FEMALE READERS' PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES TO ADVERTISEMENTS IN WOMEN'S MAGAZINE WITH EXPLICIT FEMALE NUDITY

BY

HO CHI FUN, EDWARD 何志. 勳

MBA PROJECT REPORT

Presented To

The Graduate School

In Partial Fulfillment

of the requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

TWO-YEAR MBA PROGRAMME

THE CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

MAY 1992

Miss Stella So

Advisor

thesis HF 5827 H58

UL

348007



ABSTRACT

The nearly nude or provocative female model is used commonly in advertisements targeted to women, especially in cosmetics, fashion and personal care advertising. Research shows that there are significant differences between the two sexes in rating attractive and sexy models. Therefore, this research is done to get the response to female nudity in advertisement from female magazine readers.

The objectives of this paper is to study the rationale of advertising practitioners in employing nude female model in female-oriented advertisements and to study the advertisement perception as well as the arousal effect from the readers.

Two creative writers who have experiences in preparing female product advertisements have been interviewed. They agree that the use of nudity is a necessity some time. Whether the advertisement looks offensive depends much on the product advertised as well as the message conveyed. They think nudity itself may not be the critical factor.

In addition, a questionnaire survey has been conducted to collect the responses from undergraduate students in several faculties. Most of them agree that in personal beauty and clothing (especially undergarment) advertisement, the use of a nude model may be necessary. Majority of them think that the portrayal of a nude model aims at catching the readers' attention.

For the six selected advertisements, the respondents do not found the one with

the highest degree of nudity the most offensive. They tend to decide on the whole message conveyed (whether it implies explicit sexual implications). Also, there is no direct relationship between degree of nudity and "positive arousal" effect to female readers.

In this study, the psychology students are found to be more accustomed to advertisements with nudity. Therefore, the education background of target readers should be taken into consideration if they possess similar education background.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank our advisor, Miss Stella So, lecturer of Marketing Department, Chinese University of Hong Kong, for her valuable advice and conscientious guidance in this project.

In addition, I would also like to express my greatest appreciation to the generous assistance offered by Miss Doris Leung, senior writer in the creative department of the DDB and Janice Tsang, writer in the creative department of DMB. Also I would like to express my thanks to all the students who have completed and returned the questionnaires. Surely without the invaluable assistance from all of them, this project will not be achieved to its fullness.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Chapter INTRODUCTION 1 I Title of the project 1 Literature Review 1 Effectiveness of Nude Models 2 6 Statement of the Problem Purpose of the Study 6 Objectives 6 Justification 7 7 Scope of the Study 8 Hypotheses 9 Methodology 9 Types of Data 9 Primary Data 9 Sources 9 Sample Design 9 Sampling Plan Advertising Agents 10 Female Magazine Readers 10 10 Large Scale Questionnaire Survey Procedure 10 WRITERS IN CREATIVE II. INTERVIEW WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF ADVERTISING AGENTS 13 Interview with a Senior Writer in DDB 13 15 Interview with a Writer in DMB QUANTITATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY 17 III. Basic Analysis of the Responses from Questionnaires 18 Some Statistical Results of the Responses on 20 Selected Advertisements Advertisement 1 : Frederique French Beauty Salon 21 Advertisement 2 : Claris Paris (Skin Care Product) 23 Advertisement 3 : Palmer's FadeCream (Skin Care) 24 Advertisement 4 : Triumph Daily (Undergarment) 25

i

iii

| Advertisement 5 : Outspan Grapefruit | 26 |
|--|---------------|
| Advertisement 6 : Ferre Fragrance | 27 |
| The Summary Table of Mean Scores on Di Construct | fferent 29 |
| The Results on the most Favourite, least Favourite and | |
| the most Striking One | 29 |
| The Difference in Opinion among Students From | |
| Different Faculties | 30 |
| The Summary Table for Opinion among Students from Di | fferent |
| Departments | 32 |
| IV. THE RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS | AND |
| RECOMMENDATIONS | 33 |
| Implications from the Contrast of Opinion | 33 |
| The Conclusion on Hypotheses | 34 |
| Recommendations for Future Research | 36 |
| Limitations | 36 |
| Recommendations | 37 |
| V. MARKETING IMPLICATIONS | 38 |
| APPENDIX | 39 |

v

86

88

BIBLIOGRAPHY QUESTIONNAIRE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Title of the Project

"Female reader's perceptions and attitudes to advertisements in women's magazine with explicit female nudity".

Literature Review

Sexuality in the form of nudity is employed as an advertising tool for a great variety of products. Those may range from personal-care products to heavy-industrial machinery. Sexual portrayals are effective in calling attention, creating interest for the advertised product, and in motivating consumers to buy.

Although many advertisements targeted to men use partial or complete female nudity, this usage is by no means confined to advertisement for male. Advertisements aimed at women also employ sexual appeals. Scantily clad, nude and sexually provocative women appear here as well, particularly in cosmetic, fashion and personal-care advertising.

The nearly nude or provocative female model is used commonly in advertisements targeted to women, as well as in those targeted to men. However, advertisers apparently believe that women, as well as men, prefer to see female bodies.

The Effectiveness of Nude Models

Five studies have distinguished between the effect of models who are perceived as attractive or sexy and the effect of those who are sexually suggestive or erotic because of nudity. They have examined the effects of nudity and partial nudity on advertising-effectiveness measures, including brand recall and attitudes.

Smith and Engel systematically varied the presence or absence of a partially clad female model and asked subjects to rate a variety of product attributes associated with the advertised automobile¹. After seeing the advertisement using a partially nude model, male and female subjects' rate the car on psychological and functional variables better than the control advertisement. The car was perceived to be more appealing, livelier, more youthful, better designed, higher priced, faster, less safe, and higher in horsepower when the model was present. The researchers considered this an unconscious phenomenon because few subjects reported themselves aware of any bias toward partial nudity in advertisement.

Steadman postulated that a sexually suggestive advertisement will attract attention but the increased attention will not be associated with recall of the brand

¹. George Horsley smith and rayme Engel, "Influence of a Female Model on Perceived Characteristics of an Automobile," <u>Proceedings of the 76th Annual Convention of the</u> <u>American Psychological Association</u>, 1968, pp. 681-682

name of the advertised product². He constructed twelve advertisements by selecting six photographs of neutral subjects and six photographs of female models in various stages of undress depicting varying degrees of overt sexual suggestiveness. Twelve well-known brand names were randomly allocated to the pictures to complete the mock advertisements. An attitude measurement concerning the use of sex in advertising was taken, and a portfolio of the twelve advertisements was left with each of the sixty male participants for one day. Upon return of the book of advertisements, subjects were asked to recall the brand names associated with each picture and then to rank order the six sexual advertisements from most to least erotically suggestive. A second recall procedure was administered seven days later to measure delayed brand-name recall.

The research results indicated that nonsexual illustrations were more effective than sexually suggestive ones in achieving brand-name recall. Immediate brand recall was not affected by the type of picture used, but in measurements after one week, the sexual pictures inhibited correct brand-name identification. Steadman hypothesized that participants had been distracted by the models from paying attention to the accompanying brand names. He also reported that an attitude favourable to the use of sexual illustrations in advertising was positively related to the correct recall of brand names. Apparently many male viewers in the highly favourable attitude group attended primarily to the illustrations of the nude or

². Major steadman, "How Sexy Illustrations Affect Brand Recall," <u>Journal of Advertising</u> <u>Research</u> 9 (February 1969):15-19.

partially nude models and ignored the brand names.

Alexander and Judd concluded a follow-up study in 1978³. They increased the sample size from sixty to 181 male volunteers, used an eight-item scale instead of a one-item measure to evaluate attitudes toward nudity in advertising, and prepared three advertisements for each of the five nudity levels. Each advertisement was viewed twice before respondents were asked to list the brand name remembered. Significantly fewer brand names were recalled for those advertisements with a nude female than for those containing a nonsexual illustration of a pastoral scene. Surprisingly, brand recall did not significantly decrease as the degree of explicit nudity in the advertisements increased. In answer to the question, "Should a nude female be used in advertisements directed toward men?", Alexander and Judd responded no, especially when brand recall is the main objective.

Peterson and Kerin designed an experiment to explore some of the relationships between degree of model nudity, product type, and gender of respondent.⁴ They examined the effect of these variables on perceptions of the advertisement, the advertised product, and the company producing the product. Mock-up advertisements were prepared using no model, a demure model, a seductive model, and a nude model.

The data support the concept that when the model and product are appropriately

4 .

³. M. Wayne Alexander and Ben Judd, Jr., "Do Nudes in Ads Enhance Brand Recall?', Journal of Advertising Research 18 (February 1978):47-50.

⁴. Robert A. Peterson and Roger A. Kerin, "The Female Role in Advertisements: Some Experimental Evidence," Journal of Marketing 41 (October 1977):59-63.

matched, the evaluations for advertisements, products, and companies are more favourable. Peterson and Kerin concluded that the use of nudity may produce negative effects, not only with respect to evaluation of specific advertisements, but to perceptions of product quality and corporate image as well.

Sciglimpaglia, Belch, and Cain who studied the impact of variations in nudity, suggestiveness, and model gender on male and female perceptions of print advertisements.⁵ Sciglimpaglia et al. used actual print advertisements, varying in degree of nudity and suggestiveness, rather than using the mock-up advertisements as in other studies.

Evaluation of the advertisements generally improved as the levels of suggestiveness and nudity decreased. The sexually suggestive advertisements were perceived as being in poor taste by males and females alike but were particularly offensive to the women. Men and women varied to a greater extent in their evaluations of advertisements showing nudity. Women tended to evaluate female nudity negatively; men on the other hand, evaluated female nudity significantly better. The opposite was true for male nudity.

In his article "Female Nudity in Print Advertising : An analysis of gender differences in arousal and ad response"⁶, Latour has propose some research should

5

⁵. Donald Sciglimpaglia, Michael A. Belch, and Richard F. Cain, Jr., "Demographic and Cognitive Factors Influencing Viewers' Evaluation of 'Sexy' Advertisement," in <u>Advances in Consumer Research</u>, ed.W.Wilkie, pp.62-65.

⁶. Michael S.Latour ,"Female Nudity in Print Advertising: An Analysis of Gender Differences in Arousal and Ad Response," <u>Psychology & Marketing</u>, 7(1): 65-81.

be done to get the response to female nudity in advertisements from female magazine readers. He said that there are significant differences between the two sexes in rating attractive and sexy models; what is appealing to men may be ineffective with women and vice-versa. In addition, there are significant differences within sex in evaluation of such models.

Some part of the variable measurement scale are adopted from "Female Nudity, Arousal and Ad response : An experimental Investigation" in *Journal of* Advertising.⁷

Statement of the Problem

There is a perception discrepancy in the nude model portrayal in the advertisements between readers and the advertising professional.

Purpose of the Study

Objectives

1. To study the rationale and intentions of advertising-practitioners in employing female model with nudity portrayal in female-oriented advertisement.

2. To study the readers' perception and arousal effect towards those printed advertisements for different products with female model nudity.

⁷. Michael S. Latour, Robert E. Pitts, David C. Snook-Luther, "Female Nudity, Arousal, and Ad Response: An Experimental Investigation", <u>Journal of Advertising</u>, 19, Number 4, 51-62.

3. To give advice to the advertising agency in preparing advertisements for femaleoriented products.

Justification

Many of the previous researches on nude model appeal have been done on those advertisements for male readers. However, there are also quite a few advertisements for female readers in which explicit nudity is found. Will the readers feel comfortable towards them ? Will they feel offensive and embarrassed ? This is my interest to find out whether this strategy is successful in performing the intended purpose of the advertising- practitioners.

Scope of the study

Actual limitations of the research will include the following:

. The degree of nudity from those printed advertisements are of different degree and not possible to be controlled.

. there is no control advertisements (those without nudity) since this research is not aiming at studying the effect of advertisements with nudity versus those without it.

Only those creative writers whose company are members of the Association of Accredited Advertising Agents of Hong Kong have been invited for an interview.

. In the questionnaire survey, convenience sampling was used. Bias of overrepresentation of younger group between 17 to 20 may be encountered. However, since most of them will be the dominate consumers in the 90's, their attitude

is

important and marketers should seriously consider this potential group.

Hypotheses

H1 : Creative writers in advertising agents think that those female-oriented advertisements with female nudity can give positive arousal to the readers.

H2 : Female readers to advertisements with nudity feel that the advertisements give positive arousal.

H3 : Female readers feel more offensive to those advertisements with female nudity if it is not product-related.

H4: Most of the readers agree that it may be necessary to use a nude female models in the advertisements of certain products

H5: there is not significant differences in opinion from respondents of different education background (e.g. major subject in the university)

Methodology

Types of data

Primary data

. the rationale and motivation in using female model with nudity in femaleoriented advertisements.

. The opinion of creative writers on selected female oriented advertisements with female nudity.

. the opinion of sample female respondents on the use of nude models portrayals in advertisements.

