

RECRUITING GENERATION Y:
THE ROLE OF AUTHORITY IN
HIGHER EDUCATION ADVERTISING

By

TRISH MCBEATH

Bachelor of Arts in Journalism and Broadcasting

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1998

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 2008

RECRUITING GENERATION Y:
THE ROLE OF AUTHORITY IN
HIGHER EDUCATION ADVERTISING

Thesis Approved:

Dr. Jami Fullerton

Thesis Advisor

Dr. Tom Weir

Dr. Lori McKinnon

Dr. A. Gordon Emslie

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasure to thank the many people who made this thesis possible. First, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Jami Fullerton for her knowledgeable advice, untiring patience and constant encouragement not only during the course of this thesis project, but throughout my entire three years of graduate school. I also wish to express my appreciation to Dr. Lori McKinnon and Dr. Tom Weir for their many valuable suggestions, constructive advice and expertise.

I extend a special thank you to Greg Bartlett for his help in creating the online survey and to the faculty and staff at OSU-Tulsa for their assistance in collecting the data for this study.

Many thanks to my friends and fellow students for helping me get through the difficult times and celebrating my successes. Nicole, Bria, Kari, Gary and Mary Bea...your support and friendship mean the world to me.

I also wish to thank Mom, Dad, Lance, Sasha and the rest of my extended family. You have always supported me, given me confidence and inspired me to do my best in all matters of life.

Finally, to Chris, Matthew and Ella I offer my most sincere gratefulness and love. During this time, I have relied on your sacrifice, patience and encouragement. You are my everything. It is to you that I dedicate this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Higher Education Marketing.....	3
Use of Models and Spokespersons in Advertising	4
Authority Appeals in Advertising.....	5
Purpose of the Study.....	5
Methodology.....	6
Overview.....	6
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	8
How Advertising Works.....	8
Attitude Toward Advertising.....	10
Source Credibility in Advertising.....	13
Higher Education Marketing and Advertising.....	16
College Choice.....	17
Defining the Generation Y Market.....	20
Generation Y's Attitude Toward Advertising.....	23
Generation Y's Attitude Toward Education.....	24
Generation Y's Attitude Toward Authority.....	26
The Authority Principal.....	29
Summary.....	33
III. METHODLOGY.....	34
Research Objective.....	34
Variables and Hypotheses.....	35
Experiment Design.....	36
Advertising Treatments.....	37
Research Instruments.....	38

Chapter	Page
Sampling Method.....	39
Procedure	39
Data Collection, Processing and Analysis	40
 IV. FINDINGS.....	 41
Respondent Profile.....	42
Table 1: Sample Demographics.....	43
Measuring Attitude Toward the Ad	43
Table 2: Emotional Quotient Scale.....	44
Table 3: Reaction Profile Scale.....	45
Table 4: Global Attitude Toward the Ad mean scores for entire sample	46
Testing the Hypothesis and Research Questions	46
Table 5: One-way ANOVA: Global Attitude Toward the Ad for total sample.....	47
Measuring Acceptance of Authority.....	47
Table 6: Authority Behavior Inventory Scores.....	48
Table 7: Overall Authority Behavior Inventory Scores.....	49
Table 8: Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient for Advertising Treatments	50
 V. CONCLUSION.....	 51
Summary	51
Discussion.....	52
Implications.....	55
Limitations	56
Population	56
Sample Size.....	56
Advertisement Type.....	56
Experimental Conditions	56
Research Instruments	57
Future Research	57
Generation Y.....	57
Geography and Student Status.....	57
Advertising Type	58
Conclusion	58
 REFERENCES	 60
 APPENDIX A: INSTRUMENTS.....	 67
Figure A1: Demographic Scale.....	67
Figure A2: Authority Behavior Inventory	68

Chapter	Page
Figure A3: Emotional Quotient Scale.....	69
Figure A4: Reaction Profile Scale	70
APPENDIX B: AD TREATMENTS.....	71
Figure B1: Ad featuring model of external authority status	71
Figure B2: Ad featuring model of internal authority status.....	72
Figure B3: Ad featuring model of non-authority status.....	73
Figure B4: Control ad	74
APPENDIX C: IRB DOCUMENTATION	75
Figure C1: IRB application approval.....	75
Figure C2: Approved recruitment flyer/consent document	76
Figure C3: Approved recruitment email to faculty.....	77
Figure C4: Approved faculty script for class.....	78

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
Table 1: Sample Demographics	43
Table 2: Emotional Quotient Scale	44
Table 3: Reaction Profile Scale	45
Table 4: Global Attitude Toward the Ad mean scores for entire sample	46
Table 5: One-way ANOVA: Global Attitude Toward the Ad for total sample	47
Table 6: Authority Behavior Inventory Scores	48
Table 7: Overall Authority Behavior Inventory Scores	49
Table 8: Pearson's Correlation Coefficient for Advertising Treatments	50

LIST OF FIGURES

Figures	Page
Figure A1: Demographic Scale.....	67
Figure A2: Authority Behavior Inventory	68
Figure A3: Emotional Quotient Scale.....	69
Figure A4: Reaction Profile Scale	70
Figure B1: Ad featuring model of external authority status	71
Figure B2: Ad featuring model of internal authority status.....	72
Figure B3: Ad featuring model of non-authority status.....	73
Figure B4: Control ad	74
Figure C1: IRB application approval.....	75
Figure C2: Approved recruitment flyer/consent document	76
Figure C3: Approved recruitment email to faculty.....	77
Figure C4: Approved faculty script for class.....	78

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

They may be young, but they're also tech-savvy, educated and optimistic. They are Generation Y, the latest demographic marketers are desperate to understand and reach.

Born between 1979 and 2000^{*}, Generation Y is the largest child generation in American history (Noble & Noble, 2000). With a population of 80 million, Generation Y rivals the Baby Boomer generation in number and is predicted to make a significant impact on the consumer market (Neuborne, 1999; Strauss & Howe, 2003).

Generation Y is especially important to marketers of higher education as this generation is beginning to enter college and choosing which college they will attend. A generation unlike any other, these consumers grew up in a world with instant access to information and communication tools at their fingertips. Yet, research also suggests they have grown up feeling saturated by advertising and marketing. Suspicious of invasive, traditional advertising campaigns, members of Generation Y are instead gravitating toward messages and experiences from trusted friends and peers (Johnson, 2006).

^{*}There is disagreement among scholars regarding the label and specific age range for this cohort. The author recognizes this discrepancy and addresses it in Chapter II.

Halstead (1999) suggested that, prior to September 11th, America's 18-24 year-olds were experiencing a general decline in social trust in their fellow citizens, established institutions and elected officials. As Generation Y came-of-age in a post-September 11th world, did the decline in social trust continue?

A 2005 study by Harvard University's Institute of Politics suggests the answer is yes, at least for Generation Y's trust in the U.S. government. Researchers found that in the fall of 2001, 60 percent of college students reported they trusted the federal government all or most of the time, while in 2005, the level of trust fell to 44 percent (IOP, 2005).

However, others suggest that school shootings, the September 11th terrorist attacks and an increased level of parent involvement (a phenomenon known as "helicopter parents") may have created a heightened dependence on another type of authority figure – Generation Y's parents (Coomes & DeBard, 2004; Randall, 2007).

Understanding the role of authority is important to marketers who are attempting to influence Generation Y, especially those such as colleges and universities, who often use authority-based appeals in their advertising.

Bernstein (1999) states that by the year 2015, the number of students on college campuses will jump to 22 million. With millions of members of Generation Y nearing high school and contemplating college choices, understanding the impact of authority in the use of higher education advertising is particularly relevant to colleges and universities who wish to attract this market. What types of appeals will be most effective in reaching this new cohort? How are college students influenced by advertising featuring authority appeals?

The present study used an experimental method to examine the effects of authority-based appeals in higher education advertising on Generation Y audiences, specifically college students, to determine if their attitude toward those appeals is influenced by their acceptance of authority.

Higher Education Marketing

As more opportunities become available for high school students to go to college, advertising and recruiting efforts among higher education institutions have evolved in the competitive environment (Domino et al., 2006). For instance, including branch campuses, there are 65 public or private colleges and universities in the state of Oklahoma (OSRHE, 2007). Yet, according to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, only 22.2 percent of Oklahomans 25 and older had bachelor's degrees in 2004-05. This ranks Oklahoma as 42nd in the nation for its percentage of adult population with a bachelor's degree (OSRHE, 2007). With a population of 3,579,212 for the state of Oklahoma, there appears to be an abundance of higher education institutions for a relatively small percentage of college students making competition for students quite fierce in the state.

Oklahoma State University-Tulsa is an urban, branch campus that offers junior, senior and graduate-level courses. The more than 2,600 enrolled students are nearly evenly split between traditional and non-traditional students. However, the current OSU-Tulsa administration is working to increase the population of traditional students (ages 18-26) on campus. Past advertising efforts have included traditional, aspirational-style advertising that features the president of the university, faculty members and area business and community leaders. In addition, the university has featured actual students

in their advertising to provide a picture of the OSU-Tulsa experience from students' perspective. Despite the diversity in the university's advertising efforts, little is known about its effectiveness for Generation Y, the target demographic OSU-Tulsa wishes to grow.

Use of Models and Spokespersons in Advertising

When selecting a model or spokesperson for an advertisement, marketers try to choose an individual that will have the most positive and powerful impact on the effectiveness of their message (Ohanian, 1990). In addition, marketers should also consider the audience's similarity to the source when considering models and spokespersons for their advertising. Oskamp (2004) said one of the central elements of likability is similarity and suggests that consumers like and are more influenced by sources that are more similar to themselves. There is a vast amount of research that suggests that sources are more persuasive when they are perceived as similar to the audience themselves (Hovland, Janis & Kelley, 1953; Brock, 1965; Berscheid, 1966; Mills & Jellison, 1967).

Similarly, marketers also have to consider a person's credibility when selecting a model or spokesperson. A spokesperson's source credibility in ads is defined as "the degree to which the spokesperson is perceived to have expertise on a subject and is trusted to provide an impartial opinion about the subject" (Jung & Kellaris, 2006).

While the impact of a spokesperson's credibility on audiences has been well documented, little attention has been focused on how it relates to the effectiveness of authority-based appeals in advertising research (Jung & Kellaris, 2006).

Authority Appeals in Advertising

According to Jung and Kellaris (2006), the authority principle refers to “the tendency of individuals to comply with the recommendations or directives of authority figures.”

The use of an authority figure technique with consumers can be successful in specific situations (Berry, 1988). When a consumer is feeling inadequate or incompetent in some way, they are willing to abdicate responsibility to an authority figure who offers reassurance, protectiveness and security. However, when used incorrectly, authority figures can perpetuate a sense of superiority, leaving consumers feeling inadequate, foolish and angry at the advertiser (Berry, 1988).

When targeting advertising to Generation Y, it may be beneficial to marketers to determine if the use of authority figures would positively or negatively affect their attitude toward the ad. Understanding their attitudes toward personal authority (parents and other adults in their lives) and institutional authority (government and other elected leaders) may also help marketers determine which type of authority figure may be most successful in advertising campaigns directed toward Generation Y.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of authority-based appeals in higher education advertising on Generation Y audiences, specifically college students, and determine if their attitude toward those appeals is moderated by their acceptance of authority. Understanding how Generation Y reacts to advertisements featuring sources of varying levels of authority is useful to any marketer trying to reach this demographic. In

addition, this study is important for higher education institutions wishing to recruit students. The results of this study provide marketers, specifically colleges and universities, with information that allows them to successfully choose the most effective models and spokespersons for their recruitment advertising directed toward specific target audiences.

Methodology

The methodology of this study is an experimental design. Using an online experiment, participants were randomly assigned to view four different advertising treatments. The independent variable of model status was tested keeping all other visual elements and persuasive copy consistent. Three different models were used to suggest varying levels of authority -- external authority (university president), internal authority (parent) and non-authority (Generation Y student). The fourth advertising treatment, featuring a generic photo of the university's campus fountain, served as a control ad.

The experimental design measured a respondent's acceptance of authority and their attitude toward the ad. This study uses a convenience sample of current college students in Tulsa, Oklahoma; therefore, results are not generalizable to the entire Generation Y population.

Overview

Chapter two provides a historical review of past literature on how advertising works, attitudes toward advertising, source credibility, higher education marketing and

college choice and the authority principle. Previous findings in research in these areas will also be explored.

In Chapter three, the hypothesis and research questions tested, measurement instruments, advertising treatments, sampling, and experimental and data collection procedures will be discussed in detail.

Chapter four reports the results of the experiment and data analysis. Chapter five includes examination and discussion of the relevant findings, limitations to the study, implications for current marketing professionals, and recommendations for future research studies. The thesis concludes with an appendix section which includes all advertising treatments.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the literature relevant to the present study, covering a broad area of research, including: advertising, Generation Y and the authority principle. In the course of examining this research, relevant studies in persuasion, attitude toward advertising, attitude toward the ad, source credibility, higher education marketing and college choice and the reverse authority effect are highlighted. Particular attention is paid to studies that examine the demographics, characteristics, consumer buying power and attitudes of Generation Y.

