

An examination of free elicitation and response scale measures of feelings and judgments evoked by television advertisements

By: [James S. Boles](#) and Scot Burton

James S. Boles and Scot Burton, "An Examination of free Elicitation and Response Scale Measures of Feelings and Judgments Evoked by Television Advertisements," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 20 (no. 3, Summer 1992), 225-235.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02723409>

This version of the article has been accepted for publication, after peer review (when applicable) and is subject to Springer Nature's [AM terms of use](#), but is not the Version of Record and does not reflect post-acceptance improvements, or any corrections. The Version of Record is available online at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02723409>.

Abstract:

Recent research has examined the role of feelings and judgments evoked by television advertisements through the use of large batteries of rating scales. In this study, free elicitations of feelings and judgments about ads are compared to scale responses. Some potential problems pertaining to the use of large batteries of items to measure feelings and judgments are illustrated, and complementary aspects of the two measurement approaches suggest some advantages of the concurrent use of both in gauging responses to ads. Results across both approaches confirm the importance of assessing feelings in models of the antecedents of attitude toward the ad and suggest that feelings explain about as much variance in Aad as do judgments.

Keywords: advertisements | feelings | judgments | Aad

Article:

There has been much recent interest in the effects of feelings generated by advertisements on consumers' evaluations of ads (Burke and Edell 1989; Holbrook and Batra 1987). The traditional approach to the evaluation of ads has been cognitively oriented where consumers' perceptions and judgments about an ad appear of greater concern than the array of feelings that an ad may evoke. This approach appears too limited for some current advertisements that seem to focus almost entirely on generating feelings without attempting to communicate or demonstrate the differential advantage offered by the advertised brand.

Empirical research on the roles of feelings and judgments has produced interesting results that have important implications for advertisers. Findings indicate that both judgments and feelings impact attitude toward the ad and brand and that feelings explain variance in Aad, beliefs about the brand, and attitude toward the brand beyond that explained by ad judgments (Edell and Burke 1987). Feelings also have an effect on low transformational ads (that presumably do not attempt to evoke strong feelings). It has been suggested that if "an ad gets processed, it will elicit feelings" (Edell and Burke 1987, p. 428). These results strongly argue for the inclusion of

measures of both feelings and judgments evoked by ads in attempts to understand ad effectiveness.

Recent empirical studies examining feelings and judgments have measured the constructs of interest by presenting large lists of feeling and judgment descriptors to respondents and asking them to assess the degree to which these words describe the feelings and judgments evoked by the ad. The presentation of long lists of feelings and judgments to respondents may result in overestimating the number of ad reactions reported. Literature on survey research methods supports this view. This literature contends that information presented within a question, as well as in previous questions, provides a context about the survey and researcher expectations that can affect responses (e.g., Schwarz 1990, p. 108). For instance, in an empirical investigation of open and closed-ended questions, Schwarz et al. (1985, p. 394) concluded that "response categories provided in a closed answer format inform the respondent about the researcher's knowledge of or expectations about the real world" and "information (from response categories) affects respondents' behavioral reports as well as related judgments." When presented with an inventory of more than 50 items concerning feelings, respondents may infer that the researcher anticipates that the ad will elicit a number of different feelings. Similar arguments apply to judgment inventories.

Such biases could potentially impact the estimated effects of feelings on dependent variables such as attitudes toward the ad and brand. Noting such *potential* problems Edell and Burke (1987, p. 424) state, "although any scale of this type may induce more responses than a free elicitation procedure, we believe that the responses obtained here were not systematically biased because a large number of items was included in the inventory."

One objective of this study is to address this assumption by comparing free elicitations pertaining both to feelings and judgments about ads to those obtained from response scales. No such comparison has been reported for feelings elicited from advertisements and, as noted by Lutz (1985), only a few studies (cf. Lastovicka 1983; Alwitt 1983) have directly compared the two approaches for judgments to ads. Lastovicka examined dimensions labeled as Personal Relevance, Entertainment, and Confusion. Although the across-method correlations were not high for all three dimensions, his results provide "at least partial support for the notion that the two approaches are tapping the same cognitive domain(s)" (Lutz 1985, p. 52).

