

FACTORS AFFECTING ATTITUDE TOWARD WEB ADVERTISING – A SCENARIO OF UNIVERSITY STUDENT IN PAKISTAN

AASMA NAZEER

Lecturer, Business Administration
FUUAST, Islambad
aasmanazeer@gmail.com

SEYED IBNE ALI JAFFARI

Assistant Professor, Business Administration Department
FUUAST, Islamabad
seyedjaffari5@yahoo.com, ibnealijaffari@fuuastisb.edu.pk

YASIR MEHMOOD RAJA

Phd Scholar
Alkhair University, AJK
yasirrajaca@yahoo.com

AKMAL SHAHZAD

PhD Scholar
Iqra University, Islambad
Everbrighter2011@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Over the last decade advertising evolved from conventional means to web. As the number of web users is increasing significantly, it provides the vast scope for web advertising. Pakistan has a rapidly growing 7.5% Internet penetration rate compared to India's 4.5 (%). Businessmen think that web advertising is one of the frugal marketing tools since the marginal cost of each online advertisement is very low. This study focuses on the factors which affects the attitudes towards web advertisements.

A descriptive design was used for this study. The data was collected through both primary and secondary source. For secondary data sources, online and offline available articles were consulted; whereas for primary data source, the questionnaire based survey was conducted from the sample population of 300 respondents through convenient sampling method from Islamabad and Rawalpindi. For this purpose questionnaire was adapted from published research.

The results depict that a predominant part of respondents do not like web advertisements because these advertisements create annoyance. The study further shows that respondents do not like web advertised brands and they do not take help through web advertisements for their purchase decision, because web advertisements do not contain enough information regarding the products.

Key Words: *Web advertisement, Marketing, Pakistan, Marginal Cost*

INTRODUCTION

Web advertising is the most fundamental form of advertising. Advertiser's website is usually hyperlinked with the displayed advertisements. Users can just click on the advertisements and transmit to another website having useful information. Businessmen think that web advertising is one of the frugal marketing tools since the marginal cost of each online advertisement is very low.

Entertainment has turned out to boost advertising value in different practical investigations. Ferrazzi, Chen & Li (2003) found out that entertaining game in collaboration with sales messages can encourage dialogs with consumers and project product images. Online advertising that is highly enriched with entertaining contents achieves a more positive appraisal by recipients and leads to a higher target to re visit the homepage than websites without entertainment features (Raney, Arpan, Padhupati & Brill, 2003). Online Advertising can be classified as banner advertisements or target advertisements. According to (Novak & Hoffman, 1997) banner advertisement is defined as a small rectangular graphic image that is connected to a target advertisement, and primarily serves as a lead into the visitor to find out further. A target advertisement can be one Web page or sequence of related Web pages that are contacted by a customer actively clicking on a particular banner advertisement.

While marketers are fascinated in measuring banner advertisement effectiveness by means of counting banner impressions or the total amount of advertisement click throughs, majority of these techniques are specifically designed to study reach and frequency issues, similar to conventional media planning models which are based on incidental web advertising experience. However, exposure to Web ads is not incidental but intentional and desired by the general consumer. In this medium, the extent to which a visitor interacts with the selected advertisement is a much enhanced measure of the value and effectiveness of web advertisement (Novak & Hoffman, 1997). Web ads may be impartial or part of a larger Web site that may also provide additional functions like sustaining customers, distribution, and social service. From an advertising perspective, marketers are particularly concerned in consumer visits at Web ads because they help to put up traffic on their Web sites. Extensive Web ad visits result in extensive Web site visits, and more connection with consumers promote closer buyer-seller relationships (Peppers and Rogers, 1993).

As Internet users get more and more experienced, the web advertisements become not as much of effective (Dahlen et. al., 2003). Web users think that the web advertisements are bothersome and contain a computer virus. Due to the rise of this kind of advertising, lots of software is built to stop them. Anderson (2005) found that about 38% of web users use some set of blocker to stop the irritating advertisements.

Pakistan has a rapidly growing 7.5% Internet penetration rate compared to India's 4.5 (%). None of the top ten sites visited from within Pakistan are local, which suggests an enormous opportunity for creating local content. Online advertising is also in its immaturity stage and with the prevailing market dynamics, is poised for solid growth (Standard, 2008).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Advertising investigation has shown that the effects of advertising actions are influenced by the attitude toward a web advertising message, the advertising corporation or even the applied media (MacKenzie & Lutz, 1989). But these results are related to “conventional” advertising using mass media or web-based advertising (Ducoffe, 1996).

