

**Copyright
By
William Jose Lopez
2014**

The Thesis Committee for William Jose Lopez
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:

Word of Mouth vs. Expert Reviews:
Compared Using Need for Cognition and Social Media Affinity

APPROVED BY

SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:

Supervisor: _____

Vincent Cicchirillo

Brad Love

**Word of Mouth vs. Expert Reviews:
Compared Using Need for Cognition and Social Media Affinity**

by

William Jose Lopez B.A.

Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2014

Acknowledgement

I am very grateful for the support, assistance, and patience given to me by my supervisor, Dr. Vincent Cicchirillo and reader, Dr. Brad Love. Without their guidance and confidence in me this professional report would not have been possible.

Abstract

Word of Mouth vs. Expert Reviews: Compared Using Need for Cognition and Social Media Affinity

William Jose Lopez, M.A.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2014

Supervisor: Vincent Cicchirillo

We live in a world where social media allows everyone to have a voice regardless of their expertise on any subject. With so many anonymous voices giving their opinions are the expert reviews of film critics no longer as useful? Some may believe there is a disconnect between what critics like and what people like. With this in mind, this research puts the usefulness of expert movie reviews and word of mouth against each other as can be seen through the need for cognition scale and social media affinity scale.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	1
ELECTRONIC WORD OF MOUTH AND EXPERT REVIEWS.....	3
NEED FOR COGNITION AND WORD OF MOUTH.....	5
THEORETICAL BASIS FOR EXPLORATION.....	7
SUMMARY OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	10
METHODS.....	11
MEASURES.....	12
RESULTS.....	14
DISCUSSION.....	16
GLOSSARY.....	19
QUALTRICS SURVEY.....	25
REFERENCES.....	43

Introduction

The growing use of social media has led to an influx of electronic word of mouth. Since 2005, social networking site use has expanded multiple times over (Duggan & Smith, 2013). Unlike traditional word of mouth, electronic word of mouth has the ability to spread much quicker due to easier access, higher interaction between users, and allowing each person to express themselves on a subject in which they are not antiquated (Belvaux & Marteaux, 2007). Films about to be released into theaters are among the most valuable consumables whose success can be determined by word of mouth. Word of mouth is considered more valuable to consumers than ads because providers make their own independent judgments instead of advocating corporate interests (Silverman, 2001). Internet communities have been created for the sole purpose of spreading word of mouth on a number of topics including purchase reviews and audience scores and reviews. In addition, these communities include forums where information can be exchanged. Both these forums and product information heavily influence the purchasing decisions of customers (Bansal & Vayer, 2000). Movies are considered “experiential goods” in that influencers are important sources of information and positive reviews lead to a reduction or perceived risk for other consumers (DeBenedetti, 2006). This is due to movies needing to be experienced in order to determine quality. Word of mouth is of great concern during a film’s theatrical life cycle. According to existing studies of the current Hollywood system, 6 to 7 out of every 10 movies are not considered profitable (Liu, 2006; Vogel, 2001; Shugon, 1995). Contemporary cinema places an emphasis on opening weekend,

short life cycles, and a minimum number of weekends in exhibition. Word of mouth is most active during pre-release (Liu, 2006).

Research has yet been conducted that examines need for cognitions impact on word-of-mouth in social media contexts. Need for cognition appears to be, at this point in social psychological and personality research, the primary individual difference variable identified as influencing motivation to think (Haugtvedt, Petty, and Cacioppo, 1992). It is significant because consumers who are considered to have a low need for cognition will process word of mouth differently than those who are considered to have a high need for cognition. With consumers encountering messages from multiple sources it is important to note where and how effective these messages are in order to understand how these two groups of people are affected by positive or negatively framed messages and from which sources they most trust.

Electronic Word of Mouth and Expert Reviews

Because they are among the first to see films and because they make a living out of informing the public about their movie experiences, movie critics are considered to fit the role of both innovators and opinion leaders (Reddy, Swaminathan, & Motley, 1996). It is generally assumed that it is difficult to predict box office success (Sochay, 1994) but there has been a big push to study the effects of word of mouth and expert reviews to determine if there is an effect on box office revenue (Basuroy, Chatterjee & Ravid, 2003; Dellarocos, Zhang, & Awad, 2007; De Vany & Walls, 1996; Duan, Gu, & Whinston, 2008; Elberse & Eliashburg, 2003; Holbrook & Addis, 2007; Liu, 2006; Mackenzie, 2009; Moul, 2007; Kim, Park, & Park, 2013). While expert reviews have been found to be a significant predictor for late/cumulative box office of a film they are less influential in forecasting opening weekends (Basuroy et al. 2003). Expert reviews are more associated with revenue after the first eight weeks of box office. According to Eliashburg and Shugan (1997), critics can be used to predict the overall success of a movie based on box office revenue although they are not as useful when predicting early box office outcomes.