Thus, no previous study has employed both free elicitation and multi-item scale approaches for ad-evoked judgments and feelings, although such a comparison suggests several contributions. For example, the number of unaided free elicitation responses for each of the respective feelings and judgments provides information pertaining to whether there is a potential bias in results associated with the large number of items presented in an (aided) multi-item scaling procedure. It also allows the researcher to determine whether there sometimes may be feelings or judgments evoked by ads that are overlooked by response scale procedures. Similarly, it permits assessment of whether free elicitation procedures can provide other information useful to advertisers that is not provided through the response scaling approach.

Free elicitation and scale measures of feelings and judgments also permit an examination of how results from these two approaches perform in tests pertaining to an important consequence,

attitude toward the ad. Lutz's model of cognitive and affective antecedents of Aad is used as a basis for this test. In this model, Lutz proposed five first-order determinants of Aad—ad credibility, ad judgments (or ad perceptions), attitude toward the advertiser, attitude toward advertising, and mood. Ad-evoked feelings are not explicitly specified in Lutz's model. We were interested in how the different measures of feelings could be used in a test of this proposed model and whether feelings explain variance in Aad beyond that of the other antecedents specified by Lutz. In addition, we explore the relative effects of various feeling and judgment dimensions on Aad and the overall effect of ad-evoked feelings versus ad-evoked judgments. Therefore, results across alternative methodologies can augment findings reported by Edell and Burke (1987) and Burke and Edell (1989), who measured judgments and feelings but did not have measures of other Aad antecedents proposed by Lutz, as well as add to findings of recent tests of Lutz's model (MacKenzie and Lutz 1989) that do not explicitly examine the role of feelings.

METHOD

Study Procedures and Stimuli

Subjects responded to a four-item mood scale before viewing one of the two test stimuli. Following exposure to the ad, subjects completed a survey containing a variety of questions pertaining to the test stimuli. The open-ended questions concerning feelings and judgments were placed first in the questionnaire, and were answered immediately after viewing the ad. One-half of the respondents answered a free elicitation question concerning their feelings first, while the other half first answered a free elicitation question pertaining to more cognitively oriented thoughts and judgments about the ad. The order of presentation had no significant effect on responses. Instructions pertaining to feelings evoked by the ad were as follows:

In the space below, please list how the ad you saw made you feel. Here, we are not interested in what the ad made you think about or how you would describe the ad, but the **feelings** you had while watching the ad. Please list any and all feelings that you felt while watching this commercial. There are no right or wrong answers. Again, list all feelings that you felt *during* the time you were looking at the advertisement.

The instructions used to measure the thoughts, reactions, and judgments occurring during the ad were based on the free elicitation cognitive response procedures used in previous research (MacKenzie, Lutz, and Belch 1986). They were as follows:

In the space provided below, please list all the thoughts, reactions and ideas that went through your mind while you were looking at the advertisement. Please write down any thoughts, no matter how simple, complex, relevant, or irrelevant they may seem to you. Write down everything that you thought of, regardless of whether it pertained to the product, the advertisement, or anything else. There are no right or wrong answers. Remember, list all thoughts that occurred to you *during* the time you were looking at the advertisement.

After completing these questions, subjects answered seven-point scale items from the feeling and judgment inventories developed by Edell and Burke (1987). These structured feeling and judgment scales also were rotated across subjects, but again there was no order of presentation effect. After responding to the feeling and judgment items, subjects answered scale items assessing ad credibility, general attitude toward advertising, attitude toward the ad, and demographic questions.

The two test stimuli used in the study were professionally produced television ads featuring small retail chain stores located more than 400 miles away from the study site. Pretest results indicated the outlets were unfamiliar to consumers in the area where the study was conducted. Poststudy debriefing confirmed that respondents had no previous knowledge of the stores and were not familiar with the ad stimuli.

