

# Public Attitude Toward Advertising: An Empirical Study of Northern India

---

Raghubir Singh\* and Sandeep Vij\*\*

---

*Attitude toward advertising is one of the main antecedents of attitude toward advertisements; which in turn affect the feelings of consumers about products or brands. The present study measures the public attitude toward advertising in general (Ag) as well as toward the 'institution of advertising' and 'instrument of advertising'. The paper studies the need for separate constructs of attitude-institution and attitude-instrument. The impact of demographics on attitude toward advertising has also been studied. A sample of 873 respondents from North Indian states has been drawn for the study. The study reveals the attitude-institution and attitude-instrument as separate but correlated constructs. Demographic variables were found to have moderate effect upon attitude toward advertising.*

---

## Introduction

Advertising may predispose individuals to respond positively or negatively toward a product or brand. Such elements as the execution of the advertisement, the mood created by the advertisement, the degree to which the viewer is aroused, and even the context within which the advertisement is received (e.g., television program or magazine) may affect their feelings about the advertisement, and in turn their feelings about the product or brand (Stern and Zaichkowsky, 1991).

In recent years, there has been considerable interest in the role of consumer's affective

responses to advertising. Specifically, the attitude toward advertisement (Aad) construct has been posited as an important mediator of brand attitudes and purchase intentions (Mitchell and Olson, 1981; Shimp, 1981; and Lutz, 1985). Conceptual research by Lutz (1985), has helped to delineate the various cognitive and affective antecedents and consequences of Aad. One key antecedent to Aad is the attitude toward advertising in general (Ag) construct.

Theoretically, the Ag construct is grounded in consumer beliefs toward advertising in general. Bauer and Greyser (1968), provide evidence that overall attitudes toward

## About the Authors

\* Professor, Department of Commerce and Business Management, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, India. E-mail: singhraghubir@gmail.com

\*\* Lecturer, Department of Commerce and Business Administration, Lyallpur Khalsa College, Jalandhar, India. E-mail: profsandeepvij@gmail.com

advertising in general are influenced by beliefs toward advertising in general. In turn, it is suggested that a relationship exists between consumers' overall attitudes toward advertising and reasons why certain ads are considered informative, enjoyable, annoying, or offensive.

Ag has been found to influence the success and effectiveness of a particular advertising campaign. Since Aad has been found to influence consumer brand attitude (Shimp, 1981; Thorson, 1981; Lutz, 1985; MacKenzie *et al.*, 1986; Muehling, 1987; and MacKenzie and Lutz, 1989), the influence of Ag on advertising effectiveness is bound to be important. Interest in the Ag construct gained momentum as advertising scholars showed that it was an important determinant of Aad (Lutz, 1985; and Mehta and Purvis, 1995). The present study is an attempt to measure the attitude (Ag) of Indian public and also to ascertain the impact of demographic variables on it.

### Previous Research

In past decades, researchers have tried to measure attitudes toward advertising taking different types of samples. Greyser and Reece (1971) surveyed 2700 *Harvard Business Review* subscribers in order to examine their attitudes toward advertising. Rotzoll and Christians (1980) investigated 123 employees of four advertising agencies about ethical issues in advertising. Many studies have explored the attitude toward advertising among student samples (Larkin, 1977; Sandage and Leckenby, 1980; Dubinsky and Hensel, 1984; Muehling, 1987; and Ramaprasad and Thurwanger, 1998). Zonot (1984) and Mittal (1994),

studied attitudes toward advertising among adult consumers. Zhou, Zhang and Vertinsky (2002), conducted a telephone survey of 825 consumers in five major cities in China.

As the importance of international trade and advertising increased, many scholars extended the scope of their studies to cover international consumers. Santos (1976) studied Latin American consumers. Andrews *et al.* (1991) examined the attitudes of subjects from Denmark, Greece, the USA, India and New Zealand. Yoon *et al.* (1996) compared attitudes toward advertising between Korean and American consumers. Ramaprasad and Thurwanger (1998), measured attitudes toward advertising among five South Asian countries, including Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. Yang (2000), investigated college students' attitudes toward advertising in Taiwan and compared it with the US experience.

According to Bauyer and Greyser (1968): "No identifiable large demographic group in the population is distinctively more interested in, favorable to, or critical of advertising than any other large demographic group". However, many studies have shown that respondents differed in attitudes by demographics. Durand and Lambert (1985), indicated that attitudes toward advertising are moderately related to respondents' age, gender, income, and education. Andrews (1989), found that students viewed the social aspects negatively and the economic aspects positively. Other studies found that students had generally negative attitudes

toward advertising (Larkin, 1977), more so than businessmen (Greyser and Reece, 1971; and Haller, 1974). Reid and Soley (1982) found that there is a significant difference between people's generalized and personalized attitudes toward advertising's social and economic effects, and that people are more negative on the personalized than generalized attitude level toward both types of advertising effects. Female students found advertising more offensive and felt that it used too many sexual appeals (Dubinsky and Hensel, 1984). Petroschius (1986), found that female students had a more favorable attitude toward the institution of advertising while male students had a more favorable attitude toward the ethics of advertising. Private university students were found to have a more critical view of advertising's social effects than state university students (Andrews, 1989). Lysonski and Pollay (1990), found that among business students, Danish, Greek, and New Zealand students were more critical than American students; and that females were more critical than males of the sexist portrayal of women in advertising. Zhou, Zhang and Vertinsky (2002) investigated the relationships among demographic variables and experiences, beliefs, and attitudes. They found that younger consumers have more positive beliefs and attitudes toward advertising and those with higher levels of education tend to have more positive attitudes and beliefs. Initiative Media and BBC World (2002), conducted a study on consumers' attitudes toward advertising in India and

its relevance to media. They found that positive attitude toward advertising is more prevalent amongst women, and people of middle and lower social class.