. the "advertisement cognition" and "positive arousal" of sample female respondents on those selected advertisements.

Sources

Primary data will be gathered by questionnaire survey on undergraduates with different major subjects.

Interviews with creative writers will be arranged to get their opinion on the nude model portrayal and some selected advertisements.

Sample design

Sampling Plan

The population of interest includes female magazine readers; writers of

creative department in advertising agents.

Advertising Agents

Judgement samples are used. The criteria for selection is the membership of the Association of Accredited Advertising Agents of Hong Kong as the members are supposed to be the largest in scale. Interviews will be scheduled for creative writer of each agent if they are willing to help.

Female Magazine Readers

Undergraduate female students in four departments will be selected as the sample respondents for readers' opinion. (namely Chinese, Psychology, Biochemistry and Business Administration)

Large Scale Questionnaire Survey

. 100 undergraduate female students are chosen as samples through the contact with some lecturers of different departments. The questionnaires are delivered near the end of class. The respondents are allowed to take the questionnaire home and return it on the next class. The response rate is 45% (i.e. 45 questionnaires were collected) **procedure**:

1. The questionnaire start with a series of more general questions regarding the respondents' opinion on the nude model in print advertisements.

2. Six Advertisements has been selected from some female magazines including the "Sister's Pictorial", "Woman's Journal", "Eve". The following is a basic introduction to the six advertisements.

Advertisement 1 - Frederique : the original French beauty salon. The beauty care centre offers some courses and treatment services. On the top right hand corner of the advertisement, there is a nude model covering her breast with her crossed arms. There are two big hands grapping the model. The message may be the desire to attain a more perfect, beautiful figure through the participation in the treatments and makeup courses.

Advertisement 2 - Clarins : French Skin Care products. There is a title "Youthful body beauty, firm contours". On the top left hand corner, a nude model covering the body partially with a towel. One thigh and the arms are exposed and the model show a smile.

Advertisement 3 - Palmer's SKIN SUCCESS Fade cream. There is a completely nude model sitting in a posture that exposing the arms and legs. The message may be skin without an spot, fade colour.

Advertisement 4 - Triumph Daily : there is a model wearing the Daily Bra and underwear.

Advertisement 5 - Outspan Grapefruit : the copy "Cool, refreshing, full of flavour. Wholesome, natural grapefruit - the colour of the sun. Put the rest in the shade." A model with bikini holding half of a grapefruit with a smile.

Advertisement 6 - Ferre Fragrance : the advertisement show a woman embraces a man and holds a bottle of the advertised fragrance. Both of them are completely nude.

3. On each of the above advertisement, the questionnaire consists of 10 descriptive

adjectives on a five point scale ("Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree").

The following four items constitute a multiple measure of the construct "Advertisement cognition" i) Distinctive; ii) inappropriate; iii) Interesting; iv) Offensive (the two adjectives "inappropriate" and "offensive" are reversely scored) The following four items constitute a multiple measure of the construct "Positive Arousal"

i) Active; ii) Energetic; iii) Vigorous; iv) Lively

The adjectives "healthy" and "intimate" are also included.

CHAPTER II

INTERVIEW WITH THE WRITERS IN CREATIVE DEPARTMENT OF ADVERTISING AGENTS

Out of the 19 advertising agents, two writers from DDB and DMB had kindly agree to be interviewed. Each of them has been responsible for the creation of female product advertisement. Each interview has lasted for about 40 minutes. The following is the report of the two interviews.

Interview with a senior writer in DDB

Doris Leung is a senior writer in DDB. She has participated in the creation of the following female products :

(i) Underwear; (ii) Napkin; (iii) Cosmetics

In her opinion, advertisements for female products should be presented in a nice and pretty way to the target group. (c.f. For the male product, the message may be charming, masculine and so on.) The use of a female model will be more intimate to the emotion of the target group. It sound more like a conversation between two close friends.

She found the use of female model with nudity is acceptable and may be necessary in the advertisements of the following products.

(i) Cosmetics: A nude model may be used to associate beauty with the product.

(ii) Undergarment (like underwear) : A nude model may be needed to show how the product looks when it is worn.

(iii) Personal beauty products (e.g. Skin Care Products) or services (e.g. Weight losing program) : A nude model may be used to show the effect of the products and services.

Doris expressed her opinion that having nudity in an advertising is not a crucial factor to the perception. Whether the nudity is relevant to the product or necessary in presenting the idea is more important than the degree of nudity.

Her opinion on the six selected advertisements

1. Make-up course : The use of such nude model is not necessary. It is too explicit to show such a model in such advertisement for make-up courses.

2. Skin care products : Acceptable since the model show a very healthy facial expression and it is relevant to the service to be advertised.

3. Fadecream : a little bit extreme in showing the whole body. It can show only the face of the model, say.

4. Triumph undergarment : It is necessary to use such a model to show how the products look like when they are wore.

5. Outspan grapefruit : It may not be necessary to use the model. However, it looks acceptable since it looks pretty healthy and gives a positive feeling.

6. Fragrance : use of a male and female models convey an erotic message. She feels that fragrance may be used before going to bed at night.

Interview with a writer in DMB

Janice Tsang is a writer in DMB. She has participated in the an ad of napkin.

Janice thinks the presentation of advertisements for female products are similar to others in the sense that the client's requirements on main message will strongly influence the portrayal. Whether the message is ethical or not is another issue.

In the following types of products, she consider a female model with nudity may be appropriate or necessary.

(i) Personal fitness program like weight losing : In order to show a better figure, A nude model may be needed.

(ii) Clothing especially undergarment : In order to show how the clothes look like when it is worn.

Nudity helps in catching attention but the same model should be used throughout different advertisements of the same product if one want to increase the brand recall. Nudity may not itself be offensive, what really matters may be the facial expression and the overall message conveyed.

Her opinion on the six selected advertisements

Make-up course : The use of such nude model is not necessary but not offensive.
Skin care product: From the facial expression, it looks quite healthy and acceptable. However, an alternative presentation would be better confidence with a better figure.

3. Fadecream product : It is not necessary and unnatural. It can show the close-up of the face of the model, say.

4. Triumph undergarment : It is necessary and the model expression looks healthy. with a better figure.

5. Outspan grapefruit : Acceptable since it looks pretty healthy and give a positive feeling.

6. Fragrance : The explicitly nude models convey a sexually suggestive message. It looks appealing. She supposes it may be related to the usage occasion (e.g. before going to bed). The advertisement associates sexual attractiveness with the product.

CHAPTER III

QUANTITATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

To discover the perceptions of female to advertisements in women's magazine with female nudity, a questionnaire survey is done. Out of the 100 questionnaires delivered to female students from different faculties, 45 copies are completed and received.

Out of the 45 completed questionnaires, about 40% are from the faculty of art (Major in Chinese), about 27% are from the faculty of social science (major in Psychology), about 27% are from the faculty of business administration. The remaining minority are from the faculty of science (major in biochemistry) (see Appendix A9). We can test if there are significant difference among on the responses about

(i) the "advertisement cognition"

(ii) "positive arousal" as well as

(iii) the acceptance of "healthy" and "intimate" advertisement. This can be done by cross-tabulation of the result among different subjects.

Basic Analysis of the Responses from Questionnaires

The questions (1) to (8) in the questionnaires ask for some basic opinion from the respondents. In the following paragraphs, result in each question will be discussed.

Out of the 45 respondents, about 58% of them are infrequent readers (zero to two times per year). 20% of them are frequent readers (six or more per year). Another 22% respondents read them three to five times per year. Therefore, most of the respondents do not have a habit of reading female magazines.(see Appendix A1)

From the result in question (2), over 80% of the respondents have come across some nude model in some printed advertisements(see Appendix A2). Since the above question show that most respondents are infrequent readers, the use of nude model in advertisement is quite common among female magazines.

For those respondents who have come across such advertisement, the next question ask for the type of products in which there is female nudity . 71% of respondents say that they have come across it in personal beauty advertisement. We can say the personal beauty categories is a very usual kind of advertisement for nude model usage. About 20% of respondents say that they come across such kind of model in advertisements of personal hygiene products.

Over 50% said that they have come across it in clothing advertisement (especially undergarment). About 13% of them have come across it in fragrance advertisement.

The most popular type of product advertisement is personal beauty. The clothing advertisement is the second most popular and the personal hygiene product ranked the third.(see Appendix A3)

The fourth question ask whether they think that those nude model is necessary in the advertisement. Nearly 58% of the respondents replied "No" to this question. The opinion is quite divided and perhaps it depends on the types of product being advertised. (see Appendix A4)

The fifth question ask for the respondent's opinion that if it is necessary to use nude models in the advertisement of certain female products. 42% of them say yes(see Appendix A5). For those respondent who say "yes" in this question, the next question will ask for the kinds of product advertisement in which a female nude model is necessary. 5 choices are offered and one is open ended. The other four types are "Personal beauty", "Personal hygiene", "Fragrance" and "Clothing". 20% chose the item "personal beauty" and 40% chose the "clothing" option. Less than 5% of the respondents agree that the use of nude model in "personal hygiene" and "Fragrance" advertisement. (see Appendix A6)

Even if a respondent does not agree that the use of a nude model is necessary, she may think that it is acceptable. Therefore, we want to see how much the respondents can accept the appearance of a nude model in some advertisements. In that question, 47% of respondents think that they can accept it in "personal beauty" advertisement. About 22% said that they can accept it in "personal hygiene". Only 4.4% of respondents can accept it in "fragrance" advertisement. About 67% can



accept it in "Clothing" type of advertisement. We can see the most acceptable type of advertisement in which nude model is used would be "clothing"(including undergarment). (see Appendix A7)

Concerning the purpose of using nude model in advertisement, nearly 78% said it aims at catching the attention of the reader. About 13% think that it would create a more favourable attitude towards the product. 18% of respondents think that the purpose is to make the readers feel more aroused. Only 6.7% agree that it would increase the brand recall which is quite consistent with prior research.

Three respondents have a some other opinion on the use of such nude model. One said that it may be necessary to present the advertisement with a nude model (probably in undergarment). Another subject said it may show the function of the product. The third one thinks that it may make the advertisement more convincing. (see Appendix A8)

Some statistical Results of the Responses on Selected Advertisements

There are two important constructs to be calculated from the scores in the questionnaires.

(i) "advertisement cognition" : Four relevant adjectives are used in the questionnaire to get the attitude to this construct. They are

.Distinctive .Inappropriate .Interesting

.Offensive

The method of calculating the score for "advertisement cognition" is done by averaging the score on each adjectives (e.g. "Strongly disagree" = 1). However, the two negative adjectives (i.e. "Inappropriate" and "offensive") are reversely scored (i.e. "Strongly disagree" = 5). The higher the resulting score, the more favourable "advertisement cognition" from the respondent.

(ii) "positive arousal" : the four relevant adjectives concerning this construct are

.Active

.Energetic

.Lively

.Vigorous

Again, the mean score on each of the above adjectives is calculated. The higher the score, the higher effect of "positive arousal".

(iii) Besides the eight adjectives mentioned above, two adjectives are added after conducting the interviews with the writers in creative department of two advertising agencies. They are "healthy" and "intimate".

Advertisement 1: Frederique French Beauty Salon

Most of the scores on the construct "advertisement cognition" are around 3 to 4. (11% scored 3; 13% scored 3.25; 18% scored 3.5; 18% scored 18%; and 11% scored 4). The mean score for this construct is 3.228. Therefore, the advertisement has a slightly favourable cognition from the respondents (see Appendix B1-a). For the construct "positive arousal", most of the scores are scattered around 2 to 3.75. (15.6% scored 2; 6.7% scored 2.25; 11.1% scored 2.75; 22.2% scored 3; 11.1% scored 3.25 and 15.6% scored 3.75) The mean score for this construct is 2.983. We can say the advertisement is quite neutral in making the readers feel aroused (see Appendix B1-b).

Regarding whether the advertisement looks healthy or not, about 11% of the respondents chose "strongly disagree". About 22% chose "disagree" and about 36% chose "neutral". The other 31% chose "agree". The mean score of the "healthy" construct is 2.867. Hence we can say that the advertisement is quite neutral in terms of its "healthy" perception (see Appendix B1-c).

Regarding whether the advertisement looks intimate to the reader, about 4% of the respondents replied "strongly disagree". About 22% said "disagree" and around 58% of the respondent gave a neutral reply. 16% of the respondents said that they "agree". The mean score is 2.844. Hence it is quite neutral regarding the intimacy to the readers (see Appendix B1-d).

If we take a look at the adjective "offensive" for this advertisement, 13% gave a score of 2 (agree it is offensive). 33% gave a score of 3 and another 47% gave a score of 4. About 7% of the respondents gave a score of 5. None of the respondent strongly agree that the advertisement is offensive. The mean score of all the respondents on this construct is 3.467 (see Appendix B1-e). We can say that the readers find the advertisement not offensive.

