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ABSTRACT

The study found consumers hold different types of business role schema. When participants viewed values advocacy advertisements, those who held socially oriented schema were more sensitive to the company’s prior perception (called individual company schema in this paper) on evaluating the sponsor’s motives than those who held business oriented schema. Sponsors’ perceived motives had influence on evaluating attitude toward and trustworthiness of the sponsor. Issue involvement significantly interacted with perceived motives. High-issue involvement subjects were more sensitive to perceived motives on the perceptions of the sponsor (trustworthiness and attitude) than low-issue involvement subjects. Issue involvement was also significantly interacted with the attitude toward the sponsor on purchase intention; when subjects had a high level of issue involvement, they became sensitive to the perception of attitude toward a sponsor when evaluating their purchase intentions. However, low-issue involvement consumers were less sensitive to the perception of attitude toward a sponsor when evaluating their purchase intention. Interestingly, the study showed the different results between the two designs, McDonald’s ad and Miller’s ad, which were discussed in this paper. Finally, the current study demonstrated that values advocacy advertising can achieve both goals from social perspective (enhancing socially conscious behavior) and from business perspective (purchase intention). Further, interestingly, self-efficacy toward the advocated actions was found to be an important factor influencing consumers’ purchase intention. The results suggest that consumers’ perceptions toward advocated action by a sponsor and evaluation of their purchase intention for
products produced by a sponsor are likely to interact together rather than consumers process those two different goals separately.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Corporate Social Issue Advertising

Advertising is a tool used to promote a company’s products, but it can also be a format for promoting social issues and actions. Many for-profit companies have become involved in social-issues promotions under corporate societal marketing programs (Drumwright & Murphy, 2001). Interestingly, marketing campaigns with a social dimension have found their way into mainstream marketing (Drumwright, 1996).

When a company sponsors a social issue, the sponsorship has two significant implications. First, from the standpoint of society, it has implications for public policy. Corporations generally have greater financial capacity than non-profit organizations. When non-profit organizations sponsor social-issues messages, they are more likely to have to rely on donated broadcast time due to their budget limitations. As a result, these organizations often have difficulty reaching the intended target audiences with their messages. However, if corporations, with their substantial advertising resources, can be enlisted in the effort to get the word out on social issues, their advertising can make a significant impact on public policy. Second, from the standpoint of business, previous studies have found that consumers have favorable attitudes toward companies that support social causes and that these attitudes have the potential to positively impact consumers’ purchase decisions and product evaluations (Barone, Miyazaki, & Taylor, 2000; Brown & Dacin, 1997; Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001). It seems that sponsorship of social causes by corporations could advance both social advocacy and business goals. However,
Corporate sponsorship of social-issues messages may also generate complex audience perceptions that can impede the achievement of these goals.

Corporations are primarily profit-generating institutions. Given this fact, how do viewers perceive the social issue ad messages sponsored by corporations? In other words, how do consumers make sense of corporations’ involvement in social issues? How do they process corporations’ efforts to engage them as citizens through social issue advertising? It is an established fact that source credibility is an important factor in effective persuasion. However, if audiences become skeptical of a company’s motives in sponsoring social-issue messages, such as promoting recycling or encourage healthy lifestyles, these messages are not likely to accomplish their goals. Adam Smith argued that capitalism is based on the idea of ‘self-interest’ and that self-interest drives economic prosperity (Smith, 1904). In this view, corporations pursue their ‘self-interests’ by pursuing economic profits. In a capitalist society, people can be perplexed about why ‘self-interest’-seeking corporations would devote resources to promoting social actions that do not directly improve their profits. Consumer perception of corporations’ intentions for producing social message advertisements has been the subject of much research.

Previous studies have suggested that consumers’ perceptions of companies’ social-advocacy activities affect their attitudes toward the sponsors of the social-issue advertisements, and these attitudes thus often influence consumers’ purchase behaviors (Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001). However, many issues remain unexplored regarding the psychological process prompting the formation of skeptical attitudes toward corporations’ social issue sponsorship and the effect of this skepticism on consumers’ eventual behavioral intentions to the cause and purchase intentions regarding the product produced by the advertiser.
Corporate Social Responsibility Communications

Chevron’s current “Real Issue” campaign urges people to conserve energy and raise energy awareness. Northern California’s Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is planning to invest greater spending in its conservation ads (Halliday, 2005). Starbucks promotes Earth Day activities by educating employees and customers about the impact their actions have on the environment (http://www.starbucks.com/aboutus/env_stores.asp). These campaigns, along with Avon’s Breast Cancer Awareness Crusade and Johnson & Johnson’s Nursing’s Future campaigns (Menon & Kahn, 2003; Coors & Winegarden, 2005), are but a few of the many advertising efforts of U.S. corporations in support of social causes. According to Schumann, Hathcote, and West, (1991), with increased competition at the global level as well as in the U.S. market, corporate advertising is likely to offer a differential advantage. Social-issue advertising can strengthen the relationship between a company and its customers by conveying a social consciousness that aligns with the customers’ own.

The involvement of a company in social issues is one kind of corporate social responsibility (CSR) activity. Many types of communication and communication tools have been identified as aspects of corporate social responsibility. Even though social cause advertising has been the subject of much research, it seems that researchers have not agreed on a name for such advertising. The following labels have been employed: company advertising with a social dimension, cause marketing/mission marketing (Drumwright, 1996), cause-related sponsorship (Javalgi, Traylor, Gross, & Lampman, 1994), advocacy advertising (Haley, 1996), institutional/image advertising (Sethi, 1979), and green advertising (Zinkhan & Carlson, 1995).
All these can be considered varieties of corporate social responsibility (CSR) programs (Ellen, Webb, & Mohr, 2006).

There are many types of corporate social responsibility communications, including corporate image advertising. The primary purpose of corporate image advertising is to promote a corporation. Corporate image advertising, also called institutional advertising, has broadened to include advocacy and issue advertising. These types of advertising give companies a means to promote political, social and/or economic ideas while also eliciting public support for their corporate positions. Hybrid ads, which blend product and company promotion, are also emerging (Schuman, Hachtote, & West 1991). Regarding sponsorship literature, Cornwell, Weeks, and Roy (2005) distinguished sponsorship from advertising by noting that “whereas sponsorship involves a fee paid in advance for future potential communication values, advertising offers a more knowable and more controlled communication” (p. 21). Consumers perceive corporate logos and names differently in the context of events or causes than in the context of messages about their profit-making activities. Most sponsorship studies have used experimental designs and implemented scenarios as stimuli; for example, respondents have been asked to read a scenario about a corporation’s sponsoring activities and respond to questionnaires. In addition, corporations often sponsor social causes and philanthropic events. Therefore, a cause-related sponsorship can be considered a form of corporate social issue advertising.

Dacin and Brown (2006) addressed the notion of CSR in the context of corporate branding, corporate identity, and corporate associations. These research areas are more likely to be concerned with corporations’ CSR activities than with communications. Many studies have explored consumers’ responses to companies’ socially responsible activities. In many cases,
these studies have used scenarios regarding companies’ socially responsible activities as the stimuli. That is, study participants received CSR information in the form of communications similar to those they might encounter in the real world. Studies in these areas have provided great insights about corporate social issue advertising.

Another area of research relevant to corporate social issue advertising is cause-related marketing (CRM). CRM has been defined as “a commercial activity by which businesses and charities or causes form a partnership with each other to market an image, product, or service for mutual benefit” (Adkins, 1999, p. 11). From a narrow perspective, CRM is a tactic designed to stimulate the short-term sales of a product by making the amount of a contribution to a cause contingent on unit sales (Roy & Graff, 2003). In this case, the biggest difference between CRM and corporate social issue advertising would be that when corporations use CRM, they are actually encouraging consumers to buy products in order to help social causes rather than just informing consumers about how corporations help to solve social problems. However, when consumers view advertisements in which corporations say they are donating part of profits to causes, they associate the corporation’s image with the sponsoring causes; CRM can thus be classified as a part of corporate social issue advertising. Corporate sponsorship of social change is surrounded by controversy. The practice has been both heralded as marketing’s greatest contribution to society and lambasted as marketing’s most unabashed exploitation (Smith, 1994; Smith & Alcorn, 1991).
Advocacy Advertising

Haley (1996) classified advocacy advertising as a kind of institutional/image advertising. A great deal of research in corporate advertising research has focused on institutional/image advertising rather than issue advertising, with the latter narrowly regarded as the delivery of propaganda messages (Sethi, 1979). Advocacy advertising can be classified into three types depending on its purpose: Corporations may use advocacy advertising to deflect criticism, to advocate a particular policy, or to enhance acceptance of a company’s product/service. These ends may be met through values advocacy, that is, the conveying of corporate values (Bostdorff & Vibbert 1994), political advocacy such as supporting legislation or other political action), and marketplace advocacy advertising, which builds acceptance of products or services (Arens 2004; Sinclair & Irani, 2005). Among these various types of advocacy advertising, the current study focuses on values advocacy advertising.

Purpose of the Study

Advocacy advertising is one communication tool that corporations use to enact their social responsibilities. In this paper, a particular type of advocacy advertising will be examined; values advocacy advertising. This study will explore the following questions: When consumers attribute ulterior motives to a corporation that sponsors values advocacy messages, (1) do their perceptions about a company’s responsibilities play a role in the perceptions of corporations’ advocating social issues, (2) are their attitudes toward the corporations influenced and do these attitudes shape consumers’ behavioral and purchase intentions, (3) are there moderators in
processing values advocacy advertising messages, and (4) do their behavioral intentions toward advocated action interact with their purchase intentions?

Contributions of the Study

First, this study intends to examine whether the perception of values-advocacy advertising relates to the intrinsic values consumers attach to corporate social responsibility. Values-advocacy advertising is one form of social issue advertising sponsored by corporations; the advertising form reflects the corporations’ social responsibility. However, how consumers perceive corporations’ social responsibility and what the relationship is between these perceptions and consumers’ perception of advocacy advertising messages has not been studied. If relationships are found between consumers’ perceptions of the intrinsic value in CSR and their perception of values-advocacy advertising messages, advertisers may need to pay attention to the consumers’ views of CSR in order to maximize the effects of advocacy advertising. This study particularly considers how consumers’ evaluations of CSR relate to their levels of skepticism in the perception of advocacy advertising messages.

Second, this study analyzes the two goals of values advocacy advertising: (1) promoting social actions that a corporation supports, and (2) enhancing the corporation’s image and eventually consumer purchase intentions. The first goal is explicitly evident in any values-advocacy advertisement. However, the second goal, of enhancing a purchase intention, is a strategic business goal that is generally not referred to directly or addressed explicitly in values-advocacy advertisements. These two apparently rather disparate goals may create confusion in researching values-advocacy advertising. This study suggests that these two goals should be
acknowledged and studied in relation to one another. Can consumer compliance with the social action urged by values-advocacy advertising or progress toward the social goals advocated by a company enhance purchase intention? Or is it inconsequential for a company’s image and business goals whether it is accomplishing the social goals iterated in its values-advocacy messages? How do consumers respond to these two different goals? Are the two different goals processed separately, or are they related phenomena? If the two goals are separately processed, companies can choose to focus on either goal. On the other hand, if the two goals are processed together, with consumers more likely to purchase a product when their purchase intention levels in advocating social action is enhanced, then advertisers should focus on advertising tactics that enhance consumers’ sense of the behavioral intention levels. Finally, this study explores how moderators—prior perceptions/experiences with a sponsor, perceived importance of sponsoring issue, and efficacy levels—affect the consumers’ perceptions of values advocacy advertising.

**Organization of the Dissertation**

This dissertation will investigate relationships among business role schema, perceived motives, the perceptions of the sponsor, and the sponsor’s moderators including individual company schema, issue involvement, and self-efficacy in the context of values advocacy advertising. The study will also examine both behavioral intentions toward the advocated actions and purchase intention toward the product.

Chapter 1 presents a brief introduction to the importance for studying the phenomenon of business role schema and perceived motives based on both schema theory and attribution theory in the context of values advocacy advertising. It also offers an overview of the dissertation with core
concepts, which identifies the relationships among business role schema, individual company schema, issue involvement, and the consequences of those relationships such as attitude, trust and purchase intention.

Chapter 2 serves as a theoretical framework for this dissertation. In Chapter 2, existing literature on values advocacy advertising is reviewed. Based on the review of literature, values advocacy advertising is redefined as one type of CSR communication specifically advocating an uncontroversial, socially friendly behavior. Its moderator (i.e. individual company schema) and consequences (i.e. attitude, trustworthiness and purchase intention) are identified, thus leading to the research hypotheses.

Chapter 3 describes the methodology for this dissertation study. In this chapter, a quasi-experimental design is employed to test the research hypotheses and research questions developed in the previous chapter.

Chapter 4 describes the results for this dissertation study. In this chapter, a series of MANOVA, ANOVA and regression analyses are employed to test the research hypotheses developed in the previous chapter. Finally, Chapter 5 offers a discussion of the implications of the study.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Defining Advocacy Advertising

Advocacy advertising helps marketers and organizations by creating a favorable environment among consumers for their positions. Whether or not the issues addressed in advocacy advertising are presented as being controversial, and whether or not the opposing views are mentioned, “issue” and “advocacy” have become interchangeable descriptors for advertising that addresses and attempts to influence public opinion on social issues of concern to sponsors. Furthermore, because corporate advertisers expect audiences to think positively about companies that take a stand on key issues, advocacy advertising cannot be entirely separated from institutional/image advertising (Fox, 1986).

Schumann, et al. (1991) addressed a similar point in their study. They maintained that the goal of corporate advertising could be defined as establishing, and then either altering or maintaining, a corporation’s identity. The primary objective of corporate advertising is to show goodwill and portray a positive image. However, in response to continuous political and economic changes affecting American business and industry, corporate advertising has extended to issue/advocacy presentations. Pressure from consumer groups and politicians has also increased. As a result, businesses have attempted to respond with corporate advertising, which is expected to promote a corporate image of environmental responsibility. Therefore, advocacy
advertising can be understood in the stream of corporate advertising, and it can be assumed that some corporate image advertising has developed into advocacy advertising.

The Importance of Advocacy Advertising

Advocacy advertising is a part of the genre of advertising known as corporate-image, or institutional, advertising (Sethi, 1979). The practice of corporate advertising is at an all-time high and continues to rise, according to a survey by the Association of National Advertisers (ANA) Budgets. Even though the recent data regarding advocacy ad spending increase is not available, according to a poll of 101 ANA member companies, corporate ad budgets rose almost 37% from 1992 and 13.1% from 1994 to an average of $16.7 million in 1997 (Cardona, 1998). In addition to the increase in corporate advertising, the line between traditional Public Service Announcements (PSAs) and advocacy advertising is blurring.

The Current Situation of Advocacy Advertising and PSAs

Even as discussions regarding the distinctions between advocacy advertising and paid public service advertising continue, the boundary between non-paid public service announcements and paid public service advertising is not clear. Haley and Wilkinson (1994) noted that as more corporate advertisers adopt advocacy ads as a competitive business strategy, the division between public service announcements and paid advocacy advertising has become less well-defined. In addition, given the expense associated with the placement of PSAs in times and spaces relevant to the target audiences, government and other non-profit organizations have
explored the use of corporate sponsors for public service messages and investigated other forms of paid message placement.

For example, Berger (2002) observed an increasing number of groups are competing for a limited amount of airtime for their public service messages. There are ongoing debates about whether broadcasters donate enough time to PSAs. However, before discussing that issue, there is yet no definitive answer to the simplest question: What is a PSA? Berger (2002) raised the issue by asking, if a PSA is still a PSA if it promotes a broadcaster’s programming or a corporation’s interest. In other words, if a PSA has been paid for, whether it can still be considered as a PSA is questionable. He pointed out that the traditional public service model, which has long relied on donated airtime from broadcasters seeking to fulfill their public service obligations, is no longer applicable.

Further complicating the issue, the FCC does not impose certain public service regulations and rules, relying instead on an unwritten agreement by broadcasters to run PSAs. Furthermore, it is clear that paid Public Service Advertising and promo-style Public Service Announcements, in which a network receives visibility by featuring its own media-personalities as part of a message addressing a social issue, are a significant part of the current landscape (Berger, 2002).

Media Placements of Advocacy Advertising and PSAs

Currently, there is some concern that paid Public Service Advertisements will dominate the broadcast time that would otherwise have been donated for PSAs. In reality, 43% of the time donated for PSAs is between the hours of midnight and 6 AM; only 9% of donated airtime is in
prime time. Groups buying time for their PSAs get considerably better placement than those depending on donated time. For example, Rideout and Hoff (2002) found that only 18% of the paid Public Service Advertisements they surveyed were aired between midnight and 6 AM. Lancaster and Lancaster (2002) also observed that despite the seemingly large quantity of airtime and media dollars donated by television stations to PSAs, the advertisements were reaching a very limited number of people. The same study also found that when PSAs rely on donated-media schedules, it is difficult for advertisers to control the time and the place of PSAs. Furthermore, advertisers who rely on donated time cannot control the content of their PSAs because it is subject to change made to fit the policies of the television stations. Therefore, even though some studies have shown that there are few differences in effectiveness between paid-media campaigns and donated-media campaigns, Lancaster and Lancaster (2002) argued that in fact it is unlikely that donated-media campaigns are equally effective. As a result, government and nonprofit organizations are more likely to search for corporate sponsors willing to sponsor issues messages and other forms of paid message placement (Meyers, 1989a, b).

Types of Advocacy Advertising

As discussed above, advocacy advertising can be classified into three types depending on its purpose: Corporations may use advocacy advertising to deflect criticism, to advocate a particular policy, or to enhance acceptance of a company’s product/service. These ends may be met through values advocacy in conveying corporate values (Bostdorff & Vibbert, 1994), political advocacy supporting legislation or other political action, and marketplace advocacy advertising building acceptance of products or services (Arens, 2004; Sinclair & Irani, 2005).
Among these various types of advocacy advertising, the current study focuses on values advocacy advertising.

Values Advocacy Advertising

Values advocacy has come to play an increasingly important role in organizational persuasion today because of organizations’ concern with public relations, their desire to shun controversy, and their interest in imitating the efforts of prominent-and successful-organizational communicators. Values advocacy serves three basic functions for organizational communicators: (1) It enhances the organization’s image; (2) It deflects criticism of the organization and/or its policies, products, and services; (3) It establishes value premises that can be used in later discourse. In sum, values advocacy allows organizations to enhance their images and thereby to build up a reservoir of credibility with which they may successfully sustain public criticism (Bostdorff & Vibbert, 1994). Therefore, the compelling reason to use values advocacy advertising messages would be to generate an organization’s positive image by conveying values presumably held in common with consumers. In addition, the relatively inoffensive, non-controversial content of values-advocacy messages compared with more pointed issues-advocacy messages has provided corporations access to areas of the broadcast media that they could not previously enter. When the Fairness Doctrine was still in force, networks frequently refused to air corporate advocacy spots because they feared the spots’ overtly political nature would force them to provide time for opposing views (Bostdorff & Vibbert, 1994, p.145).

As Bostdorff & Vibbert (1994) discussed, even though values-advocacy advertising is only one type of advocacy advertising, it can be used in various formats and for various purposes.
In this paper, values-advocacy advertising is defined as advertising that promotes a certain action commonly agreed to be socially valuable by the general public. In values-advocacy advertising, the purpose of promoting a certain action is more likely to enhance a corporation’s image rather than to serve a political purpose. Furthermore, advocacy advertising reflects corporations’ efforts to demonstrate their involvement in social issues. Therefore, in this study values-advocacy advertising is considered to reflect the philosophy that corporations have a responsibility to address societal issues.

