

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

ScholarWorks@UARK

Agricultural Economics and Agribusiness
Undergraduate Honors Theses

Agricultural Economics and Agribusiness

5-2022

A Descriptive Study of College Students' Preferences toward Rhetorical Devices in Advertisements

Rachel Beyer

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/aeabuht>



Part of the [Advertising and Promotion Management Commons](#), [Agribusiness Commons](#), and the [Marketing Commons](#)

Citation

Beyer, R. (2022). A Descriptive Study of College Students' Preferences toward Rhetorical Devices in Advertisements. *Agricultural Economics and Agribusiness Undergraduate Honors Theses* Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/aeabuht/23>

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

A Descriptive Study of College Students' Preferences toward Rhetorical Devices in

Advertisements

University of Arkansas

Rachel J. Beyer

Acknowledgements

I wish to extend my gratitude and appreciation to those who helped me through this honors thesis process. Firstly, I wish to thank my honors mentor Mrs. Isabel Whitehead. Without Mrs. Whitehead's guidance and help I never would have been able to complete the process and she worked very closely with me on this study for three years, I cannot thank Mrs. Whitehead enough. I next wish to thank Dr. Jill Rucker and Dr. Jefferson Miller, who were kind enough to serve on my thesis committee. Dr. Rucker and Dr. Miller provide much encouragement and guidance throughout my thesis journey, for which I am deeply grateful.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	4
Introduction.....	6
Literature Review.....	8
Methodology.....	12
Results.....	16
Discussion.....	19
Conclusion.....	20
References.....	23
Appendix A.....	28
Appendix B.....	31
Appendix C.....	32

Abstract

Advertisements are specifically created to convince people of the importance to either buy a product or subscribe to an ideal. Companies are the primary users of advertisements, where advertisements are designed to increase profitability (Roberts, 2020). The advertising industry in America is quite large. Food is a diversified and competitive industry, this competition in the food industry causes companies to be dependent on consumer preference and knowledge (UC Davis Nutrition Department, 2020). With Generation Z on the rise, there should be an increased focus on their preferences and needs in all industries, including the food industry (Southgate, 2017). The purpose of this study was to identify the advertising messages that Generation Z consumers prefer with rhetorical devices. This study used a non-experimental research design, with survey methods, using the online platform Qualtrics. The population included young adults between the ages of 18-25 enrolled at a four-year institution and a sample was recruited using convenience sampling, by using a post in Arkansas News and by reaching out to faculty in a single college. The online survey remained open for two weeks. Data was analyzed using StatsIQ, the statistical analysis program in Qualtrics. There were 113 survey responses ($n = 113$). Most participants responded with a birth year of 2002 (26.51%), female gender identities (58.43%), white (89.89%), non-Hispanic (90.91%), undergraduate students (94.38%), and Agribusiness majors (44.95%). The results of the study were that statements using aphorism and alliteration were consistently not chosen, while statements using antithesis were consistently chosen. Statements using metaphor and parataxis had mixed responses. In summary, the results of the survey show that college students have mixed preferences for rhetorical devices in advertising and that more research is needed to understand their preferences more fully. This study recommends that further studies should be conducted with a larger sample across multiple colleges, and that future researchers seek funding to incentivize

participation, and the exploration of rhetorical devices should be broken down further, asking not only if rhetorical devices are still effective, but also which rhetorical devices are effective. Potential opportunities include conducting qualitative studies to investigate the reasons and influences behind their preferences.

Introduction

Background and Need

Advertisements play a crucial role in our everyday life. We see them on TV, on social media, on billboards, in fact, there is almost no place we go or activity we perform, without seeing or hearing an advertisement (Roberts, 2020). Advertisements are specifically created and worded to convince people of the importance and need to either buy a product or subscribe to an ideal. Companies are the primary users of advertisements, where advertisements are designed to increase profitability (Roberts, 2020). The advertising industry in America is quite large. In 2019 the advertisement and public relations industry was assessed to be a 138-billion-dollar industry (Guttmann, 2021).

The food industry is especially reliant on advertising. Food is a diversified and competitive industry, with multiple companies producing and selling the same goods. This competition in the food industry causes companies to be dependent on consumer preference and knowledge (UC Davis Nutrition Department, 2020). One of the only ways for food companies to influence preferences and build knowledge is through advertisements (UC Davis Nutrition Department, 2020). Companies seeking to create preferences for their food products face an increasingly difficult problem: consumers are told by competing brands that they are each better and healthier than others. Therefore, how can companies persuade current consumers to select their products?

One answer to this question might be to use rhetorical devices in advertising. According to Bai, "As a major kind of linguistic, rhetoric is a useful and interesting way to convince people. The advertising language is a forceful language. Therefore, there are a lot of rhetorical devices in advertisements. The suitable use of rhetorical devices is to enhance the artistic style and

strengthen the expressiveness of advertisements” (Bai, 2018, para.4). Rhetorical devices include “any language that helps an author or speaker achieve a particular purpose; usually *persuasion*” (Literary Terms, 2017, p. 1). Rhetorical devices have historically been used to make effective advertisements (Bai, 2018). The food advertising industry relies on the use of rhetorical devices as much as the rest of the industry (Zimmerman & Shimoga, 2014). Although there have been studies conducted that determined that advertisements use rhetorical devices to create persuasive messaging, there are few recent studies that explore the effectiveness of rhetorical devices in advertisements.

