THE INTERACTION OF MESSAGE CONTENT, MEDIA SEQUENCE, AND PRODUCT INVOLVEMENT: AN EXAMINATION OF INTENDED MESSAGE CONTENT SEQUENCES ACROSS A TWO-CHANNEL STRATEGIC IMC EFFORT

by

ASHLEY N. MARTIN

B.A., Kansas State University, 2007

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

A.Q. Miller School of Journalism and Mass Communications
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2014

Approved by:

Major Professor
Curtis Matthews
Abstract

Integrated marketing communications strategies are being utilized more and more by practitioners who wish to reach their audiences in different ways at different times. However, the omnipresence that results from these multi-channel campaigns presents a new challenge for marketers, as their message and channel sequences may or may not be experienced in the order intended. Past literature has shown that both message order and channel sequence do matter. However, existing literature has not examined intended message sequences where the first channel “teases” the more comprehensive information available in the second channel. Therefore, the aim of this study was to bridge some of the gaps in past research by exploring message content order effects and channel sequence effects across intentional sequences for both high- and low-involvement product categories through the lens of the Elaboration Likelihood Model. A 2 (message content order: tease-to-answer versus answer-to-tease) by 2 (medium sequence: print-to-online versus online-to-print) by 2 (product involvement: high- versus low-involvement) mixed factorial experimental design was conducted to explore how message content order, channel sequence, and product involvement level affected evaluations of brand and message, as well as perceived behavioral intent. The findings indicated that message content order had significant influence over brand and message evaluation, with the tease-to-answer order producing the highest evaluations of brand and message. The findings also indicated that the online-to-print sequence was only effective for increasing behavioral intent under high-involvement conditions. Implications for marketing practitioners and future research are discussed.
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Chapter 1 - Introduction

In today’s competitive advertising landscape, expanding media channels coupled with tightening budgets have advertisers looking for innovative ways to maximize their efforts and keep their brands and products top of mind. Integrated marketing communications (IMC), a concept first introduced in the late 1990s, has evolved into a framework for keeping advertising efforts audience-centric through strategic messaging across multiple channels (Kitchen & Burgmann, 2010; Kliatchko, 2008), a practice that research has shown to have a positive cumulative effect on a variety of advertising effectiveness measures (Micu & Petina, 2012; Naik & Raman, 2003; Naik & Peters, 2009; Chang & Thorson, 2004). However, studies within the IMC field are often segmented between the key interest areas of IMC, most prominently between message content strategies and channel selection/exposure sequencing. Overlapping studies do exist in the existing literature, but there is much room for additional integrated research.

Studies examining message content strategies have legitimized the idea of “strategic consistency” across messages (Kitchen & Burgmann, 2010; Navarro-Bailón, 2011; Navarro, Sicilia, & Delgado-Ballester, 2009; Chang & Thorson, 2004; Weissberg, 2008; Liodice, 2008) versus the repetition of identical messages (Cacioppo & Petty, 1979; Shu & Carlson, 2014) as a means toward increasing cognitive elaboration. Additionally, message content studies have shown that variables such as content length (Pierro, Mannetti, Erb, Spiegel, & Kruglanski, 2005), need for closure (Vermeir, Kenhove, & Hendrickx, 2002), structure of message content, e.g. open- and close-ended messages (Chebat, Charlebois, & Gelinas-Chébat, 2001), and order of message content (Haugtvedt & Wegener, 1994; Edell & Keller, 1989; Voorveld, Niejens, & Smit, 2011) can impact overall message effectiveness, persuasive effect, and behavioral intent.
On the other side of the IMC coin, studies examining media channel sequencing have shown that sequence does indeed matter, especially when level of product involvement is considered (Zaichkowsky, 1994 and Voorveld, Neijens, & Smit, 2012). Additionally, Chatterjee (2012) found that the most effective channel sequence of those examined was one that allowed for a steady increase in length/quantity of information with each subsequent channel. However, no study in the existing literature combines variances in message content, media sequence, and product involvement to help practitioners determine the best way to present information across media sequences throughout a multi-channel campaign. Thus, the goal of the current study is to examine this interaction of message content, media channel sequence, and product involvement through the lens of the Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM).

By examining the message content and media sequence IMC constructs, combined with the moderating role of product involvement, the current study contributes to the existing body of literature by further investigating how knowledge in these areas can be combined and interwoven to create more effective integrated marketing campaigns. In order to examine these constructs, an experimental design was constructed that studied two message content structures — “tease” to “answer” and vice versa — and media sequences — postcard to Web page and vice versa — for two unique products: one low-involvement and one high-involvement. Evaluation of the brand, message evaluation (“tease” versus “answer”), and overall behavioral intent were measured. In the next sections, a brief overview of IMC will be presented, legitimizing the integration of the content and channel constructs. Research in the area of message content consistency is examined through the lens of the ELM, with consideration for a variety of related content factors that impact cognitive elaboration. Media exposure sequencing is then reviewed from a cognitive
processing perspective as well, leading to an integrated discussion of the existing literature and the hypotheses that anchor the current study.
Chapter 2 - Literature Review

Conceptual Overview: Integrated Marketing Communications

Though widely accepted and practiced among academicians and practitioners alike, integrated marketing communications (IMC) is a largely debated and criticized concept (Krol, 2008). IMC definitions range from the concept being primarily tactical in nature, concerned with ensuring a mixed use of media channels in the execution phase of a communications campaign or effort (Kitchen & Burgmann, 2010), to the concept being fully integrated into the corporation or organization, ensuring that every action and message communicated serve overall marketing objectives and goals (Rodgers & Thorson, 2012). Arguably, based on the body of research that follows, a more widely recognized and practiced definition of IMC advances the concept as an audience-oriented strategic tool for creating a consistent voice and brand identity across channels (Kitchen & Burgmann, 2010; Kliatchko, 2008; Navarro-Bailón, 2011). This view of IMC, as specifically proposed by Kliatchko (2008), also features four key defining “pillars” — stakeholders, content, channels, and results. Though these four pillars are not consistently articulated across a universally accepted IMC definition, as no such definition exists to this day, the four pillars are all widely represented in IMC scholarship and research. The greatest emphasis in IMC scholarship has focused in on two of these pillars: content and channels.

Message Content: Consistency

Under the conceptual umbrella of IMC, strategic coordination of message content has traditionally been referred to as the “one voice” idea (Navarro-Bailón, 2011; Kitchen & Burgmann, 2010). During its initial foundation as a concept, the one voice idea simply referred to advertisements and communications tactics having one look, one feel, one sound, one sight — a consistent approach toward tactical execution. However, in more recent years, scholars have
argued that *one voice* does not simply mean that an organization should only espouse one singular message but rather an integrated set of messages that are strategically consistent and work together in achieving larger organizational goals (Kitchen & Burgmann, 2010; Navarro-Bailón, 2011; Navarro, Sicilia, & Delgado-Ballester, 2009; Chang & Thorson, 2004; Weissberg, 2008; Liodice, 2008). This idea of strategic consistency, as defined by Navarro, Sicilia, and Delgado-Ballester (2009), simply refers to the degree of shared meaning across communications efforts.

This shift in thought surrounding *one voice* has prompted scholars and advertisers to explore how strategic message consistency is applied and executed across media channels. Strategic consistency versus the antiquated *one voice* approach affords content developers the flexibility to create advertisements specifically suited for each medium they advertise in, recognizing that each medium has unique properties, attributes, and strengths for communication (Nielsen, 2008; Edell & Keller, 1989). What results, then, is a natural variability in messaging, with an organization’s messages being told in unique ways to targeted members of its audiences at different times (Greeno & Sommers, 1977; Wang & Nelson, 2006). These messages, however, still must retain strategic consistency in order to produce the most desired effects, and when they do, the effects of these messages are essentially compounded, creating a cumulative effect and synergy (Micu & Pentina, 2012; Naik & Raman, 2003; Naik & Peters, 2009; Chang & Thorson, 2004).