Before investigating the factors affecting the attitude toward web advertisement, the distinctiveness of web advertising should be discussed as the background. The main uniqueness is the presenting platform. Web advertising can get the quality of printed media but not the same with it (Chang & Thorson, 2004). Some researchers have suggested that web advertisement can draw out more explanation compared with those printed media because the content formation of the Web is similar to the thinking process of the human mind (Eveland & Dunwoody, 2002).

In web advertising characteristics forced exposure is also a characteristic. Users cannot avoid from reaching the web advertisements, at least they need to have the first view of them. Although, forced exposure often disrupts a viewer's usual viewing process (Edwards et al. 2002). Researchers found that the exposure to a stimulus can produce computable effects such as attitude change. It is useful for examining customers' attitude toward the web advertisement (Hovland et. al., 1953).

However, as web users get more and more experienced, the web advertisements become less effective (Dahlen et. al., 2003). Internet users think that the online advertisements are annoying and contain a computer virus. Due to the increment of this kind of advertising, lots of software is built to block them. Anderson (2005) found that about 38% of web surfers use some form of blocker to block the annoying advertisements.

Literature in advertising suggests that advertising in both conventional media and the Internet is either easily disregarded by the audience or is thought to have little worth. Bogart in 1985 argued that the likelihood of careful processing of advertisements are lessened by the high number of advertisements contending for the individual's attention on a regular basis. Limited time and mental resources make it complicated for the audience to dedicate adequate attention to most advertisements. The expansion of the Internet is resulting in substantial growth of web advertising. This is making the rivalry for attention more severe.

The awareness of directional advertisings, given that they are used by keenly engaged users (Briggs & Hollis, 1997) rather than inactively received target audiences (Stewart, 1992), could better the effectiveness of web-based advertising strategies and streamline the contact between users and interactive media. A feature of web advertising is that it can combine the functions of communicating with the viewers and provides a medium for commercial deal by implementing a hyperlink between the two. With some clicks, online ads transforms into the market status of online business dealings. This feature provides value to the users otherwise they would have to put an order by cell phone or by a visit to the store (Stone, 1999). It also indicates a trend of junction between online advertising and online commerce, thus recommending that the designs of web advertising and Internet business may need to be considered collectively.

Attitude is an essential concept in research in marketing and information systems. According to Fishbein in 1967 attitude is defined as a learned tendency of human beings. Based on this, “an individual would respond react to an idea or an object or a number of things/opinions”. According to Kotler in 2000 found that “an attitude is a person' enduring favorable or unfavorable evaluations, emotional feelings, and action inclination toward some idea or object”. Since researchers have been researching the subject for a particularly long

time, there is a wide body of literature which deals with consumers' attitudes toward web advertising toward advertising on the Internet.

The appearance of the Internet as a new way for communication and advertising has motivated a notable amount of study that focuses on the Internet (Eighmey, 1997; Korgaonkar & Wolin, 1999). It has also driven studies on attitudes toward Internet advertising on the Web based environment. Because of the interactive nature of Internet, few surveys report that respondents viewed Internet advertising as more instructive and trustworthy than a demographically similar sample found in common advertising (Schlosser, Shavitt & Kanfer, 1999).

The content informativeness and form entertainment of advertisements are important interpreter of their value and are critical to the effectiveness of online advertising (Aaker, Batra & Mayer, 1992). Along with entertainment and informativeness, frustration caused by advertisements also influences peoples' attitude toward web advertisements (Ducoffe, 1996). This is consistent with previous research findings that interesting and pleasing advertisements have a positive effect on consumers' attitudes toward a brand (Mitchall & Olsan, 1994). Researchers have reported that attitudes toward web advertising are affected by enjoyment, informativeness, and the advertisements utility for making behavioral (purchasing) decisions (Schlosser, Shavitt & Kanfer, 1999).

In another study Ducoffe (1996) argued that the distinction between advertising and web editorial is unclear, with 57% of respondents classifying web pages as advertising. This recommend that consumer give remarks about web advertising need to be construed carefully, because they may refer to the Internet pages themselves rather than to the advertisements they carry.

According to Mehta and Sivadas (1995) newsgroup users held negative attitudes toward web advertising, but the business executives researched by other researcher did not find web advertising either irritating or annoying (Ducoffe, 1996). Gordon and Turner (1997) researched online advertising from the perspective of a social contract b/w advertisers and web users. Overall, respondents were passive, accepting web advertising as long as it was visibly recognized, and well targeted.

