

## Publication Advertisements: Content That Is Animated and Engaging

Muhammad Shoaib Khan

Lecturer at University of Peshawar at -[Mshoaib6565@gmail.com](mailto:Mshoaib6565@gmail.com)

### Abstract

This study examines how evocative text influences two specific aspects of the attractiveness of print marketing. These appeals focus on examining the variations in the intensity of visual images that individuals constantly encounter. The impact of vividness on persons' self-reported visual imagery in informational advertisements for functional products is significant. This conclusion is substantiated by the fact that vivid ads elicited a much more positive brand sentiment compared to pallid. However, the responders' low VVI was not affected by the excellent material. However, it is important to note that the use of vibrant material enhanced the way consumers perceived a brand when it was used in transformative advertising for experiential items, regardless of the variations in how individuals mentally visualize images. This is likely because advertising that displays remarkable transformations evoke vivid mental imagery in the minds of all viewers. Based on the results of the two studies, advertisers are recommended to use dynamic and engaging graphics in print ads that aim to bring about a change in the viewer's perception. On the other hand, for print ads that aim to provide information, advertisers should use clear and vivid written language. The advice is based on the results of the examinations.

### Introduction

Academics working in the field of advertising have repeatedly demonstrated an interest in the idea that vividness serves as an essential part of the execution of advertising. According to Nisbett and Ross (1980, page 45), vivid stimuli have traits that make them emotionally fascinating, palpable, capable of evoking mental imagery, and intimately connected to the senses, time, or space. These qualities make vivid stimuli emotionally captivating, tangible, capable of evoking mental imagery, and closely connected to the senses, time, or space. As opposed to relying on generalisations, it is possible to improve the efficiency of ads by including specific information that is relevant to either the product being advertised or the population that is being targeted. You can gain greater comprehension of this topic by reading the works that Rossiter and Percy (1980, 1983, 1987, and 1997) have produced. It is a widely held belief that vivisections are more convincing than cadaver dissections, which is consistent with

what one's intuition would predict. Previous research regarding the impact of vivid content aspects in advertising that was carried out by Taylor and Thompson (1982) produced results that were contradictory to one another. According to the findings of the research conducted by Bone and Ellen (1992), commercials that had content that was vivid had a more pronounced and positive influence on viewers than ones that did not feature such content. The results of this study are in line with those obtained from earlier investigations carried out by Fortin and Dholakia (2005), Mitchell and Olson (1981), Rossiter and Percy (1980), Sullivan and MacKinnon (1988), and Kisielius and Sternthal (1986). The primary objective of this study is to reconcile the conflicting research outcomes by suggesting that the effects of vividness in advertising are influenced by the interaction between the advertising style (informative or transformative) and individuals' inherent inclination to perceive vivid visual imagery, which is likely to be a habitual and innate characteristic. In order to do this, the study will suggest that the effects of vividness in advertising are influenced by the interaction between the advertising style (informative or transformative).

#### **The brightness of visual images as a variable that varies by person**

Persistent individual differences in the capacity to perceive visual pictures were argued to exist by Marks (1973). The researcher created the "Vividness of Visual Imagery Questionnaire" (VVIQ; also see Marks, 1989) to measure these differences. Multiple fields of study have made use of the VVIQ, including research on facial recognition (McKelvie, 1994), gender differences in visualisation preferences (Richardson, 1995), recalling important parental figures through visual imagery (McKelvie, 1998), and understanding the emotional impact of a loved one's death (Johnson, 1998). The Visualisation Vividness Imagery Questionnaire (VVIQ) was developed by McKelvie (1994) to distinguish people based on their capacity for visualising information. Those who are good at visualising are more likely to develop vivid and detailed visual imagery in response to stimuli that trigger visual sensations, while those who are not as good at visualising are less likely to experience visual imagery. In light of this, commercials with vivid content may effectively resonate with people who have strong visualisation ability, but may fail to interest those with less cognitive abilities in this area. The purpose of this research is to investigate how various people's propensities for visual thinking affect the impact of advertisements including visually appealing content. The study uses two experiments to probe the connection between the two variables. It is anticipated that only informational advertising campaigns that primarily focus on

product qualities will show the influence of individual differences in respondents' vivid visual experiences from ads. As opposed to focusing on the features of a product, a transformative leader puts the needs of the customer first. The definitions of informative and transformative advertising used in this study were developed by Rosenster and Percy (1987) and 1997). These advertisements frequently make use of colourful and tangible visual components to convey the desired experience quickly and efficiently. It follows that the use of visual features in the context of transformative commercials may improve people's view of a brand, independent of their propensity to engage with visual stimuli.