Advertisement 2 : Clarins Paris (Skin care product)

Most of the scores on the construct "advertisement cognition" scattered around 2.50 to 3.75. Out of the 45 respondents, about 9% had a score of 2.5 and about 11% had a score of 2.75. Nearly 29% had a score of 3 and about 13% had a score of 3.25. About 18% of them had a score of 3.5 and about 9% of them had a score of 3.75. The mean score for this construct is 3.083. Therefore the advertisement is rather neutral in this construct (see Appendix B2-a).

For the construct "positive arousal", most of the respondents' score evenly from 2.25 to 3.75. About 13% of them had a score of 2.25 and another 13% of them had a score of 2.50. Around 18% of them has a score of 2.75. About 4% of them had a score of 3. 11% of them had a score of 3.25 and 11% of them had a score of 3.5. Another 11% of them had a score 3.75. For this construct, the mean is 3.0 and the attitude is quite neutral (see Appendix B2-b).

Regarding the construct "healthy", 4.4% of the respondent gave a score of 1 (lowest). About 18% of them gave a score of 2 and around 42% of them gave a score of 3. About 31% gave a score of 4 and another 4% of them gave a score of 5 (highest). The mean score is 3.133 and the advertisement can be considered to be slightly healthy (see Appendix B2-c).

Regarding whether the advertisement is "intimate" or not, 20% of them replied "disagree" (score of 2). 58% of them said they are "neutral" and 18% of them "agree". The mean score is 2.978 and it is rather neutral in this aspect (see Appendix B2-d). Regarding to the adjective "offensive", only 2% of the respondents said that chose "strongly agree". 11% chose "agree" and about 44% of them are neutral. About 29% of them chose "disagree" and 13.3% of them said they "strongly disgree". The mean score is 3.40 and so the readers do not find that advertisement offensive (see Appendix B2-e).

Advertisement 3 : Palmer's Fadecream (Skin Care product)

Regarding the construct "advertisement cognition", most of the scores scattered around 2.25 to 3.0. 15.6% of them got a score of 2.25 and about 29% of them got a score of 2.50. 15.6% of them got a score of 2.75 and 11% of them got a score of 3.0. The mean score for this construct is 2.667 and so the attitude is not so favourable (see Appendix B3-a).

For the construct "positive arousal", most of the scores scattered around 2 to 2.75 (the negative side). About 31% of them got a score of 2 and 20% of them got a score of 2.25. 6.75 of them got a score of 2.50 and about 18% of them got a score of 2.75. Then mean score for this construct is 2.439 and so it is not considered to be a positively arousing advertisement (see Appendix B3-b).

For the "healthy" perception of this advertisement, about 49% of the respondents said they "disagree" and about 42% of them said they are "neutral". Since the mean score is 2.467, the advertisement is a quite "unhealthy" one (see Appendix B3-c).

For the "intimate" perception of the advertisement, about 27% of the

respondents said they "disagree". About 47% of them said they are "neutral" and 20% of them said they "agree". Since the mean score is 2.889, this advertisement is quite neutral in "intimacy" to the reader (see Appendix B3-d).

Concerning whether the advertisement is "offensive" or not, about 17% of them said they "agree" (score = 2). 40% of them said they are "neutral" and about 36% of them said that they "disagree" (score = 4). Since the mean score is 3.222, the advertisement is an "unoffensive" one (see Appendix B3-e).

Advertisement 4 : Triumph Daily (Undergarment)

In this advertisement of undergarment (Bra and underwear), most of the scores of the "advertisement cognition" are scattered around 2.75 to 3.50. About 13% of the respondents got a score of 2.75 and about 18% of them got a score of 3.0. 20% of them got a score of 3.25 and 22% of them got a score 3.5. The mean score for this construct is 3.161. Hence the perception is quite neutral (see Appendix B4-a).

Concerning the construct "positive arousal", about 22% of them got a score of 2.50. About 18% of them got a score of 2.75 and about 16% of them got a score of 3.0. The mean score of this construct is 2.856. Therefore, it is not a positively arousing advertisement (see Appendix B4-b).

Regarding the "healthy" perception of this advertisement, most of the respondent chose "neutral" and "agree". (about 36% chose "neutral" and about 51% chose "agree".) The mean score is 3.578 which shows that it is a rather "healthy" advertisement (see Appendix B4-c).

Regarding the "intimate" perception of the advertisement, most of them(about 53%) gave a "neutral" reply. About 31% of them said "agree". The mean score is 3.356 which means that it is a quite "intimate" advertisement (see Appendix B4-d).

Regarding the adjective "offensive", about 11% of the respondent said they "agree". While 40% of the respondents said "neutral", about 36% of them gave a "disagree" reply. Around 13% of them "strongly disagree" that the advertisement is "offensive". The mean score is 3.511 and it is definitely unoffensive (see Appendix B4-e).

Advertisement 5 : Outspan Grapefruit

Regarding the construct "advertisement cognition", the opinion is quite diversed (the range of score is from 1.75 to 4.5). About 16% of them got a score of 2.50 and 11% got a score of 2.75. About 11% of them got a score of 3.0.and 20% of them got a score of 3.25. About 13% of them got a score of 3.50 and about 11% got a score of 3.75. the mean score is 3.061 and so the perception is neutral (see Appendix B5-a).

Concerning the construct "positive arousal", the range of scores range from 2.25 to 4.25. About 16% of the respondents got a score of 2.5 and about 7% of them got a score of 2.75. About 11% of them got a score of 3.0 and around 16% of them got a score of 3.25. About 16% of them got a score of 3.50 and around 7% of them got a score of 3.75. About 18% of them got a score of 4.0. The mean score is 3.256 and it can be considered as a positively arousing advertisement (see Appendix B5-b).

Regarding the "healthy" perception, about 29% of the respondents replied "disagree". Around 22% of them replied "neutral" and about 42% of them replied "agree". The mean score is 3.267 and so the advertisement is still a healthy one (see Appendix B5-c).

Regarding the "intimate" feeling of the advertisement, about 27% of the respondents replied "disagree" About 51% of them gave the "neutral" reply and about 22% gave a "agree" answer. The mean score is 2.956 and it is quite neutral (see Appendix B5-d).

On the "offensive" adjective, 20% of them gave an "agree" answer (score = 2). About 33% of them gave a "neutral" answer and about 36% of them said "disagree". The mean score is 3.378 and so the advertisement is not considered to be offensive (see Appendix B5-e).

Advertisement 6 : Ferre Fragrance

Regarding the construct "advertisement cognition", the opinion is quite diversed. (the range of score is 1.00 to 3.75). About 11% of the respondents got a score of 2.25. About 18% of them got a score of 2.75 and about 9% of them got a score of 3. Another 11% of them got a score of 3.25%. The mean score is 2.611 which is quite a low one. The respondents had a quite unfavourable attitude towards the advertisement (see Appendix B6-a).

Concerning the construct "positive arousal", the range of score is very large (from 1.25 to 4.75). About 16% of them got a score of 2.0 and around 11% of them

27

got a score of 2.25. About 9% of them got a score of 2.5 and approximately 7% of them got a score of 2.75. About 11% of them got a score of 3.0 and approximately of them got a score of 3.25. Another 11% of the respondents got a score of 3.5. The mean score is 2.772 and it is very ineffective in the purpose to make the readers feel aroused (see Appendix B6-b).

Regarding the "healthy" perception of the advertisement, about 42% of the respondents chose "strongly disagree". Approximately 40% of them said they "disagree" while of them chose the "neutral" reply. Only about 7% of the respondents "agree" that the advertisement is a healthy one. The mean score of this item is 1.822 which means the advertisement is considered to be very unhealthy (see Appendix B6-c).

Regarding the "intimate" feeling of the advertisement, about 16% of them chose "strongly disagree". Another 16% chose "disagree" and about 36% of them chose "neutral". Approximately 25% of them said "agree". The mean score is 2.956 which is a quite low one. It implies that the advertisements does not convey an intimate feeling to the readers (Appendix B6-d).

On the "offensive" adjective, about 22% gave the lowest score (i.e. strongly agree that is offensive). About 38% "agree" that it is offensive and about 22% are "neutral". The mean score is 2.444 and so the advertisement is rather offensive to readers (Appendix B6-e).

| Constructs | Mean Scores | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|
| Advertisement Cognition | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Positive Arousal | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Healthiness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Intimacy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| Offensiveness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

The mean score on different constructs of Ad 1

The mean score on different constructs of Ad 2

| Constructs | Mean Scores | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|-----|--|
| Advertisement Cognition | 1. | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Positive Arousal | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | |
| Healthiness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | . 5 | |
| Intimacy | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | |
| Offensiveness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Constructs | Mean Scores | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|---|----|---|---|--|
| Advertisement Cognition | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Positive Arousal | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Healthiness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Intimacy | 1 | 2 | 3. | 4 | 5 | |
| Offensiveness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |

The mean score on different constructs of Ad 3

The mean score on different constructs of Ad 4

| Constructs | Mean Scores | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|---|-----|---|---|--|
| Advertisement Cognition | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Positive Arousal | 1 | 2 | _R_ | 4 | 5 | |
| Healthiness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Intimacy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Offensiveness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |

28b

The mean score on different constructs of Ad 5

| Constructs | Mean Scores | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| Advertisement Cognition | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Positive Arousal | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Healthiness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Intimacy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 | |
| Offensiveness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 | |

The mean score on different constructs of Ad 6

| Constructs | Mean Scores | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| Advertisement Cognition | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Positive Arousal | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Healthiness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Intimacy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Offensiveness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |

| Mean Scores | Ad 1 | Ad 2 | Ad 3 | Ad 4 | Ad 5 | Ad 6 |
|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Advertisement Cognition | 3.288 | 3.083 | 2.667 | 3.161 | 3.061 | 2.611 |
| Positive Arousal | 2.938 | 3.00 | 2.439 | 2.856 | 3.256 | 2.772 |
| Healthiness | 2.867 | 3.133 | 2.467 | 3.578 | 3.267 | 1.822 |
| Intimacy | 2.844 | 2.978 | 2.889 | 3.356 | 2.956 | 2.956 |
| Offensiveness | 3.467 | 3.400 | 3.222 | 3.511 | 3.378 | 2.444 |

The Summary Table of the Mean Scores on Different Constructs

The Results on the most Favourite, least Favourite and the most Striking One

Out of the six advertisements, the fifth one (outspan grapefruit) is the most welcomed one among the responses. About 31% of the respondents chose this advertisement. Although the use of a female model with bikini is not relevant to the product itself. The facial expression of the model is quite healthy. The readers seems to be quite satisfied with the model with bikini as a symbol for the color of the sun. The second favourite one is the first advertisement (Frederique beauty salon) and about 24% of them chose this one (see Appendix A10).

The least favourable advertisement is the sixth one (the Ferre Fragrance). About 62% of the respondents chose this one. This advertisement show an explicit physical contact between a nude man and a nude woman. It may not only the nudity itself but the explicit sexual activity that make the readers not like it (see Appendix A11).

The most striking advertisement is also the sixth one, about 58% of the

readers chose this one as the striking (see Appendix A12).

The Difference in Opinion among Students from Different Faculties

Over 60% of the psychology major students think that it is necessary to use nude model in certain advertisements (question 5). On the contrary, over 60% of the Chinese and Business major students said "no" to this question (see Appendix C1).

With a t-test on the score on whether it is necessary to have nude model in those advertisements they have come across, there is a significant difference between Chinese major (mean = 1.88, tends to be "no") and Psychology major (mean = 1.33) (2-tail probability = .003) (see Appendix D1)

With the t-test of the score for "advertisement cognition" and "positive arousal" on each advertisement, there is significant differences between students of different majors in the following cases :

i) the mean scores in "advertisement cognition" of advertisement 4 between Chinese major (score = 3.0) and Business major (score = 3.4). (2-tail probability = .019) (see Appendix E4)

ii) the mean scores in "positive arousal" of advertisement 2 between Chinese major (score = 3.07) and Psychology major (score = 2.67). (2-tail probability = .105) (see Appendix E20)

iii) the mean scores in "positive arousal" of advertisement 3 between Chinese major (score = 2.58) and Psychology major (score = 2.23). (2-tail probability = .082) (see Appendix E21)

iv) the mean scores in "positive arousal" of advertisement 4 between Chinese major (score = 2.93) and Psychology major (score = 2.60). (2-tail probability = .067) (see Appendix E22)

v) the mean scores in "positive arousal" of advertisement 2 between Psychology major (score = 2.67) and Business major (score = 3.17). (2-tail probability = .05) (see Appendix E32)

On the question of most favourite advertisement, majority of Chinese major students (about 35%) chose the Outspan grapefruit. The majority of Business major students (about 55%) also chose the same one. However, the psychology major students show a different opinion and most of them (50%) chose the first advertisement(Frederique) (see Appendix C1). On the least favourite and most striking advertisement, the results are more or less the same among different major students (see Appendix C2 and C3).

| Mean Scores | PSY | BCH | CHI | BBA | 2-tail Prob. |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-----|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Necessary in certain ads(Q5) | >60% say "yes" | | >60% say "no" | >60% say "no" | |
| Necessary in those ads (Q4) | 1.3 more "yes" | | 1.88 more "no" | | |
| "advertisement cogition" for ad 4 | | | 3.0 | 3.4 | .019 |
| "positive arousal" for ad 2 | 2.67 | L. | 3.07 | | .105 |
| "positive arousal" for ad 3 | 2.23 | | 2.58 | | .082 |
| "positive arousal" for ad 4 | 2.60 | | 2.93 | | .067 |
| "positive arousal" for ad 2 | 2.67 | | | 3.17 | .05 |
| Most favourite | 50% Ad1 | | 35% Ad5 | 55% Ad5 | |

The Summary Table for Opinion among Students from Different Departments

CHAPTER IV

THE RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Implications from the Contrast of Opinion

1. Both the creative writers and the readers generally agree that a nude model may be necessary in certain products. Nudity is quite well accepted in the presentation of certain products.

