CHAPTER 5

CONSUMER PERCEPTIONS: CEFS AND RELATED DISCOURSE

5.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the second part of the results and discussion and encompasses the quantitative phase of the study, which concentrates on addressing the fourth, fifth and sixth research questions as reiterated below:

4. What are consumers' perceptions about CEFs?
5. What are promotional advertisers' views about CEFs both as consumers and as producers of the discourse?
6. How can insights gained from the survey as well as the qualitative data analysis inform consumer interests?

These questions will be addressed in four consecutive sections, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4. Data for the first three sections 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 were derived from the survey questions performed on two groups of respondents. The first group comprise those whose occupations were related to the production of promotional advertisements (henceforth insiders). The second group are those whose occupations were not related to the promotional advertising fields (henceforth outsiders). Section 5.1 pertains to participants' perceived value of consumer contests. Results here were garnered from six survey questions (App. XX) from questions 4 to 8 and 17. Section 5.2 is about participants' views surrounding CEFs. Results here were interpreted from seven survey questions 9, 10, 13, 18 to 20 and, 23. Section 5.3 examines participants' acuity surrounding the influence of contest prizes on purchasing decisions. Results here were interpreted from seven survey questions 11, 12, 14 to

16, 21 and 22. The final section 5.4 corresponds with the sixth research question and presents the summary of findings for opportunities to consider insights from the survey and qualitative data that could help inform consumer interests.

5.1 Perceived value of consumer contests

Results for this section were derived from a set of attitude statements rated on a scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Table 5.1 presents the summary of responses from both groups for each corresponding item from Q4 to Q8 and Q17, who expressed their commitment on either the positive (points 4-6) or negative (points 1-3) end of the scale. As shown, each item precedes the ordinal data results for both groups of participants. Tables 5.2 and 5.3 follow to present results of further analysis on the two groups of respondents for the respective items. These responses were ordered in descending order to highlight the respondents' priorities. Table 5.4 is the final table in this section. It presents summary responses calculated via SPSS for significance of results for subsamples by standard deviation to give more information about the spread of means obtained from each variable (item). Parametric one-sample t-test to demonstrate the statistical differences in means for the two groups of participants, as well as significant p-values to present statistical significance of results at the critical value of 0.05 were also presented.

As reflected in Table 5.1 on the next page, overall responses showed a high degree of consistency across the items. Over half of the insiders and outsiders alike (Insiders 58.3%, Outsiders 57.6%) disagreed that contests could influence their purchasing decisions, or that they would spend more to participate in contests. At the same time, the majority of subsamples from both groups agreed (Insiders 81.7%, Outsiders

78%) that their chances of winning prizes in contests were as good as others who had won. Hence, if an opportunity arose in the future, they would participate in contests. However, over half of subsamples from both groups (Insiders 66.7%, Outsiders 71.2%) went on to agree that contests were a waste of time and so they would not be disappointed in the event they did not win anything in a contest they joined.

Table 5.1 **Insiders' and outsiders' views on consumer contests: Summary responses by subsamples (N = 119: 60 insiders, 59 outsiders)**

Item descriptor/ subsamples	Disagree (n) / (%)	Agree (n) / (%)
Q4. Contests influence my decision on what and when to buy		
Insiders	35 (58.3)	25 (41.7)
Outsiders	34 (57.6)	25 (42.4)
Q5. I don't mind spending more to participate in contests		
Insiders	35 (58.3)	25 (41.7)
Outsiders	34 (57.6)	25 (42.4)
Q6. If people have won prizes in contests, so can I		
Insiders	11 (18.3)	49 (81.7)
Outsiders	13 (22)	46 (78)
Q7. In future, I will participate in contests		
Insiders	11 (18.3)	49 (81.7)
Outsiders	13 (22)	46 (78)
Q8. I think contests are a waste of time		
Insiders	20 (33.3)	40 (66.7)
Outsiders	17 (28.8)	42 (71.2)
Q17. I won't feel disappointed if I don't win anything in a contest I joined		
Insiders	20 (33.3)	40 (66.7)
Outsiders	16 (27.1)	43 (72.9)

Key for ratings: 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3= somewhat disagree; 4= somewhat agree; 5= agree; and, 6= strongly agree.

