

2013

The Effectiveness of Negative and Positive Advertisements

Kristen Hora
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2013 Kristen Hora

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/hpt>

Recommended Citation

Hora, Kristen, "The Effectiveness of Negative and Positive Advertisements" (2013). *Honors Program Theses*. 572.

<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/hpt/572>

This Open Access Honors Program Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Program Theses by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

**THE EFFECTIVENESS OF NEGATIVE
AND POSITIVE ADVERTISEMENTS**

**A Thesis Submitted
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Designation
University Honors**

**Kristen Hora
University of Northern Iowa
May 2013**

This Study by: Kristen Hora

Entitled: The Effectiveness of Negative and Positive Advertisements

has been approved as meeting the thesis or project requirements for the Designation University Honors.

5/7/13
Date

Matthew Bunker, Honors Thesis Advisor, Marketing

5/10/13
Date

Dr. Jessica Moon, Director, University Honors Program

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	5
HYPOTHESIS TESTED.....	16
METHODOLOGY.....	18
RESULTS.....	21
DISCUSSION.....	33
LIMITATIONS.....	35
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	36
CONCLUSION.....	37
REFERENCES.....	38
APPENDIX.....	39
APPENDIX A: ADVERTISEMENT LINKS	
APPENDIX B: SURVEYS	
Manipulation Test	
Week 1 Pre-Test	
Week 1 Thought Listing	
Week 1 Post-Advertisement (Negative Video)	
Week 1 Post-Advertisement (Positive Video)	
Week 2 Post-Test Follow Up	

Introduction

Whether we know it or not, we are faced with hundreds or even thousands of advertisements every day. Sometimes we acknowledge them and sometimes we do not, but whether or not we realize it, they can and do impact our decisions. The purpose for my senior year Honors Program Thesis was to determine the effectiveness of negative and positive advertising on people who are already favorable or unfavorable towards an industry. I chose to examine video advertisements with the topic of the pork industry. The basis of this research comes from my past experience in promotion for the pork industry. I grew up on a farm and have a background in that industry, as I was the 2010 Iowa Pork Princess. Being an advocate for this industry, I learned a lot about the positive aspects of the industry, however, I was also faced with many negative views, opinions, and advertisements. For example, I saw many negative advertisements aimed at the industry and pig farmers in general from groups like People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), which was the springboard for my thesis topic.

As stated, the purpose of my research was to determine the effectiveness of negative and positive advertising on people who already like or dislike the pork industry. My intent is that this research will be beneficial to my future career in marketing by providing insight on consumer's opinions on advertising and which type is more effective in changing or confirming consumer's attitudes and consumption habits.

Literature Review

Introduction

Creating an ad with an effective message is critical in forming consumer attitudes of industries. There have been several studies comparing the impact of advertisements in order to increase the efficiency of advertising efforts as well as studies on the successes and failures of different types of advertisements. These studies have examined advertising valence and intensity, negativity bias, memory, corrective advertising, comparative advertising, consumer involvement, source, previously held opinions, migration of customers from one company to another, attitudes, and more. The studies discussed below were conducted by the following authors: Chen and Leu in 2011, Darke, Ashworth, and Ritchie in 2008, Espejel, Fandos, and Flavian in 2009, Geer and Geer in 2003, James and Hensel in 1991, Meijer and Kleinnijenhuis in 2007, Phillips, Urbany and Reynolds in 2008, Reardon and Miller in 2008, Shiv, Edell, and Payne in 1997, and Write in 1973.

People's opinions of products from a company are often based on their opinions of the industry as a whole. The advertising that the company utilizes or that is utilized against them is also a major factor, especially when dealing with consumer products. According to Chen and Leu (2011, p. 153) "each year businesses spend millions of dollars on advertising to engender a positive attitude among consumers about a specific brand, eliminate any mistrust and suspicion about advertising, and rectify wrong attributions about products". In addition, the largest part of the total communication budget corporations use is typically spent on advertising which is why it is important to find the best way to put those dollars to an efficient use by helping the industry to gain its

highest potential (Meijer and Kleinnijenhuis, 2007). Peter Wright (1973, p. 53) stated “being able to influence or modify consumer predispositions necessitates understanding how such modification takes place, not merely being able to detect if indeed it did”.

Therefore, it is important that marketers are able to understand their audience.

Advertisers in all industries should be aware of how to appeal to customers, gain exposure, and maximize the effectiveness of their ads so they are not wasting resources. Learning about the effectiveness of its ads can help companies determine if they are on the right track to meeting the needs of their target market.

The pork industry in particular has been targeted with negative media and advertisements regarding the H1N1 disease (also known as “swine flu” to the public); poor treatment of animals; the use of gestation stalls; farrowing crates, and indoor consignment buildings; factory farming; the castrating and ear notching of pigs; and more. There has also been an increase in the number of vegetarians and PETA supporters who have sought for a focus on the humane and fair treatment of animals. Meijer and Kleinnijenhuis (2007, p. 509) studied beef and veal and found that “while the positive impact of beef/veal advertising could counter some of the negative press, it is clear...promotions can hardly be expected to fully offset the effect of negative press”.

Negative Advertisements

There is ample research about negative advertisements in the political arena, but there is a lack of research on how it affects consumption or buying patterns in consumer markets. Past research has shown that caution should be used when using negative advertisements. Due to the increased attention towards negative advertising used in

political campaigns, “the use of negative advertising in product and service promotion has recently begun to increase” (James and Hensel, 1991, p. 53). James and Hensel (1991, p. 54) defined negative advertising as advertising that “identifies the competitor for the purpose of imputing inferiority, i.e., with the intent of damaging the image or reputation of the competition”. Overall, negative information is “absorbed more deeply and retained better than is positive information” as well as “believed to be more attention getting, vivid, and memorable than is positive advertising” (Phillips, Urbany, and Reynolds, p. 797). Many studies have shown that negative information is superior because of these traits.

There are, however, some drawbacks and implications to using negative advertising. Even though negative ads may be more powerful in influencing decisions, the effects of negative advertising are multidimensional and lead to outcomes such as defensive reactance or position change (Phillips, *et al*, p. 794). In addition, “consumers often consider the use of negative advertising to be unfair and inappropriate” for the group, product or industry they are directed towards (Shiv, Edell, and Payne, 1997, p. 285). In the political context, Geer and Geer (2003, p. 69) found that “negativity in campaigns leads to lower rates of voting by turning off citizens from the electoral process”. Phillips, Urbany, and Reynolds (2008, p. 803) also found that “negative advertising seemed to prompt more migration of vote intention, surprisingly both counter to and in the direction of the ad”. They also found that there could be a degree of personal threat towards beliefs that are stated in ads, which leads to consumers disliking them (Phillips, *et al*, 2008). People who originally supported the source may find

negative advertising unnecessary, thus changing their minds and leading to backlash against the company for the advertisement, which could prove to be even more costly.

