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ABSTRACT
Metaphorically embedded messages are an increasingly important part of complex advertising images and include copyless ads. We use qualitative data and descriptive statistics to investigate how consumers interpret complex advertising; and how this execution style influences consumers’ attitudes towards advertisements and brands. We explore direct and indirect relationships between attitudes toward the advertisement (Aad) and towards the brand (AB) (and thus advertising effectiveness). Complex advertising images particularly influence the indirect relationship between consumer attitudes toward the advertisement and brands. Consumers sometimes misinterpret the meaning of complex no-copy ads; and correct interpretation of the meaning of the ad can lead to negative attitudes towards the ad and the product/brand.

INTRODUCTION
Metaphorically embedded messages are an increasingly important part of complex advertising images and include copyless ads. These advertising executions invite the reader to “think into” an advertisement’s message (Phillips, 1997), relying on simplicity, economy, reduction and the rejection of clichés for effective communication (Heller and Fink, 1999). Barthes (1973) expounds the “pleasure of the text” as the reward that comes from processing clever arrangements of signs to elicit meanings in a message. However the impact of creativity over content on advertising effectiveness is a critical issue for marketing communications and consumer research. We use qualitative data and descriptive statistics to examine the impact of interpreting complex advertising images or no-copy ads (which do not illustrate the product and have either minimal or no verbal copy) on advertising effectiveness by investigating, firstly, consumers’ interpretation of complex print advertisements; secondly, consumers’ attitudes towards complex advertising images (Aad); and thirdly the effect of no-copy advertising in generating positive or negative attitudes to the brand. We build on earlier research which has examined the inter-relationships between advertising imagery and advertising effectiveness (Bone and Ellen, 1992), and respond to Bone and Ellen’s (1992:93) argument that there have been few empirical studies to support the key assumptions of consumer behavior researchers that “imagery increases recall, enhances attitude toward the brand and positively affects behavioral intentions.”

LITERATURE REVIEW
Advertising influences brand equity through consumer brand attitudes or memory structures for a brand (Edell, 1993). Ads seek to impress and associate the brand name and claim in the consumers’ mind (Krishnan and Chakravarti, 1993). An ad uses executional cues to facilitate brand name encoding and retrieval, credibility in terms of claims to quality, and key positioning associations (MacInnis et al., 1991). Most importantly, it seeks to spur a predisposition or intention to purchase the product or service. Lack of interaction between message and brand associations may create well-remembered ads but may not facilitate processing brand name and claims (Pieters and de Klerk-Wanferdamin, 1996).

McQuarrie and Mick (1999) argue that advertisements can deliver brand-attribute linkage through varying forms of executions because consumers appraise variety in style and content. Thus, positive communication outcome in consumer processing levels will affect the strength and enduring nature of memories and brand attitudes (MacInnis, et. al., 1991). This depends on how strong and compelling consumers regard the ad to be (Petty and Cacioppo, 1986; Petty, Cacioppo and Schumann, 1983) and whether perceptions are in favour of or against the ad message (Petty and Cacioppo, 1986; Rossiter and Percy, 1987).

Rhetorical figures in ad messages are artful deviations (Corbett, 1990) that function through various operations such as metaphors to capture the reader’s attention. The irregularity (trope) is created via the similarity between two verbal terms that are not associated (McQuarrie and Mick, 1996; Tanaka, 1994). This character of deviation or incongruity suggests that advertising language in complex advertising images is more memorable than literal advertising language (Corbett, 1990). Where readers have a positive response to the ad, the ads will generate a more positive attitude toward the ad (Aad) because it requires more processing (McQuarrie and Mick, 1996).

Research into consumer interpretation of advertising images has historically focused on linguistic processing of textual information (e.g. Barthes, 1986; Mick and Politè 1989; McQuarrie and Mick 2003; Forceville, 1995). A few studies have drawn attention to non-linguistic features (e.g. Edell & Staelin, 1983; Childers & Houston, 1984) as well as visual communication (e.g. Rossiter & Percy, 1987). Most images are accompanied by some form of text that assists in reducing any ambiguities found in an image (Barthes, 1986).

