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A continuing problem for consumer psychologists interested in the area of advertising research has been the development of adequate methods for pretesting mass media advertisements. Lucas & Britt (1963, p. 11) define pretesting as

......research on a print advertisement or a commercial before it is run. This includes measurement of various consumer responses after new advertisements are prepared, but before money has been spent to circulate them. Since most of the cost of advertising is the cost of circulation in media, it is important to discover if there are any weaknesses and to make revisions in advance.

Many different methods have been used in the attempt to evaluate the impact of advertisements before they have been widely circulated. Lucas & Britt (1963) note that currently used techniques include: opinion and attitude ratings, projective techniques, and some of the methods of laboratory testing and content analysis. The fact that the current "state of the art" has not yielded adequate methods of pretesting has frequently been pointed out by researchers in this area. Media/Scope (1968, p. 62) quotes George S. Fabian, manager of consumer research at Johnson & Johnson, as
saying

We want some assurance... that we are making the
correct advertising and marketing decisions....
to determine how well is the money spent.
But we shall never attain credicibility without
first establishing measurement. And let's face
it, we are a long way from establishing a really
actionable measurement.

E. J. Gerhold (cited by R. Barton, 1969, p. 28) alluded to
present deficiencies in pretesting techniques when, during his
1968 presidential address to the Advertising Research
Foundation, he committed his organization

.....to help the industry develop a new statement
of what advertising is and how it works. We
are going to formulate, to state, to improve
advertising theory....advertisers would be surer of
the value they might receive from their adver-
tising expenditures if they knew what the
results would be. They would be surer of the
results because they would have clearer objectives
for advertising, knowing how advertising performs
in various ways and how these ways are related
in the accomplishment of sales.

Basically, the purpose of a pretest is to predict the
impact of a persuasive message on a target audience. This impact,
a change in behavioral disposition, has often been viewed in
terms of an attitude change in the target audience.

The advertisers want predictive measures. Ever
since the DAGMAR report of the Association of
National Advertisers they have been most inter-
ested in predictive measures of the persuasive
powers of advertising. These can, perhaps, best
be measured in terms of attitude and attitude
change. (Media/Scope, 1968, 12:62)

Other applied researchers in the area of mass communication
have also stressed the importance of adequate pretesting.
Discussing military propaganda, Daugherty (in Daugherty and Janowitz, 1960, p. 75) has stipulated that

.....pretesting is not to determine what policy should be, but rather how to express, within the limits of policy considerations, the content, form and style of communications so as to maximize the psychological impact of the action and to create the understanding desired by the disseminator of a propaganda message.

Riley and Cottrell (1957, p. 149-150), speaking of psychological warfare, including the question of pretesting, maintain that

What seems to be required, therefore, is a realistic program on a level which is intermediate between the simple and the complex. Answers at the simple level are not enough. Answers at the complex level await the development of requisite techniques and an appropriate body of theory.

Daugherty and Janowitz also refer in their book Psychological Warfare Casebook to the attitude modifying function of military propaganda. Interestingly enough a suggestion has been made that much of the past work has been, to paraphrase Riley and Cottrell, conducted on a too simple level. As Brock (1967, p. 296-297) said

There is no adequate delineation of the psychological processes that anticipate and accompany reception of explicitly propagandistic communication.... Theorists have been content to discuss resistance to persuasion in terms of readily measurable end products—opinion change, attempt to persuade communicator, rejection of communication, distortion of content, reduction of communicator's credibility, reduction of opinion importance, interest in supportive information, and so forth. Only infrequently has there been concern with the prediction and measurement of anticipatory responses....and concurrent responses....

Brock's mention of the neglect of work on anticipatory and
concurrent responses to persuasive communications in part explains the problems faced by applied researchers in their attempts to pretest mass communications. As Daugherty noted, in explaining the function of pretesting in military propaganda, the procedure is essentially aimed at building a communication with the highest possible psychological impact. The use of many current techniques which do not give the researcher an insight into the processes occurring while the audience is attending to the communication, do not allow him to pick the more and less effective parts of a message.

Brock (1967), after criticizing past research for its over-emphasis on end products, then suggested a new measure, that of number of counterarguments produced. He thought that such a measure might be indicative of both persuasiveness of the message, and the process occurring when one is exposed to a counter-attitudinal communication.

Counterargumentation may be defined as the process by which a subject subvocally argues against a communication presented to him. From the work done so far there appears to be some evidence that amount of subvocal counterargumentation is negatively related to attitude change, that it is related to variables often considered separately, such as credibility of the communicator and discrepancy of the communication from the subject's own position, and finally, that certain procedures tend to restrict the number of counterarguments produced by
subjects. If these indications are in fact true (as will later be shown by a review of the relevant literature, certain research questions still must be answered), a breakthrough in pretest techniques may be looming for the applied researcher. Communications advocating the same position might be rated on the number of counterarguments elicited by each, under the assumption that those communications producing fewer counterarguments are more likely to result in attitude change. If suitable techniques for collecting counterarguments, or perhaps better still both favorable and unfavorable arguments can be developed, those interested in the construction of mass communications might be able to determine both the number and characteristics of subject responses to each segment of a message. Such a procedure would pinpoint for modification those sections producing particularly high amounts of counterargumentation, while at the same time indicating highly effective sections that should remain unchanged.

For the theorist interested in the phenomena of attitude change, further research in the area of counterargumentation also seems warranted. If, and this has yet to be specifically tested, dissimilarly worded communications advocating a similar position are found to produce both differential amounts of counterargumentation and correspondingly different amounts of attitude change, one could argue that we have finally discovered an actual process measure. Brock's (1967) work indicating some
variables effecting number of counterarguments might then warrant extension to see whether the effects of other previously noted phenomena, such as varying presentation orders, could be explained by different levels of elicited counterargumentation.
CHAPTER II

THE RESEARCH PERSPECTIVE FOR THIS STUDY

This chapter will survey the research in social psychology which laid the foundation for the use of a measure termed net counterargumentation in the evaluation of a series of mass media advertisements. Net counterargumentation was defined as the number of favorable, minus the number of unfavorable responses to a persuasive communication. The first, and most extensive body of literature, deals with a variable termed counterargumentation. A second, presently small but developing line of research, concerns Greenwald's (in Greenwald, Brock, and Ostrom, 1968) work in the area of cognitive learning. In his research Greenwald has developed a measure of what he terms cognitive response. This measure is also arrived at by subtracting the number of unfavorable from favorable responses to a communication. The term net counterargumentation will be used in this study, however, as a means of indicating the relationship of the measure with the considerable amount of work already devoted to the study of counterargumentation. In reviewing the line of research concentrating on the counterargumentation variable, one might begin with a study by Allyn and Festinger in 1961, entitled
"The Effectiveness of Unanticipated Persuasive Communications".

These investigators hypothesized that an attempt to persuade a person to change his opinion would be more effective if the persuasive communication was unexpected, than if the person anticipated the influence attempt. In this regard Allyn & Festinger cited the statement of Lazarsfeld, Berelson and Caudet (1949)

If we read or tune in a speech we usually do so purposefully, and in doing so we have a definite mental set that inhibits our receptiveness....This mental set or armor against influence, the extent to which people, and particularly those with strong partisan views, listen to speakers and read articles with which they agree in advance is evidence on this point (1961, p. 35)

After a pretest questionnaire was given to 128 high school students, the counterattitudinal issue—control of teenage automobile driving—was selected for use in the experiment. Some time later 87 of these Ss arrived at the experimental room and were given a booklet the first page of which contained instructions. Two different conditions were randomly assigned via the instructions. In the opinion orientation condition, Ss were asked to read the speech of a Mr. Nathan Maccoby, who stated that teenagers are a menace on the highway and should be effectively controlled by new laws. Subjects were told that they would be asked to give their own opinions on the problem after the speaker had finished. In the personality orientation condition Ss were instructed to form impressions of the speaker's personality, about which they would be questioned after he had concluded. Following the instructions a speech was delivered which stressed teenagers'
lack of a mature sense of responsibility and advocated stricter legal measures for the prevention and control of teenage driving. Regarding control, the communication was more extreme than the position of any of the students. After the speech Ss answered four questions concerning control of teenage driving which had been previously used during the pretest session, along with questions designed to measure among other things, rejection of the speaker and importance of the topic. Allyn and Festinger maintained that when a person is prepared for the counter-attitudinal position to be taken by a communication he will approach the situation with hesitancy and suspicion. In this situation, they predicted that the person would change his position less than if he was unprepared for the communication and tend to reject the communicator more. Results supported the researchers' initial predictions.

.....our expectations were born out. If the subjects are led to believe that a persuasive communication will disagree with them, they reject the communicator more and are less influenced than subjects who are, so to speak, caught unprepared. (p. 38)

For Ss holding initially extreme positions an average change of 2.31 occurred in the personality orientation condition, as compared to an average change of .81 in the opinion orientation condition. For those Ss with initially moderate positions there was practically no difference between conditions. Finally, the results from a number of factual recall questions that were asked, indicated that subjects in both conditions recalled about the
same amount of material.

Festinger & Maccoby (1964) reevaluated the experiment conducted by Allyn & Festinger in 1961. Allyn & Festinger interpreted their results in a framework stressing the effect of forewarning in producing greater dissonance for those subjects who expected a counterattitudinal communication. Following further study, however, Festinger & Maccoby noted that after the first few words of the speech Ss in the unforewarned personality condition would also realize the position to be taken by the communicator, thus resulting in similar amounts of dissonance for both conditions. This fact prompted Festinger & Maccoby to develop a different interpretation of the behavior of a person exposed to a counterattitudinal communication.

.....He does not sit there listening and absorbing what is said without any counteraction on his part. Indeed, it is most likely that under such circumstances, while he is listening to the persuasive communication, he is very actively, inside his own mind, counterarguing, derogating the points the communicator makes, and derogating the communicator himself. In other words we can imagine that there is really an argument going on, one side being vocal and the other subvocal.

Based on the above interpretation the authors believed that a person would be more persuaded if he could be prevented from counterarguing.

If the attention of the listener were distracted sufficiently to make it quite difficult for him to counterargue, but not so much as to interfere with his hearing of the speech, this would represent a maximally effective influence situation (p. 300)
Three experiments were performed to test the hypothesis that a persuasive communication, arguing strongly against a position to which its audience is committed, will be more effective if distraction is used to reduce counterargumentation. Two films, each presenting the same speech arguing strongly against fraternities were used. The visual portion of one film simply showed the speaker presenting the speech, while the other film presented a highly distracting video sequence entitled, Day of the Painter. A six item post-test only questionnaire, which contained two questions to measure rejection of the speaker, served as the dependent variable. The most complete experimental design was used for the third administration given at the University of Southern California. In this administration six groups were formed, composed of fraternity and nonfraternity men in three conditions: straight presentation, distracting version, no film at all.

Results, though not quite as significant as those of the second experiment in this series, indicated that the distracting persuasive communication resulted in less favorable attitude toward fraternities (more attitude change) and less rejection of the speaker than the ordinary nondistracting version. The difference between the two experimental conditions on attitude toward fraternities was significant at the 6% level and the difference in rejection of the speaker significant at the 5% level. The authors considered these results adequate since
they constituted a replication of the findings found in their second study. An analysis of the statements reflecting derogation of the communicator suggested that Ss in the distraction condition are influenced by the communication unless they are able to derogate and reject the speaker. In the nondistraction condition, however, the relationship between increased derogation of the communicator and decreasing amounts of attitude change was not as strong. The authors suggested that this might be due to the freedom of these subjects to counterargue.

Festinger and Maccoby also speculated as to why their first experiment in the series failed to yield significant results. After noting that this administration used a subject population not strongly committed to the fraternity system, they suggested that such a group might not have a strong tendency to counterargue against an antifraternity speech.

Freedman & Sears (1965) attempted to test two separate hypotheses. First, warning Ss that they are to be exposed to a counterattitudinal communication will increase their resistance to influence, and second, distracting subjects from the content of such a communication will decrease their resistance to it. Subjects were 292 high school seniors, who several weeks previously had taken a questionnaire on teenage driving. All Ss were told that they would hear a speech by Dr. Vernon Allen, a noted expert on automobiles. The speech strongly argued that teenagers not be allowed to drive. The experimental design included four main
conditions. Some of the Ss were warned ten minutes before the talk it was against teenage driving, some subjects were given no warning. Half of each of these groups were instructed to pay attention to the content of the talk and half were instructed to pay attention to the personality of the speaker. In this experiment, instructions to attend to either personality or content aspects were included as a means of experimentally manipulating distraction. The authors believed that attention to personality aspects would reduce the ability of the subjects to counterargue against the persuasive communication. It would seem, however, that this is not as strong a means of manipulating distraction as that adopted by Festinger & Maccoby (1964). Over and above the four main conditions, a fifth group was given the content instructions but warned only two minutes before the speech. The use of differential time periods between forewarning and the communication was an attempt to examine whether an active defensive process was taking place. According to Freedman & Sears, if the time interval between forewarning and the communication itself was used to construct counterarguments, then a longer interval (10 minutes vs. 2 minutes) should result in more counterarguments and less attitude change.

Results indicated that the 10 minute warning group showed significantly less attitude change than the no warning group. Subjects in the distracted groups (personality condition) showed more attitude change than subjects in the undistracted groups, but
the differences were very slight. Freedman & Sears suggested that
at least part of the reason for the failure of these differences
to reach conventional levels of significance may be due to their
method of manipulating distraction. Finally, a weak linear trend
did appear in the data ($r < .10$), with longer periods of forewarning
resulting in less attitude change. Considering the whole experi­
ment, Freedman & Sears viewed their results as providing indirect,
although weak, evidence for an active defensive process occurring
when a subject attends to a counterattitudinal communication.

Sears & Freedman (1965) found that persuasive communications
were more effective when advertised as containing novel arguments,
holding actual argument novelty constant. Anticipation of novel
arguments, however, did not of itself affect selectivity of
exposure as measured by recall scores. Sears & Freedman explain
their results in terms of a decrease in commitment to previous
position for subjects expecting novel arguments. In view of the
counterargumentation hypothesis, however, an alternative explanation
is possible. Subjects expecting a counterattitudinal communication
based on previously rejected arguments, might quite possibly
counterargue more than Ss expecting new information to be advanced.
Unfortunately Sears & Freedman did not attempt to measure amount
of counterargumentation.