Contrasting approaches were used in the commercials. One ad was assessed by two judges as having a primarily affective focus, whereas the second ad employed a less affective appeal. These perceived differences were supported by pretest scores on the transformational scale proposed by Puto and Wells (1984). Across the two ads, this scale had an α of .87. The mean transformational scale scores were 54.8 for the more affective ad and 30.4 for the ad employing a less affective appeal ($t = 8.5, p < .001$).

Coding and Reliability of Free Elicitation Measures

Categorization of written responses was carried out by two judges working independently. Rules for coding free elicitation responses were determined prior to beginning the coding process and guided the placement of subject responses into categories. Responses were assigned to one of six categories corresponding to the feeling and judgment scales developed by Edell and Burke (1987). Responses not fitting in any category were coded as "other" feelings or judgments. Examples of items that did not appear to fit any category included verbatim responses such as "cool," "southern," and "simple ad." In a few cases antonyms of items in the Edell and Burke scales were coded into categories with a negative sign. For example, the comment "not interesting" was viewed as an antonym of the evaluation item "interesting," and "no information" was coded as an antonym of "informative." Across all free elicitation, interrater reliability was .89 for judgment responses and .91 for the feeling statements.

Conflicts resulting from different coding categorizations were analyzed and resolved, either through discussion or by an independent source. Once categorization was complete, absolute and net totals were computed for each respondent for the six categories. Absolute scores were computed because of our interest in the total number of responses provided. A net score was calculated for use in models explaining the variance in Aad. Similar to procedures used elsewhere, the net score was computed by subtracting negative-coded responses from positive responses (MacKenzie and Lutz 1989).

Other Measures

The three feeling scales consisted of items measuring "upbeat," "negative," and "warm" feelings (Edell and Burke 1987). While the reliabilities were acceptable, they were slightly lower than

those reported in previous research. Here, the α 's for the upbeat, negative, and warm scales were .96, .83, and .81, respectively. The judgment scales employed by Edell and Burke were based largely on the Reaction Profile (Wells, Leavitt, and McConville 1971). In this study, α 's for the evaluation, activity, and gentleness scales were .92, .93, and .90, respectively.

Other Aad antecedent variables of interest included ad credibility, attitude toward advertising, and mood. Summated scales were used to measure these constructs. Ad credibility was measured using four bipolar seven-point scale items (MacKenzie and Lutz 1989). Coefficient alpha was .80. The three item attitude-toward-advertising measure referred specifically to subjects' opinions about advertising in general and not to the specific ad stimuli; α for this scale was .96. Mood was assessed via the four agree/disagree statements proposed by Peterson and Sauber (1983). Alpha was .84. The measure of attitude toward the ad consisted of four items used by Holbrook and Batra (1987). Coefficient alpha was .91.

Subjects

Subjects used in the study were undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory marketing course. Sample sizes were 104 and 109 for the low and high transformational ads, respectively. Fifty-seven percent of the sample viewing the low transformational ad were male, and 54 percent of the high transformational ad sample were male.

RESULTS

The number of feeling and judgment responses reported for the free elicitation questions are shown in Table 1. For the high transformation ad type, respondents reported an average of 6.5 free elicitation responses (i.e., 3.6 judgment and 2.9 feeling responses). Respondents offered 5.7 total responses for the low transformation ad. The total number of responses ranged from 3 to 14 for the high transformation ad condition and from 2 to 11 for the low transformation ad. Free elicitation procedures resulted in far fewer judgment and feeling responses than the alternative response scale methodology, where respondents answered a large number of items pertaining to feelings and judgments.

Results for the two methodologies offer one relatively weak test of whether the presentation of scales consisting of many items affects respondents' reports of feelings and judgments. To further examine this question, a second set of data ($n = 40$) was collected. In contrast to the previous procedure where free elicitation responses were provided *prior* to the scaled items, in this administration respondents viewed the ad and then answered the judgment and feeling scales *before* supplying free elicitation responses. When free elicitation followed the scaled items, respondents provided more responses across both high (9.2) and low transformation ads (8.4). Both means were significantly greater ($p < .001$) than the number of free elicitation responses provided when free elicitation questions preceded the scaled questions (means = 6.5 and 5.7 for the high and low transformation ads in the original administration). These significant differences extended to both feeling and judgment elicitation and provide support for the contention that use of a large number of scale items can upwardly bias reports pertaining to ad judgments and feelings.