How Advertising Works

Today's society is filled with advertising messages. Love it or hate it, advertising is everywhere and more than \$263 billion is spent each year to persuade consumers to do something, buy something or think something (Advertising Age, 2005). Despite the widespread use of advertising, Fullerton and Kendrick (2006) noted that while many people view advertising as mere "hucksterism" or "entertainment," in fact advertising is derived from the social scientific disciplines of persuasion, communication, social psychology and marketing (Fullerton & Kendrick, 2006). While there is a vast amount of

empirical research regarding these subject areas, the current literature review seeks to only provide readers with a basic overview of how advertising works.

Advertising can be defined as the nonpersonal communication of information, usually paid for and usually persuasive in nature, about products, services or ideas by identified sponsors through various media (Arens & Bovee, 1994). Consequently, the goal of advertising is to create a message and send it to someone, hoping it will impact their thoughts and feelings and cause them to act in a certain way (Wells, Moriarty & Burnett, 2006).

So, by definition, advertising is designed to persuade consumers. Persuasion occurs when exposure to information results in an attitude change (Olson & Zanna, 1993). When applied to advertising, successful persuasion occurs when advertising changes consumers' attitudes, beliefs and behavior toward the product, brand or service (Wells, Moriarty & Burnett, 2006).

Prior to designing and implementing an advertising campaign, marketers must identify and have a good understanding of their desired consumer, also referred to as their target market. In the simplest terms, a target market is a specific group of consumers that are most likely to purchase a particular product. Advertisers use characteristics such as age, gender, geographical location, income and expenditure patterns to pinpoint their target market (Boone & Kurtz, 2001). Once identified, advertisers must design a strategy to market their products, services or ideas to satisfy their target market's specific needs and preferences (Boone & Kurtz, 2001). O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy (2004) found that these groups of consumers may be so distinct that although the product or service remains the same, different persuasive appeals in the advertising may be required

to effectively persuade consumers to make a purchase or change their attitude toward a particular product.

Similarly, reference groups may also be instrumental in facilitating persuasion. A reference group can be defined as “those whose behavior an individual uses to guide his or her own behavior” (O’Shaughnessy & O’Shaughnessy, 2004). The authors also noted there are “positive” reference groups, those with which an individual identifies, accepts and wants to join and “negative” reference groups, those with which an individual rejects and does not want to be associated with.

No matter the brand, product, service or idea, marketers strive to develop advertising campaigns designed to inform, persuade or entertain their target market.

Attitude Toward Advertising

Personal attitudes toward advertising in general can often provide marketers and scholars with insight into how consumers pay attention to, trust or use advertising. In addition, consumers’ attitudes may also influence political and regulatory activities that could impact the advertising industry in significant ways (Shavitt, Lowrey & Haefner, 1998). Indeed, consumers’ attitudes toward advertising have long been a focus of research (Bauer & Greyser, 1968; Zanot, 1984; Mittal, 1994; O’Donohoe, 1995).

Calfee and Ringold (1994) found that there have been periods of discontent and public disillusionment with advertising since the early 1900s. In their analysis of six decades of advertising survey data, the researchers found that approximately 70 percent of consumers thought advertising was often untruthful, should be more strictly regulated and often persuades people to buy things they do not want. However, the researchers also

found that the perceived usefulness of advertising remained nearly constant throughout the years. Again, roughly 70 percent of consumers felt that advertising provides valuable information, thus suggesting the benefits of advertising outweigh its deficits.

In a 1998, nationwide telephone survey, Shavitt, Lowrey and Haefner found that while most respondents (52 percent) still expressed a distrust of advertising, Americans' attitudes toward advertising in general were somewhat favorable (75 percent favorable or neutral compared to 25 percent unfavorable). Comparable to previous studies, the researchers also found that 61 percent of respondents agreed that most advertising was useful and informative.

Not only is it important for marketers to understand consumers' attitude toward advertising in general, it is also imperative to be aware of their attitude toward a particular ad. According to Lutz (1985), attitude toward the ad can be defined as a consumer's predisposition to respond in a favorable or unfavorable manner when exposed to a particular advertisement.

Mitchell and Olson (1981) provided insight into the study of attitude toward the ad with an experiment that exposed 71 college students to four different advertisements for four different brands of facial tissue. Participants viewed each advertisement 20 times and then were surveyed about the product and brands attributes, their attitude toward the brand, attitude toward the act of purchasing and using the brand, and their evaluations of each advertisement. Mitchell and Olson (1981) found that, as they had expected, consumers' beliefs about the product attributes had a substantial mediating effect on their attitude toward the brand, which in turn, mediated their purchases intentions. However, an unexpected result suggested that another variable, attitude toward the ad, also

mediated advertising effects on brand attitudes and purchase intentions. Based on the results of their study, Mitchell and Olson (1981) suggested that brand attributes were not the sole contributor to consumers' attitude toward a brand and that a "consumers' general liking for the ad itself or the visual stimulus presented in the advertisement" could also contribute to their brand choice and purchase intentions. Thus, marketers should pay close attention to how consumers react to their advertising campaigns because how consumers feel about an advertisement, positive or negative, could influence their brand attitude and become a deciding factor in their purchase intentions (Mitchell & Olson, 1981; Shimp, 1981; MacKenzie, Lutz and Belch, 1986; Mueling, 1987).

In an attempt to better gauge emotional reactions to an ad, Wells (1964) developed the Emotional Quotient Scale and the Reaction Profile for marketers and scholars to measure attitude toward the ad research.

Wells developed the Emotional Quotient Scale and the Reaction Profile to add a new component to existing ad recall tests that only measured "how strong the memory was" and "whether the impression intended was the impression made" (Wells, 1964). In developing the Emotional Quotient Scale, three separate sets of ads were shown to 100 participants who rated them based on a list of statements compiled from previous ad recall tests. The results from the study were used to create a Likert-type scale that allows study participants to rate advertisements based on affirmative or negative responses to 12 statements (Wells, 1964).

Next, Wells (1964) created dummy ads and placed them in magazines for 190 homemakers in four cities. After reading the magazines, participants were asked to rate the ads on a scale of one to eight based on a list of pre-compiled "words and phrases that

a respondent might reasonably be expected to employ when reacting to a print advertisement” in three areas - attractiveness, meaningfulness and vitality (Wells, 1964; Zinkhan and Fornell, 1985). An ad’s score was then calculated by averaging the scores in each area. Wells (1964) used the results of this study to create the Reaction Profile, a 24-point semantic differential scale.

Wells’ Emotional Quotient Scale and Reaction Profile have been used repeatedly by scholars to measure respondents’ emotional reactions and attitudes toward specific ads. Recently, Graham (2002) used Wells’ scales to examine Hispanic audiences’ emotional response to direct mail advertising featuring models of different ethnicities. Similarly, Leach and Liu (1998) used Wells’ scales to study Taiwanese students’ attitude towards ads promoting products made in Taiwan versus the United States while Cochran (2004) used the same scales to examine the effects of using humor in print advertising for high and low involvement products. Wells’ instrument was also used in the present study.

Source Credibility in Advertising

A particularly important component of persuasive communication is the source of a message. Lynch and Schuler (1994) suggest that the selection of a model or spokesperson is an important decision for marketers because who is shown in advertisement can imply a great deal to the consumer about the benefits of a product or service.

Marketers often employ a credibility strategy by using a spokesperson or model who the target audience perceives as being expert, trustworthy, likable or respected to deliver their message, thus intensifying the believability of the message (Wells, Moriarty

& Burnett, 2006). Source credibility has been researched for decades dating back to Hovland's studies of the World War II propaganda film series *Why We Fight* in the 1950s. Pornpitakpan (2004) analyzed five decades of research on the persuasiveness of source credibility and found that commonly, a highly credible source is found to induce more persuasion than a low-credibility one.

However, during his Yale studies, Hovland (1953) found that high credible sources were more effective in the short term, but eventually did not matter in the long term. In essence, a low-credibility source demonstrates greater persuasive impact over time. Hovland termed this the " sleeper effect." Thus, the source marketers choose to communicate their message may or may not have a lasting impact on the persuasiveness of the advertisement.

In 1965, Brock conducted a field experiment to study the effects of similarity on a communicator-recipient exchange between a salesperson who was trying to persuade a consumer to change to a different price level for a particular product. Results of the study showed that the salesperson's appeal was successful when consumers perceived that they shared a similar relationship to the product with the salesperson. Brock (1965) suggested that the perceived similarities that the communicator and recipient shared created a higher perceived credibility for the source of the message.

Similarly, researchers suggest that models and spokespersons that are perceived as similar to their audiences are more likely to positively influence persuasion than those who are perceived as dissimilar (Williams, Qualls & Greer, 1995; Green, 1999; DeShields & Kara, 2000). Thus, models and spokespersons in advertisements who share personal characteristics such as age, social class, ethnicity and perceived credibility, may

have mediating effects on consumer purchase intentions (Green, 1999; DeShields & Kara, 2000). For example, demographic similarity suggests that young consumers would respond more favorably to advertisements with other young models or spokespersons than to advertisements featuring models or spokespersons of another age group (Williams, Qualls and Grier, 1995). Though most studies in marketing and social psychology literature have examined audiences' attitudes toward ads of differing ethnic and racial compositions, the results could suggest similar attitudes for ads featuring differing reference groups, such as Generation Y.

Researchers also suggest that the effectiveness of a message depends on the “expertness” and “trustworthiness” of the source (Hovland, Janis & Kelley, 1953). As marketers choose spokespersons for their advertising campaign, they sometimes look to the chief executive officer (CEO) to convey credibility to the company's products and services. While some view the CEO as a natural source of expert and credible information, Reidenbach and Pitts (1986) found that this practice might have mixed results. When the researchers studied the effectiveness of using CEOs as advertising spokespersons, they found that not all CEOs were automatically highly persuasive spokespersons as there was no inherent level of credibility found with the title. In addition, the researchers found that the majority of the CEOs used in the study were not well known and they were not perceived to be persuasive or credible when compared to CEOs who were household names, such as Lee Iacocca for Chrysler. Thus, marketers should consider the perceived believability, integrity and expertness of a CEO, as well as how well known they might be to the audience, before using a CEO as a spokesperson. Similarly, marketers of higher education should also consider this when using the

president of the college or university as a spokesperson in marketing and advertising campaigns.

Higher Education Marketing and Advertising

Over the past three decades, the landscape of higher education institutions has changed dramatically in the U.S. The once small assortment of local colleges and universities has expanded to include public or private four-year institutions, two-year institutions, for-profit institutions, proprietary, technical and vocations schools and virtual universities offering only online courses (Kinzie, Palmer, Hayek, Hossler, Jacob and Cummings, 2004).

Today, there are nearly 18 million students enrolled in more than 4,200 institutions of higher education, with an expected enrollment increase of 13 percent between 2006 and 2015 (U.S. Department of Education, 2006). Prospective students suddenly have a profusion of higher education opportunities and colleges and universities are left with increased competition for their attention.

With the surge in available higher education options, university marketers are now recognizing the value, effectiveness and potential benefits of using advertising and marketing concepts, which have successful in the business world, to gain a competitive edge (Hemsley-Brown & Oplatka, 2006). Higher education marketers are using direct mail, CD-ROMs, electronic mail distributions, the Internet and other traditional forms of consumer marketing to recruit students, develop their brand and remain competitive in a growing market.

Hossler (1999) found that while print and electronic media provide some of the most effective methods for reaching prospective older and nontraditional students, younger students are more likely to respond to direct mail, telemarketing and high school visits. However, print, radio and television advertising are successful tools for reaching parents, local community opinion leaders, friends and teachers who may pass on information about specific colleges and universities (Hossler, 1999).

There are numerous research studies in multiple areas of higher education marketing, such as the debate about students as customers, prospective students search for information and the concept of education as a service, not a product. However, to get a better understanding of the present study, this paper will focus on the specific area of college choice.

College Choice

Choosing a college or university is a complex decision that affects many different stakeholders such as high school students, parents and family members, public policy-makers and institutions of higher education (Kinzie et al., 2004).

The existing college choice research has focused on multiple factors that may influence prospective student's decision-making process. However, much of the literature can be divided into three subject areas, including the characteristics of a college or university, sources of information available to students and socioeconomic factors. The current literature review will focus on sources of information and socioeconomic factors.

More than ever before, students have access to a wide variety of information to make a decision about where to attend college. Beyond requests for traditional campus

brochures, today's students and their families are using more sophisticated techniques to obtain information, including electronic technologies such as virtual tours and DVDs, college-ranking publications, specialized guidebooks and private college counselors (Kinzie et al., 2004).

