

A STUDY ON
PUBLIC'S VIEW OF ADVERTISING

by

ALEV GÖKÇE

B.A. in Business Administration, Boğaziçi University, 1984

Submitted to the Institute for Graduate Studies in
Social Sciences in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
Business Administration

Bogazici University Library



39001100317778

14

Boğaziçi University

1986

A STUDY ON
PUBLIC'S VIEW OF ADVERTISING

APPROVED BY

Doç.Dr.Muzaffer Bodur
(Thesis Supervisor)

M. Bodur

Dr.Eser Borak

E. Borak

Prof.Dr.Mustafa Dilber

M. Dilber

DATE OF APPROVAL:

25.6.1986



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my thesis Supervisor Doç.Dr.Muzaffer Bodur for her most valuable advices, guidance, and support throughout the preparation of this thesis.

I also would like to gratefully acknowledge Dr.Eser Borak's encouragements, and her kind contributions in giving this thesis its final shape.

A B S T R A C T

A STUDY ON
PUBLIC'S VIEW OF ADVERTISING

In this thesis public's view of advertising is studied. Saliency of advertising to the public, and public's attitude toward advertising in general, and toward its institutional aspects in particular have been explored in determining public's view of advertising. Also, another major research area of the study was to find whether respondents make a distinction between advertising as the institution and advertisements as the instruments of the institution.

According to the results of the study, advertising was found to have low saliency among the respondents who have favorable attitudes toward advertising in general, and toward its social and economic institutions in particular. It is also found that respondents don't differentiate between the institution and instruments of advertising.

A literature review is presented to reveal the backgrounds of the study. As the instrument of the study a questionnaire has been made use of. Frequency, cross-tabulation, regression, and factor analyses have been applied by means of an SPSS program to the data. The results have been analysed, and the implications of the results for advertisers,

marketers, researchers, and academicians are presented.

One major contribution of this study will be on improving the functioning of advertising as an institution.

Ö Z E T

TOPLUMUN REKLAM KONUSUNDAKİ GÖRÜŞLERİ ÜZERİNE BİR ÇALIŞMA

Bu tezde, toplumun reklam konusundaki görüşleri öğrenilmeye çalışılmaktadır. Reklama karşı olan tutumu belirlemek amacıyla, reklamın toplum için önemi ve toplumun reklama karşı genel ve reklamın kurumlarına ait tutumu araştırılmıştır. Ayrıca, yanıtlayıcıların reklam kurumu ile kurumun aracı olan reklamlar arasında ayırım yapıp yapmadığı da araştırma kapsamına alınmıştır.

Çalışmanın sonucunda, reklamın yanıtlayıcılar açısından az önemli olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır. Toplumun reklama karşı olan genel tutumu ve reklamın sosyal ve ekonomik kurumlarına karşı olan tutumu olumludur. Cevap verenlerin reklam kurumu ve reklam araçları arasında bir ayırım yapmadığı saptanmıştır.

Araştırmanın temelini açıklayabilme amacıyla, bu konu ile ilgili literatür de takdim edilmiştir. Araştırma bir anket aracılığıyla yapılmıştır. Frekans dağılımı, çapraz-tablo, regresyon ve faktör analizleri SPSS programı aracılığıyla dataya uygulanmıştır. Sonuçlar yorumlanmış ve bu sonuçların reklam, pazarlama, araştırma kuruluşları ve akademisyenler

açısından önemi sunulmuştur.

Bu çalışmanın reklamın kurumsal olarak işlevlerinin düzeltilmesine de önemli bir katkısı olacaktır.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZET	vi
LIST OF TABLES	x
LIST OF EXHIBITS	xii
LIST OF SYMBOLS	xiii
INTRODUCTION	1
I. LITERATURE REVIEW	6
1.1. WHAT ARE THE SOCIAL AND ETHICAL ISSUES RELATED WITH ADVERTISING?	6
1.1.1. Information Versus Persuasion	7
1.1.2. Truth in Advertising	13
1.1.3. Bad Taste in Advertising	18
1.1.4. Insecurity Caused by Advertising	18
1.1.5. Human Values and Advertising	20
1.1.6. Does Advertising Cause Conformity?	22
1.2. PROBLEMS RELATED WITH THE ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF ADVERTISING	24
1.3. RESEARCH RESULTS ABOUT THE ATTITUDES TOWARD ADVERTISING	37
II. A STUDY ON PUBLIC'S VIEW OF ADVERTISING	54
2.1. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	54
2.1.1. Type of Research	54
2.1.2. Research Objectives	55
2.1.3. Data Collection Procedure and Instrument	56
2.1.4. The Sampling Plan	57
2.1.5. Data Analysis Methods	61
2.1.6. Limitations of the Study	61
2.1.7. Variables Studied	63
2.2. RESEARCH FINDINGS	65
2.2.1. What Respondents Think About Advertising	65
2.2.2. Overall Attitudes in Relation to Advertising Related Issues	78

	<u>Page</u>
2.2.3. Interest in Advertisements	83
2.2.4. Institution vs. Instruments of Advertising	91
2.2.5. Who Are The Respondents With Different Attitudes Toward Advertising and Different Saliences of Advertising?	99
III. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	132
3.1. CONCLUSIONS	132
3.2. COMPARISON OF THE FINDINGS WITH THE RESULTS OF THE PREVIOUS RESEARCH IN THIS AREA	140
3.3. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY	143
3.3.1. Implications of the Study for the Advertisers and Marketers	144
3.3.2. Implications of the Study for the Academicians and Researchers	146
BIBLIOGRAPHY	150
APPENDIX 1- QUESTIONNAIRE	158
APPENDIX 2- COMPUTER OUTPUTS OF FINDINGS	167

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE 1.3.1. Social and Economic Aspects of Advertising	39
TABLE 2.1.4.1. Respondent Characteristics	58
TABLE 2.1.7.1. Variables Studied	63
TABLE 2.2.1.1. Saliency as Measured by Amount of Talking	66
TABLE 2.2.1.2. Seriousness of Attitudes	67
TABLE 2.2.1.3. Definitions of Advertising	70
TABLE 2.2.1.4. Overall Attitudes Toward Advertising	72
TABLE 2.2.1.5. Attitudes Toward Institutional Aspects of Advertising	73
TABLE 2.2.1.6. Areas of Institutional Support and Criticism	74
TABLE 2.2.1.7. Patterns of Response by Economic and Social Areas	75
TABLE 2.2.1.8. Areas of Institutional Support and Criticism (based on Bauer and Greyser's (1968) social and economic indices)	76
TABLE 2.2.1.9. Patterns of Response by Economic and Social Areas (based on Bauer and Greyser's social and economic indices)	77
TABLE 2.2.2.1. The Relationship Between Saliency and Overall Attitudes	78
TABLE 2.2.2.2. Definitions of Advertising in Relationship With Respondents' Overall Attitudes	79
TABLE 2.2.2.3. Relationship Between Overall Attitude Toward Advertising and Institutional Aspects of Advertising	80
TABLE 2.2.2.4. Favorable Attitudes Toward the Institutional Aspects of Advertising With Respect to Different Overall Attitudes	82
TABLE 2.2.3.1. Number of Advertisements Remembered by People in Various Saliency Groups of Advertising	84
TABLE 2.2.3.2. Relationship Between Number of Ads Remembered and Exposure to Media	85
TABLE 2.2.3.3. Relationship Between Overall Attitude Toward Advertising and Number of Ads Remembered	86
TABLE 2.2.3.4. Relationship Between The Number of Advertisements Remembered and Advertising's Perceived Importance as an Information Source	86
TABLE 2.2.3.5. Attitudes of the Respondents Who Watch Ads on TV	87

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE 2.2.3.6. Advertising's Influence on Ad-Watchers on TV	89
TABLE 2.2.3.7. Advertising's Influence on the Respondents in General	89
TABLE 2.2.3.8. Relationship between Amount of Advertising's Influence on People and their Attitudes Toward Advertising	90
TABLE 2.2.4.1. Results of Factor Analysis for Education	92
TABLE 2.2.4.2. Results of Factor Analysis for Press	94
TABLE 2.2.4.3. Results of Factor Analysis for Advertising	95
TABLE 2.2.4.4. Results of Factor Analysis for State	96
TABLE 2.2.4.5. Results of Factor Analysis for Art	97
TABLE 2.2.4.6. Mean Ratings of Advertising on Eight Scales	98
TABLE 2.2.4.7. Ratings of Five Institutions on Two Scale Sets	98
TABLE 2.2.5.1. Relationship of Advertising's Saliency With Classification Variables	100
TABLE 2.2.5.2. The Background of People With Respect to Comparative Saliency	104
TABLE 2.2.5.3. Relationship Between the Background of People and their Definitions of Advertising	108
TABLE 2.2.5.4. The Background of Advertising's Definitions	110
TABLE 2.2.5.5. Relationship between Background of People and Overall Attitudes Toward Advertising	113
TABLE 2.2.5.6. The Background of Overall Attitudes Toward Advertising	114
TABLE 2.2.5.7. Relationship between Background of People and Institutional Aspects of Advertising	118
TABLE 2.2.5.8. The Background of People Who Watch to Advertisements on TV	129

LIST OF EXHIBITS

	<u>Page</u>
EXHIBIT 2.2.1.1. "Top-of-the-Mind Annoyances"	66
EXHIBIT 2.2.1.2. What should be done about advertising? (Open-end responses)	69
EXHIBIT 2.2.1.3. What should be done about advertising? (by respondents who don't need to answer to this question)	69
EXHIBIT 2.2.1.4. Examples of Categorizing People's Descriptions of Advertising	70
EXHIBIT 2.2.1.5. Economic and Social Issues Indices	74
EXHIBIT 2.2.1.6. Bauer and Greyser's Economic and Social Issues Indices	76

LIST OF SYMBOLS

B	Regression Coefficient
CC	Contingency Coefficient
CV	Cramer's V
d.f.	Degrees of Freedom
N	Sample Size
\bar{x}	Mean Value
r	Coefficient of Correlation
r^2	Coefficient of Determination
α	Significance Level
χ^2	Chi-square

I N T R O D U C T I O N

Advertising is one of the tools of marketing. As Ulanoff (1977, p.453) says: "The primary function of advertising is to facilitate the movement of goods through the channels of trade from producer to business-user or to ultimate consumer".

Interestingly Ulanoff notes that the beginnings of advertising dates back to "the shouting cave men" and "the criers of Babylon and Egypt." He also adds that the outdoor advertising began in ancient Greece and flourished in Rome.

Throughout the years until the Industrial Revolution advertising has been made use of though the techniques applied were quite different than the contemporary advertising techniques. With the Industrial Revolution mass production was made possible. Further, for mass production there was the need for mass consumption. Hence the need for mass consumption created the necessity to communicate with the consumer on a large scale, nationally. Advertising through the mass media was the only way to get a sales message to vast amount of people in a short time. Since then the new advertising techniques were being developed, and it received the status of being a great builder of mass markets (Ulanoff, 1977).

★ Especially in the American economy advertising has gained a substantial importance as can be demonstrated with a story: "Mark Twain was once an editor of a small newspaper. One day he received a letter from a subscriber complaining that he had found a spider in his paper and demanding an explanation. Mark Twain is credited with replying that the spider was examining the paper to discover which merchant in town did not advertise so that he (the spider) could spin a web over the merchant's door and live a life of undisturbed peace forever after" (Ulanoff, 1977, pp.25-26).

President of France, Mitterrand demonstrates a good example of advertising's role in today's world. Mitterrand was once asked in what subject he is interested in besides politics and literature. The answer was: "Advertising...Television Advertisements" (Gleizes, 1986).

★ The history of advertising in Turkey dates back to 1910's. However, it gained momentum in 1950's with the increase in the imports and investments of durable consumer products. Moreover, the improvements in the media like radio and newspapers, and the increase of people's purchasing power supported the development of advertising in Turkey. The renovations in the press during 1960's, and the beginning of TV programs during 1970's added new dimensions with respect to media. In this context advertising retained its position, and gained increasing interest (Gleizes, 1986). Hence, compared with the advertising practices in the United States, advertising institution in Turkey is very recent.

A realistic measure of the importance of advertising in an economy can be given through an analysis of advertising expenditures as a percentage of GNP. In Turkey, the amount of advertising expenditures in GNP accounted for .016 per cent in 1982, but dropped to .020 per cent in 1983. A comparison

with developed countries reveals that the advertising expenditures in GNP in 1983 was .62 per cent in Germany, .97 per cent in Japan, and 1.38 per cent in the United States (Dünya Dosyası, 1984). However, a comparison of the advertising expenditures in Turkey between 1983 and 1985 shows an important increase. In 1983 28.336 billions TL (Dünya Dosyası, 1984) were the advertising expenditures in Turkey. As a study of Manajans/Thompson (Güneş Gazetesi, 1986) reveals this amount has risen to 76.3 billions TL in 1985 (without Value Added Tax).

The increase in the advertising expenditures in Turkey indicates an increase in the exposure to advertisements by the public; however, it is still substantially lower than that of the developed countries.

Advertising has for long been a source for both criticism and support in the United States. In this country studies have been made to measure the public attitudes toward advertising. As the studies which will be discussed later in the thesis indicate, people were found to be favorable toward advertising in general, and toward its economic role in particular, however, they have been critical toward its social effects.

In Turkey, as stated before, advertising is not an old phenomenon, in fact it started developing its contemporary sense after 1970's. The author believes that there has been a subsequent lack of research in the area of public attitudes toward this new institution. Hence, this study is designed to fill this gap.

It is believed that the study will have important implications for an advertiser and marketer, and also for the academicians and researcher in the advertising area as the scope of the study includes answers to the following questions:

- 1- How salient is advertising to the Turkish respondents?
- 2- How do they define advertising?
- 3- What are their attitudes toward advertising on an overall basis, and toward institutional aspects of advertising in particular?
- 4- How do people's overall attitudes relate with advertising-related issues?
- 5- Is there any significant effect of having interest in and attention to advertisements on the attitudes toward advertising?
- 6- What are the profile of those respondents interested in advertising, and the characteristics of the respondents with different attitudes toward advertising, and different salience levels of advertising?
- 7- Do people make a distinction between institution and instruments of advertising?

Through such an attitude study an advertiser or marketer can trace the sources of criticism and support for advertising. Hence, he may be able to identify the improvements necessary for the appraisal of advertising. An advertiser or marketer needs such an attitude study to orient himself according to the wishes of the public. As the businessmen in Greyser's study (1962) believe, in the end it is the public who has the most power in "helping" or "hurting" advertising.

For an academician or researcher this study will also have implications as it is believed to be the first extensive study in Turkey about the public's view of advertising. The academician and the future researcher on this topic will thus have a previous study with all its implications and limitations to learn from.

The contents of this study are as follows:

In chapter one, the literature review on the subject of the study will be presented. The literature review will

The literature review will consist of social and ethical issues related to advertising, problems related to the economic aspects of advertising, and research results about the attitudes toward advertising.

In chapter two research methodology and findings of the study will be presented. Finally, in chapter three conclusions about the findings will be drawn, comparison with the previous research findings of other countries will be made, and implications for the advertiser, marketer, academician, and researcher will be discussed.

CHAPTER I

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter the aim and wish of the author is to give the reader sufficient information about the background and former research of the study.

At the beginning of the chapter advertising critics' and defenders' view of the social effects of advertising will be presented. Following this economic effects of advertising will be explained again from advertising critics' and defenders' point of view. Finally empirical research results of attitudes toward advertising will be revealed.

1.1. WHAT ARE THE SOCIAL AND ETHICAL ISSUES RELATED WITH ADVERTISING?

Social and ethical issues have long been the concern of advertising critics. These issues refer to the persuasive aspects of advertising, truth dimension of advertising, bad taste in advertising, people's insecurity induced by advertising, conformity caused by advertising, and human values corrupted by advertising (Borden, 1945; Greyser, 1972). First the author wants to disclose arguments about the persuasive aspects of advertising compared with its informational aspects.

1.1.1. Information versus Persuasion

✱ There are many criticisms directed to the persuasive aspects of advertising, favoring the informational role advertising plays. Vance Packard with his "The Hidden Persuaders" (1958) draw attention to the manipulative ability of advertising with the help of depth psychology and motivational research techniques.

✱ Haiman (1958) in order to define a hidden persuader says: "Who is the hidden persuader and how does he differ from the ordinary advocate? He can best be defined by describing the common denominator of his techniques. Whether they be subliminal cues, mass hypnosis, constant repetition, loaded language, the subtle use of social pressures, or the appeal to irrelevant loves, hates, and fears, they all seek the same kind of response from the listener or viewer" (p.456).

✱ While condemning the persuasive aspects of advertising critics mostly favor the informational part of advertising. This role of advertising has been explained by Professor George J. Stigler (1966), as quoted by Jules Backman (1968):

"...Under competition, the main tasks of a seller are to inform potential buyers of his existence, his line of goods, and his prices. Since both sellers and buyers change over time (due to birth, death, migration), since people forget information once acquired, and since new products appear, the existence of sellers must be continually advertised...

This informational function of advertising must be emphasized because of a popular and erroneous belief that advertising consists chiefly of nonrational (emotional and repetitive) appeals" (p.200).

Yet, Resnik and Stern (1977) explored the information content of TV advertisements. "In order for a commercial to be considered informative, it must permit a typical viewer to make a more intelligent buying decision after seeing the commercial than before seeing it," (p.50) they say. To test the information content of TV advertisements, fourteen criteria were presented to the evaluaters. They had to answer to the question: "Does this advertisement communicate any of the following cues about the product, service, or institution?" (p.51). The fourteen evaluative criteria were: 1- Price or Value; 2- Quality, 3- Performance; 4- Components or Contents; 5- Availability, 6- Special Offers; 7- Taste; 8- Packaging or Shape; 9- Guarantees or Warrantees; 10- Safety; 11- Nutrition; 12- Independant Research; 13- Company-Sponsored Research; 14- New Ideas. One of the fourteen criteria was needed to consider a commercial informative. 378 commercials were evaluated under these criteria, the results showed that for the total sample, less than one-half of the advertisements were considered informative. If the criterion for informativeness were changed and two different criteria were needed, only 16 per cent of the advertisements could have been considered informative. It would be even worse, if three different criteria were needed; the result would be only one per cent of the advertisements as informative.

Ulanoff (1977) in answering to the criticism concerning the lack of information points out that most of the advertising are directed to people who neither want to buy something, nor want to collect information about the products. Thus advertising's purpose rests in attracting attention, stimulating interest, and exciting desire. Ulanoff states that at the end advertising's aim is to make the advertised products purchased. Since this is most successfully done by stressing the satisfaction derived from the product, it is found more preferable to use sense impressions in the ads rather than

giving detailed information. Ulanoff adds that to expect from the consumers to have the time and desire to read all the information about the facts, will not be very wise.

* Critics state that advertising should offer the facts without persuasion, and should just give information. According to them advertising is the prime source of facts about the products and services. Dunn (1961) says that critics forget the importance of psychology and esthetic associated with products and services. If it is important for a consumer to find out whether he'll be criticized or admired for a kind of automobile he has bought, it is natural for an advertiser to supply this kind of information. According to Dunn people are not solely interested in facts, but also demand analysis and guidance. In addition to this the author also says that people are usually bored with just facts, and that there is space limitation for all the factual data.

* Dunn also states that advertising, in any form, has a persuasive element in it. Sandage and Fryburger (1958), as quoted by Dunn, also support this claim saying that an advertising which is only informative is, in fact, what is needed to persuade people to buy a product.

* Many critics have tried to separate the persuasive aspects of advertising from the informative aspects. Greyser (1972) concludes that this is a wrong thing to do, since all of advertising's aim is to influence people's thinking and buying. Greyser adds that in a society, where persuasion is embodied in almost all aspects of life-religious, legal, interpersonal, political-who is going to decide what good persuasion is and what bad? Greyser points out that the critics' argument, that advertising has a persuasive power, embodies the assumption that advertising has a limitless power to persuade people and to affect their needs and wants. However

according to the author this is an exaggeration, and people are not that helpless as critics assume they are.

Dunn and Barban (1982) also express that persuasion and information cannot be separated. Different people may perceive advertisements from different points of view. One may find it informative, but the other persuasive. The authors also state that the aim of advertising is to persuade people to buy the products advertised, anyway. Shelby Hunt (1976), as quoted by Dunn and Barban, gives us this explanation:

- "1) If informational advertising is okay (as most critics concede), and
- 2) If much informational advertising is very persuasive (as no person knowledgeable about advertising would dispute); and
- 3) If the purpose of all advertising is to persuade (as not even critics of advertising could deny); then
- 4) All persuasive advertising cannot be not okay."(pp.7-8).

Harris and Seldon (1959) argue that the distinction between information and persuasion is based on a misunderstanding of the nature and role of advertising. The authors add that the criticisms about the manipulation of consumers against their interest have questionable assumptions about the nature of a free society. Firstly, Harris and Seldon say that to make a distinction between informative and persuasive advertising is impossible. In general advertising's aim is to persuade people. Even the most informative advertising has a persuasion element in it. On the other hand, persuasive advertisements are informative, too. The authors conclude that the purpose of advertising is to persuade; and that it uses the method of information for this purpose.

Secondly, Harris and Seldon point out that information is not essential for advertising, it may or may not be used.

For the advertising of a new product information may be helpful, however, for an established product reminder advertising will be sufficient. Thirdly, Harris and Seldon state that advertising's effect is informative, if it leads people to buy goods or services they have not known before. In this case the information is indirect. It comes through trial and usage of the product. Fourthly, consumers may not wish to be bothered with acquiring more information. There are customers who find pleasure in obtaining information. But, on the other hand there are others who don't want to devote their free time to information seeking, rather they like to rely on the agents. Yet this doesn't make them slaves of the manufacturers, since in a free economy customers have got "the ultimate power of veto"(p.46). Fifthly, Harris and Seldon say that consumers buy products also for their intangible qualities. The authors argue that it is the consumers' decision whether intangible aspects, such as prestige, are important to them or not. Manufacturers may get use of this feature of consumers. But it's consumers' responsibility and wish, what kind of quality they seek, tangible or intangible, even if the decision is foolish. Finally, Harris and Seldon note that it is the satisfaction people get out of a product that makes them buy it the second time. Uninformative, but amusing advertisement may attract attention, but it doesn't cause the product to be sold. The authors add that this kind of advertising is far less effective than its critics believe.

Weilbacher (1984) cites Galbraith (1971) who has said that advertising causes people to make irrational or irresponsible purchases. Weilbacher points out that one can't dispose of this possibility. According to him at least some consumers may be lead by advertising to do irrational purchases. Weilbacher states that the traditional answer to this problem is that the consumers must be aware of advertising's potential influence, and that they have to learn how to protect

themselves. Another suggestion would be that government should regulate the advertising activity.

Ulanoff (1977) cites some critics who argue that advertising creates in people desires to buy goods they do not need. Thus, advertising causes irrational buying behaviour. Ulanoff wants to know what a need for a person is. According to him if we look to the issue from the perspective of a need, then what people need is just "a bear skin for clothing a cave for shelter, or some roots or a loaf of bread to eat." (p.455). Ulanoff adds that if we want to extend the above mentioned needs, then who is going to decide what things are needed, how much more, and of what quality? According to the author the question, whether this is a criticism of advertising or a criticism of a free and democratic society should be answered.

Kleppner (1973), too, counts under the basic needs of men just food, clothing and shelter. Kleppner declares all the needs above the subsistence level as tastes. He calls this standard of living, and states that each man sets that for himself to the extent he can.

Greyser (1972) also point to the difficulty in identifying needs and wants for consumers. Arnold Toynbee (1966), as cited by Greyser identifies three categories of needs and wants:

- "1. needs (minimum material requirements of life)
 2. genuine wants (which "we become aware of spontaneously, without...Madison Avenue")
 3. unwanted demand (created by advertising)"
- (p.24).

Yet, Greyser states that a product which may be a genuine want for somebody may not fit to the same category

for another. Thus, there are problems in deciding which products fall to which category of needs and wants.

As the above mentioned views suggest there is a lot of debate going on with respect to advertising's informational or persuasive aspects. In this study variables that measure consumer attitudes toward those aspects of advertising are included.

As also stated by Greyser (1972) the consideration of information content of advertising leads one to the problem of truth and deception in advertising which is the subject of the next part.

1.1.2. Truth in Advertising

English Professor, A.S.J. Baster, as quoted by Borden (1945) claims that the major part of the informative advertising has always been deceptive, with "direct lies", "intended ambiguities", "half truths" and exaggerations. The major aim of the advertisers is to deceive buyers in order to sell their goods. Baster adds that the most pleasant truths are selected to present to the public. Borden says that such critics against advertising are held by a growing minority of people. The use of influence and persuasion in moderate degree will be evaluated as dishonest by such critics.

Samm Sinclair Baker (1968), after having 30 years' experience in advertising business, wished to enlighten public about the evils and benefits of advertising. He concluded: "A lie that helps build profits is considered a permissible lie. Of course, the lie must not be so blatant that it results in eventual damage to the company's profits". He added that a great amount of advertising is based on the concept of "permissible lie". One of Baker's most important conclusions to him is that, "the immoral concept of the

permissible lie is not necessary to achieve the improved sales and profits the advertiser demands".

Dunn and Barban (1982) point out that some writers also include puffery in deception in advertising. According to Ivan Preston (1975), as quoted by the authors, puffery affects consumers' purchasing decision by presenting them untrue beliefs. Preston adds that puffery is deceiving, and that regulation which make puffery legal are totally unjustified. There are many sorts of puffery, and they account for a large proportion of the claims made by advertisers. Dunn and Barban have also searched for the evidence that advertisements which contain puffery get more attention than advertisements which do not have. The authors present the results of the study by Bruce Vanden Bergh and Leonard Reid (1980) about the magazine automobile ads. This study showed that there is no difference between the attention given to advertisements with puffery than those without it. Dunn and Barban also state that there is little evidence which shows that deceptive advertising causes more sales than nondeceptive advertising, though many people believe the opposite to be true.

Merton (1946) says:

"No single advertising or propaganda campaign may significantly affect the psychological stability of those subjected to it. But a society subjected ceaselessly to a flow of "effective" half-truths and the exploitation of mass anxieties may all the sooner lose that mutuality of confidence and reciprocal trust so essential to a stable social structure."(pp.481-482).

According to Capitman (1971) people react to the misleading advertisements since they fear to believe it. If people had been as indifferent to advertisements as the

studies suggest, there wouldn't be any problems with misleading ads; there would be just an appreciation for the honest ads.

In order to identify whether truth in advertising means "literal truth" or "true impression", Dunn quotes what the Supreme Court in the U.S. had said about misleading and fraudulent advertising:

"Advertising as a whole must not create a misleading impression even though every statement separately considered is literally truthful. Advertising must not obscure or conceal material facts. Advertising must not be artfully contrived to distract and divert reader's attention from the true nature of the terms and conditions of an offer. Advertising must be free of fraudulent traps and stratagems which would induce action which would not result from a forthright disclosure of the true nature of the offer" (p.74).

Dunn points out that the impression of an ad in people's mind is an important question. Otis Pease(1958), as quoted by Dunn, points out that the problem with the literal truth or falsity is unimportant, "since the appeal of advertisements lays not in factual assertions but in the association which it sets up in the mind of the reader".

Greyser (1972) identifies four different subcategories of truth. These are "literal truth", "true impression", "discernible exaggeration", and "false impression".

With "literal truth" Greyser explores whether the claim is substantiable or not. "True impression" reveals whether the impression is true despite the literal truth. Whether exaggeration or puffery is visible or not is, what is meant by "discernible exaggeration". Finally for "false

impression" Greyser asks the question, "whether deliberately, or not, does the ad actually include material that suggests a false impression (in contrast to suppressing information) - i.e., material that has the capacity to deceive?" Greyser believes that the problem with all these subcategories is that they are not as clear-cut as they seem to be. The application of them would cause some indistinctness.