Table 1. Feeling and Judgment Responses to Free Elicitation Procedure

Ad Type	Mean Absolute Number of Responses	Standard Deviation	Range of Responses
High Transformation Advertisement			
<i>Feelings</i>			
Upbeat	1.66	1.43	0 to 6
Negative	0.93	1.22	0 to 5
Warm	0.33	0.62	0 to 2
Other	0.01	0.10	0 to 1
Total Feelings	2.93	1.43	0 to 9
<i>Judgments</i>			
Evaluation	2.05	1.36	0 to 7
Activity	0.84	0.95	0 to 4
Gentle	0.42	0.64	0 to 3
Other	0.27	0.64	0 to 3
Total Judgments	3.58	1.58	1 to 7
Total Feeling and Judgment Responses	6.51	2.37	3 to 14
Low Transformation Advertisement			
<i>Feelings</i>			
Upbeat	0.45	0.90	0 to 4
Negative	1.74	1.51	0 to 7
Warm	0.02	0.14	0 to 1
Other	0.03	0.17	0 to 1
Total Feelings	2.24	1.14	0 to 7
<i>Judgments</i>			
Evaluation	2.87	1.84	0 to 6
Activity	0.10	0.37	0 to 2
Gentle	0.03	0.22	0 to 2
Other	0.48	0.81	0 to 4
Total Judgments	3.48	1.29	1 to 7
Total Feeling and Judgment Responses	5.72	1.85	2 to 11

Perhaps because of the large number of items comprising the feeling scales and the thorough pretesting procedures employed in scale development (cf. Edell and Burke 1987), only about 1 percent of the feeling responses from the main study could not be classified into the Edell and Burke typology. The judgments did not fare quite as well, however, with about one out of nine responses judged not to fit into the judgment scale categories. These results suggest that despite the fairly large number of judgment responses, some judgments at times may be excluded for some ads, but for these ads, the feeling scales did an excellent job of capturing reported feelings.

Free Elicitation and Response Scale Results

Free elicitation and response scale means are shown in Table 2. Correlations between the free elicitations and response scales for each of the feeling and judgment dimensions are, for the most part, positive and significant.¹ For feeling responses in both ads, all correlations exceeded .30 (p

¹ For analyses reported in Tables 2 and 3 free elicitation responses have been coded as positive or negative to reflect directionality. Negative responses were subtracted from positive responses to create a net score for each of the dimensions (MacKenzie, Lutz, and Belch 1986).

< .001), with the exception of the warm dimension in the low transformation ad. The nonsignificant correlation ($r = -.08$) for the warm dimension is not surprising because only 2 out of 104 subjects offered free elicitation responses falling in this category. Thus, the near zero variance for this free elicitation measure ($s^2 = 0.019$) suggests that if there is at least some variation in the scale measure, the between-measure correlation should be very low. Given that there was some degree of variation in the scale measure (mean = 2.27, $s^2 = 0.64$), the correlation should be near zero. Such results illustrate the potential for problems associated with "forcing" respondents to respond to scales pertaining to feelings not strongly elicited by an ad.

Table 2. Means and Correlations for Free Elicitation and Response Scale Methodologies

	High Transformation Ad			Low Transformation Ad		
	Free Elicitations ^a	Response Scales	<i>r</i>	Free Elicitations ^a	Response Scales	<i>r</i>
<i>Feelings</i>						
Upbeat	1.66	3.68	.57 ^b	0.45	2.57	.47 ^b
Negative	0.87	2.50	.56 ^b	1.70	3.40	.35 ^b
Warm	0.33	3.29	.32 ^b	.00	2.24	-.08
<i>Judgments</i>						
Evaluation	-1.05	3.14	.34 ^b	-2.32	3.46	.20 ^d
Activity	0.33	3.44	.31 ^b	0.07	2.43	.19 ^d
Gentle	0.36	3.27	.22 ^d	0.03	1.27	-.06

^aThe free elicitation are a net measure where negative judgment and feeling responses within a given dimension were subtracted from the positive judgment and feeling responses.