**Perceiving Values Advocacy Advertising**

Many studies have noticed that when individuals encounter new stimuli, such as advertising, they tend to interpret those stimuli based on prior knowledge and experiences. Wright (1984) argued that people tend to use “schemer schema,” which proposes that audiences viewing advertisements employ inferences about what the advertisers are trying to do with the messages. Schema theory proposes that these various prior experiences form abstract ideas about the phenomenon. For example, if individuals have information about politicians through media or personal experiences with them, then each incident relating to politicians is likely to form an abstract impression about politicians, such as that politicians are sociable or untrustworthy. In this example, a schema represents such expectations about the politician category as a single abstraction rather than as a collection of instances or as a single best example. Eventually, the politician schemas—a network of abstracted prior knowledge—shapes perceptions of new encounters with politicians (Friske & Linville, 1980).
Schema Theory

A schema is a hypothetical cognitive structure that guides perception, thought, and action based on prior knowledge of stimuli gained through experience, media exposure, and so on (McDaniel, 1999). According to Speck et al. (1988), schemas organize perception by organizing expectation based on prior knowledge. The concept of schema can be traced to Plato and Aristotle (Marshall, 1995), but Kant (1929) is generally considered to have been the first to theorize about schemas as organizing structures that mediate how we see and interpret the world (Johnson, 1987). Schemas are a sort of bias inherent in the mind (McVee et al., 2005). For example, economic-oriented people are likely to have a schema that all companies are primarily interested in profit generation. Therefore, a company’s efforts to sponsor values advocacy messages are likely to be perceived by these people as anti-altruistic actions even if the company has a genuine social-responsibility motive. Therefore, it can be said that those people are biased by their own schemas. Kant proposed that our schema stood between or mediated the external world and our internal mental structures (Johnson, 1987).

The schema concept was also the central mediational construct in Jean Piaget’s structural theory of the origins and development of cognition. Piaget interpreted development as an ongoing dialectic in which the individual attempts to assimilate new experience to make it consistent with existing schemas. Thus, when audiences encounter values-advocacy messages from the external world, these messages are likely to be interpreted through internal mental structures—schema.
When considering audience perceptions about business, a key problem is discovering the kinds of schema individuals use when encountering corporate social issue messages. Corporate social issue messages convey societal issues and corporations’ involvement in those societal issues. Individuals may have expectations about what role business should play in a society. There have been extensive discussions in many fields regarding the place of business among other social constructs. The following section provides a brief summary of the history of relationships between business and society and various opinions about those relationships. An examination of the views on this issue can suggest the possible business role schema consumers may hold when they evaluate advocacy advertising messages.

Business Role Schema

Adam Smith (1904) asserted that in capitalist societies, the relationship between business and society arises from economic-players’ efforts to promote their own self-interests: “It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker, that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own self-interest. We address ourselves, not to their humanity but to their self-love, and never talk to them of our own necessities but of their advantages” (Smith, 1904). In other words, Smith made it clear that ‘self-interest’ is a way to drive prosperity in a capitalist society. Capitalism purports to be the first social system in which the wealthy could claim that they received their wealth as a just reward for performing a socially useful function. Therefore, the way for businesses to contribute to society is making profits. However, the fact that so much effort is devoted to convincing both executives and investors that they possess social and moral responsibilities suggests that more than two centuries after Smith, many are still
uncomfortable with an economic system that relies so heavily on the motive of selfishness to achieve its goals. It seems that the motives of the “economic man” still trouble people (Vogel, 2001).

Creyer, Ross, and Kozup (2004) examined different consumer views regarding the discontinuation of gun sales and found that consumers who believed that corporate social responsibility (CSR) emphasized the common good, rather than merely benefiting investors, strongly believed that the discontinuation of gun sales was good business decision compared to those consumers who viewed corporate responsibility as only benefiting investors. In other words, people perceive a company’s efforts to support social issues favorably or unfavorably depending on what their perception of corporate social responsibility. It would thus be reasonable to assume that consumers who value corporate involvement in social issues are more likely to have positive attitudes toward CSR communications in general. Thus, examining how CSR is defined and discussed today will be useful in conceptualizing business role schema.

**Categories of Corporate Social Responsibility**

Today’s concept of corporate social responsibility was developed in the United States primarily during the 1960s with the notion that corporations have responsibilities that go beyond their legal obligations. Different schools of thought on CSR oscillate between two extremes: the free market concept, or classical economic theory (Friedman, 1970), and the socially oriented approach (Freeman, 1984; Wood, 1991).

Despite widespread agreement with Friedman’s belief that the only responsibility of business is to maximize profits, it cannot be denied that the belief that corporations have some
degree social responsibility above making profits has become a standard position for U.S. corporations, and one that is even essential for their survival. In this regard, Robin and Reidenbach (1987) argued, “In the long run, corporations which do not use powers in a way that society considers responsible will tend to lose it” (p. 48). The power corporations may lose is likely to be the freedom to act and the freedom to choose. In the view of these authors, business belongs to society; as a human activity and a subset of a greater social activity it depends on the prevailing social morality in order to exist. Furthermore, because society created the concept of the corporation, it has the capacity to change a corporation in any way it deems suitable. The authors implied that corporations need to be viewed as members of society, just like family, rather than considering corporations as exclusively profit-making entities. Therefore, they insisted that the value of family can be compared to the value of the organization and that corporations have obligations to society because they depend on and are members of society. Thus, CSR is a citizenship function for “mutually beneficial exchange” between an organization and its public (David et al., p. 293). From this perspective, the following question can be raised: What kinds of responsibilities do corporations need to fulfill in order to meet their social obligations?

Carroll (1979, 1999) suggested comprehensive categories of CSR and introduced four characteristics of CSR: (1) economic responsibility as the responsibility to maximize profit by designating the obligation for businesses to be productive and profitable; (2) legal responsibility as the responsibility to adhere to law, which correspond to society’s expectation to see businesses meet their economic duties within the framework of legal requirements; (3) ethical responsibility as the responsibility to behave in an ethical way by requiring that businesses abide
by established norms defining appropriate behavior, even beyond what is required by law, such as implementing an environmentally friendly business operation (4) philanthropic responsibilities reflect the common desire to see businesses become actively involved in the betterment of society and take on the responsibility of perform social activities that serve their community, or to make donations to community non-profit organizations that do so. Carroll (1999) modified the fourth responsibility category and renamed it ‘philanthropy.’ Carroll’s four categories have been utilized in various CSR studies (e.g., Maignan, 2001).

The current study also adopts Carroll’s (1999) categories as reflecting consumers’ CSR values. Furthermore, the current study proposes that ‘ethical’ and ‘philanthropy’ categories comprise corporate responsibilities that are not required to be met, but expected of socially responsible companies. However, it is the economic and legal responsibilities that a company must meet, not necessarily in order to be socially responsible company but in order to survive. In addition, the current study’s main focus is whether individuals believe that the value that business should focus on generating profits or focus on society’s betterment. Therefore, the study categorizes people who believe companies should meet economic responsibility as economically-oriented people and those who believe companies should meet philanthropic responsibility as socially-oriented people. Also, when a company sponsors values-advocacy advertising messages, it is seeking to meet responsibilities that may not be necessary to its own survival, but may impact social progress. Therefore, values-advocacy advertising messages are more likely to be consistent with the values that socially-oriented people hold.
An Individual Company Schema

In sponsorship literature, schema theory has been used to explain the relevance of the sponsor and the sponsoring cause or events (e.g., Rifon et al., 2004). The studies show that consumers evaluate corporations’ sponsorship activities based on *functional based similarity* and *image based similarity*. *Functional based similarity* explains that a sponsor has relevant business activities with the sponsored cause. *Image based similarity* explains that consumers also evaluate whether a sponsor’s image is relevant to the sponsored cause or event (Gwinner, 1997). If consumers use their own perception of a company’s image in order to its sponsorship, then it is also plausible that consumers may evaluate whether a sponsor’s image is relevant to the advertiser’s efforts of social issues sponsorship. In other words, if individuals hold schema toward a sponsor that do not match with the fact that the company is interested in sponsoring social cause, it will result in incongruence. Therefore, even though the person holds a socially oriented value, incongruent prior perception of social issue sponsorship may negate the effects on perception of the advertiser. For example, an individual’s prior knowledge and experiences may cause him or her to have schema about the company as good or bad, or ethical or unethical; the company’s efforts at good citizenship through sponsoring social issue messages may or may not be congruent with their schema. Therefore, the current study proposes that the individual company schema (prior perception of the sponsor) will be used when interpreting corporate social issue messages.
Relationships between Schema Theory and Attribution Theory

The current study has discussed the possible schema individuals may use when they perceive advocacy advertising messages. However, schema theory does not explain how incongruent and congruent schema function in processing advocacy advertising messages. Schema theory suggests attention to inconsistency and stops there. On the other hand, attribution models explain that the added attention is an effort to account for discrepancies between expectations and stimuli, such as advocacy advertising messages. Attribution processes describe what happens when data require explanation. Thus, schematic approaches suggest that people notice inconsistency, and attributional approaches clarify how people manage it (Friske & Linville, 1980). Therefore, in order to explore further how individuals process advocacy advertising messages when they find the type of messages that do not fit with their own schema, attribution theory seems appropriate to use.

Processes of causal attribution are fundamental to many aspects of consumer cognitions and behaviors, including perceptions of source credibility, promotional responses, and beliefs about advertiser motives (Folkes, 1988). Attribution theories have been used to develop a model of how perceptions of marketers’ intentions shapes consumers’ responses to persuasion attempts (Friestad & Wright, 1994). Fundamental to this new model is the belief that consumers’ attributions of marketers’ intentions guide consumer behavior, a belief borne out in recent empirical research on consumer responses to advertising (Campbell, 1995) and promotion (Forehand, 2000). Consumers’ attributions of marketers’ intentions are also applicable to
research on the development of skepticism toward corporate societal marketing efforts (Drumwright & Murphy, 2001; Forehand & Grier, 2003).

Attribution Theory

According to attribution theory, attributions are the result of a cognitive process by which people assign an underlying cause or explanation to an observed event (Kelly, 1973; Kelly & Michela, 1980). Attribution theory explains that consumers often form inferences that go beyond the information given (Kardes et al., 2004). That is, individuals try to develop a commonsense explanation of why actions have occurred and make causal inferences. It is assumed that people make attributions to achieve a greater level of understanding (and thus control) over their lives and environment (Folkes, 1988). Attribution theory predicts a relationship between attributions and subsequent attitudes and behaviors (Kelly & Michela, 1980).

Based on attribution theory, the discounting principle suggests that if an alternative explanation exists, such as extrinsic motivation, consumers discount or minimize an explanation of intrinsic motivation (Kelly, 1972). In other words, when more than one possible cause exists for an effect, the effect is more likely to be attributed to another cause. If an innate value held by a person does not adequately explain the information that the person perceives, the person is likely to attribute the cause that the best explains the effect within the frame of the person’s innate values. Thus, if consumers develop attributions about corporate motives for sponsoring social causes and actions, these attributions should exert some influence on later perceptions, attitudes, and behavior. It should be emphasized that attributions may be positive as well as negative. That is, the attribution process can result in positive attributions (attributing the
sponsorship of social causes as an act of corporate altruism) as well as negative attributions (attributing sponsorship as an act of corporate self-interest). Both types of attributions are expected to occur. The two different types of perceived motives (genuine vs. anti-genuine) have been found to be the two separate constructs (Dean 2002, 2004; Rifon et al, 2004). Dean (2002) measured polar perceptions of positive and negative attributions about sponsorship independently rather than together because that attribution theory suggests that there could be both positive and negative attributions about sponsorship.

Returning to the discussion of intrinsic CSR values, people’s interpretations of the relationship between business and society as reflected in the values-advocacy advertising may be categorized into two different types: economic-oriented and socially-oriented. If a person holds economic-oriented schema, then he or she is likely to find inconsistency between his or her own economic-oriented schema and a values advocacy ad reflecting corporations’ involvement in social causes. As discussed above, the inconsistency will generate more thoughts and the person is likely to attribute skeptical thoughts to a sponsor in advocacy ad. However, consumers with socially oriented schema will experience consistency between their schema and the stimuli, such as a values advocacy ad, and this consistency would cause them to attribute more genuine motives to the sponsor. Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed:

\( \text{H1a: Socially oriented subjects are more likely to attribute genuine perceived intention to the sponsorship of advocacy advertising messages than business oriented subjects.} \)

\( \text{H1b: Socially oriented subjects are less likely to attribute anti-genuine perceived intention to the sponsorship of advocacy advertising messages than business oriented subjects.} \)
Bae and Cameron’s (2006) study explored whether corporate reputation would have an effect on the perceived intention of an advertiser. The results of the study showed that corporate reputation (trustworthy and expertise) created perceived intention; perceived intention will eventually lead to the attitude toward the advertiser. It should be noted that prior perceptions have been studied in the context of product advertising (Goldberg & Hartwick, 1990) and corporate social responsibility advertising messages (Dean, 2002; Davis, 1994). In the corporate social responsibility advertising context, Dean (2002) focused particularly on corporate community relationships; the study manipulated the real company’s prior evaluations of the company’s community relationships and its effects on the levels of altruism and anti-altruism. The study found that when a company’s community relationship was positive, it had causal relationship with the construct of altruism in a positive way; when it was negative, it led to the construction of anti-altruism. The Dean (2003, 2004) studies also showed that when they manipulated the prior perception of a company as bad, neutral, and good reputation, it led to different types of attribution of sponsor motives.

The Davis (1994) study utilized consumers’ prior perceptions toward a corporation’s commitment to social cause advocated in the ad (e.g., whether an advertiser is environmentally committed). The author argued that prior perception of a corporation should be operationalized as context-specific for corporate social issue messages such as environmental advertising. Therefore, the study proposed that prior perception measures used in product advertising research are not appropriate to use for corporate social issue advertising. However, Bae and Cameron (2006) found that negative news coverage regarding the responsible conduct of a company can create negative global attitude toward the advertiser and influence the perceived
intention. Previous perceptions of advertisers can influence consumers’ levels of skepticism toward a sponsor’s motives in a sponsorship context (Dean, 2003, 2004; Bae & Cameron, 2006). In addition, attribution literature has suggested that people make attributions by identifying behavior in relation to the targeted individual’s corresponding disposition and by correcting the corresponding disposition with contextual information (Gilbert & Malone, 1995). Contextual information may include such factors as other cues in the immediate context, prior knowledge about the target, and situational demands. Thus, in the context of CSR, consumers may evaluate a firm not only on the basis of its CSR activity, but also in light of other accessible contextual information such as prior knowledge of the company and its products. If contextual information is salient, people are more likely to consider it along with dispositional information in evaluating the behavior (Trope, 2000). In other words, perceptions of messages are likely to vary, depending on what information and experiences a perceiver holds prior to receiving the message.

Even though the importance of prior perception of the company has been acknowledged, it is not clear how it can influence the relationship between business role schema and attributions of sponsor’s motives. If a person is socially oriented and the perception of the company is favorable, then the person may perceive the sponsor has genuine intention in sponsoring social causes. However, if a socially oriented person perceives the advocacy ad sponsored by a company unfavorably, how would he or she evaluate the company? As discussed previously, Creyer, Ross, and Kozup (2004) suggested that socially oriented consumers are more likely to be sensitive to business’s effects on society than business oriented consumers. Therefore, socially oriented consumers are more likely to be sensitive to whether or not a sponsor has a negative or positive reputation. Furthermore, the sensitivity of socially oriented consumers to prior
perceptions of the company may influence the perceptions of motives. However, business oriented consumers may not care much about whether the company has built a positive or negative image. Instead, they would care more about how effectively the company has generated profits. Therefore, when compared to socially oriented consumers business oriented consumers may not be concerned about whether the company is perceived as pleasant or ethical. Socially oriented consumers may be concerned about whether the company is a good citizen in a society, which they exhibit by being pleasant or ethical.

The moderation effect of prior perception of the company is hypothesized (Figure 1).

Prior perception of the company is designated as individual company schema as noted previously.

*H2a:* The relationship between business role schema and subjects’ genuine-perceived motives of the sponsor will be moderated by individual company schema (ICS). ICS induced changes in the subjects’ perception of the ad sponsor’s motives as Genuine will be greater for socially oriented subjects than business oriented subjects.

*H2b:* ICS induced changes in a subject’s perception of the ad sponsor’s motives as Anti-Genuine will be greater for socially oriented subjects than business oriented subjects.
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Previous studies found that in the context of CSR communications, attributions of sponsor motives can influence source credibility (Rifon, et al, 2004) and attitude toward advertisers (Bae & Cameron, 2006). Furthermore, Sinclair and Irani (2004) found that trustworthiness and attitude toward the advertiser were the strongest predictors of attitude toward marketplace advocacy advertising.

Attitude toward the Sponsor

Haley (1996) found liking, or affective evaluation, of the organization is an important criterion to perceive whether an advertiser is credible. In addition, many studies identified perceived attractiveness of an organization’s identity as a factor in whether consumers entered into strong relationships with companies (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2003; Sinclair & Irani, 2005). Therefore, the results imply that trustworthiness and attitude toward the company are important components to evaluate advocacy advertising messages. As a result, the current study employs these two constructs for the perception of advertiser. Also, it was hypothesized that perceived motives will transfer to the attitude toward a sponsor:

H3a: When participants attribute high level of genuine perceived intention, the perceptions of the advertiser (trustworthiness and attitude) will be more likely to be positive than when participants attribute low level of genuine perceived intention.
H3b: When participants attribute high level of anti-genuine perceived intention, the perceptions of the advertiser will be more likely to be negative than when participants attribute low level of anti-genuine perceived intention.
Moderating Effect of Issue Involvement

Lafferty (1996) found that consumers' responses were more positive when the cause was more important to them as opposed to less important to them. Grau and Folse (2007) asserted the importance of issue involvement in CRM campaigns. It has been documented that higher levels of involvement motivate consumers to form more enduring attitudes and behave accordingly (Andrews, Durvasula, & Akhter, 1990; Petty & Cacioppo, 1979). Furthermore, Sen and Bhattacharya (2001) found that CSR support (supporting a social cause, such as diversity) moderated the effect of CSR record on company evaluations. In their study, when a company’s CSR record was negative and consumers highly supported the issue, then company evaluation was least favorable, whereas when consumers highly supported the issue and CSR record was positive, then company evaluation was most favorable. In other words, when CSR record and issue supporting levels were opposite, it produced the least favorable evaluation of the company. Additionally, this moderating effect of CSR support is implicit in prior research into the role of “cause affinity among key constituents” (Drumwright, 1996), “importance of issue to self” (Haley 1996), and “personal relevance” (Creyer & Ross, 1997) in consumers’ reactions to CSR. In summary, previous studies have implied that when consumers support and feel relevant to an advocated issue sponsored by a certain company, consumers become favorable toward the sponsor. In other words, if the company supports the cause consumers also support, then positive feelings or thoughts can be generated toward the sponsor.