No-copy ads fall outside the conventional advertisement categories of product-information or product-image formats of representation (Leiss et. al., 1990). In these complex advertising images, the product is not explicitly found in the ad to explain its utility. No-copy ads fall mainly into Barthes’ (1973) connotative level where meanings are neither precise nor limited and require interpretation. Forceville (1996) argues that this lack of anchoring in no-copy images makes them open to a wider range of interpretations than generic advertisements.

In this exploratory study we focus on pictorial metaphors in no-copy ads. Mick and Politè (1989), investigating semantics in advertising imagery, found that denotations in advertising images did not give due attention to connotative figures, including metaphors. Forceville (1995, 1996) used Black’s (1962, 1979) theory of metaphors, and found that consumers are able, firstly to identify metaphors in ad images; and secondly, to interpret these metaphors correctly by associating the figurative secondary subjects to the literal primary subjects of an ad. Phillips’ (1997) research found that consumers interpret ad messages by creating strong and weak implicatures triggered by how far complex advertising images deviated from reality.

Message comprehension is a prerequisite to formation or change of attitude and intentions (Mick and Buh, 1992). It is also a function of the message characteristics and the reader’s opportunity, motivation and ability to process the message (Petty and Cacioppo, 1986). Aad is one of the dominant mediators of advertising effectiveness (e.g. Lutz, MacKenzie and Belch, 1983; Mitchell and Olson, 1981; Shimp, 1981; Edell and Burke, 1984). Five
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possible antecedents of Aad (Lutz et al., 1983) can be identified: ad credibility; ad perceptions; attitude toward the advertiser; attitude toward advertising in general; and mood. Consumers of advertising messages develop attitudes toward an ad that influence advertising effectiveness in terms of brand attitude or purchase intentions (Lutz, MacKenzie and Belch 1983). Response sequences that follow from exposure to communication include: firstly, affective reaction to the ad i.e. Aad; and secondly, affective reaction toward the advertised brand i.e. attitude toward the brand (AB).

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

A conceptual framework (Figure 1) was derived from Peracchio and Meyers-Levy (1994), integrating textual theories, interpretation and information processing (Section 1); and from Mitchell and Olson’s (1981) and Lutz et al.’s (1983) work on attitudes towards advertisements (Section II), notably Model 1 (direct influence of attitude to the ad on attitude to the brand); and Model 2 (indirect influence of attitude to the ad on attitude to the brand).

RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

The objective is to examine how complex advertising images contribute to the formation of or changes in attitudes toward the advertisement and the brand. We investigate the effects of no-copy ads on consumers by examining firstly, consumers’ interpretation of complex print ads; secondly, consumers’ attitudes towards complex advertising images; and thirdly the effect of no-copy advertising in generating positive or negative attitudes to the brand.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Participants: We recruited 42 male and female student participants aged 18-35 by convenience sampling (Mick and Politi 1989; Phillips 1997). We chose university students because of their ability to process visual information; and because substantial cognitive resources (e.g. abstract thinking) are required to understand no-copy ads (Aaker 1982).

Questionnaire: The first part of the questionnaire (Mick and Politi 1989; Forceville 1995; Phillips 1997) elicits interpretations of three complex no-copy advertisements using four exploratory open-ended questions. The second part of the questionnaire uses Likert scales to examine the impact of the ads on attitude formation and change towards the brands (based on Lutz et. al. 1983).

Advertisements: Three advertisements were chosen from print and poster campaigns (Appendix A) where visual dominated over verbal material (Mick and Politi 1989). The advertisements do not illustrate the product or the brand advertised; and metaphors are rendered pictorially with minimum or no copy. The ads were chosen from award-winning campaigns across a range of product categories (e.g. alcohol, tobacco and media) relevant to the participants. All three campaigns have been run at different times over the past five years, thus increasing the chance of participants’ exposure to the ads.

