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ABSTRACT

In this paper, the authors broadly investigate Hispanic consumer attitudes and their sociological behaviors toward online advertising. The study documents the correlation between Hispanic attitudes, behaviors, and three types of online advertising that have an effect on cultural distinctions. Additionally, the study compares the group’s attitudes toward TV advertising vis-à-vis the three types of online advertising to compare the two medium’s similarities and differences. Notably, Hispanics favor e-mail advertising and banner advertising over popup advertising, while Hispanics continue to enjoy advertising on television more than any of the three types of Web advertising that this paper will discuss.
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INTRODUCTION

The Hispanic View of E-mail, Popup, and Banner Advertising

In the last decade both the academic and business community has shown a growing interest in studying Hispanic consumers. This interest is the result of the substantial growth of the U.S. Hispanic population and their corresponding wealth. Marketers in particular are paying special attention to this distinct ethnic segment because the Hispanic market comprises over 46 million people and accounts for about 15 percent of the U.S. population (Sun & Johnson, 2009). Almost one in every seven Americans is of Hispanic origin. Moreover, as a population, it is growing about six times faster than the general population. The 2008 U.S. Census estimates the population of Hispanics to more than double by the year 2050 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008). The size and dynamics of Hispanic minorities have redefined several aspects of the U.S. economy. According to the Interactive Advertising Bureau (2006), U.S. Hispanic Buying Power is increasing at a much faster rate than non-Hispanics Buying Power. The buying power of Hispanics is reported to be around $1 trillion in the marketplace (Sun & Johnson, 2009). Thus, the importance of the Hispanic market to advertisers is obvious.
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Although a few studies in the past have investigated the media habits of this ethnic group, (e.g., Guernica, 1982), little is known about the beliefs, attitudes and behaviors of Hispanic consumers towards the three types of dominant Web advertising, namely, e-mail, pop-ups, and banner advertising.

Also, for Hispanic consumers, it is unknown how these three types of Web advertisements stack up against traditional television advertisements. The current study attempts to fill these gaps in the published literature.

Web advertising targeted to Hispanics is highly visible and monetarily significant. Web advertising targeting Hispanics accounts for more than 75 million dollars (Cox, 2004) up from $10 million spent in 2002. Most market research on Hispanics attitudes and beliefs toward advertising and/or advertising are general in nature and do not focus on specific advertising techniques. Research has shown many Hispanics use the Internet to learn more about brands and prices. A 2006 study by AOL reports that 55% of all Hispanics use the Internet; of the online Hispanics, 81% are mostly or partially acculturated, 77% use the Internet to learn about product brands, and 72% use the Internet to compare prices (www.imnewswatch.com).

Similar results were reported in a study quoted by Burns (2005). That study indicated Hispanic Internet usage equals or exceeds the non-Hispanic population in a variety of Internet activities. A recent study released by Yahoo! Telemundo and Experian Simmons Research (2007) suggested that online Hispanics are highly experienced and multifaceted on the Internet (Contacto Magazine, 2007). Summing up, Hispanics as a segment of the U.S. population and as a user group of the Internet offers a lucrative and growth market in the U.S. (Tellis & Ortiz 2008; U.S. Census Bureau, 2008).

Therefore, the study results are expected to be of interest to academics and practitioners alike. The next section reviews the pertinent literature and establishes the study hypotheses.

Literature and Hypotheses

Published literature in the field of Hispanic marketing has explored a variety of topics. Studies have investigated the effect of choice of language, i.e., English vs. Spanish, in advertising to Hispanics, brand loyalty, preference for shopping at neighborhood stores, and the propensity to purchase prestigious brands (e.g., Segal & Sosa, 1986; Hernandez & Newman, 1992). Advertising research has indicated that Hispanics have favorable attitudes toward advertising in general and towards direct marketing advertising in particular (Korgaonkar et al., 2000). Webster (1991) found that Hispanic consumers value advertising as an important source of information. Yankelovich et al. (1981) reported Hispanics rely significantly on commercial sources of information including advertising. It has also been suggested that Hispanics value brands most frequently advertised and believe in materialism (Bellenger & Valencia, 1982). Finally, studies by Fones (1981) and Webster (1992) suggested that advertising in radio, magazines, and brochures influence Hispanic consumers. More recently Korgaonkar et al. (2001) suggested Hispanics were ambivalent towards Web advertising.