Consumers would feel congruent with the company sponsoring an issue in which they themselves are deeply involved, and in turn the congruent feeling will create positive perceptions
of the sponsor. However, if the company’s motive in sponsoring an issue is perceived as not genuine, issue involvement will not generate great level of congruence/incongruence with audiences because, regardless of their sponsorship effort, the sponsor is involved in its own interests rather than in the cause. In turn, if the company’s motive is perceived as genuine, consumers would feel the company has similar interests in the issue as they do, and high level of issue involvement will strengthen the perceived congruence between the company and audiences, whereas a low level of issue involvement will not. Furthermore, as described above, positive (genuine) and negative attributions (anti-genuine) need to be conceptualized separately (e.g., Dean, 2002). Therefore, the moderating effects of issue involvement are hypothesized (Figure 2):

\[H4a: \textit{The relationship between perception of sponsor motives as Genuine and perceptions of the sponsor (trustworthiness and attitude) will be moderated by issue involvement. Changes in the perceptions of the sponsor (trustworthiness and attitude) induced by issue involvement will be greater for high level of Genuine motives than for low-level of Genuine motives in a positive direction.}\]

\[H4b: \textit{The relationship between perception of sponsor motives as Genuine and perceptions of the sponsor (trustworthiness and attitude) will be moderated by issue involvement. Changes in the perceptions of the sponsor (trustworthiness and attitude) induced by issue involvement will be greater for high level of Anti-Genuine motives than for low-level of Anti-Genuine motives in a positive direction.}\]
Figure 2 H3a & b and H4a & b
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Two Goals of Advocacy Advertising

Behavioral Intention to advocated actions

A role model is likely to be a good source for change in behavioral intention. Individuals tend to seek role models who are similar to themselves in some easily identifiable way, such as gender or race (Bandura, 1986; Hackett & Byars, 1996; Karunanayake & Nauta, 2004). Source credibility, such as trustworthiness, has been identified as an important factor increasing behavior intention. Therefore, it is reasonable to say that when consumers possess positive attitudes toward the sponsor and regard the sponsor as highly trustworthy, they would be more likely to change their behavioral intention according to what the sponsor advocates in the advertisements. Furthermore, in order to change a person’s behavioral intention, Bandura (1986) argued that the person must have a certain level of skill required to perform the action even if he or she has a good role model. Consistent with his argument, this paper proposes that in addition to a sponsor’s credibility, consumers may need a certain level of motivation to act on an advocated behavior or a certain level of interest in the advocated issues in order to perform an advocated action.

The Moderating Effect of Self-Efficacy

Strong motivational indicators have been also identified as increasing the levels of behavioral intention and issue involvement. Self-efficacy, which is the self perception of one’s
ability to perform the advocated action, is one of these motivational factors. If consumers do not have high enough levels of self-efficacy or interest in advocated issues, source credibility is not likely to have same power to change the behavioral intention. Efficacy has been identified as an important factor in increasing behavioral intention. Efficacy can be explained by self-efficacy, the belief in one’s ability to perform a certain action and outcome expectancy, and the belief that one’s action will result in a certain outcome. In general, researchers (e.g., Hampel, Meier, & Kümmel, 2008; Zumberg, Chang, & Sanna, 2008) have established that self-efficacy beliefs, behavior changes, and outcomes are highly correlated; thus, self-efficacy is an excellent predictor of behavior. The depth of this support prompted Graham and Weiner (1996) to conclude that self-efficacy has proven to be a more consistent predictor of behavioral outcomes than any other motivational construct, particularly in psychology and education. The current study proposes that when a person believes in his or her ability to perform an action advocated in an ad, the sponsor’s high level of credibility can reinforce the behavioral intention levels. However, when the person believes that he or she cannot perform the action, the sponsor’s high level of credibility will have less effect on consumers’ behavioral intention.

**Moderating Effect of Issue Involvement**

Consumers’ perceptions of the advocated issue and their behavioral intentions toward the advocated issue are also highly related constructs (Tichenor, Donohue & Olien, 1980, Viswanath & Demers, 1999). As discussed previously, when consumers find that a company sponsors a social cause they also support, they would feel more relevant to the company. Furthermore, as also discussed above, consumers may change their behavioral intentions as the
ad messages advocate if they perceive the sponsor of the message is highly credible. However, if consumers have low level of issue involvement, they would feel less connected to the advertiser; therefore, consumers would be less sensitive to the advertiser’s credibility in forming a perception toward the advocated actions. Based on the rationale, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H5: Perceptions (trustworthiness and attitude) of the sponsor will increase subjects’ behavioral intention toward the advocated actions.

H6: The relationship between perceptions (trustworthiness and attitude) of the sponsor and behavioral intention will be moderated by self-efficacy. When subjects have a high level of self-efficacy, changes in behavioral intention toward the advocated action generated by the perceptions of the advertiser will be greater than when subjects have a low level of self-efficacy.

H7: The relationship between perceptions (trustworthiness and attitude) of the sponsor and behavioral intention will be moderated by issue involvement. When subjects have a high level of issue involvement, changes in behavioral intention toward the advocated action generated by the perceptions of the advertiser will be greater than when subjects have a low level of issue involvement.

Purchase Intention

The current study examines advocacy advertising, which does not feature product information or brand information. Advocacy advertising only delivers messages about social issues. Therefore, if advertisers want to enhance consumers’ purchase intention, they need to
enhance it through socially responsible corporate behavior. Sen and Bhattacharya (2001) proposed that consumers’ consumptions show consumers’ self expressions. In other words, it is possible that consumers consume products of the company to show their support for the company. The study showed that CSR records (e.g., records of company’s social responsible activities) can have a direct effect on the purchase intention. This paper proposes that consumers will form perceptions of the advertiser through perceived intention after seeing advocacy advertising with CSR information. The perceptions of the advertiser can then have an effect on the purchase intention. After consumers learn about a company supporting a social cause, then they are likely to purchase the products produced by that company. In other words, when product information is absent, consumers may use the evaluation of a company as a source to determine purchase intention. In addition, for purchase intention, proposed moderators for behavioral intention, such as self-efficacy and issue involvement, toward the advocated actions will not change the relationship between perceptions (trustworthiness and attitude) of the sponsor and purchase intention.

H8: When participants have positive attitudes and high level of trustworthiness toward the sponsor, they are more likely to have a higher purchase intention for the advertiser’s product than when participants have negative perceptions of the advertiser. Further, self-efficacy and issue involvement will not moderate the relationship between the perceptions of the sponsor (attitude and trustworthiness) and purchase intention.
The Relationship between Behavioral Intention and Purchase Intention

If a company conveys the initial intention of promoting a message in order to urge a specific action, and if consumers are motivated by the message to comply with the advocated action, the consumers are likely to feel that the company has really accomplished its stated social goals. Therefore, this paper proposes that even if a company is solely interested in image enhancement, paying attention to whether consumers are motivated to comply with the advocated social action can be beneficial for the company’s image enhancement.

Both behavioral intention and purchase intention are about willingness of action. The question becomes whether it is possible that these two types of willingness of actions interact. Behavioral intention changes may occur through seeing the message directly. Purchase intention changes may occur indirectly through enhanced perception of the advertiser. An interesting inquiry would be to discover how directly promoted behavioral intention toward an advocated action and indirectly promoted behavioral intention toward purchasing a product interact. If a company conveys the initial intention of promoting messages in order to urge a specific action, and if consumers are motivated by the message to comply with the advocated action, the consumers are likely to feel that the company has actually accomplished their stated social goals (Figure 3). The overall research model is described in Figure 4.

*RQ1: How are behavioral intention toward advocated action and purchase intention related?*
Figure 3 H5-H8 and RQ1
Figure 4 Overall Research Model
CHAPTER 3: METHOD

Context

The current study employed a quasi-experimental design for hypothesis and research question testing. The study used fictitious social issue messages as the context for sponsorship by real companies. No manipulated variables were employed in this study except fictitious social issue messages. The current study measured constructs in the natural setting.

Design

The study employed a 2x2 between-subjects, randomized, quasi-experimental design for the first part of the study; Business Role Schema (Business and Society) x Individual Company Schema (Positive x Negative). The study also employed 2x2 between-subjects, randomized, quasi-experimental design for the second part of the study; perceived motives (Genuine and Anti-genuine) x Issue Involvement (High and Low). For the last part of the study, two 2x2 between subjects, randomized, quasi-experimental design was conducted; Perceptions of the company (trustworthiness and attitude) x issue involvement (High and Low) and perceptions of the company (trustworthiness and attitude) x self-efficacy (High and Low).

Stimuli

The current study developed values advocacy advertising messages sponsored by a real company name. Message contents included (1) the company’s efforts to solve an advocated issue, (2) and statements advocating consumers to get involved in the advocated issue. The causes and
brands were selected as a result of pretesting, which demonstrated that both showed variability in terms of consumers’ attitudes and perceived relevance to issue. Pretests were conducted in order to choose ‘social issues' and 'sponsoring companies' that generated variance in responses. A total of 45 respondents completed the pre-test survey. Various companies in alcohol industry (Coors, Anheuser-Busch, and Miller), insurance industry (Progressive, Geico, Allstate, State Farm, Liberty Mutual) and oil industry (Chevron, BP, and Shell) were included in the pre-test survey. Also, regarding social causes, abortion, pet adoption, recycling, obesity, energy conservation, and binge drinking were tested through pre-test survey. Based on the pre-test, the social issue of binge drinking prevention was paired with the Miller Brewing Company, and obesity prevention with the McDonald’s company. Both scenarios produced promising variance in responses.

Sampling

Currently, advocacy advertising can be often found in media targeting adults with higher education, such as BusinessWeek, New York Times, etc. It implies that educated adults are more likely to be interested in values advocacy advertising messages. Also, the current study looks at a person’s views about her own values toward business role schema. Therefore, it is speculated that adults aged 25 and older are appropriate for sampling because the age groups are more likely to produce variances in responses toward the constructs being used in the study (e.g., business role schema, individual company schema, and importance of issue) because they may have developed more various experiences than younger age groups. The current study used adults older than 25 years for sampling.
The e-Reward company was employed in order to conduct data collection. e-Rewards provides the means of conducting primary online market research and gauging consumer interest in marketing campaigns with extensive profile information for more than 2.6 million members. The e-Rewards online-survey company was chosen due to the following advantages over other online survey company. The e-Rewards company use by-invitation-only acquisition. Since the company started in 1999, every e-Rewards member has been exclusively invited into the panel and has experienced the same standardized enrollment process. By avoiding “open” recruitment, e-Rewards, Inc. does not attract the undesirable “professional survey takers” that many other panels do. The company invites panel members through a controlled mix of both online and offline methods, including e-mail and direct mail invitations. In addition, for fraud prevention, the company identifies undesirable respondents within our panels. Once identified, undesirable respondents no longer receive survey opportunities. The company checks for the following bad behaviors: Inconsistent profiling answers, Straight-lining answers, Answering surveys too quickly, Member duplication. In addition, the company requires a valid and unique e-mail address in order for panelists to receive surveys. Also, physical addresses provided by panelists are verified against government postal information. Members were rewarded by monetary rewards or receiving rewards from well-known companies.

The potential audiences of the ads employed in this study are likely to be consumers who consume products produced by McDonald's and Miller Brewing Company; therefore, the current study screened participants who have consumed beer and fast food within last two months. The purpose of using two different stimuli was to make sure that a particular issue did not confound the study results. Further, one of relationships the study is interested in is whether behavioral
intention (i.e., drink one less beer) is related to purchase intention. In order to discourage drinking behavior in future, it needs to ask people who consume a beer currently.

**Procedure**

First, subjects had to go through a screening procedure. If they answered ‘yes’ to all two screening questions: (1) Have you consumed a beer within last two months? (2) Have you consumed fast food within last two months? Then they proceeded to the next section of the survey. If they said no to either question, they were moved to the termination message by the e-Rewards company. In other words, all participants were beer drinkers and fast food consumers. For those who passed the screening questions, treatments were assigned by time order when respondents signed in. First, participants answered questionnaires for Business Role Schema and an Individual Sponsor Schema. Then, they were systematically assigned to either McDonald's ad with obesity prevention messages or Miller Brewing Company ad with binge drinking prevention messages. For example, if the first person participated in design 1 with the McDonald’s ad, the next person participated in design 2 with the Miller Brewing Company ad. Then, participants answered questions for other measurements with the following order; issue involvement, efficacy, behavioral intention, purchase intention, perception of the company, then perceived sponsor intention (1) consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine, (2) consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine).
Measurements

Business Role Schema

CSR belief refers to how people view the relationship between business and society intrinsically. Therefore, the belief is not created by external stimuli. Rather, this study investigated how this intrinsic belief influences external stimuli. Based on Carroll (1999)’s categories, following two categories will be adopted: (1) Economic (Business) (2) Philanthropic (Social). Also, 7-point likert scale to measure the categories was used as well as 2-item ranking scales (Appendix A). The pretests were conducted. Thirty-one respondents participated in this pretest survey. The results showed that 17 people ranked pro-business as more important and 14 people ranked pro-social as more important than pro-business. An eight-item, seven-point likert scale developed by Maignan (2001) was employed to measure the two categories identified in Carroll's study. Items measuring BUSINESS had high level of reliability, \( r = .824 \) for design 1 and \( r = .814 \) for design 2. Also, Items measuring SOCIAL showed high level of reliability, \( r = .872 \) for McDonald’s and \( r = .859 \) for Miller.

Individual Company Schema

The concept of “individual company schema” is operationalized as whether consumers have preexisting favorable cognitive and emotional attitudes toward the company. To assess individual advertiser schema, participants completed six, seven-point bipolar adjective items whether the company is unpleasant/pleasant, unethical/ethical, good/bad, unlikeable/likeable,
dishonest/honest, disrespectful/respectful. Reliability levels were high for both McDonald’s, \( r = .916 \) and Miller, \( r = .952 \).

**Issue Involvement**

“Issue Involvement” was measured with a four item, seven-point scale adopted from prior work whether the issue is important to themselves (Haley 1996), supportive to the issue (Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001), relevant to themselves and great concern to themselves (Grau & Folse, 2007). Reliability level was acceptable, \( r = .905 \) for McDonald’s and \( r = .871 \) for Miller.

**Self-Efficacy**

Self-efficacy is operationalized as a person’s belief as to how easy or difficult performance of the behavior is likely to be. According to Bandura (2001), scales of perceived self-efficacy must be “tailored to the particular domains of functioning that are the object of interest.” He suggests that self-efficacy scales must be tailored to activity domains and assess the multifaceted ways in which efficacy beliefs operate within the selected activity domain. The items measuring self-efficacy asked whether each subject believe that the subject “can,” “am confident that I can,” “it is easy to,” “I am able to.” Reliability was acceptable, \( r = .951 \) for McDonald’s and \( r = .922 \) for Miller.

**Perceived Intention**

“Consumers’ perceived intention” refers to the causal explanation that participants attribute to values advocacy advertising messages. This concept is operationalized using two
types of causal attributions. Attribution theory suggests that consumers can use both positive and negative attributions about sponsorship; therefore, it is necessary to measure polar perceptions independently rather than together (Dean, 2002). One is genuine (caring more about social effects that about the company’s profits); this construct is measured with items questioning whether if sponsoring action by the company would be “altruistic,” “genuine,” “generous,” “unselfish,” and “kind.” Another is anti-genuine, self-serving sponsor motives (caring more about the company’s profits than about social effects); this construct is measured with items asking if the company would have an “ulterior motive” in sponsorship, be “acting in its own self-interest,” “acting to benefit itself,” “have something other than altruistic intentions,” and “have something other than genuine intentions.” Perceived Intention was measured with a ten-item, seven-point likert scale similar to prior work (Dean, 2002). Items measuring consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine showed high level of reliability, $r = .931$ for McDonald’s and $r = .926$ for Miller. Items measuring consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine (ulterior motive, self-interest, benefit itself, something other than altruistic intentions, something other than genuine intentions) showed high level of reliability, $r = .953$.

Perceptions of Advertiser (Trustworthiness and Attitude)

Perceptions of advertiser were measured with two subscales, trustworthiness and attitude toward the advertiser with four Likert-scale items for each subscales. Trustworthiness has been used as a scale of advertiser credibility (MacKenzie & Lutz, 1989). Trustworthy was identified as a construct important in the context of advocacy advertising because the major problem for
corporations using advertising in attempt to influence public opinion on social issues are that few readers believe what corporations say (Sinclair & Irani, 2005). Therefore, trustworthy would be important construct to examine in the context of advocacy ad. For TRUSTWORTHINESS, reliability was low, $r = .60$ for the design 1 and $r = .534$ for the design 2. Therefore, the one item (“I do not believe what the ad's sponsoring organization tells me”) was omitted and it resulted the high level of reliability, $r = .925$ for the design 1 and $r = .956$ for the design 2.

Attitude toward the advertiser was used as a measure of perception of the advertiser, with three items measuring this factor whether the company is good, pleasant, and favorable while trustworthiness was measured by four-items, whether the company can be trusted and makes truthful claims, I trust the ad's sponsoring organization, the ad's sponsoring organization takes truthful claims, the ad's sponsoring organization is honest, and I do not believe what the ad's sponsoring organization tells me (Sinclair & Irani, 2005). For ATTITUDE, reliability of survey items was $r = .969$ for McDonald’s and $r = .984$ for Miller.

Behavioral Intention to the Cause

Behavioral intention is operationalized as ‘willingness’ to act as advocated in the ad. The measures were similar to prior work (Park & Smith, 2007). Four items measuring behavioral intention were “will, am highly likely to, mean to, intend to.” Reliability for survey items for behavioral intention was acceptable, $r = .961$ for McDonald’s and $r = .975$ for Miller.
Purchase Intention of the Product

“Purchase intention” is operationalized as ‘willingness’ to purchase a product, which is produced by an Ad’s sponsoring company. It was measured with three seven-point semantic differential scales (likely/unlikely, probable/improbable, possible/impossible) (MacKenzie, Lutz, & Belch, 1986). The level of reliability was acceptable, $r = .923$ for McDonald’s and $r = .898$ for M.
CHAPTER 4: RESULT

In McDonald’s, subjects (N = 223) were systematically sampled, 58% were female and 42% were male, 5% were high school educated, 20% were some college, 47% were Bachelor degree and 28% were Master’s degree or more. 29% were age 25-35, 40% were age 36-50, 31.4% were age 51 or older. In Miller, participants (N = 225) were also systematically sampled, 48% were female and 52% were male, 6% were high school educated, 27% were some college, 38% were Bachelor degree and 29% were Master’s degree or more, 27% were age 25-35, 43% were age 36-50, 30% were age 51 or older.

Hypotheses Tests

Hypotheses are tested through series of MANOVAs and ANOVAs because the main focus of the hypotheses was to examine how different groups evaluate information differently through investigating mean differences. Interaction effects revealed that individual company schema, issue involvement, and self-efficacy play as important moderators in the perception of values advocacy advertising. Further, the factor ‘company,’ (two different sponsors, McDonald’s and Miller), had significant main effects in many cases and significantly interacted with factors in all hypotheses testing. Therefore, data from subjects who viewed McDonald’s advocacy ad and Miller’s advocacy ad were analyzed separately.
Business Role Schema and Individual Company Schema (ICS) of the Company on Perceived Intentions

The study predicted that perceived motives toward advocated issues would differ between those more business oriented and more socially oriented. In H1a and H1b, the study expected that subjects who are business oriented form perceptions of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine (genuine) more (less) than those who are socially oriented. Furthermore, the study expected a moderating effect of individual company schema between business role schema and perceived motives (genuine: H2a and anti-genuine: H2b). In order to divide into two groups, socially oriented subjects and business oriented subjects; the study employed two different methods. First, to assess these predictions, participants who had a relatively high score on either BUSINESS measure (SOCIAL measure) score fell above the 60th percentile and whose SOCIAL measure (BUSINESS measure) score fell below the 40th were chosen. This procedure enabled the researcher to use data from 46 (for McDonald’s) and 31 (for Miller) for socially oriented and 44 (for McDonald’s) and 47 (for Miller) for business oriented who participated in the study. Second method was to divide SOCIAL measure into two groups to compare subjects who highly believe in business’s social responsibility and lowly believe in business’s social responsibility. Also, BUSINESS measure was divided into two groups to compare subjects who highly believe in business’s role to maximize profits and lowly believe in business’s role to maximize profits. Even though some high-social subjects would also belong to high-business subjects, it would still capture their belief toward social aspects of business.
To examine whether the factor ‘company’ (McDonalds’ and Miller) had significant effect on the main effects of business role schema and individual company schema and interaction effects between business role schema and individual company schema on perceived motives, multivariate analysis was conducted by including ‘company’ as a factor. The result showed that ‘company’ had significant simple main effect on perceived motives (Wilks’s \(\lambda = .93\), \(F = 5.91\), \(p < .01\), \(\eta^2 = .07\)). Interactions among business role schema and ICS and ‘company’ were significant (Wilks’s \(\lambda = .97\), \(F = 4.18\), \(p < .025\), \(\eta^2 = .05\)). Therefore, results of each company’s values advocacy ad were analyzed separately.