Further analyses were performed to seek more patterns of perceptual orientations in the two samples of respondents. These results by mean rating for the respective items are presented in Tables 5.2 and 5.3. Table 5.2 ranks insider subsample perceptions while Table 5.3 ranks outsider subsample perceptions. The responses were organised in descending order from highest to lowest to indicate items with higher ratings that figure more prominently in each data set. This order also allows

the researcher to describe, interpret and explain the results in a way that may be more salient to respondents' worldviews. Corresponding tests for normality of distribution (Chambers, 1983) were also performed. These are presented in Figures 5.1 to 5.6 (App. XXIII). Results from these tests assessed that the range of scores for the data set was approximately normally distributed and may be regarded as exemplary of the population where it was taken.

Table 5.2 **Insiders' views on consumer contests: Mean ratings (N = 60)**

Item descriptor	Median	Mean	Std. Dev
Q17. I won't feel disappointed if I don't win…	5.0000	4.2167	1.6983
Q6. If people have won… so can I	4.0000	3.7667	.81025
Q8. I think contests are a waste of time	4.0000	3.6500	1.5163
Q7. In future, I will participate in contests	4.0000	3.5333	1.2684
Q4. Contests influence my decision… to buy	2.0000	3.0667	1.3761
Q5. I don't mind spending more…	2.0000	2.9333	1.6658

Key for ratings: 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3= somewhat disagree; 4= somewhat agree; 5= agree; and, 6= strongly agree.

Table 5.3 **Outsiders' views on consumer contests: Mean ratings (N = 59)**

Item descriptor	Median	Mean	Std. Dev
Q17. I won't feel disappointed if I don't win…	5.0000	4.1356	1.6862
Q6. If people have won… so can I	4.0000	3.8814	.7675
Q7. In future, I will participate in contests	4.0000	3.6441	1.2561
Q8. I think contests are a waste of time	4.0000	3.2542	1.6038
Q4. Contests influence my decision… to buy	2.0000	3.1186	1.4865
Q5. I don't mind spending more…	2.0000	2.9661	1.6812

Key for ratings: 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3= somewhat disagree; 4= somewhat agree; 5= agree; and, 6= strongly agree.

As shown in Tables 5.2 and 5.3, overall rankings exhibit a positive orientation towards contests in both groups. Consistent with previous results in Table 5.1 both groups exhibited high levels of agreement with the statement in item Q17 "I won't feel disappointed if I don't win anything by the end of a contest I participated in." Additionally, results indicate that insiders were more apt to accept possibilities of

losing out than consumers who comprised the outsider subsample (Insiders 4.2167, Outsiders 4.1356). Item Q6 elicited the next highest ratings in the set from the subsamples. While both groups tend to agree, "If people have won prizes in contests, so can I" results showed that insiders were less certain of mirroring the success of previous contest winners (Insiders 3.7667, Outsiders 3.8814). Subsamples' responses to items Q7 and Q8 showed a difference in the hierarchy of ratings. While insider responses to item Q8 "I think contests are a waste of time" emerged more prominently as the third highest ratings in the data set of 6 items, outsider responses to the same item surfaced at the fourth position (Insiders 3.6500, Outsiders 3.2542). Concurrently, insiders' responses to item Q7 "In future I will participate in contests" figured at the fourth position while outsiders' ratings for the same item surfaced in the third position (Insiders 3.5333, Outsiders 3.6441).