The fall 2005 Simmons National Consumer Survey indicated more Hispanics found online advertising useful than non-Hispanics (Interactive Advertising Bureau, 2006). Although these studies are helpful as a preliminary attempt in understanding Hispanic consumers, we believe study results would be more useful if more specific forms of Web advertising such as e-mail, the pop-up, and the banner advertising were investigated instead of “general” advertising.

Although there is a significant business interest in understanding the different aspects of Web advertising, the literature pertaining to Hispanic Internet users is still scant. Most of the past studies have focused on only a single type of Web advertising and rarely had a Hispanic sample. In general, we know that the clicks thru rates are very low and intrusiveness is an issue.
A few past studies focusing on Hispanic attitudes toward general advertising and Web advertising suggest that Hispanics are favorably disposed toward it (Korgaonkar et al., 2001; Webster, 1992; Deshpande et al., 1986; Yankelovich et al., 1981; Valencia, 1989). Nevertheless, studies of Hispanic attitudes regarding the three types of Web advertising are still lacking.

Drawing from past studies of non-Hispanic Internet users and a single type of Web advertising, we know individual types of Web advertisements have differential impacts on their audiences. For example, a few published studies suggest that e-mail advertising is effective if it is perceived to be useful (Martin et al., 2003), banner ads are considered ineffective because of their poor click thru rates (Cross, 1999), and popup ads are reported to yield more click thru rates, more favorable attitudes, and higher purchase intention than standard banner ads (Cho et al., 2001). These results are comparable to radio and TV advertisements having different impacts on their audiences although both are categorized as broadcast media. Similarly, we expect significant differences in the Hispanic consumers’ attitudes between the three types of Web advertising. This leads us to hypothesize that:

II-1: Hispanic beliefs, attitudes, and behavior toward the three types of Web advertising will be significantly different from each other.

Attitude and Behavior Consistency

Several past studies in advertising and marketing suggest a strong and positive relationship between consumer attitudes and behaviors. We posit a similar relationship between the Hispanic consumers’ attitudes towards the three types of Web advertising and Hispanic consumers’ behavior towards the three advertising techniques. The specific hypothesis to be tested is that

II-2: There will be a significant positive relationship between the attitudes towards each of the three types of Web advertising and behaviors of Hispanic consumers

TV Advertising versus e-Mail, Popup, and Banner Advertising

Compared to traditional TV advertising, Hispanic evaluation of the three advertising methods is expected to be less favorable. This result is expected because Hispanic culture is suggested to be conservative and traditional in its values as well as its behavior (Valdes & Sadane, 1995; Bellenger & Valencia, 1982). Additionally, a few studies in shopping context suggest that Hispanics are less prone to take risks and less likely to try new brands or ideas (e.g., Valdes, 1991; Cartagena, 2005). The Web and the three types of Web advertising are relatively new when compared to television. Accordingly, this leads us to suggest that Hispanics are less likely to embrace the new medium and its ads as readily as traditional TV ads. As noted earlier, we expect Hispanics to have significant differences in their beliefs and attitudes towards e-mail, popup, and banner advertising. We expect these differences to spillover to their evaluations of these three types of advertising vis-à-vis TV advertising. Consequently, this leads us to hypothesize that

II-3: Significant differences are expected between the evaluations of each of the three types of Web advertising vis-à-vis TV advertising.