In addition, students also look to Web sites that offer tips and suggestions on how to choose a college, what factors to consider and how to prepare for the college experience (Kinzie et al., 2004). Indeed, a new industry has emerged in response to students' request for information about colleges and universities. McDonough (1994) found that students are utilizing ACT and SAT coaching software and study guides, as well as private college counselors who assist students in gaining admittance to and choosing colleges.

In fact, students are boosting their higher education options by completing numerous college applications. In 2002, half of all entering freshman applied to four or more colleges, compared to the 1970s when 50 percent submitted just one application and only eight percent completed five or more (Dey, Astin & Korn, 1991; Sax, 2003). Thus, by applying to and anticipating being accepted to more colleges and universities, students are increasing the number of options available to them.

Although the sources of information available to students have changed dramatically over the past few decades, the socioeconomic factors that influence their choice have not.

In previous research, economic or financial issues were some of the most important factors influencing students' college choice (Holland & Richards, 1965; Sevier, 1993; Geraghty, 1997; Hu & Hossler, 2000). In a 2006 study, researchers found that

economic factors still play a vital role in the decision-making process. Students reported that the possibility of attending a college would decrease with higher tuition and that many choose a college based on financial aid, scholarship and grant opportunities available to them (Domino, Libraire, Lutwiller, Superczynski & Tian, 2006).

Research also suggests that social factors such as social class, race and gender also play an important role in college decision-making (McDonough, 1997). McDonough (1997) found that women, and African-Americans and students with a low socioeconomic status were less likely to attend selective, prestigious colleges and universities even if their abilities and achievements were high enough to be accepted.

Finally, input from others has also shown to be influential in students' college choice. Students continue to look to parents, family members, friends, teachers, peers and other opinion leaders to guide them in the college search process (Galotti & Mark, 1994; Hossler, Schmit & Vesper, 1998; Hu & Hossler, 2000).

Regardless of the differences or similarities in the factors that influence college choice over the years, one issue is evident -- students entering colleges and universities today are much different than those of previous generations. For example, the stereotype of a typical American undergraduate as an 18- to 22-year-old recent high school graduate attending a four-year institution is not exactly accurate. Of the nation's nearly 14 million undergraduates, more than four in ten attend two-year community colleges; nearly one-third are older than 24 years old; and 40 percent are enrolled part-time (Department of Education, 2006). Since student enrollment is the livelihood of colleges and universities, it is crucial for higher education marketers to understand their prospective students'

demographics, characteristics, likes and dislikes, attitudes and beliefs and other factors that may influence their college choice.

Defining the Generation Y Market

Webster's Dictionary describes a cohort as a group of individuals united in an effort or difficulty. These groups are formed by external events, such as technological innovations, wars, political ideologies, and economic welfare that are thought to shape consumer's values, attitudes and beliefs during one's formative years (Noble & Noble, 2000; Meredith & Schewe, 1994).

The seven known American cohorts include Depression-era, World War II, Post-War, Baby Boomers I, Baby Boomers II, Generation X and Generation Y (Noble & Noble, 2000). Generation Y has also been called Millennials, Echo Boomers, Generation Next and The Connected Generation, but for the purpose of this study, they will be referred to as Generation Y.

Not only is there disagreement among sociologists in the correct label for the cohort, there has also been a wide variation in the composition of the age ranges. Although there is little agreement on their specific ages, most researchers consider those born somewhere between 1979 and 2000 as members of Generation Y. This variation creates a challenge for marketers attempting to understand the exact composition of their target market (Wolburg & Pokrywczynski, 2001).

With a population of 80 million, Generation Y makes up almost one-third of the U.S. population, rivaling the Baby Boomer generation in size and tripling the size of Generation X (Strauss & Howe, 2003). Although Generation Y has received ample

attention in the media, Noble and Noble (2000) suggest that what has been reported appears to be based more on speculation and observation than on true scientific study.

So, who is this latest cohort? When describing Generation Y, it is helpful to compare some of their characteristics to those of the generations before them. This study attempts to highlight some of the characteristics, nuances and events that define and shape Generation Y.

While Generation Y is similar in size to its parents' generation, it is different in almost every other way. For instance, one-third of Generation Y is not Caucasian, making this cohort more racially diverse than previous generations (Boone & Kurtz, 2001). In addition, one in four lives in a single-parent household, while three in four have working mothers (Neuborne, 1999).

Stapinski (1999) found that Generation Y members have been characterized as more optimistic, idealistic, moral, mature, inclined to value tradition and less cynical than Generation X members. Indeed, these characteristics are some of the few similarities between Generation Y and Baby Boomers.

Generational differences can also be found in the physical appearance of Generation Y. According to a study by the Pew Research Center (2007), about half of the 18-25 year-old members of Generation Y have either gotten a tattoo, dyed their hair an untraditional color or had a body piercing in a place other than their ear lobe. Older generations may create stereotypes based on these differences in physical appearance rather than view them as self-expression.

The two most significant factors differentiating this generation from previous ones are the technology revolution and Generation Y's unprecedented purchasing power.

Today's youth were born into in a technology-driven world and do not remember a time before cell phones, pagers, fax machines, text messagers, digital television recorders and the Internet. Indeed, according to a report by the Pew Internet & American Life Project (2007), 93 percent of Americans between the ages of 12 and 17 use the Internet, compared to 87 percent in 2004 and 73 percent in 2000. Not is the use of the Internet growing, but the amount of use is surging with 89 percent of Generation Y teens going online at least once a week. Additionally, teens' daily use of the Internet has increased from 42 percent in 2000 and 51 percent in 2004 to 61 percent in 2006 (Pew Internet & American Life Project, 2007).

In addition, members of Generation Y have experienced an extraordinary influence on today's consumer marketplace, including a direct buying power that was expected to exceed \$51.8 billion by 2006 (Dotson & Hyatt, 2005). This number only represents how much Generation Y spends of their self-earned or gifted money. It does not include the number of their parents' dollars they spend or how they influence their parents' consumer purchases. In 2006, it was estimated that members of Generation Y have purchasing power of more than \$200 billion a year, influencing as much as half of all spending in the economy (Waters, 2006).

In addition to their tremendous spending strength, Generation Y is also important to marketers who want to cement customer loyalty at a young age. Marketers strive to build relationships with customers early in their formative years so that they will become valuable consumers later. Despite their enormous potential, members of Generation Y are more difficult to market to than past generations because of the amount of access to

information they have, which makes them more sophisticated, yet skeptical purchasers (Yeqing and Shao, 2002).

Generation Y's Attitude Toward Advertising

Given their size, purchasing power, influence and diversity, understanding Generation Y's attitudes toward advertising could prove to be extremely beneficial to marketers (Maciejewski, 2004).

Growing up in a more media-saturated, brand-conscious world than previous generations, members of Generation Y are encountering and responding differently to advertising (Wolburg & Pokrywczynski, 2001). Researchers believe that intense marketing efforts aimed at Generation Y have taught them to be suspicious of invasive, traditional advertising campaigns and assume the worst about advertisers (Wolburg & Pokrywczynski, 2001; Johnson, 2006).

In a 2003 study, Beard examined Generation Y college students' attitudes toward advertising's ethical and social consequences. Beard (2003) found that respondents seem to question the truthfulness of advertising as approximately 65 percent felt advertising did not present a true picture of products; almost 67 percent thought ads should be more truthful; and 45 percent felt much of it was too misleading. In addition, nearly three-quarters of the respondents felt advertising caused people to buy things they don't need.

Conversely, a nationwide study of 1,226 advertising students (Fullerton, Kendrick & Frazier, 2005) found generally positive attitudes toward advertising overall. Although respondents were relatively neutral concerning the social and ethical aspects of advertising, they were more positive toward the role of advertising in the economy and

limiting the government's regulation of the advertising industry (Fullerton, Kendrick and Frazier, 2005).

Researchers also suggest that Generation Y responds better to specific creative approaches in advertising such as humor, irony and the unvarnished truth (Neuborne, 1999; Wolburg & Pokrywczynski, 2001; Morton, 2002). Wolburg and Pokrywczynski (2001) cite Sprite ads as a good example of a successful approach for this generation. The ads parody celebrity endorsers and carry the tagline, "Image is nothing. Thirst is everything. Obey your thirst."

Maciejewski (2004) studied 372 members of Generation Y's evaluations of sex appeals in advertising. Results indicated that men and women Generation Y college students differed significantly in their assessments of sexual appeals. Female students consistently believed that the use of the sexual appeal was unethical, whereas male respondents believed it was ethical. Based on the results, Maciejewski (2004) suggested that advertisers carefully consider the use of sexual appeals, especially aimed at women, when targeting Generation Y.

Generation Y's Attitude Toward Education

While Generation Y may have different characteristics than preceding generations, as teenagers they are still motivated by the same aspirations of previous generations: independence, privacy, ownership, status, and peer pressure (Spero & Stone, 2004). Furthermore, like their grandparents, parents and siblings before them, education remains an important aspiration for Generation Y.

A college education is more important now than ever. According to the U.S. Department of Education (2006), 90 percent of the fastest-growing jobs in the new knowledge-driven economy will require some postsecondary education. In addition, U.S. workers with only a high school diploma earn an average of 37 percent less than those with a bachelor's degree (U.S. Department of Education, 2006).

With such compelling arguments to earn a college education, it is important to note Generation Y's attitude toward education and their desire to earn a college degree.

Research studies indicate that Generation Y members are more educated and have a more positive outlook toward education than their Generation X predecessors. Strauss and Howe (2003) found that aptitude scores rose within every racial and ethnic group during the 1990s. In addition, the researchers found that eight in ten teenagers said it is "cool to be smart" and that a record number also plan to attend college.

In fact, members of Generation Y listed education as the second biggest concern, after financial issues, facing them in their lives today. According to the Pew Research Center (2007), one in five said getting into college and graduating were among the most important things they worry about.

Moreover, Generation Y is making a large impact on university campuses across the nation. Approximately 6.9 million members of Generation Y were enrolled in U.S. colleges and universities in 2002, representing 44.2 percent of all students. By 2012, Generation Y's enrollment is expected to increase to 13.3 million, representing 75 percent of all students (Coomes & DeBard, 2004).

Generation Y's Attitude Toward Authority

Like their predecessors, experiencing life-changing and generation-defining events have shaped Generation Y. Just as World War II, the Depression, the Civil Rights movement, Vietnam, Watergate and AIDS shaped the lives of previous generations, experiences such as Waco, Oklahoma City, Columbine, September 11th and the War on Terror will have a lasting effect on Generation Y (Strauss & Howe, 2003). Some argue that events such as September 11th have lessened Generation Y's trust in authority.

In 2005, Harvard University's Institute of Politics conducted 1,204 telephone interviews with college undergraduates to determine their political attitudes and examine their trust in government institutions. The researchers found that in the fall of 2001, immediately following the events of September 11th, 60 percent of college students reported they trusted the federal government all or most of the time. However, in 2005, the level of trust fell to 44 percent. In addition, presidential trust was at an all-time low as survey results showed that only 30 percent of participants trust the President most or all of the time. In addition, researchers found nearly 70 percent of college students agreed that elected officials are motivated by selfish reasons and 64 percent believe the tone of politics has become too negative (IOP, 2005).

In addition, the IOP researchers found that 93 percent of those surveyed believe that politics is an honorable profession, including 91 percent who believe that running for office and 93 percent who believe being an elected official is honorable (IOP, 2005). Yet, these college students were dissatisfied with current government leaders and institutions. The researchers suggest the results of the study show a strong cynicism among college students based on current events and the current political administration, but ultimately,

students respect politics as an institution and elected leaders need to work harder to change perceptions and gain their trust (IOP, 2005).

In spite of these statistics, others believe Generation Y is more authority-dependent than any other group in history. According to Coomes and DeBard (2004), Generation Y has spent most of their lives in a society attempting to balance a need for openness and a desire to keep them safe. This generation saw the creation of parental advisory stickers on music, the V-chip for television, the D.A.R.E. drug and alcohol awareness program and Internet blocking software (Coomes & DeBard, 2004). This need to provide a safe environment has allowed authority figures to play a primary role in the lives of Generation Y.

Many of Generation Y's parents have been termed "helicopter parents" by the media for their practice of hovering and interfering in their children's lives, including going as far as to call teachers and professors to protest grades on behalf of their students or hiring consultants to assist with their children's college applications (Randall, 2007).

Dr. Patricia Somers, at the University of Texas at Austin, suggests cultural shifts over the past few decades may have led to the increased level of parent involvement. Somers said safety concerns and reactions to events such as the Columbine High School shootings and September 11th; cell phones and instant messaging allowing for 24/7 contact; and a more-attentive child-rearing style may have contributed to the phenomenon (Randall, 2007).