Generation Z (Gen Z) has a population in the United States of approximately 68 million, and with the high numbers, these individuals have or are about to have, a sizeable amount of economic buying power (Yuen, 2021). Business Insider reported that Gen Z will have a buying power of over \$140 billion in 2021 (Davis, 2020). The gap between Gen Z and the food industry needs to be bridged, because of the buying power Gen Z holds. In order to bridge this gap, researchers need to understand how to successfully reach consumers in this generational group.

Problem Statement

Research on the next generation of consumers has yet to address how current consumers are influenced by advertisements that use rhetorical devices. The National Association of Agricultural Educators’ National Research Agenda outlined research priority areas regarding communicating about food and fiber industries to the public in which they discuss the increasing knowledge gap between practices in the agricultural production sector and what the public perceives (Roberts et al., 2016). With each generation, the gap is growing larger and there is a big push in the food advertising industry to help bridge this gap. With Gen Z on the rise, there should be an increased focus on their preferences and needs in all industries, including the food

industry (Southgate, 2017). Therefore, food companies may benefit from gaining insight into how younger audiences, such as Gen Z, respond to advertisements about food to develop effective advertising strategies tailored to their needs and preferences.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to identify the advertising messages that Gen Z consumers prefer with rhetorical devices.

Research Objective

The following research objective guided this study:

- Identify college students' preferences for food advertising messages using rhetorical devices.

Literature Review

The literature review sets the groundwork for this study by exploring literature related to the role that advertising plays in consumer purchasing habits. Additional areas of discussion include the role that advertising plays in what makes advertisements successful and the use of rhetorical devices in food advertising. The literature review will also explore what is known about the next generation of food consumers, Gen Z, and the impact of advertising on them.

The Advertising Industry

Advertising is the action of calling a thing or idea to the attention of the public especially by paid announcements (Chen, 2010). Advertising is a major industry that plays a key role in the economic success of many countries. In the United Kingdom, for every billion pounds spent on advertising, there is a corresponding increase of six billion pounds in GDP (Taylor, 2014). The United States also has a major advertising industry which was assessed at one 138 billion dollars in 2019 (Guttman, 2021). The advertising industry is an effective tool in influencing consumer

behavior. Sama (2019) found that advertisements through TV, radio, newspapers, magazines, and the internet had a profound effect on all five dimensions of consumers' behavior: awareness, interest, conviction, purchase, and post-purchase behavior.

Characteristics of Successful Advertisements

There are seven common forms of advertisements: Paid search advertising, social media advertising, native advertising, display advertising, print advertising, broadcast advertising, and outdoor advertising (Goorevich, 2019). Advertisements are used persuade consumers to invest in their product or idea (Goorevich, 2019). Persuasion in advertising refers to the attempt to convince a consumer to purchase a product or service by appealing to their needs and desires (Indeed Editorial Team, 2021). Successful advertisements can use many techniques to create persuasive messages, but when narrowed down to one main technique they often share, rhetorical devices stand out (Bai, 2018; McQuarrie & Mick, 1996). Using rhetorical devices is not a new tactic in the advertising industry. The shift to using rhetoric and rhetorical devices in advertisements began as early as the beginning of the 1990s and was predicted to continue for several decades (McQuarrie & Mick, 1992).

The Types and Uses of Rhetorical Devices

One way to define rhetorical devices is language that uses certain known rules of rhetoric to persuade individuals to either do or think something the author desires (Purdue Writing Lab, 2002, para. 5). The purpose of rhetorical devices is to create persuasive writing and messages (Forsyth, 2016). When incorporated strategically "rhetorical devices can turn boring information into either a witty idea, or a compelling message" (Forsyth, 2016, p.3). When discussing rhetorical devices, Forsyth (2016) discussed the rules or forms of speech which are specifically created or standardized to help authors create persuasive, witty, messages. The types

of rhetorical devices include: Aphorism, a brief saying embodying a principle or precept; alliteration is a series of words or phrases that all (or almost all) start with the same letter/or sound; antithesis contrast two words, opposing ideas, features, or benefits; metaphor merges two seemingly incompatible images or concepts in an effort to create a symbiotic symbolism, and parataxis, a rhetorical device in which phrases and clauses are placed one after another independently, without coordinating or subordinating them using conjunctions (Lannes, 2019).

Analyzing Advertisements with Rhetorical Devices

Rhetorical devices are used in a sentence to make that sentence more compelling; they do this by paraphrasing the sentence using certain known rules for a rhetorical device (Esposito, 2001). For instance, when using the rhetorical device alliteration, at least the beginning letter, or even the first syllable, in each word in the sentence needs to be the same. (Forsyth, 2016, p. 13) Therefore, when seeking to analyze an advertising message using rhetorical devices, first look at what the simplest way to state the sentence would be, and then ask what was added to this simple statement, or what was left out (Mulken, 2003). Rhetorical devices take a sentence and make it unique and compelling by either adding words, taking away words, or doing both (JSCC Libraries, 2020).

Advertising in the Food Industry

Food producers and sellers are an important facet of the advertising industry. Gallo (1999) studied the food and alcohol advertising industry from 1960 through 1999 and found that the advertising industry was steadily increasing over each decade. In 1999, food and alcohol advertisements made up ten percent of the entire advertising industry, which earned them the position of the second largest section of the advertising industry, after the auto division

(Gallo, 1999). More recently, the revenue in the food market amounts to 919,380 million US dollars in 2021, and the market is expected to grow annually by 3.11% (Statista, 2022).