First, the results section begins with a comparison between high social responsibility/low economic responsibility subjects and high economic/low social responsibility subjects. The terms, Individual Company Schema (ICS) and prior perception of the sponsor will be used interchangeably.

*McDonald’s*

A MANOVA (multivariate analysis of variance) was performed on the dependent measures. Multivariate results indicated a significant simple main effect of prior perception (Wilks’s \(\lambda = .68\), \(F = 19.96\), \(p < .001\), \(\eta^2 = .32\)), but not for business role schema (Wilks’s \(\lambda = .99\), \(F = .55\), \(p = .58\), \(\eta^2 = .013\)). Overall, interaction between business role schema (socially oriented and business oriented) and prior perception of a sponsor (Wilks’s \(\lambda = .95\), \(F = 2.27\), \(p = .11\), \(\eta^2 = .05\)) did not show significant effects on perceived motives. Consistent with Keppel (1991) and Rosenthal and Rosnow (1991), further examinations of univariate results and mean comparisons were necessary to assess specific predictions in H1a &b and H2a & b.
Consumer Perception of the Advertiser’s Intention as Genuine

Univariate analysis demonstrated no simple main effect of business role schema, \( F(1, 88) = .34, p = .56, \eta^2 = .004 \) (See Table 2 for mean values). Further, significant simple main effect of individual company schema was found. Significant interaction effect of business role schema and individual company schema on consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine was found, \( F(1, 88) = 4.84, p < .05, \eta^2 = .05 \) (See Table 1). Because business role schema and individual company schema (ICS) interacted significantly on the perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine, a comparison of mean values remains necessary to accurately identify predicted effects in H1a and H2a.

In H1a, socially oriented subjects (\( M = 5.38 \)) had marginally higher scores on the perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine than business oriented subjects (\( M = 4.55 \)) when subjects had positive individual company schema, \( F(1, 88) = 3.83, p = .054, \eta^2 = .042 \). However, consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine was not altered by business role schema when subjects had negative individual company schema (Socially oriented subjects = 2.83, business oriented subjects = 3.31, \( F(1, 88) = 1.32, p = .25, \eta^2 = .015 \)). Therefore, H1a was marginally supported only when consumers perceived McDonald’s ICS was positive.

The first cell means of interest for H2a are socially oriented subjects across the two levels of individual company schema (ICS: Negative vs. Positive). For the comparison concerning the perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine, the study found that socially oriented subjects responded more positively when they have positive ICS (\( M = 5.38 \)) than negative ICS (\( M = 2.83 \)), \( F(1, 88) = 37.36, p < .01, \eta^2 = .30 \). Further, business oriented subjects also responded more
Table 1 Univariate Results for Genuine and Anti-Genuine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Genuine</th>
<th>McDonald’s</th>
<th>Miller</th>
<th>Genuine</th>
<th>McDonald’s</th>
<th>Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>η2</td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-Business (SB)</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>(1, 88)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>(1, 74)</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>40.83*</td>
<td>(1, 88)</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>47.44*</td>
<td>(1, 74)</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB X ICS</td>
<td>4.84***</td>
<td>(1, 88)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>(1, 74)</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Anti- Genuine</th>
<th>McDonald’s</th>
<th>Miller</th>
<th>Genuine</th>
<th>McDonald’s</th>
<th>Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>η2</td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>η2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-Business (SB)</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>(1, 86)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>(1, 74)</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>9.37*</td>
<td>(1, 86)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>17.47*</td>
<td>(1, 74)</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB X ICS</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>(1, 86)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>(1, 74)</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01
**p < .025
***p < .05

*ICS= Individual Company Schema

Table 2 Dependent Variable Means (Business Role Schema and ICS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Genuine</th>
<th>McDonald’s</th>
<th>Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative ICS</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive ICS</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anti-Genuine</th>
<th>McDonald’s</th>
<th>Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative ICS</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive ICS</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
positively when they have positive ICS (4.55) than negative ICS (3.31), $F(1, 88) = 8.67, p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .09$. In addition, further differences can be detected through examining marginal mean differences in each variable (Keppel, 2004). Specifically (Figure 5), mean changes between negative and positive ICS in socially oriented subject and in business oriented subjects suggest that socially oriented subjects changed their perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine depending on their prior perception of the company greater (2.55) than business oriented subjects (1.24). The magnitude of changes was greater for socially oriented subjects than business oriented subjects. Therefore, the results suggest that H2a is supported (See Figure 5a).

**Consumer Perception of the Advertiser’s Intention as Anti-Genuine**

In H1b, it is proposed that socially oriented consumers would perceive company’s motive as less anti-genuine than business oriented consumers. However, univariate analysis indicates no significant main effect of business role schema (Social: 4.83, Business: 4.61) on anti-genuine motives, $F(1, 86) = .39, p = .53, \eta^2 = .01$ (See Table 1 and Table 2). Therefore, H1b was not supported. Individual company schema (ICS) showed a significant main effect on anti-genuine motives, $F(1, 86) = 9.37, p < .01, \eta^2 = .10$. Interactions between business role schema and individual company schema on the perception of the sponsor’s intention as anti-genuine was also not significant, $F(1, 86) = .901, p = .345, \eta^2 = .05$. A planned comparison of mean values was necessary to accurately identify predicted interaction in H2b. When subjects are socially oriented, consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine changed significantly with individual company schema of McDonald’s (negative ICS: 5.52, positive ICS: 4.14, $F(1, 86) = 8.15, p < .01, \eta^2 = .09$). However, simple effect of ICS on business oriented subjects did not reach
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the standard $p < .05$ (negative ICS: 4.98, positive ICS: 4.25, $F(1, 86) = .901, p = .345, \eta^2 = .05$).

The results suggest that socially oriented subjects were more sensitive to individual company schema of McDonald’s when they evaluate whether the sponsor’s intention is anti-genuine or not, supporting H2b. In sum, overall, no significant interactions by ICS between business role schema and perceived motives were found in the perception of sponsor’s motive as anti-genuine. However, the predicted contrast effect was obtained: socially oriented subjects were more sensitive to individual company schema than business oriented subjects (See Figure 5b).

Further, when subjects have negative individual company schema (ICS), their perception of advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine did vary with business role schema as the predicted direction, but did not reach the standard $p < .05$ (Social: 5.52, Business: 4.98, $F(1, 86) = 1.26, p = .27, \eta^2 = .01$). The contrast effect was also obtained for those with positive individual company schema (ICS) (Social, 4.14: Business: 4.25, $F(1, 86) = .051, p = .82, \eta^2 = .00$), which confirms that H1b is not supported (See Figure 5b). In other words, participants used their prior perception of the advertiser, McDonald’s, as a strong criterion to evaluate the company’s intention in sponsoring obesity prevention messages, but not business role schema. However, participants also used business role schema through interactions with prior perception of the advertiser.

**Miller Brewing Company**

A MANOVA (multivariate analysis of variance) was performed on the dependent measures. Multivariate results indicated a significant main effect of prior perception (Wilks’s $\lambda = .72, F = 14.02, p < .001, \eta^2 = .28$), but not for business role schema (Wilks’s $\lambda = .99, F = .32, p = .73, \eta^2 = .009$). Interaction between business role schema (socially oriented and business
*ICS=Individual Company Schema; Neg ICS=Negative ICS, Pos ICS=Positive ICS
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oriented) and prior perception of a sponsor (Wilks’s λ = 1.00, F = .13, p = .88, η² = .003) did not show significant effects on perceived motives. Further examinations of univariate results and mean comparisons were necessary to assess specific predictions in H1a & b and H2a & b (See Table 1). Please see Table 2 for mean values.

Univariate results on the perception of the sponsor’s intention as genuine did not demonstrate significant main effect of business role schema, F (1, 74) = .47, p = .50, η² = .00, which does not support H1a in Miller. Individual company schema had significant main effect (ICS), F (1, 74) = 25.67, p < .01, η² = .26. Subjects with positive ICS (M = 3.80) perceived the company’s motive in sponsorship more genuine than subjects with negative ICS (M = 5.25) (See Table 2). No significant interactions of business role schema and individual company schema on the genuine perceived motive, F (1, 74) = .09, p = .999, η² = .00 were found (See Table 1).

Planned comparisons were conducted (Analysis of Variance, 2001). The simple effects of ICS for socially oriented subjects were significant, F (1, 74) = 10.38, p < .01, η² = .12, as well as for business oriented subjects, F (1, 74) = 16.82, p < .01, η² = .19. Based on insignificant interaction effects of business role schema and ICS on genuine-perceived motive, and consistently significant simple effects of ICS across socially and business oriented subjects, H2a is not supported. In other words, in the context of Miller advocacy ad, the sponsor’s prior perception played significant roles generating genuine or anti-genuine motives regardless of what business role schema participants held.

On the consumer perception of the sponsor’s intention as anti-genuine, there was no main effect of business role schema, F (1, 74) = .00, p = .98, η² = .00. Main effect of ICS was significant, F (1, 74) = .17.47, p < .01, η² = .19. Subjects with positive ICS (M = 3.15) had lower
score on anti-genuine measures than negative ICS subjects \((M = 4.53)\). No significant interactions between business role schema and ICS were documented, \(F (1, 74) = .18, p = .68, \eta^2 = .00\) (See Table 1). Follow-up planned comparison was conducted. The simple effects of ICS for socially oriented subjects were significant, \(F (1, 74) = 8.56, p < .01, \eta^2 = .10\), as well as for business oriented subjects, \(F (1, 74) = 9.25, p < .01, \eta^2 = .11\). Insignificant interaction effects of business role schema and ICS on anti-genuine-perceived motive, and consistently significant simple effects of ICS across socially and business oriented subjects suggest that H2b is not supported in Miller.

In summary, different results were found in Miller and in McDonald’s. For Miller, no significant interaction effects were detected. When participants saw the values advocacy ad sponsored by Miller Brewing Company, their prior perception of the company and their business role schema did not interact significantly when they speculate whether the company is genuine or not in sponsoring binge drinking prevention messages. However, consumers’ prior perception of the advertiser, McDonald’s and their business role schema interacted significantly in the evaluation of the advertiser’s intention in sponsoring obesity prevention messages when they saw the values advocacy ad sponsored by McDonald’s.

Second Analysis for Business Role Schema and Individual Company Schema (Low and High Social Group and Low and High Business Group)

Overall, interactions of business role schema \(x\) individual company schema \(x\) ‘company’ were significant: interactions among social-business role schema, individual company schema, and ‘company’ on genuine measures were significant, \(F (1, 446) = 16.45, p < .01, \eta^2 = .18\). Also,
interactions among business-business role schema, individual company schema, and ‘company’ were significant, $F(1, 446) = 16.13, p < .01, \eta^2 = .18$. Further, interaction effects of social-business role schema x individual company schema x ‘company’, $F(1, 446) = 6.96, p < .01, \eta^2 = .09$, and business-business role schema x individual company schema x ‘company’, $F(1, 446) = 5.52, p < .01, \eta^2 = .18$ on consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine were significant. Therefore, data from McDonald’s and Miller was analyzed separately.

Secondary analysis was conducted in order to investigate socially oriented and business oriented constructs separately in order to explore further dynamics of two different constructs reflecting business role schema. Median-split on the business measure and social measure identified the top and bottom groups representing consumers more (McDonald’s: $M= 6.12, n=104$; Miller: $M= 6.07, n=115$) and less (McDonald’s: $M= 4.36, n=131$; Miller: $M= 4.48, n=123$) business oriented and consumers more (McDonald’s: $M= 5.44, n=116$; Miller: $M= 5.39, n=132$) and less (McDonald’s: $M= 3.12, n=119$; Miller: $M= 3.22, n=106$) socially oriented. In addition, the further analysis was conducted for individual company schema measures with median-split to identify the top and bottom terciles representing consumers more positive (McDonald’s: $M= 5.70$, Miller: $M= 5.80$) and more negative (McDonald’s: $M=3.89$, Miller: $M=4.12$) individual company schema.
McDonald’s

Social–Business Role Schema

A MANOVA (multivariate analysis of variance) was performed on the dependent measures. Multivariate results indicated a significant main effect of individual company schema (ICS) (Wilks’s $\lambda = .81$, $F = 24.95$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .17$) and social-business role schema (Wilks’s $\lambda = .96$, $F = 4.42$, $p < .025$, $\eta^2 = .04$). Interaction effects between social-business role schema and ICS were not significant (Wilks’s $\lambda = .98$, $F = 2.81$, $p = .06$, $\eta^2 = .025$).

Furthermore, univariate analysis on consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine demonstrated no significant main effect of social-business role schema, $F(1, 222) = .123$, $p = .73$, $\eta^2 = .00$. There was simple main effect of ICS, $F(1, 222) = 49.58$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .18$. Significant interaction effect of LOW and HIGH SOCIAL and prior perception on the genuine perceived motive, $F(1, 222) = 4.06$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .02$, was found.

Again, a comparison of mean values remains necessary to accurately identify predicted effects. Contrast tests demonstrated the perception of the sponsor’s intention as genuine changed significantly with individual role schema when subjects had low scores on the social-business role schema, $F(1, 222) = 12.62$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .05$ as well as when subjects had high scores on the social-business role schema, $F(1, 222) = 41.04$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .16$. Regarding the perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine, when subjects were socially oriented in high, mean difference (1.63) between who had negative ICS ($M= 3.10$) and who had positive ICS ($M=4.73$) was greater than when subjects were socially oriented in low with the mean difference (.90) between
negative ($M=3.53$) and positive ($M=4.43$) ICS, which is the finding consistent with the results from the first analysis supporting H2a. Further contrast tests revealed that for subjects with negative ICS, no significant mean differences between low- and high-social groups were found on consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine both for subjects with negative ICS, $F(1, 222) = 2.66, p = .11, \eta^2 = .01$ and for subjects with positive ICS, $F(1, 222) = 1.46, p = .23, \eta^2 = .01$ (See Figure 6a).

On the perception of the sponsor’s intention as anti-genuine, social-business role schema had significant simple main effect, $F(1, 219) = 8.15, p < .01, \eta^2 = .04$ as well as individual company schema (ICS), $F(1, 219) = 16.12, p < .01, \eta^2 = .07$. Interactions between social-business role schema and ICS were also significant, $F(1, 219) = 4.05, p < .05, \eta^2 = .02$. Specifically (Figure 6), contrast tests on the perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine demonstrated that there was no significant mean differences between negative ($M = 4.59$) and positive ICS ($M = 4.21$) for low-social group, $F(1, 219) = 1.99, p = .16, \eta^2 = .01$. However, high-social group showed significant mean differences between negative ($M = 5.51$) and positive ICS ($M = 4.37$), $F(1, 219) = 18.26, p < .01, \eta^2 = .08$. Therefore, high-social group was more sensitive to ICS than low-social group in the perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine, which is consistent with the results from the first analysis supporting H2b. Further, on the perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine, significant mean differences between low- ($M = 4.59$) and high-social groups ($M = 5.51$) were found only for subjects with negative ICS, $F(1, 219) = 11.19, p < .00, \eta^2 = .05$, which is consistent with the results from the
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first analysis supporting H1b, but not for subjects with positive ICS, $F (1, 219) = .38, p = .54, \eta^2 = .00, M = 4.21$ for low-social and $M = 4.37$ for high-social group) (See Figure 6b). In addition, subjects believed the advertisers have self-interests at the neutral levels (ranged from 4.2 to 4.59) no matter what ICS they hold toward the advertiser. However, when subjects had negative ICS and they believe business has social responsibility, it increased the belief that the advertiser has ulterior motives in sponsoring a social cause ($M = 5.51$) (See Figure 6b).

**Business-Business Role Schema**

Multivariate analysis demonstrated that for business-business role schema, only the main effect of individual company schema (ICS) was significant overall (Wilks’s $\lambda = .82, F = 23.21, p < .01, \eta^2 = .18$). There was no main effect of business measures on perceived motives (Wilks’s $\lambda = .998, F = .24, p = .79, \eta^2 = .002$) or interaction effects of ICS and business-business role schema (Wilks’s $\lambda = .65, F = .43, p = .65, \eta^2 = .004$). Univariate results also demonstrated no main effect of business-business role schema and interaction effects of business-business role schema on both the perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine and the perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine. Only main effect of ICS was significant on the perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine and as anti-genuine. Regarding consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine, contrast tests showed both low- and high-business subjects had significant mean differences between negative and positive ICS (Low-Business: $F (1, 222) = 27.06, p < .01, \eta^2 = .11$, High-Business: $F (1, 222) = 18.80, p < .01, \eta^2 = .08$). In addition, contrast tests showed that changes in the perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine between negative and positive ICS for both low- and high business subjects were significant
Figure 6b SOCIAL-Business Role Schema and ICS on Anti-Genuine
(Low-Business: $F(1, 219) = 8.22, p < .01, \eta^2 = .04$, High-Business: $F(1, 219) = 7.02, p < .01, \eta^2 = .03$). In other words, even though consumers believed in business’ economic responsibility, they were sensitive to company’s prior perception when they evaluate the sponsor’s intention as anti-genuine in sponsoring social causes, which is not consistent with the predictions in H2b.

In sum, results from social-business role schema measures reflect the results found in the first analysis for H1a & H1b and H2a & H2b (See Figure 6a & 6b). However, results from business measures did not support the findings documented in the first analysis. The findings suggest that social-business role schema responses to the measures were the essential factors that influenced the results found in the first analysis.

**Miller Brewing Company**

**Social-Business Role Schema**

A MANOVA (multivariate analysis of variance) was performed on the dependent measures. Multivariate results indicated a significant main effect of prior perception (Wilks’s $\lambda = .82, F = 25.28, p < .001, \eta^2 = .19$) on perceived motive measures, but there was no main effect of SOCIAL (Wilks’s $\lambda = .99, F = 1.09, p = .67, \eta^2 = .003$). Interaction between SOCIAL and prior perception of a sponsor (Wilks’s $\lambda = .997, F = .36, p = .79, \eta^2 = .003$) was not significant. Furthermore, on the consumer perception of the sponsor’s intention as genuine, univariate analysis also demonstrated that there is no main effect of social-business role schema, $F(1, 224) = 1.48, p = .23, \eta^2 = .01$, which is consistent with the results from the first analysis in
Miller, not supporting H1a. Significant main effect of individual company schema (ICS), $F(1, 224) = 47.84, p < .01, \eta^2 = .18$, was found (See Table 4 for mean values). No significant interaction effect of social-business role schema and prior perception on the genuine-perceived sponsor’s motive, $F(1, 224) = .04, p = .85, \eta^2 = .00$ (See Table 3). In addition, contrast tests demonstrated that both low- ($F(1, 224) = 25.81, p < .01, \eta^2 = .10$) and high-social subjects’ perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine changed significantly with individual company schema (ICS) ($F(1, 224) = 22.14, p < .01, \eta^2 = .09$), which is consistent with the results from the first analysis in Miller, not supporting H2a. In other words, in the context of Miller, even though subjects had low scores on social-business role schema measures, they were sensitive to ICS in the perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine.

On consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine, social-business role schema did not have significant main effect, $F(1, 224) = .15, p = .70, \eta^2 = .001$. Further, there was a significant main effect of ICS, $F(1, 224) = 15.58, p < .01, \eta^2 = .07$ (SEE Table 3). Contrast tests also showed that changes in the perception of the sponsor’s intention as anti-genuine between negative and positive ICS for both low- and high society subjects were significant (Low-Social: $F(1, 224) = 5.34, p < .025, \eta^2 = .02$, High-Social: $F(1, 224) = 10.64, p < .01, \eta^2 = .05$), which is consistent with the results from the first analysis in Miller, not supporting H2b.

**Business-Business Role Schema**

For business-business role schema, multivariate analysis documented the significant main effect of individual company schema (ICS) (Wilks’s $\lambda = .82, F = 25.18, p < .01, \eta^2 = .15$). However, there was no main effect of BUSINESS on perceived motives (Wilks’s $\lambda = .993, F$
Table 3 Univariate Results for Genuine and Anti-Genuine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Genuine</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>Df</td>
<td>η2</td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>η2</td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>(1, 219)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>(1, 224)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.37*</td>
<td>(1, 219)</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>47.84*</td>
<td>(1, 224)</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S X ICS</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.88***</td>
<td>(1, 219)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>(1, 224)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>Df</td>
<td>η2</td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>η2</td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.15*</td>
<td>(1, 219)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>(1, 224)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.12*</td>
<td>(1, 219)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>15.78*</td>
<td>(1, 224)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S X ICS</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.05***</td>
<td>(1, 219)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>(1, 224)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>Df</td>
<td>η2</td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>η2</td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>(1, 219)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>(1, 224)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.04*</td>
<td>(1, 219)</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>47.44*</td>
<td>(1, 224)</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X ICS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>(1, 219)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>(1, 224)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>Df</td>
<td>η2</td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>η2</td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>(1, 219)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>(1, 223)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.04*</td>
<td>(1, 219)</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>15.78*</td>
<td>(1, 223)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X ICS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>(1, 219)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>(1, 223)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ICS=Individual Company Schema

*p < .05
**p < .025
***p < .01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Genuine</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McDonald’s</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially Low</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially High</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative ICS</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive ICS</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anti-Genuine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially Low</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially High</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative PP</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive PP</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
= .76, \( p = .47, \eta^2 = .007 \)) or interaction effects of prior perception and BUSINESS (Wilks’s \( \lambda = .995, F = .54, p = .59, \eta^2 = .005 \)). Univariate results on consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine also demonstrated no main effect of business-business role schema, \( F (1, 224) = .86, p = .36, \eta^2 = .004 \) and interaction effects of business-business role schema and ICS, \( F (1, 224) = .21, p = .65, \eta^2 = .001 \). Only main effect of ICS was significant, \( F (1, 224) = 47.44, p < .01, \eta^2 = .18 \) (See Table 3, See Table 4 for mean values). Positive ICS subjects had higher score on genuine measures (\( M = 4.04 \)) than negative ICS subjects (\( M = 5.13 \)) (See Table 5). Contrast tests showed both low- and high-business subjects had significant mean differences between negative and positive ICS on Genuine (Low-Business: \( F (1, 224) = 21.24, p < .01, \eta^2 = .09 \), High-Business: \( F (1, 224) = 26.74, p < .01, \eta^2 = .11 \)). In other words, even though consumers believed in business’ economic responsibility, they were sensitive to company’s prior perception when they evaluate the sponsor’s intention in sponsoring social causes, which is not consistent with the prediction in H2a.

On the perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine, contrast tests showed that changes in the perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine between negative and positive ICS for both low- and high business subjects were significant (Low-Business: \( F (1, 224) = 4.44, p < .05, \eta^2 = .02 \), High-Business: \( F (1, 224) = 12.21, p < .01, \eta^2 = .05 \)) (See Figure 6).

Therefore, in Miller, individual company schema had significant effect regardless of the levels of consumers’ belief toward business’s social responsibility or business responsibility on both the perception of the sponsor’s intention as genuine and as anti-genuine. In sum, in Miller, either social measures or business measures did not supported the predictions proposed H1a & b or H2a & b.
### Table 5 Dependent Variable Means (BUSINESS-Business Role Schema and ICS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genuine</th>
<th>McDonald’s</th>
<th>Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Low</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business High</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative ICS</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive ICS</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anti-Genuine</th>
<th>McDonald’s</th>
<th>Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Low</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business High</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative PP</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive PP</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceived Intentions and Issue Involvement on Perceptions (trustworthiness and attitude) toward a Sponsor

Univariate analysis documented the significant interactions among genuine-perceived motive, issue involvement and ‘company’ on trustworthiness, $F(1, 446) = 44.92, p < .01, \eta^2 = .04$ and on attitude, $F(1, 446) = 33.09, p < .01, \eta^2 = .31$. Further, univariate analysis, it was evident that interactions among anti-genuine perceived motive, issue involvement, and ‘company’ on trustworthiness, $F(1, 443) = 5.43, p < .01, \eta^2 = .07$ and attitude, $F(1, 443) = 4.33, p < .01, \eta^2 = .06$. Therefore, since the interaction results suggest that the factor, ‘company’, has played a significant role, the two different company data were analyzed separately.

*McDonald’s*

In H3a &b, the study predicted higher scores on trustworthiness and attitude toward a sponsor when participants have high scores on the perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine (low scores on the perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine) than with low scores on the perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine (H3a) (high scores on the perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine (H3b)). Also, H4a & b proposed that issue involvement will moderate the relationship between two types of perceived motives (genuine: H4a and anti-genuine: H4b) and trustworthiness/ attitude toward the company. To access the analysis, median splits were conducted on issue involvement low ($M= 3.42$) and high ($M= 5.92$) groups and on low ($M= 2.97$) and high ($M= 5.33$) genuine groups, and low ($M= 3.02$) and high ($M= 5.50$) anti-genuine groups.
**Genuine and Issue Involvement on Trustworthiness and Attitude**

Multivariate results indicated a significant simple main effect of genuine (Wilks’s $\lambda = .65$, $F = 60.35$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .35$) and issue involvement (Wilks’s $\lambda = .94$, $F = 7.09$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .06$). Furthermore, results showed the significant interactions between genuine and issue involvement (Wilks’s $\lambda = .97$, $F = 4.0$, $p < .025$, $\eta^2 = .04$).

Follow-up univariate analysis showed that the perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine had significant simple main effects on both trustworthiness and attitude (See Table 6; See Table 7a for mean values). The result showed significant interaction effect of issue involvement and the perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine on attitude, $F (1, 222) = 6.87$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .03$, and on trustworthiness, $F (1, 222) = 5.95$, $p < .025$, $\eta^2 = .03$ (See Table 6). To specifically assess the prediction in H3a and H4a, a comparison of mean values remains necessary to accurately identify predicted effects.

In H3a, the study predicted higher scores on trustworthiness and attitude toward a sponsor when participants have high scores on the perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine than when participants have low scores on perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine. For H3a, the first cell means of interest were those for low- issue involvement subjects across the two levels of the perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine. Contrast univariate tests demonstrated that when subjects had low issue involvement, the levels of trustworthiness varied with the perception of the advertiser’s motive as genuine (low-genuine = 4.01, high-genuine = 5.04, $F (1, 222) = 29.99$, $p < .01$). Attitude toward the company also varied with the perception of the advertiser’s motive as genuine when subjects had low-issue involvement.
Table 6 Univariate Results for Trustworthiness (Trust) and Attitude toward the Company

### Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Trust McDonald’s</th>
<th>Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine (G)</td>
<td>113.67*</td>
<td>(1, 222)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Involve (II)</td>
<td>11.40*</td>
<td>(1, 222)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G X II</td>
<td>5.95**</td>
<td>(1, 222)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Trust McDonald’s</th>
<th>Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine (G)</td>
<td>73.54*</td>
<td>(1, 222)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Involve (II)</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>(1, 222)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G X II</td>
<td>6.87*</td>
<td>(1, 222)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Trust McDonald’s</th>
<th>Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AntiGenuine (AG)</td>
<td>14.61*</td>
<td>(1, 219)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Involve (II)</td>
<td>17.42*</td>
<td>(1, 219)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG X II</td>
<td>5.89**</td>
<td>(1, 219)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Trust McDonald’s</th>
<th>Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AntiGenuine (AG)</td>
<td>13.50*</td>
<td>(1, 219)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Involve (II)</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>(1, 219)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG X II</td>
<td>5.13***</td>
<td>(1, 219)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01
**p < .025
***p < .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McDonald’s</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine Low</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine High</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low II</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High II</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McDonald’s</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine Low</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine High</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low II</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High II</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7a Dependent Variable Means and Comparison Results for Genuine and II
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involvement (low-genuine = 4.01, high-genuine = 5.04, $F(1, 222) = 15.73, p < .01$), supporting H3a. The next cell means of interest were those for high-issue involvement subjects across the two levels of the perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine. When subjects has high issue involvement, the levels of trustworthiness varied with the perception of the advertiser’s motive as genuine (low-genuine = 3.67, high-genuine = 5.61, $F(1, 222) = 98.32, p < .01$). When subjects had high-issue involvement, the levels of attitude also varied with the perception of the advertiser’s motive as genuine (low-genuine = 3.67, high-genuine = 5.61, $F(1, 222) = 72.82, p < .01$), supporting H3a (See Figure 7). Therefore, the prediction in H3 was supported regardless of consumers’ issue involvement levels.

H4a predicted that when consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine is high, consumers’ perceived trustworthiness and attitude will change significantly with issue involvement levels more than when consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine is low. To specifically assess the prediction in H4a, the study tested contrast effects of the perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine when subjects had low-issue involvement and when subjects had high-issue involvement. Contrast tests demonstrated that regarding the perception of trustworthiness, when subjects’ perception of advertiser’s intention as genuine is low, no significant mean differences between low- ($M = 3.31$) and high-issue involvement groups ($3.46$) were found, $F(1, 222) = .49, p = .49$. Also, regarding attitude toward the sponsor, when subjects’ perception of advertiser’s intention as genuine is low, no significant mean differences were found between low- ($M = 3.67$) and high issue involvement groups ($4.01$), $F(1, 222) = 2.13, p = .15$. However, when subjects’ perception of advertiser’s intention as genuine is high, the perception of trustworthiness significantly varied with issue involvement levels (low- =
Figure 7 Genuine and II on Trustworthiness and Attitude
and high-issue involvement groups = 5.55, $F(1, 222) = 15.37, p < .01$). Attitude toward the sponsor also significantly varied with issue involvement (low–issue involvement = 5.04 and high-issue involvement group = 5.61, $F(1, 222) = 4.91, p < .05$), supporting H4a (See Figure 7).

**Anti-Genuine and Issue Involvement on Trustworthiness and Attitude**

Multivariate results indicated a significant simple main effect of the perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine (Wilks’s $\lambda = .93, F = 8.26, p < .001, \eta^2 = .07$) and issue involvement (Wilks’s $\lambda = .92, F = 9.93, p < .01, \eta^2 = .04$). Furthermore, results showed the significant interactions between anti-genuine and issue involvement (Wilks’s $\lambda = .97, F = 3.25, p < .05, \eta^2 = .03$). Follow-up univariate analysis showed that anti-genuine had significant simple main effect on both trustworthiness and attitude. In addition, the results showed the significant interactions between the perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine and issue involvement on trustworthiness, $F(1, 219) = 14.61, p < .01, \eta^2 = .063$ and on attitude, $F(1, 219) = 13.50, p < .01, \eta^2 = .058$ (See Table 6) (See Table 7b for mean values).

Again, a comparison of mean values remains necessary to accurately identify predicted effects in H3b. The cell means of interest for this hypothesis are whether the perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine significantly altered the levels of trustworthiness and attitude toward the sponsor when subjects had low-issue involvement as well as when subjects had high-issue involvement. The results suggest that the effect of the perception of advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine on trustworthiness changed depending on subjects’ issue involvement levels. First, the contrast tests detected that the subjects’ perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine did not significantly alter the level of trustworthiness when issue involvement is
Table 7b Dependent Variable Means and Comparison Results for Anti-Genuine and II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>McDonald’s</th>
<th>Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-G Low</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-G High</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low II</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High II</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>McDonald’s</th>
<th>Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-G Low</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-G High</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low II</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High II</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
low (low anti-genuine = 3.96, high anti-genuine = 3.69, \( F(1, 219) = .88, p = .35, \eta^2 = .004 \)). Also, the subjects’ perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine did not significantly altered the level of attitude when issue involvement is low (low anti-genuine = 4.54, high anti-genuine = 4.27, \( F(1, 219) = .90, p = .35, \eta^2 = .004 \)), which did not support H3b. Further, the second cell means of interest for this hypothesis are whether the perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine significantly altered the levels of trustworthiness and attitude toward the sponsor when subjects had high-issue involvement, and found the levels of trustworthiness was significantly altered (low level of anti-genuine = 5.22, high level of anti-genuine = 4.02, \( F(1, 219) = 14.61, p < .01, \eta^2 = .063 \)), and significantly altered attitude toward the sponsor (low level of anti-genuine = 5.33, high level of anti-genuine = 4.17, \( F(1, 219) = 19.81, p < .01, \eta^2 = .063 \)), supporting H3b. In other words, H3b was supported only when issue involvement was high (See Figure 8).

To specifically assess the prediction in H4b, the contrast effects of issue involvement across the two levels of the perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine was low versus high were examined. When the perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine was low, the subjects’ perception of trustworthiness was significantly changed with issue involvement (low issue involvement = 3.96, high issue involvement = 5.22, \( F(1, 219) = 21.79, p < .01, \eta^2 = .09 \)). Attitude toward the sponsor was not also altered significantly with issue involvement when the perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine was low (low issue involvement = 4.54, high issue involvement = 5.33, \( F(1, 219) = 8.12, p < .01, \eta^2 = .036 \)). However, when subjects’ perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine is high, their perception of trustworthiness did not vary with issue involvement levels (low-issue involvement:
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3.69, high-issue involvement: 4.02, \( F (1, 219) = 1.52, p = .22, \eta^2 = .007 \). Also, their perception of attitude did not vary with issue involvement levels (low-issue involvement: 4.27, high-issue involvement: 4.17, \( F (1, 219) = .12, p = .73, \eta^2 = .001 \)), supporting H4b (See Figure 8).

Overall, mean comparisons detected that H3b was supported only when subjects had high-issue involvement. H3b was not supported when subjects had low-issue involvement subjects (SEE Figure 8). When subjects were less involved in obesity issue, whether the company’s motive in sponsorship is genuine or anti-genuine did not make much differences on the levels of trustworthiness and attitude toward the company. In other words, subjects’ high level of issue involvement was necessary in order to activate consumers’ perception of the advertiser’s intention to generate positive or negative perception toward the advertiser.

On the perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine, mean comparisons detected that H3a was supported fully, both low- and high-issue involvement subjects’ trustworthiness and attitude were altered significantly with the two levels in the perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine. However, H3b was supported partially. Only high-issue involvement subjects’ trustworthiness and attitude changed significantly with the levels in consumers’ perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine. If consumers were not highly interested in the advocated issue in the ad, then they did not care whether the sponsor has self-interested motive or not.

In general, issue involvement changed the levels of trustworthiness and attitude toward the sponsor in a positive direction only when the perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine is low (See Figure 8). Issue involvement changed the levels of trustworthiness and attitude toward the sponsor in a positive direction both when the perception of the advertiser’s
intention as genuine is low and high. However, the magnitude of change in the perceptions of trustworthiness and attitude was greater when consumers’ issue involvement level was high than when consumers’ issue involvement level was low. Overall, all interactions between the perceptions of the advertiser and issue involvement levels reached the significance level .05. in the context of McDonald’s values advocacy ad.

**Miller Brewing Company**

In Miller, to access the analysis, median splits were conducted on issue involvement low (M= 3.04) and high (M = 5.48) groups and on low (M = 3.61) and high (M = 5.70) genuine groups, and low (M = 2.57) and high (M = 4.96) anti-genuine groups.

**Genuine and Issue Involvement on Trustworthiness and Attitude**

In Miller, the result was different from McDonald’s; Mutivariate analysis showed that there was significant main effect of genuine (Wilks’s λ = .63, F = 66.23, p = .00, η^2 = .37). However, there were no main effect of issue involvement (Wilks’s λ = .99, F = .65, p = .52, η^2 = .006), and no interaction effects between genuine and issue involvement (Wilks’s λ = .99, F = 1.15, p = .32, η^2 = .01).

Univariate analysis found that the perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine had significant main effects on attitude, F (1, 224) = 113.63, p < .01, η^2 = .34, and on trustworthiness, F (1, 224) = 104.15, p < .01, η^2 = .32, supporting H3a (See Table 6) (See Table 7a). Further planned comparisons were necessary in order to specifically assess the predictions in H4a. When subjects’ perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine was high, trustworthiness was not
altered by issue involvement levels, \( F(1, 224) = 3.13, p = .08, \eta^2 = .01 \). Also, when subjects’ perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine was low, trustworthiness was not also altered by issue involvement levels, \( F(1, 224) = .19, p = .67, \eta^2 = .00 \). The attitude toward the company also was not changed with issue involvement when the perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine was high, \( F(1, 224) = .13, p = .73, \eta^2 = .00 \), as well as when the perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine was low, \( F(1, 224) = 1.37, p = .24, \eta^2 = .01 \), which suggest that H4a is not supported.

Anti-Genuine and Issue Involvement on Trustworthiness and Attitude

Through a multivariate analysis, the main effect of anti-genuine was found (Wilks’s \( \lambda = .89, F = 13.53, p < .01, \eta^2 = .11 \)). However, there was no interaction effect between anti-genuine and issue involvement (Wilks’s \( \lambda = .99, F = 1.63, p = .20, \eta^2 = .01 \)). Follow-up univariate analysis detected the significant main effects of the perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine on attitude, \( F(1, 224) = 15.44, p < .01, \eta^2 = .064 \) and on trustworthiness, \( F(1, 224) = 5.72, p < .025, \eta^2 = .025 \), supporting H3b (See Table 6) (See Table 7 for mean values). Interaction effects between anti-genuine and issue involvement were not found both on trustworthiness, \( F(1, 224) = .22, p = .64, \eta^2 = .00 \) and on attitude, \( F(1, 224) = 1.41, p = .24, \eta^2 = .01 \) (See Table 6) (See Table 7b for mean values).

For H4b, the study assessed whether the level of trustworthiness was altered with issue involvement when the subjects’ perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine was low and found that issue involvement did not significantly change the level of trustworthiness (low-issue involvement = 4.11, high-issue involvement = 4.02, \( F(1, 224) = .17, p = .69, \eta^2 = .00 \)). Also,
when the subjects’ perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine was high, issue involvement did not change the levels of trustworthiness, (low-issue involvement = 5.48, high-issue involvement = 5.85, $F (1, 224) = 1.62, p = .20, \eta^2 = .01$), which do not support H4b.

Regarding attitude toward the sponsor, when the subjects’ perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine was high, the perception of attitude did not significantly change with issue involvement (low-issue involvement = 4.78, high-issue involvement = 5.08, $F (1, 224) = 1.62, p = .204, \eta^2 = .01$). The consistent results were found when subjects’ perception of advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine was low, attitude was not changed by issue involvement (low- issue involvement = 5.64, high- issue involvement groups = 5.54, $F (1, 224) = .17, p = .69$, $\eta^2 = .00$), which do not support H4b.