When considering synergy and message consistency, the terms imply that an organization’s messages appear more than once, whether repeated identically or in their varied forms. Therefore, it is prudent to discuss repetition effects in advertising within this context. Strategic message consistency applied across media channels (versus identical message
repetition in a single medium) has been found to result in higher levels of mental processing and engagement (Navarro-Bailón, 2011). This could also be attributed to mere exposure, as repeated exposure to stimuli can enhance attitudes toward the message (Zajonc, 1968). However, Cacioppo and Petty (1979) found that message repetition does not always lead to higher levels of mental processing and engagement, as over-exposure can lead to satiation effects and message dismissal. Taken together, these findings imply that message content variation plays a role in how repetition affects cognitive processing of messages, as well as the evaluation of those messages. And level of cognitive processing, or elaboration, is an important consideration when examining message adoption and effectiveness.

**Elaboration Likelihood Model**

The Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM), attributed to social psychologists Richard Petty and John Cacioppo (Cacioppo & Petty, 1979; Cacioppo & Petty, 1982; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986), offers a way of understanding how messages lead to varying levels of cognitive elaboration, which in turn leads to either message acceptance or rejection. Petty and Cacioppo (1986) suggest that attitudes can be formed, reinforced, or changed based on the level of thought given to a message (Schumann, Kotowski, Ahn, & Haugtvedt, 2012). Additionally, processing occurs via one of two pathways: the central route (where extensive cognitive processing takes place and motivation is often high) or the peripheral route (where little to no cognitive processing takes place and motivation is often low) (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986; Schumann et al., 2012; Pierro et al., 2005). Central and peripheral processing serve as bookends to an overall processing continuum, along which Petty and Cacioppo (1986) suggest that attitudes formed as a result of high levels of processing via the central route have greater longevity and resistance to change than those formed via the peripheral route. Therefore, a positive relationship is suggested
to exist between high levels of cognitive elaboration and “stickiness” — or perpetuity — of attitudes formed from a message construct. Variables, such as degree of content consistency, can then be employed in communication efforts to reinforce or change attitudes along the continuum, as well as impact the level of cognitive elaboration expended in exploring the message construct (Schumann et al., 2012).

When applied to the IMC concept, the ELM supports the supposition that over time, repetition of messaging can actually decrease cognitive elaboration, which can lead to unwanted attitudinal change (Cacioppo & Petty, 1979; Shu & Carlson, 2014). Therefore, as outlined above, repetition alone is not the answer. However, strategically consistent, varied messaging across media channels has been shown to positively affect attitudes and elongate periods of high cognitive elaboration before natural satiation sets in (McCullough & Ostrom, 1974; Cacioppo & Petty, 1979; Chang & Thorson, 2004). Essentially, this varied messaging requires individuals to mentally “piece the puzzle” of related messages together into the overarching message, which translates to higher levels of cognitive elaboration.

In creating these message “puzzle pieces”, the ELM offers insight into a variety of tools that practitioners can utilize when varying strategically consistent messages throughout the course of an integrated campaign. Length of source information is one of those tools. Pierro et al. (2005) found that long messages that required more cognitive processing were only persuasive under conditions of high motivation. Conversely, short messages that were easier to process were most persuasive under low motivation conditions. These findings indicate that manipulating message length can potentially improve persuasive effect (and behavioral intent) under conditions where the appropriate cognitive and motivational resources are present (Pierro et al., 2005).
**Need for closure**

In addition to manipulating message length, understanding how cognitive elaboration and need for closure are related offers another strategy for practitioners. Need for closure encompasses an individual’s motivation to process messaging and ultimately make a decision about that messaging or the action it is advocating (Vermeir, Kenhove, & Hendrickx, 2002). High need-for-closure individuals look to make judgments early to minimize the need for additional cognitive elaboration, while low need-for-closure individuals are more open to longer periods of cognitive elaboration (Vermeir, Kenhove, & Hendrickx, 2002). Given this, practitioners can manipulate the construction of individual messages across a campaign’s lifecycle to appeal to these different types of individuals’ needs. For example, this variation in messaging can be achieved through a combination of open-ended messaging and close-ended messaging (Chebat, Charlebois, & Gelines-Chébat, 2001 and Ahearne, Gruen, & Saxton, 2000), where open-ended messages “tease” the existence of additional information (and subsequently, additional messaging), whereas close-ended messages seemingly provide a comprehensive view of available information upfront, thus answering all potential questions and minimizing the need for additional cognitive elaboration.

**Primacy and recency**

When considering open- versus close-ended messaging and how practitioners can utilize these tools to lead customers down a prescribed path of cognitive elaboration, the sequence of messaging also comes into consideration. Pierro et al. (2005) found that the manipulation of individual message length within a sequence of messages had a relationship with overall persuasive effect. Under conditions of high motivation, late-appearing messaging was found to be more persuasive, resulting in a recency effect. In other words, the final message exposure had
the greatest influence on persuasion. Arguably, since motivation was high, level of cognitive processing was also high, which offers insight into the fact that the late-appearing messaging was still being processed well into the sequence of messages. Conversely, under conditions of low motivation, early-appearing messaging was found to be more persuasive, resulting in a primacy effect: The first message exposure had the greatest influence on persuasion. Again, since motivation was low, level of cognitive processing was arguably also low, which offers insight into why only the first exposure was influential.

While recency/primacy effects have been observed between sequences of message content, they have also been observed across media sequences (Haugtvedt & Wegener, 1994; Edell & Keller, 1989; Voorveld, Niejens, & Smit, 2011). Haugtvedt and Wegener (1994) found that under high-elaboration conditions, primacy effects were observed, whereas under low-elaboration conditions, recency effects were observed. Similarly, Edell and Keller (1989) found that the second channel within a two-channel sequence always received less evaluative processing than the first, which they suggested to be the result of the first channel “teasing” the second channel, arousing an initial interest/curiosity that “died off” once the answer was retrieved on the second channel. Voorveld, Niejens, and Smit (2011) also supported these results when they found forward-encoding processes between media channels, meaning the first ad viewing acted as a primer for the second ad viewed in a separate media channel, indicating recall enactment.

These studies suggest that strategic consistency in content is not the only variable at play in an IMC campaign; as Kliatchko (2008) suggested in the four pillars of IMC, the channels utilized to carry those messages are also an important consideration — and as found in a variety of studies, so is the sequence in which those channels are utilized.
Channels: Media Sequence

In today’s age of rapid technological advancement, the choice of media channels available to advertisers is extensive. From traditional media — such as newspapers, television, and radio — to burgeoning online media like display advertising, pay per click advertising, and social media, the options and combinations are seemingly infinite. As practitioners engage in media planning and buying, they are often selecting multiple channels to not only reach their audiences and increase their frequency of touch points — subscribing to the “stakeholders” IMC pillar proposed by Kliatchko (2008) — but to also increase the perceptions of their products or brands as “good” or “popular,” due to multiple source perception effects (Voorveld, Niejens, & Smit, 2011). Once multiple channels are selected, practitioners must then consider the order in which audiences are exposed to various media channels utilized in the cross-channel campaign, as media channel exposure sequences can affect attitude formation and strength, recall, and message acceptance (Wang, 2009; Edell & Keller, 1989; Loda & Coleman, 2005; Voorveld, Niejens, & Smit, 2012; Chatterjee, 2011).

