, Q25=4, Q26=7, Q27=7
I	ndex = $3 + 5 + 7 + 7 + 7 + 6 + 6 + 4 + 7 + 7 / 10 = 59/10 = 5.9$
А	ttractiveness Index = 3 + 5 + 7 + 4 / 4 = 19/4 = <u>4.75</u>
M	eaningfulness Index = 7 + 7 + 6 + 7 / 4 = 27/4 = <u>6.75</u>
v	itality Index = $6 + 7 / 2 = 13/2 = 6.50$

#### LIKERT INDEX

Index: Sum of Q28 thru Q33, divided by 6
Example: Coded responses: Q28=2, Q29=3, Q30=5, Q31=4, Q32=1, Q33=5
Index = 2 + 3 + 5 + 4 + 1 + 5 / 6 = 20/6 = 3.33

#### COMMERCIAL LIKING SCORES

Index:	Sum of Q2 thru Q6, divided by 5 (of Part II)
Example:	Coded responses: Q2=4, Q3=3, Q4=4, Q5=1, Q6=4
	Index = $4 + 3 + 4 + 1 + 4 / 5 = 16/5 = 3.2$

APPENDIX D

.

.

# COMMERCIALS UTILIZED IN THE STUDY

Alka-Seltzer (30 seconds)

Utilizing a nostalgic, reminiscing tone, a newspaper editor thinks back to his first assignment many years ago. A flashback shows the young, timid reporter facing his stern boss after the young man had written the story. Surprisingly, the frowning boss says he liked the story and will give the reporter a raise. After leaving the Boss' office, the young man takes an Alka-Seltzer to settle his stomach. Forty years later, now editor, the man still uses Alka-Seltzer. "It was good back then and still is today."

# Commercial #2 Old Milwaukee (60 seconds)

The scene is a baseball field in spring training. The manager wants to see a new batter, and asks his name. The young man replies, "George Herman Ruth, but my friends call me Babe". The coach is skeptical but gives the kid a chance for a laugh. Babe hits every ball for a home run to everyone's disbelief. A voiceover states that it's hard to live up to a good name, and makes the connection that Old Milwaukee is from the city that means beer. As the commercial ends, the manager puts his arm around Babe and asks him if he knows any kids named Gehrig.

Anacin (30 seconds)

A man sits behind a desk holding a bottle of Anacin. He says that there are some things about pain relievers we should know. Not all pain relievers get in the blood stream as fast as Anacin. He uses a graph to demonstrate the fact, which shows Anacin superior. At the end of the commercial, he repeats that Anacin is fast, fast, fast.

Pepsi-Cola (30 seconds)

The Pepsi song dominates, "having fun, feeling free," as a college of action films shows people having fun. The people are young and old, black and white, and many sipping Pepsi. Typical scenes are couples throwing leaves, bicycling, and picnicking.

Pabst (30 seconds)

The viewer watches as a huge hammer stamps a Pabst impression on a keg of beer. As the pounding continues, a voiceover talks of the high quality of Pabst. The voice challenges the viewer to taste and compare Pabst with any other beer. The commercial ends with, "Since 1844, the quality has always come through".

Schlitz (30 seconds)

Two men in a fishing boat head for land. But they disagree on where they are by the map. When they dock, they go to a bar, carrying the map, to ask the bartender which one of them is right. It turns out both are wrong, and there is laughing, back-slapping, and Schlitz-drinking. The Schlitz song ends the commercial by urging all to grab for all the gusto you can.

Yamaha (60 seconds)

Music and photography dominate. Mark Lindsay sings new Yamaha lyrics to his song "Silver Bird". A young man invites his father for a ride on his new Yamaha, and reluctantly the older man goes. The mother looks concerned. The two men ride over hills and valleys, the father enjoying the ride. Upon returning to the anxious mother, the son offers her a helmet to ride, and the commercial ends.

Faygo (60 seconds)

The entire commercial involves a scene on a large boat, full of happy, enthusiastic people. They are all drinking Faygo, laughing, and singing the nostalgic Faygo song. The words to the song flash across the bottom of the screen, inviting the viewer to sing along. The commercial ends with the sun setting and the singing fading away.

.

Suzuki (30 seconds)

A young motorcycle rider grinds through mounds of dirt and sails over hills. The music in the background is hard-driving and equates the man and his machine. Speed and durability are demonstrated by the cyclist. The commercial ends with the logo and "Suzuki-the man's machine".

Honda (30 seconds)

As the voiceover lists the seven kinds of motorcycles available from Honda, the video shows a split-screen. On one side, a businessman in a suit rides to work; on the other side, the same man is enjoying the bike on a day off as a dirt bike. The audio is subdued.

