Universidade de Brasília
Instituto de Psicologia
Departamento de Psicologia Social e do Trabalho
Programa de Pós-Graduação em Psicologia Social, do Trabalho e das Organizações

Dissertação de Mestrado

THE SCIENCE OF ADVERTISING: EXPERTS' INTUITIONS AND USAGE OF BEHAVIORAL CHANGE PRINCIPLES TO INFLUENCE CONSUMERS

Jonathan Jones dos Santos Pereira

Brasília, março de 2018

The science of advertising: Experts' intuitions and usage of behavioral change principles to influence consumers

A ciência da publicidade: Conhecimento intuitivo e uso de princípios de mudança comportamental por especialistas para influenciar consumidores

Jonathan Jones dos Santos Pereira

Dissertação de Mestrado apresentada ao Programa de Pós-Graduação em Psicologia Social, do Trabalho e das Organizações, do Instituto de Psicologia da Universidade de Brasília, como parte dos requisitos para obtenção do título de Mestre em Psicologia Social, do Trabalho e das Organizações.

Orientador: Prof. Dr. Fabio Iglesias

Comissão Examinadora:

Prof. Dr. Samuel Lincoln Bezerra Lins
Faculdade de Psicologia e de Ciências da Educação
Universidade do Porto
Membro externo

Profa. Dra. Raquel C. Hoersting
Programa de Pós-Graduação em Psicologia Social, do Trabalho e das Organizações
Universidade de Brasília - UnB
Membro interno

Profa. Dra. Amalia Raquel Pérez-Nebra
Facultat de Psicologia
Universitat de València
Membro suplente

Brasília, março de 2018

DEDICATÓRIA

Dedico este trabalho a Angélica Nascimento de Oliveira, por toda a ajuda e carinho.

Advertising is a craft executed by people who aspire to be artists, but is assessed by those who aspire to be scientists. I cannot imagine any human relationship more perfectly designed to produce total mayhem.
John Ward, England's B&B Dorland

AGRADECIMENTOS

Primeiramente, agradeço à Angélica Nascimento de Oliveira, em reconhecimento à sua importância na aventura que me trouxe até aqui. Sua companhia e paciência transformaram esse curso em uma maravilhosa experiência de descobrimento pessoal. Ao superar com charme e dignidade os desafios mais escabrosos, Angélica estabeleceu para mim a referência da mentalidade vencedora com a qual devemos encarar a vida.

Agora, aos amigos: agradeço a Lana Nárcia, Lenemar Silveira e Thaís Páscoa, pelo incentivo moral e, em muitos casos, financeiro. Eles praticamente patrocinaram esse mestrado. Agradeço também a Renato e à Soraia, pelo carinho e pela hospitalidade, e por todas as conversas interessantes; a Matheus Velloso, pela amizade sincera; e ao prof. dr. Eladio Palencia, do Iesb/DF, por ter acreditado, desde o começo.

Sou também muito grato aos colegas acadêmicos Lucas Matsunaga, Martina Mazzoleni e Yuri de Albuquerque, por terem me ajudado com tanto afinco – em troca, geralmente, de um simples "obrigado".

Diversos professores me guiaram nessa jornada de aprendizado, aqui e no exterior. Nada disso teria sido possível sem vocês. Especificamente, os professores Cláudio Torres, Hartmut Günther, Luciano Grüdtner Buratto e, claro, Raquel Hoersting (a quem devo muito mais do que apenas agradecimentos pelo conteúdo ensinado). Em especial, agradeço ao Prof. Dr. Jorge Mendes de Oliveira-Castro Neto, que ministrou disciplinas que me impactaram profundamente, influenciando minha pesquisa e mudando minha perspectiva sobre aspectos decisivos do comportamento humano. Enquanto houver professores do mais alto nível como vocês, há esperança.

No Canadá, agradeço ao Prof. Dr. Ben C. H. Kuo, meu orientador na Universidade de Windsor, e aos membros do Multicultural Clinical and Counselling Research Group. Nossos

encontros quinzenais foram fundamentais para o aprimoramento das minhas habilidades de pesquisa.

Agradeço à Profa. Dra. Catherine Kwantes, por ter gentilmente me convidado para participar dos encontros do Centre for Culture and Organizational Research da Universidade de Windsor, e também à Michelle Fitzgerald pelo carinho, a roupa de cama e a comida, e aos membros do "conversation group", em especial à Helen Power e à Nicole Corbo, que se reunia semanalmente na biblioteca, pela companhia e pelas gargalhadas.

Nada disso teria sido possível, entretanto, sem a bolsa (tardia, é verdade, mas ainda assim importante) que recebi do Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq) e o prêmio que ganhei do governo do Canadá, que, através do Global Leader in International Education, subsidiou o Emerging Leaders in the Americas Program.

Por fim, agradeço ao meu orientador, o Prof. Dr. Fabio Iglesias. Um pesquisador altamente qualificado e possuidor de um conhecimento enciclopédico sobre psicologia, ele é um verdadeiro homem da ciência, com a habilidade de inspirar todos aos seu redor e de esclarecer os mais complexos conceitos científicos a seus alunos e orientandos. Aprendi mais com ele do que em quatro anos de curso (inclusive estudando no exterior!). Enquanto eu viver, serei grato por todas as oportunidades que me deu. E foram muitas, sendo uma das mais importantes a de conviver com pesquisadores competentes e talentosos no grupo Influência do Laboratório de Psicologia Social da Universidade de Brasília, como Isângelo Senna, Lude Marietta, Raquel Sousa e Víthor Rosa Franco.

RESUMO

Um grande número de mensagens publicitárias buscam mudar as atitudes, os comportamentos e os hábitos de consumidores. Apesar disso, este é um processo difícil e complexo. Disciplinas científicas como a psicologia social, cujo objetivo primário é o de estudar como indivíduos influenciam uns aos outros, têm identificado princípios e táticas empiricamente testados que podem ser aplicados a anúncios publicitários. Com o intuito de entender de que forma o conhecimento sobre a evidência empírica em influência social tem sido aplicada por publicitários a campanhas, este trabalho apresenta três manuscritos, um teórico e dois empíricos, em formato próprio para serem submetidos a periódicos científicos. O Manuscrito 1 descreve, analisa e articula os principais arcabouços teórico-conceituais utilizados para descrever mudanças atitudinais e comportamentais, propondo sua interface e indicando alternativas para o uso prático da evidência empírica no processo de desenvolvimento de anúncios. O Manuscrito 2 objetivou investigar de que maneira as táticas de influência social têm sido empregadas por campanhas publicitárias. Tomando como base o Índice de Princípios Persuasivos (PPI) de Armstrong – uma lista de controle que reúne grande parte da evidência empírica existente sobre táticas persuasivas e a aplica à publicidade – cinco juízes avaliaram uma amostra de anúncios premiados ($N = 97$). A análise apontou uma concordância global de $W = .398$. Os seis anúncios mais persuasivos foram identificados e descritos, bem como as estratégias mais utilizadas, discutindo-se potenciais aplicações. Finalmente, o Manuscrito 3 mensurou o conhecimento de publicitários e psicólogos sobre táticas de influência testadas empiricamente e comparou esse conhecimento com o de indivíduos sem treinamento avançado nessas áreas. Para isso, participantes ($N = 399$) avaliaram 12 anúncios impressos selecionados no estudo realizado no Manuscrito 2. Metade das mensagens tiveram escores altos de acordo com o PPI (indicando um maior grau de efetividade em persuadir consumidores), enquanto a outra metade possuía os escores mais

baixos. De maneira geral, os resultados mostraram que publicitários e psicólogos tiveram um desempenho muito similar ao de leigos em predizer quais anúncios eram os mais persuasivos. Em alguns casos, eles se saíram ligeiramente pior do que pessoas sem treinamento em estratégias mercadológicas ou comportamento humano. Os três estudos contribuem para um maior entendimento de como a evidência empírica disponível tem sido aplicada e fornecem diretrizes para seu uso na atividade publicitária.

Palavras-chave: publicidade, conhecimento de especialistas, princípios de influência social, mudança comportamental, comportamento do consumidor

ABSTRACT

A large number of advertising messages seek to change the attitudes, behaviors and habits of consumers. Nevertheless, this is a difficult and complex process. Scientific disciplines such as social psychology, whose primary purpose is to study how individuals influence each other, have identified empirically tested principles and tactics that can be applied to commercials. In order to understand how knowledge about empirical evidence on social influence has been applied by advertisers to campaigns, this paper presents three manuscripts, one theoretical and two empirical, in a format suitable for submission to scientific journals. Manuscript 1 describes, analyzes and articulates the main theoretical-conceptual frameworks used to describe attitudinal and behavioral changes, proposing an interface between them and indicating alternatives for the practical use of empirical evidence in the ad development process. Manuscript 2 aimed to investigate how the tactics of social influence have been employed by advertising campaigns. Based on the Persuasive Principles Index (PPI) – a checklist that gathers much of the existing empirical evidence on persuasive tactics and applies it to advertising – five judges evaluated a sample of award-winning ads ($N = 97$). The analysis showed an overall agreement of $W = .398$. The six most persuasive ads were identified and described, as well as the most commonly used strategies. Finally, Manuscript 3 measured the knowledge of advertising practitioners and psychologists on empirically tested influence tactics and to compared it with that of individuals without advanced training in these areas. To that end, participants ($N = 399$) evaluated 12 full-page print ads selected through the study conducted in Manuscript 2. Half of the messages had high scores according to the PPI (indicating a greater degree of effectiveness in persuading consumers), while the other half had the lowest scores. Overall, the results showed that advertising practitioners and psychologists performed very similarly to non-experts in predicting which ads were the most persuasive. In some cases, they performed slightly worse than people without any training in

marketing strategies or human behavior. The three studies contribute to a greater understanding of how the available empirical evidence has been applied and provides guidelines for its use in the advertising activity.

Keywords: advertising, experts' knowledge, social influence principles, behavioral change, consumer behavior

SUMÁRIO GERAL

ÍNDICE DE FIGURAS

INTRODUÇÃO GERAL

Este trabalho disserta sobre o uso de princípios e táticas de influência social por publicitários, psicólogos e leigos, utilizando para isso uma perspectiva aplicada da psicologia social. O texto está organizado em três manuscritos independentes, porém conectados pela temática maior de entendimento do uso da evidência empírica por especialistas, em formato próprio para submetê-los a periódicos científicos, conforme as normas da American Psychological Association. Os manuscritos constituem uma encadeamento programático, evoluindo da teoria para estudos empíricos (e dentro deles metodológica e analiticamente), apresentando e discutindo os principais conceitos para posteriormente aplicá-los.

O Manuscrito 1 analisa e articula os principais quadros teóricos sobre mudança atitudinal e comportamental, propondo suas interfaces e indicando a lista de controle desenvolvida por Armstrong (2010) como uma alternativa para o uso sistemático da evidência empírica no processo de desenvolvimento de anúncios. Dessa maneira, apresenta os referenciais teóricos que fundamentam todo o trabalho. No interesse de divulgar esses arcabouços teórico-conceituais no cenário brasileiro e promover mais estudos sobre a temática, o manuscrito está escrito em português.

Os dois trabalhos seguintes, redigidos em inglês, relatam estudos empíricos. O Manuscrito 2 utiliza a lista de controle de Armstrong para analisar e avaliar o desempenho de campanhas premiadas em importantes festivais brasileiros, de maneira a identificar os anúncios mais persuasivos e as estratégias de influência utilizadas por eles. Finalmente, partindo de dados do estudo anterior, o Manuscrito 3 procurou medir e comparar o conhecimento que publicitários, psicólogos e pessoas sem treinamento nesses dois campos possuem sobre princípios e táticas de influência social.

Referências

Armstrong, J. S. (2010). *Persuasive advertising: Evidence-based principles*. London:

   Palgrave MacMillan.

Manuscrito 1

Influenciando atitudes e comportamentos com anúncios publicitários

Influencing attitudes and behaviors with advertisements

Resumo

Persuadir consumidores é o objetivo fundamental de grande parte dos anúncios publicitários. Entretanto, poucas campanhas têm uma teoria para fundamentar mensagens que busquem mudar atitudes ou comportamentos. A psicologia social supre essa necessidade ao oferecer princípios e táticas empiricamente testados que podem ser aplicados a anúncios publicitários. Dessa forma, este trabalho tem por objetivo analisar a relevância e discutir teorias psicossociais referentes a mudança de atitudes e a influência social. Mais especificamente, o estudo articula os principais quadros teóricos utilizados no campo, propondo uma interface entre eles e indicando os princípios de Armstrong (2010) como uma alternativa para o uso sistemático da evidência empírica no processo de desenvolvimento de anúncios. Armstrong organizou os achados de pesquisas sobre mudança atitudinal e comportamental em termos de 195 princípios que podem ajudar anunciantes a projetarem campanhas mais persuasivas, resumindo, ao longo de 16 anos, o conhecimento de mais de 3.000 estudos. O trabalho discute ainda as diversas possibilidades de uso prático das teorias e métodos da psicologia social, visando potenciais benefícios para a indústria publicitária.

Palavras-chave: publicidade, influência social, mudança de atitudes, mudança de comportamentos, comportamento do consumidor

Abstract

Persuading consumers is the fundamental goal of most advertising. However, few campaigns have a theory to substantiate messages that seek to change attitudes or behaviors. Social psychology supplies this need by offering empirically tested tactics for attitudinal and behavioral change that can be applied to advertising. Thus, this paper aims to review the scientific literature on strategies related to changing attitudes and social influence. More specifically, the present study presents the main theoretical frameworks used in both and indicates the principles of Armstrong (2010) as a proposal for the systematic use of such research in advertising. Armstrong organized research on changing attitudes and behaviors in social psychology in terms of 195 principles that can help advertisers design more persuasive campaigns – summing up, over 16 years, the knowledge of more than 3,000 studies. The advertising industry has thus much to gain from the various empirical studies that have emerged on the subject - this being a great opportunity to improve the effectiveness of what has been produced, based on the methods and techniques of science.

Keywords: advertising, social influence, attitude change, behavior change, consumer behavior

Persuadir consumidores é o objetivo fundamental de grande parte dos anúncios publicitários. Entretanto, poucas campanhas têm uma teoria (ou partem de dados empíricos) para fundamentar mensagens que busquem mudar atitudes, comportamentos ou hábitos, em muitos casos dependendo unicamente de crenças intuitivas e criatividade. A partir desse panorama, o arcabouço teórico-conceitual da psicologia social pode contribuir com princípios empiricamente testados que podem ser aplicados aos anúncios, aumentando sua efetividade (Bator & Cialdini, 2000).

Este trabalho tem o objetivo, portanto, de analisar e articular a literatura científica sobre as estratégias relacionadas à mudança de atitudes e à influência social quando aplicadas à publicidade. Mais especificamente, o presente estudo busca entender de que maneira o referencial teórico da psicologia social pode ser empregado para o desenvolvimento de anúncios publicitários informados pela evidência empírica, proveniente (em grande parte) da psicologia social.

Com isso, o trabalho também contribui para dar ao consumidor conhecimentos que ele possa vir a utilizar em seu próprio benefício. Compreender os processos persuasivos é de vital importância para esse público, sendo ele o alvo primário dessas investidas constantes. Consumidores podem, por exemplo, beneficiar-se ao assumir uma postura mais crítica diante de apelos publicitários persuasivos.

Primeiramente, o manuscrito descreve as principais teorias contemporâneas da mudança de atitudes, destacando os modelos de processamento duplo (Chaiken, Liberman, & Eagly, 1989; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986) e como estes se relacionam aos sete princípios de influência social identificados por Cialdini (1984; 2016), assim como ao índice de táticas persuasivas organizado por Pratkanis (2008), e como eles têm sido aplicados à publicidade (Armstrong, 2010). Por fim, o trabalho revisa também o que a evidência empírica parece sugerir sobre a maneira como essas mensagens estimulam as vendas.

Mudança de atitudes

A história dos estudos sobre influência social poderia facilmente começar com o sistema de retórica desenvolvido por gregos e romanos, dois mil anos atrás. Este trabalho, entretanto, oferece um olhar mais restrito, enfatizando as pesquisas empíricas sobre a temática realizadas a partir da década de 1890, com Triplett (1898). A influência social se refere, de maneira mais ampla, a como e por que as pessoas mudam os pensamentos, sentimentos e comportamentos umas das outras (Pratkanis, 2008).

Em sua forma mais básica, persuadir envolve mudar os estados mentais de indivíduos, como um precursor da mudança comportamental. Para Seiter e Gass (2004), o ato de persuadir seria um caso especial de influência social. Após um levantamento bibliográfico crítico, realizado com o intuito de dar mais transparência conceitual ao termo, eles concluíram que muitos acadêmicos e pesquisadores parecem concordar que uma perspectiva mais tradicional do construto envolva pelo menos dois critérios: a intencionalidade do emissor, e a presença de efeitos, ou seja, um contexto no qual o recebedor seja – de qualquer forma – alterado, mudado ou afetado. O ganho de aquiescência, quando intencional, seria um subconjunto do ato de persuadir, que aconteceria mais especificamente em contextos face-a-face.