^b $p < .001$.

^c $p < .01$.

^d $p < .05$.

While correlations between the free elicitation and response scale measures for judgments suggest that the two different methodologies generally tap into the same underlying constructs, the correlations were not as high as for the feeling measures. Problems similar to the one described above were encountered for the only nonsignificant between-method correlation, the gentle dimension for the low transformation ad type. Again, there were very few free elicitation responses that fell into this category (mean = 0.03, $s^2 = 0.05$). Although the scale results appeared more consistent with free elicitation findings (mean = 1.27, $s^2 = 0.36$), the correlation between the measures remained quite low ($r = -.06$) due to the small degree of variance.

Incremental Effect of Feelings on Attitude Toward the Ad

These two alternative measures next were used to test the role of feelings in a model of the antecedents of Aad. Specifically, we wanted to assess (1) whether the different measures of feelings could explain variation in Aad beyond that explained by the first-order antecedents proposed by Lutz (1985), and (2) the relative effects of judgments and feelings on Aad.

To address this first objective, hierarchical regression analyses were performed for each ad with both the free elicitation and response scale measures (See Table 3). In the first step, three antecedent variables were entered—(overall) attitude toward advertising, mood, and ad credibility. In step two, ad judgments were entered to assess whether additional variance could be explained using each of the two alternative measurement techniques. Feelings were entered in

the final step to assess whether they could explain Aad variance beyond that explained by the first order antecedents proposed by Lutz.

Table 3. Judgments and Feelings as First-Order Antecedents of Aad

Dependent Variable = Attitude Toward the Ad						
Step/Indep. Variables	Model F	d.f.	P Value	Model R²	R² Change	Signif. Of Change
Low Transformational Ad: Response Scales						
<i>Step 1</i>						
Attitudes toward Advertising, Mood, Credibility	22.6	(3,103)	.001	.397	—	—
<i>Step 2</i>						
Ad Judgments	22.3	(6,100)	.001	.572	.175	<.001
<i>Step 3</i>						
Feelings	22.1	(9,97)	.001	.672	.100	<.001
Low Transformational Ad: Free Elicitation Measures						
<i>Step 1</i>						
Attitudes toward Advertising, Mood, Credibility	22.6	(3,103)	.001	.397	—	—
<i>Step 2</i>						
Ad Judgments	14.2	(6,100)	.001	.460	.063	<.025
<i>Step 3</i>						
Feelings	14.9	(9,97)	.001	.581	.121	<.001
High Transformational Ad: Response Scales						
<i>Step 1</i>						
Attitudes toward Advertising, Mood, Credibility	26.5	(3,103)	.001	.435	—	—
<i>Step 2</i>						
Ad Judgments	20.9	(6,100)	.001	.556	.121	<.001
<i>Step 3</i>						
Feelings	20.3	(9,97)	.001	.654	.097	<.001
High Transformational Ad: Free Elicitation Measures						
<i>Step 1</i>						
Attitudes toward Advertising, Mood, Credibility	26.5	(3,103)	.001	.435	—	—
<i>Step 2</i>						
Ad Judgments	22.1	(6,100)	.001	.570	.135	<.001
<i>Step 3</i>						
Feelings	17.8	(9,97)	.001	.622	.052	<.01

Across both ad types, response scale and free elicitation measures of ad judgments (i.e., Step 2 in Table 3) explained a significant amount of residual variance in Aad. Similarly, in Step 3 feelings explained additional variance regardless of the method of measurement. While the regression models employing free elicitation measures of judgments and feelings explained well over 50 percent of the variance in Aad for both ad types ($R^2 = .581$ and $.622$, respectively), the variance explained was greater for the models using the response scale measures ($R^2 = .672$ and $.654$). This slightly stronger performance for the response scale measures may be expected since the explained variance for these models should benefit from greater common methods variance.