Like the rest of the advertisement industry, the food advertising industry is not just a means of entertaining people, “food advertisements have a profound effect on how and what consumers buy” (Zimmerman & Shimoga, 2014, p. 342). Not all studies agree with this finding, however. According to a study by Mills et al. (2013), there was no definite correlation between advertisements and consumer behavior. This study showed consumers a series of food advertisements and then studied the food purchasing behavior of the test subjects afterwards. These two studies differed so much in their results that we do not have a conclusive answer.

Rhetoric in Food Advertisements

Rhetorical devices are just as important to the food advertising industry as they are in the rest of the advertising industry. Rhetorical devices are systematically used in food advertisements and have historically been effective (Zimmerman & Shimoga, 2014). But this might not be enough anymore. Food advertisements and labels have not always been truthful in the claims they make. In fact, people today are much less likely to believe advertisements and labels than they were a decade ago (Welford, 1992). With the evident lack of trust consumers feel for advertisements and labeling, food companies need more than ever to have effective, convincing, and truthful advertisements (Welford, 1992). This trend, which was noted by Welford in 1992 continues into today and needs to be addressed (Southgate, 2017).

Generation Z Defined and Characterized

The generation known as Gen Z is of particular interest given its size, and the lack of information we have about it. Gen Z individuals are those who were born between 1997 to 2012 (Beresford Research, 2022). Gen Z has approximately 68 million people in the United

States, which is 20.6% of the U.S. population (Yuen, 2021). This generation is not like any other and needs special attention, especially when discussing the effects that advertisements have upon them (Southgate, 2017). Gen Z consumers are surrounded by advertisements, but most of these advertisements are conveyed digitally, through tv, podcasts, and social media. These digital advertisements are most often in the form of a video or speech, and this in connection with the shortened attention span of Gen Z consumers, shortened from 12 seconds for Millennials to 8 seconds for Gen Z, which brings the effectiveness of written advertisements into a questionable state (Southgate, 2017).

Since Gen Z is such a young generation, and just entering the world of consumer purchasing power, there is a lot of information concerning their preferences that is yet unknown, however some studies have been conducted and there is some information about Gen Z available (Southgate, 2017). In one study, researchers found that Gen Z had significantly negative responses to the principles of marketing. Phrases such as “marketing tricks” and “marketing lies” are being used more frequently by Gen Z. Gen Z representatives characterize many of today’s marketing activities as “intrusive,” “disturbing,” “misleading” and “deceptive” (Gubíniová et al., 2021, p. 12-13). This attitude of Gen Z consumers could affect the way they view and are potentially influenced by rhetorical devices in advertisements.

Advertisements have historically used rhetorical devices to produce convincing and effective written advertisements. However, with a new generation of consumers who do not have as much interaction with written advertisements, have a shorter attention span, and have an increase distrust of marketing, will rhetorical devices in advertisements still be effective? (Gubíniová et al., 2021; Southgate, 2017). Few studies have been found in the literature specifically related to the current effectiveness of rhetorical devices in advertising. This study

will seek to delve into the question of how the next generation of consumers will respond, if at all, to rhetorical devices currently used in advertising, with a focus on food products.

Methods and Materials

This study aimed to identify the advertising messages that Gen Z consumers prefer with rhetorical devices. This section will explain the research design, the population and sampling, and rigor of the study. The instruments, as well as the methods of data collection and analysis will also be discussed.

Research Design

This study used a non-experimental research design, with survey methodology. Survey methodology is the process of collecting responses from participants through questionnaires. This methodology can provide an objective, measurable answer to the research question. Data from surveys are then statistically analyzed to draw meaningful research conclusions (Glasow, 2005). An online survey is a structured questionnaire that your target audience completes over the internet through filling out a form. Online surveys can vary in length and format. Online surveys allow researchers to gather their target information efficiently, while also making it easier for participants to access (Creswell, 2008).

Rigor

Rigor establishes the validity and reliability of a study's method and tools (Marquart, 2017). Validity is the extent to which a score from a measure represents the intended variable, while reliability refers to the consistency of a measure (Peräkylä, 2011). Steps can be taken to increase these aspects of rigor. This study is subject to internal validity issues in that the survey being used was created by the researcher, as opposed to an established survey validated and found reliable by experts.

To address potential internal validity issues, three cognitive interviews were conducted. A cognitive interview offers a detailed description of meanings and processes used by respondents to answer questions, which will impact the survey data (Köhnken et al. 1999). As such, a cognitive interview offers insight that can enhance understanding of question validity and response error (CDC (Centers for Disease Control), 2014). Three cognitive interviews were conducted, the participants clearly understood what was being asked of them, and no negative feedback was given. The survey was also circulated to a panel of experts in agricultural communications to review the items for face and content validity.

Face validity refers to how a measure appears on the surface: Does it ask all the needed questions? Does it use the appropriate language and language level to do so? Face validity does not rely on established theory for support. Content validity refers to the extent to which a measure thoroughly and appropriately assesses the skills or characteristics it is intended to measure (Rubio, 2005). As part of testing the content validity of the survey questions, a professor in the English with content expertise in composition and rhetoric was contacted to review the survey to ensure that rhetorical devices were appropriately used, and that the plain statements did not use any rhetorical device. The English expert advised simple wording changes to two of the survey statements for more accuracy in the use of rhetorical devices, these changes were adopted.

Participants and Sampling

The population included young adults between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five enrolled at a four-year institution. This study used a non-probability sampling method called accidental or convenience sampling. Non-probability sampling is a technique in which each unit in a sample population does not have a specifiable probability of being selected (Thyer, 2010).