# Qantas Airlines (30 seconds)

An Australian koala bear takes the viewer on a tour of a Qantas 747. As he crawls around the plane, he complains in a wobbly voice about all the . tourists that Qantas brings to Australia. As the commercial ends, the price of a flight from Detroit to Australia is flashed on the screen.

### Excedrin (30 seconds)

There is a close-up of a man about 30. In a matter-of-fact voice he tells the viewer that he thinks his pain reliever is better than the viewer's. He cites two studies at leading independent universities that proved Excedrin is a better pain reliever than any other. He makes a final appeal to try Excedrin, the extra-strength pain reliever.

Pringles (60 seconds)

Two construction workers sit down to lunch. As one man begins eating regular potato chips, the other begins listing reasons why Pringles are better. He tells him how unbroken Pringles are and that you get just as many chips in a can. His friend calls him a "potato chip snob", but admits they are better. The commercial ends with both men munching Pringles happily. APPENDIX E

COMMERCIAL TOTALS

.

### COMMERCIAL AVERAGES ACROSS 67 SUBJECTS

COM	MERCIAL	Q1	Q2-6	Q7	Q8	Preferred/Non-Preferred
#1	Alka Seltzer	1.67	2.96	2.22	2.73	6 / 61
#2	Old Milwaukee	2.12	2.85	2.10	2.64	8 / 59
#3	Anacin	1.15	1.81	1.93	2.19	2 / 65
#4	Pepsi	1.19	3.19	2.48	2.67	14 / 53
#5	Pabst	1.43	2.24	2.15	2.39	19 / 48
#6	Schlitz	2.00	2.58	2.18	2.48	9 / 58
#7	Yamaha	2.18	3.49	2.57	2.78	14 / 53
#8	Faygo	1.48	3.10	2.40	2.69	4 / 63
<b>#9</b>	Suzuki	1.94	2.47	1.97	2.30	6 / 61
<b>#10</b>	Honda	2.28	2.28	2.04	2.38	29 / 38
#11	Qantas	2.22	3.13	2.60	2.63	-
#12	Excedrin	1.76	1.76	1.88	2.12	20 / 47
#13	Pringles	1.64	2.46	2.27	2.60	-

- Q1: Seen-Before Measure (Note: due to coding procedure, the more times seen, the lower the average)
- Q2-6: Commercial Liking Score
- Q7: Self-Persuasion Measure
- Q8: Other-Persuasion Measure

### APPENDIX F

- - •

·

# VARIABLES, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEV.	CASES
VAR001 Seen-Before	1.7975	.4295	67
VAR002 Impact	2.6482	.4724	67
VAR003 Like/Dislike	2.8600	. 3424	67
VAR004 Repetitive	2.4775	.2865	67
VAR005 Interest/Welldoneness	2.3866	. 5050	67
VAR006 Acceptance	2.8343	. 3980	67
VAR007 Self-Persuasion	2.2004	.2092	67
VAR008 Other-Persuasion	2.5048	.2900	67
VAR009 Commercial Liking Score	2.6422	. 3594	67
VAR010 Media Use Index	10.7164	3.0441	67
VAR011 Semantic Differential	3.7254	1.2271	67
VAR012 Sem. DiffAttractiveness	3.7239	1.3811	67
VAR013 Sem. DiffMeaningfulness	3.5485	1.3975	67
VAR014 Sem. DiffVitality	4.2164	1.4853	67
VAR015 Likert Index	4.2413	1.0199	67

# APPENDIX G

.

.

.

# CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

VAR 001 002 003 004 005 006 007 008 009 010 011 012 013 014 **VAR002** .267 Impact **VAR003** .286 .831 Like/Dislike **VAR004** .159 .745 .757 Repetitive **VAR005** .237 .745 .780 .688 Interest/Welldoneness **VAR006** .149 .657 .745 .505 .620 Acceptance **VAR007** .114 .703 .620 .610 .689 .513 Self-Persuasion **VAR008** .016 .101 .135 .170 .127 .344 .270 Other-Persuasion **VAR009** .268 .910 .932 .823 .886 .803 .733 .203 Commercial Liking Score **VAR010** -.225 .035-.032-.139 .028-.025-.094-.263-.020 Media Use Index .154 .532 .467 .211 .591 .390 .507-.008 .521 .191 **VAR011** Semantic Differential **VAR012** .054 .493 .456 .207 .569 .322 .432-.034 .487 .210 .870 S.D. - Attractiveness **VAR013** .152 .482 .438 .218 .527 .449 .449 .078 .497 .141 .886 .597 S.D. - Meaningfulness **VAR014** .210 .380 .326 .154 .434 .188 .414-.110 .361 .150 .821 .611 .696 S.D. - Vitality **VAR015** .193 .489 .474 .357 .477 .368 .472 .123 .499 .155 .692 .532 .683 .541 Likert Index (Note: VAR001 is Seen-Before)
# BIBLIOGRAPHY