At this point the reader is already informed about the variety of criticisms of advertising as not being truthful. Kottman (1969) wants to point out that actually advertising is truthful, but that it suffers from an untruthful image. Kottman gives five reasons for this image. One of them is that the relatively few number of advertisements which contain untruthful messages cause people to generalize advertisements as being false and untruthful. The second reason is that most of the people, including intellectuals and critics, do not make a distinction between "factual statements" and "value judgements" when they talk about ads. Kottman states that value judgements cannot be evaluated as true or false, since they are not statements about the world's content, and are, therefore not verifiable. To be correct value judgements should be evaluated as acceptable or unacceptable. Since what we have in advertisements are judgemental statements, it would be an error to judge them as true or false. The third reason Kottman states, is that people tend to draw conclusions about the statements in advertisements. These conclusions are mostly different from those said or hinted. Often these conclusions are considered as being untrue. In fact it is possible that they are really untrue. Thus, Kottman says that people see advertisements, make conclusions about them, which are most of the time not true, and then decide upon their own untrue conclusions that the advertisements are not true. Kottman also points out that people's conclusions are value judgements, hence, they should be evaluated as acceptable or unacceptable,

and not as true or false. Fourth reason is, "that it appears to be full of contradiction, either stated, implied, or inferred." Kottman maintains that those contradictory advertising claims are a part of the society with its free-enterprise system and competitive economy. According to the author, "competition by its very nature is conflict, and advertising is one reflection of it". The last reason for advertising's untruthful image is that it stresses the trivial differentials thus making unimportant things seem important. However, Kottman says that this is the rule of the game. Yet, the author adds that this shouldn't imply that advertisers can do whatever they want to do. They should obey to some rules, and have a high degree of social responsibility. Kottman also points out that people who are going to criticize advertising should also possess responsibility and evaluate advertising "in the context of their culture, not in that of a utopia."

Kleppner (1973) suggests that most of the advertisements must have been made good, since otherwise public had made it disappear. Yet this hasn't happened. Kleppner states that there are other reasons besides morality why an advertiser shouldn't use misleading advertisements, if he wants to stay in the business. Advertisers need buyer's confidence. If a buyer finds out that the advertisement of a product had been misleading, he wouldn't buy it again. To avoid such a circumstance is to the advertiser's interest. Thus, an advertiser has enough pressure upon him to prevent false and misleading advertisements, if he wants to see satisfied customers around him.

However, Dunn and Barban (1982) state that there is not much evidence to show that deception in advertisements will cause the consumers to turn against the related products.

Dunn (1961) concludes that advertising usually tells the truth, but not necessarily the whole truth.

Thus, it can be concluded that truth in advertising has been an important area which attracted critics. In order to explore consumer attitudes toward the truth dimension of advertising a truth related variable is included in the research instrument of the present survey.

Another important aspect of advertising's content is bad taste associated with it.

1.1.3. Bad Taste in Advertising

Greyser (1972) identifies the most common criticisms to the taste aspect of advertising as:

- "o Moral concern over the product itself
- o Objections to the occasion of the ad
- o Objections to the appeals employed
- o Objections to the techniques of advertising strategy" (p.28).

Greyser believes that many criticisms for the taste aspect of advertisements are the cause of individual life situations, depending on the usage of the products advertised, on the preference of the brands advertised, and also one's seeking pleasure by way of fantasy. The author adds that it is difficult to find standards for advertising's taste aspect which may be broadly accepted.

Dunn and Barban (1982) find terms such as "offensive" and "bad taste" difficult to define. The authors declare that products themselves, and the way they are presented in the advertisements are both the cause to criticisms of taste in advertising. As an example Dunn and Barban state that some

people are offended by liquor advertisements. Examples of the criticisms to presentation may be book and movie advertisements. The authors also note that the advertisements which people find most offensive are the ones with sex, violence or body functions included.

Borden (1945) concludes, from the attitude studies he has examined, that advertising disturbs a substantial number of consumers' feelings as to what is good taste and honesty.

Capitman (1971) argues that taste is related to social class, education, values and other social or personal factors, and that it is not a moral issue. The author declares that the morality in using the symbols in advertising consists of good or bad consequences of the symbolizing. He says: "These moral questions about symbolism are, at one level, at least closely tied to the levels of morality and hypocrisy in the system as a whole. The issue, for example, of whether or not to use nudity in advertising is confused by the equivocal nature of public moral standards on nudity" (p.130).

In this research it is not one of the objectives to search for the consumer attitudes toward taste aspect of advertising; still to inform the reader about the existence of such a potential for criticism seemed important.

1.1.4. Insecurity Caused by Advertising

According to the critics advertising causes people to feel insecure through making them worry about body odor, tooth decay, and so forth. Then, of course, the advertiser claims that his product will abolish these worries. Dunn (1961) says that this may partly be true. However, he argues that this fear may be caused by advertising, if there is a basis for it in people. What advertising may do, is exaggerating latent

fears. If an insurance man wants to do his business, he knows that he should emphasize the already existing fears of people, in order to sell life or fire insurance. The author also believes that although advertising may cause people to worry about some problems, it also gives solutions to those problems. Dunn says, "in assessing the argument that advertising creates insecurity we must balance the relative value of assuaging people's fears against advertising's tendency to accentuate latent fears".

Since the author believes that insecurity caused by advertising is an important phenomenon, for the evidence of its presence will be pursued in this research.

1.1.5. Human Values and Advertising

Leo Bogart (1978) gives a passage of the critics who say, "that advertising corrupts and debases human values; it creates a preoccupation with material goods and exploits irrational and neurotic motives to promote products that serve little genuine purpose" (p.19).

Sissors (1978) tries to answer to this sort of critics. First of all, he points out that when the critics talk about values, they in reality mean something else; namely they confuse the terms values and needs. Sissors adds that advertising may affect beliefs or attitudes about how a product satisfies a need. However, he is not so sure about advertising's effect on values. Sissors also declares that values are organized hierarchically as a system in the individual. Thus, he states that it may be possible that advertising affects the values which rank low in an individual's system of values. Therefore the author proposes that the relationship between advertising and values which rank low and high in a society should be determined. Critics argue that in the long run

cumulative effects of advertising causes values to be changed. According to Sissors church, government, school and the family all pushed people to change the values. He argues that people are now what they wanted to be. The author doesn't see any reason why advertising should work in changing values in the long run, when other institutions didn't work. Sissors argues that a better explanation would be that values are created through the interaction of individuals in a culture. Advertising can do a better job if it tries to fulfill these values rather than creating its own ones. Sissors points out that values can be learned through observation and/or communication. Sissors concludes that one thing advertising is able to do is to disseminate the major value systems of a society to a huge part of that society. By doing this advertising also informs those who are not aware of these value systems. However, the author points out that it is uncertain whether advertising can influence those unaware of the value systems. Sissors states that since communication has a slight effect on values, it can be assumed that advertising also has some effect. But according to him the evidence is not very strong.

Greyser (1972), too, believes that there is no specific example showing that change in the values can be solely attributed to advertising.

Weilbacher (1984) states: "The real problems are that what a society consumes reflects the values of that society and what an individual consumes reflects the values of that individual. The values held by a society or by an individual within that society may very well produce, for those involved, perceptions of product utility that are rejected by other societies or individuals that hold a different set of values" (p.54).

This topic, namely advertising's effect on human values may be the subject of another study. Sissors (1978)

points out that research conducted to find out how values are changed are relatively small so that we can only make some generalizations. Sissors also adds that these generalizations are not enough to enable us the discovery of advertising's effects on values. More research is needed on this matter. As Sissors also states, since there are difficulties associated with the finding out of advertising's effect on values, it won't be included as a subject in this study.

1.1.6. Does Advertising Cause Conformity?

Conformity is defined by Elliot Aronson (1976), Professor of Psychology, "as a change in person's behaviour or opinions as a real or imagined pressure from a person or group of people" (p.15). Kleppner (1966) says that according to modern anthropology all societies impose on their members the desire to conform. People who do not conform are punished. Kleppner states that advertising is just one of the forces in the American life that seem to foster conformity. All the mass media-radio, television, newspapers, and so forth-spread ideas and styles to people; advertising is just one aspect of them. Besides those mentioned there are also other institutions that seem to encourage conformity, like education system and even mass production. However, Klepper declares that advertising emphasizes differences and diversity of goods. As an example Kleppner gives the advertisements published in one single issue of the life magazine:

"Ford	17 Fords to choose from
Coty	42 beautiful colors
Chevrolet	Choose from 15 Chevrolets in four beautiful series
Du Pont	This fall-more styles, more colors with Dacron
Jarman Shoes	See our wide selection of shoes for every occasion" (p.40).

Kleppner also gives the example of Detroit car makers who offered 323 different models within one year with variations in color, shape and so forth. The author adds that besides the differences within a product there are also differences among the products which help individuals in stating their own individuality.

According to Vance Packard (1959), as quoted by Dunn (1961)

"Most of us surround ourselves, wittingly or unwittingly, with status symbols we hope will influence the raters appraising us, and which we hope will help establish some social distance between ourselves and those we consider below us. The vigorous merchandizing of goods as status symbols by advertisers is playing a major role in identifying status consciousness"(p.7).

Dunn points out that with the increase of economic prosperity people have now better economic conditions and get better education. This kind of improvements in the life standards caused a degree of homogeneity in a country. However, Dunn says that the increase in the standard of living has caused at the same time some differences in people's life. Having more money and time, people can devote themselves more to their personal tastes. Dunn states that actually advertising emphasizes differences through denoting various kinds of brands, colours, shapes, and so forth. The author adds that this decreases rather than increase conformity. Finally, Dunn points out: "The main point is that advertising has not changed people but instead merely mirrors them as they are" (P.84).

Greyser (1972) believes that in the area of conformity there are much opinion and value judgements. However, he

adds that there are no data available. Greyser points to the two sides of the coin saying that according to a marketer it might be that product differentiation causes greater possibility for diversity. However, according to a critic it might be that products with large shares of the market causes conformity.

The purpose of this study doesn't include the search for whether advertising causes conformity, or not.

1.2. PROBLEMS RELATED WITH THE ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF ADVERTISING

The economic aspects of advertising have also got some critics and some defenders. In this part the author's purpose is to make the reader aware of the critics toward the economic aspects of advertising. Besides the critics the defenders' view toward those aspects will also be presented to the reader. The criticisms toward the economic aspects of advertising include criticisms that advertising causes waste, that advertising creates monopolies, and that advertising increases prices of the products. Also included in the economic aspects of advertising are the notions that advertising causes better products and that advertising increases the standard of living.

Since the author believes that all of the above mentioned economic aspects of advertising are intermingled with each other, the author finds it meaningful not to separate those economic aspects, but present them under one heading to the reader.

In the present study the author will try to find out people's views about whether advertising causes better

products, whether advertising increases the standard of living, and whether advertising increases or decreases prices of the products.

Kleppner (1966) cites three broad categories of competition: perfect competition, imperfect competition and complete monopoly. In perfect competition there are no differences between the products of the same product class. The producer doesn't need to advertise his product, for it isn't any different from other products. Kleppner adds that an association of the producers may together advertise their products in order to increase the total usage. In imperfect competition there are only a number of firms in a field which produce products with differences from each other. These firms have some control over the prices. In this type of competition the product needs identification by a trademark. The trademark causes the product be automatically different from those which do not have the same trademark. Kleppner adds that there may be other differentials relating to the features of the product. Kleppner explains that in complete monopoly there is only one producer or one product. The producer may advertise if he wants to increase the usage of the product, or if he wants to build good will.

According to Kleppner "perfect" and "imperfect" competition are technical terms used for some price behaviour theories of the competitive system. The author states that these terms are used loosely by some economists when they talk about advertising, as, "the imperfections of competition", or "advertising is an impediment to perfect competition".

Kleppner expresses that according to the economists it is valuable to do advertising in the pioneering stage of a product. What they criticize is the advertising of a product in the competitive stage. This is then criticized by them as

"combative", "manipulative", "superfluous and misleading", "puffing or product differentiation", or "wasteful".

Backman (1968) also states that competitive advertising has been the main area of those who think that advertising is wasteful. Backman believes that competition necessarily has duplication and waste inherent. However, he adds that the advantages of competition are much greater than its waste. Through competition people get new products, better and improved quality, better service, and pressures on prices. In the United States competition has contributed to economic growth, thus enabling higher standards of living. Backman says that advertising fostered the production of new and better products. Expanding markets through large scale advertising has enabled the existence of those new products. The author expresses that this process may include some waste, but that it has been more than recovered by other benefits.

Bauer and Greyser (1968) point out that advertising causes better products, and that advertising raises the standard of living are two of the economic aspects of advertising. The authors make a summary of advertising proponents and critics of both aspects. Advertising proponents state that through competitive advertising better products are developed. However, advertising critics argue that those better products are the cause of a natural development, or else they also state that these developments occur as a cause of the competitive system in which advertising has only a small role. With regard to the standard of living, according to the proponents advertising stimulates both consumers for a better standard of living, and business for producing products that raise the standard. Advertising critics, on the other hand, believe that with respect to this aspect what advertising can do is exaggerated, especially with regard to products which are no more new. Another view that the critics hold is that much advertising creates "psychological obsolescence" causing no actual improvement in the living standards of people

Backman (1968) states: "Advertising is an integral and vital part of our growing economy and contributes to the launching of the new products so essential to economic growth" (p.137).

Steuart Henderson Britt (1960) in his book, "The Spenders", expresses that advertising educates in two ways. It educates the manufacturer by showing them the needs and wants of the consumer thus aiding to have a higher standard of living. It educates the consumers by showing them the utilities of different products, thus enabling them to spend more wisely.

Jules Backman (1968) points out that advertising contributes to economic growth. In order to support his argument, he quotes David M.Blank (1964):

"...advertising by acquainting the consumer with the values of new products, widens the market for these products, pushes forward their acceptance by the consumer, and encourages the investment and entrepreneurship necessary for innovation. Advertising, in short, holds out the promise of a greater and speedier return than would occur without such methods, thus stimulating investment, growth, and diversity"(p.151).

Kleppner (1966) argues that the target of the critics is the "differential" that advertisers use in order to distinguish their products from those of competitors. The author talks about two kinds of differential: "the imaginary differential", and "the trivial differential". One of those criticisms of differential, namely trivial differential contains some minor differences between substantially alike products. The critics want to know the justification why

advertising has been devoted to such trivial differences. Kleppner states that the trivial differential of the products being advertised may be found not very important at any moment; however, the combination of those trivial differences cause major improvements to happen after a period of time. The consumer is also assured to have better products through competition.

Backman (1968) points out to the critics who argue that those resources devoted to advertising, would be used more efficiently by other means. According to the author this kind of critics forget that the United States has a surplus economy. In a subsistence economy these resources could have really been used more efficiently. However, in a surplus economy for the resources used for advertising there isn't any better alternative. It's even possible that resources devoted to advertising would have been used less efficiently, had there been no advertising. Another point Backman expresses is that abolishment of advertising means a shift to other marketing techniques, which may be less efficient than advertising.

Kleppner (1973) says that critics argue that advertising just shifts demand from one product to another, causing customers to buy Product A instead of Product B. The critics add that by doing this advertising doesn't increase the total demand. According to the critics consumers should be protected from this kind of advertising. However, Kleppner believes that one cannot talk about a static demand. Population is rising in the United States with one third of the rise by 1985 being in the 25 to 34 year age group, thus creating a market for young marrieds. Kleppner points out that with the increase in population and with the change in composition, potential market for a product is also changing. Change in life-style and tastes of people should also be kept in mind. Kleppner (1966) concludes that the criticism of advertising as merely exchanging customers

in a closed market for most products is not supported by reality.

Ulanoff (1977) also cites critics who say that advertising causes switching of brands and creates little new demand. According to Ulanoff, advertising naturally causes some switching of demands; however, he adds that this is a part of the competitive free economy, and that this brand switching will occur with or without advertising any way. Moreover, to assume that advertising doesn't create new demand would mean that same amount of goods is sold each year. This hasn't happened in the past, and there are no cues existing to indicate that it will happen in the future. The population is increasing each year, thus, demand is also increasing. Furthermore, gross national product in the United States is also increasing meaning that people have more money to buy goods. Ulanoff also states that the expanding economy has enabled the occurrence of increasingly great marketing opportunities.

Kleppner (1966) expresses that critics consider advertising as breeding monopolies and restricting the free competition in a field. The trademark is considered to be the central point of the monopoly power. The author states that advertising may play a role in making the trademark famous, but not necessarily. Kleppner quotes Chamberlin (1950) who in order to prevent monopolies with their "useless differentiation", has proposed that the use of a trademark should be granted to a manufacturer for a limited time period. After this period the identical product might be produced by other manufacturers under the same name. Chamberlin adds, as quoted by Kleppner, "the wastes of advertising about which economists have so often complained would be reduced, for no one could afford to build up good will by this means only to see it vanish through the unimpeded entrance of competitors" (p.274).

Kleppner agrees that there would be less advertising. However, he finds it questionable whether a man will take the risk of producing new and better products while having just a couple of years "to recover his costs and profit by his risk". Kleppner points out that if somebody wants to enter an industry with established manufacturers, he has to compete in many fields with them. Kleppner, however, gives example of the new small advertisers who have successfully competed with big advertisers, not by trying to have the same large amount of advertising, but through product design, good timing, and imaginative advertising. Kleppner quotes Galbraith (1962) who has stated that in an established industry, there is no freedom of entry, rather entrance depends on time and circumstances.

James Ferguson (1974), as quoted by Bogart (1978) concludes that "there is both an inadequate theoretical and inadequate empirical basis for any public policy based on the presumption that advertising decreases competition."

Kleppner (1973) gives another example of those who view advertising as a barrier to entry for a manufacturer, and thus breeding monopoly. Federal Trade Commission, as described by Backman (1967) notes:

"Ease of entry into a market has long been regarded as one of the key indicia of a competitive market structure. The courts have given this factor considerable emphasis in judging the legality of mergers. Heavy advertising expenditures have been viewed by some critics as creating barriers to entry because present producers develop such goodwill for their products that newcomers must spend large sums on advertising to compete effectively. Thus, it allegedly limits entry in two ways: (1) the volume of resources required to compete is very great; this limits the entry of small firms into the

market; and (2) it is difficult to overcome existing brand loyalties; this acts as a deterrent to larger firms"(p.40).

Kleppner says that established manufacturers have for sure some advantages. However, none of these advantages can keep a firm out of the field in case it has a superior product to manufacture. According to the author, in America there is not only one market, but there are many markets. A big manufacturer with extensive advertising may be top in some of them, but may be just a small scale seller in others. There are many markets in which the regional manufacturers are the best sellers. It might be possible that the popularity of this manufacturer would spread some day and that he would be a national advertiser.

Harris and Seldon (1959) point out that some critics think of advertising as tightening competition, and thus making costs and prices higher than they could be. The authors argue that this could be true for short periods, but for the long run, effects of advertising in "attracting competitors", "opening the way for innovators," and "keeping the economy flexible and dynamic" should not be forgotten. Why the critics have gone wrong is explained by Harris and Seldon: Firstly, the authors state that critics compare the existing system with the models of "perfect competition" which is a theoretical model. The authors add that the existing imperfect competition may be "the best possible state of affairs in the economic system," though it may not be as good as the idea of perfect competition. Harris and Seldon conclude that: "Imperfections are, paradoxically, a means of keeping the market more competitive even in the short run before new ideas and techniques enable newcomers (with the assistance of advertising) to challenge the established large firms" (p.48). Secondly, Harris and Seldon point out that critics have a too narrow and short view point, and that actually competition is less

imperfect than the critics suppose. The authors express that the critics look at each competition, imperfect, monopolistic, and so forth, separately, forgetting to consider the competition between industries. According to the authors, "the critics under-estimate the power of potential competition and the dynamic of growth within individual firms in disciplining "oligopolists" that fail to toe the consumer line" (p.49). Thirdly, Harris and Seldon note that the critics of imperfect competition don't see the fact that advertising plays an important role in maintaining competition, and permitting and stimulating the entrance of new competitors into the field to motivate the already existing products and services. Fourthly, the authors state that there are some faults of advertising, but they don't see that advertising can be "dispensed with in a free economy", or even be prohibited by regulations. Lord Heyworth as cited by Harris and Seldon, in his annual address to Unilever shareholders, say that producers should be free to experiment and "waste" resources testing the markets for their products, and that they should use advertising in this process; he states that otherwise it won't be possible to speak of a free economy. According to Daniel Bell (1956), as quoted by Harris and Seldon: "Waste is an image that shocks a utilitarian or a Fabian temper, but just as parliamentary disorder is often a price of political liberty, so waste is the price of free consumer choice". Fifthly, the authors state that critics sometimes propose measures that would attack the principles of a free society. In a way, they propose the retailer dominance instead of manufacturer dominance. Harris and Seldon admit that manufacturers have used advertising to create their dominance on the market place, since they've built through advertising consumer loyalty for their brands. Thus, retailers have almost been put in a position of passive stockists. But according to the authors this doesn't cause it to be meaningful to establish a retailer dominance instead of manufacturer dominance. Why should retailer dominance be more beneficial than manufacturer dominance?

Leo Bogart (1978) says that though there is no evidence that advertising fosters monopolies, leads to higher prices, or creates demand for products that have no "real utility", critics draw attention to those product classes, where advertising expenditures are quite high. They even suggest that the amount of advertising for those products should be limited. However, the author argues that: "Limitations on the volume of advertising would simply divert sales pressures into other forms of merchandise and promotion—from market research to push money-directed to the same purpose and perhaps more difficult to regulate" (p.24).

Ulanoff (1977) points out to some critics who argue that advertising increases the prices of the goods. Ulanoff says that it is true that like any other cost, advertising, too, is charged as a cost on the price of the goods. But he adds that this doesn't mean that prices are higher with advertising than they would be without it. The author continues to explain that if advertising makes mass production possible through creating mass markets which could not be created without it, advertising would even make lower prices possible, since mass production, will enable lower unit costs. However, the author also states that whether this lower unit costs will be reflected on the price of the goods as lower prices, is the decision of the management. On the other hand, if advertising is used to create an image that will enable to charge a higher price for a product; that would also be a decision of the management. Ulanoff summarizes that advertising may "make possible" goods to be sold at higher or lower prices. But, he adds that this is not the same as saying that advertising makes prices higher or lower. At the end, it is the decision of the management, and not of advertising.

Kleppner (1966), too, points out that consumers do also pay for advertising; he adds that this doesn't necessarily

mean that "consumer is paying more because of the advertising". According to the author whether the consumer pays more or less in a specific case, depends on:

- "1. The effect of advertising on the production costs of a product
2. The effect of advertising on the selling costs
3. The value goals of management"(p.546).

For the first of them Kleppner says that it is possible to reduce the production costs when advertising creates mass production with the help of the increase in the volume of the sales. But he states that this doesn't necessarily mean that mass-production would always reduce the costs. After a point in mass production unit costs may remain constant, or sometimes it may even go up. Kleppner also notes that the job of advertising is to help create the volume of orders needed to produce the optimum level of production, which in return enables the reduction of manufacturing costs. To decide whether this reduction in cost will be reflected to the selling price, thus to the consumer, is management's job. To explain the effect of advertising on the selling costs, Kleppner says that advertising doesn't always reduce selling costs for the producer. If, for example, the sales of a product is declining for some reason other than advertising, then this means that the amount the producer has to pay per dollar of sales is increasing. The author adds: "But the increasing use of advertising by companies that are competing with other companies for all possible economies in operations would indicate that they have found advertising to reduce the cost of selling the desired volume of goods" (p.547). Here again Kleppner states that whether the buyers get that saving is management's decision. According to Kleppner the value goal of management is an important factor in deciding whether the consumer will pay more or less. Management may have long-range goals, short-range goals or "value goals". As an example the

value goal of management may be to produce "the least expensive watch", or to produce "the most expensive watch". In order to produce "the least expensive watch" all possible savings may be made, but in order to produce "the most expensive watch" no concern to the savings will be given. In this case advertising won't be a means for making the cost lower. Because of the differences in the management goals, it is difficult to generalize the effects of advertising on the cost of a product to the consumer. However, Kleppner says: "The fact does remain that for most products designed for widespread consumer use, the value goal of management is to produce a better product at a lower cost to the consumer" (p.547). Finally, Kleppner concludes that: "Advertising is a part of the competitive free enterprise system that makes better products and prices possible."(p.548).

Dunn (1961) after examining advertising's effect on production cost concludes that in most cases advertising makes the product cheaper, but in some cases not. Dunn explains that there is an optimum rate of production where production costs are at the lowest. If this optimum rate is at a high level, advertising would help in achieving this production rate. One should also keep in mind that certain industries are more easily adaptable to mass production than others. Dunn adds that advertising may also decrease production cost in the case of products with seasonal fluctuations through facilitating demand when it is low.

While examining advertising's effect on marketing cost, Dunn notes that one might expect that advertising would cut down other selling costs and reduce total marketing cost. However, he adds that this might depend on several other variables. As an example he gives the age of an industry. In order to support his view Dunn quotes Borden who has found that in new industries since they want to attract demand,

advertising costs are often relatively high.

When evaluating the effect of the consumer demand on the price of the consumer goods, Dunn explains with the help of a hypothetical example that at a certain demand level costs may be lower than a lower or even higher demand level. However, Dunn also quotes British economist F.P.Bishop (1944) who pointed to the difficulty in evaluating the effect of the demand since "goods that are advertised are not the same goods as would be produced without advertising".

Dunn concludes that the evidence in the area of costs and pricing is indefinite, and that it is not easy to generalize. One can find cases where through high rate of advertising prices are lower than they used to be; but on the other hand, one can also find cases where prices remained the same, though also highly advertised, however there has been an increase in the quality.

Harris and Seldon (1959) declare that there are five ways through which advertising may increase the scale of production or reduce costs:

- "a) by stimulating demand,
- b) by ironing fluctuations in demand,
- c) by guiding demand into fewer channels,
- d) by displacing more costly methods of marketing,
- e) by sharpening competition" (p.56)

Harris and Seldon believe that advertising increases the scale of production, thus reducing costs and prices. The authors state with the support of examples that there has been a vast amount of increase in the level of output from 1920's till 1960's. To search for the credit advertising can demand for this increase in output, the authors state that advertising is one of the methods of raising and stimulating demand. The others can be: an improvement in quality, a change in package

or design, a change in fashion or taste, or a rise in incomes. The authors also state: "How far lower costs are passed on to the consumer in lower prices depends primarily on the degree of competition, actual or potential, from other brands or commodities". Harris and Seldon conclude that the evidences show that advertising has speeded the movements for a technical progress to lower real costs, and that it has reduced costs and prices faster than they otherwise would be.

So far the social and economic aspects of advertising were presented to the reader, and the view of advertising's critics and defenders as to the evils and merits of those aspects were disclosed. In the following part the author wishes to present the empirical research results about the attitudes toward advertising to the reader.

1.3. RESEARCH RESULTS ABOUT THE ATTITUDES TOWARD ADVERTISING

In order to find out attitudes toward advertising, researchers have been surveying either a special segment of the population like housewives, students, and so on, or consumers in general. As Greyser (1962) has found out businessmen believe that public has the most power to help or hurt advertising. Thus they maintain that public's opinions have to be given most attention.

Among the studies done in this field Sandage and Leckenby's (1980) study can be mentioned useful in finding out whether people make a distinction between institutional and instrumental aspects of advertising. Thus it can be found out whether people make a distinction between criticisms toward the institution of advertising and criticisms toward the instruments of the institution. In other words this is a distinction between advertising as the institution and

advertisements as instruments of advertising.

From 1960 to 1978 data were gathered from introductory advertising students in the United States. Data were collected by means of a semantic differential instrument from 1552 students. In order to mask the central emphasis on advertising and also in order to compare attitudes toward advertising, four other institutions, namely state government, religion, labor union and education were included besides advertising in the questionnaire. Good/bad, clean/dirty, honest/dishonest, strong/weak, valuable/worthless, sincere/insincere, safe/dangerous, and necessary/unnecessary were the constant eight 7-point semantic differential scales. Supported by Rokeach's (1973) studies of value systems, it was hypothesized that one subset of scales (good, strong, valuable, and necessary) measures the concept of institution and the other subset of scales (clean, honest, sincere and safe) measures the concept of instrument. The consideration of the mean ratings of advertising on those eight scales revealed that those two subsets of scales measure different dimensions of advertising. The ratings of all the five institutions on two scale sets also supported the hypothesis. Except for religion a statistically significant spread occurred between those two sets of scales.

Further, to support this finding another questionnaire has administered in 1971. This questionnaire included religion, church, advertising, advertisement, education and university. There was almost no difference between the mean scores of advertising and advertisement on the instrumental subset. However, there was a greater difference between advertising and advertisement mean ratings on the institutional subset.

Based on a factor analysis conducted on the 1971 data of the ratings of advertising it was revealed that the good, valuable, necessary and strong scales loaded on the first

factor, and the other four scales loaded on the second factor. This result implied that those two subsets really measure two different dimensions of advertising. Similar results were obtained from the factor analysis done to the other institutions of the 1971 data.

Findings also disclosed that students are more favorable toward the institution of advertising than toward its instruments. This result is also valid for state government, labor union, and education. It is also interesting to note that at the institutional level advertising got the second best result after education. But at the instrumental level though it got a better result than state government or labor union, it didn't fared as well as at the instrumental level.