Accidental or convenience sampling is a sampling procedure in which a researcher selects participants in any manner that is convenient to be included in the sample (Thyer, 2010). The sample was composed of students meeting the age criteria enrolled at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville campus, particularly those accessible through Arkansas News, a newsletter which is published online each day, and large-enrollment courses in the Dale Bumpers College of Agricultural, Food and Life Sciences.

Instrumentation

This study was developed as an online survey, through the Qualtrics platform. The survey was created by the student researcher and edited by the honors faculty mentor and committee members. Forsyth (2016) was used as a reference when creating advertisement messages which contained rhetorical devices. The five rhetorical devices used in food advertisements that this study focused on were: aphorism, alliteration, antithesis, metaphor, and parataxis. These five rhetorical devices are frequently found in food advertisements, as well as other forms of advertising (Chetia, 2015). These forms are used frequently due to their simplicity of form, which makes them easier to use in sentences (Chetia, 2015). The author of this paper chose these five rhetorical devices because they are commonly used in rhetorical devices and are easy to construct.

The survey included a variety of multiple choice and open-ended questions. A screening question on the first page of the survey confirmed that the respondents were enrolled in a degree program at the University of Arkansas. Participants were then asked several preliminary questions in a multiple-choice format to report demographic characteristics. Participants were asked to report their age, gender identity, race, ethnicity, college, and major. Following the demographic questions, participants were presented with a series of food advertisement

messages. One message was a plain statement, without a rhetorical device and the second message paraphrased the first, using a rhetorical device. There were five rhetorical devices used, and ten questions. The five rhetorical devices included in the advertising messages were: aphorism, alliteration, antithesis, metaphor, and parataxis. Each device was presented in two different messages. In each survey question, the participants were presented with a multiple-choice option to choose between the two statements, one using a rhetorical device and the other not using a rhetorical device.

Data Collection and Analysis

Prior to conducting the study, approval was sought from the University of Arkansas Institutional Review Board (IRB Protocol # 2112375380). A description of the survey and the survey link was submitted to Arkansas News, where the whole University could access the link. Professors in Bumpers College were directly emailed with the survey link, with a request to post the link on their courses' BlackBoard page. The student researcher also visited a few large-enrolled courses to recruit students in-person to take the survey, using a single PowerPoint slide with a Quick Response (QR) code to the survey. The survey remained open for approximately two weeks to allow participants time to complete the survey. At the conclusion of the two-week period, the survey was closed. Data was aggregated and then analyzed. Data was analyzed using StatsIQ, the statistical analysis program in Qualtrics to generate descriptive statistics including frequencies and percentages.

Results

In this section, the results will be presented, and data will be discussed categorically, based on the sections of the survey. A total of 113 ($n = 113$) survey responses were received out of a total solicitation of 29,068 students in the Fall 2021. As such, the response rate was 0.389% (Quick Facts,

2021). Though the response rate is below the 30% normally obtained during survey research, the researcher was satisfied with the response due to time constraints for data collection. Tables 1-17 depict the responses to the survey questions.

Participant Demographics

All the participants were between 18-25 years old, with most reporting a birth year of 2002 (26.51%, n= 83), with 2001 as the second-highest reported birth year (25.30%, n=83). Most participants reported as female identifying (58.43%, n=89), white (89.89%, n=89), non-Hispanic (90.91%, n=88), and undergraduate status (94.38%, n=89), (Tables C11-13, C17). Bumpers College represented most of the respondents (Table C15). Agribusiness (44.95%, n=90), Horticulture (10.11%, n=90), and Agricultural Education Communication & Technology (5.62%, n=90) were the most represented majors for the participants (Table C16).

Rhetorical Device Preferences: Aphorism

In the first survey question, the statement without the rhetorical device aphorism had a frequency of 57, which was 63.33% of the total number of participants (n=90). The statement which used the rhetorical device had a frequency of 33, which was 36.67% of n (Table C1). In the second survey question, the statement without the rhetorical device aphorism had a frequency of 46, which was 51.11% of the total number of participants (n=90). The statement which used the rhetorical device had a frequency of 44, which was 48.89% of total participants (Table C2).

Table C1

Rhetorical Device Preferences: Aphorism p1.

Item	Frequency	Percent
Statement without aphorism	57	63.33
Statement using aphorism	33	36.67
n = 90		

Rhetorical Device Preferences: Alliteration

In the third survey question, the statement without the rhetorical device alliteration had a frequency of 50, which was 55.56% of the total number of participants (n=90). The statement which used the rhetorical device had a frequency of 40, which was 44.44% of n (Table C3). In the fourth survey question, the statement which did not use alliteration had a frequency of 64, which was 71.11% of the total number of participants (n=90). The statement which used alliteration had a frequency of 26, which was 28.89% of n (Table C4).

Table C4

Rhetorical Device Preferences: Alliteration p2.

Item	Frequency	Percent
Statement without alliteration	64	71.11
Statement using alliteration	26	28.89

: n = 90

Rhetorical Device Preferences: Antithesis

In the fifth survey question, the statement which did not use the rhetorical device antithesis had a frequency of 12, which was 13.33% of the total number of participants (n=90). The statement which used antithesis had a frequency of 78, which was 86.67% of total participants (Table C5). In the sixth survey question, the statement without the rhetorical device had a frequency of 36, which was 40.00% of the total number of participants (n=90). The statement which used the antithesis had a frequency of 54, which was 50.00% of total participants (Table C6).

