

Psychology of Advertising: The Effect of Self-Monitoring and Message Framing on
Advertisement Persuasion

By

Emily Murray

* * * * *

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for
Honors in the Department of Psychology
Union College

March 2012

Advisor: Professor Kenneth DeBono

Abstract

The current study examined the interaction between self-monitoring and message framing on overall advertisement evaluation. Seventy-six undergraduate students (56 females and 20 males) at a small liberal arts school were exposed to a 2(Self-monitoring: High vs. Low) x 2(Message Framing: Promotion-framed advertisement vs. Prevention-framed advertisement) between-subjects design. The participants were shown three advertisements, one of which was framed in either a promotion-focused or prevention-focused manner. The participants then filled out a series of questionnaires and were classified as being high or low self-monitors. It was hypothesized that the participants who were classified as high self-monitors would evaluate the promotion-framed advertisement more favorably and the participants who were classified as low self-monitors would evaluate the prevention-framed advertisement more favorably. The results supported our hypothesis and an interaction.

Psychology of Advertising: The Effect of Self-Monitoring and Message Framing on
Advertisement Persuasion

In the consumer market, a product is not just an item that performs a single function. A product and its service are often used as a tool that provides a means to an end or fulfills a greater purpose for someone. Toothpaste may be used to protect someone's teeth from cavities or whiten them, but ultimately it is used to maintain hygiene and create a smile that a person is willing and wanting to show off. The goal a product fulfills and the way a product is perceived by a consumer depends on how a product is marketed. Through a fairly automatic process, each individual decides what function a product serves for them, what goal it fulfills and how it will pertain to their lifestyle based on the information that is provided to them.

The basic notion of "feeling right," whether it is at a new home, job, or school, has remained the same even when applied to consumer behavior – it is essentially a gut feeling that an individual experiences but cannot quite define. To achieve this feeling in the field of consumer psychology one must take into consideration consumption goals and self-regulatory goals. The regulatory fit theory consists of two self-regulatory internal systems that look at an individual's goal and the means to reaching that goal. Individuals express control of their emotional state by regulating their behavior to reach a desired end state. One component that takes part in determining which self-regulatory system a person uses is a personality variable; each person differs in their own regulatory focus orientation. The second component is the situation component since different situations may require or bring out a different regulatory focus orientation. These two components combine to reach a desired end state, either what you would gain or what you'd lose out

on. The two self-regulatory systems of salient nurture goals and salient security goals have become known as promotion focused goals and prevention-focused goals, respectfully (Lee & Higgins, 2009).

Self-regulatory goals consist of satisfying either salient nurture goals, which focus on growth and accomplishment, typically through affect, or salient security goals, which focus on security and safety, typically through reason. In the realm of consumer psychology, salient nurture goals become promotion focus goals that advocate ways of advancing through eager attainment; promotion-focus goals can be seen as strong ideals, or the hopes, wishes and aspirations that they or their significant others have. Salient security goals become prevention-focus goals that advocate advancing while remaining vigilant. Prevention goals are the strong oughts, or the beliefs one has about their duties, obligations and responsibilities. Both systems are motivation approaches in that the individual attempts to reduce discrepancies between their current state and their desired end state (Higgins, 1997; Lee & Higgins, 2009).

The “fit” feeling of regulatory fit has been found to enhance performance and lead to more favorable attitudes on succeeding tasks by increasing reactions (Lee, Keller & Sternthal, 2010). Research has also indicated an effect on message processing. A study conducted by Lee, Kelly and Sternthal in 2010 found that individuals who were primed with a promotion-focus were more likely to construe information at high, abstract levels, where as individuals primed with a prevention focus were more likely to construe information at low, concrete levels (Lee, Keller & Sternthal, 2010).

In 2004 Lee and Higgins decided to look at regulatory fit in terms of a persuasion appeal and the frame of the message. One of the six experiments they performed tested a

Welch's grape juice product using promotion and prevention goals in a gain frame, which was a positively framed message, and a loss frame, which was a negatively framed message. They found that message framing focused on promotion concerns were more effective in a gain (vs. loss) frame, whereas appeals focused on prevention concerns were more effective when in a loss (vs. gain) frame (Lee & Higgins, 2004). "Feeling right" is experienced when the goal in mind, a nurture/promotion goal or a security/prevention goal, is paired with its appropriate goal approach. This means that for promotion goals, one should advocate approaching gains and avoiding nongains where for prevention goals, one should advocate avoiding losses and approaching nonlosses, to reach a desired end-state (Lee & Higgins, 2009).