Brock (1967) conducted an experiment to determine some of
the attributes affecting amount of anticipatory counterargumentation.
As has been seen in this review of the literature relevant to the
counterargumentation hypothesis Festinger & Maccoby advanced the theory in 1964. Two studies, by Freedman & Sears (1965) and Sears & Freedman (1965) either directly supported the hypothesis or failed to refute it. To this point, however, while counterargumentation had been hypothesized as an intervening variable, no one had attempted its explicit measurement. Brock, in his attempt to find a relationship between levels of certain variables and amount of counterargumentation, was forced to develop a method to measure subvocal counterarguments. This experimenter decided to study the effect on number of counterarguments produced of three variables: communication discrepancy, perceived intent to persuade, and the inclusion in task instructions of a "priming" counterargument. Regarding these variables Brock advanced three hypotheses. First, one explanation for the decrease in communication effectiveness with higher amounts of discrepancy may be the messages' elicitation of higher amounts of counterargumentation. Brock thus predicted a positive linear relationship between communication-recipient discrepancy and Ss production of counterarguments. Secondly, warning a subject of intent to persuade decreases communication effectiveness (cf Freedman & Sears, 1965). As noted previously this might be attributed to a larger number of counterarguments with perception of an attempt to persuade. The third hypothesis simply predicted that subjects given an illustrative counterargument would produce more arguments than subjects who had not been provided with an
example. One hundred and sixty-one introductory psychology students listed their thoughts before actual exposure to a counterattitudinal communication advocating a tuition increase. Instructions and measures were presented via a booklet, with subjects assigned to the cells of a $3 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$ design. Upon arrival at the experimental room Ss were handed a booklet in which were contained the experimental manipulations. In the first section Ss were told that they were to read a message advocating an increase in tuition, which was prepared by either a journalism seminar as an assignment, or a faculty council strongly committed to such action. Through this procedure E manipulated perceived intent to persuade. Subjects were also given one of three figures for amount of advocated tuition increase: $135.00, $250.00, or $400.00. Since students view tuition increases negatively, the three amounts of advocated additional charges constituted three levels of recipient-communication discrepancy. The experiment was run over two days so that time a subject was tested, either first or second day, was also included as a variable. In the second part of the booklet all Ss were given 10 minutes in which to write their thoughts concerning the message topic. One-half of these subjects were also initially provided with an illustrative counter-argument. At this point the actual experiment was concluded but E considered it desirable to present a persuasive communication and obtain questionnaire measures of evaluation and communicator
acceptance.

Rules were developed for scoring subject thoughts for counterarguments with high interrater agreement. Results indicated a degree of support for all three hypotheses. Counterarguing was increased by communication discrepancy \((p<.001)\), by perceived intent to persuade \((p<.10)\), and by inclusion of a priming counterargument \((p<.001)\). Brock then examined post communication questionnaire responses, although with care, since he considered the data "impure". The primary problem in this case was that the independent variables had already produced differences in counterarguing. Any results of this questionnaire analysis, then, could only be considered suggestive. The author noted that product moment correlations between counterarguing and acceptance measures were negative for all levels of all treatments. Summing up his study Brock wrote

This experiment demonstrated that imminent propaganda elicits counterarguing in proportion to the discrepancy of the anticipated propaganda and to the perceived manipulative intent of the propaganda source. Moreover, internal analyses suggested that counterarguing reduced acceptance of the propaganda. (p. 304)

Brock's work, although suggestive, does not directly address itself to certain questions which assume importance when one is considering the use of a measure of counterargumentation in a pretest situation. First, one must answer the question of whether counterargumentation is negatively correlated with attitude change. As previously noted, Brock himself considered his
data "impure" and not clear evidence on this point. Second, Brock produced his differences in counterargumentation via an artificial situation. Subjects were specifically told ahead of time the exact position the communication was to advocate, the communicators' intention in writing the message, given in one condition a priming counterargument, and then allowed ten minutes to, if they so desired, formulate counterarguments. In a real life mass communication situation, on the other hand, a person is more likely to find himself in a counterattitudinal situation without the preparation time and specific warnings given by Brock. In this situation the question arises: will amount of counterargumentation still be negatively correlated with behavior?. Another question concerns itself with the sensitivity of a pretest measure of counterargumentation to rather small differences in communication effectiveness. Given, perhaps, an advertising pretest situation, in which the most effective ad must be selected from a group of messages designed by professionals, is a counterargument based technique able to differentiate between communications?

Silverman & Regula (1968) hypothesized that part or all of the distraction effect might be due to evaluation apprehension on the part of subjects. In their study, distraction during the presentation of a counterattitudinal message was imposed under two conditions: in one subjects were led to believe the distraction was intentional and in the other Ss were led to believe it was not. The authors predicted that those subjects
who viewed the distraction as intentional would see the experiment as a test of their ability to concentrate, attend more closely to the communication and thus tend to change their attitude more. Degree of distraction was manipulated by varying the amount of static present in a recorded counterattitudinal message. In no condition did this static obscure the content of the message. Attitude change was measured by a five item opinion questionnaire. Statistical analysis indicated that high distraction groups were significantly more persuaded than low distraction groups and a significant interaction effect existed between intentionality and distraction, reflecting the fact that the effect was greater in the intentional condition. Finally, the low distraction intentional group was found to be significantly lower than the base line in persuasibility. Silverman and Regula (1968) considered their results as indicative of a pattern different from that found by Festinger and Maccoby (1964). In the 1968 experiment subjects in the distraction intentional conditions were not more persuasible than base line subjects. A questioning of subjects revealed, however, that within the high distraction intentional condition subjects who thought the experimenter was testing their powers of concentration were more persuasible than control Ss. On the other hand those subjects in this condition holding alternative hypotheses showed less persuasibility than the control group.

Even if demand characteristics could explain the effect found by Festinger and Maccoby (1964), however, such a variable
does not explain the findings of Brock (1967), or Allyn & Festinger (1961). Upon reviewing the experimental design used by Silverman & Regula (1968) one might ask whether their distraction condition actually resulted in a reduction in the amount of information Ss obtained from the speech. If true this would violate the stipulation made by Festinger & Maccoby (1964), that if the counterargumentation hypothesis is correct distraction would result in greater attitude change, if it did not produce a decrease in information acquired by Ss. Finally, Ss intent on simply learning a communication might be able, through very close attention, to acquire as much information as nondistracted Ss while at the same time having little opportunity to counterargue. Festinger & Maccoby would expect such a situation to be very conducive to attitude change.

Shamo and Meador (1968), again tested whether distraction while listening to a counterattitudinal speech would result in greater amounts of attitude change. These researchers repeated past work in their finding that subjects in the distraction condition showed significantly greater amounts of post communication attitude change. Interestingly enough, however, Ss in their distraction condition showed a significant decrease (at the .01 level) in amount of information recalled. Festinger and Maccoby (1964), as noted previously, would not predict that distraction would facilitate attitude change in a situation in which it also reduced the
amount of acquired information.

Kiesler & Mathog (1968) compared two alternative hypotheses regarding the manner in which distraction acts to reduce attitude change. They noted that the effect may occur because distraction interferes with subvocal counter-arguing or because the distraction requires more effort to listen and thus arouses dissonance. Due to the difficulty of manipulating distraction and effort independently, Kiesler & Mathog designed an experiment in which the distraction and effort hypotheses would make opposite predictions. Such a situation would exist when degree of distraction and credibility of the communicator were orthogonally manipulated. Under such conditions both the distraction and effort hypotheses would predict greater persuasibility as a function of a highly credible communicator and greater interference during the persuasive communication. Both theories, however, predict different patterns of results for the interaction between credibility and interference. The effort hypothesis, based on dissonance theory, predicts that greater dissonance should be reflected in more attitude change. According to this theory greater dissonance should be aroused when Ss expend effort listening to a low credible, rather than a high credible communicator. The distraction hypothesis, on the other hand, predicts that resistance to a counterattitudinal communication is in large part due to subvocal counterargumentation on the part of the subject. Interference should have little effect in a low credible
source situation, because such a communication could be easily derogated and amount of counterargumentation would be minimal. In a high credible source situation the communication could not be as easily disposed of, counterargumentation would be higher, and interference should have a relatively greater effect. To sum up, the effort hypothesis predicts a greater increase in communication effectiveness under low credibility conditions while the distraction model predicts increased effectiveness when subjects are distracted while listening to a highly credible source.

Thirty-two tinder graduate subjects were assigned to four groups. Each group then received in a counterbalanced design, four communications, reflecting the four experimental conditions: high credible communicator, low and high distraction, low credible communicator, high and low distraction. After listening to each speech Ss wrote out its main points on a blank sheet and filled out a questionnaire measuring attitude toward the previously counterattitudinal issue and effectiveness of the experimental manipulations. Results indicated a significant effect (p<.01) for speaker credibility but no main effect for distraction. The interaction effect was significant, yielding a pattern supportive of the distraction hypothesis. High interference was found to raise communication effectiveness under high credibility but not under low credibility (p<.05). Kiesler & Mathog summed up their results by saying
These data, together with Brock's (1967) suggestive results on counterarguing strongly support the distraction hypothesis: that distraction interferes with counterarguing and thus increases the effectiveness of a communication. The more a person counterargues, the greater is the likelihood that distraction will enhance communication effectiveness. (1968, p. 132)

Haaland & Venkatesan (1968), in an experiment manipulating both visual and behavioral distraction in a persuasive communication, found that less attitude change occurred in the distraction conditions. Results, however, also indicated that subjects in the distraction conditions recalled significantly fewer (p < .01) arguments than Ss in the nondistressed conditions. As noted previously Festinger & Maccoby (1964) predicted that distraction should enhance attitude change in those situations in which Ss' knowledge of the counterattitudinal arguments advanced was not reduced. Haaland & Venkatesan (1968) did not, on the whole, find that distraction increased persuasion, but since their experimental manipulations reduced argument recall, they cannot be said to have adequately tested the hypothesis of Festinger & Maccoby.

Baron & Miller (1969) investigated two potential antecedents of amount of counterargumentation: distraction and source credibility. The authors note that two alternative predictions for the amount of counterargumentation can be made. Festinger & Maccoby (1964) and Kiesler & Mathog (1968) would predict that exposure to a barely credible source would result in less counterarguing than exposure to a highly credible source, since low credibility
more easily permits resistance by derogation. This position predicts that nondistracted Ss should counterargue more than distracted subjects when exposed to a high credibility source, that there should be no differences when the source is barely credible, and that those exposed to a highly credible source generally should counterargue more than those exposed to a barely credible source.

Based on previously unpublished research Baron & Miller advanced an alternative hypothesis. These researchers expected that a barely credible communicator would elicit more counter-arguing than a highly credible one. Baron & Miller note that such a result could possibly be attributed to the fact that Ss do not anticipate disagreeing with a high credible communicator and, therefore, are not as predisposed to muster counterarguments. An experiment was designed to factorially manipulate presence or absence of distraction and high or low credibility. In line with their hypothesis these experimenters predicted that distracted Ss would offer fewer counterarguments than undistracted subjects when attending to a highly credible source, but more arguments than nondistracted Ss when the source was barely credible. Ss were 190 males. Distraction was introduced by asking one group of subjects to attend to the speaker's personality. Credibility was manipulated by telling subjects that the source was either a university professor or a retired carpenter interviewed at a local discount store. All subjects were forewarned as to the
nature of the counterattitudinal topic used.

Statistical analysis of the number of counterarguments revealed that the predicted interaction was marginally significant (p<.08). Fewer counterarguments were advanced by the distracted as opposed to the nondistracted Ss in the high credibility cells. The interaction effect was primarily due to differential counterarguing occurring in the low credibility cells. Finally, the main effect of credibility on number of counterarguments was highly significant (p<.02).

The authors pointed out that in their experiment, evaluation instructions did not uniformly distract or interfere with a subject's ability to counterargue as had been suggested by Festinger & Maccoby (1964). Instead when the source was of low credibility, distraction tended to produce heightened counterarguing. With regard to credibility there was little ambiguity, Ss offered more counterarguments when anticipating exposure to a low credible communicator than when anticipating exposure to a highly credible source. Baron & Miller conclude by stating that

It is interesting to consider the possibility, however, that the frequently observed relationship between persuasion and credibility may be mediated by either ability or motivation to counterargue. (1968, p. 412)

Greenwald (1969) in a study examining the openmindedness of the counterattitudinal role player, found that Ss

.....tended strongly to accept arguments supporting their own position and reject
Greenwald hypothesized that the effectiveness of role playing may in large part be due to its success in getting Ss to evaluate counterattitudinal information in an unbiased fashion. McCullough (1968) theorized that the roleplaying effect might be attributed to a different source, the technique's tendency to restrict counterargumentation on the part of the roleplayer.

Osterhouse and Brock (1970) conducted another study to examine whether distraction would increase yielding by inhibiting counterargumentation. In the second of two reported experiments subjects were individually exposed to a communication advocating the counterattitudinal position of a tuition increase. Prior to exposure Ss read an instruction booklet which through differing explanations manipulated communication threat (the probability of a tuition increase) and self-perceived influence in avoiding the threat. Subjects were assigned to one of three conditions of distraction: high, low, or none. After being exposed to the communication Ss were allowed 3 minutes to list their thoughts. Three graduate students scored the protocols for counterarguments, obtaining an interrater reliability coefficient of .89. Level of distraction was found to significantly influence (p<.03) counterargument production, while neither communication threat nor perceived degree of influence significantly influenced counterarguing. The overall
within cell correlation between counterargument production and agreement with a tuition increase was -.53 (df=128, p<.01). Distraction conditions did not affect argument recall although they did reduce Ss ability to answer multiple choice questions based on the communication. A within cell r, however, between number of multiple choice questions correctly answered and acceptance scores was .15, indicating that multiple choice retention scores were not systematically related to communication acceptance scores. In their discussion Osterhouse and Brock also referred to the point previously stressed in this review, of the possible inapplicability of a counterargumentation model when distraction results in a decrease in transmitted information. These authors note

In every case, however, where the major arguments contained in a communication were recalled equally well by distracted and nondistracted subjects, results were in the direction predicted by the distraction hypothesis. This may suggest that distraction serves to facilitate acceptance of a counterattitudinal message only when the distraction is not so severe as to inhibit reception of the arguments contained in the message. (p. 355).

Finally, Zimbardo et al. (1970) conducted a study which in part examined the effect of distraction when it does or does not inhibit the learning of a persuasive communication. These researchers felt that the failure of some past studies to obtain a distraction effect may have been due to confusion on the part of subjects as to which was the message to be attended to and which was the distractor. In a situation in which E directed
Ss primary attention to either the message or the distractor, Zimbardo et al. predicted that distraction will result in greater influence by a persuasive communication if attention to the message is seen as the primary task, a lesser effect when attention to distractor was primary, and that no systematic distraction effect would occur when persons were left free to focus on either the message or the distractor. Results indicated that 90% of the message-set subjects came to agree with the proposed tuition increase as compared to 45% of the message only and 15% of the distractor set groups. Such a categorization yielded a chi square significant at the p<.005 level and was seen as supportive of the task-attention hypothesis. A further rather surprising result was that within distraction conditions self reports of attitude did not significantly correlate with self reports of counterarguing (r=-.20, df=32). It should be noted, however, that number of counterarguments was not actually measured, as in Brock's work, but instead Ss were asked to estimate the relative percentage of time they spent listening to and arguing against the position taken by the speaker. Self reported counterarguing, then, might be a somewhat different variable than that measured by Brock.

