

#36 Attention to the Ad (General)

SCALE NAME: Attention to the Ad (General)

SCALE DESCRIPTION:

The scale is composed of multiple statements using a seven-point response format to indicate the extent of cognitive resources a person indicates having devoted to an advertisement, the product in an ad, or a portion of an ad.

SCALE ORIGIN:

The scales were originally developed by Lacznia, Muehling, and Grossbart (1989). Muehling, Stoltman, and Grossbart (1990) indicated that the scale had previously been used by Cohen (1983) and Mitchell (1979). They used two versions of the scale, the first version measuring the amount of attention paid to the written message in an ad while the second version measured the visual aspects of the ad. A slightly modified version of the scale was used with broadcast ads by Bucholz and Smith (1991) to measure the amount of attention paid to a computer. Lacznia and Muehling (1993) used the scale to measure the attention paid to the written message in an ad. Stevenson, Bruner, and Kumar (2000) adapted the scale slightly for use with a commercial run at a website.

RELIABILITY:

Alphas of .91, .95, .90, .94, .76 were reported for the versions of the scale used by Bruner and Kumar (2000), Bucholz and Smith (1991), Cline, Altsech, and Kellaris (2003), Lacznia and Muehling (1993), and Stevenson, Bruner, and Kumar (2000), respectively. Muehling, Stoltman, and Grossbart (1990) reported alphas of .94 (written message) and .86 (visual aspects).

VALIDITY:

No examination of scale validity was reported in any of the studies.

REFERENCES:

- Bruner II, Gordon C. and Anand Kumar (2000), "Web Commercials and Advertising Hierarchy-of-Effects," *JAR*, 40 (Jan-Apr), 35-42.
- Bucholz, Laura M. and Robert E. Smith (1991), "The Role of Consumer Involvement in Determining Cognitive Response to Broadcast Advertising," *JA*, 1 (20), 4-17.
- Cline, Thomas W., Moses B. Altsech and James J. Kellaris (2003), "When Does Humor Enhance or Inhibit As Responses: The Moderating Role of the Need for Humor," *JA*, 32 (3), 31-45.
- Lacznia, Russell N., Darrel D. Muehling, and Sanford Grossbart (1989), "Manipulating Message Involvement in Advertising Research," *JA*, 18 (2), 28-38.
- Lacznia, Russell N. and Darrel D. Muehling (1993), "The Relationship Between Experimental Manipulations and Tests of Theory in an Advertising Message Involvement Context," *JA*, 3 (22), 59-74.

- Moore, Robert S., Claire Allison Stammerjohan, and Robin A. Coulter (2005), "Banner Advertiser-Web Site Context Congruity and Color Effects on Attention and Attitudes," *JA*, 34 (2), 71-84.
- Muehling, Darrel D., Russell N. Laczniak, and Jeffrey J. Stoltman (1991), "The Moderating Effects of Ad Message Involvement: A Reassessment," *JA*, 20 (2), 29-38.
- Muehling, Darrel D., Jeffrey J. Stoltman, and Sanford Grossbart (1990), "The Impact of Comparative Advertising on Levels of Message Involvement," *JA*, 4 (19), 41-50.
- Stevenson, Julie, Gordon C. Bruner II, and Anand Kumar (2000), "Webpage Background and Viewer Attitudes," *JAR*, 40 (January/April), 29-34.

SCALE ITEMS:¹

1. How much attention did you pay to _____.
2. How much did you concentrate on _____.
3. How involved were you with _____.
4. How much thought did you put into evaluating _____.
5. How much did you notice _____.

Bruner and Kumar (2000): 1, 2, 5

Bucholz and Smith (1991): 1-5

Cline, Altsech, and Kellaris (2003): 1, 2, 5

Laczniak and Muehling (1993): 1-5

Moore, Stammerjohan, and Coulter (2005): 1-5

Muehling, Stoltman, and Grossbart (1990): 1, 2, 5

Muehling, Stoltman, and Grossbart (1990): 1, 2, 5

Stevenson, Bruner, and Kumar (2000): 1, 2, 5

¹ Most if not all of the studies used verbal anchors on their response scales ranging from *none / not at all* to *very much*.