Methodology

Sample

The sample for the study consists of 660 consumers in the Southeast United States. The sample is drawn from a metropolitan area with a population of about five million people, 30 percent of which is of Hispanic ethnicity. The area has two major English and one major Spanish newspaper; it also has four major English and three major Spanish TV stations. As noted by many scholars, the ability to administer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Email advertising</th>
<th>Popup advertising</th>
<th>Banner advertising</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>(.170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>p&lt;.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Email advertising</th>
<th>Popup advertising</th>
<th>Banner advertising</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduates</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(.108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade School graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>p&lt;.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate/professional degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Email advertising</th>
<th>Popup advertising</th>
<th>Banner advertising</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(.021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 30 years</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 60 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family speaks Spanish at home</th>
<th>Email advertising</th>
<th>Popup advertising</th>
<th>Banner advertising</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All the time</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>(.080)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>p&lt;.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Were you born in another country?</th>
<th>Email advertising</th>
<th>Popup advertising</th>
<th>Banner advertising</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>(.220)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>p&lt;.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Probabilistic sampling procedures in the investigation of ethnic studies is very difficult (Marin & Marin, 1995). Recognizing the difficulty of sampling Hispanics without a population listing, the surveys of adult Hispanics were conducted via personal interviews in several geographical areas to capture the diversity in socioeconomic as well as Hispanic background. Interviewers fluent in both English and Spanish contacted the subjects at home or work. The interviewers were instructed to sample respondents as randomly as possible and to administer the surveys on different days and at different times. Only those adult respondents who had surfed the Web were asked to respond to the survey. The interviewers explained the objectives of the study and gave the respondent an option of completing an English or Spanish language questionnaire. A total of 588 usable questionnaires were obtained from a sample of 660.

One sample group responded to banner advertising questions (n=267), a second group to popup advertising questions (n=287), and a third group to the e-mail advertising questions (n=106). The demographic profile of each respondent group is shown in Table 1. The sample of respondents for the banner advertising was slightly younger than the other two groups; the sample of the e-mail advertising group were more likely to have family members speaking Spanish at home than the other two groups.
Measurement

To obtain a clearer understanding of consumers’ Web advertising beliefs and attitudes, we examined published literature. Bauer and Greyser (1968) were the first to systematically examine attitude toward advertising; they assessed advertising beliefs as two clusters: economic and social effects. Succeeding studies have used variations of Bauer and Greyser’s two-factor model (Muehleng, 1987). More contemporary studies suggest several, not just two, facets of consumers’ advertising beliefs.

Alwitt and Prabhaker (1992) found that consumers’ perceptions of television advertising spans six dimensions, and in a (1994) follow-up study, they observed consumers’ advertising evaluations comprise six dimensions. In his 1994 study Mittal describes ten consumer advertising perceptions and beliefs.

Pollay and Mittal (1993) as well as Korgaonkar et al. (2001) support a seven-factor belief model. Because the two studies have established the validity and reliability of these measures with both Hispanic and non-Hispanic consumers, we chose the seven-factor model they developed. In the two studies, the seven factors represent three personal uses of advertising: product information, social role and image, and hedonic/pleasure, along with four social effects of advertising: good for the economy, materialism, value corruption, and falsity/no sense. We describe below the seven belief factors as they relate to our study. The actual statements used to measure each belief as well as the overall attitude construct are shown in Table 2.

Seven Belief Factors

Product Information. This personal use factor suggests that one of advertising’s roles is to provide information. Web advertising information allows for greater marketplace efficiencies, where consumers’ needs and wants are better matched with advertisers’ offerings.

In his 1996 study, Ducoff (1996) found a substantial and significant correlation between informative and Web advertising value. “Product Information” is measured by: a) “______ advertisements are a very valuable source of information about local sales;” b) “______ advertisements tell me which brands have the features I am looking for;” and c) “______ advertisements help me keep up-to-date about products available in the marketplace.” The coefficient alpha of the construct was 0.673.

Social role and image. Different forms of Web advertising, like other forms of mass media advertising, promote social and lifestyle messages through associated status, portrayal of ideal users, social reaction to purchase, and brand image (Pollay & Mittal, 1993; Korgaonkar et al., 2001). Moreover, the vivid, interactive messages in advertisements enhance its ability to convey these social messages. Additionally, it is expected that major companies will devote more money to brand advertising as measurements become more refined, fueling consumers’ desire to pay premium prices for branded items. “Social role and image,” also a personal factor, is measured by “From ______ advertisements, I learn what is in fashion and what I should buy for keeping a good social image” b) “I like it when ______ advertisements show people like me using the brand I am using” and c) “In ______ advertisements I often see and hear my own beliefs and values being portrayed.” The coefficient alpha of the construct was 0.813.

