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Abstract. Marketers decided to pull over $100 million worth of commercials from network, cable, local and syndicated TV outlets on the United States market in the first 48 hours of the 2003 Iraq war. Given this loss to advertisers and media, we looked at how consumers respond to commercials during wartime. Would they change their attitude towards products that are advertised during war coverage? Would they consider advertising during such coverage inappropriate? Consistent with previous mood theory study findings, the results suggest a positive relationship between the mood generated by the interest in the program content and support for advertisements during the program. We also found that factors influencing the mood induced by war coverage were support for the President’s decisions and for the war. These findings open the door to a completely new line of research on attitudes towards media contents. Future research could explore the relationship between political ideology of viewers and their mood when watching sensitive news content.
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1. Introduction

According to Advertising Age (2003a) estimates, $100 million worth of commercials were pulled from network, cable, local and syndicated TV outlets on the United States market in the first 48 hours of the 2003 Iraq war. Other sources estimated the losses even higher, between $150 million and $200 million for the first days of conflict (New York Daily News, 2003). Losses were also predicted for newspapers, magazines and other media. The issue of marketers being reluctant to advertise during war coverage has been studied by corporate researchers (e.g., Association of National Advertisers poll quoted by Advertising Age, 2003b). Given this loss to advertisers and media, it is important to ask how consumers respond to commercials during wartime. Here, we ask how consumers respond to ads when they are most intensely exposed to a war and its impact on their community – during evening television news.
Both advertisers and media outlets had voices on either side of the issue and some of their strategies employed are presented in this paper. However, the ultimate answer to this question lies on the consumers’ side. Would they change their attitude towards products that are advertised during war coverage? Would they consider advertising during such coverage inappropriate? Who are the people who would mind advertisements during war coverage? Who are the ones who would not? These are some of the questions that motivated the authors to start this study when the war with Iraq was becoming a certainty in March 2003. The study focuses on TV advertising because TV outlets reach the largest audience, represent the medium with the highest monetary implications, and also because "television is where the horsepower of advertising is" (Broadcasting & Cable, 2003a).

For the media outlets, the issue of how their viewers – and consequently the advertisers - feel about advertisements during war coverage is the key to their strategy at such a time. By strategy the authors mean the financial and media planning (e.g., giving cash back to advertisers or rescheduling commercials for the second quarter – Advertising Age, 2003c) that they would have to make, taking into account the possibility of lower advertising revenue (TelevisionWeek, 2003).

Fox News’s ad Sales Chief Paul Rittenberg said the network had lost about $4 million in ad sales in the first five days of the Iraq war of 2003 as the channel chose to go largely ad-free (New York Daily News, 2003). A programming day usually earns Fox News between $850,000 and $1.2 million. Fox News aired ads from companies like Pfizer Inc. and Aflac Inc. only “occasionally” over the first weekend of the war (Wall Street Journal, 2003a).

What made planning even harder was that different advertisers were reacting in different ways and even worse, some were undecided about pulling the ads. TelevisionWeek (2003) quoted one top broadcast network executive saying on March 24th, four days after the war began: “Advertisers are all over the place on this. Some don’t want to be pulled at all, and at the other extreme some have told us, ‘Don’t put us back on the air until we call you and tell you it’s OK.’”

We look briefly at the specific processes causing advertisers to pull ads and media outlets to lose advertising money while covering the war and what are some alternative strategies employed.

2. Why do TV outlets lose money while covering a war?

There are two aspects about media outlets losing advertising revenue during war coverage. First, there are various reasons for ads being pulled both on the outlet’s side and on the advertiser’s side. Second, once that revenue is lost, there are reasons why that money is hard to get back even though marketers do not shrink their allocated advertising budgets (Advertising Age, 2003d).
2.1. Why do media outlets decide to pull the ads during war coverage?

One situation in which TV outlets decide not to air the scheduled advertisements is when the initial programming is not respected any more and the war is covered wall-to-wall, meaning 24/7, as seen in the September 11th, 2001 coverage in the U.S. (Broadcasting & Cable, 2003b).

Another situation in which no ads are featured is when the media outlet or the marketer makes it their policy not to air/run ads out of consideration and respect for the population considering the context in which the ads would appear. AOL Time Warner’s CNN has been advertising-free since the start of the bombing in Iraq, wrote AdAge.com on March 24th. According to Brandweek (2003), networks and cable channels like CNN and Fox News were offering wall-to-wall news coverage without commercial breaks.

