

PUBLIC AFFAIRS ADVERTISING:
CORPORATE INFLUENCE, PUBLIC OPINION AND VOTE INTENTIONS
UNDER THE THIRD-PERSON EFFECT

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

Theanship School of Mass Communication

by
Anita Grace Day
B.A., University of Houston, 1993
M.M.C., Louisiana State University, 2000
December 2006

To Annabel and Lily

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people helped bring this dissertation to life. I would like to briefly acknowledge the help and support of those who contributed. First, I would like to thank my former chair, Dr. Stephen Banning for guiding the initial stages of this dissertation and theory exploration and Dr. Denis Wu for seeing it through to completion. I would like to thank each committee member for their work and significant contributions: Dr. Richard A. Nelson, Dr. Lance Porter, Dr. Lori Boyer and Dr. William Black.

Special thanks are also needed to Dr. Margaret DeFleur for her guidance and support during the process as well as Dr. Ralph Izard. I am in fact, appreciative of the support of the entire Manship School staff and faculty. The unwavering encouragement of my friends, Dr. Paul S. Lieber and Dr. Guy J. Golan are dear to me and I am thankful for their support.

Finally, I would like to recognize the personal contributions that my family have had in this process. To my daughters Lily and Annabel who sometimes fell asleep on the floor next to my feet as I worked late into the night on class papers, thank you for giving so much of your time to this endeavor. Thanks are also given to Clarke Gernon, Mila Gernon, my father and siblings for their curiosity and encouragement. As well, the love and support of my dearest one, Judd Jeansonne, is to be especially noted here. And last, I wish to thank my mother, as she always believed in me – may she rest in peace.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
ABSTRACT.....	viii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
2.1 TPE Background.....	7
2.2 TPE and the Perceptual Component.....	7
2.3 The Behavioral TPE Component.....	8
2.4 TPE Hypothesis.....	8
2.5 First-Person Effect.....	11
2.6 TPE Methods.....	12
2.7 Research Gaps.....	13
3 METHOD.....	18
3.1 The Sample.....	18
3.2 The Stimuli.....	20
3.2 The Survey Instrument.....	22
4 RESULTS.....	29
5 CONCLUSION.....	67
6 DISCUSSION.....	75
6.1 Implications.....	75
6.2 Limitations.....	77
6.3 Future Research	77
REFERENCES.....	79
APPENDIX: SURVEY INSTRUMENT.....	85
VITA.....	98

LIST OF TABLES

1. Cronbach’s α for the Positive Index (3 items) for each stimuli ad.....	24
2. Cronbach’s α for the Desire Index (2 items) for each stimuli ad.....	24
3. Cronbach’s α for the Positive Index (3 items) for each control ad	25
4. Cronbach’s α for the Desire Index (2 items) for each control ad	25
5. Cronbach’s α for the Positive/Desire Index (5 items) for each stimuli ad.....	26
6. Cronbach’s α for the Positive/Desire Index (5 items) for each control ad.....	26
7. Correlations Between Index Means and TPE Score.....	34
8. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of Advanced Fuels ad on self (N=85).....	36
9. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of Advanced Fuels ad on others (N=85).....	37
10. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of LNG ad on self (N=85).....	38
11. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of LNG ad on others (N=85).....	39
12. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of People ad on self (N=85).....	40
13. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of People ad on others (N=85).....	41
14. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of Tiger ad on self (N=85).....	42
15. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of Tiger ad on others (N=85).....	43
16. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of Malaria Initiative ad on self (N=50).....	46

17. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of Malaria Initiative ad on others (N=50).....	47
18. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of Science Education ad on self (N=50)	48
19. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of Science Education ad on others (N=50)	49
20. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of People ad on self (N=50)	51
21. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of People ad on others (N=50)	52
22. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of Tiger ad on self (N=50)	53
23. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of Tiger ad on others (N=50)	54
24. Hierarchical regression predicting likelihood to purchase from watching Malaria Initiative ad (N=50)	56
25. Hierarchical regression predicting likelihood to vote from watching Malaria Initiative ad (N=50)	57
26. Hierarchical regression predicting likelihood to purchase from watching Science Education ad (N=50)	58
27. Hierarchical regression predicting likelihood to vote from watching Science Education ad (N=50)	59
28. Hierarchical regression predicting likelihood to purchase from watching People ad (N=50)	60
29. Hierarchical regression predicting likelihood to purchase from watching Tiger ad (N=50)	61
30. Hierarchical regression predicting likelihood to purchase from watching Tiger ad (N=85)	62
31. Hierarchical regression predicting likelihood to purchase from watching People ad (N=85)	63

32. Hierarchical regression predicting likelihood to purchase from watching Advanced Fuels ad (N=85)	64
33. Hierarchical regression predicting likelihood to purchase from watching LNG ad (N=85)	65

ABSTRACT

This study examined corporate public affairs and brand awareness advertising under the third-person effect. Third-person effect studies examine the interaction between the media and its effect on public opinion. Past research in third-person effect indicates that individuals perceive that the media is more influential on others than oneself. However, recent studies find a reverse effect, where individuals perceive a greater effect on oneself when compared to others when media messages are positive and desirable to be influenced by.

Findings from this study indicate that ExxonMobil public affairs advertisements are found to be socially desirable to be influenced by and that individuals attribute a greater effect to themselves from such ads when compared to others. Further, they are likely to act on that perception in the form of purchasing ExxonMobil fuel and voting for legislation supporting the cause promoted by the corporation. These unique findings suggest that message influence is derived in part from social acceptance in general rather than one's individual assessments of media messages.

As such, corporate use of tools such as issue ads, cause related marketing and advocacy advertising are valuable when those messages are deemed socially acceptable, as they lay a foundation of support for corporate operations. Pro-social messages help build the image of a corporation as socially responsible. And the bottom line for such a reputation for corporations is the importance it has securing future sales both directly and indirectly. In other words, public affairs messages can help a company's bottom line indirectly by managing the corporation's image to ensure favorable policies toward the corporation. As well, socially responsible corporations are looked favorably upon by individuals and this perception can realize a direct increase in sales.

The implications of such findings rest in the commercial speech debate of corporations who comment on public issues and under the larger umbrella of media effects. We realize that media effects do not occur in a vacuum. They occur in social contexts. As such, as undue influence is of great concern to the debate of public salient issues, the need for responsible corporate citizens who comment in the market place of ideas is paramount.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The debate about corporate speech rights and the blur between political discourse and commercial persuasion came to a head with the *Nike v. Kasky* case in 2002 in which the California Supreme Court ruled out First Amendment protection for companies that speak out on public issues. In the *Nike v. Kasky* case, Nike was accused of false advertising, namely statements made about the conditions of workers in Nike factories. The California Supreme Court ruled against Nike's argument that its public relations statements were protected political speech, not commercial speech. The case was not heard by the U.S. Supreme Court and the case was settled out of court. We are now persuaded then to examine the congruence between corporate political speech and commercial speech in other venues, namely its interaction with the media and subsequent impact on public opinion.

With the Nike case as a backdrop, we look at image advertising among corporations as a subset of strategic management of public opinion and perceptions towards the corporation- also known as reputation management. Reputation management provides the environment, or ensures, a corporations' 'license to operate' – in which image advertising is but one tool. Other tools such as issue ads, lobbying, cause related marketing and advocacy advertising also help provide key information to strategic audiences in the hopes of laying a foundation of support for corporate operations. According to the Edelman Agency, reputation is an important asset to managing an effective corporate image. And the bottom line for reputation management is the importance it has securing future sales (Pringle & Thompson, 1999).

Corporations that successfully manage their reputation seek to market their corporate image as one that is credible and socially responsible. According to Pringle & Thompson (1999), your reputation is what you deserve. Joe Marconi illustrates this point further by

revealing that reputations are only preserved or established through behavior. “A good reputation is the result of a series of positive images and perceptions presented over a period of time, creating a history upon which a favorable opinion can be formed” (Marconi, 2002: 147). And that behavior must be communicated.

Many companies have become involved in socially-oriented message initiatives from Budweiser’s promotion of responsible drinking and driving (Szykman, Bloom & Blazing, 2004) to Dow Chemical’s support of Habitat for Humanity. Subsequently, scholars have examined such practices for indications of undue influence (Day, 2005) and public opinion formation of such practices (Nelson, 2003). Indications are that society values corporate public affairs advertising and that undue influence of public affairs issues as indicated by dollars spent alone is less problematic as incorrect information. In general, this line of mass communication research seeks to examine corporate speech within its societal context.

Research on the social effects of mass communication messages have examined several relationships between people’s perceptions of mediated messages and public opinion (Davison, 1983; Fields & Schuaman, 1976; Glynn, Ostman & McDonald, 1995). Studies have addressed media effects on knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors (McLeod, Eveland & Nathanson, 1997), voting decisions (Hu & Wu, 1998), fairness (Perloff, 1989) and persuasive impact (Howitt, Driscoll & Salwen, 1998). Most studies have focused on the socially unacceptable impacts of the media such as the perception of high crime from watching television news (negative media messages). Little research has focused on positive social impacts within media effects such as raising public awareness of national salient issues (positive media messages).

Of the more current hypothesis afloat of mass communication media effects on public opinion is the Third-person effect. W. Phillips Davison first proposed the TPE hypothesis in

1983 in his article published by *Public Opinion Quarterly* that called for understanding media effects on public opinion. Davison proposed that individuals perceive a stronger effect on others than themselves from mediated messages in general and that those individuals tend to overestimate those effects on public opinion, and thus respond to that perception. Davison's TPE postulate is a significant reconceptualization of media effects from one that assumes a direct effect to that of an indirect effect.

A good number of papers and articles have examined the TPE as hypothesized by Davison since 1983, yielding robust empirical findings for the perceptual hypothesis in several studies utilizing both experiments and surveys (Paul, Salwen & Dupagne, 2000). In fact, when compared to other studies on media effects in mass communication research such as the influence of pornography on aggression, television violence on antisocial behavior or perceptions of public opinion support and a willingness to speak out, the TPE was rather substantial (Perloff, 1999).

Most studies of the TPE that have examined the perceptual component - individuals perceive communications will exert a stronger influence on others than themselves - have focused on negative messages illustrated as defamatory news coverage, vitriolic, accusatory political ads and pornography (Perloff, 1993). Research has found that individuals believe that mediated messages influence other's perceptions more readily when the messages are negative in nature as outlined above. There are several justifications proposed to explain why this is so.

Paul, Salwen and Dupagne (2000) point to attribution theory and biased optimism. Under attribution theory, a person believes that external factors, such as social norms, are more likely to affect message reception for self whereas internal factors (individual dispositions) are likely to affect message reception in others. With biased optimism, individuals perceive media effects to

be less so for themselves with negative messages because they perceive themselves to be smart enough to mediate incoming messages. The theory suggests that people are able to resist persuasive messages and this resistance is a function of their attempt to reinforce self-esteem (Paul, Salwen & Dupagne, 2000).

Beyond a perceptual component of TPE however, there is emerging support for a behavioral aspect in which individuals not only perceive others to be affected by persuasive messages, they also appear willing to act from that perception. A Salwen and Dupagne study (1999) found a behavioral intent in the TPE with supporting evidence of restrictions on television violence, televised trials and negative political advertising. The effect was found to be issue dependent with fewer restrictions for televised trials and political ads that focused on general negative issues when compared to television violence.

Salwen and Driscoll (1997) provided specific examples in the coverage of the O.J. Simpson Trial. In that study the authors found that restrictions for press coverage of the trial were based on an individual's perceptions of how others would view the press coverage of the trial. However, the study indicated that this perception was based in part from previous attitudes about press restrictions rather than the press coverage of the trial alone. While both the Salwen and Driscoll (1997) and the Salwen and Dupagne (1999) studies served to support the perceptual component of TPE hypothesis and provided evidence of its complexity, both studies, in addition, gave credence to the recent track of behavior intentions now under study by TPE scholars.

In contrast to TPE is a first-person effect which holds the reverse of self other perceptions for negative messages. Under first-person effect, positive messages are perceived as being more influential on self and not others. A Gunther and Thorson study (1992) examined the first-person effect in positive messages in product commercials and public service announcements

(Gunther and Thorson, 1992), paving the way for a modification and reconceptualization of TPE with the possibility of finding in future examinations first-person effect from media messages perceived to have positive social impacts.

The Gunther and Thorson (1992) study found a first-person effect from emotional ads for both commercial products and public service announcements. The first-person effect was realized in that respondents considered it socially acceptable to be influenced by product commercials judged as pleasant, emotional and moving. In the study they suggested a reconceptualization of TPE to look away from the intended effects of the message to the notion that TPE is a phenomenon in which “people maximize socially acceptable attributes in themselves and minimize them in others” (p. 592). This study suggested a close relationship between pro-social messages deemed positive and a first-person effect to socially unacceptable messages deemed negative and a TPE.

The behavioral intentions of TPE have only begun to be researched. Most research has focused on censorship and government regulations from the perception of harmful advertising messages (Salwen & Driscoll, 1997; Wan & Youn, 2004) to support for restrictions on negative election messages (Salwen, 1998). While the perceptual component was again recognized in the Golan, Banning & Lundy (2005) study, the behavioral component of TPE was only realized in part for a media viewer’s likelihood to vote based on the perceptions those political ads had on others.

Research has focused on consumer product advertising perceived to be both positive in terms of being socially acceptable and negative in terms of being harmful as well as public service messages with positive, socially acceptable intentions. Also political ads with harmful effects have been examined but, as of yet, no studies have examined a behavioral effect from

corporate brand awareness advertising or public affairs messages deemed socially acceptable to be influenced by. Corporate speech rights are constantly debated as the *Nike v. Kasky* case shows. Commercial advertising and the public debate of salient issues by corporations has become increasingly hazy (Szykman, Bloom & Blazing, 2004) since the turn of the century. This study will investigate a third-person perceptual and behavioral effect in positive corporate advertisements to promote brand awareness when compared to public affairs, pro-social messages.

This study will also expand upon the public service aspect of mediated messages in commercial advertising, public affairs messages and the political implications of corporate public affairs messages in both the perceptual and behavioral effects of TPE from past research. Beyond expanding TPE research in communication studies, this research hopes to contribute to a larger understanding of the ever-increasing blur between corporate speech, political debate and media effects on public discourse and political participation.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 TPE Background

When W. Phillips Davison (1983) first proposed the third-person effect, he was specifically interested in understanding media effects on public opinion. His thesis was that people's perception of persuasive communication would be that its greatest impact is on others (the third-person) rather on themselves (the first-person). Moreover, this indirect effect of the media was realized in the perceptions of others as being more persuadable, thus prompting individuals to act on that belief. This was a unique concept as it provided a nuanced view of media effects – individuals are affected by mediated messages indirectly, rather than directly. Also, this theory led to a trend that the content of the mediated messages became less important in scholarship while the perception of message content (Perloff, 1993) gained a greater interest by media researchers.