O alvo mais comum de estudo desse processo tem sido a mudança das atitudes de uma pessoa. Para melhor contemplar as complexidades desse fenômeno, modelos de processamento múltiplo foram propostos, de acordo com os quais existiriam dois diferentes processos mentais. Esses processos espelhariam as duas grandes abordagens, contrastantes, que caracterizavam as pesquisas sócio-cognitivas: uma elemental e outra holística. Esses dois caminhos foram combinados na abordagem do modo dual, um paradigma que estabelece a existência de processos relativamente automáticos e processos conscientes. Kahneman (2012) se refere a eles, didaticamente, como "sistemas da mente". O Sistema 1 é o responsável por

procedimentos operacionais padronizados e agiria de forma automática, rápida e desprovida de controle voluntário, exigindo pouco ou nenhum esforço. O Sistema 2, por outro lado, é consciente, raciocinador, gerenciando atividades mentais laboriosas, como a busca deliberada de memória, cálculos complexos, planejamento e escolha. A grosso modo, o Sistema 2 se representa o "eu" lógico e racional.

O modelo de processamento duplo descrito por Kahneman está presente em diversas outras teorias da psicologia e áreas afins. Segundo ele, os processos automáticos começam na pura automaticidade – desprovidos de intencionalidade e controle –, mas são eficientes, autônomos e fora da consciência. Esse conceito fornece também as bases do modelo da probabilidade de elaboração (MPE; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986) e do modelo heurístico-sistemático (MHS; Chaiken, Liberman, & Eagly, 1989), que inspiraram a maior parte dos estudos contemporâneos sobre mudança atitudinal. Desses, o MPE é o que gerou mais pesquisas sobre processos persuasivos em uma perspectiva comunicacional.

O MPE é um modelo desenvolvido na tentativa de integrar a literatura sobre os processos persuasivos ao propor que há um conjunto limitado de processos centrais através do qual variáveis poderiam afetar atitudes. Assim, variáveis influenciam a quantidade de pensamento que ocorre, a valência (favorável ou desfavorável) desses pensamentos, as propriedades estruturais dos pensamentos gerados (processos meta-cognitivos) e servem como argumentos persuasivos para os méritos de uma proposta, ou como pistas simples para a desejabilidade.

De acordo com esse modelo, atitudes formadas ou mudadas através de processos de pensamento deliberativos tendem a ser mais persistentes, resistentes à mudança e preditivas de comportamento do que atitudes mudadas através de processos de pensamento mais automáticos. O MPE postula ainda que quaisquer variáveis (como fonte, mensagem,

destinatário ou contexto) influenciam atitudes ao afetar qualquer um desses processos-chave (Petty & Briñol, 2010).

Embora possam diferir significativamente em alguns aspectos, o MPE e o MHS compartilham características fundamentais: ambos descrevem que os processos persuasivos acontecem através de duas "rotas" qualitativamente diferentes (Kruglanski & Thompson, 1999). No MPE, essas rotas recebem o nome de "central" e "periférica"; no MHS, de rota "sistemática" e "heurística". Ambos ressaltam que a análise cuidadosa dos argumentos da mensagem resultará na mudança das atitudes através de uma das rotas (no MPE, pela rota central; no MHS, pela rota sistemática), ao mesmo tempo que argumentos julgados com menos esforço, usando indicadores acessórios, modificam a atitude através das rotas periférica (no MPE) e heurística (no MHS).

A ocorrência da rota periférica/modelo heurístico, mais especificamente, está associada ao uso de heurísticas cognitivas – atalhos mentais que reduziriam problemas complexos e os simplificariam em termos de julgamentos mais simples (Kahneman, 2012). Em seu dia a dia, as pessoas utilizariam um grande número de heurísticas, algumas mais gerais e outras mais idiossincráticas, devido a uma variedade de fatores, como tempo limitado, complexidade e volume de argumentos relevantes, assim como dúvidas sobre a qualidade da evidência disponível. Ao contrário, entretanto, do que é comumente imaginado, heurísticas tipicamente produziriam respostas corretas (Todd & Gigerenzer, 2012).

Há também uma literatura crescente acerca dos correlatos neurais dos processos persuasivos. Apesar de essencialmente descritivos, estudos utilizando imageamento por ressonância magnética funcional têm correlacionado atividade regional no córtex pré-frontal medial e no córtex pré-frontal lateral à apelos persuasivos que influenciaram atitudes (Cacioppo, Cacioppo, & Petty, 2017). Outros estudos utilizaram atividade regional do

cérebro (em geral, no córtex pré-frontal medial) em resposta a um apelo persuasivo para efetivamente prever mudanças de comportamento.

Influência social e mudança do comportamento

Em *Influence*, um dos livros mais populares da psicologia social, Cialdini (1984, reeditado até Cialdini, 2008) resumiu a literatura disponível sobre influência social em termos de seis princípios ou "armas de influência automática": reciprocidade, comprometimento e consistência, prova social, autoridade, empatia e raridade. Mais recentemente, Cialdini adicionou mais um princípio à lista: a unidade (Cialdini, 2016) – relacionado ao sentimento de identidade e de agir sincronizadamente, de maneira colaborativa.

Para identificar esses princípios, Cialdini articulou um modelo ecologicamente válido de pesquisa básica que ele denominou de "psicologia social de ciclo completo" (Mortensen & Cialdini, 2010), baseado em conduzir pesquisas que se movem ciclicamente entre o que é observado no ambiente natural, a teoria e experimentos de laboratório. Em um estudo etnográfico que durou três anos, Cialdini atuou como observador participante entre profissionais cujo sustento financeiro dependia do sucesso de seus apelos persuasivos. Sua hipótese era a de que um processo seletivo natural ocorreria com as táticas persuasivas: de acordo com ele, os procedimentos mais fortes e adaptáveis para gerar mudança comportamental emergiriam, persistiriam e se acumulariam. Especificamente, Cialdini procurou por princípios de influência abrangentes, que ocorressem de múltiplas formas, aparecessem em todo o espectro estudado, fossem empregados pelo maior número de profissionais e tivessem sido utilizados com sucesso historicamente. Os princípios de Cialdini se fundamentam em teorias e achados importantes da psicologia social, além de organizar táticas de influência comportamental que vêm sendo estudadas experimentalmente por pesquisadores há mais de cem anos.

O primeiro dos princípios identificados por Cialdini é a norma da reciprocidade, segundo a qual as pessoas parecem mais propensas a consentir com um pedido feito por alguém que lhes tenha fornecido anteriormente um favor. A "técnica da porta-na-cara" (ver Feeley, Anker, & Aloe, 2012), por exemplo, é uma das diversas táticas persuasivas que exploram a tendência automática a retribuir. Nesse procedimento, um pedido inicial relativamente grande é feito para a pessoa, que o recusa. Um pedido menor é feito imediatamente depois, na expectativa de que a recusa ao primeiro tornará a pessoa mais suscetível a aceitar o segundo (que era o verdadeiro objetivo). Os estudos sobre reciprocidade têm encontrado ainda que presentes significativos, inesperados e personalizados obtêm uma taxa de sucesso ainda maior (Strohmetz, Rind, Fisher, & Lynn, 2002).

O segundo princípio, a consistência, estabelece que, após comprometer-se com um determinado posicionamento, é-se mais propenso a consentir com pedidos para comportamentos coerentes com ele. Esse princípio emerge, principalmente, de achados empíricos apoiados em uma das teorias mais populares da psicologia social, a dissonância cognitiva (Festinger, 1957). De acordo com essa teoria, quando um indivíduo mantém dois ou mais processos mentais inconsistentes uns com os outros, isso criaria um estado de desconforto – a chamada "dissonância". As pessoas tentariam reduzir esse estado desagradável, geralmente protegendo a crença mais resistente à mudança. Para diminuir a dissonância, indivíduos utilizariam diversas estratégias: adicionar crenças consonantes, suprimir crenças dissonantes, aumentar a importância das crenças consonantes ou simplesmente reduzir a importância das crenças dissonantes (Harmon-Jones & Harmon-Jones, 2007). A mudança comportamental seria, portanto, um dos possíveis subprodutos desse processo, e estratégias baseadas em mecanismos cognitivos análogos poderiam ser utilizados para influenciar indivíduos.

De acordo com o princípio da prova social, é-se mais propenso a consentir com um pedido se ele for coerente com o que outros similares parecem estar pensando. Em um experimento clássico, Asch (1956) demonstrou que as pessoas concordariam que uma linha correspondia ao comprimento de outra – mesmo quando eram visivelmente diferentes – se outros ao seu redor dissessem o mesmo. Seus estudos sobre conformidade foram replicados exaustivamente, e em diversos países, encontrando, por exemplo, que culturas mais coletivistas parecem ainda mais suscetíveis à prova social (Cialdini, Wosinska, Barrett, Butner, & Gornik-Durose, 1999). Normas sociais – regras que preveem expectativas sobre o comportamento apropriado em um determinado contexto – representariam um consenso social implícito e, portanto, agiriam através do mesmo mecanismo. Há uma literatura vasta sobre o uso de normas para direcionar comportamentos em uma variedade de contextos (Miller & Prentice, 2016).

O princípio da autoridade determina que as pessoas tendem a seguir os conselhos de uma autoridade legítima. Em uma série de estudos pioneiros sobre obediência à figuras de autoridade, Milgram (1974) demonstrou que, sob as ordens de um pesquisador, 62.5% dos participantes em um experimento estava disposta a administrar choques elétricos potencialmente mortais em um outro participante. Esses estudos foram replicados por pesquisadores em diversos contextos diferentes (Blass, 1999). Mais recentemente, Burger (2009), e também Doliński et al. (2017), reproduziram parcialmente o experimento original, dentro do permitido pela ética científica, com resultados muito semelhantes aos encontrados por Milgram. Da mesma maneira, pesquisadores têm demonstrado que títulos (Hofling, Brotzman, Dalrymple, Graves, & Pierce, 1966) e trajes (Bickman, 1974), por exemplo, agem por meio de processos semelhantes.

Segundo o princípio da empatia, indivíduos tendem a consentir mais com os pedidos de amigos ou outros indivíduos gostados. Diversos fatores parecem aumentar sentimentos

positivos relacionados à fonte do apelo persuasivo, sendo a atratividade física um dos traços estáveis mais importantes. Além disso, um indivíduo parece mais atraente à medida em que apresenta certas características psicológicas – tais como ser caloroso/confiável, ter vitalidade e status/recursos. Outros fatores relevantes estudados tem sido a familiaridade para com o alvo, o uso de elogios, o nível de *self-disclosure* e até mesmo, no caso de mulheres, o período fértil do ciclo menstrual (Finkel & Baumeister, 2010).

No princípio da raridade, deve-se tentar assegurar as oportunidades que pareçam escassas ou que aparentem estar diminuindo. Evidência desse princípio pode ser encontrada, por exemplo, em estudos da economia comportamental cognitiva sobre julgamento e processo decisório que mostram que o impacto psicológico de perdas é muito maior que o de ganhos, mesmo quando o valor de ambos é exatamente o mesmo (Neumann & Böckenholt, 2014).

O último dos princípios propostos é a unidade, descrito por Cialdini (2016) como a experiência de ser reconhecido como membro de um grupo, e se refere ao compartilhamento de identidade. O princípio da unidade envolve as categorias que indivíduos usam para definirem a si próprios (raça, etnia, nacionalidade, família, posicionamento político, crenças religiosas) e o sentimento de fundir-se aos outros.

De acordo com Cialdini (1987; 2008), os princípios de influência social funcionariam como heurísticas, o que os associaria, portanto, a um modo de processamento mais automático, em linha com o proposto por Guadagno (2017), para quem os princípios aumentariam a probabilidade de aquiescência porque seriam processados sem pensar. Chaiken (1987) também argumenta que os princípios equivaleriam a regras decisórias simples, previstas pelo MHS. Cialdini e Griskevicius (2010) destacam que, de uma perspectiva evolucionista, os princípios funcionariam por promoverem comportamentos adaptativos. Para eles, retribuir favores e concordar com quem se gosta é fundamental para o

desenvolvimento de relacionamentos sociais. Da mesma maneira, é decidir da forma mais adequada possível, de modo a favorecer seus outros objetivos da maneira efetiva. Por exemplo, quando os caminhos possíveis parecem ambíguos, é adaptativo seguir o conselho de uma autoridade ou o comportamento de outros similares. Indivíduos também teriam uma forte necessidade de comportarem-se de maneira consistente com suas atitudes, comprometimentos e crenças.

As pesquisas em psicologia social sobre o uso sistemático dos princípios de influência demonstram que eles têm sido largamente empregados nos mais diversos contextos. Pesquisadores documentaram apelos persuasivos baseados nesses princípios entre vendedores (Damasceno & Iglesias, 2017; Iglesias & Damasceno, 2013), em mensagens de utilidade pública sobre o meio-ambiente ou cujo objetivo é o de incutir comportamentos pró-saúde (Taylor, 2010) e seu uso tem sido discutido até mesmo em esforços militares (Cialdini, 2011; King, 2011), revelando resultados promissores.

Abordagens baseadas em influência social também têm sido utilizadas em estratégias mercadológicas (Kirmani & Ferraro, 2017) e, mais especificamente, em campanhas publicitárias (Armstrong, 2010; Iglesias, Caldas, & Lemos, 2013), mesmo que de maneira essencialmente intuitiva. A reciprocidade, por exemplo, apresenta-se na forma da amostra grátis (Cialdini, 2008). Outra técnica baseada nesse princípio é a "isso não é tudo", o procedimento de oferecer um produto a um preço elevado e, logo depois, apresentar uma oferta mais vantajosa, adicionando outro produto ou reduzindo o preço (Burger, 1986); o comprometimento e a consistência emergem em anúncios que rotulam o consumidor com estereótipos que o incentivam a agir de forma semelhante (por exemplo, mencionando que pessoas elegantes fumam); anúncios utilizando o princípio da prova social destacam a popularidade do produto ou serviço (Jeong & Kwon, 2012), exibindo várias pessoas o consumindo, informando que ele é o mais vendido ou relatando, com testemunhais, o

comportamento de outros clientes; o princípio da empatia é empregado quando o anúncio utiliza a imagem de pessoas atraentes, ou quando o texto tenta invocar similaridade de ideias, traços de personalidade, experiências ou estilos de vida com o consumidor potencial. Esse é, inclusive, o princípio por trás da estratégia de associar a marca à celebridades. A regra da empatia estipula, também, que argumentar contra seus próprios interesses – o que inclui mencionar uma desvantagem em suas propostas ou produtos – sinaliza honestidade e confiança. O uso desse princípio é o responsável pelo sucesso de duas campanhas marcantes da indústria publicitária, a do Fusca e a da locadora de carros Avis (Goldstein, Martin, & Cialdini, 2008).

Já um anúncio utilizando a regra da autoridade invoca o uso geral de credenciais e títulos para embasar seus argumentos, ou apresenta pessoas vestindo roupas específicas (batinas, jalecos brancos, uniformes policiais, ternos) que atribuem respeitabilidade; um anúncio utilizando a raridade ressalta que existem poucas unidades do produto, que ele é raro ou pode estar acabando, sendo este um apelo frequentemente utilizado por anúncios publicitários (Mukherjee & Lee, 2016). A peça fundamentada no princípio da unidade, por fim, destaca o sentimento de pertencimento a um determinado grupo e pode, por exemplo, ressaltar determinados aspectos de uma identidade.

Quando se trata de publicidade, mais especificamente, outros autores propuseram mais princípios de influência à lista. Armstrong (2010), por exemplo, menciona a força dos argumentos racionais e da estratégia de atribuir comportamentos e traços favoráveis ao mercado-alvo. Já Fennis e Stroebe (2016), apesar de pouco aprofundarem-se em exemplos, destacam as estratégias persuasivas que visam confundir os consumidores durante a compra.