Hedonic pleasure. Web advertising with its multimedia capabilities can be beautiful, sentimental, motivating, humorous and entertaining. Hoffman and Novak (1996) maintain that image and content-rich Web sites embedded with enjoyable, interactive presentations represent the future of Web advertising. To the extent that consumers enjoy viewing Web sites, there should be a positive impact on Web advertising beliefs. Thus, the creativity of the Internet advertising adds value to the advertised products and services. “Hedonic/pleasure,” the third personal factor, is measured by: a) “I find ______ advertisements a welcome break in viewing Websites.” and b) “Some ______ advertisements make me feel good.” The reliability alpha of the construct was 0.749.
Table 2. Measurements and significance tests of beliefs, attitudes, and behavior toward email, popup, banner advertising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief Construct/Measure *</th>
<th>E-mail mean value (SD) N=106</th>
<th>Pop Ups mean value (SD) N=240</th>
<th>Banner mean value (SD) N=242</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Reliability coefficient alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advertisements are a very valuable source of information about local sales</td>
<td>1.6792 (.46889)</td>
<td>1.7355 (.92695)</td>
<td>2.2042 (.210697)</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brands have the features I am looking for</td>
<td>1.6792 (.46898)</td>
<td>1.7149 (.83072)</td>
<td>2.0417 (.88833)</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advertisements help me keep up-to-date about products available in the marketplace</td>
<td>1.7736 (.42050)</td>
<td>1.7149 (.93642)</td>
<td>2.0417 (.96287)</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social role and image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From ______ advertisements I learn what is in fashion and what I should buy for keeping a good social image</td>
<td>1.5755 (.49662)</td>
<td>1.5455 (.82994)</td>
<td>1.9333 (1.04488)</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like it when ______ advertisements show people like me using the brand I am using</td>
<td>1.7075 (.45705)</td>
<td>1.7149 (.94962)</td>
<td>1.9875 (.99992)</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In ______ advertisements I often see and hear my own beliefs and values being portrayed</td>
<td>1.5849 (.49508)</td>
<td>1.4793 (.71845)</td>
<td>1.8083 (.97497)</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonic/ Pleasure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find ______ advertisements a welcome break in viewing websites</td>
<td>1.5755 (.49662)</td>
<td>1.4339 (.75518)</td>
<td>1.6875 (.90919)</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some ______ advertisements make me feel good</td>
<td>1.6604 (.47583)</td>
<td>1.5950 (.84557)</td>
<td>1.9708 (.99538)</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value corruption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ advertisements sometimes make people live in a world of fantasy</td>
<td>1.8396 (.36876)</td>
<td>2.0661 (1.12117)</td>
<td>2.2417 (1.09005)</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of ______ advertisements are based on ideas and values which are opposite to my own personal values</td>
<td>1.8962 (.30642)</td>
<td>2.2769 (1.69402)</td>
<td>2.5167 (2.69039)</td>
<td>p&lt;.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ advertisements invade my privacy</td>
<td>1.8585 (.35020)</td>
<td>2.7603 (1.42605)</td>
<td>2.6042 (1.17398)</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsity/ No Sense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One can put more trust in products advertised through ______ advertisements than in those not advertised on the Web. (reverse scale)</td>
<td>1.6321 (.48453)</td>
<td>1.6033 (.78871)</td>
<td>1.8792 (.94070)</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(reverse scale) d ______ advertisements advertise poor quality products</td>
<td>1.8679 (.34018)</td>
<td>2.4298 (1.07504)</td>
<td>2.5417 (2.82960)</td>
<td>p&lt;.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With all the ______ advertising going on, I do not</td>
<td>1.8491 (.35969)</td>
<td>2.2924 (1.32039)</td>
<td>2.4000 (1.19902)</td>
<td>p&lt;.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite know what to believe and what not to believe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued on following page
### Table 2. continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief Construct/Measure</th>
<th>E-mail mean value (SD) N=106</th>
<th>Pop Ups mean value (SD) N=240</th>
<th>Banner mean value (SD) N=242</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Reliability coefficient alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good for the economy ____________ advertisements improve people’s standard of living</td>
<td>1.6226 (0.48703)</td>
<td>1.4380 (0.68040)</td>
<td>1.6750 (0.79919)</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td>.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________ advertisements help the consumer buy the best brand for the price</td>
<td>1.6981 (0.46126)</td>
<td>1.6446 (0.78745)</td>
<td>1.9375 (0.95519)</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there were no ____________ advertisements deciding what to buy would be difficult.</td>
<td>1.4811 (0.50202)</td>
<td>1.4050 (0.79499)</td>
<td>1.5208 (0.74849)</td>
<td>p&lt;.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materialism ____________ advertisements make you buy things you do not really need</td>
<td>1.8585 (0.35020)</td>
<td>2.3182 (1.20940)</td>
<td>2.4833 (1.14609)</td>
<td>p&lt;.1</td>
<td>.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________ advertisements increase dissatisfaction among consumers by showing products which some consumers can’t afford</td>
<td>1.8491 (0.35969)</td>
<td>2.2231 (1.01022)</td>
<td>2.2667 (0.93030)</td>
<td>p&lt;.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There have been times when I have bought something because of a ____________ advertisement.</td>
<td>1.5755 (0.49662)</td>
<td>1.4421 (0.82414)</td>
<td>1.6667 (0.89474)</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Overall, do you consider ____________ advertisements a good or bad thing?***</td>
<td>2.5660 (1.02371)</td>
<td>2.0992 (2.21614)</td>
<td>2.4667 (0.98468)</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________ advertisements a good or bad thing?***</td>
<td>2.2453 (1.11108)</td>
<td>1.5909 (0.85092)</td>
<td>2.0142 (1.00708)</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, do you like or dislike ____________ advertisements?***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior When you see a ____________ advertisement how close attention do you play? ****</td>
<td>2.2264 (1.09790)</td>
<td>1.6570 (0.87977)</td>
<td>.8458 (1.03353)</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you see a ____________ advertisement how often do you click on the ad to find more information? ****</td>
<td>1.8868 (1.06298)</td>
<td>1.5041 (0.88907)</td>
<td>1.6708 (0.90788)</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you see a ____________ advertisement how often do you get annoyed and leave the website? **</td>
<td>3.4057 (1.255568)</td>
<td>2.9711 (1.40951)</td>
<td>3.2958 (1.28395)</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Value corruption.** Web advertisements can undermine the values parents try to impress upon their children. Web advertising has the power to mold users’ values, and thus, has the potential to corrupt the values of its users. Value corruption is a major user concern prompting “ad blocker” software that prevents ads from appearing on a Web page (Bridis, 1998). “Value corruption,” the first of four societal effects, is measured by: a) “________ advertising sometimes makes people live in a world of fantasy,” b) “A lot of __________ advertisements are based