Similarly, with the intent of creating well-rounded individuals and providing direction in their children's lives, parents have designed schedules with nonstop programs and activities. Day care options, after-school programs, recreational centers, sports

activities, music and dance lessons and art programs have come to occupy an increasing amount of what was once free time for other generations (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Coomes & DeBard, 2004). Thus, America's youth are spending the majority of their time under the supervision and direction of parents, teachers, coaches and other leaders. Howe and Strauss (2000) suggest this practice has caused Generation Y to both trust and count on authority in their everyday lives, more than in previous generations.

Research suggests that members of Generation Y are rule-followers. Strauss and Howe (2003) found that from 1993 to 2003, rates of violent crime among teens fell by 70 percent; rates of teen pregnancy and abortion by 30 percent; rates of high school sexual activity by 20 percent; and rates of alcohol and tobacco consumption were reaching all-time lows.

According to the Pew Research Center (2007), Generation Y also tends to name family members, teachers and mentors as their heroes and people they admire. In addition, nine-in-ten teens say they "trust" and "feel close to" their parents (Strauss & Howe, 2003). Similarly, a 2005 study of 1,005 high school students (13 to 19 years old) named family members (47 percent) as their highest choice for a role model, followed by friends (15 percent), entertainers (11 percent), and teachers (9 percent). Business leaders (3 percent), local political or community leaders (1 percent) and national/international political leaders (1 percent) were at the bottom of the percentages (Horatio Alger Association, 2005).

The Authority Principle

According to Cialdini (2001), our society is trained from birth that obedience to authority is right and disobedience is wrong. In fact, researchers say much of our social structure depends on respect and influence being given to authority figures (Breckler, Olson & Wiggins, 2006).

Perhaps the most noted example of authority theory is Milgram's seminal series of social psychology experiments. In the 1960s, Milgram conducted experiments that measured the willingness of study participants to obey an authority figure who instructed them to inflict harm upon another individual, an act that conflicted with their personal morals. The subjects ("teachers") delivered what they believed to be intense and dangerous levels electric shocks to a "learner" who incorrectly answered their questions. In addition, a lab-coated technician directed the teachers to perform their duties. The technician, in the role of the authority figure, and the learner were actually actors who were aware of the experiment. Despite the learners' screams of agony and pleas to stop the experiment (which were all simulated), the teachers continued to carry out the shocks as instructed by the technicians. According to Milgram (1963), his study demonstrated the "extreme willingness of adults to go to almost any lengths on the command of an authority."

While there is a vast amount of research regarding authority effects in social psychology literature, it is useful for this study to relate the authority theory to advertising. Authority-based appeals are popular techniques in advertising. For example, popular commercials for Trident chewing gum tout that "four out of five dentists

recommend chewing Trident after meals,” while “choosy Moms choose Jif” has been a long-running tagline for Jif brand peanut butter for years.

Indeed, sometimes the appearance of an authority figure is enough to persuade consumers, specifically in advertising where marketers use symbols such as titles and clothing to suggest certain levels of authority. Cialdini (2001) cites a 1979 Sanka coffee commercial as a telling example of the use of a perceived authority figures in advertising. The television commercial features actor Robert Young, known as Marcus Welby, M.D. from a popular television series, warning consumers against the dangers of caffeine while also recommending caffeine-free Sanka coffee. Cialdini (2001) notes that while Young was merely an actor known for playing a doctor, audiences were swayed by an unearned title and perceived authority, making the commercial a highly successful, long-running campaign for Sanka.

According to Cialdini (2001), credibility is the key to successful, influential authority and a credible source is one who is both expert and trustworthy. Authority figures such as policemen and doctors are often viewed as credible in everyday life and consequently, using them as a spokesperson or model in advertising can be an effective tactic in persuasion (O’Shaughnessy & O’Shaughnessy, 2004).

In services marketing, where there are no tangible products to advertise, marketers tend to rely on symbols to portray the quality and level of service their company provides (Cobb-Walgreen & Mohr, 1998). In 1998, Cobb-Walgreen and Mohr conducted a content analysis of 4,898 ads between 1982 and 1992 to explore the presence of symbols in service advertisements. Authority symbols ranged from uniforms, specialized equipment and diplomas to personal characteristics such as age, status, facial

expression and body posture. Results showed that low consumer power services, service categories in which customers feel they have little influence in the outcome of the interaction (such as colleges and universities), often used authority symbols in their advertising. The researchers suggest authority symbols may be effective in conveying the quality of service the business or company could provide (Cobb-Walgreen & Mohr, 1998).

Perhaps the most interesting research related to the present investigation is a recent study examining young French and Americans consumers' responsiveness to authority-based persuasion attempts. Researchers Jung and Kellaris (2006) conducted an experiment designed to determine if source credibility and power distance altered the effects of authority on the young consumers' attitudes and purchase intentions.

Hofstede (1991) defines power distance as the "extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally." Hofstede's model suggests that in a society with a low power distance, such as the United States, everyone is treated relatively equal. In contrast, people in a high power distance society understand that not everyone is treated equally and there is a defined social structure in place.

In relation to authority figures in advertising, the amount of influence an authority figure has on an audience may differ greatly between those in high or low power distance cultures.

For their first experiment, about one year prior to September 11th, Jung and Kellaris (2006) exposed 248 students at French and U.S. universities to printed descriptions of radio ads in dialog format. Three sets of ads were used to represent low,

mid and high levels of authority. For example, the versions representing a high level of authority featured a mother recommending a yogurt to a daughter or a boss recommending an Internet retailer to a subordinate.

After the respondents read the ads, they were asked questions to measure their attitude toward the ad, attitude toward the brand, purchase intent, source credibility and power distance. The researchers found that the higher the level of authority in the radio ads, the more negative the attitudes and purchase intentions of the young consumers, especially among American participants (Jung & Kellaris, 2006). The researchers referred to this as the “reverse authority effect.” In addition, both perceptions of spokesperson credibility and power distance moderated authority effects among both the French and American respondents.

Next, Jung and Kellaris (2006) repeated the experiment in 2003, approximately three years after the first study and two years after the events of September 11th. In the second study, 169 American students (the two American groups in each study were not statistically different in their ages, work experience or gender composition) were exposed to the same ad treatments and answered the same questions as in the initial experiment. Interestingly, the researchers found that the reverse authority effect was not present among the post-September 11th participants. In addition, the second group of American participants exhibited a higher power distance than those prior to September 11th. Jung and Kellaris (2006) suggested that these findings imply that the events of September 11th might have caused a shift in young Americans’ cultural values, which may have resulted in a more positive opinion of authority and authority-based appeals. Finally, the researchers suggest that the increase in power distance for the second group of young

Americans may be a result of the nation's united front in defending freedom and fighting terrorism. In other words, Americans may have become more receptive to ideas of personal sacrifice for the common good (i.e. security checks at the airport and the Patriot Act), which may have elevated their sense of respect for authority (Jung & Kellaris, 2006).

Summary

As millions of members of Generation Y contemplate college choices, it is important to marketers of higher education to understand the demographics, personality characteristics, likes, dislikes and specific attitudes of this cohort. There is little empirical research regarding Generation Y's beliefs and attitudes toward authority figures, specifically in a post-September 11th environment. This study hopes to add to the small amount of existing research in this subject area.

Based on the studies in the preceding literature review, it seems that attitudes and respect for personal authority from adults in their lives is stronger among Generation Y (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Strauss & Howe, 2003; Coomes & DeBard, 2004; Horatio Alger Association, 2005; Randall, 2007), while respect for institutional authority, such as government, may have weakened (Halstead 1999; IOP, 2005)

The researcher hopes to determine if these suggestions are replicated in the form of authority figures as models in advertising and to gain an understanding of how Generation Y's attitude toward authority-based appeals is related to their overall acceptance of authority.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes in detail research objectives, independent and dependent variables, hypotheses tested and the experimental design for the present study. The chapter also includes a discussion of the measurement scales, advertising treatments and sampling methods used for the experiment. The chapter concludes with details of the study's data collection, data processing and statistical analysis.

Research Objective

The objective of this study was to better understand Generation Y's attitudes toward varying levels of authority in higher education advertising. An experimental methodology was chosen to explore these relationships.

The present study hopes to build on past studies that have examined Generation Y's attitude toward authority figures such as government leaders and their parents (Strauss & Howe, 2003; Coomes & DeBard, 2004; Horatio Alger Association, 2005; IOP, 2005). In addition, the study hopes to add to the small amount of literature that focuses on the effectiveness of authority-based appeals in advertising and marketing research (Jung & Kellaris, 2006).

Marketers, specifically colleges and universities, can use the information garnered from this study to successfully choose the most effective models and spokespersons for their advertising campaigns directed toward Generation Y.

Variables and Hypotheses

This experiment's independent variable is model status (represented by three different levels of authority: external authority, internal authority and non-authority). The respondents' level of acceptance of authority is an intervening variable. The dependent variable is the respondents' attitude toward the advertisement.

Empirical research suggests that models and spokespersons that are perceived as similar to their audiences are more likely to positively influence persuasion than those who are perceived as dissimilar (Williams, Qualls & Greer, 1995; Green, 1999; DeShields & Kara, 2000). Thus, it is hypothesized that young consumers will respond more favorably to advertisements featuring models and spokespersons who share similar personal characteristics such as age and perceived authority.

H1: Overall, members of Generation Y will have a more positive attitude toward the ad featuring a model of non-authority status.

Research on Generation Y's attitude toward authority appears to vary based on whether the authority figure is personally involved in their lives, such as a parent, or whether the authority figure is regarded on an external level, such as a government official. Thus, it is difficult to predict a specific direction in terms of a respondent's

attitude toward the ad. Therefore, the following research questions are proposed:

RQ1: Are respondents' attitude toward the ad featuring an external authority figure (university president) related to their acceptance of authority scores?

RQ2: Are respondents' attitude toward the ad featuring an internal authority figure (parent) related to their acceptance of authority scores?

RQ3: Are respondents' attitude toward the ad featuring a non authority figure (Generation Y student) related to their acceptance of authority scores?

Experiment Design

This experiment is a 4 x 1 factorial design that examines the relationship between the independent variable of model status and the intervening variable of respondents' level of acceptance of authority and the dependent variable of attitude toward the higher education advertisement.

First, the online questionnaire collected demographic data and participants' level of acceptance of authority. Study participants were then randomly assigned a single higher education advertising treatment featuring either the control ad showing a generic campus photograph or one of the three different levels of the independent variable of model status - external authority (university president), internal authority (parent) and non-authority (Generation Y student). Copy and layout elements remained constant for

each ad treatment. Participants were then asked to review the advertisement and complete a questionnaire that measured their attitude toward the ad. All responses were then automatically tabulated and compiled into a single database. Using Campbell and Stanley's (1963) notation system, the experimental design can be defined as:

O R X_{1-4} O

In this experiment, O represents the observation of acceptance of authority, R represents the random assignment of subjects to advertising treatments, X_{1-4} represents the three levels of the independent variable of model status and the control ad, and the final O represents the observation of attitude toward the ad.

Advertising Treatments

The advertising treatments used in the study resembled a student recruitment advertisement for Oklahoma State University-Tulsa (OSU-Tulsa). The advertisements are representative of a general enrollment recruitment piece for local higher education institutions.

Four variations of the higher education advertisement were created for the experiment. External authority was represented with an ad featuring an adult man with gray hair who was dressed in a business suit. The man was identified as the university's president in the photo's cutline and was, in fact, the president of OSU-Tulsa at the time of the study. Internal authority was represented with an ad that included a middle-aged woman described as a parent of an OSU-Tulsa student. Non-authority was represented with an ad that featured a young man who was labeled as a current OSU-Tulsa student.

The final treatment served as a control ad and featured a generic photo of OSU-Tulsa's campus water fountain.

The ad treatments were created using Adobe Photoshop and Microsoft Publisher graphic design software. The ad treatments were created using photography provided to the researcher by OSU-Tulsa's Marketing and Public Relations department. Each ad treatment was identical with the exception of the three models and their respective names and labels described in each outline.

The full-color ad treatments were designed to resemble a 5 inch by 7 inch print advertisement that might be found in a newspaper, magazine or university recruiting piece. The design and copy elements of the ad treatment included a single photograph, headline, supporting copy, university logo and contact information. The researcher paid special attention to details such as model placement, demeanor and stance to keep the layout of each advertisement consistent.

Research Instruments

Participants' attitude toward the ad was measured using Wells' (1964) Emotional Quotient Scale (EQ) and Reaction Profile. The EQ scale is a 12-item Likert-type scale that measures the participants' overall emotional reaction toward the ad. The Reaction Profile is a 24-point semantic differential scale that measures participants' reaction to an advertisement in three specific areas - attractiveness, meaningfulness and vitality. The two scales were combined and a mean score was calculated to provide an overall attitude toward the ad score.

Rigby's (1987) Authority Behavior Inventory, a 24-item, Likert-type scale, was used to measure participants' acceptance of authority. The researcher used a slightly modified version of Rigby's ABI to create an additional six statements that specifically measure participants' acceptance of their parents' authority.