Summing up the research so far considered, there does appear to be evidence that distraction will increase attitude change, at least in those conditions in which it does not reduce the amount of information subjects can obtain from a
persuasive message. Festinger & Maccoby (1964), however, first introduced distraction as a variable not for its own sake, but as a means of testing their hypotheses about a process they termed counterargumentation. Brock (1967) developed a technique for measuring counterargumentation and found that its amount tended to be negatively related to such variables as: communication-recipient discrepancy, perceived intent to persuade and inclusion of a priming counterargument. Baron & Miller (1969), in something of an extension of Brock (1967), found a negative relationship between amount of counterargumentation and both lower communicator credibility and the presence or absence of distraction. Several writers such as Baron & Miller (1969), Kiesler & Mathog (1968), Brock (1967) and Festinger & Maccoby (1964), have at least suggested that amount of counterargumentation might be negatively related to attitude change. So far, however, as has been already noted, experiments in this area have been conducted under somewhat restricted conditions. Most notable has been the frequent use of explicit forewarning and the allotment of a period of time before or after the communication in which subjects could compose counterarguments. In mass communication situations it would seem that a situation at least as frequent is one in which a subject suddenly finds himself attending to a communication whose position he does not agree with. Festinger & Maccoby (1964) originally conceived of counterargumentation in terms of a process, yet little of the published literature records an
attempt to measure counterargument production as a communication is being received. Further all studies to date have depended on experimenter constructed, and thus perhaps somewhat artificial, persuasive messages.

A problem present in current thinking about counterargumentation stems from the failure of previous experimenters to explicitly state a theoretical framework as a means of integrating their research. Janis (1968) has, in an attempt to explain the effects of roleplay, advanced a conception called incentive theory which does seem to hold at least the beginnings of a theory regarding counterargumentation. According to Janis, incentive theory is based on a conflict model of attitude change.

Decisional conflicts are conceptualized in terms of a balance sheet containing weighted positive and negative values corresponding to the potential gains (positive incentives) and potential losses (negative incentives) that are anticipated by the decision maker when he evaluates each alternative open to him. (in Abelson et al., 1968, p. 810)

Reviewing the experiments considered so far it can be said that underlying the work there appears to have been an intuitive acceptance of a conflict type of approach to attitude change. The idea of determining the number of counterarguments to a particular message might be seen as a means of quantifying the negative side of an Ss balance sheet regarding a particular issue. Further, experimenters who have alluded to the possibility of an inverse relationship between amount of counterargumentation and attitude change can be seen as maintaining that in a situation
in which number of positive arguments (positive incentives) is relatively constant, attitude change should show a definite relationship to counterargumentation (negative incentives). So far, however, none of the investigators of counterargumentation has attempted to quantify the positive side of a subject's balance sheet. To some extent this might be due to the assumption that similar positive incentives for attitude change would be provided through the standardized counterattitudinal messages that have been used. While this could be true, the applicability of a conflict approach to the area would suggest that future experimenters should also measure positive arguments, thus filling in the plus side of a person's balance sheet.

Another suggestion stemming from balance theory for future work in the area of counterargumentation concerns the possibility of weighting both positive arguments and counterarguments. However, strong indications of a relationship between counterargumentation and attitude change have already been found without the complications of such a procedure, and Cullen (1964) noted only slight differences between unitary and differential argument weighting techniques. Previously it was noted that if amount of counterargumentation was negatively related to amount of attitude change such a measure would be useful in the pretesting of mass communications. In view, however, of Janis' conflict approach a theoretically more defensible procedure would be to subtract the number of counterarguments from the number of positive arguments and then relate
this measure of net counterargumentation to attitude and behavioral change.

Greenwald (in Greenwald, Brock, & Ostrom, 1968, p. 147-170) discusses a measure like the one proposed but which was developed on the basis of a somewhat different theoretical rationale. Greenwald's chapter, entitled "Cognitive Learning, Cognitive Response to Persuasion, and Attitude Change", questions the assumption that persuasion by a communication is a function of the retention of its content. This author views attitude change as a situation mediated by a subject's learning of his own cognitive responses to a message. According to this view what is important in a communication situation is not the learning of particular arguments but rather the sum of an S's affective responses to the situation. This of course differs from the counterargumentation approach in that reduction of counterargumentation is seen as leading to increased persuasion in a situation in which learning of message content is not reduced while reducing counterarguments.

Greenwald gathered what he termed cognitive responses to a communication by having subjects list all their thoughts pertinent to forming an opinion on the message topic. Such a procedure is comparable to that necessary in collecting statements to be used in the proposed net counterargumentation approach. In his chapter Greenwald recounts the master's research done by Robert Love. Love assessed the correlations (with pretest opinion
partialed out) of persuasion effectiveness with message recall, content of cognitive reactions (number of favorable minus number of unfavorable reactions elicited during a reading of the communication), and later recall of these cognitive reactions. The best predictor of effectiveness was cognitive reaction (average of 4 r's=.52), followed by recall of cognitive reactions (average of 4 r's=.30). The poorest predictor of effectiveness by far was the retention measure for the persuasive communication itself (average of 4 r's=.03). Love's operationalization of his dependent variable termed cognitive reaction was essentially the same procedure as would be used for the previously advocated net counterargumentation measure. As previously noted the reason for using a different term in this context was to more closely relate the measure with the much larger body of work done on counterargumentation.

As can be seen from the previous survey of relevant literature, a good deal of evidence has arisen concerning the possible relationship between a measure of subject reaction, be it termed counterargumentation, net counterargumentation, or cognitive reaction and attitude change. Theoretically such a finding would be important in that the impact of many previously studied independent variables might then be found to result from their effect on net counterargumentation. Practically, to the consumer psychologist, such a measure would also be of great interest. First the procedure does not require the construction
of differing instruments for different types of products, thus resulting in a potentially large saving in both time and money. Second, the measure would be particularly useful if a technique could be developed allowing the collection of favorable and unfavorable reactions during the time an advertisement was being attended to. Such measurements could be examined to determine those message sections having the least impact on the target audience. This information might then act as a guide to segments of the communication requiring revision. Mass communications, however, are frequently used not simply in the hope of producing attitude change, but rather of causing modifications in certain behaviors of the audience. This point is important since as Festinger (1964) has noted, past studies have indicated no necessary relationship between attitude change and behavioral change. Thus if one is interested in using amount of net counter-argumentation in a pretest situation, there should be at least some indication that the measure is related to behavior. The best method for this, of course, would simply be to relate amount of counterargumentation to a persuasive counterattitudinal message and later behavior. Such a criterion, however, might not be sensitive enough in the sense that a single exposure to a message, while possibly predisposing a subject to a behavioral change, might not be sufficient to produce such change. A second, perhaps more sensitive criterion, would be an attitude scale whose items have been chosen on the basis of their relationship to the
particular behavioral disposition advocated by the communication.

An experiment was conducted to specifically test whether pretest measures of the amount of net counterargumentation elicited by different communications are simply related to a criterion of communication effectiveness. The criterion for such a test was "after only" measures on an attitude scale whose items were selected on the basis of their ability to discriminate between groups which had, or had not, indicated a preference for the type of behaviors advocated by the communications. The specific messages used were advertisements constructed by an advertising agency as part of a planned campaign.

The campaigns dealt with two content areas: one group of ads concerning itself with a commercial product, the other group advancing a public service message. The ads selected came from magazine issues previous to and including the year 1965. The use of ads at least 5 years old resulted in most of the messages being "new" to the majority of introductory students used in the experiment.
CHAPTER III

AN OVERVIEW OF THE EXPERIMENT AND HYPOTHESES TESTED

Scaling of the Advertisements

The first section of the experiment was concerned with scaling two groups of five ads each in terms of their net elicited counterargumentation. Of the two groups one dealt with a commercial product, the other with a public service message. Ads within each of the two groups advocated the same position, using the same general arguments, but were phrased in different ways. Since it is commonly accepted that different ways of stating the same thing may be more or less persuasive, it was expected that within each group some of the messages would differ in persuasiveness. Net counterargumentation scores for the five ads within each of the two groups were analyzed by an analysis of variance. Those communications rated significantly different from each other were defined as high or low in terms of predicted persuasiveness. An attempt was also made to determine the extent to which total scores from the measure of net counter-argumentation process (the term process is used here since each ad was broken into four parts and arguments were collected after an S ha read each part) converged with the scores for a paper and pencil attitude questionnaire. A significant relationship was expected
between the two even though the questionnaire items, obtained from the Attitude-Belief Scale of Fishbein and Raven (in Fishbein, 1967, p.184), were not specifically designed to pretest communications. It was felt that since the A-B items were intended to measure generalized attitude and belief, and that to be valid the net counterargumentation measure would also be expected to be sensitive to these factors, a significant relationship would result. A second pencil and paper measure was also incorporated into this section of the experiment. Subjects viewing ads within either of the two groups were asked to evaluate how persuasive each of these messages would be for the general population (persons other than themselves). No specific predictions as to convergence could be made for this measure. If Ss used their own evaluation as a basis for attribution of general population persuasiveness, then this measure would be expected to relate to both net counterargumentation and total A-B item scores. In a situation, however, in which subjects felt their opinions were not held by the general population, significant correlations with neither net counterargumentation nor A-B item scores could be expected.

If net counterargumentation is shown to differentiate between ads within the two groups and at the same time yield a consistent relationship with a post exposure paper and pencil measure, then a strong argument could be advanced for its implementation as a pretest technique. Not only is the measure flexible, in that it doesn't have to be tailored to suit the
particular point of view or product discussed, it also yields information as to the strong and weak points of the message. A problem in this argument, of course, would be that although net counterargumentation might differentiate between ads, and relate to a paper and pencil measure, these differences might not reflect later evaluations by a different audience. To allow for this possibility, another group of subjects would later evaluate ads scaled as high or low persuasive via a questionnaire whose items had been selected on the basis of their relationships with the message advocated behavior.

Construction of the Experimental Questionnaire

The second section of the experiment was devoted to the construction of a behaviorally oriented questionnaire. A group of students who had not participated in the scaling were asked to indicate on a questionnaire their opinions regarding the particular commercial product and public service organization whose ads had been previously rated. For both the product and public service organization three questions specifically asking for behavioral dispositions were included. On the basis of these questions Ss were divided into behaviorally favorable and unfavorable groups with regard to the commercial product and public service issue. Other attitude items in the questionnaire, concerning either the product or service, were analyzed to determine the extent to which they differentiated between the favorable and unfavorable groups. The ten most discriminating
items for each of the two groups formed the experimental questionnaire.

Re-test of the Scaled Ads

The purpose of this section was to allow a different group of subjects to respond to commercial product and public service ads which the net counterargumentation procedure had previously rated as relatively "good" or "poor". Each subject saw one commercial product and one public service message. Ss then indicated their personal opinion of the product and public service organization on the experimental questionnaire constructed in section two. If net counterargumentation differences are predictive of later impact, one would expect better product and service organization evaluations to occur after subjects had been exposed to ads with more favorable net counterargumentation ratings. If this pattern of differences did occur it could be argued that due to the manner in which the instrument was constructed, differences in questionnaire response patterns were also reflective of a difference in behavioral disposition.
CHAPTER IV

SCALING OF THE ADVERTISEMENTS

Introduction

The purpose of this stage of the experiment was to determine if a measure of net counterargumentation could indicate differences in persuasiveness for two groups of ads. If such variability were found, ads differentiated by this measure would then be defined as relatively high or low persuasive and used as such in later sections of the experiment. This chapter will recount, (a) the experimental subjects used in stage one, (b) the selection of ads and the means by which their presentation was operationalized, (c) the measurement of both the primary dependent variable, net counterargumentation scores, and the secondary dependent variables, ratings of overall persuasiveness and the total score on a series of items oriented toward Ss' attitudes and beliefs, (d) the experimental procedures employed.

Subjects

Fifty-seven male subjects enrolled in the introductory psychology course at The Ohio State University participated in this stage of the experiment. Subjects received two of the four hours of experimental credit required from introductory psychology students.
Selection of Advertisements: The Independent Variable

E conducted a survey of magazine ads published between 1957 and 1965 in order to select messages applicable to a present day college population. A group of advertisements in two specific classes were sought. The first class was to be composed of a series of five ads for a product of interest to, and easily purchasable by, undergraduate students. The second group of five was to concern itself with a public service, non-commercial type of message. Thus two different areas of advertising were sampled. All the communications surveyed were subjected to several criteria. First, if concerned with a product, was the item still being sold in the same form. Second, did any aspect of the ad obviously show it to be dated. In this regard, types of illustration, situations, and fashions depicted were all considered. Third, were the messages such that black and white reproduction would radically effect their meaning (Only one of the ads finally selected was originally published in color).

Fourth, was the manner of presentation obviously not suitable for the age group used in the experiment. Messages passing this screening were grouped with ads for the same products and services, after which a further set of criteria were applied. Of these further criteria the first required a group of five ads for the same product or service all of which stressed the same points but expressed them in different ways. A second consideration, although not judged critically important since the dependent measure was to be net counterargumentation, was that messages
considered be at least somewhat similar in length. Upon applying the preceeding criteria, two five message groups, advocating Yardley After Shave and the U.S.O. were selected for use in stage one. All five Yardley ads mentioned the same four general points: Yardley isn't a typical after shave, Yardley contains agents to prevent infections, Yardley's ingredients replace skin moisture, the fragrance is pleasant. Reproductions of the Yardley ads selected are listed in Appendices F through J. The five U.S.O. communications were also characterized by four general themes: loneliness felt by young American men away from home, tough working conditions experienced by military personnel, the large number of American men and women in this situation, the civilian's obligation to help military personnel. Again, although these points were phrased differently and sometimes appeared in slightly different order, the same general themes were touched upon. The five ads selected for inclusion in the U.S.O. unit are shown in Appendices A through E.

Experimental Measures

Net counterargumentation. Net counterargumentation was defined as the number of positive arguments minus the number of negative arguments. Each protocol written by a subject in response to a particular ad was scored by a rater in terms of the number of favorable, unfavorable, and neutral arguments or ideas expressed. The three categories to which an argument could be assigned were defined as follows:
Favorable—Indicating acceptance or slightly qualified acceptance of, agreement with, support of, or favorable response to, elements of the ad in question, points that it is trying to make or aspects related to it.

Unfavorable—Indicating rejection of, slightly qualified rejection of, disagreement with, or unfavorable response to, elements of the ad in question, points that it is trying to make, or aspects related to it.

Neutral—Combining favorable and unfavorable elements in such a way as not to be identifiable as either favorable or unfavorable. Irrelevant ideas containing no apparent reference to either the message or relevant points.

An individual argument or idea was defined for scoring purposes as expressing only a single fact, value, good or bad feature, thought, feeling, or belief about either the position advanced by the advertisement or the ad itself.