There is a slight negative association between popular appeal and expert judgment on films as experts have better knowledge, but focus more on artistic value than market value (fun factor) (Kim, Park, & Park, 2013). Word of mouth is statistically and economically significant to the exposure and potential box office revenue of a film. A film with toxic word of mouth is destined to a short theatrical run and a low multiplier

when its opening weekend to total box office revenue is observed. Meanwhile, a film with glowing praise will likely make four or five times its opening weekend gross. Family and friends play a greater role in this case as their word of mouth will entice other consumers to visit a film that they may not have considered prior. This is more effective than any other mass communication including advertising (Herr, Kardes, & Kim, 1991). Source credibility determines a message's persuasiveness (Dholakia & Sternhal, 1977). With word of mouth coming from various sources there will be some who are held in higher regard and seen as more trustworthy than others. How a recommendation will be processed can vary greatly from person to person. The internet only complicates this as it decreases spatial and temporal constraints typically associated with word of mouth (Katz & Lazarsfeld, 1955; Kruger, 1997). Virtual community participation and user generated content are among the prevailing forms of electronic word of mouth and has presented a greater amount of information to those looking to reduce perceived risk on a product that they are aware of but not well informed about (Mahajon, Miller, and Kerin, 1984). Newly released films exhibit characteristics that are similar to those of newly-released products, and it has been well established that word of mouth generally has a significant effect on the movie-going choices of customers (Austin, 1989; Bayus, 1985; Faber and O'Guinn, 1984; Neelamegham and Chintagunta, 1999). Source Credibility may still have an effect on the movie-going choices of consumer based on individual personality variables such as need for cognition.

Need for Cognition and Word of Mouth

Need for Cognition is an assessment that quantitatively measures "the tendency for an individual to engage in and enjoy thinking" (Cacioppo & Petty, 1982, p 162). Cohen et al. (1955) distinguished this concept from gestalt models of tendencies to structure the environment (cf. Witkin, Dyk, Faterson, Goodenough, & Karp 1962) by suggesting that "feelings of tension and deprivation arise from its frustration" (Cohen et al. 1955 p. 291). Cohen et al. (1955) proposed that the resulting tension would lead to "active efforts to structure the situation and increase understanding (Cohen et al. 1955 p.291) The Need for Cognition scale has been validated through multiple studies using a variety of techniques (Cacioppo and Petty, 1982, 1984; Cacioppo et al., 1983; Lassiter, Briggs, and Bowman, 1991; Petty, Cacioppo, and Kasmer, 1985; Srull, Lichtenstein & Rothbart, 1985). Need for Cognition is not influenced by an individual's sex, or by differences in the individual's level of test-taking anxiety or cognitive style (the particular way that an individual accumulates and merges information during the thinking process) (Cacioppo & Petty, 1982). In general, scores on the Need for Cognition Scale also are not impacted by whether or not the individuals are trying to paint a favorable picture of themselves (Cacioppo & Petty, 1982). This means that regardless of whether or not a participant tries to answer in a way that may skew their answer in a certain direction it is still an accurate measurement of their need for cognition.

Previous studies on need for cognition have proven that individuals with a high need for cognition base their evaluations of products on their attributes while those with a

low need for cognition base their evaluations on peripheral cues (Haugtvedt, Petty, and Cacioppo, 1992). This is due to a person with a low need for cognition's desire to only do as much thinking as is necessary to complete a task. Those with a high need are less likely to reduce effortful thinking even when put into a situation where reduction of effort typically occurs such as when groups are responsible for cognitive work (Petty et al., 1985). It is also suggested that those with a lower need for cognition show more salient differences in how they are affected by the opinions of others than those with a high need for cognition. In Petty, Cacioppo, and Schumann (1983), it was found that those with a higher need for cognition were more affected by an ad if the product's attributes were highlighted than those with a low need. The inverse was true when the ad contained a celebrity endorsement in that those with a low need for cognition were more affected than those with a high need. Subsequent studies demonstrated a similar pattern regarding motivation being high or low and the success of message arguments (Burnkrant & Unnava, 1989; Miniard, Bhatla, Lord, Dickon, & Unnava, 1991; Schumann, Petty, & Clemons, 1990)

Theoretical Basis

Attribution Theory

This approach comes from previous studies on consumer evaluations of movies that have focused on theories such as Attribution Theory (Kelley, 1967). He and other attribution theorists believe everyone is an amateur psychologist. One doesn't observe passively what is going on in an environment but rather usually wants to make sense of available information by finding probable cause. Jones & Davis (1965) believed the external world was made of a multitude of effects for which an individual is inclined to infer cause. How consumers react to expert reviews and electronic word of mouth depends on casual analysis. Attribution Theory has three criteria – distinctiveness, consistency, & consensus (Kelley, 1967). An effect is distinctive if it does not usually occur in the presence of its entity. A positive review of a new movie (the entity) is distinctive if the critic (the person) has a generally harsh reputation when it comes to reviewing new movies. A positive review from a critic who generally dislikes movies made by a director is considered inconsistent. Consensus is whenever there is an agreement between the critic and what others think. A high consensus over the quality of a movie will lead to entity (person) attributions as will highly distinctive (nondistinctive) and highly consistent (inconsistent) effects (d'Astous and Touil, 1999).