Positive Advertisements

Positive advertising has been found to be effective because the ads produce fewer counterarguments, are found to gain acceptance more easily, and are better received in terms of attitude and intent (Reardon and Miller, 2008). Reardon and Miller (2008, p. 73) found that although “both positive and negative ads had an effect; positive ads had a stronger effect”. Overall, “positive benefits were more likely to be embraced than negative consequences of not adopting a product or behavior” (Reardon and Miller, 2008, p. 73). Reardon and Miller stated, “A possible explanation for the apparently contradictory results is the potential that all types of ads work to some degree” (2008, p. 73).

Other Types of Advertisements

Another significant feature in the difference between positive and negative advertising is how positive and how negative the messages are seen to be which is referred to as valence. Ad valence and intensity are very similar and “refer to the degree to which a person benefits (or suffers) from engaging or not engaging in the depicted behavior” (Reardon and Miller, 2008, p. 69). Reardon and Miller’s study discussed the framing of advertising and how that was able to help or hinder the advertisement’s effectiveness. Reardon and Miller’s research “examined the relative impact of intensity of the message, valence of the message, and intended recipient (i.e., self versus other) of

the consequences conveyed in the message” (Reardon and Miller, 2008, p. 67). They found that the intensity levels of the message in fact did not have a relative effect on the attitude towards the ad (Reardon and Miller, 2008).

On the other hand, Shiv, Edell and Payne (1997) did a three-part experiment that examined the effects of negative and positive valence of messages in ads on consumers’ choices and attitudes. They found that negatively framed messages are more likely to be effective because negative claims are weighted more heavily than positive ones and that brand choice for the sponsor was higher when the message was framed negatively (Shiv, *et al*, 1997). In general, the intensity and the framing of ads can affect some consumer’s opinions and actions, therefore, are important items to research in future studies.

Overall, there seems to be mixed results on whether positive or negative ads are more effective. Those who argue towards negative ads find that there is a negativity bias formed in which “consumers tend to favor or assign disproportionate value to negative information in the decision-making process” (James and Hensel, 1991, p. 61). Another type of advertisement that has been examined in the past is comparative advertising. This type of advertising compares positive information of the sponsor of the advertisement with negative information about the competitor (James and Hensel, 1991). James and Hensel (1991) stated that this type of advertising is perceived as being offensive and less believable, honest, or credible than non-comparative advertising.

Meijer and Kleinnijenhuis (2007, p. 82-83) also examined another type of advertising, corrective advertising, which is used to “undo” wrongful claims. They found that “corrections from a regulator tend to be more effective in amending erroneous beliefs than corrections from the company” and “corrective advertising causes consumers

to dislike firms that initially had a positive reputation” Darke, Ashworth and Ritchie (2008, p. 82) found that “the effectiveness of corrective advertising varies considerably, depending on the content or strength of the message”. It is important to remember to use these types of advertisements with caution as well because “exposure to deceptive advertising leads consumers to become broadly distrustful of advertising as a whole” especially because they had been previously misled by the advertiser (Darke, Ashworth and Ritchie, 2008, p. 83). Companies need to be sure to monitor what types of effects their advertisements may have so they are not seen as suspicious, or cynical, and do not cause customers to disregard them.

Information Recall

Another important aspect of advertising’s effectiveness comes from the ability of consumers to recall what they viewed in the advertisements. People are faced with an overwhelming amount of information in their everyday lives and “through the process of encoding, some of the information is then placed into memory or storage. Then, when called on, the stored information is retrieved and available for use in helping to guide and direct behavior” (Geer and Geer, 2003, p. 71). Some of that information, however, is never actually stored. For example, Wright (1973) stated that selective avoidance occurs when people are faced with an abundance of information, therefore, the receiver may have a hard time in keeping all of the information under control so they choose to ignore some of it. It is important to understand that “selective attention, errors in storage, effects of previously stored information, and retrieval errors all provide the opportunity for memory to contain inaccuracies” (Geer and Geer, 2003, p. 71).

There is conflict over which type of ads, positive or negative, are found to be more memorable. It has been noted that negative information tends to be exaggerated in our memories and therefore, memories of negative ads are not as accurate. Geer and Geer (2003, p. 69) declared, “subjects’ recall as many things about positive ads as attack ads. However, when taking a closer look at what they recall, it turns out that attack ads yield many more inaccurate memories than do positive ads”. On the other hand, it has been found that “one week after exposure, negative information was recalled with more accurateness and more confidence than was positive information” (James and Hensel 2011 p. 57). When determining which type of advertisements are more memorable, it was found that negative ads are retained longer and more deeply and are therefore more effective in influencing purchase decisions (Phillips, *et al*, 2008). Because there is contradiction in past research, it would be beneficial to examine the effects of migration, or the changing from one perspective to another in the future.

Consumer Involvement

One aspect that was considered in a several studies in the past is the amount of involvement consumers have when they choose products. Consumer involvement can impact whether or not consumers find an advertisement to be worth their time. It is defined by Espejel, Fandos and Flavian (2009, p. 1214) as “the degree of interest that the consumer has regarding certain product or the importance that specific kind of product has for consumers on the basis of the consumer’s inherent needs, values and interests”. Chen and Leu (2011, p. 154) added that product involvement includes “consumers’ cognition or subjective feelings about the importance of a product”. Highly involved

customers are more receptive to advertising stimuli. Customers with low involvement are not as easily influenced by advertising of products due to the low degree of personal relevance and the lack of interest towards the product and purchase (Espejel, Fandos, and Flavian, 2009, p. 1214).

Espejel, Fandos, and Flavian (2009, p. 1212) concluded, “food products have traditionally been considered as low involvement products. However, more recently and due to the individuals’ increasing concern regarding health and the food crises, individuals’ involvement in foods products consumption has increased noticeably”. If in fact purchasing pork products for consumers is seen as a low-involvement process, Shiv, Edell and Payne (1997) believed that negative framing ads are effective when consumers have to choose between products without much thought but the when choice is impulsive. However, backlash towards the sponsor of the negative ad can occur if consumers engage in more elaborate processing before making decisions. While consumer attitudes are typically already formed towards food products due to past experience, the treatment of animals and food safety are issues that have increased consumer involvement in purchasing pork products and meat products in general. Espejel, Fandos, and Flavian (2009) found that the production and consumption of chicken and beef have been negatively impacted by safety crises and has changed consumer’s attitudes, beliefs and behaviors towards such products.