METHOD

At the beginning of the questionnaire participants were told that the purpose was to: “discover the thoughts and feelings of consumers by answering some questions on print advertisements (e.g. magazines, newspapers, billboards)”. In Part 1, four open-ended questions elicited participants’ interpretations of three ads (based on Forceville 1995; Mick and Politi 1989):  

1. In your own words, please describe the ad.
2. Ignore what the advertiser may have intended and describe your opinions and feelings about the ad.

3. What do you think the advertiser was trying to communicate with this ad?
4. How do you know what the advertiser was trying to communicate with this ad? What makes you think so?

The three ads were arranged in ascending order of difficulty of the complex imagery, allowing for learning effects. The participants answered the four questions for ad 1; then for ad 2; and then for ad 3 (Mick and Politi, 1989; Forceville 1995).

Part 2 comprised twenty-two dichotomous questions and 5-point Likert scales anchored by “strongly agree—strongly disagree” to assess responses to the advertising images. Aad was assessed by the mean summation of 8 items (α=0.85); anchored by the Likert-scaled sub-variables of liking, perception, motivation, ability, ad credibility, ad claim discrepancy and attitude towards advertising in general. AB was directly measured from participant brand perceptions based on one question anchored by high-low quality of brand on a 5-point scale. AE was assessed by the mean summed total of 4 items (α=0.75); anchored by message conveyed, ad remembered, brand remembered and brand noted. Correlation analysis between these three variables is used to investigate advertising effectiveness (Figure 1 and Table 2).

Qualitative Data Analysis

NUD*ist was used to code 504 participant statements (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996) to four open-ended questions about the three ads. In advertisements, one or more features from a secondary object (the source domain) are mapped on to the primary object (the target domain) (Black, 1979). The secondary object of an advertisement is generally taken to be the image of the product or something that refers to it. The primary object is the product or service advertised. With no-copy advertisements, the secondary object exercises a much stronger influence on the primary object because no product is pictorially represented.

We used Forceville’s (1996 p. 174) method to determine participants’ comprehension and interpretation of the metaphorically framed messages in the ads. This involved three evaluative criteria (Ratings 1, 2 and 3). A number of themes and keywords were identified for each rating:

1. Which are the two terms of the metaphor? Does the participant explicitly mention the brand and the primary object identified by the researcher? (This is derived from the brand logo or name.)
2. Which is the metaphor’s primary subject and which its secondary subject? Is it explicitly or implicitly acknowledged that the advertised brand is to be understood in terms of the primary object?
3. What feature(s) is/are mapped from the secondary on to the primary subject? Is at least one feature of the primary object mentioned that is to be attributed to the brand?

Ratings 1 and 2 require participants to explicitly identify elements of the metaphor. Ratings have to be judged cautiously by taking participant responses one question at a time as well as in terms of how all four questions for each ad are linked. Responses for Ratings 1 and 2 were coded as success or failure in fulfilling its requirements. Rating 3 incorporates positive and negative re-

---

42 questionnaires X 12 questions in each questionnaire. A detailed description of analysis using NUD*ist, e.g. categories and index tree, is presented in full in *.* (2003), but omitted here for reasons of space.
TABLE 1
Breakdown of Participant Responses for Part 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breakdown of Participant Responses for Part 1