Source credibility plays a large part into attribution theory. "Attribution theory deals with how the social perceiver uses information to arrive at causal explanations for events. Then the information gathered is examined and combined to

form a casual judgement (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). The effects of this have been of special interest to advertisers. It has been found that positively attributed communication are more persuasive than negatively attributed communications (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993) Whether the information comes from a professional critic or electronic word of mouth will effect how those with different needs for cognition process the recommendation. Source credibility will also vary depending on what medium the perceiver gets their information from. As mentioned earlier, with the rapid increase of internet use in recent years it can be widely expected that much of this information comes from the internet. Attribution Theory is challenged here because with the internet available to most, there is more challenge in determining where information is coming from and many avenues to find it.

Social Cognitive Theory of Internet Uses and Gratifications

In Social Cognitive Theory of Internet Uses and Gratifications by LaRose and Eastin (2004) challenged the original notion that gratification sought explained individual media exposure. However, as noted by the writers, media exposure was not explained well due to the internet being a unique medium. Usage of the internet is determined by the expected outcomes that follow from consumption. Self-Efficacy is one's capability to organize and execute a particular course of action (Bandura, 1986). As the internet becomes more self-efficacious, expectations have risen that users will obtain specific outcomes. Self-regulating individuals monitor themselves and judge it in relation to personal and social standards and apply self-reactive incentives to moderate their own behavior (LaRose & Eastin, 2004). Habit is a well-established predictor of behavior

(Oulette & Wood, 1998; Triandis, 1980). Recent qualitative research suggests that a great deal of media behavior is habitual. Habit strength is expected to influence ongoing behavior independent of current thinking about expected outcomes.

Extending the perspective, those with a low need for cognition are likely to have a higher need to use the internet to seek out information in order exude less cognitive effort. In order to measure this, the social media affinity scale (Gerlich, Browning, and Westerman, 2010) will be used. Originally used to assess the difference in social media usage between males and females, the scale will now be used to measure the overall use of social media by those taking the need for cognition score.

Summary of Research Questions

The central focus of this research is to gain insight into the thought processes of consumers viewing them only as either high or low need cognitive individuals. Need for cognition gives us an idea of how a person may elaborate on a message. Social media affinity affects where a person may get a message from which affects attribution theory. Also with people of varying needs of cognition looking up information online, some may expect the thinking to be done for them to lower cognitive effort. With all of that in mind and if Attribution Theory tells us that a source's credibility determines a message's persuasiveness and someone with a high need for cognition is less likely to reduce cognitive effort in a group setting than the following may be true:

H1a- Individuals with a high need for cognition will show a stronger preference for expert reviews than individuals with a low need for cognition.

H1b- Individuals with a high need for cognition will show a lower preference for electronic word of mouth than individuals with a low need for cognition.

H2a- Individuals with a low need for cognition will show higher positive attitudes towards expert reviews than individuals with a high need for cognition.

H2b- Individuals with a low need for cognition will show higher positive attitude towards electronic word of mouth.

H3a- Those with a lower social media affinity will be more impacted by word of mouth

H3b- Those with a higher social media affinity will show a higher value towards social media.

Methods

Participants and procedures

Participants were a volunteer sample of 92. From these responses, six were eliminated due to improper completion of the survey. Thus, the overall response rate was 93%. Participants completed a questionnaire, which included the shortened Need for Cognition Scale by Cacioppo & Petty in collaboration with Chuan Feng Kao (1984), the Social Media Affinity scale, and lastly, a number of questions on their feelings towards films across a number of different situations. Data was collected over a five-day period in April 2014. The survey was exempt from IRB review. Respondents were 57.5% female with a mean age of 25.2 and median age of 24. Races represented were: White; 76%, Hispanic; 14%, East Asian; 5%, South Asian, 1%; Middle Eastern, 1%; Native American, 1%; with 2% selecting “other”. The education level of this sample was 15% some college, 41% college graduates, and 44% post-graduates.

Measures

A number of survey participants did not respond to every question on the survey so in order to be able to complete statistical analysis, mean replacement was used (Winkler, 2004). In order to fill in the missing information, the mean of all answers involved in that portion of the survey were used. A median split based on the mean was used in order to break down Need for Cognition and Social Media Affinity into high and low categories.

Independent Variables.

Respondents began their survey by answering the questions on the Need for Cognition scale. The shortened Need for Cognition scale consists of 18 items. These items were ranked on a 5 point Likert-scale question from strongly disagree to strongly agree and asks the respondent to rate multiple scenarios involving thinking and their process of thinking. Reverse items were recoded. ($M = 3.1943$, $SD = .16227$, $\alpha = .670$). The Social Media Affinity Scale consists of 13 items. These items were evaluated on a 5 point Likert-scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree, of which nine are stated in the positive, and four in the negative. These four were re-coded in subsequent analysis. The survey is comprehensive in that it includes items questioning social media usage and beliefs about social media. ($M = 3.6043$, $SD = .56144$, $\alpha = .804$)

Dependent Variables.