It is also believed that in order to trace the emphasis of criticisms or improvements of advertising, to search weather people make a distinction between institutions and instruments of advertising is needed. For this aim it is also the intention trying to find out in this research whether people make this distinction, or not

TABLE 1.3.1

Social and Economic Aspects of Advertising
(Bauer and Greyser, 1968)

Advertising is essential
 Advertising does not insult intelligence
 Advertising results in lower prices
 Advertising does not persuade people to buy things they do not need
 Advertising presents a true product picture
 Advertising helps raise the standard of living
 Advertising results in better products

The seven variables in Table 1.3.1 were used in many studies (Greyser and Bauer, 1968; A.A.A.A.'s Study, 1974; Thorelli, Becker, and Engledow, 1975) to measure the social and economic dimensions of advertising. Moreover, except 'advertising is essential' the remaining six variables will be included in the questionnaire of this research for the same purpose, namely to measure the social and economic dimensions of advertising. However, "advertising is essential" variable will be included in the questionnaire to measure the overall attitude toward advertising.

Anderson, Engledow, and Becker (1978) gave further support to the belief that those seven variables actually measure the social and economic dimensions of advertising. For the analysis two separate data were used: 1) Data collected through the seven Bauer-Greyser questions (Table 1.3.1) on social and economic aspects of advertising in 1970 from 629 subscribers to Consumer Reports magazine as part of a larger study (Thorelli, Becker, and Engledow, 1975). 2) The same seven questions asked to 549 Consumer Reports subscribers in 1976. Responses to those seven variables were on a five-point scale. An additional variable to measure the overall attitude toward advertising had a seven-point scale.

Factor analysis applied to both of the above data separately divided the seven variables into two factors. The variables: advertising is essential, advertising results in lower prices, advertising helps raise the standard of living, and advertising results in better products loaded in one factor, representing the economic dimension of advertising. The variables: advertising does not insult intelligence, and advertising does not persuade people to buy things they do not need loaded in another factor, representing the social dimension of advertising. Those findings revealed the same results as had been hypothesized. "Advertising presents a true

product picture" variable, however, didn't load on the social dimension as hypothesized, but showed a more complex relationship with split loadings between the social and economic factors. Another finding of the study was that generally attitudes were significantly less favorable in the 1976 study than the 1970 one. Regression analysis applied separately on the 1970 and the 1976 group with the criterion variable "the overall attitude toward advertising", and the predictors, being the derived factors, showed that the two factors, namely social and economic, are the cause of a large proportion of the variance in the general attitude. Social issues were more important in predicting the overall attitude in 1970, while economic dimension was more important in 1976.

Reid and Soley (1982) wanted to determine whether there is a difference between people's generalized and personalized attitudes toward advertising's social and economic effects. As the sample 260 households were selected from the telephone directory of a community with 100,000 people. At the end of the telephone interviews 222 completed interviews were at hand. Six of the seven economic and social aspects of advertising, as shown in Table 1.3.1, were used ("Advertising is essential" was not included). Twelve attitude statements were constructed by rewording the six statements, so that they represented the generalized and personalized attitudes. The survey results manifested that people really make a distinction between their personalized and generalized attitudes toward advertising's social and economic effects. Both, to the social and economic effects of advertising, people were more critical at the personal level than they were at the general level. The findings have also revealed that people believe that advertising has positive economic effects, but negative social effects. The difference in attitudes toward advertising's economic and social dimensions is tried to be explained to an extent by the distinction

people make between institution and instruments of advertising. Reid and Soley give reference to Sandage and Leckenby (1980) who have manifested that people are more favorable toward the institution of advertising than they are toward its instruments. Reid and Soley state that advertisements are experienced by most of the people at the personal level which is closely connected to the social dimension of advertising. People who are exposed to the advertisements which they label as insulting, misleading, and deceptive; and the same people who manifest nonrational purchasing behaviour, may excuse their behaviour by blaming advertising's persuasiveness.

On the other hand, economic effects of advertising are not felt personally. Reid and Soley say: "Rather, people tend to view advertising as an abstract market-place force and to associate product price, product quality, and standard of living with other, more directly experienced forces"(p.6). Since advertising's social effects are closer to personal experience than its economic effects, it is understandable that people are more critical toward the social effects than economic effects.

Finally, Reid and Soley point to the danger of generalization of the research findings about attitudes toward advertising from "limited-parent populations such as magazine subscribers and college students"(p.6). The authors state that comparisons show that "limited-parent populations" are more critical toward advertising than the general population.

Such a research with limited-parent populations is done with an "inherently friendly" group, namely businessmen. Greyser (1962) reports the findings of the study, in which Harvard Business Review has surveyed a cross section of its own readers, and also other executives in American industry and commerce to find out their view of advertising's role,

function, and influence. A complex, eight-page questionnaire was the instrument of the study, with a sample size of 2400 business-men. Findings revealed that businessmen thought that advertising is essential. They generally believed in advertising's over-all value, especially in terms of its economic role strongly. With respect to the social influence businessmen did not always favor advertising, though they generally disagreed with its major social criticisms. Businessmen pointed out that advertising persuades people to buy things they shouldn't, and that this is a bad thing to do. In terms of advertising's content businessmen considered it as advertising's most important problem. Executives often criticized advertisements which are irritating, and which insult the intelligence. It was also apparent from the study that there is a distinction made between advertising and advertisements. Another finding was that businessmen thought that ethical codes are needed for the regulation of advertising. These codes should be, according to them, more strict than the codes needed for their own industries. If asked, what they recommended for the advertising industry to improve themselves, businessmen demanded more taste and more truth in advertisements, and also stronger self-regulation by the industry. Further, businessmen believed that its top-managements' responsibility to foster these improvements.

Since it was found necessary to update the study of 1962, Greyser and Reece (1971) applied an eight-page questionnaire, similar to the in 1962. After the responses have been evaluated, it was clear that businessmen still favored advertising, and showed respect particularly to its economic role. Though businessmen had strong beliefs in the economic validity of advertising, for some of the advertising's economic influences they supported it less than in 1962. From the point of overall appraisal businessmen agreed that advertising is essential. But when the subject was the social

influences of advertising, they were overall less favorable than they were in 1962. Another major finding was that businessmen were clearly not satisfied with the content of advertising. However, there was only a slightly less favorable attitude toward content than in 1962.

Another study conducted to explore consumer and physician attitudes toward the advertising of professional services in health care sector includes also some related findings with this research (Miller and Waller, 1979). A total of 750 physician questionnaires and 500 consumer questionnaires were mailed; 25 per cent and 32 per cent were the usable response rates respectively. With respect to the attitudes toward advertising in general, consumers and physicians show a general agreement. The both groups have almost the same scores to the statements: "advertising results in lower prices", and "advertisements present a true picture of the products and services advertised". Their scores are between neither agree nor disagree and disagree. To the statement "advertising insults the intelligence", consumers agree, but physicians tend to answer between agree and neither agree nor disagree.

Some of the surveys about consumer attitudes toward advertising has been undertaken by the researchers in different countries for making a cross-cultural comparison possible.

Such a multinational study (Wills and Ryans, 1978) searches for the significant differences in attitudes toward advertising held by consumerists, students, academicians, and managers. The central theme of the survey is the basic role of advertising as an information source. Responses were gathered from some 32 countries. 23 per cent of the manager respondents were from the United States and Canada, 46 per cent from Europe, and 31 per cent from other areas. Nearly half of

the academicians were from the United States, 29 per cent from Western Europe, and 19 per cent from other regions. Consumerists were chosen from the Consumer Directory, published by the International Organization of Consumers' Unions. Additionally thirty-eight heads of state and local consumerist groups in the United States, and executives of both United States and foreign government consumer organizations were included in the survey. Students (graduate and undergraduate) in six countries, namely Australia, Nigeria, Sweden, France, Japan and Canada were surveyed. A highly structured questionnaire was used as the instrument of the mail survey. The questionnaire consisted of 13 descriptive attributes of advertising on a Likert scale. Most of the statements dealt with the information content of advertising, and the rest were about the quality of presentation of advertisements. Results showed that consumerists' attitudes toward advertising differed strongly from managers' attitudes. Managers thought of advertising as providing factual and important information about products advertised, whereas consumerists took the opposite viewpoint. Students and academicians were at the middle ground. However, generally students thought more like the consumerists. Academicians' attitudes were more like the managers'. But they sometimes criticized advertising which implied that they were not as positive overall as the managers. To search for the regional differences the four groups were classified by region. After the examination for within-group differences, no significant differences were identified.

Thorelli, Becker, and Engledow (1975) searched for the consumer attitudes toward advertising as an institution in German and American metropolitan areas. The responses were then compared and contrasted in light of existing cross-cultural similarities and differences. The sample size consisted of 301 American and 295 German respondents. In the study, both, the average consumers and also subscribers to the three

product testing magazines: Consumer Reports, DM and test were surveyed. Four sets of variables were used in the questionnaire: 1) advertising attitude variables; 2) perceived use of advertising as an information source; 3) consumer characteristics (demographic and socioeconomic); and 4) environmental variables. The results revealed that Americans' attitudes are more favorably inclined toward advertising in general than Germans. In both countries advertising was considered as an essential ingredient of the free market system. American respondents were favorable toward advertising's economic aspect, but they criticized its social image. On the other hand German respondents didn't greatly support both of the aspects of advertising, economic and social. In both countries respondents who were favorable to advertising in general, were also favorable to its social and economic dimensions. The subscribers of the German sample were more favorable toward advertising than average consumers. American subscribers, on the other hand, were to a lesser degree less favorable than the average consumers. This implies that American and German subscribers, namely Information Seekers, share more similar attitudes toward advertising than the average consumers. Respondents who view advertising as an important information source and who are generally satisfied with it have a more favorable attitude toward it. This finding is more consistent among German respondents than among Americans.

Thorelli, Becker, and Engledow give a summary of the Reader's Digest Study (1970), which is conducted in 16 European countries. The results generally implied that consumers in the developed countries were in favor of advertising, considering it an important ingredient of the economy. Advertising was considered as leading to higher quality products by fostering competition. Consumers believed that advertising prevents products from being priced lower. They didn't consider the belief that advertising can lower prices by enabling large-

scale production. Furthermore advertising was believed to be not always truthful. Because of advertising people would buy things they do not need and want. The findings of the study suggested that people were favorably inclined toward advertising's economic role. What they criticized was the social impact of advertising, perceived as acting against the consumer welfare.

A survey is conducted by French, Barksdale, and Perreault (1982) to find out consumer attitudes toward marketing in England. In order to make a comparison results of the latest United States survey conducted in 1979 is also presented with the results of the English survey. In the United States survey 628 consumers were included. In the English survey a mail questionnaire with Likert scales were used. Out of the 990 households to which the questionnaires were sent, 305 were returned. The findings of the questions relating to the promotion revealed that respondents didn't believe to the truth in advertisements. Respondents even refused the belief that advertised products are more reliable than unadvertised ones. Among the English respondents retirement was the factor which was related with the differences in attitudes. Retired respondents were much more favorable toward advertising than blue-and white-collar workers. A comparison of the findings of the United States and British respondents revealed that American respondents believed less than the English respondents in the credibility of advertising. This finding is tried to be explained by the authors by the fact that Americans are over-exposed to advertisements, which might have caused a degree of indifference that lead to the disbelief. Barksdale and Darden (1972) also searched for the consumer attitudes toward marketing and consumerism. The data were gathered through a mail questionnaire. 354 complete and usable questionnaires were at hand, each containing 40 Likert-type statements. What the authors found for advertising specifically was lack of confidence to it.

The conclusions of many respondents was that: 1) most product advertising is not believable, 2) with respect to product quality and performance most advertisements are not reliable sources of information, 3) advertisements generally do not present a true picture of the products advertised. Another finding of the study is that consumers find the advertised products more reliable than the unadvertised products.

Age and political predisposition were the classification variables which showed differences in responses. Younger and liberal respondents were more critical of advertising.

Some researchers wanted to trace the factors which might be the cause of consumer criticisms toward advertising. Durand and Lambert (1985) tried to examine the correlation between advertising and environmental elements consisting of consumer and political alienation. Alienation is considered as having some variants, and these were defined. "Powerlessness" showed an individuals expectations not to be able to influence a seller's actions that effects the buyers. "Consumer normlessness" points to the expectations that producers will do even socially unapproved behaviours when they believe it to be necessary for their own goals without considering the hazardous effects on consumer interest. "Meaninglessness" occurs when a person is not so sure what to believe, when a person's "minimal standards for clarity" are not met, when an individual is only able to see little difference among alternatives. "Cultural estrangement pertains to a dislike for many of the trappings of a culture, particularly those that mirror the tastes and values of the masses" (p.10). The phrase "insulting to one's intelligence" may be related to this. Finally "political alienation" consisted of "political efficacy" and "political trust". "Political efficacy" points to person's ability to influence government, and "political trust" refers to the cynicisms with politics.

Out of the 1320 mailed questionnaires 325 questionnaires were returned. Included in the questionnaire were 19 five-point Likert-type items. Respondents' attitudes toward 12 advertising criticisms were also measured through Likert-type scales.

Analysis have been conducted in two steps. After having categorized respondents according to levels of alienation, differences in advertising criticisms have been compared across alienation level through MANOVA.

Results revealed that advertising criticisms differed with the level of consumer and political alienation. However, the authors state that additional research is necessary to find out whether advertising is causing alienation, or whether alienation is caused by other factors, and prepares a basis for advertising criticisms.

The above research is presented by the author as an example of the explorations by the researchers to trace the cause and basis of advertising criticisms.

Rena Bartos (1974) reports about the A.A.A.A.'s study on the consumer view of advertising. The purpose of the study was to update results of the 1964 study on the same subject. The sample size of the study was 1803, and the study has been conducted in the United States. First of all the researchers wanted to find out the level of salience and concern of advertising in people's minds. The results compared with the 1964 study indicated that advertising was ranked low in both years with respect to salience. In both of the years, 1964 and 1974, advertising remained low in the list of things that need immediate attention and change. To find the overall opinion about advertising was another aim of the study. Four other institutions were also included in the question. When

asked how people feel about advertising and other major institutions, namely the press, labor unions, big business, and federal government, the press got the highest level of approval, and advertising was following close behind. Moreover, it was found out that people who were favorable toward advertising, were also favorable toward the other four institutions. People who were most negative toward advertising, had also negative attitudes toward other institutions. For the credibility question advertising was again ranked at the second place after the press. However, when asked whether respondents advise a young person to look for a career in those five institutions, government or big business, though not being approved as much as the other institutions, still were considered as good places to pursue a career. Advertising was also considered as a not bad career opportunity. If asked about the opinion about advertising through the seven statements presented in Table 1.3.1, more consumers in 1974 than in 1964 believed that advertising is essential. However there was a decline in the number of consumers who agreed with other positive statements about advertising in 1974 compared with 1964. More consumers in 1974 believed that "advertising insults the intelligence of the average consumer". Eight issues which were defined by the consumers themselves, were identified as the major ways through which consumers look at advertising. Among those eight issues consumer benefits, credibility and the entertainment value were the issues, which mostly contributed to consumer attitudes toward advertising. Advertising as a social and economic force, manipulation or motivation, and clutter, intrusiveness were the other three issues, which contributed to a lesser degree to consumers' overall attitudes toward advertising. The contribution of the last two issues, namely program/ad content and media support were quite low.

The most comprehensive study done in the field of consumer attitudes toward advertising was made by Greyser and Bauer (1968). 1846 respondents were surveyed. Generally the aim of the study was to explore public attitudes toward advertising as an institution, and also to reveal public's reactions to advertisements. In detail, four major areas are covered by this research. Firstly, the authors tried to find out the salience level of advertising compared with other aspects of American life. Secondly, they explored consumer attitudes toward advertising, both their overall attitudes of advertising, and also attitudes toward advertising's social, economic, and content aspects. Thirdly, how consumers react to advertisements, were explored. Finally, why they react to advertisements as they do, were tried to find out.

Because of the time-demanding nature and complexity of measurement of reactions to advertisements, it is not the authors intend to include this measurement in this study. Therefore it is believed that a detailed summary of the part of the study dealing with advertisements are unnecessary here. However, it may be pointed out that advertisements which are classified enjoyable and informative by far outweighed those classified as annoying and offensive.

The authors believed to the importance of measuring the salience level. Greyser and Bauer stated that when asked consumers would of course, express whether they criticize or support advertising. However, this doesn't necessarily mean that advertising is an important issue for them. Thus the measurement of salience would reveal the importance of that subject in people's minds. Two separate questions were designed to measure the salience. First of them dealt with the "top-of-the-mind annoyance" to people, and the second one measured the comparative salience of advertising.

In this research the author also wants to find out the salience of advertising among the Turkish respondents. For this aim the author borrowed the variables which measure the salience in Bauer, Greyser study. Only some minor changes have been made among the aspects of life of the comparative salience variables.

The results of the Bauer, Greyser study revealed that advertising was not a major issue in people's minds, and that rather it had a secondary importance.

Another finding was that the majority of people could be classified as indifferent and mixed in their attitudes toward advertising. Moreover, out of the respondents who had a definite view of advertising, respondents who were favorable outnumbered those who were unfavorable. An interesting point was that even those who were unfavorable toward advertising, appreciated its economic role; and even those who were favorable criticized its impact on individuals.

It was also apparent from the study that backgrounds of people didn't differentiate their attitudes toward advertising. The classification variables age, sex, income, and education were at most slightly related with the support or criticisms of advertising.

Informational role of the advertising was the major reason why Americans had approved advertising. The emphasis for the disliking of advertising lied in its secondary aspects, and not in its central economic aspects. That advertising is "unpleasant, boring, intrusive, interrupts entertainment", and so on were the main reasons for why advertising had been disliked.

Unfortunately, surveys about consumer view of advertising in Turkey are rare. What was found in the

literature were two student papers, one of them being an MBA-thesis.

Muzaffer Canatan (1972) searched for the consumer attitudes toward advertising. The sample size was 100. The results revealed that respondents were indifferent toward advertising. However, when asked directly, what they think of advertising, they had a favorable attitude in general.

Perran Akan (1982) also searched for the consumer attitudes toward marketing and consumerism. The sample consisted of 130 students of the Boğaziçi University. The questionnaire of the survey included 45 Likert-type questions. The results relating to advertising revealed that students were critical of advertising, although they agreed that it increases competition.

So far the background of the study and former research on the subject of this study have been presented to the reader. The empirical research findings suggest that people are overall favorable toward advertising; with respect to advertising's aspects they criticize its social aspect, but they tend to appreciate advertising's economic role.

In the following chapter the methodology and findings of this study about public's view of advertising will be presented.

CHAPTER II

A STUDY ON PUBLIC'S VIEW OF ADVERTISING

2.1. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The aim of this study is to explore public's view of advertising. For this aim the salience of advertising, overall attitudes toward advertising as well as attitudes toward particular aspects of advertising will be searched for.

2.1.1. Type of Research

The research will be exploratory and descriptive at the same time.

As Churchill (1976) explains the objective of an exploratory research is to "gain insights, and ideas". Further, Tull and Hawkins (1980) state that "exploratory research is concerned with discovering the general nature of the problem and the variables that relate to it"(p.40).

As the aim of the study is to discover people's attitudes toward advertising with the aim to discover the variables relating to this attitude, namely salience level, and institutional aspects of advertising, the study is exploratory. There was also the desire to have a flexibility in the study in order to find all the ideas and clues that

may be helpful in finding the attitudes of people and why they have those attitudes. As Churchill states this flexibility is inherent in the nature of the exploratory research.

The research is also descriptive as one of the objectives is to find who the people are holding different attitudes, different salience levels toward advertising.

2.1.2. Research Objectives

Attitudes toward advertising will be searched in the direction of the following questions:

- 1- How salient is advertising to the Turkish respondents?
- 2- How do they define advertising?
- 3- What are their attitudes toward advertising on an overall basis, and toward institutional aspects of advertising in particular?
- 4- How do people's overall attitudes relate with advertising-related issues?
- 5- Is there any significant effect of having interest in and attention to advertisements on the attitudes toward advertising?
- 6- What are the profile of those respondents interested in advertising, and the characteristics of the respondents with different attitudes toward advertising, and different salience levels of advertising?
- 7- Do people make a distinction between institution and instruments of advertising?

2.1.3. Data Collection Procedure and the Instrument

Data for this study is collected through a questionnaire which is presented in Appendix 1. The questionnaire was structured, and it was disguised at the beginning as the aim was to measure the salience of advertising to the respondents. Had the questionnaire been undisguised at the beginning, respondents would have answered the questions related with salience under the effect of the knowledge that the study is about advertising. Thus, reliable results could have not been achieved. After the questions about salience had been administered, it was evident that the study is about advertising.

The same questions with the same wording and order were asked to all of the respondents.

Out of 145 self-administered questionnaires 125 could have been included in the study. The remaining 20 were either didn't returned back, or the majority of the questions were not filled by the respondent.

The questionnaire consisted of 20 questions.

The first question is asked to find the "top-of-the-mind" annoyance of the respondents.

The second question measured the comparative salience of advertising with respect to nine other topics.

Through question three it could be revealed how respondents define advertising.

In question four the first statement, namely "advertising is essential" is asked to measure the overall attitude of

respondents toward advertising. The other statements in question four showed respondents' attitudes toward institutional aspects of advertising.

Question five is asked to find whether respondents make a distinction between institution and instruments of advertising.

Through question six it was possible to detect the amount of influence of advertising on the respondents.

Question seven to 12 were classification variables.

Question 13 is asked to measure the respondent's interest in the advertisements.

Question 14 was asked to find the influence of exposure to TV on the attitude toward advertising.

Question 15 to 20 were again classification variables.

2.1.4. The Sampling Plan

Non-probabilistic convenience sampling is used due to time constraints.

As Tull and Hawkins (1980) point out: "Convenience samples are often used in exploratory situation when there is a need to get only an approximation of the actual value quickly and inexpensively."(p.387).

Though convenience sampling is used, attention has been paid to having representatives from all age groups, education, and income levels. It has been also tried to have almost the same amount of female and male respondents.

The general respondent characteristics are presented in Table 2.1.4.1. Thus the reader will be able to make comparison with the findings about the background of people.

TABLE 2.1.4.1
Respondent Characteristics

<u>AGE</u>	<u>24 and under</u>	<u>25 - 34</u>	<u>35 - 44</u>	<u>45 - 54</u>	<u>55 - 64</u>	<u>65 and over</u>
No	21	41	23	23	14	3
Per cent	16.8	32.8	18.4	18.4	11.2	2.4

<u>MARITAL STATUS</u>	<u>Married</u>	<u>Unmarried</u>	<u>Divorced/Widowed</u>
No	69	44	12
Per cent	55.2	35.2	9.6

<u>EDUCATION LEVEL</u>	<u>Read and Write</u>	<u>Primary School</u>	<u>Middle School</u>	<u>High School</u>	<u>University</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
No	0	9	9	26	56	25
Per cent	-	7.2	7.2	20.8	44.8	20.0

<u>WORKING STATUS</u>	<u>Doesn't Work</u>	<u>Part-time</u>	<u>Full-time</u>
No	38	13	74
Per cent	30.4	10.4	59.2

<u>OCCUPATION</u>	<u>Self Employed</u>	<u>Artisan</u>	<u>Government Sector High-Level Employee</u>	<u>Private Sector</u>
No	12	8	15	33
Per cent	9.6	6.4	12.0	26.4

TABLE 2.1.4.1
(continued)

	<u>Worker</u>	<u>Retired</u>	<u>Housewife</u>	<u>Student/ Assistant Researcher</u>	
No	17	8	14	17	
Per cent	13.6	6.4	11.2	13.6	
	<u>Not Reported</u>				
No	1				
Per cent	.8				
<u>INCOME LEVEL</u>	<u>50,000 and under</u>	<u>50,000- 100,000</u>	<u>100,000- 200,000</u>	<u>200,000- 300,000</u>	<u>300,000- 400,000</u>
No	9	10	30	25	10
Per cent	7.2	8.0	24.0	20.0	8.0
		<u>400,000- 500,000</u>	<u>500,000 and over</u>	<u>Not Reported</u>	
No		7	24	10	
Per cent		5.6	19.2	8.0	
<u>NUMBER OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES KNOWN</u>		<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
No		38	60	24	3
Per cent		30.4	48.0	19.2	2.4
<u>NUMBER OF NEWSPAPERS READ</u>		<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	
No		38	50	37	
Per cent		30.4	40.0	29.6	

TABLE 2.1.4.1
(continued)

<u>NUMBER OF ITEMS OWNED</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
No	4	1	4	6	28	22	31	21	3	5
Per cent	3.2	.8	3.2	4.8	22.4	17.6	24.8	16.8	2.4	4.0

<u>SEX</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>
No	65	60
Per cent	52.0	48.0

<u>REGION</u>	<u>Etiler Levent etc.</u>	<u>Gayrettepe Mecidiyeköy etc.</u>	<u>Göztepe Erenköy etc.</u>	<u>Kadıköy etc.</u>	<u>Üsküdar Beykoz etc.</u>	<u>Gültepe etc.</u>	<u>Not reported</u>
No	21	23	11	17	24	12	17
Per cent	16.8	18.4	8.8	13.6	19.2	9.6	13.6

As can be seen in Table 2.1.4.1 about half of the respondents are at the age of 34 and younger, namely 32.8 per cent of the respondents are at the age group 25-34, and 16.8 per cent of them are at the age of 24 and under. The majority of the respondents are married (55.2 per cent). The majority of the respondents are either university graduates (44.3 per cent) or graduates of a higher institution (20 per cent). Most of the respondents work full-time (59.2 per cent); 26.4 per cent of the respondents work at the private sector, 13.6 per cent of the respondents are workers, and another 13.6 per cent are either students or assistant researchers at the university. Twenty-four per cent of the respondents have an income between 200,000 TL and 300,000 TL, and 19.2 per cent of the respondents have an income of 500,000 TL and over. Most of the respondents (48 per cent) can speak one foreign language. Out of the respondents 30.4 per cent cannot speak any foreign languages. Two newspapers are read by 40 per cent of the respondents. Out of the respondents 24.8 per cent own six items at their homes, and 22.4 per cent own four items. Fifty-two per cent of the respondents are female, and 48 per

cent are male. Finally, 19.2 per cent of the respondents live at Üsküdar, Beykoz etc., and 18.4 per cent of them live at Gayrettepe, Mecidiyeköy etc.

2.1.5. Data Analysis Methods

SPSS Program is used to analyze the data.

Firstly, frequency analysis was made use of.

Factor analysis has been applied to search for the difference between institution and instruments of advertising.

Regression analysis was conducted to reveal the importance of the exposure to media for the interest toward the advertisements.

Cross-tabulation analysis has been used to find the background differences of respondents with respect to their attitudes toward advertising.

Also the relationship between respondent's definitions of advertising and both, their overall attitudes, and their attitudes toward the institutional aspects of advertising have been revealed through cross-tabulation analysis.

The relationship between overall attitudes toward advertising and institutional aspects of advertising has been searched by pearson-correlation analysis.

2.1.6. Limitations of the Study

This study has the limitation of having a non-probabilistic convenience sampling. As Tull and Hawkins (1980) say: "Convenience samples contain unknown amounts of both variable and systematic selection errors".

Sample size is another limitation of the study. 125 is not able to represent the city of Istanbul.

The most important limitation of this study, according to the author is that it does not include a variable that directly measures the overall-attitude toward advertising. While the study was designed, the overall attitude toward advertising was aimed to be measured from the open-end responses to the question about the definition of advertising (SEE question 3 in APP 1). However, during the coding procedure of the data it was apparent that the structure of the responses to the definition of advertising was not appropriate to judge the respondents about having favorable or unfavorable attitudes toward advertising.

Hence, it was hypothesized that the statement 'advertising is essential' measures the overall attitude toward advertising. This hypothesis has also been supported by Bauer and Greyser (1968) who declared:

"The institutional aspect closest to an overall appraisal of advertising is "advertising is essential". We say closest because many respondents may have perceived this issue as primarily related to advertising's economic role since advertising is a marketing tool. Indeed, from all we know, the hard core of public support for advertising is in its economic role of bringing information to the consumer about goods which someone has to sell him. We believe that saying "advertising is essential" means approximately this: "While I may or may not have complaints about advertising, in the end I think we can't do without it." In short responses to this question comes closer to representing a plebiscite than do the generalized attitudes referred to above. It is clearly the broadest of our eight items" (pp.96-97).

Hence, in order to make the variable 'advertising is essential' represent the overall attitude toward advertising the scales on the questionnaire were transformed so that completely agree meant totally favorable, agree meant favorable, disagree meant unfavorable, and completely disagree meant totally unfavorable.