Previous research has shown that attitudes toward advertising are composed of several dimensions, most often considered in economic or social terms. However, both these aspects seem to address the institution of advertising, while giving less attention to the instrument (practices) of advertising. Given the proposed link between generalized attitudes toward advertising and reactions to specific ads, it seems critical to determine whether or not individuals hold attitudes, not only about the institution (i.e., its purpose and effects), but also about the instruments (executional qualities and shortcomings) of advertising, and more importantly, to determine whether both dimensions actively influence global attitudes. Sandage and Leckenby (1980), conducted a study on attitude of students and the results indicated that measurement instrument tapped two dimensions of attitudes. One dimension was attitude toward the institution, and the other, attitude toward the instrument. Findings disclosed that the advertising students had more favorable attitude toward the institutions than toward the instrument of advertising, i.e., attitudes toward advertising were significantly more favorable than attitudes toward advertisements. Muehling (1987), has also studied the attitude toward the institution of advertising (attitude-institution) and attitude toward the instrument of advertising (attitude-instrument) as separate constructs.

## Research Methodology

This study aims to measure the public attitude toward advertising and to find the impact of demographic variables upon attitude toward advertising. Three constructs have been used to measure the attitude toward advertising:

- Ag: defined as ‘a learned predisposition to respond in a consistently favorable or unfavorable manner to advertising in general’.
- Attitude-institution: defined as the attitude toward ‘the purpose/role of advertising’.
- Attitude-instrument: defined as the attitude toward ‘the contents, methods and tone of advertisements’.

Ag has been measured with a scale including two statements on 5-point Likert scale. Attitude-institution and attitude-instrument have been measured with the help of 7-point Semantic Differential Scales including six and twelve items respectively. Cronbach Alpha coefficient, showing the reliability of scales, for Ag construct is found to be 0.60. For attitude-institution alpha is 0.83 and for attitude-instrument it is 0.89 as shown in Table 2. Cronbach’s alpha is the most common form of internal consistency reliability coefficient. By convention, a lenient cutoff of 0.60 is common in exploratory research. Nunnally (1978), suggests an alpha of 0.70 and above as acceptable. However, an alpha of 0.60 for Ag is satisfactory as scales with small number of statements have lower alpha, which is an acceptable fact.

## Hypotheses

The following three hypotheses were made for the purpose of this study:

*H<sub>1</sub>: Attitude-institution and Attitude-instrument dichotomy is not necessary for measuring the attitude toward advertising.*

*H<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference in average attitude toward advertising for different groups within demographic categories.*

*H<sub>3</sub>: Attitude toward advertising is independent of respondents’ demographics.*

## The Sample

The population for the study comprised the general public from 7 North Indian states (Punjab, Jammu and Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Haryana and Uttranchal) plus the Union Territory of Chandigarh and National Capital Territory of Delhi.

A sample of 900 respondents comprising 100 from every state/UT was selected on the basis of convenience sampling<sup>1</sup>. The data has been collected personally with the help of a well structured and non-disguised questionnaire. After scrutiny of the filled questionnaires, 873 were found to be fit for analysis; others were incomplete or lacked seriousness in response and hence weeded out. People from all strata of society were included in the survey to make the sample more representative. Table 1 gives the description of demographic characteristics of the respondents.

---

<sup>1</sup> Kerlinger and Lee (2000) are of the view that if the theory behind statistical testing “is forbidden to us with non-random samples, much use of statistics and the inferences that accompany statistics would have to be abandoned. The reality is that the statistics seem to work very well even with non-random samples provided the researcher knows the limitations of such samples” (p. 286).

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents		
	Number of Respondents	Percentage
<b>Age</b>		
Up to 25 years	368	42.2
25-50 years	418	47.9
Above 50 years	87	10.0
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	458	52.5
Female	415	47.5
<b>Occupation</b>		
Business	109	12.5
Service	354	40.5
Student	267	30.6
Housewife	100	11.5
Retired	26	3.0
Any Other	17	1.9
<b>Education</b>		
Post Graduation and Above	308	35.3
Graduation	238	37.6
Matric or Undergraduate	192	22.0
Below Matric	10	1.1
Any Other	35	4.0
<b>Income</b>		
Below Rs. 10,000 p.m.	459	52.6
Rs. 10,000-20,000 p.m.	274	31.4
Rs. 20,000-30,000 p.m.	86	9.9
Above Rs. 30,000 p.m.	54	6.2
<b>Family Type</b>		
Joint Family	349	40.0
Nuclear Family	524	60.0
<b>Religion</b>		
Hindu	673	77.1
Sikh	118	13.5
Muslim	52	6.0
Christian	13	1.5
Others	17	1.9

## Data Analysis

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows (10.0.1) and Microsoft Excel have been used to apply various statistical tests for data analysis purpose.