Advertisement Source

The source of the advertisement is influential on the impact the message will have on involved consumers. If consumers do not find the ad to be believable, the message

will not be effective in getting consumers to change their habits; therefore, source credibility is a strong predictor of whether or not the ad will be effective. Chen and Leu's (2011, p. 154) research found that "advertisement trust enhances brand commitment and loyalty, and even affects consumers' choices". James and Hensel (2011, p. 154) found that "when a source is perceived as lacking credibility, or when the message arguments presented are too extreme...advertising would be ineffective in persuading consumers".

Chen and Leu (2011, p. 154) stated that skepticism about advertising can be defined as "the tendency not to believe the information claims in the advertisement" and consumers tend to be skeptical because of the "perceived value of the information, the appropriateness of advertising for specific audiences, the motives of the advertisement, and the truth of claims". If consumers are skeptical about the source, they are not likely to believe the ad or purchase the product or service in the advertisement. It has also been found that the types of advertisements can reflect on the sponsor. Phillips, Urbany and Reynolds (2008) found that negative ads tend to reflect poorly on the source in political advertisements and do little to add to their case. If this is the case in marketing for consumer products, negative advertising could sway consumers away from buying the product by producing negative opinions of the source.

Contrary to James and Hensel (2008) however, Phillips, Urbany and Reynolds (2008) found that even if advertising content itself is disliked or disbelieved, it is still possible that it will influence consumer attitudes and behavior. Darke, Ashworth, and Ritchie (2008) stated that even though negative messages can cause harmful effects for consumers, the firm's positive reputation can insulate their reputation from being discredited. One aspect of my study examined people's cognitive reactions to

advertisements by asking respondents to write down their reactions to an advertisement that they view. This is important as cognitive responses are the primary mediators of message acceptance (Wright, 1973, p. 54).

Previously Formed Opinions

Some research has discovered that it is not the source of the message that determines whether or not the ad will be believable and effective, but previously formed opinions on the topic of the advertisement before it is viewed. Wright (1973) generalized that when people actively process incoming information and compare it to their already existing structure of beliefs and values. So those people who are aware of industry issues and facts, compare the advertising content to the opinions they previously held to assess its accurateness. Phillips, Urbany and Reynolds (2008) discussed the effects of confirmatory and disconfirmatory information in their studies. They found that information that disconfirms previous beliefs is simply rejected and discounted because people engage in defense mechanisms when it is viewed.

On the other hand, when information is found to confirm prior views, the information is seen as coming from a positive advertisement and source. This information “should be perceived as relevant, reliable, and accepted at face value” (Phillips, *et al*, 2008). In general, “confirmatory ads should evoke more support arguments and fewer counterarguments, evoke more positive evaluations, and more likely be integrated into decision making than advertising that disconfirms prior preferences” (Phillips, *et al*, p 796). Another aspect of this study is to determine if the types of advertisements shown, either positive or negative, are able to change consumers’ already

formed opinions on the subject at hand to see if their purchase intentions for the future are changed depending on the content of the advertisement they view. It has been determined that “prior behaviors (past experiences) *directly* affect both intentions and subsequent behavior and that attitude *directly* affects behavior as well as having an indirect effect through intentions” (James and Hensel, 1991, p. 59).

Migration and Attitude

The most important part of this study is to determine whether or not the advertisements viewed are perceived as effective. Migration is the action of participants changing their intentions towards a product over the course of an experiment. Phillips, Urbany and Reynolds (2008) found a 16.6% migration in candidate choice for their political study on negative and positive advertisements. Write, who performed a similar study, found a 10% migration rate (1973). Phillips, Urbany, and Reynolds (2008, p. 802) discovered that “negative ads were significantly more likely to generate migration of vote intention than were positive ads”. In addition, “more skeptical consumers tend to dislike advertisements, disbelieve their claims, and consider them less informative” which is why advertisers must use caution employing negative ads as brand attitude, purchase intention, and a company’s long-standing reputation are on the line in terms of migration (Chen and Leu 2011, p. 154).

One key predictor of migration is attitude towards a company or industry’s advertisements. Chen and Leu (2011, p. 153) studied the result of skepticism towards an advertisement in regard to brand attitude and purchase intention. Doubt perceived from the advertisements created a negative attitude towards the company as an effect of the ad,

which could harm sales. Wright (1973, p. 60) believed that cues within the ad are important in shaping attitudinal acceptance and stated “a receiver relies heavily on her evaluative mental responses to message content, rather than on the content itself, to arrive at an attitudinal position after exposure”. Overall, it is important to study which type of message content, positive or negative, is more effective in changing attitudes rather than focus solely on the content of the message.

Hypotheses Tested

Overall, after reviewing literature on negative and positive advertising, I came to a few conclusions that allowed me to formulate hypotheses to test the effectiveness of negative and positive advertising for people who were already favorable or unfavorable towards a particular industry. I believe those who are already favorable towards the industry will find negative advertising to come from an unknowledgeable source, they will find the ad to be too pessimistic and the ad will not change their eating habits, while those are unfavorable will not find the negative ad to be too pessimistic. Those who are unfavorable will also find the negative ad to be more truthful and will see the ads as confirming their beliefs. The main reason for these hypotheses relates to Phillips, Urbany and Reynold’s study which found that information that disconfirms previous beliefs is simply rejected and discounted while information that confirms beliefs is seen as relevant and reliable (2008).

Due to the fact that negative information is often retained longer and is more memorable, as discussed earlier, I assumed that positive ads will overall not significantly change attitudes towards the industry or the eating habits of either group, but rather I

believe that negative information will change attitudes. Overall, no matter what type of ad the viewers watch, I expected that the migration in preformed opinions of the industry would have a change of 10 to 15% after week 2 as Wright experienced a 10% migration and Phillips, Urbany and Reynolds saw a 16.6% change. From this information, I was able to form the following hypotheses:

Attitude towards advertisement and/or industry

- **Hypothesis 1:** People who are already favorable toward the industry will find negative advertising to come from an unknowledgeable source.
- **Hypothesis 2:** People who are already favorable toward the industry will find negative advertising to be too pessimistic.
- **Hypothesis 3:** People who are not favorable towards the industry will find negative ads to be more truthful.
- **Hypothesis 4:** People who are not favorable towards the industry will not find the negative ads to be too pessimistic.
- **Hypothesis 5:** Positive ads will not significantly change respondent's attitudes towards the industry.

Intent to purchase (consumption of product)

- **Hypothesis 6:** Negative ads will not significantly change the eating habits for people who already support the product.
- **Hypothesis 7:** Negative ads will confirm the belief for people who are not favorable of the product.