The demographic questions revealed the participants' gender, age, race, year in school, part-time or full-time student status, employment status, and whether or not they were a parent.

Sampling Method

A convenience sample was drawn for this study from several undergraduate and graduate classes at OSU-Tulsa in the metropolitan area of Tulsa, Oklahoma. During January, February and March of 2008, OSU-Tulsa professors were asked by the researcher to assist with recruiting subjects for participation in the study. During their classes, professors read a script provided by the researcher and handed out a flyer to students containing the Internet address and additional informational information about the study. Students were informed that participation in the study was completely voluntary and could be completed in their free time at home or in the university's computer lab.

Procedure

The experiment was created and conducted on the Internet with the assistance of the university Web developer. Once participants logged onto the Web site, they were given an overview of the study, but were not informed to any specific details regarding

the purpose of the experiment. First, participants were asked 11 demographic questions. They were then given instructions on how to use the Likert-style and semantic scales. Next, participants answered 30 questions that measured their acceptance of authority. Each participant was then randomly assigned one of the four ad treatments. Finally, a set of instructions directed participants to view the advertisement and answer the subsequent questionnaire which included 38 questions that measured attitude toward the ad.

Data Collection, Processing and Analysis

The online questionnaires contained a total of 79 questions that once completed, were automatically downloaded into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. This collection method reduced the concern of human data entry errors associated with traditional experiments. The data was then imported into SPSS for statistical analysis.

To test the hypotheses, mean scores for attitude toward the ad for each ad treatment were compared using analysis of variance (ANOVA). Sub-analysis of differences in scores for each level of acceptance of authority were also compared using Pearson's Correlation Coefficients. Results, implications and limitations of the study will be discussed in detail in Chapters 4 and 5.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This chapter describes in detail the findings of this study, which utilized an experimental methodology to better understand Generation Y's attitudes toward varying levels of authority in higher education advertising. Advertising treatments featuring three levels of authority and a control ad were randomly assigned to Generation Y students with the purpose of determining if the independent variable of model status (represented by external authority, internal authority and non-authority), impacted the respondents' attitude toward the ad and if respondents' level of acceptance of authority mediated this impact.

The ad treatments were identical with the exception of the three models and a generic photograph of the campus fountain, and their respective names and labels described in the outline. The four variations of the advertising treatments included a version featuring a university president (external authority), a version featuring a parent (internal authority), a version featuring a current student (non-authority), and a version featuring a generic photo of OSU-Tulsa's campus water fountain (control ad).

Three measurement scales were used in this study. Rigby's (1987) Authority Behavior Inventory (ABI) ($\alpha=.537$) was used to measure participants' acceptance of authority. The ABI is a 24-item, Likert-type scale ranging from one to five – five indicating an affirmative response and one indicting a negative response. Participants' attitude toward the ad was measured using Wells' (1964) Emotional Quotient Scale (EQ) ($\alpha=.658$) and Reaction Profile ($\alpha=.949$). The EQ scale is a 12-item, Likert-type scale

ranging from one to five – five indicating an affirmative response and one indicating a negative response. The Reaction Profile is a 24-item, semantic differential scale ranging from one to eight – eight indicating an affirmative response and one indicating a negative response.

Respondent Profile

The data for this study were collected from 111 college students in Tulsa, Oklahoma during January, February and March of 2008. The study was designed to explore the attitudes of Generation Y; therefore only respondents who fell into the 18 to 28 age range, which is within the college-age range of Generation Y, were used. Of the respondents to the survey, 56.3 percent were female and 43.8 percent were male. Additional demographic data revealed that 78.6 percent of the sample was White, 12.5 percent were Native American, 3.6 percent were Hispanic, 2.7 percent were Asian American, 1.8 percent were African American and .9 percent were Pacific Islander. The sample consisted mostly of junior (47.3 percent), senior (40.2 percent) and graduate-level (10.7 percent) students. A complete demographic profile can be found in Table 1.

Table 1: Sample Demographics

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Gender			Year in School		
Male	49	43.8	Freshman	1	.9
Female	63	56.3	Sophomore	0	0
Age Group			Junior	53	47.3
18-22	53	47.3	Senior	45	40.2
23-28	59	52.7	Graduate student	12	10.7
Race			Student Status		
White, Non-Hispanic	88	78.6	Part-time	88	78.6
Native American	14	12.5	Full-time	14	12.5
Hispanic	4	3.6	Employment Status		
Asian American	3	2.7	Not currently employed	16	14.3
African American	2	1.8	Employed full-time	48	42.9
Pacific Islander	1	.9	Employed part-time	48	42.9
			Parental Status		
			Parent	18	16.1
			Not yet a parent	94	83.9

Measuring Attitude Toward the Ad.

Wells' (1964) Emotional Quotient and Reaction Profile scales were used to measure respondents' attitude toward the ad. The Emotional Quotient scores ranged from one to five, with higher scores indicating a more positive orientation for the emotional response to the ad. The Reaction Profile scores ranged from one to eight, with higher scores indicating a positive emotional reaction to the ad and lower scores indicating a negative emotional reaction. Negatively phrased statements on the Emotional Quotient and Reaction Profile were reverse coded so that mean scores for both scales could be calculated and combined to give a global attitude toward the ad score with an overall range of 13 to one. Higher global scores indicated a positive overall attitude toward the ad, while lower global scores indicated a negative overall attitude toward the ad.

Table 2: Emotional Quotient Scale

<i>Emotional Quotient Scale</i>	<i>Mean Scores</i>			
	<i>External Authority (university parent)</i>	<i>Internal Authority (parent)</i>	<i>Non-Authority (Gen Y student)</i>	<i>Control Ad (campus fountain)</i>
This ad is very appealing to me.	3.06	3.05	3.70	3.26
I would probably skip this ad if I saw it in a magazine.	3.83	4.05	3.26	3.77
This is a heart-warming ad.	2.29	2.82	3.09	2.48
This ad makes me want to buy the brand it features.	2.65	2.41	3.48	2.68
This ad has little interest for me.	3.32	3.86	2.74	3.06
I dislike this ad.	3.20	3.23	1.78	2.74
This ad makes me feel good.	2.86	2.77	3.48	2.93
This is a wonderful ad.	2.57	2.50	3.13	2.52
This is the kind of ad you forget easily.	4.03	4.23	3.43	4.23
This is a fascinating ad.	2.38	2.32	2.57	2.29
I'm tired of this kind of advertising.	3.31	3.45	3.09	3.35
This ad leaves me cold.	3.09	2.73	2.13	2.68

Table 3: Reaction Profile Scale

<i>Reaction Profile Scale</i>	<i>Mean Scores</i>			
	<i>External Authority (university parent)</i>	<i>Internal Authority (parent)</i>	<i>Non-Authority (Gen Y student)</i>	<i>Control Ad (campus fountain)</i>
Attractive - Unattractive	4.06	4.09	5.70	4.58
Easy to understand – Hard to understand	6.77	6.23	6.78	7.19
Exciting – Unexciting	2.94	2.82	4.57	3.32
Strong – Weak	4.03	3.86	5.30	4.26
Appealing - Unappealing	4.00	3.86	5.43	4.29
Sharp, bright, clear – Washed-out looking	5.60	4.68	6.91	5.61
Interesting – Uninteresting	3.63	3.68	5.09	3.90
Common, ordinary – New, different	6.00	6.36	6.00	6.58
Lively – Lifeless	3.77	3.50	4.96	4.03
Meaningful – Meaningless	4.63	5.05	5.83	5.03
Worth looking at – Not worth looking at	4.20	4.18	5.48	4.23
Easy to remember – Hard to remember	4.66	3.91	4.91	4.68
Important to me – Unimportant to me	4.47	3.95	5.57	4.65
In good taste – In poor taste	6.03	5.73	6.96	6.13
Fascinating – Boring	3.35	3.27	4.43	3.48
Simple – Complicated	6.32	6.41	6.78	6.94
Convincing – Unconvincing	4.53	4.45	5.70	5.00
Comforting – Frightening	5.00	4.86	5.83	5.45
Gentle – Harsh	5.62	5.86	6.17	6.03
Funny – Serious	2.35	3.14	3.26	2.10
Beautiful – Ugly	4.32	4.59	5.35	4.55
Worth remembering – Not worth remembering	4.06	3.64	4.91	4.16
Pleasant – Unpleasant	5.23	5.36	6.26	5.42
Fresh – Stale	4.17	3.36	5.17	4.32
Colorful – Colorless	5.00	3.91	6.52	5.32
Honest - Dishonest	5.86	5.86	7.09	6.39

Table 4: Global Attitude Toward the Ad mean scores for entire sample

<i>Attitude Toward the Ad Mean Scores: Entire Sample</i>			
Ad version	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
External Authority (university president)	35	7.35	1.14
Internal Authority (parent)	22	7.26	1.93
Non-Authority (Gen Y Student)	23	8.78	1.16
Control Ad (campus fountain)	31	7.67	1.53

Testing the Hypothesis and Research Questions

Hypothesis 1 predicted that overall, members of Generation Y will have a more positive attitude toward the ad featuring a model of non-authority status. Descriptive statistics indicated that the advertising treatment featuring the model of non-authority status (Generation Y student) had the absolute highest mean at 8.78, followed by the control ad (campus fountain) at 7.67, the model of external authority status (university president) at 7.35 and finally, the model of internal authority status (parent) at 7.26.

A one-way ANOVA revealed a significant statistical difference ($F = 5.681$, $p = .001$) in attitude toward the ad among the four advertising treatments. A Tukey HSD post-hoc analysis revealed that respondents had a significantly higher ($p = .002$) attitude toward the ad for the advertising treatment featuring the Generation Y student representing a model of non-authority status ($M = 8.78$) than one featuring the university president representing a model of external authority ($M = 7.35$). Respondents also scored the non-authority (Generation Y student) advertising treatment significantly higher than the advertising treatment featuring the model of internal authority status ($M = 7.26$, $p =$

.003) and the control advertisement featuring the campus fountain (M=7.67, p = .030). There were no significant differences among the external, internal and control ad treatments. Thus, Hypothesis 1 was supported.

Table 5: One-way ANOVA: Global Attitude Toward the Ad for total sample

<i>One-way ANOVA: Global Attitude Toward the Ad for Total Sample</i>					
Attitude Toward the Ad	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	35.39	3	11.797	5.681	.001
Within Sample	222.20	107	2.077		
Total	257.59	110			

Measuring Acceptance of Authority.

In order to examine how a respondents’ attitude toward authority influences their advertising model preference, it was necessary to measure respondents’ acceptance of authority. Rigby’s (1987) Authority Behavior Inventory provided an acceptance of authority score ranging from one to five, with higher scores indicating a more positive orientation toward acceptance of authority. Negatively phrased questions on the scale were reverse coded and a mean score was calculated. The range of acceptance of authority scores was a low of 2.05 to a high of 4.61, with an overall mean score of 3.53.

Table 6: Authority Behavior Inventory Scores

<i>Authority Behavior Inventory Scale Items</i>	<i>Mean Scores</i>
Do you listen attentively to what older people say about how you should behave?	3.58
Do you question the judgment of umpires or referees when you think they have made an incorrect decision?	3.24
When a person in authority whom you trust tells you to do something, do you do it, even though you can't see the reason for it?	3.72
Do you criticize people who are rude to their superiors?	3.58
Do you encourage young people to do what they want to do, even when it is against the wishes of their parents?	2.54
When you go to work, do you dress so as to be acceptable to the people who run the place?	4.40
Do you treat experts with respect even when you don't think much of them personally?	3.99
Do you support left-wing, radical policies?	2.52
Do you take part in demonstrations to show your opposition to policies you do not like?	2.05
Do you express approval for the work of school teachers?	3.61
Do you listen attentively to what your parents say about how you should behave? *	3.79
Do you go to church?	2.88
Do you make fun of the police?	2.32
When things are bad, do you look for guidance from someone wiser than yourself?	4.21
Do you show special respect for your parents? *	4.43
Do you sympathize with rebels?	2.57
When you are in a hurry, do you break the speed limit or encourage your driver to do so, if it seems reasonably safe?	3.68
Do you follow doctor's orders?	3.98
Do you criticize people who are rude to their parents? *	3.71
Do you question what you hear on the news?	3.56
Do you cross the road against the pedestrian traffic lights?	3.07
Do you listen attentively to what your parents say about how you should behave? *	3.72
Do you ask for a "second opinion" when you feel uncertain about a doctor's advice?	3.13
Do you stand when they play the national anthem in public?	4.61
Do you express contempt for politicians?	3.05
When a parent tells you to do something, do you do it, even though you can't see the reason for it? *	3.57
Do you get annoyed when people sneer at those in authority?	3.26
Do you show special respect for people in high positions?	3.84
Do you speak up against your boss or person in charge when he or she acts unfairly?	3.23
When things are bad, do you look for guidance from a parent? *	4.10
*Indicates questions that were added by the researcher to specifically measure participants' acceptance of their parents' authority.	