2.2 TPE and the Perceptual Component

Media scholars have since looked at the perceptual component of the TPE in non-political news (Baldwin, 1991), commercial ads (Faber, Shah, Hanyoun & Rojas, 1997; Huh, Delorme & Reid, 2004), pornography (Gunther, 1995), television violence (Rojas, 1994) and politics (Rucinski & Salmon, 1990). All are particularly negative in content (Paul, Salwen & Dupagne, 2000) and the perceptual component of TPE in these media studies has been well established. The negative message content examined in these studies includes a TPE from the perception of the potentially harmful effects of pornography (Gunther, 1995; Lo & Paddon, 1998; Rojas, Shah & Faber, 1996), the advertising of harmful products such as cigarettes and alcohol (Banning, 2001) and television violence and aggression (Hoffner, Plotkin, Buchanan, Anderson, Kamigaki, et. al, 2001). Each of these studies suggest that these persuasive messages

are socially undesirable to be affected by and that individuals perceive that they would impact others more than themselves.

2.3 The Behavioral TPE Component

TPE studies have since expanded in the 1990's to include a behavioral exploration of the TPE in which the perception of media effects prompts one to act on that belief. Explorations of the behavioral component have now gained a foothold in the recent scholarship of TPE and as such, the examination of the behavioral aspects of TPE studies are beginning to outpace the examination of TPE perception in media content.

Studies examining the behavioral component of the TPE have largely measured a subject's intent to support restrictions on media content (Perloff, 1999). These studies include support for censorship of pornography (Lee & Yang, 1996), television violence (Rojas et al., 1996) and misogynic rap lyrics (McLeod, Eveland & Nathanson, 1997) as well as government regulations of news coverage (Price, Tewksbury & Huang, 1998). In addition, other behavioral intentions have been realized in part in the likelihood to vote (Golan, Banning & Lundy, 2005), the censorship of product advertising (Shah, Faber & Youn, 1999) and support for restrictions on political advertising (Salwen & Dupagne, 1999).

2.4 TPE Hypotheses

Several hypotheses exist to explain the causes of TPE and will be explained in detail below. However, in addition to theoretical explanations of TPE, several studies have examined contingent factors producing a TPE, suggesting that individual factors may also work to produce a TPE. Individual factors thought to cause TPE on self and others have been found in studies examining children (Henriksen & Flora, 1999), gender and race (David, Morrison, Johnson & Ross, 2002; Lo & Wei, 2002), religiosity (Golan, 2002) and education (Peiser & Peter, 2000). In

addition to individual contingent factors creating a TPE, the amount of time spent consuming various media and the sponsor of the mediated message itself has a TPE. For example, the perceived hostility versus friendliness of a message sponsor had a different effect on the perceived message impact of newspaper articles on oneself compared to others in a Cohen, Mutz, Price and Gunther (1988) study.

Two principal theories are utilized to explain TPE. These include attribution theory (Gunther, 1991; Hoffner et al., 2001; Rucinski & Salmon, 1990) and biased optimism (Brosius & Engel, 1996; Chapin, 1999; Gunther & Mundy, 1993) as expressed earlier. Yet other theories exist to explain TPE as well. These include ego involvement (Perloff 1989), elaboration likelihood (White, 1997) and social identity (Turner, 1982).

As previously mentioned, biased optimism and attribution theory are the two widely used theories to explain the TPE (Paul, Salwen & Dupagne, 2000). Biased optimism (Chia, Lu & McLeod, 2004; Gunther & Mundy, 1993) posits that people evaluate themselves in a more favorable light than others and therefore believe themselves to be less harmed by messages with harmful outcomes. On the other hand, they also perceive of themselves as capable of recognizing desirable outcomes in media messages and attribute more positive effects to themselves (Huh, Delorme & Reid, 2004) in those situations. Attribution theories that explain TPE assert that people will attribute media effects on self to situational factors only when self-esteem is not threatened (Gunther, 1991; Rucinski & Salmon, 1990; Rojas et al., 1996) while interpreting effects on others is based on dispositional characteristics (Shah, Faber & Youn, 1999).

As described above, other frameworks constructed for understanding TPE include ego involvement (Perloff 1989) and elaboration likelihood (White, 1997). Ego involvement occurs

when individuals with a preexisting interest in the subject of the message perceive others to be more affected by the message content. Likewise, elaboration likelihood (White, 1997) theory explains the TPE in terms of perception of others in that individuals are persuaded not by a logical, conscious decision-making process but are swayed by surface characteristics. One of these surface characteristics is social distance. A TPE explained by social distance occurs when one perceives others further away as more likely to be influenced by media messages than herself.

TPE has been measured in regard to various groups of “others”. The classic third-person effect posits that people believe that the media affects others more than themselves. Originally, as in Davison’s (1983) seminal work, the others were simply stated as a general “others.” As research progressed and the social distance corollary was introduced, the “others” sometimes became more geographically specific, e.g. others in the state, others in the nation, etc.

The social distance corollary was derived from the application of social identity theory to third-person perceptions. Social identity theory posits that the need for positive self-esteem motivates people to perceive of their identification with one group as favorable to another. Every social group, which can be defined as two or more people who perceive they are similar (Turner, 1982), is either an in-group that includes the perceiver or an out-group that excludes them (Simon, 1993). Studies that have examined social distance have included racial group identity and how it affects inter-group perceptions (Hraba, Radloff & Ray-Gray, 1999). More recently in third-person effect studies, the “others” have been thought to be separated from the self, not just by an in-group identification or an out-group association but by surface characteristics such as geography or education. A TPE explained by social distance occurs in

these cases when one perceives others further away (i.e. geographically or educationally) as more likely to be influenced by media messages than one's self.

Studies examining the third-person effect that consider the social-distance corollary have generally come to recognize that the effects of social distance are contingent on the generality or specificity of the target group, the similarity or dissimilarity between the respondent and the target group, and the comparison group's perceived likelihood of exposure to the target stimuli. Research focusing on social identity theory and inter and outer group identity within the third-person effect indicate that the perceived effects of media on self compared to other group identities differ and that this in-group and out-group comparison is a factor when projecting media effects on others (David, Morrison, Johnson & Ross, 2002).

2.5 First-Person Effect

While content from various media have been examined for a perceptual and behavioral TPE, explained by the theories mentioned above, they have largely concentrated on negative media content. Negative media content has been examined in news (Haridakis & Rubin, 2003; Salwen & Driscoll, 1997), music (McLeod, Eveland & Nathanson, 1997) and advertising (Henriksen & Flora, 1999) and include such content as pornography (Lo & Wei, 2002), crime (Salwen & Driscoll, 1997), television violence (Duck & Mullin, 1995), rap music (Eveland & McCleod, 1999) and political campaign ads (Duck, Hogg & Terry, 1995).

TPE studies began to examine the perceptual component of positive media content messages in the early 1990's. Positive messages examined have included public service announcements (Duck, Terry & Hogg, 1995) and product advertisements (Gunther & Thorson, 1992). Positive media content messages are those that are pro-social in nature. By examining positive media content such as those deemed socially acceptable, research has demonstrated a

reverse TPE, or a first-person effect. Reverse TPE studies have concluded that being influenced by messages that are desirable to be influenced by, such as public service announcements which promote a public good, creates a reverse effect, or first-person effect. Innes and Zeit (1988) examined a first-person effect in a study that compared three media issues which included political campaigns, media violence and public service announcements. Each issue exhibited different effects in influence desirability in that a TPE tended to be stronger the more undesirable the message is (e.g. those who viewed a PSA perceived a greater influence on self while a message with violent content elicited a *classic* TPE).

Gunther and Thorson (1992) also compared self-other differences in the perceived desirable and undesirable influences among brand advertising for consumer products and PSAs. They found that the more the ad contained an emotional appeal, the greater the estimate of perceived influence upon one's self as opposed to neutral ads where people perceived themselves as more resistant. This study also found the PSA's that were deemed desirable to be influenced by did not engender any significant perception of influence on self and other. However, Gunther and Mundy (1993) found that PSA's with potential benefits to self were considered just as much if not more desirable to be influenced by than product advertisements that were also deemed desirable to be influenced by. Hoorens and Ruiter (1996) also found a link between the desire to be influenced and a reverse TPE in various media cases in which the media message was considered desirable to be influenced by.

2.6 TPE Methods

Most TPE studies are conducted as experiments with student populations. Previous studies utilizing undergraduate subjects have been used (Duck & Mullin, 1995; Duck, Terry & Hogg, 1995; Gunther & Thorson, 1992). In addition, studies utilizing undergraduates have

ranged in sample number from as small as forty-two (Gunther & Thorson, 1992) to as large as 112 (Duck & Mullin, 1995). Surveys have been the primary measurement tool in several TPE studies examining self-other comparisons in public service announcements and product advertisements (Gunther & Thorson, 1992; Duck, Terry & Hogg, 1995).

2.7 Research Gaps

While many studies have examined negative media messages in the search to support the perceptual and behavioral components of TPE, and some studies have examined the perceptual intentions of TPE in positive media messages, very little, if any, research has examined the behavioral component of positive corporate advertisements in the form of brand awareness ads or public affairs messages.

Public affairs messages in this study are operationalized as messages that support or promote the public good, or are pro-social in nature, rather than merely attempting to persuade in order to maximize company profits. Previous research addressing the definition of public affairs messages from corporations claim such ads to fall under the rubric of indirect image ads which deal with social, financial, or economic matters (Heath & Nelson, 1985). These ads are considered “indirect because the company’s services, products, or reputation cannot be identified from the content of the ad” (Heath & Nelson, 1985, p. 65).

Also, for purposes of this study, consumer brand product ads are operationalized here as those that “carefully and clearly differentiate a company, its products, or services from its competitors” (Heath & Nelson, 1985, p. 65). Brand awareness advertising in this study is defined as the promotion of a corporate name or identity in association with a particular product or service (Hoyer & Brown, 1990).

Advertising, as noted by Gunther and Thorson (1992), is by nature intended to persuade, and differentiates it from all other mass media. Indeed, many studies have been conducted on the adverse effects of advertising to consumers with harmful products such as alcohol and cigarettes (Atkin, 1984; Casswell, 1995; Ho, 1994; Warner, 1990). Even TPE studies on advertising messages have largely concentrated on harmful message content from cigarettes and alcohol ads (Banning, 2001), gambling services (Shah, Faber & Youn, 1999) to negative political ads (Salwen & Dupagne, 1999).

While several TPE studies have used corporate advertising as stimuli, they have not specifically examined it as an entity in itself when compared to non-corporate advertising. Rather, the stimuli used by such studies as those examining gambling (Shah, Faber & Youn, 1999) have been used merely as a vehicle to test the behavioral hypothesis raised by TPE theory. Only Gunther and Thorson (1992) examined advertisements of consumer brand products with positive associations for the perceptual component of the TPE. Yet to be studied are public affairs messages with positive associations created by commercial entities for both the perceptual and behavioral components of the TPE.

All studies concerning TPE and public affairs messages have concentrated on PSA's from a governmental or non-profit organization (Duck & Mullin, 1995; Duck, Terry & Hogg, 1995; Hoorens & Ruiter, 1996; Gunther & Thorson, 1992) and have only examined a perceptual impact. Studies examining TPE in positive media content advertising from a commercial corporate entity are needed to provide further understanding of the indirect effects of media content in both perception and behavior – phenomena in which TPE studies hope to expound upon.

Several studies have examined public affairs messages including the use of seat belts (Gunther & Mundy, 1993) and responsible drinking and driving (Innes & Zeitz, 1988), finding a first-person effect for pro-social messages. However, it is important to note, these studies did not differentiate public affairs messages from non-profit or governmental agencies, nor corporate entities. These studies only examined those pro-social messages produced by non-profit or governmental agencies. Non-profit organizations are defined here as any agency in which the Internal Revenue Service allows the public discussion of issues as a business deduction.

This study will examine previous findings in the context of positive pro-social messages that are sponsored by a for-profit corporation. Thus, the following hypothesis is posited:

H1: Corporate public affairs advertising with socially desirable messages can create a first-person effect.

According to Gunther and Thorson (1992) respondents who perceive that brand product commercials are socially desirable to be influenced by will attribute a greater effect to self than to others. In other words, those messages where respondents felt it was socially desirable to be influenced by indicated a greater effect on self than other, or a first-person effect. With the findings from Gunther and Thorson (1992) study examining brand advertising for consumer products deemed socially desirable to be influenced by, the following hypotheses are constructed:

H2: Corporate commercial brand awareness advertising with socially desirable messages can create a first-person effect.

H3: There is a correlation between subjects who find it socially desirable to be influenced by positive corporate commercial brand awareness advertisements and the size of that effect on self when compared to others.

Studies examining TPE for pro-social public affairs messages from non-profits or governmental agencies (Duck, Terry & Hogg, 1995; Duck & Mullin, 1995; Innes and Zeitz, 1988) have found that, where the desire to be influenced by the message was greater, the impact of self was greater than that for others. While no study has examined the effects of the TPE for corporate public affairs messages, and has instead only looked at non-profit or governmental agencies, the following hypothesis is constructed based on findings from studies examining public affairs messages.

H4: There is a correlation between subjects who find it socially desirable to be influenced by a corporate public affairs pro-social message and the size of that effect on self when compared to others.

If perceptual studies for the TPE and positive product advertising and public affairs messages are scarce, behavioral studies can be said to be non-existent. This research will attempt to fill that void.

Studies in the behavioral effects of the TPE first began in 1996 with the examination of pornography and television violence and support for censorship (Lee & Yang, 1996; Rojas, et al., 1996). Other behavioral studies examining advertising and TPE include support for restrictions on political advertising (Salwen & Dugagne, 1999) and the likelihood to vote in response to political ads (Golan, Banning & Lundy, 2005). These studies found that the perception of the impact on others versus self was the motivation to likely act on those perceptions. No study has examined the behavioral intent of subjects to act based on socially acceptable messages from corporate brand awareness or public affairs advertisements.