Thus, it was not possible to reflect peoples attitudes as mixed and indifferent, which may have revealed a better solution in pointing to the difference in the attitudes of people.

2.1.7. Variables Studied

In the following page the variables which are included in the study and also having been used by the previous researchers are presented to the reader (Table 2.1.7.1).

TABLE 2.1.7.1
Variables Studied

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Operational Definition</u>	<u>Previous Researchers Using the Same Variable</u>
"Top-of-the-mind" salience	Question 1 Open-end question	Bauer and Greyser (1968)
Comparative Salience	Question 2	Bauer and Greyser (1968) A.A.A.A.'s Study (1974)
<u>Institutional Aspects</u>	Question 4	
Advertising insults intelligence*	Likert Scale	Bauer and Greyser (1968)
Advertising lowers prices*		Thorelli, Becker, and Engledow (1975)
Advertising doesn't persuade people to buy things they don't need		Reid and Soley (1982) A.A.A.A.'s Study(1974)
Advertising doesn't give true product picture*		*Miller and Waller (1979) Anderson, Engledow, Becker (1976)

TABLE 2.1.7.1

(continued)

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Operational Definition</u>	<u>Previous Researchers Using the Same Variable</u>
Advertising increases people's living standards.		
Advertising causes better products		
Advertising is essential (we measured overall attitude, the previous researchers measured advertising's economic aspect)	Question 4 Likert Scale	Bauer and Greyser (1968) Thorelli, Becker, and Engledow (1975) A.A.A.A.'s Study (1974) Anderson, Engledow, Becker (1976)
<u>Institution vs. Instrument</u>	Question 5	Sandage and Leckenby (1980)
This Study Included: Education Press Advertising State Art	Semantic-Differential Scale	Sandage and Leckenby's Study Included: State Government Advertising Religion Labor Union Education

*In Miller and Waller's study only these statements are included.

2.2. RESEARCH FINDINGS

In this part of the study the research findings will be presented under five headings.

These are:

- 1- What respondents think about advertising
- 2- Overall attitudes in relation to advertising related issues
- 3- Interest in advertisements
- 4- Institution vs instruments of advertising
- 5- Who are the respondents with different attitudes toward advertising and different saliences of advertising.

2.2.1. What Respondents Think About Advertising

Firstly, "top-of-the-mind annoyances" of the respondents will be presented to the reader. "Top-of-the-mind annoyances" are derived from respondents' answers to the question what the four or five issues are that annoy the respondents most. Out of the total respondents 121 people have mentioned at least one or more personal annoyances though in the question it was mentioned that respondents shouldn't write their personal annoyances. Four respondents (3.2 per cent) have mentioned broad issues of social or public policy as annoyances. Eighteen respondents (14.4 per cent) have mentioned besides personal annoyances those broad social or public issues as annoyances. Advertising has never been mentioned as "top-of-the-mind annoyance" besides three respondents whose "top-of-the-mind annoyances" of advertising has not been evaluated by the author since they knew in advance that the study was about advertising.

Examples of respondents' personal annoyances and annoyances about broad issues of social or public policy has been presented in Exhibit 2.2.1.1. Another finding is that three respondents (2.4 per cent) mentioned sellers' activities as annoyances.

EXHIBIT 2.2.1.1

"Top-of-the - Mind Annoyances"

Examples of Personal Annoyances

Lies
Injustice
Disrespect
Noise
Weather
Traffic
Bad manners
Arrogance

Annoyances of Social or Public Issues

Pollution
Politics, politicians
Education system
Burocracy
World situation

TABLE 2.2.1.1

Salience as Measured by Amount of Talking

	Talk About			
	Most		Least	
	No	Per cent	No	Per cent
Business Life	91	73	7	6
Education	72	58	4	3
Family Life	65	52	13	10
Travelling	57	46	25	20
Politics	52	42	39	31
Bringing up Children	51	41	41	33
Clothing and Fashions	31	25	48	38
Entertainment Life	29	23	52	42
Professional Sports	21	17	63	50
Advertising	4(10th)	3	76(1st)	61
No answer	0	-	1	.8

(N=125)

As we can see in Table 2.2.1.1 advertising has the lowest rating (3 per cent) among the issues which people talk about most. Consistent with this finding is that advertising has been rated the first (61 per cent) among the issues which people talk about least. Professional sports and entertainment life are the second and third issues, respectively, which people talk about least. 73 per cent of the respondents said that they talk about business life the most, followed by education with 58 per cent of the respondents.

Generally the ratings about all the topics in the talk most and talk least dimensions are consistent with each other. The topics which have been rated from one to ten in the talk most dimension, have been rated just oppositely in the talk least dimension, namely from ten to one.

TABLE 2.2.1.2
Seriousness of Attitudes

	Have Strong Opinions		Complain About But Not Seriously		Needs Attention and Change	
	No	Per cent	No	Per cent	No	Per cent
Family Life	73	58	32	26	46	37
Education	71	57	20	16	105	84
Business Life	68	54	32	26	37	30
Bringing up Children	54	43	20	16	71	57
Politics	29	23	41	33	45	36
Travelling	22	18	18	14	6	5
Professional Sports	21	17	22	18	17	14
Clothing and Fashions	21	17	47	38	2	2
Advertising	16(8th)	13	36(4th)	29	2(9th)	2
Entertainment Life	10	8	38	30	0	-
No answer	3	2.4	8	6.4	4	3.2

(N=125)

The above table reveals that advertising has been rated the eighth among the issues about which people have strong opinions. Moreover, only two per cent of the respondents believe that advertising needs immediate attention and change. Further, respondents give the fourth place to advertising among the issues about which they like to complain without considering it too serious.

Fifty-eight per cent of the respondents state that they have strong opinions about family life. Education has been rated at the second place by 57 per cent of the respondents.

Eighty-four per cent of the respondents suggest that at the first place education needs immediate attention and change. Bringing up children has been rated at the second place by 57 per cent of the respondents among the issues which need attention and change. Among the issues about which people like to complain without considering it too serious clothing and fashions attains the first place with 38 per cent of the respondents, and politics gets the second place with 33 per cent of the respondents.

Those respondents who believe that advertising needs attention and change were asked to write their views of what should be done about advertising. The answers of the two respondents who indicated the view that advertising needs attention and change are tabulated in Exhibit 2.2.1.2.

EXHIBIT 2.2.1.2

What should be done about advertising?
(Open - end responses)

"Reklamın samimi olması. Kaliteli ürünler için reklam yapılması".

"Reklamların gerçekçi ve ciddi olarak bir bilim dalı gibi ele alınması gereklidir. Yani sadece göze ve kulağa hitab etmemeli, beynimizde bazı imajlar uyandırmalıdır".

Only respondents who mentioned advertising among the issues that need immediate attention and change were asked about what should be done about advertising.

However, some of the respondents mentioned what they think should be done about advertising though they haven't mentioned it among the issues that need attention and change. Examples of those mentions are presented in Exhibit 2.2.1.3.

EXHIBIT 2.2.1.3

What should be done about advertising?
(by respondents who don't need to answer to this question)

"Reklam ciddi ve mantıklı olmalı. Reklamlarda topluma sağlık ve manevi açıdan zarar verecek unsurlar olmamalı. Sigara reklamı gibi".

"Reklam da bir eğitim gerecidir. Böyle olunca reklamlar tam gerçeği yansıtmalı. İnsanlar kandırılmamalı. Reklam bir yalancılık müessesesi olmaktan kurtarılmalı".

"Türkiye'de yapılan reklamların çok amatörce hazırlanmış olduğunu gözlüyorum. - Gerek wording'leri gerek görüntüleri amatörce".

In Table 2.2.1.3 respondents' definitions of advertising based on the content analysis of the author have been presented. The majority of respondents (24.8 per cent) define advertising as a means for the introduction of products or services. Both new products and existing ones are included

in the definition. 23.2 per cent of respondents define advertising as a means for the introduction of products, and at the same time they mention advertising's role as a selling activity. 19.2 per cent of the respondents define advertising as a means for the introduction of a product through the usage of puffery, meaning that only the good sides of the product has been demonstrated. Unfavorable definitions have been given by 6.4 per cent of respondents, and favorable definitions by 3.2 per cent. Examples of the definitions for each category may be found in Exhibit 2.2.1.4.

TABLE 2.2.1.3
Definitions of Advertising

<u>Definition</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Favorable	4	3.2
Introduction of a Product	31	24.8
Mixed	6	4.8
Introduction of a Product by Puffery	24	19.2
Unfavorable	8	6.4
Introduction of a Product and at the same time a Selling Activity	29	23.2
No answer or meaningless	23	18.4
	125	100.0

EXHIBIT 2.2.1.4

Examples of Categorizing People's Descriptions of Advertising
(based on content analysis)

Coded as 'favorable':

"Güncel hayatta reklamın çok rolü var. Bize lazım olan herhangi bir metayı veya yapmamız icab eden bir iş bazen bir reklam sayesinde açıklığa kavuşabilir. Tanıtma bakımından herhangi bir şeyi bize açarak veren şeydir."

EXHIBIT 2.2.1.4

(continued)

Coded as 'introduction of a product':

"Reklam, insanlara yeni bir ihtiyaç maddesinin tanıtılmasıdır".

"Bir malı piyasaya tanıtmak için, o malın özellikleri hakkında kitle iletişim araçlarıyla halka bilgi vermektir".

"Reklam, ekonomik değeri olan bir şeyin topluma tanıtılması çabalarıdır".

Coded as 'mixed':

"Bir malın iyi veya kötü yönüyle tanıtılması".

"Herhangi bir mal veya hizmet için pazar yaratmak veya talebi arttırmak amacıyla ve her çeşit yayın aracını kullanarak yapılan tanıtma. Ayrıca alışkanlıkları değiştirmek gibi, eğitim amacını güden reklamlar da olabilir".

Coded as 'introduction of a product by puffery':

"Tanıtıcı, özendirici, sevdirci yahut merak ettiren bilgi veya bilgiler sunmak".

"Bir malı en iyi şekilde tanıtmak".

"Bir malı pazarlamak amacıyla tanıtmak ve en iyi yönlerini göstermek".

"Herhangi bir şeyin en iyi taraflarını gösterecek şekilde biraz abartılarak anlatılmasıdır".

Coded as 'unfavorable':

"Bilmediğiniz, kullanmadığınız bir malın olumsuz yönlerini gizleyip, göze ve kulağa hitab etmek suretiyle o malın üstünlüğünü insanı psikolojik etki altına alarak kabul ettirmeye çalışmak".

"Reklam, bir malı allayıp pullayıp, iyi yanlarını göstererek yutturmaya çalışmaktır".

Coded as 'introduction of a product and at the same time a selling activity':

"Bir ürünün tanıtılması ve satılmasını amaçlayan kampanyaya reklam denir".

"Mal satma yöntemi".

"Satışını arttırmak için bir mamulün tanıtılması".

"Ürettiğin malın tanıtımı ve tüketiminin teşviki".

TABLE 2.2.1.4
Overall Attitudes Toward Advertising^a

	<u>No</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Totally Favorable	18	15
Favorable	77	62
Unfavorable	21	17
Totally Unfavorable	8	6
No answer	<u>1</u>	<u> </u>
Total mentions (excluding no answer)	124	100%
	(N=125)	

^aThe table has been constructed from the respondents' answers to the statement "advertising is essential". "Totally favorable" represents "totally agree", "favorable" represents "agree", unfavorable represents "disagree", and "totally unfavorable" represents "totally disagree".

Table 2.2.1.4 reveals overall attitudes of the respondents toward advertising. According to the findings 15 per cent of the respondents are totally favorable, and 62 per cent of the respondents are favorable toward advertising. 17 per cent and 6 per cent of the respondents have unfavorable and totally unfavorable attitudes toward advertising respectively.

In Table 2.2.1.5 respondents' attitudes toward institutional aspects of advertising have been disclosed. The findings reveal that the majority of the respondents believe that advertising doesn't insult the intelligence of the consumer (82 per cent), that advertisements give a true picture of the product advertised (53 per cent), and that advertising causes better products for the public (55 per cent). 69 per cent of the respondents are totally favorable, and 62 per cent of the respondents are favorable toward advertising. 17 per cent and 6 per cent of the respondents have unfavorable and totally unfavorable attitudes toward advertising, respectively.

TABLE 2.2.1.5

Attitudes Toward Institutional Aspects of Advertising

Advertising	Favorable Attitude		Unfavorable Attitude	
	No	Per cent ^a	No	Per cent ^a
Insults Intelligence ^b	99	82	22	18
Lowers Prices ^c	25	21	96	79
Doesn't Persuade People ^c	48	39	76	61
Doesn't Give True Picture	64	53	57	47
Increases Standard of Living ^c	56	46	67	54
Better Products ^c	67	55	55	45
People aren't Affected ^c	19	15	104	85
Means for Entertainment ^c	47	39	75	61
Solution to the Problems ^c	86	69	38	31
Informs People ^c	111	90	12	10
Causes Insecurity ^b	94	77	28	23

(N=125)

^aMissing variables are excluded by the calculation

^b"Favorable Attitude" consists of "disagree" and "totally disagree" answers. "Unfavorable Attitude" consists of "agree" and "totally agree" answers.

^c"Favorable Attitude" consists of "agree" and "totally agree" answers. "Unfavorable Attitude" consists of "disagree" and "totally disagree" answers.

don't believe that advertising causes insecurity. On the other hand the majority of people state that advertising doesn't lower prices of the products (79 per cent), and that advertising persuades people to buy things they do not need (61 per cent). Moreover, 54 per cent of the respondents don't believe that advertising increases the standard of living, and that people aren't effected by advertisements (85 per cent). Finally, 61 per cent of the respondents don't consider advertising as a means for entertainment.

TABLE 2.2.1.6
Areas of Institutional Support and Criticism¹

<u>Attitudes</u>	<u>Institutional Area</u>			
	<u>Social</u>		<u>Economic</u>	
	<u>No</u>	<u>Per cent</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Three favorable	19	15.2	12	9.6
Two favorable, one unfavorable	<u>59</u>	<u>47.2</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>24.8</u>
Total favorable	78	62.4	43	34.4
Two unfavorable, one favorable	31	24.8	45	36.0
Three unfavorable	<u>9</u>	<u>7.2</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>24.0</u>
Total unfavorable	40	32.0	75	60.0
Unclassifiable	7	5.6	7	5.6

(N=125)

¹The idea for this table has been derived from Bauer and Greyser's study.

EXHIBIT 2.2.1.5

Economic and Social Issues Indices

Economic Issues Index

- 1) Advertising lowers prices
- 2) Advertising increases people's living standards
- 3) Advertising causes better products for the public

Social Issues Index

- 1) Advertising insults people's intelligence^a
- 2) Advertising doesn't persuade people to buy things they do not need
- 3) Advertising doesn't give true product picture^a

^aFavorable attitude consists of "disagree" and "totally disagree" answers.

Table 2.2.1.6 reveals respondents' attitudes toward the social and economic dimensions of advertising. Social and economic dimensions have been formed as may be seen in Exhibit 2.2.1.5. According to the findings in Table 2.2.1.6 the majority of people (62.4 per cent) have favorable attitudes toward the social dimension of advertising, and 60 per cent of the respondents have unfavorable attitudes toward the economic dimension of advertising.

TABLE 2.2.1.7
Patterns of Response by Economic and Social Areas¹

	<u>No</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Both favorable	27	21.6
Economic favorable, social unfavorable	13	10.4
Social favorable, economic unfavorable	47	37.6
Both unfavorable	26	20.8
Unclassifiable	<u>12</u>	<u>9.6</u>
(N=125)	125	100.0

¹The idea for this table has been derived from Bauer and Greyser's study.

As can be seen from the above table respondents who are favorable toward social dimension of advertising, and at the same unfavorable toward its economic dimension constitute the largest group (37.6 per cent). Respondents who are favorable or unfavorable to both aspects constitute 21.6 per cent and 20.8 per cent respectively of the whole respondents.

TABLE 2.2.1.8

Areas of Institutional Support and Criticism
(based on Bauer and Greyser's (1968) social and economic indices)

<u>Attitudes</u>	<u>Institutional Area</u>			
	<u>Social</u>		<u>Economic</u>	
	<u>No</u>	<u>Per cent</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Three favorable	19	15.2	30	24
Two favorable, one unfavorable	<u>59</u>	<u>47.2</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>37.6</u>
Total favorable	78	62.4	77	61.6
Two unfavorable, one favorable	31	24.8	31	24.8
Three unfavorable	<u>9</u>	<u>7.2</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>10.4</u>
Total unfavorable	40	32.0	44	35.2
Unclassifiable	7	5.6	4	3.2
			(N=125)	

EXHIBIT 2.2.1.6

Bauer and Greyser's Economic and Social Issues Indices

Economic Issues Index

- 1) Advertising is essential
- 2) Advertising increases people's living standards
- 3) Advertising causes better products for the public

Social Issues Index

- 1) Advertising insults people's intelligence^a
- 2) Advertising doesn't persuade people to buy things they do not need
- 3) Advertising doesn't give true product picture^a

^a Favorable attitude consists of "disagree" and "totally disagree" answers.

Table 2.2.1.8 is constructed based on Bauer and Greyser's (1968) social and economic indices presented in Exhibit 2.2.1.6, in order to allow a comparison between Turkish and American respondents which will be presented in chapter three of the study. According to Table 2.2.1.8 almost the same amount of respondents have favorable attitudes toward both the social and economic dimensions of advertising, namely 62.4 per cent and 61.6 per cent of the respondents have favorable attitudes toward advertising's social and economic dimensions respectively. And almost the same amount of respondents have unfavorable attitudes toward advertising's social and economic dimensions, 32 per cent and 35.2 per cent respectively.

TABLE 2.2.1.9

Patterns of Response by Economic and Social Areas
(based on the indices in Exhibit 2.2.1.6)

	<u>No</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Both favorable	53	42.4
Economic favorable, social unfavorable	21	16.8
Social favorable, economic unfavorable	23	18.4
Both unfavorable	19	15.2
Unclassifiable	<u>9</u>	<u>7.2</u>
	125	100.0

(N=125)

As can be seen from Table 2.2.1.9 respondents who are favorable to both economic and social areas, constitute the largest group (42.4 per cent). 18.4 per cent of the respondents are favorable to the social area, but unfavorable to the economic area; and 16.8 per cent of the respondents are favorable to the economic area, but unfavorable to the social area.

2.2.2. Overall Attitudes in Relation to Advertising Related Issues

In this part mostly overall attitudes toward advertising will be taken as basis in judging the advertising related attitudes.

TABLE 2.2.2.1

The Relationship between Saliience and Overall Attitudes

<u>Saliience Criterion</u>	<u>Favorable</u>	<u>Unfavorable</u>
ALL RESPONDENTS (N=124)	77%	23
Talk most (N=4)	75%	25
Talk least (N=76)	80%	20
Strong Opinion (N=16)	69%	31
Complain but not seriously (N=36)	69%	30
Needs attention and change (N=2)	50%	50

¹Favorable attitude consists of "totally favorable" and "favorable" answers; and unfavorable attitude consists of "totally unfavorable" and "unfavorable" answers.

Table 2.2.2.1 shows the overall attitudes of those people who have rated advertising in various criteria of saliience. It can be seen from the above table that the top three rows have some similarities. 77 per cent, 75 per cent, and 80 per cent are favorable attitudes of all of the respondents, respondents who talk most, and respondents who talk least, respectively. As we go down to the list favorable attitudes toward advertising are decreasing while unfavorable attitudes toward advertising are increasing. This result is consistent with Bauer and Greyser's (1968) findings. According to Bauer and Greyser the similarity of the overall attitudes of the respondents both who talk about advertising the most and the least with the overall attitudes of all of the respondents seem to indicate that these "talking" criteria are

independent of attitude. The authors content that "reports of the respondents on the topics about which they talk most do in fact reflect where the focus of their attention lies" (p.116). Bauer and Greyser conclude that the "talking" criteria are appropriate measures for the salience.

TABLE 2.2.2.2

Definitions of Advertising in Relationship with Respondents' Overall Attitudes

<u>Definitions</u>	<u>Overall Attitudes</u>			
	<u>Totally Favorable</u>	<u>Favorable</u>	<u>Unfavorable</u>	<u>Totally Unfavorable</u>
Introduction of a Product (N=31)	25.8%	64.5%	3.2%	6.5%
Introduction of a Product by Puffery (N=24)	16.7	62.5	20.8	-
Introduction of a Product and at the Same Time a Selling Activity (N=29)	10.34	44.83	34.49	10.34

Chi-square = 13.34, d.f.=6, $\alpha=.0379$, CV/CC=.28180

The findings reveal that there is a relationship between overall attitudes of respondents and how they define advertising (Table 2.2.2.2). However, the Cramer's V value being .28180 implies that the relationship is not strong. As can be seen from Table 2.2.2.2 25.8 per cent and 64.5 per cent of the respondents who define advertising as introduction of a product to the public have totally favorable and favorable attitudes toward advertising respectively. Out of the respondents who define advertising as a means in the introduction of products by using puffery, 16.7 per cent have totally favorable attitudes toward advertising, and 62.5 per cent have favorable attitudes. 10.34 per cent of the respondents who also define advertising as a selling activity besides being a means for product introduction, are totally favorable

toward advertising, and 44.83 per cent of them are favorable toward it.

As can be seen from Table 2.2.2.2 only the three types of definitions of advertising including 'advertising introduces products' factor have been included in the analysis. The reason for this selection is that only few respondents have defined advertising through using favorable, unfavorable, or mixed wordings. 3.2 per cent, 4.8 per cent, and 6.4 per cent of the respondents defined advertising through using favorable, mixed, or unfavorable wordings respectively. These frequencies can also be seen in Table 2.2.1.3.

TABLE 2.2.2.3

Relationship between Overall Attitude Toward Advertising and Institutional Aspects of Advertising

<u>Correlation of Overall Attitude toward Advertising with</u>	<u>r</u>	<u>α</u>	<u>r²</u>
Insults Intelligence	.32350	.0002	.1047
Lowers Prices	.18784	.0199	.0353
Doesn't Persuade People	-.06414	.2405	.0041
Doesn't Give True Picture	.28180	.0009	.0794
Increases Standard of Living	.06674	.2326	.0045
Better Products	.41889	.0000	.1755
People aren't Affected	-.12794	.0801	.0164
Means for Entertainment	-.14188	.0603	.0201
Solution to the Problems	.22047	.0071	.0486
Informs People	.16551	.0342	.0274
Causes Insecurity	.14156	.0607	.0200

Table 2.2.2.3 reveals correlations between overall attitude toward advertising and institutional aspects of advertising. According to the findings 10 per cent (r^2) of the variation in the belief that advertising insults intelligence

is explained by the overall attitude toward advertising. Eight per cent and two per cent are the variations in the beliefs that advertising doesn't give true product picture, and that advertising causes insecurity respectively which are explained by the overall attitude toward advertising. Four per cent of the variation in the statement that advertising lowers prices is explained by the overall attitude. Further, 18 per cent of the variation in the belief that advertising causes better products can be explained by the overall attitude.

The statement that people aren't affected by advertising is negatively correlated with the overall attitude toward advertising. A negative correlation implies that the more the respondents are favorable toward advertising the less they believe that people aren't affected by advertising. Two per cent of the variation in the view that people aren't affected by advertising is explained by the overall attitude. Similarly a negative correlation exists between the statement that advertising is a means for entertainment and overall attitude toward advertising. Two per cent of the variation in the belief that advertising is a means for entertainment is explained by the overall attitude. The negative correlation implies that the more the respondents are favorable toward advertising, the less they consider it as a means for entertainment.

Five per cent and three per cent are the variations in the beliefs that advertising offers solution to the problems, and that advertising informs people respectively, which are explained by the overall attitude.

Significant correlations cannot be found between the overall attitude toward advertising and the views that:

- a) Advertising doesn't persuade people to buy things they do not need.
- b) Advertising increases people's standard of living.

TABLE 2.2.2.4

Favorable Attitudes Toward the Institutional Aspects of Advertising with Respect to Different Overall Attitudes

	Overall Attitude			
	<u>Totally Favorable</u>	<u>Favorable</u>	<u>Unfavorable</u>	<u>Totally Unfavorable</u>
Insults Intelligence ^a	(N=16)93.8%	(N=77)89.6%	(N=19)63.2%	(N=8)25%
Lowers Prices ^b	(N=17)29.4	(N=74)23.0	(N=21) 9.5	(N=8)12.5
Doesn't Persuade People ^b	(N=18)22.3	(N=77)40.3	(N=20)50.0	(N=8)37.5
Dosn't Give True Picture ^a	(N=17)64.7	(N=76)61.8	(N=19)26.3	(N=8) -
Increases Standard of Living ^b	(N=17)47.1	(N=76)43.4	(N=21)57.1	(N=8)25.0
Better Products ^b	(N=17)82.3	(N=76)56.5	(N=20)45.0	(N=8)12.5
People aren't Affected ^b	(N=17)11.8	(N=76)15.8	(N=21)14.3	(N=8)25.0
Means for Entertainment ^b	(N=18)27.8	(N=75)41.3	(N=20)40.0	(N=8)37.5
Solution to the Problems ^b	(N=18)88.9	(N=76)65.7	(N=21)61.9	(N=8)75.0
Informs People ^b	(N=18)88.9	(N=76)92.1	(N=20)85.0	(N=8)87.5
Causes Insecurity ^a	(N=17)76.5	(N=76)79.0	(N=20)80.0	(N=8)50.0

^a'disagree' and 'totally disagree' categories are combined to form the favorable attitude toward those aspects of advertising.

^b'agree' and 'totally agree' categories are combined to form the favorable attitude toward those aspects of advertising.

In Table 2.2.2.4 the amount of favorable attitudes toward the institutional aspects of advertising with respect to different overall attitudes have been presented to the reader. As can be seen the most favorable attitudes from both the overall unfavorable or favorable respondents are toward the informational role advertising plays.

88.9 per cent, 92.1 per cent, 85.0 per cent and 87.5 per cent are totally favorable, favorable, unfavorable, and totally unfavorable respondents respectively, who believe that advertising informs people. Further, 88.9 per cent, 65.7 per cent, 61.9 per cent, and 75.0 per cent are again totally favorable, favorable, unfavorable, and totally unfavorable respondents respectively who state that advertising offers solution to some of their problems. The belief that advertising causes insecurity, is rejected by 76.5 per cent, 79.0 per cent, 80.0 per cent and 50.0 per cent of the totally favorable, favorable, unfavorable, and totally unfavorable respondents respectively.

To the views that advertising doesn't insult intelligence, that advertising gives true product picture, and that advertising causes better products, favorable attitudes decline from overall totally favorable respondents to overall totally unfavorable respondents.

2.2.3. Interest in Advertisements

Some of the respondents declared that they specifically watch ads on TV. Further the respondents have manifested the number of ads they remember, and the number of products they have bought as a result of advertising's effect. In this part of the study the significance of the above mentioned declarations of the respondents with respect to their attitudes toward advertising will be revealed.

TABLE 2.2.3.1

Number of Advertisements Remembered by People
in Various Salience Groups of Advertising

Number of Ads Remembered	Talk Most		Talk Least		Strong Opinion		Complain but not Seriously		Needs Attention and Change	
	No	Per cent	No	Per cent	No	Per cent	No	Per cent	No	Per cent
	2 and under	1	25	42	55.26	7	43.75	18	50	1
3 and over	3	75	34	44.74	9	56.25	18	50	1	50
	4	100	76	100.00	16	100.00	36	100	2	100

Table 2.2.3.1 reveals that among those respondents who talk about advertising the most, and who have strong opinions about advertising, the majority remember 3 or more advertisements¹, being 75 per cent of the talk most group, and 56.25 per cent of the strong opinion group. Out of the two respondents who believe that advertising needs attention and change, one remembers two ads and under, and the other respondent remembers 3 ads and over. The majority of respondents who talk about advertising least (55.26 per cent) remember two or less ads. Finally, half of the respondents who complain about advertising without considering it as a serious matter remember two or less ads, and the other half three or more ads.

¹The findings about the number of ads remembered are related to the question No 13 in the questionnaire (SEE APPENDIX 1).