These findings meant that regulatory fit is not restricted to an emotional state; it can also be expressed within a message (Lee & Higgins, 2009). It has also been found that the incongruence of regulatory fit in a message can weaken the appeal (Cesario & Higgins, 2008). When a promotion focused message or advertisement is advocated as approaching gains or reaching an end point through eager means, the message will cause the viewer to experience "fit" regardless if the person reading the message is typically promotion-focused or prevention-focused (Lee & Higgins, 2009).

Higgins has also researched chronic promotion (approaching matches and avoiding errors or misses) versus prevention focus (avoiding mismatches and attaining correct rejections, in individuals) (Higgins, 1997). Chronic regulatory focus was studied through an anagram task where the stronger an individual's regulatory focus was, the better they did on the anagram task when the compatible regulatory orientation was used; as the strength of an individual's promotion focus increased, so did their performance on

the task when the incentive was framed as approaching a match (versus avoiding a mismatch) and as the strength of an individuals prevention focus increased, so did their performance on the task when the incentive was framed as avoiding a mismatch (versus approaching a match). The results of this study suggest that there is a strategic compatibility between incentive, goal motivation and performance (Higgins, 1997).

Higgins later researched chronic regulatory fit by researching achievement pride. Higgins, Friedman, Harlow, Idson, Ayduk, and Taylor did a study in 2001 that looked at regulatory focus theory in relation to McClelland and Atkinson's classic theory of achievement motivation. As previously discussed, the regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997, 1998) consists of two distinct motivational systems, promotion and prevention. Higgins hypothesized that over time, past successes with achievement tasks will elicit emotions for new achievement tasks; past successes would lead to a feeling of pride that motivates individuals to accomplish the new task in a similar manner to reach to new task goal. If a person has a subjective history of success for attaining promotion focus goals, they would have promotion pride (versus prevention-focus goals and prevention pride). The regulatory focus pride an individual has produces different orientations to new tasks; therefore they would approach the task differently as well (eagerness for promotion related and vigilance for prevention related) (Higgins, 2001).

In relation to product function, Chernev's study in 2004 found that participants who were primed with a prevention-focus gave more weight to utilitarian and reliability related attributes because they serve the goal of safety and security, where as participants primed with promotion-focus typically gave more weight to hedonic, attractive, and

performance-related attributes because they tend to goals that maximize positive outcomes of a choice (Chernev, 2004).

Effective advertising is essential to give one company, product or brand the edge over competitors. Prevention and promotion focus have been looked at as situation variables and in the context of consumer relations, however, who are the people who are the people affected by these approaches and what other factors play a part? Who responds more to a prevention-focus approach as opposed to a promotion-focus, or vice versa? To have effective advertising, it is essential to know how different people react to different approaches of advertising. It is in the best interest of advertising companies, and to the consumer, to narrow down ways of how to market a product to varying individuals. This allows the consumer to more easily process how a product fits their individual characteristics, needs and priorities. Studies have shown that dispositional differences and personality variables can and do play an important role in determining the success of influence attempts (Haugtvedt, Petty & Cacioppo, 1992).

One advertisement for a product can influence one consumer, but yet leave another consumer completely unfazed. One possibility for this difference could be self-monitoring. A similar duality can be seen between regulatory fitness and self-monitoring. The basic qualities of high and low self-monitors reflect similar principles that have shown to be influential when using either the promotion or prevention self-regulatory systems.

Self-monitoring is a personality variable on which a substantial amount of research has been conducted in the field of consumer psychology. Self-monitoring is the extent to which an individual regulates and/or attempts to control how others perceive

them in particular situations (DeBono, 2006). A high self-monitor, an individual who scores high on the self-monitoring scale (Snyder & Gangestad, 1986), will monitor how they project their sense of self in social interaction to a great extent, they are sensitive to social cues, and are particularly attentive to information that guides expressive self-presentation and social comparison; there is likely to be a situation to situation shift in their overall self-presentation (Snyder & Gangestad, 1986).