According to (GVU, 1998) surfers dislike web advertising slightly more than common advertising, (38% vs. 32%). Advertising banners which takes a long time to download were seen by respondents as the main problem in using the internet, with 62% agreeing.

Schlosser, Shavitt & Kanfer (1999) studied attitudes to web advertising using an alike questionnaire to that used for common advertising by Shavitt et. al. (1998). They compared the findings of a demographically matched section from the two studies. Respondents were classified: 38% liked web advertising, 35% disliked it, and 28% were impartial. Advertising in general was more liked than web advertising, 46% Vs 38%, and less disliked, 24% Vs 35%. However, when looking at particular attitudes, web advertising attitudes were sometimes more effective for example. 48% vs 38% felt they could trust web advertising. Researcher concluded that the nature of web advertising makes it less annoying to consumers than traditional advertising, "fewer respondents felt insulted and misled". However, this may be because web advertising is less pervasive, less invasive, and less persuasive, rather than because consumers prefer it (Shavitt et. al., 1998).

In focus group research Rettie (2001) found respondents were enormously negative about advertising. You just instantly know, that adverts, get relieve of it.

Negative attitudes to web advertising mean that surfers may intentionally escape advertisements. Dreze and Hussherr (1999) found that surfers intentionally avoid looking at banner advertisements during their online

actions, which helps to explain fewer clicks through rates. Using eye tracking, they concluded that Internet users were seriously less likely to look at a web advertising banner than some where else on the page. They also concluded significant differences in eye pattern movements between beginners and experts; such as, experts are quicker and look at some parts of a web page. Dreze & Hussherr (1999) also measured advertising recall, brand recall, and brand understanding effects; they found that these carried more significance than click through rates. This supports a previous finding by Briggs and Hollis (1997), which illustrated that banner advertisements have an effect on consumers' attitudes to brand, free of click through.

Sukpanich & Chen (1999) used the study of reasoned action to build up a scale of attitudes to web advertising. They found three constructs that affect web advertising attitudes: awareness, preference and intention or motive. E.g., an advertisement for a desired brand results in a more favorable attitude.

Stafford and Stafford (1998) concluded that respondents who were using the web for communication were less likely to notice advertising. Rodgers and Thorson (2000) also recommended that different consumer motives affect attitudes to web advertising. Testing this hypothesis, Li and Bukovac (1999) results shows that although information looking respondents paid more consideration to advertisements than surfers, the difference was not clear.

Whether a surfer is in flow is likely to impact on his attitude to web advertising. Flow is “the holistic understanding that people experience when they act with total involvement” (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975). Some other researchers identify flow as a fundamental feature of consumer attitude on the Internet, “flow is the 'glue' sustaining the consumer in the hypermedia Computer Mediated Environment” (Hoffman & Novak, 1996). Rettie (2001) argued advertising was especially annoying when in the flow, so that while flow may obtain surfers at a web site where they are promoted to advertising, it may negatively affect their reaction to that advertising.

Additional factors that affect web usage, and which might have an influence on the attitudes towards web advertising, are the duration, frequency, and location of use (Rogers & Sheldon, 1999).

It is likely that the effectiveness of web advertising largely depends upon the perceptions towards the medium which carries it. Attitudes to general advertising have diminished and consumer exposure. It is probable that attitudes towards web advertising will also decrease as web users become more used to the medium. The agenda of the researcher was to evaluate attitudes to web advertising, and to conclude how these were affected by the extent of web experience. Dimensions of experience include the duration the respondent has used the Internet, frequency and volume of use (Hoffman & Novak, 1996).

METHODOLOGY

For the purpose of this study the data was collected from different universities and from the general users having Internet experience. The sample size of 300 respondents was taken and questionnaires were provided to them directly. To get the responses, convenient sampling was used because of time constraint.

The questionnaire was designed to ask about the attitudes toward the web advertising and some independent variables like attitudes towards web advertisements, advertisement content and Brand name and one independent variable which was purchase intention. All these variables were answered on five point likert scale having different labels to gauge responses. The questionnaires were distributed to respondents directly and the respondents were requested to read and respond to each and every statement carefully. This ensures the validity of the responses and research. After getting the data from the respondents, the data was processed and analyzed in the Statistical Package for Social Sciences program (SPSS). To analyzing the data frequency distribution test was applied to that data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table No. 4.1

Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "Age" (N=300)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Under 18	19	6.3	6.3	6.3
22-29	240	80.0	80.0	86.3
30-39	25	8.3	8.3	94.7
>39	16	5.3	5.3	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.1 depicts that out of 300 respondents 6.3% respondents are under 18, 80% are in the age group of 22-29 years, 8.3% are in the age group 30-39 years and 5.3% are in the age group of above 39.