Past research has shown that consumers have a favorable attitude towards purchases and product evaluation of companies that support a cause (Barone, Miyazaki & Taylor, 2000) but are

suspicious of corporate motivations of pro-social messages which relate to the industry (Szykman, Bloom & Blazing, 2004) with which they are associated (e.g. Budweiser sponsoring a do not drink and drive ad). Based on the behavioral intentions found from TPE studies coupled with findings from socially acceptable product advertisements and public affairs messages, the following hypotheses will be tested:

H5: As message influence desirability increases, the intent to act on a socially desirable corporate pro-social public affairs advertisement increases.

H6: As message influence desirability increases, the intent to act on a socially desirable corporate brand awareness advertisement increases.

CHAPTER 3: METHOD

This study expands upon previous research in TPE studies of advertisements and examines brand awareness ads and public affairs messages from a corporate commercial entity. Previous studies examining public service announcements, or advertisements with a pro-social message, have examined drunk driving (Gunther & Thorson, 1992; Duck & Mullin, 1995; Innes & Zeitz, 1988), aids prevention (Duck, Terry & Hogg, 1995), and maternal health (Gunther & Storey, 2003). Since research has shown that individuals are suspicious of corporations that sponsor social programs related to its industry (Szykman, Bloom & Blazing, 2004), this study examined two ExxonMobil public affairs ads discussing the eradication of malaria in Africa and the importance of science education in American schools.

3.1 The Sample

In order to test the above hypotheses focusing on a public affairs advertisement from a corporate commercial entity when compared to advertisements promoting brand awareness, a quasi experiment was conducted in the Spring of 2006 with two classes of introduction undergraduate mass communication classes at Louisiana State University (N=135). Both classes were a sophomore-level mass communication course, MC 2020, Foundations of Advertising and Public relations. The selection of similar students was preferred to minimize error due to any differences in undergraduate majors.

Since this study involves human subjects, prior to conducting the experiment, approval of the measurement instrument was conducted by the Institutional Review Board of the Office of Sponsored Research at LSU in January, 2006. Following IRB guidelines, the researcher ensured that all subjects were induced to participate on a volunteer basis and were offered extra credit for participating. Students were also provided the opportunity to opt out of the survey and were

instructed that they may turn in a blank survey at the end and receive extra credit by other means. Students were further instructed not to write their names on the survey. Students were also told that the purpose of the study was research on ExxonMobil advertising and that all answers would remain anonymous.

Previous studies utilizing undergraduate subjects have been used (Duck & Mullin, 1995; Duck, Terry & Hogg, 1995; Gunther & Thorson, 1992). In addition, studies utilizing undergraduates have ranged in sample number from as small as forty-two (Gunther & Thorson, 1992) to as large as 112 (Duck & Mullin, 1995). Experimental judgment- task methods have been utilized in several TPE studies examining self-other comparisons in public service announcements and product advertisements (Gunther & Thorson, 1992; Duck, Terry & Hogg, 1995). Since judgment task experiments focus on the generalizability of stimuli rather than respondents, a probability sampling is not required (Golan, Banning & Lundy, 2005). As well, convenience samples are common in experiments and TPE studies are no exception. Minimizing error variance was aided by carefully controlling the experiment conditions. Only sophomores were used and instructions to the respondents for both classes were clear and uniform. As well, age should not be a factor that would affect subject's reaction to stimuli.

Of the two classes, one class was randomly selected to view the public affairs advertisements along with two control advertisements while the second class was subsequently shown the brand awareness ads and two control ads. Each student was handed a questionnaire booklet to answer questions pertaining to the four 30-second television commercials that were shown to them. Group one was asked to view two stimuli ads (brand awareness) and two control ads. Group two was asked to view two control ads and two other stimuli ads (public affairs).

Each ad was shown rotating from stimuli then to control. After each ad was shown, students were instructed to answer the questions pertaining to the ad just shown.

3.2 The Stimuli

Stimuli ads were composed of a set of two (2) public affairs thirty-second commercial advertisements from ExxonMobil and another set of two (2) thirty-second commercial advertisements promoting ExxonMobil brand awareness. To reiterate the definition of a public affairs message operationalized above, public affairs messages are messages that support or promote the public good, or are pro-social in nature, rather than merely attempting to persuade audiences in order to maximize company profits. Brand awareness advertising is defined as the promotion of a corporate identity or image in association with a particular product or service. The two control ads, which were viewed by each group, were a set of consumer product ads for ExxonMobil fuels. Brand product advertising in this study is operationalized as consumer product advertising used to persuade recipients about the features or aspects of a consumer brand product by a commercial entity.

The public affairs ads from ExxonMobil highlighted the company's efforts to promote science education and to eradicate worldwide malaria. Of the two, the "Science Education" ad spoke about supporting future scientist in grammar schools. The ad copy consisted of the following statements: "discovering ways to meet the worlds growing demands for energy will take a growing number of technological breakthroughs, that's why for over 50 years ExxonMobil has supported science and engineering in schools – because the next generation of discoveries will only come if there is a next generation of scientist." The "Malaria Initiative" ad spoke about partnering with Harvard University to eliminate malaria in sub-Saharan Africa. Its wording goes,

“as part of living and working here, ExxonMobil is supporting in the fight against malaria.” For greater clarity, each ad is labeled “Science Education” and “Malaria Initiative” here.

Following the brand awareness ad definition from the previous section, the brand awareness ads shown touted the company’s advancements in fuel transportation for greater use of clean burning fuel and automobile fuel advancements. The “Advanced Fuels” ad focused on the ExxonMobil’s historical technical and future advancements of fuel production for the automobile. The wording in this ad was “at ExxonMobil, we have been delivering the fuels of the future, so whatever ends up powering the cars of the future – we’re working on it today.” The “LNG” ad promoted the benefits of liquefied natural gas and ExxonMobil’s efforts to harness such energy. The ad featured the image of a fuel gauge for various cars. The first gauge was one for a car in the early part of the century labeled “fuel” and transition between “diesel,” “unleaded,” “low sulfur,” “hybrid,” and finally, “fuel cell.” The copy of the LNG ad was “natural gas is one of the world’s cleanest fuels, but the largest supplies can be thousands of miles away. The answer is to cool it until it shrinks and turns into a liquid so it can be shipped. And thanks to new advances in technology, this can now be done on a massive scale. So wherever people need natural gas, we can now deliver it.” The LNG ad employed an image of a blue gas flame morphing into a liquid drop before fading into the ExxonMobil logo floating on a black screen. The brand awareness ads are labeled “Advanced Fuels” and “LNG” for easy reference.

The two control ads, which were viewed by both groups, were a set of consumer product ads for ExxonMobil fuels. The consumer product brand ads promoted ExxonMobil’s high performance automobile fuel. Since each consumer product ad spoke to ExxonMobil’s high performance fuel, they are similar, yet distinct in approach with their visual representation. One

ad focuses on the popularity of ExxonMobil fuel because of its high performance with a tagline of “people stopping by.” The first ad focused on ExxonMobil’s ability to produce reformulated gasoline for cleaner burning engines and improved air quality without sacrificing performance. The other ad touted the high performance nature of ExxonMobil’s Phase IV fuel represented by a morphing tiger from an automobile. The ad copy in this ad spoke about Phase IV gasoline and its ability to clean engine fuel injectors and intake valves, resulting in higher performance for the automobile. These two control ads are labeled as “People” and “Tiger” respectively for greater clarity.

Again, the ads were shown in a rotating order, starting with the first public affairs ad, control ad, and then again a public affairs ad to minimize primacy effects. The same rotation was utilized for the group that viewed the two brand awareness ads and in the survey booklet for each group. The respondents were then asked to recall the ads in filling out the survey questions for that ad after each ad had been viewed. The same control ads were shown to both groups. The experiment lasted approximately twenty minutes and participants were de-briefed and thanked for their participation.

3.3 The Survey Instrument

All four stimuli ads were selected based on the criteria that they are positive in content as they are socially desirable to American society. To perform a manipulation check, two indexes were used. One index sought to measure positive media content by three semantic differential scales anchored by bad-good, pleasant-unpleasant and favorable-unfavorable (Huh, Delorme & Reid, 2004). These measures were utilized by Huh, Delorme and Reid (2004) in a TPE study to measure an overall evaluation of attitude toward advertising. According to the authors, these questions were adapted from research on attitudes toward advertising in general (MacKenzie &

Lutz, 1989; Muehling, 1987; Pollay & Mittal, 1993; Ramaprasad, 2001). This index is labeled as the “Positive” index for greater clarity.

The survey instrument also measured the desirability to be influenced by each ad with two questions containing a seven-point scale response from much less to much more, based on Huh, Delorme and Reid’s (2004) question construction. The subjects were asked to rate the relative impact of each message and how “the degree to which the ad on that topic usually changes how you think about the subject when compared to the average student of your age, education and sex at LSU.” This question addresses the claim of subjects to be “less strongly influenced in the direction advocated by the message than the average peer” (Hoorens & Ruiter, 1996: 607). The other question that formed the second half of the influence desirability scale asked “How desirable do you think it is that an ad on this topic changes how someone thinks about the subject?” Responses ranged on a seven-point scale from much less to much more. This index was labeled the “Desire” index for greater clarity. Both indexes proved to be reliable with results yielding a Cronbach’s α no less than .609 and as high as .946. Results for the index α ’s for the stimuli ads are listed in Tables One and Two. Results for the index α ’s for the control ads shown to both groups are listed in Tables Three and Four.

The two indexes were combined to create an overall Positive/Desire Index to easily measure the component of the hypotheses that sought to find a relationship between socially desirable corporate brand and public affairs messages to a first-person effect. Reliability results of this five-item index are recorded in Tables Five and Six.

Table 1. Cronbach's α for the Positive Index (3 items) for each stimuli ad.

Advertisement	Cronbach's α
LNG	.946
Advanced Fuels	.881
Science Education	.833
Malaria Initiative	.879

Table 2. Cronbach's α for the Desire Index (2 items) for each stimuli ad.

Advertisement	Cronbach's α
LNG	.749
Advanced Fuels	.460
Science Education	.609
Malaria Initiative	.787

Table 3. Cronbach's α for the Positive Index (3 items) for each control ad.

Advertisement	Cronbach's α
PA Group (n = 55)	
People	.940
Tiger	.868
BA Group (n = 85)	
People	.894
Tiger	.921

Table 4. Cronbach's α for the Desire Index (2 items) for each control ad.

Advertisement	Cronbach's α
PA Group (n = 55)	
People	.784
Tiger	.868
BA Group (n = 85)	
People	.625
Tiger	.619

Table 5. Cronbach's α for the Positive/Desire Index (5 items) for each stimuli ad.

Advertisement	Cronbach's α
LNG	.892
Advanced Fuels	.790
Science Education	.782
Malaria Initiative	.883

Table 6. Cronbach's α for the Positive/Desire Index (5 items) for each control ad.

Advertisement	Cronbach's α
PA Group (n = 55)	
People	.877
Tiger	.868
BA Group (n = 85)	
People	.851
Tiger	.850

A manipulation check was utilized to measure the level of activism in each participant. Based on a survey questionnaire developed by Werner and Roy (1985) to measure nuclear activism, three questions were asked to create an index of activism with each participant. Respondents were asked to indicate if and how many times he or she performed the following activities in the past four years: contributing money to an organization that attempts to change public opinion; signing a petition; or attempting to convince a relative about a specific social issue. Results indicated that the three item activism index was reliable for exploratory research (Kerlinger, 1986) with a Cronbach's $\alpha = .526$. Werner and Roy reported a $.56 \alpha$ with their activism index containing fourteen items concerning nuclear energy in the United States.

The survey instrument also asked questions to test for both a perceptual and behavioral effect. Studies examining a third-person effect with advertisements use as a base, questions similar to the ones utilized by Gunther and Thorson (1992) such as: "How much do you think this commercial has affected your opinion of (product brand)" to measure effects on self and "How much do you think this commercial has affected other students' opinions of the brand?" to measure effects on others. A seven-point Likert-type scale was utilized to measure the third-person effect in relation to each ad for both the perceptual component and the behavioral component. Since some psychological research shows that people can make up to seven distinctions reliably (Miller, 1956), the respondents were asked to express agreement or disagreement along a seven-point scale. Several TPE studies have utilized a seven-point scale. These include Cohen et al. (1988), Mutz (1989), and White (1995).

Respondents were asked the following questions to create a TPE perceptual index: "How much does this ad affect your opinion of ExxonMobil?" and "How much do you think this ad has affected the opinion of the average student your age, education and sex at LSU of ExxonMobil?"

The qualifying clause of “the average student your age, education and sex at LSU” is added to control for the effect of social distance.

The respondents were given the opportunity to answer by placing an X on a scale between “None” which was scored zero and six which equaled “A lot.” Each respondent’s answer was scored for each of the two part groupings of questions for each ad. Mean scores for the “self” question was subtracted from the mean scores of the “other” questions for all responses to create a TPE score for all respondents for each ad. A positive score revealed a third-person effect while a negative score revealed a reverse third-person effect (or first-person effect).

Respondents were asked two questions to create a TPE behavioral index for the public affairs ads: “How much does this ad affect your likelihood to support legislation for the community efforts mentioned in this ad?” and “How much does this ad affect your likelihood to purchase ExxonMobil fuel?” Respondents were asked one question to create a behavioral index for the brand awareness ads: “How much does this ad affect your likelihood to purchase ExxonMobil fuel?” Unlike the public affairs ads, the brand awareness ads did not logically lend themselves to questions about supporting legislation for the community efforts mention in the ad in order to test a behavioral intent. A positive score revealed a likelihood to act while a negative score revealed no behavioral intent.

The respondents were also asked to provide demographic information such as sex, education, race and age and hours spent each week utilizing various media. This data was used as control variables in the final analysis of the data.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Following the collection of the survey data, descriptive statistics were run to ascertain the population demographics. The public affairs group consisted of 50 sophomores with a mean age of 20 years old. The 88% of respondents were Caucasian and 70% were female. The brand awareness group consisted of 85 sophomores with a mean age of 19 years old and 67% were Caucasian and 72% were female. Both groups proved to be somewhat demographically homogeneous as was expected to minimize variance between student populations.

Respondent's answers to the positive and desirability questions were recoded to a midpoint of zero (rather than three on the original 7-point scale). After this recoding, positive values indicated that being influenced by the message was seen as desirable. Conversely, negative values indicated that being influenced by the message was seen as undesirable. This index is labeled the Positive/Desire Index for greater clarity.

The scores for the Positive/Desire Index were summed and the mean of the index scores of each ad were compared. A t-test of the Positive/Desire Index mean index scores was performed to see if there was a significant difference between the Positive/Desire Index means between the control ads and the public affairs and the brand awareness ads examined in H1 and H2. Correlations were then run between the Positive/Desire mean index score and the third-person score for each ad.