---
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on ideas and values which are opposite to my own personal values." c) "________ advertisements invade my privacy." The reliability alpha of the construct was 0.504.

_Falsity/no sense._ In their rush to have presence on the Web, many firms that ordinarily employ sound research practices abandon their logic and develop ineffective Web sites (Nadilo, 1998). Some of the characteristics of these sites include half-truths, deceptive claims and intelligence-insulting prose. Like other forms of advertising, Web advertising often promises consumers magical results and fuels the falsity factor. Falsity/No sense scale with the alpha of 0.239 is measured by: a) "One can put more trust in products advertised through ______ advertisements than in those not advertised on the Web (a reverse scale)." b) "______ advertisements advertise poor quality products." c) "With all the ______ advertising going on, I do not quite know what to believe and what not to believe."

_Good for the economy._ Advertising saves consumers' time and makes it possible for them to choose from a wide variety of merchandise conveniently from almost any location. Additionally, the three types of Internet advertising facilitate the introduction of new products and services.

Particularly, when shopping for big-ticket items where price comparison in an information rich environment is fairly easy, and the potential for savings significant, the economic motivation to shop on the Web could be strong. "Good for the economy," another societal effect, is measured by: a) "______ advertising improves people's standard of living." b) "______ advertisements help the consumer buy the best brand for the price." and c) "If there were no ______ advertisements deciding what to buy would be difficult." The coefficient alpha of the scale was 0.755.

_Materialism._ Materialism is defined by Pollay and Mittal (1993) as a set of belief structures that sees consumption as the route to most, if not all, satisfactions. Web users are faced with an enticing array of goods which may promote concerns about materialism. Online storefronts and on-line malls displaying a wide variety of goods tempt consumers with their enticing display of wares. "Materialism," the fourth societal effect, is measured by: a) "________ advertisements make you buy things you do not really need." b) "________ advertisements increase dissatisfaction among consumers by showing products which some consumers can't afford." c) "There have been times when I have bought something because of a ______ advertisement." The coefficient alpha of the scale was 0.582.