These hierarchical differences in position and ratings show that insiders are generally more supportive of contests but at the same time, were less likely to participate in future contests compared with the outsiders. Both subsamples' responses to item Q4 "Contests influence my decisions on what and when to buy" emerged with the second lowest ratings in the data set. Although respondents in both groups tend to disagree that consumer contests can influence their purchasing decisions (Insiders 3.0667, Outsiders 3.1186), results reflect that the insiders seemed to be more certain of their ability to control their purchasing habits. The final item Q5 "I don't mind spending more to participate in contests" elicited the lowest ratings in this data set. Here, while both groups disapproved of spending more money to join contests, (Insiders 2.9333, Outsiders 2.9661) insiders showed a higher level of disagreement.

In all, results from this data set demonstrated that although the initial variance in perceptions reflected in Table 5.1 seemed small, results by mean ratings underlined the notion that insiders' occupational roles in "producing and encoding beliefs and points of views" (McCarthy & Carter, 1994, p. 155) do impact their responses. Although the insiders seemed to be more supportive of consumer contests in their higher levels of disagreement with the statement that contests are a waste of time, their responses in ensuing items also showed that the insiders were less inclined to spend more money to participate in future contests. A possible explanation for these responses may be associated with insiders' occupations. Their jobs and livelihood do depend partly on producing consumer contest campaigns. At the same time, what the insiders know, or think they know of the texts encoded within these campaigns could reduce their expectations of winning or believing that their purchasing decisions may be influenced by words they come across perhaps on a daily basis.

To provide further verifications for these observations, additional analysis on the respective items by standard deviation, t-test, and significant p-values at the critical value of 0.05 were performed. Table 5.4 on the following page presents the perceived value of contests presented as consumer ratings by respondent subsamples. A t-test was run to see if there were significant differences in the perceived value of contests between insiders and outsiders. The data show that there are no significant differences in the perceived values for items Q4, Q5, Q6, Q7 and Q17 ($p > 0.05$). This means that the insiders and outsiders share similar perceptions for these items. As explained in the preceding chapter, these results draw attention to the notion that despite insiders' occupational insights, as consumers, they may share similar "ideological constructions and interpretations" (Fairclough, 1998, p. 107).

Table 5.4 **Perceived value of contests presented as consumer ratings by respondent subsamples: N=119 (60 Insiders; 59 Outsiders)**

Item descriptor	Subsamples	Mean	Std. Dev.	t.	Sig. p
Q4. Contests influence my decisions on what and when to buy	Insiders	3.1360	1.5476	.169	.308
	Outsiders	3.1864	1.5253		
Q5. I don't mind spending more to participate in contests	Insiders	2.8983	1.7089	.152	.275
	Outsiders	2.9492	1.6960		
Q6. If people have won prizes in contests, so can I	Insiders	3.8644	.7758	.116	.671
	Outsiders	3.8814	.7675		
Q7. In future, I will participate in contests	Insiders	3.5932	1.3014	.193	.058
	Outsiders	3.6441	1.2561		
Q8. I think contests are a waste of time	Insiders	3.1667	1.6381	.101	.047
	Outsiders	3.7288	1.3998		
Q17. I won't feel disappointed if I don't win anything…	Insiders	4.2203	1.6924	-.311	.057
	Outsiders	4.1356	1.7266		

Key for ratings: 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3= somewhat disagree; 4= somewhat agree; 5= agree; and, 6= strongly agree.

That said, results for item Q8 "I think contests are a waste of time" do indicate a higher level of awareness or appreciation amongst insiders about the power of words and images to sway purchasing decisions ($p < 0.05$). In any event, considering that the bulk of commonsense assumptions within the promotions and advertising practices have taken years to articulate, it is perhaps not surprising to see that consumers generally accept the familiarity of participation in contests commonsense.

5. 2 Views and preferences surrounding CEFs

Having considered subsamples' perceptions about consumer contests in the previous section, this section is focussed on subsamples' views and preferences that relate to CEFs. Results here were garnered from seven survey questions. The first six items Q9, Q10, Q13, and Q18 to Q20 were based on the 6-point Likert scale attitude statements from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Table 5.5 presents the summary of subsamples' responses for these ordinal data items. Corresponding tests for normality of distribution were also performed on these items and presented in

Figures 5.7 to 5.12 (App. XXII). Results from these tests demonstrate that the range of scores in the data set follow a normal distribution.

