

5-2015

The Effectiveness of Modern Advertising at Achieving Brand Remembrance

Connor P. Robertson

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.uark.edu/mktguht>

Recommended Citation

Robertson, Connor P., "The Effectiveness of Modern Advertising at Achieving Brand Remembrance" (2015). *Marketing Undergraduate Honors Theses*. 24.

<http://scholarworks.uark.edu/mktguht/24>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Marketing at ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Marketing Undergraduate Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact scholar@uark.edu, ccmiddle@uark.edu.

The Effectiveness of Modern Advertising at Achieving Brand Remembrance

By

Connor Robertson

Advisor: Chris Tompkins III

**An Honors Thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Science in Business Administration in Marketing**

Sam M. Walton College of Business

University of Arkansas

Fayetteville, Arkansas

Abstract

The relationship between aspects of modern commercial advertising, such as use of storytelling, positive and negative emotional factors, and message content, and their effect on achieving correct brand remembrance with the commercial's viewers was studied. One hundred sixty subjects completed a survey that prompted them to remember the brands associated with five different commercials shown during the 2015 Super Bowl, as well as asked other questions about each commercial and the subjects' television viewing habits. Results showed that a very small percentage of viewers correctly remembered the brand associated with commercials they had seen, and that this correct brand remembrance can be influenced by the aforementioned advertising methods and psychological factors.

Introduction

In today's marketing and advertising industry, one of the most prominent buzzwords as of late has been "storytelling" (Snow, 2014). That is, instead of simply pitching a customer about a product's features and price, advertising has become more about telling a unique and meaningful story that incorporates the company's product or brand. For example, Chipotle's recent "Farmed and Dangerous" advertising series (Tuttle, 2014) serves as recent examples of modern advertising through the use of storytelling. While stories can be more effective at utilizing imagery and eliciting an emotional response in the customer, the overuse of storytelling can deter from a TV commercial's true purpose: to promote a brand and/or a product. If consumers can remember specific elements of an advertisement's story but can't remember the brand associated with them, then potentially millions of dollars in advertising budgeting have gone to waste. This begs a very important question: Are today's advertisers able to effectively get the viewer to remember their brand? Storytelling can be great for displaying creativity through humor or drama, but being able to effectively mix a great story with a memorable branded message through TV advertising is crucial to accomplishing the purpose of a commercial.

Television and radio advertisements were the go-to method of promoting products and brands in past advertising strategies. While commercials today have become more advanced and complex in terms of content and message, television advertising is losing credibility with respect to its role as a source of information to consumers (Burdett, Smith, Curry, Gildenberg, & Mader, 2013). The Edelman Trust Report of 2010 revealed that only 25% of today's consumers trust the credibility of the claims made in television

advertising. This is due, in part, to a phenomenon called the “activation of persuasion knowledge” (Mei-Ling Wei, Fisher, and Main 2008). This idea describes how, when confronted with manipulated attempts to persuade their perceptions (such as in traditional commercial advertising), consumers’ evaluations and trust are negatively impacted. As a result, messages that use these attempts are viewed as less honest and less reliable. Because of this trend, those in the marketing and advertising industry have had to develop new ways of informing and relating to consumers, the most common of which seems to be through the use of storytelling. People who watch commercials are caring less and less about what the product does, and are more receptive to an advertisement that involves a story around what the product means (Snow, 2014). Stories tend to do better at resonating in the viewer’s mind more than simple product information or demonstration. But this can also serve as a problem: today’s viewers are remembering stories instead of brands.

The advent of mobile technology has served as a catalyst behind this shift in consumer focus on product meaning instead of product features (Pavlika, 2014). Today’s shoppers are more engaged with technology than ever before, being able to produce and share content with the click of a button. They are what social shopper company Collective Bias calls “connected consumers” in that they are constantly attached to and connected with some form of advertising or social content. Inspiring and interesting stories have become the most successful at catching the consumers’ eye and allowing them to engage in the “ultimate moment of truth”, in which those resonating stories are shared via social media and other mobile platforms, furthering the spread of the advertisement’s message.

Although the idea of storytelling has been around in the marketing industry for quite some time, it has only recently become an area of focus due to changing consumer expectations (Snow, 2014). The rise of social media has made consumers more comfortable with having back and forth dialogues with a company or brand, both crafting and conveying their own stories. In this manner, consumers have changed their expectations for commercial advertising from a simple monologue with product features to a two-way street of social engagement, in which the brand almost becomes its own person. While it is true that storytelling is one of the more effective ways to engage consumers in interesting content, it is not enough to simply tell a story through advertising. Rachel Headland at Saatchi & Saatchi X advises companies focused on shopper-centric marketing practices to not become “distracted by shiny objects.” It seems as though the idea of storytelling has become one of the hottest shiny objects in today’s advertising industry. Advertisers are caught up in creating content that tells a great story, but this can also cause them to lose focus on the fact that at the end of the day, an advertisement is supposed to promote a brand. Without a memory of which company the advertisement is for, consumers won’t know the first place to look when they start their shopping list.

Make no mistake, a good story in a commercial is a great way to display a powerful message or engage the viewer in an emotional relationship, which could in turn lead to more buzz about the advertisement and more popularity on social media. However, harnessing the power of this increased popularity does no good if the customer does not know which brand to choose off of the shelf. Creating an advertisement that

explodes in popularity on social media is great only if both the story and the brand are remembered.

This paper seeks to investigate how well the use of storytelling in modern commercial advertising achieves correct remembrance of the commercial's brand. As described previously, storytelling can be an effective way at remembering the message of the commercial. However, the purpose of this research is to discover how well these stories are at eliciting *brand* remembrance. If it is discovered that a commercial's brand cannot correctly be identified or remembered, then potentially millions of dollars in advertising expenses have gone to waste. Therefore, discovering which aspects of a commercial are successful at eliciting emotional, shareable stories as well as brand remembrance could lead to more effective methods of advertising.

Literature & Theme Review

Theme 1: Modern advertising focuses more on storytelling than product description due to changing social and psychological focuses among consumers.

Both in theory and in practice, the concept of storytelling in modern advertising and marketing is spreading like wildfire. Where advertisements of the past were more focused on promoting a certain new product and detailing its competitive features, today's advertisements center more on how those benefits can make a difference in your life in an emotional and meaningful way (Jensen, 2002). The reason for this lies in the fact that nearly all products today have become successful at demonstrating use value, and therefore marketers and advertisers now must showcase the products' social and symbolic value.