Influência social e publicidade

Apesar de existir considerável evidência empírica sobre os mecanismos através dos quais a publicidade influenciaria consumidores (Ehrenberg, Barnard, Kennedy, & Bloom,

2002; Sharp, 2010), muitos profissionais de publicidade e propaganda têm praticado seu ofício baseados em pressupostos enraizados no campo (Feldwick, 2015, revisa as diferentes perspectivas adotadas por praticantes da área para pensar sobre a publicidade ao longo dos anos). Uma perspectiva de funcionamento da publicidade que tem sido continuamente sustentada pela evidência baseia-se, essencialmente, em regularidades empíricas identificadas por Goodhardt, Ehrenberg e Chatfield (1984). Para eles, a publicidade agiria ao refrescar, ou ocasionalmente construir, estruturas da memória (Sharp, 2010). De acordo com Kerin e Sethuraman (1999; posteriormente rediscutido por Hunt, 2010), essas regularidades empíricas (ou condicionais generalizados) seriam as formas mais básicas de uma lei científica. Uniformidades desse tipo precisariam, entretanto, incorporar outros critérios importantes (como o de conteúdo empírico e o de universalidade nomológica) para atingirem o nível mais elevado de princípio. Outro quesito é estar sistematicamente integrada a um corpo coeso de conhecimento científico – ou seja, precisam ser explicadas ou estar conectadas à teorias (Barwise, 1995). De acordo com Sharp (2010), a publicidade é, por consequência, parte importante do processo de crescimento de uma marca, constituindo uma das muitas maneiras de desenvolver a "disponibilidade mental" – a tendência da marca ser lembrada em contextos de compra.

Apesar de um interesse crescente em identificar quais os elementos que tornam um anúncio mais persuasivo, progresso nessa área é dependente de avanços metodológicos, principalmente na área de testagem de anúncios. Até hoje, medir a efetividade dos anúncios permanece sendo um dos maiores problemas de agências publicitárias e anunciantes. Devido, provavelmente, à dificuldade prática de utilizar medidas comportamentais mais sofisticadas, a maioria das técnicas de testagem de anúncios utiliza medidas puramente atitudinais, com poucas evidências de validade e um poder preditivo limitado (Kennedy, Northover, Leighton, Lion, & Bird, 2010). Com avanços recentes, pesquisadores começaram a propor medidas

baseadas em métodos neurofisiológicos (Plassmann, Venkatraman, Huettel, & Yoon, 2015), mas mesmo essas medidas oferecem resultados limitados (Varan, Lang, Barwise, Weber, & Bellman, 2015) e uma das melhores alternativas para medir a efetividade de anúncios parece ser utilizar dados de fonte única, que coletam dados para indivíduos (ou domicílios) tanto ao serem expostos à publicidade quanto ao comprarem a marca (McDonald, 2000).

Além disso, a falta de transparência conceitual e de um consenso entre acadêmicos sobre o que "persuadir" significaria leva a um uso muito amplo (ou muito estreito) do construto. Por exemplo, ao descreverem esse fenômeno, trabalhos influentes do campo, como Ehrenberg, Barnard, Kennedy e Bloom (2002), assim como as meta-análises realizadas nos bancos de dados de prêmios sobre efetividade em publicidade, como o IPA Effectiveness Awards (Binet & Field, 2007; 2013), utilizam conceitos diferentes entre si, mas também dos tradicionalmente empregados nos modelos teóricos existentes em psicologia social, a disciplina científica com mais estudos sobre a temática.

Partindo, portanto, do princípio de que a publicidade poderia ser utilizada como um meio efetivo de persuadir indivíduos a adotem certos comportamentos (Nolan, Schultz, & Knowles, 2009) – um propósito que seria, ao contrário do que é comumente imaginado, subutilizado – Armstrong (2010) propôs uma lista de controle para facilitar o uso de princípios e táticas persuasivas. Com o intuito de superar muitos dos obstáculos que profissionais enfrentam ao usar evidências experimentais no desenvolvimento de anúncios mais persuasivos, ele organizou os resultados de pesquisas científicas sobre mudança de atitudes e comportamentos de disciplinas científicas como a economia comportamental, a psicologia cognitiva e a social, o comportamento organizacional, a política e a publicidade, entre outras, em um formato compreensível e de fácil acesso. Em um esforço de 16 anos, Armstrong e uma equipe de mais de 80 pesquisadores resumiram em 195 princípios operacionais a evidência acumulada em cerca de 640 artigos científicos e 50 livros –

pesquisas de laboratório, de campo e quasi-experimentos, cobrindo um período de aproximadamente um século – sobre efetividade em publicidade. Ele dividiu seus 195 princípios em estratégias, táticas gerais e táticas específicas para certas mídias. Em estudos subsequentes, Armstrong, Du, Green e Graefe (2016) encontraram evidências de validade de face e concorrente para o instrumento, além de testarem sua validade preditiva e demonstrarem a potencialidade de seu uso para a testagem de anúncios. Apesar do instrumento ter se mostrado promissor, testes mais rigorosos, utilizando dados de fonte única, ainda precisam ser conduzidos, sobretudo em diferentes contextos culturais (Sharp & Hartnett, 2016).

A proposta de Armstrong engloba o trabalho de muitos dos pesquisadores aqui mencionados, como os modelos teóricos de mudança atitudinal e os princípios de influência social. A ferramenta fornecida por Armstrong é especialmente útil porque seu foco primário é o uso publicitário desses princípios. Ao contrário, por exemplo, do trabalho de Cialdini, que contempla muitas táticas de uso interpessoal, Armstrong fornece diretrizes que podem ajudar anunciantes e agências a projetarem campanhas mais persuasivas.

O referencial teórico aqui proposto, se aplicado ao processo criativo das peças, tem o potencial de causar um impacto positivo na indústria publicitária. O trabalho de Armstrong é valioso por agrupar de maneira bastante clara e coerente os princípios e táticas que a psicologia social identificou (e tem identificado) ao longo das últimas décadas, oferecendo também uma perspectiva mais diretamente centrada no uso publicitário. Os princípios de Armstrong podem ser utilizados para estimular a criatividade, oferecendo uma lista do que verificar durante o desenvolvimento das peças, assim como avaliar a melhorar anúncios.

Considerações finais

Este artigo procurou analisar e articular as principais teorias psicológicas relacionadas à mudança de atitudes e de comportamentos – ressaltando a possibilidade de seu uso prático

nas campanhas de publicidade. O conhecimento desse quadro também contribui para o empoderamento do consumidor, ao permitir o reconhecimento de apelos persuasivos efetivos, como um primeiro passo para a resistência.

Acadêmicos frequentemente se queixam de que profissionais de publicidade ignoram a literatura científica ao delinearem estratégias ou pensarem anúncios. De fato, parte disso provavelmente se deve ao fato de que o atual paradigma da indústria publicitária reforça o comportamento de desenvolvimento de peças mais criativas e artísticas, ao invés de peças mais efetivas (o que pode ser um resultado, entre outros, da dificuldade, tanto das agências quanto de pesquisas na área, em encontrarem e desenvolverem métodos mais preditivos de testagem das peças), existindo uma forte crença compartilhada pela indústria de que peças mais criativas seriam mais eficientes. A criatividade ocupa um papel central em publicidade, a ponto do principal festival publicitário ter mudado seu nome de "Festival Internacional de Publicidade" para "Cannes Lions Festival Internacional de Criatividade".

Por outro lado, outro fator que contribui para essa ausência de evidência empírica em publicidade é, provavelmente, a dificuldade de gerentes e publicitários de terem fácil acesso à ela. Sommer (2006), por exemplo, sugere uma forma de atacar esse problema ao defender que resultados de estudos devem ser tornados públicos e mais acessíveis dentro e fora da comunidade científica por pesquisadores, no que ele chama de método dual de disseminação. Todavia, poucos pesquisadores possuem o tempo ou a pachorra para tal. Revisar a literatura científica à procura de respostas é um processo complexo, que exige muito treinamento, paciência e tempo – o que acaba dificultando seu uso prático.

Os princípios de Armstrong se apresentam, dessa maneira, como uma forma de solucionar esse problema e permitir que as pesquisas disponíveis ao processo criativo de peças na publicidade, de uma maneira que integrasse o referencial proposto anteriormente por autores como Cialdini (2006) ou Pratkanis (2008). Grande parte do trabalho de Armstrong se

refere, justamente, a organizar, de maneira compreensível, pesquisas amparadas por resultados robustos.

Entretanto, certamente há espaço para melhorias. Sugerem-se, a partir disso, o seguinte: a) a lista de controle de Armstrong precisa ser atualizada para incluir táticas faltantes, como o recém-proposto princípio da unidade, b) o conhecimento de teorias da psicologia social (como o MPE e o MHS, por exemplo) podem ajudar pesquisadores e profissionais e tirarem maior proveito da lista, e c) assim como um maior entendimento de como a publicidade influencia vendas. Além disso, d) mais pesquisas sobre o uso midiático dos princípios precisam ser conduzidas, ao invés dos tradicionais estudos com foco interpessoal. O trabalho de Armstrong é ainda muito recente, de modo que se torna necessária uma análise posterior dos desdobramentos de seu uso. Destaca-se que a indústria publicitária tem muito a ganhar com os diversos estudos empíricos que tem surgido sobre o tema – sendo esta uma grande oportunidade de melhorar a efetividade do que tem sido produzido, utilizando como base os métodos e as técnicas da ciência.

Por fim, a literatura sobre influência é polivalente, sendo útil a um amplo espectro de atores. Apesar de Cialdini (1999; 2016) argumentar que o uso antiético de princípios persuasivos seria, em última instância, prejudicial às empresas, é importante que os próprios consumidores desenvolvam estratégias independentes, baseadas em conhecimento científico sério, para identificar e resistir às diversas abordagens e apelos de vendas, conforme defendido pelo movimento da "pesquisa transformativa do consumidor" (ver Mick, Pettigrew, Pechmann, & Ozanne, 2011).

Referências

Armstrong, J. S. (2010). *Persuasive advertising: Evidence-based principles*. London:

Palgrave MacMillan.

Armstrong, J. S., Du, R., Green, K. C., & Graefe, A. (2016). Predictive validity of evidence-

based persuasion principles: An application of the index method. *European Journal of

Marketing, 50*(1/2), 276-293.

Asch, S. E. (1956). Studies of independence and conformity: I. A minority of one against a

unanimous majority. *Psychological Monographs, 70*(9).

Barwise, P. (1995). Good empirical generalizations. *Marketing Science, 14*(3), G29-G35.

Bator, R. J., & Cialdini, R. B. (2000). The application of persuasion theory to the

development of effective proenvironmental public service announcements. *Journal of

Social Issues, 56*(3), 527–541.

Bickman, L. (1974). The social power of a uniform. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 4*,

47-61.

Binet, L., & Field, P. (2007). *Marketing in the era of accountability*. London: World

Advertising Research Centre.

Binet, L., & Field, P. (2013). *The long and the short of it: Balancing short and long-term

marketing strategies*. London: Institute of Practitioners in association with Thinkbox.

Blass, T. (1999). The Milgram paradigm after 35 years: Some things we now know about

obedience to authority. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 29*(5), 955-978.

Burger, J. M. (1986). Increasing compliance by improving the deal: The that's-not-all

technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 277-283.

Burger, J. M. (2009). Replicating Milgram: Would people still obey today? *American

Psychologist, 64*, 1–11.

Cacioppo, J. T., Cacioppo, S., & Petty, R. E. (2017). The neuroscience of persuasion: A

review with an emphasis on issues and opportunities. *Social Neuroscience*, 1-44.

Chaiken, S. (1987). The heuristic model of persuasion. Em M. P. Zanna, J. M. Olson, & C. P.

Herman (Eds.), *Social influence: The Ontario symposium* (Vol. 5, pp. 3-39). Hillsdale,

NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Chaiken, S., Liberman, A., & Eagly, A. H. (1989). Heuristic and systematic processing

within and beyond the persuasion context. Em J. S. Uleman & J. A. Bargh (Eds.),

Unintended thought (pp. 212-252). New York: Guilford Press.

Cialdini, R. B. (1987). Compliance principles of compliance professionals: Psychologists of

necessity. Em M. P. Zanna, J. M. Olson, & C. P. Herman (Eds.), *Social influence: The

Ontario symposium* (Vol. 5, pp. 165-184). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cialdini, R. B. (1999). Of tricks and tumors: Some little-recognized costs of dishonest use of

effective social influence. *Psychology & Marketing, 16*(2), 91-98.

Cialdini, R. B. (2008). *Influence: Science and practice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Cialdini, R. B. (2011). Roots, shoots, and fruits of persuasion in military affairs. *Analyses of

Social Issues and Public Policy, 11*(1), 27-30.

Cialdini, R. (2016). *Pre-suasion: A revolutionary way to influence and persuade*. New York:

Simon & Schuster.

Cialdini, R. B., & Griskevicius, V. (2010). Social influence. Em R. F. Baumeister & E. J.

Finkel (Eds.), *Advanced social psychology: The state of the science* (pp. 385-417). New

York: Oxford University Press.

Cialdini, R. B., Wosinska, W., Barrett, D. W., Butner, J., & Gornik-Durose, M. (1999).

Compliance with a request in two cultures: The differential influence of social proof and

commitment/consistency on collectivists and individualists. *Personality and Social

Psychology Bulletin, 25*(10), 1242-1253.

Damasceno, R., & Iglesias, F. (2017). Táticas de persuasão de vendedores em shopping-centers: Um estudo de campo. *Psicologia Argumento, 32*(79), 187-195.

Doliński, D., Grzyb, T., Folwarczny, M., Grzybała, P., Krzyszycha, K., Martynowska, K., & Trojanowski, J. (2017). Would you deliver an electric shock in 2015? Obedience in the experimental paradigm developed by Stanley Milgram in the 50 years following the original studies. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 1-7.

Ehrenberg, A., Barnard, N., Kennedy, R., & Bloom, H. (2002). Brand advertising as creative publicity. *Journal of Advertising Research, 42*(4), 7-18.

Feeley, T. H., Anker, A. E., & Aloe, A. M. (2012). The door-in-the-face persuasive message strategy: A meta-analysis of the first 35 years. *Communication Monographs, 79*(3), 316-343.

Feldwick, P. (2015). *The anatomy of humbug: How to think differently about advertising*. Leicestershire: Troubador Publishing.

Fennis, B. M., & Stroebe, W. (2016). *The psychology of advertising*. New York: Routledge.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Evanston, IL: Row Peterson.

Finkel, E. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (2010). Attraction and rejection. Em R. F. Baumeister & E. J. Finkel (Eds.), *Advanced social psychology: The state of the science* (pp. 303-340). New York: Oxford University Press.

Goldstein, N. J., Martin, S. J., & Cialdini, R. (2008). *Yes! 50 scientifically proven ways to be persuasive*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Guadagno, R. E. (2017). Compliance: A classic and contemporary review. Em S. G. Harkins, K. D. Williams, & J. M. Burger (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of social influence* (pp. 107-128). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Harmon-Jones, E., & Harmon-Jones, C. (2007). Cognitive dissonance theory after 50 years of development. *Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie, 38*(1), 7-16.

Hofling, C. K., Brotzman, E., Dalrymple, S., Graves, N., & Pierce, C. M. (1966). An

    experimental study of nurse-physician relationships. *Journal of Nervous and Mental*

    Disease, 143, 171–180.

Hunt, S. D. (2010). *Marketing theory: Foundations, controversy, strategy, resource-*

    advantage theory. New York: M. E. Sharpe.

Iglesias, F., Caldas, L. S., & Lemos, S. M. S. (2013). Publicidade infantil: Uma análise de

    táticas persuasivas na TV aberta. *Psicologia & Sociedade, 25*(1), 134-141.

Iglesias, F., & Damasceno, R. (2013). Estratégias persuasivas de vendedores: As percepções

    de consumidores em lojas de varejo. *Revista Psicologia: Organizações e Trabalho,*

    13(2), 171-186.

Jeong, H. J., & Kwon, K. N. (2012). The effectiveness of two online persuasion claims:

    Limited product availability and product popularity. *Journal of Promotion Management,*

    18(1), 83-99.

Kahneman, D. (2012). *Rápido e devagar: Duas formas de pensar*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora

    Objetiva.

Kennedy, R., Northover, H., Leighton, J., Lion, S., & Bird, G. (2010). *Pre-test advertising -*

    Proposing a new validity project. Artigo apresentado na 39th EMAC Conference,

    Copenhagen, Dinamarca.

Kerin, R. A., & Sethuraman, R (1999). 'Revisiting marketing's lawlike generalizations': A

    comment. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 27*(1), 101–4.

King, S. B. (2011). Military social influence in the global information environment: A

    civilian primer. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 11*(1), 1-26.

Kirmani, A., & Ferraro, R. (2017). Social influence in marketing: How other people influence

    consumer information processing and decision making. Em S. G. Harkins, K. D.

Williams, & J. M. Burger (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of social influence* (pp. 415-432). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Kruglanski, A. W., & Thompson, E. P. (1999). Persuasion by a single route: A view from the unimodel. *Psychological Inquiry, 10*, 83-110.

McDonald, C. (2000). How single-source data research first developed. In J. P. Jones (Ed.), *International advertising: Realities and myths* (pp. 287-297): Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mick, D. G., Pettigrew, S., Pechmann, C. P., & Ozanne, J. L. (Eds.). (2011). *Transformative consumer research for personal and collective well-being*. New York: Routledge

Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to authority: An experimental view*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Miller, D. T., & Prentice, D. A. (2016). Changing norms to change behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology, 67*, 339-361.