2. Both the creative writers and the readers agree that a nude model is necessary and appropriate in the following two kinds of products.

. Personal beauty : a good figure as a symbol of beauty is widely accepted

. Clothing (especially undergarment) : a model wearing only bra and underwear is widely accepted.

Both the creative writers and the readers agree that the sixth advertisement is the most striking one. However, they all have a negative attitude towards the advertisement. Therefore, the main objective of an advertisement should be clarified before designing the message. (to create favourable attitude or to be striking)
 The two writers think that nudity itself is not the key determinant for perception but rather the relevance to the product. Therefore, the sixth advertisement do not expose the body very much but it conveys a very overt sexual message and the

product itself is not directly related to the message. The readers also dislike the sixth advertisement. The writers should take precaution in the whole message conveyed rather than the degree of nudity. A sexually suggestive advertisement may not include a completely nude model but may be too offensive to the reader.

5. Both the creative writers and the readers think that the most important purpose for using a nude model with nudity is catching the attention of the reader. The second important purpose would be a more arousing effect. When a writer intends to catch the attention of the reader, nudity seems to be a good choice.

6. Janice (one of the creative writer) said the use of nude model has no direct relationship with brand recall. More important is the consistent appearance of the **same** model. It agree with the readers' response as well as the existing literature. Therefore, a writer should be very cautious if one aims primarily at increasing the brand recall.

The conclusion on hypotheses

On the several hypotheses (H1-H5), we can make the following conclusion. H1: Female nudity in the advertisement may not give positive arousal to the female readers. More important is the type of product advertised as well as the message being conveyed. H1 is rejected.

H2: The readers feel aroused only to the advertisement 5 (Outspan Grapefruit). For the third, fourth and sixth, the effect is just the opposite. The factor that make the readers feel aroused may not be simply the nudity. H2 is rejected. H3: Out of the sixth advertisement, the nudity in the fifth (outspan grapefruit) and the sixth one (the Ferre Fragrance) is not product related . However, the readers feel offensive only to the sixth one. Therefore, nudity itself may not be a critical factor. More important is the implied suggestion or the message conveyed.

However, the feeling of offensiveness may be less probable if the nudity employed is directly product related (like the fourth one Triumph Daily). H3 is rejected.

H4 : Since 57.8% of the respondents say "no" to the fifth question, more readers do not think that it is necessary to use nude female model in the advertisement of certain products. However, this percentage does not help to reject or accept this hypothesis.

H5 : The are several cases of significantly different scores in the "advertisement cognition" and "positive arousal" between two group of students from different faculty.

For the fourth advertisement (Triumph Daily), Chinese major students got a score that is 0.4 lower than the Business major students in "advertisement cognition".

For the second, third and fourth advertisement, the Psychology major students mean scores in "positive arousal" are about 0.3 lower than that of the Chinese major students. For those three advertisement, the Chinese major students got a consistently higher scores than that of psychology major students.

The mean score of "positive arousal" construct in advertisement 2 for Business students is 0.5 greater than that of psychology students.

For the question " Is it necessary to use nude model(s) in the advertisements

of certain female products? ", the majority of psychology students (over 60%) say "yes" while the majority of Chinese and business student say "no".

From the above result, H5 should be rejected. It seems that the psychology students are less sensitive to nude models. (less arousal score). Also they are more open in their attitude towards the usage of nude model in advertisements.

Recommendations for Future Research

Limitations

It is very useful to have the opinion from two experienced creative writers as well as potential readers. However, we should notice the following essential limitations of the study:

- only the creative writers from two advertising agents have been interviewed there is a lack of advertisement without nudity for the same product and copy.
 - all the respondents are college students and there is no respondents from a different age and occupation (e.g. housewives)
- Variables other than the nudity are operating in affecting the responses, for example, the message to be conveyed (e.g. erotic or healthy)

Recommendations

For future study, the following suggestions is made:

a larger scale survey on more advertising agents should be prepared so that the results will be more representative.

Advertisements which differ in the model exposure with the same copy for a same product should be prepared. Then the effect of nudity can be isolated. more sophisticated survey can be made on analysis based on demographic characteristics such as occupation, age, education level and psychographic characteristics

CHAPTER V

MARKETING IMPLICATIONS

From this research results, the following points should be noticed by advertising professionals:

The female nudity itself in a advertisement may not be a positive arousal for female readers. Therefore, the message to be conveyed as well as the association of the portrayal with the product may be more important. The creative writers should not think in the same way as preparing an advertisement for male readers.

The female nudity in an advertisement may not be a critical factor for the readers to feel offensive. Even for some product-unrelated nudity (like the outspan grapefruit), the association of the grapefruit with a healthy skin make it a quite favourite one.

Higher degree of nudity will not imply higher arousal effect to the female readers. Therefore, the product and message to be conveyed have to be considered before the decision to use a nude model.

For certain advertisement which are targeted to more specific customer group, the educational background should be taken into consideration. For those customers who are less sensitive to nude models, an advertisement with a nude model may not get the expected arousal effect.

QONE FREQUENCY OF READING

| Value Labe | 1 | Value F | requency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|--|----------------------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| SIX OR MORE THREE TO FIV ZERO TO TWO | PER YEAR E PER YE PER YEAR | 1 2 3 | 9 10 26 | 20.0 22.2 57.8 | 20.0 22.2 57.8 | 20.0 42.2 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Mean | 2.378 | Std Err | .120 | Std | Dev | .806 |
| Valid Cases | 45 | Missing Cas | es O | | | |

APPENDIX A2

| QTWO | HAVE YOU COM | E ACROSS FEM | ALE NUDE MC | DEL | | |
|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|
| Value L | abel | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
| YES NO | | 1 2 | 36 9 | 80.0 20.0 | 80.0 20.0 | 80.0 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Mean | 1.200 | Std Err | .060 | Std | Dev | .405 |
| Valid Cas | es 45 | Missing C | ases 0 | 2- | | ÷ |

QTHREE

| Value Label | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Personal Beauty Personal hygiene Fragrance Clothing Other | 1 2 3 4 5 | 32 10 6 23 0 | 71.1 22.2 13.3 51.1 0 | 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 | 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 |

APPENDIX A4

QFOUR

| Value La | bel | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|-----------|-------|-------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| Yes No | ÷. | 1 2 9 | 11 26 8 | 24.4 57.8 17.8 | 29.7 70.3 MISSING | 29.7 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Mean | 1.703 | Std Err | .076 | Std | Dev | .463 |

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 8

| Value I | Label | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|---------|-------|---------|-----------|--------------|------------------|----------------|
| | | 1 2 | 19 26 | 42.2 57.8 | 42.2 57.8 | 42.2 |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Mean | 1.578 | Std Err | .074 | Std | Dev | .499 |
| | | | | | | |

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

APPENDIX A6

QSIX

QFIVE

| Value Label | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|-------------|-------|-----------|---------|------------------|----------------|
| | 1 | 9 | 20.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2 | 2 | 4.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 3 | 1 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 4 | 18 | 40.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 5 | 0 | 0.0 | MISSING | |
| | | | | | |

QSEVEN

| Value Label | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|-------------|--------|-----------|------------|------------------|----------------|
| | 1 | 21 | 46.7 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 3 | 2 | 4.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 4 5 | 30 0 | 66.7. 0 | 100.0 MISSING | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |

APPENDIX A8

QEIGHT

.

| Value Label | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|-------------|-------|-----------|---------|------------------|----------------|
| | 1 | 35 | 77.8 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 2 | 3 | 6.7 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 3 | 6 | 13.3 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 4 | 8 | 17.8 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | 5 | 3 | 6.7 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |

QNINE MAJOR SUBJECT

| Value | Label | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|---------------------------------------|--------|------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| CHINESE BIOCHEM PSYCHOLC BBA | GY | 1 2 3 4 | 19 2 12 12 | 42.2 4.4 26.7 26.7 | 42.2 4.4 26.7 26.7 | 42.2 46.7 73.3 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Mean | 2.378 | Std Err | .191 | Std | Dev | 1.284 |
| Valid Ca | ses 45 | Missing C | ases 0 | · · · · · · · · · · | | |

APPENDIX A10

.

QTEN MOST FAVOURITE AD

19

| Value La | bel | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|--|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Frederique Clarins Par Palmer Fade Triumph Da Outspan gra Ferre Frage | ris eCream ily apefruit rance | 1 2 3 4 5 6 9 | 11 5 3 5 14 1 6 | 24.4 11.1 6.7 11.1 31.1 2.2 13.3 | 28.2 12.8 7.7 12.8 35.9 2.6 MISSING | 28.2 41.0 48.7 61.5 97.4 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Mode | 5.000 | | | | | |

8

Valid Cases 39 Missing Cases 6

QELEVEN LEAST FAVOURITE AD

| Value Label | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|---|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| Frederique Palmer FadeCream Outspan grapefruit Ferre Fragrance | 1 3 5 6 9 | 1 4 6 28 6 | 2.2 8.9 13.3 62.2 13.3 | 2.6 10.3 15.4 71.8 MISSING | 2.6 12.8 28.2 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| and the second se | | | | | |

Mode 6.000

Valid Cases 39 Missing Cases 6

APPENDIX A12

QTWELVE MOST STRIKING AD

| Value Labe | el | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|--------------|---------|-------|-----------|---------|------------------|----------------|
| Frederique | | 1 | 6 | 13 3 | 15 0 | 15 0 |
| Palmer FadeC | Cream | 3 | 2 | 4.4 | 5.3 | 21 1 |
| Triumph Dail | -у | 4 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.6 | 23.7 |
| Outspan grap | pefruit | 5 | 3 | 6.7 | 7.9 | 31.6 |
| Ferre Fragra | ance | 6 | 26 | 57.8 | 68.4 | 100.0 |
| | | 9 | 7 | 15.6 | MISSING | 1.2.2.2.2.1 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Mode | 6.000 | | | | | |

Valid Cases 38

Missing Cases 7

APPENDIX B1-a

| ADCOG1 | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------|------------|----------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | | | | Valid | Cum |
| Value Label | | Value H | requency | Percent | Percent | Percent |
| | | 1.75 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | . 4.4 |
| | | 2.00 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 6.7 |
| | | 2.25 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 11.1 |
| | | 2.50 | 3 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 17.8 |
| | | 2.75 | 4 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 26.7 |
| | | 3.00 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 37.8 |
| | | 3.25 | 6 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 51.1 |
| | | 3.50 | 8 | 17.8 | 17.8 | 68.9 |
| 4 | | 3.75 | 8 | 17.8 | 17.8 | 86.7 |
| | | 4.00 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 97.8 |
| | | 4.25 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | | |
| Mean | 3.228 | | | | | |
| Valid Cases | 45 | Missing Ca | ses 0 | | | |

APPENDIX B1-b

| | | | | | Valid | Cum |
|----------|-------|-------|---------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Value La | abel | Value | Frequency | Percent | Percent | Percent |
| | | 1.50 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| | | 2.00 | 7 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 17.8 |
| | | 2.25 | 3 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 24.4 |
| | | 2.75 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 35.6 |
| | | 3.00 | 10 | 22.2 | 22.2 | 57.8 |
| | | 3.25 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 68.9 |
| | | 3.50 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 80.0 |
| | | 3.75 | 7 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 95.6 |
| | | 4.00 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 97.8 |
| | | 4.25 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| 9 | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Mean | 2.983 | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | |
| | | | | 4 | | |

÷.

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

AROUSAL1

APPENDIX B1-c

QONE9

| Value | e Labe | el | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|-------|--------|-------|------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | 1 2 3 4 | 5 10 16 14 | 11.1 22.2 35.6 31.1 | 11.1 22.2 35.6 31.1 | 11.1 33.3 68.9 100.0 |
| | | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Mean | * | 2.867 | | | | | |

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

APPENDIX B1-d

in the state of the

| QONE10 | | | | | | |
|------------|-------|-------|-----------|---------|------------------|----------------|
| Value Labe | el. | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
| | | 1 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.4 |
| | | 2 | 10 | 22.2 | 22.2 | 26.7 |
| | | 3 | 26 | 57.8 | 57.8 | 84.4 |
| | | 4 | 7 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Voon | 2 944 | | | | | |

Mean 2.844

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases

.