The final portion of the survey asks a number of questions using 5 point Likert-scale questions from strongly disagree to agree on the subject of how respondents perceive the opinions of others given to them whether it is from a professional or familiar source and situations where the likelihood of them going to see a movie might change. Questions such as whether the subjects actively seek out information on a film before deciding to see it and their preferences of reviews from experts, electronic word of mouth, or from friends were also asked.

Results

Hypothesis 1a predicted that expert reviews would impact individuals with a high need for cognition. The results were not significantly different for this prediction $F(1, 77) = .087, p = \text{n.s.}$ for trust in expert reviewers and was not significant for believability in expert reviewers $F(1,77) = 1.61, p = \text{n.s.}$

Hypothesis 1b did not support predictions that need for cognition impacts the influence of word of mouth communication about films. There were no main effects for need for cognition on positive word of mouth $F(1,78) = 2.344, p = \text{n.s.}$ Furthermore, there was no main effect for need for cognition on negative word of mouth $F(1, 78) = .061, p = \text{n.s.}$

Hypothesis 2a predicted that expert reviews would impact individuals with a lower social media affinity. The results were not significantly different for this prediction $F(1,77) = .533, p = \text{n.s.}$ for trust in expert reviewers and was not significant for believability in expert reviewers $F(1,77) = .689, p = \text{n.s.}$

Hypotheses 2b predicted that need for cognition would impact social media value. The result was significantly different $F(1,81) = 5.016, p < .05$. Individuals with a lower need for cognition ($M = 12.34, SD = 2.78$) were more impacted by social media than individuals with a higher need for cognition ($M = 10.80, SD = 3.26$).

Furthermore, there were no main effects for Social Media Affinity on negative or positive word of mouth. Therefore hypotheses 3a was not supported. There was no main

effects for social media affinity on positive word of mouth $F(1, 78) = .877, p = \text{n.s.}$. Also, there were no main effects for social media affinity on negative word of mouth $F(1,78) = 1.032, p = \text{n.s.}$

Hypotheses 3b predicted that Social Media Affinity would impact social media value. The result was significantly different $F(1, 81) = 7.558, p < .01$. Individuals with a higher social media affinity ($M = 12.42, SD = 2.94$) were more impacted by social media than individuals with a lower social media affinity ($M = 10.63, SD = 2.93$).

Although not predicted there was a significant interaction effect between need for cognition and social media affinity for trust in expert reviewers opinions $F(1,77) = 5.03, p < .05$. The results showed that individuals with a low need for cognition and low social media affinity ($M = 2.70, SD = 1.04$) valued expert reviews over individuals with a high need for cognition and high social media affinity ($M = 2.06, SD = .92$).

Discussion

There was little data to suggest significance for all but one of the hypotheses. Through analysis it can be determined that people with a high need for cognition were not affected by either positive or negative word of mouth. This suggests that this group is likely to make their own decisions and is not impacted by the opinions of others regardless of source credibility. A low need for cognition was not affected by word of mouth whether positive or negative either. A lack of main effects for both group indicates that according to this study, neither high nor low need for cognition is affected by positive or negative word of mouth. High and low social media affinity also showed a lack of significant impact from word of mouth whether positive or negative. Overall it appears that if word of mouth is to affect someone it will not be due to their need for cognition nor their affinity towards social media.

The next area of interest for this study was the social media impact. This study found that those with a low need for cognition had significantly more affinity towards social media than those with a high need for cognition. Behaving akin to LaRose and Eastin's Social Cognitive Theory of Internet Uses and Gratifications (2004), those with a low need for cognition who do not enjoy using more cognitive effort than is needed may expect their information from a source such as social media. expected, those with a high social media affinity were impacted more by social media information than those who have a low social media affinity.

Similar to need for cognition and social media affinity's results on impact from word of mouth, there were no significant findings to find a correlation between the two and the impact on them from expert reviews. Since expert reviews did not affect any of the groups significantly this study shows that the effects of expert reviews on people is not affected by their need for cognition nor their affinity towards social media. This was not expected as Attribution Theory would have predicted.

Although not predicted, the interaction between need for cognition and social media affinity for trust in expert reviews was significant in that it found a correlation between the two scales. The value held in expert reviews proved to be similar for both low need for cognition and low social media affinity as well as between high need for cognition and high social media affinity. This suggests that with further study, a stronger correlation may be found.

Although this study utilized theoretical underpinnings it is not without flaws or limitations. The present study has limitations that suggest opportunities for future research. The Need for Cognition scale was found to not be reliable in this situation due to missing responses and a smaller sample size. In addition, a more diverse sample size that consists of a greater variety of education levels may have affected the outcomes differently. Also, this study only considered one type of product (i.e., movies). Future investigations should consider different products that utilize word of mouth to better understand the moderating effect of online communities. Second, this study considered all social media as a whole. Future studies may want to consider focusing on specific forms of social media such as Facebook or Twitter.

In summary, this study found that there is little to no significant correlation between need for cognition, social media affinity, and their affects on how expert reviews and word of mouth are perceived. The limited results do not support or refute any previous research and more investigation is required. A larger and more diverse sample size, a focus on a different consumable, or an investigation through the ideas of a different theory may more effectively discover a significant finding. Further research would be beneficial to marketers as a more detailed profile of their targets that includes both need for cognition and social media affinity may help target audiences better.

