Zdenek Linhart, Lucie Linhartova

RESPONSES OF CZECH CONSUMERS TOWARDS SMS ADVERTISING

Introduction

Impact of different features of SMS advertising was not researched frequently yet. Therefore, this study put focus on how the information types and the SMS message content influence the receiver's attention to advertising. This research tested the effect on user attention of three segments:
1) shop name advertising,
2) product brand name advertising,
3) job offer advertising.

SMS information is differentiated by frequency of broadcasts and message appearance with text or picture (MMS). The objective is to find how information type influences SMS receiver of advertising.

1. Theoretical background and hypotheses

Consumers generally have negative attitudes toward mobile advertising (Tsang et al., 2004) pointing on problems of credibility, irritation and informativeness. Xu (2006) added personalization as an affecting factor. Chowdhury et al. (2006) have simplified the list of factors only on credibility as significant factor of mobile advertising. This discussion over factors of attitude was tackled by Percy and Rossiter (1992, p. 85) who noted that "no other topic has stimulated as much research interest − and confusion − as the concept of attitudes toward an ad". Test of answers instead of attitudes towards SMS was not found in scientific literature jet. Therefore, we hypothesise that:

H1: People will differently react on values of plain SMS, MMS and reminders in each of the three (geographical, brand, or job) content offers tested.

Response to SMS ad is higher if involvement is higher. There are two kinds of involvement. Firstly, approaches accepting the institution generate passive acceptance and secondly, ability to handle the message as instrument is sign of active attitude to changed attention, processing the impulse or product intention. Therefore, institution based approach strengthen brand loyalty and instrumental approach opens attention for new impulses and products. The border between remembered institutionalised knowledge and newly adopted impulse in SMS depends on "keyword conversation". "Keyword conversation" is influenced by effort to put the most of information to the limited number of characters for the SMS message on sender side and also by readiness to exclude or accept the meaning changing keyword in such condensed message on receiver side.

H2: Recall of positive memories on brand names and messages will be much higher then number of received SMS answers because of attractiveness of keywords used in SMS (as they can be used for Internet search for comparison, for example).

Law on product placement enables to send SMS ads. Teacher is producing audio-video production, what is necessary precondition of SMS broadcasting. But, teacher's authority can damage impact of ad. Therefore, we ma hypothesise that

H3.1: Local shop has stronger impact then unknown brand.

H3.2: Teacher broadcasting message will be recognised by diligent students (respondents) who will ignore ad content.

To measure cognitive dimension, we used Durvasula et al. (1993) scale, which comprises attitude toward advertising in general (good-bad, unfavorable--favorable, negative-positive; Muehling, 1987), attitude-institution (important--unimportant, worthless-valuable, unnecessary-necessary), and attitude--instrument (dirty-clean, dishonest-honest, insincere-sincere, dangerous-safe), with seven-point semantic differential pairs. We complemented this measure with Mehta's (2000) seven-point Likert scale, which includes the following items: 'Advertising helps me keep up-to-date about products and services that I need or would like to have'; 'Too many products do not perform as well as the ads claim'; 'Advertising is more manipulative than it is informative'; 'Most advertising is way too annoying'; 'I like to look at advertising'; and 'On average, brands that are advertised are better in quality than brands that are not advertised.' Negative attitudes towards mobile advertising allow us to hypothesise that

H4: Instrumental attitudes will not change as they are technically determined by mobile communication opposed to institutional attitudes.

2. Experimental design

Five features (A-E) tested different values and content of SMS advertising, each by 50 respondents.

Content Values	SMS ad send by a consumer (professor)	SMS ad send by brand	MMS ad send by brand
Sent in one day		A- N=50	
Sent after one week	B- N=50	C- N=50	D- N=50
Sent in one week (with 4 repetition)		E- N=50	

TOTAL = over 650 SMS were sent to 250 individuals in CR.