Table No. 4.2

Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "Gender" (N=300)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	184	61.3	61.3	61.3
Female	116	38.7	38.7	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.2 shows that out of 300 respondents 61.3% respondents are male and 38.7% are female respondents.

Table No. 4.3

Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "Internet Usage per Day" (N=300)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Less than 1 hour	75	25.0	25.0	25.0
1-5 hours	201	67.0	67.0	92.0
>5 hours	24	8.0	8.0	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.3 describes that 25% respondents are those who use Internet less than an hour per day, 67% respondents lies under 1-5 hours per day and 8% respondents use Internet daily more than 5 hours.

Table No. 4.4

Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "Web Experience" (N=300)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Less than 1 year	55	18.3	18.3	18.3
1-5 Years	85	28.3	28.3	46.7
>5 Years	160	53.3	53.3	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.4 shows that 18.3% respondents have web experience less than one year whereas 28.3% lies between 1-5 years web experience and 53.3% have web experience greater than 5.

Table No. 4.5

Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "I like web advertisements alot" (N=300)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	16	5.3	5.3	5.3
Disagree	82	27.3	27.3	32.7
Neutral	81	27.0	27.0	59.7
Agree	113	37.7	37.7	97.3
Strongly Agree	8	2.7	2.7	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.5 reveals that 5.3% are strongly disagree whereas 27.3% are disagree ; the table further shows that 27% participants remain neutral where as 37.7% agree with the statement that they like web advertisements a lot and 2.7% are strongly agree.

Table No. 4.6

Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "Web advertisements are very appealing (N=300)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	8	2.7	2.7	2.7
Disagree	40	13.3	13.3	16.0
Neutral	135	45.0	45.0	61.0
Agree	117	39.0	39.0	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.6 depicts that 2.7% are strongly disagree whereas 13.3% are disagree; the table further shows that 45% participants remain neutral whereas 39% agree with the statement that web advertisements are very appealing.

Table No. 4.7**Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "I don't think web advertisements are very interesting" (N=300)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	9	3.0	3.0	3.0
Disagree	97	32.3	32.3	35.3
Neutral	98	32.7	32.7	68.0
Agree	88	29.3	29.3	97.3
Strongly Agree	8	2.7	2.7	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.7 shows that 3% are strongly disagree whereas 32.3% are disagree; the table further shows that 32.7% participants remain neutral whereas 29.3% agree and 2.7% are strongly agree with that the web advertisements are not very interesting.

Table No. 4.8**Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "I think web advertisements are very convincing" (N=300)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	16	5.3	5.3	5.3
Disagree	69	23.0	23.0	28.3
Neutral	106	35.3	35.3	63.7
Agree	100	33.3	33.3	97.0
Strongly Agree	9	3.0	3.0	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.8 demonstrates that 5.3% are strongly disagree whereas 23% are disagree; the table further shows that 35.3% participants remain neutral whereas 33.3% agree and 3% are strongly agree with the statement that the web advertisements are very convincing.

Table No. 4.9

**Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "Web advertisement are not effective"
(N=300)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	36	12.0	12.0	12.0
Disagree	158	52.7	52.7	64.7
Neutral	65	21.7	21.7	86.3
Agree	33	11.0	11.0	97.3
Strongly Agree	8	2.7	2.7	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.9 demonstrates that 12% are strongly disagree whereas 52.7% are disagree; the table further shows that 21.7% participants remain neutral whereas 11% agree and 2.7% are strongly agree with the statement that web advertisements are not effective.

Table No. 4.10

**Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "I like to look at web advertising"
(N=300)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	16	5.3	5.3	5.3
Disagree	79	26.3	26.3	31.7
Neutral	80	26.7	26.7	58.3
Agree	117	39.0	39.0	97.3
Strongly Agree	8	2.7	2.7	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.10 demonstrates that 5.3% are strongly disagree whereas 26.3% are disagree; the table further shows that 26.7% participants remain neutral whereas 39% agree and 2.7% are strongly agree with the statement that they like to look at web advertisements.