In decades past, not all products had successful functionality, and as such, advertisements and marketing strategies focused on the features of the product, as well as ensuring that the customer was aware that the product actually worked (Jensen, 2002). This is what we today call the Industrial Society. The marketplace was fascinated with and focused on making products that actually work, or perform better than other products. Therefore, one product could easily be differentiated from another simply by how well it performed as compared to its competitors. Nowadays, however, according to Jensen, most all products work about equally well, so functionality is no longer a concern for most consumers. Therefore, modern consumers have advanced from an Industrial Society that focuses on functionality to what some are calling the "Dream Society". According to this "dream theory", consumers today are focused more on purchasing

products that provide them with a sense of experience and adventure. When it comes to shopping and the things that we buy, we are noticing products that entice our heart rather than our brain. Because of this psychological shift from an interest in information to an interest in experience, from the perspective of those in the marketing industry, strategies must be implemented that appeal to these new interests. Instead of choosing between a watch or a car that works and one that doesn't, consumers now get to choose between the experience and the notoriety of buying a Rolex versus an Omega or a BMW versus a Mercedes. While there exist still advertisements that highlight functionality and quality, they are becoming few and far between. The marketing industry is moving from straddling between the Information Age and the Dream Age, to moving toward a holistic acceptance of the new "Dream Society."

Jensen further argues that bridging the gap between the rules and structure of the business realm with the creativity and intuition of the storytelling realm is one of the more difficult tasks to accomplish. The best stories are the myths, legends, and fairy tales that have survived for centuries, and they have survived thus far because they encompass and appeal to the entire human emotional spectrum. On the other hand, in the business realm, the most successful companies are those that develop a deeply rooted set of principles and guidelines that provide better-than-expected results. The combination of these two realms is expressed in a "circle of life" that constitutes both a "sphere of light", in which daily life is secure and stable, and a "sphere of darkness", in which our daily life is disrupted with chaos and challenge. Essentially, the best stories (and therefore best advertisements) are those that provide the consumer with a "call to action", a reason to

move from the sphere of light and take on a challenge such as buying a new product or switching existing products.

This call to action can be successful in motivating consumers to engage in the activity or purchase the product that they advertiser wants, but its success relies on the effective application of several psychological concepts. The most basic motive for behavior change stems from the theory of cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1962). This theory states that an uncomfortable cognitive state arises when there is an inconsistency between what a person says and what they do. For example, a person who smokes may know that smoking is bad for their health, but may still continue to smoke. As well, a parent may have a belief that children should be quiet and unobtrusive, but may praise their children when they stand out and gain the attention of others. The theory also states that people are motivated to engage in actions that reduce this sense of inconsistency so that their beliefs and behavior are aligned again. In marketing practices, advertisers seek to capitalize on creating cognitive dissonance in the mind of their consumers and showing them that engaging in their brand or buying their product is the most effective way to reduce this dissonance.

Similar to the idea of cognitive dissonance, the self-discrepancy theory proposed by Higgins (1998) suggests that people can be motivated to act or change their behavior when there is a realized discrepancy between their current “actual” self and their desired “ideal” or “ought” self. That is, when a person has an image in their mind of the type of person that they want to be, and that image is not where they currently are, then they will be motivated to solve this discrepancy and move as close to their desired “self-state” as possible. The underlying psychological principle behind this theory states simply that

people move toward pleasure and away from pain. Drawing upon both the cognitive dissonance and self-discrepancy theories, advertisers can produce a successful commercial with a message that creates cognitive dissonance by exploiting the differences between the consumer's current "actual" self and their desired "ideal" self. For example, a cell phone company could point out the fact that a customer's current phone bill is too high (i.e., "actual" state represents pain) and that by switching to their service, they will save money (i.e., "ideal" state represents pleasure). Therefore, the message of the advertisement represents the "call to action" for the consumer to move away from the pain of their current state to the pleasure of their desired state by purchasing their product or service.

These theories provide an interesting introspective look into the mind of the consumer in explaining what may cause someone to feel the need to change their purchasing behavior or alter their ways of thinking about a certain company's service. By making a consumer feel one way about a commercial's message and highlighting the fact that they are not already engaging in this behavior, advertisers create cognitive dissonance. When the message highlights aspects of a consumer's life that could be improved or changed to satisfy this inconsistency and move them closer to their desired self, consumers can be motivated to change their behavior. These theories provide great insight into methods of motivating people to go to the store or pick up the phone and respond to the call to action. However, while consumers can be as motivated to purchase a product as they want, this motivation does no good if the consumer does not associate their source of motivation with the memory of the brand attached to the advertising message.

Theme 2: Commercial advertisements that do not do a good job at eliciting brand remembrance lose all benefit of a motivational story.

Advertising today is now about storytelling and creating positive brand equity while also driving sales. In order to achieve both of these things, commercial advertisements must be effective in solidifying the idea associated with their message to their brand name in their consumers' minds. A person may view an Under Armour commercial and feel the motivation to become more active and purchase athletic gear to exercise in. Under Armour must then hope that, when in the store, the consumer remembers that their motivation to become more active was due to Under Armour and will then purchase their products. However, if the consumer fails to associate their sense of motivation with the Under Armour brand, they may simply choose a style, color, or price range of products they enjoy instead of purchasing the specific brand that caused them to come to the store in the first place.

Extant literature provides effective ways to improve consumers' long-term memory for brands. Elaborating on Jensen's notion, Murray argues that due to the psychological shift from the theorized Industrial Society to a "Dream Society", retailing is focusing less on simply capturing consumers' attention and more on getting them to participate with a brand. Participating can be anything from downloading an app, using a coupon, or sharing an ad on Facebook. The idea is that participating in a promotion, advertisement, or shopper program requires more time and effort than simply being aware of it. Therefore, Murray states that the more difficult task of participating will lead to the consumer being more likely to remember the message of the advertisement.

But how does a marketer get someone to participate? Here is where the math comes in. Murray argues that, before deciding to participate in anything related to shopping, consumers must first ensure that the value of the product exceeds the effort required to participate. According to this “return-on-effort” formula, if the benefits outweigh the costs required to participate (i.e. effort, price, time, etc.), then the consumer will participate and be more likely to remember the message. Therefore, mathematically speaking:

$$\text{Return-on-effort} = \text{Expected Value/Costs}$$

Putting this theory into practice, Murray suggests that marketers and business professionals alike who focus on increasing participation will be more likely to achieve consumers’ remembrance of their brand. They can do this (mathematically, it seems) by either increasing the value of the product, or decreasing the amount of effort it takes to participate, be it financial effort through price, or effort to engage with brand. Many practices have been used to do either of these, but today’s marketing strategies have become revolutionary in their methods of decreasing effort required. The advent of social media with Facebook’s “like” and “share” feature, as well as the growing use of smartphone apps, make participation literally at your fingertips. As well, many advertising campaigns today are associating their brand, product, or message with a specific hashtag that can be used on Twitter, Instagram, and other social media sites. In this year’s biggest advertising campaign, the 2015 Super Bowl, brands such as Coca Cola®, Nissan®, Always®, and Budweiser® all created hashtags associated with their advertising campaign. These hashtags could then easily be used by consumers to spread the brand’s message. Therefore, according to Murray, the messages associated with these

advertisements will be better remembered because they utilized a method that significantly decreases the amount of effort required to participate in their brand's promotion.