A variety of media channel exposure sequences have been examined in existing literature, though there is much room for additional research and replication studies. Edell and Keller (1989) found that channel sequence between television and radio was an important consideration, as the television-to-radio sequence produced higher levels of brand recall and advertising claims recall than radio-to-television or repeated channel sequences. Loda and Coleman (2005) examined channel sequence between publicity efforts and advertising efforts, finding that the publicity-to-advertising channel sequence produced greater message acceptance and response than advertising-to-publicity, citing credibility as a key moderating factor. Taken together through the lens of the ELM, these studies suggest that individual channels or communication tactics taken in a sequence can impact level of cognitive elaboration, as higher
levels of elaboration typically lead to higher levels of message acceptance, response, recall, and recognition. Additionally, ad presentation and sensory cues can impact level of cognitive elaboration, as visual presentations have been found to produce higher levels of elaboration than auditory presentations (Unnava, Burnkrant, & Erevelles, 1994). Furthermore, Chatterjee (2011) found that self-selected channel exposure first before forced-exposure channels resulted in increased brand recall and brand attitude versus the alternate sequence, indicating that media exposure type can also serve as a moderating variable.

Product involvement

When considering all potential moderating variables that could impact level of cognitive elaboration, one variable that is more prevalent than most in the existing literature is level of product involvement. As defined by Zaichkowsky (1994), level of product involvement is determined by an individuals’ assessment of “how the product is to his/her life.” This operationalization of product involvement is closely related to the concept of salience, which is defined by the phenomenon that some things are more readily noticed/perceived than others (Romaniuk & Sharp, 2004). Salience can be influenced by factors like brand familiarity (the more familiar you are with a brand, the more likely you are to notice it); and proximity of purchase decision (the closer you are to purchasing a product, the more you may pay attention to messages surrounding your product choices).

In this context, product involvement can also be directly compared to cognitive elaboration and the amount of consideration given to a message, an information source (channel), and ultimately, a purchase decision. The greater the level of product involvement (and presumably, the greater the interest in the product category), the greater the capacity for
cognitive elaboration, as individuals will be “tuned in” to the messaging presented to them and will seek out additional sources of information if needed (Voorveld, Neijens, & Smit, 2012).

In a study examining television and website media channel sequences, the website-to-TV sequence was found to be more effective informing consumers about high-involvement products, whereas the TV-to-website sequence was amenable to both high- and low-involvement products (Voorveld, Neijens, & Smit, 2012). This finding is reasonable when considering the amount of content presented on a website versus a TV advertisement; for a high-involvement product, a large quantity of information is acceptable to consumers; for a low-involvement product, it could be dismissed.

Chatterjee (2012) examined content length and channel sequences: banner ad (shortest content length due to space constraints); print ad (medium content length due to space constraints); and finally, email ad (longest content length due to lack of space constraints). Ultimately, the study supported the sequence condition that gradually increased the quantity of information: banner ad—print ad—email ad. However, the self-selected versus forced-exposure channel characteristics of an email ad versus a print ad or banner ad were not extensively examined.

**Hypotheses**

While numerous studies examine variance in message content and media sequence as independent constructs within IMC, very few studies examine the interaction between these constructs across an IMC campaign, especially when product category/involvement level is also considered. As advertising and marketing practitioners aim to create the most impactful sequence of information in an effort to optimize their sales funnel, their IMC campaigns should be utilizing strategically consistent (though not identical) messaging across a variety of media.
channels in order to reach their audiences. But how do they release the right quantity of information on the right media channel at the right time during a multi-channel campaign?

No existing literature to date has examined intended message sequences across a multi-channel strategic IMC effort. With tools like message length and open- versus close-ended message construction (i.e. an open-ended “tease” to a close-ended “answer”) combined with an understanding of cognitive elaboration and processing, especially among various product types and involvement levels, practitioners can strategically create message sequences with information leading down an intended path of discovery. However, what is the effect on brand and message evaluation when an intended message sequence is experienced out of order?

H1a: A message sequence of tease-to-answer versus answer-to-tease will have a more positive overall brand evaluation regardless of product involvement level.

H1b: A message sequence of tease-to-answer versus answer-to-tease will have a more positive overall message evaluation regardless of product involvement level.

When considering product involvement level, the literature suggests that consumers who are exposed to messaging for high-involvement products are more likely to cognitively elaborate on that content versus messaging for low-involvement products (Pierro et al., 2005; Voorveld, Neijens, & Smit, 2012). Therefore, does the significance of message order differ between high-versus low-involvement products?

H2a: There will be no statistically significant difference in brand and message evaluation between a message sequence of tease-to-answer or answer-to-tease for high-involvement products.
H2b: A message sequence of answer-to-tease versus tease-to-answer will have a less positive overall brand and message evaluation for low-involvement products than high-involvement products.

Additionally, the sequence of channels utilized to deliver integrated messaging has been shown to impact ad/message recall and persuasive effect (Voorveld, Niejens, and Smit, 2012). With some media channels more suited for particular levels of elaboration compared to others, practitioners again are armed with the knowledge they need to craft their sequences strategically. Given that, how does the channel sequence through which messages are delivered impact overall brand and message evaluation when layered on top of message order effects?

RQ1: Will channel sequence have an effect on brand/message evaluation?

Finally, given that print and online media channels each have their own unique, individual advantages and disadvantages (Nielsen, 2008; Edell & Keller, 1989), how does channel sequence impact overall behavioral intent relative to both high- and low-involvement products?

H3a: The print-to-online sequence will result in higher behavioral intent for both low- and high-involvement products.

H3b: The online-to-print sequence will only result in higher behavioral intent for high-involvement products.
Chapter 3 - Methods

The current study examines intended message sequences between print/online mediums for both low- and high-involvement products. The message sequence, media sequence, and product involvement serve as the manipulated, independent variables and the resulting attitudes toward the brand, message evaluation, and behavioral intent serve as the dependent measures. Therefore the study was constructed as a 2 (message content order: tease-to-answer versus answer-to-tease) by 2 (medium sequence: print-to-online versus online-to-print) by 2 (involvement: high- versus low-involvement) mixed factorial design, where message content order and medium sequence served as between-subjects variables and involvement was treated as a within-subjects comparison.

Figure 3:1 Experimental design

Participants

Participants — consisting of undergraduate students age 18-22 — were recruited at a large, Midwestern university. One sample of participants was recruited from a stratified random sample of 1,500 students from the university’s overall undergraduate population. An additional
sample was recruited from a large lecture class. No significant differences were found between the dependent variables in the two gathered samples. Therefore, the samples were merged, and incomplete responses were deleted, leaving a total of 304 participants in the study (175 females and 129 males). The majority of participants were classified as sophomores (26.0%) and juniors (24.7%), though all other classifications — freshman, senior, and fifth-year senior and beyond — were represented among the sample as well (17.1%, 12.2%, and 20.1%, respectively). The sample consisted of primarily domestic students (97.4%) versus international students (2.6%). Additionally, the sample primarily consisted of non-Hispanic, White participants (78.0%), which is reflective of the overall study population from which the sample was obtained. All participants were randomly assigned to one of the four experimental conditions, and there were no significant differences in the analysis of dependent variables when crossed with demographic distribution. Thus, non-significant findings of demographic differences will be dropped from further discussion.

**Apparatus and materials**

Both pre-test data and primary experimental data were collected utilizing the Qualtrics online survey platform.

**Pre-test**

The pre-test survey (Appendix A) was designed to determine one high-involvement product and one low-involvement product for use in the primary experimental design. Participants in the pre-test were pulled from a sample population similar to the primary experimental design, but no one participated in both questionnaires. Members examined a list of 14 products. Half of those products had been previously identified as, or inferred to be, high-involvement products, and half were previously identified as, or inferred to be, low-involvement
products based on previous research (Voorveld, Neijens, & Smit, 2011; Pfau, 1994; Traylor, 1981).

Participants ranked the top three products (as measures of high involvement) and bottom three products (as measures of low involvement) based on how much time they would spend thinking about the products before making a purchase decision, and how likely they would be to seek out additional information about the products before making a purchase decision. The high- and low-involvement products for the primary study were then derived by summing and weighting the rankings — weight of five for a ranking of “1”, weight of three for a ranking of “2”, and weight of one for a ranking of “3”. The product with the highest overall sum score for the high-involvement measures became the high-involvement product in the experimental study.