- **Hypothesis 8:** Positive advertisements should not significantly change the eating habits for respondents who have favorable or unfavorable views of the pork industry.
- **Hypothesis 9:** Whether the ad is positive or negative, 10-15% of people will change their opinions regarding the pork industry.

Methodology

The methodology I used was adopted from two studies (Wright 1973; Phillips, Urbany, and Reynolds 2008). I borrowed and adapted the methodologies described in these studies to align with my research. My main research consisted of showing two separate groups of students two different advertisements; one pro-pork industry advertisement and one anti-pork industry advertisement. I then surveyed the students to examine their reactions to the advertisement.

Before I performed my study, my first step was to do a manipulation test to decide on which two video advertisements to show the groups. I tested two separate UNI College of Business classes by showing one of the groups three pro-pork industry videos and the other group three anti-pork industry videos. The manipulation test was used to clarify whether the ads I showed were portrayed as negative or positive to the viewers. I asked the respondents from each group to rank the three advertisements they viewed in order of which video best portrayed the industry in a positive light (for the class that saw the three pro-pork industry sources) or in a negative light (for the class that viewed the three anti-pork industry sources).

By examining the responses, I chose the two videos I used for my main research; I chose the videos from the responses to the following: please rank the (pro-pork/anti-

pork) position that each of these videos portrayed. There was a scale from 1 to 10 with 1 being a weak pro-pork or anti-pork statement and 10 being strong pro-pork or anti-pork statement. For the class that saw the videos from the pro-pork industry sources, I found that video 1 from the group I showed ranked the highest in mean, although there was not a significant difference when compared to the other videos (mean: 8.49, standard deviation: .222; full results in table below).

Although there was not a significant difference in this test, I concluded that it was due to the fact that the three videos I showed were very similar in nature and were from similar sources. The class that saw the videos from the anti-pork industry sources, I found that video three from the class ranked the highest in mean and did show a significant difference compared to the other videos (mean: 8.63, standard deviation: 1.140; full results in table below). The videos in this group were diverse in nature and came from different types of sources and video three stood out in the group as the most anti-pork.

**Table 1: Manipulation Test
Pro-Pork Advertisement Results**

	Video	Mean	Standard Deviation
Pair 1	Video 1	8.49	.222
	Video 2	7.89	.283
Pair 2	Video 1	8.49	.222
	Video 3	8.11	.277
Pair 3	Video 2	7.89	.283
	Video 3	8.11	.277

Pair 1: $t = 1.734$; $p = .092$
 Pair 2: $t = 1.349$; $p = .186$
 Pair 3: $t = -0.725$; $p = .473$

Anti-Pork Advertisement Results

	Video	Mean	Standard Deviation
Pair 1	Video 1	7.11	1.811
	Video 2	7.00	1.863
Pair 2	Video 1	7.11	1.811
	Video 3	8.63	1.140
Pair 3	Video 2	7.00	1.863
	Video 3	8.63	1.140

Pair 1: $t = 0.395$; $p = .695$
 Pair 2: $t = -4.070$; $p < .001$
 Pair 3: $t = -3.991$; $p < .001$

My study was conducted with two separate classes in the UNI College of Business with over fifty students per class and with no students that were involved in the manipulation test groups. I pretested both classes beforehand to see if they had previously formed favorable or unfavorable attitudes towards the pork industry in general by having them rank their replies to several pork industry related questions on a Likert type scale with 1 as unfavorable and 7 as favorable. After the pretest, I showed them the approximately 30-second video advertisements that were chosen from the manipulation test. One class saw the video with the pro-pork industry source and the other class saw the video with the anti-pork industry source.

After showing either the positive or negative videos to the two classes, I checked to see what the classes felt about the advertisement by using a technique called “thought listing”. The respondents wrote down any thoughts that occurred to them during the exposure of the advertisements about the ad in general or the industry itself, ignoring spelling, punctuation, and grammar. I gave the viewers a three-minute limit to think about this to themselves, as three minutes was found to be the optimal amount of time to complete “honestly spontaneous thoughts while reducing the probability that purely reactive thoughts are not listed” (Wright 1973). Letting the participants come up with these thoughts by themselves provided a better insight for their true decision making process as well as helped me to gain insight and understanding of their cognitive process.

My faculty advisor Professor Bunker and I examined the responses and placed them into categories based on the nature of the thoughts. The responses were placed in the following three categories: counter argument, supporting argument, and source discounting. After each individual thought was placed into a category that Professor

Bunker and I agreed upon, I examined the results to see if there were themes among viewers of the ads.

After the thought listing was completed, I had the classes complete one more survey. This last survey was to determine the student's reactions to the advertisements by having them rank if they agreed with the ad, if the ad made them question their thoughts/behaviors, and if they felt that the ad was truthful, powerful, convincing, believable, effective, and came from a knowledgeable source.

One week after the original advertisement exposure, I went back to the same classes to do a follow up survey. In order to produce pure results with no bias, I told the groups that I was doing another unrelated survey for a class. I gave the class a survey, which consisted of the same questions as the pre-test survey the classes took before viewing the advertisements. I used the same survey questions in order to compare results from the pre-test the first week and the week two survey to see if the responses significantly changed after the students saw the advertisements. It was possible for me to compare the student's answers between surveys because I had a code to identify individual responses that still allowed for the students to remain anonymous.

Results

Overall, I wanted to conclude whether the positive or negative message the ad portrayed influenced the participants' perception of the product or attitude towards the advertisement, the industry, or the source of the message. I expected to find that people who were already in favor of the pork industry would not change their overall attitudes towards the industry. I assumed that those people would also see negative ads as being

too pessimistic and to come from an unreliable source and would find positive ads to confirm their beliefs and come from a reliable source. On the other hand, I expected that people who were not favorable towards the pork industry would find the negative ads to be more truthful or reliable. I also felt that positive ads would not significantly change attitudes or eating habits for either type of consumer. Overall, no matter what type of ad the viewers watch, I expected that the migration in preformed opinions of the industry would have a change of 10 to 15% after week 2.

I ended up with over 100 participants who viewed the advertisements. Fifty students viewed the positive advertisement and sixty students viewed the negative advertisement. Before the advertisements were shown, a pre-test was used to determine the respondent's attitude of the industry: favorable or neutral/unfavorable. After collecting the survey data from week one and two, I used SPSS to examine the data. Using SPSS, analyses were run to support or reject my hypotheses based on the survey questions. I used an alpha of 0.05 for each test I conducted.