,

### BOOKS

- Bauer, Raymond A. and Greyser, Stephen, <u>Advertising in America</u>: <u>The</u> Consumer View, (Boston: Harvard University), 1968.
- Bridge, Harry P., <u>Practical Advertising</u>, (New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc.), 1949.
- Britt, Steuart Henderson, <u>Consumer Behavior and the Behavioral Sciences</u>, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.), 1966.
- Dunn, S. Watson, <u>Advertising</u>: <u>Its Role in Modern Marketing</u>, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston), editions 1, 2, and 3, 1961, 1969, and 1974.
- Feldman, Shel, ed., <u>Cognitive</u> <u>Consistency</u>: <u>Motivational</u> <u>Antecedents</u> <u>and</u> <u>Behavioral</u> <u>Consequents</u>, (New York: Academic Press), 1966.
- Hotchkiss, George Burton, <u>An Outline of Advertising</u>, (New York: The MacMillan Company), revised edition, 1940.
- Hovland, C.I., Janis, I.L., and Kelley, H.H., <u>Communication and Persuasion</u>, (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press), 1966.
- Juster, F. Thomas, <u>Anticipations and Purchases</u>, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press), 1964.
- Klapper, Joseph, <u>The Effects of Mass Media</u>, (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press), 1960.
- Lucas, Darrell Blaine and Britt, Steuart Henderson, <u>Advertising</u> <u>Psychology</u> and Research, (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc.), 1950.
- McNemar, Quinn, <u>Psychological Statistics</u>, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.), 4th. Edition, 1969.
- Osgood, Charles E., et. al., <u>The Measurement of Meaning</u>, (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press), 1957.
- Owen, D. B., <u>Handbook of Statistical Tables</u>, (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc.), 1962.
- Presbey, Frank, <u>The History and Development of Advertising</u>, (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Doran, and Company, Inc.), 1929.
- Roper, Burns W., <u>A Ten-Year View of Public Attitudes Toward Television</u> <u>and Other Mass Media</u>, 1959-68, (New York: Television Information Office), 1969.
- Steiner, Gary, <u>The People Look At Television</u>, (New York: Knopf Publishing), 1963.

## PERIODICALS

Achenbaum, Alvin A., "Is Copy Testing a Predictive Tool?", Proceedings, 10th, Annual Conference, ARF, 1964, page 66.

.

- Armstrong, Donald B., Jr., "Measured Advertising Results: Revisited", article in <u>Perspectives</u> in <u>Advertising Management</u>, Association of National Advertisers, April, 1969, page 203.
- Aronson, Elliot and Golden, Burton W., "The Effect of Relevant and Irrellevant Aspects of Communicator Credibility on Opinion Change", Journal of Personality, Volume 30, Number 2, June 1962, pages 135-146.
- Aronson, Elliot; Turner, Judith A.,; Carlsmith, J. Merrill; "Communicator Credibility and Communication Discrepancy As Determinants of Opinion Change", <u>Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology</u>, Volume 67, Number 1, 1963, pages 31-36.
- Axelrod, Joel N., "Attitude Measures That Predict Purchase", <u>Journal of</u> Advertising Research, Volume 8, Number 1, March 1968, pages 3-17.
- Caffyn, John and Rogers, Nigel, "British Reactions to TV Commercials", Journal of Advertising Research, Volume 10, Number 3, June 1970, pages 21-27.
- Canter, Stanley D., "Alternative Criteria in Evaluating Television Commercials", <u>Proceedings</u>, <u>13th. Annual Conference</u>, ARF, 1967, pages 70-77.
- Clancy, Kevin J. and Garsen, Robert, "Why Some Scales Predict Better", Journal of Advertising Research, Volume 10, Number 5, October 1970, pages 33-38.
- Cronen, Vernon E., "Belief, Salience, Media Exposure, and Summation Theory", Journal of Communication, Volume 23, March 1973, pages 86-94.
- Cronkhite, Gary and Goetz, Emily, "Dogmatism, Persuasibility, and Attitude Instability", Journal of Communication, Volume 21, December 1971, pages 342-352.
- Dodge, Sherwood, "Comments on the Current Scene in Copy Research", article in <u>Perspectives in Advertising Management</u>, Association of National Advertisers, April 1969, pages 206-219.
- Fishbein, Martin, "Attitude and the Prediction of Behavior", article in <u>Cognitive Consistency</u>: <u>Motivational Antecedents and Behavioral Conse-</u> <u>quents</u>, 1966.
- Fulton, R. Barry, "The Measurement of Speaker Credibility", Journal of Communication, Volume 20, September 1970, pages 270-279.