Perceptions toward the Sponsors and Issue Involvement/Self-Efficacy on Behavioral Intention

In H5, the study predicted that when participants have higher levels of trustworthiness and more positive attitude toward McDonald’s, they will have higher levels of behavioral intention toward obesity prevention actions. In H6 and H7, the study predicted that when participants have high efficacy levels (H6) and high issue involvement levels (H7), consumers will be sensitive to the advertiser’s credibility regarding their behavioral intention toward the advocated actions. To access analysis, median splits on trustworthiness (McDonald’s: low score group: $M = 3.07, n=118$; high score group: $M = 5.47, n=110$; Miller Brewing Company: low score group: $M = 3.67, n=107$; high score group: $M = 5.91, n=123$) and attitude (McDonald’s: low
score group: $M = 3.49, n = 113$; high score group: $M = 5.67, n = 113$; Miller Brewing Company: low score group: $M = 4.2, n = 114$; high score group: $M = 6.3, n = 114$) measures were conducted.

*McDonald’s*

**Trustworthiness/ Attitude and Self-Efficacy on Behavioral Intention**

There were significant main effects of trustworthiness, $F(1, 224) = 9.89, p < .01, \eta^2 = .04$, self-efficacy, $F(1, 224) = 114.73, p < .01, \eta^2 = .34$, supporting H5. There was no interactions between trustworthiness and self-efficacy on behavioral intention toward advocated action, $F(1, 224) = .031, p = .91, \eta^2 = .00$. Also, there were significant main effects of attitude, $F(1, 224) = 5.87, p < .025, \eta^2 = .03$, supporting H5, and self-efficacy, $F(1, 224) = 117.71, p < .01, \eta^2 = .35$. However, no interaction effect of attitude x self-efficacy was found, $F(1, 224) = .28, p = .60, \eta^2 = .00$ on behavioral intention toward advocated action (SEE Table 8) (See Table 9 for mean values). These findings support H5. A comparison of mean values remains necessary to accurately identify predicted effects in H6.

The first cell means of interest for H6 are those for high self-efficacy subjects across the two levels of trustworthiness. For the first comparison, the study assessed whether those with high level of self-efficacy responded high level of behavioral intention when trustworthiness is high ($M = 6.02$) than low ($5.57$) and found the predicted significant difference, $F(1, 224) = 5.10, p < .05, \eta^2 = .02$. Also, those with low level of self-efficacy responded high level of behavioral intention when trustworthiness was high ($M = 4.42$) versus low ($3.93$), $F(1, 222) = .43, p < .05, \eta^2 = .02$, which does not support H6 (See Figure 9).
The second cell means of interest for H6 are those for high self-efficacy subjects across the two levels of attitude. For the first comparison, the study assessed whether those with high level of self-efficacy responded high level of behavioral intention when attitude is positive (M = 5.96) than negative (5.67) and no significant difference, $F(1, 222) = 1.83, p = .18, \eta^2 = .01$. However, those with low level of self-efficacy responded high level of behavioral intention when attitude was positive (M = 4.38) versus negative (3.93), and found the significant difference, $F(1, 222) = 4.28, p < .05, \eta^2 = .02$, which does not support the predictions proposed in H6 (See Figure 9).

**Trustworthiness/ Attitude and Issue Involvement on Behavioral Intention**

There were significant main effects of trustworthiness, supporting H5, $F(1, 224) = 9.95, p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .04$, and issue involvement, $F(1, 224) = 17.90, p < .01, \eta^2 = .07$. No significant interaction effect of trustworthy x issue involvement was found, $F(1, 224) = .923, p = .34, \eta^2 = .00$ on behavioral intention toward advocated action. Also, there were significant main effects of attitude, $F(1, 222) = 10.93, p < .01, \eta^2 = .05$, supporting H5, issue involvement, $F(1, 222) = 26.24, p < .01, \eta^2 = .11$. There was no interaction of attitude x issue involvement, $F(1, 222) = .43, p = .52, \eta^2 = .00$ on behavioral intention toward advocated action (See Table 8) (See Table 9 for mean values). A comparison of mean values remains necessary to accurately identify predicted effects in H7.

The first cell means of interest for H7 are those for high issue involvement subjects across the two levels of trustworthiness. For the first comparison, the study assessed whether those with high level of issue involvement responded high level of behavioral intention when
### Table 8 Univariate Results for Behavioral Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>McDonald’s</th>
<th></th>
<th>Miller</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>df</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>η²</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust (T)</td>
<td>9.95*</td>
<td>(1, 224)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>7.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Involve (II)</td>
<td>17.90*</td>
<td>(1, 224)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>49.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T X II</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>(1, 224)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>McDonald’s</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>df</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>η²</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (A)</td>
<td>10.93*</td>
<td>(1, 222)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>5.73**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Involve (II)</td>
<td>26.24*</td>
<td>(1, 222)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>51.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X II</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>(1, 222)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miller</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>df</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>η²</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust (T)</td>
<td>9.89*</td>
<td>(1, 224)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy (SE)</td>
<td>114.73*</td>
<td>(1, 224)</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>96.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T X SE</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>(1, 224)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>McDonald’s</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>df</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>η²</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (A)</td>
<td>5.87**</td>
<td>(1, 222)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy (SE)</td>
<td>117.71*</td>
<td>(1, 222)</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>89.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X SE</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>(1, 222)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01

**p < .025

***p < .05
Table 9 Dependent Variable (BI) Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BI</th>
<th>McDonald’s</th>
<th>Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust L</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust H</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low II</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High II</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>McDonald’s</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miller</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att Low</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att High</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low II</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High II</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>McDonald’s</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miller</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Low</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust High</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Low SE</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SE</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>McDonald’s</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miller</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att Low</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att High</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SE</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SE</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 9 Trustworthiness/Attitude and Self-Efficacy/Issue Involvement on BI (McDonald's)
trustworthiness is high ($M = 5.58$) than low ($M = 5.17$) and found no significant difference, $F (1, 224) = 2.85, p = .09, \eta^2 = .01$. However, those with low level of issue involvement responded high level of behavioral intention when trustworthiness was high ($M = 4.97$) versus low ($M = 4.21$), $F (1, 224) = 7.33, p < .01, \eta^2 = .03$, which does not support the predictions made in H7.

The second cell means of interest for H7 are those for high issue involvement subjects across the two levels of attitude. For the first comparison, the study assessed whether those with high level of issue involvement responded high level of behavioral intention when attitude is positive ($M = 5.96$) than negative ($M = 5.67$) and found the predicted significant difference, $F (1, 222) = 3.94, p < .05, \eta^2 = .01$. Also, those with low level of issue involvement responded high level of behavioral intention when attitude was positive ($M = 4.38$) versus negative ($M = 3.93$), and found the significant difference, $F (1, 222) = 7.08, p < .01, \eta^2 = .03$, which does not support H7.

In final, in McDonald’s, for H5, even though contrast tests revealed that trustworthiness had insignificant effect when consumers have high level of issue involvement, and revealed that attitude had insignificant effect when consumers have high level of self-efficacy, the directional support of the prediction was found (See Figure 9). Further, H5 is supported based on significant main effects of trustworthiness and attitude on behavioral intention through two 2x2 factorial designs; (1) trustworthiness/attitude (low vs. high) x self-efficacy (low vs. high) (2) trustworthiness/attitude (low vs. high) x issue involvement (low vs. high). Follow-up t-test also found that when subjects had a high level of trustworthiness ($M = 4.75$), their behavioral intention is higher than when they had a low level of trustworthiness ($M = 4.02$) ($t = -3.16, p$
Further, attitude toward the advertiser also enhanced behavioral intention toward the advocated action (negative attitude = 4.13, positive attitude = 4.73, t = - 2.59, p < .01), supporting H5.

**Miller Brewing Company**

**Trustworthiness/ Attitude and Self-Efficacy on Behavioral Intention**

Behavioral intention did not vary significantly with levels of trustworthiness (low trustworthiness = 4.20, high trustworthiness = 4.56, F (1, 226) = 3.11, p = .08, η² = .01), suggesting that H5 is not supported. Significant main effect of self-efficacy was found, F (1, 224) = 89.10, p < .01, η² = .29. Interaction between trustworthiness and self-efficacy was also not significant, F (1, 226) = .10, p = .93, η² = .00 (See Table 8) (See Table 9 for mean values). Those who have positive attitude (M = 4.45) did not have a higher level of behavioral intention than those who have negative attitude (4.33), F (1, 224) = .39, p = .53, η² = .00. Therefore, the findings suggest that H5 is not supported in Miller in testing trustworthiness/attitude (low vs. high) x self-efficacy (low vs. high) factorial design. A comparison of mean values remains necessary to accurately identify predicted effects in H6 (See Figure 10).

The first cell means of interest for H6 are those for high self-efficacy subjects across the two levels of trustworthiness. For the first comparison, the study assessed whether those with high level of self-efficacy responded high level of behavioral intention when trustworthiness is high (M = 3.62) than low (M = 3.28) and found no significant difference, F (1, 226) = 1.71, p = .19, η² = .01. Also, those with low level of self-efficacy responded high level of behavioral
intention when trustworthiness was high ($M = 5.49$) versus low (5.12), and supported the prediction directionally but did not reach the standard $p < .05$ level of significance, $F (1, 226) = 1.41, p = .24, \eta^2 = .01$, which does not support H6 (See Figure 9).

The second cell means of interest for H6 are those for high self-efficacy subjects across the two levels of attitude. For the first comparison, the study assessed whether those with high level of self-efficacy responded high level of behavioral intention when attitude is positive ($M = 5.51$) than negative (5.19) and supported the prediction directionally but did not reach the standard $p < .05$, $F (1, 224) = 1.26, p = .26, \eta^2 = .01$. Also, those with low level of self-efficacy responded high level of behavioral intention when attitude was positive ($M = 3.39$) versus negative (3.46), and found no significant difference, $F (1, 224) = .05, p = .82, \eta^2 = .00$, which does not support H6 (See Figure 10).

**Trustworthiness/ Attitude and Issue Involvement on Behavioral Intention**

In line with H5, behavioral intention was greater for those with high level of trustworthiness ($M = 4.72$) than low level of trustworthiness (4.12), $F (1, 226) = 7.88, p < .01, \eta^2 = .03$, and issue involvement, $F (1, 226) = 50.02, p < .01, \eta^2 = .18$. There was no interaction effect between trustworthiness and issue involvement, $F (1, 226) = 1.16, p = .28, \eta^2 = .01$ on behavioral intention toward advocated action. Further, there were significant main effects of attitude, $F (1, 224) = 5.68, p < .025, \eta^2 = .03$, and of issue involvement, $F (1, 224) = 49.92, p < .01, \eta^2 = .18$. There was also significant interaction effect of attitude x issue involvement, $F (1, 224) = 4.14, p < .05, \eta^2 = .02$ on behavioral intention toward advocated action (See Table 8) (See Table 9 for mean values). The findings suggest that H5 was supported for trustworthiness.
Figure 10 Trustworthiness/Attitude and Self-Efficacy/Issue Involvement on BI (Miller).
However, simple main effects of attitude toward the sponsor need to be examined further through contrast tests because of the significant interactions found in attitude x issue involvement. Mean comparisons detected that attitude toward the sponsor had significant effect on the level of behavioral intention only when subjects’ issue involvement level is high. Therefore, H5 was supported when examining the effect of consumers’ attitude toward the company on the behavioral intention only among high issue involvement subjects (See Figure 10). Also, a comparison of mean values remains necessary to accurately identify predicted effects in H7.

The first cell means of interest for H 7 are those for high issue involvement subjects across the two levels of trustworthiness. For the first comparison, the study assessed whether those with high level of issue involvement responded high level of behavioral intention when trustworthiness is high (M = 5.58) than low (4.76) and found the predicted significant difference, $F(1, 226) = 7.06, p < .01, \eta^2 = .03$. However, those with low level of issue involvement responded high level of behavioral intention when trustworthiness was high (M = 3.85) versus low (3.49), $F(1, 226) = 1.61, p = .21, \eta^2 = .01$, supporting H7.

The second cell means of interest for H7 are those for high issue involvement subjects across the two levels of attitude. For the first comparison, the study assessed whether those with high level of issue involvement responded high level of behavioral intention when attitude is positive (M = 5.67) than negative (4.73) and found the predicted significant difference, $F(1, 224) = 9.39, p < .01, \eta^2 = .04$. However, as H7 predicted, those with low level of issue involvement responded high level of behavioral intention when attitude was positive (M = 3.73) versus
negative (3.66), and found no significant difference, $F (1, 224) = .07, p = .78, \eta^2 = .00$, supporting H7 (See Figure 10).

In final, overall, the findings demonstrated that H5 is not supported in the trustworthiness/ attitude (low vs. high) x self-efficacy (low vs. high) factorial design. Further, when the effect of subject’s issue involvement levels was a factor, trustworthiness and attitude had significant effect only when subjects had high levels of issue involvement. The levels of trustworthiness and attitude toward the sponsor altered behavioral intention toward the advocated action only when subjects had high level of issue involvement. Behavioral intention did not vary with the levels of trustworthiness and attitude if the subjects had low level of issue involvement for Miller (See Figure 10). Resulted in two different 2 x2 factorial designs utilized in testing H5, the inconsistent results for H5 made difficult to conclude whether H5 is supported or not. Follow-up independent t-test demonstrated that when subjects had high level of trustworthiness ($M = 5.40$), their behavioral intention toward the advocated action was significantly higher than those who had low level of trustworthiness ($M = 4.62$) ($t = -3.16, p < .01$). Also, subjects with positive attitude toward the sponsor ($M = 4.67$) had higher level of behavioral intention than with negative attitude toward the sponsor ($M = 5.32$) ($t = -2.59, p < .01$), supporting H5 in Miller.

**Perceptions toward Sponsors on Purchase Intention**

In H8, the study predicted that trustworthiness and attitude will have effects on purchase intention, but will not interact with issue involvement or self-efficacy. A series of ANOVAs were conducted to test H8.
Interaction Effects of II and SE on Purchase Intention

*McDonald’s*

**Trustworthiness / Attitude and Issue Involvement on Purchase Intention**

Simple main effects of trustworthiness was found on purchase intention, $F(1, 224) = 9.95$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .05$. There was significant interaction effect between trustworthiness and issue involvement on purchase intention, $F(1, 224) = 4.25$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .02$ (See Table 10) (See Table 11 for mean values). In order to test H8, a comparison of mean values remains necessary to accurately identify predicted effects. Concerning purchase intention, the study assessed whether those who has low level of trustworthiness toward the company responded more favorably for high- issue involvement group ($M = 3.36$) versus low- issue involvement group ($M = 3.57$) and found no significant differences, $F(1, 224) = .79$, $p = .38$, $\eta^2 = .00$. Further, those who had high level of trustworthiness responded more favorably on purchase intention when they had high level of issue involvement ($M = 5.34$) than low issue involvement level ($M = 4.82$), $F(1, 224) = 3.89$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .02$. Further contrast tests showed that both low- and high- issue involvement subjects demonstrated the significant mean differences between low- and high-trustworthiness groups on purchase intention; low-issue involvement, $F(1, 224) = 21.45$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .09$; high-issue involvement, $F(1, 224) = 73.63$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .25$. Therefore, regarding ‘trustworthiness,’ H8 was partially supported. Subjects’ perception of the sponsor’s trustworthiness significantly altered purchase intention regardless of self-efficacy and issue involvement. Still interaction effects were present.
Table 10 Univariate Results for Purchase Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>McDonald's</th>
<th>Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$F$ value</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.78*</td>
<td>(1, 224)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Involve (II)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>(1, 224)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T X II</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.25***</td>
<td>(1, 224)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*$p &lt; .01$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>***$p &lt; .05$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.95*</td>
<td>(1, 222)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Involve (II)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.57*</td>
<td>(1, 222)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X II</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.51**</td>
<td>(1, 222)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*$p &lt; .01$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>***$p &lt; .05$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td>92.17*</td>
<td>(1, 224)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy (SE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>(1, 224)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T X SE</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>(1, 224)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*$p &lt; .01$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>***$p &lt; .05$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.59*</td>
<td>(1, 222)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy (SE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>(1, 222)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X SE</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>(1, 222)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*$p &lt; .01$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>***$p &lt; .05$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, simple main effect of attitude on purchase intention was found, $F(1, 224) = 57.95$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .21$ as well as simple main effect of issue involvement, $F(1, 224) = 7.57$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .03$. Interactions between attitude toward the sponsor and issue involvement was significant, $F(1, 222) = 6.51$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .03$. Again, a comparison of mean values remains necessary to accurately identify predicted effects. Concerning purchase intention, the study assessed whether those who had negative attitude toward the sponsor will respond more favorably when they had low level of issue involvement ($M = 3.56$) versus high level of issue involvement ($M = 3.60$) and found no significant difference, $F(1, 222) = .02$, $p = .89$, $\eta^2 = .00$. However, those who had positive attitude toward the sponsor responded more favorably on purchase intention when they had high-issue involvement ($M = 5.41$) versus low-issue involvement ($M = 4.47$) and found significant difference, $F(1, 222) = 13.82$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .06$. Further contrast tests revealed that both low- and high- issue involvement groups showed significant mean differences between negative and positive attitude groups on purchase intention; low issue involvement group, $F(1, 222) = 11.56$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .05$; high issue involvement group, $F(1, 222) = 57.88$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .21$. Therefore, H8 was also partially supported for ‘attitude’; when subjects’ attitude toward the sponsor is positive. Purchase intention level was high for both low- and high- issue involvement subjects. Also, interaction between attitude and issue involvement on purchase intention was found, which is inconsistent to the prediction in H8 (See Figure 11a).
**Figure 11a Trustworthiness/Attitude and Issue Involvement on Purchase Intention (McDonald's)**

**Trustworthiness/Attitude and Self-Efficacy on Purchase Intention**

Significant main effect of trustworthiness on purchase intention was found, $F(1, 224) = 92.17, p < .01, \eta^2 = .29$. Subjects with high level of trustworthiness ($M = 3.48$) showed higher level of purchase intention and low level of trustworthiness ($M = 5.13$). However, no main effect of self-efficacy, $F(1, 224) = 2.04, p = .16, \eta^2 = .01$ was found. Further, no interaction effect of trustworthiness and self-efficacy were demonstrated, $F(1, 224) = 2.39, p = .123, \eta^2 = .01$. Post-hoc contrast tests detected that when subjects had high level of trustworthiness, purchase intention varied significantly with the level of self-efficacy (low self-efficacy = 4.87, high self-efficacy = 5.38, $F(1, 224) = 4.22, p < .05, \eta^2 = .02$). However, when subjects had low level of
trustworthiness, purchase intention did not vary with the level of self-efficacy (low self-efficacy = 3.49, high self-efficacy = 3.47, \( F(1, 224) = .01, p = .93, \eta^2 = .00 \)).

Significant main effect of attitude, \( F(1, 224) = 62.04, p < .01, \eta^2 = .22 \). Positive attitude subjects showed significantly higher mean score (\( M = 5.36 \)) than negative attitude subjects (\( M = 3.88 \)) on purchase intention. Self-efficacy did not have significant main effect on purchase intention \( F(1, 224) = 3.12, p = .079, \eta^2 = .014 \). Further, interactions between attitude and self-efficacy were not significant, \( F(1, 224) = .001, p = .98, \eta^2 = .00 \). Post-hoc contrast tests detected that when subjects had high level of trustworthiness, purchase intention varied significantly with the level of self-efficacy (low self-efficacy = 4.67, high self-efficacy = 5.27, \( F(1, 224) = 5.32, p < .025, \eta^2 = .02 \)). However, when subjects had low level of trustworthiness, purchase intention did not vary with the level of self-efficacy (low self-efficacy = 3.56, high self-efficacy = 3.61, \( F(1, 224) = .034, p = .85, \eta^2 = .00 \)) (See Figure 11b). Overall, H8 was supported. As predicted, trustworthiness and attitude toward the company had significant effect on purchase intention, also, self-efficacy and issue involvement strengthen the effects of high level of trustworthiness and attitude on the purchase intention.