Table C5

Rhetorical Device Preferences: Antithesis p1.

Item	Frequency	Percent
Statement without antithesis	12	13.33
Statement using antithesis	78	86.67

n = 90

Rhetorical Device Preferences: Metaphor

In the seventh survey question, the statement which did not use the rhetorical device metaphor, had a frequency of 49, which was 54.44% of the total number of participants (n=90). The statement which used the rhetorical device had a frequency of 41, which was 45.56% of participants (Table 7). In the eighth survey question, the statement without the rhetorical device had a frequency of 34, which was 38.20% of the total number of participants (n=89). The statement which used the rhetorical device metaphor had a frequency of 44, which was 48.89% of total participants (Table 8).

Table C8

Rhetorical Device Preferences: Metaphor p2.

Item	Frequency	Percent
Statement without metaphor	34	38.20
Statement using metaphor	55	61.80

n = 89

Rhetorical Device Preferences: Parataxis

In the ninth question, the statement which did not use parataxis had a frequency of 39, which was 43.39% of the total number of participants (n=90). The statement which used the rhetorical device had a frequency of 51, which was 56.67% of participants (Table C9). In the tenth survey question, the statement without the rhetorical device had a frequency of 56, which was 62.22% of the total number of participants (n=90). The statement which used the parataxis had a frequency of 34, which was 37.78% of n (Table C10.)

Table C9

Rhetorical Device Preferences: Parataxis p1.

Item	Frequency	Percent
Statement without parataxis	39	43.39
Statement using parataxis	51	56.67

n = 90

Discussion

Participants consistently preferred the statements which did not use aphorism over the statements which did use aphorism. The participants consistently preferred the statements which did not use alliteration over the ones which did use alliteration as well. Statements using antithesis were more popular than the other two rhetorical devices, in both questions the statements using antithesis were preferred by participants than the plain statements. For statements using metaphor and parataxis the findings are not as clear, for each of those devices, one statement was popular, and was unpopular. The overall response of participants to the statements using rhetorical devices is more negative than positive, though the results show variations.

The findings of this study are consistent with the findings of Southgate (2017), who said that Gen Z was different from prior generations, and that the advertising methods which previously worked may not work with this generation. Gen Z representatives characterize many of today's marketing activities as "deceptive" (Gubíniová et al., 2021, p. 12-13). The focus of this study was specific to the use of advertising messages incorporating five rhetorical devices. This study did not explore the participants' perceptions of the wording, specific phrases, or meaning behind the messages, and as such, it cannot determine *why* participants held certain preferences. The results illustrated a dislike of aphorism, alliteration, and mixed preferences for

metaphor and parataxis among Gen Z participants. This suggests that rhetorical devices in advertising were not as popular, or persuasive, among Gen Z as previously found in the group of college students studied by Zimmerman & Shimoga (2014). The college students in Zimmerman and Shimoga's (2014) study could have been older members of Gen Z, which begs the question – is Gen Z divided in their preferences?

Conclusions

This section will identify the conclusions that can be drawn from the results of the survey and how they relate to the main research objective, what the limitations of the study were, and what recommendations can be made for the future. In summary, the results of the survey are inconclusive.

Research Objective 1

The initial objective of the study was to identify college students' preferences for food advertising messages using rhetorical devices. The results indicate that some rhetorical devices were consistently liked, some consistently disliked, and some presented mixed preferences. In the two questions regarding aphorism respondents preferred not to use the rhetorical device, and it was the same with the questions which referred to alliteration. In the questions using antithesis, the rhetorical devices were preferred, while for the statements using metaphor and parataxis, the results were split. The main conclusion drawn is that, unlike previous generations, Gen Z has mixed preferences for rhetorical devices. Participants reported consistent dislikes and likes for certain rhetorical devices, but they had mixed preferences for rhetorical devices as a whole.

Limitations of the Study

The survey questions used provided quantifiable answers to the research objective. However, the response was low. The population for the study was Gen Z undergraduate, graduate, and master's students from the Dale Bumpers College of Agricultural, Food and Life Sciences and students enrolled in other colleges at the University of Arkansas. The subsample of

the sample (n = 113) represents 5.18% of the undergraduate student population of Bumpers College (University of Arkansas, n.d). There are approximately 29,068 (Fall 2021) students and faculty at the University of Arkansas, so this study surveyed 0.39% of the campus population (Quick Facts, 2021). A larger sample and a stronger sampling procedure would be needed to generalize the preferences of Gen Z college students for rhetorical devices in food advertising messages. The results of this study cannot be generalized beyond the respondents. Additionally, time and resources were a constraint in this research study. Finally, the reliability of the data is weakened by using a researcher developed survey without a pilot study to measure the reliability.

Recommendations for Future Research

The researcher recommends the following:

- Further studies should be conducted with a larger sample across multiple colleges,
- Future researchers should seek funding to incentivize participation, and the exploration of rhetorical devices should be broken down further, asking not only if rhetorical devices are still effective, but also which rhetorical devices are effective and/or ineffective.
- Future studies should ask the question, why is Gen Z's preference for rhetorical devices in advertising different from that of previous generations? Why are they for or against rhetorical devices in advertising? Potential opportunities include conducting qualitative studies to investigate the reasons and influences behind their preferences.

Considering the study's findings, it is recommended that further research be conducted with Gen Z participants about their messaging preferences, particularly using rhetorical devices.