Colleges/universities (597) were identified as the high-involvement exemplar to be used in the experimental manipulation, while cars and cell phone providers followed with sum scores of 489 and 228, respectively. The product with the highest overall sum score for the low-involvement measures became the low-involvement product in the experimental study. Candy bars (402) were self-identified as the exemplar requiring the least amount of cognitive effort to process for any behavioral intent, while ink pens and facial tissue followed with sum scores of 370 and 322, respectively.

**Experiment**

For the primary experiment, four versions of postcard stimuli — tease content, low-involvement product (Figure B.1); tease content, high-involvement product (Figure B.2); answer content, high-involvement product (Figure B.3); answer content, low-involvement product (Figure B.4) — were created. In terms of message sequence, the tease content is the first content intended to be seen and the answer content is the second content intended to be seen. Four Web
pages were created utilizing the same creative versioning — tease content, low-involvement product (Figure B.5); tease content, high-involvement product (Figure B.6); answer content, high-involvement product (Figure B.7); answer content, low-involvement product (Figure B.8). The design scheme, color scheme, and photography were consistent between the creative versions within each product category to control for possible confounding variables. Additionally, the dimensions of all postcard stimuli were consistent in size at 10 inches wide by 5 inches tall, while the Web page stimuli were consistent in size at 14.25 inches wide by 10.75 inches tall. Furthermore, in order to control for brand affinity, British brands were utilized for the low- and high-involvement products as a means to reduce any familiarity effects (Phelps & Thorson, 1991). Each “medium of study” — print versus online — was clearly identified above each stimulus in the Qualtrics display. In addition to the experimental stimuli, four distractor stimuli — short news articles from idahostatesman.com and witneygazette.co.uk — were presented between stimuli. The complete set of experimental stimuli and the experimental survey can be found in Appendix B.

### Procedure

The survey apparatus was designed to randomly assign participants to one of the four experimental conditions. Each of the four experimental groups was exposed to the message content and medium sequence for its condition for both the low- and high-involvement products. Additionally, the survey apparatus again randomized the order of the presentation between the low-involvement sequence and high-involvement sequence for each participant.

Following a request to participate and acknowledgement of IRB approval, participants were first provided with brief instructions as to the structure and purpose of the study. For the first randomized product category, the first stimulus was shown, followed by a distractor; and
then the second stimulus in the sequence was shown, followed by an additional distractor. The condition was then repeated for the second product category. The stimuli and distractor display times were all locked at 20-second minimums to control for time effects across conditions, and to ensure participants did not skip past the stimuli. The 20-second delay was established after monitoring the minimum time used by participants in a practice sample.

Once all stimuli were displayed, the participants were then asked a series of questions relative to the dependent measures for one product category, followed by the same question set for the second product category. The display order of the high-involvement and low-involvement product category question sets was randomized. Participants were also asked to rank the stimuli represented by the two product categories on Zaichkowsky’s (1994) personal involvement inventory 10-item, 7-point semantic differential scale as a manipulation check of product involvement. Finally, participants were asked to provide demographic information before the survey closed and debriefing was provided.

**Measures**

**Brand evaluation**

Attitude toward the brand was measured with a five-item, five-point semantic differential scale derived from those utilized by Chang and Thorson (2004) and Voorveld, Neijens, and Smit (2011). The five items used to answer the question “How would you collectively describe the postcard and online messages you saw?” included: very likable/not very likable; interesting/not interesting; good/bad; very informative/not very informative; and appealing/not appealing.

**Message evaluation**

Derived from Voorveld, Neijens, and Smit (2011), evaluation of the message was assessed utilizing a five-item, five-point semantic differential scale. The scale utilized by
Voorveld, Niejens, and Smit (2011) was only a two-item measure (trustworthy/not trustworthy; good/bad); therefore, the scale was expanded for the current study. The five items used to answer the question “How would you rate your attitude toward the text content you read?” included: very informative/not very informative; comprehensive/not very comprehensive; satisfactory/not very satisfactory; very useful/not useful at all; trustworthy/not very trustworthy.

**Behavioral intent**

Derived in part from Chang and Thorson’s (2004) measure for product purchase intention, behavioral intent was measured utilizing a five-point semantic differential scale analyzing: intent to obtain additional information; intent to purchase, and intent to recommend. Each of these three items were measured with a two-item, five-point semantic differential scale where the items included: very likely/not very likely and very probable/very improbable.

**Data manipulation and analysis**

Descriptive/frequency statistics were first run on the sample to assess the distribution of the demographic categories across the sample and between conditions. A t-test was conducted to check the manipulation on involvement. T-tests were also conducted to examine the relationship of message sequence to both brand evaluation and message evaluation (H1a and H1b), as well as the relationships between message sequence, brand evaluation, and message evaluation for both high- and low-involvement product categories (H2a and H2b). A one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore the main effect between channel order, brand evaluation, and message evaluation, followed by post-hoc tests utilizing Tukey HSD (RQ1). A one-way ANOVA was also conducted to explore the main effect between channel order and behavioral intent for both high- and low-involvement product categories, followed again by post-hoc tests utilizing Tukey HSD (H3a and H3b).


Chapter 4 - Results

Data transformation

Before analyses were conducted, data were transformed. All dependent measures were presented to participants in the order used in previous studies ranging from low to high scores — left to right (Chang and Thorson, 2004; Voorveld, Neijens, and Smit, 2011). This necessitated reverse-coding responses so that higher overall scores were represented as higher means for easier explanation via figures and tables. The five-item measure for brand evaluation was combined into one scale for both high- and low-involvement product categories, and then these two scales were also combined into one measure of brand evaluation. The five-item measure for message evaluation was also combined into one scale for both high- and low-involvement product categories, and again, these two scales were also combined into one measure of message evaluation. The two-item scales measuring intent to obtain additional information, intent to purchase, and intent to recommend were combined into one behavioral intent scale for the high-involvement product category and one behavioral intent scale for the low-involvement product category. The 10-item personal involvement inventory scale was also transformed by reverse coding factors 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 9 on the scale to ensure all factors would be compared appropriately, and so that once again higher means would represent higher involvement during analysis and reporting of results. These 10-item scales were combined into one scale each for the high-involvement product category and the low-involvement product category.

Based on the four experimental conditions, two additional new variables were also created: order, which combined the two tease-to-answer conditions together and the two answer-to-tease conditions together (regardless of channel sequence) and channel, which combined the two print-to-online conditions together and the two online-to-print conditions together.
(regardless of message sequence). Participants in Condition One were disproportionately underrepresented \((n = 6)\) for unexplainable reasons by either dropping out of the study or providing incomplete responses, while participants in Condition Two were overrepresented \((n = 15)\) in comparison to the number of viable participants in Conditions Three and Four. An initial ANOVA indicated inequalities of variance. Therefore a data replacement procedure was required to account for these inequalities. Participants from Condition One were randomized and responses from six participants were re-inserted for statistical analysis, while the scores of 15 participants in Condition Two were randomly eliminated and deleted from analysis (Babbie, 2012; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2000).

**Manipulation check**

A \(t\)-test was conducted to check the involvement manipulation. The high-involvement condition, utilizing the combined high-involvement scale, was compared against the low-involvement condition, utilizing the combined low-involvement scale. There was a significant difference in the scores for the high-involvement \((M = 5.46, SD = 1.06)\) and low-involvement \((M = 3.96, SD = 1.16)\) conditions; \(t(303) = 89.72, p = 0.001\). This indicates that the involvement manipulation was successful, as participants viewing the high-involvement stimuli did self-report a significantly higher amount of involvement with the messages regarding a college than with the low-involvement stimuli for a candy bar.