Using these scoring rules statements such as: "I wouldn't buy Yardley", or "The government should support the U.S.O., not me!", would both be scored as unfavorable. In some cases statements written by subjects were not restricted to a single argument and for scoring had to be broken down. Thus, the statement, "picture good, slogan good, I don't like the word kids", was scored as two favorable, one unfavorable. It was decided to perform test-retest and interrater reliability checks for this scoring
procedure since the scoring rules applied represent a modification of those used by Brock (1967) and Love (1969).

**Total attitude and belief scores.** To examine the construct validity of the net counterargumentation measure, Ss evaluated each of the ads they had seen on a series of items developed by Fishbein and Raven for their A-B scale (1962, cited in Fishbein, 1967, p. 183-189). This questionnaire is composed of twenty bipolar items (Appendix K). According to Fishbein and Raven, two different five item groups on this scale measure the relatively independent dimensions of attitude and belief. Since the general purpose of an advertisement is to affect both attitude and belief, and since a single overall rating for a message was desired, subject responses to the ten items were then summed to yield a total attitude and belief score.

**Overall persuasiveness for the general population.** Besides the attitude and belief data obtained for each ad, a second type of questionnaire was also used. This questionnaire simply asked subjects to rate each message in terms of how persuasive it would be to members of the general population. Ss were told that by members of the general population was meant persons other than themselves. The scale used was of a nine point Likert type, anchored by the phrases "High Persuasive", "Low Persuasive" (Appendix L).
Preparation of the Stimuli

All the selected advertisements were photographed using a Honeywell Pentax single lens reflex camera mounted on a tripod. Light present was held constant through the use of four color balanced lamps. Kodak Panatomic X black and white film was used and then prepared through a reversal processing procedure so that a true reproduction of the original ad could be obtained. Portions of an ad were blacked out by placing thin pre-cut sheets of black paper over the sections to be deleted. A small triangular marker, used to indicate to subjects the beginning of a section of material not previously shown was also made from this same material.

As noted previously each ad in both the Yardley and U.S.O. groups refered to four general themes. In determining the size and nature of the increments by which a particular ad was exposed to subjects these general themes were used as a guide. Thus an attempt was made to make the four segments into which a particular message was broken for presentation, generally correspond to the four underlying themes.

Slides produced from the photographs were shown via a Kodak Carousel 860 projector equipped with an automatic focusing system, a remote focusing control and a special 3 inch, F:3.5 wide angle lens. Use of the wide angle lens resulted in an image projected on the movie screen 3 1/2' wide x 4 1/2' long.
Procedure

In all, 57 Ss were exposed to either the five Yardley or five U.S.O. advertisements. Of this group, scores from seven subjects, four who viewed the Yardley and three who viewed the U.S.O. advertisements, had to be discarded for failure to follow instructions. In all cases this failure was due to these subjects simply summarizing what the ad said and not listing any personally referent comments concerning the stimuli.

This section of the experiment was conducted over a six week period in two major units. The first group viewed the five Yardley messages with the remaining subjects being exposed to the U.S.O. ads. For both units the basic procedures were similar. Ss were run in groups of from 1 to 5. The use of groups with a maximum size of 5 allowed E to counterbalance order of presentation within the two units. All ads in both units had been randomly assigned an identifying number. The numbers used were: 11, 13, 17, 24, 33. Ads were presented in five different orders: (I) 11, 13, 17, 24, 33; (II) 24, 11, 33, 17, 13; (III) 13, 24, 11, 33, 17; (IV) 33, 17, 13, 11, 24; (V) 17, 33, 24, 13, 11.

Upon entering the experimental room subjects were given an envelope, told to write their names on the outside, and then assured of anonymity with regard to any responses they would make during the experiment. E then introduced himself to subjects and oriented them to the experimental situation in the following manner.
I better start off by saying that my name is Lee McCullough and that I'm a member of the industrial psychology department. Today's study deals with a mass communication situation, a situation in which one side communicates with an audience but the audience can't immediately talk back. We find ourselves in such a situation, for instance, when we watch and listen to a news announcer on television and can't immediately tell him, as we can in everyday conversation, whether we agree or disagree; what our ideas, thoughts and feelings are about what he is saying. A similar situation occurs when we read newspaper and magazine ads, and can't immediately tell an advertiser how we think and feel about what he's saying to us. Instead when we read ads we generally just keep our thoughts, feelings and opinions to ourselves. The psychology department is now conducting a study which enables people to talk back to an advertiser by writing down all their ideas, thoughts and feelings while reading an advertisement.

At this point E had finished the memorized introduction and then read to subjects the following instructions.

We have photographed five ads prepared by the Yardley company to sell their After Shave (or in the U.S.O. unit--We have photographed 5 ads prepared by the U.S.O. whose purpose is to stimulate contributions). We are going to present all five ads to you in the same way. First very
quickly you'll see a picture of the whole ad. Then we will show you a picture of just the first part of the ad and give 45 seconds to both read the section and write down your thoughts about it. Next we'll show you a slide of both the first part and a new second part. We have used a little black triangle to show the beginning of a new part. Again, you'll have 45 seconds to both read and write down your thoughts about the new part, or both the old and new part. Each of the five ads you will be shown has been broken into four parts. Now I'd like you to read the instructions on the top of the sheet I'm handing out to sort of clarify things.

At this point E handed out the standardized net counter-argumentation protocol form (Appendix M). He explained that the number in the upper right hand corner simply indicated the ad Ss would see. The experimenter asked if there were any questions and if so answered them on the basis of the instructions previously given. He then quickly restated the previous instructions, and added

Although the picture for any section of an ad will only be on the screen for 45 seconds, I will allow you enough time to finish writing your comments. I won't go on to the next slide until everybody indicates that they are finished.

E then very briefly showed an overall picture of the first
advertisement, followed by part one. The first part of the first message was exposed for 45 seconds. All subjects were allowed to finish writing and when they had done so part two was presented. At the end of the first ad E told subjects to put their protocol sheets in the envelope and handed out a new form. He then told the Ss that each message was to be considered separately and they were not to refer back to, or compare, different ads in their comments. The four remaining communications were then presented. After all ads in a unit were viewed, subjects were allowed to take a short break.

After the break E said to the Ss:

Now I'm going to hand out a sheet on which I want you to place a checkmark to indicate how persuasive each of the ads would be for the general population. By general population I mean persons other than yourself. The scale runs from 1 to 9 with a 9 indicating very high persuasive and a 1 indicating very low persuasive. You can only use whole numbers, so don't for instance, check between a 2 and a 3 to indicate a rating of 2 1/2. Rate the ads in order so the first ad I show you should be rated under ad number 1. When everybody has finished rating the first ad we'll go on to ad number 2.

The experimenter then handed out the overall population persuasiveness sheet and answered any questions on the basis of the preceding instructions. Stimuli were presented in the same
order in which they had initially been seen in the net counter-argumentation section. After all messages had been evaluated subjects put the rating sheet in their envelope and E handed out an instruction sheet for the attitude and belief items. This instruction sheet was based on one initially used by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957, p.82-83). The experimenter explained that the sheet was necessary (see Appendix N) because of the very different type of form Ss would be asked to fill out.

After subjects had read the instructions the first A-B scale sheet was distributed. An ad was then shown and subjects allowed as much time as necessary to complete the scale. The completed sheet was inserted by an S into his envelope, a new sheet distributed, and another stimulus shown. For each group of students, messages were presented in the order in which they had been viewed in the net counterargumentation and overall population persuasiveness sections.

After finishing this final part of their experiment Ss were completely debriefed. This entailed a quick discussion of the theory behind net counterargumentation, a non-technical explanation of how the data was to be analyzed, and an offer to share with them the results after analysis was completed.

Results

The U.S.O. dependent variable scores obtained from 25 Ss were analyzed by three separate two way repeated measures analyses of variance (order of presentation groups x ads,
subjects repeated across ads). The different orders of presentation were each represented by five subjects. It should be noted that the expected mean square for the main effect of order in this type of design is not a pure one, but is in fact confounded with the effect for subjects. Such a confounding was of course not a critical factor given the purpose of the experiment.

The analysis of variance (Table I) conducted on Ss ratings of the overall persuasiveness of the messages for the general population (persons other than themselves) revealed one significant effect, that for different types of ads ($F=15.487, df \, 4,80, p<.01$). The same analysis conducted on the total of the A-B item scores (Table II) again showed ads to be the one significant effect ($F=7.336, df \, 4,80, p<.01$). The third two way repeated measures analysis of variance was conducted on the net counterargumentation scores (Table III). In this analysis the difference between ads was marginally significant ($F=2.150, df \, 4,80, p<.08$). To determine which messages were shown by a particular measure to be particularly better or worse than other stimuli in a unit, a Newman-Keuls test of the significance of differences between treatment means was applied. A .05 level of significance was used when this test was applied to both the analyses of variance conducted on the A-B item score totals and the ratings of general population persuasiveness. A significance level of .10 was chosen for the Newman-Keuls evaluation of the net counterargumentation
data since the overall F was not significant at the .05 level. Results of the analysis are shown in Table IV. Survey of this table shows that for all three of the dependent measures the ad labeled 33 was evaluated as significantly inferior to the other messages. In both the A-B item and net counterargumentation analysis none of the other ads were shown to be significantly different. For both scales in which the S was to list his own opinion, then, the only significant difference between messages was that advertisement 33 was judged inferior to the others. On the analysis based on persuasiveness for the general population, however, ad 24 was seen as significantly better than the other four stimuli. In this case Ss were evidently attributing a persuasiveness to the message over and above the actual impact it had on them.

Since this section of the experiment dealt with an attempt to select ads significantly different in terms of net counterargumentation scores, the two messages ranked highest and lowest in terms of these scores were defined as relatively high and low persuasive.

Three two way repeated measures analyses of variance were also conducted on the dependent variable scores obtained from 25 Ss who viewed the Yardley messages. The analysis, based on Ss ratings of an ad's overall persuasiveness to members of the general population (Table V), again indicated a significant advertisement effect (F=2.169, df 4,80, p<.05). A similar analysis conducted on the total score of the ten attitude and belief items (Table VI) also yielded
TABLE I

U.S.O. Two Way Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for Ratings on a One to Nine Scale of Overall Ad Persuasiveness for the General Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Order</td>
<td>3.248</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ss within Order</td>
<td>102.480</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements</td>
<td>119.808</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.952</td>
<td>15.487 p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order x Ads</td>
<td>54.271</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.391</td>
<td>1.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ads x Ss w. Order</td>
<td>154.710</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II

U.S.O. Two Way Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for Subject Ratings of the Advertisements on the Total of Fishbein's Attitude and Belief Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Order</td>
<td>1504.288</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>376.071</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ss Within Order</td>
<td>8174.254</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>408.712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements</td>
<td>943.968</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>235.991</td>
<td>7.335 p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order x Ads</td>
<td>308.270</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.266</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ads x Ss w. Order</td>
<td>2573.460</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32.168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE III

U.S.O. Two Way Repeated Measures Analysis
Variance for Net Counterargumentation
Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Order</td>
<td>1031.600</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>257.399</td>
<td>2.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ss within Order</td>
<td>2555.195</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>127.759</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements</td>
<td>155.680</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38.920</td>
<td>2.150 p&lt;.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order x Ads</td>
<td>480.314</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30.019</td>
<td>1.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ads x Ss w. Order</td>
<td>1447.835</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>18.097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IV

U.S.O. Mean Evaluations for the Three Analyses. Means with a Common Underline are Nonsignificantly Different, a Break in the Underline Indicates Significant Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>33</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.O. Evaluation of Persuasiveness for the General Population (scale from 1 to 9)</td>
<td>3.980</td>
<td>5.080</td>
<td>5.440</td>
<td>5.640</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ad differentiation at the .05 level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>33</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ad differentiation at the .05 level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>33</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.O. Net Counterargumentation Scores</td>
<td>-1.840</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ad differentiation at the .10 level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
an ad effect significant at the .05 level (F=2.496, df 4,80) and again none of the other terms was significant. A third two way repeated measures analysis was applied to the Yardley net counterargumentation data (Table VIII). This analysis was the only one of the six that yielded a significant order effect (F=3.414, df 4,20, p<.05). A Newman-Keuls test at the .05 level was conducted to determine the exact source of this difference. It was found to occur in the order represented by the sequence: 33, 17, 13, 11, 24. As noted previously the design confounded subject and order effects. This single difference in one order stems from a tendency for these five subjects to give a much lower evaluation to all the ads. The difference between ads was found to be marginally significant (F=2.222, df 4,80, p<.07). In an analysis similar to that conducted on the U.S.O. data, mean evaluation scores for the stimuli were then ranked on each of the dependent measures and three Newman-Keuls tests performed (Table VIII). Study of Table VIII will show that for all three dependent measures advertisement 33 tended to receive a significantly lower evaluation. It is also interesting to note that when Ss evaluated the persuasiveness of a message for persons other than themselves both ads 11 and 33 received the lowest ratings. The evaluative rank order obtained from the A-B item total and net counterargumentation measures was quite similar, the only difference being the inversion of rank for the two most positively evaluated ads. The two communications most positively and negatively evaluated in terms of net counterargumentation scores
### TABLE V
Yardley Two Way Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for Ratings on a One to Nine Scale of Overall Ad Persuasiveness to the General Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Order</td>
<td>25.392</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.348</td>
<td>1.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ss within Order</td>
<td>120.080</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements</td>
<td>38.432</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.608</td>
<td>2.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order x Ads</td>
<td>67.647</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.228</td>
<td>1.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ads x Ss w. Order</td>
<td>293.505</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE VI
Yardley Two Way Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for Subject Ratings of the Advertisements on the Total of Fishbein's Attitude and Belief Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Order</td>
<td>1861.647</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>465.411</td>
<td>2.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ss within Order</td>
<td>4237.512</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>211.875</td>
<td>2.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements</td>
<td>523.887</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>130.971</td>
<td>2.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order x Ads</td>
<td>706.418</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44.151</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ads x Ss w. Order</td>
<td>4196.996</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>52.462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VII
Yardley Two Way Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for Net Counterargumentation Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Order</td>
<td>603.647</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>150.911</td>
<td>3.414 p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ss within Order</td>
<td>884.072</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44.203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements</td>
<td>143.248</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35.812</td>
<td>2.222 p&lt;.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order x Ads</td>
<td>309.618</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.351</td>
<td>1.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ads x Ss w. Order</td>
<td>1289.514</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16.118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE VIII**

Yardley Mean Evaluations for the Three Analyses. Means with a Common Underline are Nonsignificantly Different, a Break in the Underline Indicates Significant Differences.

| Yardley Evaluation of Persuasiveness for the General Population (scale from 1 to 9) |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 11    | 33    | 17    | 13    | 24    | 4.000 | 4.080 | 4.760 | 4.800 | 5.520 |
|       |       |       |       |       | (ad differentiation at the .05 level) |

| Yardley Personal Evaluation Questionnaire (Attitude + Belief Scales Combined) (scale from -30 to +30) |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|       |       |       |       |       | (ad differentiation at the .05 level) |

| Yardley Net Counterargumentation Scores |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 33    | 13    | 11    | 17    | 24    | -3.320 | -2.050 | -2.080 | -1.640 | .000 |
|       |       |       |       |       | (ad differentiation at the .10 level) |
were selected and defined as the high and low persuasive Yardley messages to be used later in the experiment.