Mortensen, C. R., & Cialdini, R. B. (2010). Full-cycle social psychology for theory and application. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 4*(1), 53-63.

Mukherjee, A., & Lee, S. Y. (2016). Scarcity appeals in advertising: The moderating role of rxpectation of scarcity. *Journal of Advertising, 45*(2), 256-268.

Neumann, N., & Böckenholt, U. (2014). A meta-analysis of loss aversion in product choice. *Journal of Retailing, 90*(2), 182-197.

Nolan, J. M., Schultz, P., & Knowles, E. S. (2009). Using public service announcements to change behavior: No more money and oil down the drain. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39*(5), 1035-1056.

Petty, R. E., & Briñol, P. (2010). Attitude change. Em R. F. Baumeister & E. J. Finkel (Eds.), *Advanced social psychology: The state of the science* (pp. 217-259). New York: Oxford University Press.

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). *Communication and persuasion: Central and peripheral routes to attitude change.* New York: Springer-Verlag.

Plassmann, H., Venkatraman, V., Huettel, S., & Yoon, C. (2015). Consumer neuroscience: Applications, challenges, and possible solutions. *Journal of Marketing Research, 52*(4), 427-435.

Pratkanis, A. R. (2008). Social influence analysis: An index of tactics. Em A. R. Pratkanis (Ed.), *The science of social influence: Advances and future progress* (pp. 17–82). New York: Psychology Press.

Seiter, J. S., & Gass, R. H. (Eds.). (2004). *Perspectives on persuasion, social influence, and compliance gaining.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Sharp, B. (2010). *How brands grow: What marketers don't know*. Victoria: Oxford University Press.

Sharp, B., & Hartnett, N. (2016). Generalisability of advertising persuasion principles. *European Journal of Marketing, 50*(1/2), 301-305.

Sommer, R. (2006). Dual dissemination: Writing for colleagues and the public. *American Psychologist, 61*(9), 955.

Strohmetz, D. B., Rind, B., Fisher, R., & Lynn, M. (2002). Sweetening the till: The use of candy to increase restaurant tipping. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*, 300–309.

Taylor, S. E. (2010). Health psychology. Em R. F. Baumeister & E. J. Finkel (Eds.), *Advanced social psychology: The state of the science* (pp. 697-731). New York: Oxford University Press.

Todd, P.M. & Gigerenzer, Gerd. (2012). Mechanisms of ecological rationality: Heuristics and environments that make us smart. Em L. Barrett & R. Dunbar (Eds.). *Oxford Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology* (pp. 197-209). New York: Oxford University Press.

Triplett, N. (1898). The dynamogenic factors in pacemaking and competition. *American Journal of Psychology, 9*, 507–533.

Varan, D., Lang, A., Barwise, P., Weber, R., & Bellman, S. (2015). How reliable are neuromarketers' measures of advertising effectiveness?. *Journal of Advertising Research, 55*(2), 176-191.

APRESENTAÇÃO DO MANUSCRITO 2

Parece existir uma percepção geral de que anúncios utilizam as mais poderosas estratégias persuasivas para manipular consumidores, levando-os a gastar cada vez mais. Entretanto, poucas foram as investigações empíricas destinadas a verificar essas alegações. Portanto, tomando como base a evidência empírica disponível sobre mudança de atitudes e comportamentos, o manuscrito a seguir analisa e descreve os princípios e as táticas de influência social utilizadas por campanhas premiadas em importantes festivais de publicidade do Brasil.

Manuscrito 2

An analysis of persuasive principles in award-winning advertisements

Uma análise de princípios persuasivos em anúncios premiados

Abstract

Identifying effective behavior change strategies has been the goal of a number of different scientific endeavors, and the advertising industry has naturally being interested in applications of this knowledge. The goal of this paper is to investigate to what extent and in which manner are social influence tactics employed by award-winning advertising campaigns. Using Armstrong's Persuasion Principles Index (PPI) – a checklist developed over 16 years that summarizes most empirical knowledge on attitude and behavior change and applies it to the development of effective advertising – and the social influence principles identified by Cialdini, we conducted an empirical analysis of a sample of 97 print advertisements found in the archives of two important Brazilian advertising festivals. Five independent raters analyzed all ads according to the principles in the PPI. Analysis revealed raters were concordant (or agreed with one another?) with one another (global concordance: $W = .398$). The six most persuasive advertisements were identified and described, as well as the strategies mostly used. This paper also considers and discusses the implications of using Armstrong's checklist as a way of assessing how professionals in the advertising industry are applying persuasive principles to the production of successful campaigns.

Keywords: award-winning campaigns, consumer behavior, social influence principles, behavior change

Resumo

Identificar estratégias eficazes de mudança de comportamento tem sido o objetivo de uma série de empreendimentos científicos diferentes, e o setor de publicidade está naturalmente interessado em aplicações desse conhecimento. O objetivo deste trabalho é investigar até que ponto e de que maneira táticas de influência social são empregadas por campanhas publicitárias premiadas. Usando o Índice de Princípios de Persuasão de Armstrong (*PPI*, sigla em inglês) – uma checklist desenvolvida ao longo de 16 anos que resume a maioria dos conhecimentos empíricos sobre mudança de atitude e de comportamento que se aplica ao desenvolvimento de publicidade efetiva – e os princípios de influência social identificados por Cialdini, realizou-se uma análise empírica de uma amostra de 97 anúncios impressos encontrados nos arquivos de dois importantes festivais de publicidade brasileira. Cinco avaliadores independentes analisaram todos os anúncios de acordo com os princípios do IPP. A análise revelou que os avaliadores estavam concordantes um com o outro (concordância global: W = .398). Os seis anúncios mais persuasivos foram identificados e descritos, bem como as estratégias mais utilizadas. Este manuscrito também considera e discute as implicações de usar a lista de verificação da Armstrong como forma de avaliar como profissionais do setor de publicidade estão aplicando princípios persuasivos para a produção de campanhas bem-sucedidas.

Palavras-chave: campanhas premiadas, comportamento do consumidor, princípios de influência social, mudança de comportamento

Identifying effective behavior change strategies has been the goal of a number of different scientific endeavors. Social psychologists, for instance, have studied how people influence each other since the 1890s (Pratkanis, 2008). A lot of empirical knowledge has been gathered since then, from theoretical models of attitude change (see Tormala & Briñol, 2015) to the neural correlates of compliance (Cacioppo, Cacioppo, & Petty, 2017). This lasting interest appears justified as, in modern Western societies, persuasion is the mechanism of choice for individuals to make decisions or resolve disputes, amongst many other uses (Pratkanis & Aronson, 2002). Persuasion-related activities are also an important part of a country's economy. In the United States, for instance, they account for approximately 30% of the Gross Domestic Product (Antioch, 2013). Behavioral economics has brought renewed attention to the topic, and recently governments have grown more and more interested in understanding how theories, methods and concepts from the behavioral sciences could be applied to large-scale intervention programs (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008). In 2010, a Behavioral Insights Team was established at the center of the United Kingdom's government in order to promote public priorities by using a "libertarian paternalist" approach. This has been based on the application of research findings from cognitive social psychology and low-cost opt-out rights, an initiative that has been followed by an increasing number of countries around the world (Benartzi et al., 2017).

Advertising has naturally being interested in those applications. Much research has been done on how advertising works (Sharp, 2010), what are the best measures of its effectiveness (Bruner II & King, 2011) and how different copy styles and creative execution affect buying behavior (Binet & Field, 2009; 2013). Over the years, evidence-based marketing practices started gaining increased popularity around the world, particularly amongst global brands (Sharp, Wright, Kennedy, & Nguyen, 2017). As a fundamental part of the marketing mix, advertising as well has benefited from this trend. Notwithstanding,

advertising practitioners still act mostly based on creativity and intuitions (Armstrong, 2010;

Sharp, 2010). As a result, many professionals developed their own notions of how mass

persuasion works, and those largely differ from well-supported scientific theories (Feldwick,

2016). Furthermore, the evidence suggests that trusting experts' judgments, in many contexts,

is simply not worth it (as demonstrated by the comprehensive studies conducted by Tetlock,

2006). Therefore, a number of ways has been proposed to improve advertisements aimed at

shifting attitudes, behaviors and habits, from decision-making based on data and business

analytics (Erevelles, Fukawa, & Swayne, 2016) to the use of neuroscience tools

(Venkatraman et al., 2015). However, it turns out that even when they have the data,

marketers still risk to misinterpret it, as shown by Sharp (2010).

Nonetheless, compelling evidence from areas such as public policy (Sunstein, 2017),

health (Kelly & Barker, 2016; Volpp et al., 2017) and voting psychology (Kalla &

Broockman, 2017) has shown that changing human behavior is not an easy process.

Therefore, relying mostly on creativity and intuitions simply might be a poor approach to

successfully pushing consumers towards brands and, if anything else, a waste of useful

scientific resources.

The goal of this paper is to investigate to what extent and in which manner are social

influence tactics used by award-winning advertising campaigns. First, we review the

scientific literature on behavioral compliance from the standpoint of Cialdini's (2008) social-

psychological principles of influence and how they have been applied to advertisements

through Armstrong's (2010) Persuasion Principles Index. Then we proceed to an empirical

analysis of a selected sample of print advertisements produced in Brazil. Consequently, our

main objective is to identify, measure and describe the use of those principles and tactics in

award-winning print advertisements. This paper also considers and discusses the implications

of using Armstrong's checklist as a way of assessing how professionals in the advertising industry are applying persuasive principles to the production of successful campaigns.

Cialdini's seven principles of social influence

There have been recent attempts to summarize findings on behavioral compliance. Pratkanis (2008), for instance, organized 107 different experimentally tested social influence tactics according to classical rhetoric theory. However, a more rewarding approach to reviewing the literature on persuasion might be looking at general tendencies in human behavior towards compliance. Cialdini's (2008) seminal work on social influence principles lays the groundwork for such a broad analysis by suggesting that deeply evolutionary roots (Sundie, Cialdini, Griskevicius, & Kenrick, 2012) and a limited set of basic psychological human drives (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004) could explain most of persuasive processes.

Cialdini (2008) synthetized the accumulated findings on persuasion into seven core, cross-situational principles, that, according to him, could be taught, learned, and applied by any individual. He uncovered those principles by studying the actions of commercial compliance professionals *in loco* and by matching what was observed against experimental research findings, mostly from social psychology. Cialdini hypothesized that understanding those individuals' "weapons of influence" was particularly telling because their livelihoods depended on the effectiveness of their procedures. Cialdini's principles, briefly reviewed below, could be labeled as: reciprocation, commitment and consistency, consensus, authority, empathy, scarcity and unity.

The first principle, reciprocity, involves providing favors or concessions to others, creating a feeling of obligation and indebtedness that increases the likelihood of compliance, since not repaying could cause individuals to risk social disapproval. Researchers have reportedly demonstrated this rule as one of the most effective principles of persuasion (Alkış

& Temizel, 2015). As a consequence, reciprocity-based tactics, such as free samples and coupons, are quite common and widespread, especially in marketing actions (Cialdini, 2008).

The principle of consistency establishes that an individual will be more likely to comply with requests that are consistent with some past behavior or a position publicly declared. There is much evidence on people's tendency to avoid inconsistencies, that being the cornerstone of cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957), one of social psychology's most robust and well-established contributions (see McGrath, 2017).

The principle of consensus reflects people's tendency to look for validation from similar others, especially in ambiguous situations. This principle draws from a vast literature on conformity and herd mentality that goes back to Jenness (1932), and was more famously demonstrated by Asch's (1956) line judgment task. Extensive research since then has shown that yielding to group pressures and social norms are effective ways of changing behaviors (Bicchieri, 2016). The principle of authority, on the other hand, describes that highly credible sources generate more assent than those who are not. Milgram's (1974) landmark experiments on obedience to authority firstly outlined people's willingness to defer to legitimate experts (see Haslam, Loughnan, & Perry, 2014, for an empirical synthesis of Milgram's experiments).

According to the principle of empathy, individuals are more easily persuaded by those they like the most. Research has demonstrated that some traits (e.g. physical attractiveness), and a number of techniques, such as the deliberate use of similarity, compliments and cooperation (to name a few) are successful in enhancing positive feelings towards an individual, and, ultimately, persuasion (see Pratkanis, 2008). The endorsement of celebrities in advertising, for instance, is a well-known persuasive approach that steams from this principle (Fleck, Korchia, & Le Roy, 2012).

Cialdini's sixth principle, scarcity, states that people are motivated to secure opportunities they believe are rare or dwindling in supply. Scarcity-based appeals are pervasive in television, radio, online, and in-store promotional advertising (Roy & Sharma, 2015). Recent studies on the psychological processes enabling rarity appeals have suggested a number of factors play a part in it, such as the desire to gain social status from consumption (Gierrl & Huettl, 2010).

More than thirty years after introducing his original six principles, Cialdini (2016) identified a new one: unity, based on the experiences of shared identities and social connections. Evidence from neuroscientific studies supports the phenomenon of confusing one's self with close others' representations (Pfaff, 2015), and two main processes appear to underlie the psychology of unity: being and acting together. The first explains the persuasive effectiveness of genetically close relatives and of physical proximity, while the second involves the influence of factors such as synchronized motoric, vocal, or sensory coordination.

Since Cialdini's principles first appeared, they were applied on a variety of settings (Van Baaren & Dijksterhuis, 2012) and identified as important variables in many others, especially in sales and advertising (Damasceno & Iglesias, 2017; Iglesias, Caldas, & Lemos, 2013). Much research was also done on how they operate on a cognitive level (Petty & Briñol, 2012), which individuals are more susceptible to each principle (Alkış & Temizel, 2015) and how to use them for maximum benefit (Cialdini, 2016), amongst many other findings.

The Persuasion Principles Index

A more evidence-based advertising is a pursuit that dates back to Hopkins' (1923) influential *Scientific Advertising*, and a number of different research initiatives investigated the elements behind successful campaigns rigorously (see Hartnett, Kennedy, Sharp, &

Greenacre, 2015). Persuasion, more specifically, has been a common target for researchers, much of the empirical knowledge on the subject steaming from social psychology (Wänke, 2009).

In order to stimulate a more evidence-informed advertising practice, Armstrong (2010), for instance, proposed a checklist that would gather most of the empirical evidence on persuasion and summarize it in an actionable and friendly-user way for practitioners in the advertising industry. All things considered, Armstrong's checklist constitutes, to the best of our knowledge, the most thorough attempt to promote the translation of psychological science for the use of advertising practitioners. A result of a review conducted over 16 years, Armstrong's checklist summarizes knowledge from 687 sources and more than 3,000 studies (Armstrong, 2010). It incorporates, for instance, most of Cialdini's (2008) principles discussed here. Initial tests of Armstrong's checklist (Armstrong, Du, Green, & Graefe, 2016) showed that its use correctly predicted the relative effectiveness of an advertisement 75% of the time (against, for example, 59% from a different copy testing measure), being especially suitable for high-involvement products.

Armstrong's checklist is especially appealing because it has been specifically designed for advertising practitioners, to whom this would inject scientific rigor into the business of developing more sales effective advertisements (Carlson, Rossiter, Stewart, & Armstrong, 2011, for instance, have discussed its relevance for marketing elsewhere). Despite being copyrighted, Armstrong's checklist is free to use, and although more tests of it are necessary (O'Keefe, 2016; Sharp & Hartnett, 2016; Woodside, 2016; Wright, 2016), its potential is undeniable (Green, Armstrong, Du, & Graefe, 2016).

Method

Sample

Award-winning advertisements reflect the consensus of groups of advertising practitioners about exemplary creative work and tend to shape how the industry operates, as awards bring fame, might influence the hiring of advertising agencies, and also affect their remuneration. Therefore, we selected a sample of 97 award-winning print advertisements, found in the archives of two important Brazilian advertising festivals: *Clube de Criação de São Paulo* (http://www.clubedecriacao.com.br) and *Prêmio Colunistas* (http://colunistas.com.br).

A recentness criterion was used. For the former, we selected all campaigns in the "press" and/or "press – conventional formats" category awarded with "gold" and/or "gold campaign" from the last five years (from the 34º to the 38º *Anuário do Clube de Criação*). For the later, we selected prizes awarded for print advertisements on a national level from 2012 to 2016 (*Prêmio Colunistas Mídia Impressa*).

Advertisements came from 30 different campaigns (5 from *Clube de Criação de São Paulo* and 25 from *Prêmio Colunistas*) for diverse brands as diverse as Volkswagen, Havaianas, Billboard, Nissan, Forbes, Band Sports, Goodyear, Americanas, Brasilcap, Submarino, Bayer, Philips Walita, Mercedes-Benz, Caixa, Getty Images or even the Ministry of Justice and Public Security of the Federal Government of Brazil. All advertisements analyzed can be accessed online.