To test the first hypothesis ( $H_1$ ), Pearson's correlation coefficient and stepwise multiple regression have been applied. To test the second hypothesis ( $H_2$ ), one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) has been applied to ascertain if mean scores for attitude toward advertising are different for different groups of demographic variables. When there are more than two independent groups, one-way ANOVA procedure is used to compare the means of different groups for identifying any

significant differences in means. To test the third hypothesis ( $H_3$ ), chi-square test was used to identify the underlying variables of attitude-institution and attitude-instrument which are significantly associated with demographic variables. While the chi-square measures may indicate that there is a relationship between the two variables, they do not indicate the strength or direction of the relationship. Therefore, average scores (refer Table 8) for different variables of attitude toward advertising constructs have been observed for interpreting the associations found through the application of chi-square test.

## Results and Discussion

Table 2 shows that the attitude of public toward advertising is positive in general.

Table 2: Average Scores for Attitude Toward Advertising	
Constructs/Variables	Weighted Average Score
Attitude toward advertising in general (Ag)* Alpha=0.60	4.00
Overall, I like advertising	3.96
Overall, I consider advertising a good thing	4.03
Attitude toward the Institution of Advertising (Attitude-Institution)** Alpha=0.83	5.51
Strong/Weak	5.67
Valuable/Worthless	5.46
Necessary/Unnecessary	5.60
Important/Unimportant	5.62
Convincing/Unconvincing	5.46
Meaningful/Meaningless	5.23
Attitude toward the Instrument of Advertising (Attitude-Instrument)** Alpha=0.89	5.35
Clean/Dirty	5.21

(Contd...)

Table 2: Average Scores for Attitude Toward Advertising (...contd)	
Constructs/Variables	Weighted Average Score
Honest/Dishonest	4.69
Sincere/Insincere	4.76
Informative/Worthless	5.67
Entertaining/Irritating	5.83
Fascinating/Boring	5.41
Enjoyable/Annoying	5.61
Pleasant/Unpleasant	5.25
Comforting/Frightening	5.07
Interesting/Uninteresting	5.56
Appealing/Unappealing	5.34
Attractive/Unattractive	5.72
<b>Note:</b> * Measured on a 5-point Likert Scale, Mean Value = 3. ** Measured on a 7-point Semantic Differential Scale, Mean Value = 4.	

Average score for overall attitude of all the respondents is 4 on a 5-point Likert scale with mean value of 3.

Table 3 indicates that correlation between attitude-institution and attitude-instrument is high and significant at 0.01 level of significance. It may lead to acceptance of hypothesis  $H_1$  that distinction of institution and instrument of advertising is not necessary. However,

results of step-wise multiple regression (refer Table 4) indicate that both attitude-institution and attitude-instrument explain the variance in Ag separately. It indicates that attitude-institution and attitude-instrument dichotomy is justified if the purpose is to measure the attitude toward advertising in general. Thus, attitude-institution, attitude-instrument and Ag are

Table 3: Pearson's Correlation Coefficients among Ag, Attitude-Institution and Attitude-Instrument	
Variables	Pearson's Coefficient
Ag and Attitude-Institution (r1)*	0.370
Ag and Attitude-Instrument (r2)*	0.372
Attitude-Institution and Attitude-Instrument (r3)*	0.640
<b>Note:</b> * All correlations are significant at $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed).	

Table 4: Results of Step-Wise Multiple Regression <sup>®</sup>					
Model Summary					
Model	R	R-Square	Adjusted R-Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	
1	0.372 <sup>a</sup>	0.138	0.137	0.7620	
2	0.409 <sup>b</sup>	0.168	0.166	0.7494	
Regression Coefficients					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	<i>t</i>	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	2.158	0.157		13.708	0
Attitude-Instrument	0.343	0.029	0.372	11.823	0
2 (Constant)	1.768	0.170		10.393	0
Attitude-Instrument	0.212	0.037	0.229	5.691	0
Attitude-Institution	0.199	0.036	0.223	5.544	0
<b>Note:</b> a. Predictors: (Constant), Attitude-Instrument. b. Predictors: (Constant), Attitude-Instrument, Attitude-Institution. ®Dependent Variable: Ag.					

separate, yet correlated constructs which are metrically similar across samples.

Table 5 reveals that mean scores of different demographic categories of income, age, education and family type are significantly different at 95% level of confidence ( $p < 0.05$ ). Mean scores of different categories within gender are significantly different at 90% level of confidence ( $p < 0.10$ ). The relationships of these five demographic variables (for which *F*-test is significant) and attitude toward advertising have been explored as follows:

To analyze and identify the group differences, Scheffé test was applied for pair-wise comparison of means of age

groups, income groups and qualification groups; shown in Table 6. Since the post hoc tests, including Scheffé, require minimum of three groups for comparison, the mean differences of gender and family type are observed from the mean scores for attitude toward advertising for two family types and genders; as shown in Table 8. Chi-square test has been used to identify underlying variables of attitude-institution and attitude-instrument which are significantly associated with demographic variables. Chi-square values for demographics and different variables of attitude toward advertising are shown in Table 7.