In comparison, low self-monitors, individuals who score lower on the self-monitoring scale, are not as concerned with constantly assessing the social scene. They place more value on maintaining congruence between who they are and what they do. Low self-monitors are more true to themselves, and their words and actions are more accurate portrayals of their attitudes and feelings (Snyder & Gangestad, 1986). Numerous findings have indicated split reactions for high and low self-monitors in response to product advertising. It was also found that high self-monitors react more favorably to products marketed with an image appeal, as opposed to a product-quality oriented advertisement and low self-monitors react more favorably to product-quality orientation advertisements (DeBono & Packer 1991; Snyder & DeBono 1985).

In advertising, one method of marketing a product is by appealing to a product's image, or what the consumer would gain or achieve by using the product. A second method is focusing on claims about the quality of the product or their overall content. In a 1985 study, Snyder and DeBono hypothesized that high self-monitors would react more favorably to image oriented advertisements where as low self-monitors would find quality oriented advertisements more favorable. Low self-monitors would be more concerned with the consistency between the products claim and overall performance, the

product's utilitarian function, not how using the product would add to their social identity (Snyder & DeBono, 1985). Results of the study indicated that high self-monitors reacted more favorably to image-oriented advertisements and low self-monitors reacted more favorably to the product-quality oriented advertisements. High self-monitors reacted more favorably to image-oriented advertisements, where as low self monitors reacted more favorably to product quality-oriented advertisements. High self monitors were also willing to pay more for products advertised with an image orientation and were even more willing to try a product if they were marked with an image appeal. In contrast, low self-monitors were willing to pay more for products advertised with quality orientation, and were even more willing to try a product if it was marketed with a quality claim (Snyder & DeBono, 1985).

High and low self-monitor's perception of product quality also differ based on the country of origin (DeBono & Rubin, 1995). When given a sample of cheese that was either more or less pleasant tasting and from either France or Kansas, high self-monitors evaluated the quality of the cheese based on its origin (higher evaluations for cheese from France), where as low self-monitors evaluations were dependant upon the cheese's actual taste regardless of country origin (DeBono & Rubin, 1995). The exterior packaging of a product also influences product evaluation; high self monitors evaluated brands of coffee, chocolate and water more favorably when they had more attractive packaging(DeBono, Leavitt & Backus, 2003). In a second study, participants were asked to evaluate perfume that was more or less pleasant smelling and in either a more or less attractive package. High self-monitors continued to evaluate products more favorably based on its physical appeal, regardless of whether or not pleasant or less pleasant smells were used; their

evaluations of products were based on how the use of the product would appear to others. On the other hand, low self-monitors evaluated the products based on pleasantness of their smell; they based their evaluations on concrete values rather than social appeals (DeBono, Leavitt & Backus, 2003).

The differentiation between behaviors witnessed for high and low self-monitors in varying situations may stem from the functions their attitudes serve (DeBono, 1987). For high self-monitors, their attitudes primarily serve a social-adjustive function; they are concerned about whether their attitudes or beliefs appear to be appropriate in an interpersonal situation. Low self-monitors' attitudes primarily serve a value-expressive function meaning they express what values and beliefs are important to them. Low self-monitors may change their attitude at times, but only so that they remain consistent with their values (DeBono, 1987).

Shavitt, Lowrey and Han also looked at self-monitoring and attitude functions, however they looked at the two variables in combination with product type (social-identity product, utilitarian product or multi-use product). Social-identity products are seen as being used to facilitate social relationships and obtain social approval. Utilitarian products are items whose purchase and usage are typically based on reward and punishment outcomes. Multiple-use products give important utilitarian outcomes and allow for self-expression. In the first experiment of their study, participants were asked to explain their attitude towards the products presented to them that were categorized as utilitarian products (air conditions, aspirin, coffee, cough syrup, orange juice and toothpaste), social-identity products (a high school class ring, gift wrap, a greeting card, portrait photograph, university decal, and a wedding ring) or multiple function products

(athletic shoes, credit cards, gourmet frozen food, jeans, sunglasses and watches). High and low self-monitors did not differ in their strongly utilitarian explanations of the utilitarian product, however, for the social-identity product, high self-monitors explained their attitudes using more social terms and less utilitarian terms than low self-monitors. In the second and third experiments of the study, participants were asked to write advertisements for the products presented to them. In experiment 2, the social-identity product was a class ring, and the utilitarian product was an air conditioner. In experiment 3, the social-identity product was a university flag, the utilitarian product was aspirin, and the multiple use product was sunglasses. Both high and low self-monitors chose the same arguments for the social-identity product advertisement and for the utilitarian product advertisement. The arguments chosen differed, however, for the multi-function product; high self-monitors used social arguments in the advertisement, where as low self-monitors preferred utilitarian arguments (Shavitt, Lowrey & Han, 1992). This once again suggests that self-monitoring does have an impact on persuasive messaging and which attitude function they illicit for different individuals.