TABLE 2.2.3.2
 Relationship between Number of Ads Remembered
 and Exposure to Media

<u>MULTIPLE R</u>	<u>R SQUARE</u>	<u>ADJUSTED R SQUARE</u>	<u>F(EQU)</u>	<u>SIGNIF F</u>
.23054	.05315	.02967	2.26403	.0845

<u>Variables</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>STANDARD ERROR B</u>	<u>T VALUE</u>	<u>SIG T</u>	<u>CORREL.</u>	<u>PART. CORREL.</u>
No of newspapers read	.19915	.20170	.987	.3254	.11551	.08734
Amount of exposure to TV	.09908	.07459	1.328	.1865	.09070	.11751
No of magazines read	.19492	.09538	2.043	.0432	.17314	.18077
(CONSTANT)	1.25118	.60525	2.067	.0408		

Table 2.2.3.2 reveals the multiple regression analysis results of the relationship between number of ads remembered and amount of exposure to TV, number of magazines read, and number of newspapers read. It is evident from the findings that 5.3 per cent of variance in the number of ads remembered is explained by the amount of exposure to TV, number of magazines read, and number of newspapers read. Number of magazines read is the most important factor affecting the number of ads remembered. Three per cent (square of .17314) of the effect on the number of ads remembered is accounted for by the number of magazines read variable alone. Number of newspapers read and amount of exposure to TV have not been found as significant variables affecting the number of ads remembered.

TABLE 2.2.3.3

Relationship between Overall Attitude Toward Advertising
and Number of Ads Remembered

	Number of Ads Remembered					
	2 and under		3 and over		t	α
	Mean	Std.Dev.	Mean	Std.Dev.		
Overall Attitude	2.81	.737	2.89	.755	-.56	.573

As Table 2.2.3.3 shows no significant relationship has been found between overall attitude toward advertising and number of ads remembered.

TABLE 2.2.3.4

Relationship between the Number of Advertisements
Remembered and Advertising's Perceived Importance
as an Information Source

Informational Aspects of Advertising	Number of Ads Remembered					
	2 and under		3 and over		t	α
	Mean	Std.Dev.	Mean	Std.Dev.		
Solution to the Problems	2.60	.799	2.73	.632	-1.00	.321
Informs People	3.00	.573	3.10	.473	-1.04	.301

Table 2.2.3.4 indicates that there is no significant relationship between the number of ads respondents remember and advertising's perceived importance as an information source. However, it is evident from this table that respondents who remember three or more ads are more in agreement with the statements that advertising offers solution to the problems, and that advertising informs people.

TABLE 2.2.3.5
Attitudes of the Respondents
Who Watch Ads on TV

Overall Attitude

<u>Totally Favorable</u>	<u>Favorable</u>	<u>Totally Unfavorable</u>	<u>Unfavorable</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>Std.Dev.</u>
17.9%	57.1%	14.3%	10.7%	2.821	.863

Attitudes

<u>Advertising</u>	<u>No Answer</u>	<u>Totally Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Totally Disagree</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	
Lowers Prices	3.6%	-	10.7%	60.7%	25%	1.852 .602	
Doesn't Persuade People	-	3.6%	32.1	32.1	32.1	2.071 .900	
Increases Standard of Living	-	10.7	42.9	35.7	10.7	2.536 .838	
Better Products	-	7.1	42.9	50	-	2.571 .634	
People aren't Affected	-	-	3.6	60.7	35.7	1.679 .548	
Means for Entertainment	3.6	-	42.9	42.9	10.7	2.333 .679	
Solution to Problems	-	7.1	60.7	28.6	3.6	2.714 .659	
Informs People	-	28.6	67.9	3.6	-	3.250 .518	
		<u>Totally Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Totally Agree</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>
Insults Intelligence	-	21.4%	67.9%	10.7%	-	3.107 .567	
Doesn't Give True Picture	-	-	67.9	32.1	-	2.679 .476	
Causes Insecurity	-	17.9	67.9	10.7	3.6	3.0 .667	

(N=28)

Table 2.2.3.5 reveals that the majority of respondents who watch ads on TV have favorable overall attitudes toward advertising (a total of 75 per cent, consisting of 17.9 per cent totally favorable and 57.1 per cent favorable).

Table 2.2.3.5 also shows the attitudes toward institutional aspects of advertising of those respondents who watch ads on TV. According to the findings the majority of those respondents don't believe that advertising lowers prices (85.7 per cent), that advertising doesn't persuade people to buy things they do not need (64.2 per cent), and that people aren't affected by advertisements (96.4 per cent). 53.6 per cent of the respondents who watch ads also don't believe that advertising is a means for entertainment.

The notion that advertising causes better products for the public is supported by half of the respondents; the other half, however, didn't support this view.

The majority of the respondents who watch ads on TV believe that advertising increases the standard of living (53.6 per cent). Further, the majority don't think that advertising insults the intelligence of the consumer (89.3 per cent), that advertisements don't give true product picture (67.9 per cent), and that advertising causes insecurity (85.8 per cent). Those respondents are also favorable toward the informational aspects of advertising. 67.8 per cent of them believe that advertising offers solutions to some of the problems of people, and 96.5 per cent of them believe that advertising informs people about the new and already existing products.

TABLE 2.2.3.6

Advertising's Influence on Ad-Watchers on TV

<u>Number of Products Bought</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Per cent</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>Std.Dev.</u>
1 and less	7	25	2.357	1.496
2 and more	<u>21</u>	<u>75</u>		
	28	100		

TABLE 2.2.3.7

Advertising's Influence on the Respondents in General

<u>Number of Products Bought</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Per cent</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>Std.Dev.</u>
1 and less	61	48.8	1.640	1.516
2 and more	<u>64</u>	<u>51.2</u>		
	125	100.0		

Table 2.2.3.6 discloses the number of products bought by the ad-watchers as a result of having been influenced by advertising. It is evident from the findings that the majority of ad-watchers (75 per cent) have bought 2 or more products as a result of advertising's influence.

Table 2.2.3.7 has been presented to the reader in order to enable comparison with the sample population. A comparison of Table 2.2.3.6 with Table 2.2.3.7 reveals that 51.2 per cent of the respondents in general have bought 2 and more products whereas among the ad-watchers this amount has been 75 per cent.

TABLE 2.2.3.8

Relationship between Amount of Advertising's Influence on People and their Attitudes Toward Advertising

	<u>r</u>	<u>α</u>	<u>r²</u>
Overall Attitude	.1286	.077	.0165
Insults Intelligence	.1664	.034	.0277
Lowers Prices	-.0028	.488	.0000
Doesn't Persuade People	-.1299	.075	.0169
Doesn't Give True Picture	.1642	.036	.0270
Increases Standard of Living	.0856	.173	.0073
Better Products	.1468	.053	.0216
People aren't Affected	-.2553	.002	.0652
Means for Entertainment	-.0922	.156	.0085
Solution to the Problems	.1027	.128	.0105
Informs People	.1539	.045	.0237
Causes Insecurity	.0500	.292	.0025

Table 2.2.3.8 reveals correlations between advertising's influence on people, derived from the number of products bought as the result of advertising's influence, and attitudes of people toward advertising. The findings reveal that 1.7 per cent (r^2) of the variation in the overall attitude toward advertising are explained by the number of products bought because of advertising. Similarly 2.2 per cent of the variation in the belief that advertising causes better products, and 2.4 per cent of the variation in advertising's informational aspect are caused by the same variable.

The statements that advertising doesn't persuade people, and that people aren't affected by advertising are both negatively correlated with the number of products bought as a result of advertising's influence. A negative correlation implies that an increase in the number of products bought determines an amount of decrease in the favorable attitudes

toward the statements that advertising doesn't persuade people, and that people aren't affected by advertising. 1.7 per cent (r^2) and 6.5 per cent (r^2) of the variation in the views that advertising doesn't persuade people, and that people aren't affected by advertising respectively can be explained by the increase in the number of products bought because of advertising's influence.

Finally, 2.8 per cent of the variation in the belief that advertising insults intelligence and 2.7 per cent of the variation in the belief that advertisements don't give a true product picture are explained by the amount of products bought as a result of advertising's influence.

No significant correlations can be identified between the amount of products bought as a result of advertising's influence and the views that:

- a) advertising lowers prices of the products,
- b) advertising increases the standard of living,
- c) advertising is seen as a means for entertainment,
- d) advertising offers solutions to some problems of people,
- e) advertising causes insecurity.

2.2.4. Institution vs. Instruments of Advertising

As can be seen in the literature review part of the study, to find out whether respondents can make a difference between institution and instruments of advertising, namely advertising as the institution, and advertisements as the instruments of the institution, it was hypothesized that the scales good, strong, valuable, and necessary measure the "terminal values", and the scales clean, honest, sincere, and safe measure the "instrumental values". Hence, to the ratings on

the eight scales of the five institutions, education, press, advertising, state, and art factor analysis has been applied. It was hypothesized that the scales good, strong, valuable, and necessary will load on the first factor, and the scales clean, honest, sincere, and safe will load on the second factor in a factor analysis.

The four institutions other than advertising are also included in the analysis in order to make a comparison of the analysis results between advertising and these four institutions. Besides advertising for those four institutions, namely education, press, state, and art it will also be investigated whether respondents can make a distinction between institution and instruments of the institution.

TABLE 2.2.4.1
Results of Factor Analysis for Education
(N=102)

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std.Dev.</u>
Good-Bad	3.75	1.25
Clean-Dirty	3.47	1.11
Honest-Dishonest	3.63	1.21
Strong-Weak	3.22	1.47
Valuable-Worthless	4.18	1.30
Sincere-Insincere	3.44	1.22
Safe-Unsafe	3.61	1.22
Necessary-Unnecessary	4.73	.85

TABLE 2.2.4.1
(continued)

Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Factor 2</u>
Good-Bad	.79702	.10268
Clean-Dirty	.50068	.40705
Honest-Dishonest	.69416	.43851
Strong-Weak	.79689	.22104
Valuable-Worthless	.41417	.38961
Sincere-Insincere	.78177	.23533
Safe-Unsafe	.23357	.93612
Necessary-Unnecessary	.08191	.20690
Eigenvalues	4.03	1.09
Pct. of Var.	50.4	13.7
Cum.Pct.	50.4	64.1

The factor analysis results of the institution education reveals a two factor principal components solution. The two factors explain 64.1 per cent of the variance of the original eight scales (Table 2.2.4.1). Varimax-rotated factor matrix in Table 2.2.4.1 reveals that good, clean, honest, strong, sincere scales loaded on the first factor. Safe scale loaded on the second factor. Valuable scale loaded both on the first and second factors. Necessary scale didn't load on any of the factors.

TABLE 2.2.4.2
Results of Factor Analysis for Press
(N=104)

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std.Dev.</u>
Good-Bad	3.60	1.22
Clean-Dirty	2.63	1.06
Honest-Dishonest	2.82	1.17
Strong-Weak	3.78	1.28
Valuable-Worthless	3.98	1.10
Sincere-Insincere	2.65	1.24
Safe-Unsafe	3.09	1.18
Necessary-Unnecessary	4.79	.65

Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Factor 2</u>
Good-Bad	.41346	.59157
Clean-Dirty	.57314	.29189
Honest-Dishonest	.60274	.43214
Strong-Weak	.32164	.15495
Valuable-Worthless	.22758	.66057
Sincere-Insincere	.86691	.16329
Safe-Unsafe	.29172	.56842
Necessary-Unnecessary	.11544	.50729
Eigenvalues	3.50	1.06
Pct.of Var.	43.7	13.3
Cum.Pct.	43.7	57.0

Factor analysis has been conducted in order to summarize the eight scales of the institution press. Table 2.2.4.2 reveals the two-factor principal components solution. The two factors explain 57.0 per cent of the variance of the original eight scales. Varimax-rotated factor matrix in Table 2.2.4.2

shows that sincere, honest, and clean scales loaded on the first factor; and valuable, good, necessary and safe scales loaded on the second factor. Strong scale didn't load on any of the factors.

TABLE 2.2.4.3
Results of Factor Analysis for Advertising
(N=103)

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std.Dev.</u>
Good-Bad	3.67	1.12
Clean-Dirty	3.02	1.04
Honest-Dishonest	2.69	1.12
Strong-Weak	3.99	1.12
Valuable-Worthless	3.46	1.19
Sincere-Insincere	2.75	1.17
Safe-Unsafe	3.05	1.01
Necessary-Unnecessary	4.07	1.14

Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Factor 2</u>
Good-Bad	.51275	.48474
Clean-Dirty	.67867	.23852
Honest-Dishonest	.60493	.21288
Strong-Weak	.32865	.06977
Valuable-Worthless	.45903	.52818
Sincere-Insincere	.62456	.31912
Safe-Unsafe	.76442	.23587
Necessary-Unnecessary	.21701	.97566
Eigenvalues	3.88	1.01
Pct. of Var.	48.6	12.6
Cum. Pct.	48.6	61.2

Factor analysis has been applied to the eight scales of the institution advertising. Two-factor principal components solution have been achieved, as can be seen in Table 2.2.4.3. The two-factors explain 61.2 per cent of the variance of the original eight scales. After the varimax rotation (Table 2.2.4.3) it was clear that clean, honest, sincere, and safe scales loaded on the first factor; and valuable and necessary scales on the second factor. It can be said that good scale has loaded both on the first factor and second factor. Strong scale didn't load on any of the factors.

TABLE 2.2.4.4
Results of Factor Analysis for State
(N=101)

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std.Dev.</u>
Good-Bad	3.71	1.23
Clean-Dirty	3.21	1.14
Honest-Dishonest	3.33	1.17
Strong-Weak	3.79	1.31
Valuable-Worthless	4.10	1.13
Sincere-Insincere	3.13	1.22
Safe-Unsafe	3.79	1.19
Necessary-Unnecessary	4.59	.91

Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Factor 2</u>
Good-Bad	.65798	.38783
Clean-Dirty	.81466	.17941
Honest-Dishonest	.85746	.19442
Strong-Weak	.69355	.15963
Valuable-Worthless	.45912	.51739
Sincere-Insincere	.77271	.20063
Safe-Unsafe	.62746	.35205
Necessary-Unnecessary	.14328	.98918
Eigenvalues	4.66	1.02
Pct.of Var.	58.2	12.7
Cum.Pct.	58.2	70.9

Factor analysis has also been applied to the eight scales of the institution state. Table 2.2.4.4 shows the two-factor principal components solution. The two-factors explain 70.9 per cent of the variance of the original eight scales. Table 2.2.4.4 also shows the results of the varimax rotation. According to the results the good, clean, honest, strong, sincere, and safe scales loaded on the first factor, and the valuable and necessary scales loaded on the second factor.

TABLE 2.2.4.5
Results of Factor Analysis for Art
(N=103)

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std.Dev.</u>
Good-Bad	4.61	.65
Clean-Dirty	3.96	.97
Honest-Dishonest	4.06	1.00
Strong-Weak	3.78	1.24
Valuable-Worthless	4.58	.75
Sincere-Insincere	3.99	1.05
Safe-Unsafe	3.68	1.16
Necessary-Unnecessary	4.84	.50

Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Factor 2</u>
Good-Bad	.52643	.22628
Clean-Dirty	.68673	.11560
Honest-Dishonest	.76259	.15506
Strong-Weak	.62977	.09925
Valuable-Worthless	.39785	.45042
Sincere-Insincere	.61059	.26653
Safe-Unsafe	.22367	.31790
Necessary-Unnecessary	.07890	.99638
Eigenvalues	3.33	1.15
Pct.of Var.	41.6	14.3
Cum.Pct.	41.6	55.9

Factor analysis has been applied on the eight scales of the institution art. Two-factor principal components solution has been achieved (Table 2.2.4.5). The two-factors explain 56 per cent of the variance of the original eight scales. Results of the varimax-rotation have also been presented in Table 2.2.4.5. According to the results good, clean, honest, strong, and sincere scales loaded on the first factor; and valuable and necessary scales loaded on the second factor. Safe scale didn't load on any of the factors.

TABLE 2.2.4.6

Mean Ratings of Advertising on Eight Scales

<u>Scale I</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>	<u>Scale II</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>
Good-Bad	3.67	Clean-Dirty	3.02
Strong-Weak	3.99	Honest-Dishonest	2.69
Valuable-Worthless	3.46	Sincere-Insincere	2.75
Necessary-Unnecessary	4.07	Safe-Unsafe	3.05
Mean of the Mean Ratings	3.80	Mean of the Mean Ratings	2.88

(N=103)

TABLE 2.2.4.7

Ratings of Five Institutions on Two Scale Sets

	Scale I	Scale II
	Good Strong Bad Weak	Clean - Honest Dirty - Dishonest
	Valuable Necessary Worthless Unnecessary	Sincere Safe Insincere - Unsafe
Education(N=102)	3.97	3.54
Press(N=104)	4.04	2.80
Advertising(N=103)	3.80	2.88
State(N=101)	4.05	3.37
Art(N=103)	4.45	3.92

Table 2.2.4.6 reveals the mean ratings of advertising on eight scales. Mean ratings of scales good, strong, valuable, and necessary (3.67, 3.99, 3.46, 4.07, respectively) show a difference from the mean ratings of the scales clean, honest, sincere, and safe (3.02, 2.69, 2.75, and 3.05, respectively). This implies to a difference of the dimension that these both scales measure. The ratings of the other four institutions on two scale sets also suggest that ratings on the scales good, strong, valuable, and necessary measure different dimensions than the scales clean, honest, sincere, and safe (Table 2.2.4.7). According to the above findings it seems that respondents make a difference between institution and instruments of the five institution. However, Wilcoxon test is needed to test the significance of this evaluation.

2.2.5. Who Are the Respondents with Different Attitudes Toward Advertising and Different Saliences of Advertising?

One of the objectives was try to find who the respondents are reacting differently to advertising and to its institutional aspects. Further, it is also hoped to reveal the background of the respondents having different salience levels for advertising.

TABLE 2.2.5.1

Relationship of Advertising's Saliency with
Classification Variables

<u>Relationship of Talk Most with</u>	<u>χ^2</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>α</u>	<u>CC/CV/PHI</u>
Age	3.81	4	.4328	.17451
Marital Status	.52	1	.4694	.11042
Education Level	0.00	1	1.0000	.03883
Working Status	2.01	1	.1560	.17629
Occupation	3.15	7	.8712	.15927
Income Level	2.82	4	.5883	.15661
Number of Foreign Languages Known	1.91	2	.3856	.12348
Number of Newspapers Read	.78	2	.6756	.07920
Number of Items Owned	2.79	3	.4248	.14945
Sex	.18	1	.6692	.08370
Region	4.95	5	.4214	.21419
<u>Relationship of Talk Least with</u>				
Age	2.52	4	.6402	.14211
Marital Status	1.71	1	.1912	.13339
Education Level	2.07	1	.1505	.14575
Working Status	9.17	1	.0025	.28870
Occupation	8.39	7	.2995	.26010
Income Level	3.59	4	.4636	.17680
Number of Foreign Languages Known	3.13	2	.2088	.15830
Number of Newspapers Read	.28	2	.8685	.04749
Number of Items Owned	6.42	3	.0929	.22662
Sex	.13	1	.7193	.04854
Region	6.49	5	.2618	.24505

TABLE 2.2.5.1
(continued)

<u>Relationship of Strong Opinions with</u>	<u>χ^2</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>α</u>	<u>CC/CV/PHI</u>
Age	1.49	4	.8284	.10918
Marital Status	.51	1	.4733	.08822
Education Level	1.43	1	.2320	.13196
Working Status	2.35	1	.1250	.16325
Occupation	12.31	7	.0907	.31512
Income Level	4.46	4	.3478	.19685
Number of Foreign Languages Known	3.65	2	.1613	.17085
Number of Newspapers Read	.26	2	.8792	.04538
Number of Items Owned	.82	3	.8457	.08079
Sex	.40	1	.5272	.08052
Region	3.84	5	.5728	.18854
<u>Relationship of Complain About but not seriously with</u>				
Age	2.78	4	.5956	.14908
Marital Status	2.08	1	.1496	.14665
Education Level	7.97	1	.0047	.27107
Working Status	1.20	1	.2724	.11737
Occupation	16.73	7	.0192	.36728
Income Level	12.59	4	.0134	.33091
Number of Foreign Languages Known	6.77	2	.0340	.23264
Number of Newspapers Read	.75	2	.6872	.07747
Number of Items Owned	5.27	3	.1529	.20538
Sex	0.00	1	1.0000	.00990
Region	12.73	5	.0260	.34332

TABLE 2.2.5.1

(continued)

<u>Relationship of Needs Attention and Change with</u>	<u>χ^2</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>α</u>	<u>CC/CV/PHI</u>
Age	2.28	4	.6847	.13500
Marital Status	.75	1	.3866	.14154
Education Level	.09	1	.7608	.09398
Working Status	.03	1	.8671	.08427
Occupation	5.61	7	.5865	.21262
Income Level	5.77	4	.2172	.22394
Number of Foreign Languages Known	1.38	2	.5019	.10502
Number of Newspapers Read	3.05	2	.2178	.15617
Number of Items Owned	1.43	3	.6990	.10688
Sex	.00	1	1.0000	.00510
Region	3.53	5	.6184	.18086

The relationship between advertising's comparative salience and classification variables have been tested through chi-square analysis. The results have been disclosed in Table 2.2.5.1. Significant relationships cannot be found between advertising as an issue people talk about most and classification variables consisting of age, marital status, education level, working status, occupation, income level, foreign languages known, number of newspapers read, number of items owned, sex, and region.

Considering the relationship between the talk least criterion and the classification variables shows that there is a significant relationship between advertising and both working status and number of items owned. Out of the respondents who talk about advertising least 20 per cent do not work. Eighty per cent of the respondents who talk about advertising least work either part-time or full-time (Table 2.2.5.2). Forty-two per cent of the least-talking respondents own four or five items. Out of the respondents who

talk about advertising least 27.6 per cent own six items, and 15.8 per cent own seven, eight, or nine items. And finally, 14.5 per cent of the respondents who talk about advertising least own three or less items (Table 2.2.5.2).

Table 2.2.5.1. also reveals that there is a significant relationship between having strong opinions about advertising and occupation. Out of the respondents who have strong opinions about advertising 6.25 per cent are self-employed, 12.5 per cent work at the government sector as a high-level employee, 25.0 per cent work at the private sector, another 25 per cent are housewives, and 31.25 per cent are either students or assistant researchers at the university (Table 2.2.5.2).

55.6 per cent of the respondents who like to complain about advertising without considering it too serious have an education of high school and under, and 44.4 per cent have an education of university and over (Table 2.2.5.2). Out of those not seriously complaining people 2.9 per cent are self-employed, 8.5 per cent are artisans, another 8.5 per cent work at the government sector as high level employees, 22.9 per cent work at the private sector, another 22.9 per cent are workers, and an additional 22.9 per cent are housewives, finally, 2.9 per cent are either students or assistant researchers. 63.6 per cent of the respondents who complain about advertising without being serious have an income of 200,000 TL and under, 27.3 per cent have an income between 200,000 TL and 500,000 TL, and 9.1 per cent have an income of 500,000 TL and over (Table 2.2.5.2). 47.2 per cent of the complaining people don't know any foreign languages, 36.1 per cent can speak one foreign language, and 16.7 per cent speak either two or three foreign languages. 41.4 per cent of the complaining respondents come from high income residents (Etiler, Levent, etc; Göztepe, Erenköy, etc; Gayrettepe, Mecidiyeköy, etc.). 34.5 per cent of those respondents come from middle-income residents (Kadıköy, etc; Üsküdar, Beykoz, etc) and 24.1 per cent come from low-income residents (Gültepe, etc.) (Table 2.2.5.2).

TABLE 2.2.5.2

The Background of People with Respect to Comparative Salience

	<u>Talk Most</u>	<u>Talk Least</u>	<u>Have Strong Opinions</u>	<u>Complain About But Not Seriously</u>	<u>Needs Attention and Change</u>
AGE	(N=4)	(N=76)	(N=16)	(N=36)	(N=2)
24 and under	25%	14.5%	12.5%	11.1%	-
25-34	25	36.8	37.5	41.7	50%
35-44	50	15.8	25.0	13.9	50
45-54	-	19.7	18.75	19.4	-
55-64+65 and over	-	13.2	6.25	13.9	-
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>100.00%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>100%</u>
MARITAL STATUS	(N=4)	(N=76)	(N=16)	(N=36)	(N=2)
Married	25%	60.5%	43.75%	66.7%	-
Unmarried+Divorced/ Widowed	75	39.5	56.25	33.3	100%
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>100.00%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>100%</u>
EDUCATION LEVEL	(N=4)	(N=76)	(N=16)	(N=36)	(N=2)
High school and under	25%	40.8%	18.75%	55.6%	-
University and over	75	59.2	81.25	44.4	100%
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>100%</u>
WORKING STATUS	(N=4)	(N=76)	(N=16)	(N=36)	(N=2)
Doesn't work	75%	19.7%	50%	38.9%	-
Part time+Full time	25	80.3	50	61.1	100%
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>100%</u>

TABLE 2.2.5.2

(continued)

	<u>Talk Most</u>	<u>Talk Least</u>	<u>Have Strong Opinions</u>	<u>Complain About But Not Seriously</u>	<u>Needs Attention and Change</u>
OCCUPATION	(N=4)	(N=75)	(N=16)	(N=35)	(N=2)
Self Employed	-	8.0%	6.25%	2.9%	-
Artisan	-	6.7	-	8.5	-
Government Sector					
High Level Employee	25%	14.6	12.5	8.5	-
Private Sector	25	30.6	25.0	22.9	100%
Worker	-	16.0	-	22.9	-
Retired	-	6.7	-	8.5	-
Housewife	25	6.7	25.0	22.9	-
Student/Assistant Researcher	<u>25</u>	<u>10.7</u>	<u>31.25</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>-</u>
	100%	100.0%	100.00%	100.0%	100%
INCOME LEVEL	(N=4)	(N=72)	(N=15)	(N=33)	(N=2)
100,000 and under	-	20.8%	-	33.3%	-
100,000-200,000	50%	26.4	40.0%	30.3	100%
200,000-300,000	-	18.1	20.0	18.2	-
300,000-500,000	25	15.3	13.3	9.1	-
500,000 and over	<u>25</u>	<u>19.4</u>	<u>26.7</u>	<u>9.1</u>	<u>-</u>
	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%
NO of FOREIGN LANGUAGES KNOWN	(N=4)	(N=76)	(N=16)	(N=36)	(N=2)
0	-	35.5%	12.5%	47.2%	-
1	75%	42.1	68.75	36.1	50%
2+3	<u>25</u>	<u>22.4</u>	<u>18.75</u>	<u>16.7</u>	<u>50</u>
	100%	100.0%	100.00%	100.0%	100%
NO of NEWSPAPERS READ	(N=4)	(N=76)	(N=16)	(N=36)	(N=2)
1	50%	31.6%	25.0%	25.0%	-
2	25	38.1	43.75	44.4	100%
3	<u>25</u>	<u>30.3</u>	<u>31.25</u>	<u>30.6</u>	<u>-</u>
	100%	100.0%	100.00%	100.0%	100%

TABLE 2.2.5.2
(continued)

	<u>Talk Most</u>	<u>Talk Least</u>	<u>Have Strong Opinions</u>	<u>Complain About But Not Seriously</u>	<u>Weeds Attention and Change</u>
NO of ITEMS OWNED	(N=4)	(N=76)	(N=16)	(N=36)	(N=2)
0+1+2+3	-	14.5%	12.5%	22.2%	-
4+5	75%	42.1	37.5	33.3	50%
6	-	27.6	18.75	25.0	-
7+8+9	<u>25</u>	<u>15.8</u>	<u>31.25</u>	<u>19.5</u>	<u>50%</u>
	100%	100.0%	100.00%	100.0%	100%
SEX	(N=4)	(N=76)	(N=16)	(N=36)	(N=2)
Female	75%	53.9%	62.5%	52.8%	50%
Male	<u>25</u>	<u>46.1</u>	<u>37.5</u>	<u>47.2</u>	<u>50</u>
	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%
REGION	(N=4)	(N=64)	(N=15)	(N=29)	(N=1)
Etiler, Levent etc.	50%	17.2%	20.0%	10.3%	-
Gayrettepe, Mecidiyeköy etc.	25	23.4	20.0	27.6	-
Göztepe, Erenköy etc.	25	6.3	20.0	3.5	-
Kadıköy etc.	-	17.2	20.0	6.9	-
Üsküdar, Beykoz etc.	-	20.3	20.0	27.6	100%
Gültepe etc.	<u>-</u>	<u>15.6</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>24.1</u>	<u>-</u>
	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%

Significant relationships cannot be found between complaining about advertising and classification variables consisting of age, marital status, working status, number of newspapers read, number of items owned, and sex.

No significant relationships have been found between the belief that advertising needs attention and change and any of the classification variables.

Though in the preceding pages the classification variables which have significant relationships with the different criterion of advertising's salience have been demonstrated, the author wants to present the reader the distribution of all of the classification variables with respect to salience, consisting of significant and insignificant relationships (Table 2.2.5.2).