**Brand and message evaluation**

**Message sequences**

Hypothesis 1a predicted that a message sequence order of tease-to-answer versus answer-to-tease would have a more positive overall brand evaluation regardless of product involvement level. A \(t\)-test was conducted to examine the relationship between message sequence and brand
evaluation. There was a significant difference in the scores for the tease-to-answer message sequence ($M = 3.83, SD = 0.51$) compared to the answer-to-tease sequence ($M = 3.51, SD = 0.63$) conditions when examining these orders against the combined brand evaluation scale; $t(302) = 4.90, p = 0.001$ (Figure 4.1). H1a was thus supported, as the findings indicate that a message sequence exposure order is critical to overall brand evaluation; messages need to be experienced in the correct sequence in order to bolster brand evaluation.

Hypothesis 1b stated that a message sequence of tease-to-answer versus answer-to-tease would have a more positive overall message evaluation regardless of product involvement level. There was a significant difference in the scores for the tease-to-answer message sequence ($M = 3.91, SD = 0.63$) compared to the answer-to-tease sequence ($M = 3.43, SD = 0.66$) conditions when examining these orders on the combined message evaluation scale; $t(302) = 6.50, p = 0.001$ (Figure 4.1). Therefore, H1b was also supported, as the findings indicate that a message sequence exposure order is critical to overall message evaluation, as well as the previously identified brand evaluation in H1a.

**Figure 4:1 Message sequence compared to brand and message evaluation**
Hypothesis 2a predicted there would be no statistically significant difference in brand and message evaluation between a message sequence of tease-to-answer or answer-to-tease for high-involvement products. Results of a *t*-test indicate there was a significant difference in the scores for the tease-to-answer message sequence \( (M = 3.68, SD = 0.63) \) and answer-to-tease sequence \( (M = 3.30, SD = 0.76) \) conditions when examining these orders against the high-involvement brand evaluation scale; \( t(302) = 4.77, p = 0.022 \). Additionally, results of an additional *t*-test indicate there was a significant difference in the scores for the tease-to-answer message sequence \( (M = 3.88, SD = 0.77) \) compared to the answer-to-tease sequence \( (M = 3.43, SD = 0.80) \) conditions when examining these orders with the high-involvement message evaluation scale; \( t(302) = 4.97, p = 0.032 \). H2a was therefore not supported, as the order of the message appears to have far outweighed the additional impact of more thoughtful processing of the high-involvement product category, as displayed in Figure 4.2.

Hypothesis 2b predicted that a message sequence of answer-to-tease versus tease-to-answer will have a less positive overall brand and message evaluation for low-involvement products than high-involvement products. Analysis of a *t*-test indicate there was a significant difference in the scores for the tease-to-answer message sequence \( (M = 4.03, SD = 0.75) \) compared to the answer-to-tease sequence \( (M = 3.64, SD = 0.82) \) conditions when examining these orders against the low-involvement brand evaluation scale; \( t(302) = 4.32, p = 0.004 \). Furthermore, there was a significant difference in the scores for the tease-to-answer message sequence \( (M = 3.95, SD = 0.76) \) and answer-to-tease sequence \( (M = 3.38, SD = 0.84) \) conditions when examining these orders against the low-involvement message evaluation scale; \( t(302) = 6.29, p = .006 \). Therefore, H2b was only partially supported, as only the message evaluation mean for the low-involvement product category was lower than that of the high-involvement
product category for the answer-tease sequence. The brand evaluation mean for the low-involvement product category was actually higher than that of the high-involvement product category for the answer-to-tease sequence, as shown in Figure 4.2 below. However, the individual findings between involvement categories continue to support the finding that the tease-to-answer order versus the answer-to-tease sequence is still the most effective at influencing positive brand and message evaluation.

**Figure 4:2 Message sequence compared to brand and message evaluation for high- versus low-involvement product categories**

![Graph showing brand and message evaluation for high- and low-involvement product categories]

**Message and channel sequences**

RQ1 questioned what effect channel sequence would have on brand/message evaluation. In order to explore RQ1, a one-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of both message sequence and channel sequence on brand and message evaluation in all four experimental conditions. There was an overall main effect of message sequence and channel sequence on brand evaluation for the four conditions \(F(3, 300) = 8.40, p = 0.001\). Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the print tease-online
answer condition \( (M = 3.88, SD = 0.49) \) was highest, followed by the online tease-print answer condition \( (M = 3.78, SD = 0.53) \); print answer-online tease \( (M = 3.51, SD = 0.64) \); and online answer-print tease \( (M = 3.50, SD = 0.62) \) conditions. Additionally, there was an overall main effect of message sequence and channel sequence on overall message evaluation at the \( p < .05 \) level for the four conditions \( [F(3, 300) = 15.24, p = 0.001] \). Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the online tease-print answer condition \( (M = 3.93, SD = 0.64) \) was highest, followed by the print tease-online answer \( (M = 3.89, SD = 0.62) \), print answer-online tease \( (M = 3.53, SD = 0.68) \), and online answer-print tease \( (M = 3.34, SD = 0.71) \). Figure 4.3 below displays the relationships, clearly showing that while both message sequence and channel sequence can together affect brand and message evaluation, the message sequence effect is far more dominant.

Figure 4:3  Message and channel sequence effects on brand and message evaluation

A further analysis examined the interaction of message sequence and channel sequence with brand evaluation and message evaluation by reviewing these measures separated out by high- and low-involvement product categories. The results indicate that while the tease-to-
answer message sequence consistently resulted in the highest mean score for both product categories, the preferred channel sequence has some disparity. The print tease-online answer condition had the highest mean score for brand evaluation in both high- and low-involvement product categories. However, the print tease-online answer condition only had the highest mean score in the message sequence low-involvement product category, whereas the online tease-print answer condition had the highest mean score for message evaluation in the high-involvement product category. Table 4.1 displays the mean scores for each condition compared with both brand evaluation and message evaluation, each separated between high- and low-involvement product categories.

**Table 4.1 Mean scores for high- and low-involvement brand and message evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brand Eval: High Involv</th>
<th>Brand Eval: Low Involv</th>
<th>Message Eval: High Involv</th>
<th>Message Eval: Low Involv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print Tease-Online</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Tease-Print</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Answer-Print</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Answer-Online</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Behavioral intent**

Hypothesis 3a stated that the print-to-online sequence would result in higher behavioral intent for both low- and high-involvement products, while Hypothesis 3b predicted that the online-to-print sequence would only result in higher behavioral intent for high-involvement products. Up to this point in the analysis, the findings have shown that the message sequence effects outweigh channel sequence effects for brand evaluation and message evaluation. A one-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of channel sequence on another variable: behavioral intent, separated between high- and low-involvement product
categories. There was an overall main effect of channel sequence on the combined high-involvement behavioral intent index at the $p < .05$ level for the two channel sequence conditions \[ F(1,302) = 7.67, p = 0.006 \]. The online-to-print sequence ($M = 2.76, SD = 1.08$) had a higher mean score than the print-to-online sequence ($M = 2.42, SD = 1.03$). The individual components of behavioral intent — intent to obtain additional information, intent to purchase, and intent to recommend — each also produced notable results for the high-involvement product category. Significance was approached when examining channel sequence on intent to obtain additional information \[ F(1,302) = 3.76, p = 0.053 \]. A main effect of channel sequence on purchase intent was found \[ F(1,302) = 11.74, p = 0.001 \], as well on intent to recommend \[ F(1,302) = 6.78, p = 0.010 \].