Instruments and procedures

To determine to what extent the award-winning advertisements applied evidence-based principles, we used Armstrong's (2010) Persuasion Principles Index (PPI). The checklist has 195 items, relating to 195 different evidence-based principles that Armstrong placed under three broad categories: strategy, general tactics, and media-specific tactics. Strategy-related principles cover research findings on information, influence, emotion, and mere exposure; general principles address themes as reducing resistance from consumers,

gaining acceptance, producing the message and gaining attention. Finally, PPI has specific principles for still media, as well as motion and sound media.

Since all materials analyzed consisted of print advertisements, 13 items containing empirical evidence specifically for the analysis of motion and sound commercials were excluded. As pointed out by O'Keefe (2016), some of the principles are abstract and complex, what makes their use confusing at times. Therefore, items regarding general aesthetics, or evaluated as too vague, broad or excessively subjective, were also removed. Overall, 78 items were excluded for the analysis. For this study, PPI was also translated to Portuguese, so raters, whose first language was that, could more easily perform the task of analyzing the ads.

Five independent raters analyzed all ads according to the principles in the PPI on a 3-point scale (0 = Absence of principle; 1 = Presence to a lesser degree of principle; 2 = Definitely has the principle). Analysis of the advertisements by all raters took a month and a half, on average. Finally, when examining the data, Kendall's coefficient of concordance (W) was used to measure inter-rater agreement.

Results

Kendall's coefficient of concordance (W) was applied to observations from all raters. The five raters were concordant with one another ($p < .001$) and global concordance (W) was .398. Descriptors for the scores of each advertisement and principle were also calculated. Advertisements ($N = 97$) had the average ranking of the sum of the raters' scores ranging from 36 to 75.40 ($M = 50.21$, $SD = 7.43$). All principles ($N = 117$) had the average ranking of the sum of raters' scores ranging from 0 to 184.2 ($M = 41.56$, $SD = 45.15$).

In a sense, all advertisements performed similarly ($M = 50,21$), in a scale ranging from 0 (no principles at all) to 236 possible points (all empirical evidence applicable). Generally, means for the advertisements analyzed went from 36 to 75,5. The highest scores

(means ranging from 75 to 75.4) were attributed to five advertisements for the Ministry of Justice and Public Security's disarmament campaign, which rated slightly higher than the average. Overall, the most used principles by all 97 advertisements were 1) 'Does the ad employ illustrations that support the basic message?' ($M = 184.2$); 2) 'Does the ad use a single relevant theme?' ($M = 165.4$); 3) 'Do elements of an ad reinforce one another?' ($M = 160.4$); 4) 'Does the ad use color to gain attention?' ($M = 159.8$); 5) 'Unless the target market believes the opposite, does the ad avoid negative words?' ($M = 149.4$); 6) 'If the ad employs fast-exposure media, does it keep the message short?' ($M = 148.4$); 7) 'Does the ad avoid mixing rational and emotional appeals?' ($M = 143.2$); 8) 'Does the ad use familiar words or phrases?' ($M = 133.2$); 9) 'If there are strong arguments, does the ad avoid irrelevant information?' ($M = 124.2$); and 10) 'If the product is high-involvement and has strong arguments, does the ad use simple prose?' ($M = 118.2$).

On the other hand, the least used principles according to our analysis were 1) 'Does the ad offer credit for currently owned products?', 2) 'If the product is low-involvement, does the ad forewarn about persuasion attempts?', 3) 'Does the ad ask customers to imagine their satisfaction with a product?', 4) 'Does the ad ask customers to remember the brand name or key arguments?', 5) 'If the brand has clear comparative benefits and small market share, does the ad use comparative advertising?', and 6) 'Does the ad compare the product to market leaders?', with no rater identifying those principles in any message analyzed. Overall, eight principles scored zero in this analysis.

Six most persuasive campaigns and the principles they used

From the 30 campaigns analyzed, the six most persuasive came from the Prêmio Colunistas (this could be due to the fact that most of our sample came from that particular festival). Overall, 20 advertisements ranked higher on the checklist (means ranging from 54 to 75.4). Examples of those campaigns can be found at the Appendix. We provide now a brief

description of those campaigns and the unique principles they applied, starting with the most persuasive ones.

Firstly, this analysis found the item 'Does the ad employ illustrations that support the basic message?'($M = 184.2$) emerged as a principle all ads scored equally high on. Not by coincidence, that is also the principle most ads shared. Since most campaigns usually gravitate around the same "creative concept", that ensures they will be developed respecting a certain consistency of themes and visual identity, it was expected for advertisements from the same campaign to score almost exactly alike.

Five advertisements from the campaign "Jogral" (awarded in 2012), developed by the advertising agency DM9 for the Brazilian Ministry of Justice, scored the highest on the PPI (means ranging from 75 to 75,4). Using strong, emotional messages, this State-funded campaign targeted gun owners, urging them to hand over their weapons to the police. Those messages performed uniquely high on the item 'Does the ad use familiar words or phrases?' ($M = 133.2$). This advertisement also scored particularly high for two specific items, 'If fund raising or raising awareness for a cause, does the ad focus on victims similar to the target market?'($M = 25.2$), and 'Does the ad convey a threat related to likely or severe consequences that can be eliminated?' ($M = 27.6$), while the rest of the sample performed very differently.

Three advertisements from the campaign "Você não é um croqui" (awarded in 2013), developed by the agency Revolution Brasil for Star Models (means ranging from 57.2 to 57.6), had a public health purpose, raising awareness on eating disorders such as anorexia/bulimia. They received high marks on 'If the ad employs fast-exposure media, does it keep the message short?' ($M = 148.4$).

Three advertisements from the campaign "Adoção Tardia" (awarded in 2014), also developed by Revolution Brasil for Aldeias Nissi (mean in the PPI ranging from 56.6 to

57.6), scored exclusively high on 'Does the ad use absolute numbers for small values or frequency rates for large values?'($M = 32$). Those campaigns had a social goal, encouraging late adoption.

Three advertisements from the campaign "Infinitas Possibilidades" (awarded in 2016), developed by the agency AlmapBBDO for Getty Images Brasil (means ranging from 55.6 to 54.8) promoted their resourceful image database. They scored uniquely high on the item 'If the product is high-involvement and has strong arguments, does the ad use simple prose?' ($M = 118.2$).

Despite scoring high on a number of principles to the point of being evaluated as one of the most persuasive messages, three advertisements from the campaign "Viajar está no DNA" (awarded in 2015; means ranging from 54.4 to 54.8), did not score distinctively high on any particular item. This campaign, developed by the advertising agency Master for the travel planning webpage MalaPronta.com, explored the link between genetic ancestry, diversity and multicultural origin.

'Does the ad show the product?' ($M = 9$) and 'If the product is well-known and low-involvement, does the ad use humor?'($M = 53$) emerged as important principles for the three advertisements from the campaign "Desliga Na Hora" (awarded in 2015), developed by Revolution Brasil for Philips Walita (means ranging grom 50 to 54.4). This campaign presented cartoon characters in different embarrassing situations where a feature their product has could prove helpful.

Although a number of other items in the PPI addresses evidence related to persuasion, in what comes specifically to the principles identified by Cialdini, all advertisements scored very low (means ranging from 0.2 to 21.4, in a scale that went from 0 to 97). Only one item, related to the psychological principle of liking, scored slightly higher than the others, 'Does the ad associate the product with things that are favorable and relevant?' ($M = 60.2$).

Discussion

First of all, some general considerations are necessary. Despite Armstrong (2010) himself emphasizing his checklist is not meant to guide the development of advertisements, it can be used to analyze how those principles are being applied, and approaches like that will secure a much-needed scientific rigor for the advertising industry.

Overall, most of the campaigns performed very similarly. The lack of evidence-based principles in the advertisements might have a number of origins. Notwithstanding, it is important to acknowledge the difficulty of applying research findings to marketing strategies. In part, this helps explain why marketing and advertising professionals ignore the evidence. Reviewing the scientific literature requires training, a lot of effort, is a time-consuming process and, at times, might be just overwhelming, due to the amount of papers published on a topic every month. Using evidence-based knowledge is, in most cases, simply unpractical. This is true even for experienced researchers, who face problems when analyzing the literature. That is why Armstrong's approach looks so attractive. He summarizes the empirical evidence in an accommodating way, for the regular manager/advertising professional interested in improving his/her marketing strategies and advertisements.

Secondly, the advertising industry seems to reward more creative advertisements, instead of the more effective ones, what might be causing a general bias in the industry towards a certain type of commercial messages. Creativity tends to be conceptualized as a more artistic process, not necessarily attached to the formality and rigor of scientific procedures such as the use of checklists or copy testing. However, as Armstrong (2010) and Sharp (2010) argue, the empirical evidence available should not be considered a threat, but an interesting way to boost the effectiveness of creative campaigns. An evidence for this bias can be found in this very study: the campaign that scored the highest on persuasion principles was a Government-funded initiative with very clear behavioral goals (i.e. reducing the

availability of guns in Brazil). That was one of the few campaigns that actually presented much information beyond images, using persuasive arguments and guiding the target in a clear, straightforward way.

Interestingly, and as a fit example of what is being discussed here, the item 'Does the ad show the product?' scored very low in the analysis ($M = 9$). Depicting the product being advertised is one of the most fundamental tasks of advertising, but most campaigns at Cannes simply failed to do so. Regarding persuasion, more specifically, Cialdini's contributions were almost totally ignored.

Evidently, this research could be improved by a number of modifications in the research design. Although not being a traditional psychological scale, a more rigorous approach for the adaptation and translation of the content of the PPI is needed. Furthermore, despite all the effort of the authors in excluding abstract items, raters consistently reported problems in interpreting a number of them. It is also worth pointing out that despite Brazilian advertising campaigns being worldly regarded as having the highest quality, a more representative sample could be obtained by analyzing prominent events of the industry (such as the Cannes Lions International Festival of Creativity). Finally, a more basic consideration is necessary. Most of the empirical evidence presented in the PPI comes from social-psychological studies, and the majority of the research on attitude and behavior change is based on a interpersonal basis. Therefore, applying it in a mass media context might be an intricate procedure, even for some well-established social influence principles (e.g. reciprocity).

References

Alkış, N., & Temizel, T. T. (2015). The impact of individual differences on influence

    strategies. *Personality and Individual Differences, 87*, 147-152.

Antioch, G. (2013). Persuasion is now 30 per cent of US GDP: Revisiting McCloskey and

    Klamer after a quarter of a century. *Economic Roundup*, (1), 1-10.

Armstrong, J. S. (2010). *Persuasive advertising: Evidence-based principles*. London:

    Palgrave MacMillan.

Armstrong, J. S., Du, R., Green, K. C., & Graefe, A. (2016). Predictive validity of evidence-

    based persuasion principles: An application of the index method. *European Journal of*

    Marketing, 50(1/2), 276-293.

Asch, S. E. (1956). Studies of independence and conformity: I. A minority of one against a

    unanimous majority. *Psychological Monographs, 70*(9), 1-70.

Benartzi, S., Beshears, J., Milkman, K. L., Sunstein, C. R., Thaler, R. H., … & Galing, S.

    (2017). Should governments invest more in nudging?. *Psychological Science*, *28*(8)

Bicchieri, C. (2016). *Norms in the wild: How to diagnose, measure, and change social*

    norms. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Binet, L., & Field, P. (2009). Empirical generalizations about advertising campaign success.

    Journal of Advertising Research, 49(2), 130.

Binet, L., & Field, P. (2013). *The long and the short of it: Balancing short and long-term*

    marketing strategies. London: Institute of Practitioners in association with Thinkbox.

Bruner II, G. C., & King, M. F. (2011). Assessing progress in advertising-related scale

    development & usage. *The Journal of Applied Business Research, 19*(2), 97-107.

Cacioppo, J. T., Cacioppo, S., & Petty, R. E. (2017). The neuroscience of persuasion: A

    review with an emphasis on issues and opportunities. *Social Neuroscience*, *13*(2), 1-44.

Carlson, L., Rossiter, J. R., Stewart, D. W., & Scott Armstrong, J. (2011). Comments on J. Scott Armstrong's 'Evidence-based advertising: An application to persuasion'. *International Journal of Advertising, 30*(5), 769-794.

Cialdini, R. B. (2008). *Influence: Science and practice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Cialdini, R. (2016). *Pre-suasion: A revolutionary way to influence and persuade*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Cialdini, R. B., & Goldstein, N. J. (2004). Social influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annual Review of Psychology, 55*, 591-621.

Damasceno, R., & Iglesias, F. (2017). Táticas de persuasão de vendedores em shopping-centers: Um estudo de campo. *Psicologia Argumento, 32*(79), 187-195.

Erevelles, S., Fukawa, N., & Swayne, L. (2016). Big Data consumer analytics and the transformation of marketing. *Journal of Business Research, 69*(2), 897-904.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Evanston, IL: Row Peterson.

Fleck, N., Korchia, M., & Le Roy, I. (2012). Celebrities in advertising: Looking for congruence or likability?. *Psychology & Marketing, 29*(9), 651-662.

Gierl, H., & Huettl, V. (2010). Are scarce products always more attractive? The interaction of different types of scarcity signals with products' suitability for conspicuous consumption. *International Journal of Research in Marketing, 27*(3), 225-235.

Green, K. C., Armstrong, J. S., Du, R., & Graefe, A. (2016). Persuasion Principles Index: Ready for pretesting advertisements. *European Journal of Marketing, 50*(1/2), 317-326.

Hartnett, N., Kennedy, R., Sharp, B., & Greenacre, L. (2016). Creative that sells: How advertising execution affects sales. *Journal of Advertising, 45*(1), 102-112.

Hopkins, C. (1923). *Scientific advertising*. Chicago: NTC Business Books.

Iglesias, F., Caldas, L. S., & Lemos, S. M. S. (2013). Publicidade infantil: Uma análise de táticas persuasivas na TV aberta. *Psicologia & Sociedade, 25*(1), 134-141.

Jenness, A. (1932). The role of discussion in changing opinion regarding a matter of fact. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 27*, 279-296.

Lemos, S. M. S., Iglesias, F., & Pérez-Nebra, A. R. (2013). *Ambientação, efetividade, relações sociais e emoções: Analisando táticas não-coercitivas da publicidade no período de Natal*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Social and Work Psychology, University of Brasília, Distrito Federal, Brazil.

Kalla, J. L., & Broockman, D. E. (2017). The minimal persuasive effects of campaign contact in general elections: Evidence from 49 field experiments. *American Political Science Review, 112*(1), 148-166;

Kelly, M. P., & Barker, M. (2016). Why is changing health-related behaviour so difficult?. *Public Health, 136*, 109-116.

McGrath, A. (2017). Dealing with dissonance: A review of cognitive dissonance reduction. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 11*(12), 1-17.

Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to authority: An experimental view*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

O'Keefe, D. (2016). Evidence-based advertising using persuasion principles: Predictive validity and proof of concept. *European Journal of Marketing, 50*(1/2), 294-300.

Petty, R. E., & Briñol, P. (2012). A multiprocess approach to social influence. In D. T. Kenrick, N. J. Goldstein, & S. L. Braver (Eds.). *Six degrees of social influence: Science, application, and the psychology of Robert Cialdini* (pp. 49-58). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pfaff, D. W. (2015). *The altruistic brain: How we are naturally good*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Pratkanis, A. R. (2008). Social influence analysis: An index of tactics. In A. R. Pratkanis (Ed.), *The science of social influence: Advances and future progress* (pp. 17–82). New York: Psychology Press.

Pratkanis, A. R., & Aronson, E. (2002). *Age of propaganda: The everyday use and abuse of persuasion*. New York: Holt Paperbacks.

Roy, R., & Sharma, P. (2015). Scarcity appeal in advertising: Exploring the moderating roles of need for uniqueness and message framing. *Journal of Advertising, 44*(4), 349-359.

Sharp, B. (2010). *How brands grow: What marketers don't know*. Victoria: Oxford University Press.

Sharp, B., & Hartnett, N. (2016). Generalisability of advertising persuasion principles. *European Journal of Marketing, 50*(1/2), 301-305.

Sharp, B., Wright, M., Kennedy, R., & Nguyen, C. (2017). Viva la revolution! For evidence-based marketing we strive. *Australasian Marketing Journal*.

Sundie, J. M., Cialdini, R. B., Griskevicius, V., & Kenrick, D. T. (2012). The world's (truly) oldest profession: Social influence in evolutionary perspective. *Social Influence, 7*(3), 134-153.

Sunstein, C. R. (2017). Nudges that fail. *Behavioural Public Policy, 1*(1), 4-25.

Tetlock, P. E. (2006). *Expert political judgment: How good is it? How can we know?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. New York: Penguin Books.

Tormala, Z., & Briñol, P. (2015). Attitude change and persuasion: Past, present, and future directions. In M. I. Norton & D. D. Rucker (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of consumer psychology* (pp. 29-64). Cambridge: Cambridge Press.