The effect of source attractiveness and source expertise in advertisements on persuasion has also been studied (DeBono & Harnish, 1988; DeBono & Telesca, 1988) and results once again indicated a difference in message processing. When participants listened to either an expert or attractive male deliver a counter attitudinal message, high self-monitors agreed with the expert regardless of argument strength due to heuristic processing and with the attractive source only when the message was strong due to systematic processing. Low self-monitors displayed the exact opposite; low self-monitors agreed with the attractive source regardless of argument strength due to heuristic

processing and with the expert source only when the message was strong due to systematic processing (DeBono & Harnish, 1988).

In consumer psychology, a substantial amount of research on self-monitoring has focused on what it is physically about an advertisement or product that makes one individual prefer it to another. High self-monitors focus on the images of advertisements where as low self-monitors focus on the quality of the product portrayed (DeBono & Packer, 1991), high self-monitors are more easily persuaded by the physical attractiveness of a spokesperson or the box where as low self-monitors tend to look past the frills and maintain a constant evaluation of the product on its consistency of perceived function and actual performance (DeBono & Telesca, 1990).

High and low self-monitors will also choose to describe the purpose of multiuse products in their respective image versus quality ideals as described above (Shavitt, Lowrey & Han, 1992). These findings are extremely significant in that explanations about people's attitudes, personality and priorities are created to help explain why certain aspects of advertisements influence high or low self-monitors. They help explain why some advertisements appeal to one type and less so to the other. However, research on self-monitoring has yet to look at how the attitude, personality and priorities of individuals all influence the goals they have and ultimately influence what they are persuaded by.

High self-monitors and their focus on social situations and attaining a self-image parallels promotion focus goals, where as low self-monitors and their focus on product quality and congruence parallels prevention focus goals. Self-regulatory goals consist of satisfying either salient nurture goals, which focus on growth and accomplishment,

typically through affect, or salient security goals, which focus on security and safety, typically through reason. In the realm of consumer psychology, salient nurture goals become promotion focus goals that advocate ways of advancing through eager attainment, and salient security goals become prevention focus goals that advocate advancing while remaining vigilant (Lee & Higgins, 2009).

Low self-monitors are often seen as principled beings whose behaviors reflect an accurate portrayal of their values and the actions they take are to maintain congruence between the two. On the other hand, high self-monitors are often seen as status oriented individuals who manipulate their behavior to fit a situation or the expectations of others; their actions are to achieve an ideal appearance.

High self-monitors are typically defined as being able to adapt how others perceive them in any given situation, however in the field of consumer psychology, it is possible that when high self monitors look at an advertisement, they attempt to visualize how that product would affect how others see them in a possible future scenario; they may then go out of their way to try and attain a goal and ensure a positive outcome. Low self-monitors may look at an advertisement for a product and see how using a certain product will ensure that they maintain congruence with their identity. A person's goals and past history of success with these goals may also influence how a person responds to advertising.

In the current study, it is hypothesized that when evaluating visually similar advertisements, high self-monitors will express higher persuasion to a product when shown an advertisement where the messages are framed in a promotion focused manner

and low self-monitors will express higher persuasion to the product when shown an advertisement where the messages are framed in a prevention focused manner.

Method

Participants

Seventy-six undergraduate students (56 females and 20 males) between the ages of eighteen and twenty-two at a small liberal arts college volunteered to participate in this study. Sixty-two students volunteered to participate in this study in exchange for course credit used to fulfill out of class activity requirements and fourteen students volunteered to participate in the study in exchange for a monetary fee of four dollars.

Materials and procedures

The experimenter told the participants that they would be evaluating three advertisements produced by a single advertising company. They were also told that each advertisement is for a different hygienic product and that the companies will most likely be unfamiliar to them because they are products marketed in the Midwest.

The participants were first instructed that they would be given a packet of three advertisements that would be looked at one at a time. They were given thirty seconds to read over each advertisement carefully and were told when their thirty seconds was up to evaluate the advertisement. The first advertisement for body lotion and third advertisement for shampoo were filler advertisements that promoted the products in a neutral manner; neither advertisement advocated attaining a future gain, or avoiding a future loss. The body lotion advertisement offered general information about the product and the shampoo advertisement drew attention to the brand's new formula.