Table 5: One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Mean Comparison of Attitude of Different Groups in Demographic Variables		
Demographic Variable	F-test	Significance
Occupation	0.811	0.542
Gender	3.126	0.077**
Income	4.169	0.006*
Age	3.073	0.047*
Education	2.709	0.029*
Family Type	5.792	0.016*
Religion	0.640	0.634
<b>Note:</b> * Significant at $p < 0.05$ . ** Significant at $p < 0.10$ .		

### Age and Attitude Toward Advertising

From Table 6, which shows the results of Scheffé test for pair-wise multiple comparisons of means for age-wise differences in attitude toward advertising, it is evident that the difference is significant for age groups  $A_1$  and  $A_3$ , i.e., for respondents belonging to age groups ‘up to 25 years’ and ‘above 50 years’. Table 8 shows that average scores for Ag for respondents belonging to age group  $A_1$  are higher than respondents belonging to age group  $A_3$ . It shows that younger respondents have more positive Ag compared to older respondents. Further, Table 7 shows that chi-square test is significant at 0.05 level for ‘necessary’ and ‘important’ variables of attitude toward institution of advertising. A comparison of average values for attitude for these variables in Table 8 shows that respondents in age group  $A_1$  find the institution of

advertising more ‘necessary’ and ‘important’ than respondents in the age group  $A_3$ . Similarly, Table 7 shows that chi-square value is significant for attitude toward instrument of advertising for variables ‘enjoyable’ and ‘attractive’. Mean values for these variables from Table 8 show that respondents in age group  $A_1$  find the advertisements more ‘enjoyable’ and ‘attractive’ than those in age group  $A_3$  (5.70 and 5.78 for  $A_1$  as compared to 5.32 and 5.47 for  $A_3$ ).

Thus, the younger people have more favorable attitude toward advertising in general than the older ones because they are more positive about ‘necessity’ and ‘importance’ of institution of advertising. They also find the instrument of advertising, i.e., advertisements more ‘enjoyable’ and ‘attractive’ than others.

Table 6: Pair-Wise Multiple Comparisons of Means for Age-Wise, Income-Wise and Education-Wise Differences in Attitude Toward Advertising		
Statistic: Scheffé Dependent; Variable: Ag		
Groups of Variables		Mean Difference (I-J)
(I) Age Group	(J) Age Group	
Up to 25 years	25-50 years	0.047
	Above 50 years	0.242*
25-50 years	Up to 25 years	-0.047
	Above 50 years	0.195
Above 50 years	Up to 25 years	-0.242*
	25-50 years	-0.195
(I) Income Level (per month)	(J) Income Level (per month)	
Below Rs. 10,000	Rs. 10,000-20,000	0.083
	Rs. 20,000-30,000	0.214
	Above Rs. 30,000	0.350*
Rs. 10,000-20,000	Below Rs. 10,000	-0.083
	Rs. 20,000-30,000	0.131
	Above Rs. 30,000	0.267
Rs. 20,000-30,000	Below Rs. 10,000	-0.214
	Rs. 10,000-20,000	-0.131
	Above Rs. 30,000	0.136
Above Rs. 30,000	Below Rs. 10,000	-0.350*
	Rs. 10,000-20,000	-0.267
	Rs. 20,000-30,000	-0.136
(I) Educational Qualification	(J) Educational Qualification	
Postgraduation and Above	Graduation	-0.140
	Matric. or Undergraduate	0.010
	Below Matric.	0.132
Graduation	Postgraduation and Above	0.140
	Matric. or Undergraduate	0.150
	Below Matric.	0.272
Matric. or Undergraduate	Postgraduation and Above	-0.010
	Graduation	-0.150
	Below Matric.	0.122
Below Matric.	Postgraduation and Above	-0.132
	Graduation	-0.272
	Matric. or Undergraduate	-0.122
Note: * The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.		

Table 7: Chi-Square ( $\chi^2$ ) Values for Association Between Demographics and Attitude Toward Advertising								
Construct/Variable	Age	Gender	Occupation	Family Type	Income Group	Education	Religion	
<b>Attitude Toward Advertising in General (Ag)</b>								
Overall, I like advertising	24.45*	8.82	16.12	4.71	23.58*	13.00	10.69	
Overall, I consider Advertising a good thing	5.04	6.85	29.83	10.19*	19.98	25.66	16.93	
<b>Attitude Toward the Institution of Advertising (Attitude-Institution)</b>								
Strong/Weak	12.81	8.74	40.61	7.66	22.05	53.57*	25.36	
Valuable/Worthless	16.15	9.85	32.21	7.78	26.61	19.56	28.16	
Necessary/Unnecessary	25.45*	9.25	37.53	4.10	27.15	25.31	19.30	
Important/Unimportant	30.24*	6.48	36.31	7.05	25.12	21.92	39.82*	
Convincing/Unconvincing	11.99	6.89	40.00	4.47	33.05*	27.19	14.22	
Meaningful/Meaningless	18.66	13.44*	22.63	6.08	24.09	29.18	35.48	
<b>Attitude Toward the Instrument of Advertising (Attitude-Instrument)</b>								
Clean/Dirty	20.24	7.83	32.43	7.43	14.53	41.50*	15.21	
Honest/Dishonest	13.28	12.99*	48.03*	18.63*	20.59	35.71	27.55	
Sincere/Insincere	12.59	8.97	43.64	5.07	11.78	17.19	31.91	
Informative/Worthless	19.66	10.27	33.14	4.70	26.43	35.87	36.38	
Entertaining/Irritating	18.11	7.14	35.19	6.40	15.69	21.11	36.41	
Fascinating/Boring	13.31	3.61	25.64	11.77*	23.33	31.88	19.98	
Enjoyable/Annoying	25.18*	11.92	37.04	7.63	13.54	25.29	20.59	
Pleasant/Unpleasant	18.06	9.19	28.75	8.03	21.95	27.06	16.01	
Comforting/Frightening	14.73	11.83	32.15	9.52	23.39	39.80	23.36	
Interesting/Uninteresting	17.35	3.41	38.99	9.36	25.80	38.58*	33.03	
Appealing/Unappealing	13.60	12.90*	31.64	2.25	25.57	26.89	17.80	
Attractive/Unattractive	20.59*	5.66	41.14	8.57	21.01	24.30	26.48	
Note: * Significant at $p < 0.05$ .								