The findings indicate the challenges in identifying Gen Z students' preferences for rhetorical devices in food advertising, which can be used to inform further research on this issue. This study provides groundwork for further research on the overall effectiveness of rhetorical devices, and for research on the separate effectiveness of different rhetorical devices used in advertising. When discussing the results of this study in connection with previous studies, three questions stood out: Why are preferences for the use of rhetorical devices mixed, what are the perceptions that lead to these mixed preferences, and could Gen Z be divided over their preferences for rhetorical devices in advertising?

References

- Roberts, T. G., Harder, A., & Brashears, M. T. (Eds). (2016). American Association for Agricultural Education national research agenda: 2016-2020. Gainesville, FL: Department of Agricultural Education and Communication. https://www.ageds.iastate.edu/files/inline-files/AAAE_National_Research_Agenda_2016-2020.pdf
- Bai, Z. (2018). The characteristics of language in cosmetic advertisements. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 8(7), 841-847. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0807.16> Retrieved October 13, 2019.
- Beresford research. (2022, January 04). *Age range by generation*. <https://www.beresfordresearch.com/age-range-by-generation/>
- National Center for Health Statistics. (2014, August 26). CCQDER - Cognitive Interviewing. Centers for disease control and prevention. <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/ccqder/evaluation/CognitiveInterviewing.htm>
- Chen, H. (2010). Advertising and Generational Identity: A Theoretical Model. American Academy of Advertising. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/6b09dcaa97dc33f2a0cffcd69ffb2dfd/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=40231>
- Chetia, B. (2015, November 11). Rhetorical devices in English advertisement texts. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 5(11), 980-984. <http://www.ijssh.org/papers/591-C00006.pdf>.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Student Study Guide to accompany Creswell's educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson Education.

- U. C. Davis Nutrition Department. (2020, December 05). *How can advertisements influence your food choices?* Center for nutrition in schools. <https://cns.ucdavis.edu/news/how-can-advertisements-influence-your-food-choices>
- Esposito, J. (2001). A critical approach to the analysis of advertisements. *The Linguistics Journal*, 5(1), 197-219.
doi:<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.418.360&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Forsyth, Mark. 2016. *Elements of eloquence: How to turn the perfect english phrase*. Burkly University.
- Gallo, Anthony E. (1999). *America's Eating Habits: Changes and Consequences*. Agriculture Information Bulletin No. (AIB750),484
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/23516801_America%27s_Eating_Habits_Changes_and_Consequences
- Eliopoulos G. M., Harris A. D., Bradham D. D., Baumgarten M., Zuckerman I. H., Fink J. C., Perencevich E. N. (2004). The use and interpretation of quasi-experimental studies in infectious diseases, *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 38(11), Pages 1586-1591.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/420936>
- Glasow, P.A. (2005). *Fundamentals of survey research methodology*. Mitre.
https://www.mitre.org/sites/default/files/pdf/05_0638.pdf
- Goorevich, E. (2019, March 21). *7 types of advertising (+how they're used)*. G2.
<https://www.g2.com/articles/types-of-advertising>
- Gubíniová, K., Štarchoň, P., Vilčeková, L., Bartáková, G. P., & Brtková, J. (2021). Marketing communication and its role in the process of creating rational awareness of generation Z representatives. *Developments in Information & Knowledge Management for Business Applications*, 203-221. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-76632-0_6

Guttman, A. (2021, February 04). *U.S. advertising industry revenue*. Statista.

<https://www.statista.com/statistics/183932/estimated-revenue-in-advertising-and-related-services-since-2000/>

Indeed, Editorial Team. (2021, April 1). *What is persuasive advertising?* Indeed.

<https://www.indeed.com/career-advice/career-development/persuasive-advertising>

JSCC Libraries. (2020, November 2). *A writer's handbook: Rhetorical and visual analysis idea development*. Jefferson State Community College.

<https://library.jeffersonstate.edu/c.php?g=798707&p=6891761>

Köhnken, G., Milne, R., Memon, A., & Bull, R. (1999) The cognitive interview: A meta-analysis. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 5(1-2), 3-27. DOI: [10.1080/10683169908414991](https://doi.org/10.1080/10683169908414991)

Lannes, X. (2019, August 02). Use of rhetorical devices, figures of speech & literary devices in advertising. *Calcutta University Journal*. <http://myagency.com/blog/literary-devices-when-small-words-generate-big-ideas/>

Marquart, F. (2017). Methodological rigor in quantitative research. In *the international encyclopedia of communication research methods*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118901731.iecrm0221>

McQuarrie, Edward F., and David Glen Mick. (1996). Figures of rhetoric in advertising language. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 22(4). doi:10.1086/209459.

McQuarrie, E. F., and Mick, D. G. (1992). On resonance: A critical pluralistic inquiry into advertising rhetoric. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19(2). doi:10.1086/209295.

Mills, S. D., Tanner, L. M., & Adams, J. (2013). Systematic literature review of the effects of food and drink advertising on food and drink-related behavior, attitudes, and beliefs in adult populations. *Obesity Reviews: An Official Journal of the International Association for the Study of Obesity*, 14(4). <https://doi.org/10.1111/obr.12012>

Mulken, M. V. (2003). (PDF) analyzing rhetorical devices in print advertisements. *Document Design* 4(2).