2.2. Why do advertisers decide to pull the ads during war coverage?

The advertisers’ positions on airing ads were similar. On March 20th, an AT&T spokesperson declared, „We paused all television advertising and our consumer telemarketing activity out of respect for the U.S. military activities in Iraq” (AdAge.com, 2003). Procter & Gamble Co., one of the nation’s largest advertisers, has a policy of not airing commercials during coverage of an international conflict out of respect for consumers (Associated Press, 2003). MasterCard’s initial plan was to stay off the air for at least one week (TelevisionWeek, 2003).

Advertisers are most concerned with the alteration of a brand’s image once the commercial is viewed at what the consumer decides to be an inappropriate time for advertisements and with the impact on sales of this change in brand perception. A good example of a company avoiding association of its image to the war is Reebok, whose advertising director asked that Reebok’s commercials „not to be the first commercials coming out of the war coverage” (The New York Times, 2003).

Consumer surveys and other research methods would tell the marketer whether the brand image is at risk in case the commercials air. However, gathering such information is time consuming and costly. Therefore, some advertisers would decide to stop the campaign as soon as the war starts and cap it until they see what other marketers are doing or until they are able to gather sufficient data in order to make an informed decision about when to resume the campaign. Procter & Gamble Co. said it would not place ads on major broadcast networks during the first 48 hours of the war with Iraq and would avoid buying ads during war news coverage as long as the war lasts (Associated Press, 2003). AT&T pulled its new TV campaign in the first wave of ad changes wrought by the war (AdAge.com, 2003). Brandweek (2003) mentioned AT&T and Procter & Gamble alongside Toyota and Verizon as they were
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pulling their TV ads for at least 48 hours shortly after the war broke out on March 19. The Wall Street Journal (2003a) quoted a media-services executive saying that some clients asked „to go off the air for up to seven days.”

2.3. What are the alternative advertising strategies employed?

Advertisers followed one or both of two alternative strategies: moving the commercials from news to entertainment programs (Broadcasting & Cable, 2003c; B to B, 2003) and altering the ads creatively (Advertising Age, 2003b,e; B to B, 2003) by fitting them for the new context – war coverage.

2.3.1 Moving commercials from news to entertainment programs

Considering the long buildup to war (Brandweek, 2003), advertisers had time to change plans and air commercials during ABC’s 75th Academy Awards showcase and other entertainment programs on ESPN or Lifetime. Advertising Age (2003f) indicated that „less than 24 hours after the war began, NBC decided America would rather watch „Friends” than enemies”, pointing out that advertisers still had high-audience outlets for their ads.

2.3.2 Tailoring ads to the gravity of wartime

March 18’s Wall Street Journal (Marketplace, p.6) mentions a report of a poll conducted by WPP Group’s J. Walter Thompson that showed the possibility of war, together with rising unemployment levels, has caused an increase in anxiety levels. Marketers, therefore, have tailored new ads “to quell consumer’s fears” (Marketing Magazine, 2003) and to avoid appearing tasteless or inappropriate during the war (Advertising Age, 2003e).

Advertising Age (2003b) listed among other „prudent steps” that advertisers should take during war times being „sensitive about the message, tone, imagery and placement” of the ads. Commercials should be combed for „irreverent, edgy, maudlin and comic references.” A consumer survey study cited by TelevisionWeek (2003) suggested that advertisers need to be cautious, especially with humor, because „consumers are sensitive but patriotic.” For example, Cox Communications altered a campaign for cable and high-speed Internet that started March 24, 2003. The campaign originally featured humorous and wacky scenarios (AdAge.com, 2003). Earthlink decided to pull ads for at least seven days at the beginning of the war to have time to regroup as its creative mentioned the Internet service’s „rocket speed” and its ability to „bomb spam” (Brandweek, 2003).
2.4. Why lost ad revenue is hard to regain

Strategies on both TV outlet and advertiser side make lost advertising revenue hard to recover (Wall Street Journal, 2003a).

The media outlet sells advertising spaces in advance (Wall Street Journal, 2003a); already filling up the slots from the regular programming that follows war news. It would be difficult to insert additional commercials.