### **Two experiments**

The current research is divided into two studies that use magazine ads to test the hypothesis that the personality trait of vivid visualisation tendency moderates the effects of print advertisements. Using the Visual Vividness Imagery Questionnaire (VVIQ), Experiment 1 will determine if changes in the vividness of the verbal copy material, in the form of vivid language, have any moderating effect. The second experiment tests the hypothesised boundary condition for the effect of people's propensity to visualise. To accomplish this, we will use a paradigm-shifting commercial for a premium imported champagne brand.

### **Experiment 1**

The purpose of Experiment 1 is to test the hypothesis that variations in the intensity of visual imagery perceived by individuals will alter the degree to which vivid content affects persuasion in the Experiment 1 participants were asked to read a passage from a book and rate its vividness. This study tests the hypothesis that persons with high visual cognitive abilities have a more favourable attitude towards a brand when exposed to vivid informational commercials as opposed to boring advertisements. On the other hand, individuals with low visual cognitive abilities do not have a more favourable attitude towards a brand.

### **Method**

The study involved a group of participants and employed a specific research design. The sample of participants comprised 114 individuals, with 47 being male, residing in a populous town in the Netherlands. This sample included a mix of undergraduate students from a prominent university, students from a polytechnic college, and individuals who happened to. The average age of the participants was 24 years, with a standard deviation of 9 years. The study utilised a between-subjects design, with one

factor having two levels: the type of ad copy (vivid vs. pallid). The participants' VThe dependent variable in this study was the attitude towards the brand, denoted as Ab. The participants willingly accepted to participate in the study, and the investigator randomly allocated them to either of the two experimental conditions.

### Experiment 2

The initial experiment aims to illustrate the moderating influence of visualisation ability in relation to informational advertisements for a practical product, specifically the new model frying pan. In order to investigate the proposed boundary impact related to the type of appeal in the header, Experiment 2 aims to test the interaction hypothesis using a transformational advertisement for an experiential product, specifically champagne.

### Method

Humans and aesthetics. A group of 78 undergraduates (mean age 22, standard variation 2.6 years) from another Dutch university participated in exchange for 8 euros, or around \$10 US. The two independent variables in this experiment were the same as in the previous one (type of illustration: bright vs. pallid), and the VVIQ was used to investigate individual differences in the vividness of visual imagery.

### Conclusions and practical implications

These new research explain why some buyer groups and types of advertisements benefit from vivid content while others do not. More specifically, they explain why clearly articulated words and clearly experienced graphics that should both create visual imagery are beneficial. People who are good at visualising things are more likely to like a brand when it is being sold if the attributes of the brand are described in a way that is vivid rather than in a way that is unclear. On the other hand, people who have trouble visualising things are unaffected by this difference (Ab). On the other side, vividly graphic advertisements make individuals feel better about transformative ads, even if they aren't inherently excellent at visualising things. This is true even for people who aren't particularly artistic. According to Rossiter and Percy's research from 1978 and 1980, having better visual imagery skills reduces the impact of vivid content. They hypothesised that high visualizers would receive visual validation of their product performance ideas when they visualised themselves eating the food and drinking a Bavarian beer as part of their experiment. Those with a low capacity for visualisation, on the other hand, would not. They reasoned that by providing a visual reminder, consumers would have a more positive attitude towards the brand that was

being marketed. People who are good at seeing things seemed to have a greater response to visual input when they were given a branded beer glass that was larger and appeared to show the product more clearly. In Beerad's trial, they found that large product photographs, as opposed to smaller ones, were the most successful. When it was larger, this non-experiential picture probably only conjured up ideas in the minds of people who are really good at visualising things. It is possible that you will need to use the product in the same manner as was done in this study in order to avoid the contact effect. The four findings of the study have a lot of repercussions in the actual world for advertising. According to the results of the second experiment, vividness appears to have the greatest influence on transformational leads that promote highly motivated experiential goods (see Rossiter and Percy, 1987, 1997). According to the findings, transformative advertising should continue to make use of graphic elements that are immersive and cause people to think of images. Because it does not alter how consumers feel about the brand, the use of product claim language in informative advertisements for useful goods has no overall effect and hence, no big influence. On the other hand, the visualiser interaction effect is significant, and it can be seen in advertisements for educational products. When it comes to advertising, this form of contact is not very helpful most of the time. To begin, marketers may be able to quantify these characteristics; nevertheless, it would be difficult for them to target high scorers and low scorers differently through various channels. There is no way to classify advertisements according to factors such as how easy or difficult it is for people to imagine things or according to the well-known "Need for Cognition" theory, which is based on the "Big Five" psychological qualities (for more information, see Rossiter and Percy, 1987, 1997). Second, these distinctions between persons who have similar characteristics may be exploited in some contexts, but some of these distinctions work both ways. Strong fear calls are effective for persons who have little anxiety; nevertheless, people who have excessive anxiety may find them unpleasant and perceptive (see Rossiter and Bellman, 2005). On the other hand, visual ability appears to be a one-way variable between individuals, given that vivid content does not cause visualizers to experience feelings of melancholy. Because of this, marketers should employ vibrant language in informational advertisements, even if it means their advertisements will reach more people than boring advertisements, which only reach around half of the audience.