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233655452_Analyzing_rhetorical_devices_in_print_advertisements

Peräkylä, A. (2011). *Validity in research on naturally occurring social interaction*. Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies. <https://researchportal.helsinki.fi/en/publications/validity-in-research-on-naturally-occurring-social-interaction>

Purdue Writing Lab. (2002, 01). *Visual rhetoric: Overview // Purdue Writing Lab*. Purdue writing lab, [https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/general_writing/visual_rhetoric/visual_rhetoric/index.html#:~:text=Visual%20rhetoric%3A%20Overview,These%20resources%20will&text=%22Visual%20rhetoric%22%20has%20been%20used,\(fonts\)%2C%20and%20more](https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/general_writing/visual_rhetoric/visual_rhetoric/index.html#:~:text=Visual%20rhetoric%3A%20Overview,These%20resources%20will&text=%22Visual%20rhetoric%22%20has%20been%20used,(fonts)%2C%20and%20more). Retrieved January 26, 2022.

Quick Facts, U. (2021, 09). *Quick facts*. University of Arkansas. <https://www.uark.edu/about/quick-facts.php>

Roberts, J. (2020). *The role of advertising in society*. University of Ohio State Pressbooks. <https://ohiostate.pressbooks.pub/stratcommwriting/chapter/role-of-advertising-in-society/#:~:text=Advertising%20is%20the%20paid%20promotion,audience's%20attitudes%20and%20For%20behaviors.&text=Although%20many%20consumers%20find%20them,everything%20from%20products%20to%20politics>. Retrieved January 24, 2022.

Rubio, D. (2005) Face and content validity. *In the international encyclopedia of education* (3rd ed.) (pp. 538-539). <https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/mathematics/face-validity>

Sama, Ramzan. (2019). Impact of media advertisements on consumer behavior. *Journal of Creative Communications*, 14(1) pp. 54–68. doi:10.1177/0973258618822624

Southgate, D. (2017). The emergence of generation Z and its impact in advertising. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 57(2), 227-235. doi:10.2501/jar-2017-028

Statista. (2022). Food - United States: Statista market forecast. Statista.

<https://www.statista.com/outlook/cmo/food/united-states>

Thyer, B. A. (2010). Quantitative sampling. In *The handbook of social work research methods* (pp. 22-23). https://www.csun.edu/~hbsoc126/soc4/chapter_8_outline.pdf

Welford, W. (1992). Supermarket semantics: The rhetoric of food labeling and advertising. *ETC: A Review of General Semantics*, 49(1), pp. 3-17. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42577327>

Wright, M. (2020, August 27). Pilot testing can improve your user research.

<https://www.widerfunnel.com/blog/pilot-testing-user-research/>

Yuen, M. (2021). *Resident population in the United States in 2021, by generation*. Insider intelligence.

<https://www.insiderintelligence.com/charts/united-states-population-by-generation/#:~:text=How%20big%20is%20the%20Gen,sexually%20diverse%20generation%20in%20history.>

Zimmerman, F. J. & Shimoga, S. V. (2014). The effects of food advertising and cognitive load on food choices. *BMC Public Health*, 14, 342. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-14-342>

Appendix A

Survey Instrument

Screening Question (skip logic)

Were you born between the years 1997 and 2012?

- If yes, continue with the survey to purpose and consent, etc.
- If no, skip to end of the survey.

Purpose & Consent Paragraph

The purpose of this survey is to assess Generation Z's advertising message preferences. For the purposes of this study, Generation Z is defined as individuals born between 1997 and 2012. This study is being conducted as partial completion of the Bumpers College Honors Program requirements.

Completion of this survey represents your implied consent to participate in this study and you may stop at any time. Data will be kept anonymous to the fullest extent possible. The results of this study may be used to inform internal/external organizations about the study's findings through poster and/or oral presentations or journal article submissions.

For more information, please email student investigator Rachel Beyer at rw043@uark.edu. This investigation is conducted under the direction of Isabel Whitehead. The University of Arkansas Institutional Review Board has approved this study (Protocol #). For questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, please contact Ro Windwalker, the University's IRB Coordinator, at (479) 575-2208 or by email at irb@uark.edu.

Thank you so much for your time and participation!

Preferences for Rhetorical Devices Section

Of the following two statements, please select the message that appeals to you the most.

Drinking water is a necessity for life.
Drink water. Drink life.

Eating bananas can improve your health.
Eat bananas. Improve your health.

Lettuce can make your life healthier.
Lettuce makes life livelier.

Just a liter of water a day can improve your health and life.
Life is living in a liter of water.

Salt is important, only a little of it can vastly improve flavor.
A little salt can make a big difference.

Water is cheap, but can make a big difference to your health.
Water, big difference for little cost.

Milk can make your bones and muscles stronger.
Milk, it makes you strong.

Eating these strawberries will give you a taste of heaven.
Eat strawberries and taste heaven.

Apples are a tasty fruit, which can be healthy for you, and therefore good for you.
Apples. Tasty. Healthy. Good.

Cereal is healthy, tastes good, and is what's for breakfast.
Cereal. Healthy. Yummy. And what's for breakfast.

Demographics Section

What is your birth year:

- A. 1997
- B. 1998
- C. 1999
- D. 2000
- E. 2001
- F. 2002
- G. 2003
- H. 2004
- I. 2005
- J. 2006
- K. 2007
- L. 2008
- M. 2009
- N. 2010
- O. 2011
- P. 2012
- Q. Other _____

Other – open response

What is your gender identity?

- A. Male
- B. Female
- C. Non-binary or Third Gender
- D. Prefer not to answer

What is your race?

- A. American Indian or Alaskan Native
- B. Asian
- C. African American
- D. Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- E. White
- F. Two or More Races
- G. Other _____

What is your ethnicity?