For the low-involvement product category, no statistically significant results were found at the 95% confidence interval for the overall behavioral intent index or the individual measures of intent to obtain additional information, intent to purchase, or intent to recommend. Thus, H3a is rejected, as behavioral intent was not significantly higher for the low-involvement product category. However, H3b is supported, as the online-to-print sequence was only significant for the high-involvement product category.
Chapter 5 - Discussion

Integrated marketing communications is becoming more and more prevalent as communicators looks for creative ways to reach their audiences and keep their products top of mind (Olenski, 2014). This multi-channel marketing approach allows communicators to take advantage of the unique properties of the different channels available to them, giving communicators the ability to share their messages in strategically consistent — though not identical — ways to different customers at different times (Nielsen, 2008; Edell & Keller, 1989). And with more and more adults using the Internet each year — 87% of adults in 2014 compared to 14% of adults in 1995 — and more of those adults using mobile devices to access the Internet, more companies and organizations are moving their content online in order to take advantage of this on-demand content, 24/7 marketing opportunity (PewResearch, 2014; U.S. Department of Commerce, 2014). However, despite this growth in online content, traditional media still retain their place in the marketing mix, as today’s most effective integrated marketing efforts combine the use of digital and traditional marketing to bolster brand messaging (Doctoroff, 2014).

While this combination of media/channels creates seemingly endless opportunities for the variety of ways that in which audiences can experience brand messaging, it also produces some new challenges. A recent report from Oracle Marketing Cloud (2014) indicates that while companies understand and recognize the importance of integrating their online and offline channels, only 43% of those companies say they “understand customer journeys and adapt the channel mix accordingly”. This phenomenon becomes particularly relevant when considering the findings of the current study: The order of exposure for message sequences still matters despite the complexities of today’s omnipresent communications channels. When individuals are exposed to a tease message that hints at the existence of additional, more comprehensive
information, they evaluate the overall brand and message more positively than if they had seen the comprehensive information before the tease message, regardless of the channel sequence they experienced or the level of product involvement. However, higher behavioral intent — the likelihood to seek out additional information, purchase, and recommend the product to others — was observed for the online-to-print channel sequence for high-involvement products, reflective of the growing content shift to online channels (Oracle Marketing Cloud, 2014).

**Limitations and implications**

As in any research endeavor, there are some limitations to this current study. First, in order to standardize the exposure to the stimuli and control for time, both the postcard stimuli and online page stimuli were presented as images in the Qualtrics survey system. While necessary for experimental control, this did lend a sense of artificiality to the channel exposures. Second, while the study sample was representative of the overall population it was derived from, the sample did skew primarily domestic in nature, possibly limiting the generalization of the results across other cultures. Future studies could examine these same measures across different cultures. Third, each participant was only exposed to one sequence of messages for both the high- and low-involvement product category. Future studies could explore multiple repetitions to further examine order effects. Fourth, the current study concentrated on only print and online channel examples. Future studies could examine different variations of channels to further explore the impact of channel and channel sequence on brand and message evaluation. The highest performing first exposure of a message was found in the print tease-online answer condition. There was no significant difference between this and the fourth condition, which featured an online tease followed by a print answer. Therefore, it is possible that our participants, taken from a sample of college students, see little difference between the media channels used in
an initial exposure to a message — as long as the short introductory message hints that more will follow. This fits with conventional findings that millennials are more likely to vary in how and when they choose to select a message to process, and potentially click through to explore more about the topic (Oracle Marketing Cloud, 2014; PewResearch, 2014). Fifth, the study population and sample only included undergraduate college students. Given the fact that these students had already selected a college (and may not be willing or ready to consider another college again at this time), the high-involvement product measures could have been affected by subject bias and issues of salience. However, millennials are also among the highest population of Internet users, indicating that they are highly likely to experience messages out of order due to their savviness when it comes to on-demand, 24/7 content (PewResearch, 2014). Given this, they were also the most ideal population from which to draw the study sample.

Conclusion

These findings have important implications for today’s marketing communications professionals. While controlling message exposure order seems to be a monstrous task in today’s omnipresent digital society, it is still paramount — and there are steps that can be taken to increase control. When designing an integrated marketing communications campaign, the tease message should always be released to the audience in advance of the answer. The tease message could hint at the release of the comprehensive information at a later date (to control exposure), or it could lead to an unindexed Web page only accessible (in theory) to those who received the tease message. Regardless of the method, communicators should take care in designing their campaigns to ensure the message order is experienced as it was intended in order to bolster message evaluation and overall brand evaluation. Furthermore, while it’s a given that communicators should deeply understand the product they are creating messaging about, the
study also suggests that it is paramount that they understand product involvement and how
different products are evaluated across different channel sequences. Their understanding could
make all the difference in increasing purchase intent and likelihood of product recommendations.

When all is said and done, message order, channel sequence, and product involvement
level all interact to produce varying effects on marketing and communication efforts.
Understanding this interaction is important to the design of a successful marketing
communications strategy and multi-channel campaigns.


Shu, S. B. & Carlson, K. A. (2014). When three charms but four alarms: Identifying the optimal number of claims in persuasion settings. *Journal of Marketing* *78*(1), 127-139. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jm.11.0504


Appendix A - Pre-test

Pre-test survey

Product Survey Pre-Test

Q1 Welcome to the product categorization survey. As a survey participant, you will be presented with six questions in which you will be asked to rank products based on a specific attribute. Pay close attention to the questions, as every other questions asks you for a positive response, while the questions in between ask you for a negative response. These four questions will be followed by three demographic questions. The survey will take less than 10 minutes to complete, and the results will be entirely confidential. As you read and select your answers within this survey, please realize that the researcher appreciates your honest thoughts and opinions relative to the questions asked. This survey is being conducted as preliminary research for a master's thesis and is approved via Kansas State University's IRB protocol #7341. The results of this survey will be used to determine the products tested in the researcher's primary thesis experiment later on this fall.

Q2 Participant Statement of Consent I understand that this survey is part of a master's thesis, and that my participation is completely voluntary. I also understand that if I decide to participate in this study, I may withdraw my consent at any time and stop participating at any time without explanation, penalty, or loss of benefits, or academic standing to which I may otherwise be entitled. I verify that by selecting and submitting my agreement to participate, I am indicating that I have read and understand this consent notification and willingly agree to participate in this study under the terms described.

☐ I agree to voluntarily participate in this study (1)
☐ I do NOT agree to participate in this study (2)

If I do NOT agree to participate... Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey
Q3 Please review the list of products below and rank the three product categories that you would spend the MOST amount of time thinking about and/or considering before purchasing. Do so by typing in “1” next to the product category you would spend the most time thinking about, “2” next to the second, and “3” next to the third. Leave the remainder of the product category rankings blank.

_____ Athletic shoes (1)
_____ Bath soap (2)
_____ Candy bars (3)
_____ Cars (4)
_____ Cell phone providers/services (5)
_____ Coffee grounds (for home brew) (6)
_____ Energy suppliers (7)
_____ Facial tissue (8)
_____ Home furniture (9)
_____ Ink pens (10)
_____ Soft drinks/soda (11)
_____ Tablet computers (12)
_____ TVs (13)
_____ Universities/colleges (14)
Q4 Please review the list of products below and rank the three product categories that you would spend the LEAST amount of time thinking about and/or considering before purchasing. Do so by typing in “1” next to the product category you would spend the least time thinking about, “2” next to the second least, and “3” next to the third least. Leave the remainder of the product category rankings blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Product Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Athletic shoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bath soap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Candy bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cell phone providers/services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Coffee grounds (for home brew)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Energy suppliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Facial tissue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Home furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ink pens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Soft drinks/soda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tablet computers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>TVs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Universities/colleges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5 Please review the list of products below and rank the three product categories for which you would seek out MORE than one information source before making a purchase decision. Do so by typing in '1' next to the product category you are most likely to seek out more than one information source for, '2' next to the second, and '3' next to the third. Leave the remainder of the product category rankings blank.