An interesting finding from Table 2.2.5.2 is that out of those respondents who have strong opinions about advertising 81 per cent are university or a higher institution's graduates.

The respondents who talk least about advertising (36.8 per cent), who have strong opinions about advertising (37.5 per cent), and who complain about advertising without considering it too seriously (41.7 per cent) come from 25-34 age group. However, the reader should keep in mind that 41 per cent of the total respondents come from this age group (Table 2.1.4.1).

The majority of respondents who talk least about advertising (60.5 per cent), or who complain without considering it too serious (66.7 per cent) tend to be married (2.2.5.2).

According to Table 2.2.5.2 it seems that majority of respondents who talk least (80.3 per cent) and who complain are working either part-time or full-time (61.1 per cent). However, the reader should again keep in mind that the majority of the total respondents do either work full-time or part-time (69.6 per cent) (Table 2.1.4.1).

The author again wants to emphasize that the above stated relationships were found insignificant. The above find-

ings and Table 2.2.5.2 are presented just to give the reader information about the distribution of the relations between classification variables and criteria of advertising's salience.

TABLE 2.2.5.3

Relationship between the Background of People and their Definitions of Advertising

<u>Relationship of Definitions of Advertising with</u>	<u>χ^2</u>	<u>d.f</u>	<u>α</u>	<u>CC/CV/PHI</u>
Age	25.28	20	.1908	.24894
Marital Status	7.30	5	.1990	.26761
Education Level	4.45	5	.4866	.20887
Working Status	4.48	5	.4821	.20966
Occupation	48.73	35	.0615	.31062
Income Level	19.14	20	.5130	.22441
No of Foreign Languages Known	10.04	10	.4366	.22189
No of Newspapers Read	14.18	10	.1649	.26366
No of Items Owned	20.62	15	.1494	.25960
Sex	5.14	5	.3990	.22448
Region	18.46	25	.8224	.41639

Table 2.2.5.3 reveals the chi-square analysis results conducted to search for the relationships between the background of people and their definitions about advertising.

Out of respondents who define advertising as a means for product introduction 41.9 per cent work at the private sector. The majority of respondents (33.3 per cent) who define advertising as introduction of a product through puffery work at the government sector; 16.7 per cent of those respondents are either students or assistant researchers (Table 2.2.5.4).

Out of the respondents who define advertising as

product introduction and selling activity 35.7 per cent work at the private sector, 25 per cent are either students or assistant researchers, and 21.4 per cent are housewives (2.2.5.4).

No significant relationships can be found between definitions of advertising and classification variables age, marital status, education level, working status, income level, number of foreign languages known, number of newspapers read, number of items owned, sex, and region.

In Table 2.2.5.3 the only significant relationship is present between occupation and advertising's definitions. However, it would be interesting to present the reader the distribution of all of the classification variables with respect to advertising's definitions. At this point it is meaningful to take the distribution of all of the respondents with respect to classification variables into consideration (Table 2.1.4.1). As can be seen in Table 2.1.4.1 a substantial amount of all of the respondents are from 25-34 age group (32.8 per cent). Further the majority of all of the respondents are at least university graduates (64.8 per cent). Hence, the findings that a substantial group of respondents with different definitions of advertising come from 25-34 age group (Table 2.2.5.4), and that the majority of those respondents are at least university graduates (Table 2.2.5.4) are due to all of the respondents characteristics of this study.

According to Table 2.2.5.4 an interesting finding that can be pointed out is that out of the respondents who define advertising as a means for product introduction through puffery or a selling activity 70.8 per cent and 87.5 per cent are university or higher institutions graduates compared with those who define advertising just as a means for product introduction (64.5 per cent).

TABLE 2.2.5.4
The Background of Advertising's Definitions

	Definitions					
	Favorable	Product Introduction	Mixed	Product Introduction by Puffery	Unfavorable	Product Introduction + Selling
AGE	(N=4)	(N=31)	(N=6)	(N=24)	(N=8)	(N=29)
24 and under	-	25.8%	16.7%	16.67%	-	20.7%
25-34	-	32.3	66.6	25.00	37.5%	37.9
35-44	-	16.1	-	29.16	-	13.8
45-54	50%	16.1	16.7	16.66	25.0	20.7
55-64+65 and over	50	9.7	-	12.50	37.5	6.9
	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.00%	100.0%	100.0%
MARITAL STATUS	(N=4)	(N=31)	(N=6)	(N=24)	(N=8)	(N=29)
Married	75%	41.9%	16.7%	58.3%	75%	55.2%
Unmarried + Divorced/Widowed	25	58.1	83.3	41.7	25	44.8
	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100.0%
EDUCATION LEVEL	(N=4)	(N=31)	(N=6)	(N=24)	(N=8)	(N=29)
High School and under	-	35.5%	50%	29.2%	12.5%	31%
University and over	100%	64.5	50	70.8	87.5	69
	100%	100.0%	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100%
WORKING STATUS	(N=4)	(N=31)	(N=6)	(N=24)	(N=8)	(N=29)
Doesn't work	25%	29%	-	29.2%	25%	41.4%
Part-time+Full-time	75	71	100%	70.8	75	58.6
	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	100%	100.0%
OCCUPATION	(N=4)	(N=31)	(N=6)	(N=24)	(N=8)	(N=28)
Self Employed	25%	9.7%	-	12.5%	25.0%	-
Artisan	25	3.2	16.7%	8.3	12.5	7.2%
Government sector						
high-level employee	25	9.7	16.7	33.3	12.5	3.6
Private sector	-	41.9	33.3	12.5	12.5	35.7
Worker	-	9.7	33.3	4.2	-	3.6
Retired	25	9.7	-	-	12.5	3.6
Housewife	-	6.4	-	12.5	-	21.4
Student/Assistant researcher	-	9.7	-	16.7	25.0	25.0
	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE 2.2.5.4

(continued)

	Definitions					
	Favorable	Product Introduction	Mixed	Product Introduction by Puffery	Unfavorable	Product Introduction + Selling
INCOME LEVEL	(N=3)	(N=29)	(N=6)	(N=22)	(N=8)	(N=27)
100,000 and under	-	13.8%	50.0%	9.09%	12.5%	7.4%
100,000-200,000	66.7%	20.7	-	31.82	25.0	33.4
200,000-300,000	-	20.7	33.3	22.73	25.0	25.9
300,000-500,000	-	20.7	16.7	22.73	25.0	7.4
500,000 and over	33.3	24.1	-	13.63	12.5	25.9
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.00%	100.0%	100.0%
NO of FOREIGN LANGUAGES KNOWN	(N=4)	(N=31)	(N=6)	(N=24)	(N=8)	(N=29)
0	-	19.3%	50.0%	33.34%	12.5%	24.1%
1	100.0%	58.1	33.3	45.83	62.5	41.4
2+3	-	22.6	16.7	20.83	25	34.5
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.00%	100.0%	100.0%
NUMBER of NEWSPAPERS READ	(N=4)	(N=31)	(N=6)	(N=24)	(N=8)	(N=29)
1	50%	41.9%	-	29.2%	12.5%	31.0%
2	-	32.3	33.3%	50.0	25.0	41.4
3	50	25.8	66.7	20.8	62.5	27.6
	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
NUMBER of ITEMS OWNED	(N=4)	(N=31)	(N=6)	(N=24)	(N=8)	(N=29)
0+1+2+3	-	16.1%	33.3%	-	25.0%	10.4%
4+5	-	32.3	50.0	54.2%	12.5	44.8
6	50%	22.6	16.7	33.3	50.0	24.1
7+8+9	50	29.0	-	12.5	12.5	20.7
	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SEX	(N=4)	(N=31)	(N=6)	(N=24)	(N=8)	(N=29)
Female	75%	64.5%	66.7%	54.2%	25.0%	51.7%
Male	25	35.5	33.3	45.8	75.0	48.3
	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE 2.2.5.4

(continued)

	Definitions					
	Favorable (N=4)	Product Introduction (N=29)	Mixed (N=5)	Product Introduction by Puffery (N=20)	Unfavorable (N=7)	Product Introduction + Selling (N=23)
REGION						
tiler, Levent etc.	-	17.2%	20.0%	5.0%	28.6%	30.4%
ayrettepe, Mecidiyeköy etc.	25%	27.6	-	30.0	28.6	17.4
öztepe, Erenköy etc.	25	13.8	-	15.0	-	8.7
adıköy etc.	25	13.8	20.0	20.0	-	26.1
isküdar, Beykoz etc.	25	17.2	40.0	25.0	42.8	13.0
ültepe etc.	-	10.4	20.0	5.0	-	4.4
	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0

TABLE 2.2.5.5
 Relationship between Background of People and Overall
 Attitudes Toward Advertising

	<u>χ^2</u>	<u>d.f</u>	<u>α</u>	<u>CC/CV/PHI</u>
Age	10.82	12	.5440	.17058
Marital Status	1.62	3	.6540	.11444
Education Level	1.77	3	.6214	.11949
Working Status	12.15	3	.0069	.31301
Occupation	21.60	21	.4231	.24192
Income Level	8.84	12	.7167	.16075
No of Foreign Languages Known	3.88	6	.6927	.12510
No of Newspapers Read	5.29	6	.5077	.14599
No of Items Owned	8.26	9	.5083	.24989
Sex	3.88	3	.2753	.17678
Region	20.53	15	.1525	.25291

The relationship between the background of people and their overall attitudes toward advertising has been presented in Table 2.2.5.5.

As can be calculated from Table 1 in Appendix 2, 73 per cent of the respondents who have favorable overall attitudes toward advertising work either full-time or part-time. On the other hand 59 per cent of the respondents who are unfavorable toward advertising do work.

There are no significant relationships between overall attitudes toward advertising and classification variables:
 a) age, b) marital status, c) education level, d) occupation, e) income level, f) number of foreign languages known, g) number of newspapers read, h) number of items owned, i) sex, j) region.

TABLE 2.2.5.6
The Background of Overall Attitudes
Toward Advertising

	Overall Attitude			
	Totally Favorable	Favorable	Unfavorable	Totally Unfavorable
AGE	(N=18)	(N=77)	(N=21)	(N=8)
24 and under	11.1%	18.18%	23.8%	-
25-34	22.2	32.47	38.1	50%
35-44	22.2	16.88	14.3	37.5
45-54	27.8	19.48	4.8	12.5
55-64 + 65 and over	16.7	12.99	19.0	-
	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
MARITAL STATUS	(N=18)	(N=77)	(N=21)	(N=8)
Married	66.7%	54.5%	47.6%	62.5%
Unmarried + Divorced/ Widowed	33.3	45.5	52.4	37.5
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
EDUCATION LEVEL	(N=18)	(N=77)	(N=21)	(N=8)
High School and under	44.4%	31.2%	42.9%	37.5%
University and over	55.6	68.8	57.1	62.5
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
WORKING STATUS	(N=18)	(N=77)	(N=21)	(N=8)
Doesn't work	16.7%	29.9%	57.1%	-
Part-time + Full-time	83.3	70.1	42.9	100.0%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE 2.2.5.6
(continued)

OCCUPATION	Overall Attitude			
	Totally Favorable	Favorable	Unfavorable	Totally Unfavorable
	(N=18)	(N=77)	(N=21)	(N=7)
Self Employed	11.11%	10.39%	9.52%	-
Artisan	11.11	6.49	4.76	-
Government Sector- High Level Employee	5.56	14.29	-	28.57%
Private Sector	27.77	25.97	28.58	28.57
Worker	22.22	11.69	4.76	42.86
Retired	5.56	7.79	4.76	-
Housewife	5.56	10.39	23.81	-
Student/Assistant Researcher	11.11	12.99	23.81	-
	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
INCOME LEVEL	(N=15)	(N=72)	(N=20)	(N=7)
100,000 and under	20%	13.88%	20%	28.57%
100,000-200,000	20	30.56	20	14.29
200,000-300,000	13.33	18.06	30	42.85
300,000-500,000	13.33	18.06	10	-
500,000 and over	33.33	19.44	20	14.29
	99.99%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
FOREIGN LANGUAGES KNOWN	(N=18)	(N=77)	(N=21)	(N=8)
0	38.9%	31.2%	19.0%	37.5%
1	33.3	50.6	52.4	37.5
2+3	27.8	18.2	28.6	25.0
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
NUMBER OF NEWSPAPERS READ	(N=18)	(N=77)	(N=21)	(N=8)
1	38.9%	27.27%	38.1%	25.0%
2	38.9	40.26	47.6	25.0
3	22.2	32.47	14.3	50.0
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE 2.2.5.6
(continued)

	Overall Attitude			
	Totally Favorable	Favorable	Unfavorable	Totally Unfavorable
NUMBER OF ITEMS OWNED	(N=18)	N=77)	(N=21)	(N=8)
0+1+2+3	5.6%	9.10%	14.29%	37.5%
4+5	44.4	38.96	42.85	37.5
6	22.2	25.97	28.57	12.5
7+8+9	<u>27.8</u>	<u>25.97</u>	<u>14.29</u>	<u>12.5</u>
	100.0%	100.00%	100.00%	100.0%
SEX	(N=18)	(N=77)	(N=21)	(N=8)
Female	50%	57.1%	42.9%	25%
Male	<u>50</u>	<u>42.9</u>	<u>57.1</u>	<u>75</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
REGION	(N=18)	(N=64)	(N=18)	(N=7)
Etiler, Levent etc.	22.22%	20.31%	16.66%	-
Gayrettepe, Mecidiyeköy etc.	22.22	18.75	38.90	-
Göztepe, Erenköy etc.	22.22	6.25	11.11	14.29%
Kadıköy etc.	11.11	20.31	5.56	14.29
Üsküdar, Beykoz etc.	11.11	26.56	16.66	28.57
Gültepe etc.	<u>11.11</u>	<u>7.82</u>	<u>11.11</u>	<u>42.85</u>
	99.99%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

In Table 2.2.5.5 the only significant relationship is found between working status and overall attitude toward advertising. The other classification variables have been found to be statistically insignificant in explaining the overall attitude toward advertising. The aim in presenting Table 2.2.5.6 is to give the reader information about the distribution of respondents with respect to their overall attitude.

Table 2.2.5.7 reveals the relationship between the classification variables and attitudes toward the institutional aspects of advertising.

According to the findings 60 per cent of the respondents of the age 24 and less consider advertising as a means for entertainment. However 70 per cent of the respondents from the age group 25-34, and half of the respondents from the age group 35-44 don't consider advertising as a means for entertainment. Further 61 per cent of the age group 45-54 and 82.3 per cent of the respondents older than 55 years of age don't believe that advertising is a means for entertainment (Table 2 in Appendix 2).

Significant relationships cannot be found between age and statements that advertising: a) insults intelligence, b) lowers prices, c) doesn't persuade people, d) doesn't give true picture, e) increases standard of living, f) causes better products, g) doesn't affect people, h) offers solutions, i) informs people, j) causes insecurity.

As can be calculated from Table 3 in Appendix 2 65 per cent of the respondents who believe that advertisements don't give true product picture are married. On the other hand 53 per cent of the respondents who don't agree with the statement that advertisements don't give true product picture are unmarried, or either divorced or widowed.

TABLE 2.2.5.7
 Relationship between Background of People and
 Institutional Aspects of Advertising

Relationship between Age and Institutional Aspects of
 Advertising

	χ^2	d.f	α	CC/CV/PHI
Insults Intelligence	10.63	12	.5607	.17114
Lowers Prices	13.52	12	.3322	.19302
Doesn't Persuade People	14.09	12	.2948	.19464
Doesn't Give True Picture	14.92	12	.2461	.20271
Increases Standard of Living	6.31	12	.8999	.13072
Better Products	5.50	12	.9391	.12259
People aren't Affected	7.50	12	.8229	.14257
Means for Entertainment	23.65	12	.0227	.25421
Solution to the Problems	8.56	12	.7403	.15166
Informs People	17.10	12	.1460	.21525
Causes Insecurity	16.29	12	.1782	.21099

Relationship between Marital Status and Institutional Aspects
 of Advertising

	χ^2	d.f	α	CC/CV/PHI
Insults Intelligence	2.89	3	.4091	.15452
Lowers Prices	2.75	3	.4318	.15075
Doesn't Persuade People	.78	3	.8549	.07918
Doesn't Give True Picture	6.46	3	.0911	.23113
Increases Standard of Living	2.40	3	.4934	.13973
Better Products	.96	3	.8105	.08879
People aren't Affected	2.21	3	.5299	.13405
Means for Entertainment	3.64	3	.3034	.17266
Solution to the Problems	1.26	3	.7385	.10083
Informs People	9.12	3	.0277	.27234
Causes Insecurity	4.76	3	.1906	.19744

TABLE 2.2.5.7
(continued)

Relationship between Education Level and Institutional
Aspects of Advertising

	<u>χ^2</u>	<u>d.f</u>	<u>α</u>	<u>CC/CV/PHI</u>
Insults Intelligence	2.57	3	.4630	.14571
Lowers Prices	2.56	3	.4646	.14545
Doesn't Persuade People	6.17	3	.1034	.22315
Doesn't give True Picture	1.74	3	.6285	.11986
Increases Standard of Living	4.00	3	.2612	.18039
Better Products	1.69	3	.6381	.11787
People aren't Affected	12.79	3	.0051	.32252
Means for Entertainment	.36	3	.9475	.05465
Solution to the Problems	3.14	3	.3710	.15906
Informs People	.68	3	.8788	.07414
Causes Insecurity	.78	3	.8531	.08021

Relationship between Working Status and Institutional
Aspects of Advertising

	<u>χ^2</u>	<u>d.f</u>	<u>α</u>	<u>CC/CV/PHI</u>
Insults Intelligence	2.63	3	.4515	.14755
Lowers Prices	2.20	3	.5319	.13484
Doesn't Persuade People	2.61	3	.4560	.14504
Doesn't give True Picture	4.44	3	.2175	.19160
Increases Standard of Living	4.37	3	.2245	.18841
Better Products	1.99	3	.5741	.12777
People aren't Affected	1.21	3	.7517	.09900
Means for Entertainment	5.90	3	.1166	.21989
Solution to the Problems	2.83	3	.4192	.15097
Informs People	1.46	3	.6906	.10909
Causes Insecurity	2.70	3	.4397	.14885

TABLE 2.2.5.7
(continued)

Relationship between Occupation and Institutional Aspects of Advertising

	<u>χ^2</u>	<u>d.f</u>	<u>α</u>	<u>CC/CV/PHI</u>
Insults Intelligence	27.32	21	.1606	.27546
Lowers Prices	20.96	21	.4615	.24128
Doesn't Persuade People	18.75	21	.6014	.22539
Doesn't give True Picture	30.95	21	.0745	.29322
Increases Standard of Living	27.07	21	.1687	.27194
Better Products	15.43	21	.8006	.20619
People aren't Affected	23.65	21	.3103	.25421
Means for Entertainment	23.89	21	.2986	.25652
Solution to the Problems	27.43	21	.1570	.27266
Informs People	22.99	21	.3445	.25063
Causes Insecurity	26.50	21	.1881	.27018

Relationship between Income Level and Institutional Aspects of Advertising

	<u>χ^2</u>	<u>d.f</u>	<u>α</u>	<u>CC/CV/PHI</u>
Insults Intelligence	9.93	12	.6220	.17269
Lowers Prices	12.73	12	.3886	.19468
Doesn't Persuade People	10.76	12	.5500	.17734
Doesn't give True Picture	17.52	12	.1312	.22936
Increases Standard of Living	7.97	12	.7874	.15334
Better Products	9.61	12	.6500	.16913
People aren't Affected	19.11	12	.0860	.23741
Means for Entertainment	12.68	12	.3927	.19426
Solution to the Problems	9.91	12	.6241	.17020
Informs People	9.46	12	.6631	.16632
Causes Insecurity	12.43	12	.4122	.19230

TABLE 2.2.5.7
(continued)

Relationship between Foreign Languages Known and Institutional Aspects of Advertising

	<u>χ^2</u>	<u>d.f</u>	<u>α</u>	<u>CC/CV/PHI</u>
Insults Intelligence	8.30	6	.2172	.18516
Lowers Prices	6.84	6	.3357	.16814
Doesn't Persuade People	9.61	6	.1422	.19682
Doesn't give True Picture	15.61	6	.0160	.25397
Increases Standard of Living	4.88	6	.5593	.14085
Better Products	6.58	6	.3611	.16426
People aren't Affected	21.32	6	.0016	.29438
Means for Entertainment	6.59	6	.3603	.16435
Solution to the Problems	1.41	6	.9653	.07874
Informs People	8.34	6	.2141	.18414
Causes Insecurity	4.32	6	.6338	.13302

Relationship between Number of Newspapers Read and Institutional Aspects of Advertising

	<u>χ^2</u>	<u>d.f</u>	<u>α</u>	<u>CC/CV/PHI</u>
Insults Intelligence	2.63	6	.8538	.10423
Lowers Prices	4.10	6	.6635	.13012
Doesn't Persuade People	1.25	6	.9745	.07090
Doesn't give True Picture	10.03	6	.1233	.20361
Increases Standard of Living	4.47	6	.6140	.13473
Better Products	5.32	6	.5040	.14761
People aren't Affected	7.32	6	.2919	.17255
Means for Entertainment	1.33	6	.9699	.07389
Solution to the Problems	3.44	6	.7515	.11784
Informs People	6.18	6	.4038	.15844
Causes Insecurity	4.74	6	.5771	.13943

TABLE 2.2.5.7
(continued)

Relationship between Number of Items Owned and Institutional Aspects of Advertising

	χ^2	d.f	α	CC/CV/PHI
Insults Intelligence	11.11	9	.2680	.29003
Lowers Prices	2.15	9	.9888	.13220
Doesn't Persuade People	13.61	9	.1368	.31451
Doesn't give True Picture	16.54	9	.0564	.34678
Increases Standard of Living	3.74	9	.9275	.17184
Better Products	11.64	9	.2342	.29516
People aren't Affected	14.11	9	.1185	.32078
Means for Entertainment	6.44	9	.6950	.22395
Solution to the Problems	5.16	9	.8198	.19995
Informs People	10.79	9	.2900	.28405
Causes Insecurity	4.39	9	.8839	.18636

Relationship between Sex and Institutional Aspects of Advertising

	χ^2	d.f	α	CC/CV/PHI
Insults Intelligence	6.46	3	.0912	.23108
Lowers Prices	1.65	3	.6472	.11691
Doesn't Persuade People	.62	3	.8909	.07095
Doesn't give True Picture	9.66	3	.0217	.28255
Increases Standard of Living	2.45	3	.4850	.14104
Better Products	1.79	3	.6163	.12125
People aren't Affected	2.59	3	.4590	.14514
Means for Entertainment	10.30	3	.0162	.29051
Solution to the Problems	10.55	3	.0144	.29166
Informs People	1.64	3	.6507	.11542
Causes Insecurity	8.30	3	.0401	.26088

TABLE 2.2.5.7
(continued)

Relationship between Region and Institutional Aspects of Advertising

	<u>χ^2</u>	<u>d.f</u>	<u>α</u>	<u>CC/CV/PHI</u>
Insults Intelligence	18.35	15	.2449	.24250
Lowers Prices	15.08	15	.4456	.21986
Doesn't Persuade People	18.13	15	.2561	.23763
Doesn't give True Picture	26.63	15	.0319	.29077
Increases Standard of Living	16.00	15	.3822	.22324
Better Products	15.28	15	.4316	.21919
People aren't Affected	21.49	15	.1220	.25871
Means for Entertainment	6.53	15	.9695	.14258
Solution to the Problems	23.17	15	.0805	.26868
Informs People	18.87	15	.2196	.24361
Causes Insecurity	17.25	15	.3043	.23289

Eighty-seven per cent of the married, and 94 per cent of the unmarried, or either divorced or widowed respondents believe that advertising informs people about the new or already existing products. Another finding is that out of the respondents who don't believe that advertising informs people 75 per cent are married (Table 4 in Appendix 2).

Significant relationships cannot be found between marital status and statements that advertising: a) insults the intelligence of the consumer, b) lowers prices of the products, c) doesn't persuade people to buy things they do not need, d) increases standard of living, e) causes better products, f) doesn't affect people, g) is a means for entertainment, h) offers solution to the problems, i) causes insecurity.

As can be calculated from Table 5 in Appendix 2 out of the respondents who don't believe that people aren't affected by advertising 71 per cent are better educated people, namely with an education from university or higher institutions. On the other hand 68 per cent of those respondents who believe that people aren't affected by advertising are less educated, namely graduates of high school or lesser level institutions.

No significant relationships have been found between the education level and statements that advertising: a) insults intelligence of the consumer, b) lowers prices of the products, c) doesn't persuade people to buy things they do not need, d) doesn't give true picture of the product advertised, e) increases standard of living, f) causes better products for the public, g) is a means for entertainment, h) offers solution to the problems, i) informs people, j) causes insecurity.

Between working status and any of the institutional aspects of advertising no significant relationship can be found.

As can be calculated from Table 6 in Appendix 2 out of those respondents who state that advertisements don't give true picture of the products advertised 25 per cent work at the private sector, 23 per cent are workers, and 16 per cent work at the government sector as high-level employees. 30 per cent of the respondents who believe that advertisements give true picture of the products advertised work at the private sector, and 19 per cent of those respondents are either students or assistant researchers at the university.

Significant relationships cannot be found between occupation and statements that advertising: a) insults the intelligence, b) lowers prices, c) doesn't persuade people,

d) increases standard of living, e) causes better products, f) doesn't affect people, g) is a means for entertainment, h) offers solution to the problems, ı) informs people about the products, j) causes insecurity.

As can be calculated from Table 7 in Appendix 2 24 per cent of the respondents who don't believe that people aren't affected by advertising have an income of 500,000 TL and over, another 24 per cent have an income between 100,000 TL and 200,000 TL, 22 per cent have an income between 200,000 TL and 300,000 TL, and 16 per cent have an income between 300,000 TL and 500,000 TL. Out of the respondents who believe that people aren't affected by advertising 47 per cent have an income of 100,000 TL and under.

Significant relationships cannot be found between income level and statements that advertising: a) insults intelligence, b) lowers prices, c) doesn't persuade people, d) doesn't give true product picture, e) increases standard of living, f) causes better products, g) is a means for entertainment, h) offers solution to problems, ı) informs people about the products, j) causes insecurity.

Out of the respondents who believe that advertisements don't give true product picture 47 per cent can speak one foreign language, and 39 per cent can not speak any foreign language. Forty-eight per cent and 28 per cent of the respondents who don't agree with the statement that advertisements don't give true product picture can speak one and two or three foreign languages respectively (calculated from Table 8 in Appendix 2).

Fifty-two per cent of the respondents who don't believe that people aren't affected by advertising can speak one foreign language. Twenty-five per cent of those respondents

can speak two or three foreign languages. On the other hand 68 per cent of the respondents who believe that people aren't affected by advertising cannot speak any foreign language (calculated from Table 9 in Appendix 2).

Significant relationships cannot be found between foreign languages known and statements that advertising: a) insults intelligence, b) lowers product prices, c) doesn't persuade people, d) increases standard of living, e) causes better products, f) is a means for entertainment, g) offers solution to problems, h) informs people, i) causes insecurity.

There are no significant relationships between the number of newspapers read and any of the institutional aspects of advertising.

Forty-nine per cent of the respondents who believe that advertisements don't give true product picture own four or five items at their homes, and 26 per cent of those respondents own six items at their homes. Out of the respondents who don't believe that advertisements don't give true product picture 34 per cent own seven, eight, or nine items, and 23 per cent own six items, and finally 31 per cent own four or five items (calculated from Table 10 in Appendix 2).

There are no significant relationships between the number of items owned and the statements that advertising: a) insults intelligence, b) lowers product prices, c) doesn't persuade people, d) increases standard of living, e) causes better products, f) doesn't affect people, g) is a means for entertainment, h) offers solution to the problems, i) informs people, j) causes insecurity.

²Total number of the items people own at their homes. SEE question 18 at the questionnaire (APPENDIX 1).

As can be calculated from Table 11 in Appendix 2 57 per cent of those respondents who state that advertising doesn't insult intelligence are women. On the other hand 64 per cent of the respondents who state that advertising insults intelligence are men.

A calculation from Table 12 in Appendix 2 reveals that 58 per cent who believe that advertisements don't give true product picture are men. However, 61 per cent of those who don't agree with the statement that advertisements don't give true product picture are women.

Fifty-two per cent of the respondents who don't consider advertising as a means for entertainment are men. But, 57 per cent of the respondents who consider advertising as a means for entertainment are women (calculated from Table 13 in Appendix 2).