For H1, the Positive/Desire Index means for the consumer product ads and the public affairs ads were all significantly different. The index mean of the consumer product control ad People ($M=.050$, $SD=1.58$) was significantly different from both the Science Education ($M=1.05$, $SD=1.32$; $t=-8.369$, $df=248$, $p<.001$) and Malaria ($M=1.01$, $SD=1.5$; $t=-8.590$, $df=248$, $p<.001$) index means. As well, the index mean of the consumer product control ad Tiger ($M=.414$,

SD=1.57) was significantly different from both the Science Education ($M=1.05$, $SD=1.58$; $t=5.481$, $df=248$, $p < .001$) and Malaria ($M=1.01$, $SD=1.5$; $t=5.155$, $df=248$, $p < .001$) index means.

Respondents' answers to the TPE index questions were then calculated by subtracting the scores of how much one thought the ad affected their opinion of ExxonMobil and how much one thought the ad affected others' opinion of ExxonMobil for both public affairs ads. T-tests were performed to ascertain the significant differences of the means between the TPE couplet.

Examining H1 with the ads from the Public Affairs group, the Science Education stimuli ad had a mean Positive/Desire Index score of (1.05) while the Malaria Initiative ad had a mean index score of (1.01). After re-coding to a point of zero, the lowest possible score was (-3.00) and the highest possible score for this index was (3.00).

For the Science Education ad, a third-person effect was realized by subtracting the others ($M=2.4$, $SD=1.3$) scores from the self scores ($M=2.7$, $SD=1.8$). The Science Education ad TPE score was (-0.30) ($t=10.71$, $df=49$, $p < .001$).

The Malaria Initiative stimuli ad TPE score was (-0.11) ($t=11.812$, $df=49$, $p < .001$). A third-person effect was realized by subtracting the others ($M=3.1$, $SD=1.5$) scores from the self scores ($M=3.2$, $SD=1.9$).

The two control ads, People and Tiger had a Positive/Desire Index score of (.050) and (.414) respectively. A TPE for the People ad was realized by subtracting the others ($M=1.9$, $SD=1.6$) scores from the self scores ($M=1.8$, $SD=1.8$). The People control ad TPE score was (.16) ($t=7.04$, $df=49$, $p < .001$). For the Tiger control ad, a TPE was also calculated by subtracting the others ($M=2.2$, $SD=1.7$) scores from the self scores ($M=2.0$, $SD=1.8$). The Tiger control ad TPE score was (.16) ($t=7.65$, $df=49$, $p < .001$). Both control ads for the public

affairs group were deemed positive and desirable to be influenced by and yielded a TPE. Since the public affairs ads showed a first-person effect, a correlation between the Positive/Index means and the TPE self score of each ad was run. Results indicate that there is a positive significant correlation between each index mean and each TPE self score for each ad.

The Science Education ad Positive/Desire Index mean and the TPE self score were positively correlated ($r(50) = .52, p < .001$). In addition, the Malaria Initiative ad Positive/Desire Index mean and the TPE self score were positively correlated ($r(50) = .69, p < .001$).

Since the control ads showed a TPE, a correlation between the Positive/Index means and the TPE other score of each ad was run. Results indicate that there is a positive significant correlation between each index mean and each TPE other score for each ad. The People ad Positive/Desire Index and the TPE other score were positively correlated ($r(50) = .49, p < .001$). The Tiger ad Positive/Desire Index and the TPE other score were positively correlated ($r(50) = .47, p < .005$).

In short, both control ads, while deemed positive, were not desirable and yielded a third-person effect. Both public affairs ads were deemed both positive and desirable to be influenced by and yielded a first-person effect. Index means for the Positive/Desire scales were significantly different between the two consumer product control ads and the two public affairs Positive/Desire Index means. These results indicate support for H1 that corporate public affairs advertising with socially desirable messages can create a first-person effect.

Similar procedures were performed in order to test for H2 for the brand awareness group. First the Positive/Desire Index means of the stimuli ads and the control ads were calculated to determine if respondents considered the two sets of ads different. The Positive/Desire Index mean for the consumer product control ads, People ($M = .121, SD = 1.67; t = 1.49, df = 425, p =$

.137) and Tiger ($M= 5.34$, $SD= 1.48$; $t = 5.431$, $df=425$, $p= .250$) were not significantly different from the Positive/Desire Index means of the stimuli brand awareness ads Advanced Fuels ($M= .680$, $SD= 1.34$; $t = 5.431$, $df=425$, $p= .250$) and LNG ($M= .080$, $SD= 1.54$; $t= -.299$, $df=425$ $p = .765$).

For the Brand awareness group, the two control ads, People and Tiger had a Positive/Desire Index score of (.121) and (.534) respectively. A TPE for the People ad was realized by subtracting the others ($M= 1.7$, $SD= 1.5$) scores from the self scores ($M = 1.8$, $SD = 1.7$). The People control ad TPE score was (-.02) ($t=9.64$, $df=84$, $p < .0001$). For the Tiger control ad, a TPE was also calculated by subtracting the others ($M= 2.2$, $SD= 1.7$) scores from the self scores ($M = 2.0$, $SD = 1.8$). The Tiger control ad TPE score was (-.13) ($t=11.57$, $df= 84$, $p < .0001$).

The Tiger control ad for the brand awareness group was deemed positive and desirable to be influenced by and yielded a first-person effect. The People ad was deemed positive and socially undesirable to be influenced by and yielded a first-person effect.

Regarding the brand awareness ads, the Advanced fuels ad had a mean of $M=.680$ for the positive/desirability index while the Liquefied Natural gas ad had a mean of $M= .080$. The Advanced Fuels TPE score was (-0.29) ($t=11.515$, $df=84$, $p < .0001$) and the LNG ad TPE score was (-0.34) ($t=9.685$, $df=84$, $p < .0001$). A third-person effect for the Advanced Fuels ad was realized by subtracting the others ($M= 1.6$, $SD= 1.4$) scores from the self scores ($M = 1.9$, $SD = 1.5$). A third-person effect for the LNG ad was realized by subtracting the others ($M= 1.5$, $SD= 1.4$) scores from the self scores ($M = 1.8$, $SD = 1.7$). Both brand awareness ads, Advanced Fuels and LNG were overall deemed positive and desirable to be influenced by and yielded a first-person effect.

Since the brand awareness ads and the control ads showed a first-person effect, a correlation between the Positive/Desire Index means and the TPE self score of each ad was calculated. Results indicate that there is a positive significant correlation between each Positive/Desire Index mean and each TPE self score for each ad. The Advanced Fuels ad Positive/Desire Index mean and the TPE self score were positively correlated ($r(85) = .41, p < .001$). The LNG ad Positive/Desire Index mean and the TPE self score were positively correlated ($r(85) = .55, p < .001$). The People ad Positive/Desire Index mean and the TPE self score were positively correlated ($r(85) = .54, p < .001$). The Tiger ad Positive/Desire Index mean and the TPE self score were positively correlated ($r(85) = .55, p < .001$).

Results indicate support for H2. Corporate commercial brand awareness advertising with socially desirable messages can create a first-person effect. As well, respondents did not differentiate between the brand awareness ads and the consumer product ads. Respondent's scores indicated a first-person effect for the brand awareness and consumer product ads which were deemed positive and desirable to be influenced by. Results of each ad's Positive/Desire Index mean, Positive Index mean, Desirable Index mean, correlation and TPE score for both H1 and H2 are listed in Table Seven.

Further examination of the data for testing H3 and H4 was conducted using a hierarchical multivariate regression analysis to ascertain the magnitude of the first-person effect on one's self and the third-person effect on others. As well, a hierarchical regression analysis would also reveal the magnitude of effect of each set of independent variables on the dependent variable. These calculations were performed for both the brand awareness and public affairs groups. Also possible with a hierarchical regression analysis was the ability to measure the contribution of the

contingent factors of the TPE, such as the demographic variables and the activism index, to the third-person and first-person effect.

Table 7. Correlations Between Index Means and TPE Score.

Advertisement	Positive/Desire Index Mean	Correlation	Positive Index Mean	Desirable Index Mean	TPE Score
PA Group (n = 50)					
People	.050	.49 (other)	.370	-.43	.16 (third-person)
Tiger	.414	.47 (other)	.76	-.105	.16 (third-person)
Science Education	1.05	.52 (self)	1.40	.525	-.30 (first-person)
Malaria Initiative	1.01	.69 (self)	1.07	.875	-.11 (first-person)
BA Group (n = 85)					
People	.121	.54 (self)	.204	-.003	-.02 (first-person)
Tiger	.534	.55 (self)	.760	.194	-.13 (first-person)
Advanced Fuels	.680	.41 (self)	1.06	.103	-.29 (first-person)
LNG	.080	.55 (self)	.041	.118	-.34 (first-person)

The first set of regression analyses performed examined the correlation between subjects who find it socially desirable to be influenced by corporate commercial brand awareness ads and the size of that effect on self when compared to others (H3). The first regression entered four blocks of independent variables on the perceptions of media affects on self for each advertisement (TPE-self). A second analysis entered four blocks of independent variables on the perceptions of media affects on others (TPE- others). Results are indicated in Tables Nine and Ten.

Results for the first set of regression analyses for H3 shown in Table Nine and Ten for the Advanced Fuels ad indicate that the perception of how favorable or unfavorable respondents considered the ad to be had an effect on the degree to which that ad impacted how they thought about the subject when compared to other students (the effect on oneself of the TPE couplet). As well, respondents attributed a greater effect to self based on their desire to be influenced by the ad. In other words, the desire to be influenced for oneself was a predictor of effect for oneself than the desire to be influenced in general. The desire to be influenced in general was a greater predictor of the effect for others. Results also show that overall, the magnitude of effect was greater for the self (Total $R^2 = .389$) than for others (Total $R^2 = .338$).

Results for the second set of hierarchical regression analyses of H3 in Tables 11 and 12 for the LNG ad indicate that as the desire to be influenced in general increased, so did the perception of the effect of the ad had on one's self. Results also show that the magnitude of effect was greater for the self (Total $R^2 = .463$) than for others (Total $R^2 = .419$). The social influence desirability of the ad (rather than personal desirability) had a greater impact on the effect of the ad on oneself than for others.

Results for the third and fourth sets of hierarchical regression analyses of H3 for the consumer product control ads are listed in Tables 13 and 14. The control ads in the brand awareness group indicated a first-person effect for both ads as respondents attributed a greater effect for self than for others (Total R^2 for People regression for DV-self = $.428$; Total R^2 for Tiger regression for DV-self = $.551$). In addition, the People ad was deemed good and had a perceived effect on self. In other words, the more respondents categorized the ad as good, the greater the effect was attributed to oneself. As well, the desire to be influenced personally rather than in general was a predictor of the perceived effect of both oneself and others for the People

ad. The correlation of the desire to be personally influenced and the perceived effect on self was the greatest with the Tiger ad. Respondents also perceived that the desire to be influenced personally had an effect on the perceived impact of others as well.

Table 8. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of Advanced Fuels ad on self (N=85)

Variable	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.048	.011	.048
Age	.094	.412			
Race	-.205	.076			
Gender	.052	.648			
Block two: Media Usage			.063	-.028	.014
Hours of television each week	.026	.843			
Hours of radio each week	.021	.882			
Hours of newspaper each week	.006	.966			
Hours spent online each week	-.123	.315			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.195	.091	.132
The desire to be influenced for self	.252	.038			
The desire in general to be influenced	.234	.047			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.389	.279	.194
Good/Bad	.187	.270			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	-.048	.801			
Favorable/Unfavorable	.422	.011			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.

Total R² = .389

Table 9. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of Advanced Fuels ad on others (N=85)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.014	-.025	.014
Age	.076	.513			
Race	-.101	.386			
Gender	-.004	.971			
Block two: Media Usage			.065	-.025	.052
Hours of television each week	-.008	.952			
Hours of radio each week	.018	.900			
Hours of newspaper each week	-.077	.585			
Hours spent online each week	-.195	.114			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.205	.103	.139
The desire to be influenced for self	.196	.102			
The desire in general to be influenced	.295	.013			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.338	.220	.133
Good/Bad	.332	.062			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	-.091	.644			
Favorable/Unfavorable	.241	.159			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.
Total R² = .338

Table 10. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of LNG ad on self (N=85)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.061	.024	.061
Age	.043	.708			
Race	-.223	.052			
Gender	.095	.401			
Block two: Media Usage			.106	.019	.045
Hours of television each week	-.120	.360			
Hours of radio each week	-.021	.880			
Hours of newspaper each week	-.007	.959			
Hours spent online each week	.197	.103			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.420	.345	.314
The desire to be influenced for self	.306	.011			
The desire in general to be influenced	.397	.001			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.463	.367	.043
Good/Bad	.254	.269			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	-.111	.552			
Favorable/Unfavorable	.124	.625			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.
Total R² = .463

Table 11. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of LNG ad on other (N=85)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.007	-.032	.007
Age	-.028	.814			
Race	-.074	.529			
Gender	-.029	.803			
Block two: Media Usage			.039	-.054	.032
Hours of television each week	-.064	.636			
Hours of radio each week	.001	.994			
Hours of newspaper each week	-.035	.808			
Hours spent online each week	.184	.139			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.318	.231	.279
The desire to be influenced for self	.306	.019			
The desire in general to be influenced	.358	.007			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.419	.315	.101
Good/Bad	.070	.770			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	-.070	.718			
Favorable/Unfavorable	.455	.088			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.
Total R² = .419

Table 12. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of People ad on self (N=85)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.067	.030	.067
Age	.076	.499			
Race	.036	.751			
Gender	.255	.025			
Block two: Media Usage			.091	.003	.024
Hours of television each week	.057	.668			
Hours of radio each week	-.043	.759			
Hours of newspaper each week	.078	.572			
Hours spent online each week	.099	.410			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.293	.202	.202
The desire to be influenced for self	.374	.002			
The desire in general to be influenced	.170	.168			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.428	.325	.135
Good/Bad	.318	.048			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	.096	.561			
Favorable/Unfavorable	.074	.694			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.
Total R² = .428

Table 13. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of People ad on others (N=85)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.014	-.025	.014
Age	.087	.455			
Race	.070	.546			
Gender	.028	.809			
Block two: Media Usage			.024	-.071	.010
Hours of television each week	.033	.809			
Hours of radio each week	.096	.516			
Hours of newspaper each week	-.071	.619			
Hours spent online each week	.021	.867			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.164	.057	.141
The desire to be influenced for self	.294	.020			
The desire in general to be influenced	.168	.209			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.239	.103	.075
Good/Bad	-.021	.909			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	.322	.094			
Favorable/Unfavorable	.046	.832			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.
Total R² = .239

Table 14. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of Tiger ad on self (N=85)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.020	-.018	.020
Age	.126	.280			
Race	-.080	.488			
Gender	-.031	.788			
Block two: Media Usage			.043	-.050	.022
Hours of television each week	.114	.398			
Hours of radio each week	.060	.683			
Hours of newspaper each week	-.143	.315			
Hours spent online each week	-.009	.942			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.471	.403	.428
The desire to be influenced for self	.619	.000			
The desire in general to be influenced	.125	.227			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.551	.470	.080
Good/Bad	.469	.010			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	-.333	.077			
Favorable/Unfavorable	.161	.350			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.
Total R² = .552

Table 15. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of Tiger ad on others (N=85)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.032	-.006	.032
Age	.060	.601			
Race	.060	.600			
Gender	-.142	.217			
Block two: Media Usage			.070	-.020	.038
Hours of television each week	.068	.611			
Hours of radio each week	.138	.339			
Hours of newspaper each week	-.222	.116			
Hours spent online each week	.040	.743			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.438	.365	.368
The desire to be influenced for self	.465	.000			
The desire in general to be influenced	.273	.012			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.450	.352	.012
Good/Bad	.032	.872			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	.058	.778			
Favorable/Unfavorable	.074	.699			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.
Total R² = .419

H3 examined a correlation between subjects who find it socially desirable to be influenced by corporate commercial brand awareness advertisements and the size of that effect on self when compared to others. The Advanced Fuels brand awareness ad was deemed positive in part, in terms of being favorable, and desirable to be influenced by both personally for oneself and generally for others as well. The perception of effect was greater for self than for others. The LNG ad also realized a higher correlation between being desirable to be influenced by in general, and the perceived effect of the ad on oneself. As well, respondents attributed a greater effect for oneself than for others.