Exploring the Relative Importance of Feelings and Judgments

Although the relative contribution of individual judgment and feeling dimensions are of interest, high correlations between some of the scaled independent variables raised concerns about collinearity and highly unstable beta weights. To assess concerns about collinearity, each scaled predictor was used as a dependent variable and the other scaled predictors were entered as independent variables. Multiple correlations exceeded .90 for two of the dependent variables and .80 for three others. Given these results, findings reported in Table 3 represent a conservative test pertaining to additional variance explained at each step and suggest no attempt should be made to interpret individual beta coefficients.

An important question ignored by the hierarchical analysis concerns the relative importance of feeling dimensions versus judgment dimensions in explaining Aad. A referee suggested that a factor analysis with an orthogonal rotation would result in zero correlation between the feeling and judgment dimensions, and the uncorrelated factor scores could be used as independent variables in a regression analysis, thus reducing concerns about collinearity.

Given there were similar correlations for high and low transformation ads, the data from the ads were pooled for this exploratory analysis. A factor analysis with a varimax rotation was performed on all judgment and feeling scale items. Based on Burke and Edell's work the number of factors extracted was set at six (i.e., three feelings and three judgment factors). While the results reproduced five of the six factors fairly well, two problems arose. Negatively worded items from the evaluation dimension did not load highly on that factor, and items from the warm dimension did not load on a separate factor but tended to load on the upbeat dimension. The analysis was rerun with the number of factors set to five after eliminating negatively worded items on the evaluation factor and the items pertaining to the warm dimension. The resulting five factors explained 59 percent of the variance in the original data. Average loadings for the negative and upbeat factors were .56 and .65, respectively. Average loadings for the judgment factors of evaluation, activity, and gentle were .62, .47, and .75, respectively.² The judgment and feeling factor scores were entered as predictors of Aad along with credibility, attitude toward advertising, and mood scales (See Table 4). The beta coefficients show that evaluation and upbeat were strong predictors of Aad, followed by negative and gentle.³

To examine the overall contribution of feelings relative to judgments, a regression on Aad was performed in which uncorrelated feeling and judgment factor scores were entered as the sole predictors. The adjusted R^2 associated with the feeling predictors was .34, and the adjusted R^2 for the judgment predictors was .36. Thus, the uncorrelated feelings and judgments were able to explain approximately equal amounts of variance in Aad, and the feeling and judgment factors together explained over 70 percent of the Aad variance.

² We also examined results when a subsequent factor analysis was performed only on items with loadings exceeding .50 on their respective factors, and factor scores from this analysis were used as the independent variables in subsequent regressions. Regression results were virtually identical to those shown in Table 4.

³ Regression results using the free elicitation responses as independent variables also indicated that the upbeat and evaluation dimensions were the strongest feeling and judgment predictors of Aad.

Table 4. Regression Results Using Judgment and Feeling Factor Scores as Predictors of Attitude Toward the Ad

Independent Variables	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	Beta	T-Value	<i>p</i>
Judgments					
Evaluation	2.61	.311	.403	8.4	<.001
Gentle	2.03	.242	.315	8.4	<.001
Activity	0.73	.244	.113	3.0	<.01
Feelings					
Upbeat	2.54	.250	.394	10.2	<.001
Negative	-2.23	.268	-.346	-8.3	<.001
Credibility	0.25	.076	.168	3.3	<.01
Mood	0.14	.194	.023	0.7	n.s.
Attitude Toward Advertising	-0.02	.057	-.013	-0.4	n.s.
Constant	9.16	1.525	—	6.0	<.001

Model $F = 65.7$, $df = (8,197)$, $p < .001$, adjusted $r^2 = .72$.

DISCUSSION

Results of this study provide further support for the importance of feelings evoked by ads in assessing consumers' attitudes toward the ad. Results offer some general support for the feeling scales of Edell and Burke (1987) while also illustrating some advantages of using free elicitation measures to complement scale responses concerning judgments and feelings. Specifically, results demonstrate the potential for overestimating judgments and feelings evoked by ads when using a large battery of scale items. Results suggest that with a rating scale approach it is possible to evoke feeling or judgment responses when free elicitation procedures suggest the feeling/judgment is weak or nonexistent. For example, in response to warm feeling scale items for the low transformation ad, respondents had a mean of 2.24 with a standard deviation of .80. Although this mean is not high, it suggests that the ad evoked a greater level of warm feelings than indicated by free elicitation procedures where only 2 out of 104 subjects provided any response perceived by the judges as pertaining to warmth. Also, when free elicitation questions followed the scale questions, a significantly larger number of judgment and feeling elicitation responses were offered than when these questions preceded the scale measures. Thus, there remains some concern about the validity of the measure and that such overreporting could impact interpretations of the effects of such variables.