Glossary

Table 1 – Need for Cognition Results

Descriptive Statistics						
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
NFC I would prefer complex to simple problems.	87	-4.00	4.00	1.2874	1.96426	3.858
NFC I like to have the responsibility of handling a situation that requires a lot of thinking.- 	87	-4.00	4.00	2.1379	1.88119	3.539
Q7_NFC_3R	86	-3.00	4.00	1.9186	1.97761	3.911
Q8_NFC_4R	85	-3.00	4.00	1.8824	1.92979	3.724
Q9_NFC_5R	86	-2.00	4.00	2.3837	1.55047	2.404
NFC I find satisfaction in deliberating hard and for long hours.- 	87	-4.00	4.00	1.0115	2.00287	4.011
Q11_NFC_7R	86	-4.00	4.00	1.1279	2.09648	4.395
Q12_NFC_8R	86	-3.00	4.00	.4186	2.06634	4.270
Q13_NFC_9R	86	-4.00	4.00	.1512	2.48060	6.153
NFC The idea of relying on thought to make my way to the top appeals to me.	87	-4.00	4.00	2.1954	1.69705	2.880

Need for Cognition Results Continued

NFC I really enjoy a task that involves coming up with new solutions to problems.- 	87	-3.00	4.00	2.4138	1.54432	2.385
Q16_NFC_12R NFC I prefer my life to be filled with puzzles that I must solve.- 	86	-3.00	4.00	2.6860	1.48927	2.218
NFC The notion of thinking abstractly is appealing to me.- 	87	-4.00	4.00	1.1954	1.85422	3.438
NFC I would prefer a task that is intellectual, difficult, and important to one that is somewhat important but does not require much thought.- 	87	-2.00	4.00	1.6897	1.76075	3.100
Q20_NFC_16R	87	-4.00	4.00	.4368	2.23971	5.016
Q21_NFC_17R	86	-4.00	4.00	1.7442	1.95349	3.816

Need for Cognition Results Continued

I usually end up deliberating about issues even when they do not affect me personally.- 	87	-4.00	4.00	1.7471	1.97789	3.912
Valid N (listwise)	85					

Table 2 – Social Media Affinity Results

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Social networks are a great way for people to stay in touch with one another.- 	87	-3.00	5.00	1.9425	1.28820	1.659
Q24_SMA_2R	86	-3.00	4.00	.2326	1.81286	3.286
Social networks allow people with similar interests to stay connected.- 	87	-2.00	5.00	1.5977	1.20522	1.453
Q26_SMA_4R	86	-3.00	3.00	.0814	1.63214	2.664
It is important for a person to have his or her own social networking page in which they can tell about themselves and their activities.- 	86	-3.00	3.00	-.4186	1.63394	2.670

Social Media Affinity Results Continued

The emergence of social networking sites illustrates a growing need among people for a sense of community.- 	87	-3.00	5.00	.6552	1.80328	3.252
A social network could be an effective communications tool in a college class.- 	87	-3.00	5.00	1.2414	1.81060	3.278
Social networking sites have great potential for marketing businesses and/or individuals.- 	87	-3.00	6.00	1.9080	1.40292	1.968
Valid N (listwise)	85					

Qualtrics Survey

Informed Consent Form

Identification of Investigator and Purpose of Study

You are invited to participate in a research study on Internet content. The study is being conducted by a team of researchers at The University of Texas at Austin, Department of Advertising & Public Relations.

Your participation will contribute to a better understanding of how people of varying needs of cognition and social media use are affected by the opinions of others. You are free to contact the investigator at the address and phone number listed below to discuss the study. You must be at least 18 years old to participate.

If you agree to participate:

- You will be asked to schedule a time to complete a short survey and view an online message. In total, these activities will take approximately 10-15 minutes of your time.

Risks/Discomfort

There are no anticipated risks or discomforts from taking part in this survey greater than those associated with everyday media consumption. If at any time during this study you would like to end your participation, you may do so with no penalty and you will still be able to receive credit for participating in research.

Benefits/Compensation

There will be no cost for participating in this research. Upon completion of the second phase of this study, you will be given extra credit for completing the study. If you would like to receive credit but do not want to participate in this study, please talk to your instructor about completing the alternative assignment. The alternative assignment should be equivalent in time and effort that would be needed to participate in this study. There is no direct benefit for participating in this study.

Confidentiality

All data obtained from participants will be kept confidential and will only be reported in an aggregate format (by reporting only combined results and never reporting individual ones). All questionnaires will be concealed on a password protected computer and only the primary investigator and assistant researcher listed below will have access to them. Contact information will only be collected for purposes of giving the participant research credit and will remain separate from participant responses. All contact information will be destroyed at the end of the study.

Participation

Participation in this research study is completely voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at any time. If you desire to withdraw, your responses will be reviewed and may be accepted or rejected at the researchers' discretion. Withdrawal will not affect your relationship with The University of Texas in anyway.