An independent sample t-test was used to test Hypothesis 1, which stated, "people who are already favorable toward the industry will find negative advertising to come from an unknowledgeable source". Only the respondents who viewed the negative advertisement were included in this test. I looked at their answer to the question: "I believe that the people that made this ad (the source) are knowledgeable of the pork industry". I found that there was a significant difference between those who were previously favorable and those who were not favorable towards the industry in their opinion of the source. Of those respondents, the people that were least favorable towards

the industry found the advertisement to come from a more knowledgeable source than those were favorable towards the industry, therefore I was able to support this hypothesis.

Table 2: Independent Samples T-Test Results

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Unfavorable towards pork industry	4.4750	1.35850
Favorable towards pork industry	2.8125	1.51520

T=4.004, p<.001

For Hypotheses 2 and 4, I also used an independent samples t-test to determine whether “people who are already favorable toward the industry will find negative advertising to be too pessimistic” and to determine if “people who are not favorable towards the industry will not find the negative ads to be too pessimistic”. There was a significant difference between those who were favorable and unfavorable towards the industry and if they found the advertisement to be too pessimistic. I found that those who were favorable towards the industry found the negative advertisement to be too pessimistic compared to those who were unfavorable, who did not rate the advertisement as being too pessimistic. Again, I was able to support both hypothesis 2 and 4. Results are shown in the table below.

Table 3: Independent Samples T-Test Results

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Unfavorable towards pork industry	4.1500	1.31168
Favorable towards pork industry	5.1875	1.04682

T=-2.820, p=.007

In order to test Hypothesis 3, “people who are not favorable towards the industry will find negative ads to be more truthful”, I conducted another independent samples t-test to compare whether or not people found the negative advertisement to be truthful. I found that there was a significant difference between people who were favorable and

were not favorable towards the industry and was able to support my hypothesis. People who were not favorable towards the industry found that the negative advertisement was more truthful than those who were favorable towards the industry.

Table 4: Independent Samples T-Test Results

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Unfavorable towards pork industry	4.9250	1.11832
Favorable towards pork industry	3.6250	1.78419

T=3.287, p=.002

I used a paired samples t-test for Hypothesis 5, “positive ads will not significantly change respondent’s attitudes” which I failed to support. I found that positive ads did in fact produce a slight change in respondent’s attitudes, which was unexpected. Overall, there was a significant difference in attitudes between the first and second weeks and the respondent’s attitude towards the industry increased from week 1 to week 2 after viewing the positive advertisement.

Table 5: Paired Samples T-Test Results

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Week 1 attitude towards industry	4.6170	1.101195
Week 2 attitude towards industry	4.9574	1.14127

T=-2.486, p=.017

The next set of hypotheses had to do with consumer’s intent to purchase and consumption of the product, which in this case was pork (ham, bacon, pork chops, pulled pork, pork loins, pork ribs, tenderloins, etc). Hypothesis 6 stated that “negative ads will not significantly change the eating habits for people who already support the product”. To test this hypothesis, I used a paired samples t-test. I only viewed responses from respondents that were favorable towards the product and that saw the negative advertisement. I compared their eating habits from week 1 to week 2 and found that there was a slight decrease in consumption after viewing the negative advertisement.

However, there was not a significant difference, therefore my hypothesis was still supported.

Table 6: Paired Samples T-Test Results

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Week 1 Eating Habits	4.0238	1.11504
Week 2 Eating Habits	3.8810	1.04069

T=1.289, p=2.05

I also failed to support Hypothesis 7, which stated that “negative ads will confirm the belief for people who are not favorable of the product”. I analyzed only the people who were unfavorable of pork products to see if the negative advertisement confirmed their belief by running a one samples t-test for responses on whether or not the advertisement confirmed respondents “thoughts about the pork industry”. I found that there was no significant difference but that more people believed that their thoughts were confirmed than those who did not feel that the advertisement confirmed their thoughts (mean: 4.2222, standard deviation: .66667, t: 1.000 (df: 8), p: .347).

The next test I performed was a one-sample t-test for Hypothesis 8: “positive advertisements should not significantly change the eating habits for respondents who have positive or negative views of the pork industry”. For those who were unfavorable towards the industry, I found that there will not likely be a change in eating habits in the future (mean: 2.1481, standard deviation: 1.19948, t: -8.022 (df: 26), p: <.001). For those who were favorable towards the industry, eating habits will definitely not be changed (mean: 1.9130, standard deviation: 1.53484, t: -6.521 (df: 22), p: <.001).

My last hypothesis, Hypothesis 9, “whether the ad is positive or negative, 10-15% of people will change their opinions regarding the pork industry”, was intended to determine the migration in attitude from week 1 to week 2 of my research. I conducted a

crosstabs test on SPSS to compare the attitudes between the first and second week, examined extreme changes that resulted from viewing the advertisement, and found that the total migration was just within my estimated range at 10.21%. There were not as many major attitude changes as I suspected among those that viewed the negative advertisement. I found that overall there was only a 3.80% migration rate towards having a positive view in week one to having a negative view in week 2. The positive video had a larger migration and 6.41% of respondents migrated from having a negative or neutral to a positive attitude towards the industry after viewing the positive advertisement. This was different than I suspected as Phillips, Urbany and Reynolds found in their study on political advertisements that negative ads were more likely to generate migration (2008, p. 802).

In addition to the SPSS tests that I conducted to support or reject my hypotheses, I also decided to run additional tests to examine the overall effectiveness of the advertisement based on the respondent's ranking of effectiveness factors of each advertisement. The items I examined included responses about the ad such as if it was seen as truthful, powerful, believable, memorable, attention grabbing, and overall effective. I performed exploratory tests to see how effective the ads were in the viewer's minds directly after watching the videos. I conducted independent samples t tests to compare these responses depending on if the viewers were favorable or unfavorable towards the industry prior to watching the advertisement.