The literature also suggests that there exists a relationship between mood and the subsequent appraisal of commercial advertisements (Goldberg & Gorn, 1987). It was found that a happy television program resulted in a happier mood in viewers while watching both a television program and its commercials. However, while this study showed that happier television programming resulted in more positive appraisals of commercials, the research did not investigate the effect of positive mood on brand recall.

Congruently, research by Isen & Dauman (1984) found that mood affects the process of encoding information into memory and that people in positive moods will more easily be able to encode and remember brand names when viewing advertisements. It is believed that, compared to a neutral mood, a positive mood activates a broader range of interconnected pathways in the brain that are used for information processing and memory. Therefore, when information is encoded during a positive cognitive affect, the new information is linked to and stored in a larger number of neural links in the brain. This increase in neural linkages during encoding makes it more likely that the information will be better stored in memory.

On the contrary, a study by Roozen (2010) found that subjects who viewed a "sad" commercial performed better at brand recall than those who viewed a "happy" commercial. Preliminary research showed that "sad" commercials were effective at inducing a congruent mood in the viewer, and the same was true for those viewing a "happy" commercial. It is hypothesized that, contrary to the increase in neural linkages

during a happy mood, people in a sad mood are more concentrated while viewing a commercial, and therefore result in higher brand recall. Roozen did find, however, that performance on brand recall was significantly better when the context of the television program (e.g. “happy” or “sad”) matched the context of the commercials shown. Therefore, it may be important to note that commercials that seek to elicit a certain mood should be shown during a television program that also elicits the same mood.

This study seeks to investigate the effectiveness of different commercial advertisements on the basis of achieving significant levels of brand recall. As well, this study seeks to analyze whether commercials sponsored by different types of brands perform better than others at achieving brand recall. Based on the findings of previous research, several hypotheses have been constructed. The hypotheses and their reasoning are listed as follows:

1. Television commercials that create a newfound sense of self-discrepancy via cognitive dissonance with its branded message/story will be rated as more favorable than commercials that do not. For the purpose of this research, the commercial from Always® is deemed to elicit the most cognitive dissonance within the viewer due to its content, and therefore is expected to have the highest favorability rating. It is hypothesized that by eliciting a painful situation via a sense of cognitive dissonance, the viewer feels motivated to move away from this pain. By providing a favorable solution to this problem, the commercial is expected to be more positively viewed for its problem-solving message.

2. People who specifically remember seeing a commercial will be more confident in correctly selecting the brand associated with said commercial than those who are unsure as to whether or not they saw the commercial.
3. People who watch television more often will be more likely to correctly remember brands associated with commercials. Repeated exposure to a message is thought to create a higher number of neural linkages in which to store the commercial's message and brand into memory.
4. Commercials that portray a happy mood will have higher levels of brand remembrance than commercials with a sad mood because the context of the program being viewed (the Super Bowl) is congruent with this mood.
5. Commercials that have a message that interests the viewer or aligns with the viewer's beliefs will be more likely to achieve brand remembrance. Neural linkages have already been created for currently held beliefs. Therefore, if a commercial's message activates these already created pathways, information will be more easily stored into memory.

Research Methods

Procedure, Materials, & Subjects

For this research, a survey was distributed to a convenience sample of 160 participants. The survey asked various questions regarding the participant's TV viewing habits and attitudes toward commercials. Each participant was shown images taken from five different commercials that were aired during the 2015 NFL Super Bowl. Participants were asked various questions regarding each commercial, namely whether they remembered seeing the commercial and, if so, whether they remembered which brand/company was associated with the commercial. The survey was distributed and administered online, and each participant completed the survey anonymously.

Preliminary screening questions at the beginning of the survey led to a decrease in total number of completed surveys. Participants who did not watch the Super Bowl or had watched the Super Bowl but reported not watching any of the commercials were rejected from finishing the survey so as to control for conflicting variables. Responses were only desired from participants who had seen the commercials in question and could provide an informed response. Therefore, the 160 surveys administered were reduced to a sample of 88 complete surveys (61% female, 37% male; median age range: 35-54 years old).

The commercials used in the survey were selected by the researchers for their content and message. Each participant was shown several (4-5) still images of the commercial in question. None of the images shown contained brand names or logos, leaving the participant with the task of remembering the brand/company on their own.

The main variables of interest were whether or not the participant remembered seeing the commercial and if they chose the correct brand associated with the commercial. Participants indicated whether they were sure they had seen the commercial, were sure they had not, or were “unsure” as to whether they had seen the commercial. For the latter variable, after being shown the still images for each commercial, participants were presented with a list of companies from which to choose, with one representing the correct brand/company and the others representing similar or competing brands to the correct brand/company. For example, answer choices for the commercial presented by Nissan (a car company) included other car companies such as Chevrolet, Honda, Toyota, and Hyundai. This response task is known as recognition, which differs from its more difficult counterpart, recall (Singh & Rothschild, 1983). The difference between the two is that recall would have required the participant to remember the brand on their own from memory (such as a fill-in-the-blank type response), whereas recognition presents the participant with the correct information to be remembered (such as a multiple choice type response). For this survey procedure, a recognition task was used for remembering brand names due to its resemblance to the subsequent shopping experience. When choosing a product on the shelf, consumers are presented with the correct information (e.g., the product they will ultimately purchase) from which to choose. Therefore, a similar memory task was used in the survey so as to most closely mirror the consumer shopping experience.

Results and Analyses

General TV Viewing Habits

Results of the participants' general TV viewing habits revealed that 60 percent of participants watch TV every day, with the most popular time to watch TV being in the evening time from 5-10 pm. A majority of the participants prefer to watch TV shows that are pre-recorded via a DVR or other recording device. Interestingly, 66 percent of the participants felt that commercials are an important aspect to TV programs, however an overwhelming 90 percent admitted to fast-forwarding through or otherwise not watching commercials when viewing a recorded TV show. This news may not be shocking given the rise in popularity of TV recording devices. The good news for marketing and advertising professionals though is that a majority of the participants revealed that they would tell a friend about a commercial that they found interesting.