Van Baaren, R., & Dijksterhuis, A. (2012). Behavioral change Cialdini-style. In D. T.

    Kenrick, N. J. Goldstein, & S. L. Braver (Eds.). *Six degrees of social influence: Science,*

    application, and the psychology of Robert Cialdini (pp. 134-141). Oxford: Oxford

    University Press.

Venkatraman, V., Dimoka, A., Pavlou, P. A., Vo, K., Hampton, W., Bollinger, B., ... &

    Winer, R. S. (2015). Predicting advertising success beyond traditional measures: New

    insights from neurophysiological methods and market response modeling. *Journal of*

    Marketing Research, 52(4), 436-452.

Volpp, K. G., Troxel, A. B., Mehta, S. J., Norton, L., Zhu, J., Lim, R., ... & Levin, T. (2017).

    Effect of electronic reminders, financial incentives, and social support on outcomes after

    myocardial infarction: The HeartStrong Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Internal*

    Medicine, 177(8), 1093-1101.

Wänke, M. (2009). What's social about consumer behavior?. In M. Wänke (Ed.), *Social*

    psychology of consumer behavior (pp. 3-18). New York: Psychology Press.

Woodside, A. G. (2016). Predicting advertising execution effectiveness: Scale development

    and validation. *European Journal of Marketing, 50*(1/2), 306-311.

Wright, M. J. (2016). Predicting what? The strengths and limitations of a test of persuasive

    advertising principles. *European Journal of Marketing, 50*(1/2), 312-316.

Apêndice do Manuscrito 2: Anúncios mais persuasivos

Figure 1. Advertisement from the campaign "Jogral"

Figure 2. Advertisement from the campaign "Você não é um croqui".

Figure 3. Advertisement from the campaign "Adoção Tardia"

Figure 4. Advertisement from the campaign "Infinitas Possibilidades"

Figure 5. Advertisement from the campaign "Viajar está no DNA"

Figure 6. Advertisement from the campaign "Desliga Na Hora"

APRESENTAÇÃO DO MANUSCRITO 3

Ao se investigar o uso da persuasão por anúncios, dois caminhos óbvios são possíveis. O primeiro, contemplado pelo Manuscrito 2, refere-se a analisar os frutos dos trabalhos de publicitários, os anúncios, e mensurar o grau de uso de táticas persuasivas. O segundo envolve medir, diretamente, o conhecimento desses profissionais sobre táticas persuasivas, e compará-lo ao de leigos. Este é, portanto, o objetivo deste último Manuscrito da Dissertação.

Manuscrito 3

Persuasion knowledge: How much do advertising practitioners and psychologists know about influence strategies?
Conhecimento sobre persuasão: O quanto publicitários e psicólogos sabem sobre estratégias de influência?

Abstract

Despite all the empirical evidence on attitude and behavior change that could be used to improve advertising success, most practitioners in the advertising business still act based on intuitions, even when extensive research has shown the limits of experts' performance in a number of fields. This study, therefore, aimed to measure advertising practitioners and psychologists' knowledge on empirically tested persuasion tactics and compare it with the knowledge held by non-experts. In order to do that, 399 participants from those three backgrounds evaluated 12 full-page print advertisements. Half of the commercial messages scored high on persuasion according to the Persuasion Principles Index – a checklist that gathers most of the empirical evidence on persuasion and applies it to advertising, – while the other half scored very low. Overall, results suggest that advertising practitioners and psychologists could not perform better than non-experts at predicting which advertisements were the most persuasive or not. In some cases, they even performed slightly worst than regular people with no training in marketing strategies or human behavior. Results of the study were then related to previous work on behavior change and advertising effectiveness.

Keywords: award-winning campaigns, experts' knowledge, social influence principles, behavioral change, expertise, consumer behavior

Resumo

Apesar da evidência empírica existente sobre mudança de atitudes e comportamentos que podem ser utilizadas para melhorar o sucesso de campanhas publicitárias, muitos profissionais dessa área ainda atuam baseados em intuições mesmo quando extensa pesquisa tem mostrado as limitações da performance de especialistas em diversos campos. Este estudo, portanto, objetiva mensurar o conhecimento de publicitários e psicólogos sobre táticas de persuasão testadas empiricamente e comparar esse conhecimento com o de não-especialistas. Para isso, 399 participantes avaliaram 12 anúncios publicitários impressos. Metade das mensagens tiveram escores altos de acordo com o Índice de Princípios de Persuasão - uma checklist que reúne a maioria da evidência empírica em persuasão e a aplica à publicidade -, enquanto a outra metade possuía escores baixos. De uma forma geral, os resultados sugerem que profissionais de publicidade e psicólogos não se saíram melhor que os não-especialistas em predizer quais anúncios eram os mais persuasivos ou não. Em alguns casos, eles se saíram ligeiramente pior que pessoas sem treinamento em estratégias de marketing ou no comportamento humano. Os resultados do estudo foram então relacionados a trabalhos anteriores sobre mudança comportamento e efetividade de anúncios publicitários.

Palavras-chave: campanhas premiadas, conhecimento de especialistas, princípios de influência social, mudança comportamental, expertise, comportamento do consumidor

Extensive research has shown that experts are no better than most people at a variety of tasks, from the forecasting of political outcomes (Tetlock, 2006) to investment decisions (Bodnaruk & Simonov, 2015), estimating the statistical power necessary for quantitative research (Bakker, Hartgerink, Wicherts, & van der Maas, 2016) or even detecting lies (Aamodt & Mitchell, 2006). Despite all the available evidence, however, people continue recurring to experts for guidance in a variety of subjects where expertise beyond an easily achieved minimum demonstrated having little to offer (Armstrong, 1980).

Marketing and advertising practitioners are no exception to that. Recent research by Bogomolova, Szabo and Kennedy (2017) has shown that manufacturers and retailers make important marketing decisions (e.g. price-promotions) out of intuition and, at times, have beliefs that are simply in sheer contrast with academic knowledge. As another example, Armstrong (1991) has demonstrated that academics and practitioners could not perform better than chance at predicting the results of consumer behavior studies (in this case, academics did significantly worse than chance). In advertising, Kover, James and Sonner (1997) found that practitioners and consumers evaluated commercials differently, the former favoring award-winning commercials (both from creativity and effectiveness awards) while the later giving more positive responses to self-enhancing advertisements, regardless of their award status. When analyzing the performance of advertisements in generating sales, studies such as that conducted by Hartnett, Kennedy, Sharp and Greenacre (2016) have shown that practitioners with category experience and in marketing or consumer insights roles made slightly better predictions, although results were far from impressive.

Notwithstanding, despite the growing knowledge accumulated in the scientific literature, most retailers, as well as marketing and advertising practitioners, rely on intuitive beliefs about human behavior and operate based on creativity, feelings, rules of thumb and prior practice rather than facts, rigorous experimentation and evidence-based theories.

However, it is now well established from a variety of studies, that intuition tends to be biased, leading to predictable and systematic errors (Kahneman, 2012). There appears to be a long-standing disconnect between research and practice in the application of empirically grounded knowledge in advertising (Weilbacher, 2003). Some practitioners believe that advertising is more of an "art" than a "science", and worry that guidelines would jeopardize the creative process of developing advertisements (Armstrong, 2010; Ogilvy, 2004). Creatives tend to perceive advertising as more appropriate when it is artistic, and although many assume creativity to be highly related to effectiveness, there is no firm evidence tying creative campaigns to sales revenues (Kover, 2016), with some studies showing, for instance, that creativity did not enhance aided recall, purchase intent, or brand and advertisement attitude (Till & Baack, 2005) and others that creativity is closely related to effectiveness (Field & IPA, 2012). Advertising professionals even seem to have instinctive generic beliefs about how advertisements influence consumers and sales that largely differ from those proposed by academic theories (Kover, 1995).

Despite all that, market research already borrows heavily from the behavioral sciences and advertising as a whole is becoming more accountable. Strategic decisions informed by data analytics (Deighton, 2017) or tools and theories from neuroscience (Karmarkar & Yoon, 2016) are becoming increasingly more common, mirroring a growing presence of a more empirical thinking in marketing, with experts starting to recur to the scientific literature more often for answers (Sharp, Wright, Kennedy, & Nguyen, 2017).

However, keeping up with the latest science might be simply unpractical for many managers and advertising practitioners. Reviewing the scientific literature is a time-consuming and expensive process that requires lots of energy, advanced training and experience. Interpreting research findings, deciding which studies are relevant or reliable and how to apply them in a marketing plan is a complicated task. In that sense, the checklist

developed by Armstrong (2010) is a useful tool for those whose job is to craft mass persuasion messages. Based on much research supporting the value of using checklists (Hales & Pronovost, 2006), Armstrong developed an instrument summarizing most empirical knowledge on persuasion in advertising. As a result of a 16 year-effort, he found 195 evidence-based principles that govern how consent is sought by advertising messages. Although potentially useful for advertising copy testing – raters utilizing Armstrong's checklist correctly predicted the relative effectiveness of an advertisement 75% of the time (Armstrong, Du, Green, & Graefe, 2016) – the instrument needs to be tested in different contexts, with more rigorous measures, such as single-source data, more trustworthy to indicating advertising success (O'Keefe, 2016; Sharp & Hartnett, 2016; Woodside, 2016; Wright, 2016).

The goal of this study, therefore, is to identify possible differences between the persuasion knowledge held by advertising practitioners and non-experts. More specifically, we intend to measure and describe how advertising practitioners (and non-experts) intuitively recognize principles and tactics of social influence on a sample of selected advertisements. We hope that responding to that question might give us initial insight on how much advertising practitioners intuitively know about persuasion from a scientific standpoint.

To the best of our knowledge, the checklist developed by Armstrong (2010) seems to be the most adequate and comprehensive instrument for a broad analysis of persuasion strategies in advertising, probably the only one specifically designed with that goal in mind. Since Cialdini's (2008) principles constitute 6 out of the 8 items Armstrong uses to address influence in advertising (and one of them, "attribution", could be fairly included under the umbrella of liking), and being the main goal of this article to address the persuasion phenomenon in campaigns, we shall now review, more specifically, Cialdini's theoretical framework. Beyond introducing how psychological sciences describe effective persuasion,

we also review how people think about the topic, using as our starting point the Persuasion

Knowledge Model (Friestad & Wright, 1994), a theoretical model on how people think about

persuasive strategies. Understanding how advertising people think about persuasion is an

important part of comprehending the strategies they choose to use, and it is the main goal of

this paper. With this study, we intend to expand the existing knowledge on the use of

psychosocial concepts when applied to advertising; to offer a primer on the knowledge of

advertising professionals about social influence and contribute to the field by verifying the

use of those principles in a more ecological context.

Principles of social influence

In the evolution of research on social influence and persuasion, there has been a

progression from the study of specific variables (e.g. attractiveness of the source, certain

verbal commands; for a review, see Petty & Briñol, 2010), to an emphasis on general,

integrated theoretical models steaming from the dual processing paradigm (Teeny, Briñol, &

Petty, 2017), to recent neuroscience investigations (Cacioppo, Cacioppo, & Petty, 2017) and

the subsequent application of the accumulated knowledge to large-scale interventions in

several domains (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008).

Consent without coercion is the main goal of research on social influence. One of the

most impactful contributions to this field was made by Cialdini (2008; 2016), who identified

seven general tendencies people have towards compliance. Those tendencies account for the

most effective tactics to persuade an individual (Pratkanis, 2008) and mirror well established

findings from cognitive social psychology. According to Cialdini, the core principles

underlying behavioral compliance could be briefly explained as follows:

The first principle, reciprocity, describes a widely accepted social rule that requires

individuals to repay favors or concessions (as demonstrated, for instance, by Burger,

Ehrlichman, Raymond, Ishikawa, & Sandoval, 2006); consistency is the human tendency to

avoid cognitive and behavioral incongruities (see Festinger, 1957), especially when a public, irreversible and freely chosen commitment has been made (Salancik, 1977); social proof refers to inferring the expected behavior in a certain situation (and acting accordingly) simply by observing similar others (see Asch, 1956); the principle of authority establishes that experts should be trusted and respected (see Milgram, 1974); liking states that individuals prefer and assent more easily to requests made by people they enjoy and admire, such as friends (Chaiken, 1979); scarcity specifies that rare objects and opportunities have more value (Lynn, 1989); and unity that people consent more to those they share identities with, such as members of groups they feel they are part of (Cialdini, 2016).

Cialdini's principles were derived from his review of over a century of research on the empirical investigation of influence, and also have deep psychological (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004) and evolutionary roots (Sundie, Cialdini, Griskevicius, & Kenrick, 2012). Using the scientific literature as a rationale, Cialdini also went undercover and observed compliance professionals in the field for a period of about three years.

Those principles have been applied to a variety of marketing actions. For example, the norm of reciprocity translates into actions such as discount coupons or free samples (Cialdini, 2008); low-balling, the unethical sales tactic of switching for a more costly option once the consumer is already committed to a product is based on the mechanisms underlying the principle of consistency (Burger & Cornelius, 2003); social proof-inspired tactics imply that a significant amount of people is buying the product (Cialdini, 2008); advertising showing experts recommending products are a common way of applying the authority principle (Wang, 2005); all advertising showing celebrities' endorsements fall under the umbrella of the liking principle (Reinhard & Messner, 2009); and messages such as "the product is in short supply" are an example of how the scarcity principle influences consumers (Roy & Sharma, 2015). Finally, emphasizing that buying a certain product will make the consumer

part of a group is a unity-based strategy (as interpreted according to how the principle is described by Cialdini, 2016).

The Persuasion Knowledge Model

One of the most influential theories for understanding how people think about persuasive attempts is Friestad and Wright's (1994) Persuasion Knowledge Model (hereafter PKM). This model was developed to address people's intuitive theories about how marketers try to persuade consumers. In opposition to many other models that provided no explicit role for audience members' persuasion knowledge, the PKM has a strong emphasis on the perspective of the target of persuasion e.g. for whom a persuasion attempt is intended (Kirmani & Campbell, 2009).

The PKM offers a broad conceptualization of what persuasion is and assumes that knowledge about it continues developing throughout the life span. According to this model, both agent and target have three different knowledge structures that interact to determine how persuasion attempts occur: persuasion knowledge (a set of interrelated beliefs about coping tactics, psychological mediators, marketer's goals, their tactics and perceived effectiveness), agent (or target) knowledge, and topic knowledge. Therefore, the PKM proposes that targets deal with agents' attempts by using coping tactics they believe are more effective and suitable for a given "persuasion episode", the observable part of an agent's behavior (Kirmani & Campbell, 2009).

Advocates for the PKM also argue that it allows important advances into the study of persuasive processes from a social-cognitive perspective. A number of different studies have applied the PKM as theoretical framework e.g. to compile a typology of the different ways in which consumers resist advertising (Fransen, Verlegh, Kirmani, & Smit, 2015) or to understand the complementary effect of advertising and publicity (Kim, Kim, & Marshall, 2016), amongst many other uses.

When first describing their model, Friestad and Wright (1994) clearly defended that, thanks to the knowledge individuals had about persuasion, it was common for them to dynamically alternate between the roles of target, coping with persuasion, and agent, producing it. However, persuasion agents such as advertising practitioners are usually assumed to have a great deal of knowledge on how to persuade targets, and, to the best of our knowledge, no study was conducted using the PKM to sustain this thinking. As a parallel, Friestad and Wright (1995) found that, in many ways, lay people's beliefs regarding persuasion are similar to those of psychology researchers. Those results offer some basis for the rationale that marketers and consumers might have very similar understandings of the persuasion process as well. After all, persuasion agents are also, first and foremost, targets – and acquire most of the knowledge they have on persuasion as such, and even when supplied with data and knowledge of experimentally tested tactics might still rely heavily on what they learnt intuitively. This study, therefore, aims to address this gap in the literature by examining how advertising practitioners think about influence strategies and how does that differ from non-experts i.e. targets.

Method

Participants

A convenient sample of advertising practitioners, psychologists, students of those two disciplines, and non-experts ($N = 399$, female = 53,1%, age mean = 27,59, $SD = 9,50$). 40,9% had uncompleted undergraduate degrees, 26,8% had higher education status, and 10,5% had specialization degrees. They were all organized in three different groups. The first group ($n = 85$; 21,3%) consisted of advertising practitioners, undergraduate and graduate students of advertising/marketing; the second one, psychologists, as well as undergraduate and graduate students of psychology ($n = 111$; 27,8%); the last group contained non-experts in advertising, marketing and psychology ($n = 203$; 50,9%), from various backgrounds. From the 61

advertising practitioners, 20 were "creative" professionals, responsible for designing the ads. The rationale for including psychologists and undergraduate students of psychology was the hypothesis that, because of their education and training on human behavior, they might be able to perform better on the task of identifying the more persuasive advertisements.