Table 8: Average Scores® for Various Attributes of Attitude Toward Advertising												
	M	F	A <sub>1</sub>	A <sub>2</sub>	A <sub>3</sub>	O <sub>1</sub>	O <sub>2</sub>	O <sub>3</sub>	O <sub>4</sub>	O <sub>5</sub>	F <sub>1</sub>	F <sub>2</sub>
<b>Attitude Toward Advertising in General (Ag)*</b>												
Overall, I like advertising	3.91	4.02	4.03	3.96	3.68	3.95	3.88	4.06	4.02	3.88	4.05	3.90
Overall, I consider advertising a good thing	3.98	4.07	4.05	4.03	3.92	3.96	4.04	4.05	4.10	3.81	4.10	3.98
<b>Attitude Toward the Institution of Advertising (Attitude-Institution)**</b>												
Strong/Weak	5.68	5.65	5.59	5.76	5.54	5.82	5.65	5.61	5.73	5.69	5.76	5.60
Valuable/Worthless	5.51	5.41	5.45	5.51	5.33	5.58	5.51	5.44	5.22	5.46	5.52	5.42
Necessary/Unnecessary	5.56	5.64	5.61	5.60	5.55	5.77	5.56	5.59	5.62	5.46	5.61	5.59
Important/Unimportant	5.60	5.63	5.65	5.65	5.33	5.77	5.64	5.58	5.57	5.19	5.68	5.57
Convincing/Unconvincing	5.47	5.45	5.40	5.50	5.55	5.72	5.47	5.36	5.45	5.27	5.53	5.42
Meaningful/Meaningless	5.26	5.20	5.15	5.28	5.36	5.42	5.25	5.13	5.19	5.38	5.32	3.18
<b>Attitude Toward the Instrument of Advertising (Attitude-Instrument)**</b>												
Clean/Dirty	5.23	5.29	5.29	5.25	5.14	5.04	5.18	5.32	5.23	5.15	5.28	5.17
Honest/Dishonest	4.74	4.62	4.67	4.67	4.82	4.56	4.68	4.19	4.79	4.73	4.77	4.63
Sincere/Insincere	4.73	4.79	4.77	4.74	4.83	4.65	4.72	4.81	4.93	4.58	4.85	4.70
Informative/Worthless	5.69	5.65	5.66	5.72	5.51	5.72	5.70	5.72	5.51	5.65	5.64	5.70
Entertaining/Irritating	5.83	5.82	5.87	5.83	5.66	5.78	5.84	5.90	5.83	5.38	5.89	5.79
Fascinating/Boring	5.44	5.37	5.41	5.43	5.29	5.28	5.42	5.50	5.31	5.15	5.51	5.34
Enjoyable/Annoying	5.68	5.53	5.70	5.60	5.32	5.48	5.63	5.74	5.45	5.54	5.72	5.55
Pleasant/Unpleasant	5.27	5.23	5.24	5.28	5.14	5.19	5.27	5.28	5.19	5.00	5.36	5.18
Comforting/Frightening	4.99	5.16	4.96	5.15	5.10	4.98	5.16	4.96	5.21	4.88	5.18	5.00
Interesting/Uninteresting	5.56	5.55	5.60	5.56	5.39	5.46	5.53	5.64	5.58	5.46	5.68	5.48
Appealing/Unappealing	5.41	5.27	5.24	5.45	5.26	5.24	5.46	5.26	5.30	5.27	5.38	5.32
Attractive/Unattractive	5.74	5.69	5.78	5.71	5.47	5.68	5.68	5.82	5.70	5.31	5.78	5.68
<b>Note:</b> * Measured on a 5-point Likert Scale, Mean Value = 3; ** Measured on a 7-point Semantic Differential Scale, Mean Value = 4; @ Higher average score for a variable indicates more positive attitude for the construct; M=Male, F=Female, A <sub>1</sub> = Up to 25 years, A <sub>2</sub> = 25-50 years, A <sub>3</sub> = Above 50 years, O <sub>1</sub> =Business, O <sub>2</sub> =Service, O <sub>3</sub> =Student, O <sub>4</sub> =Housewife, O <sub>5</sub> =Retired, F <sub>1</sub> =Joint Family, F <sub>2</sub> = Nuclear Family.												