Hypothesis 1

Table 1

t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Equal Variances						
	Commercial Brand					
	Reebok	Always	DOVE	Always	Nationwide	Always
Mean Favorability Rating	3.32	3.92	3.41	3.92	3.17	3.92
Variance	0.73	1.18	0.92	1.18	0.74	1.18
Observations	37.00	64.00	34.00	64.00	48.00	64.00
Pooled Variance	1.02		1.09		0.99	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0.00		0.00		0.00	
df	99.00		96.00		110.00	
t Stat	-2.87		-2.30		-3.97	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.00		0.01		0.00	
t Critical one-tail	1.66		1.66		1.66	

Table 1 displays the results of multiple independent sample t-tests between the commercial's brand and its subsequent favorability rating (on a scale from 1-5). The mean favorability rating for each commercial was compared to that of the mean favorability rating for that of the commercial from Always because this commercial was subjectively rated as inducing the highest potential cognitive dissonance within the viewer. While this study had no standardized objective measure for cognitive dissonance, the Always commercial was rated as highest based on subjective measures. The commercial's message called out gender stereotypes in today's society and how doing something "like a girl" is viewed in a negative light. Those viewing the commercial were likely to relate to the negative treatment of girls, and therefore could be seen as seeing the highest discrepancy between their "actual" self and "ideal" self. The data support the hypothesis; when compared to the Always commercial, the Reebok ($t(99) = -2.87, p < .05$), DOVE® ($t(96) = -2.30, p < .05$), and Nationwide® ($t(110) = -3.97, p < .05$)

commercials all received significantly lower overall favorable ratings than did the Always commercial.

While not objectively stated, it can be tentatively concluded that creating high levels of cognitive dissonance in viewers leads to higher overall favorable ratings of the commercial. The Always commercial both presented the viewer with a problem with their current “actual” self (e.g., treating girls as inferior) and their “ideal” self (e.g., treating both sexes equally) as well as with a pleasing solution to the problem (thinking of the term “like a girl” in a more positive light). Due to this high degree of problem presentation as well as problem solution within its message, it received a more favorable rating than other commercials. Based on subjective measurement, the Reebok commercial elicited moderate levels of cognitive dissonance, whereas the DOVE and Nationwide commercials did not achieve significant levels of cognitive dissonance, thus leading to lower overall ratings.

While the data show that the commercial that induced the highest level of cognitive dissonance resulted in higher overall favorability ratings, it cannot be definitively concluded that commercials that elicit higher levels of cognitive dissonance will be more favorably rated. This study had no objective way of measuring levels of cognitive dissonance within viewers, and as such results of this test cannot be generalized to circumstances outside the scope of this study. Festinger’s (1962) operational definition of cognitive dissonance was not able to be accurately measured, and was therefore only subjectively inferred based on the content of the commercial. Participants could have rated the Always commercial more favorably because they had seen the commercial more often, because they had used the brand before and liked it, or because they could relate to

its content more. Because there was no way to measure the level of cognitive dissonance induced by each commercial, it cannot be firmly concluded that it was an increased level of dissonance that led to an increase in favorability ratings for the Always commercial.

Hypothesis 2

Table 2

			How confident are you that the brand/company you chose is correct?											Total	
			0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Do you remember seeing the commercial displayed by the images above?	Reebok	Yes	0	0	4	1	3	0	3	3	1	1	3	19	
		Not sure	0	3	5	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	14	
	DOVE	Yes	0	4	4	1	1	1	3	0	2	3	3	22	
		Not sure	0	2	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	
	Nationwide	Yes	2	4	5	8	4	4	5	3	1	2	1	39	
		Not sure	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
	Nissan	Yes	0	5	3	3	6	6	3	2	3	3	7	41	
		Not sure	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
	Always	Yes	0	8	4	5	5	8	3	4	4	3	16	60	
		Not sure	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	
	Total			2	32	30	22	21	24	18	13	11	12	30	215

Table 3

t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Equal Variances										
	Reebok		DOVE		Nationwide		Nissan		Always	
	Yes	Not Sure	Yes	Not Sure	Yes	Not Sure	Yes	Not Sure	Yes	Not Sure
Mean	5.74	2.86	5.23	2.89	4.13	1.20	5.54	2.00	5.93	3.25
Variance	8.20	2.90	11.80	2.36	6.54	0.20	9.35	0.00	10.84	8.25
Observations	19.00	14.00	22.00	9.00	39.00	5.00	41.00	2.00	60.00	4.00
Hypoth. Mean Diff.	0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00	
df	31.00		29.00		42.00		40.00		62.00	
t Stat	3.34		1.95		2.53		7.40		1.59	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.00		0.03		0.01		0.00		0.06	
t Critical one-tail	1.70		1.70		1.68		1.68		1.67	

Table 2 displays a cross tabulation of participants' response of whether or not they specifically remembered seeing the commercial in question, and their level of confidence of whether they believed the brand they chose in the survey was the correct brand associated with the commercial (ex: if they believed Nissan was the commercial's brand instead of Chevrolet or Honda). Levels of confidence were rated on a scale from 0-10, with a 0 indicating the participant was not confident at all that they remembered the correct brand, and a 10 indicating the participant was extremely confident or certain they remembered the correct brand. Table 3 displays the results of t-tests for each commercial of the confidence levels between participants who remembered seeing the commercial and those who were unsure.

The data are somewhat mixed with regard to the hypothesis that participants who were able to indicate that they specifically remembered seeing a commercial will have significantly higher levels of confidence in their brand choice than those who were not sure. Participants who reported for sure having seen the Reebok, DOVE, Nationwide, and Nissan commercials had significantly higher levels of confidence that their brand choice was correct ($t(31) = 3.34, p < .05$; $t(29) = 1.95, p < .05$; $t(42) = 2.53, p < .05$, $t(40) = 7.4, p < .05$, respectively). However, no significant difference was found between those who reported for sure having seen and Always® commercials and those who were not sure ($t(62) = 1.59, p > .05$).

Overall, in four of the five commercials, participants who specifically remembered seeing the commercial in question were more likely to be more confident that the brand that they thought was associated with the commercial was correct. Note that this does not mean that participants who specifically remembered seeing the

commercial in question were more likely to *remember* the correct brand, but rather more likely to *believe* they had remembered the correct brand. This phenomenon loosely stems from the effect of commitment on post-decision dissonance studied by Knox & Inkster (1968). That is, once a person has made a commitment to a decision, they are then likely to be more confident that this decision was correct. In the case of this research, participants who indicated that they for sure had seen the commercial in question made more of a commitment than those who were “not sure.” Therefore, as predicted, they reported significantly higher levels of confidence that their brand choice was correct than those who were not sure if they had seen the commercial in question.