The two consumer product ads in the brand awareness group realized a greater effect for self based on personal influence desirability, unlike the brand awareness ads that showed a greater perceived effect on oneself from a general influence desirability. In other words, the brand awareness ads were shown to be socially desirable to be influenced by and thus respondents attributed a greater effect to self than others. The perception of effect to self for the consumer product ads was based on personal rather than social influence desirability. These results indicate support for H3. Brand awareness ads deemed desirable to be influenced by both personally and even more so, socially, created a greater effect for self than for others.

Similar to H3, the examination of H4 sought to find a correlation between subjects who find it socially desirable to be influenced by corporate public affairs pro-social messages and the size of that effect on self when compared to others. A similar set of regression analyses was performed for H4 for the public affairs ads with an additional block of three independent variables. The addition of three more independent variables measured any contribution to the dependent variables that might have been realized due to respondents' possible level of political activism. The results for regression analyses of H4 are listed in Tables 17 through 24.

Results for the first regression analysis for H4 indicate that as message influence desirability in general increased for the Science Education ad, the effect of the ad on one's self increased. Women were also more likely to attribute a greater effect to others than to self. As well, the amount of money one had contributed money in the last four years to an organization that had attempted to change public opinion was a predictor of the whether one would attribute a greater effect to oneself than to others. Finally, results also show that the magnitude of effect was greater for the self ($R^2 = .591$) than for others ($R^2 = .521$).

Results for the regression analysis for H4 with the Malaria Initiative ad indicate that that as the desire to be personally influenced increased, so did the perceived effect of the ad on oneself. However, results indicate that the general influence desirability of the ad had a greater impact of the perception of effect on others. In other words, others were perceived to be more effected as the general influence desirability of the ad increased. As well, women were more likely to attribute a greater effect to themselves than to others. In addition, results also show that overall the magnitude of effect was greater for the self ($R^2 = .684$) than for others ($R^2 = .648$). Media usage, in terms of the number of hours watching television and the amount of time spent online had an effect on the perceived impact of the ad on oneself. Respondents who watched more television felt the impact of the ad on the self was greater. Yet, as the number of hours spent online increased, the perceived impact of the ad on oneself decreased.

Results for the third and fourth regression analysis of H4 for the consumer product control ads are listed in Tables 21 through 24. The level of general influence desirability was a greater predictor of the impact of the People ad on others than for oneself. However, with the Tiger ad, the desire to be personally influenced by the ad had a greater impact than the desire in general for others to be effected.

Table 16. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of Malaria Initiative ad on self (N=50)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.205	.151	.205
Age	.107	.457			
Race	-.068	.615			
Gender	.464	.002			
Block two: Media Usage			.437	.151	.232
Hours of television each week	.345	.011			
Hours of radio each week	-.107	.446			
Hours of newspaper each week	.018	.904			
Hours spent online each week	-.425	.002			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.620	.530	.183
The desire to be influenced for self	.396	.028			
The desire in general to be influenced	.234	.103			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.668	.555	.048
Good/Bad	.346	.130			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	.052	.728			
Favorable/Unfavorable	.022	.907			
Block five: Level of Activism			.684	.537	.016
Convince a relative	-.016	.904			
Sign a petition	-.029	.820			
Contribute money	.173	.224			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.

Total R² = .684

Table 17. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of Malaria Initiative ad on others (N=50)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.122	.062	.122
Age	.175	.247			
Race	-.048	.739			
Gender	.354	.022			
Block two: Media Usage			.177	.033	.055
Hours of television each week	.177	.267			
Hours of radio each week	.081	.635			
Hours of newspaper each week	-.052	.777			
Hours spent online each week	-.200	.202			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.562	.458	.385
The desire to be influenced for self	.297	.120			
The desire in general to be influenced	.549	.001			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.605	.470	.043
Good/Bad	.215	.383			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	.002	.991			
Favorable/Unfavorable	.177	.393			
Block five: Level of Activism			.648	.482	.043
Convince a relative	-.231	.106			
Sign a petition	.099	.468			
Contribute money	.198	.190			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.

Total R² = .648

Table 18. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of Science Education ad on self (N=50)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.107	.044	.107
Age	.164	.286			
Race	-.070	.634			
Gender	.319	.042			
Block two: Media Usage			.244	.108	.137
Hours of television each week	-.073	.586			
Hours of radio each week	-.277	.060			
Hours of newspaper each week	-.157	.329			
Hours spent online each week	-.192	.154			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.460	.329	.216
The desire to be influenced for self	.055	.721			
The desire in general to be influenced	.373	.028			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.515	.343	.054
Good/Bad	.234	.311			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	.046	.785			
Favorable/Unfavorable	.071	.726			
Block five: Level of Activism			.591	.393	.076
Convince a relative	.342	.027			
Sign a petition	-.080	.586			
Contribute money	-.901	.553			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.

Total R² = .591

Table 19. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of Science Education ad on others (N=50)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.148	.089	.148
Age	.120	.424			
Race	-.130	.362			
Gender	.365	.018			
Block two: Media Usage			.176	.028	.028
Hours of television each week	.083	.606			
Hours of radio each week	.097	.573			
Hours of newspaper each week	.046	.803			
Hours spent online each week	-.079	.617			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.342	.182	.166
The desire to be influenced for self	.312	.065			
The desire in general to be influenced	.183	.301			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.436	.237	.094
Good/Bad	.300	.229			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	-.110	.542			
Favorable/Unfavorable	.204	.353			
Block five: Level of Activism			.521	.289	.084
Convince a relative	.319	.054			
Sign a petition	-.084	.601			
Contribute money	.252	.137			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.

Total R² = .521

When comparing the Total R^2 for the DV- TPE self regression to the DV-TPE other regression for both public affairs ads, the size of the effect is greater for self than for others. However, only the Science Education ad realized a perception of social influence desirability and an effect on oneself. Indeed, the Malaria Initiative ad had a greater correlation between being socially desirable to be influenced by and impacting others more than the Science Education ad. These results indicate partial support for H4 that subjects who find it acceptable to be influenced by positive public affairs pro-social messages will attribute a greater effect to self when compared to others. Specifically, public affairs ads that are desirable for others in general to be influenced by can affect one's perception of effect for oneself. The consumer product ads in comparison realized an opposite effect. Social desirability had a greater perceived effect on others rather than to oneself.

A behavioral intention was measured for H5 for the public affairs advertisements by questioning the respondent's likelihood to both purchase ExxonMobil fuels and if they were likely to vote for legislation supporting the cause mentioned in the ad. Again, responses were recoded to a mid point of zero rather than three on the original seven point scale. A positive score revealed the intent to act, while a negative score revealed no intent to act.

Only the public affairs advertisements yielded the intent to act by supporting legislation to further the cause mentioned in the ad (Science Education vote legislation ($M=.09$, $SD =1.7$); Malaria vote legislation $M=.47$, $SD=1.9$). The intent to purchase ExxonMobil fuel after watching both brand awareness ads and public affairs ads was not realized - Advanced Fuels purchase intent ($M= -1.3$, $SD =1.7$); LNG purchase intent $M= -1.5$, $SD=1.7$; Science Education purchase intent ($M= -1.5$, $SD=1.7$); Malaria purchase intent ($M= -.64$, $SD=2.0$).

Table 20. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of People ad on self (N=50)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.078	.015	.078
Age	-.071	.643			
Race	-.185	.210			
Gender	.165	.288			
Block two: Media Usage			.272	.145	.194
Hours of television each week	.294	.054			
Hours of radio each week	-.209	.195			
Hours of newspaper each week	-.115	.502			
Hours spent online each week	-.268	.072			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.613	.521	.341
The desire to be influenced for self	.029	.851			
The desire in general to be influenced	.669	.000			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.659	.542	.046
Good/Bad	.316	.197			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	-.431	.055			
Favorable/Unfavorable	.230	.996			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.
Total R² = .659

Table 21. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of People ad on others (N=50)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.030	-.036	.030
Age	.077	.625			
Race	-.006	.968			
Gender	.181	.256			
Block two: Media Usage			.155	.007	.125
Hours of television each week	.288	.078			
Hours of radio each week	.042	.807			
Hours of newspaper each week	-.257	.170			
Hours spent online each week	-.173	.272			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.574	.473	.419
The desire to be influenced for self	.053	.746			
The desire in general to be influenced	.730	.000			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.610	.476	.036
Good/Bad	.432	.102			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	-.289	.223			
Favorable/Unfavorable	-.034	.891			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.
Total R² = .610

Table 22. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of Tiger ad on self (N=50)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.029	-.037	.029
Age	-.041	.796			
Race	-.151	.319			
Gender	.050	.752			
Block two: Media Usage			.183	.040	.154
Hours of television each week	.249	.119			
Hours of radio each week	-.288	.094			
Hours of newspaper each week	-.059	.748			
Hours spent online each week	-.022	.889			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.601	.506	.417
The desire to be influenced for self	.624	.000			
The desire in general to be influenced	.118	.448			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.620	.489	.019
Good/Bad	.248	.312			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	.000	.998			
Favorable/Unfavorable	-.080	.701			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.
Total R² = .620

Table 23. Hierarchical regression predicting perception of effect of Tiger on others (N=50)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.015	-.052	.015
Age	.097	.545			
Race	.007	.962			
Gender	.112	.482			
Block two: Media Usage			.076	-.086	.061
Hours of television each week	.248	.144			
Hours of radio each week	-.017	.923			
Hours of newspaper each week	-.103	.594			
Hours spent online each week	-.065	.694			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.600	.505	.525
The desire to be influenced for self	.554	.001			
The desire in general to be influenced	.307	.054			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.635	.510	.035
Good/Bad	.335	.166			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	-.314	.088			
Favorable/Unfavorable	.038	.851			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.
Total R² = .635

However, in order to test for a correlation between each ad's influence desirability and a likelihood to act for H5, a set of regression analyses were performed. Similar hierarchical regressions as those above were performed to test for H5. Four blocks of independent variables were entered for the purchase dependent variable. An additional block of independent variables were added for the dependent variable, vote. This block of independent variables attempted to measure any impact that might have been realized from respondent's level of political activism. Results for H5 are listed in Tables 24 through 29.

Results for both regressions for the Malaria Initiative ad indicate that as the desire to be influenced measured in terms of the ad's impact on one's self increased, the likelihood to vote to support legislation for the cause mentioned in ad increased. Indeed the magnitude of effect was rather high. Also, females were more likely to purchase ExxonMobil fuel after watching the Malaria Initiative ad. In addition, those who watched more television indicated a greater likelihood to purchase ExxonMobil fuel after watching the Malaria Initiative ad.

While the Malaria Initiative ad realized a behavioral intent in terms of voting for legislation supporting the community cause mentioned in the ad, there was no correlation between the influence desirability of the Malaria Initiative ad to purchase ExxonMobil fuel.

Results for both regressions for the Science Education ad indicate that only women were likely to vote and purchase ExxonMobil fuel after watching the ad. Results indicate there was no correlation between the influence desirability of the Science Education ad and the intent to purchase ExxonMobil fuel or to vote for legislation supporting the community efforts mentioned in the ad.

Table 24. Hierarchical regression predicting likelihood to purchase from watching Malaria Initiative ad (N=50)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.167	.110	.167
Age	-.046	.751			
Race	.045	.747			
Gender	.392	.010			
Block two: Media Usage			.415	.313	.249
Hours of television each week	.333	.016			
Hours of radio each week	-.287	.050			
Hours of newspaper each week	.032	.836			
Hours spent online each week	-.344	.011			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.508	.391	.093
The desire to be influenced for self	.279	.165			
The desire in general to be influenced	.168	.298			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.511	.343	.003
Good/Bad	.099	.717			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	-.013	.942			
Favorable/Unfavorable	-.079	.731			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.
Total R² = .511

Table 25. Hierarchical regression predicting likelihood to vote from watching Malaria Initiative ad (N=50)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.240	.188	.240
Age	-.010	.944			
Race	-.153	.254			
Gender	.450	.002			
Block two: Media Usage			.334	.218	.094
Hours of television each week	.248	.087			
Hours of radio each week	-.030	.843			
Hours of newspaper each week	.198	.233			
Hours spent online each week	-.133	.343			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.568	.466	.234
The desire to be influenced for self	.581	.003			
The desire in general to be influenced	.134	.377			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.616	.484	.048
Good/Bad	-.238	.330			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	.290	.076			
Favorable/Unfavorable	.050	.805			
Block five: Level of Activism			.650	.487	.035
Convince a relative	.082	.558			
Sign a petition	.004	.978			
Contribute money	.188	.210			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.