APPENDIX B1-e

QONE7

| Valu | e Label | | Value H | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|-------|---------|-------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | 2 3 4 5 | 6 15 21 3 | 13.3 33.3 46.7 6.7 | 13.3 33.3 46.7 6.7 | 13.3 46.7 93.3 100.0 |
| Mean | | 3.467 | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Valid | Cases | 45 | Missing Cas | ses O | | | |

APPENDIX B2-a

| Value La | abel | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|----------|-------|-------|-----------|---------|------------------|----------------|
| | | 1.25 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| | | 2.00 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 4.4 |
| | | 2.25 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 6.7 |
| | | 2.50 | 4 | 8.9 | 8.9 . | 15.6 |
| | | 2.75 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 26.7 |
| | | 3.00 | 13 | 28.9 | 28.9 | 55 6 |
| | | 3.25 | 6 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 68 9 |
| | | 3.50 | 8 | 17.8 | 17.8 | 86.7 |
| a., | | 3.75 | 4 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 95.6 |
| | | 4.00 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 100.0 |
| - | | TOTAL | . 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Mean | 3.083 | | **** | | | 1 |
| | | | | | | |

Valid Cases 45

Missing Cases 0

APPENDIX B2-b

AROUSAL2

ADCOG2

| Value Label | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|-------------|-------|-----------|---------|------------------|----------------|
| | 1.75 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| | 2.00 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 6.7 |
| | 2.25 | 6 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 20.0 |
| | 2.50 | 6 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 33.3 |
| | 2.75 | 8 | 17.8 | 17.8 | 51.1 |
| | 3.00 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 55.6 |
| | 3.25 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 66.7 |
| | 3.50 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 77.8 |
| | 3.75 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 88.9 |
| | 4.00 | 4 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 97.8 |
| | 4.25 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | | | | |

Mean

3.000

APPENDIX B2-c

| Valid Cases QTWO9 | 45 | Missing C | ases O | | | |
|----------------------|-----|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Value Label | | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
| | | 1 2 3 4 5 | 2 8 19 14 2 | 4.4 17.8 42.2 31.1 4.4 | 4.4 17.8 42.2 31.1 4.4 | 4.4 22.2 64.4 95.6 100.0 |
| Mean | 122 | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Valid Cases | 45 | Missing Ca | ases 0 | ÷ | | |

APPENDIX B2-d

QTWO10

| Value L | abel | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|---------|-------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| e i | ÷ | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 9 26 8 1 | 2.2 20.0 57.8 17.8 2.2 | 2.2 20.0 57.8 17.8 2.2 | 2.2 22.2 80.0 97.8 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Mean | 2.978 | | | | | |

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

.

APPENDIX B2-e

| e Label | | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|---------|---------|----------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | | 1 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| | | 2 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 13.3 |
| | | 3 | 20 | 44.4 | 44.4 | 57.8 |
| | | 4 | 13 | 28.9 | 28.9 | 86.7 |
| | | 5 | 6 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | | | | | |
| | 3.400 | | | | | |
| Cases | 45 | Missing Ca | ases 0 | | | |
| | | | | | | **.010 |
| | 2 Label | Label 3.400 Cases 45 | 2 Label Value 1 2 3 4 5 TOTAL 3.400 Cases 45 Missing Ca | Value Frequency Value Frequency Value Frequency Value Frequency Value Frequency Value Frequency Solution Value Frequency Solution Solution Value Frequency Solution Value F | Yalue Frequency Percent 1 1 2.2 2 5 11.1 3 20 44.4 4 13 28.9 5 6 13.3 TOTAL 45 3.400 3.400 | Label Value Frequency Percent Valid 1 1 2.2 2.2 2 5 11.1 11.1 3 20 44.4 44.4 4 13 28.9 28.9 5 6 13.3 13.3 TOTAL 45 100.0 100.0 3.400 3.400 Missing Cases 0 |

APPENDIX B3-a

ADCOG3

QTWO7

| Value Label | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|-------------|-------|-----------|---------|------------------|----------------|
| | 1.50 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| | 1.75 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 4.4 |
| | 2.00 | 3 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 11.1 |
| | 2.25 | 7 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 26.7 |
| | 2.50 | 13 | 28.9 | 28.9 | 55.6 |
| | 2.75 | 7 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 71.1 |
| | 3.00 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 82.2 |
| | 3.25 | 3 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 88.9 |
| | 3.50 | 3 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 95.6 |
| | 4.00 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Mean 2.667

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

APPENDIX B3-b

| Value Label | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|-------------|-------|-----------|---------|------------------|----------------|
| | 1.25 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| | 1.75 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 6.7 |
| | 2.00 | 14 | 31.1 | 31.1 | 37.8 |
| | 2.25 | 9 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 57.8 |
| | 2.50 | 3 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 64 4 |
| | 2.75 | 8 | 17.8 | 17.8 | 82 2 |
| | 3.00 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 84 4 |
| | 3.25 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 88 9 |
| | 3.50 | 4 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 97.8 |
| | 3.75 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| | TOTAL | | 100.0- | 100.0 | - |
| Noan 2 430 | | | | | |

Mean 2.439

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

APPENDIX B3-c

| QTHREE9 | |
|---------|--|
|---------|--|

AROUSAL3

| Value Label | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|-------------|-------|-----------|---------|------------------|----------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.4 |
| | 2 | - 22 | 48.9 | 48.9 | 53.3 |
| | 3 | 19 | 42.2 | 42.2 | 95.6 |
| | 4 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | | | | |

Mean 2.467

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

51

QTHREE10

| Value Labe | L | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|-------------|-------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | 4 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 2 12 21 9 | 4.4 26.7 46.7 20.0 | 4.4 26.7 46.7 20.0 | 4.4 31.1 77.8 97.8 |
| Mean | 2.889 | TOTAL | <u>-</u> 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Valid Cases | 45 | Missing Ca | ses O | | | |

APPENDIX B3-e

QTHREE7

.

| Value Label | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|-------------|-------|-----------|---------|------------------|----------------|
| | 1 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| | 2 | 8 | 17.8 | 17.8 | 20.0 |
| | 3 | 18 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 60.0 |
| | 4 | 16 | 35.6 | 35.6 | 95.6 |
| | 5 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | .45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | | | | |

4

Mean 3.222

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

APPENDIX B4-a

| | AI | C | 0 | G | 4 |
|--|----|---|---|---|---|
|--|----|---|---|---|---|

| Value Label | L) | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|-------------|-------|------------|-----------|---------|--|----------------|
| | | 2.25 | 3 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.7 |
| | | 2.50 | 3 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 13.3 |
| | | 2.75 | 6 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 26.7 |
| | | 3.00 | 8 | 17.8 | 17.8 | 44 4 |
| | | 3.25 | 9 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 64 4 |
| | | 3.50 | 10 | 22.2 | 22.2 | 86 7 |
| | | 3.75 | 4 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 95 6 |
| a. | | 4.00 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 97.8 |
| | | 4.25 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Mean | 3.161 | | | | ************************************** | |
| valid Cases | 45 | Missing Ca | ses O | | | |

AROUSAL4

APPENDIX B4-b

| Value Labe | L | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|-------------|-------|------------|-----------|---------|------------------|----------------|
| | | 1.50 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| | | 1.75 | 1 / | 2.2 | 2.2 | 4 4 |
| | | 2.00 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 8 9 |
| | | 2.25 | 3 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 15 6 |
| | | 2.50 | 10 | 22.2 | 22.2 | 37 8 |
| | | 2.75 | 8 | 17.8 | 17.8 | 55 6 |
| | | 3.00 | 7 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 71 1 |
| | | 3.25 | 3 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 77 8 |
| | | 3.50 | 4 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 86.7 |
| | | 3.75 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 97.8 |
| | | 4.00 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Mean | 2.856 | | 1 | | | |
| Valid Cases | 45 | Missing Ca | ses 0 | | | |

1

APPENDIX B4-c

| QFOUR9 | |
|--------|--|
|--------|--|

| Value Label | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|-------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| | 2 3 4 5 | 3 16 23 3 | 6.7 35.6 51.1 6.7 | 6.7 35.6 51.1 6.7 | 6.7 42.2 93.3 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

÷,

Mean 3.578

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

QFOUR10

| Value La | abel | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|----------|-------|------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| 4 | | 2 3 4 5 | 4 24 14 3 | 8.9 53.3 31.1 6.7 | 8.9 53.3 31.1 6.7 | 8.9 62.2 93.3 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Mean | 3.356 | | | | | |

APPENDIX B4-d

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

APPENDIX B4-e QFOUR7 Valid Cum Value Label Value Frequency Percent Percent Percent 11.111.111.140.040.051.135.635.686.713.313.3100.0 2 5 3 18 16 4 5 6 --------------TOTAL 45 100.0 100.0 Mean 3.511 . Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0 APPENDIX B5-a ADCOG5 Valid Cum Value Tabel

| value L | abel | Value | Frequency | Percent | Percent | Percent |
|---------|-------|-------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | 1.75 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.4 |
| | | 2.00 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 6.7 |
| | | 2.25 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 11.1 |
| | | 2.50 | 7 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 26.7 |
| | | 2.75 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 37.8 |
| | | 3.00 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 48.9 |
| | | 3.25 | 9 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 68.9 |
| | | 3.50 | 6 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 82.2 |
| | | 3.75 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 93.3 |
| | | 4.00 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 97.8 |
| | | 4.50 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Mean | 3.061 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

1

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

| | | APPEN | DIX B5-b | | | |
|-------------|------|-------------|-----------------|---------|---------|---------|
| AROUSAL5 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Valid | Cum |
| Value Label | | Value | Frequency | Percent | Percent | Percent |
| | | 2.25 | 3 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.7 |
| | | 2.50 | 7 | 15 6 | 15 6 | 22.2 |
| | | 2 75 | 3 | 6.7 | 5.0 | 22.2 |
| | | 3 00 | 5 | 11 1 | 11 1 | 20.9 |
| | | 3 25 | 7 | 15 6 | 15 6 | 40.0 |
| | | 3 50 | 7 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 55.0 |
| | | 3.50 | 2 | 15.0 | 15.6 | 71.1 |
| | | 3.75 | 3 | 17.0 | 6.7 | 77.8 |
| | | 4.00 | 0 | 17.8 | 17.8 | 95.6 |
| | | 4.25 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Mean 3 | .256 | 900 | • • • • • • • • | | | |
| Valid Cases | 45 | Missing C | ases O | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | APPE | NDIX B5-c | | | |
| QFIVE9 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Valid | Cum |
| Value Label | | Value | Frequency | Percent | Percent | Percent |
| | | 2 | 13 | 28.9 | 28.9 | 28.9 |
| | | 3 | 10 | 22.2 | 22.2 | 51.1 |
| | | 4 | 19 | 42.2 | 42.2 | 93.3 |
| | | 5 | 3 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100 0 | 100 0 | |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Mean 3 | .267 | | | | | |

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

APPENDIX B5-d

| OF | T | VF | 1 | 0 |
|----|---|------|---|---|
| 2- | - | A TO | - | v |

| Value Label | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|-------------|-------|-----------|---------|------------------|----------------|
| | 2 | 12 | 26.7 | 26.7 | 26.7 |
| | 3 | 23 | 51.1 | 51.1 | 77.8 |
| | 4 | 10 | 22.2 | 22.2 | 100.0 |
| | | | | | |
| + | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | | | | |

Mean 2.956

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

QFIVE7

| Value Label | | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|-------------|---|-------|-----------|---------|------------------|----------------|
| e • 1 | 7 | 2 | 9 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |
| | | 3 | 15 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 53.3 |
| | | 4 | 16 | 35.6 | 35.6 | 88.9 |
| | | 5 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | | | | | |

Mean 3.378

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

| ADCOG6 | APPEI | NDIX B6-a | | | |
|---------------|----------------|-----------|---------|------------------|----------------|
| Value Label | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
| | 1.00 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.4 |
| | 1.50 | 3 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 11.1 |
| *1 | 1.75 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 15.6 |
| | 2.00 | 4 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 24.4 |
| | 2.25 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 35.6 |
| | 2.50 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 46.7 |
| | 2.75 | 8 | 17.8 | 17.8 | 64.4 |
| | 3.00 | 4 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 73.3 |
| | 3.25 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 84.4 |
| | 3.50 | 3 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 91.1 |
| + | 3.75 | 4 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 100.0 |
| | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Mean | 2.611 | | | | |
| Valid Cases - | - 45 Missing C | ases 0 | | | |