Results of an intercorrelation of the three dependent measures obtained from the Yardley and U.S.O. units are presented in Table IX. Due to the interdependence of r's within the matrix independent tests of significance cannot be run for each coefficient in a unit. What was done, therefore, was to test for significance the lowest obtained r in each of the two units. For the Yardley group the lowest r was .36, significant beyond the .0005 level (N=125). The lowest U.S.O. coefficient was .22 which with an N of 125 was significant at the .01 level. Since the lowest obtained r in each of the units resulted in a value significant well beyond the .05 level it was assumed that the three measures were interrelated. The two most important r's were, of course, those between the A-B score and net counterargumentation. As shown in the table, for the U.S.O. group this r was .50, while for the Yardley unit a figure of .36 was obtained. These correlations were obtained in spite of the fact that the paper and pencil A-B measure was not specifically constructed as an instrument to pretest advertisements.

An examination of the inter-rater and test-retest reliability of the net counterargumentation scoring procedure was also conducted. Four days after determining the net counterargumentation scores for stimuli in the Yardley and U.S.O. units, E randomly selected two protocols for each of the ten ads. Each of the protocols came
from a different subject. The net counterargumentation scoring procedure was again applied and within the Yardley and U.S.O. blocks of ads the new values compared with previously assigned net counterargumentation scores. The test-retest \( r \) for the ten randomly selected U.S.O. ads was .967, while in the case of the Yardley group the \( r \) was .988. Another random sample of ten protocols from both the Yardley and U.S.O. groups was evaluated by a different rater. This rater was instructed in the basic theory behind the net counterargumentation hypothesis, had read the scoring rules, and scored for practice several protocols not in the sample. When the rater felt comfortable with the system he then scored the selected ads in the Yardley and U.S.O. units. The degree of agreement between the initial and second rater was indicated by an \( r \) of .825 for the U.S.O. ads and .900 for the Yardley group. All \( r \)'s for both the test-retest and inter-rater reliability checks were significant beyond the .01 level. The scoring system was thus assumed reliable.
TABLE IX

Intercorrelations of the Three Dependent Variables; Net Counterargumentation (N.C.A.), A-B Scale Scores (A.B.) and Overall Population Persuasiveness (O.P.) for both the U.S.O. and Yardley Ad Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>U.S.O.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Yardley</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.C.A.</td>
<td>A-B</td>
<td>O-P</td>
<td>N.C.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C.A.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.B.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* test run on this the lowest of the three intercorrelations in the unit yielded p<.01

** test run on this the lowest of the three intercorrelations in the unit yielded p<.0005
CHAPTER V
CONSTRUCTION OF THE EXPERIMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Introduction

In the context of the overall experiment, the purpose of this section was the construction of a special type of attitude questionnaire on which the selected high and low persuasive ads would later be rated.

As noted by researchers such as Festinger (1964), a survey of the literature does not reveal a consistent relationship between attitude scores and later behavior. One way of explaining this fact would be to state that attitude questionnaires have typically been constructed to measure an "attitude complex" and not necessarily to predict later behavior. Since the advertisements used in this study were written with the intention of producing specific behavioral effects, a method of constructing a behaviorally oriented attitude questionnaire was used. This chapter will consider subjects who responded to the initial pretest questionnaire, the manner in which this pretest questionnaire was constructed, and the form of analysis used to build a behaviorally oriented attitude instrument.

Subjects

Subjects were a rather eclectic group of forty-two males...
obtained from introductory courses in: psychology, sociology, English, and also freshman members of the university band. Females in these groups were also sampled, but due to the nature of the ads, their responses were not used in the item selection analysis.

The Pretest Questionnaire

The pretest questionnaire formed the initial body of items from which those best discriminating between behaviorally favorable and unfavorable positions would be selected. The questionnaire was divided into two parts, the first section with 28 items concerning Yardley After Shave, while the second part consisted of a similar number of items dealing with the U.S.O.. In both of these parts the first three items asked specific questions about past or future behavior regarding the topic of the advertisements. The first three items for Yardley After Shave were:

Do you presently use Yardley After Shave?

Yes__, No___

Within the past year have you purchased Yardley After Shave?

No___, Yes___

If buying an after shave would you consider purchasing Yardley:

Would
seriously _____'____'____'____'____'
Would not
seriously consider

In the U.S.O. section of the questionnaire the following three initial items were used:
If asked, I would contribute to the support of the U.S.O.

Disagree __,___,___,___,____,____,___,____ Agree

Knowing that the Community Chest and United Fund supply the funds for the U.S.O. makes me more likely to contribute to these charities.

Agree __,___,___,___,____,____,____,____ Disagree

I would like to help the work of the U.S.O.

Disagree __,___,___,___,____,____,____,____ Agree

In constructing all the remaining items of the questionnaire two points became important. First, since stage one of this experiment elicited subject comments to the stimuli, whenever possible these comments could be used to form the basis for questionnaire statements. This approach allowed some degree of assurance as to the relevance of this group of items to the topic in question. The second point dealt with specific questions to avoid in composing items. Following section one the experimenter knew which ads would be evaluated in stage three via the experimental questionnaire. It was thus possible in constructing statements to avoid phrases which might tend to load a statement in terms of one or the other advertisement. Specifically an attempt was made to construct items which avoided using words or phrases specific to only one of the two stimuli.

Procedure

While in class Ss were asked by their instructors to fill out the pre-test questionnaire. When time was available this was
done during class, if not subjects took the questionnaires home and returned them later.

**Results**

The first three items on the U.S.O. questionnaire were summed, thus giving a score indicating the degree to which a subject endorsed these three behaviorally oriented statements. Subject scores were then cast into a frequency distribution and two equal n groups selected from the upper and lower segments of the distribution. This procedure resulted in two groups, defined as either favorable or unfavorable, both with an n of 16. The nine remaining Ss yielded scores tied at a point between the two groups, and thus their data was excluded from the item analysis.

T tests were run between these groups with the ten items yielding the highest scores being selected for the experimental questionnaire. The range of the absolute t scores for the items selected was from 2.36 to 3.59 with the average of the absolute t's being 3.06. In a situation with thirty degrees of freedom a t of 2.021 is significant at the .05 level, while a score of 2.423 is required for .01 level significance.

Evaluation of the Yardley questionnaire indicated an almost complete lack of variance for the first two items. In this sample hardly anybody used, or had recently purchased, Yardley. Due to this fact response to item three alone became the criterion by which subjects were placed into either favorable or unfavorable groups. Each of these groups was composed of twenty-one persons. Again, t scores
for each item were computed between the two groups and the ten most discriminating questions selected to form the experimental questionnaire. Absolute t scores for the items selected ranged from 1.33 to 3.10 with an average of 2.09. The t score required for .05 significance with forty degrees of freedom was 2.02 with a score of 2.42 indicating significance at the .01 level. A listing of the scores for every item in the pretest questionnaire is included in Appendix 0.
CHAPTER VI
RETEST OF THE SCALED ADS ON A BEHAVIORALLY ORIENTED QUESTIONNAIRE

Introduction

Results from the initial advertisement scaling section of this experiment had indicated that a net counterargumentation measure did discriminate between several of the stimuli used. A significant correlation was also found between net counterargumentation and attitude scores obtained from a paper and pencil measure. Following these results another question was posed. Namely, to what extent would ads defined as relatively high or low persuasive produce in another group of Ss differential response on a questionnaire oriented toward behavioral disposition. The empirical construction of this questionnaire was discussed in Chapter V. The present chapter will relate, (a) the experimental subjects used, (b) the manner in which both ads and dependent measures were presented to subjects, (c) procedures employed, (d) analysis of the primary dependent variable, behavioral disposition scores, and an ancillary measure, personal reaction to each of the messages.

Subjects

Seventy male subjects filled in the experimental questionnaire
at the end of their introductory psychology class. Subjects were volunteers in that they were told that the questionnaire was not mandatory and that they could leave before the materials were distributed. As in previous sections of this experiment, questionnaires filled out by females were not analyzed.

**Presentation of the Experimental Materials**

The stimuli were four ads, two concerning Yardley After Shave, and two advocating contributions to the U.S.O.. On the basis of the scaling procedure used in the first section of the experiment, one of the two Yardley and U.S.O. ads had been defined as relatively high persuasive, the other as relatively low persuasive. Messages were professionally reproduced via a metal plate process, thereby ensuring an extremely high degree of fidelity with the original communications. Experimental booklets containing one Yardley and one U.S.O. ad were then constructed (Appendix P). The first page in all booklets presented the same instructions for completing the materials. These instructions were followed by a blank page and then the advertisements. The booklets were formed so that all four possible pairings of the relatively high and low persuasive Yardley and U.S.O. messages were obtained. Thus, for example, one group of booklets would contain a relatively high persuasive Yardley and low persuasive U.S.O. ad, while another group was comprised of a low persuasive Yardley and low persuasive U.S.O. message. Order in which the two basic types of ads were presented was also manipulated. One block of booklets presented first the Yardley then the U.S.O. message, while the other block presented
the types in the opposite order. The two orders and four persuasiveness pairings, then, resulted in eight different groups of booklets. Following the stimuli was a blank page after which Ss responded to the same three personal evaluation questions for each of the messages viewed. The three questions asked subjects to indicate how persuasive the ad was to them, whether they liked the way it delivered its message, and finally, whether they thought the communication was a good one. Those booklets presenting the Yardley ad first also listed the Yardley personal reaction items before those for the U.S.O. The U.S.O. personal reaction items were presented first in those booklets in which this message type was initially seen.

The personal reaction section was followed by the Yardley and U.S.O. behavioral disposition questionnaires. These questionnaires were also presented in the order in which the ad types had been placed in the booklet.

Procedure

At the end of a normal class hour students were asked to volunteer to stay very briefly and fill out a short questionnaire for the industrial psychology department. Four classes were used with the majority of students in the sections volunteering to participate. Booklets representing eight different combinations of persuasiveness and order of presentation were then randomly distributed to students. On the first page of all booklets Ss were given the same instructions for the experimental task. Subjects were informed that the primary purpose of the study was to obtain their opinion of the persuasiveness of a series of
ads for Yardley After Shave and the U.S.O. It was also stated that since peoples ratings tend to be influenced by whether they approve or disapprove of the message subject, Ss would be asked to indicate their personal opinions of the product and service advocated. The purpose of these instructions was to emphasize the importance of the personal response questions, as opposed to the principle dependent measures, response to the U.S.O. and Yardley behavioral disposition questionnaires. In this manner E attempted to mask the true purpose of the experiment.

After subjects had read the instructions their classroom instructor told them to work straight through the booklet, and not refer back to ads previously read, or questionnaires that had already been filled out. Preceeding the behavioral disposition questionnaires, a brief paragraph again reiterated the deception that the purpose of the questions was to control for the effect on peoples ratings of their personal opinion of the product or service advertised.

Results

To determine the extent to which the three U.S.O. and Yardley personal reaction statements were measuring a similar construct, item scores were intercorrelated. Using Fisher's r to z transform an average r was obtained. This average score between the three personal reaction items was .76 for the U.S.O. group and .80 for
the Yardley questions. In light of these high inter-item correlations, scores on the three personal reaction statements were simply summed to yield a total personal reaction score to a particular ad.

Two $2 \times 2 \times 2$ unweighted means analyses of variance were then performed on the U.S.O. and Yardley total personal reaction scores (Tables X and XI). The main effects in this analysis were: booklet order, whether the Yardley or U.S.O. communication appeared first; ads, referring to the previous scaling of messages as either relatively high or low persuasive; and pairing, since within a booklet each ad was presented in combination with either the relatively high or low persuasive communication of the other type. The use of an unweighted mean analysis was required since an unequal number of male subjects responded to the eight different treatments. In all four of the analyses of variance to be reported in this chapter the n per cell was never less than five nor greater than eleven.

Results indicated that differences in personal reaction between the relatively high and low persuasive Yardley and U.S.O. ads were very weak. The F for this effect was less than one in the case of the U.S.O. ads and 1.866 (df 1,63, p<.18) for the Yardley group. Table XII lists the means for the relatively high and low persuasive stimuli on the dependent variables used in this section of the experiment. From the table it can be seen that although the differences were quite small, messages previously defined as high persuasive did, on the average, receive a more favorable evaluation than the low persuasive ads. Such slight
### TABLE X

**U.S.O. Three Way Unweighted Means Analysis of Variance**

*for the Total Personal Reaction Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Booklet order</td>
<td>21.267</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.267</td>
<td>1.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairing</td>
<td>43.760</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.760</td>
<td>2.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ads</td>
<td>7.377</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.377</td>
<td>.4603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bko. x pairing</td>
<td>27.693</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.693</td>
<td>1.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bko x ads</td>
<td>28.187</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.187</td>
<td>1.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bko x pa x ads</td>
<td>2.846</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.846</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>993.726</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16.027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XI

**Yardley Three Way Unweighted Means Analysis of Variance**

*for the Total Personal Reaction Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Booklet order</td>
<td>18.516</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.516</td>
<td>1.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairing</td>
<td>20.913</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.913</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ads</td>
<td>32.503</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.503</td>
<td>1.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bko x pairing</td>
<td>252.943</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>252.943</td>
<td>14.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bko x ads</td>
<td>15.667</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.667</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bko x pa x ads</td>
<td>10.665</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.665</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1097.376</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
differences in personal reaction might be attributed either to the fact that ads, defined as high or low persuasive relative to each other, were not really that different, or to a lack of sensitivity of the personal reaction questions.

TABLE XII
Average of the Cell Means of Ads Previously Scaled as High or Low Persuasive on the Two Dependent Variables, Personal Reaction and Behaviorally Oriented Questionnaire. A Higher Score Indicates a More Favorable Evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>U.S.O.</th>
<th>Yardley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal reaction</td>
<td>15.86</td>
<td>14.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Behaviorally oriented | 53.25     | 48.99      | 36.43      | 36.95     

The Yardley booklet x pairing interaction effect was highly significant ($F=14.521$, df 1,62, $p<.003$). This effect can largely be attributed to a reversal in relative message evaluation for those subjects who saw the high persuasive U.S.O. ad before they read either of the Yardley communications. These subjects on the whole tended to evaluate the low persuasive ad more favorably than the high persuasive message. Ss in all other order x pairing groups reacted more positively to the high persuasive ad.