- A. Hispanic or Latino
- B. Not Hispanic or Latino

What college are you affiliated with?

- A. Dale Bumpers College of Agricultural, Food and Life Sciences
- B. Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design
- C. Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences
- D. Sam M. Walton College of Business
- E. College of Education and Health Professions
- F. College of Engineering

What is your primary major?

- A. Open response

What is your level of study?

- A. Undergraduate Student
- B. Master's Student
- C. Doctoral Student

Appendix B

IRB Approval Letter



To: Isabel M Whitehead
From: Douglas J AdamsJustin R Chimka, Chair
IRB Expedited Review
Date: 03/03/2022
Action: **Exemption Granted**
Action Date: 03/03/2022
Protocol #: 2112375380
Study Title: A Descriptive Study of College Students Preferences toward Rhetorical Devices in Advertisements

The above-referenced protocol has been determined to be exempt.

If you wish to make any modifications in the approved protocol that may affect the level of risk to your participants, you must seek approval prior to implementing those changes. All modifications must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

If you have any questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact the IRB Coordinator at 109 MLKG Building, 5-2208, or irb@uark.edu.

cc: Rachel Joy Beyer, Investigator

Appendix C

Tables

Table C1

Rhetorical Device Preferences: Aphorism p1.

Item	Frequency	Percent
Statement without aphorism	57	63.33
Statement using aphorism	33	36.67

Note: n = 90

Table C2

Rhetorical Device Preferences: Aphorism p2.

Item	Frequency	Percent
Statement without aphorism	46	51.11
Statement using aphorism	44	48.89

Note: n = 90

Table C3

Rhetorical Device Preferences: Alliteration p1.

Item	Frequency	Percent
Statement without alliteration	50	55.56
Statement using alliteration	40	44.44

Note: n = 90

Table C4

Rhetorical Device Preferences: Alliteration p2.

Item	Frequency	Percent
Statement without alliteration	64	71.11
Statement using alliteration	26	28.89

Note: n = 90

Table C5

Rhetorical Device Preferences: Antithesis p1.

Item	Frequency	Percent
Statement without antithesis	12	13.33
Statement using antithesis	78	86.67

Note: n = 90

Table C6

Rhetorical Device Preferences: Antithesis p2.

Item	Frequency	Percent
Statement without antithesis	36	40.00
Statement using antithesis	54	60.00

Note: n = 90

Table C7

Rhetorical Device Preferences: Metaphor p1.

Item	Frequency	Percent
Statement without metaphor	49	54.44
Statement using metaphor	41	45.56

Note: n = 90

Table C8

Rhetorical Device Preferences: Metaphor p2.

Item	Frequency	Percent
Statement without metaphor	34	38.20
Statement using metaphor	55	61.80

Note: n = 89

Table C9

Rhetorical Device Preferences: Parataxis p1.

Item	Frequency	Percent
Statement without parataxis	39	43.39
Statement using parataxis	51	56.67

Note: n = 90

Table C10

Rhetorical Device Preferences: Parataxis p2.

Item	Frequency	Percent
Statement without parataxis	56	62.22
Statement Using parataxis	34	37.78

Note: n = 90

Table C11***Birth Year (xxxx)***

Item	Frequency	Percent
1997	4	4.82
1998	5	6.02
1999	2	2.4
2000	16	19.28
2001	21	25.30
2002	22	26.51
2003	12	14.46
2004	1	1.20
2005	-	-
2006	-	-
2007	-	-
2008	-	-
2009	-	-
2010	-	-
2011	-	-
2012	-	-

Note: n = 83**Table 12*****Gender Identity***

Item	Frequency	Percent
Male	35	39.33
Female	52	58.43
Non-Binary/Third Gender	2	2.25
Prefer not to Say	-	-

Note. n = 89**Table C13*****Race***

Item	Frequency	Percent
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	1.12
Asian	2	2.25
African American	1	1.12
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	1.12
White	80	89.89
Two or More Races	3	3.37
Other	1	1.12

Note: n = 89

Table C14***Ethnicity***

Item	Frequency	Percent
Hispanic or Latino	8	9.09
Not Hispanic or Latino	80	90.91

Note: n = 88**Table C15*****College Affiliation***

Item	Frequency	Percent
Dale Bumpers College of Agricultural, Food and Life sciences	54	60.67
Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design	5	5.62
Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences	15	16.85
Sam M. Walton College of Business	6	6.74
College of Education and Health Professions	5	5.62
College of Engineering	4	4.49

Note: n = 89**Table C16*****Primary Major***

Item	Frequency	Percent
Agricultural Business	40	44.95
Horticulture, Landscape & Turf Sciences	9	10.11
Bachelor of Science in Nursing	1	1.12
Landscape Architecture	3	3.37
Criminology	2	2.25
Finance	2	2.25
Architecture	2	2.25
Psychology	4	4.49
Agricultural Education, Communication & Technology	5	5.62
Crop Science	3	3.37
Animal Science	2	2.25
Human Nutrition and Dietetics	1	1.12

Human Development and Family Science	3	3.37
Environmental Soil and Water Science	1	1.12
International Studies	2	2.25
Biological Engineering	2	2.25
Electrical Engineering	1	1.12
Industrial Engineering	1	1.12
Space and Planetary Sciences	1	1.12
Chemistry and Biochemistry	4	4.49

Note: n =

Table C17

Level of Study

Item	Frequency	Percent
Undergraduate Student	84	94.38
Masters Student	3	3.37
Doctoral Student	2	2.25

Note: n = 89