Table 5.5 **Insider' and outsiders' perceptions on CEFs: Summary responses of 6 items by respondent subsamples (N = 119: 60 Insiders, 59 Outsiders)**

Item descriptor/ subsamples	Disagree (1-3) / (%)	Agree (4-6) / (%)
Q9. I prefer contest entry forms that are printed in English		
Insiders	16 (26.7%)	44 (73.3%)
Outsiders	17 (28.8%)	42 (71.2%)
Q10. The size and shape of a contest entry form do not matter		
Insiders	29 (48.3%)	34 (56.7%)
Outsiders	23 (39%)	36 (61%)
Q13. I prefer contests with a longer period than those that are ending soon		
Insiders	26 (43.3)	34 (56.7)
Outsiders	25 (42.4)	34 (57.6)
Q18. I prefer contests where I don't have to write slogans, draw, guess or count		
Insiders	31 (51.7)	29 (48.3)
Outsiders	27 (45.8)	32 (57.6)
Q19. I prefer contests that are printed in colour instead of black and white		
Insiders	25 (42.4)	34 (57.6)
Outsiders	9 (15.3)	50 (84.7)
Q20. I always read the rules and regulations of a contest I intend to join		
Insiders	25 (41.7)	35 (58.3)
Outsiders	24 (40.7)	35 (59.3)

Key for ratings: 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3= somewhat disagree; 4= somewhat agree; 5= agree; and, 6= strongly agree.

Overall results in Table 5.5 show relatively uniformed levels of perceptions for some items. Over 70% of respondents (Insiders 73.3%, Outsiders 71.2%) agreed that they preferred English CEFs. The majority (Insiders 56.7%, Outsiders 61%) showed impassiveness towards the size and shape of a CEF. Most (Insiders 56.7%, Outsiders 57.6%) preferred a longer period left to participate and largely agreed (Insiders 58.3%, Outsiders 59.3%) that they read the R&R of a contest they intended to join. However, some of these responses appear to contradict verbatim comments in chapter 4 where there were complaints about lack of space to fill in particulars (p. 192), recommendations for a shorter waiting period (p. 192) and grouses about R&R being hard to understand (p. 188).

While these opposing perspectives may be ascribable to spontaneous views of a minority in the subsamples, other items within this data set showed a contention in terms of subsamples' perceptions. More specifically, while a majority of insiders (51.7%) disagree, a majority of outsiders (57.6%) showed approval for contests without a skill criteria component. This discrete inconsistency seems to indicate a higher level of awareness amongst insiders regarding the legal mandate to employ a skill criteria component in CEFs. Tables 5.6 and 5.7 present results of further analysis by mean ratings to help elucidate these initial findings and uncover more patterns of perceptual orientations within the groups of respondents. Subsamples' perceptions were organised in descending order from highest to lowest scores to indicate items with higher ratings that figure more prominently in the data set.

Table 5.6 **Insiders' views on CEFs: Mean ratings (N = 60)**

Item descriptor	Median	Mean	Std. Dev
Q19. I prefer contests… printed in colour…	4.0000	4.4333	1.4423
Q20. I always read the R&R… I intend to join	6.0000	4.3000	1.5216
Q9. I prefer CEFs that are printed in English	4.0000	4.1000	1.3740
Q13. I prefer contests with a longer period…	4.0000	3.8833	1.5080
Q10. The size and shape of a CEF do not matter	4.0000	3.7333	1.4828
Q18. …don't have to write slogans, draw…	6.0000	3.6500	2.0238

Key for ratings: 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3= somewhat disagree; 4= somewhat agree; 5= agree; and, 6= strongly agree.