Potential explanations for these findings include the possibility that the timing of the commercial during the Super Bowl had an impact on whether or not the commercial was remembered. Many participants reported having only watched some of the commercials during the Super Bowl due to various distractions such as conversation with friends, leaving the room to make food, and family members and pets requiring attention. Therefore, it cannot be controlled for or assumed that each participant actually viewed all of the commercials in question.

Another potential explanation for the lack of significant difference in the data is that the number of times each participant viewed the commercial during or since the Super Bowl could not be controlled for. Some participants could have seen some or all commercials multiple times, resulting in higher likelihood of both indicating they had seen the commercial and being more confident that they were able to remember the correct brand. Other participants could have only seen the commercial once or twice

during or since the Super Bowl, resulting in a lower likelihood for these factors being true.

Hypothesis 3

Table 4

		About how many times per week do you watch television?			
		0	1 - 3	4 - 6	Every Day
Reebok Commercial Brand Options	Nike	0	0	2	3
	Under Armour	0	2	7	6
	Adidas	0	0	1	3
	Reebok	0	3	3	6
	Total	0	5	13	18
DOVE Commercial Brand Options	Neutrogena	0	0	1	1
	DOVE	1	2	3	9
	Olay	0	1	0	0
	Johnson & Johnson	0	3	4	10
	Total	1	6	8	20
Nationwide Commercial Brand Options	Nationwide	0	2	6	13
	Allstate	0	0	1	1
	Esurance	2	2	2	7
	Farmer's Insurance	0	0	1	1
	Progressive	1	2	0	7
	Total	3	6	10	29
Nissan Commercial Brand Options	Toyota	0	3	3	4
	Hyundai	0	0	1	1
	Honda	0	0	0	2
	Chevy	0	1	2	5
	Nissan	1	6	6	9
	Total	1	10	12	21
Always Commercial Brand Options	DOVE	1	3	8	17
	Playtex	1	3	2	6
	Always	0	3	4	15
	Tampax	0	0	0	2
	Total	2	9	14	40

Table 5

t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Equal Variances										
	Reebok		DOVE		Nationwide		Nissan		Always	
	Reebok	Other	DOVE	Other	Nationwide	Other	Nissan	Other	Always	Other
Mean	5.25	5.75	5.36	5.50	5.91	5.19	4.77	5.55	5.95	5.51
Variance	4.57	2.28	5.63	3.95	2.47	6.70	5.42	3.69	3.19	4.59
Observations	12.00	24.00	14.00	20.00	22.00	27.00	22.00	22.00	22.00	43.00
df	34.00		32.00		47.00		42.00		63.00	
t Stat	-0.81		-0.19		1.15		-1.20		0.83	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.21		0.43		0.13		0.12		0.20	
t Critical one-tail	1.69		1.69		1.68		1.68		1.67	

Table 4 displays the results of a cross-tabulation between the participants' response as to which brand they believed was associated with the commercial and their frequency of watching television. Table 5 displays the results of a t-test between these variables. For the remainder of this research, the variable Other is described as any response by a participant who remembered the incorrect brand associated with the commercial. As shown, across all five commercials, those who remembered the correct brand associated with each commercial did not watch television a significantly longer amount of time on average than those who associated the commercial with the incorrect brand ($t(34) = -0.81, p > .05$; $t(32) = -0.19, p > .05$; $t(47) = 1.15, p > .05$; $t(42) = -1.20, p > .05$; $t(63) = 0.83, p > .05$). The data therefore suggests that those who watch television and are exposed to the commercial more often are not more likely to correctly remember the brands of various commercials.

This lack of significant difference could be due to the fact that it cannot be concluded that each participant was actually exposed to the commercials in question by watching more television. Those who reported watching television more often could have been viewing television networks that did not show the commercials the participants were

asked about, or could have not been paying attention during commercial breaks while watching television. Therefore, there is no control over whether watching more television will actually result in more exposure to the commercials in question.

Hypothesis 4

Table 6

Commercial Brand	% Who Remembered Seeing the Commercial	% Correct Brand Remembrance	Avg. Confidence Level (Scale 1-10)
Reebok	21 (20)%*	32%	4.41
DOVE	26 (13)%*	43%	4.55
Nationwide	47 (7)%*	44%	3.8
Nissan	49 (2)%*	50%	5.37
Always	69 (5)%*	34%	5.77

*Numbers listed in parentheses represent the percentage of subjects who were "not sure" if they had seen the commercial

Table 7

t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances		
	Happy	Sad
Mean Correct Brand Remembrance	45.66666667	33
Variance	14.33333333	2
Observations	3	2
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	3	
t Stat	5.269651864	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.006660006	
t Critical one-tail	2.353363435	

Overall performance on brand remembrance for each commercial was relatively low, as displayed the results in Table 6. Note that due to survey design, participants who indicated they had not seen the commercial were not asked to identify the brand associated with the commercial. Therefore, mean correct brand remembrance percentages reflect the responses of only those participants who indicated they either remembered

seeing the commercial or were “not sure.” The bad news for advertisers is that a low percentage of participants reported specifically having remembered seeing the commercial in question ($M = 42.4\%$). Of these participants that had actually seen the commercial, an even smaller percentage were able to correctly remember the brand associated with each commercial ($M = 40.6\%$). This means that, on average, for every 100 people that are shown a commercial, only 42 will remember seeing the commercial, and only 17 will actually remember which brand the commercial was for.

For the purposes of this hypothesis, the DOVE, Nationwide, and Nissan commercials were determined to be “happy”, whereas the Reebok and Always commercials were determined to be “sad” based on their content. Table 7 displays the results of a t-test between the mean correct brand remembrance rates (percent correct) of commercials that were labeled “Happy” and those that were labeled “Sad”. As shown, on average, happy commercials elicited a significantly higher level of brand remembrance than sad commercials ($M = 45.67, SD = 2.89$ vs. $M = 33, SD = 1.0; t(3) = 5.27, p < .05$). The data support the hypothesis. For the purposes of this research, the Super Bowl was subjectively classified as a happy event that would elicit overall generally positive emotions in viewers. Therefore, consistent with the findings of Roozen (2010), commercials that also had a happy and positive message (congruent with the television program) achieved higher levels of brand remembrance than did commercials with a sad mood (not congruent with the mood of the television program). Research by Isen and Dauman (1984) can be used to explain these findings, suggesting that the happy mood elicited by watching the Super Bowl activates a higher number of neural linkages within the viewer in which to store information to memory. Bolstered by the findings of Roozen

(2010), the increase in neural linkages combined with the congruent mood elicited by the happier commercials allowed for both the commercial’s message and brand to be more easily stored into memory.