Social media was used to recruit participants, mainly via posts on Facebook. A snowball sampling technique was also employed, with messages asking participants to share the survey with their contacts.

Instruments and Procedure

Participants evaluated 12 full-page print advertisements, administered over SurveyMonkey, a web-based survey management site. Half of the ads scored high on persuasion principles according to Armstrong's checklist, while the other half scored very low (this was verified in a previous study, by a team of five independent raters; see Manuscript 1). Different from more educational approaches to access perceptions on advertisement's effectiveness e.g. *Which Ad Pulled Best?*'s (Purvis, 2010), offering categorical data from forced-choice questions, we opted for using a Likert scale, in order to gain insight on the magnitude of the differences between groups. Therefore, participants evaluated the ads according to a single-item question regarding persuasion effectiveness ('This advertisement is persuasive'). To mitigate biases related to primacy and recency of stimuli, the order of presentation of the ads was randomized.

Participants were also asked the degree to which the advertisement was liked or disliked. This was prompted both by the importance of advertising likeability for advertising effectiveness (as demonstrated by classic studies in the field such as the Advertising Research Foundation's Copy Research Validity Project, Haley & Baldinger, 1991; see Smit, Van Meurs, & Neijens, 2006) and its pervasiveness in advertising pre-testing.

Stimulated by research on the third-person effect (see Paul, Salwen, & Dupagne, 2000), we also asked participants if they believed others would be more persuaded by the advertisements than themselves. This item was designed as another proxy for estimating the perceived persuadability of the advertisement.

Items inspired by the *Knowledge about Persuasion Tactics* scale (Boush, Friestad, & Rose, 1994), originally designed to measure dispositional persuasion knowledge in the context of TV advertising, were adapted to reflect both common marketing strategies as well as the social influence principles described by Cialdini (2008) and incorporated in Armstrong's (2010) checklist. Therefore, none of the six tactics proposed by Boush, Friestad, and Rose (1994) were used. Instead, they were replaced by examples of marketing applications of the social influence principles identified by Cialdini (2008) and an extra item regarding fear appeals, as this is often seen as a powerful persuasive approach in mass communication (see Tannenbaum et al., 2015). Also, none of the eight effects suggested in the original research article were used. Instead, "make you buy the product" was used in the questions, as this appears to be more closely related to a behavioral measure, such as sales (the most relevant measure for advertising success, according to Sharp, 2010). The *Knowledge about Persuasion Tactics* scale is based on the Persuasion Knowledge Model (Friestad & Wright, 1994), as reviewed by Ham, Nelson, and Das (2015).

Participants also were invited to express their beliefs on advertising practitioners' natural talents to persuade consumers and their usage of findings from scientific research for the same purpose. All items used a five-point (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) scale. Finally, demographic information regarding gender, age, education, and professional experience in advertising or psychology (such as years of service and area of work in the industry) was also collected. Analysis of variance intra- and inter-subjects were performed to

compare three different groups (advertising practitioners, psychologists and non-experts). When that was not possible, their non-parametric counterparts were conducted.

Results

Although the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test indicated a deviation from normality for the three groups during the analysis of the most persuasive advertisements (advertising practitioners: $D(85) = .118$, $p < 0.05$; psychologists: $D(111) = .148$, $p < 0.05$; non-experts: $D(203) = .113$, $p < 0.05$), a visual inspection of the histogram suggested those distributions were very close to normal and parametric tests were first conducted. The one-way independent ANOVA did not show any significant differences between the persuasion knowledge held by advertising practitioners, psychologists, and non-experts, $F(2, 396) = 2.648$, $p = .072$, $d = .222$. For the least persuasive messages, the distribution was also significantly non-normal (advertising practitioners: $D(85) = .110$, $p < 0.05$; psychologists: $D(111) = .127$, $p < 0.05$; non-experts: $D(203) = .077$, $p < 0.05$), but the same process was repeated, with parametric tests finding no significant differences between the three groups, $F(2, 396) = 2.279$, $p = .104$, $d = .215$. Since those results could be attributed to the violation of the assumption of normality, non-parametric tests were also conducted. A summary of the results of those tests can be found in Table 1. Significant results and further analyses are presented in more detail.

———————————————

Insert Table 1

———————————————

A Kruskal–Wallis test revealed that there was a significant difference between the three groups for the most persuasive messages, $H(2) = 6.91$, $p = .032$, $d = 0.224$. Pairwise comparisons with adjusted p-values showed that there were no significant differences between advertising practitioners and psychologists ($p = .137$). There were also no significant differences between psychologists and non-experts ($p = 1.00$). A statistically significant

difference was found, however, between advertising practitioners and non-experts ($p = .029$), with advertising practitioners performing worst (*Mdn* = 13, range = 7-30) than non-experts (*Mdn* = 14, range = 7-26), attributing the lowest scores to the most persuasive advertisements. For the least persuasive messages, no differences between the three groups was found, $H(2) = 3.94$, $p = .139$, $d = 0.14$.

For the analysis of the third-person effect hypothesis, again the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test indicated the assumption of normality was violated for all groups during the analysis of the most persuasive (advertising practitioners: $D(85) = .126$, $p < 0.05$; psychologists: $D(111) = .091$, $p < 0.05$; non-experts: $D(203) = .069$, $p < 0.05$) and the least persuasive advertisements (advertising practitioners: $D(85) = .107$, $p < 0.05$; psychologists: $D(111) = .086$, $p < 0.05$; non-experts: $D(203) = .076$, $p < 0.05$). After analyzing the histogram, parametric tests were conducted, and no significant differences were found between advertising practitioners, psychologists, and non-experts, both for the most persuasive, $F(2, 396) = 0.627$, $p = .535$, $d = .11$, and the least persuasive advertisements, $F(2, 396) = 0.422$, $p = .656$, $d = .091$, indicating, again, no difference in the way the persuasiveness of the messages was perceived by the three groups. If anything, an analysis of the means showed psychologists performed slightly better (*M* = 16.57, *SE* = .317) in identifying more persuasive messages than advertising practitioners (*M* = 16.27, *SE* = .415) and non-experts (*M* = 16.11, *SE* = .242); and advertising practitioners performed slightly worst (*M* = 16.44, *SE* = .385) than non-experts (*M* = 16.07, *SE* = .254) in identifying the least persuasive advertisements, although all those results were non-significant. Using non-parametric tests, no difference was found between the groups, both for the most persuasive, $H(2) = 1.022$, $p = .600$, $d = 0.1$, and the least persuasive messages, $H(2) = .749$, $p = .688$, $d = .113$.

For the analysis of the likeability of the advertisements, the Kruskal-Wallis test revealed a statistically significant difference between the three groups both for the most

persuasive, $H(2) = 21.642$, $p < .000$, $d = .457$, and the least persuasive messages, $H(2) =$ 16.320, $p < .001$, $d = .367$. For the most persuasive ones, pairwise comparisons with adjusted p-values showed that there were significant differences between advertising practitioners and psychologists, and advertising practitioners and non-experts (both at $p < .001$), with advertising practitioners finding the most persuasive messages less likeable ($Mdn = 13$, range = 8-30) than psychologists ($Mdn = 15$, range = 7-26) and non-experts ($Mdn = 15$, range = 7-27). No difference was found between psychologists and non-experts ($p = 1.000$). For the least persuasive advertisements, further analysis showed a statistically significant difference between psychologists and advertising practitioners, and psychologists and non-experts (both at $p < .001$), with psychologists favoring less persuasive messages ($Mdn = 19$, range = 10-30) more than advertising practitioners ($Mdn = 17$, range = 10-30) and non-experts ($Mdn = 17$, range = 8-29).

When identifying persuasion strategies, the Kruskal-Wallis test revealed a statistically significant difference between the three groups, $H(2) = 39.678$, $p < .001$, $d = .649$. Pairwise comparisons with adjusted p-values showed that there were no significant differences between advertising practitioners and non-experts ($p = .825$). A difference was found, however, between psychologists and advertising practitioners ($p < .001$), and psychologists and non-experts ($p < .001$). This difference, though, showed that psychologists performed worst ($Mdn = 15$, range = 7-25) than advertising practitioners ($Mdn = 17$, range = 10-35) and non-experts ($Mdn = 18$, range = 9-33) in identifying strategies supported by empirical evidence from the behavioral sciences.

For the item "Advertising practitioners have a natural talent to influence consumers", there was a significant difference between the three groups, $H(2) = 50,029$, $p < 0.001$, $d = .743$. Pairwise comparisons with adjusted p-values showed that there were no significant differences between how advertising practitioners and non-experts perceived advertising

professionals' abilities ($p = 1.000$). However, there was a statistically significant difference between psychologists and advertising practitioners and between psychologists and non-experts (both significant at the $p < 0.01$ level), with psychologists believing more strongly (*Mdn* = 4, range = 1-5) than advertising practitioners themselves (*Mdn* = 3, range = 1-5) and non-experts (*Mdn* = 3, range = 1-5) that advertising professionals have a natural talent to persuade consumers. Finally, for the item "Advertising practitioners utilize findings from scientific research to influence consumers", no significant difference between the groups was found, $H(2) = 2,261$, $p = 0.323$, $d = .051$.

Discussion

Overall, results suggest that advertising practitioners and psychologists could not perform better than non-experts at predicting which advertisements were the most persuasive or not. In some cases, they performed slightly worst than regular people with no training in marketing strategies or human behavior. The results seem to encourage the following question: if experts cannot be trusted to produce effective mass persuasion campaigns, what should be done? Nevertheless, that would be a misinterpretation of the findings. The results suggest simply that expert's intuitions have limitations – what is hardly a new finding, as shown by extensive research on cognitive bias by Kahneman (2012) and on political forecasting by Tetlock (2006). If anything, results like the ones found in this study serve to emphasize how tools such as data analytics, neuroscientific methods, or checklists based on rigorous evidence from social psychology, for instance, could aid professionals to make better decisions.

These results also raise questions regarding the perceived difference between agents and targets' persuasion knowledge according to the PKM, suggesting a better understanding of this distinction is needed. This study approached a very specific type of persuasion knowledge – the one required in the context of producing advertisements, possibly not the

most familiar option for the majority of people – but it still encourages further research on how knowledge on persuasion is equally perceived (or not) by those in this dynamic.

Of course, these results could be strengthened by improvements in the research design related to sampling and selection of advertisements. While the non-experts' sample has participants from all walks of life, the use of undergraduate students for the samples of advertising practitioners and psychologists is suboptimal. Limitations are clear, but an ideal sample for advertising practitioners would consist solely of professionals from actual advertising agencies, and, more specifically, from "creative" departments, such as copywriters and art directors (since they are the ones responsible for crafting the ads). Fully-trained psychologists also would bring more validity to the study. Finally, more rigorous methods for estimating advertising success could be employed for selecting the campaigns used in the study, such as single-source data. It is acknowledged, however, that the prohibitive costs associated with this technique make it inaccessible for the majority of researchers.

The benefits of evidence-based marketing, when properly applied, are obvious. Research can offer parameters within which creativity would be more effective in persuading consumers. All in all, best practices in the advertising industry — informed by data and research — can save financial resources and push agencies into pathways to yield better results. Furthermore, this knowledge could positively affect the welfare of consumers, as stated by movements such as the transformative consumer research (see Mick, Pettigrew, Pechmann, & Ozanne, 2011).

However, it is worth to point out that, without having an in-depth understanding of attitude change theories and social influence research, applying the principles might be difficult. Those strategies are often theory-dependent, and a conceptual framework is necessary to interpret how they fit into the overall body of scientific literature and might

work differently in distinctive contexts. Therefore, recent attempts to map intervention theories and methods (such as Kok et al., 2016) could help practitioners to design campaigns in accordance with the core principles of persuasion right from the beginning.

Everything considered, that is a great opportunity for agencies to benefit from knowledge generated by research. Checklists and pre-tests might be useful for avoiding advertising creativity that does not add to the functionality of the advertisement. Professionals might find that incorporating those research findings into their practice improves their overall success and ultimately strengthens the effectiveness of their work. This study hopes that its results may increase knowledge about advertising practice and lead to the development of more effective mass persuasion strategies. An addendum must be made, however: the objective of persuading consumers might drive many campaigns, but it is not the sole purpose of advertising. For instance, advertising success is highly dependent on variables such as the quality of the copy (Binet & Field, 2013) and the quantity of times consumers are exposed to it (Schmidt & Eisend, 2015).

Also, a great number of principles in Armstrong's checklist are based on an interpersonal basis of influence, and it would be fair to assume the advertising context is a very different one and that achieving the same results at a distance, through mass persuasion, might be difficult. Therefore, principles should be tested in advertisements, ideally using behavioral measures, such as single-source data, to confirm its effectiveness (as suggested by Sharp & Hartnett, 2016) or even neural measurement, that recent research has shown can outperform behavioral data in predicting market-level outcomes (Karmarkar & Yoon, 2016).

There is a lack of consensus on the conditions in which several persuasive tactics work (Lee, Han, Cheong, Kim, & Yun, 2017). Therefore, studies replicating the PPI applications are also needed. This study also differs from similar initiatives, such as the one conducted by Hartnett, Kennedy, Sharp and Greenacre (2016) in the sense that it contributes

to our existing body of knowledge by analyzing and describing known persuasive features in advertisements as a way of giving predictive power regarding its effectiveness to practitioners.

References

Aamodt, M. G., & Mitchell, H. (2006). Who can best catch a liar? A meta-analysis of individual differences in detecting deception. *Forensic Examiner, 15*, 6–11.

Armstrong, J. S. (1980). The seer-sucker theory: The value of experts in forecasting. *Technology Review, 83*, 16–24.

Armstrong, J. S. (1991). Prediction of consumer behavior by experts and novices. *Journal of Consumer Research, 18*(2), 251-256.

Armstrong, J. S. (2010). *Persuasive advertising: Evidence-based principles*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Armstrong, J. S., Du, R., Green, K. C., & Graefe, A. (2016). Predictive validity of evidence-based persuasion principles: An application of the index method. *European Journal of Marketing, 50*(1/2), 276-293.

Asch, S. E. (1956). Studies of independence and conformity: I. A minority of one against a unanimous majority. *Psychological Monographs, 70*(9), 1-70.

Bakker, M., Hartgerink, C. H., Wicherts, J. M., & van der Maas, H. L. (2016). Researchers' intuitions about power in psychological research. *Psychological Science, 27*(8), 1069-1077.

Binet, L., & Field, P. (2013). *The long and the short of it: Balancing short and long-term marketing strategies*. London: Institute of Practitioners in association with Thinkbox.

Bodnaruk, A., & Simonov, A. (2015). Do financial experts make better investment decisions?. *Journal of Financial Intermediation, 24*(4), 514-536.

Bogomolova, S., Szabo, M., & Kennedy, R. (2017). Retailers' and manufacturers' price-promotion decisions: Intuitive or evidence-based?. *Journal of Business Research, 76*, 189-200.

Boush, D. M., Friestad, M., & Rose, G. M. (1994). Adolescent skepticism toward TV

    advertising and knowledge of advertiser tactics. *Journal of Consumer Research, 21*(1),

    165-175.

Burger, J. M., & Cornelius, T. (2003). Raising the price of agreement: Public commitment

    and the lowball compliance procedure. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 33*, 923–

    934.

Burger, J. M., Ehrlichman, A. M., Raymond, N. C., Ishikawa, J. M., & Sandoval, J. (2006).

    Reciprocal favor exchange and compliance. *Social Influence, 1*(3), 169-184.

Cacioppo, J. T., Cacioppo, S., & Petty, R. E. (2017). The neuroscience of persuasion: A

    review with an emphasis on issues and opportunities. *Social Neuroscience*, 1-44.

Celsi, M. W., & Gilly, M. C. (2010). Employees as internal audience: How advertising

    affects employees customer focus. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 38*(4),

    520-529.

Chaiken, S. (1979). Communicator physical attractiveness and persuasion. *Journal of

    Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 1387-1397.

Cialdini, R. B. (2008). *Influence: Science and practice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Cialdini, R. (2016). *Pre-suasion: A revolutionary way to influence and persuade*. New York:

    Simon & Schuster.

Cialdini, R. B., & Goldstein, N. J. (2004). Social influence: Compliance and conformity.

    Annual Review of Psychology, 55, 591-621.

Deighton, J. (2017). Rethinking the profession formerly known as advertising: How data

    science is disrupting the work of agencies. *Journal of Advertising Research, 57*(4), 357-

    361.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Evanston, IL: Row Peterson.

Field, P. & IPA (2012). *The link between creativity and effectiveness*. London, UK: Thinkbox & Manning House.

Fransen, M. L., Verlegh, P. W., Kirmani, A., & Smit, E. G. (2015). A typology of consumer strategies for resisting advertising, and a review of mechanisms for countering them. *International Journal of Advertising, 34*(1), 6-16.