**Miller Brewing Company**

**Trustworthiness/ Attitude and Issue Involvement on Purchase Intention**

A series of ANOVAs was conducted. Simple main effects of both trustworthiness, \( F(1, 226) = 48.95, p < .01, \eta^2 = .18 \), and issue involvement, \( F(1, 226) = 8.74, p < .01, \eta^2 = .04 \), were found on purchase intention. Interactions between trustworthiness and issue involvement were
also significant, $F(1, 226) = 4.64, p < .05, \eta^2 = .02$. Further, simple main effects of both attitude, $F(1, 224) = 74.82, p < .01, \eta^2 = .25$ and issue involvement, $F(1, 224) = 10.73, p < .01, \eta^2 = .05$ were found. Interactions between attitude and issue involvement were also significant, $F(1, 224) = 4.64, p < .05, \eta^2 = .02$ (See Table 10) (See Table 11 for mean values).

A comparison of mean values remains necessary to accurately identify predicted effects in H8 for Miller. The study assessed whether those who had low level of trustworthiness subjects responded more favorably on purchase intention when they had high issue involvement ($M = 3.99$) versus low issue involvement (3.84) and found no significant differences, $F(1, 226) = .30, p = .59, \eta^2 = .00$. However, when the study assessed whether those who had high level of trustworthiness responded favorably on purchase intention when they had high-issue...
Table 11 Dependent Variable (PI) Means and Comparison Results for Perceptions of Sponsors and II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI</th>
<th>McDonald’s</th>
<th>Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust L</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust H</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low II</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High II</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>McDonald’s</th>
<th>Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att Low</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att High</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low II</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High II</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*II = Issue Involvement
involvement (M = 5.70) versus low-issue involvement (M = 4.75) and found significant
difference, \( F(1, 226) = 14.22, p < .01, \eta^2 = .06 \). Further, mean differences between low- and
high-trustworthiness groups were significant for both low- issue involvement, \( F(1, 226) = 12.57, \\
p < .01, \eta^2 = .05 \) and high- issue involvement groups, \( F(1, 226) = 39.23, p < .01, \eta^2 = .15 \).

Further, a comparison of mean values remains necessary to accurately identify predicted
effects in H8 for Miller regarding attitude toward the sponsor. The study assessed whether those
who had negative attitude toward the advertiser responded more favorably on purchase intention
when they had high issue involvement (M = 3.95) versus low issue involvement (3.75) and found
no significant differences, \( F(1, 224) = .61, p = .44, \eta^2 = .00 \). However, when the study assessed
whether those who had high level of trustworthiness responded favorably on purchase intention
when they had high-issue involvement (M = 5.89) versus low-issue involvement (M = 4.91) and
found significant difference, \( F(1, 224) = 14.92, p < .01, \eta^2 = .06 \). Further, mean differences
between low- and high-trustworthiness groups were significant for both low- issue involvement,
\( F(1, 226) = 12.57, p < .01, \eta^2 = .05 \) and high- issue involvement groups, \( F(1, 226) = 39.23, p \\
< .01, \eta^2 = .15 \). Overall, H8 was partially supported. The levels of trustworthiness and attitude
altered purchase intention significantly regardless of levels of self-efficacy and issue
involvement. Interactions among those variables are also salient (See Figure 12a).

**Trustworthiness/ Attitude and Self-Efficacy on Purchase Intention**

There were main effects of trustworthiness, \( F(1, 226) = 41.92, p < .01, \eta^2 = .16 \), and self-
efficacy, \( F(1, 226) = 5.94, p < .025, \eta^2 = .03 \), on purchase intention. Significant mean differences
were found between low- (M = 3.93) and high levels of trustworthiness groups (M = 5.18) on
purchase intention. Further, low- \( (M = 4.32) \) and high-levels of self-efficacy groups \( (M = 4.80) \) showed significant mean differences on purchase intention. However, interaction effects between trustworthiness and self-efficacy were not significant, \( F(1, 226) = 1.06, p = .30, \eta^2 = .01 \). Post-hoc contrast tests detected that when subjects had high level of trustworthiness, purchase intention varied significantly with the level of self-efficacy (low self-efficacy = 4.84, high self-efficacy = 5.51, \( F(1, 226) = 6.46, p < .025, \eta^2 = .03 \)). However, when subjects had low level of trustworthiness, purchase intention did not vary with the level of self-efficacy (low self-efficacy = 3.79, high self-efficacy = 4.06, \( F(1, 226) = .93, p = .34, \eta^2 = .01 \))

Main effects of attitude, \( F(1, 224) = 62.04, p < .01, \eta^2 = .22 \), and self-efficacy on purchase intention, \( F(1, 224) = 4.004, p < .05, \eta^2 = .02 \), were found. Low- \( (M = 3.88) \) and high-attitude groups \( (M = 5.36) \), and low- \( (M = 4.43) \) and high- \( (M = 4.81) \) self-efficacy groups showed significant mean differences on purchase intention. However, there were no interactions between attitude and self-efficacy, \( F(1, 224) = .001, p = .98, \eta^2 = .00 \) (See Table 10) (See Table 10)
106 for mean values). Post-hoc contrast tests detected that when subjects had high level of
trustworthiness, purchase intention did not vary significantly with the level of self-efficacy (low
self-efficacy = 5.17, high self-efficacy = 5.56, $F(1, 224) = 2.04, p = .16, \eta^2 = .01$). Also, when
subjects had low level of trustworthiness, purchase intention did not vary with the level of self-
efficacy (low self-efficacy = 3.69, high self-efficacy = 4.06, $F(1, 224) = 1.97, p = .16, \eta^2 = .01$)
(See Figure 12b).

Table 12 Dependent Variable (PI) Means and Comparison Results for Values Advocacy Ad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI</th>
<th>McDonald’s</th>
<th>Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Low</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust High</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SE</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SE</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>McDonald’s</th>
<th>Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att Low</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att High</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SE</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SE</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SE=Self-Efficacy
Figure 12b Trustworthiness/Attitude and Self-Efficacy on Purchase Intention (Miller)

Relationships between Behavioral Intention and Purchase Intention

McDonald’s

RQ3 proposed the question how behavioral intention toward advocated action and purchase intention of products produced by the sponsor interact together. Correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationships between purchase intention and behavioral intention toward the advocated action and the correlations were significant (.305). Further, linear regression was used to examine the relationships between behavioral intention and purchase intention. The results of linear regression showed that the effect of purchase intention on behavioral intention was significant (β=.305, t =4.811, p=.000).
Miller Brewing Company

RQ3 proposed the question how behavioral intention toward advocated action and purchase intention of products produced by the sponsor interact together. Correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationships between purchase intention and behavioral intention toward the advocated action and the correlations were significant (.286). Further, linear regression was used to examine the relationships between behavioral intention and purchase intention. The results of linear regression showed that the effect of purchase intention on behavioral intention was significant ($\beta=.324$, $t=5.175$, $p=.000$).
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

The current study examined a specific type of corporate social issue advertising—values advocacy advertising. The study showed that schema theory and attribution theory can together explain how consumers may develop different types of perceived motives when they view values advocacy advertising. Furthermore, this study examined how perceived motives influence outcomes by interacting with issue involvement. Expanding on previous studies, the current study showed that consumers do not simply accept values advocacy advertising messages at face value. Instead, consumers process these messages based on schema arising out of their own experiences, values, and so on. Consumers process messages especially deeply when they perceive the advocated issues to be relevant.

Business Role Schema and Individual Company Schema on Perceived Motives

The business role schema did not have a direct influence on perceived motives, but it did have an indirect influence on generating perceived sponsor motives in interaction with the individual company schema. Even though consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine was marginally influenced by business role schema when consumers had positive individual company schema toward McDonald’s, the effect of business role schema was minimal. Furthermore, the results differed for the two designs (design one with McDonald’s and design two with Miller’s), which implies that, depending on different types of industry, the business role schema and individual company schema can interact in different ways, generating different perceptions of the motives of sponsors.
The current study showed that the business role schema is likely to play an important role in advocacy advertising. Previous studies of product advertising have shown that product schema in general can have downstream effects on brand beliefs (Batra & Homer, 2004; Meyers-Levy & Tybout, 1989; Peracchio & Tybout, 1996). In the context of values advocacy advertising, it seems that the business role schema can have downstream effects for consumers who hold a socially oriented business role schema, making these consumers sensitive to individual company schema when they attribute the sponsor’s motives in sponsoring social causes. Such effects were not evident for consumers whose role schema was more business oriented. Further discussions regarding the interactions of business role schema and individual company schema in relation to consumers’ attribution processes follow.

Business Role Schema as a Reinforce in Stereotyping Companies’ Motives

According to Individual Company Schema

Previous research has shown that a company’s prior reputation or socially responsible image can have an effect on consumers’ levels of skepticism toward the sponsor’s motives (e.g., Bae & Cameron, 2006; Dean, 2002). Bae and Cameron’s (2006) study particularly demonstrated the influence of corporate credibility, measured as ‘trustworthiness’ and ‘expertise,’ on perceived intentions. In addition, Klein and Dawar (2004) found that corporate social responsibility (CSR) can affect consumers’ attributions in a product-harm crisis situation. The current study expanded on previous research by showing that the global image of a company, composed of both affective and cognitive measures, can affect consumer perception of the advertiser’s intentions in
sponsoring social causes. The current study also expanded on the previous studies by showing that business oriented consumers may be less concerned about the sponsor’s prior reputation or how ethical a company is than socially oriented consumers when they attribute the company’s motives in issue-sponsorship. In other words, consumers seem to care to a lesser degree whether the company has a bad image or a good image when they believe generally that business has little social responsibility compared to those who believe that business has social responsibility. This result suggests that those who do not believe corporations should help society are less likely to connect the relationship of values advocacy messages and the prior perception of the company, or may even be disinterested in those messages. As a result, they are more likely to jump to conclusions about a sponsor’s motive without going through complex information processing, such as being more likely to match the values advocacy message up against their own schema toward the particular sponsor than socially oriented consumers.

It is useful to compare this study’s findings on the relationship between the business role schema and prior perceptions of a company on the one hand, and perceived intentions on the other with those of Creyer, Ross, and Kozup (2004). Creyer et al. (2004) showed a significant effect of business role schema—which they defined as “attitude toward business role”—on perceived ethicality. Their study concluded that consumers who favored the common good, compared to those who favored investor benefits, were more likely to think a retailers’ discontinuation of gun sales was ethical than those who favored investor benefits. Thus, Cryder et al. (2004) would have predicted that consumers who believe that corporations should have social responsibility would see McDonald’s effort to advocate against obesity as positive compared to those participants who believe only slightly that corporations should have social
responsibility. That was also the original hypothesis of the current study. However, this study has raised a new set of questions concerning the relationships between perceived motives and business role schema. It seems that when consumers speculate on a sponsor’s intentions for sponsoring a social issue, they try to match their schema of the company with their perceptions of the company’s sponsorship activities. As they engage in this line of thought, consumers are stimulated by their business role schema as to whether or not they employ their individual company schema.

In addition, it should be noted that the second analysis in H1 and H2 revealed that even though consumers believe that corporations should maximize their profits to perform their responsibility in a high level, consumers will be greatly sensitive to the company’s prior perceptions in evaluating the company’s intention to sponsor social causes, unless they believe corporations should not be involved in social causes at the same time. Therefore, if advertisers are interested in consumer segments with business oriented schema it is important to identify consumers who believe strongly in corporate economic responsibility and at the same time believe little in corporate social responsibility. Advertisers holding negative prior perceptions among consumers could be interested in finding audiences who care less about their prior perception in order to generate positive outcomes through values advocacy advertising. Only identifying the consumer segment that strongly believes in corporations’ economic responsibility would not help advertisers searching for those who are less sensitive to the advertiser’s prior perceptions. Consumers can also believe in corporations’ social responsibility at the same time and this belief will lead them to become sensitive to whether the advertiser has positive prior perception or negative prior perception when they perceive values advocacy advertisements.
Moreover, the following intriguing finding should receive attention. Consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine did not change with individual company schema as much as did consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine. Both socially oriented and business oriented consumers’ perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine were moderate no matter what individual company schema they have (mean 4.0 or above on the seven-point “anti-genuine” scale). This implies that consumers expect that profit organizations have self-interest at the moderate level, but the magnitude of these expectations were decided according to what prior perception consumers hold toward the sponsor among socially oriented consumers, but not in the case of business oriented consumers. Business oriented consumers might think all businesses pursue their own self-interests moderately no matter what prior perception they have. Therefore, these inconsistent results between Genuine and Anti-Genuine support previous research (e.g., Dean 2002); consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine and as anti-genuine are separate constructs that consumers perceive differently.

Can Prior Consumer Perception of a Company Activate a Stereotype?

From the results of the current study, especially with regard to socially oriented consumers, the following two conclusions can be derived: First, when consumers have positive prior perception of the sponsor, they find the sponsor has a genuine motive in the sponsorship. However, when sponsors have a bad image to start with, consumers develop stereotypes, perceiving the sponsors as not genuine when they try to advocate on social issues. Schema theory explains that a schema can result in the development of a stereotype as people interpret
information in ways that fit their preexisting schema (McVee et al., 2005). In other words, consumers may develop confirmatory bias when they evaluate the advertiser’s motives in sponsoring social causes, which is explained by the tendency to search for or interpret new information in a way that confirms one's preconceptions and avoids information and interpretations which contradict prior beliefs (Dawar & Pillutla, 2000). For example, if consumers perceive a company as bad, they will conclude, in keeping with this schema, that the company must be motivated by its own interest to advocate for a social issue and not genuinely sponsoring social causes at all. However, if consumers have positive individual company schema for McDonald’s, even though the company has involved in controversy relating to obesity issue that the products produced by the company may partially cause, consumers perceive that the company has genuine intentions in helping the obesity issues in order to confirm their prior beliefs toward the advertiser, especially for socially oriented consumers.

The same discussions can apply to Miller Brewing Company’s values advocacy ads. Generally, people commonly think that consumers are likely to be skeptical of a beer company’s efforts to advocate reduced alcohol consumption, which can decrease company sales. However, consumers believed the company has a genuine motive in its binge drinking prevention campaigns because they have developed positive perception of the advertiser; conversely, if they think the advertiser is not genuinely helping the cause, then it will bring cognitive dissonance to consumers who think the advertiser is a good company, especially for socially oriented consumers. In other words, socially oriented consumers may have a stronger schema than business oriented consumers that a good company will sponsor social causes out of genuine motives.
Therefore, it is plausible that consumers attribute the advertiser’s (with consumers’ positive prior image) intention as genuine in order to confirm their existing beliefs/schema, toward the advertiser. Consumers may attribute a different type of sponsor’s motives in order to confirm the individual company schema consumers hold. Furthermore, whether individual company schema will be activated in the attribution process when consumers read values advocacy advertising would be decided depending on what business role schema the consumers have. The current study also demonstrated that consumers use various schema to comprehend new stimuli such as values advocacy ads, and those schema are connected and interact together in processing information.

Differences between Two Companies in Consumer Perception of the Advertiser’s Intention as Genuine and as Anti-Genuine

Interestingly, the results reported above for the Miller ad stimulus, unlike the McDonald’s ad stimuli, showed no downstream effect of the business role schema on perceived motives in interaction with individual company schema. For the Miller ad, unlike the McDonald’s ad, even people who believed very little in the notion that businesses have social responsibilities used the criterion of whether Miller had a previously positive image or negative image to evaluate the company’s motives. In other words, people were willing to regard Miller Brewing Company as a genuine sponsor of an advocacy ad on binge drinking if they had a positive prior image of the company no matter what their business role schema was. It can be speculated that this happened because of the special nature of the beer industry (Bhattacharya &
Consumers know that in order to survive in the beer industry, Miller has to sell its products, so, if people have a bad image of Miller, their advocacy message promoting less beer-drinking could arouse a great sense of skepticism. But for people who have a positive image of Miller, the company’s sponsorship of the anti-binge drinking campaign, which is so contradictory to its business interests, could change consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine in a positive direction no matter what business role schema consumers hold. For those who had a negative image of Miller, the company’s sponsorship of the binge drinking issue was perceived as not genuine no matter what business role schema consumers held. In other words, consumers do not jump to the conclusion that Miller would sponsor binge drinking prevention issues out of own self-interest motive.

Consumer Perception of the Advertiser’s Intention and Consumer Issue Involvement in the Perceptions toward the Advertiser

It is well documented that when consumers attribute marketing actions to self-serving motivations, negative reactions to the sponsoring companies often ensue (Andreasen, 1996; Drumwright, 1996; Ellen et al., 2000; Gurin, 1987; Webb & Mohr, 1998). However, Forehand and Grier (2003) have pointed out that although this effect is well documented, the process by which these negative reactions are created is not completely clear. The current study supports that consumer perception of advertiser’s intention in sponsorship is a complicated process.

Like the Dean (2002) study, the current study suggests that consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine or anti-genuine are separate concepts explaining the advertiser’s intention in sponsoring a social cause. Dean (2002) showed that the perception of the advertiser’s
intention as anti-genuine was not a significant factor causing the perception of the company’s community relationships either in a positive or in a negative direction; the advertiser’s intention as genuine was the significant factor causing consumer perception of the company’s community relationships. The work of Rifon et al. (2004) also found through factor analysis that genuine and anti-genuine are separate concepts. Their study adopted only consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine to explain consumers’ perceived advertiser’s intention in sponsoring a cause and found significant effect on sponsor credibility.

Consumer Perception of the Advertiser’s Intention as Genuine

The current study also suggests that consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine and as anti-genuine are not the same factor explaining a single concept, consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention in sponsoring social causes. Consumers expected the advertiser to have genuine interest toward the sponsoring causes in order to have a positive perception of the advertiser no matter what their level of issue involvement. Furthermore, the study result expanded on the previous research suggesting that consumers respond to the companies more positively when the sponsoring cause is more important to them (Lafferty, 1996), or supporting one to them (Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001). The current study suggests that without consumer perception of the company’s intention as genuine, even though the advertiser selects the social cause that their target audiences support, the campaign is not likely to successfully create positive advertiser perceptions among consumers. When consumers have low level of consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as genuine, regardless of whether they have high or low issue involvement, they are likely to reach only the negative attitude and the
The low level of trustworthiness. Therefore, it confirms that for consumers the actor’s intention of behavior, even for good behavior, is important to evaluate the sponsor. Even though consumers are not interested in the specific advocated issues, if they believe the advertiser has a genuine intention in sponsoring the issue, they perceive the company as trustworthy and favorable. In other words, even though the sponsorship effort in advocating a certain issue does not particularly reflect consumer interest in that social cause, consumers give credit to the advertisers trying to help social causes for genuine motivation.

Consumer Perception of the Advertiser’s Intention as Anti-Genuine

It seems that consumers have taken for granted that advertisers have anti-genuine motive (self-interest toward their own benefit from a sponsorship effort) when sponsoring social causes. Consumers had neutral or positive attitude and trustworthiness toward the advertisers regardless of their perception levels of advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine, especially when consumers have a low level of issue involvement. Consumers maintained average scores at a neutral level or above on the advertiser perceptions even though consumers perceived the advertisers to have high level of anti-genuine intention (i.e., mean advertiser perception of 4.2 on seven-point of ‘attitude’ and ‘trustworthiness’ scales for McDonald’s).