However, many participants did not view every commercial presented during the Super Bowl due to various reasons and distractions. While the data support the findings of Roozen (2010) that mood-congruent programs and commercials elicit higher levels of brand remembrance, the conclusion is tentative. Levels of “happiness” and “sadness” induced by each commercial were subjectively defined, not objectively measured, and therefore it cannot be definitively concluded that each commercial successfully elicited a significant level of the appropriate mood within each viewer.

Hypothesis 5

Reebok

Table 8

		Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: I am interested in what this commercial is trying to say					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Which brand/company was being advertised in the commercial?	Nike	0	0	3	2	0	5
	Under Armour	3	4	5	3	0	15
	Adidas	0	1	2	1	0	4
	Reebok	1	1	3	6	1	12
Total		4	6	13	12	1	36

Table 9

		Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: This commercial aligns with my interests and opinions					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Which brand/company was being advertised in the commercial?	Nike	0	0	2	3	0	5
	Under Armour	1	4	6	4	0	15
	Adidas	0	1	0	2	1	4
	Reebok	2	0	1	8	1	12
Total		3	5	9	17	2	36

Table 10

		Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: Overall, I enjoyed this commercial					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Which brand/company was being advertised in the commercial?	Nike	0	0	4	1	0	5
	Under Armour	0	2	7	5	1	15
	Adidas	0	1	0	3	0	4
	Reebok	1	1	4	5	1	12
Total		1	4	15	14	2	36

Table 11

t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Equal Variances						
	Please indicate your agreement with the statement:					
	I am interested in what this commercial is trying to say		This commercial aligns with my interests and opinions		Overall, I enjoyed this commercial	
	Other	Reebok	Other	Reebok	Other	Reebok
Mean	2.79	3.42	3.17	3.50	3.33	3.33
Variance	0.95	1.17	0.93	1.55	0.58	1.15
Observations	24.00	12.00	24.00	12.00	24.00	12.00
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0.00		0.00		0.00	
df	34.00		34.00		34.00	
t Stat	-1.75		-0.89		0.00	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.09		0.38		1.00	
t Critical two-tail	2.03		2.03		2.03	

Tables 8, 9, and 10 represent cross-tabulations of the participants' response as to with which brand they believed the commercial to be associated with their subsequent level of agreement with various statements about the commercial. Table 11 displays the results of a two-sample t-test between these variables. As shown, participants who associated the commercial with the incorrect brand did not show a significantly lower level of interest in the message of the commercial ($t(34) = -1.75, p > .05$). Similarly, these participants did not report lower levels of commercial message aligning with their interests and opinions ($t(34) = -0.89 > -2.03, p > .05$) or overall enjoyment of the commercial ($t(34) = 0.00, p > .05$).

DOVE

Table 12

		Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: I am interested in what this commercial is trying to say					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Which brand/company was being advertised in the commercial?	Neutrogena	0	0	0	2	0	2
	Dove	1	1	3	9	1	15
	Olay	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Johnson & Johnson	0	5	9	2	0	16
Total		1	6	12	14	1	34

Table 13

		Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: This commercial aligns with my interests and opinions				Total
		Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Which brand/company was being advertised in the commercial?	Neutrogena	0	1	1	0	2
	Dove	3	4	6	2	15
	Olay	0	0	1	0	1
	Johnson & Johnson	3	9	4	0	16
Total		6	14	12	2	34

Table 14

		Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: Overall, I enjoyed this commercial					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Which brand/company was being advertised in the commercial?	Neutrogena	0	0	1	1	0	2
	Dove	1	1	3	7	3	15
	Olay	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Johnson & Johnson	1	1	9	5	0	16
Total		2	2	13	14	3	34

Table 15

t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Equal Variances						
	Please indicate your agreement with the statement:					
	I am interested in what this commercial is trying to say		This commercial aligns with my interests and opinions		Overall, I enjoyed this commercial	
	Other	DOVE	Other	DOVE	Other	DOVE
Mean	3.00	3.53	3.16	3.47	3.21	3.67
Variance	0.56	0.98	0.47	0.98	0.62	1.24
Observations	19.00	15.00	19.00	15.00	19.00	15.00
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0.00		0.00		0.00	
df	32.00		32.00		32.00	
t Stat	-1.79		-1.07		-1.40	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.08		0.29		0.17	
t Critical two-tail	2.04		2.04		2.04	

Tables 12, 13, and 14 represent cross-tabulations of the participants' response as to with which brand they believed the commercial to be associated with their subsequent level of agreement with various statements about the commercial. Table 15 displays the results of a two-sample t-test between these variables. As shown, participants who associated the commercial with the incorrect brand did not show a significantly lower level of interest in the message of the commercial ($t(32) = -1.79, p > .05$). Similarly, these participants did not report lower levels of commercial message aligning with their interests and opinions ($t(32) = -1.07, p > .05$) or overall enjoyment of the commercial ($t(32) = -1.40, p > .05$).

Nationwide

Table 16

		Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: I am interested in what this commercial is trying to say					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Which brand/company was being advertised in the commercial?	Nationwide	4	9	5	3	0	21
	Allstate	0	1	1	0	0	2
	Esurance	0	5	7	1	0	13
	Farmer's Insurance	0	1	1	0	0	2
	Progressive	1	3	4	1	1	10
Total		5	19	18	5	1	48

Table 17

		Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: This commercial aligns with my interests and opinions					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Which brand/company was being advertised in the commercial?	Nationwide	3	6	10	2	0	21
	Allstate	0	0	2	0	0	2
	Esurance	2	4	7	0	0	13
	Farmer's Insurance	0	1	1	0	0	2
	Progressive	0	2	7	0	1	10
Total		5	13	27	2	1	48

Table 18

		Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements: Overall, I enjoyed this commercial					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Which brand/company was being advertised in the commercial?	Nationwide	2	4	9	5	1	21
	Allstate	0	0	2	0	0	2
	Esurance	0	2	4	7	0	13
	Farmer's Insurance	0	0	2	0	0	2
	Progressive	0	0	7	2	1	10
Total		2	6	24	14	2	48

Table 19

t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Equal Variances						
	Please indicate your agreement with the statement:					
	I am interested in what this commercial is trying to say		This commercial aligns with my interests and opinions		Overall, I enjoyed this commercial	
	Other	Nationwide	Other	Nationwide	Other	Nationwide
Mean	2.70	2.33	2.67	2.52	3.33	2.95
Variance	0.68	0.93	0.62	0.76	0.46	1.05
Observations	27.00	21.00	27.00	21.00	27.00	21.00
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0.00		0.00		0.00	
df	46.00		46.00		46.00	
t Stat	1.43		0.60		1.55	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.16		0.55		0.13	
t Critical two-tail	2.01		2.01		2.01	

Tables 16, 17, and 18 represent cross-tabulations of the participants' response as to with which brand they believed the commercial to be associated with their subsequent level of agreement with various statements about the commercial. Table 19 displays the results of a two-sample t-test between these variables. As shown, participants who associated the commercial with the incorrect brand did not show a significantly lower level of interest in the message of the commercial ($t(46) = 1.43, p > .05$). Similarly, these participants did not report lower levels of commercial message aligning with their interests and opinions ($t(46) = 0.60, p > .05$) or overall enjoyment of the commercial ($t(46) = 1.55, p > .05$).