The advertisement of interest was the second advertisement, which was an advertisement for “Boomerang Toothpaste” framed in either, a promotion-focused or a prevention-focused manner. Whitening toothpaste was selected as the product to be used in the advertisement that would be manipulated since it could be seen as a multi-function product that can elicit both social identity and utilitarian attitudes (Shavitt, 1990; Shavitt, Lowrey & Han, 1992).

The wording and information presented in the promotion and prevention-focused advertisements for “Boomerang Toothpaste” were adapted from previous studies that manipulated the heading and body of the advertisement for fictional products such as “Desir Chocolate” and real products such as “Welch’s Grape Juice” (Micu & Chowdhury; Lee & Aaker, 2004; Kees, Burton & Tangari, 2010).

The promotion-focused advertisement (*See Appendix A*) had the headline “Get the Whiter Teeth You Have Always Dreamed Of!” and emphasized enhancement and obtaining a positive goal by taking actions or eager means, “Choose Boomerang Plus Whitener toothpaste and get the whiter, brighter smile you’ve always wanted. Micro-cleansing whiteners coat your teeth to gently polish them for a smooth, bright smile.” The prevention-focused advertisement (*See Appendix B*) had the headline “Avoid Discoloration That Ruins Your Smile!” and emphasized obtaining a positive goal by avoiding negatives or vigilant means, “Don’t let yellow teeth stand in your way of a healthy looking smile. Micro-cleansing whiteners coat your teeth to loosen surface stains and prevent future stains from forming.” The headline and information presented in the advertisements were the only aspects of the advertisements that were manipulated; the

images within the two advertisements and their overall format remained exactly the same to eliminate any other possible confounds.

After looking over each advertisement, the dependent variable of overall persuasion to the advertisement was measured by a questionnaire adapted from Kees, Burton and Tangari study in 2010. *(See Appendix C)* The questionnaire measures participants' personal reaction towards the advertisement on fourteen items such as "Negative/Positive" and "Not at all convincing/Very convincing," as well as questions designed to measure the behavioral intent of the participant such as "How likely is it that this ad will help people make better consumer purchases? How helpful was the information presented for making up your mind about potentially purchasing this product should the opportunity ever arise?" The scores to the questions were then averaged together (Kees, Burton & Tangari, 2010).

After the participant was finished evaluating the three advertisements, each participant was given a packet that contained general questionnaires. Although the participants filled out a series of questionnaires, the only scale of interest for the current study was the Self-Monitoring Scale, entitled Personal Reaction Inventory. *(See Appendix D)* The Self-Monitoring Scale used was from Snyder and Gangestad 1988 study. Self-Monitoring was measured on 18 True or False questions such as "I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people" and "I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information."

Results

A Cronbach's Alpha was computed for the fourteen items of the advertisement evaluation for all participants and there was high internal consistency across the items,

alpha = 0.91. Given this, an overall evaluation score was created by collapsing all items into single average. A 2(Self Monitoring: High vs. Low) x 2(Regulatory Focus: Prevention vs. Promotion) factorial analysis of variance tested the effects of self-monitoring and message framing on overall advertisement evaluation. Results indicated there was not a significant main effect for self-monitoring, $F(1, 72) = .095, p = .759$. The average advertisement evaluation score did not differ significantly for high self-monitors ($M = 4.207, SD = .905$) and low self-monitors ($M = 4.253, SD = .856$). There was also not a significant main effect of advertisement presented, $F(1, 72) = .215, p = .644$. The average advertisement evaluation score did not differ significantly for the promotion-framed advertisement ($M = 4.236, SD = .941$) and the prevention framed advertisement ($M = 4.233, SD = .801$).