In other words, consumer perception that the advertiser has self-interest in sponsoring a social cause did not deteriorate the trustworthiness or attitude toward the company deeply, which supports the insignificant effect of consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-altruistic on corporate community relations found in the Dean (2002) study. The current study suggests that the similarly insignificant effect of consumer perception of the advertiser’s
intention as anti-genuine on the general advertiser’s perceptions, such as attitude and trustworthiness, can occur. However, when consumers had a high level of issue involvement toward the advocated issue, they were sensitive to the perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine in evaluating the advertiser as a trustworthy and favorable organization. It seems high issue involvement consumers can only feel congruent to the company sponsoring their highly involved cause when the advertiser’s intention is not perceived as anti-genuine, and in turn, the congruent feeling generated favorable perceptions of the advertiser. On the other hand, it seems that when consumers are not interested in the issue, they maintain a neutral attitude toward the company regardless of whether their perception toward the company’s intention as anti-genuine is low or high. In general, consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine did not change attitude or trustworthiness toward the advertiser either in a positive or a negative direction. Only consumers with high levels of issue involvement reacted to their perceptions of the sponsor’s low level of interest for its own benefits when they evaluated the sponsor. Further exploration in the differences between the constructs genuine and anti-genuine is worthwhile. Additional discussion regarding issue involvement’s moderating effect is in the following section.

In sum, in the context of product advertising, involvement literature has suggested that consumer involvement levels in different involvement types are closely related to the consumers’ attitudes and purchase intentions (Celsi & Olson, 1998; Cho, 1999; Gill, Grossbart & Laczniak, 1988; Lee, 2000). In the context of values advocacy advertising, issue involvement has been identified as an important involvement type. Sen and Bhattacharya (2001) showed that consumers who were highly involved in advocated issues were more sensitive to CSR (i.e.,
positive CSR record or negative CSR record) than those who were not highly involved in their perceptions of congruence between themselves and the company. To explain these results, the researchers argued that perceptions of consumer-company congruence are likely to vary depending on consumer personal support of issues in the domain of the company’s CSR actions (CSR support). Consumers whose self-concept included support of issues in the company’s CSR domain (e.g., high CSR support) perceived greater congruence between themselves and that company, either in terms of common attributes or a shared prototype, than those whose support of issues in the CSR domain was low (i.e., low CSR support). The current study showed that a company that sponsors a social issue that with which consumers are greatly involved will not generate favorable perceptions of the company if the consumers believe the company sponsors the social cause out of ulterior motives or the company is not genuinely interested in sponsoring social cause.

Furthermore, Grau, and Folse (2007) argued that the effects of certain type of message cues can have a greater effect for low-issue involvement consumers while other message cues may have a more pronounced effect for high-issue involvement consumers. Once again, the current study showed that even though consumers had high issue involvement, if they perceive the advertiser’s intention is not genuine, the values advocacy ad will not produce positive outcomes. Therefore, the current study suggests that advertisers must make an effort to create a company image as sponsoring a cause out of its genuine intention and at the same time, advertising messages need to heighten the consumer’s interest in advocating the social issue in order to create positive perceptions of the advertiser.
Interpreting the Unexpected Results of the Miller Brewing Company Advertisement

It is important to address why consumers who viewed the advocacy ad messages sponsored by Miller, even those who had low cause involvement, used consumer perception of the advertiser’s intention as anti-genuine as a criterion to determine their perception of trustworthiness and attitude toward the company. Further, in the context of the Miller brewing company, the perceptions of advertiser were not swayed by cause involvement levels at all. This result is inconsistent with previous studies. Much research has identified issue involvements the crucial factor affecting whether social issue messages are able to produce ideal outcomes, such as enhancement of corporate image or increase in purchase (Grau & Folse, 2007; Basil & Herr, 2006; Haley 1996). Therefore, further study is necessary to probe the significance of the unique findings of this study with regard to industries (in this case the beer industry) that seem to have potentially problematic social status (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2004).

Interactions of Product Evaluation and Behavioral Intention toward the Advocated Action

Previous studies have shown that source credibility is an important criterion to increase behavioral intention (e.g., Szykman, Bloom, & Blazing, 2004). The current study showed that trustworthiness and attitudes toward a company can serve as a form of source credibility to enhance behavioral intention. If consumers have positive attitudes toward the company, then they are more likely to have higher levels of behavioral intention toward the advocated action.
Previous research (Szykman, et al., 2004; DeCarlo, et al., 1997) showed that non-profit organizations are more effective sponsors of social issue advertising than for-profit organizations. The current study suggests that profit corporations can also be effective sponsors by encouraging socially conscious behaviors if these organizations enjoy a certain level of positive attitude and trustworthiness among target audiences. However, the current study suggests being cautious to conclude the perceptions of the sponsor as influencer of behavioral intention. For example, a series of contrast tests detected that in the case of Miller, attitude toward the sponsor did not have any effects on behavioral intention if consumers’ level of issue involvement was not high.

Effects of consumer perceptions of the advertiser on behavioral intention were examined through two tests: (1) consumer perceptions of the advertiser x self-efficacy, and (2) consumer perceptions of the advertiser x issue involvement. Inconsistent results regarding the effect of the perceptions of the advertiser suggest that moderators will change the effects of the perceptions of the advertiser on consumers’ behavioral intention. Therefore, it seems that dynamic interactions of source credibility and audiences’ self-perception toward the advocated action are the important factors advertisers need to consider if they are interested in enhancing consumers’ behavioral intention toward the advocated social issue. For instance, when self-efficacy was taken into consideration the effects of trustworthiness and attitude toward the company on behavioral intention became minimal. In other words, the effects of self-efficacy are too strong and override the influence of the perceptions of advertiser.

Further, trustworthiness and attitude had significant effects on the levels of behavioral intention toward the advocated actions. However, the study shows the consumers’ dynamic information processing in the evaluation of their behavioral intention. In Miller, it was
interesting that even though consumers had a high level of interest in binge drinking prevention, if the source of the message, Miller Brewing Company, was considered to be untrustworthy and unfavorable, then they were less likely to perform the advocated action. However, if consumers see that the credible company sponsors the social cause they are interested in, they are likely to be persuaded to perform the advocated actions. In other words, it seems that a high level of interest in the social cause is not a sufficient criterion to increase consumers’ behavioral intention toward the advocated action.

**Purchase Intention**

The results for purchase intention were interesting in establishing that trustworthiness and attitude toward the company were important variables influencing purchase intentions. These variables have been identified as predictors of attitudes toward the advertisements in the context of advocacy advertising (Sinclair & Irani, 2005). The current study also suggests that trustworthiness and attitude toward the company can directly predict purchase intentions. Also, much previous research has provided the evidence that consumers’ perception of companies can influence the evaluation of the product produced by the companies (e.g., Brown & Dacin, 1997). Furthermore, the current study supports those studies and expands on previous research by suggesting that consumers’ self-perception regarding the advocated social issues, including their sense of self-efficacy toward the advocated action and their issue involvement, can also influence their purchase intentions. The study also suggests that two the outcomes—enhancement of behavioral intention toward the advocated action and purchase intention—are related. This
relationship can shed light on previous findings about how corporate social responsibility can influence purchase intention (e.g., Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001).

Previous research has suggested that consumers try to express themselves through purchase behavior (e.g., Belk 1988). The study of Sen and Bhattacharya (2001) implied that the support of the advocated cause can have an effect on purchase intention because consumers feel congruent to the company supporting a social cause they also support. Furthermore, consumers express their congruent feelings through purchasing the company’s products. Expanding on the previous study, the current study suggests that when consumers feel that they can perform the advocated action after reading the ad, they are also more likely to purchase the products produced by the advertiser. However, there is a complex interaction of variables at work here. When consumers have low trust or negative attitudes toward the sponsor, then neither self-efficacy nor issue involvement are likely to have the power to enhance purchase intentions.

In other words, when consumers find they can perform the advocated action when they view the ad, they could feel more connected to the values advocacy advertisement and transfer to purchase intention. However, it seems that their self-efficacy and issue involvement were expressed through purchase intention when the source of the message was trustworthy and the attitude toward the advertiser was positive. In other words, consumers would not purchase products only because the advertiser enhanced their confidence to perform a certain action or increase their issue involvement. Consumers are not likely to express themselves through purchasing the advertiser’s products produced by the company they do not perceive as trustworthy and hold negative attitudes toward. Once again, when consumers are highly involved in an issue, they might feel congruent with the company; therefore, this congruent perception
might enhance purchase intentions (Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001). However, the current study suggests that congruence between self and the company through supporting consumers’ relevant issues might have a significant effect only when consumers have a positive attitude and trustworthiness toward the company. With the certain level of positive perceptions among consumers, it may be important for the advertiser to pay attention to enhance consumers’ self-efficacy in performing an advocated action through the values advocacy ad. The work of Rummel et al. (1994) study showed that self-efficacy can be enhanced through the advertisement, therefore, advertisers’ efforts to enhance consumers’ self-efficacy would be worthwhile in order to achieve both goals of increasing behavioral intention toward the advocated actions and purchase intention of products produced by the advertiser.

The Contributions of the Current Study

In CSR communication research, there is the tendency to equate CSR to cause marketing. However, CSR initiatives are more complex, and the outcomes of CSR initiatives are not as easily measured as cause marketing (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2004). The current study also confirms the complicated nature of values advocacy advertising. Factors directly related to consumers’ behavior toward the action advocated in the ad are interdependent with consumer’s intention to purchase the company’s products.

In addition, with regard to the interaction between attitudes/trustworthiness toward a company and issue involvement as an influence on purchase intentions, both McDonald’s and Miller Brewing Company showed significant interaction. The inconsistency between the two study designs disappears when outcomes are considered apart from perceived motives. Thus,
inconsistent findings between Miller and McDonald’s discussed previously do not seem to have been caused by measurement problems, but are in fact revealing. More studies of real-life companies in similar industries could reveal more significant findings, for instance several beer companies sponsoring the same advocacy ad messages or several fast food companies sponsoring obesity prevention messages. Furthermore, comparing tobacco companies and alcohol companies could reveal some consistent findings, since these two industries have been accused as ones producing harmful products.

Finally, the current study has contributions to make to the body of knowledge in CSR research. Even though the current study employed a quasi-experiment design by creating a certain type of values advocacy ad, the sponsors were real-life companies, which increased external validity. This was an improvement over previous studies that used fictional companies and were only able to manipulate two different levels of prior perception of the company (e.g., Dean, 2003-2004; Bae & Cameron, 2006). Dean (2004) noted that real-life companies are not as one-dimensional as the fictional companies in his study, and that the real products, corporate images, and complex relationships with customers and the public are not easily duplicated in a laboratory setting. One important contribution of the current study is that it demonstrated how such limitations can be overcome. The current study design allowed exploring complex relationships in a more natural setting with real-life companies and with naturally generated constructs.

Another contribution of the current study is that previous research has only examined how consumers’ prior perceptions of the advertiser in regard to its social responsibility (e.g., consumers’ prior perception of corporate community relations) affect consumer perception of
the advertiser’s intention or purchase intentions when consumers view the advertiser’s CSR communications. The current study also measured non-social aspects of the companies, such as consumers’ perceptions of their pleasantness and likeability. It showed that these variables can also influence outcomes. This suggests that companies do not have to focus only on developing socially responsible images in order to maximize the effectiveness of CSR communications. Establishing a pleasant company images through other types of marketing and advertising efforts could also optimize a company’s issue advocacy efforts. The current study also suggests that crisis management can have an important implication; companies that want to prepare for future crises do not have to focus only on developing images of social responsibility, but can also use emotional appeals to deflect future criticism in a crisis.

Managerial Implications

The current study investigated real-life companies sponsoring health-related social causes. In order to maximize the effects of such messages, companies should make sure that the social advocacy messages that they sponsor are perceived as genuine. This will only be the case if individual company schema is positive. If consumers have negative schema toward sponsors, targeting a business oriented audience would be a better use of resources than targeting a socially oriented audience because they are less influenced by their schema toward sponsors. The question of which consumer segments are likely to be business oriented is unanswered. Currently, many companies place their values advocacy ads in business magazines such as Business Week, Forbes, and so on. Would business people whose main concern is profit-maximization be the best target for advocacy messages? Would they be less likely than other groups of consumers to
accept the schema that businesses have a social responsibility? Whether a particular group of people is more likely to be either business oriented or socially oriented can be essential information when deciding how to target values advocacy advertising. Also, socially oriented people with a positive image of the company are those who are most likely to perceive that a company has a genuine motive. It should be noted that these calculations do not seem to apply to companies with questionable social status regarding advocated issues, such as a beer company sponsoring binge drinking prevention messages. Therefore, such companies should pay closer attention to what types of schema their target audiences hold about them than to consumers’ general business role schema.

Finally, if a company wants to increase consumers’ purchase intention through values advocacy ads, a good strategy might be to focus on messages that maximize consumers’ perceptions of self-efficacy toward an advocated action or that highlight how the advocated social causes are relevant to them. However, to make these messages work, the company needs to foster positive attitudes among consumers and an image of trustworthiness. In addition, nonprofit organizations seeking for-profit organizations to promote their causes should look carefully at whether those for-profit companies maintain a positive image among consumers. If so, then they can serve as effective sponsor of social causes.

Limitations and Future Research

Study design is based on measurement; in other words, treatments were measured rather than manipulated. Future design might try a manipulation even though it might sacrifice external validity. For example, according to a recent Harris poll data on company reputation most
reputable and least reputable companies can be selected in order to manipulate the prior perceptions of a sponsor as positive and negative. Future studies might examine how people interpret questions regarding consumers’ perception of the advertiser’s intention. That research could include open-ended questions to discover how respondents interpret items (e.g., motives of company to engage in advocacy advertising – Genuine v. Anti-Genuine).

Participants in this study were either fast food or beer users. Therefore, they were experienced with fast food or beer, which are products the companies produce. However, the current study did not investigate whether participants were heavy or light users. This variable might produce significant results, since the experiences with the advocated issues of binge drinking and obesity might be very different for each group. Also, the current study did not measure whether the level of difficulty in performing the advocated actions is different between McDonald’s and Miller. A different difficulty level of advocated actions could change the moderating effect of self-efficacy in the relationship between the advertiser’s credibility and behavioral intention toward the advocated action. Therefore, whether difficulty levels are equivalent across two stimuli should also be explored.

Different Types of Message Strategy for Business Oriented and Socially Oriented Consumers

Forehand and Grier’s (2003) study proposed that if advertising messages explicitly cite the company benefits from sponsorship, inhibition effects on generating skepticism may occur, resulting in positive company evaluation. Would the business role schema play a role in the perception of different types of messages? Would an explicit statement of how the sponsor’s
interests are served by sponsoring social causes be more appealing to business oriented people? Also, if it is true that business oriented people are less likely to be involved in advocacy messages, they might use peripheral cues to process values advocacy messages sponsored by certain types of industry. Therefore, it might be worthwhile to utilize message strategies to explore which message strategies are most effective for consumers possessing different types of business role schema.

Balance Theory in Values Advocacy Ad

In future studies, balance theory might be employed to provide a fuller explanation of the many complex relationships among the variables examined in the current study through investigating consumers’ attitude change by values advocacy ad. Dean’s (2004) study showed that due to contrast effects, when cause sponsorship efforts are sponsored by unexpected companies (with bad reputation), the companies with bad reputation showed heightened attitude levels more than with good reputation. Will business oriented consumers change attitude more than socially oriented consumers or vice versa? Will companies from different industries produce different levels of attitude changes? The current study measured consumers’ various perceptions before and after the ad message exposure separately and did not examine the magnitude of attitude change. Examining how consumers’ perceptions regarding various factors examined in the current study can be changed in order to balance their perceptions of three players in the values advocacy ad (sponsor, advocated issue, consumers) would reveal interesting findings by applying balance theory in the context of values advocacy ad.
In addition, many types of CSR communications should be studied separately to see whether the way in which consumers process different types of CSR communications in a different way can expand the body of knowledge in CSR communication research. Advocacy advertising is one type of corporate social responsibility (CSR) communication effort. How consumers process different types of CSR communications (e.g., values advocacy ad vs. cause related marketing communication) would be worth exploring in order to enhance our understanding of the complex information processing involved in CSR communication.

Finally, even though the current study explored the separate relationships in the process leading from consumers’ intrinsic schema to the various outcomes of social advocacy message—(1) consumer perception of the advertiser intention, (2) perceptions of advertiser: trustworthiness and attitude, and (3) behavioral intention and purchase intention—the study did not take on the challenge of examining the process comprehensively. In future studies, path analysis should be conducted in order to explore the information processing that consumers engage in throughout this process, in a holistic way. For example, dividing consumers who believe in businesses have a social responsibility into low and high, and examining how the two groups process the messages differently may reveal intriguing results. Also, a future study may discover why stronger results for moderators as main effects or simple main effects independent variables except for attitude predicting purchase intention since F values were in favor of moderators.
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APPENDIX
Appendix A. Stimuli for McDonald's

LET’S BEAT OBESITY!

Reducing obesity rates across the nation is an important concern of McDonald’s.

Our employees are involved in a Wellness Program to promote nutrition and regular exercise.

Through the program, employees manage their eating and fitness habits through a variety of resources such as physical activity suggestions and nutritional information for popular foods.

Join us in our efforts to curb obesity.
Starting today, try to eat more veggies and go for a walk today.

Healthy Diet and Regular Exercise can Beat Obesity
– It’s worth the effort.
Let's Prevent Binge Drinking

Preventing binge drinking is a critical part of Miller Brewing Company’s mission.

Our employees are involved in a Wellness Program to reduce binge drinking. Through the program, employees are educated about the downsides of binge drinking through a variety of resources.

Join us in an effort to curb binge drinking. Next time you drink, think about drinking one less beer, and encourage your friends and co-workers to drink one less, too.

Binge Drinking Prevention – It’s worth the effort.
Appendix B.

Survey Questionnaire

Survey Items

Business must:

<SOCIAL-BUSINESS ROLE SCHEMA>
help solve social problems
participate in the management of public affairs
allocate some of their resources to philanthropic activities
play a role in our society that goes beyond the mere generation of profits.

<BUSINESS – BUSINESS ROLE SCHEMA>
Maximize profits.
Control their production costs strictly
Plan for their long term success.
Always improve economic performance.

<ISSUE INVOLVEMENT>
(social issue) prevention is an important to me.
(social issue) prevention is relevant to me.
(social issue) prevention is of great concern to me.
I am supportive of (social issue) prevention.

<INDIVIDUAL COMPANY SCHEMA>
(Company Name) is
Unpleasant/Pleasant
Unlikeable/Likeable
Dishonest/Honest
Bad/Good
Unethical/Ethical
Disrespectful/Respectful

<SELF-EFFICACY>
I can (action)
I am confident that I can (action)
It is easy to (action)
I am able to (action)
I will (action)
I am highly likely to (action)
I mean to (action)
I intend to (action)

<PURCHASE INTENTION>
I am likely to purchase the product produced by (company)
It is possible to purchase the product produced by (company)
I would probably purchase the product produced by (company)
I would consider purchasing the product produced by (company)

<TRUSTWORTHINESS>
I trust the ad's sponsoring organization, (company).
The ad's sponsoring organization takes truthful claims.
The ad's sponsoring organization is honest.
I do not believe what the ad's sponsoring organization tells me.

<ATTITUDE>
My overall impression of (company) is pleasant.
My overall impression of (company) is good.
My overall impression of (company) is favorable.

<GENUINE>
The ad's sponsoring organization, (company)'s effort in sponsoring (social issue) prevention is altruistic.
The (company)'s effort in sponsoring (social issue) prevention is genuine.
The (company)'s effort is generous in sponsoring (social issue) prevention.
The (company)'s effort in sponsoring (social issue) prevention is unselfish.

<ANTI-GENUINE>
The ad's sponsoring organization, (company) has ulterior motive in sponsoring (social issue)
(company) acts in its own self-interest in sponsoring (social issue) prevention.
(company) acts to benefit itself in sponsoring (social issue) prevention.
(company) has something other than altruistic intentions in sponsoring (social issue)
(company) has something other than genuine intentions in sponsoring (social issue).
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