Nissan

Table 20

		Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: I am interested in what this commercial is trying to say				Total
		Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Which brand/company was being advertised in the commercial?	Toyota	2	3	5	0	10
	Hyundai	0	0	1	1	2
	Honda	0	1	1	0	2
	Chevy	3	2	2	1	8
	Nissan	3	7	10	2	22
Total		8	13	19	4	44

Table 21

		Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: This commercial aligns with my interests and opinions					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Which brand/company was being advertised in the commercial?	Toyota	0	3	4	3	0	10
	Hyundai	0	0	0	2	0	2
	Honda	0	0	2	0	0	2
	Chevy	0	2	3	2	1	8
	Nissan	2	3	9	7	1	22
Total		2	8	18	14	2	44

Table 22

		Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: Overall, I enjoyed this commercial					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Which brand/company was being advertised in the commercial?	Toyota	1	0	3	6	0	10
	Hyundai	0	0	0	1	1	2
	Honda	0	0	1	1	0	2
	Chevy	1	1	2	3	1	8
	Nissan	0	2	6	10	4	22
Total		2	3	12	21	6	44

Table 23

t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Equal Variances						
	Please indicate your agreement with the statement:					
	I am interested in what this commercial is trying to say		This commercial aligns with my interests and opinions		Overall, I enjoyed this commercial	
	Other	Nissan	Other	Nissan	Other	Nissan
Mean	3.36	3.50	3.18	3.09	3.45	3.73
Variance	0.91	0.74	0.73	1.04	1.12	0.78
Observations	22.00	22.00	22.00	22.00	22.00	22.00
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0.00		0.00		0.00	
df	42.00		42.00		42.00	
t Stat	-0.50		0.32		-0.93	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.62		0.75		0.36	
t Critical two-tail	2.02		2.02		2.02	

Tables 20, 21, and 22 represent cross-tabulations of the participants' response as to with which brand they believed the commercial to be associated with their subsequent level of agreement with various statements about the commercial. Table 23 displays the results of a two-sample t-test between these variables. As shown, participants who associated the commercial with the incorrect brand did not show a significantly lower level of interest in the message of the commercial ($t(42) = -0.50, p > .05$). Similarly, these participants did not report lower levels of commercial message aligning with their interests and opinions ($t(42) = 0.32, p > .05$) or overall enjoyment of the commercial ($t(42) = -0.93, p > .05$).

Always

Table 24

		Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: I am interested in what this commercial is trying to say					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Which brand/company was being advertised in the commercial?	Dove	1	1	8	12	7	29
	Playtex	2	3	0	3	4	12
	Always	2	2	1	7	10	22
	Tampax	0	0	0	1	0	1
Total		5	6	9	23	21	64

Table 25

		Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: This commercial aligns with my interests and opinions					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Which brand/company was being advertised in the commercial?	Dove	1	1	10	10	7	29
	Playtex	2	1	3	4	2	12
	Always	2	2	4	6	8	22
	Tampax	0	0	0	1	0	1
Total		5	4	17	21	17	64

Table 26

		Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: Overall, I enjoyed this commercial					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Which brand/company was being advertised in the commercial?	Dove	1	0	6	15	7	29
	Playtex	2	1	1	5	3	12
	Always	1	1	3	6	11	22
	Tampax	0	0	0	1	0	1
Total		4	2	10	27	21	64

Table 27

t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Equal Variances						
	Please indicate your agreement with the statement:					
	I am interested in what this commercial is trying to say		This commercial aligns with my interests and opinions		Overall, I enjoyed this commercial	
	Other	Always	Other	Always	Other	Always
Mean	3.73	3.95	3.56	3.73	3.78	4.14
Variance	1.25	1.76	1.20	1.73	1.13	1.27
Observations	41.00	22.00	41.00	22.00	41.00	22.00
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0.00		0.00		0.00	
df	61.00		61.00		61.00	
t Stat	-0.71		-0.53		-1.24	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.48		0.59		0.22	
t Critical two-tail	2.00		2.00		2.00	

Tables 24, 25, and 26 represent cross-tabulations of the participants' response as to with which brand they believed the commercial to be associated with their subsequent level of agreement with various statements about the commercial. Table 27 displays the results of a two-sample t-test between these variables. As shown, participants who associated the commercial with the incorrect brand did not show a significantly lower level of interest in the message of the commercial ($t(61) = -0.71, p > .05$). Similarly, these participants did not report lower levels of commercial message aligning with their interests and opinions ($t(61) = -0.53, p > .05$) or overall enjoyment of the commercial ($t(61) = -1.24, p > .05$).

Across all commercials, the data did not support the hypothesis. Participants who were interested in the message of the commercial and/or held similar interests and opinions as that expressed by the message of the commercial were no more likely to correctly remember the commercial's brand than participants who were disinterested in

or disagreed with the message of the commercial. A potential explanation for this lack of difference is that the neural linkages associated with interests and beliefs are not similar to those that are activated when encoding and retrieving information from memory. Therefore, information processing related to interests and beliefs are not synonymous with those that occur when storing information into memory. As such, the activation of neural linkages associated with interests and beliefs may not subsequently activate those linkages associated with memory retrieval.

Conclusions

Overall, it can be concluded that modern advertising does not do an effective job at achieving high levels of brand remembrance among viewers. Although only 17 percent of participants, on average, were able to remember the correct brand associated with the commercial in question (and were not very confident they had remembered correctly), correct brand remembrance rates were affected by a number of marketing and psychological factors.

Cognitive dissonance seemed to play a role in eliciting higher levels of brand remembrance in viewers. By using story-telling and emotional content to create a discrepancy in the viewer's mind between their actual and ideal self, commercials seemed to be more likely to motivate viewers to pay attention to the message of the commercial as well as its brand. However, specific levels of cognitive dissonance within the mind of the viewer could not be objectively measured. Therefore, future research should consider finding a standardized method of objectively measuring potential cognitive dissonance for each commercial and actual cognitive dissonance achieved within each participant. This way, it can be concluded which commercials achieved significantly higher levels of cognitive dissonance, and if these commercials were subsequently rated higher as compared to those that did not induce a significantly high level of cognitive dissonance.