Total R² = .650

Table 26. Hierarchical regression predicting likelihood to purchase from watching Science Education ad (N=50)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.029	-.039	.029
Age	.120	.424			
Race	-.130	.362			
Gender	.365	.018			
Block two: Media Usage			.104	-.056	.075
Hours of television each week	.083	.606			
Hours of radio each week	.097	.573			
Hours of newspaper each week	.046	.803			
Hours spent online each week	-.079	.617			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.139	-.070	.035
The desire to be influenced for self	.312	.065			
The desire in general to be influenced	.183	.301			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.195	-.089	.056
Good/Bad	.300	.229			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	-.110	.542			
Favorable/Unfavorable	.204	.353			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.
Total R² = .195

Table 27. Hierarchical regression predicting likelihood to vote from watching Science Education ad (N=50)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.129	.068	.129
Age	.140	.357			
Race	-.031	.830			
Gender	.370	.018			
Block two: Media Usage			.138	-.017	.009
Hours of television each week	-.012	.939			
Hours of radio each week	-.096	.584			
Hours of newspaper each week	.009	.961			
Hours spent online each week	-.032	.842			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.234	.048	.096
The desire to be influenced for self	.156	.384			
The desire in general to be influenced	.231	.229			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.325	.087	.091
Good/Bad	-.066	.806			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	.300	.135			
Favorable/Unfavorable	.096	.689			
Block five: Level of Activism			.380	.080	.055
Convince a relative	.281	.145			
Sign a petition	-.017	.925			
Contribute money	.004	.985			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.

Total R² = .380

Table 28. Hierarchical regression predicting likelihood to purchase from watching People ad (N=50)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.105	.044	.105
Age	-.186	.225			
Race	-.059	.685			
Gender	.204	.185			
Block two: Media Usage			.232	.097	.127
Hours of television each week	.294	.060			
Hours of radio each week	-.101	.538			
Hours of newspaper each week	-.051	.774			
Hours spent online each week	-.250	.100			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.416	.278	.185
The desire to be influenced for self	.177	.356			
The desire in general to be influenced	.384	.042			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.428	.232	.011
Good/Bad	.193	.539			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	-.142	.616			
Favorable/Unfavorable	.059	.846			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.
Total R² = .428

Table 29. Hierarchical regression predicting likelihood to purchase from watching Tiger ad (N=50)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.018	-.049	.018
Age	-.084	.598			
Race	-.101	.506			
Gender	.016	.918			
Block two: Media Usage			.171	.026	.153
Hours of television each week	.325	.046			
Hours of radio each week	-.230	.182			
Hours of newspaper each week	-.024	.895			
Hours spent online each week	-.086	.581			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.594	.498	.423
The desire to be influenced for self	.594	.000			
The desire in general to be influenced	.163	.301			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.627	.499	.033
Good/Bad	.407	.098			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	-.112	.540			
Favorable/Unfavorable	-.125	.547			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.
Total R² = .627

Table 30. Hierarchical regression predicting likelihood to purchase from watching Advanced Fuels ad (N=85)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.080	.044	.080
Age	.175	.122			
Race	-.218	.055			
Gender	.116	.301			
Block two: Media Usage			.141	.058	.061
Hours of television each week	-.060	.639			
Hours of radio each week	.256	.067			
Hours of newspaper each week	.035	.795			
Hours spent online each week	-.125	.288			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.218	.118	.077
The desire to be influenced for self	.307	.011			
The desire in general to be influenced	-.058	.613			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.259	.126	.041
Good/Bad	.237	.205			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	.047	.820			
Favorable/Unfavorable	-.020	.911			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.
Total R² = .259

Table 31. Hierarchical regression predicting likelihood to purchase from watching LNG ad (N=85)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.033	-.005	.033
Age	.032	.783			
Race	-.112	.333			
Gender	.137	.233			
Block two: Media Usage			.109	.022	.075
Hours of television each week	-.230	.081			
Hours of radio each week	.134	.342			
Hours of newspaper each week	.022	.870			
Hours spent online each week	.192	.110			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.218	.117	.109
The desire to be influenced for self	.171	.212			
The desire in general to be influenced	.243	.082			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.277	.148	.059
Good/Bad	.300	.260			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	-.243	.263			
Favorable/Unfavorable	.213	.469			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.
Total R² = .277

Table 32. Hierarchical regression predicting likelihood to purchase from watching People ad (N=85)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.061	.024	.061
Age	.218	.057			
Race	-.022	.847			
Gender	.143	.205			
Block two: Media Usage			.080	-.009	.019
Hours of television each week	.064	.632			
Hours of radio each week	-.063	.661			
Hours of newspaper each week	.103	.741			
Hours spent online each week	.052	.666			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.124	.012	.044
The desire to be influenced for self	.194	.129			
The desire in general to be influenced	.047	.732			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.217	.076	.092
Good/Bad	.318	.089			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	-.029	.880			
Favorable/Unfavorable	.077	.727			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.
Total R² = .217

Table 33. Hierarchical regression predicting likelihood to purchase from watching Tiger ad (N=85)

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>p</i>	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² change
Block one: Demographics			.038	.000	.038
Age	.184	.111			
Race	-.074	.519			
Gender	-.047	.682			
Block two: Media Usage			.055	-.037	.017
Hours of television each week	.087	.516			
Hours of radio each week	.076	.597			
Hours of newspaper each week	-.024	.865			
Hours spent online each week	-.064	.601			
Block three: Desire to be Influenced			.362	.280	.306
The desire to be influenced for self	.499	.000			
The desire in general to be influenced	.147	.197			
Block four: How Positive/Negative is ad			.460	.363	.098
Good/Bad	.477	.016			
Pleasant/Unpleasant	-.559	.008			
Favorable/Unfavorable	.316	.098			

Note. Coded as male = 0, female = 1; white = 1, non-white = 0.
Total R² = .460

Results indicate that for the consumer product control ads in the public affairs group, the level of socially desirability of the People was a predictor of purchase intent. For the Tiger ad, the level of personal influenced desirability had an impact on purchase intent as well as the number of hours spent watching television each week. As well, the Tiger ad realized similar results in the brand awareness group. The People ad in the brand awareness group did not realize any correlations to purchase intent.

Results for the brand awareness ads testing H6 indicate that the desire to be personally influenced by the Advanced Fuels ad was predictor of purchase intent. No other variable had an effect on purchase intent for the Advanced Fuels ad and no variable realized an effect on purchase intent for the LNG ad. According to these results, H6, which sought to test that as message influence desirability increases, the intent to act on a socially desirable corporate brand awareness advertisement increases is partially supported. Results of the regression analyses for H6 are listed in Tables 30 through 34.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

This study set out to examine the first-person effect from positive corporate advertisements. The results indicate that there is support for the perception of media effects being greater for self than others, or a first-person effect, when the advertisement is deemed socially desirable to be influenced by.

First-person effect research has recently come into vogue with TPE studies. However, examinations of the first-person effect in previous research have largely concentrated on consumer product advertisements, finding significant effects for ads deemed positive and desirable to be influenced by. This study was the first of third-person effect studies to examine advertising by focusing on the advertiser itself, corporations. Further, the examination of corporate advertising included both brand awareness ads and public affairs ads in addition to consumer product ads as past third-person effect studies have largely concentrated on.

This study also sought to examine first-person effect findings in light of corporate brand awareness ads and public affairs ads. In particular, this study was the first to examine if corporate public affairs ads or brand awareness ads could create a first-person effect. They can.

Both public awareness ads utilized in this study were deemed socially desirable to be influenced by and realized a first-person effect. Both ads offered pro-social messages promoting funding for science education and a partnership with Harvard University to eradicate world-wide malaria. What is particularly unique about this study apart from other TPE studies is that this first-person effect is from a corporate commercial entity, ExxonMobil specifically, not from a non-profit or governmental agency.

A close scrutiny of the corporate public affairs advertisements in this study found that subjects who find it acceptable to be influenced by socially desirable corporate public affairs pro-

social messages attribute a greater size of effect on oneself when compared to others. This finding is similar to a Gunther and Thorson (1992) study that found that consumer product ads deemed desirable and positive can create a first-person effect.

This study compared subject's perception of consumer product ads and public affairs ads in terms of how socially desirable they were to be influenced by. The public affairs ads were deemed positive and desirable to be influenced by while the consumer product ads were deemed positive yet not desirable.

Results showed that subjects in the public affairs group felt that the public affairs ads were significantly different from the consumer product ads in terms of message influence desirability and how positive they were. As such, the natures of the ads were different enough to yield the intended effect. The public affairs ads created a first-person effect, where the less positive and socially undesirable consumer product acts created a TPE.

Examining the data further revealed which factors contributed directly to the first-person effect for the public affairs ads. For the Science Education ad, as message influence desirability in general increased, the effect of the ad on one's self increased. As well, the amount of money one had contributed in the last four years to an organization that had attempted to change public opinion was a predictor of the whether one would attribute a greater effect to oneself than to others. Perhaps these respondents, through a sense of biased optimism, recognized the societal benefits of supporting a public affairs issue such as science education and attributed a higher level of political acumen to themselves than to others less "politically educated."

There may be some relationship to one's level of political knowledge, or interest that explains this finding. According to the ego involvement postulate, if individuals feel more informed than others, they would feel less persuadable and would instead be guided by their own

knowledge and expertise to form an opinion on that subject rather than an ad alone. This assessment then makes sense under the Gunther and Thorson (1992) iteration of the TPE that individuals simply tend to maximize socially acceptable traits in themselves and minimize them in others.

This finding is also interesting when we consider that individuals might consider political activism or political acumen as a socially acceptable trait. The implications for public debate on salient issues would then look favorably for the American political process, especially in light of criticisms that television erodes social capital- or what is understood as the cooperative networks of individuals in the pursuit of shared objectives (Norris, 1996).

But political activism had no bearing on the perception of effect for self from the public affairs Malaria Initiative ad. Instead, respondents who watched more television felt the impact of the ad on the self was greater. Yet, as the number of hours spent online increased, the perceived impact of the ad on oneself decreased. Past TPE studies have shown that the amount of time spent consuming various media does have an impact on the perception of effect for one self when compared to others (Cohen, et. al, 1988). These findings reveal yet another indication of media consumption interacting with the perception of the effect of the media for oneself and others.

Generally, results indicate opposite effects in the Malaria Initiative and Science Education ads. For the Science Education ad, as message influence desirability in general increased, the effect of the ad on one's self increased. With the Malaria Initiative ad, as message influence desirability in general increased, the effect of the ad on others was deemed greater. We must then begin to question what the differences about each subject were for respondents' and how that could have played a part. Is science education a subject closer to the understanding of

university students since they are undergraduates themselves engaged in the education process?
Is the plight of Third World countries with disease too distant of a concern for their current lives?

If social distance theory (Turner, 1982) were considered in this question, we would assume respondents would think differently about the subject of the ad than others who are perceived distant or too dissimilar to their own lives (a distance created by not only geography but by education perhaps). Respondents would likely think that an ad on a subject so removed from their daily lives should affect others rather than themselves. In other words, respondents felt that people in sub-Saharan Africa would be more affected by such an ad than themselves while an ad on science education would affect themselves more than others presumably less educated and further away geographically.

As well, respondent's knowledge of possible issues facing science education in America would be reasonably greater than worldwide malaria eradication. We would expect that respondents who felt more politically active and aware than others about a public affairs issue closer to their understanding would perceive such an ad to have a greater impact on themselves than on others.

This study also sought to determine if brand awareness ads were capable of producing a first-person effect as the public affairs ads had. Both brand awareness ads did realize a first-person effect. However, unlike the public affairs group, the consumer product control ads in the brand awareness group also revealed a first-person effect.

In terms of message influence desirability and positive message perceptions (as previous research on the first-person effect had done with similar commercial advertisements), both brand awareness ads and both consumer product ads were deemed positive and desirable to be

influenced by. All four ads may have created a first-person effect due to the fact that respondents did not differentiate between the brand awareness ads and the consumer product ads. The content of all four ads may not have been different enough to measure a different effect for the brand awareness and the consumer product ads like the public affairs group.

Further scrutiny of the data via a regression analysis pointed directly to those elements of each ad that were deemed different in terms of being positive and desirable to be influenced by. The Advanced Fuels brand awareness ad was deemed positive in part, in terms of being favorable, and desirable to be influenced by both personally for oneself and generally for others as well. The LNG ad also realized a higher correlation between being desirable to be influenced by in general, and the perceived effect of the ad on oneself. As well, respondents attributed a greater effect for oneself than for others for both brand awareness ads.

Unlike the two brand awareness ads, the two consumer product ads in the brand awareness group realized a greater effect for self based on personal influence desirability. In other words, the brand awareness ads were shown to be socially desirable to be influenced by and thus respondents attributed a greater effect to self than others. The perception of effect to self for the consumer product ads was based on personal rather than social influence desirability.

Again, to look for answers, we would question the differences between the content of the brand awareness and consumer product ads. What was favorable about the Advanced Fuels ad and what was socially desirable about both brand awareness ads that created a perceived generally socially acceptable level of influence for oneself? The Advanced Fuels ad focused on automobile fuel, a necessary consumer good. The LNG ad focused on natural gas, a necessary consumer good, but marketed differently. The difference may be in the way each product was feature in the advertisements.

As Gunther and Thorson have professed, advertising by its very nature is intended to persuade (1992). Perhaps it is that as one perceives messages to have less socially desirable outcomes, i.e. to be easily persuaded to part with one's money based on an advertisement, one will repel the persuasion and instead, through a sense of biased optimism, be unmoved to action. Therefore, it might seem more reasonable for subjects to agree to a general level of desirability for society to be influenced by a message that does not explicitly seem to intend to persuade one to act on the message sent.

Conversely, respondents attributed a greater effect for self with the perceived desire to be personally influenced. Therefore, again, under a sense of biased optimism, respondents were able to attribute an effect from an ad from their own assessment of the message rather than be persuaded from a perceived general societal level of influence desirability. In others words, respondents indicated that they could mitigate the effects of the ad personally based on their own assessments of the ad (i.e. deeming it good or bad) and attribute an effect to themselves based on that assessment rather than a general social acceptance of being influenced by such an ad.

Those are the perceptual findings of this study. This study also sought to investigate the underpinning of behavioral intent from corporate brand awareness and public affairs advertisements.

Only the two public affairs ads realized a behavioral intent. Respondents indicated that they would vote to support legislation for the community causes mentioned in the ads. Respondents did not indicate an intent to purchase ExxonMobil fuel after watching the public affairs ads, consumer product control ads or the brand awareness ads.