The advertiser’s strategy is to show the client rating points – which are not as high with half of the campaign period gone and so there is less compelling justification for airing during the remaining time of the initial campaign schedule (e.g. Advertising Age (2003c) quotes Peggy Green, president-national broadcast for Publicis Group’s Zenith Media Services saying that once commercials are not aired „you’ve lost the [gross rating points] weight” and that marketers have to decide whether they want to be „off the air” and risk the fact that they “might not get those GRPs back.”

In a section titled “Communicating During War” the Ketchum agency website featured opinions and advice from the CEO and two top communication professionals about „encouraging clients to develop alternative communications strategies that hedge against the lack of advertising” (Ketchum.com, 2003). These would be alternatives to advertising, like public relations communication campaigns that would change the destination of advertising budgets altogether.

3. What do the consumers think?

There have been some reports out about where the consumers stand on the issue (e.g. MediaWest Worldwide Study cited by TelevisionWeek, 2003, Brandweek, 2003, and Advertising Age, 2003c; WPP Group’s Lightspeed Research quoted by Advertising Age, 2003g). However, the researchers here were interested in examining the demographics of the people who would accept ads during war coverage. Another question posed was whether support for the war was a factor in accepting commercials. Mood theory is listed to relate the viewers’ mood generated by the context – war coverage – with the viewers’ attitude toward advertising in the context.

3.1. Mood Theory

Thinking about consumer response to advertising in the context of their country being at war suggests that mood changes may play an important role. Therefore, we turn next to theory about mood impacts on advertising.

Gardner defines (1985, p.282) moods as a subcategory of feeling states that are subjectively perceived by people. According to Clore and Martin (2001), mood theories are grounded in earlier research that focused on feelings and the effects of
feelings on thoughts and behavior (e.g., Gouaux, 1971; Griffit and Veitch, 1971; Clore and Byrne, 1974). Mood theories began to attract significant attention when research explaining both mood-dependent recall and, more importantly, mood-congruent evaluation – in terms of mood-congruent memory surfaced in 1978 (Bower et al., 1978; Isen et al., 1978). The phenomenon Bower (1981, 1983) called „mood-congruent processing” was operationalized as a situation where a person’s mood sensitizes the person to take in primarily information that agrees with that mood. Material that is congruent with the mood becomes salient so that the person attends to it more deeply than to other material. The person thinks about that material more deeply and associates it more extensively with other information. The result is that the person learns this material better than non-mood-congruent material. Thus, when happy, people will attend and respond more to pleasant than unpleasant stimuli and learn more about them; when sad, they will attend and respond more to unpleasant stimuli and learn more about them.

Interest in the effects that moods have on consumers has been substantial after Isen and Bower’s studies (e.g., Gardner, 1985; Batra and Ray, 1986; Edell and Burke, 1987; Worth and Mackie, 1987; Gardner and Hill, 1989; Mackie and Worth, 1991). Relevant to this paper are studies that have looked at the effects that program-induced mood has on advertising evaluations (e.g., Isen and Shalker, 1982; Goldberg and Gorn, 1987; MacKenzie and Lutz, 1989; Bless et al., 1990; Schumann and Thorson, 1990; Kamins, Marks, and Skinner, 1991; Lord and Burnkrant, 1993; Aylesworth and MacKenzie, 1998; Coulter, 1998; Gupta et al., 2001; Janssens and De Pelsmacker, 2005).

First, there are studies that support the positive relationship between attention to a program and attention to following commercials (Thorson et al., 1988; Krugman et al., 1995). Second, what researchers found (Goldberg and Gorn, 1987; MacKenzie and Lutz, 1989) was that program-induced positive or negative mood can be transferred to the attitude toward the ad. Some researchers (Batra and Stayman, 1990; Bless et al., 1990; Mackie and Worth, 1989; Gardner and Hill, 1988) concluded that positive mood generated a lower number of cognitions – therefore processing through the peripheral route, while negative mood generated the opposite – a greater number of cognitions or central-route processing (Petty and Cacioppo, 1981). Those in positive moods are more likely to be influenced by heuristic cues and experience reduced levels of systematic processing, while those in negative moods tend to more carefully examine the arguments in a message (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993). There are also explanations that link these effects to the impact of moods on the motivation and probably resources to process information (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993). Not all researchers agreed on these findings, some (Mathur and Chattopadhyay, 1991; Mano, 1990, 1992) stating that negative mood could sometimes generate either peripheral route processing or positive evaluations.