APPENDIX B6-b

AROUSAL6

| | | | | | valid | Cum |
|-------------|-------|------------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|
| Value Label | L | Value H | Frequency | Percent | Percent | Percent |
| | | 1.25 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| | | 1.50 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 6.7 |
| | | 1.75 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 11.1 |
| | | 2.00 | 7 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 26.7 |
| | | 2.25 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 37.8 |
| | | 2.50 | 4 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 46.7 |
| | | 2.75 | 3 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 53.3 |
| | | 3.00 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 64.4 |
| | | 3.25 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 75.6 |
| | | 3.50 | 5 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 86.7 |
| | | 3.75 | 3 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 93.3 |
| | | 4.00 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 95.6 |
| | | 4.75 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 100.0 |
| * (| | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | | 4 | | | |
| Mean | 2.772 | | | ٠ | | |
| Valid Cases | 45 | Missing Ca | 0 202 | ί. | | |
| vallu cases | 45 | missing ca | 000 | | | |

APPENDIX B6-c

| Value Label | L | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|-------------|-------|-----------|-----------|-------------|------------------|----------------------|
| | | 1 | 19 18 | 42.2 | 42.2 | 42.2 |
| | | 3 4 | 5 3 | 11.1 6.7 | 11.1 6.7 | 93.3 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Mean | 1.822 | | | | | |
| Valid Cases | 45 | Missing C | ases 0 | | | |
| | | | | | ••• ••• | to the same training |
| | | APPEI | NDIX B6-d | | | |
| QSIX10 | | | | | 3 | |
| Value Labe | 1 | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
| | | 1 | 7 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 15.6 |
| | | 2 | 7 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 31.1 |
| | | 3 | 11 | 35.0 | 35.0 | 00.7 |
| | | 5 | 4 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | | | | | |

Mean 2.956

QSIX9

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

APPENDIX B6-e

QSIX7

| Value La | bel | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|----------|-------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | | 1 2 3 4 5 | 10 17 10 4 4 | 22.2 37.8 22.2 8.9 8.9 | 22.2 37.8 22.2 8.9 8.9 | 22.2 60.0 82.2 91.1 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Mean | 2.444 | | | | | |

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

APPENDIX C1

| Crosstabu. | Lation: | QFIVE Y QNINE | MAJOR | SUBJECT | | |
|------------------|--|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| QNINE-> QFIVE | Count Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct | CHINESE 1 | BIOCHEM 2 | PSYCHOLO GY 3 | BBA 4 | F |
| | 1 | 7 36.8 36.8 15.6 | - I | 8 42.1 66.7 17.8 | 4 21.1 33.3 8.9 | 4 |
| | 2- | 12 46.2 63.2 26.7 | 7.7 100.0 4.4 | 4 15.4 33.3 8.9 | 30.8 66.7 17.8 | 5 |
| | Column Total | 19 42.2 | 2 4.4 | 12 26.7 | 12 26.7 | + 10 |

servat ions 0

APPENDIX C2

| QNINE-> Co TC QTEN | Count ow Pct ol Pct ot Pct | CHINESE 1 | BIOCHEM 2 | PSYCHOLO GY 3 | BBA 4 | Row Total |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| Frederique | 1 | 4 36.4 23.5 10.3 | 3 | 5 45.5 50.0 12.8 | 2 18.2 18.2 5.1 | 11 28.2 |
| Clarins Par | 2 cis | 4 80.0 23.5 10.3 | | | 1 20.0 9.1 2.6 | 12.8 |
| Palmer Fade | 3 eCream | 2 66.7 11.8 5.1 | | 1 33.3 10.0 2.6 | | 3 7.7 |
| Triumph Dai | 4 lly | 1 20.0 5.9 2.6 | 1 20.0 100.0 2.6 | 1 20.0 10.0 2.6 | 2 40.0 18.2 5.1 | 5 12.8 |
| Outspan gra | 5 apefru | 6 42.9 35.3 15.4 | | 2 14.3 20.0 5.1 | 6 42.9 54.5 15.4 | 14 35.9 |
| Ferre Fragr | 6 ance | | | 1 100.0 10.0 2.6 | | 1 2.6 |
| C mber of Mis | olumn Total sing Ob | 17 43.6 pservation | 1 2.6 | 10 | 11 28.2 | - 39 100.0 |
APPENDIX C3

| CIUSSCADU. | Lation: E | QELEVEN BY QNINE | I LEAST MAJOR | FAVOURITE SUBJECT | AD | |
|--------------------|--|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| QNINE-> QELEVEN | Count Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct | CHINESE 1 | BIOCHEM 2 | PSYCHOLO GY 3 | BBA 4 | Row Total |
| Frederic | 1 Iue | | | | 1 100.0 9.1 2.6 | 1 2.6 |
| Palmer F | adeCream | 1 25.0 5.9 2.6 | | 2 50.0 20.0 5.1 | 1 25.0 9.1 2.6 | 4 10.3 |
| Outspan | 5 grapefru | 2 33.3 11.8 5.1 | | 4 66.7 40.0 10.3 | | 6 15.4 |
| Ferre Fra | 6 agrance | 14 50.0 82.4 35.9 | 1 3.6 100.0 2.6 | 4 14.3 40.0 10.3 | 9 32.1 81.8 23.1 | 28 71.8 |
| | Column Total | 17 43.6 | 1 2.6 | 10 25.6 | 11 28.2 | - 39 100.0 |

鲁港中文大學圖書館嚴書

6

Number of Missing Observations =

Cro

63

APPENDIX C4

| | Count | 1 | | | | |
|------------|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| I | Row Pct | CHINESE | BIOCHEM | PSYCHOLO | BBA | |
| QNINE-> C | Col Pct | 1 | 2 | GY 3 | 4 | Row |
| QTWELVE - | | - | - | | | - |
| Frederique | e T | 50.0 18.8 7.9 | | 1 16.7 10.0 2.6 | 2 33.3 18.2 5.3 | 6 15.8 |
| Palmer Fac | deCream | 2 100.0 12.5 5.3 | | 11 - 1 - 1 | • •) • • • • • • • • | 2 5.3 |
| Triumph Da | 4 aily | | | 1 100.0 10.0 2.6 | i. | 1 2.6 |
| Outspan g | 5 rapefru | | | 1 33.3 10.0 2.6 | 2 66.7 18.2 5.3 | 3 7.9 |
| Ferre Fra | 6 grance | 11 42.3 68.8 28.9 | 1 3.8 100.0 2.6 | 7 26.9 70.0 18.4 | 7 26.9 63.6 18.4 | 26 68.4 |
| | Column Total | 16 42.1 | 1 2.6 | 10 26.3 | 11 28.9 | † 38 100.0 |

Number of Missing Observations =

7

64

APPENDIX D1

Independent samples of QNINE MAJOR SUBJECT

Group 1: QNINE EQ 1 Group 2: QNINE EQ 3

t-test for: QFOUR

| | Number of Cases | Mean | Standaro Deviation | d Sta n E | indard Tror | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Group 1 Group 2 | 17 9 | 1.8824 1.3333 | .33: | 2 | .081 .167 | |
| - | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separat | e Variance E | stimate |
| F 2-Tail Value Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 2.27 .156 | 3.36 | 24 | .003 | 2.97 | 11.85 | .012 |

APPENDIX D2

Independent samples of QNINE MAJOR SUBJECT

Group 1: QNINE EQ 1 Group 2: QNINE EQ 3

t-test for: QFIVE

| | | Number of Cases | Mean | Standar Deviatio | d Sta n E | ndard Fror | |
|------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Gr | oup 1 | 19 | 1.6316 | .49 | 6 | .114 | |
| Gr | oup 2 | 12 | 1.3333 | .49 | 2 | .142 | |
| | | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separat | e Variance E | Stimate |
| F Value | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.01 | 1.000 | 1.64 | 29 | .113 | 1.64 | 23.66 | .115 |

APPENDIX D3

Independent samples of QNINE MAJOR SUBJECT

Group 1: QNINE EQ 1 Group 2: QNINE EQ 4 t-test for: QFOUR

| | | Number of Cases | Mean | Standard Deviation | d Sta n E | indard Tror | |
|-----|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|
| | Group 1 Group 2 | 17 9 Pooled | 1.8824 1.6667 Variance E | .332 .500 stimate | 2 D Separat | .081 .167 e Variance B | Stimate |
| Val | F 2-Tail lue Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 2. | .27 .156 | 1.32 | 24 | .199 | 1.17 | 11.85 | 267 - |

APPENDIX D4

Independent samples of QNINE MAJOR SUBJECT

Group 1: QNINE EQ 1 Group 2: QNINE EQ 4 t-test for: QFIVE

| | Number | | | | Standard | Standard | |
|-------|--------|----|-------|--------|-----------|----------|--|
| | | of | Cases | Mean | Deviation | Error | |
| Group | 1 | | 19 | 1.6316 | .496 | .114 | |
| Group | 2 | | 12 | 1.6667 | .492 | .142 | |

| | | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separat | e Variance I | Estimate |
|------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| F Value | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.01 | 1.000 | 19 | 29 | .849 | 19 | 23.66 | .849 |

T

66

APPENDIX D5

Independent samples of QNINE MAJOR SUBJECT

Group 1: QNINE EQ 3 Group 2: QNINE EQ 4

t-test for: QFOUR

| | | Number of Cases | Mean | Standard Deviation | Standard Error |
|-------|---|--------------------|--------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Group | 1 | 9 | 1.3333 | 500 | 165 |
| Group | 2 | 9 | 1.6667 | .500 | .167 |

.

| | | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separat | e Variance E | stimate |
|------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| F Value | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.00 | 1.000 | -1.41 | 16 | .176 | -1.41 | 16.00 | .176 |

APPENDIX D6

Independent samples of QNINE MAJOR SUBJECT

Group 1: QNINE EQ 3 Group 2: QNINE EQ 4 t-test for: QFIVE

| | | Number of Cases | Mean | Standar Deviatio | d Sta on H | andard Error | |
|------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| G: G: | roup 1 roup 2 | 12 12 | 1.3333 1.6667 | .49 | 2 | .142 .142 | |
| | | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separat | e Variance E | stimate |
| F Value | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.00 | 1.000 | -1.66 | 22 | .111 | -1 66 | 22 00 | |

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 1 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4

t-test for: ADCOG1

| | | Number of Cases | Mean | Standar Deviatio | cd Sta on E | ndard rror | |
|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| | Group 1 Group 2 | 19 12 | 3.2895 3.1250 | .61 .76 | L4 55 | .141 | |
| | | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separat | e Variance E | stimate |
| F Valu | 2-Tail e Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.5 | 5.393 | .66 | 29 | .514 | .63 | 19.77 | .537 |

14

APPENDIX E2

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 1 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4

t-test for: ADCOG2

| | Number of Cases | Mean | Standar Deviatio | n Stan | dard ror | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Group 1 Group 2 | 19 12 | 3.0658 3.2500 | .41 | .5 . | 095 123 | |
| | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separate | Variance H | Istimate |
| F 2-Tail Value Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.05 .889 | -1.19 | 29 | .243 | -1.18 | 23.07 | ,249 |

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 1 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4 t-test for: ADCOG3

| | | Number of Cases | Mean | Standar Deviatio | d Sta n E | andard Irror | |
|----------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| | Group 1 Group 2 | 19 12 | 2.7500 2.4792 | .60 .44 | 7 5 | .139 .129 | |
| | | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separat | e Variance H | Estimate |
| F Val | 2-Tail ue Prob | Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1. | 86 .297 | 1.33 | 29 | .193 | 1.43 | 28.21 | .164 |

APPENDIX E4

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 1 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4

t-test for: ADCOG4

| | Number of Cases | Mean | Standar Deviatio | d Stan n Ei | ndard rror | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Group 1 Group 2 | 19 12 | 3.0000 3.4167 | .43 | 3 | .099 | -i |
| | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separate | e Variance E | stimate |
| F 2-Tail Value Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.29 .607 | -2.48 | 29 | .019 | -2.40 | 21.27 | .025 |

Independent samples of MAJOR

| Group | 1: | MAJOR | EQ | 1 | Group | 2: | MAJOR | EO 4 |
|-------|----|-------|----|---|-------|----|-------|------|

| t-test : | for: AD | COG5 Number of Cases | Mean | Standaro Deviation | d Stan n Er | dard ror | |
|------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Gi | coup 1 coup 2 | 19 12 | 3.0395 3.1250 | .579 | | 133 191 | |
| | | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separate | Variance E | stimate |
| F Value | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.31 | .595 | 38 | . 29 | .707 | 37 | 21.19 | .717 |

APPENDIX E6

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 1 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4

t-test for: ADCOG6

| | | Number | | Standard | Standard |
|-------|---|---------|--------|-----------|----------|
| | 0 | f Cases | Mean | Deviation | Error |
| Group | 1 | 19 | 2.6579 | .791 | .182 |
| Group | 2 | 12 | 2.4583 | .698 | .201 |
| | | | | | |

Pooled Variance Estimate | Separate Variance Estimate F 2-Tail t Degrees of 2-Tail t Degrees of 2-Tail Value Prob. Value Freedom Prob. Value Freedom Prob. 1.29 .683 .71 29 .481 .74 25.75 .468