Table No. 4.11**Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "Much of web advertising is too way annoying" (N=300)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	16	5.3	5.3	5.3
Disagree	24	8.0	8.0	13.3
Neutral	95	31.7	31.7	45.0
Agree	141	47.0	47.0	92.0
Strongly Agree	24	8.0	8.0	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.11 exhibits that 5.3% are strongly disagree whereas 8% are disagree; the table further shows that 31.7% participants remain neutral whereas 47% agree and 8% are strongly agree with the statement that much of web advertising is too way annoying.

Table No. 4.12**Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "I usually get better value for my money in advertised brands of products than in unadvertised brands" (N=300)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	16	5.3	5.3	5.3
Disagree	35	11.7	11.7	17.0
Neutral	72	24.0	24.0	41.0
Agree	158	52.7	52.7	93.7
Strongly Agree	19	6.3	6.3	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.12 exhibits that 5.3% are strongly disagree whereas 11.7% are disagree; the table further shows that 24% participants remain neutral whereas 52.7% agree and 6.3% are strongly agree with the statement that they get better value for their money in advertised brands rather than un advertised brands.

Table No. 4.13**Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "I mostly like the brand advertised online" (N=300)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	16	5.3	5.3	5.3
Disagree	24	8.0	8.0	13.3
Neutral	140	46.7	46.7	60.0
Agree	112	37.3	37.3	97.3
Strongly Agree	8	2.7	2.7	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.13 exhibits that 5.3% are strongly disagree whereas 8% are disagree; the table further shows that 46.7% participants remain neutral whereas 37.3% agree and 2.7% are strongly agree with the statement that they mostly like the brands advertised online.

Table No. 4.14**Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "I shall probably buy the brand advertised online" (N=300)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	16	5.3	5.3	5.3
Disagree	101	33.7	33.7	39.0
Neutral	103	34.3	34.3	73.3
Agree	80	26.7	26.7	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.14 exhibits that 5.3% are strongly disagree whereas 33.7% are disagree; the table further shows that 34.3% participants remain neutral whereas 26.7% agree with the statement that they shall probably buy the brands advertised online.

Table No. 4.15**Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "I think online advertised brands are good brands" (N=300)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	58	19.3	19.3	19.3
	Neutral	99	33.0	33.0	52.3
	Agree	127	42.3	42.3	94.7
	Strongly Agree	16	5.3	5.3	100.0
	Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.15 depicts that 19.3% are disagree; the table further shows that 33% participants remain neutral whereas 42.3% agree and 5.3% are strongly agree with the statement that they think online advertised brands are good brands.

Table No. 4.16**Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "I feel favourably towards online advertised brands" (N=300)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Disagree	49	16.3	16.3	16.3
	Neutral	127	42.3	42.3	58.7
	Agree	96	32.0	32.0	90.7
	Strongly Agree	28	9.3	9.3	100.0
	Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.16 demonstrates that 16.3% are disagree; the table further shows that 42.3% participants remain neutral whereas 32% agree and 9.3% are strongly agree with the statement that they feel favorably towards online advertised brands.

Table No. 4.17

Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "I recommend the advertised brands to others" (N=300)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	16	5.3	5.3	5.3
Disagree	90	30.0	30.0	35.3
Neutral	90	30.0	30.0	65.3
Agree	96	32.0	32.0	97.3
Strongly Agree	8	2.7	2.7	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.17 exhibits that 5.3% are strongly disagree whereas 30% are disagree; the table further shows that 30% participants remain neutral whereas 32% agree and 2.7% are strongly agree with the statement that they recommend the advertised brands to others.

Table No. 4.18

Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "Too many products do not perform as well as the web advertisements claim" (N=300)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	8	2.7	2.7	2.7
Disagree	65	21.7	21.7	24.3
Neutral	102	34.0	34.0	58.3
Agree	117	39.0	39.0	97.3
Strongly Agree	8	2.7	2.7	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.18 exhibits that 2.7% are strongly disagree whereas 21.7% are disagree; the table further shows that 34% participants remain neutral whereas 39% agree and 2.7% are strongly agree with the statement that too many products do not perform as well as the web advertisements claim.

Table No. 4.19**Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "I feel offended sometimes by web advertisements" (N=300)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	68	22.7	22.7	22.7
Neutral	86	28.7	28.7	51.3
Agree	130	43.3	43.3	94.7
Strongly Agree	16	5.3	5.3	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.19 exhibits that 22.7% are disagree; the table further shows that 28.7% participants remain neutral whereas 43.3% agree and 5.3% are strongly agree with the statement that they feel offended sometimes by web advertisements.