Not surprisingly, the data suggest that specifically remembering having seen a commercial increases the likelihood that a person will be confident in which brand is associated with the commercial. However, due to television viewing habits and various distractions in attention, no control was exhibited over how many times each participant

was exposed to each commercial. Therefore, future research should seek to standardize and control for the number and duration of each participant's exposure to each commercial. By doing so, it can be ensured that each participant was exposed to each commercial an equal number of times and for an equal amount of time. Therefore, when a participant indicates that he or she specifically remembers seeing a commercial, it cannot be attributed to simply watching more television. More definitive conclusions can then be drawn based simply on the exposure to the commercial during the course of the research.

One of the more surprising findings of this research was that those who reported watching television more often were not more likely to correctly remember the commercial's brand. However, simply having seen more television does not guarantee a participant was exposed to a commercial more often. Therefore, future research should consider gathering data that indicates how many times a participant remembers having seen the commercial in question, if at all. Along with amount of television watched per week, by utilizing this response, it can be more accurately concluded that participants who watch more television were also exposed to the commercials in question more often. As a result, any significant difference found between those who watch television more often as compared to those who do not can be attributed to having been exposed to the different commercials a higher number of times.

Participants performed most poorly on both commercial and brand recognition for the Reebok commercial. Only one in five participants reported remembering seeing the commercial during the Super Bowl, and only a third of those who actually saw the commercial were able to remember the correct brand with which it was associated.

Confidence in choosing the correct brand was lowest for the Nationwide commercial, as participants rated their level of confidence that they had remembered the correct brand at 3.80/10. As well, there was no objective measure to determine the type or level of mood (whether happy or sad) that was induced by each commercial. Due to this fact, it cannot be specifically stated that the happy commercials in fact elicited a happy mood in the viewers, and vice versa for the sad commercials.

Future research should take into consideration conducting preliminary research similar to that of Goldberg & Gorn (1987) to ensure that each commercial properly elicits either a happy or a sad mood within the viewer. Similar tests should also be conducted on the television program itself (in this case, the Super Bowl). This way, it can be definitively concluded that each commercial achieves either a congruent or contrasting mood to that of the television program, and data corresponding to the viewer's ability to then remember correct brands can be appropriately analyzed.

This research sheds light on the fact that modern advertising does not achieve high levels of return on investment when it comes to brand remembrance for commercials. As the data show, on average only 17 percent of viewers will remember seeing the commercial and remember the brand of the commercial. This means that, especially for Super Bowl advertisement spots, potentially millions of dollars are wasted on putting a commercial in front of a huge audience that is both unlikely to remember the commercial as well as unable to remember the brand with which it is associated. Storytelling in advertising seeks to elicit a generally positive reaction from the viewer that can then be associated with the brand. This association of message and brand therefore can boost not only sales, but also intangible aspects such as positive brand

equity. However, as the data show, this connection between content and brand is not being achieved, and the entire goal of using advertising to promote positive reactions about a specific brand is falling short.

Even more displeasing to advertisers, the data show a potential for incorrect content-brand association. Not only did less than half the participants on average correctly remember the brand associated with each commercial, some of the commercials had a majority of participants associate the commercial with the incorrect brand. For example, 43 percent of participants correctly remembered the brand DOVE in its commercial. However, another 49 percent of participants indicated that they thought the commercial was sponsored by Johnson & Johnson®. As well, the Always commercial generated a correct recognition rate of 34 percent, but another 45 percent of participants incorrectly associated the commercial with the brand DOVE.

This means that not only did DOVE and Always pay millions of dollars in advertising expense to have only a small portion of their viewers remember their company name, in essence these brands spent huge sums of money to promote their competitors over themselves. It does no good for DOVE if more people think their commercial is sponsored by Johnson & Johnson than their own brand. Essentially, Johnson & Johnson then receives free advertising and DOVE drives viewers away from their positive message. This then increases the financial loss of the advertising campaign by combining low advertising effectiveness with the lost sales of potential customers.

The positive news about the implications of this research is that it provides insight into possible strategies that can be used to construct a commercial that will achieve higher levels of brand remembrance. Based on the findings, an effective commercial

would be one that elicits a high level of cognitive dissonance within the mind of the consumer as well as provides a product or service that dissuades this mental state of discomfort. Complementary to this, the commercial would likely promote a message that induces a mood that is consistent with the type of television program with which it is being aired, and is showed during times of day that feature the most number of viewers.

There is no secret formula for constructing the perfect commercial that both influences the viewer to purchase the product and induces positive feelings associated with the brand. Each commercial is designed for achieving a specific goal set forth by marketing and advertising strategists, and no two commercials are alike. However, a combination of these marketing and psychological factors can be used to help ensure that a great story is not just heard, but remembered.

References

- Burdett, L., Smith, J., Curry, A., Gildenberg, B., & Mader, S. (2013, January 1). The Future Shopper: How changing shopper attitudes and technology are reshaping retail. The Futures Company/Kantar Retail, 1-16.
- Festinger, Leon. A theory of cognitive dissonance. Vol. 2. Stanford university press, 1962.
- Goldberg, Marvin. E. and Gerald J. Gorn (1987), Happy and Sad TV Programs: How They Affect Reactions to Commercials, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 14, 387- 403.
- Headland, R. (2013). The Future is Omnichannel. *The Future of Shopper Marketing*, 22-24.
- Higgins, E. T. (1998). Promotion and prevention: Regulatory focus as a motivational principle. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 30, 1-46.
- Isen, A.M. and Daubman, K.A. (1984), The Influence of Affect on Categorization, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47 (Dec), 1206-1207.
- Jensen, R. (2002). Storytelling in management, marketing and advertising. Paper available at: <http://www.dreamcompany.dk/en/contribution/articles.php>.
- Knox, RE; Inkster, JA (1968). "Postdecision dissonance at post time". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 8 (4): 319–323.
- Lee, Angela Y.; Sternthal, Brian. (1999) The Effects of Positive Mood on Memory. *Journal of Consumer Research*, Sep, Vol. 26 Issue 2, 115-127, 13p.
- Murray, T. (2014, September 1). Mental Math. *The Hub Magazine*, 34-35.
- Pavlika, H. (2014, August 11). The Ultimate Moment of Truth. Retrieved from <https://blog.collectivebias.com/ultimate-moment-truth/>
- Roozen, I. (2010). The Importance of the Fit between the Context of the Programme and the TV commercial.
- Snow, S. (2014, February 3). This Will Be the Top Business Skill of the Next 5 Years.
- Tuttle, B. (2014, February 18). Chipotle's 'Farmed and Dangerous': Entertainment or Marketing Propaganda? *Time Magazine*.