The results from those who viewed the negative video are below:

Table 7: Independent Samples T-Test Results (Negative Video)

Effectiveness Measure & Favorable or Unfavorable towards industry	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	P
Truthful - Unfavorable	4.9250	1.11832	3.287	.002
Truthful - Favorable	3.6250	1.78419		
Powerful - Unfavorable	4.4250	1.41217	2.206	.032
Powerful - Favorable	3.4375	1.75000		
Believable- Unfavorable	5.0750	1.18511	3.295	.002
Believable- Favorable	3.7500	1.73205		
Memorable- Unfavorable	4.1500	1.54505	1.229	.224
Memorable- Favorable	3.5625	1.78769		
Attention Grabbing- Unfavorable	4.1000	1.59808	1.526	.133
Attention Grabbing- Favorable	3.3750	1.62788		
Effective- Unfavorable	3.9000	1.58195	2.239	.029
Effective- Favorable	2.8750	1.45488		

People who viewed the negative advertisement found the ad to be more truthful, powerful, believable, memorable, attention grabbing, and effective if they were unfavorable to the industry. These items were not rated as high for those who were favorable towards the industry leading to the conclusion that those who were already favorable towards the industry are likely to discount the information from the negative advertisement while those that are unfavorable agree with the advertisement and feel that it is effective. The results from those who viewed the positive videos are below

Table 8: Independent Samples T-Test Results (Positive Video)

Effectiveness Measure & Favorable or Unfavorable towards industry	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	P
Truthful - Unfavorable	4.2593	1.40309	-1.562	.125
Truthful - Favorable	4.8261	1.11405		
Powerful - Unfavorable	3.2963	1.32476	-.505	.616
Powerful - Favorable	3.4783	1.20112		
Believable- Unfavorable	4.0000	1.54422	-1.628	.110
Believable- Favorable	4.6957	1.45960		
Memorable- Unfavorable	3.0370	1.31505	.709	.482
Memorable- Favorable	2.7826	1.20441		
Attention Grabbing- Unfavorable	3.1481	1.16697	.052	.959
Attention Grabbing- Favorable	3.1304	1.25424		
Effective- Unfavorable	3.1852	1.35978	-1.193	.239
Effective- Favorable	3.6522	1.40158		

People who viewed the positive advertisement found the ad to be more truthful, powerful, believable, and effective if they were favorable to the industry, but the difference between those who were favorable and those who were unfavorable was not significant. These items were not rated as high for those who were unfavorable towards the industry leading to the conclusion that those who were unfavorable towards the industry are likely to discount the information from the positive advertisement while those that are favorable agree with the advertisement. Unlike the negative advertisement, however, the positive advertisement was seen as being more memorable and more attention grabbing to the group with the opposite view.

When comparing the results from the two advertisements, the negative advertisement was seen as more truthful, powerful, believable, memorable, attention grabbing, and effective by those who were unfavorable towards the industry than the positive advertisement was to those who were favorable. The negative advertisement was seen as more memorable by both those who were favorable and unfavorable towards the industry and was also seen as slightly more powerful than the positive one. The group that saw the negative video also felt that it grabbed their attention more than those who saw the positive ad. Naturally, the negative video was seen as overall more effective by those unfavorable towards the industry and the positive advertisement was seen as more effective by those favorable towards the industry.

In order to discover participant's honest opinions of the advertisements viewed, the next part of my research was to examine their thought listing responses. Cross researcher reliability was ensured by comparing the results from the thought listing activity between myself and my faculty advisor Professor Bunker. Consequently we

placed each participant's thought listing responses into three different categories: counter argument, supporting argument, and source discounting.

A counterargument is classified by a statement that is "activated when incoming information is compared to the existing belief system and a discrepancy is noted. The spontaneous thought activated is assumed to neutralize or counter message evidence" and include "statements which are directed against the idea of or the use of the products in the advertising" (Wright, 1973, p. 54, 64). A support argument is used "in relating incoming information to existing beliefs, the receiver may activate responses indicating that congruent associations have been discovered or that the message argument is supported by already entrenched beliefs" and signify acceptance and favor of the idea or use of the advertisement or product (Wright, 1973, p. 54). A source discounting statement is a statement that "focuses on the source of the information...(it) may serve as a substitute for counterargument and may be used quite frequently in situations where the source is easily viewed as biased" and may be directed towards the sponsoring organization or the advertisement in general (Wright, 1973, p. 54).

After examining the responses to the thought listing activity, coder agreement averaged a 98% agreement rate. Overall, the negative ad produced 22 counter arguments, 30 support arguments, and 10 source discounting responses. The positive ads produced a total of 11 counter arguments, 38 support arguments, and 5 source discounting statements. It is hard to draw conclusions from the actual numbers that we derived, however, overall the thought listing experiment was congruent with what the rest of the experiment found. Those who were against the industry supported the negative ad or made counterarguments against the positive ad while those who were favorable of the

industry supported the positive ad and made counterarguments against the negative ad. Those who discounted the sources held opposite opinions than the ad portrayed in regards to the pork industry and provided counterarguments against the advertisement itself.

One conclusion that I did find from the thought listing activity was that people had a tendency to simply accept and not question the information in the positive ad while many questioned the information provided in the negative ad. An example of common responses found from those who viewed the positive ad include statements that mentioned that from the video, it “seems like” and “looks like” the industry is moving in a positive direction and that from what they saw the industry seems to have improved. These statements were from people who simply accepted the message and had upbeat comments that mentioned that the ad even made them feel better about the industry. One person said that it seemed to be an “accurate portrayal of real life” and that they “trust that I am provided with quality, safe meat”. Others commented “keep the food coming” and “bacon is good”, showing that they supported the industry. They enjoyed that the video was enthusiastic and even commented that, “it seems trustworthy and reliable” and that it “looked like this woman knew what she was doing and cared about producing a great product”.

People were more skeptical of the information from the negative ad; therefore, they questioned and challenged it and were two times more likely to disregard the source from the positive video. Some examples of statements from those who saw the negative video are “this reporter is very biased. There are two sides to every argument and the video left out numerous positive aspects of the industry” and similarly, “in this video I saw anti-pork industry but it did not show anything that was pro-pork industry.

Therefore, this video is slightly biased”, “It is only showing the bad stuff, what about the good pork producers?”, “the video showed the conditions of only 1 pork producer. Does not mean that this represents all. I do not find the source credible. No research/facts/back up given during the video”, and “I’m sure that they are only speaking of the bad things in this video since they are trying to ban the industry; they should give both sides to be fair. Need more facts”.

People were concerned that negative videos did not show any positive information, while it was never questioned that the positive videos only contained positive information. Examples of respondents that had more questions from the negative ad included those that wondered “Are all pigs really in these conditions?” and “that’s terrible. Is that true?”. There were no similar responses from those who saw the positive videos as the information was simply accepted. One reason I believe the information was challenged was due to the fact that some students may have had a background with the industry and felt that the facts were not accurate. They also may have challenged the ad because it may have come off as accusing the industry and because they seemed to be extreme statements.

The positive ad also had negative comments such as “I didn’t think it was a good advertisement. It was more informative and is not gonna make me remember it” which is consistent with my finding that many people who took the surveys did not see the advertisement as being very effective after viewing it. However, as mentioned, many people who saw the positive ad felt that it was realistic and truthful. This is not to point out that the negative advertisement was not effective. While the negative ad was seen as misleading and inaccurate in some cases, it was eye-opening in other cases. More than

one person mentioned that they did were not aware of the information that was provided to them and another mentioned that the ad would make them pay attention to where they got their product in the future as they “eat meat every day and never thought about where and how it was raised”.