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 1 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4 t-test for: AROUSAL1

| | Number of Cases | Mean | Standar Deviation | d Star n Er | ndard ror | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Group 1 Group 2 | 19 12 | 3.0658 2.8542 | .62 | 8 | 144 210 | |
| | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separate | Variance E | stimate |
| F 2-Tail Value Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.34 .564 | .86 | 29 | .397 | .83 | 20.98 | .415 |

APPENDIX E8

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 1 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4

t-test for: AROUSAL2

| | Nu of | mber Cases | Mean | Standar Deviatio | d Stan n Er | dard ror | |
|---------------------|----------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Group Group | 1 2 | 19 12 | 3.0658 3.1667 | • 68 • 59 | 1 7 : | 156 172 | |
| | P | ooled | Variance Es | stimate | Separate | Variance E | stimate |
| F 2-Ta Value Pro | il , | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t i Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.30 .60 | 56 | 42 | 29 | .677 | 43 | 25.86 | .668 |

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 1 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4 t-test for: AROUSAL3

| | ndard rror | d Star on Er | Standar Deviatio | Mean | Number of Cases | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------|--|
| | .147 .166 | | .64 .57 | 2.5789 2.3125 | 19 12 | oup 1 oup 2 | Gr Gr | |
| Istimate | e Variance E | Separate | stimate | Variance Es | Pooled | | | |
| 2-Tail Prob. | Degrees of Freedom | t - Value | 2-Tail Prob. | Degrees of Freedom | t Value | 2-Tail Prob. | F Value | |
| .241 | 25.43 | 1.20 | .251 | 29 | 1.17 | .733 | 1.24 | |

APPENDIX E10

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 1 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4

t-test for: AROUSAL4

| | | Number of Cases | Mean | Standar Deviatio | d Sta on E | ndard rror | |
|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| | Group 1 Group 2 | 19 12 | 2.9342 2.9167 | .46 | 3 | .106 | |
| | | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separat | e Variance E | stimate |
| F Valu | 2-Tai e Prob | l t • Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 2.4 | 6.08 | 7 .08 | 29 | .935 | .07 | 16.70 | .941 |

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 1 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4

t-test for: AROUSAL5

| | | N | umber | | Standard | Standard |
|-------|---|----|-------|--------|-----------|----------|
| | | of | Cases | Mean | Deviation | Error |
| Group | 1 | | 19 | 3.1842 | .655 | .150 |
| Group | 2 | | 12 | 3.4583 | .509 | .147 |

| | Pooled | Variance Es | stimate | Separat | e Variance | Estimate |
|-------------------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| F 2-Tail Value Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.66 .396 | -1.23 | 29 | .228 | -1.30 | 27.59 | .203 |

APPENDIX E12

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4 Group 1: MAJOR EQ 1 t-test for: AROUSAL6 Standard Standard Number of Cases Mean Deviation Error .834 Group 1 19 2.5789 .191 2.6250 .787 12 Group 2 .227 Pooled Variance Estimate | Separate Variance Estimate t Degrees of 2-Tail Degrees of 2-Tail F 2-Tail t Value Freedom Prob. Value Prob. Value Freedom Prob. -.15 . -.16 .878 29 .879 24.57 1.12 .870

Independent samples of MAJOR

| Group 1: MAJOR | EQ 1 | Group | p 2: MAJO | DR EQ 3 | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| t-test for: ADO | Number of Cases | Mean | Standaro Deviation | d Stan | ndard rror | |
| Group 1 Group 2 | 19 12 | 3.2895 3.3333 | .614 | 4 | .141 .152 | |
| | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separat | e Variance E | stimate |
| F 2-Tail Value Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.36 .610 | 20 | 29 | .840 | 21 | 26.22 | .834 |

APPENDIX E14

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 1 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 3

t-test for: ADCOG2

| | Number of Cases | Mean | Standard Deviation | l Sta n E | ndard rror | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Group 1 Group 2 | 19 12 | 3.0658 2.9792 | .419 | 5 | .095 .223 | |
| | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separat | e Variance E | stimate |
| F 2-Tail Value Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 3.46 .019 | .41 | 29 | .687 | .36 | 15.08 | .726 |

Independent samples of MAJOR APPENDIX E15

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 1 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 3

t-test for: ADCOG3

| | | Nu | mber | | Standard | Standard Error |
|-------|---|----|-------|--------|-----------|-------------------|
| | | of | Cases | Mean | Deviation | |
| Group | 1 | 3 | 19 | 2.7500 | 607 | 1.0.0 |
| Group | 2 | 3 | 12 | 2.6875 | .513 | .139 |

| | | Pooled | Variance Es | stimate | Separate | e Variance H | Estimate |
|-------|-----------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------------|----------|-----------------------|----------|
| Value | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail |
| 1.40 | .577 | .30 | 29 | .769 | .31 | 26.43 | 761 |

APPENDIX E16

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 1 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 3

t-test for: ADCOG4

| | Number of Cases | Mean | Standar Deviatio | d Sta | ndard rror | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Group 1 Group 2 | 19 12 | 3.0000 3.1875 | .43 .42 | 3 | .099 .124 | |
| | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separat | e Variance E | stimate |
| F 2-Tail Value Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.02 1.000 | -1.18 | 29 | .248 | -1.18 | 23.75 | .249 |

Independent samples of MAJOR

| Group 1: MAJO | R EQ 1 | Gro | up 2: MA | JOR EQ | 3 | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| t-test for: A | DCOG5 | | | | | |
| | Number of Cases | Mean | Standar Deviatio | d Stan | ndard rror | |
| Group 1 Group 2 | 19 12 | 3.0395 3.1042 | .57 | 9 7 | .133 .178 | |
| | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separate | e Variance | Estimate |
| F 2-Tail Value Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.13 .784 | 30 | 29 | .770 | 29 | 22.41 | .774 |

APPENDIX E18

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 1 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 3 t-test for: ADCOG6

| | | Number of Cases | Mean | Standar Deviatio | d Sta n E | ndard rror | |
|------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Ga Ga | coup 1 coup 2 | 19 12 | 2.6579 2.7708 | .79 .68 | 1 6 | .182 .198 | |
| | | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separat | e Variance i | Estimate |
| F Value | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.33 | .641 | 41 | 29 | .687 | 42 | 26.02 | .678 |

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 1 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 3

t-test for: AROUSAL1

| | ndard rror | d Stan | Standar Deviatio | Mean | Number of Cases | | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|----------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------|
| | .144 .212 | 8 4 | .62 .73 | 3.0658 3.0208 | 19 12 | oup 1 oup 2 | Gr Gr |
| Estimate | e Variance | Separate | stimate | Variance E | Pooled | | |
| f-2-Tail Prob. | - Degrees -of Freedom | Value | 2-Tail Prob. | Degrees of Freedom | t Value | 2-Tail- Prob. | Value |
| .862 | 20.80 | .18 | .857 | 29 | .18 | .538 | 1.37 |

APPENDIX E20

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 1 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 3

t-test for: AROUSAL2

| | | Number of Cases | Mean | Standaro Deviation | d Star n Er | ndard cror | |
|------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Gi | oup 1 | 19 | 3.0658 | .68 | 1. | 156 | |
| Gı | coup 2 | 12 . | 2.6667 | .58 | 7. | .169 | |
| | | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separate | e Variance E | stimate |
| F Value | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.35 | .625 | 1.67 | 29 | .105 | 1.73 | 26.12 | .095 |

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 1 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 3 t-test for: AROUSAL3

| | indard Tror | d Stan n Er | Standar Deviatio | Mean | Number of Cases | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------|
| | .147 .072 | 0 9 : | .64 | 2.5789 2.2292 | 19 12 | coup 1 coup 2 | G: G: |
| Estimate | e Variance H | Separate | stimate | Variance E | Pooled | | |
| f 2-Tail Prob. | Degrees of Freedom | t Value | 2-Tail Prob. | Degrees of Freedom | t Value | 2-Tail Prob. | F Value |
| 042 | 25.28 | 2.14 | .082 | 29 | 1.80 | .003 | 6.61 |

APPENDIX E22

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 1 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 3

t-test for: AROUSAL4

| Number | | | | Standard | Standard | |
|---------|----|-------|--------|-----------|----------|--|
| | of | Cases | Mean | Deviation | Error | |
| Group 1 | | 19 | 2.9342 | .463 | .106 | |
| Group 2 | | 12 | 2.6042 | .482 | .139 | |

| | | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separate Variance Estimate | | |
|------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| F Value | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.09 | .847 | 1.90 | 29 | .067 | 1.89 | 22.81 | .072 |

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 1 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 3 t-test for: AROUSAL5

| | Number of Cases | Mean | Standard Deviation | l Standard Error | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| Group 1 Group 2 | 19 12 | 3.1842 3.1042 | .655 | .150 .167 | |
| | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separate Varianc | e Estimate |
| F 2-Tail Value Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Degrees Value Freedo | of 2-Tail m Prob. |
| 1.28 .687 | .35 | 29 | .732 | .36 25.73 | .725 |

APPENDIX E24

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 1 . Group 2: MAJOR EQ 3 t-test for: AROUSAL6

| | | N of | umber Cases | Mean | Standard Deviation | l Star 1 Er | ndard ror | |
|------------|----------------|---------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Gr Gr | oup 1 oup 2 | | 19 12 | 2.5789 2.9792 | .834 .607 | ; | 191 175 | |
| | | 1 | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separate | e Variance | Estimate |
| F Value | 2-Tai Prob | 1 | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.88 | .28 | 85 | -1.44 | 29 | .162 | -1.54 | 28.28 | .134 |

79

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 3 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4

t-test for: ADCOG1

| | Number of Cases | Mean | Standard Deviation | i Sta n E | ndard rror | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Group 1 Group 2 | 12 12 | 3.3333 3.1250 | .526 | 5 | .152 | |
| | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separat | e Variance E | stimate |
| F 2-Tail Value- Prob | t Value | Degrees of Freedom - | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 2.12 .229 | .78 | 22 | .445 | .78 | 19.50 | .446 |

APPENDIX E26

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 3 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4

t-test for: ADCOG2

| | N | umber | | Standard | Standard |
|---------|----|-------|--------|-----------|----------|
| | of | Cases | Mean | Deviation | Error |
| Group 1 | | 12 | 2.9792 | .772 | .223 |
| Group 2 | | 12 | 3.2500 | .426 | .123 |

| | | Pooled Variance Estimate | | | Separate Variance Estimate | | |
|------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| F Value | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 3.28 | .061 | -1.06 | 22 | .299 | -1.06 | 17.14 | .302 |

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 3 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4

t-test for: ADCOG3

| ÷ | | Number of Cases | Mean | Standar Deviatio | d Star n Er | ndard rror | |
|------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| | roup 1 roup 2 | 12 12 | 2.6875 2.4792 | .51 .44 | 3 | .148 .129 | |
| | | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separate | e Variance | Estimate |
| F Value | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.32 | .649 | 1,06 | 22 | .299 | 1.06 | 21.58 | .300 |

APPENDIX E28

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 3 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4

t-test for: ADCOG4

| | | Number of Cases | Mean | Standard Deviation | d Stan n Ei | ndard rror | |
|------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Gi | roup 1 roup 2 | 12 12 | 3.1875 | . 42 | 8 | .124 | |
| | | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separate | e Variance E | stimate |
| F Value | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.32 | .651 | -1.22 | 22 | .237 | -1.22 | 21.58 | .237 |

.

.