Table 7: Overall Authority Behavior Inventory Scores

<i>Authority Behavior Inventory Mean Scores: Entire Sample</i>			
	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Total Sample	112	3.53	.29
Female respondents	63	3.56	.27
Male respondents	49	3.49	.32

A Pearson's Correlation Coefficient was calculated to measure the strength of the association between the variables of attitude toward the ad and acceptance of authority for each ad treatment.

Research Question 1 asked if the respondents' attitude toward the ad featuring an external authority figure (university president) is related to their acceptance of authority scores. The correlation of $-.157$ between acceptance of authority and attitude toward the ad featuring the authority external authority figure (university president) had a p-value of $.368$, which is not statistically significant. Thus, respondents' attitude toward the ad featuring an external authority figure was not related to their acceptance of authority scores.

Research Question 2 asked if the respondents' attitude toward the ad featuring an internal authority figure (parent) is related to their acceptance of authority scores. Test results indicated a correlation of $.030$ between acceptance of authority and attitude toward the ad featuring the internal authority figure (parent) with a p-value of $.894$, which is not statistically significant. Thus, no significant relationship existed among respondents' attitude toward the ad featuring an internal authority figure and their acceptance of authority.

Research Question 3 asked if the respondents' attitude toward the ad featuring a non-authority figure (Generation Y student) is related to their acceptance of authority

scores. The correlation of .268 between acceptance of authority and attitude toward the ad featuring a non-authority figure had a p-value of .216, which is not statistically significant. Thus, respondents' attitude toward the ad featuring a non-authority figure was not related to respondents' acceptance of authority scores.

Table 8: Pearson's Correlation Coefficient for Advertising Treatments

<i>Pearson's Correlation Coefficients for Advertising Treatments</i>			
	N	Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)
External Authority (university president) Acceptance of Authority & Attitude Toward the Ad	35	-.157	.368
Internal Authority (parent) Acceptance of Authority & Attitude Toward the Ad	22	.030	.894
Non-Authority (Generation Y student) Acceptance of Authority & Attitude Toward the Ad	24	.268	.216
Control Ad (Campus fountain) Acceptance of Authority & Attitude Toward the Ad	31	.144	.411

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Summary

Based on the sheer size of their population of 80 million, Generation Y (those born between 1979 and 2000) will surely make a significant impact on the consumer market in the United States. A college education is more important now than ever and members of Generation Y have an abundance of options when choosing a college (U.S. Department of Education, 2006). Thus, higher education marketers are increasing their efforts to recruit members of Generation Y in a rather competitive environment. In an attempt to understand how to best reach this market in terms of higher education advertising, it is important to understand how Generation Y reacts to advertisements featuring models representing varying levels of authority.

In a post-September 11th environment, it is important to consider Generation Y's beliefs and attitudes toward authority figures when creating advertising appeals. The results of this study provide marketers with insight into how Generation Y's overall acceptance of authority is related to their preference for authority-based appeals. As a result, higher education marketers can successfully choose the most effective models and spokespersons for their recruitment advertising directed toward Generation Y.

The present study used an experimental methodology to determine if members of Generation Y's acceptance of authority played a role in garnering positive or negative attitudes toward varying levels of authority in higher education advertising. A convenience sample of 111 college students was drawn from several undergraduate and graduate classes at OSU-Tulsa in the metropolitan area of Tulsa, Oklahoma during January, February and March of 2008. The participants were randomly assigned one of four variations of an advertisement for OSU-Tulsa, including versions featuring a university president (external authority), a parent (internal authority), a current student (non-authority), and a generic photo of OSU-Tulsa's campus water fountain (control ad). Each ad treatment was identical with the exception of the photograph and their respective names and labels described in each cutline. Data were collected using three scales – one to measure respondents' acceptance of authority and two to measure their attitude toward each advertising treatment.

Discussion

In general, the current study revealed few differences in the respondents' attitude toward the ad for the advertising treatments featuring models representing external authority (university president) and internal authority (parent). Indeed, the control ad (campus fountain) earned higher attitude toward the ad scores than did the ad treatments featuring the university president and parent. On the other hand, statistical analysis showed that the sample did show more positive attitudes toward the ad featuring the model representing non-authority (Generation Y student).

Hypothesis 1 predicted that overall, members of Generation Y will have a more positive attitude toward the ad featuring a model of non-authority status. This hypothesis was supported. Significantly higher attitude toward the ad scores were found for the ad featuring the Generation Y student. This result is consistent with previous research that suggests that consumers like and are more influenced by sources that perceived as similar to themselves (Hovland, Janis & Kelley, 1953; Brock, 1965; Berscheid, 1966; Mills & Jellison, 1968).

Research Question 1 sought to determine if respondents' attitude toward the ad featuring an external authority figure (university president) would be significantly related to their acceptance of authority scores. The findings revealed that respondents' preference for the ad featuring an external authority figure were not related to their acceptance of authority. Previous research suggests that since the events of September 11th, Generation Y's respect for institutional authority, such as government officials, may have weakened (IOP, 2005). The findings do not, however, suggest a relationship exists between a negative attitude or lack of acceptance of external authority and Generation Y's preference for an advertisement featuring an external authority figure, such as a university president.

Research Question 2 examined whether respondents' attitude toward the ad featuring an internal authority figure (parent) was related to their acceptance of authority scores. Results showed that respondents' preferences for the ad featuring an internal authority figure were not related to their acceptance of authority. Past research suggests that Generation Y has a positive attitude and respect for personal authority from adults in their lives (Coomes & DeBard, 2004; Randall, 2007; Howe & Strauss, 2000; Horatio

Alger Association, 2005; Pew Research Center, 2007). Although Generation Y may have a positive attitude, respect and acceptance of internal authority, the findings do not suggest a relationship exists between Generation Y's acceptance of authority and their preference for an advertisement featuring an internal authority figure, such as a parent.

Research Question 3 considered whether respondents' attitude toward the ad featuring a non-authority figure (Generation Y student) would be significantly related to their acceptance of authority scores. The findings revealed that respondents' preferences for the ad featuring a non-authority figure were not related to their acceptance of authority. Therefore, although the findings suggest that members of Generation Y prefer advertisements that feature models similar to themselves, the data did not reveal that their acceptance of authority influenced their preference for an advertisement featuring a non-authority figure, such as a fellow Generation Y college student.

The results of this study found that no relationship exists between Generation Y's level of acceptance toward authority and their advertising model preference. Previous literature suggests that compared to previous generations, attitudes and respect for personal authority from adults in their lives is stronger among Generation Y (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Strauss & Howe, 2003; Coomes & DeBard, 2004; Horatio Alger Association, 2005; Randall, 2007), while respect for institutional authority, such as government, may have weakened (Halstead 1999; IOP, 2005). Yet, the Generation Y respondents in this study reported a mean authority score of 3.53 on a five-point scale, indicating a higher than average acceptance of authority overall. Still, their relatively positive orientation toward authority did not impact their preference for an advertising model with more authority. Perhaps Generation Y's attitude toward authority is not as

decisive as the literature leads us to believe. Indeed, the results of this study suggest that authority figures may not influence Generation Y's attitudes positively or negatively. Perhaps Rigby's (1987) Authority Behavior Inventory was not the most reliable instrument to measure Generation Y's attitude toward the various types authority figures in their lives. An instrument that measures respondents' level of acceptance for internal and external authority figures separately may offer a more reliable and accurate account of respondents' acceptance of authority for figures such as government officials or parents.

Implications

While the results of this study cannot be generalized to the entire Generation Y population, the data would indicate that higher education marketers should consider using Generation Y models in their recruitment advertising. Occasionally, higher education advertisements feature models such as respected members of the administration, faculty and other alumni. The results of this study suggest that regardless of Generation Y's acceptance of authority, advertising featuring models of higher levels of authority status are simply not as well-liked. Thus, marketers should consider these results when attempting to recruit members of Generation Y, who appear to prefer advertisements featuring models similar to themselves. Consequently, Generation Y itself may be the most helpful tool in reaching the Generation Y market.

Limitations

When analyzing the results of the present study, several limitations should be considered. The population, sample size, advertisement type, experimental conditions and research instruments are limitations in this study.

Population. The results of this study cannot be generalized to the entire Generation Y population due to the convenience sampling method utilized for the experiment. Although selected findings were supported by the literature, the results of this study should be restricted to describing the Generation Y population drawn from the undergraduate and graduate students in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Sample Size. The relatively small sample size used for this study should be considered a limitation. The cell samples for external authority (N=35), internal authority (N=22), non-authority (N=23) and control ad (N=31) were all relatively small which could have made an impact on the sub-analysis.

Advertisement Type. The results of this study should be restricted to describing attitudes toward higher education advertising. Thus, results of this study cannot be generalized to all types of advertising to Generation Y consumers.

Experimental Conditions. The purpose of this study was to determine attitudes toward higher education advertising. The experiment utilized treatments that were designed for a print advertising campaign, however, the stimulus was presented in an artificial environment. Instead of viewing the advertising treatments in a newspaper, magazine or other printed recruiting piece, the respondents viewed them online. It is unclear if the results of the study would be similar if the respondents were to view the same advertisements in a traditional print environment. Therefore, the manner in which

the respondents were exposed to the advertising treatments could be considered a limitation.

Research Instruments. Another limitation of this study is the low reliability (alpha scores) of one of the research instruments used for the experiment. Rigby's (1987) Authority Behavior Inventory was used to measure respondents' acceptance of authority. Although the instrument reports reliability with an alpha of .84, reliability for the current study reported an alpha of .5370 for the original instrument and .6911 for the slightly modified version that included an additional six statements to specifically measure participants' acceptance of their parents' authority. It is unclear why the reliability score for the current study is much lower, however, it may be related to the small sample size. Thus, a low reliability score for one research instrument should be considered a limitation for this study.

Future Research

Generation Y. As one of the largest cohorts in American history, Generation Y is an important population to research. Although much has been written about this group, there is relatively little scholarly research that contributes to the understanding of the personality characteristics, attitudes, likes, dislikes and beliefs of the young Generation Y population. Many consider the events of September 11th as a generation-defining event. Future research should further investigate how the terrorist attacks may have changed or shaped Generation Y compared to previous generations.

Geography and Student Status. This study examines the attitudes of a limited number of Generation Y college students in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Additional research should

be conducted in other areas of the country, including the study of Generation Y in urban, suburban and rural environments. A larger sample could also include members of Generation Y with varying levels of education.

Advertising Type. This study utilized a print advertising treatment to examine respondents' attitudes toward various ads. However, Generation Y is a tech-savvy cohort and additional media, such as online or television advertising, should be used to further investigate the effectiveness and preferences of this age group. In addition, this study examined preferences for higher education advertising only. Therefore, it would be beneficial to marketers to research other types of products and services.

Conclusion

As the Generation Y population continues to mature, it will be increasingly important for marketers to understand the best way reach this target market. Generation Y will also represent a huge opportunity for colleges and universities. Since competition is strong and student enrollment is the livelihood of colleges and universities, higher education marketers must be aware of who can make the most positive and powerful impact on the effectiveness of their message.

This study has examined the effects of authority-based appeals in higher education advertising on Generation Y audiences, specifically college students, and determined if their attitude toward those appeals is moderated by their acceptance of authority.

The findings of this study indicated that Generation Y can be reached using advertising and other recruiting materials featuring Generation Y models. These results

were supported by previous research that suggests people prefer advertising models and spokespersons similar to themselves (Hovland, Janis & Kelley, 1953; Brock, 1965; Berscheid, 1966; Mills & Jellison, 1968). This creates implications for marketers who wish to target the Generation Y market.

The results of this study also indicate that regardless of Generation Y's level of acceptance of authority, marketers should carefully consider whether they should use models and spokespersons that are perceived as strong authority figures when attempting to reach the Generation Y market. No significant relationships were found between respondents' level of acceptance of authority and attitude toward the ad in this study, however, it is suggested that the advertising treatments featuring models of higher levels of authority status were not as well-liked.