Overall, the positive ad also only produced 11 counter arguments while the negative ad produced 22 counterarguments, two times as many, while the number of support arguments was similar between the ads. This comes to show that many people seem to simply accept the information that is provided to them, however, when it comes to disregarding or countering information, it is two times more likely that this will occur with negative advertisements as it will for positive advertisements.

I also found responses that mentioned that while the information in the negative ad seemed horrible, it would not change their habits. These responses included “even though I think this is horrible I do not think it would stop me from eating pork”, “I could care less how the product gets to my plate. Hogs are raised for slaughter anyways so who cares how they get to that point”, and “I won’t stop eating pork because of it but I wish they were nicer to the pigs. I still think bacon is delicious”.

In conclusion, the thought listing activity complimented the results that I found from the surveys. The positive ad overall seemed to get across to the viewers better while the negative ad left more people questioning the source and the message. Overall, it is important to remember that the majority of UNI students are Iowans, therefore they may have been exposed to or familiar with this industry in the past; therefore, more discounting may have occurred with the negative ads than would occur in another region as people may have seen them as extreme or invalid.

Discussion

Overall, I failed to support hypothesis 5 that positive ads would not change respondent's attitudes towards the industry and hypothesis 7 that negative ads will confirm the belief for people who are not favorable of the product. I was surprised to find that positive ads were in fact effective in changing respondent's attitudes as further research provided that they were not as effective and were not weighted as heavily as negative ads (Shiv, *et al*, 1997). I believe that the ad was effective in that it was able to educate consumers about an industry that they may not have been previously knowledgeable of, which could be why the advertisement also produced a higher migration rate. One possible reason that I was not able to support hypothesis 7 is that the people that were unfavorable towards the ad were turned off from the industry for reasons other than ones that were discussed in the specific negative ad that I showed. If the ad had covered other negative aspects of the industry, it may have been better at confirming the beliefs of those unfavorable towards the industry.

Based on the above results, it is difficult to tell which advertisement is in fact more effective. When viewing the results from the survey and being directly asked which was more effective, the negative ad seemed to excel over the positive ad; however, when looking at migration of actual attitudes from week to week, the positive advertisement showed a higher rate of migration. It may be that consumers believe that there is a larger impact from negative advertisements. While the negative advertisements seem so extreme and memorable, the positive advertisements that are able to better reach consumers and educate them when facing actual purchase decisions since when it comes to attitude change, the positive ads were more effective over the one week period. This

could be that people do not fully understand the impact the ad will have on their lives until they live it out. This is why it is so difficult to measure effectiveness without actually recording purchase behaviors, especially with mass advertising. It is possible that attitude changes can occur without the consumer noticing it. There is research conducted by the Neilson Company ratings and other similar studies that show the viewership of advertisements; However, these studies cannot connect that measure into how much that would translate into sales, as there could be other factors that play into sales trends.

In conclusion, from this research, I hoped to find which type of ads were more effective to determine the best way for advertisers to reach their targeted customers. This research verified that overall, both positive and negative advertisements were effective and can be successful in different ways. Appropriate advertisements can reinforce congruent beliefs for target consumers to support or not support an industry. If the advertisement is too extreme in the positive or negative direction, however, it is possible that it would alienate potential customers instead of attracting them and convincing them to change from their current views. I definitely think that this is dependent on the industry and prior attitude is important as it can have significant impact on how a consumer views an advertisement. Although the best type of advertisement to use was not completely determined, previous research on this subject matter also confirms that both negative and positive ads play an important role in advertising and depend on the industry, the context, and the amount of consumer involvement given towards the ad and product.

Limitations

The limitations of this study are very much related to the depth of advertising in general. There are so many types of advertisements available, which makes it hard to generalize all of them into the categories of “positive” or “negative”. In addition, there are other types of advertisements that may have been more or less effective, such as comparative ads or attack ads, which I did not consider due to time constraints. The time constraints set by the timeline of the project and budget constraints prevented finding a more representative pool of respondents to include in the study.

In addition, a majority of UNI students are from Iowa, which is, for the most part, a very homogenous state as far as upbringings and beliefs. It is possible that coming from Iowa, many of the students may have been raised on or around farms, so they may have had strong previously formed opinions about the industry. I may have had completely different results if I would have chosen a different industry or location. The groups that did take the survey were students, therefore most of them likely ranged from ages 18-25, whereas different age groups could have had different opinions on the advertisements. I was not able to control for the respondent’s unfavorable or favorable bias towards the industry with such a small pool of respondents as well.

Lastly, the limitation of being in a research setting makes it difficult to tell which type of advertisement is actually more effective in producing consumption changes. It is important to consider that consumer involvement in real life situations may be different than in a research situation where respondents are asked to pay attention to and view the ad (Meijer and Kleinnijenhuis, 2007). Meijer and Kleinnijenhuis (2007, p. 508) also mentioned that “people have more opportunities of escaping from the advertisement in

real-life situations (i.e., by getting something to drink during a commercial) than in a laboratory situation". In real life, consumer involvement with an advertisement is definitely essential for that advertisement to make an impact and be effective. Therefore, advertisements need to be aimed where they will reach the correct target of involved consumers.

Recommendations for Future Research

Further research in this area will help build on the various aspects and categories of advertisements and their unique effects. It would have been interesting to study different mediums of advertising, such as radio and print advertisements, which are likely to have a different effect than video ads depending on the situation. In addition, the industry I chose may also have affected the results, therefore, I would recommend further studies to include various industries and products with a wider audience. It may also be valuable to look at ad valence to determine "how positive" or "how negative" advertisements are perceived and if that makes a difference in the effectiveness of the ad.

Additional areas for future research include if positive advertisements can effectively offset negative media appropriately. I would also recommend showing both the positive and negative advertisements to the same group to see if one is more effective when put up against the other as consumers are exposed both types of advertisements in real life situations. Lastly, it would have been interesting to look at a longer time period to see if the changes that occur one week after exposure continue weeks or months down the road in the long run and to see if the attitude change matches the purchase behavior.

Conclusion

I believe that the largest takeaway from this particular study is that the type of advertisement that marketers should use depends on the target they are trying to reach. If they are trying to simply promote a product, either positive advertising about that product or negative advertising about a competitor's product could be used. If the intent is to sway opinions of those who have negative views, then I believe that a positive advertisement would be more effective as the migration rate was seen as stronger for the positive advertisement and fewer counterarguments and source discounting were present.