With regression analysis however, the specific variables affecting the vote and purchase intentions of each ad were discernable. Results indicate that with the Malaria Initiative ad, there

was a correlation between the desire to be influenced personally and a likelihood to support legislation for that issue. Indeed the magnitude of effect was rather high. In addition, those who watched more television indicated a greater likelihood to purchase ExxonMobil fuel after watching the Malaria Initiative ad.

The Science Education ad results indicate there was no correlation between the influence desirability of the Science Education ad and the intent to purchase ExxonMobil fuel or to vote for legislation supporting the community efforts mentioned in the ad.

Results indicate that for the consumer product control ads in the public affairs group, the level of socially desirability of the People ad was a predictor of purchase intent. For the Tiger ad, the level of personal influenced desirability had an impact on purchase intent as well as the number of hours spent watching television each week.

Both public affairs ads promoted social causes such as funding science education and finding cures for malaria. Respondents indicated that they would vote for legislation in favor of supporting the causes mentioned in the ads. The magnitude of effect however, was greater for the Malaria Initiative ad than the Science Education ad. This now seems at odds with the findings mentioned above in which respondents felt that the Science Education ad affected their opinion more than others and the Malaria Initiative ad effected the opinion of others more than themselves. But those findings were examining the perceptual component of the TPE, not its behavioral intentions.

With the Malaria Initiative ad, respondents felt that the more the ad affected their opinion about eradicating malaria, the more likely they were to vote for legislation supporting such an effort. Respondents felt motivated to act by this public affairs ad based on how much they thought the ad influenced their opinion on the subject. In other words, as the respondents were

more persuaded to agree with the advertiser that world wide eradication of malaria was an important issue, the more likely they were to act on that belief in the form of voting for legislation that would work to accomplish that goal.

These findings are significant for corporations that are heavily regulated such as the petrochemical industry in the United States. If corporations can secure the support of the public on policies effecting industry, the ability of the corporation to survive is enhanced.

Another finding that is interesting is respondents' intent to purchase ExxonMobil fuel after watching a public affairs ad. With the Malaria Initiative and Science Education ad, women were more likely to purchase ExxonMobil fuel. Also, for the Malaria Initiative ad, as the number of hours spent watching television each week increased, the likelihood to purchase ExxonMobil fuel increased. These findings bode well for corporations who support socially oriented programs and seek to promote those initiatives through television advertisements.

Corporate use of tools such as issue ads, cause related marketing and advocacy advertising are valuable when those messages are deemed socially acceptable, as they lay a foundation of support for corporate operations. Pro-social messages help build the image of a corporation as socially responsible. And the bottom line for such a reputation for corporations is the importance it has securing future sales both directly and indirectly. In other words, public affairs messages can help a company's bottom line indirectly by managing the corporation's image to ensure favorable policies toward the corporation. As well, socially responsible corporations are looked favorably upon by individuals and this perception can realize a direct increase in sales.

CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION

Several important findings were borne out by this study. As well, there are also several limitations to the applicability of these findings. Future research is needed to further examine the limitations and findings presented here. Each consideration will be discussed below.

This study revealed that individuals will attribute a greater effect to oneself than others from corporate commercial public affairs advertisements found socially desirable to be influenced by. Further, they are likely to act on that perception in the form of voting for legislation supporting the cause promoted by the corporation. This unique finding suggests that individuals may legislate for others based on their perception of how they feel the media affects others.

Overall, findings indicate strong support for the notion that social influence rather than individual desire causes one to attribute a greater media effect to oneself than to others. These findings fall in line with the previous notion that the third-person effect can generally be described as a phenomenon in which people tend to maximize socially acceptable traits in themselves and minimize them in others.

6.1 Implications

Considering the implications of this study under the broad umbrella of media effects, we realize that media effects do not occur in a vacuum. They occur in social contexts. The old hypodermic needle model of message sent is message received has long been countered. TPE studies show that one factor of message effects is the social considerations of individuals who compare the impact of media messages to themselves in relation to others. Specifically, this TPE study reveals that message influence is derived in part from social acceptance in general rather than one's individual assessments of media messages.

The implications of research such as this on the positive perceptions of media messages from corporate entities raises concerns about the possible influence of corporations in society generally and on public discourse specifically. Past research has focused on consumer product advertising perceived to be both positive and negative in intent, public service messages with positive intent and political ads with negative components. Before now, no study had examined a behavioral effect from positive corporate advertising for brand awareness or public affairs messages.

Since findings here indicate that corporate public affairs advertising can be persuasive, and that message influence is derived in part from social contexts, we are compelled to continue examining the important implications of corporate speech in other venues, namely its persuasive impact on public opinion. When individuals are persuaded to agree with corporate advertisers about issues of public importance, such as drilling in the Alaskan National Wildlife Refuge, and further, to act on that belief in the form of voting for legislation supporting the corporation's stance - we begin to understand the impact that corporations have in our American democracy with greater clarity.

This realization is especially unique in terms of media effects when we consider, as TPE studies do, the indirect effect of the media on public opinion. At the heart of TPE studies is the concern of the behavioral consequences of public opinion perceptions first purposed by Davison (1983). The recent stream of studies examining behavioral impacts from the TPE on public opinion are important because they move back to the original considerations of the TPE hypothesis which are a re-conceptualization of the media from one that has a direct effect on individuals, to one in which its greatest consequence is its indirect impact. When we consider possible indirect message impacts from corporate commercial advertisements, we are then likely

to see potential real world effects, i.e. those that move beyond the living room *per se* and into the voting booth.

6.3 Limitations

A comparison of the differences of behavioral intentions between the public affairs ads and the brand awareness ads was sought in this study. No significant difference was seen with purchase intent between the public affairs ads and the brand awareness ads. Unfortunately, the intent to act for the brand awareness ads was only measured by respondent's intent to purchase ExxonMobil fuel. Since a behavioral intent for the brand awareness ads was only measured in terms of purchase intent, the only comparison of differences that could be compared between the brand awareness ads and the public affairs ads was purchase intent rather than both vote intent and purchase intent.

The limitations of this measure of a behavioral intent for the brand awareness ads lie in the nature of the content of each set of ads. The brand awareness ads would not have readily led respondents to ponder vote intentions for the subject matter at hand, as had the public affairs ads. However, it is and should be a consideration for further research to allow for greater comparisons between behavioral intents from corporate brand awareness and public affairs advertisements.

6.2 Future Research

TPE studies, while already examining contingent factors such as race and education, would expand upon the findings presented here to examine further the contingent factors of the TPE such as race, age and gender. In this study, women were shown to have exhibited greater effects from the ads shown. However, this may be an artifact of the composition of respondents who were predominately women. Also, race was not significantly varied enough to measure any differences of effect. Thus, the homogeneity of respondents in terms of race as well as age may

have been a factor of the effects observed. Future studies would take these points into consideration.

Future studies could also examine the differences between media, such as television commercials and print advertisements in order to point to the specific components of each medium that possibly influence message perceptions. These components could include music, copy or the graphic elements that comprise each ad. This approach would entail a more qualitative approach to TPE studies by a careful content analysis of advertising messages and the media employed. This is particularly interesting in light of the findings here that point to possible differences in television programming and its interaction with the TPE for public affairs messages.

As TPE research is relatively new in the academy, there is much left to explore. The perceptual components of the third-person effect have been well established. The behavioral intentions of TPE are just beginning to be examined. The future of TPE research should continue the behavioral explorations similar to the ones presented here. This is important as we consider the reconceptualization of the media as having its greatest impact indirectly rather than directly.

REFERENCES

- Atkin, C. (1983). The role of alcohol advertising in excessive and hazardous drinking. *Journal of Drug Education*, 13(4), 313-325.
- Banning, S. (2001). Do you see what I see? Third-person effects on public communication through self-esteem, social stigma, and product use. *Mass Communication & Society*, 4(2), 127-147
- Barone, M.J., Miyazaki, A.D. & Taylor, K.A. (2000). The influence of cause-related marketing on consumer choice: Does one good turn deserve another? *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, 28, 248-262.
- Brosius, H., & Engel, D. (1996). The causes of third-person effects: Unrealistic optimism, impersonal impact, or generalized negative attitudes towards media influence? *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 8, 142-162.
- Casswell, S. (1995). Does alcohol advertising have an impact on the public health? *Drug and Alcohol Review*, 14(4), 395-403.
- Chia, S.C., Lu, K.H., & McLeod, D.M. (2004). Sex, lies and video compact disc: A case study on third-person perception and motivations for media censorship. *Communication Research*, 31(1), 109-130.
- Cohen, J. & Davis, R.G. (1991) TPEs and the differential impact in negative political advertising. *Journalism Quarterly*, 65, 680-688.
- Cohen, J., Mutz, D., Price, V., & Gunther, A. (1988). Perceived impact of defamation. An experiment on third-person effects. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 52(2), 161-173.
- David, P., Morrison, G., Johnson, M.A., & Ross, F. (2002). Body image, race and fashion models: Social distance and social identification in third-person effects. *Communication Research*, 29(2), 270-294.
- Davison, W.P. (1983). The third-person effect in communication. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 47, 1-15.
- Day, A. (2005). Business as usual? Ubiquitous telemarketing and the public outcry: Public opinion, the media agenda and policy setting. *Competition Forum*, 3(2), 374-381.
- Duck, J.M., Hogg, M.A., & Terry, D.J. (1995). Me, us and them: Political identification and the third-person effect in the 1993 Australian federal election. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 25, 195-215.
- Duck, J.M. & Mullin, B.A. (1995). The perceived impact of the mass media: Reconsidering the third-person effect. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 25, 77-93.

- Duck, J.M., Terry, D.J., & Hogg, M.A. (1995). The perceived influence of AIDS advertising: Third-person effects in the context of positive media content. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17(3), 305-325.
- Eveland, W.P., Jr., & McLeod, D.M. (1999). The effect of social desirability on perceived media impact: Implications for third-person perceptions. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 11(4), 315-333.
- Faber, R. J., Shah, D., Hanyoun, S., & Rojas, H. (1997). Advertising censorship: Factors accounting for a willingness to restrict commercial speech for legal products. Unpublished manuscript submitted for publication, *Journal of Advertising*. Manship School of Mass Communication, Louisiana State University.
- Fields, J., & Schuman, H. (1976). Public beliefs about the beliefs of the public. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 40, 427-428.
- Glynn, C.J., & Ostman, R.E. (1988). Public opinion about public opinion. *Journalism Quarterly*, 65, 299-306.
- Golan, G. (2002). Religiosity and the third-person effect. *Journal of Media and Religion*, 1(2), 105-120.
- Golan, G., Banning, S., & Lundy, L. (2005). Likelihood to vote, candidate choice and the third-person effect: Behavioral implications of political advertising in the 2004 presidential election. Paper presented in the Mass Communication and Society Division at the Annual International Communication Association Conference, New York, NY.
- Gunther, A. (1991). What we think others think: Cause and consequence in the TPE. *Communication Research*, 18, 355-372.
- Gunther, A. (1995). Overrating the X-rating: The third-person perception and support of censorship of pornography. *Journal of Communication*, 45(1), 27-38.
- Gunther, A., Borzekowski, D., Liebhart, J., & Weber, K. (2003). Presumed Influence: How mass media indirectly affect adolescent smoking. Paper presented at the Annual International Communication Association Conference, San Diego, CA.
- Gunther, A., & Mundy, P. (1993). Biased optimism and the third-person effect. *Journalism Quarterly*, 70, 58-67.
- Gunther, A., & Storey, D. (2003). The influence of presumed influence. *Journal of Communication*, 53(2), 199-215.
- Gunther, A., & Thorson, E. (1992). Perceived persuasive effects of product commercials and public service announcements: TPEs in new domains. *Communication Research*, 19, 574-596.

- Haridakis, P.M., & Rubin, A.M. (2003). Motivation for watching television violence and viewer aggression. *Mass Communication & Society*, 6, 29-56.
- Haridakis, P.M., & Rubin, A.M. (2005). Third-person effects in the aftermath of terrorism. *Mass Communication & Society*, 8(1), 39-59
- Heath, R.L., & Nelson, R.A. (1985). Image and issue advertising: A corporate and public policy perspective. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(Spring), 58-68.
- Henriksen, L., & Flora, J. A. (1999). Third-person perception and children: Perceived impact of pro and anti-smoking ads. *Communication Research*, 26(6), 643-665.
- Ho, R. (1994). Cigarette advertising and cigarette health warnings: What role do adolescents' motives for smoking play in their assessment? *Australian Psychologist*, 29(1), 49-56.
- Hoffner, C., Plotkin, R., Buchanan, M., Anderson, J., Kamigaki, S., Hubbs, L., Kowalczyk, L., Silberg, K., & Pastorek, A. (2001). The TPE in perceptions of the influence of television violence. *Journal of Communication*, 51(2), 283-299.
- Hoorens, V., & Ruiter, S. (1996). The optimal impact phenomenon: Beyond the TPE. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 599-610.
- Howitt, E., Driscoll P.D., & Salwen, M.B. (1998, February). The role of self-esteem, body satisfaction, and body image on female college students' third-person perceptions: An examination of the "thin ideal" myth. Paper presented at the annual Intercultural Communication Conference, Miami, FL.
- Hoyer, W.D., & Brown, S.P. (1990). Effects of brand awareness on choice for a common, repeat-purchase product. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17(2), 141-148.
- Hraba, J., Radlof, T., & Ray-Gray, P. (1999). A comparison of black and white social distance. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 139(4), 536-539.
- Hu, Y.W., & Wu, Y.C. (1998, August). The "critics," "believers," and "outsiders" of election polls: Comparing characteristics of the third-person effect, first-person effect and consensus effect. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Baltimore.
- Huh, J., Delorme, D.E., & Reid, L.N. (2004). The third-person effect and its influence on behavioral outcomes in a product advertising context: The case of direct-to-consumer prescription drug advertising. *Communication Research*, 31(5), 568-590.
- Innes, J.M., & Zeitz, H. (1988). The public's view of the impact of the mass media: A test of the "third-person" effect. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 18, 457-463.