REFERENCES

- 4th *Annual Guide to Advertising & Marketing*. (2006). Advertising Age Fact Pack, Crain Communications, Inc.
- Arens, W., & Bovee, Courtland. (1994). *Contemporary advertising*. Boston: Irwin.
- Bauer, R. & Greyser S. (1968). *Advertising in America: The consumer view*. Boston, MA: Harvard University.
- Beard, F. (2003). College student attitudes toward advertising's ethical, economic and social consequences. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 48, 217-228.
- Bernstein, A. (1999, May 31). What can K.O. inequality? College. *Business Week*.
- Berry, N. (1988). Revitalizing brands. *The Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 5 (3), 15-20.
- Berscheid, E. (1966). Opinion change and communicator-communicatee similarity and dissimilarity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, 670-680.
- Boone, L., & Kurtz, D. (2001). *Contemporary marketing*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt, Inc.
- Breckler, S., Olson, J., & Wiggins, E. (2006). *Social psychology alive*. California: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Brock, T. (1965). Communicator-recipient similarity and decision change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1, 650-654.
- Calfee, J. & Ringold, D. (1994). The 70% majority: Enduring consumer beliefs about advertising. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 13 (2), 228-239.
- Campbell, D., & Stanley, J. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research on teaching*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Cialdini, R. (2001). *Influence: Science and practice*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Cobb-Walgreen, C., & Mohr, L. (1998). Symbols in service advertisements. *The Journal of Services Marketing*, 12 (2).
- Cochran, L. (2004). Product involvement and humour in advertising: An Australian empirical study. *Journal of Asia Pacific Marketing*, 3 (1), 68.
- Coomes, M., & DeBard, R. (2004). *Serving the Millennial generation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- DeShields, O. & Kara, A. (2000). The persuasive effect of spokesperson similarity moderated by source credibility. *American Marketing Association Conference Proceedings*, 11, 132.
- Dey, E.L., Astin, A.W., & Korn, J.S. (1991). *The American freshman: Twenty-five year trends, 1966-1990*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, Inc.
- Domino, S., Libraire, T., Lutwiller, D., Superczynski, S., & Tian, R. (2006). Higher education marketing concerns: Factors influence students' choice of colleges. *The Business Review, Cambridge*, 6 (2), 101-111.
- Dotson, M., & Hyatt, E. (2005). Major influence factors in children's consumer socialization. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 22 (1), 35-42.
- Ferrell, O. & Skinner, S. (1988). Ethical behavior and bureaucratic structure in marketing research organizations. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 25, 103-109.
- Fullerton, J., & Kendrick, A. (2006). *Advertising's war on terrorism: The story of the U.S. State Department's Shared Values Initiative*. Spokane: Marquette Books.
- Fullerton, J., Kendrick, A., & Frazier, C. (2006, August). *Advertising students' attitudes about advertising: A nationwide survey of generation Y*. Paper presented at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication convention, San Francisco, CA.
- Galotti, K. & Mark, M. (1994). How do high school students structure an important life decision? A short-term longitudinal study of the college decision-making process. *Research in Higher Education*, 35, 589-607.
- Geraghty, M. (1997). Finances are becoming more crucial in students' college choice, survey finds. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 43 (19), 41-43.
- Graham, K. (2002). *Direct mail advertising to Hispanics: The influence of acculturation on attitude toward the ad*. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, Tulsa.
- Green, C. (1999). Ethnic evaluations of advertising: Interaction effects of strength of

- ethnic identification, media placement, and degree of racial composition. *Journal of Advertising*, 28 (1), 49-64.
- Halstead, T. (1999). A politics for Generation X. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 284 (2), 33-42.
- Hemsley-Brown, J., & Oplatka, I. (2006). Universities in a competitive global marketplace: A systematic review of the literature on higher education marketing. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 19 (4), 316-338.
- Hofstede, G. (1991) *Cultures and organizations*. Berkshire: McGraw-Hill Book Company Europe.
- Holland, J. & Richards, J. (1965). *A factor analysis of student explanations of their choice of a college*. Iowa City, IA: American College Testing Program.
- Horatio Alger Association (2005). *The state of our nation's youth*. Alexandria, VA: Horatio Alger Association of Distinguished Americans, Inc.
- Hossler, D. (1999). Effective admissions recruitment. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 108, 15-30.
- Hossler, D., Schmit, J., & Vesper, N. (1998). *Going to college: Social, economic and educational factors' influence on decisions students make*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hovland, C., Janis, I. & Kelley, H. (1953). *Communications and persuasion: Psychological studies in opinion change*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Howe, N. & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials Rising*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Hu, S., & Hossler, D. (2000). Willingness to pay and preferences for private institutions. *Research in Higher Education*, 41, 685-701.
- Institute of Politics. (2005). *Redefining political attitudes and activism*. Cambridge, MA: Institute of Politics at John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.
- Johnson, L. (2006). *Mind your X's and Y's: Satisfying the 10 cravings of a new generation of consumers*. New York: Free Press.
- Jung, J.M., & Kellaris, J.J. (2006). Responsiveness to authority appeals among young French and American consumers. *Journal of Business Research*, 59, 735-744.
- Kinzie, J., Palmer, M., Hayek, J., Hossler, D., Jacob, S., & Cummings, H. (2004). Fifty years of college choice: Social, political and institutional influences on the decision-making process. *New Agenda Series*, 5 (3). Bloomington: Lumina

Foundation for Education.

- Leach, M. & Liu, A. (1998). The use of culturally relevant stimuli in international advertising. *Psychology & Marketing*, 15 (6), 523.
- Lutz, R. (1985). Affective and cognitive antecedents of attitude toward the ad: A conceptual framework. In L. Alwitt and A. Mitchell, eds., *Psychological processes and advertising effects: Theory, research and applications* (pp.45-63). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Lynch, J. & Schuler, D. (1994). The matchup effect of spokesperson and product congruency: A schema theory interpretation. *Psychology & Marketing*, 11 (5), 417.
- Maciejewski, J. (2004). Is the use of sexual and fear appeals ethical? A moral evaluation by Generation Y college students. *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 26 (2), 97-105.
- MacKenize, S., Lutz, R., & Belch, G. (1986). The role of attitude toward the ad as a mediator of advertising effectiveness: A test of competing explanations. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 23, 130-143.
- McDonough, P. (1994). Buying and selling higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 65 (4) 427-446.
- McDonough, P. (1997). *Choosing colleges: How social class and schools structure opportunity*. New York: SUNY Press.
- Meredith, G. & Schewe, C. (1994). The power of cohorts. *American Demographics*, 16, 22-27.
- Milgram, S. (1963). Behavioral study of obedience. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67 (4), 371-378.
- Mills, J., & Jellison, J. M. (1968). Effect on opinion change of how desirable the communication is to the audience the communicator addressed. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 6, 98-101.
- Mitchell, A. & Olson, J. (1981). Are product attribute beliefs the only mediator of advertising effectiveness on brand attitude? *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 318-332.
- Mittal, B. (1994). Public assessment of TV advertising: Faint praise and harsh criticism. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 34 (1), 35-53.
- Morton, L. (2002). Targeting Generation Y. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 47 (2).

- Muehling, D. (1987). An investigation of factors underlying attitude-toward-advertising-in-general. *Journal of Advertising*, 16 (1), 32-49.
- Noble, S., & Noble, C. (2000). Getting to know Y: The consumption behaviors of a new cohort. *American Marketing Association, Conference Proceedings*, 11, 293-300.
- Neuborne, E. (1999, February 15). Generation Y. *Business Week*, 81-88.
- O'Donohoe, S. (1995). Attitudes to advertising: A review of British and American research. *International Journal of Advertising*, 14, 245-261.
- Ohanian, R. (1990). Construction and validation of a scale to measure celebrity endorser's perceived expertise, trustworthiness and attractiveness. *Journal of Advertising*, 19 (3), 39-52.
- Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. (2007). Colleges and Universities. Retrieved August 1, 2007 from www.okhighered.org.
- Olson, J. M., & Zanna, M. P. (1993). Attitudes and attitude change. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 44, 117-154.
- O'Shaughnessy, J. & O'Shaughnessy N. J. (2004). *Persuasion in advertising*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Oskamp, S. (2004). *Attitudes and opinions*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Pew Internet and American Life Project. (2007). *Teens, Privacy & Online Social Networks: How teens manage their online identities and personal information in the age of MySpace*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project, Pew Research Center for the People and the Press.
- Pew Research Center. (2007). *How young people view their lives, futures and politics: A portrait of "Generation Next."* Washington, DC: Pew Research Center for the People and the Press.
- Pornpitakpan, C. (2004). The persuasiveness of source credibility: A critical review of five decades' evidence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34 (2), 243-281.
- Randall, Kay. (2007). Mom needs an "A:" Hovering, hyper-involved parents the topic of landmark study. Retrieved August 1, 2007 from www.utexas.edu.
- Reidenbach, R. & Pitts, R. (1986). Not all CEOs are created equal as advertising spokespersons: Evaluating the effective CEO spokesperson. *Journal of Advertising*, 15 (1), 30-46.

- Rigby, K. (1987). An authority behavior inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 51, 615-625.
- Sax, L.J. (2003). Our incoming students: What are they like? *About Campus*, 8 (3), 15-20.
- Sevier, T. A. (1993). Recruiting African-American undergraduates. *College and University Journal*, 68 (1), 48-52.
- Shavitt, S., Lowrey, P., & Haefner, J. (1998). Public attitudes toward advertising: More favorable than you might think. *Journal of Advertising Research*, July-August, 7-22.
- Shimp, T. (1981). Attitude toward the ad as a mediator of consumer brand choice. *Journal of Advertising*, 10, 9-15.
- Spero, I., & Stone, M. (2004). Agents of change: How young consumers are changing the world of marketing. *Qualitative Market Research*, 7 (2), 153-159.
- Stapinski, H. (1999). Y not love? *American Demographics*, 21, 62-69.
- Strauss, W. & Howe, N. (2003). *Millennials go to college: Strategies for a new generation on campus*. Great Falls, VA: LifeCourse Books.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2006). *A test of leadership: Charting the future of U.S. higher education*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2006). Fall Enrollment in colleges and universities. *Digest of Education Statistics*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Waters, J. (2006, October 11). Young, with tons of purchasing power. *MarketWatch*.
- Wells, W. (1964). EQ, son of EQ, and the reaction profile. *Journal of Marketing*, 28, (4), 45-52.
- Wells, W., Moriarty, S., & Burnett, J. (2006). *Advertising principles and practice*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Williams, J. Qualls, W., & Grier, S. (1995). Racially exclusive real estate advertising: Public policy implications for fair housing practices. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 14 (2), 225-245.
- Wolburg, J., & Pokrywczynski, J. (2001). A psychographic analysis of Generation Y college students. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 33-52.

- Yeqing, B., & Shao, A. (2002). Nonconformity advertising to teens. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 42 (3), 56-65.
- Zanot, E. (1981). Public attitudes toward advertising. In H. Keith Hunt, ed., *Advertising in a new age – AAA proceedings*. Provo, UT: American Academy of Advertising.
- Zinkhan, G. & Fornell, C. (1985). A test of two consumer response scales in advertising. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 22, 447-452.

APPENDIX A

Instruments

Graduate Student Research Study
Mass Communications/Media Management Program
Primary Researcher: Trish McBeath

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research study. This survey is designed to gain information about effective recruiting tools for colleges and universities.

To begin the survey, click the button below. The survey should take less than 10 minutes to complete.

The information you provide will be completely anonymous. All data gathered in this study will be generalized and reported in summary form. Your individual responses will be confidential, which means that they will neither be provided to any organization outside the university, nor be used for any purpose outside the research study description.

This survey is being conducted by Oklahoma State University. If you have any questions, please contact the primary researcher Trish McBeath at 918-346-3712 or trish.mcbeath@okstate.edu. This research study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board.

SECTION 1

Instructions: For each question, click on the button beside the response of your choice. When you are finished, click the "Next" button to continue the survey.

1. What is your gender?
 Male Female

2. What is your age?
 18-22 years 23-28 years 29-34 years 35-40 years 41 or above

3. What is your race/ethnicity?
 White, Non Hispanic Hispanic Native American Asian American Pacific Islander African American
 International - Non-Resident Other

4. What is your year in college?
 Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate student

5. What is your student status?
 Full-time Part-time

6. What is your GPA?

7. What is your employment status?
 Not currently employed Employed full-time Employed part-time

8. Are you a parent?
 Yes No

9. Where do you prefer to get your news?
 Radio TV Newspapers Magazines Internet Other

10. What medium do you prefer for entertainment?
 Radio TV Newspapers Magazines Internet Other

11. Which medium do you spend the most time using in an average week?
 Radio TV Newspapers Magazines Internet Other

Figure A1: Demographic Scale

SECTION 2

Instructions: For each statement, click on the button beside the response that best applies. When you are finished, click the "Next" button to continue the survey.