Questionnaire A has collected answers from all 250 respondents about their attitudes towards researched values and content before SMS were sent. Questionnaire B collected answers 192 respondents. It means that 77% of respondents have filled questionnaire B only.

For sending all in the same week:
− SMS for Mobile Discount: on Monday at 7:00 (cells: ABCD),
− recall 1 for Mobile Discount: on Wednesday at 7:00 (cell: E),
− recall 2 for Mobile Discount: on Friday at 7:00 (cell: E),
− recall 3 for Mobile Discount: on Sunday at 7:00 (cell: E),
− SMS for MAC2: on Wednesday at 7:00 (cells: AB),
− SMS for JPS: on Wednesday at 7:00 (cells: CDE).

Respondents were students. Students were selected mainly because of comparability of results internationally in future researches.

3. Results

To test our first hypothesis we have compared number of received SMS answers on our SMS broadcasting to five groups of roughly 50 receivers. The results, as we show in Table 1, indicate number of answers below evaluation statistical reliability.

Table 1

Answers on advertised content and values (N = 260)

			Content			
	Source	Data	Shop + Brand A + B		Shop + Job C + D + E	
			Complaints + Appreciations	None answer	Complaints + Appreciations	None answer
Values	Independent – A + C	No	1	51	1	51
		P	0.019	0.981	0.019	0.981
	Authority – B	No	2			
		P	0.039	0.962		
	Picture – D	No			2	50
		P			0.039	0.962
	Reminders – E	No			6	44
		P			0.120	0.880

Total number of 12 answers is less then 0.5% out of 260 respondents who have filled questionnaire A and received two or five SMS messages. The highest number of six answers was received from repeated messages four times. But five of them have arrived after the first broadcasting. For low number of answers the H1 is neither confirmed nor denied. Why people did not react if they understood well? The number of respondents who knew tested names and brands was high (Table 2).

Table 2

Number of remembered brand names and messages by groups A-E (N = 192)

Question		Mobile Discount is known	JPS is known	MAC2 is known	„50% discount" is desired offer	Mobile Discount is place of purchase	JPS ad received	MAC2 ad received
Total N	No	192	111	81	192	192	111	81
Positive answers	No	77	35	60	162	102	22	22
	%	40.1	31.5	74.1	84.38	53.13	20	27

From five tested groups A-E) 192 respondents have filled questionnaire B. From that AB = 39, BB = 42, CB = 40, DB = 37 and EB = 34. Previous 0.5% of 260 respondents who received SMS the answers differ from affiliation to messages, places and brand names, which was expressed by 192 respondents of questionnaire B. As respondents know what and where to buy they do not replay on SMS messages even if premiums are promised. The message about premium „50% discount" was the most interesting (84%) influencing probably decision to buy there (53%). The level of interest was measured by questions about discussions between respondents about received SMS. The main issue competing with brand names was person of SMS broadcaster (Table 3).

Table 3

Identification of impact of prime mover on discussions between 180 respondents about ad content and values (N = 192)

Related questions	Chi-square	P
Broadcaster (teacher) was significantly less recognised to influence showing the SMS about „Mobile Discount" to other people (Q7D * Q7E)	8.532	0.003
Investigated broadcaster (teacher) significantly less influenced inter-personnal discussions of SMS „Mobile Discount" (Q7D * Q7H)	30.543	0.000
SMS „Mobile Discount" was shown to other people significantly less often then was discussed inter-personnally (Q7E * Q7H)	35.389	0.000
Broadcaster (teacher) was significantly less recognised to influence showing the SMS about „brands JPS or MAC2" to other people (Q10D * Q10E)	9.762	0.002
Investigated broadcaster (teacher) significantly less influenced inter-personnal discussions of SMS „brands JPS or MAC2" (Q10D * Q10H)	30.145	0.000

Only significantly different answers are listed in Table 3. The importance of message sender (teacher) or media (SMS on display of mobile phone or talk between people) is shown. It was expected that reputation of teacher is stronger and receivers will not remember brand or message besides the message from teacher or if his origin is known. The opposite is true. Shop Mobile Discount was better remembered then brands as it appeared five times to 192 respondents. For MAC2 81 respondents and for JPS 111 respondents answered. We have summed up answers of MAC2 and JPS groups, but still lower number of differences was found opposed to Mobile discount.