What all researchers agreed on was congruent judgment or the mood congruency model (Bower, 1981, 1983; Isen et al., 1978). Some researchers (Cialdini
et al., 1973; Cialdini et al., 1987) also looked at the consistency effect or the negative-state relief model (Kamins et al., 1991). According to this latter model, "an advertisement which is consistent with a negative mood may be perceived as positive and effective because it elicits a pro-social empathic response" (Kamins, 1991, p. 4).

For the purposes of this study, it is important to stress the finding that program-induced mood has an effect on how advertisements are evaluated (Kamins et al., 1991; Aylesworth and MacKenzie, 1998; Coulter, 1998). Shapiro, MacInnis and Park (2002) dissociated the valence (positive versus negative) from the arousal (moderate versus high) that the program content generated in the viewer as predictors of the level and nature of ad processing. Their results indicated that the arousal and valence dimensions of mood differentially affect ad processing, with arousal affecting the level of processing and valence influencing the nature of processing. The findings about valence are consistent with previous results; positive valence was associated with the greater use of schematic processing, whereas negative valence was associated with the greater use of data-driven processing. The more interesting finding was that the processing level was more "shallow" when the arousal level was high rather than moderate.

Some other mood-related findings are important as well, like involvement with the program as an additional contributing factor to the evaluation (Murry, Lastovicka, and Singh, 1992) and that there is a distinction to be made between overall liking of a program and liking of the content of the program (Schumann, 1986; Coulter, 1998).

The effect of involvement with the program on attitude towards ads is important because in this study we are looking at news that involves the viewer both at a cognitive level (how will the war play out?) and emotionally (when dramatic war scenes are showed).

The distinction between liking of the program and liking of the content is important because someone might watch various news programs often but may not watch war news as often. De Pelsmacker, Geuens and Alckaert (2002) studied the impact of context appreciation on the attitude toward the ad and recall. Ads shown in a highly appreciated television or print context resulted in a more positive attitude toward the ad. As opposed to a print environment, in a television context, ad content and brand recall were positively influenced by a positively appreciated context. Also, in a television environment, the evaluation of a program has a significantly positive impact on the evaluation of the immediately following ad pod (Park and Yun, 2003). However, Janssens and De Pelsmacker (2005) found that positive emotional contexts generate positive responses only for the well-known brands rather than for new brands.

Whether for new or existing brands, the authors did not find previous studies that looked at the effect of war-coverage-induced mood on thoughts about advertising. Moreover, the authors did not find previous studies that looked at demographics – such as political orientation or education – in relation to the evaluation of advertising featured during coverage of a sensitive topic like a war. Hypotheses are drawn on the
earlier mood-congruency theory and on the newer findings (Coulter, 1998; Shapiro et al., 2002; De Pelsmacker et al., 2002) that attitude toward the program content has an impact on the attitude toward the ad.

Hypothesis 1: The more interested in the war the viewers are, the more positive the mood they will be in, and consequently the more supportive they will be of commercials being aired during war coverage.

Hypothesis 2: The more supportive of the war the viewers are, the more positive the mood they will be in, and consequently the more supportive they will be of commercials being aired during war coverage.

Hypothesis 3: The more supportive of President Bush’s war decisions the viewers are, the more positive the mood they will be in, and consequently the more supportive they will be of commercials being aired during war coverage.

4. Methodology

An online survey of American adult news viewers was fielded by a known media research company six days after the war began, between March 25 and March 27, 2003. Eight television stations participated in the study (all in distinct markets across the United States). Viewers of those stations who had signed up for e-mail alerts (e.g., for either news or weather updates) were contacted via e-mail and invited to participate by clicking on a link embedded in the e-mail. This link took them to the web site of the company hosting the survey. In addition to having signed up for e-mail alerts from the television station, viewers had to be 25 or older and had to watch early- or late-evening newscasts at least once in a typical week. No incentives were given for participation. Overall there were 2,034 completed questionnaires. In terms of response rate, 55,000 emails were sent meaning the response rate was 4%; quite good considering the equivalent straight-up response rate for computer-assisted telephone research is 1% for all dials made. In this study, about 30% of the e-mails were undeliverable. Therefore, the actual number of e-mail invitations sent out was 38,500, giving us an actual response rate of 5.3%.