## References

Aiken LS, West SG. Multiple Regression: Testing and interpreting interactions. Newbury Park, CA: Sage; 1991. Bergkvist L, Rossiter JR. The predictive validity of multiple-. J Mark Res 2007;44:175–84.

Bone PF, Ellen PS. The generation and consequences of communication-evoked imagery. J Consum Res 1992;19:93-104.

Fortin DR, Dholakia RR. Interactivity and vividness effects on social presence and involvement with a web-based advertisement. J Bus Res 2005;58(3):387–96.

Frey KP, Eagly AH. Vividness can undermine the persuasiveness of messages. J Pers Soc Psychol 1993;65(1):32–44.

Johnson MP. Miscarriage: Is vividness of visual imagery a factor in the grief reaction of the partner? Br J Health Psychol 1998;3(2):137–46.

Kisielius J, Sternthal B. Examining the vividness controversy: An availability-valence perspective. J Consum Res 1986;12(4):418–31.

LeBoutillier N, Marks DF. The factorial validity and reliability of the eyes-open version of the vividness of visual imagery questionnaire. J Ment Imagery 2001;25(3–4):107–14.

Marks DF. Visual imagery differences in the recall of pictures. Br J Psychol 1973;64(1):17–24.

Marks DF. Bibliography of research utilizing the vividness of visual imagery questionnaire. Percept Mot Skills 1989;69(3,Pt1):707–18.

McKelvie SJ. The vividness of visual imagery questionnaire as a predictor of facial recognition memory performance. Br J Psychol 1994;85(1):93-104.

McKelvieSJ. Effectsofgenderonreportedvividnessofvisualimageryforparents. *J Ment Imagery* 1998;22(3-4):99-112.

MitchellAA, OlsonJC. Areproductattributebeliefstheonlymediatorofadvertisingeffects onbrandattitude? *J Mark Res* 1981;18:318-32.

NisbettRE, RossL. *Human Inference: Strategies and Shortcomings of Social Judgment*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall; 1980.

PutoCP, WellsWD. Informationalandtransformationaladvertising: Thedifferentialeffectsovertime. *Adv Consum Res* 1984;11:572-6.

RichardsonJTE. Genderdifferencesinthevividnessofvisualimageryquestionnaire: Ameta-analysis. *J Ment Imagery* 1995;19(3-4):177-87.

RossiterJR, BellmanS. *Marketing Communications: Theory and Applications*. Frenchs Forest, Australia: Pearson Prentice Hall; 2005.

RossiterJR, BergkvistL. Theimportanceofchoosingonegooditemforsingle-itemmeasuresofattitudetowardstheadandattitudetowardsthebrandandigeneralizationtoallmeasures. *Transf Werbeforschung Prax* 2009;55(2):8-18.

RossiterJR, PercyL. Visualimagingabilityasamediatorofadvertisingresponse. *Adv Consum Res* 1978;5:621-9.

RossiterJR, PercyL. Attitudechangethroughvisualimageryinadvertising. *J Advert* 1980;9:10-6.

RossiterJR, PercyL. Visualcommunicationinadvertising. In: HarrisRJ, editor. *Information Processing Research in Advertising*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum; 1983.

RossiterJR,PercyL.AdvertisingandPromotionManagement.NewYork:McGraw-Hill;1987.

RossiterJR,PercyL.AdvertisingCommunicationsandPromotionManagement.2ndedition.NewYork:McGraw-Hill;1997.

SullivanGL,MacklinCM.Vividnessandunvividnesseffectsinprintadvertising:Anexperimentalinvestigation.JMentImagery1988;12(3-4):133-44.

TaylorSE,ThompsonSC.Stalkingtheelusive“vividness”effect.PsycholRev 1982;89(2):155-81.