In the end, I hope that my research can add to and improve previous research on this subject matter and help advertisers make more successful decisions for their advertising campaigns. From my findings I have found that both types of advertisements can be seen as effective, however positive advertisements were seen as more powerful in swaying attitudes about the pork industry in general.

Literature Cited

- Chen, Fang-Ping and Jun-Der Leu, (2011), "Product Involvement in the Link Between Skepticism Toward Advertising and its Effects," *Society for Personality Research*, 39, 153-160.
- Darke, Peter R, Laurence Ashworth, and Robin J.B. Ritchie, (2008), "Damage from Corrective Advertising: Causes and Cures," *Journal of Marketing*, Volume 72, 81-97.
- Espejel, Joel, Carmina Fandos, and Carlos Flavian, (2009), "The Influence of Consumer Involvement on Quality Signals Perception: An Empirical Investigation in the Food Sector," *British Food Journal*, Volume 111 No. 11, 1212-1224.
- Geer, John G. and James H. Geer, (2003), "Remembering Attack Ads: An Experimental Investigation of Radio," *Political Behavior*, Volume 25, 69-85.
- James, Karent E. and Paul J. Hensel. (1991), "Negative Advertising: The Malicious Strain of Comparative Advertising," *Journal of Advertising*, Volume XX, Number 2, 53-69.
- Meijer, May-May and Jan Kleinnijenhuis, (2007), "News and Advertisements: How Negative News May Reverse Advertising Effects," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 507-517.
- Phillips, Joan M, Joel E. Urbany, and Thomas J. Reynolds. (2008), "Confirmation and the Effects of Valenced Political Advertising: A Field Experiment," *Journal of Consumer Research*, Volume 34, 794-806.
- Reardon, James and Chip Miller, (2008), "Smoking Prevention Messages for Adolescents: How Intensity, Valence, and Recipient of Consequences Affect Attitude Toward the Ad and Intent to Smoke," *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 67-77.
- Shiv, Baba, Julie A Edell, and John W. Payne, (1997), "Factors Affecting the Impact of Negatively and Positively Framed Ad Messages," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 285-294.
- Wright, Peter L. (1973), "The Cognitive Processes Mediating Acceptance of Advertising," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53-62.

Appendix A

Negative Video Link:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RzO9W2wmPWs&feature=relmfu>

Positive Video Link: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k4fSymAZch4&feature=plcp>

Appendix B

Manipulation Test:

Negative Advertisements:

Directions: You will see a series of 3 negative advertisements. After each advertisement is shown, please take the time to rank the negativity of the advertisement on the scales below. Circle one number per line after you watch each video. Please be as honest as possible.

Please rank the anti-pork position that each of these videos portrayed:

(Circle one number per line)	Weak Anti-Pork				Neutral					Strong Anti-Pork
Video 1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Video 2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Video 3	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Positive Advertisements:

Directions: You will see a series of 3 positive advertisements. After each advertisement is shown, please take the time to rank the positivity of the advertisement on the scales below. Circle one number per line after you watch each video. Please be as honest as possible.

Please rank the pro-pork position that each of these videos portrayed:

(Circle one number per line)	Weak Pro-Pork				Neutral					Strong Pro-Pork
Video 1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Video 2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Video 3	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Week 1 Pre-Test

Directions: Please answer each question below as honestly as possible. Thank you all for your time and participation in this study. None of this information will be linked to you in any way.

1. Approximately how often do you eat pork (ham, bacon, pork chops, pulled pork, pork loins, pork ribs, tenderloins, etc)? (choose the best option)
 - a. Never
 - b. Once a month
 - c. 2-3 times a month
 - d. Once a week
 - e. 2-3 times a week

- f. Once a day
- g. More than once a day

(Circle one number per line)	Unfavorable			Neutral			Favorable
2. What is your attitude towards the pork industry?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

(Circle one number per line)	Do not like the taste			Neutral			Enjoy the taste
3. What is your attitude towards pork products (do you like eating them or not)? If you do not eat pork, skip this question and list below the reason you do not eat pork.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

If you do not eat pork, what is your reason for not eating pork: _____

What is your birthday? Month: _____ Day: _____

What are the last four digits of your cell phone (or primary phone)? _____

Week 1 Thought Listing

Thought-listing: Please list any thoughts that occurred to you during the exposure of this advertisement. These can be thoughts you had about the advertisement/video in general, about the industry portrayed in the advertisement, or the source of the advertisement. Please ignore all spelling, grammar, and punctuation. You will have 3 minutes.

Week 1 Post-Advertisement (Negative Video)

Directions: Please answer each question below as honestly as possible. Thank you all for your time and participation in this study. None of this information will be linked to you in any way.

(Circle one number per line)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I find this ad to be too pessimistic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. Seeing this ad...

(Circle one number per line)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
b) Will change my eating habits	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

(Circle one number per line)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
3. I find this ad is truthful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. This ad was powerful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. This ad was convincing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. This ad is believable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. This ad was memorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. This ad got my attention	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. This ad was effective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. I believe that the people that made this ad (the source) are knowledgeable of the pork industry	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

11. What is your birthday? Month: _____ Day: _____
 12. What are the last four digits of your cell phone (or primary phone)? _____

Week 1 Post-Advertisement (Positive Video)

1. Seeing this ad....

(Circle one number per line)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
b) Will change my eating habits	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

(Circle one number per line)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
2. I find this ad is truthful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. This ad was powerful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. This ad was convincing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. This ad is believable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. This ad was memorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. This ad got my attention	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. This ad was effective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. I believe that the people that made this ad (the source) are knowledgeable of the pork industry	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

10. What is your birthday? Month: _____ Day: _____
 11. What are the last four digits of your cell phone (or primary phone)? _____

Week 2 Post-Test Follow Up

Directions: Please answer each question below as honestly as possible. Thank you all for your time and participation in this study. None of this information will be linked to you in any way.

2. Approximately how often do you eat pork (ham, bacon, pork chops, pulled pork, pork loins, pork ribs, tenderloins, etc)? (choose the best option)
 - a. Never
 - b. Once a month
 - c. 2-3 times a month
 - d. Once a week
 - e. 2-3 times a week
 - f. Once a day
 - g. More than once a day

(Circle one number per line)	Unfavorable			Neutral			Favorable
2. What is your attitude towards the pork industry?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

(Circle one number per line)	Do not like the taste			Neutral			Enjoy the taste
3. What is your attitude towards pork products (do you like eating them or not)? If you do not eat pork, skip this question and list below the reason you do not eat pork.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

If you do not eat pork, what is your reason for not eating pork: _____

4. What is your birthday? Month: _____ Day: _____
5. What are the last four digits of your cell phone (or primary phone)? _____