This was an exploratory study, a first attempt to survey audience’s opinions on war and advertising. The respondents do not constitute a statistically drawn sample of the US population. Still, even though not generalizable, the findings provide significant suggestions and are important considering the increasing uncertainty of today’s environment and the decisions that both marketers and media professionals need to take about advertising during sensitive news.

The 2034 respondents answered a set of questions about their levels of agreement/disagreement with various statements about advertising being present during the news, about their feelings towards the war and President Bush, and about their demographic characteristics.
4.1. Dependent Variables

The first dependent variable was mood. It was measured by asking respondents whether they felt more optimistic or more pessimistic about the future after watching the war coverage.

The second dependent variable was named support for advertising. This variable was obtained by factor analyzing the responses to questions about different reactions to the general idea of commercials being aired during war news. We asked whether viewers would: (1) still buy a national or local advertisers’ products, (2) be bothered by seeing commercials on news and information programs, (3) look favorably on a company that showed its support for the armed forces in an ad or commercial, (4) think the companies that sponsor news programs are performing a public service by keeping the public informed, (5) specifically avoid buying the advertised products, (6) think commercials are a normal part of TV so one should expect to see them whenever one watches television or (7) think companies should steer clear of politics in the ads. The Likert scale items for items (2), (5), and (7) were flipped to reflect support for and not opposition to advertising during war news. Cronbach’s alpha for the factor support for advertising was .76.

4.2. Independent Variables

There were two sets of IVs. First, there were the predictors in the three hypotheses. It was hypothesized that interest in the war, support for the war, and support for President Bush’s war decisions have an impact on the mood generated by TV war news and, consequently, on the level of support for commercials being aired during such news. Second, there were the demographics explored for their influence on either dependent variable in the research questions.

So, the hypotheses asked whether interest in the war, support for war, and support for President Bush’s war decisions had an influence on mood and, consequently, on support for advertising. Interest in the war and support for President Bush’s war decisions were measured through five-item Likert scales. The first question asked about the actual level of interest in the war. The second asked how much the viewer approved of the way President Bush was handling the war. Support for the war was measured through a dichotomous question that asked whether the viewer wanted the war to either continue or stop.

The demographics included in the analysis were age, political orientation, education, and income. All four were categorical variables. Political orientation was recoded into a dichotomous variable, with the value -1 for Republican and 1 for Democrat, while responses that were not in these two categories (i.e., independent, don’t know) were excluded.
5. Findings

In terms of demographics, participants in this study had a mean age group of 45 to 54, with a female majority (63.9%). Most often indicated education levels were: university graduate (29%) and high-school graduate (24.2%). Most often indicated income levels were: from $25,000 to $49,000 (24.3%) and from $50,000 to $74,000 (22.7%).

First, through regression analysis, we identified the demographics that were significantly related to either mood or support for advertising. Mood appeared to be significantly related to political orientation and education ($R^2=.082$), while support for advertising appeared to be significantly related to political orientation and age ($R^2=.032$, see regression tables in Appendix 1). The significant IVs were entered in the first block of all future hierarchical regressions that were computed on either DV, in order to distinctly measure the relations to additional predictor variables.

Second, through hierarchical regression, the relationship between interest in the war, support for the war, and support for President Bush’s decisions and the mood generated by watching war news was examined. The IVs under study were included in the second block of the hierarchical regression, while the demographics we were controlling for were included in the first block. The new variables included in the second block appeared to be significantly related to mood, also significantly ($F(3,706)=70.675$, $p=.000$) improving $R^2$ from .08 to .29 (see regression coefficients in Appendix 2). Thus, we demonstrated this far that interest in the war is significantly related to mood.

Third, the relationship between mood and support for advertising during war news was examined. Another hierarchical regression, this time having political orientation and age in the first block and mood in the second, determined whether the mood induced by the war coverage was significantly related to support for commercials during war news. Adding the mood variable increased $R^2$ from .026 to .030 ($F(1,708=3.53$, $p=.06)$. So, the mood generated by the war coverage appeared related to the support for advertising during the coverage.