Table No. 4.20**Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "On average, brands that are advertised on web are better in quality than brands that are not advertised online" (N=300)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	8	2.7	2.7	2.7
Disagree	64	21.3	21.3	24.0
Neutral	96	32.0	32.0	56.0
Agree	124	41.3	41.3	97.3
Strongly Agree	8	2.7	2.7	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.20 shows that 2.7% are strongly disagree whereas 21.3% are disagree; the table further shows that 32% participants remain neutral whereas 41.3% agree and 2.7% are strongly agree with the statement that on average, brands that are advertised on web are better in quality than brands that are not advertised online.

Table No. 4.21

Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "Web advertising helps me keep up-to-date about the products and services that i need or would like to have" (N=300)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	43	14.3	14.3	14.3
Neutral	48	16.0	16.0	30.3
Agree	157	52.3	52.3	82.7
Strongly Agree	52	17.3	17.3	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.21 exhibits that 14.3% are disagree; the table further shows that 16% participants remain neutral whereas 52.3% agree and 17.3% are strongly agree with the statement that web advertising helps them keep up-to-date about the products and services that they need or would like to have.

Table No. 4.22

Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "I often have felt misled by web advertisements" (N=300)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	8	2.7	2.7	2.7
Disagree	67	22.3	22.3	25.0
Neutral	96	32.0	32.0	57.0
Agree	121	40.3	40.3	97.3
Strongly Agree	8	2.7	2.7	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.22 shows that 2.7% are strongly disagree whereas 22.3% are disagree; the table further shows that 32% participants remain neutral whereas 40.3% agree and 2.7% are strongly agree with the statement that they have often misled by web advertisements.

Table No. 4.23

frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "Most web advertising is informative" (N=300)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	16	5.3	5.3	5.3
Disagree	46	15.3	15.3	20.7
Neutral	106	35.3	35.3	56.0
Agree	116	38.7	38.7	94.7
Strongly Agree	16	5.3	5.3	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.23 shows that 5.3% are strongly disagree whereas 15.3% are disagree; the table further shows that 35.3% participants remain neutral whereas 38.7% agree and 5.3% are strongly agree with the statement that Most web advertising is informative.

Table No. 4.24

Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "Products that i have used usually live up to the promises of quality and performance made in their web advertisements" (N=300)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	8	2.7	2.7	2.7
Disagree	62	20.7	20.7	23.3
Neutral	134	44.7	44.7	68.0
Agree	96	32.0	32.0	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.24 shows that 2.7% are strongly disagree whereas 20.7% are disagree; the table further shows that 44.7% participants remain neutral whereas 32% agree with the statement that Products that they have used usually live up to the promises of quality and performance made in their web advertisements.

Table No. 4.25

Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "I generally feel confident using information seen in a web advertisement to make a purchase intention" (N=300)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	19	6.3	6.3	6.3
Disagree	84	28.0	28.0	34.3
Neutral	96	32.0	32.0	66.3
Agree	101	33.7	33.7	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.25 shows that 6.3% are strongly disagree whereas 28% are disagree; the table further shows that 32% participants remain neutral whereas 33.7% agree with the statement that Products that they generally feel confident using information seen in a web ad to make a purchase decision.

Table No. 4.26

Frequency distribution of the respondents w.r.t "Most of time I use web advertising to help make my purchase decision" (N=300)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	43	14.3	14.3	14.3
Disagree	64	21.3	21.3	35.7
Neutral	57	19.0	19.0	54.7
Agree	120	40.0	40.0	94.7
Strongly Agree	16	5.3	5.3	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.26 shows that 14.3% are strongly disagree whereas 21.3% are disagree; the table further shows that 19% participants remain neutral whereas 40% agree and 5.3% are strongly agree with the statement that Products that Most of time they use web advertising to help make my purchase decisions.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research has examined the factors affecting the attitudes towards web advertisement. Many factors were considered during this research, which are attitudes towards the web advertisements, brand name, advertisement contents and purchase decision. All these variables have an influence on the effectiveness of web advertisements. The influence of some variables is more as compared to others. From table 4.5 to 4.26 the questionnaire is divided into four parts.