When there was a reasonable level of variance in the free elicitation measures, there were modest (i.e., around .20) to reasonably strong (i.e., .57) correlations between the open-ended and response scale feeling and judgment measures. These across-method correlations are similar to those obtained by Lastovicka (1983). Although it can be argued that the correlations across the two approaches in our study are not as high as would be desired, the results offer some evidence that the two tap into the same underlying constructs.

Free elicitation results suggest that for some ads rating scales may not always capture all potential feelings and judgments resulting from ad exposure. For the ads examined in this study, about one out of nine judgment responses could not be classified into the judgment categories. Thus, free elicitation procedures may capture some important ad reactions that would not be

assessed even by response scales comprised of a very large number of items. Furthermore, while response scales may provide information about the intensity of feelings or judgments, they may be of less direct use to copy writers and creative ad designers than verbatim responses. Free elicitation advantages, however, should be weighed against their limitations. Relative to rating scales, free elicitations are both time-consuming and costly. They also are affected by the variance in respondents' ability to express themselves either orally or in writing.

Results across both rating scale and free elicitation measures of feelings used in regression analyses of the antecedents of Aad support the contention of Burke and Edell (1989) that "... affective responses to ads, specifically feelings responses, are important advertising effects and should be included in models of advertising effects" (p. 79). In this study, feelings and judgments explained near equal levels of variance in Aad when factor scores associated with an orthogonal rotation were used as independent predictors.

Although researchers might anticipate some level of correlation between feelings and judgments, the correlation between some feeling and judgment scales was surprising. For example, the average correlation between upbeat (i.e., a feeling) and activity (i.e., a judgment) was .72, and for warm and gentle the average r was .53. While these correlations may be a function of the ads tested here, the strong standardized parameter estimates pertaining to these relationships reported elsewhere (Burke and Edell 1989, p. 76) also suggest strong relationships. Interestingly, the correlations between judgment and feeling free elicitations were not as high, with none exceeding .40.

These strong correlations between judgment and feeling scales raise conceptual questions concerning how highly a feeling should correlate with a more cognitive judgment as well as important methodological concerns about the degree of impact of common method variance. Burke and Edell (1989) note that the distinction between feelings and cognitive judgments is important because while an individual may make the cognitive judgment that an ad has the characteristic of being amusing (and is thus judged amusing), the individual may not *feel* amused by the ad. Future research across a large number of ads featuring a wide range of executional and message appeals may reveal how well structured scales can capture this relatively fine distinction. Similarly, it is important for such research to address the issue of correlation between feelings and judgments and directly assess discriminant and convergent validity using a multitrait-multimethod approach across a large, representative pool of ads.

Limitations and Future Research

There are a number of limitations that restrict the generalizability of the results. Student subjects were used and responses were obtained in a classroom environment. While the sample and conditions are consistent with recent studies examining Aad antecedents (MacKenzie, Lutz, and Belch 1986), the number/types of feelings and judgments evoked by an ad probably will differ in naturalistic settings. Future studies employing multiple methods of examining ad judgments and feelings under more naturalistic conditions are of interest.

This research also employed only two ad stimuli that exhibited strong differences in transformational scores. Specific results concerning the number of free elicitation judgments and

feelings and the across-method correlations may not extend to other ads. However, other recent studies focusing on a model of Aad antecedents have used a single ad stimulus (cf. MacKenzie and Lutz 1989), and our purpose here was to demonstrate the potential for problems when using only scale measures and the often complementary nature of free elicitation and response scale methods. For example, our results show that (aided) scale measures may overrepresent estimates of feelings evoked by ads while not capturing all potential reactions resulting from ad exposure, as assessed by less structured methods. Thus, for some ads and conditions, this may raise questions pertaining to the convergent validity of measures.