Next, we used the structural equation modeling program AMOS to test the goodness-of-fit of the proposed model. The demographic variables that were found in the previous steps of the analysis to be significantly related to the dependent variables in the model were added before fitting the model. The goodness of the path model’s fit to the data was judged by several criteria: (a) a chi-square test divided by the degrees of freedom of 2 or less; (b) a GFI (goodness of fit) index of .85 or greater; (c) an AGFI (adjusted goodness of fit) of .90 or greater; (d) a CFI (comparative fit index) of .90 or greater, as close to 1 as possible (Bentler 1990), and (e) a RMSEA (root mean square error of approximation) less than or equal to .05 for a close fit (Browne and Cudeck 1993). The significance of the chi square test ($p=.02$) was not a criterion considering the large sample size. Our resulting model (see Appendix 3) fits the data well.
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(χ²=23.98; df=12; GFI=.992; AGFI=.976; CFI=.987; RMSEA=.037). The model suggests that the three independent variables: interest in the war, support for the war, and support for the President’s war decisions had an influence on the mood induced by the war coverage. In addition, the mood generated by watching war news had an influence on the support given to advertising during war coverage besides the influence of demographic factors such as age or political orientation.

6. Discussion

The current study was conducted in order to learn more about how people react to advertising during war news. The findings provide good insight and a starting point to answering the posed question. These findings can be used by both researchers when conducting future research on the topic (we recommend a replication in a controlled environment) and by marketing and media professionals when taking decisions about airing advertisements during sensitive news.

Consistent with previous mood theory study findings (Shapiro et al. 2002; De Pelsmacker et al. 2002), the results suggest a positive relationship between the mood generated by the interest in the program content and support for advertisements during the program. The novel addition is that, for the studied sample, the finding applies for a program that contains war news. It is of great importance to both advertisers and media organizations to know that previous findings confirming the relationship between mood generated by the program and support for the advertisements aired during the same program hold in case the program is war coverage. It is equally important to know that factors influencing the mood induced by war coverage were support for the President’s decisions and for the war. These findings open the door to a completely new line of research on attitudes towards media contents. Future research could explore the relationship between political ideology of viewers and their mood when watching sensitive news content.

For advertisers, knowing that viewers consider advertising appropriate as long as they are interested in and support the program content, is valuable knowledge aiding in taking decisions related to ad placement.

By April 2 media outlets were starting to devote resources to other issues, such as the SARS virus and the affirmative action case in front of the Supreme Court and both CNN and Fox News were airing about 50 percent of the commercials they would normally run (Wall Street Journal, 2003b). Most of the loss occurred during the first three days of war (Mediaweek, 2003). So, even though TV stations were exhibiting some battle scars from the Iraq war’s disruption of advertising, the damage was not as severe as some had feared” (Broadcasting & Cable, 2003d). As an executive declared to Advertising Age (2003i) „The Iraq war inspired a ‘life goes on’ mentality among advertisers and audiences… Advertising in uncertain times is the new norm.” Knowing that a large percent of the viewers were interested in the war and that such
interest was generating a positive mood leading to a supportive attitude towards advertising during war coverage would have helped both advertisers and media outlets avoid the losses incurred during the first days of war.

7. Limitations

Unlike authors of previous studies employing mood theory, the researchers did not conduct an experiment. Still, they believe the losses incurred from a less controlled environment were balanced by the gains from the more realistic setting. People’s attitudes and opinions were captioned in their natural setting and, very important, at the right time for this study. Attempting to organize an experiment would have been more time consuming and the data would have been collected post-factum rather than at the time people were watching the war coverage. The electronic gathering of data was the optimum combination of timeliness and response rate.

Another limitation, as mentioned before, was the convenience sample. Nevertheless, the study provides meaningful insight of the problem under study and helps answer the questions posed when the research was started.
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Appendix 1

Regression tables for the relationship between demographics and the DVs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicting Mood</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-7.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predicting Support for Advertising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-2.87</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 2

Regression Tables for the Relationship between Support Variables and Mood and between Mood and Support for Advertising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicting Mood</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in the war</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Bush</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for the war</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicting Support for Advertising</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-3.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-2.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Model

Interest in the war
Support for the war
Support for President Bush

Mood generated by the war coverage
Education
Political Orientation
Age

Support for advertising during war

Coefficients:
- 0.36
- 0.14
- 0.19
- 0.07
- 0.04
- 0.12
- 0.11