There was a significant interaction between the two factors, $F(1, 72) = 4.280, p < .05$, indicating that advertisement evaluation was not the same for high and low self-monitors. For high self-monitors, overall advertisement evaluation was greater for those who were shown the promotion-focused advertisement ($M = 4.447, SD = .956$) than for those who were shown the prevention-focused advertisement ($M = 3.935, SD = .788$). An independent-samples t-test, however, revealed that there was not a significant difference between the two means $t(72) = 1.62, p > .1$. For low self-monitors, overall advertisement evaluation was greater for those who were shown the prevention-focused advertisement ($M = 4.415, SD = .769$) than for those who were shown the promotion-focused advertisement ($M = 4.090, SD = .924$). An independent-samples t-test revealed, however, that there was not a significant difference between the two means $t(72) = 1.27, p > .1$.
(Figure 1)

Discussion

Advertising is more than just visually appealing to consumers, just as consumers are more than robots with systematic actions. People are complex with individual differences and personality constructs. People have different needs, wants and desires that accompany personal, social, and economic goals that are fitting for their lifestyle and personality. In addition to having different goals, each individual has a certain way of approaching goals to ensure a positive outcome; all of these are effected by their individual differences. These factors must be considered in addition to situation variables when studying advertising approaches such as prevention and promotion-focus. Advertisement approaches may be influential, however they are significantly less effective if one does not know who is influenced by them and why.

High and low self-monitors each have their own goals as to how they portray themselves to others in social situations. High self-monitors want their behavior to be seen as socially acceptable for a certain situation therefore they are drawn to the products that promise luxury or physical appeal. Low self-monitors, on the other hand, want to maintain their congruence between what they believe and how they act in a situation, therefore they are drawn to products that promise quality and utility (DeBono & Rubin, 1995; DeBono, Leavitt & Backus, 2003). Prevention and promotion-focus research has looked at when certain approaches are affective and why, but extremely little research has address the question of who is effected. The way a message is worded or framed should take into consideration not only the use a product fulfills or the goals a person has for using a product, but who the message is addressing and how they hope to reach that goal.

The current study found significant results that supported the initial hypothesis. When asked to evaluate an advertisement that was either framed in a promotion focused or a prevention focused manner, high self-monitors evaluated promotion framed advertisements more positively than prevention framed advertisements, and low self-monitors evaluated prevention framed advertisements more positively than promotion framed advertisements.

These results indicate that just as high and low self-monitors conduct themselves differently in various social situations or interactions, high and low self-monitors may also have different goals and ways of attaining those goals, also known as goal orientations. Low self-monitors have been described as principle beings that try to maintain a congruence between their values and their actions, even when selecting or purchasing products. This information, combined with the results of the study could suggest that low self-monitors attempt to maintain their congruence, their goal and thus a positive outcome, by avoiding losses and approaching non-losses using vigilant means. The prevention-framed advertisement used the headline “Avoid Discoloration That Ruins Your Smile!” By avoiding losses, in this example having discolored teeth, it allows low self-monitors to take preventative measures to make sure how they see themselves is not altered.

High self-monitors, on the other hand are much more likely to alter how they portray themselves and care more about their outward presentation to others. This information, combined with the results of the study could suggest that high self-monitors find it more appealing to approach gains and avoid nongains to ultimately reach a positive outcome through eager means. The promotion-framed advertisement used the

headline “Get the Whiter Teeth You Have Always Dreamed Of!” High self-monitors proactively change their behavior to suit the situation. Having whiter teeth is a goal in site they can easily reach; they don’t have to go around preventative measures to reach their desired outcome.

Although significant results were achieved, this study was not without limitations. Since self-monitoring is a personality variable it is not an independent variable that can be randomly assigned to the participants in the study. Therefore forty-eight of the participants were scored as low self-monitors on the Personal Reaction Inventory, where as only thirty of the participants were scored as high self-monitors. Although within the two self-monitoring categories there were an equal number of participants who were exposed to the promotion framed advertisement and the prevention framed advertisement, if this study were to be replicated, it would be of great interest to test a larger number of participants so that all four between subject groups could be equal to substantiate the findings.

An additional limitation to the study may have been the relatively small age range of the participants that was limited to college students ages eighteen to twenty-two. Research has shown that young adults may have especially strong promotion orientations, as opposed to prevention orientations, since young adults typically expect stronger gains and less decline, as well as reporting numerous self-improvement goals (Heckhausen, Dixon & Baltes, 1989). Therefore, the difference for the evaluation of the promotion-focused advertisement for high and low self-monitors may have been greater had a larger age range been used.

One final concern pertained to the wording on prevention advertisement. It was possible that teeth whitening could tap into the public sector of people's lives, where as cavity protection is more of private matter. This may have influenced high self-monitors to rate the promotion-focus advertisements more favorably and low self-monitors to rate the prevention-focused advertisement more positively based on the content of the advertisement, not necessarily the wording, contributing to the overall interaction.