Questions about the Research

If you have any questions about the study, you may contact the researchers:

Dr. Vincent Cicchirillo	William Lopez	Office of Research Support
Belo Center for New Media (BMC)	Belo Center for New Media (BMC)	Peter T. Flawn Academic Center (FAC)
300 West Dean Keeton, A1200 Austin, TX 78712 (512) 471-1101 v.cicchirillo@mail.utexas.edu	300 West Dean Keeton, A1200 Austin, TX 78712 (512) 471-1101 Lopez.William.J@gmail.com	2400 Inner Campus Dr., Suite 426 Austin, TX 78712 (512) 471-8871 orsc@uts.cc.utexas.edu

Your willingness to participate in this research study is implied if you click the link below to proceed with completing this survey.

- Yes, I agree to participate

Need for Cognition Scale

	1	2	3	4	5
I would prefer simple to complex problems					
I like to have the responsibility of handling a situation that requires a lot of thinking.					
Thinking is not my idea of fun.					
I would rather do something that requires little thought than something that is sure to challenge my thinking abilities.					
I try to anticipate and avoid situations where there is likely a chance I will have to think in depth about something.					

Need for Cognition Scales Continued

I find satisfaction in deliberating hard and for long hours.					
I only think as hard as I have to.					
I prefer to think about small, daily projects to long-term ones.					
I like tasks that require little thought once I've learned them.					
The idea of relying on thought to make my way to the top appeals to me.					
I really enjoy a task that involves coming up with new solutions to problems.					
Learning new ways to think doesn't excite me very much.					

Need for Cognition Scale Continued

I prefer my life to be filled with puzzles that I must solve.					
The notion of thinking abstractly is appealing to me.					
I would prefer a task that is intellectual, difficult, and important to one that is somewhat important but does not require much thought.					
I feel relief rather than satisfaction after completing a task that required a lot of mental effort.					
It's enough for me that something gets the job done; I don't care how or why it works.					

Need for Cognition Scale Continued

I usually end up deliberating about issues even when they do not affect me personally.					
--	--	--	--	--	--

Social Media Affinity Scale

	1	2	3	4	5
Social networks are a great way for people to stay in touch with one another.					
Social network sites are a waste of time.					
Social networks allow people with similar interests to stay connected.					
It consumes too much time to maintain and/or read social networking pages.					
It is important for a person to have his or her own social networking page in which they can tell about themselves and their activities.					
I want to read about my friends and/or family members on their social network pages.					

Social Media Affinity Scale Continued

Potential and/or existing employers may use information found on social networking pages to make decisions about prospective and/or existing employees.					
Social network sites are a great way to build online communities of people with shared interests or traits.					
Social networking sites are just a fad.					
I do not care what other people are doing.					
The emergence of social networking sites illustrates a growing need among people for a sense of community.					
A social network could be an effective communications tool in a college class.					

Social Media Affinity Scale Continued

Social networking sites have great potential for marketing businesses and/or individuals.					
---	--	--	--	--	--

On average, how much time do you spend on social media on any given weekday?

- Less than one hour
- 1-3 hours
- 3-5 hours
- 5-10 hours
- 10+ hours

On average, how much time do you spend on social media on any given day of the weekend?

- Less than one hour
- 1-3 hours
- 3-5 hours
- 5-10 hours
- 10+ hours

What forms of social media do you use?

How often do you go to the movies?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

When are you most likely to see a film?

- Opening weekend
- First week
- Second week
- Third week or later
- After it leaves theaters

How often do you watch films at home?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

	1	2	3	4	5
I place more value on the opinions of my friends than critics.					
I place more value on the opinions of critics than my friends.					
When I decide to see a film I seek out information about that film.					
I look up a lot of information about a film before I see it.					
If reviews are bad I will usually avoid that movie.					
If reviews are good I will					

usually go see that movie.					
I trust my friends reviews more than those of professional critics or on social media					
I trust reviews on social media more than those of professional critics or my friends.					
I trust professional reviews more than those of social media or my friends.					
I believe professional critic reviews are an indicator of a film's potential success.					
I believe audience reaction is an indicator of a film's potential success.					
I believe some critics are out of touch with the demands of the movie-					

going public.					
---------------	--	--	--	--	--

Social media is a good indicator of a movie being good.					
Your friends say a film is bad but critics are giving it positive reviews. How likely are you to see this film?					
Your friends say a film is good but critics are giving it negative reviews. How likely are you to see this film?					
A film you have not seen has been out for a month and it is still getting a notable amount of word of mouth. How likely are you to see this film?					
A film opens at #1 at the box office. How likely					

are you to see this film?					
A film you are excited to see is about to be released. How likely are you to see this film?					
A film you are excited to see is released to negative reviews from critics. How likely are you to see this film?					
A film you are excited to see is released but your friends give it negative reviews. How likely are you to see this film?					
Your friends have seen a film already. How likely are you to see this film?					
A film has been released without any expert reviews. How likely are you to see this film?					