- Athletic shoes (1)
- Bath soap (2)
- Candy bars (3)
- Cars (4)
- Cell phone providers/services (5)
- Coffee grounds (for home brew) (6)
- Energy suppliers (7)
- Facial tissue (8)
- Home furniture (9)
- Ink pens (10)
- Soft drinks/soda (11)
- Tablet computers (12)
- TVs (13)
- Universities/colleges (14)
Q6 Please review the list of products below and rank the three product categories for which you would NOT seek out more than one information source before making a purchase decision. Do so by typing in “1” next to the product category you are least likely to seek out additional information sources for, “2” next to the second, and “3” next to the third. Leave the remainder of the product category rankings blank.

_____ Athletic shoes (1)
_____ Bath soap (2)
_____ Candy bars (3)
_____ Cars (4)
_____ Cell phone providers/services (5)
_____ Coffee grounds (for home brew) (6)
_____ Energy suppliers (7)
_____ Facial tissue (8)
_____ Home furniture (9)
_____ Ink pens (10)
_____ Soft drinks/soda (11)
_____ Tablet computers (12)
_____ TVs (13)
_____ Universities/colleges (14)
Q7 Just a few more questions and you're all done. What is your gender?
☐ Male (1)
☐ Female (2)

Q8 What is your current academic classification?
☐ Freshman (1)
☐ Sophomore (2)
☐ Junior (3)
☐ Senior (4)
☐ 5th Year Senior and beyond (5)

Q9 What is your race/ethnicity?
☐ American Indian/Alaskan Native (1)
☐ Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (2)
☐ Black or African American (3)
☐ Asian or Asian American (4)
☐ Hispanic or Latino (5)
☐ Non-Hispanic White (6)
☐ Other (7)

Q10 Closing Message Thank you for participating in this survey examining product classifications. If you have any questions about this study at any time, please contact the graduate student researcher, Ashley Martin, at ashley07@k-state.edu. Click on the NEXT button below to save all of your responses and end the survey.
Appendix B - Experiment

Experimental stimuli

Figure B:1 Low-involvement Print Tease

![Low-involvement Print Tease](image1)

Figure B:2 High-involvement Print Tease

![High-involvement Print Tease](image2)
Figure B:3 High-involvement Print Answer

Figure B:4 Low-involvement Print Answer
Figure B:5  Low-involvement Online Tease

Figure B:6  High-involvement Online Tease
Figure B:7 High-involvement Online Answer

Figure B:8 Low-involvement Online Answer
Experiment survey

Thesis Survey - Primary Study

Q1 Survey: Welcome to the Marketing/Communications Tactics Evaluation survey. The survey should take no more than 20 minutes of your time, and the results will be entirely confidential. The researcher greatly appreciates your time. Participation in this survey will help us better understand how marketing/communications pieces are evaluated by college students. This survey is being conducted as research for a master's thesis and is approved via Kansas State University's IRB proposal #7341.

Q2 Participant Statement of Consent: I understand that this survey is part of a master’s thesis, and that my participation is completely voluntary. I also understand that if I decide to participate in this study, I may withdraw my consent at any time and stop participating at any time without explanation, penalty, or loss of benefits, or academic standing to which I may otherwise be entitled. I verify that by selecting and submitting my agreement to participate, I am indicating that I have read and understand this consent notification and willingly agree to participate in this study under the terms described.

☑ I agree to voluntarily participate in this study
☑ I do NOT agree to participate in this study

Q3 Thank you for agreeing to participate. As a study participant, you will be presented with a few different marketing/communications pieces, each identified as one of the following: Postcard, short story, or Web page. You will be required to stay on each page for a minimum of 20 seconds before the button will appear that allows you to advance to the next question. Once you've viewed all pieces, you will be asked to answer some questions about the pieces, as well as a few demographic questions. The researcher again appreciates your time and honest responses.
[CONDITION 1]

Q4 Timing

First Click
Last Click
Page Submit
Click Count

Q5 See the POSTCARD below.

<STIMULUS: High-involvement, tease, postcard> (Figure B.2)

Q6 Timing

First Click
Last Click
Page Submit
Click Count

Q7 See the SHORT STORY below.

Source: witneygazette.co.uk

Painting the perfect picture about birds

Birds are often something we admire from afar, but artist Andrew Forlizzi is helping people get closer to the creatures with his new exhibition.

Birds for sale, an exhibition of Mr Forlizzi’s acrylic paintings, opens at West One Arts art gallery in Bournemouth today.

It coincides with the publication of the Witney artist’s book, A-Z of Bird Portraits, in which he showcases and tips on how to paint birds accurately.

Mr Forlizzi, 50, said: ‘As an artist, I’m constantly searching for inspiration for something that captures the urge to produce my own representation of what I have seen.

‘Nothing provides us with more than elements of the natural world and, most specifically, birds.’

Speaking about the book, he said: ‘Some letters of the alphabet were easy to select.

‘The kingfisher – or Alcedo atthis, as the alphabet uses the Latin names – is wonderful to paint because of its plumage pattern and interesting body shape.'
Q8 Timing
  First Click
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  Click Count

Q9 See the WEB PAGE below.
<STIMULUS: High-involvement, answer, Web page> (Figure B.7)

Q10 Timing
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Q11 See the SHORT STORY below.
Source: idahostatesman.com

Simplot potato processing plant closure delayed

J.R. Simplot Company is delaying the closure of a southwest Idaho potato processing plant.

Company spokesman David Cuioio tells the Idaho Press-Tribune in a story on Friday that unexpectedly high product demand will keep the plant in Nampa open past a previously announced Oct. 31 closing.

Cuioio says a French fry processing line and packaging line is expected to run through November, and a second processing line will run through the rest of the year.

Simplot is consolidating operations by closing three plants in the region with an expected loss of 800 jobs.

The plants are being replaced by a new plant in Caldwell that will employ about 250 people and can produce the same output as the three other plants combined.
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Q13 See the POSTCARD below.

<STIMULUS: Low-involvement, tease, print> (Figure B.1)
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Q15 See the SHORT STORY below.

*Source: witneygazette.co.uk*

Pupils are enjoying their first days at school

My, they grow up so fast.

This angelic class from St Mary’s Church of England Primary School have made it through their first half-term at school.

Apple Class, made up of four- and five-year-olds, are one of the reception classes at the Chipping Norton school.

We featured a host of new classes in our two First Days at School souvenirs but, due to a production error, we failed to publish this picture of Apple Class.

Reflecting on her first few weeks of school, Georgia Palmer, four, pictured front, second from left, said: “I like coming to school because I’ve made lots of new friends.”
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Dick's Sporting Goods opens Nampa Store

Dick's Sporting Goods opened its new Nampa store Friday at 16905 N. Marketplace Blvd.

Boise State University alumni and former NFL running back Ian Johnson will be at the store during a grand opening celebration from 12:30 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. Sunday.

The store opens at 8:00 a.m. Saturday and 9:00 a.m. Sunday.

Saturday and Sunday giveaways at the new store include a $5 to $500 gift card for the first 100 adults in line.

The store will have Nike and Under Armour shops, athletic and outdoor apparel and footwear and the latest gear for team sports, fitness, camping, hunting and fishing.
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**Simplott potato processing plant closure delayed**

J.R. Simplot Company is delaying the closure of a southwest Idaho potato processing plant.

Company spokesman David Cuolo tells the Idaho Press-Tribune in a story on Friday that unexpectedly high product demand will keep the plant in Nampa open past a previously announced Oct. 31 closing.

Cuolo says a French fry processing line and packaging line is expected to run through November, and a second processing line will run through the rest of the year.

Simplott is consolidating operations by closing three plants in the region with an expected loss of 800 jobs.

The plants are being replaced by a new plant in Caldwell that will employ about 250 people and can produce the same output as the three other plants combined.
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Dick's Sporting Goods opens Nampa Store

Dick's Sporting Goods opened its new Nampa store Friday at 16905 N. Marketplace Blvd.