**TABLE 1**

**FINDINGS**

Rating 1: Successful Rating 1 responses (identifying the two terms of the metaphor) were high at 92.9% for Ad 1 which was the simplistic of the three ads. All participants mentioned the brand name Guinness as the primary object e.g. “A pint of Guinness is being portrayed as an ice cream” (Jake). Participants interpreted this advertisement as a new version or brand extension of Guinness and not as the original Guinness Stout product itself e.g. “a cold variant of the original” (Anna). Unsuccessful ratings did not mention either brand or alcoholic beverage when describing this ad: “Alcoholic drink in the form of an ice lolly/ice cream” (Tim). For Ad 2, the presence of the government smoking warning was an important part of the ad’s description e.g. “Silk Cut. It is a slice in a piece of purple silk. My feelings are that because cig advertisers were not allowed to show pictures of cigs they had to come up with another irreverent way of advertising their product” (Nick). For Ad 3, text anchoring of the Economist’s brand name is paramount to identifying the ad: “The Economist magazine, but I only know this from the writing. I would not have been able to tell it was the Economist just from the picture” (Chloe).

Rating 2: Nine out of ten respondents correctly identified the metaphor’s primary and secondary subjects for Ad 1: “New product-it is written that this taste is new. The product is from Guinness. The taste is extra cold. The picture of the ice cream is the analogy” (Wayne). Some responses failed because, although they correctly acknowledged the presence of the product, they interpreted the ad image as advertising for a completely different product: “From the word “new”, it is a new product...so it could be ice cream with Guinness flavour and alcoholic” (Pamela).

Most participants understood that Ad 2 was a cigarette ad though the brand name was not always explicitly stated: “The warning contained in the advertisement would suggest that cigarettes are being advertised” (Tina). The secondary object of silk with a cut is meant to allude to the brand name rather than the product i.e. cigarette. Several participants associated the colour purple better with the brand as they find this trait more distinctive than the imagery of the silk and the cut itself: “Based on the colours and the slit I knew it was Silk Cut, which advertises cigarettes” (Chris). Responses failed where participants interpreted the ad as having a different object source e.g. health warning instead of the silk and the cut: “…it is not really a product being advertised, it is more of a government warning about smoking harming the unborn children of mothers” (Ray).

Ad 3 was interpreted in two ways. Some participants associated the image with the characteristics of the magazine whilst others associated this with the readers of the magazine. Colour association was also important for the Economist brand, traditionally known for a red background with contrasting white typeface: “An ad for the periodical the Economist. Red is the principal colour for the magazine (used quite often in their ads)” (Angelina). Responses failed where participants did not associate the relevance of the image of the switch to the brand: “A new magazine about businesses. To give a view like this is a process of unleashing the hidden potential of your company” (Todd).

Rating 3: This rating establishes whether participants have experienced any significant formation or change of attitude towards the ad and/or brand. The “yes” category is therefore sub-divided into positive or negative feelings held about the ad or brand.
Participants who correctly interpreted the advertiser’s messages and yet unequivocally dismissed the product or advertising message were categorised as negative responses.

For Ad 1 participants observed the ad’s strong source of appeal from its ability to target its specific audience by relaying a personalised message from the ad. However, negatively framed responses show that a message has been conveyed as the participant makes positive inferences about the ad: “I enjoy the visual humour, but, since I don’t drink stout, it doesn’t influence me towards buying a particular product…” (Mark).

For Ad 2 some clear negative feelings were attributed to the nature of the ad execution: “The colour contrast and the simplicity of the print work caught my eye, but I had to spend some time looking in order to understand what was the product advertised. The brand name is almost invisible and in general I don’t like the ad” (Stan). On the other hand, positive responses focus on the ad’s creativity: “The advertisement...forms an illustrative representation of the brand Silk Cut and encourages people to think of its significance” (Tim). Salience is relevant here as participants who described themselves as being opposed to smoking automatically dismissed the ad message. Negative feelings about the brand could flow from negative interpretation of the ad image: “annoying because makers are so confident of selling their product...That the product is high class, that the dangers of smoking the product aren’t worse than the benefits, i.e. appearing ‘cool’” (Brandon). One consequence of the limitless interpretation of no-copy ads were that participants’ attitudes towards the ad might have been unnecessarily altered for the worse due to the ambiguous nature of the ad: “Obviously the name Silk Cut is linked to a piece of silk being cut but I feel that there is a deeper meaning that I do not fully appreciate/understand” (Natasha). Responses that failed rating 3 associated the wrong objects with the brand “… illustrating the delicacy of silk in comparison to the delicacy of a pregnancy.” That babies are delicate, just like silk” (Rio).