How likely are you to see a film with no preexisting knowledge about it?					
You would see a film that has been described as “fun” over a film that has been described as “critically acclaimed”					
You would see a film that has been described as “critically acclaimed” over a film that has been described as “fun”					
How likely are you to see a film based off of its promotion (commercials, trailers, posters, etc)?					
How likely are you to see a film based on critical reviews					

How likely are you to see a film based on reviews on social media					
Do you see any risk in dissatisfaction watching a film recommended to you by a friend?					
Do you see any risk in dissatisfaction watching a film with positive professional reviews?					
You are more likely to take a critic review seriously if it is positive.					
You are more likely to take a critic review seriously if it is negative.					
You are more likely to believe online word of mouth if it is positive.					
You are more likely to believe online word of					

mouth if it is negative.					
You are more likely to see a film with a lot of reviews.					
You are less likely to see a film with few reviews.					
You have no desire to see a film but your friends give it positive reviews. How likely are you to see this film?					
You have no desire to see a film but critics are giving it positive reviews. How likely are you to see this film?					
You just saw a film you really enjoyed. How likely are you to recommend it?					
You just saw a film that you disliked. How likely are you to discourage					

others from seeing it?					
You are more likely to share information about a film before you've seen it.					
You are more likely to share information about a film after you've seen it.					
You are more likely to see a film if it has a lot of online buzz regardless of the quality of the buzz.					
You are more likely to see a film if it has positive buzz, regardless of the quantity of buzz.					

How old are you?

What is your sex?

- Male
- Female

What is your level of education?

- High school or less
- Some college
- College graduate

- Postgraduate

What racial or ethnic background do you consider yourself most associated with?

- Non-Hispanic White or European American
- Black, Afro-Caribbean, or African American
- Latino or Hispanic American
- East Asian or Asian American
- South Asian or Asian American
- Middle Eastern or Arab American
- Native American or Alaskan Native
- Other

Are you a student at The University of Texas at Austin?

- Yes
- No

References

- Austin, B. (1989) *Immediate Seating: A Look at Movie Audiences*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bansal, H. S., & Voyer, P. A. (2000). Word-of-mouth processes within a services purchase decision context. *Journal of Service Research*, **3**, 166–177.
- Basuroy, S., S. Chatterjee, and S. Ravid (2003), “How Critical Are Critical Reviews? The Box Office Effects of Film Critics, Star Power, and Budgets,” *Journal of Marketing*, 67(October), 103–117.
- Bayus, B. (1985), “Word of Mouth: The Indirect Effect of Marketing Efforts.” *Journal of Advertising Research*, 25 (3), 31-39.
- Belvaux, Bertrand, and Severine Marteaux. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing (AFM c/o ESCP-EAP)*. : , 2007.
- Burnkrant, R. E., and Unnava, H. R. (1989). Self-referencing: A strategy for increasing processing of message content. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 15, 628-638.
- Cacioppo, J. T, and Petty, R. E. (1982), The need for cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 116-131.
- Cacioppo, J. T., & Petty, R. E. and Morris, K. (1983). Effects of need for cognition on message evaluation, recall, and persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 805-818.
- Cacioppo, J. T., Petty, R. E., and Kao, C. F. (1984). The efficient assessment of need for cognition. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 48, 306-307.
- Cohen, A. R., Stotland, E., and Wolfe, D. N. An experimental investigation of need for cognition. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1955, 51, 291-294
- d'Astous, Alain, and Nadia Touil. "Consumer Evaluations of Movies on the Basis of Critics' Judgments." *Psychology and Marketing* 16: 677-694.
- Debenedetti S. (2006), L'impact de la critique de presse sur la consommation culturelle : un essai de synthèse dans le champ cinématographique, *Recherche et Applications en Marketing*, 21, 2, 43-59

- Dellarocas, C. Zhang, X. Awad, N. F. Dellacros, C., Zhang, X. and Awad N. F. 2007. Exploring the value of online product reviews in forecasting sales: The case of motion pictures. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 21: 23–45.
- De Vany, A. Walls, D. De Vany A. and Walls, D 1996. Bose-Einstein dynamics and adaptive contracting in the motion picture industry. *The Economic Journal*, 106: 1493–1514.
- Dholakia, Ruby Roy and Brian Sternthal (1977), "Highly Credible Sources: Persuasive Facilitators or Persuasive Liabilities?" *Journal of Consumer Research*, 3 (March), 223-232.
- Duan, W. Gu, B. Whinston, A. B. Duan, W., Gu, B. and Whinston, A. B. 2008. Do online reviews matter?: An empirical investigation of panel data. *Decision Support Systems*, 45: 1007–1016.
- Duggan, M, and Smith, A. "Social Media Update 2013." Pew Research Centers Internet American Life Project RSS. <http://www.pewinternet.org/2013/12/30/social-media-update-2013/>
- Eagley, Alice H. and Shelly Chaiken (1993), *The Psychology of Attitudes*, Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich
- Elberse, A. and Eliashberg, J. 2003. Demand and supply dynamics for sequentially released products in international markets: The case of motion pictures. *Marketing Science*, 22: 329–354.
- Eliashburg, J. and Shugan, S. M. 1997. Film critics: Influencers or predictors?. *Journal of Marketing*, 61: 68–78.
- Faber, R. and O'Guinn, T. (1984), "Effect of Media Advertising and Other Sources on Movie Selection," *Journalism Quarterly*, 61, 371-377
- Fiske, S.T., and Taylor, S.E. (1991). *Social cognition (2nd ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Gerlich, R. Nicholas, Leigh Browning, and Lori Westermann. "The Social Media Affinity Scale: Implications for Education." *Contemporary Issues In Education Research* 3: 35-42.
- Haugtvedt, C. P., Petty, R. E., and Cacioppo, J. T. (1986, May). Need for cognition and the use of peripheral cues. Paper presented at meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago.