Friestad, M., & Wright, P. (1994). The persuasion knowledge model: How people cope with persuasion attempts. *Journal of Consumer Research, 21*(1), 1-31.

Friestad, M., & Wright, P. (1995). Persuasion knowledge: Lay people's and researchers' beliefs about the psychology of advertising. *Journal of Consumer Research, 22*(1), 62-74.

Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review, 25*, 161-178.

Hales, B. M., & Pronovost, P. J. (2006). The checklist – a tool for error management and performance improvement. *Journal of Critical Care, 21*, 231-235.

Haley, R. I., & Baldinger, A. L. (1991). The ARF Copy Research Validity Project. *Journal of Advertising Research, 31*(2), 11-32.

Ham, C. D., Nelson, M. R., & Das, S. (2015). How to measure persuasion knowledge. *International Journal of Advertising, 34*(1), 17-53.

Hartnett, N., Kennedy, R., Sharp, B., & Greenacre, L. (2016). Marketers' intuitions about the sales effectiveness of advertisements. *Journal of Marketing Behavior, 2*(2–3), 177-194.

Kim, J., Kim, J. E., & Marshall, R. (2016). Are two arguments always better than one? Persuasion knowledge moderating the effect of integrated marketing communications. *European Journal of Marketing, 50*(7/8), 1399-1425.

Kahneman, D. (2012). *Rápido e devagar: Duas formas de pensar*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Objetiva.

Karmarkar, U. R., & Yoon, C. (2016). Consumer neuroscience: Advances in understanding consumer psychology. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 10*, 160-165.

Kirmani, A., & Campbell, M. C. (2009). Taking the target's perspective: The persuasion knowledge model. In M. Wänke (Ed.), *Social psychology of consumer behavior* (pp. 297-316). New York: Psychology Press.

Kok, G., Gottlieb, N. H., Peters, G. J. Y., Mullen, P. D., Parcel, G. S., Ruiter, R. A., ... & Bartholomew, L. K. (2016). A taxonomy of behaviour change methods: An Intervention Mapping approach. *Health Psychology Review, 10*(3), 297-312.

Kover, A. J. (1995). Copywriters' implicit theories of communication: An exploration. *Journal of Consumer Research, 21*(4), 30-45.

Kover, A. J. (2016). Advertising creativity: Some open questions. *Journal of Advertising Research, 56*(3), 235-238.

Kover, A. J., James, W. L., & Sonner, B. S. (1997). To whom do advertising creatives write? An inferential answer. *Journal of Advertising Research, 37*(1), 41-54.

Lee, S., Han, S., Cheong, M., Kim, S. L., & Yun, S. (2017). How do I get my way? A meta-analytic review of research on influence tactics. *The Leadership Quarterly, 28*(1), 210-228.

Lynn, M. (1989). Scarcity effect on value: Mediated by assumed expensiveness. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 10*, 257-274.

Mick, D. G., Pettigrew, S., Pechmann, C. P., & Ozanne, J. L. (Eds.). (2011). *Transformative consumer research for personal and collective well-being*. New York: Routledge

Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to authority: An experimental view*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Ogilvy, D. (2004). *Confessions of an advertising man.* London: Southbank Publishing.

O'Keefe, D. (2016). Evidence-based advertising using persuasion principles: Predictive

validity and proof of concept. *European Journal of Marketing, 50*(1/2), 294-300.

Paul, B., Salwen, M. B., Dupagne, M. (2000). The third-person effect: A meta-analysis of the

perceptual hypothesis. *Mass Communication & Society, 3*(1), 57-85.

Petty, R. E., & Briñol, P. (2010). Attitude change. In R. F. Baumeister & E. J. Finkel (Eds.),

Advanced social psychology: The state of the science (pp. 217-259). New York: Oxford

University Press.

Pratkanis, A. R. (2008). Social influence analysis: An index of tactics. In A. R. Pratkanis

(Ed.), *The science of social influence: Advances and future progress* (pp. 17–82). New

York: Psychology Press.

Purvis, S. C. (2010). *Which ad pulled best?*. New York: McGraw-Hill Education.

Reinhard, M. A., & Messner, M. (2009). The effects of source likeability and need for

cognition on advertising effectiveness under explicit persuasion. *Journal of Consumer

Behaviour, 8*(4), 179-191.

Roy, R., & Sharma, P. (2015). Scarcity appeal in advertising: Exploring the moderating roles

of need for uniqueness and message framing. *Journal of Advertising, 44*(4), 349-359.

Salancik, G. R. (1977). Commitment is too easy! *Organizational Dynamics, 6*(1), 62–80.

Schmidt, S., & Eisend, M. (2015). Advertising repetition: A meta-analysis on effective

frequency in advertising. *Journal of Advertising, 44*(4), 415-428.

Sharp, B. (2010). *How brands grow: What marketers don't know.* New York: Oxford

University Press.

Sharp, B., & Hartnett, N. (2016). Generalisability of advertising persuasion principles.

European Journal of Marketing, 50(1/2), 301-305.

Sharp, B., Wright, M., Kennedy, R., & Nguyen, C. (2017). Viva la revolution! For evidence-

based marketing we strive. *Australasian Marketing Journal*.

Smit, E. G., Van Meurs, L., & Neijens, P. C. (2006). Effects of advertising likeability: A 10-year perspective. *Journal of Advertising Research, 46*(1), 73-83.

Sundie, J. M., Cialdini, R. B., Griskevicius, V., & Kenrick, D. T. (2012). The world's (truly) oldest profession: Social influence in evolutionary perspective. *Social Influence, 7*(3), 134-153.

Tannenbaum, M. B., Hepler, J., Zimmerman, R. S., Saul, L., Jacobs, S., Wilson, K., & Albarracín, D. (2015). Appealing to fear: A meta-analysis of fear appeal effectiveness and theories. *Psychological Bulletin, 141*(6), 1178-1204.

Teeny, J., Briñol, P., & Petty, R. E. (2017). The elaboration likelihood model: Understanding consumer attitude change. In C. V. Jansson-Boyd & M. J. Zawisza (Eds.), *Routledge international handbook of consumer psychology* (pp. 390-410). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Tetlock, P. E. (2006). *Expert political judgment: How good is it? How can we know?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Till, B. D., & Baack, D. W. (2005). Recall and persuasion: Does creative advertising matter?. *Journal of Advertising, 34*(3), 47-57.

Wang, A. (2005). The effects of expert and consumer endorsements on audience response. *Journal of Advertising Research, 45*(4), 402-412.

Weilbacher, W. M. (2003). How advertising affects consumers. *Journal of Advertising Research, 43*(2), 230-234.

Woodside, A. G. (2016). Predicting advertising execution effectiveness: Scale development and validation. *European Journal of Marketing, 50*(1/2), 306-311.

Wright, M. J. (2016). Predicting what? The strengths and limitations of a test of persuasive

advertising principles. *European Journal of Marketing, 50*(1/2), 312-316.

Table 1. Summary of results for non-parametric tests.

Items	Type	Comparison	Difference?	p-value
Identifying persuasive ads	More persuasive ads	Ad practitioners and non-experts	Yes	$p = .029$
		Psychologists and non-experts	No	$n.s.$
		Ad practitioners and psychologists	No	$n.s$
	Less persuasive ads	Ad practitioners and non-experts	No	$n.s.$
		Psychologists and non-experts	No	$n.s.$
		Ad practitioners and psychologists	No	$n.s.$
Third-person effect	More persuasive ads	Ad practitioners and non-experts	No	$n.s.$
		Psychologists and non-expert	No	$n.s.$
		Ad practitioners and psychologists	No	$n.s.$
	Less persuasive ads	Ad practitioners and non-experts	No	$n.s.$
		Psychologists and non-experts	No	$n.s.$
		Ad practitioners and psychologists	No	$n.s.$
Ad likability	More persuasive ads	Ad practitioners and non-experts	Yes	$p < .001$
		Psychologists and non-experts	No	$n.s$
		Ad practitioners and psychologists	Yes	$p < .001$
	Less persuasive ads	Ad practitioners and non-experts	No	$n.s.$
		Psychologists and non-experts	Yes	$p < .001$
		Ad practitioners and psychologists	Yes	$p < .001$
Identifying persuasion strategies	-	Ad practitioners and non-experts	No	$n.s.$
		Psychologists and non-experts	Yes	$p < .001$
		Ad practitioners and psychologists	Yes	$p < .001$
Natural talent	-	Ad practitioners and non-experts	No	$n.s$
		Psychologists and non-experts	Yes	$p < 0.01$
		Ad practitioners and psychologists	Yes	$p < 0.01$
Science usage	-	Ad practitioners and non-experts	No	$n.s.$
		Psychologists and non-experts	No	$n.s.$
		Ad practitioners and psychologists	No	$n.s.$

Apêndice do Manuscrito 3: Instrumento da Pesquisa

Por favor, examine cada anúncio e indique o quanto você concorda com as afirmações abaixo.

Discordo totalmente: 1	Discordo: 2	Não discordo nem concordo: 3	Concordo: 4	Concordo totalmente: 5

Anúncio 1
  O anúncio é persuasivo. (_____)
  Eu gosto do anúncio. (_____)
  Eu acho que outras pessoas seriam mais persuadidas do que eu por esse anúncio. (_____)
Anúncio 2
  O anúncio é persuasivo. (_____)
  Eu gosto do anúncio. (_____)
  Eu acho que outras pessoas seriam mais persuadidas do que eu por esse anúncio. (_____)
Anúncio 3
  O anúncio é persuasivo. (_____)
  Eu gosto do anúncio. (_____)
  Eu acho que outras pessoas seriam mais persuadidas do que eu por esse anúncio. (_____)
Anúncio 4
  O anúncio é persuasivo. (_____)
  Eu gosto do anúncio. (_____)
  Eu acho que outras pessoas seriam mais persuadidas do que eu por esse anúncio. (_____)
Anúncio 5
  O anúncio é persuasivo. (_____)
  Eu gosto do anúncio. (_____)
  Eu acho que outras pessoas seriam mais persuadidas do que eu por esse anúncio. (_____)
Anúncio 6
  O anúncio é persuasivo. (_____)
  Eu gosto do anúncio. (_____)
  Eu acho que outras pessoas seriam mais persuadidas do que eu por esse anúncio. (_____)
Anúncio 7
  O anúncio é persuasivo. (_____)
  Eu gosto do anúncio. (_____)
  Eu acho que outras pessoas seriam mais persuadidas do que eu por esse anúncio. (_____)
Anúncio 8
  O anúncio é persuasivo. (_____)
  Eu gosto do anúncio. (_____)
  Eu acho que outras pessoas seriam mais persuadidas do que eu por esse anúncio. (_____)
Anúncio 9
  O anúncio é persuasivo. (_____)
  Eu gosto do anúncio. (_____)
  Eu acho que outras pessoas seriam mais persuadidas do que eu por esse anúncio. (_____)
Anúncio 10

O anúncio é persuasivo. (_____)

Eu gosto do anúncio. (_____)

Eu acho que outras pessoas seriam mais persuadidas do que eu por esse anúncio. (_____)

Anúncio 11

O anúncio é persuasivo. (_____)

Eu gosto do anúncio. (_____)

Eu acho que outras pessoas seriam mais persuadidas do que eu por esse anúncio. (_____)

Anúncio 12

O anúncio é persuasivo. (_____)

Eu gosto do anúncio. (_____)

Eu acho que outras pessoas seriam mais persuadidas do que eu por esse anúncio. (_____)

Agora estamos interessados em saber o que você pensa sobre algumas estratégias utilizadas por anúncios publicitários. Por favor, responda aos itens a seguir.

Discordo totalmente: 1	Discordo: 2	Não discordo nem concordo: 3	Concordo: 4	Concordo totalmente: 5

Um anúncio fará as pessoas comprarem o produto se...

* ... Oferecer amostras grátis. (_____)

* ... Mencionar que o consumidor comprou o produto no passado. (_____)

* ... Mostrar que a demanda pelo produto é muito grande. (_____)

* ... Afirmar que especialistas recomendam o produto. (_____)

* ... Afirmar que celebridades utilizam o produto. (_____)

* ... Explicar que há poucas unidades do produto. (_____)

* ... Mostrar que o produto ajuda a evitar situações ruins ou desagradáveis. (_____)

Gostaríamos de saber o que você pensa sobre o conhecimento e a prática de publicitários. Por favor, responda aos itens a seguir.

Discordo totalmente: 1	Discordo: 2	Não discordo nem concordo: 3	Concordo: 4	Concordo totalmente: 5

* Publicitários possuem um talento natural para influenciar consumidores. (_____)

* Publicitários utilizam achados de pesquisas científicas para influenciar consumidores. (_____)

Obrigado por suas respostas! Finalmente, gostaríamos de saber um pouco mais sobre você!

* **Sexo**: ( ) Masculino   ( ) Feminino

* **Qual sua idade? _____**

* **Marque seu MAIOR grau de escolaridade:**

( ) Ensino fundamental

( ) Ensino médio

( ) Ensino superior incompleto

( ) Ensino superior completo

( ) Especialização incompleta

( ) Especialização completa
( ) Mestrado incompleto
( ) Mestrado completo
( ) Doutorado incompleto
( ) Doutorado completo
* Se você estuda, qual o seu curso? _____ **Qual semestre?**

_____
* Qual a sua experiência profissional?
( ) Profissional de publicidade/publicitário
( ) Psicólogo
( ) Outro_____
Quantos anos de experiência? _____
* Se você é profissional de publicidade/marketing, qual a área?
( ) Atendimento
( ) Planejamento
( ) Mídia
( ) Criação
( ) Produção
( ) Outro (especifique) _____

**Se tiver dúvidas ou quiser conhecer os resultados da pesquisa, entre em contato
conosco:**
Jonathan Jones | jonathan@uwindsor.ca

CONSIDERAÇÕES FINAIS SOBRE A DISSERTAÇÃO

Onde quer que tenham sido aplicados, os métodos e as técnicas da ciência sempre trouxeram benefícios práticos, melhorias gerais e aperfeiçoamentos técnicos. A psicologia social, por exemplo, é uma disciplina que tem estudado, com um alto grau de rigor metodológico e analítico, de que maneira indivíduos influenciam uns aos outros, e os dados obtidos através dessas pesquisas têm alimentado teorias e modelos que oferecem um entendimento aprofundado sobre o comportamento humano.

Conforme demonstrado neste trabalho, parte importante da vida social envolve persuadir. Uma das diversas indústrias que gravitam ao redor do uso instrumental da influência é a publicidade. Publicitários possuem como principal tarefa de seus ofícios projetarem e vincularem mensagens persuasivas para seus clientes, sejam eles pequenos ou grandes empreendedores, das mais variadas áreas. Um número crescente de pesquisas, entretanto, tem demonstrado que mudar o que consumidores pensam, ou como eles agem, é um processo muito mais difícil e complexo do que o comumente imaginado.

Muitos argumentam que persuadir por meio das mídias de massa requer criatividade e um talento natural, e que a publicidade pode ser comparada a um processo artístico. Todavia, os resultados deste e de muitos outros trabalhos semelhantes, provenientes dos mais diferentes campos, parecem sugerir que esses elementos, mais abstratos e intuitivos, por si só, parecem pouco suficientes para garantir o sucesso de campanhas publicitárias em promover determinados comportamentos de consumo. Afinal, apesar de toda a arte que, de fato, é parte essencial da atividade publicitária, é preciso jamais esquecer que a publicidade, via de regra, possui (ou deve possuir) objetivos claros, servindo a um propósito funcional.

Como forma de verificar, portanto, de que maneira estratégias persuasivas têm sido utilizadas por anúncios, este trabalho, por um lado, analisou campanhas premiadas e, como

outra maneira de adereçar o problema, também procurou mensurar diretamente o conhecimento de estudantes e profissionais provenientes da indústria publicitária.

Os resultados deste trabalho parecem concordar, de maneira geral, com o que uma vasta literatura sobre o desempenho de especialistas tem encontrado. Fundamentalmente, os publicitários que responderam a esta pesquisa tiveram um desempenho muito similar ao de leigos sem qualquer treinamento em estratégia mercadológica ou comportamento humano, indicando que um pressuposto comum à indústria (mas também compartilhado pelo grande público, como os resultados deste estudo apontaram) de que talento (ou habilidade natural, intuitiva) é um elemento essencial para a efetividade da influência. Mesmo quando se incluiu uma amostra de estudantes e psicólogos formados que, em teoria, receberam treinamento avançado em princípios da psicologia, encontrou-se pouca (ou nenhuma) diferença entre os grupos.

Acima de tudo, os resultados sugerem que o talento possui limites, e que a ajuda da evidência empírica é sempre bem-vinda. Finalmente, como maneira de remediar essas desvantagens, o estudo recomendou um número de quadros teóricos, instrumentos e procedimentos que podem tornar a publicidade comercial um processo com mais precisão, objetividade e mensurabilidade, aumentando suas chances de sucesso**.**