(Contd....)

Table 8: Average Scores® for Various Attributes of Attitude Toward Advertising												(...contd)
Attitude Toward Advertising in General (Ag)*	I <sub>1</sub>	I <sub>2</sub>	I <sub>3</sub>	I <sub>4</sub>	E <sub>1</sub>	E <sub>2</sub>	E <sub>3</sub>	E <sub>4</sub>	R <sub>1</sub>	R <sub>2</sub>	R <sub>3</sub>	R <sub>4</sub>
Overall, I like advertising	4.03	3.97	3.74	3.70	3.92	4.02	3.89	3.90	3.92	3.98	3.81	3.92
Overall, I consider advertising a good thing	4.10	3.99	3.95	3.72	3.94	4.13	3.95	3.70	3.91	4.03	4.06	4.46
Attitude Toward the Institution of Advertising (Attitude-Institution)**												
Strong/Weak	5.63	5.76	5.64	5.52	5.69	5.78	5.50	4.40	5.73	5.65	5.62	5.54
Valuable/Worthless	5.48	5.51	5.33	5.26	5.49	5.49	5.37	5.50	5.53	5.48	5.17	5.46
Necessary/Unnecessary	5.64	5.58	5.44	5.56	5.64	5.61	5.49	5.50	5.72	5.59	5.40	5.62
Important/Unimportant	5.68	5.59	5.49	5.37	5.68	5.63	5.52	5.30	5.80	5.62	5.35	5.31
Convincing/Unconvincing	5.43	5.58	5.38	5.22	5.51	5.57	5.22	5.20	5.39	5.48	5.38	5.46
Meaningful/Meaningless	5.20	5.32	5.26	5.06	5.26	5.34	5.04	4.80	5.20	5.23	5.40	5.31
Attitude Toward the Instrument of Advertising (Attitude-Instrument)**												
Clean/Dirty	5.23	5.23	5.13	5.11	5.12	5.38	5.13	4.50	5.30	5.21	5.15	5.08
Honest/Dishonest	5.63	5.82	4.52	4.78	4.59	4.84	4.63	4.40	4.74	4.69	4.85	4.31
Sincere/Insincere	4.75	4.78	4.69	4.83	4.71	4.80	4.78	5.10	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.69
Informative/Worthless	5.67	5.72	5.71	5.44	5.68	5.73	5.59	5.30	5.73	5.65	5.90	6.00
Entertaining/Irritating	5.83	5.86	5.73	5.80	5.89	5.82	5.78	5.40	5.62	5.88	5.56	6.31
Fascinating/Boring	5.39	5.47	5.42	5.13	5.44	5.38	5.41	5.00	5.29	5.44	5.35	5.23
Enjoyable/Annoying	5.62	5.64	5.62	5.52	5.59	5.58	5.69	5.50	5.54	5.62	5.63	5.85
Pleasant/Unpleasant	5.23	5.29	5.28	5.17	5.28	5.24	5.21	5.20	5.27	5.25	5.02	5.85
Comforting/Frightening	5.02	5.12	5.21	4.94	5.19	5.08	4.83	4.40	5.14	5.07	4.90	5.31
Interesting/Uninteresting	5.57	5.54	5.58	5.46	5.54	5.62	5.52	4.70	5.55	5.57	5.38	5.77
Appealing/Unappealing	5.28	5.45	5.45	5.17	5.39	5.49	5.06	5.20	5.31	5.36	5.25	5.54
Attractive/Unattractive	5.80	5.64	5.57	5.61	5.69	5.81	5.64	5.30	5.73	5.71	5.77	5.77
<b>Note:</b> * Measured on a 5-point Likert Scale, Mean Value = 3; ** Measured on a 7-point Semantic Differential Scale, Mean Value = 4; ® Higher average score for a variable indicates more positive attitude for the construct; I <sub>1</sub> = Below Rs. 10000 p.m, I <sub>2</sub> = Rs. 10000-20000 p.m, I <sub>3</sub> = Rs. 20000-30000 p.m, I <sub>4</sub> = Above Rs. 30000 p.m; E <sub>1</sub> = Post Graduation and above, E <sub>2</sub> = Graduation, E <sub>3</sub> = Matric or Under Graduation, E <sub>4</sub> = Below Matric; R <sub>1</sub> = Sikhism, R <sub>2</sub> = Hinduism, R <sub>3</sub> = Muslim, R <sub>4</sub> = Christian.												

### **Income and Attitude Toward Advertising**

From Table 6, which shows the results of Scheffé test for pair-wise multiple comparisons of means for income-wise differences in attitude toward advertising, it is evident that the difference is significant for income groups  $I_1$  and  $I_4$ , i.e., for respondents belonging to income groups 'below Rs. 10,000 per month' and 'above Rs. 30,000 per month'. Table 8 shows that average scores for Ag of respondents belonging to income group  $I_1$  are much higher than respondents belonging to income group  $I_4$ . It shows that people with less income have more positive Ag as compared to people with high income. Table 7 shows that chi-square value is significant for 'convincing' variable of attitude toward institution of advertising. Mean values for this variable show that comparatively poor people, belonging to income group  $I_1$  have more positive attitude toward institution of advertising than people belonging to income group  $I_4$  (5.43 for  $I_1$  as compared to 5.22 for  $I_4$ ).