The first part from table 4.5 to table 4.11 contains attitudes towards the web advertisement; this part shows the attitude of the respondents towards the web advertisements. The current research concluded that majority of respondents have a negative inclination towards web advertisement. Research shows that respondents think that web advertisements are effective and very interesting; a predominant majority of respondents also feel that web advertisements are at times not convincing and even annoying.

The second part of the questionnaire contains brand name. According to table 4.12 to table 4.17, it is concluded that a major part of the participants generally prefer brands that are advertised as they feel advertised brands give better value for their money, on the contrary; respondents do not appreciate web advertised brands and they feel that web advertised brands are inferior in quality to brands advertised by conventional means.

The third part of the questionnaire contains advertisement contents. According to table 4.18 to table 4.24, web advertised products generally perform as advertisements claim but it is a widespread belief that web advertisement lack adequate information. Still the web advertisement is thought of a good source that helps potential buyers to keep up-to-date with the products and services they need or would like to have.

The forth part from table 4.25 to table 4.26 contains purchase decision; this part reveals that when it comes to making purchase decisions majority of the respondents do not rely on the information provided to them in web advertisements, therefore the role of web advertisements in provoking buying behavior is minimal.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Attitudes towards web advertising can be made more positive by making web ads more convincing and less annoying for their target audience. People think that web ads are interesting and effective but at times not convincing and even annoying so web advertisers should focus on adding features that make their ads more convincing and less annoying.

Although consumers feel that conventionally advertised brands give better value for their money, Web ads are not considered to be a good means for promoting brand names because it is perceived that web-advertised brands are inferior in quality to conventionally advertised brands.

Web ads lack relevant content and adequate information and are thus, used as a source to keep up-to-date with desired products and services rather than for decision-making purposes. Web advertisers should try to provide adequate and relevant content so that consumers consider web ads when making purchase decisions.

People are not confident in using information provided in a web ad when making a purchase decision and hence do not rely on web ads when making purchase decisions. Web advertisers should try to make people rely on web ads to make purchase decisions.

REFERENCES

1. Aaker, D.S.; Batra, R.; and Mayers, J.G. Advertising Management. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1992.
2. Anderson, D. 2005. Pop-up Ads are No Longer as Popular with Marketers. *Brandweek*, 46(5): 13
3. Baker, S.M., P.F. Kennedy (1994), "Death By Nostalgia: A Diagnosis of Context-Specific Cases", *Advances in Consumer Research*, 21, 169-174.
4. Bogart, L. War of the Words: Advertising in the Year 2010. *Across the Board*, January 1985.
5. Briggs, Rex and Nigel Hollis (1997), "Advertising on the Web: Is There Response before Click-Through?", *Journal of Advertising Research*, 37 (2), 33-45.
6. Chang, Y., & Thorson, E. 2004. Television and Web Advertising Synergies. *Journal of Advertising*, 33(2): 75-84
7. Cho, C. 2003, Factors influencing clicking of banner ads on the WWW. *Cyber Psychology & Behavior*, 6(2): 201-215
8. Csikszentmihalyi, Mihalyi (1975), *Beyond Boredom and Anxiety*. San Francisco, Josey-Bass.
9. Dahlen, M., Rasch, A., & Rosengren, S. 2003. Love at First Site? A Study of Website Advertising Effectiveness. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 43(1): 25-33
10. Drèze, Xavier and François-Xavier Husherr (1999), "Internet Advertising: Is Anybody Watching?", Working Paper, Marshall School of Business, University of Southern California.
11. Ducoffe, R. H. (1996). Advertising Value and Advertising on the Web. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 36(September/October), 21 - 36.
12. Ducoffe, R.H. (1996) Advertising value and advertising on the Web. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 36, 5, 21–35.
13. Edwards, S. M., Li, H., & Lee, J. 2002. Forced Exposure and Psychological Reactance: Antecedents and Consequences of the Perceived Intrusiveness of Pop-up Ads. *Journal of Advertising*, 31(3): 83-95
14. Eighmey, J. Profiling user responses to commercial Web sites. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 37, 3 (1997), 21–35.
15. Eveland, W. P., Jr., & Dunwoody, S. 2002. An Investigation of Elaboration and Selective Scanning as mediators of Learning from the Web Versus Print. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 46(1): 34-53
16. Fishbein, M. (ed.). *Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement*. New York: Wiley, 1967.
17. Glennan, Tk & Melmed, A 1996: *Fostering The Use Of Educational Technology: Elements Of National Strategy*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
18. Gordon, Mary Ellen and Katheryn De Lima-Turner (1997), "Consumer Attitudes towards Internet Advertising – A Social Contract Perspective", *International Marketing Review*, 14 (5), 362–375.
19. GVU's WWW 10th User Survey (1998), available at <http://www.gvu.gatech.edu>
20. Hoffman, Donna and Thomas P. Novak, (1996), "Marketing in Hypermedia Computer Mediated Environments", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol.60, 50–68.
21. Hovland, C. I., Janis, I. L., & Kelley, H. H. 1953. *Communication and Persuasion*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
22. Kotler, P. *Marketing Management*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2000.
23. Koopman, C. 2003. Philosophy, Music and Emotion. *Mind*, 112(448): 759-762
24. Korgaonkar, P., and Wolin, L. A. Multivariate analysis of Web usage. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 39, 2 (1999), 53–68.
25. Leckenby, John D. and Hairong Li (2000), "Why We Need the Journal of Interactive Advertising",