As previously stated, this study measures the seven dimensions of beliefs and attitudes toward Web advertising via adopting Pollay and Mittal (1993) and Korgonkar et al. (2001) measurement scale for Web advertising. Each of the seven scale dimensions (product information, social role and image, hedonic pleasure, value corruption, falsity/no sense, good for the economy, and materialism) was operationalized in terms of three or four items. For each item, respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each respondent was asked about one of the three types of Web advertisements under investigation. The item evaluations were elicited using a five-point scale with descriptive anchors ranging from "strongly agree" (coded 1) to "strongly disagree" (coded 5).

_Attitude_ 

The attitude construct was operationalized using two items utilized in past studies (Ducoff, 1998; Korgonkar et al., 2001). The two items are a) Overall, do you consider Web advertising a good or bad thing? Measured on a five-point scale of (1) "very bad" thru (5) "very good" and b) Overall, do you like or dislike Web advertising? Measured on a five-point scale of (1) "strongly dislike" thru (5) "strongly like" The coefficient alpha of the scale was 0.607.

_Web Advertising Behavior_ 

Web advertising behavior is conceptualized as an activity variable of three dimensions. The
three dimensions are: 1) When I see a ______ advertisement on my computer screen I pay close attention to it (attention), 2) When I see a ______ advertisement on my computer screen I click on the advertisement to find more information (interest), 3) When I see a ______ advertisement on my computer screen I leave the Web site (avoidance, a reverse item). Each item is measured on a five-point scale of (1) Never (2) Occasionally, (3) Sometimes, (4) Often, (5) Always. The coefficient alpha of the scale was 0.593. Thus despite the difficulties involved in translating the meanings of the terms from English to Spanish the overall reliabilities for almost all the measures except Falsity/No Sense were fairly acceptable ranging from 0.504 to 0.813.

Web vs. TV

The evaluation of the specific type of Web advertising in comparison to TV advertising was measured by asking the question: “Compared to ______ advertisements, how will you evaluate TV advertising? Is TV advertising more (1), the same (2), or less (3)” on a list of pertinent advertising related attributes.

The attributes drawn from previous advertising literature (e.g., Korgaonkar et al., 2001; Duflo, 1996) and were enjoyable, offensive, informative, deceptive, annoying, useful, good for the economy, intrusive and invades privacy.

Demographics

Additionally, demographic information such as gender, education, age, the extent of Spanish spoken at home, preference for speaking the Spanish versus English language and country of birth was collected.

Analysis and Results

Table 2 shows the specific items used to measure beliefs, attitudes and behavior toward each of the three types of Web advertising. Additionally, it shows differences, if any, between email, popup, and banner advertising with regards to the statements. As Table 1 indicates the three samples for the Web advertising were significantly different in terms of age (p < .05) and the extent of Spanish language spoken at home (p < .10).

Thus the results in Table 2 are reported after controlling for these variables.

The overall results are supportive of hypothesis one. As we examine the overall attitudes there were significant differences (p < .05) to the statement responses “Do you consider each one of the three types of Web advertisements good or bad?” The popup ads scored the least favorable response when compared to both the e-mail and banner ads. The pop-ups are the least favored because of the inability of the Web surfers to anticipate, control them or delete them. The pop-ups are the most intrusive among the three types of web advertising. Consequently, perhaps they are also the most annoying. The responses to all three behavior statements regarding the three types of ads show that the pop-ups are significantly (p < .05 or better) the least useful. This is consistent with a study suggesting that the visitors to a Web site will adopt more negative attitudes because of intrusive ads such as pop-ups and pop-unders (McCoy et al., 2007).

The responses to the beliefs statements reveal a similar pattern. With the exception of two belief categories, five of the belief categories indicated responses to popup are the least favorable. The exceptions are the responses to the constructs of value corruption and falsity/no sense.