Table 4

Changes of general attitudes towards the advertising after the specific SMS
ad was received (N = 179)

Hypothesis	Chi-square	P
Instrumental		
Q6A1 * Q8B4	4.986	0.289
Q6A1 * Q11B4	7.030	0.134
Q6A10 * Q8B7	2.487	0.870
Q6A10 * Q11B7	6.504	0,369
Institutional		
Worthless/valuable Q6A5 * Q8B6 not/beneficial MD	10.421	0.034*
Worthless/valuable Q6A5 * Q11B6 not/beneficial MAC2/JPS	9.944	0.041*
Q6A6 * Q8B5	2.272	0.686
Q6A6 * Q11B5	3.991	0.407

Questions about attitudes were difficult for respondents. Therefore, only 172 from 192 who filled questionnaire B have answered them. Instrumental attitudes were not changed. Institutional attitudes about content of the ad have become negative as majority of respondents were not interested with the product offer, probably. We may take this result as sign of full understanding to the questionnaire by respondents. H4 was accepted.

Conclusions

H1 was not confirmed because of low number (0.5%) of SMS answers. H2 has shown high recall (20-53%) of positive memories on brand names and messages. Statistical significance of this result can be measured after this research will be repeated in different country. Still, it is interesting why so few SMS answers were received and so many respondents had positive recall of brand names and

slogans. Therefore, H3.2 tested influence of teacher opposed to personal communication of respondents and impact of brands. The significant difference denied impact of teacher on understanding of brand names and messages. Local shop SMS was shown on display of mobile phone to friends with name of sender (teacher) opposed to brands and its premium offers (H3.1). Therefore, association of names with local shops can be recommended to practice. Future research should deepen knowledge of keyword conversation, which is new feature of communication in direct response media.

SMS advertising is negatively perceived. Therefore, H4 have tested whether general instrumental or institutional attitudes will change after the SMS ads were received. Instrumental attitudes were not changed opposed to institutional ones. Respondents became even more negative about institution of value in both cases shop and brand. H4 was accepted. We may guess that delivered keywords by SMS receiver later test on Internet to compare different offers. Internet offers are comparable but SMS offers not. This may explain negative mode of respondents about this institution.

Hypothesis H2 was not really tested. Its testing is passed to future international comparisons. Number of real SMS responses is not enough to be statistically evaluated.

References

Chowdhury H.K., Parvin N., Weitenberner C., & Becker M. (2006a): *Consumer Attitude toward Mobile Advertising in an Emerging Market: An Empirical Study*. "International Journal of Mobile Marketing", 1(2), p. 33-42.

Durvasula S., Lysonski S., Andrews J.C. (1993): *A Cross-cultural Study of the Generalizability of Scale for Profiling Consumers' Decision-making Style*. "Journal of Consumer Affairs", No 27, p. 55-65.

Mehta S. (2000): *Marketing Strategy*. www.shsn.edu/~mkt_ssm/mkt570/Chap04.ppt.

Muehling D.D. (1987): *An Investigation of Factors Underlying Attitude – toward Advertising-in-General*. "Journal of Advertising", Vol. 16, No 1, p. 32-40.

Percy L., & Rossiter J.R. (1992): *Advertising Stimulus Effects: A Review*. "Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising", 14, 1, p. 75-90.

Tsang M.M., Ho S.C., & Liang T.P. (2004): *Consumer Attitudes Toward Mobile Advertising: An Empirical Study.* "International Journal of Electronic Commerce", 8(3), p. 65-78.

Xu D.J.J. (2006): *The Influence of Personalization in Affecting Consumer Attitudes Toward Mobile Advertising in China*. "Journal of Computer Information Systems", 47(2), p. 9-19.