Two three way (booklet order x pairing x ads) unweighted means analyses of variance were conducted on the total scores obtained from the behavioral disposition questionnaires (Tables XIII and XIV).
### TABLE XIII

U.S.O. Three Way Unweighted Means Analysis of Variance for the Total Behavioral Disposition Questionnaire Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>M.S.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Booklet order</td>
<td>399.368</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>399.368</td>
<td>4.009 p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairing</td>
<td>67.786</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67.787</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ads</td>
<td>302.264</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>302.264</td>
<td>3.034 p&lt;.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bko x pairing</td>
<td>1.855</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.855</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bko x ads</td>
<td>89.186</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89.186</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bko x pa x ads</td>
<td>2.455</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.455</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>6247.675</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>99.598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XIV

Yardley Three Way Unweighted Means Analysis of Variance for the Total Behavioral Disposition Questionnaire Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>M.S.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Booklet order</td>
<td>135.142</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135.143</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairing</td>
<td>178.191</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178.191</td>
<td>2.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ads</td>
<td>2.828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.828</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bko x pairing</td>
<td>385.469</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>385.469</td>
<td>5.705 p&lt;.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bko x ads</td>
<td>36.759</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.759</td>
<td>.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bko x pa x ads</td>
<td>2.190</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.190</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>4256.023</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67.555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the case of the U.S.O. group the difference between ads yielded an F of 3.034 which was marginally significant at the .09 level. Reference to Table XII also shows this difference to have occurred in the predicted direction, with the message previously scaled as high persuasive being more favorably evaluated. The main effect for ads in the Yardley group was not significant, resulting in an F less than one. In fact, as can be seen from Table XII, the message previously scaled as low persuasive received a very slightly more favorable evaluation than the ad which had been defined as high persuasive. In the four high versus low persuasive comparisons within Table XII this was the only case in which such a pattern occurred. These results were influenced, however, by the fact that the booklet order by pairing interaction was again significant (F=5.705, df 1,63, p<.02). As can be seen from Table XV, in booklets where the Yardley ad was viewed first, the ad scaled as high persuasive was in one case viewed more favorably and in the other as quite similar to the low persuasive ad. If, however, the U.S.O. message was viewed first, the Yardley ad scaled as low persuasive was evaluated much more favorably than the stimulus which was predicted to be high persuasive. Such a result was definitely not expected and might be attributed to some difference in the perception of Yardley ads when they were preceded by the U.S.O. message. Due to this interaction, which was an artifact of the manner in which stimuli were presented, the Yardley data was not considered to afford a suitable test of a main effect difference
Cell Means for the Three Way Yardley Behavioral Disposition Questionnaire Analysis (Ads x Pairing x Order), A Higher Score Indicates a More Favorable Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADS</th>
<th>high pers.</th>
<th>low pers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yardley PAIRING with high pers. U.S.O.</td>
<td>42.111</td>
<td>42.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>w. low pers. U.S.O.</td>
<td>35.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yardley PAIRING with high pers. U.S.O.</td>
<td>33.286</td>
<td>35.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>w. low pers. U.S.O.</td>
<td>35.222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the analysis of the U.S.O. behavioral disposition scores, the main effect of booklet order (F=4.009, dg 1,63, p<.05) was found to be significant. This effect was due to a more favorable evaluation of both the high and low persuasive U.S.O. messages, when these ads appeared in the booklet before the Yardley communications.

In this final section of the experiment, then, a between subjects analysis of the personal reaction scores indicated a more favorable reaction to those ads defined through the net counter-argumentation technique as being relatively high persuasive. The differences between these ads were not strong, never attaining customarily accepted significance levels, but were in the expected direction. Analysis of the Yardley behavioral disposition scores yielded an insignificant main effect for ads. Interpretation of
this failure to replicate the previous scaling of advertisements was, however, hampered by a significant order by pairing interaction (an effect also noted in the Yardley personal reaction analysis). Interpretation of the U.S.O. data, however, was not complicated by such an interaction, and in this case results were in the predicted direction. The U.S.O. message which had been scaled as high persuasive via the net counterargumentation technique was evaluated more favorably on the behavioral disposition questionnaire. The difference between the high and low persuasive U.S.O. communications was not that strong, being significant at the .09 level. Such a significance level, would seem acceptable, however, when it is remembered that the indicated difference between U.S.O. ads in the net counterargumentation scaling section was also weak (p<.08).
CHAPTER VII
DISCUSSION

Various researchers have suggested that a subject's ongoing responses while attending to a communication might be a critical factor in determining persuasive impact. Several theories, ranging from Festinger and Maccoby's (1964) discussion of counter-argumentation to Greenwald's (1968) consideration of cognitive response, have pointed, for different reasons, to the importance of a subject's subvocal reactions to a message.

This researcher accepted the importance of such reactions and hypothesized that the persuasive impact of a message is highly related to its net counterargumentation score, the number of positive relative to negative arguments which it elicits. Implied within this hypothesis, then, is a view of the communication recipient as being actively involved in a process of acceptance and rejection while considering a message. Frequently we hear that one message is "better" than another, even though both messages advocate the same position via similar arguments. Advertisers, for example, frequently spend much time and effort pretesting similar communications to determine which will best present their product. If this common assumption of differences in persuasiveness is correct, and if level of net counter-
argumentation is an important indicator of message impact, then net counterargumentation scores should vary within a series of similar but differingly persuasive ads. In the event that a systematic differentiation was found within a group of messages, added support would be offered to those postulating the importance to attitude change of a mediating process such as net counter-argumentation. The fact that such a measure could be used to determine persuasiveness would also have great practical importance. As has already been noted advertisers frequently attempt to select the best of a very similar group of ads. The practical advantage of a net counterargumentation pretest technique would seem to lie in the fact that by analyzing responses, a researcher could arrive at not only a total rating of impact, but also a determination of the strong and weak parts of a message.

The first section of this experiment was concerned with determining whether a measure of net counterargumentation could discriminate within groups of similar, professionally written, product and public service advertisements. The use of professionally constructed messages was, of course, a rather severe test of the net counterargumentation hypothesis, since it could be expected that expertly written messages using similar arguments would not differ radically in impact. Results indicated that a net counter-argumentation measure did discriminate within both groups of ads. The differences between ads in these groups were not strong but
this can be attributed to the similarity of arguments presented. Net elicited counterargumentation scores were also found to be significantly related to other frequently used forms of attitude measurement. A degree of convergent validity was thus shown to exist for a net counterargumentation score approach. An examination of interrater reliability also revealed a further practical argument for the adoption of such a measure. Not only is the coding procedure easy to apply, but in both the present study and that by Osterhouse and Brock (1970), in which only counterarguments were considered, a high degree of interrater reliability was obtained.

In concluding this part of the experiment, further support has been lent to those theorists who stress the importance of a subject's ongoing positive and negative responses to a persuasive communication. Further, this support was obtained through an experiment whose design and stimuli were somewhat different than those used by previous researchers in this area. Results from the first part of this investigation suggested that a measure of net counterargumentation would be useful in a communication pretest situation. Since mass communications are often used in an attempt to change audience behavior, an important additional question concerns the possibility of a relationship between net counterargumentation and later behavior. No published research has yet considered this question. Surveys of the literature dealing with attitude and behavior, however,
have indicated no necessary relationship between these two factors (cf Festinger 1964). This part of the study, then, attempted to determine whether a relationship might exist between a measure of net counterargumentation and later behavior.

In the second section of the experiment two behavioral disposition questionnaires were empirically constructed. Behavioral disposition questionnaires were used as a means of approximating the ultimate, and not readily available, criterion of actual behavior.

The third, and final section, allowed E to determine whether ads defined as relatively high or low persuasive produced differing scores on the behaviorally oriented questionnaires, and a short three item personal reaction instrument.

Analysis of the personal reaction scores indicated non significant differences between high and low persuasive ads in the two groups. In both cases, however, mean evaluation for the high persuasive ad was more favorable than that of the low persuasive message.

Results for the U.S.O. group on the behavioral disposition questionnaire analysis, indicated that the ad scaled as high persuasive received a more favorable rating than the low persuasive message. Differences between these ads were again only marginally significant (p < .09), but this can be attributed to the fact that the original scaling section of this experiment had indicated that the ads were not that different (the initial difference between ads being significant at only the .08 level). Since the messages
used mentioned the same general points, it can be said that varying behavioral disposition scores indicate the high persuasive message was more successful in getting it's arguments across.

The main effect difference for ads in the Yardley behavioral disposition questionnaire analysis was not significant, yielding an F less than one. The presence of an interaction effect, however, stemming from the manner in which stimuli were presented, complicated the interpretation of these results (a similar interaction was found in the Yardley personal reaction analysis). The interaction effect was rather weak, yielding a $\omega^2$ of .063, but it was the strongest component in the analysis. It is surprising that such an effect did occur and at the present time will just be attributed to a different perception of the Yardley ads when they are preceded by a U.S.O. message. The existence of such an interaction does point to possible inherent problems in the attempt to predict the impact of a communication outside of the context in which the actual message is to be presented.

Summarizing the second part of this study, the determination of persuasiveness made via the net counterargumentation technique was confirmed through a behavioral disposition retest in which an interaction involving manner of presentation of the stimuli was not present. Due to the fact that only two groups of ads were sampled, that in one group differences in ads were not obtained, and that a behavioral disposition questionnaire is only an attempt to approximate actual behavior, no definite conclusion
regarding the relationship between net counterargumentation scores and later behavior could be drawn at this time. Further research, especially in light of the applicability of a measure of net counterargumentation as a pretest technique, is necessary. Reviewing the experiment as a whole, it may be said that the findings obtained strongly suggest that communication induced attitude change is related to responses made by subjects while attending to a message.
APPENDIX A

Basic text of U.S.O. Ad 11 divided into the four sections in which the material was presented and followed by a reduced reproduction of the ad itself.
1. HE CAN'T DO IT ALONE
He's one of 2,750,000 Americans in uniform today. But--he's just a kid, and he's thousands of miles from home. Away from home for the first time, maybe. Just a kid...and given a man's job to do.

2. The tough job of patrolling an uneasy peace on the frontiers of the world. Maybe his is a vigil in Berlin...a watch on the fringe of the Arctic Circle.

3. Maybe he isn't shooting or dodging bullets. But he might be...any minute. Right now, he's just waiting. Tension and tedium are his bitterest foes. Now, as never before, he needs the spiritual lift and warm comfort the USO can give--in many strange and alien places where American men and women in uniform serve America.

4. But--what if the USO can't reach him? It means one thing: There isn't enough money coming into the Community Chest and United Fund. It's up to you to help the USO help him. Remember--He's your investment in freedom. Don't short-change him. Support the USO at home and abroad through your local Community Chest or United Fund.
He can’t do it alone

He’s one of 2,750,000 Americans in uniform today. But—he’s just a kid, and he’s thousands of miles from home. Away from home for the first time, maybe. Just a kid... and given a man’s job to do.

The tough job of patrolling an uneasy peace on the frontiers of the world. Maybe his is a vigil in Berlin... a watch on the fringe of the Arctic Circle. Maybe he isn’t shooting or dodging bullets. But he might be... any minute.

Right now, he’s just waiting. Tension and tedium are his bitterest foes.

Now, as never before, he needs the spiritual lift and warm comfort the USO can give. And does give—in many strange and alien places where American men and women in uniform serve America.

But—what if the USO can’t reach him? It means one thing: There isn’t enough money coming into the Community Chest and United Fund. It’s up to you to help the USO help him. Remember—

He’s your investment in freedom. Don’t shortchange him.

Support the USO at home and abroad through your local Community Chest or United Fund.
APPENDIX B

Basic text of U.S.O. Ad 13 divided into the four sections in which the material was presented and followed by a reduced reproduction of the ad itself.
1. **U.S.O. IS THERE ONLY IF YOU CARE...**
   Who is the lonely guardian? Maybe he's your son, your brother, your fiance, or the kid from the next block.

2. Whatever his name, he's one of the 2,500,000 young people flung out across the world to guard our freedoms. One from every 18 American families, serving at the very edge of danger--waiting, lonely, far from home.

3. How good to know that wherever in the world he serves, he'll find the U.S.O.! Bringing a touch of home to men and women far from theirs, with 197 friendly clubs. Bringing joy and laughter with traveling camp shows, to the loneliest outposts on earth. If they're there...so is the U.S.O.

4. But the U.S.O. is there only if you care. U.S.O. gets no government funds; it depends entirely on personal contributions. Every dollar comes from people who care, who are grateful, who give through their United Fund or Community Chest. This year--tell them you care. GIVE! The U.S.O. is supported by your United Fund or Community Chest.
Who is the lonely guardian? Maybe he's your son, your brother, your fiancé, or the kid from the next block. Whatever his name, he's one of 2,500,000 young people flung out across the world to guard our freedoms. One from every 18 American families, serving at the very edge of danger—waiting, lonely, far from home.

How good to know that wherever in the world he serves, he'll find the U.S.O.! Bringing a touch of home to men and women far from theirs, with 197 friendly clubs. Bringing joy and laughter with traveling camp shows, to the loneliest outposts on earth. If they're there . . . so is the U.S.O.

But U.S.O. is there only if you care. U.S.O. gets no government funds; it depends entirely on personal contributions. Every dollar comes from people who care, who are grateful, who give through their United Fund or Community Chest. This year—tell them you care. GIVE! The U.S.O. is supported by your gift to your United Fund or Community Chest.

Published as a public service in cooperation with The Advertising Council
APPENDIX C

Basic text of U.S.O. Ad 17 divided into the four sections in which the material was presented and followed by a reduced reproduction of the ad itself.
1. **USO IS THERE...ONLY IF YOU CARE**

   Who cares if he's up to his neck in a rice paddy, six thousand miles from home? Who cares if he's lonely, at that frozen Arctic outpost? Who cares how feels, patrolling the barbed-wire edge of danger? Who cares what he does, when his ship comes to that teeming foreign port?

2. **You care**, when you give to the USO. Because USO is there, bringing the grateful handclasp from home to faraway places. Bringing entertainment and laughter to our lonelest outposts. Offering a choice of conduct in overcrowded cities and camp towns here and overseas.

3. Is USO needed today? Just ask our 2,300,000 servicemen and women, who visited our 167 clubs and 71 camp shows over 20 million times last year! Know a better way to say you're grateful to them, for helping to safeguard you?

4. Remember, civilian-supported USO depends entirely on your contribution to your local United Fund or Community Chest. Give, because USO is there, only if you care!
USO IS THERE ... ONLY IF YOU CARE

Who cares if he's up to his neck in a rice paddy, six thousand miles from home? Who cares if he's lonely, at that frozen Arctic outpost? Who cares how he feels, patrolling the barbed-wire edge of danger? Who cares what he does, when his ship comes in to that teeming foreign port? You care, when you give to USO. Because USO is there, bringing the grateful handclasp from home to faraway places. Bringing entertainment and laughter to our loneliest outposts. Offering a choice of conduct in overcrowded cities and camps here and overseas.

Is USO needed today? Just ask our 2,300,000 service men and women, who visited our 185 clubs and 21 camp shows over 20 million times last year!