- Kerlinger, Fred N. (1986), *Foundations of Behavioral Research*, 3rd ed., Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- Lo, V.H., & Wei, R. (2002). TPE, gender and pornography on the internet. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 46, 13-33.
- McLeod, D.M., Detenber, B.H., & Eveland, W.P., Jr. (2001, December). Behind the third-person effect: differentiating perceptual processes for self and other. *Journal of Communication*, 51(4), 678-695.
- McLeod, D.M., Eveland, W.P., Jr., & Nathanson, A.I. (1997). Support for censorship of violent and misogynic rap lyrics: An analysis of the third-person effect. *Communication Research*, 24, 153-174.
- Meirick, P.C. (2004). Topic-relevant reference groups and dimensions of distance: Political advertising and first and third-person effects. *Communication Research*, 31(2), 234-255.
- Nelson, R.A. (2003). Issue advertising and “deep pockets”: Ethics and reality. *Business Research Yearbook: Global Business Perspectives*, Vol. X, 872-876
- Norris, P. (1996). Does television erode social capital? A reply to Putnam. *Political Science and Politics*, 29(3), 474-480.
- Paul, B., Salwen, M.B., & Dupagne, M. (2000). The third-person effect: A meta-analysis of the perceptual hypothesis. *Mass Communication & Society*, 3, 57-85.
- Peiser, W., & Peter, J. (2000). Third-person perception of television-viewing behavior. *Journal of Communication*, 50(1), 25-45.
- Perloff, R.M. (1989). Ego-involvement and the TPE of televised news coverage. *Communication Research*, 16, 236-262.
- Perloff, R.M. (1993). Third-person effect research 1983-1992: A review and synthesis. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 5(2), 167-184.
- Perloff, R.M. (1999). The third-person effect: A critical review and synthesis. *Media Psychology*, 1, 353-378.
- Price, V., Tewksbury, D., & Huang, L.N. (1998). Third-person effects on publication of a Holocaust-denial advertisement. *Journal of Communication*, 48(2), 3-26.
- Pringle, H., & Thompson, M. (1999). *Brand Spirit: How Cause Related Marketing Builds Brands*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rojas, H., Shah, D.V., & Faber, R.J. (1996). For the good of others: Censorship and the third-person effect. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 8, 163-186.

- Rucinski, D., & Salmon, C.T. (1990). The “other” as vulnerable voter: A study of the TPE in the 1988 U.S. presidential campaign. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 2, 343-368.
- Salwen, M.B. (1998). Perceptions of media influence and support for censorship: the TPE in the 1996 presidential election. *Communication Research*, 25, 259-285.
- Salwen, M.B., & Driscoll, P.D. (1997). Consequences of third-person perception in support of press restrictions in the O.J. Simpson trial. *Journal of Communication*, 47(2), 60-78.
- Salwen, M.B., & Dupagne, M. (1999). The TPE: Perceptions of the media’s influence and immoral consequences. *Communication Research*, 26(5), 523-550.
- Salwen, M.B., & Dupagne, M. (2001). Third-person perception of television violence: The role of self-perceived knowledge. *Media Psychology* 3, 211-236.
- Shah, D.V., Faber, R.J., & Youn, S. (1999). Susceptibility and severity: Perceptual dimensions underlying the third-person effect. *Communication Research*, 26, 240-267.
- Simon, B. (1993). On the asymmetry in the cognitive construal of in-group and out-group: A model of egocentric social categorization. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 23(2), 131-147.
- Szykman, L.R., Bloom, P.N., & Blazing, J. (2004). Does corporate sponsorship of socially-oriented message make a difference? An investigation of the effects of sponsorship identity on responses to an anti-drinking and driving message. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 14 (1&2), 13-20.
- Tewksbury, D., Moy, P., & Weis, D. (2004, March). Preparations for Y2K: Revisiting the behavioral component of the third-person effect. *Journal of Communication*, 54(1), 138-155.
- Turner, J.C. (1982). Towards a cognitive redefinition of the social group. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Social identity and intergroup relations* (pp. 15-40). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Vallone, R., Ross, L., & Lepper, M. (1985). The hostile media phenomenon: Biased perception and perceptions of media bias in coverage of the Beirut massacre. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 577-585.
- Wan, F., & Youn, S. (2004). Motivations to regulate online gambling and violent game sites: An account of the third-person effect. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 4(3), 1.
- Warner, K. (1990). Effects of cigarette advertising. *British Journal of Addiction*, 85(5), 687-688.
- Werner, P.D., & Roy, P.J. (1985). Measuring activism regarding the nuclear arms race. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(2), 181-186.
- White, H.A. (1997). Considering interacting factors in the TPE. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 74, 557-564.

Youn, S.F., & Shah, D.V. (2000). Restricting gambling advertising and the third-person effect.
Psychology and Marketing, 17(7), 633-649.

APPENDIX
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Advertising Research Survey Questions Group 1 (BA)

1. In general, how many hours a week do you watch television? _____
2. In general, how many hours a week do you listen to radio? _____
3. In general, how many hours a week do you read a newspaper? _____
4. In general, how many hours a week do you go online? _____

Where necessary, please place an X where you fall in response to the question.

5. Advertising by companies about issues of public importance helps keep me up to date about issues that I would like to know or are concerned about.

Agree _____ Disagree

6. Companies who advertise about issues of public importance are honestly concerned about the issue presented.

Agree _____ Disagree

7. Advertising about issues of public importance is more manipulative than it is informative.

Agree _____ Disagree

8. I feel better about companies that support a social cause.

Agree _____ Disagree

9. I like to purchase products from companies that support social causes.

Agree _____ Disagree

10. I am willing to vote for legislation that helps companies that support social causes.

Agree _____ Disagree

Now, recalling the ExxonMobil's "Advanced fuels" ad, please answer the following questions.

11. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Bad _____ Good

12. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Unpleasant _____ Pleasant

13. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Unfavorable _____ Favorable

14. Please indicate the degree to which this ad impacts how you think about this subject when compared to the average student of your age, education and sex at LSU:

Much less _____ Much more

15. How desirable do you think it is that an ad on this topic changes how someone thinks about the subject?

Very Undesirable _____ Very Desirable

16. How much do you think this ad has affected your opinion of ExxonMobil?

None _____ A Lot

17. How much do you think this ad has affected the opinion of the average student your age, education and sex at LSU of ExxonMobil?

None _____ A lot

18. How much does this ad affect your likelihood to purchase ExxonMobil fuel?

None _____ A lot

Now, recalling the ExxonMobil “People Stopping By” ad, please answer the following questions.

19. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Bad _____ Good

20. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Unpleasant _____ Pleasant

21. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Unfavorable _____ Favorable

22. Please indicate the degree to which this ad impacts how you think about this subject when compared to the average student of your age, education and sex at LSU:

Much less _____ Much more

23. How desirable do you think it is that an ad on this topic changes how someone thinks about the subject?

Very Undesirable _____ Very Desirable

24. How much do you think this ad has affected your opinion of ExxonMobil?

None _____ A Lot

25. How much do you think this ad has affected the opinion of the average student your age, education and sex at LSU of ExxonMobil?

None _____ A lot

26. How much does this ad affect your likelihood to purchase ExxonMobil fuel?

None _____ A lot

Now, referring to the following ad, "Liquefied Gas," please answer the following questions.

27. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Bad _____ Good

28. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Unpleasant _____ Pleasant

29. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Unfavorable _____ Favorable

30. Please indicate the degree to which this ad impacts how you think about this subject when compared to the average student of your age, education and sex at LSU:

Much less _____ Much more

31. How desirable do you think it is that an ad on this topic changes how someone thinks about the subject?

Very Undesirable _____ Very Desirable

32. How much do you think this ad has affected your opinion of ExxonMobil?

None _____ A Lot

33. How much do you think this ad has affected the opinion of the average student your age, education and sex at LSU of ExxonMobil?

None _____ A lot

34. How much does this ad affect your likelihood to purchase ExxonMobil fuel?

None _____ A lot

Now, refer to the “Phase Four” ad, please answer the following questions.

35. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Bad _____ Good

36. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Unpleasant _____ Pleasant

37. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Unfavorable _____ Favorable

38. Please indicate the degree to which this ad impacts how you think about this subject when compared to the average student of your age, education and sex at LSU:

Much less _____ Much more

39. How desirable do you think it is that an ad on this topic changes how someone thinks about the subject?

Very Undesirable _____ Very Desirable

40. How much do you think this ad has affected your opinion of ExxonMobil?

None _____ A Lot

41. How much do you think this ad has affected the opinion of the average student your age, education and sex at LSU of ExxonMobil?

None _____ A lot

42. How much does this ad affect your likelihood to purchase ExxonMobil fuel?

None _____ A lot

Read each item and then indicate if and how many times you performed that activity during the last four years. Please use the scale below. Write the number of your answer on the line in front of each item.

3= Three or more times

2= Two times

1= One time

0= Never, no times

_____ **43. Contributed money to an organization that attempts to change public opinion.**

_____ **44. Signed a petition.**

_____ **45. Attempted to convince a relative about a specific opinion on a social issue?**

46. Gender ___ M ___ F

47. Age ____

48. Race _____

Now, please answer the following questions once again.

49. Advertising by companies about issues of public importance helps keep me up to date about issues that I would like to know or are concerned about.

Agree__ __ __ __ __ __ __ Disagree

50. Companies who advertise about issues of public importance are honestly concerned about the issue presented.

Agree__ __ __ __ __ __ __ Disagree

51. Advertising about issues of public importance is more manipulative than it is informative.

Agree__ __ __ __ __ __ __ Disagree

53. I feel better about companies that support a social cause.

Agree__ __ __ __ __ __ __ Disagree

54. I like to purchase products from companies that support social causes.

Agree__ __ __ __ __ __ __ Disagree

55. I am willing to vote for legislation that helps companies that support social causes.

Agree__ __ __ __ __ __ __ Disagree

THANK YOU!!

Advertising Research Survey Questions Group 2 (PA)

1. In general, how many hours a week do you watch television? _____
2. In general, how many hours a week do you listen to radio? _____
3. In general, how many hours a week do you read a newspaper? _____
4. In general, how many hours a week do you go online? _____

Where necessary, please place an X where you fall in response to the question.

5. Advertising by companies about issues of public importance helps keep me up to date about issues that I would like to know or are concerned about.

Agree _____ Disagree

6. Companies who advertise about issues of public importance are honestly concerned about the issue presented.

Agree _____ Disagree

7. Advertising about issues of public importance is more manipulative than it is informative.

Agree _____ Disagree

8. I feel better about companies that support a social cause.

Agree _____ Disagree

9. I like to purchase products from companies that support social causes.

Agree _____ Disagree

10. I am willing to vote for legislation that helps companies that support social causes.

Agree _____ Disagree

Now, referring to the following ad, "Science Education," please answer the following questions.

11. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Bad _____ Good

12. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Unpleasant _____ Pleasant

13. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Unfavorable _____ Favorable

14. Please indicate the degree to which this ad impacts how you think about this subject when compared to the average student of your age, education and sex at LSU:

Much less _____ Much more

15. How desirable do you think it is that an ad on this topic changes how someone thinks about the subject?

Very Undesirable _____ Very Desirable

16. How much do you think this ad has affected your opinion of ExxonMobil?

None _____ A Lot

17. How much do you think this ad has affected the opinion of the average student your age, education and sex at LSU of ExxonMobil?

None _____ A lot

18. How much does this ad affect your likelihood to purchase ExxonMobil fuel?

None _____ A lot

19. How much does this ad affect your likelihood to support legislation for the community efforts mentioned in this ad?

None _____ A lot

Now, recalling the ExxonMobil “People Stopping By” ad, please answer the following questions.

20. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Bad _____ Good

21. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Unpleasant _____ Pleasant

22. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Unfavorable _____ Favorable

23. Please indicate the degree to which this ad impacts how you think about this subject when compared to the average student of your age, education and sex at LSU:

Much less _____ Much more

24. How desirable do you think it is that an ad on this topic changes how someone thinks about the subject?

Very Undesirable _____ Very Desirable

25. How much do you think this ad has affected your opinion of ExxonMobil?

None _____ A Lot

26. How much do you think this ad has affected the opinion of the average student your age, education and sex at LSU of ExxonMobil?

None _____ A lot

27. How much does this ad affect your likelihood to purchase ExxonMobil fuel?

None _____ A lot

Now, refer to the “Malaria Initiative” ad, please answer the following questions.

28. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Bad _____ Good

29. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Unpleasant _____ Pleasant

30. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Unfavorable _____ Favorable

31. Please indicate the degree to which this ad impacts how you think about this subject when compared to the average student of your age, education and sex at LSU:

Much less _____ Much more

32. How desirable do you think it is that an ad on this topic changes how someone thinks about the subject?

Very Undesirable _____ Very Desirable

33. How much do you think this ad has affected your opinion of ExxonMobil?

None _____ A Lot

34. How much do you think this ad has affected the opinion of the average student your age, education and sex at LSU of ExxonMobil?

None _____ A lot

35. How much does this ad affect your likelihood to purchase ExxonMobil fuel?

None _____ A lot

36. How much does this ad affect your likelihood to support legislation for the community efforts mentioned in this ad?

None _____ A lot

Now, referring to the following ad, "Phase 4," please answer the following questions.

37. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Bad _____ Good

38. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Unpleasant _____ Pleasant

39. Please rate this ad on the following scale:

Unfavorable _____ Favorable

40. Please indicate the degree to which this ad impacts how you think about this subject when compared to the average student of your age, education and sex at LSU:

Much less _____ Much more

41. How desirable do you think it is that an ad on this topic changes how someone thinks about the subject?

Very Undesirable _____ Very Desirable

42. How much do you think this ad has affected your opinion of ExxonMobil?

None _____ A Lot

43. How much do you think this ad has affected the opinion of the average student your age, education and sex at LSU of ExxonMobil?

None _____ A lot

44. How much does this ad affect your likelihood to purchase ExxonMobil fuel?

None _____ A lot

Read each item and then indicate if and how many times you performed that activity during the last four years. Please use the scale below. Write the number of your answer on the line in front of each item.

3= Three or more times

2= Two times

1= One time

0= Never, no times

_____ **45. Contributed money to an organization that attempts to change public opinion.**

_____ **46. Signed a petition.**

_____ **47. Attempted to convince a relative about a specific opinion on a social issue?**

48. Gender __ M __ F

49. Age _____

50. Race _____

THANK YOU!

VITA

Anita G. Day began her twenty-year career in communications at the age of sixteen when she received her FCC license. She received her Bachelor of Arts from the University of Houston and her Master of Mass Communication from Louisiana State University. Before returning for her doctoral studies in the Manship School of Mass Communication at LSU, she served for four years as Executive Director of the Louisiana Chemical Industry Alliance, a grass roots lobbying association for the Louisiana chemical industry. Her research interests include corporate public affairs, public opinion and public relations. She teaches courses in advertising, public relations and visual communication.