Boise State University alumni and former NFL running back Ian Johnson will be at the store during a grand opening celebration from 12:30 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. Sunday.

The store opens at 8:00 a.m. Saturday and 9:00 a.m. Sunday.

Saturday and Sunday giveaways at the new store include a $5 to $500 gift card for the first 100 adults in line.

The store will have Nike and Under Armour shops, athletic and outdoor apparel and footwear and the latest gear for team sports, fitness, camping, hunting and fishing.
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Pupils are enjoying their first days at school
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My, they grow up so fast.

This angelic class from St Mary’s Church of England Primary School have made it through their first half-term at school.

Apple Class, made up of four- and five-year-olds, are one of the reception classes at the Chipping Norton school.

We featured a host of new classes in our two *First Days at School* souvenirs but, due to a production error, we failed to publish this picture of Apple Class.

Reflecting on her first few weeks of school, Georgina Palmer, four, pictured front, second from left, said: “I like coming to school because I’ve made lots of new friends.”
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Simplot potato processing plant closure delayed

J.R. Simplot Company is delaying the closure of a southwest Idaho potato processing plant.

Company spokesman David Cuoio tells the Idaho Press-Tribune in a story on Friday that unexpectedly high product demand will keep the plant in Nampa open past a previously announced Oct. 31 closing.

Cuoio says a French fry processing line and packaging line is expected to run through November, and a second processing line will run through the rest of the year.

Simplot is consolidating operations by closing three plants in the region with an expected loss of 800 jobs.

The plants are being replaced by a new plant in Caldwell that will employ about 250 people and can produce the same output as the three other plants combined.
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![Pupils are enjoying their first days at school](image)

My, they grow up so fast.

This angelic class from St Mary’s Church of England Primary School have made it through their first half-term at school.

Apple Class, made up of four- and five-year-olds, are one of the reception classes at the Chipping Norton school.

We featured a host of new classes in our two First Days at School souvenirs but, due to a production error, we failed to publish this picture of Apple Class.

Reflecting on her first few weeks of school, Georgia Palmer, four, pictured front, second from left, said: “I like coming to school because I’ve made lots of new friends.”
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**Dick's Sporting Goods opens Nampa Store**

Dick’s Sporting Goods opened its new Nampa store Friday at 16905 N. Marketplace Blvd.

Boise State University alumni and former NFL running back Ian Johnson will be at the store during a grand opening celebration from 12:30 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. Sunday.

The store opens at 8:00 a.m. Saturday and 9:00 a.m. Sunday.

Saturday and Sunday giveaways at the new store include a $5 to $500 gift card for the first 100 adults in line.

The store will have Nike and Under Armour shops, athletic and outdoor apparel and footwear and the latest gear for team sports, fitness, camping, hunting and fishing.
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Simpot potato processing plant closure delayed

J.R. Simplot Company is delaying the closure of a southwest Idaho potato processing plant.

Company spokesman David Cuioio tells the Idaho Press-Tribune in a story on Friday that unexpectedly high product demand will keep the plant in Nampa open past a previously announced Oct. 31 closing.

Cuioio says a French fry processing line and packaging line is expected to run through November, and a second processing line will run through the rest of the year.

Simpot is consolidating operations by closing three plants in the region with an expected loss of 800 jobs.

The plants are being replaced by a new plant in Caldwell that will employ about 250 people and can produce the same output as the three other plants combined.
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Dick’s Sporting Goods opens Nampa Store

Dick’s Sporting Goods opened its new Nampa store Friday at 16905 N. Marketplace Blvd.

Boise State University alumni and former NFL running back Ian Johnson will be at the store during a grand opening celebration from 12:30 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. Sunday.

The store opens at 8:00 a.m. Saturday and 9:00 a.m. Sunday.

Saturday and Sunday giveaways at the new store include a $5 to $500 gift card for the first 100 adults in line.

The store will have Nike and Under Armour shops, athletic and outdoor apparel and footwear and the latest gear for team sports, fitness, camping, hunting and fishing.
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   Pupils are enjoying their first days at school

   My, they grow up so fast.

   This angelic class from St Mary’s Church of England Primary School have made it
   through their first half-term at school.

   Apple Class, made up of four- and five-year-olds, are one of the reception classes at the
   Chipping Norton school.

   We featured a host of new classes in our two First Days at School souvenirs but, due to a
   production error, we failed to publish this picture of Apple Class.

   Reflecting on her first few weeks of school, Georgia Palmer, four, pictured front, second
   from left, said: “I like coming to school because I’ve made lots of new friends.”
Q68 We now have some questions with regard to Coventry University. How would you collectively describe the Coventry University postcard and Web page you saw?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likable:Not very likable</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting:Not very interesting</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good:Bad</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very informative:Not very informative</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealing:Not appealing</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q69 How would you describe your attitude toward the text content you read about Coventry University?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very informative:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not very informative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not very comprehensive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfactory:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not very satisfactory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very useful:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not very useful</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trustworthy:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not very trustworthy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q70 Based on the Coventry University content you read, how would you characterize your intent to obtain additional information about Coventry University?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very likely:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not very likely</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very probable:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not very probable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q71 Based on the Coventry University content you read, how would you characterize your intent to invest in an education with Coventry University?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely: Not very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very probable: Not very probable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q72 Based on the Coventry University content you read, how would you characterize your intent to recommend an education with Coventry University to others?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely: Not very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very probable: Not very probable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q73 We now have some questions with regard to the Double Decker candy bar. How would you collectively describe the Double Decker candy bar postcard and Web page you saw?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likable:Not very likable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting:Not very interesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good:Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very informative:Not very informative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealing:Not appealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q74 How would you describe your attitude toward the text content you read about the Double Decker candy bar?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very informative: Not very informative</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive: Not very comprehensive</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory: Not very satisfactory</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very useful: Not very useful</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy: Not very trustworthy</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q75 Based on the Double Decker content you read, how would you characterize your intent to obtain additional information about the Double Decker candy bar?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely: Not very likely</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very probable: Not very probable</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q76 Based on the Double Decker content you read, how would you characterize your intent to purchase a Double Decker candy bar?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely:Not very likely</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very probable:Not very probable</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q77 Based on the Double Decker content you read, how would you characterize your intent to recommend Double Decker candy bars to others?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely:Not very likely</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very probable:Not very probable</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q78 10 product attributes are represented on the 7-point scales below. Between each attribute's continuum, please rate college/universities relevant to these attributes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important:Unimportant</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring:Interesting</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant:Irrelevant</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exciting:Unexciting</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means nothing:Means a lot to me</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealing:Unappealing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fascinating:Mundane</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthless:Valuable</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving:Uninvolving</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not needed:Needed</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q79 10 product attributes are represented on the 7-point scales below. Between each attribute's continuum, please rate candy bars relevant to these attributes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important:Unimportant</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring:Interesting</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant:Irrelevant</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exciting:Unexciting</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means nothing:Means a lot to me</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealing:Unappealing</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fascinating:Mundane</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthless:Valuable</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving:Uninvolving</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not needed:Needed</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q80 Just a few more questions and you're all done. What is your gender?
- Male
- Female

Q81 What is your current academic classification?
- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- 5th Year Senior and beyond

Q82 I consider myself to be:
- A domestic student
- An international student

Q83 What is your race/ethnicity?
- American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- Black or African American
- Asian or Asian American
- Hispanic or Latino
- Non-Hispanic White
- Other

Q84 Closing Message: Thank you for participating in this survey examining attitudes toward print/online mediums, message evaluations of those mediums, and behavioral intent relative to medium/message sequences. If you have any questions about this study at any time, please contact the graduate student researcher, Ashley Martin, at ashley07@k-state.edu.