Only television ads were examined in this research, and the number and type of feelings and judgments evoked by print ads and other media may vary considerably. Future research examining larger numbers of television and print ads employing free elicitation and response scale methods is warranted.

Despite these limitations, results suggest that free elicitation and response scale methods can complement one another in terms of the information provided about feelings and judgments evoked by ads. It seems particularly useful to employ alternative methods in the early stages of research on constructs as elusive as ad-related feelings. Research concerning how the structured and unstructured methods employed in this study relate to physiological measures is also certainly of interest. The role of feelings will prove to be an important addition to the ad effectiveness research stream, and we hope future research will not ignore advantages offered by assessing feelings using alternative measurement methods.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank George Zinkhan, Dan Sherrell, and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments. The authors also gratefully acknowledge the support provided by the colleges of business administration of Louisiana State and Georgia State Universities.

REFERENCES

- Alwitt, Linda F. 1983. "What Do People Mean When They Talk About Advertising?" In *Advertising and Consumer Psychology*. Eds. Larry Percy and Arch Woodside. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 273-286.
- Burke, Marian Chapman and Julie A. Edell. 1989. "The Impact of Feelings on Ad-Based Affect and Cognition." *Journal of Marketing Research* 26 (February): 69-83.
- Edell, Julie and Marian Chapman Burke. 1987. "The Power of Feelings in Understanding Advertising Effects." *Journal of Consumer Research* 14 (December): 421-433.
- Holbrook, Morris B. and Rajeev Batra. 1987. "Assessing the Role of Emotions as Mediators of Consumer Response to Advertising." *Journal of Consumer Research* 14 (December): 404-420.
- Lastovicka, John. 1983. "Convergent and Discriminant Validity of Television Commercial Rating Scales." *Journal of Advertising* 12 (2): 14-23, 52.

- Lutz, Richard J. 1985. "Affective and Cognitive Antecedents of Attitude Toward the Ad: A Conceptual Framework." In *Psychological Processes and Advertising Effects: Theory, Research, and Application*. Eds. Linda F. Alwitt and Andrew A. Mitchell. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 45-65.
- MacKenzie, Scott B. and Richard J. Lutz. 1989. "An Empirical Examination of the Structural Antecedents of Attitude Toward the Ad in an Advertising Pretest Context." *Journal of Marketing* 53 (April): 48-65.
- MacKenzie, Scott B., Richard J. Lutz, and George E. Belch. 1986. "The Role of Attitude Toward the Ad as a Mediator of Advertising Effectiveness: A Test of Competing Explanations." *Journal of Marketing Research* 23 (May): 130-143.
- Peterson, Robert A. and Matthew Sauber. 1983. "A Mood Scale for Survey Research." In *Proceedings, Summer Educators' Conference*. Eds. Patrick Murphy, Gene Laczniak, Paul Anderson, Russell Belk, O. C. Ferrell, Robert Lusch, Terence Shimp, and Charles Weinberg. Chicago: American Marketing Association, 409-414.
- Puto, Christopher P. and William D. Wells. 1984. "Informational and Transformational Advertising: The Differential Effects of Time." In *Advances in Consumer Research*. Ed. Thomas C. Kinnear. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research. Vol. 11, 572-576.
- Schwarz, Norbert. 1990. "Assessing Frequency Reports of Mundane Behaviors: Contributions of Cognitive Psychology to Questionnaire Construction." In *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*. Eds. C. Hendrick and M. S. Clark. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 98-117.
- Schwarz, Norbert, Hans Hippler, Brigitte Deutsch, and Fritz Strack. 1985. "Response Categories: Effects on Behavioral Reports and Comparative Judgments," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 49 (Fall), 388-395.
- Wells, William D., Clark Leavitt, and Maureen McConville. 1971. "A Reaction Profile for Commercials." *Journal of Advertising Research* 11 (December): 11-17.