For Ad 3 participants responded positively to figuring out the message: “…its quirky in-game makes me feel part of the gang. A sense of exclusivity and intellectual elitism. The idea that readers will be empowered by the information within…” (Marcus). In contrast, a negative response occurs when a participant’s explicit recognition of the ad’s novelty is followed by dismissal of the brand. Here, the novelty of the ad apparently overshadows the brand name: “It makes one think about the advert itself, and not the product it is selling. Personally, it wouldn’t buy the product” (Tim). Responses failed where participants were unable to draw the requisite ad associations: “Confusing. I think they (the advertiser) assume that the readers are familiar with the word “The Economist”. I don’t” (Mary).

Rating 3 is cross-tabulated (Tables 2a-c) with participants’ appreciation of complex ads, quantified as ad effectiveness. These cross-tabulations demonstrate the advantages and disadvantages of no-copy ads in relation to ad comprehension difficulty. Most participants found Ad 1 (Table 2a) easy to interpret and understand. Eleven participants who agreed about the effectiveness of complex ads also positively interpreted Example 1’s ad message. For Ad 2 (Table 2b) there was a more diverse mix of responses from the same 11 participants, including four negative responses and two wrong interpretations. Similarly, two negative responses and one wrong interpretation are recorded for Ad 3 (Table 2c). This crucially shows that comprehension of ad messages is influenced by the nature of complex ads and is capable of affecting an ad’s effectiveness.

The correlation matrix (Table 3) shows significant correlation for Model 2 (Figure 1)($r=0.38$, $p<.01$), suggesting that ad credibility influences consumer attitude toward the brand, AB. There was no significant correlation for the direct relationship between Aad and AB (attitude to the brand) in Model 1 (Figure 1). In terms of other influences on attitudes to ads and advertising effectiveness, perceptions of advertisements were positively correlated with Aad ($r=0.637$, $p<.01$); and ad credibility with Aad ($r=0.738$, $p<.01$).

**DISCUSSION**

Whilst early communication models assumed the audience to be largely passive in the consumption of advertising, our results support later arguments about the important role of active individual interpretation and attitudes in the consumption of advertising (Scott 1994; Phillips 1997; Stern). In line with earlier studies (Mick and Politi, 1989; Forceville, 1992; Phillips, 1997), it was shown that consumers can interpret complex ads. In general, consumers are capable of identifying and interpreting pictorial metaphors in complex advertisements. In no-copy ads, this is largely through previous exposure to the ads or by forming some inference of previous knowledge of the brand to the ad. The accuracy of consumer comprehension of meanings is of critical concern to advertisers who assume that consumers attach salient importance to their intended advertisement messages (Mick and Buhl, 1992). However we did not find that no-copy ads are necessarily more effective than other types of executions in marketing communications strategies. There was mixed reaction about the need to interpret complex advertising images as opposed to more generic forms of executions. In a practical sense, most consumers were not willing to spend time on ads that they did not find relevant to themselves. Factors that influenced consumer desire to interpret ads included academic background, time constraint and appreciation of the message.

We extended previous research into the interpretation of rhetorical figures in advertising (Mick and Buhl 1992; Scott 1994; Forceville 1995; Phillips 1997) by incorporating earlier models (Lutz et al 1983) of advertising effectiveness into our conceptualisation and research design. Our findings confirmed Lutz et al’s work on the importance of the indirect influence of attitude to the ad (notably its credibility and perception of the ad) on attitude to the brand. In terms of changing advertising attitudes and generating substantial effectiveness, there was no significantly observable impact. Purchase intention and brand attitudes, as components of advertising effectiveness, were not significantly influenced by this specific method of ad execution.