- Journal of Interactive Advertising, 1 (1).
26. Li, Hairong, and Janice L. Bukovac (1999), "Cognitive Impact of Banner Ad Characteristics: An Experimental Study", *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 76 (2), 341-53.
 27. MacKenzie, S. B. and R. L. Lutz (1989). An Empirical Examination of the Structural Antecedents of Attitude Toward the Ad in an Advertising Pretesting Context. *Journal of Marketing*, 53(April 1998), 48 - 65.
 28. Mehta, R. Sivadas, E. (1995), "Direct marketing on the Internet: An Empirical Assessment of Consumer Attitudes", *Journal of Direct Marketing* 9 (3), 21-31.
 29. Mitchell, A.A., and Olson, J.C. Are product attribute beliefs the only mediator of advertising effects on brand attitude? *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 3 (1981), 318–332.
 30. Ng Ka Po. (2006), "Factors Affecting Attitude toward Web Advertising", Baptist University, Hong Kong.
 31. Novak, T.P and Hoffman, D.L. (1997), "New metrics for new media: toward the development of Web measurement standards", *World Wide Web Journal*, Vol. 2, Winter, pp. 21346.
 32. Peppers, D. and Rogers, M. (1993), *The One to One Future*, Doubleday, New York, NY
 33. Raney, A. A., L. M. Arpan, K. Padhupati and D. A. Brill (2003). At the movies, on the Web: An investigation of the effects of entertaining and interactive Web content on site and brand evaluations. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 17(4), 38-53.
 34. Rettie Ruth (2001), "An Exploration of Flow During Internet Use", *Internet Research*, 11, 2, 103–113.
 35. Rodgers, Shelly and Esther Thorson (2000), "The Interactive Advertising Model", *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 1 (1).
 36. Rodgers, Shelly and Kennon M. Sheldon (1999), "The Web Motivation Inventory: A New Way to Characterize Web Users", 1999 Conference of the American Academy of Advertising.
 37. Schlosser, A.E.; Shavitt, S.; and Kanfer, A. Survey of Internet users' attitudes toward Internet advertising. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 13, 3 (1999), 34–54.
 38. Shavitt, Sharon, Lowrey, Pamela M. and James E. Haefner (1998), "Public Attitudes Toward Advertising: More Favorable Than You Might Think", *Journal of Advertising Research*, (July/August) 7–22.
 39. Shavitt, S., Lowrey, P. M. & Haefner, J. E. (1998, July/ August). Public Attitudes Toward Advertising: More Favorable Than You Might Think. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 7–22.
 40. Stafford, Thomas F. and Marla R. Stafford (1998), "Uses and Gratifications of the World Wide Web: A Preliminary Study", *Proceedings of the 1998 Conference of the American Academy of Advertising*, 174-181.
 41. Stewart, D. W. "Speculations on the Future of Advertising Research," *Journal of Advertising* (21:3), 1992, pp. 1-18.
 42. Stone, M. L. *Sticking to the Web: ad-tech keynoters discuss online advertising*. Editor & Publisher, the Fourth Estate (132:9), 1999, p.20
 43. Stout, P., & Leckenby, J. D. 1984. The Rediscovery of Emotional Response in Copy Research. In *Proceedings of the 1984 Convention of the American Academy of Advertising*, Glover, D. R., eds., Lincoln, NE: School of Journalism, University of Nebraska-Lincoln: 40-45
 44. Sukpanich, N. & Chen, L. (1999), "Measuring the Effectiveness of Web Advertising", University of Memphis working paper.