Know a better way to say you're grateful to them, for helping to safeguard you? Remember, civilian-supported USO depends entirely on your contribution to your local United Fund or Community Chest. Give, because USO is there, only if you care!
APPENDIX D

Basic text of U.S.O. Ad 24 divided into the four sections in which the material was presented and followed by a reduced reproduction of the ad itself.
1. **MOM'S JUST STARTING THE BACON ABOUT NOW**

Somewhere, thousands of miles from home, a solitary boy stops to look at his GI watch. So far away that even the daylight hours differ from those at home. How does he pass the long watchful hours? Maybe he's picturing the folks, lounging before breakfast with the Sunday papers. Or maybe he's looking forward to relaxing soon at a nearby USO. If there is a USO nearby.

2. Far too often...due to a lack of funds, lonely GI's are being deprived of the vital warmth...spiritual lift...the homey touch that USO can bring them.

3. Today, over 2,750,000 Americans are in uniform. Over half are under 25. Many, away from home for the first time. Those kids need USO. And USO needs your help to reach them.

4. Remember, you're helping your boy or girl in uniform by helping the USO. Not one of them should wonder—even for a minute... "DOES ANYBODY KNOW I'M HERE?" Support the USO through United Fund or your Community Chest.
1. MOM'S JUST STARTING THE BACON ABOUT NOW
   Somewhere, thousands of miles from home, a solitary boy stops to look at his GI watch. So far away that even the daylight hours differ from those at home. How does he pass the long watchful hours? Maybe he's picturing the folks, lounging before breakfast with the Sunday papers. Or maybe he's looking forward to relaxing soon at a nearby USO. If there is a USO nearby.

2. Far too often...due to a lack of funds, lonely GI's are being deprived of the vital warmth...spiritual lift...the homely touch that USO can bring them.

3. Today, over 2,750,000 Americans are in uniform. Over half are under 25. Many, away from home for the first time. Those kids need USO. And USO needs your help to reach them.

4. Remember, you're helping your boy or girl in uniform by helping the USO. Not one of them should wonder—even for a minute..."DOES ANYBODY KNOW I'M HERE?" Support the USO through United Fund or your Community Chest.
Mom's just starting the bacon about now

Somewhere, thousands of miles from home, a solitary boy stops to look at his GI watch. So far away that even the daylight hours differ from those at home. How does he pass the long watchful hours? Maybe he's picturing the folks, lounging before breakfast with the Sunday papers. Or maybe he's looking forward to relaxing soon at a nearby USO. If there is a USO nearby.

Far too often . . . due to a lack of funds, lonely GI's are being deprived of the vital warmth . . . spiritual lift . . . the homey touch that USO can bring them.

Today, over 2,750,000 Americans are in uniform. Over half are under 25. Many, away from home for the first time. Those kids need USO. And USO needs your help to reach them.

Remember, you're helping your boy or girl in uniform by helping the USO. Not one of them should wonder—even for a minute . . .

"Does Anybody Know I'm Here?"

Support the USO through United Fund or your Community Chest.
APPENDIX E

Basic text of U.S.O. Ad 33 divided into the four sections in which the material was presented and followed by a reduced reproduction of the ad itself.
1. HIS LONGEST DAY
It's his first day on guard duty, and he's just a kid. While he's out there walking post, maybe thousands of miles from home, he realizes suddenly he has a man's job to do.

2. The **tough** job of patrolling an uneasy peace. Maybe it isn't a shooting war. But it might be--any time. So he's on the alert...all the time. That's why, in his off-duty hours, he needs the relaxation...the spiritual lift the USO can give him.

3. But, to keep its doors open to every American kid in uniform, the USO needs your help. It's up to you to see that there's enough money in Community Chest and United Fund to help the USO help him.

4. Remember--He's your investment in freedom. Don't shortchange him. Support the USO at home and abroad through your local United Fund or Community Chest.
His longest day

It's his first day on guard duty, and he's just a kid. While he's out there walking post, maybe thousands of miles from home, he realizes suddenly he has a man's job to do.

The tough job of patrolling an uneasy peace. Maybe it isn't a shooting war. But it might be—any time. So he's on the alert... all the time.

That's why, in his off-duty hours, he needs the relaxation... the spiritual lift the USO can give him. But, to keep its doors open to every American kid in uniform, the USO needs your help.

It's up to you to see that there's enough money in Community Chest and United Fund to help the USO help him. Remember—

He's your investment in freedom. Don't shortchange him

Support the USO at home and abroad through your local United Fund or Community Chest.
APPENDIX F

Basic text of Yardley Ad 11 divided into the four sections in which the material was presented and followed by a reduced reproduction of the ad itself.
1. THE LEAST IMPORTANT THING IS ITS FAMOUS FRAGRANCE
Yardley After-Shaving Lotion happens to smell great. Clean. Manly.
And extraordinarily refreshing.

2. But that isn't only its purpose. Yardley After-Shaving Lotion also performs several vital skin care functions. It helps heal nicks, chase bacteria and prevent infection. It keeps your skin lubricated, moist and comfortable. It acts as a brisk after-shave stimulant.

3. And it probably does these things more effectively than any lotion you've ever tried. Because Yardley After-Shaving Lotion contains an impressive selection of modern ingredients. There's a special healing agent that aids the growth of replacement cells, does away with dead tissues; a unique, high-powered bacteria check designed to protect the health of your skin;

4. humectants to help replace the natural youthful moisture that's lost with the years.
The least important thing is its famous fragrance.

Yardley After-Shaving Lotion happens to smell great. Clean. Manly. And extraordinarily refreshing.

But that isn't its only purpose.

Yardley After-Shaving Lotion also performs several vital skin care functions. It helps heal nicks, chase bacteria and prevent infection. It keeps your skin lubricated, moist and comfortable. It acts as a brisk after-shave stimulant.

And it probably does these things more effectively than any lotion you've ever tried. Because Yardley After-Shaving Lotion contains an impressive selection of modern ingredients. There's a special healing agent that aids the growth of replacement cells, does away with dead tissues; a unique, high-powered bacteria check designed to protect the health of your skin; humectants to help replace the natural youthful moisture that's lost with the years.
APPENDIX G

Basic text of Yardley Ad 13 divided into the four sections in which the material was presented and followed by a reduced reproduction of the ad itself.
1. **THIS AFTER-SHAVING LOTION IS NO LUXURY!**
   It's a necessity for almost every man who shaves 365 times a year. Here's why: Many men believe that after-shave lotion is just a nice little touch to indulge in now and then. But a good after-shave, like Yardley's After-Shaving Lotion, does much more than just refresh your face.

2. Yardley's good, rich emollients check the skin irritation that can build up from everyday shaving... and soothe all the soreness out of skin roughed up by the razor.

3. Its special healing agents go to work on cuts and nicks. And its gentle, effective antisepetics never ever give infection a chance to start. Of course, Yardley's pleasant, invigorating feeling starts a day off just right.

4. But don't let this happiness fool you. Yardley was created to solve the problems shaving can bring. And after-shave with every shave is the golden rule. Use Yardley regularly and it will not only ease your skin back into shape with each shave, it will also condition your skin for future shaves.
THIS AFTER-SHAVING LOTION IS NO LUXURY!

IT'S A NECESSITY FOR ALMOST EVERY MAN WHO SHAVES 365 TIMES A YEAR. HERE'S WHY:

Many men believe that after-shave lotion is just a nice little touch to indulge in now and then. But a good after-shave, like Yardley's After-Shaving Lotion, does much more than just freshen your face. Yardley's good, rich emollients check the skin irritation that can build up from everyday shaving...and soothe all the soreness out of skin roughed up by the razor. Its special healing agents go to work on cuts and nicks. And its gentle, effective antiseptics never give infection a chance to start.

Of course, Yardley's pleasant, invigorating feeling starts a day off just right. But don't let this happiness fool you. Yardley was created to solve the problems shaving can bring. And after-shave with every shave is the golden rule. Use Yardley regularly and it will not only save your skin back into shape with each shave, it will also condition your skin for future shaves.
APPENDIX H

Basic text of Yardley Ad 17 divided into the four sections in which the material was presented and followed by a reduced reproduction of the ad itself.
1. ARE ALCOHOL AND A NICE FRAGRANCE ALL YOU CAN EXPECT IN AN AFTER-SHAVE?

2. Not in Yardley's. Besides its famous fragrance and a measure of refreshing alcohol, you get a moisture ingredient designed to keep your face feeling taut or chapped.

3. A high-powered bacteria check that helps prevent infections and irritations from shaving. A healing agent that actually helps heal shaving nicks and scrapes.

4. And a lubricant that replaces some of the natural oils you shave away every day. What's surprising is that Yardley can add so many beneficial qualities to their After Shaving Lotion...and still come up smelling like YARDLEY.
Are alcohol and a nice fragrance all you can expect in an after-shave?

Not in Yardley's. Besides its famous fragrance and a measure of refreshing alcohol, you get a moisture ingredient designed to keep your face from feeling taut or chapped. A high-powered bacteria check that helps prevent infections and irritations from shaving. A healing agent that actually helps heal shaving nicks and scrapes. And a lubricant that replaces some of the natural oils you shave away every day. What's surprising is that Yardley can add so many beneficial qualities to their After Shaving Lotion . . . and still come up smelling like YARDLEY.
APPENDIX I

Basic text of Yardley Ad 24 divided into the four sections in which the material was presented and followed by a reduced reproduction of the ad itself.
1. **THERE'S MORE TO THIS THAN MEETS THE NOSE.**
   Fragrance is only one part of this after-shave.

2. It contains extra ingredients to perform half-a-dozen important jobs. A healing agent, to help cope with shaving nicks and scrapes.

3. A soothing emollient to keep your face from feeling chapped or taut. A special high-grade alcohol to refresh your skin.

4. Even a bacteria check to help fight infections that result from shaving. Put all these elements plus a fine fragrance into one bottle—and you've got a first-rate after shaving lotion. It's called YARILEY.
There's more to this than meets the nose.

Fragrance is only one part of this after-shave. It contains extra ingredients to perform half-a-dozen important jobs. A healing agent, to help cope with shaving nicks and scrapes. A soothing emollient to keep your face from feeling chapped or tight. A special high-grade alcohol to refresh your skin. Even a bacteria check to help fight infections that result from shaving. Put all these elements plus a fine fragrance into one bottle—and you've got a first-rate after shaving lotion. It's called Yardley.
APPENDIX J

Basic text of Yardley Ad 33 divided into the four sections in which the material was presented and followed by a reduced reproduction of the ad itself.
1. A world-famous barber says: "SOME MEN SERIOUSLY NEED AFTER-SHAVING LOTION. SOME DON'T." DO YOU?
Charles De Zemler, the internationally admired barber, has seen many a close shave. "I've shaved princes and thieves (only rich ones, of course)," says De Zemler, "and I can tell you that there are as many types of skin as there are men. To some men, after-shaving lotion is no luxury!

2. "If, for instance, you live in a hot climate, you probably have more sensitive skin than the man up North. Or, if you shave with an electric razor that passes over and over your skin, you need the healing agents and emollients in a really good after-shaving lotion.

3. You need that conditioning, too, if your beard is heavy and you shave often...or if you use brushless or aerosol foam instead of natural soap lathers."

4. About the best conditioning your skin can get, today, is in Yardley After-Shaving Lotion, a blend of the latest healing agents and most effective emollients. No matter how you shave you'll find it's a big help.
A world-famous barber says: 

"Some men seriously need after-shaving lotion. Some don't." Do you?

Charles De Zemler, the internationally admired barber, has seen many a close shave. "I've shaved princes and thieves (only rich ones, of course)," says De Zemler, "and I can tell you that there are as many types of skin as there are men. To some men, after-shaving lotion is no luxury.

"If, for instance, you live in a hot climate, you probably have more sensitive skin than the man up North. Or, if you shave with an electric razor that passes over and over your skin, you need the healing agents and emollients in a really good after-shaving lotion. You need that conditioning, too, if your beard is heavy and you shave often, or if you use brushless or aerosol foam instead of natural soap lathers."

About the best conditioning your skin can get, today, is in Yardley After-Shaving Lotion, a blend of the latest healing agents and most effective emollients. No matter how you shave you'll find it's a big help.

A world-famous barber says:

"Some men seriously need after-shaving lotion. Some don't." Do you?
APPENDIX K

Fishbein and Raven's A-B Scale, used as a Source of Items for one of the Dependent Measures in Stage One
Please rate the attached ad on each of the following scales. Indicate your rating by a check mark.

rational  _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:two plus six is eight
APPENDIX L

Scale on which Subjects Rated the Ads in Terms of their Persuasiveness for the Overall Population
The five ads which you have already seen will now very briefly be shown again. Rate each of the ads by a checkmark on the following nine point scales.

Ad Number 1

Low Persuasive

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

High Persuasive

Ad Number 2

Low Persuasive

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

High Persuasive

Ad Number 3

Low Persuasive

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

High Persuasive

Ad Number 4

Low Persuasive

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

High Persuasive

Ad Number 5

Low Persuasive

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

High Persuasive
APPENDIX M

Net Counterargumentation Protocol Form used by Subjects to List their Reactions to each of the ads Presented to them
After you have read a section of the advertisement I would like you to write in the blank spaces below statements reflecting your thoughts to that point about the ad. Thoughts can be any reaction at all you have to the ad or sections of it. Thus as thoughts you could express approval or disapproval of the whole ad, sections of it, or things the ad reminds you of. You might also indicate if there are any points in the ad which you don't understand.

Basically we'd like you to write down all thoughts you have while reading this ad. Don't worry about spelling, punctuation or grammar.

Although the ad is presented to you in parts, when writing your ideas you can refer to either the new part you have just seen or any previous old parts.

PART 1

thought-__________________________

________________________________________

thought-__________________________

________________________________________

thought-__________________________

________________________________________

thought-__________________________

________________________________________

thought-__________________________

________________________________________

PART 2

thought-__________________________

________________________________________

thought-__________________________

________________________________________
PART 3

thought-________________________________________

thought-________________________________________

thought-________________________________________

thought-________________________________________

PART 4

thought-________________________________________

thought-________________________________________
thought-

thought-

thought-

thought-
APPENDIX N

Instruction Sheet for the A-B Semantic Differential Scale
The purpose of this study is to measure the meanings of certain ads to various people by having them judge them against a series of descriptive scales. In taking this test please make your judgements on the basis of what these scales mean to you.

Here is how you are to use these scales:

If you feel that the ad is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

graceful $\begin{array}{cccccc}\text{X} & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\text{awkward} & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots
\end{array}$
or

graceful $\begin{array}{cccccc} \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \text{X} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\text{awkward} & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots
\end{array}$

If you feel that the ad is quite closely related to one end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your check-mark as follows:

strong $\begin{array}{cccccc}\text{X} & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\text{weak} & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots
\end{array}$
or

strong $\begin{array}{cccccc} \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \text{X} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\text{weak} & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots
\end{array}$

If the ad seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should check as follows:

active $\begin{array}{cccccc} \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \text{X} & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\text{passive} & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots
\end{array}$
or

active $\begin{array}{cccccc} \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \text{X} & \vdots & \vdots \\
\text{passive} & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots
\end{array}$

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the ad you're judging. If you consider the advertisement to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the ad, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, unrelated to the advertisement, then you should place your check-mark in the middle space:

honest $\begin{array}{cccccc} \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \text{X} & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\text{dishonest} & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots
\end{array}$

IMPORTANT: (1) Place your check-marks in the middle of spaces, not on the boundaries.

\begin{array}{cccccc}\text{this} & \vdots & \text{not this} & \vdots & \vdots \\
\vdots & \text{X} & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\end{array}
(2) Be sure you check every scale for every ad—do not omit any.