- Herr, P. M., Kardes, F. R., and Kim, J. (1991). Effects of word-of-mouth and product attribute information on persuasion: An accessibility–diagnosticity perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *17*, 454–462.
- Holbrook, M. B. and Addis, M. 2007. Taste versus the market: An extension of research on the consumption of popular culture. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *34*: 415–424.
- Katz E. and Lazarsfeld P. (1955), *Personal influence*, Glencoe, Free Press
- Kelley, H. H. (1967). Attribution theory in social psychology. In D. Levine (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation* (Vol. 15, pp. 192-241). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Kim, Sang Ho, Namkee Park, and Seung Hyun Park. "Exploring the Effects of Online Word of Mouth and Expert Reviews on Theatrical Movies' Box Office Success." *Journal of Media Economics* *26*: 98-114.
- Kruger A. (1997), *Traitement de l'information et décision de choix d'un film : influence des caractéristiques individuelles et de la communication interpersonnelle*, Doctoral Dissertation on Management Science, University of Bourgogne.
- LaRose, Robert, and Matthew Eastin. "A Social Cognitive Theory of Internet Uses and Gratifications: Toward a New Model of Media Attendance." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* *48*: 358-377.
- Lassiter, G. D., Briggs, M. A., and Bowman, R. E. (1991). Need for cognition and the perception of ongoing behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *17*, 156-160
- Liu, Y. (2006), "Word of Mouth for Movies: Its Dynamics and Impact on Box Office Revenue," *Journal of Marketing*, *70*(July), 74-89.
- Mahajan, V. Muller, E, and Kerin. (1984), "Introduction Strategy for New Products with Positive and Negative Word-of-Mouth," *Management Science*, *30* (12), 1389-1404.
- Miniard, P. W., Bhatla, S., Lord, K. R., Dickson, P. R., and Unnava, H. R. (1991). Picture-based persuasion processes and the moderating role of involvement. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *18*, 92-107.
- McKenzie, J. 2009. Revealed word of mouth and adaptive supply: Survival of motion pictures at the Australian box office. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, *33*: 279–299.

- Moul, C. 2007. Measuring word-of-mouth's impact on theatrical movie admissions. *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, 16: 859–892.
- Neelamegham, R, and Chintagunta, P. (1999), “A Bayesian Model to Forecast New Product Performance in Domestic and International Markets,” *Marketing Science*, 18 (2), 115-136
- Ouellette, J. A., and Wood, W. (1998). Habit and intention in everyday life: The multiple processes by which past behavior predicts future behavior. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 54-74.
- Petty, R. E., Cacioppo, J. T., and Schumann, D. W. (1983). Central and peripheral routes to advertising effectiveness: The moderating role of involvement. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10, 135-146.
- Petty, R. E., Cacioppo, J. T., and Kasmer, J. (1985, May). Effects of need for cognition on social loafing. Paper presented at the meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago.
- Reddy, S., Swaminathan, V., and Motley, C. (1996), Hits on Broadway: The role of critic's reviews in the success of an experimental good. In E.A. Blair & W. A. Kamakura (Eds.) *Proceedings of the 1996 AMA Winter Marketing Educators' Conference* (pp. 313-324). Chicago, IL: American Marketing Association.
- Schumann, D. W., Petty, R. E., and Clemons, S. (1990). Predicting the effectiveness of different strategies of advertising variation: A test of the repetition-variation hypotheses. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17, 192-202.
- Shugan, S. (1995), *Service Strategy*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Silverman, G. (2001), *Secrets of Word-of-mouth Marketing: How to trigger exponential sales through runaway word of mouth*. NY: AMACOM.
- Sochay, S. 1994. Predicting the performance of motion pictures. *Journal of Media Economics*, 7(4): 1–20. [Taylor & Francis Online]
- Srull, T. K., Lichtenstein, M., and Rothbart, M. (1985). Associative storage and retrieval processes. *Journal of Experimental and Social Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 11, 316-345.
- Triandis, H.C. (1980). Values, attitudes and interpersonal behavior. In H.E. Howe & M. M. Page (Eds.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation*. Vol. 37, 195-259 Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Vogel, H. (2001), *Entertainment Industry Economics: A Guide for Financial Analysis*, 5th ed. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Winkler, A. *In: Software World*, May 2004, vol.35, no.3, pp. 11-14, Journal Paper., Database: Inspec

Witkin, H. A., Dyk, R. B., Faterson, H. F., Goodenough, D. R., and Karp, S. A. *Psychological differentiation*. Potomac, Md.: Eribaum, 1974.