So, lower income group consumers are more positive about advertising because they find the institution of advertising more convincing than others.

### **Educational Qualification and Attitude Toward Advertising**

From Table 6, which depicts the results of Scheffé test for pair wise multiple comparisons of means for qualification wise differences in attitude toward advertising, it is evident that no difference is significant for education groups. It implies that education level of the respondents does not affect the attitude of public toward advertising in general. However, test for association (chi-square) between

qualification and variables 'strong' and 'clean' is significant at 0.05 level. Table 8 shows that higher education groups find the institution of advertising more 'strong' and instrument of advertising more 'clean' as compared to lower educational groups (5.69 and 5.12 for  $Q_1$  as compared to 4.40 and 4.50 for  $Q_4$ ).

### **Gender and Attitude Toward Advertising**

Table 8 indicates that attitude of females toward advertising in general (Ag) as compared with the males is not much different. Both have highly favorable attitude toward advertising. However, chi square values for association between gender and variables 'meaningful', 'honest' and 'appealing' are significant at 0.05 level. Table 8 shows that males perceive the institution of advertising more 'meaningful' than perceived by females. Males also perceive the advertisements as more 'honest' and 'appealing' as compared to females (4.74 and 5.41 for males as compared with 4.62 and 5.27 for females).

### **Family Type and Attitude Toward Advertising**

Table 7 shows that chi-square values for association between family type and 'honest' and 'fascinating' variables of instrument of advertising is significant at  $p < 0.05$ . From Table 8, average score for the variables 'honest' and 'fascinating' for joint family is found to be higher than for nuclear family (5.28 and 5.51 for  $F_1$  as against 5.17 and 5.34 for  $F_2$ ).

It implies that people living in joint family have more positive attitude toward advertising than people living in nuclear family because they find the advertisements comparatively more 'honest' and 'fascinating'.

## Conclusion

Attitude of Indian public toward advertising is positive in general. Attitude-institution and attitude-instrument have been found to be separate but correlated constructs. The youngest segment of consumers has relatively more favorable opinion about advertising as compared to the old generation. Especially, they are highly positive about the 'necessity' and 'importance' of institution of advertising. They also find advertisements more 'enjoyable' and 'attractive' than their elders. Lower income group consumers were more positive toward advertising because they found the institution of advertising as more 'convincing'. Highly educated consumers found the institution of advertising more 'strong' and instrument of advertising more 'clean' as compared to consumers with less educational qualifications. Though females have more positive overall perception about advertising; males perceive the institution of advertising more 'meaningful' as compared to females. Males also perceive the advertisements as more 'honest' and 'appealing' in comparison to females. Consumers belonging to joint families have more favorable attitude toward advertising than consumers living in nuclear family; because they find the advertisements comparatively more 'honest' and 'fascinating'.

These findings are indicators to the marketers regarding the factors responsible for comparatively more favorable attitude toward advertising for some of the demographic segments. The underlying reasons for relatively more positive attitudes toward advertising are concerned both with the institution (necessary, important, clean, strong, and convincing)

and the instrument (enjoyable, attractive, appealing, fascinating, and honest) of advertising. Therefore, advertisers and advertising agencies should develop advertisements which are informative, entertaining and honest, presenting the true picture of the product advertised. At the same time, they should endeavor to boost the image of the institution of advertising; so that the predisposition of the consumers toward advertising in general becomes more positive.

## Limitations and Contributions

The present study may also have the traditional limitations associated with survey research such as selection error, measurement error, and non-response error. Secondly, the study was limited in its scope due to time and resource constraints.

Despite these limitations, this study makes several contributions. Major contributions of this study lie in an understanding of Ag in two ways. It substantiates the claim that attitudes toward advertising are made up of two separate dimensions, i.e., instrument of advertising and institution of advertising. Secondly, this study provides an evidence of relationship between some of the demographic variables and attitude toward advertising; along with the underlying variables responsible for differences in the attitude of different sections of society toward advertising.

An examination of the results presented in this study by the industry may lead to better understanding of how attitudes toward specific advertisement are shaped by consumers' general attitudes toward advertising. The empirical findings provide a benchmark for future studies in India. It is suggested to explore the belief factors responsible for attitude toward advertising.