(3) Never put more than one check-mark on a single scale.

Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your first impressions, the immediate feelings about the items, that we want. On the other hand, please do not be careless, because we want your true impressions.
APPENDIX O

Pretest Questionnaire Filled out by Forty-two Male Subjects, with t Scores Obtained by Comparing Groups Indicating Favorable or Unfavorable Behavioral Dispositions. Items Preceded by an Asterisk were Selected for the Experimental Questionnaire
The purpose of this study is to determine the actual opinions of people toward various products and services which have been, or will be, advertised nationally.

All information obtained by this questionnaire will definitely be kept anonymous. You are asked to give your name simply as a way of keeping the various questionnaires in order.

In the first section we would like you to state your personal opinions concerning Yardley After Shave. If you are not personally familiar with the product fill out this questionnaire as best you can on the basis of impressions you have about it.

Please answer all the items. Indicate your response to each question by a check mark. Do not mark between spaces to indicate an in-between type of rating. Thus if two spaces were provided for a Yes or No type of rating (e.g. Yes __, No __) you can mark either Yes or No, but not in-between the two spaces to show an intermediate or maybe type of rating. Most of the statements are followed by 7 spaces and the words agree—disagree. In these questions the space you check indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with what has been said. Thus if you answered

Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Disagree

you would indicate a high degree of agreement with the statement. A response of this nature
Disagree ___.___.____ X ___ Agree

would also indicate agreement but not quite as high as before.

A check on the disagree side would, of course, indicate some
tendency to disagree. Watch closely to see which ends the words
agree and disagree are on, since they switch back and forth.

Do you presently use Yardley After Shave?

Yes___, No___ (1)____

Within the past year have you purchased Yardley
After Shave?

No____, Yes___ (2)____

If buying an after shave would you consider
purchasing Yardley?

Would
seriously ___.___._____, seriously (3)____
consider ___.___._____, consider

*Yardley solves many of the problems shaving
can cause.

Disagree ___.___._____, Agree *(4) 1.33 (40)

Good fragrance is the most important thing
about an after shave.

Agree ___.___._____, Disagree (5) -.90 (40)

Only older people would use Yardley After Shave.

Disagree ___.___._____, Agree (6)-1.27 (40)

*Yardley is a brisk after shave stimulant.

Agree ___.___._____, Disagree (7)-2.85 (39)

Yardley is not a masculine after shave.

Disagree ___.___._____, Agree (8) -.97 (40)
The emollient ingredients in Yardley are an
important plus,

Agree _______ Disagree (9) \( t = -0.81 \) df (40)

*Yardley performs important skin care functions.

Disagree _______ Agree (10) \( t = 1.58 \) (40)

After shave is bad for the skin.

Agree _______ Disagree (11) \( t = 0.17 \) (40)

Yardley is an above average after shave.

Disagree _______ Agree (12) \( t = -1.85 \) (40)

*Most men would like Yardley after shave.

Agree _______ Disagree (13) \( t = -2.94 \) (40)

At 1.25 a bottle Yardley is overpriced.

Disagree _______ Agree (14) \( t = 0.88 \) (40)

Healing ingredients are an important part of
an after shave.

Agree _______ Disagree (15) \( t = -1.20 \) (40)

*Yardley is just another gimmick after shave.

Disagree _______ Agree (16) \( t = -2.07 \) (40)

*Yardley After Shave contains high quality
ingredients.

Agree _______ Disagree (17) \( t = -1.45 \) (40)

Yardley is more of a medicine than an after shave.

Disagree _______ Agree (18) \( t = 0.61 \) (40)

*Using Yardley After Shave would start the day
off right.

Agree _______ Disagree (19) \( t = -1.52 \) (40)
Yardley is the best after shave.

Disagree ___________ Agree *(20) 1.67 (40)

After shave is not important for the average man.

Agree ___________ Disagree (21) -.70 (40)

Women like the scent of Yardley.

Disagree ___________ Agree (22) 1.25 (39)

*I would recommend that a friend try Yardley After Shave.

Agree ___________ Disagree *(23) -2.36 (40)

It is a good idea to look for more in an after shave than fragrance.

Disagree ___________ Agree (24) -.43 (40)

Yardley After Shave would make a nice gift.

Agree ___________ Disagree (25) -.30 (40)

After shaving, Yardley does not help rebuild the skin.

Disagree ___________ Agree (26) -.11 (40)

*Yardley does not contain more healing agents than other after shaves.

Agree ___________ Disagree *(27) 3.10 (40)

Yardley is a good smelling after shave.

Disagree ___________ Agree (28) .73 (40)
In the following section we would like you to indicate your opinion of the U.S.O. and your feelings about helping such an organization through contributions to the Community Chest and the United Fund. Again answer every question, indicating with a check mark your decision.

If asked, I would contribute to the support of the U.S.O.

Disagree ___________ Agree (1)

Knowing that the United Fund and Community Chest support the U.S.O. makes me more likely to contribute to these charities.

Agree ___________ Disagree (2)

I would like to help the work of the U.S.O.

Disagree ___________ Agree (3)

A civilian supported U.S.O. is probably a bad idea.

Agree ___________ Disagree (4) 1.63 (30)

The U.S.O. gives warmth and comfort to our men in uniform.

Disagree ___________ Agree (5) 1.78 (30)

*The U.S.O. should reduce its services.

Agree ___________ Disagree *(6) 2.61 (30)

Our men need the benefits supplied by the U.S.O.

Disagree ___________ Agree (7) 1.42 (30)

The U.S.O. is where it's needed most.

Agree ___________ Disagree (8) 1.68 (30)

*The U.S.O. does not spend the money given to it wisely.

Disagree ___________ Agree (9) 3.48 (30)
Most soldiers probably do not care about the U.S.O.

Agree __________ Disagree (10) 1.25 (30)

A contribution to the U.S.O. is a way of showing sympathy for the condition of the soldier.

Disagree __________ Agree (11) -1.10 (30)

Instead of having a U.S.O. we should just bring the troops home.

Agree __________ Disagree (12) 2.19 (30)

Most soldiers have a tough job to do.

Disagree __________ Agree (13) -1.35 (30)

*If you have friends or relatives in the military you should help them by helping the U.S.O.

Agree __________ Disagree #(14) -3.06 (30)

*I would not support the U.S.O. because it is militaristic.

Disagree __________ Agree #*(15) -3.05 (30)

*Soldiers need friends and letters from home not U.S.O. shows.

Agree __________ Disagree *(16) -3.14 (29)

*The U.S.O. provides worthwhile entertainment for our men.

Disagree __________ Agree *(17) -2.48 (30)

*Contributions to the U.S.O. are a way of indicating that we have not forgotten our troops overseas.

Agree __________ Disagree *(18) -3.59 (30)

If you are against the Vietnam war you should not support the U.S.O.

Disagree __________ Agree (19) -2.10 (30)

If I was in the military I'd want a U.S.O. there.

Agree __________ Disagree (20) -1.96 (30)

*The government should support the U.S.O. not civilians.

Disagree __________ Agree *(21) -3.82 (30)
*A gift to the U.S.O. is a way of helping the men who are serving us.*

Agree ___ , ___, ___, ___ Disagree *(22) -2.36 (30)*

Our troops overseas are not really protecting us.

Disagree ___ , ___, ___, ___ Agree (23) -1.05 (30)

*Civilians should help the U.S.O. to make the soldiers job easier.*

Agree ___ , ___, ___, ___ Disagree *(24) -2.98 (29)*

The U.S.O. can not make the soldier feel any better about being away from home.

Disagree ___ , ___, ___, ___ Agree (25) -1.69 (30)

The U.S.O. must have civilian help to remain open.

Agree ___ , ___, ___, ___ Disagree (26) -2.02 (30)

No G.I. should be deprived of the U.S.O. due to lack of funds.

Disagree ___ , ___, ___, ___ Agree (27) -1.96 (30)

The U.S.O. helps to relieve the tension and tedium at foreign outposts.

Agree ___ , ___, ___, ___ Disagree (28) -1.59 (30)
APPENDIX P

Reproduction on standard size paper of 8 page experimental (10" x 13") booklet used in the behaviorally oriented retest of scaled ads, for those booklets in which the Yardley ad was presented first the personal reaction and behaviorally oriented questions were listed before those for the U.S.O.
The purpose of this study is to get college students' actual opinions of the persuasiveness of a series of ads for Yardley After Shave and the U.S.O. After these ads have been rated for persuasiveness they will be used by the industrial psychology department in a major study of the effects of magazine advertising. On pages two and three of this booklet you will see two ads. You will then be asked to rate how persuasive or "good" the ads are by a questionnaire on page 4. This of course is the critical section of this study.

Since, however, people do tend to better like ads for products and services that they approve of, pages five and six ask you to indicate your personal opinion of Yardley and the U.S.O. This kind of information will let us know whether only people who like Yardley and the U.S.O. approve of the ad, or whether it has wider acceptance. Now, before you turn the page make sure you have filled in the information on the upper right hand corner of the sheet.

Although this booklet may seem long it should not take that much time to fill out. When you have finished turn your booklet over on the desk.
In this section two full page U.S.O. and Yardley ads were presented.
ADVERTISEMENT EVALUATION

The questions below ask for your evaluation of the two ads you have just seen. Please answer all the questions. If you feel that the ad is very closely related to one end of the scale place a checkmark as follows:

High Persuasive X,___,___,___,___ Low Persuasive

or

High Persuasive ___,___,___,___,___ X Low Persuasive

If the ad seems quite closely related to one end of the scale (but not extremely) you should place your checkmark as follows:

Very Poor Ad ___,X,___,___,___ Very Good Ad

or

Very Poor Ad ___,___,___,___,___ X,___ Very Good Ad

The direction towards which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seems most characteristic of the ad you are judging. If you consider the advertisement to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the ad, then you should place your checkmark in the middle space.

IMPORTANT: (1) Place your checkmark in the middle of the dashes not in between.

this not this

___,X,___,___,___ ___

(2) Never put more than one checkmark on a single scale.

(3) Watch the words on the end of each scale very closely since they switch back and forth.
How persuasive to you was the U.S.O. ad?

High Persuasive _____ Low Persuasive

Did you like the way the U.S.O. ad delivered its' message?

Did Not Like _____ Liked Very Much

Do you think that the U.S.O. ad is a good one?

Very Good Ad _____ Very Poor Ad

How persuasive to you was the Yardley ad?

High Persuasive _____ Low Persuasive

Did you like the way the Yardley ad delivered its' message?

Did Not Like _____ Liked Very Much

Do you think that the Yardley ad is a good one?

Very Good Ad _____ Very Poor Ad
PERSONAL OPINION

As noted before, peoples ratings of how good or bad a particular ad is tend to be influenced by what they think of the product or service advertised. To control for this the following two groups of questions ask for your present personal opinion of Yardley After Shave and the U.S.O.. As in the previous section indicate your response by a checkmark. Remember to answer all the questions.

U.S.O.

The U.S.O. should reduce its services.

Agree ___,___,___,__,___,____ Disagree

The U.S.O. does not spend the money given it wisely.

Disagree ___,___,___,__,___,____ Agree

If you have friends or relatives in the military you should help them by helping the U.S.O..

Agree ___,___,___,__,___,____ Disagree

I would not support the U.S.O. because it is militaristic.

Disagree ___,___,___,__,___,____ Agree

Soldiers need friends and letters from home not U.S.O. shows.

Agree ___,___,___,__,___,____ Disagree

The U.S.O. provides worthwhile entertainment for our men.

Disagree ___,___,___,__,___,____ Agree

Contributions to the U.S.O. are a way of indicating that we have not forgotten our men overseas.

Agree ___,___,___,__,___,____ Disagree

The government should support the U.S.O. not civilians.

Disagree ___,___,___,__,___,____ Agree
A gift to the U.S.O. is a way of helping the men who are serving us.

Agree _______ Disagree

Civilians should help the U.S.O. to make the soldiers job easier.

Disagree _______ Agree

YARDLEY

Yardley solves many of the problems shaving can cause.

Disagree _______ Agree

Yardley is a brisk after shave stimulant.

Agree _______ Disagree

Yardley performs important skin care functions.

Disagree _______ Agree

Most men would like Yardley After Shave.

Agree _______ Disagree

Yardley is just another gimmick after shave.

Disagree _______ Agree

Yardley After Shave contains high quality ingredients.

Agree _______ Disagree

Yardley is the best after shave.

Disagree _______ Agree

Using Yardley After Shave would start the day off right.

Agree _______ Disagree

I would recommend that a friend try Yardley After Shave.

Disagree _______ Agree
Yardley does not contain more healing agents than other after shaves.

Agree       Disagree

Thank you for your assistance.
APPENDIX Q

Scoring Rules Used by Raters in Evaluating Comments as Positive, Negative, or Neutral for Use in Determining Net Counterargumentation Scores.
Statements with multiple elements are broken down. Thus the statement "Picture good, slogan good, I don't like the style of type" would be broken down into a rating of 2 favorable, 1 unfavorable. When a statement contains an evaluative part and a string of descriptors, use the evaluative part simply to show direction and each of the descriptors as a separate element. Score obviously compound descriptors, such as cold and cruel as single ideas. Simply relisting what an ad is saying is not scored at all. Interrogative statements, unless they obviously reflect agreement or disagreement, are not scored.
Indicate whether each individual idea stated by a subject is favorable, unfavorable, or neutral to the message being communicated by the advertisement.

The three evaluative categories are defined as follows:

**Favorable**—Indicating acceptance or slightly qualified acceptance of, agreement with, support of, or favorable response to, elements of the ad in question, points that it is trying to make or aspects related to it.

**Unfavorable**—Indicating rejection of, slightly qualified rejection of, disagreement with, or unfavorable response to, elements of the ad in question, points that it is trying to make, or aspects related to it.

**Neutral**—Combining favorable and unfavorable elements in such a way as not to be identifiable as either favorable or unfavorable. Irrelevant ideas containing no apparent reference to either the message or relevant points.

An individual idea is one which expresses only a single fact, value, good or bad feature, thought, feeling or belief about either the position advanced by the advertisement or the ad itself. Using these scoring rules statements such as "I wouldn't buy Yardley", or "The government should support the U.S.O., not me" would both be scored as unfavorable. On the other hand a statement such as "The ad is interesting" would be rated as favorable since it reflects a positive evaluation of the ad in general.
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