The majority of the respondents who don't think that advertising offers solutions to some problems are women (74 per cent). On the other hand 57 per cent of the respondents who believe that advertising offers solutions to the problems are men (calculated from Table 14 in Appendix 2).

Out of the respondents who believe that advertising causes insecurity 61 per cent are men. However, 57 per cent of the respondents who don't believe that advertising causes insecurity are women (calculated from Table 15 in Appendix 2).

Significant relationships cannot be found between sex and statements that advertising: a) lowers prices, b) doesn't persuade people, c) increases standard of living, d) causes better products for the public, e) doesn't affect people, f) informs people about the products.

Fifty-three per cent of the respondents who live in the high-income region (Etiler, Levent, etc.; Gayrettepe, Mecidiyeköy, etc.; Göztepe, Erenköy, etc.) don't agree with the statement that advertisements don't give true product picture. 66 per cent of the middle income residents (Üsküdar, Beykoz, etc.; Kadıköy, etc.) don't agree with the statement that advertisements don't give true product picture, either. However, 91 per cent of the respondents from low income regions (Gültepe, etc.) believe that advertisements don't give true product picture (calculated from Table 16 in Appendix 2).

Seventy-three per cent of the high-income region residents, 58 per cent of the middle-income region residents, and 83 per cent of the low-income region residents believe that advertising offers solutions to some problems of people (calculated from Table 17 in Appendix 2).

There are no significant relationships between region and statements that advertising: a) insults intelligence, b) lowers prices, c) doesn't persuade people, d) increases standard of living, e) causes better products, f) doesn't affect people, g) is a means for entertainment, h) informs people about products, 1) causes insecurity.

Table 2.2.5.8 reveals the distribution of the ad - watchers among the classification variables. According to Table 2.2.5.8 out of the ad-watchers 64.3 per cent are women, 82.1 per cent know at least one foreign language, 68 per cent are university or a higher institution's graduates, 64.3 per cent work either full-time or part-time, and 57 per cent are either unmarried or divorced or widowed.

TABLE 2.2.5.8

The Background of People Who Watch to Advertisements on TV^a
(N = 28)

	<u>Per cent</u>
AGE	
24 and under	28.6
25-34	28.6
35-44	21.4
45-54	7.1
55-64+65 and over	<u>14.3</u>
	100.0
MARITAL STATUS	
Married	42.9
Unmarried + Divorced/Widowed	<u>57.1</u>
	100.0
EDUCATION LEVEL	
High school and under	32.1
University and over	<u>67.9</u>
	100.0
WORKING STATUS	
Doesn't work	35.7
Part-time + Full-time	<u>64.3</u>
	100.0

TABLE 2.2.5.8
(continued)

	<u>Per cent</u>
OCCUPATION	
Self Employed	10.72
Artisan	3.57
Government Sector High-Level Employee	3.57
Private Sector	35.71
Worker	7.14
Retired	3.57
Housewife	17.86
Student/Assistant Researcher	<u>17.86</u>
	100.00
INCOME LEVEL	
100,000 and under	10.7
100,000-200,000	25.0
200,000-300,000	25.0
300,000-500,000	14.3
500,000 and over	17.9
Not reported	<u>7.1</u>
	100.0
NO of FOREIGN LANGUAGES KNOWN	
0	17.9
1	57.1
2+3	<u>25.0</u>
	100.0
NO of NEWSPAPERS READ	
1	28.6
2	35.7
3	<u>35.7</u>
	100.0

TABLE 2.2.5.8
(continued)

	<u>Per cent</u>
NO of ITEMS OWNED	
0+1+2+3	7.1
4+5	28.6
6	35.7
7+8+9	<u>28.6</u>
	100.0
SEX	
Female	64.3
Male	<u>35.7</u>
	100.0
REGION	
Etiler, Levent etc.	14.3
Gayrettepe, Mecidiyeköy etc.	25.0
Göztepe, Erenköy etc.	14.3
Kadıköy etc.	7.1
Üsküdar, Beykoz etc.	25.0
Gültepe etc.	3.6
Not reported	<u>10.7</u>
	100.0

^aBased on the answers of those respondents who mention advertisements among the programs on TV they watch the most.

CHAPTER III

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

3.1. CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study can be summarized as follows:

Advertising is not a "top-of-the-mind" annoyance for the Turkish respondents. People's "top-of-the-mind" annoyances are rather personal issues. They don't bother themselves very much with broad social or public issues. For a very small part of the respondents selling activities of the sellers are "top-of-the-mind" annoyances.

As to the comparative salience advertising is the topic people talk about the least. They rather like to talk about personal issues, like business life, education, family life. Respondents also do not have strong opinions about advertising, and very few of them believe that advertising needs attention and change. People rather like to complain about advertising without being serious about it. Those very few respondents who believe that advertising needs attention and change state that advertising should be sincere, and only for quality products advertisements should be made. Advertising should not only communicate to the eyes and ears, but also should awaken some images in our brain.

Though some of the respondents haven't mentioned advertising among the issues that need attention and change, they stated by themselves what it should be done about advertising³. According to them advertisements should be logical, serious and truthful. They are not satisfied with the application of advertising in Turkey.

It should be also stated that the "talking criteria" have found to be appropriate measures for the salience.

The majority of respondents include the statement that advertising introduces products into their definitions of advertising. The differences in their definitions consists of the additional characters they attribute to advertising. Some of the respondents believe that advertising's role consists of merely product introduction. Others state that advertising introduces products through puffery while another group state that advertising introduces products, and further it is a selling activity.

The majority of all the respondents have favorable overall attitudes toward advertising. Only less than one fourth of the respondents have unfavorable attitudes toward advertising.

The consideration of the institutional aspects of advertising reveals that the most favorable attitudes are devoted to the informational role of advertising. Respondents believe that advertising neither insults the intelligence of the consumer, nor causes insecurity. Further the majority of the respondents, but now to a lesser degree believe that advertising causes better products for the public, and that it gives true picture of the product advertised.

³ Only those respondents who state that advertising needs attention and change, were asked what should be done about advertising.

However, the majority of respondents also believe that advertising persuades and affects people. Furthermore respondents don't believe that advertising lowers prices, and increases the standard of living. Respondents do not consider advertising as a means for entertainment, either.

The attitudes toward the economic and social aspects of advertising with our social and economic indices show that respondents favor the social aspects of advertising, however, that they are critical toward its economic role. The same comparison made this time with Bauer and Greyser's economic and social indices reveal that respondents are favorable toward advertising's both social and economic aspects.

Among the definitions of advertising with the 'introduction of a product' factor in them, the definition that 'advertising introduces products' is the one with the most favorable attitude associated. The definition that advertising introduces products through puffery has also favorable overall attitudes toward advertising behind it. However, the definition of advertising as 'introduction of a product and at the same time a selling activity' though still stated by the majority of favorable respondents, has got the least favorable overall attitude associated with it compared with the other two definitions.

Significant correlations have been found between the overall attitude toward advertising and the statements that advertising insults intelligence, that advertisements don't give true product picture, and that advertising causes insecurity. There are also significant correlations between the overall attitude and the statements that advertising lowers prices, that advertising causes better products, that

advertising offers solution to problems, and that advertising informs people. Finally, negative correlations exist between the overall attitude and the statements that people aren't affected by advertising, and that advertising is a means for entertainment.

Though respondents differentiate in their overall attitudes as being favorable or unfavorable, it is interesting to note that both favorable and unfavorable groups have similar attitudes toward some particular aspects of advertising. Both groups believe in the informational role advertising plays, and they approve this role. Both groups don't believe that advertising causes insecurity, though totally unfavorable group has rather an indifferent attitude toward this aspect. Both the favorable and unfavorable respondents don't consider advertising as a means for entertainment. Both groups believe that people are affected by advertising, and that advertising doesn't lower prices. On the other hand the overall favorable group have more favorable attitudes compared with the overall unfavorable group toward the statements that advertisements give true pictures of the product advertised, that advertising creates better products for the public, and that advertising insults the intelligence of the consumer.

It seems that respondents who have strong opinions about advertising remember more advertisements compared with the respondents who talk about advertising most, least, who complain about advertising without being serious, and who believe that advertising needs attention and change.

One of the findings is that the number of magazines read is a determinant for the number of advertisements remembered.

It seems that people who watch too advertisements on

TV have more favorable attitudes toward advertising than those who don't watch.

Those ad-watchers don't believe that advertising lowers prices. Further they state that advertising persuades and affects people. The ad-watchers are indifferent toward advertising's role in causing better products. They appreciate advertising's role in informing people, and they don't consider advertising as a threat to the intelligence of the consumer. The view that advertising causes insecurity, is also not supported by the ad-watchers. They also believe that advertisements give true product picture. Yet, the ad-watchers don't consider advertising as a means for entertainment.

* Consistent with the belief of ad-watchers that people are affected by advertising is their admission that they have bought two or more items as a result of being affected by advertisements.

The respondents who have bought products as a result of advertising's effect confess that advertising affects and persuades people.

With this study it is also explored whether people make a distinction between institution and instruments of advertising. It has been hypothesized that good, strong, valuable, and necessary scales load on the first factor, and the clean, honest, sincere, and safe scales load on the second factor. However, this came out not to be true for advertising, and the other four institutions, consisting of education, press, state, and art. Thus, it has to be concluded that people don't make a distinction between institution and instruments of advertising. This point will be further explained in the part 'Implications of the Study for the Advertisers and Marketers.

Though factor analysis results have not been as hypothesized, it was desired to further search for the distinction between institution and instruments of advertising. Though mean ratings of advertising on the good, strong, valuable, and necessary scales, and mean ratings on the clean, honest, sincere, and safe scales seem to have differences that suggest that those two different subset of scales measure different dimensions of advertising, Wilcoxon test is needed to test the significance of this interpretation. Moreover the difference between the mean-ratings of the other four institutions support the view that the two subset of scales measure different dimensions of those institutions.

It is also investigated who the respondents are that have different salience levels toward advertising.

Respondents who talk about advertising the least are mostly those who work either part-time or full-time, consisting mostly of middle-income group having between four or six items at home.

Mostly students and assistant researchers have strong opinions about advertising, followed by housewives, and respondents who work at the private sector.

* Respondents who like to complain about advertising without being serious about it are mostly higher educated (university and over); the majority consisting of those respondents who work at the private sector, housewives, and workers. Most of them have an income of 200,000 TL and under, followed by those with an income between 200,000 TL and 500,000 TL. Consistent with the finding that they are better educated is the finding that half of those complaining people speak one or more foreign languages. Most of them live in high-income districts, followed by those living in middle-income ones.

Another aim was to find the background of the respondents who have defined advertising in various ways.

Those who define advertising as a means for the introduction of a product mostly work at the private sector. Those respondents who define advertising as introduction of a product through puffery work mostly at the government sector. And again those respondents who define advertising as introduction of a product and at the same time as a selling activity work at the private sector.

Another finding of the study was that more of the respondents who have favorable attitudes toward advertising work either full-time or part-time compared with those who have unfavorable attitudes.

Moreover, it was also the aim to identify the background of the respondents with different attitudes toward the institutional aspects of advertising.

The youngest respondents consider advertising as a means for entertainment. However, for the older and the eldest respondents advertising is not a means for entertainment. Further, more women than men consider advertising as a means for entertainment.

Majority of the respondents who don't believe that advertisements are truthful, are married. More unmarried, divorced or widowed respondents than married ones believe in the truth in advertisements. Furthermore, respondents who believe that advertisements are truthful work at the private sector, or they are students or assistant researchers. Workers and respondents who work at the government sector as high level employees don't believe that advertisements give true product picture. Those respondents who believe that

advertisements don't give true product picture can speak at most one foreign language. On the other hand the majority of those respondents who believe that advertisements give true product picture can speak at least one foreign language. The respondents who don't agree with the statement that advertisements don't give true product picture own more items at their homes compared with those who believe that the above statement is true. Consistent with the above finding is that respondents who live in the high-income and middle-income regions believe that advertisements give true product picture. On the other hand those respondents who are living in the low-income regions don't believe that advertisements give true product picture. Finally, more women compared to men believe that advertisements give true product picture.

The majority of both, married and unmarried, divorced or widowed respondents state that advertising informs people about the new and already existing products. The minority who don't believe in the informational aspect of advertising consist mostly of married respondents.

* Better educated (university and over) respondents are more susceptible of advertising's role in affecting people. Less educated (high-school and less), on the other hand believe that people aren't affected by advertising. Consistent with the above finding is that those respondents who believe that advertising affects people, can speak at least one foreign language. Respondents who believe that people aren't affected by advertising do not speak any foreign languages. The largest group of respondents who believe that people aren't affected by advertising consists of those whose income are 100,000 TL and less.

More men than women believe that advertising offers solutions to some of the people's problems. More respondents

from the low-income region compared with respondents from the other regions believe that advertising offers solutions to some of the people's problems.

* Most of the respondents who state that advertising doesn't insult intelligence are women. Men, on the other hand believe that advertising insults intelligence.

Further, more women compared to men believe that advertising doesn't cause insecurity.

Comparing the findings of this study with the findings of the previous studies in this field may be interesting in showing the similarities or differences of the Turkish respondents from the respondents of the developed countries. This comparison will be made in the following part of the study.

3.2. COMPARISON OF THE FINDINGS WITH THE RESULTS OF THE PREVIOUS RESEARCH IN THIS AREA

Bauer and Greyser (1968) found that advertising is of low salience for the American respondents. The same finding is valid for the Turkish respondents. However, it should be noted that about one in ten Americans stated advertising related issues as "top-of-the-mind" annoyances. However, none of the Turkish respondents mentioned advertising related issues as "top-of-the-mind" annoyances. Americans like the Turkish respondents mention their personal problems. Bauer and Greyser found that the majority of American respondents have favorable overall attitudes toward advertising. In this study it has been also found that Turkish respondents have overall favorable attitudes toward advertising.

Bauer and Greyser revealed that the American respondents appreciate advertising's economic role, however, that they were critical of its social influence. But, in this study it has been found through the social and economic indices Bauer and Greyser have used that Turkish respondents appreciate both advertising's social and economic aspects.

Bauer and Greyser found to their surprise that salience of advertising and attitudes toward advertising were not explained by the background of people. They have identified that the attitudes are just mildly related with the demographic variables age, sex, income, and education.

In this study it has been also revealed that the classification variables do not differentiate very much in people's attitudes and advertising's salience. Some significant relationships have been found between classification variables and attitudes toward advertising or its salience. However, it has been observed by the author that these relationships are in minority.

Bauer and Greyser have identified that the most important reason Americans state in favor of advertising is its informational role. However, the authors add that when the respondents evaluated the specific advertisements, what they called favorable were the advertisements they called enjoyable besides the advertisements they called informative. It is to the knowledge of the author that all of the Turkish respondents, having overall favorable or unfavorable attitudes, appreciate advertising's informational role, and don't consider it as a means for entertainment. But, the author is not in a position to make a comparison with Bauer and Greyser's findings since it is not known how respondents would react to specific advertisements.

Sandage and Leckenby (1980) searched whether people make a distinction between institution and instruments of advertising. They compared the mean-ratings of advertising on good, strong, valuable, necessary subset of scales, and on clean, honest, sincere, and safe subset of scales. Through Wilcoxon test they found that there is a significant difference between these two subsets of scales. Hence, they concluded, based on Rokeach's studies of value systems consisting of terminal and instrumental values⁴, that these two subsets measure different dimensions of advertising representing the institution and instruments of advertising. This finding has been supported as Sandage and Leckenby have also tested the differences between the mean ratings of the other four institutions, consisting of state government, religion, labor union, and education on two subsets through Wilcoxon test. A statistically significant spread emerged between the two subsets.

Moreover, a factor analysis applied to eight scales revealed that good, strong, valuable, and necessary scales loaded on the first factor and clean, honest, sincere, and safe scales loaded on the second factor. Thus, it was confirmed that people make a distinction between institution and instruments of advertising.

In the present study factor analysis has also been applied to the same eight scales. However, in this study the scales didn't load on the two factors as they did in Sandage and Leckenby's study.

But, the mean ratings of advertising on eight scales, and further the mean ratings of the other four institutions indicate that the two subsets measure different dimensions.

⁴Cleanliness, honesty, sincerity, and safety were found to be the instrumental values.

Yet, Wilcoxon test is needed to test the significance of this belief.

3.3. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study has important implications, since it is believed to be the first extensive study in the area of public attitudes toward advertising in Turkey.

The questions about the salience were asked to find the relative importance of advertising in people's minds. If the questions about advertising had been directly asked, the same answers would be given. However, it wouldn't be possible to judge the importance of these findings in the life of the respondents. Now, that it is known that advertising is of low-salience to the Turkish respondents, their reactions and attitudes toward advertising may be evaluated accordingly.

That the majority of respondents have favorable attitudes toward advertising, is of course a satisfying result for the advertisers.

When Bauer and Greyser's (1968) social and economic indices are taken as the basis, it is found that respondents have favorable attitudes to both economic and social dimensions of advertising. It seems that people don't make a difference between social and economic dimensions of advertising, and approve it really overall. The reason why people don't make a difference between social and economic dimensions of advertising may be the lack of sufficient information about advertising. As noted before advertising is a recent institution in Turkey.

perceive the truth aspect of advertising according to the direction of their overall attitudes. The author claims that respondents' evaluation of the truth in advertisements may not be a very dependable and objective analysis of whether advertisements are really truthful, or not.

Rokeach (1973) has divided human values as instrumental and terminal, and identified the values belonging to each category. As it has been stated before in this study, the analysis about the division between instrumental and institutional aspects of advertising has been based on Rokeach's value systems. Thus, it has been hypothesized that Rokeach's value systems are also applicable in Turkey. Yet, clearcut results as in the United States has not been achieved in Turkey, since good, strong, valuable, and necessary scales, and clean, honest, sincere, and safe scales didn't load on two different factors as has been hypothesized, meaning that Turkish respondents don't differentiate between the institution and instruments of advertising.

Actually, the author argues that in Turkish, in the every day speech different words for 'advertisement' and 'advertising' are not existing. The same word 'reklam' is used for both institution and instruments of advertising. Hence, it may very well be concluded that it is not unusual to expect that respondents don't make a distinction between advertising and advertisements as even their languages don't make a distinction between the two.

Further, the author hypothesizes that it may be due to the lack of knowledge about advertising in general that the respondents don't make a difference between the institution and instruments of advertising. As stated before advertising is a recent institution in Turkey, and the degree of knowledge about advertising by the public is a questionable issue.

This finding has, of course, some implications for the advertisers.

As Ulanoff states: "There are dishonest and incompetent people in all professions and in all walks of life-politics, law, medicine, and even the clergy. ...Business and advertising likewise have their inept and unscrupulous practitioners" (p.456). That there is no distinction made by the respondents between the institution and instruments of advertising, may be to the advantage of those "inept and unscrupulous practitioners." Without the distinction made between the institution and instruments the practices of those people would be attributed to advertising in general. This attribution would have harmful effects on the image of the advertising institution in public's eye, and these "inept and unscrupulous practitioners" will hide themselves behind this institution.

It is the author's contention that advertisers are not making full use of this potential difference between the institution and instruments of advertising. Actually, they could have used this difference in educating the public as to the functioning of advertising as the institution, and advertisements as the instruments. However, as market economy develops in Turkey, due to increased competition, the advertisers will be forced to satisfy the public. Thus, the necessity will be aroused to emphasize this difference.

3.3.2. Implications of the Study for the Academicians and Researchers

In this part of the study implications for the academicians, as well as research areas which are believed to be useful and necessary in improving and supporting this study will be presented.

Respondents both favorable and unfavorable toward advertising don't believe that advertising lowers prices. It is apparent that those respondents who don't believe that advertising lowers prices, don't consider the possibility that through large scale production induced by advertising, unit costs and as a result the product prices would be lower.⁵

It would be interesting, however, had it been possible to know why the minority believes that advertising lowers prices. Do they believe that advertising lowers prices as they consider the possibility that through mass-production induced by advertising unit costs have been dropped? Or did they check the agree, or completely agree scales of the statement that advertising lowers prices, only by chance? Or else what did they think? These questions stay unanswered at this point. Only a further question would reveal the latent views of the respondents with respect to advertising's ability in lowering prices.

Another point that should be explained is that Greyser and Bauer (1968) don't consider the statement that advertising increases prices of the products as an unfavorable attitude toward advertising. They state that according to their findings, people who say that advertising increases product prices are ready to pay more for the advertised products. Greyser and Bauer also state that another argument in support of advertising is that it creates "added value". They argue that if advertising is able to create "added value" why then should it constitute an unfavorable attitude to believe that advertising increases prices.

⁵For a detailed information SEE LITERATURE REVIEW.

However, the author didn't include in this survey a variable that measures whether people are willing to pay more for the advertised products, or not. Hence, the author is not at Bauer and Greyser's position to judge whether the view that advertising increases prices represents an unfavorable attitude, or not. The author just wanted to point at the possibility of the belief that the statement 'advertising increases prices' do not necessarily represent an unfavorable attitude.

The search for the background of overall attitudes toward advertising revealed that the only significant relationship is existing between working status and overall attitude toward advertising. The author believes that this point needs further investigation. It should be investigated whether this is the result of the methodology employed, or whether the background of people really don't differentiate much among the overall attitudes toward advertising. However, one should also keep in mind that this result is in agreement with the findings in the United States. Bauer and Greyser (1968) revealed that: "Support or criticism of advertising is at most only mildly related to the traditional demographic classifications of age, sex, income, and education" (p.332).

An important research area would be to search through a regression analysis for the effects of social and economic aspects of advertising in forming attitudes toward advertising in general. Thus, the relative importance of both aspects in forming the overall attitude can also be revealed.

The author believes that attitudes of people toward individual advertisements may also be an important determinant of the overall attitudes of people toward advertising. The difficulty in the administration of a study to search for the attitudes toward the ads didn't make it possible to include

it in this study. However, in the future for those who want to find out people's attitudes toward the ads Bauer and Greyser's (1968) "Advertising in America" may be a useful guide.

In Turkey, as the author believes the discrepancy between the urban and rural areas are very much, whereas in the United States such a difference is almost not existing. Hence, a study at a part or in a city of the United States may be attributed to the whole nation. However, this is not possible in Turkey as the author believes that there is a large difference between the urban and rural areas with respect to education, and life style in general. If in the future it is desired to get a valid picture of the whole Turkey, the researchers should include the rural areas of Turkey into their studies.

Another point is that the medium of advertisements may be an important factor for the favorable or unfavorable attitudes, as Wills and Ryans (1982) have found in their study.

Moreover, the reactions to products themselves such as cigarettes, alcoholic drinks, or one's political predisposition may also be important determinants for the reaction toward advertising.

In Turkey, in the area of public attitudes toward advertising, the only existing studies to the knowledge of the author are the two student studies already stated in the Literature Review. Thus, future research in this area is needed to see the trends among the Turkish respondents.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

- Akan, Perran. Consumer Attitudes Toward Marketing and Consumerism in Turkey, unpublished paper, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, 1982.
- Anderson, Ronald D., Jack L. Engledow, and Helmut Becker. "How Consumer Reports Subscribers See Advertising," Journal of Advertising Research, Vol.18, No.6, December 1978, pp.29-34.
- Aronson, Elliot. The Social Animal, 2nd ed. San Francisco: W.H.Freeman and Company, 1976.
- Backman, Jules. Advertising and Competition. New York: New York University Press, 1967.
- Backman, Jules. "Is Advertising Wasteful?" Journal of Marketing, Vol.32, January 1968, pp.2-8.
- Baker, Samm Sinclair. The Permissible Lie. Ohio: The World Publishing Co., 1968.
- Barksdale, H.C. and William R. Darden. "Consumer Attitudes Toward Marketing and Consumerism," Journal of Marketing, Vol.36, October 1972, pp.22-35.

- Bartos, Rena. "Top Line"-Preliminary Report "The Consumer View of Advertising-1974". Dorado, Puerto Rico: American Association of Advertising Agencies, 1975.
- Bauer, Raymond A. and Stephen A. Greyser. Advertising in America: The Consumer View. Boston: Harvard University, Graduate School of Business Administration, 1968.
- Bell, Daniel. Listener. 27th December, 1956.
- Bishop, F.P. Economics of Advertising. London: Robert Hall, Ltd., 1944.
- Blank, David M. "Some comments on the Role of Advertising in the American Economy-A Plea for Revaluation" in Reflections on Progress in Marketing, L. George Smith, (ed.). Chicago, Illinois: American Marketing Association, 1964.
- Bogart, Leo. "Is All This Advertising Necessary?" Journal of Advertising Research, Vol.18, No.5, October 1978, pp.17-26.
- Borden, Neil H. "Advertising, Ethics, and Morals" in The Role of Advertising, C.H. Sandage and Vernon Fryburger, (eds.). Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1960, pp.429-441.
- Borden, Neil H. The Economic Effects of Advertising. Chicago: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1942.
- Britt, Stuart Henderson. The Spenders. New York: Mc Graw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960.

- Canatan, Muzafer. Attitude Towards Advertising, MBA thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, 1972.
- Capitman, William G. "Morality in Advertising-A Public Imperative," MSU Business Topics, Vol.19, Spring 1971, pp.21-26.
- Chamberlin, Edward. The Theory of Monopolistic Competition, 6th ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.
- Churchill, G. Marketing Research: Methodological Foundations, 2nd ed. Illinois: The Dryden Press, 1976.
- Dunn, S.W. Advertising; Its Role in Modern Marketing. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961.
- Dunn, S.Watson and Arnold M.Barban. Advertising: Its Role in Modern Marketing, 5th ed. Chicago: Dryden Press, 1982.
- Durand, Richard M. and Zarrel V.Lambert. "Alienation and Criticisms of Advertising," Journal of Advertising, Vol.14, No.3, 1985, pp.9-17.
- Ferguson, James M. Advertising and Competition: Theory Measurement, Fact. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1974.
- French, W.A., H.C.Barksdale, and W.D.Perreault, Jr. "Consumer Attitudes Toward Marketing in England and the United States," European Journal of Marketing, Vol.16, No.6, 1982, pp.20-30.
- Galbraith, John Kenneth. American Capitalism. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962, pp.38-39.

- Gleizes, Serge. "Değişen Reklamcılık ve Yeni Eğilimler," STATUS, No.4, 1986, pp.128-133.
- Greyser, Stephen A. "Advertising: Attacks and Counters, " Harvard Business Review, Vol.50, No.24, March-April 1972, pp.22-28, and 140-146.
- Greyser, Stephen A. "Businessmen Re Advertising: Yes, But...", Harvard Business Review, Vol.40, No.3, May-June 1962, pp.20-30, 34 ff.
- Greyser, Stephen A. and Bonnie B.Reece."Businessmen Look Hard at Advertising," Harvard Business Review, Vol.49, No.3, May-June 1971, pp.18-26, and 157-165.
- Haiman, Franklyn S. "Democratic Ethics and the Hidden Persuaders" in The Role of Advertising, C.H.Sandage and Vernon Fryburger, (eds.). Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1960, pp.456-465.
- Harris, Ralph and Arthur Seldon. Advertising in a Free Society. London: Institute of Economic Affairs, 1959.
- Hunt, Shelby D. "Informational vs. Persuasive Advertising: An Appraisal," Journal of Advertising, Summer 1976.
- Kleppner, Otto. Advertising Procedure, 5th ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.
- Kleppner, Otto with the collaboration of Stephen A.Greyser. Advertising Procedure, 6th ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.
- Kottman,E.John. "Truth and the Image of Advertising," Journal of Marketing, Vol.33, No.4, October 1969, pp.64-66.

- Manajans/Thompson Araştırması. "Reklam Sektörü 76 milyar lira," Güneş Gazetesi, 20.2.1986.
- Merton, R.K. "The Moral Dimension" in The Role of Advertising, C.H.Sandage and Vernon Fryburger, (eds.). Homewood: Illinois: Richard D.Irwin, Inc., 1960, pp.479-482.
- Miller, John A. and Robin Waller. "Health Care Advertising: Consumer vs. Physician Attitudes," Journal of Advertising, Vol.8, No.4, 1979, pp.20-29.
- Packard, Vance. The Hidden Persuaders, Cardinal edition. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1958.
- Packard, Vance. The Status Seekers. New York: David Mc Kay Co., Inc., 1959.
- Pease, Otis. The Responsibilities of American Advertising. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958.
- Preston, Ivan L. The Great American Blow-Up. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1975.
- Reader's Digest Association. A Survey of Europe Today. London: The Reader's Digest Association, 1970.
- Reid, Leonard N. and Lawrence C.Soley. "Generalized and Personalized Attitudes Toward Advertising's Social and Economic Effects," Journal of Advertising, Vol.11, No.3, 1982, pp.3-7.
- Resnik, Alan and Bruce L.Stern. "An Analysis of Information Content in Television Advertising," Journal of Marketing, Vol.41, January 1977, pp.50-53.