Complex advertisements tend to attract more attention. However the extra effort expended in interpreting complex advertising images does not necessarily lead to consumers being more persuaded. For both attitude towards the brand and attitude towards the ad, the net effect of persuasion is ultimately negligible when the benefits of complex advertising are significantly negated by confusion, miscomprehension and even irritation (McQuarrie and Mick, 1999). Relevance in the form of previous knowledge and usage of a brand play a big factor in appreciation of these ads. This is supported by a positive correlation between the ad credibility and ad claim discrepancy variables with consumer attitudes toward the brand.

Consumer attitude towards the brand (AB) is not significantly directly influenced by their attitude toward the advertisement (Aad) in complex no-copy advertising. Consumer attitude toward the brand is significantly influenced by their attitude toward the advertisement indirectly through acceptance of ad claims or ad credibility in complex no-copy advertising. Our findings also contributed to earlier research by exploring complex advertising in a cultural setting (i.e. U.K.) different from earlier studies in the U.S., Canada and the Netherlands.
### TABLES 2A, 2B AND 2C

**Rating 3 Sample 1 * Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness Crosstabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating 3 Sample 1</strong></td>
<td>negative % within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no % within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>positive % within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>1 21 11 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>20.0% 80.8% 100.0% 78.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total % within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating 3 Sample 2 * Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness Crosstabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating 3 Sample 2</strong></td>
<td>negative % within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no % within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>positive % within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total % within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating 3 Sample 3 * Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness Crosstabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating 3 Sample 3</strong></td>
<td>negative % within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>20.0% 23.1% 18.2% 21.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no % within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>60.0% 9.1% 9.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>positive % within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>20.0% 76.9% 72.7% 69.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total % within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Mean Summated Ad Effectiveness</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION (INCLUDING LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS)

In terms of methodological limitations, firstly we presented participants with stimulus material which did not coincide with how people actually process research stimuli (Kreuz and Roberts 1993). Secondly, we did not necessarily capture the whole meaning of our participants’ responses (Mick and Politic 1989); but rather settled for responses to pictorial interpretations that identified and characterised significant concepts and themes. Thirdly, we could not estimate the level of processing opportunity of each participant that ties in with ad repetition. Results from studies of ad repetition have been associated with increased levels of cognitive response (Petty and Cacioppo, 1980), more enduring ad and brand attitudes and stronger purchase intentions (Batra and Ray, 1986; Edell and Keller, 1988). Finally selective ad processing, as occurs in real life, was not accounted for in this study. We don’t seek to mimic real-life exposure but to provide for relevant and spontaneous interpretations (Phillips, 1997).

Future research could explore at greater length the relationships of ad credibility on attitude towards the brand and the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VE</th>
<th>VAD</th>
<th>VAD1</th>
<th>VAD2</th>
<th>VAD5+6</th>
<th>VB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAD</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAD1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAD2</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>0.637**</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAD5+6</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.738**</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Model 1) (Model 2)

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed)

[KEY: VE: Advertising Effectiveness; VAD Attitude to the Ad; VB: Attitude to the Brand; VAD1: Liking; VAD2: Perception; VAD5: Ad credibility; VAD6 Ad claim discrepancy].

APPENDIX A

No copy ads
Influence of perception and liking on attitude toward the ad within the context of the debate on the effectiveness of no-copy and complex advertising and purchase intentions; and also the impact of branding and brandmarks on the model.

In conclusion, complex visual images in advertising have the potential to alter consumer perception of brands by virtue of deriving emotive rewards from interpreting the ad message. The advantages from complex images are most notably derived from pleasure and greater engagement in the ad, which translates into liking towards the ad. Conversely, the advertisement may not be effective when consumers are not able to interpret the ads. General doubt about an ad message is more often than not expressed as a negative response to the ad.
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