**99.** 

- Gerhold, Paul E.J., "Five Suggestions on Measuring the Effectiveness of Advertising", article in <u>Perspectives in Advertising Management</u>, Association of National Advertisers, April 1969, pages 221-229.
- Grass, Robert C.; Bantges, David W.; Piech, Jeffrey L; "Measuring Corporate Ad Effects", Journal of Advertising Research, Volume 12, Number 6, December 1972, pages 15-22.
- Green, Paul E. and Carmone, Frank J., "Marketing Research Applications of Non-Metric Scaling Methods", <u>Operational Research Quarterly</u>, Volume 21, Special Conference Issue, pages 73-96.
- Gruber, Alin, "Purchase Intent and Purchase Probability", Journal of Advertising Research, Volume 10, Number 1, pages 23-27.
- Hill, Conrad R., "Delineating the Components of Attitude for Improved Pre-Test Measures of Advertising", Combined Proceedings, 1971 Spring and Fall Conference, Series No. 33, 1972, American Marketing Association, pages 332-336.
- Hovland, C. I. and Weiss, W., "The Influence of Source Credibility on Communication Effectiveness", <u>Public Opinion Quarterly</u>, Volume 15, 1951, pages 635-650.
- Klapper, Joseph T., "What We Know About the Effects of Mass Communications, The Brink of Hope", <u>Public Opinion Quarterly</u>, Winter 1957-1958, pages 455-478.
- Langhoff, Peter, "Options in Campaign Evaluation", <u>Journal of Advertising</u> <u>Research</u>, Volume 7, December 1967, pages 41-47.
- Lavidge, Robert C. and Steiner, Gary A., "A Model for Predictive Measurement of Advertising Effectiveness", Journal of Marketing, October 1961, pages 59-62.
- Leavitt, Clark, "A Multi-Dimensional Set of Rating Scales for Television Commercials", Journal of Applied Psychology, Volume 54, Number 5, October 1970, pages 427-429.
- McLaughlin, G. Harry; Haskins, Jack B.; Feinbert, Barry M.: "An Economical Technique for Pre-Testing Commercial Campaigns", <u>Journal of Applied</u> Psychology, Volume 54, Number 4, August 1970, pages 331-333.
- Mielke, Keith W., "Education Level as a Correlate of Attitudes Toward Television", Journal of Broadcasting, Volume 9, Number 4, Fall 1965, pages 313-321.
- Mullen, James J., "The Congruity Principle and Television Commercials", Journal of Broadcasting, Volume 7, Number 1, Winter 1962-63, pages 35-42.
- Palda, Kristian S., "The Hypothesis of a Hierarchy of Effects", Journal of Marketing Research, February 1966, pages 13-26.

- Plummer, Joseph T., "A Theoretical View of Advertising Communication", Journal of Communication, Volume 21, December 1971, pages 315-325.
- Plummer, Joseph T., "Evaluating TV Commercial Tests", <u>Journal of Advertising</u> Research, Volume 12, Number 5, October 1972, page 21.
- Preston, Ivan, "Logic and Illogic in the Advertising Process", <u>Journalism</u> Quarterly, Summer 1967, pages 231-239.
- Preston, Ivan and Brown, Lawrence, "Perceiving Advertisements as Emotional, Rational, Irrational", Journalism Quarterly, Spring 1971, pages 73-84.
- Simon, Marji Frank, "Influence of Brand Name on Attitudes", <u>Journal of</u> Advertising Research, Volume 10, Number 3, June 1970, pages 28-30.
- Stanton, Frank, "A State of the Art Appraisal of Advertising Research Measurements", article in <u>Perspectives in Advertising Mangement</u>, Association of National Advertisers, April 1969, pages 237-245.
- Weilbacher, W. M., "What Happens to Advertisements When They Grow Up", <u>Public Opinion Quarterly</u>, Volume 34, Number 2, Summer 1970, pages 216-223.
- Wells, William D., "EQ, Son of EQ, and the Reaction Profile", <u>Journal of</u> <u>Marketing</u>, Volume 28, Number 4, pages 45-52.
- Wells, William D.; Leavitt, Clark; McConville, Maureen; "A Reaction Profile for TV Commercials", Journal of Advertising Research, Volume 11, Number 6, December 1971, pages 11-15.
- Zimbardo, P. G., "Involvement and Communication Discrepancy as Determinants of Opinion Conformity", <u>Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology</u>, 1960, Volume 60, pages 86-94.
- Zuckerman, "Attitudes and Behaviors", <u>Psychology Reports</u>, August 1972, page 288.

### UNPUBLISHED SOURCES

- Burke Marketing Research, Inc., brochure, "Standard Day-After Recall Technique".
- Mauldin, Charles, Q-study of Attitudes Toward Advertising, Michigan State University, Department of Advertising, 1974.
- "Ownership and Use of the Mass Media By On-Campus Student Residents at Michigan State University", Department of Television-Radio, MSU, March, 1974.

101.

# 8877 \*



.

•

.