12. Do you listen attentively to what older people say about how you should behave?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
13. Do you question the judgment of umpires or referees when you think they have made an incorrect decision?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
14. When a person in authority whom you trust tells you to do something, do you do it, even though you can't see the reason for it?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
15. Do you criticize people who are rude to their superiors?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
16. Do you encourage young people to do what they want to do, even when it is against the wishes of their parents?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
17. When you go to work, do you dress so as to be acceptable to the people who run the place?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
18. Do you treat experts with respect even when you don't think much of them personally?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
19. Do you support left-wing, radical policies?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
20. Do you take part in demonstrations to show your opposition to policies you do not like?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
21. Do you express approval for the work of school teachers?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
22. Do you listen attentively to what your parents say about how you should behave?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
23. Do you go to church?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
24. Do you make fun of the police?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
25. When things are bad, do you look for guidance from someone wiser than yourself?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
26. Do you show special respect for your parents?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
27. Do you sympathize with rebels?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
28. When you are in a hurry, do you break the speed limit or encourage your driver to do so, if it seems reasonably safe?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
29. Do you follow doctor's orders?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
30. Do you criticize people who are rude to their parents?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
31. Do you question what you hear on the news?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
32. Do you cross the road against the pedestrian traffic lights?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
33. Do you listen attentively to what your parents say about how you should behave?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
34. Do you ask for a "second opinion" when you feel uncertain about a doctor's advice?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
35. Do you stand when they play the national anthem in public?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
36. Do you express contempt for politicians?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
37. When a parent tells you to do something, do you do it, even though you can't see the reason for it?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
38. Do you get annoyed when people sneer at those in authority?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
39. Do you show special respect for people in high positions?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
40. Do you speak up against your boss or person in charge when he or she acts unfairly?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never
41. When things are bad, do you look for guidance from a parent?
 Very Frequently Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never

Next ->

Figure A2: Authority Behavior Inventory

SECTION 3

Instructions: For each statement, click on the button beside the response that best applies to how you feel about the ad on the previous page. When you are finished, click the "Next" button to continue the survey.

42. This ad is very appealing to me.

Agree Somewhat Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree

43. I would probably skip this ad if I saw it in a magazine.

Agree Somewhat Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree

44. This is a heart-warming ad.

Agree Somewhat Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree

45. This ad makes me want to buy the brand it features.

Agree Somewhat Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree

46. This ad has little interest for me.

Agree Somewhat Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree

47. I dislike this ad.

Agree Somewhat Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree

48. This ad makes me feel good.

Agree Somewhat Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree

49. This is a wonderful ad.

Agree Somewhat Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree

50. This is the kind of ad you forget easily.

Agree Somewhat Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree

51. This is a fascinating ad.

Agree Somewhat Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree

52. I'm tired of this kind of advertising.

Agree Somewhat Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree

53. This ad leaves me cold.

Agree Somewhat Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree

Next ->

Figure A3: Emotional Quotient Scale

SECTION 4

Instructions: For the following 26 items, click on the button between the words and phrases that best shows how you feel about the ad. When you are finished, click the "Next" button to complete the survey.

- 54. Attractive Unattractive
- 55. Easy to understand Hard to Understand
- 56. Exciting Unexciting
- 57. Strong Weak
- 58. Appealing Unappealing
- 59. Sharp, bright, clear Washed-out looking
- 60. Interesting Uninteresting
- 61. Common, ordinary New, different
- 62. Lively Lifeless
- 63. Meaningful Meaningless
- 64. Worth looking at Not worth looking at
- 65. Easy to remember Hard to remember
- 66. Important to me Unimportant to me
- 67. In good taste In poor taste
- 68. Fascinating Boring
- 69. Simple Complicated
- 70. Convincing Unconvincing
- 71. Comforting Frightening
- 72. Gentle Harsh
- 73. Funny Serious
- 74. Beautiful Ugly
- 75. Worth remembering Not worth remembering
- 76. Pleasant Unpleasant
- 77. Fresh Stale
- 78. Colorful Colorless
- 79. Honest Dishonest

Next ->

Figure A4: Reaction Profile Scale



APPENDIX B

Advertising Treatments

The OSU Advantage

In today's job market, companies are looking for talented professionals with college degrees. A nationally respected OSU degree can give you the competitive advantage.

Call 594-8000 to learn more about the 80 degree options available at OSU-Tulsa.



Dr. Gary Trennepohl
OSU-Tulsa President

700 North Greenwood Avenue 918-594-8000 www.osu-tulsa.okstate.edu

Figure B1: Ad featuring model of external authority status

The OSU Advantage

In today's job market, companies are looking for talented professionals with college degrees. A nationally respected OSU degree can give you the competitive advantage.

Call 594-8000 to learn more about the 80 degree options available at OSU-Tulsa.



Kathy Elliott
Parent of an
OSU-Tulsa Student



700 North Greenwood Avenue 918-594-8000 www.osu-tulsa.okstate.edu

Figure B2: Ad featuring model of internal authority status

The OSU Advantage

In today's job market, companies are looking for talented professionals with college degrees. A nationally respected OSU degree can give you the competitive advantage.

Call 594-8000 to learn more about the 80 degree options available at OSU-Tulsa.



Mike Hainzinger
OSU-Tulsa Student



700 North Greenwood Avenue 918-594-8000 www.osu-tulsa.okstate.edu

Figure B3: Ad featuring model of non-authority status

The OSU Advantage

In today's job market, companies are looking for talented professionals with college degrees. A nationally respected OSU degree can give you the competitive advantage.

Call 594-8000 to learn more about the 80 degree options available at OSU-Tulsa.



700 North Greenwood Avenue 918-594-8000 www.osu-tulsa.okstate.edu

Figure B4: Control ad

APPENDIX C

IRB Documents

Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board

Date: Monday, December 17, 2007

IRB Application No AS0782

Proposal Title: Recruiting Generation Y: The Role of Authority in Higher Education Advertising

Reviewed and Processed as: Exempt

Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved Protocol Expires: 12/16/2008

Principal Investigator(s)

Trish McBeath	Jami Armstrong Fullerton
18607 Valley Ave.	OSU-Tulsa 700 N. Greenwo
Collinsville, OK 74021	Tulsa, OK 74106

The IRB application referenced above has been approved. It is the judgment of the reviewers that the rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected, and that the research will be conducted in a manner consistent with the IRB requirements as outlined in section 45 CFR 46.


The final versions of any printed recruitment, consent and assent documents bearing the IRB approval stamp are attached to this letter. These are the versions that must be used during the study.

As Principal Investigator, it is your responsibility to do the following:

1. Conduct this study exactly as it has been approved. Any modifications to the research protocol must be submitted with the appropriate signatures for IRB approval.
2. Submit a request for continuation if the study extends beyond the approval period of one calendar year. This continuation must receive IRB review and approval before the research can continue.
3. Report any adverse events to the IRB Chair promptly. Adverse events are those which are unanticipated and impact the subjects during the course of this research; and
4. Notify the IRB office in writing when your research project is complete.

Please note that approved protocols are subject to monitoring by the IRB and that the IRB office has the authority to inspect research records associated with this protocol at any time. If you have questions about the IRB procedures or need any assistance from the Board, please contact Beth McTernan in 219 Cordell North (phone: 405-744-5700, beth.mcternan@okstate.edu).

Sincerely,



Sue C. Jacobs, Chair
Institutional Review Board

Figure C1: IRB application approval



Okla. State Univ.
IRB
Approved 12/17/07
Expires 12/16/08
IRB # A-0782

**Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research study.
Please read the following information before completing the online survey.**

Study Purpose

The purpose of this study is to gain information about effective recruiting tools for colleges and universities. Because you have identified yourself as a current college student, your participation is very important to this study.

State University, including the OSU Graduate College and the OSU Institutional Review Board. Data will be maintained indefinitely and will be reported using statistical analysis of the information.

Procedure

After reading this page, please go to <http://www.orangepower.com/survey> to complete the online survey. Please follow the instructions for each section carefully. There are a total of 79 questions.

The OSU IRB has the authority to inspect consent records and data files to assure compliance with approved procedures.

The questions will ask for general demographic information, as well as your attitudes on different subjects.

Contacts

Trish McBeath
Primary Investigator, OSU Graduate Student
918-855-1402

The online survey will take about 10-15 minutes to complete.

Dr. Jami Fullerton
Assistant Professor, OSU
918-594-8579

Risks of Participation

There are no known risks associated with the project which are greater than those ordinarily encountered in daily life.

For information on subjects' rights, contact:
Dr. Sue Jacobs
IRB Chair
219 Cordell North
405-744-1676
irb@okstate.edu

Benefits

Participants will not receive any direct benefits from this study.

Participant Rights

Participation in this study is voluntary. You may discontinue your involvement at any time without reprisal or penalty. Your completion of the online survey indicates that you have read and fully understand the preceding information, that you are participating in this study voluntarily, and that you are at least 18 years of age.

Confidentiality

No personal data will be collected or stored in association with this study. All data collected during this study will be completely confidential and will be stored by the researcher. Access to the data will be given to officials of Oklahoma

Thank you for your participation.

Figure C2: Approved recruitment flyer/consent document

Initial Faculty Email

To: OSU-Tulsa Faculty
From: Trish McBeath
RE: Higher Education Advertising Survey for Graduate Research



Dear faculty member,

I am currently working on a research project that will partially fulfill the requirements for a Master of Science degree in Mass Communication from OSU-Tulsa.

I would like to request your assistance with my research. With your help, I would like to recruit current OSU-Tulsa college students to participate in my research project regarding higher education advertising and recruiting tools for colleges and universities.

The information that your students provide in an online survey will be completely confidential and will be used in a summary form with other respondents. Students who agree to participate in the study will be asked to go online in their own time (not in the classroom) and complete a short 10-15 minute survey.

If you wish to present your students with this opportunity to participate in a research study, I have attached a recruitment script that you may use to explain the project in your classroom. In addition, I have attached an informational page that provides all the necessary instructions on how to complete the online survey. If you would prefer hard copies of these documents, please let me know and I will be happy to provide them.

It is important to remind students that their participation in this study is completely voluntary and it is not a class requirement that they participate in the study.

I appreciate your assistance with this project and if you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Trish McBeath
918-855-1402

Figure C3: Approved recruitment email to faculty



**HIGHER EDUCATION ADVERTISING SURVEY
FACULTY SOLICITATION SCRIPT**

I have been asked by an OSU graduate student to request your participation in a research project regarding recruiting tools for colleges and universities. Since you are all college students, you are eligible to participate in the research study, if you wish. I will handout information regarding the research study today in class.

If you agree to participate in the study, you will take a short online survey. It will take about 10-15 minutes to complete. Participation in this study is completely voluntary. It is not a class requirement that you participate in the study.

The information that you provide in the survey will be used in an academic research paper and possibly published in an academic journal. The survey will not ask for your name, so your responses will be kept anonymous and your answers will be used in a summary form with other respondents. The information you provide will not be connected to you in any way. If you choose to participate, you may withdraw at any point, if you do not feel comfortable answering any of the questions.

If you are interested in participating in this research project, please take one of the flyers I am about to distribute. The flyer provides all the necessary instructions on how to complete the online survey.

Figure C4: Approved faculty script for class

VITA

Trisha L. McBeath

Candidate for the Degree of Master of Science

Thesis: RECRUITING GENERATION Y: THE ROLE OF AUTHORITY IN HIGHER
EDUCATION ADVERTISING

Major Field: Mass Communication/Media Management

Biographical:

Education:

Oklahoma State University
Bachelor of Arts – Journalism and Broadcasting/Advertising Emphasis
May 1998

Oklahoma State University
Master of Science – Mass Communication/Media Management
May 2008

Experience:

Oklahoma State University-Tulsa – Tulsa, OK
Communications Specialist (2004-Present)

TRC Nutritional Laboratories – Tulsa, OK
Marketing Project Manager (2003-2004)

The Star-Herald – Belton, MO
Advertising Account Executive (2002)

Ackerman McQueen – Oklahoma City, OK
New Media Project Coordinator (1998-2001)

Professional Memberships:

Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication
Association for Women in Communications
Oklahoma Colleges Public Relations Association
Kappa Tau Alpha

Name: Trisha L. McBeath

Date of Degree: May, 2008

Institution: Oklahoma State University

Location: Tulsa, Oklahoma

Title of Study: RECRUITING GENERATION Y: THE ROLE OF AUTHORITY IN
HIGHER EDUCATION ADVERTISING

Pages in Study: 78

Candidate for the Degree of Master of Science

Major Field: Mass Communication/Media Management

Scope and Method of Study:

This study examines the effects of authority-based appeals in higher education advertising on Generation Y audiences, specifically college students, to determine if their attitude toward those appeals is moderated by their acceptance of authority. An experiment was conducted using a convenience sample of 111 Generation Y college students in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Four different advertising treatments were used including a control ad and three ads representing different levels of authority: external (university president), internal (parent) and non-authority (Generation Y student). Participants' attitude toward the ads was measured using Wells' Emotional Quotient Scale (EQ) and Reaction Profile. Rigby's Authority Behavior Inventory was used to measure participants' acceptance of authority.

Findings and Conclusions:

Results indicated that Generation Y can be reached using advertising and other recruiting materials featuring Generation Y models. Findings were supported by research found in the literature review that suggests people prefer advertising models and spokespersons similar to themselves. In addition, the results indicate no significant relationships exist between respondents' acceptance of authority and attitude toward the ad in this study. Implications and recommendations for future research are discussed.

ADVISER'S APPROVAL: _____ Dr. Jami Fullerton