The factors thus identified can further be studied for predicting the attitude of Indian consumers toward advertising. ☺

## References

1. Andrews J Craig (1989), "The Dimensionality of Beliefs Toward Advertising in General", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 26-35.
2. Andrews J Craig, Durvasula Srinivas, and Lysonski Steven (1991), "Understanding Cross-Cultural Student Perceptions of Advertising in General: Implications for Advertising Educators and Practitioners", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 15-28.
3. Bauer Raymond A and Greyser Stephen A (1968), *Advertising in America: The Consumer View*, Harvard University Press, Boston.
4. Dubinsky A J and Hensel P J (1984), "Marketing Student Attitudes Toward Advertising: Implications for Marketing Educators", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 21, Summer, pp. 22-26.
5. Durand Richard M and Lambert Zarrel V (1985), "Alienation and Criticism of Advertising", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 9-17.
6. Greyser Stephen A and Reece Bonnie B (1971), "Businessmen Look Hard at Advertising", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 49, May-June, p. 18.
7. Haller Thomas F (1974), "What Students Think of Advertising", *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 33-38.
8. Initiative Media-BBC World AdWatch (2002), "Consumers' Attitudes Towards Advertising and its Relevance to Media", <http://indiatelevision.com>, May 17.
9. Kerlinger Fred N and Lee Howard B (2000), *Foundations of Behavioral Research*, Harcourt College Publishers, New York.
10. Larkin E F (1977), "A Factor Analysis of College Student Attitude Toward Advertising", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 42-46.
11. Lutz Richard J (1985), "Affective and Cognitive Antecedents of Attitude Toward the Ad: A Conceptual Framework", in Linda F Alwitt and Andrew A Mitchell, (Eds.), *Psychological Processes and Advertising Effects*, pp. 45-63, Hillsdale, Erlbaum, NJ.
12. Lysonski Steven and Pollay Richard W (1990), "Advertising Sexism is Forgiven, but not Forgotten: Historical, Cross-Cultural and Individual Differences in Criticism and Purchase Boycott Intentions", *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 9, No. 4, pp. 317-329.
13. MacKenzie S B and Lutz R B (1989), "An Empirical Examination of the Structural Antecedents of Attitude Toward the Ad in an Advertising Pretesting Context", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 53, April, pp. 48-65.
14. MacKenzie Scott B, Lutz Richard J and Belch George E (1986), "The Role of Attitude Toward the Ad as a Mediator of Advertising Effectiveness:



- A Test of Competing Explanations”, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 23, May , pp. 130-143.
15. Mehta Abhilasha and Purvis Scott C (1995), “When Attitude Towards Advertising in General Influence Advertising Success”, paper presented at Conference of the American Academy of Advertising, Norfolk, VA.
  16. Mitchell Andrew A and Olson Jerry C (1981), “Are Product Attribute Beliefs the Only Mediator of Advertising Effects on Brand Attitude?” *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 18, August, pp. 318-332.
  17. Mittal Banwari (1994), “Public Assessment of TV Advertising: Faint Praise and Harsh Criticism”, *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 34, No. 1, pp. 35-53.
  18. Muehling Darrel D (1987), “An Investigation of Factors Underlying Attitude-Toward-Advertising-in-General”, *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 32-40.
  19. Nunnally J C (1978), *Psychometric theory* 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, McGraw-Hill, New York.
  20. Petroschius Susan M (1986), “An Assessment of Business Students’ Attitudes toward Advertising”, in AMA Educators’ Proceedings, Terence A Shimp, *et al.* (Eds.), Chicago, American Marketing Association, IL, pp. 127-131.
  21. Ramaprasad Jyotika and Thurwanger Micheal L (1998), “South Asian Student Attitudes Toward and Beliefs About Advertising: Measuring Across Cultures”, Paper presented to International Communication Division, AEJMC National Convention in Baltimore, MD, August.
  22. Reid Leonard N and Soley Lawrence C (1982), “Generalized and Personalized Attitudes Toward Advertising’s Social and Economic Effects”, *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 3-7.
  23. Rotzoll K B and Christians C G (1980), “Advertising Agency Practitioners’ Perception of Ethical Decisions”, *Journalism Quarterly*, Vol. 57, No. 3, pp. 425-433.
  24. Sandage C H and Leckenby J D (1980), “Student Attitudes Toward Advertising: Institution vs. Instrument”, *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 29-32.
  25. Santos S (1976), “Latin and American Students’ View of Advertising”, *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 35-39.
  26. Shimp Terence A (1981), “Attitude Toward the Ad as a Mediator of Consumer Brand Choice”, *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 9-15.
  27. Stern B and Zaichkowsky J L (1991), “The Impact of ‘Entertaining’ Advertising on Consumer Responses”, *Australian Marketing Researcher*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 68-80.
  28. Thorson E (1981), “Likeability: 10 Years of Academic Research”, Transcript Proceedings: 8<sup>th</sup> Annual

- Advertising Research Foundation  
Copy Research Workshop, Advertising  
Research Foundation, New York.
29. Yang Chung-Chuan (2000),  
“Taiwanese Students’ Attitudes  
Towards and Belief About  
Advertising”, *Journal of Marketing  
Communications*, Vol. 6, No. 3.
  30. Yoon K, Muehling D and Cho H  
(1996), “A Comparison of Korean and  
American Attitudes Toward  
Advertising”, *Journal of Marketing  
Communications*, Vol. 2, pp. 231-245.
  31. Zano Eric J (1984), “Public Attitudes  
Towards Advertising: The American  
Experience”, *International Journal of  
Advertising*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 3-15.
  32. Zhou Dongsheng, Zhang Weijiong and  
Vertinsky Ilan (2002), “Advertising  
Trends in Urban China”, *Journal of  
Advertising Research*, Vol. 42, May/  
June, pp. 73-81.

Reference # 03J-2008-01-05-01

Copyright of ICFAI Journal of Marketing Management is the property of ICFAI University Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.