Both self-monitoring and regulatory focus has conducted research in relation to product performance. Shavitt, Lowrey and Han found that for the social-identity product, high self-monitors explained their attitudes using more social terms and less utilitarian terms than low self-monitors (Shavitt, Lowrey & Han, 1992) and Chernev found that prevention-focused participants gave more weight to utilitarian and reliability related attributes, where as promotion-focus participants gave more weight to hedonic, attractive, and performance-related attributes (Chernev, 2004). Therefore, potential future research could run a similar study where utilitarian and social-identity products were used in the prevention and promotion framed advertisements to see if product type also plays a role in the interaction between self-monitoring and message framing on overall advertisement evaluation.

The link between self-monitoring and regulatory focus has the potential to bring about new studies focused primarily on consumer psychology and advertising. Numerous studies can be created linking the bridge between successful advertisements for high and low self-monitors and prevention and promotion focused advertisements. For example, future research could look at whether or not central route processing will add more strength to a prevention focused advertisement, or allow it to be more easily processed,

and whether or not peripheral route processing will add more strength to a promotion focused advertisement, or allow it to be more easily processed. Ultimately, the combination of looking at various personality variables and their interaction with various advertisement appeals allow for a great amount of growth in the field of consumer psychology research.

References

- Chernev, A. (2004). Goal-attribute compatibility in consumer choice. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 14, 141–150.
- DeBono, K. G. (1987). Investigating the social-adjustive and value-expressive functions of attitudes: Implications for persuasion processes. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 52, 279-287.
- DeBono, K. G. (2006). Self-monitoring and consumer psychology. *Journal Of Personality*, 74, 715-737.
- DeBono, K. G., Leavitt, A., & Backus, J. (2003). Product packaging and product evaluation: An individual difference approach. *Journal Of Applied Social Psychology*, 33, 513-521.
- DeBono, K. G., & Packer, M. (1991). The effects of advertising appeal on perceptions of product quality. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17, 194-200.
- DeBono, K. G. & Telesca, C. (1990). The influence of source physical attractiveness on advertising effectiveness: An individual perspective. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 20, 1383-1395.

- DeBono, K.G. & Rubin, K. (1995). Country of origin and perceptions of product quality: An individual difference. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17, 139-247.
- Haugtvedt, C. P., Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1992). Need for cognition and advertising: Understanding the role of personality variables in consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 1, 239-260.
- Heckhausen, J., Dixon, R. A., & Baltes, P. B. (1989). Gains and losses in development throughout adulthood as perceived by different adult age groups. *Developmental Psychology*, 25, 109-121.
- Higgins, E. T., Friedman, R. S., Harlow, R. E., Idson, L. C., Ayduk, O. N., Taylor, A. (2001). Achievement orientations from subjective histories of success: Promotion pride versus prevention pride. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 3-23.
- Kees, J., Burton, S., & Tangari, A. (2010). The impact of regulatory focus, temporal orientation, and fit on consumer responses to health-related advertising. *Journal Of Advertising*, 39, 19-34.
- Lee, A. Y., & Aaker, J. L. (2004) Bringing the frame into focus: The influence of regulatory fit on processing fluency and persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 205-218.

- Lee, A. Y., Keller, P., & Sternthal, B. (2010). Value from regulatory construal fit: The persuasive impact of fit between consumer goals and message concreteness. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36, 735-747.
- Lee, A. Y., & Higgins, T. E. (2009). The persuasive power of regulatory fit. In M. Wänke (Ed.), *Social psychology of consumer behavior* (pp. 319-333). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Micu, C., & Chowdhury, T. G. (2010). The effect of ageing and time horizon perspective on consumers' response to promotion versus prevention focus advertisements. *International Journal Of Advertising: The Quarterly Review Of Marketing Communications*, 29, 621-642.
- Shavitt, S., Lowrey, T. M., & Han, S. (1992). Attitude functions in advertising: The interactive role of products and self-monitoring. *Journal Of Consumer Psychology*, 1, 337-364.
- Snyder, M., & DeBono, K. G. (1985). Appeals to image and claims about quality: Understanding the psychology of advertising. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 49, 586-597.
- Snyder, Mark, and Steve Gangestad. (1986). "On the Nature of Self-monitoring: Matters of assessment, matters of validity." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 125-139.

Appendix A

*Get the
Whiter
Teeth You
Have Always
Dreamed Of!*



BOOMERANG
Advanced Toothpaste PLUS whitener

Choose Boomerang Plus Whitener toothpaste and get the whiter, brighter smile you've always wanted. Get the best results while choosing what's best for your teeth, and for your smile!