On these two constructs the e-mail advertising fairs the least popular method of Web advertising (p < .1 or better). These e-mail advertisements, although intrusive, could be deleted without having to read them. Additionally, once identified as spam by the Internet service provider, they are routinely deposited in a spam folder by most providers.

The responses to the statement, “When you see an ad how often do you click on it to find more information?” received the most positive response to e-mail ads and the least
to the pop-ups, with banner ads in the middle
(p < .01). Overall, the banner ads fared the best
in comparison to the other two. These are less
intrusive (p < .05), more pleasurable (p < .01),
more informative (p < .01), more trustworthy
(p < .1 or better) and better for the economy
(p < .01 or better) when compared to e-mail and
popup ads. However, as expected, the banner
ads attract the least attention when compared
to the other two (p < .01).

Table 3 shows the correlation coefficients
between the attitude score of the summed
two-item scale and the behavior score of the
summed three item score with significance
levels for each type of advertising.

The results are supportive of hypothesis
two. All three coefficients are statistically
significant at the 0.001 level. This again
underscores the rationale for developing positive
attitudes by studying the underlining beliefs
towards each type of method of Web advertising.
Table 4 shows the mean values for TV
advertising vis-à-vis each of the three types of
advertising for the eight attributes with tests
for significance differences.

Overall, the television advertisements fare
well in comparison to the Web based advertise-
ments. The results show that Hispanic consum-
ers in this study value television advertising for
information, usefulness, and enjoyment aspects.
The subjects also consider television ads to be
less offensive, less deceptive, less annoying,
and less invasive than the three types of Web
advertising. This bodes well for traditional
television advertising.

Turning to the differences among the three
types of the Web ads, significant differences
(p < .1 or better) were found for five out of
eight constructs.

The television advertisements were consid-
ered to be the least offensive in comparison to
the popup ads (p < .05), the most informative in
comparison to the banner ads (p < .05), the most
defective in comparison to the banner ads (p <
.1), less annoying than the popup ads (p< .05), and more useful than the popup ads p< .1).

These results could be useful to advertisers using one or more of these Web advertising methods to reach Hispanic consumers. Advertisers should be aware of the differences between each of the three Web methods on various important attributes. Additionally, results indicate that television ads are still popular with the Hispanic consumers.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, U. S. Hispanic consumers’ usage of the Web is on the rise and growing at a much faster rate than the U. S. non-Hispanic population. According to Leggatt (2007) the online spending of Hispanics is on the rise. However, usage does not necessarily translate into positive attitudes towards all types of Web advertising. This finding negates a suggestion by Ducoffe (1996) that media context influences the value of advertising. Specifically, the Hispanic consumers in this study favored e-mail advertising and banner advertising over popup advertising.

E-mail advertising was favored because of its attention getting value was perceived to be higher than banner ads and popup ads respectively. The banner ads are believed to be the most enjoyable by the Hispanics in our sample. Given that the banner ads are more prevalent than the email and pop ups there is usually a concern of overexposure leading to a potential backlash. The results of this study suggest that Hispanics continue to favor banner advertising. This is encouraging given that banner advertising is reported to affect purchasing patterns over the Web (Manchanda et al., 2006). The popup ads are considered the least effective of the three advertising methods. Compared to the other two, popup advertisements interrupt browsing activity. It forces the audience to physically as well as cognitively pay attention. While emails and banner ads could be potentially avoided it is not true for pop-ups.

Another important finding was a significant correlation between attitudes and behaviors towards all three types of Web advertising. This provides the nomological validity of the two scales. Finally, Hispanics continue to enjoy advertising on television more than any of the three types of Web advertising. Although the Internet shows great promise in expanding outreach designed to tap the Hispanic market, the results indicate that television advertising still captures the minds and hearts of this segment of the population.

A recent article in the Wall Street Journal (Steel, 2009) reported that Google and ad agency WPP are funding research on how traditional and digital ads work together to influence consumer behavior. This study is a small step in that direction. The study attempts to fill a void in the published literature by examining evaluations of three types of Web advertising by the growing Hispanic segment of the U.S. population (Leggatt, 2007; Michman et al., 2003). The study results are limited to one geographic region and could be expanded to other Hispanic enclaves such as California and/or Texas in future studies to improve the generalized findings to a wider market of the Hispanic population.
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