- Rokeach, Milton. The Nature of Human Values. New York: Free Press, Inc., 1973.
- Sandage, C.H. and Vernon Fryburger. Advertising Theory and Practice, 5th ed. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1958, pp.101-102.
- Sandage, C.H. and John D. Leckenby. "Student Attitudes Toward Advertising: Institution vs. Instrument," Journal of Advertising, Vol.9, No.2, 1980, pp.29-32.
- Sissors, Jack Z. "Another Look at the Question: Does Advertising Affect Values?" Journal of Advertising, Vol.7, No.3, 1978, pp.26-30.
- Stigler, George J. The Theory of Price, 3rd ed. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.
- Study on Consumer Judgement of Advertising. New York: American Association of Advertising Agencies, Inc., 1965.
- Temo, İbrahim. "Türk reklamcılığı, altın devrini mi yaşıyor," Dünya Dosyası, 46, 26 Kasım 1984, p.7.
- Thorelli, Hans B., Helmut Becker, and Jack Engledow. The Information Seekers: An International Study of Consumer Information and Advertising Image. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1975.
- Toynbee, Arnold. America and the World Revolution. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Tull, Donald S. and Del I. Hawkins. Marketing Research: Measurement and Method, 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1980.

Ulanoff, Stanley M. Advertising in America. New York: Hastings House, Publishers, 1977.

Vanden Bergh, Bruce G. and Leonard N.Reid. "Puffery and Magazine Ad Readership," Journal of Marketing, Spring 1980, pp.78-81.

Weilbacher, William M. Advertising, 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1984.

Wills, James R., Jr. and John K.Ryans, Jr. "Attitudes Toward Advertising: A Multinational Study," Journal of International Business Studies, Vol.13, Winter 1982, pp.121-129.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1
QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Her insanı sınırlendiren bazı şeyler vardır: Sağlık, para, diğer insanlar gibi. Bu gibi kişisel sorunların haricinde, sizi sınırlendiren dört, beş konuyu yazabilir misiniz?

2. Aşağıdaki listede hayatımızın birer parçası olan konular yer almaktadır. Bu listeyi dikkatle okuduktan sonra, takip eden soruları cevaplayınız.

1. Moda, giyim
2. Çocuk yetiştirme
3. Reklam
4. Eğitim
5. İş hayatı
6. Aile hayatı
7. Profesyonel sporlar
8. Turistik seyahat
9. Eğlence hayatı
10. Politika

a) Şimdi, bu listeden sizin ve arkadaşlarınızın en çok üzerinde konuştuğu üç veya dört konuyu belirleyiniz. Bu konuların numaralarını aşağıdaki A SÜTUNU'nda daire içine alınız.

A	B	C	D	E
1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9
10	10	10	10	10

- b) Yukarıdaki listede sizin ve arkadaşlarınızın en az üzerinde konuştuğu üç veya dört konuyu belirleyiniz. Bu konuların numaralarını B SÜTUNU'nda daire içine alınız.
- c) Yukarıdaki listede haklarında kesin, güçlü yargı ve düşünceleriniz olan konular hangileridir? Bu konuların karşısında olmanız veya desteklemeniz vereceğiniz cevap açısından farketmiyor. Sadece hangi konularda kendinizi güçlü hissettiğiniz önemli. Belirlediğiniz üç veya dört konunun numaralarını C SÜTUNU'nda daire içine alınız.
- d) Hayatımızda öyle konular vardır ki, bu konulardan şikayet etmekten hoşlanırsınız ancak şikayetlerimizde çok da ciddi değilizdir. Listede-
kilerden hangileri sizce böyle konulardır? D SÜTUNU'ndaki konu numaralarını daire içine alarak belirtiniz.
- e) Size göre listedeki hangi konuların üzerinde öncelikle ve acilen durulması ve bu konularda önlemler alınması gerekiyor? E SÜTUNU'ndaki konu numaralarını daire içine alarak belirtiniz.
- f) Eğer 2.e numaralı soruda reklam konusuna değindiyseniz, bu konuda neler yapılması gerektiğini aşağıya yazınız:

3. Hiç reklamın ne olduğunu bilmeyen bir kişiye reklamı nasıl tarif edersiniz? Aşağıda boş bırakılan yere yazınız.

4. Aşağıdaki cümlelerle ilgili görüşlerinizi uygun kutuyu işaretliyerek belirtiniz.

<u>Reklam</u>	<u>Kesinlikle Katılıyorum</u>	<u>Katılıyorum</u>	<u>Katılmıyorum</u>	<u>Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum</u>
- İnsanlar tarafından gerekli bir husus olarak görülür.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- İnsanların zekasıyla alay etmektedir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Sayesinde insanlar daha ucuz fiyatlara kavuşur.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- İnsanları ihtiyaçları olmayan şeyleri almaya ikna etmez.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Tanıttığı ürün hakkında insanlara doğru bilgi vermez.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- İnsanların yaşam standartlarının yükselmesini sağlar.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Sayesinde insanlar daha iyi ürünlere kavuşurlar.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Reklam'lardan insanlar genelde etkilenmez.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Bir eğlence aracı olarak görülür.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Reklam'lar sayesinde insanlar bazı sorunlarına çözüm bulabilirler.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- İnsanlara yeni ya da eski ürünler hakkında bilgi sağlar.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- İnsanlarda reklamı yapılan malı kullanmadıkları takdirde kötü durumda kalacakları hissini uyandırarak, insanların kendilerine güvenlerinin azalmasına neden olur.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. Aşağıda beş husus hakkında özellikler sıralanmıştır. Her özellik için, görüşünüzü en çok yansıtan kutuya (X) işareti koyunuz.

Eğitim

iyi	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	kötü
saf değil, kirli	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	saf, temiz
dürüst	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	hileli
güçlü	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	zayıf
değersiz	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	değerli
samimi	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	samimi değil
emniyetsiz	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	emniyetli
gerekli	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	gereksiz

Basın, Yayın

iyi	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	kötü
saf değil, kirli	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	saf, temiz
dürüst	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	hileli
güçlü	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	zayıf
değersiz	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	değerli
samimi	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	samimi değil
emniyetsiz	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	emniyetli
gerekli	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	gereksiz

Reklam

iyi	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	kötü
saf değil, kirli	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	saf, temiz
dürüst	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	hileli
güçlü	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	zayıf
değersiz	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	değerli
samimi	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	samimi değil
emniyetsiz	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	emniyetli
gerekli	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	gereksiz

Devlet

iyi	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	kötü
saf değil, kirli	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	saf, temiz
dürüst	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	hileli
güçlü	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	zayıf
değersiz	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	değerli
samimi	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	samimi değil
emniyetsiz	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	emniyetli
gerekli	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	gereksiz

Sanat

iyi	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	kötü
saf değil, kirli	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	saf, temiz
dürüst	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	hileli
güçlü	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	zayıf
değersiz	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	değerli
samimi	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	samimi değil
emniyetsiz	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	emniyetli
gerekli	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	gereksiz

6. Reklamından etkilenip de satın aldığınız ürünleri aşağıya yazınız.

7. Yaşınız

- ≤ 24
 25-34
 35-44
 45-54
 55-64
 ≥ 65

8. Medeni durumunuz: Evli Bekar Dul/Boşanmış

9. Eğitim durumunuz:

- Okur/yazar
 İlkokul
 Orta
 Lise
 Üniversite
 Yüksek

10. Çalışma durumunuz:

- Çalışmıyor
 Yarı zamanlı çalışıyor
 Tam zamanlı çalışıyor

11. Mesleğiniz

12. Ailenizin toplam aylık net gelir

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|-----------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | ≤ | 50.000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | 50.001-100.000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | 100.001-200.000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | 200.001-300.000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | 300.001-400.000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | 400.001-500.000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | ≥ | 500.001 |

13. Şu anda hatırlanıza gelen reklamlar neler?

ReklamNerede: okudunuz/duydunuz/seyttiniz?

14. TV'de en çok seyttiğiniz programlar:

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | belgeseller | <input type="checkbox"/> | yarışma |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | yerli diziler | <input type="checkbox"/> | spor |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | yabancı diziler | <input type="checkbox"/> | haber program |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | yerli filmler | <input type="checkbox"/> | çocuk programları |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | yabancı filmler | <input type="checkbox"/> | kadın programları |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | haberler | <input type="checkbox"/> | kırsal kesime yönelik programlar |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | reklamlar | <input type="checkbox"/> | Diğer: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | müzik, eğlence | | |

15. Okuduđunuz yerli/yabancı mecmular: _____

16. Bildiđiniz yabancı diller: _____

17. Okuduđunuz gazeteler: _____

18. Aşağıdakilerden sahip olduklarınızın markasını belirtiniz.

- Çamaşır makinası _____
- Buzdolabı _____
- Araba _____
- Televizyon _____
- Video _____
- Bulaşık makinası _____
- Elektrik süpürgesi _____
- Çamaşır kurutma makinası _____
- Computer _____

19. Cinsiyetiniz Kadın Erkek

20. Oturduđunuz semt?

APPENDIX 2
COMPUTER OUTPUTS OF FINDINGS

KEY TO APPENDIX 2

The codings used in the study for the variables included in Appendix 2 are as follows:

V56: Advertising is essential

- | | |
|------------------------|----------------|
| 4. Totally favorable | 3. Favorable |
| 1. Totally unfavorable | 2. Unfavorable |

V57: Advertising insults people's intelligence

- | | |
|---------------------|-------------|
| 4. Totally disagree | 3. Disagree |
| 1. Totally agree | 2. Agree |

V60: Advertisements don't give true picture of the product advertised

- | | |
|---------------------|-------------|
| 4. Totally disagree | 3. Disagree |
| 1. Totally agree | 2. Agree |

V63: People, generally aren't affected by advertising

- | | |
|---------------------|-------------|
| 4. Totally agree | 3. Agree |
| 1. Totally disagree | 2. Disagree |

V64: Advertising is a means for entertainment

- | | |
|---------------------|-------------|
| 4. Totally agree | 3. Agree |
| 1. Totally disagree | 2. Disagree |

V65: Advertising offers solutions to some problems of people

- | | |
|---------------------|-------------|
| 4. Totally agree | 3. Agree |
| 1. Totally disagree | 2. Disagree |

V66: Advertising informs people about the new or already existing products

- | | |
|---------------------|-------------|
| 4. Totally agree | 3. Agree |
| 1. Totally disagree | 2. Disagree |

- V67: Advertising causes insecurity
- | | |
|---------------------|-------------|
| 4. Totally disagree | 3. Disagree |
| 1. Totally agree | 2. Agree |
- V109: Age
- | | | |
|-----------------|----------|-----------------------|
| 1. 24 and under | 3. 35-44 | 5. 55-64 +65 and over |
| 2. 25-34 | 4. 45-54 | |
- V110: Marital Status
- | | |
|------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Married | 2. Unmarried + Divorced/Widowed |
|------------|---------------------------------|
- V111: Education Level
1. High School and Under
 2. University and over
- V112: Working Status
1. Doesn't work
 2. Part-time or Full-time
- V113: Occupation
- | | |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Self Employed | 5. Worker |
| 2. Artisan | 6. Retired |
| 3. Government Sector | 7. Housewife |
| High Level Employee | 8. Student/ |
| 4. Private Sector | Assistant Researcher |
- V114: Income Level
- | | |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1. 100,000 and under | 4. 300,000 - 500,000 |
| 2. 100,000-200,000 | 5. 500,000 and over |
| 3. 200,000-300,000 | |

V145: Number of Foreign Languages Known

0. Don't know
1. One foreign language
2. Two or three foreign languages

V150: Number of Items Owned

1. 0, 1, 2, or 3 items
2. 4 or 5 items
3. 6 items
4. 7, 8, or 9 items

V160: Sex

1. female
2. male

V161: Region

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Etiler, Levent, etc. | 4. Kadıköy, etc. |
| 2. Gayrettepe, Mecidiyeköy,
etc. | 5. Üsküdar, Beykoz, etc. |
| 3. Göztepe, Erenköy, etc. | 6. Gültepe, etc. |

TABLE 1

Relationship Between Overall Attitude Toward Advertising and Working Status

		V112					
	COUNT	I				ROW	
	ROW PCT	I				TOTAL	
	COL PCT	I					
	TOT PCT	I		1I	2I		
VJ5b	1	I	I	3	I	3	
		I	I	100.0	I	6.5	
		I	I	9.3	I		
		I	I	6.5	I		
+-----+							
	2	I	12	I	9	I	21
		I	57.1	I	42.9	I	15.9
		I	31.6	I	10.5	I	
		I	9.7	I	7.3	I	
+-----+							
	3	I	23	I	54	I	77
		I	29.9	I	70.1	I	62.1
		I	60.5	I	62.8	I	
		I	13.5	I	43.5	I	
+-----+							
	4	I	3	I	15	I	13
		I	16.7	I	83.3	I	14.5
		I	7.9	I	17.4	I	
		I	2.4	I	12.1	I	
+-----+							
	COLUMN	38		86		124	
	TOTAL	30.6		69.4		100.0	

TABLE 2

Relationship Between Entertainment Aspect of Advertising and Age

COUNT	I	V109					ROW TOTAL
		1I	2I	3I	4I	5I	
ROW PCT	I						
COL PCT	I						
TOT PCT	I						
1	I	1	4	1	2	5	13
	I	7.7	30.8	7.7	15.4	33.5	10.7
	I	5.0	10.0	4.5	8.7	29.4	
	I	.8	3.3	.8	1.6	4.1	
2	I	7	24	10	12	9	52
	I	11.3	38.7	16.1	19.4	14.5	50.8
	I	35.0	60.0	45.5	52.2	52.9	
	I	5.7	19.7	8.2	9.8	7.4	
3	I	12	12	8	7	3	42
	I	28.6	28.6	19.0	16.7	7.1	34.4
	I	60.0	30.0	36.4	30.4	17.5	
	I	9.8	9.8	6.6	5.7	2.5	
4	I			3	2		5
	I			60.0	40.0		4.1
	I			13.6	8.7		
	I			2.5	1.6		
COLJMN		20	40	22	23	17	122
TOTAL		16.4	32.8	18.0	18.9	13.9	100.0

TABLE 3

Relationship Between Truth in Advertising and Marital Status

		V110				ROW TOTAL
		1I	2I			
V360		COUNT				
		ROW PCT				
		COL PCT				
		TOT PCT				
	1	I 8	I 1	I	I	9
		I 38.9	I 11.1	I	I	7.4
		I 11.9	I 1.9	I	I	
		I 6.6	I .3	I	I	
	2	I 29	I 19	I	I	43
		I 60.4	I 39.6	I	I	39.7
		I 43.3	I 35.2	I	I	
		I 24.0	I 15.7	I	I	
	3	I 29	I 33	I	I	62
		I 46.8	I 53.2	I	I	51.2
		I 43.3	I 61.1	I	I	
		I 24.0	I 27.3	I	I	
	4	I 1	I 1	I	I	2
		I 50.0	I 50.0	I	I	1.7
		I 1.5	I 1.9	I	I	
		I .8	I .6	I	I	
		COLUMN				
		TOTAL	67	54		121
			55.4	44.6		100.0

TABLE 5

Relationship Between Effect of Advertising and Education Level

VJ63	V111						ROW TOTAL
	COUNT	I					
	ROW PCT	I					
	COL PCT	I					
TOT PCT	I		1I 2I				
1	I	4	I	18	I	22	
	I	18.2	I	31.8	I	17.9	
	I	7.3	I	22.5	I		
	I	3.3	I	14.6	I		
2	I	25	I	56	I	82	
	I	31.7	I	63.3	I	66.7	
	I	60.5	I	70.0	I		
	I	21.1	I	45.5	I		
3	I	12	I	5	I	17	
	I	70.6	I	29.4	I	13.8	
	I	27.9	I	6.3	I		
	I	9.8	I	4.1	I		
4	I	1	I	1	I	2	
	I	50.0	I	50.0	I	1.6	
	I	2.3	I	1.3	I		
	I	.3	I	.8	I		
COLJMN	43		80		123		
TOTAL	35.0		55.0		100.0		

TABLE 4

Relationship Between Informational Aspect of Advertising and Marital Status

VJ65	V110						ROW TOTAL
	COUNT	I					
	ROW PCT	I					
	COL PCT	I					
TOT PCT	I		1I 2I				
1	I		I	1	I	1	
	I		I	100.0	I	.8	
	I		I	1.9	I		
	I		I	.3	I		
2	I	9	I	2	I	11	
	I	31.8	I	18.2	I	8.9	
	I	13.0	I	3.7	I		
	I	7.3	I	1.6	I		
3	I	54	I	38	I	92	
	I	58.7	I	41.3	I	74.8	
	I	78.3	I	70.4	I		
	I	43.9	I	30.9	I		
4	I	6	I	13	I	19	
	I	31.6	I	58.4	I	15.4	
	I	8.7	I	24.1	I		
	I	4.9	I	10.6	I		
COLJMN	69		54		123		
TOTAL	56.1		43.9		100.0		

TABLE 6

Relationship Between Truth in Advertising and Occupation

		V113											
COUNT												ROW	
ROW	PCT											TOTAL	
COL	PCT												
TOT	PCT	1I	2I	3I	4I	5I	6I	7I	8I	9I			
VJ60	1	I	1	I	2	I	2	I	3	I	1	I	9
		I	11.1	I	22.2	I	22.2	I	33.3	I	11.1	I	7.5
		I	14.3	I	13.3	I	6.1	I	18.3	I	12.5	I	
		I	.8	I	1.7	I	1.7	I	2.5	I	.8	I	
	2	I	5	I	7	I	12	I	10	I	4	I	47
		I	10.6	I	14.9	I	25.5	I	21.3	I	8.5	I	39.2
		I	45.5	I	46.7	I	36.4	I	62.5	I	50.0	I	
		I	4.2	I	5.8	I	10.0	I	3.3	I	3.3	I	4.2
	3	I	6	I	6	I	19	I	3	I	2	I	62
		I	9.7	I	9.7	I	30.6	I	4.8	I	3.2	I	51.7
		I	54.5	I	85.7	I	40.0	I	57.6	I	18.8	I	25.0
		I	5.0	I	5.0	I	5.0	I	15.8	I	2.5	I	1.7
	4	I		I		I		I		I	1	I	2
		I		I		I		I		I	50.0	I	50.0
		I		I		I		I		I	12.5	I	6.3
		I		I		I		I		I	.8	I	.8
COLUMN TOTAL		11	7	15	33	16	3	14	16	120			
		9.2	5.3	12.5	27.5	13.3	6.7	11.7	13.3	100.0			

TABLE 7

Relationship Between Effect of Advertising and Income Level

		COUNT	I	V114					ROW				
		ROW PCT	I						TOTAL				
		COL PCT	I										
		TOT PCT	I	1I	3I	4I	5I	7I					
VJ63	1	I	1	I	4	I	6	I	4	I	6	I	21
		I	4.8	I	19.0	I	28.6	I	19.0	I	23.6	I	18.6
		I	5.3	I	13.8	I	25.0	I	23.5	I	25.0	I	
		I	.9	I	3.5	I	5.3	I	3.5	I	5.3	I	
	2	I	11	I	20	I	15	I	12	I	18	I	77
	I	14.3	I	26.0	I	20.8	I	15.6	I	23.4	I		58.1
	I	57.9	I	69.0	I	66.7	I	70.6	I	75.0	I		
	I	9.7	I	17.7	I	14.2	I	10.6	I	15.9	I		
	3	I	6	I	5	I	1	I	1	I		I	13
	I	46.2	I	33.5	I	7.7	I	7.7	I		I		11.5
	I	31.6	I	17.2	I	4.2	I	5.9	I		I		
	I	5.3	I	4.4	I	.9	I	.9	I		I		
	4	I	1	I		I	1	I		I		I	2
	I	50.0	I		I	50.0	I		I		I		1.8
	I	5.3	I		I	4.2	I		I		I		
	I	.9	I		I	.9	I		I		I		
	COLUMN		19		29		24		17		24		113
	TOTAL		16.8		25.7		21.2		15.0		21.2		100.0

TABLE 9

Relationship Between Effect of Advertising and Number of Foreign Languages Known

		V145							
		COLNT	I					RCW	
		RCW PCT	I					TOTAL	
		CCL PCT	I						
		TCT PCT	I	CI	1I	2I			
V063	1	I	2	I	14	I	6	I	22
		I	9.1	I	63.6	I	27.3	I	17.9
		I	5.4	I	23.7	I	22.2	I	
		I	1.6	I	11.4	I	4.9	I	
	2	I	22	I	40	I	20	I	82
		I	26.8	I	48.8	I	24.4	I	66.7
		I	59.5	I	67.8	I	74.1	I	
		I	17.9	I	32.5	I	16.3	I	
	3	I	12	I	5	I		I	17
		I	70.6	I	29.4	I		I	13.8
		I	32.4	I	8.5	I		I	
		I	9.8	I	4.1	I		I	
4	I	1	I		I	1	I	2	
	I	50.0	I		I	50.0	I	1.6	
	I	2.7	I		I	3.7	I		
	I	.8	I		I	.8	I		
COLUMN			37		59		27		123
TOTAL			30.1		48.0		22.0		100.0

TABLE 10
 Relationship Between Truth in Advertising and Number of
 Items Owned

		V15C								
		COUNT	1I		2I		3I		4I	ROW
		PCT	PCT		PCT		PCT		PCT	TOTAL
VC60										
	1	I	2	I	4	I	3	I	I	9
		I	22.2	I	44.4	I	33.3	I	I	7.4
		I	13.3	I	8.3	I	10.0	I	I	
		I	1.7	I	3.3	I	2.5	I	I	
	2	I	6	I	24	I	12	I	6	48
		I	12.5	I	50.0	I	25.0	I	12.5	39.7
		I	40.0	I	50.0	I	40.0	I	21.4	
		I	5.0	I	19.8	I	9.9	I	5.0	
	3	I	7	I	20	I	15	I	20	62
		I	11.3	I	32.3	I	24.2	I	32.3	51.2
		I	46.7	I	41.7	I	50.0	I	71.4	
		I	5.8	I	16.5	I	12.4	I	16.5	
	4	I		I		I		I	2	2
		I		I		I		I	100.0	1.7
		I		I		I		I	7.1	
		I		I		I		I	1.7	
		COLUMN	15		48		30		28	121
		TOTAL	12.4		39.7		24.8		23.1	100.0

TABLE 14

Relationship Between 'Advertising Offers Solutions' and Sex

		V16C				ROW TOTAL	
		1I		2I			
COLUNT	I						
RCW PCT	I						
CCL PCT	I						
TCT PCT	I						
VU65	1	I	8	I	3	I	11
		I	72.7	I	27.3	I	8.9
		I	12.3	I	5.1	I	
		I	6.5	I	2.4	I	
	2	I	20	I	7	I	27
	I	74.1	I	25.9	I	21.8	
	I	30.8	I	11.9	I		
	I	16.1	I	5.6	I		
	3	I	33	I	46	I	79
	I	41.8	I	58.2	I	63.7	
	I	50.8	I	78.0	I		
	I	26.6	I	37.1	I		
	4	I	4	I	3	I	7
	I	57.1	I	42.9	I	5.6	
	I	6.2	I	5.1	I		
	I	3.2	I	2.4	I		
COLUMN		65	59			124	
TCTAL		52.4	47.6			100.0	

TABLE 13

Relationship Between Entertainment Aspect of Advertising and Sex

		V16C				ROW TOTAL	
		1I		2I			
COLUNT	I						
RCW PCT	I						
CCL PCT	I						
TCT PCT	I						
VU64	1	I	4	I	9	I	13
		I	30.8	I	69.2	I	10.7
		I	6.3	I	15.3	I	
		I	3.3	I	7.4	I	
	2	I	32	I	30	I	62
	I	51.6	I	48.4	I	50.8	
	I	50.8	I	50.8	I		
	I	26.2	I	24.6	I		
	3	I	27	I	15	I	42
	I	64.3	I	35.7	I	34.4	
	I	42.9	I	25.4	I		
	I	22.1	I	12.3	I		
	4	I		I	5	I	5
	I		I	100.0	I	4.1	
	I		I	8.5	I		
	I		I	4.1	I		
COLUMN		63	59			122	
TOTAL		51.6	48.4			100.0	

TABLE 15

Relationship Between 'Advertising Causes Insecurity'
and Sex

		V16C					
	COUNT	I				ROW	
	PCT	I				TOTAL	
	CCL	I					
	TCT	I		1I	2I		
VC67	1	I	1	I	4	I	5
		I	20.0	I	80.0	I	4.1
		I	1.5	I	7.0	I	
		I	.8	I	3.3	I	
	2	I	10	I	13	I	23
		I	43.5	I	56.5	I	18.9
		I	15.4	I	22.8	I	
		I	8.2	I	10.7	I	
	3	I	37	I	35	I	72
		I	51.4	I	48.6	I	59.0
		I	56.9	I	61.4	I	
		I	30.3	I	28.7	I	
4	I	17	I	5	I	22	
	I	77.3	I	22.7	I	18.0	
	I	26.2	I	8.8	I		
	I	13.9	I	4.1	I		
COLUMN			65		57		122
TCTAL			53.3		46.7		100.0

TABLE 16

Relationship Between Truth in Advertising and Region

		V161											
		COUNT	I		I		I		I		I		ROW
		RCW	PCT	I		I		I		I		TOTAL	
		CCL	PCT	I		I		I		I			
		TCT	PCT	I		I		I		I			
				1I	2I	3I	4I	5I	6I				
V060	1	I	2	I	1	I	3	I	2	I	8		
		I	25.0	I	12.5	I	37.5	I	25.0	I	7.6		
		I	9.5	I	4.5	I	17.6	I	18.2	I			
		I	1.9	I	1.0	I	2.9	I	1.9	I			
	2	I	8	I	2	I	6	I	9	I	8	41	
		I	19.5	I	19.5	I	14.6	I	4.9	I	22.0	39.0	
		I	38.1	I	36.4	I	60.0	I	11.8	I	37.5	72.7	
		I	7.6	I	7.6	I	5.7	I	1.9	I	8.6	7.6	
	3	I	11	I	12	I	3	I	12	I	15	1	54
		I	20.4	I	22.2	I	5.6	I	22.2	I	27.8	1.9	51.4
		I	52.4	I	54.5	I	30.0	I	70.6	I	62.5	9.1	
		I	10.5	I	11.4	I	2.9	I	11.4	I	14.3	1.0	
	4	I		I	1	I	1	I		I			2
		I		I	50.0	I	50.0	I		I			1.9
		I		I	4.5	I	10.0	I		I			
		I		I	1.0	I	1.0	I		I			
COLUMN		21	22	10	17	24	11	105					
TOTAL		20.0	21.0	9.5	16.2	22.9	10.5	100.0					

TABLE 17

Relationship Between 'Advertising Offers Solutions' and Region

		V161						ROW						
		COLNT	I					TOTAL						
		RCW PCT	I											
		CCL PCT	I											
		TCT PCT	I	1I	2I	3I	4I	5I	6I					
VC65	1	I	I	I	1	I	2	I	3	I	2	I	8	
		I	I	I	12.5	I	25.0	I	37.5	I	25.0	I	7.5	
		I	I	I	9.1	I	12.5	I	12.5	I	16.7	I		
		I	I	I	.9	I	1.9	I	2.8	I	1.9	I		
	2	I	4	I	8	I	2	I	4	I	8	I		26
		I	15.4	I	30.8	I	7.7	I	15.4	I	30.8	I		24.3
		I	19.0	I	34.8	I	18.2	I	25.0	I	33.3	I		
		I	3.7	I	7.5	I	1.9	I	3.7	I	7.5	I		
	3	I	16	I	15	I	6	I	10	I	13	I	8	68
		I	23.5	I	22.1	I	8.8	I	14.7	I	19.1	I	11.8	63.6
		I	76.2	I	65.2	I	54.5	I	62.5	I	54.2	I	66.7	
		I	15.0	I	14.0	I	5.6	I	9.3	I	12.1	I	7.5	
4	I	1	I		I	2	I		I		I	2	5	
	I	20.0	I		I	40.0	I		I		I	40.0	4.7	
	I	4.8	I		I	18.2	I		I		I	16.7		
	I	.9	I		I	1.9	I		I		I	1.9		
COLUMN			21		23		11		16		24		12	107
TCTAL			19.6		21.5		10.3		15.0		22.4		11.2	100.0