Add Boomerang Advanced Toothpaste PLUS whitener to your oral care routine today!

**Boomerang PLUS
Whitener Toothpaste
is the choice you
want to make!**

New Boomerang Plus Whitener brings whitening toothpaste to a whole new level. Micro-cleansing whiteners coat your teeth to gently polish them for a smooth, bright smile. The unique foaming-action formula carries whitening agents that surround teeth.



This product has been approved by the American Dental Association.

Appendix B



*Avoid
Discoloration
That Ruins
Your Smile!*

BOOMERANG
Advanced Toothpaste PLUS whitener

BOOMERANG PLUS WHITENER
ADVANCED TOOTHPASTE

Don't let yellow teeth
stand in your way of a
healthy looking smile.

Avoid cavities and
bacteria that are ruining
the integrity of your
teeth and protect
against new stains from
tarnishing your teeth!

Tooth decay and discoloration
could be happening to you!

**Don't Miss Out on a
Healthy Smile From
Boomerang PLUS
Whitener!**

New Boomerang Plus
Whitener brings stain fighting
to a whole new level. Micro-
cleansing whiteners coat your
teeth to loosen surface stains
and prevent future stains
from forming. The unique
foaming-action formula
carries cavity-fighting agents
to surround teeth.



This product has been approved by the American Dental Association.

Appendix C

DIRECTIONS: The statements below concern your personal reactions towards the advertisement that you just looked at. Consider each statement carefully before answering. For each 7-point scale, circle the appropriate number in regards to your opinion of the advertisement.

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2 Disagree
- 3 Disagree somewhat
- 4 Undecided
- 5 Agree somewhat
- 6 Agree
- 7 Strongly agree

Negative
Positive

1	2	3	4	5	6
7					

Unfavorable
Favorable

1	2	3	4	5	6
7					

Bad
Good

1	2	3	4	5	6
7					

Not at all convincing
convincing

Very

1	2	3	4	5	6
7					

Not at all effective
effective

Very

1	2	3	4	5	6
7					

Not informative
informative

Very

1	2	3	4	5	6
7					

Not interesting interesting					Very
1	2	3	4	5	6
7					
Not at all impactful impactful					Very
1	2	3	4	5	6
7					
Not useful to me me					Very useful to
1	2	3	4	5	6
7					

How likely is it that this ad will help people make better consumer purchases?

Not at all likely
likely

Very

1 2 3 4 5 6
7

Definitely will not
will

Definitely

1 2 3 4 5 6
7

No chance
happen

Certain to

1 2 3 4 5 6
7

How helpful was the information presented for making up your mind about potentially purchasing this product should the opportunity ever arise?

Not helpful to me
me

Very helpful to

1 2 3 4 5 6
7

Not useful to me
me

Very useful to

1 2 3 4 5 6
7

Appendix D

Personal Reaction Inventory

Directions: The statements below concern your personal reactions to a number of different situations. No two statements are exactly alike, so consider each statement carefully before answering. If a statement is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you, fill in the T, and if the statement is FALSE or MOSTLY FALSE as applied to you, fill in the F, (e.g. (T) (F))

(T) (F) 1. I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people.

(T) (F) 2. At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things others will like.

(T) (F) 3. I can only argue for ideas that I already believe.

(T) (F) 4. I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information.

(T) (F) 5. I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain others.

(T) (F) 6. I would probably make a good actor or actress.

(T) (F) 7. In a group of people, I am rarely the center of attention.

(T) (F) 8. In different situations and with different people, I often act like very different persons.

(T) (F) 9. I am not particularly good at making other people like me.

(T) (F) 10. I'm not always the person I appear to be.

(T) (F) 11. I would not change my opinion (or the way I do things) in order to please someone or
win their favor.

(T) (F) 12. I have considered being an entertainer.

(T) (F) 13. I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting.

(T) (F) 14. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.

(T) (F) 15. At a party, I let others keep the jokes and stories going.

(T) (F) 16. I feel a bit awkward in public and do not show up quite as well as I should.

(T) (F) 17. I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for a right end).

(T) (F) 18. I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them.

Figure 1: An interaction occurred in that high self-monitor participants evaluated the promotion-framed advertisement significantly more favorably than the prevention focused advertisement where the opposite was true for low self-monitor participants.