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 3 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4

t-test for: ADCOG5

| | | Number of Cases | Mean | Standar Deviatio | d Sta n E | andard Error | |
|------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| G: G: | roup 1 roup 2 | 12 12 | 3.1042 3.1250 | .61 | 7 1 | .178 .191 | |
| | | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separat | e Variance E | stimate |
| F Value | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.15 | .820 | 08 | 22 | .937 | 08 | 21.89 | .937 |

APPENDIX E30

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 3 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4

.

t-test for: ADCOG6

| | | N | umber | | Standard | Standard | |
|-------|---|----|-------|--------|-----------|----------|--|
| | | of | Cases | Mean | Deviation | Error | |
| Group | 1 | | 12 | 2.7708 | .686 | .198 | |
| Group | 2 | | 12 | 2.4583 | .698 | .201 | |

| | | Pooled Variance Estimate | | | Separate Variance Estimat | | |
|------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| F Value | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.03 | .958 | 1.11 | 22 | .281 | 1.11 | 21.99 | .281 |

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 3 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4

t-test for: AROUSAL1

| | N of | umber Cases | Mean | Standard Deviation | Stand Eri | lard for | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Grou | 1 1 1 2 2 | 12 12 | 3.0208 2.8542 | .734 | | 212 210 | |
| | 1 | Pooled Va | ariance Es | stimate | Separate | Variance E | stimate |
| F 2- Value 1 | -Tail Prob. | t De Value | egrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t I Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.02 | .972 | .56 | 22 | .582 | .56 | 22.00 | .582 |

APPENDIX E32

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 3 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4 t-test for: AROUSAL2

| | | Number of Cases | Mean | Standar Deviatio | d Sta n E | ndard rror | |
|------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Gi | oup 1 | 12 | 2.6667 | .58 | 7 | .169 | |
| Gi | coup 2 | 12 | 3.1667 | .59 | 7 | .172 | |
| | | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separat | e Variance 1 | Estimate |
| F Value | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 1.03 | .958 | -2.07 | 22 | .050 | -2.07 | 21.99 | .050 |

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 3 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4 t-test for: AROUSAL3

| | | of Cases | Mean | Standaro Deviation | d Sta n E | ndard rror | - |
|-------|--------|----------|------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------|---------|
| Gi | roup 1 | 12 | 2.2292 | .249 | 9 | .072 | |
| Gi | roup 2 | 12 | 2.3125 | .57 | 5 | .166 | |
| | 1 | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separat | e Variance E | Stimate |
| F | 2-Tail | t | Degrees of | 2-Tail | t | Degrees of | 2-Tail |
| Value | Prob. | Value | Freedom- | Prob. | Value | Freedom | Prob. |
| 5.34 | .010 | 46 | 22 | .650 | 46 | 14.98 | .652 |

APPENDIX E34

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 3 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4 t-test for: AROUSAL4

| | | Number of Cases | Mean | Standaro Deviation | d Sta n E | indard Irror | |
|------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Gi | coup 1 | 12 | 2.6042 | .48 | 2 | .139 | |
| Group 2 | | 12 | 2.9167 | .72 | 6 | .209 | |
| | | Pooled | Variance E | stimate | Separat | e Variance E | stimate |
| F Value | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
| 2.26 | .191 | -1.24 | 22 | .227 | -1.24 | 19.13 | .229 |

Independent samples of MAJOR

| Group | 1: | MAJOR | EQ 3 | Group 2: | MAJOR | EQ 4 |
|--------|----|----------|------|----------|-------|------|
| t-test | fo | r: AROUS | SALS | | | |

* *

| | indard Error | n Er | Standar Deviatio | Mean | of Cases | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|------------|------------------|-------------|
| | .167 .147 | 9. | . 57 | 3.1042 3.4583 | 12 12 | coup 1 coup 2 | Gr Gr |
| Estimate | e Variance H | Separate | stimate | Variance E | Pooled | | |
| 2-Tail Prob. | Degrees of Freedom | t Value | 2-Tail Prob. | Degrees of Freedom | t Value | 2-Tail Prob. | F -Value |
| .126 | 21.65 | -1.59 | .126 | 22 | -1.59 | .680 | 1.29 |

APPENDIX E36

Independent samples of MAJOR

Group 1: MAJOR EQ 3 Group 2: MAJOR EQ 4

t-test for: AROUSAL6

| | | N | umber | | Standard | Standard | |
|-------|---|----|-------|--------|-----------|----------|--|
| | | of | Cases | Mean | Deviation | Error | |
| Group | 1 | | 12 | 2.9792 | .607 | .175 | |
| Group | 2 | | 12 | 2.6250 | .787 | .227 | |

| | | Pooled Variance Estimate | | | Separate Variance Estimate | | | |
|------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--|
| F Value | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | |
| 1.68 | .403 | 1.23 | 22 | .230 | 1.23 | 20.67 | .231 | |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Alice E. Courtney, Thomas W. Whipple. <u>Sex Stereotyping in</u> <u>Advertising</u>. Lexington, Massachusetts, Toronto: LexingtonBooks, 1983.

Periodicals

George Horsley Smith and Rayme Engel, "Influence of a Female Model on Perceived Characteristics of an Automobile," <u>Proceedings of the 76th Annual Convention of the American</u> <u>Psychological Association</u>, 1968, pp.681-682.

Major Steadman, "How Sexy Illustrations Affect Brand Recall," Journal of Advertising Research, 9 (February 1969):15-19.

M. Wayne Alexander and Ben Judd, Jr., "Do Nudes in Ads Enhance Brand Recall?", <u>Journal of Advertising Research</u> 18 (February 1978):47-50.

Robert A. Peterson and Roger A. Kerin, "The Female Role in Advertisements: Some Experimental Evidence," <u>Journal of</u> <u>Marketing</u> 41 (October 1977):59-63.

Donald Sciglimpaglia, Michael A. Belch, and Richard F. Cain, Jr., "Demographic and Cognitive Factors Influencing Viewers' Evaluation of 'Sexy' Advertisements," in <u>Advances in Consumer</u> <u>Research</u>, ed.W.Wilkie (Ann Arbor: Association for Consumer Research, 1979), pp.62-65.

Michael S. LaTour, "Female Nudity in Print Advertising: An Analysis of Gender Differences in Arousal and Ad Response", <u>Psychology and Marketing</u> 7(1): 65-81(Spring 1990).

Michael S. LaTour, Robert E. Pitts, David C. Snook-Luther, "Female Nudity, Arousal, and Ad Response: An Experimental Investigation", Journal of Advertising, 19, No.4, 51-62.

Interview

Leung, Doris : Senior Writer in creative department of DDB. 17 February, 1992.

Tsang, Janice : Writer in creative department of DMB 18 February, 1992. SURVEY ON PERCEPTIONS TO ADS IN WOMEN'S MAGAZINE WITH EXPLICIT FEMALE NUDITY (Including partial nudity)

1. How often do you read any women's magazine (not necessary buy it) ?

- a. six or more times per year
- b. three to five times per year
 - c. zero to two times per year

2. In the women's magazine you read, have you come across some female product advertisement with a female nude (partially or fully) model ?

- a. Yes
- b. No (Skip question 3 and 4)

3. What is/are-the type(s) of product ads in which there is female nudity?

- a. Personal beauty (product or service)
- b. Personal hygiene
- c. Fragrance
- d. Clothing (including inner clothing)
- e. Other (please specify)

4. Do you feel that it may be necessary to use such nude models in those ad(s) you have seen ?

a. Yes b. No

5. Do you feel that it may be necessary to use nude model(s) in the ads of certain female products ?

a. Yes

b. No (skip question 6)

6. In what kinds of female products' ads do you think that a female model with nudity is necessary ?

- a. Personal beauty (product or service)
- b. Personal hygiene
- c. Fragrance
- d. Clothing (including inner clothing)
- e. Other (please specify)

7. In what kinds of female products' ads do you think that a female model with nudity is acceptable ?

- a. Personal beauty (product or service)
- b. Personal hygiene
- c. Fragrance
- d. Clothing (including inner clothing)
- e. Other (please specify)

8. What do you think is the purpose of using a female model with nudity in a female product ad ?

- a. Catch the attention of the reader
- b. Increase the brand recall
- c. Create a more favourable attitude
- d. Feel more aroused by the ads
- e. Other (please specify)

9. What is your major ?

The following series of ads are excerpted from some female magazines. For each ad, you are invited to choose the appropriate choice for each item by circling.

eauty is only skin deep." "WRONG beauty is Body, Mind and Spirit deep"

t Frederique we know that beauty begins on the inside and that the holistic approach to natural beauty is the most meaningful and effective.

Beauty care at Frederique combines using natural ingredients such as Phytomer, from France, in conjunction with modern scientific methods. Our salon offers a full range of treatments to improve your body shape, skin tone and the way you feel about yourself.

olistic

lealth

eauty

Care.

entre





Youthful body beauty, firm contours.

Firm contours. Silky-smooth skin. Now, the key to a beautiful silhouette is not only a gift from nature. Clarins, the leading skin care company in France, offers superb treatments to help combat slackening of the skin and to help minimize "sponginess". Summertime body beauty is at hand...with Clarins.

mproved contours, minimized "sponginess".

Winner of the 1989 Prix d'Excellence de la Beauté awarded by European journalists and beauty editors, Clarins Body Shaping Gel Concentrate refines contours, firms and tightens whilst acting to progressively reduce "sponginess". Refreshing and discreetly fragranced, this brilliant body treatment provides the pleasure of superb skin care combined with toned, silky-smooth skin.







For information and stockists write to: Clarins (UK) Limited, Dept BIO, 4 Queen Street, Mayfair, London WIX Clarins is also available in North and South Ireland.

xfoliate for lasting body beauty.

LARINE

Gommage

Exfoliant

pour une peau neuve

Exfoliating

Body-Scrub

The essential initial treatment for firm, youthful-looking body beauty: Clarins Exfoliating Body Scrub contains spheric polishing grains which gently lift dead surface cells from the epidermis. Skin is immediately smoother and softer and glows with healthy radiance. Use once or twice a week all over the body, including the bust, to prepare the skin for maximum effectiveness from complementary body treatment products.

Ad 1 : Frederique French Beauty Salon

| * | Strongly Disagree | e Disagre | Agree | Strongly Agree | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|----------|
| a) The ad looks active | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b) The ad looks distinctive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c) The ad looks inappropriate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d) The ad looks energetic | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e) The ad looks lively | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| f) The ad looks vigorous | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| g) The ad looks offensive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| h) The ad looks interesting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| i) The ad looks healthy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| j) The ad looks intimate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Ad 2 : Clarins Paris (Skin care pro | oduct) | | | | ÷ |
| | Strongly | Disagra | Noutral | 1 | Strongly |

| | Disagre | e D | Agree | Agree | | |
|-------------------------------|---------|-----|-------|-------|-----|---|
| a) The ad looks active | 1 | | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b) The ad looks distinctive | 1 | | 2 | 3 | . 4 | 5 |
| c) The ad looks inappropriate | 1 | | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d) The ad looks energetic | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e) The ad looks lively | 1 | | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| f) The ad looks vigorous | 1 | | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| g) The ad looks offensive | 1 | | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| h) The ad looks interesting | 1 | | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| i) The ad looks healthy | 1 | | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| j) The ad looks intimate | 1 | | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | | | | | | |





| Ad 3 : Palmer's Fadecream(Skin car | e product) Strongly Disagree | Disagree | e Neutra | l Agree | Strongly Agree |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------|----------|---------|-------------------|
| a) The ad looks active | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b) The ad looks distinctive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c) The ad looks inappropriate | 1 | 2 | 3 | - 4 | 5 |
| d) The ad looks energetic | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e) The ad looks lively | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| f) The ad looks vigorous | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| g) The ad looks offensive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| h) The ad looks interesting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| i) The ad looks healthy | 1 | - 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| j) The ad looks intimate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Ad 4 : Triumph Daily | Strongly Disagree | e Disagre | e Neutra | l Agree | Strongly Agree |
| a) The ad looks active | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b) The ad looks distinctive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c) The ad looks inappropriate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d) The ad looks energetic | 1 | • 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e) The ad looks lively | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| f) The ad looks vigorous | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| g) The ad looks offensive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| h) The ad looks interesting | 1 | 2 | 3 | . 4 | 5 |
| i) The ad looks healthy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| j) The ad looks intimate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

DUTSPAN. THE GREAT TASTE DF GRAPEFRUIT.

Cool, refreshing, full of flavour. Wholesome, atural grapefruit – the colour of the sun. 'uts the rest in the shade.

outspar

RTRAGRANCE POUR FEMME

SILV

HAR

Ad 5 : Outspan Grapefruit

| | Strong Disagre | Strongly Agree | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|-------------------|-----------|-------|-------------------|----|
| a) The ad looks active | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| b) The ad looks distinctive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| c) The ad looks inappropriate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| d) The ad looks energetic | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| e) The ad looks lively | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | |
| f) The ad looks vigorous | . 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | |
| | L | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| g) The ad looks offensive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ** |
| h) The ad looks interesting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| i) The ad looks healthy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| j) The ad looks intimate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Ad 6 : Ferre Fragrance | <u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u></u> | | | | | |
| | Disagree | e Disagre | e Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree | |
| a) The ad looks active | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| b) The ad looks distinctive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| c) The ad looks inappropriate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| d) The ad looks energetic | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| e) The ad looks lively | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| f) The ad looks vigorous | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| g) The ad looks offensive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| h) The ad looks interesting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| i) The ad looks healthy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| j) The ad looks intimate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
10. What is the ad you like the most ?

a. Ad 1 : Frederique French Salon
b. Ad 2 : Clarins Paris(skin care product)
c. Ad 3 : Palmer's FadeCream(skin care product)
d. Ad 4 : Triumph Daily
e. Ad 5 : Outspan grapefruit
f. Ad 6 : Ferre Fragrance

11. What is the ad you like the least ?

a. Ad 1 : Frederique French Salon
b. Ad 2 : Clarins Paris(skin care product)
c. Ad 3 : Palmer's FadeCream(skin care product)
d. Ad 4 : Triumph Daily
e. Ad 5 : Outspan grapefruit
f. Ad 6 : Ferre Fragrance

12. What is the ad that is the most striking ?

a. Ad 1 : Frederique French Salon
b. Ad 2 : Clarins Paris(skin care product)
c. Ad 3 : Palmer's FadeCream(skin care product)
d. Ad 4 : Triumph Daily
e. Ad 5 : Outspan grapefruit
f. Ad 6 : Ferre Fragrance