Table 5.7 **Outsiders' views on CEFs: Mean ratings (N = 59)**

Item descriptor	Median	Mean	Std. Dev
Q19. I prefer contests… printed in colour…	5.0000	4.5576	1.4645
Q20. I always read the R&R… I intend to join	4.0000	4.1017	1.4347
Q9. I prefer CEFs that are printed in English	4.0000	3.9831	1.5255
Q18. …don't have to write slogans, draw…	3.0000	3.6949	2.0782
Q13. I prefer contests with a longer period…	4.0000	3.5424	1.5122
Q10. The size and shape of a CEF do not matter	3.0000	3.2542	1.5153

Key for ratings: 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3= somewhat disagree; 4= somewhat agree; 5= agree; and, 6= strongly agree.

Compatible with the initial results from Table 5.5, the subsamples showed a high level of agreement with the statement in item Q19 "I prefer contest entry forms that are printed in colour instead of just black and white (Insiders 4.4333; Outsiders 4.5576). This result also corroborates with that of the qualitative phase in chapter 4, which posited that the use of colour not only lends appeal but also "truth value" (Kress & van Leeuwen, 1990, p. 159) or credibility to the messages within CEFs.

At the same time, insiders showed more disagreement indicating a higher level of awareness surrounding the use of colours in processes of appropriation (Fairclough, 2000) to manipulate how texts are received and accepted by readers. Results for items Q20 and Q9 elicited the second and third highest ratings respectively in the data set. While the majority in both groups expressed agreement with the statement in item Q20 "I always read the rules and regulations of a contest I intend to join" (Insiders 4.3000, Outsiders 4.1017), the insiders seemed to be show more honesty with a lower level of agreement compared with outsiders. Likewise, insiders showed a lower level of agreement for the statement in item Q9 "I prefer contest entry forms that are printed in English" (Insiders 4.1000, Outsiders 3.9831).

Considering that part of their jobs may entail producing CEFs, insiders lower level of agreement may be attributed to knowledge that the use of more languages may also translate to reaching more consumers who may be more fluent in other languages used such as Bahasa Malaysia or Chinese.

The three ensuing items in the data set showed variances in the overall hierarchy of ratings between the subsamples. Responses to item Q13 "I prefer to join contests that

have a longer period left than those that are going to end soon" featured fourth in the insiders list but emerged in the fifth position in the outsiders' list (Insiders 3.8833, Outsiders 3.5424). This shows a higher level of disagreement amongst the insiders for contests with longer periods. A possible reason may be derived from the verbatim responses that associated longer contest periods with a longer waiting period before receiving results of participation. Another less explicit reason may conceivably be related to a longer working time frame on a campaign they may be involved in organising for their clients.

The second lowest rating on the insiders' list, item Q10 "The size and shape of a contest entry form does not matter" emerged at the last position and lowest ratings on the outsiders' list (Insiders 3.7333, Outsiders 3.2542). The differences in hierarchy and ratings suggest higher levels of disagreement amongst insiders with the statement. This supports previous findings that the insiders are more sensitive the impact of visual representations in CEFs.

At the same time, results with the lowest ratings for the final item Q18 "I prefer contests where I don't have to write slogans, draw, guess or count" on the insiders' list appeared on the fourth position in the outsiders' list (Insiders 3.6500, Outsider 3.6949) show a higher level of disagreement amongst the insiders with the statement. This seems to correspond with findings from the previous chapter 4 as well as from Table 5.5, which indicated that insiders were more aware of the legal requirement to include a genuine test of skill in CEFs. Table 5.8 is presented in the next page to augment results that concern subsamples perceptions about CEFs.

Table 5.8 **Perceptions surrounding CEFs by respondent subsamples: N=119 (60 Insiders; 59 Outsiders)**

Item descriptor	Subsamples	Mean	Std. Dev.	t.	Sig. p
Q9. I prefer CEFs that are printed in English	Insiders	4.1333	1.2949	.126	.506
	Outsiders	4.0000	1.5312		
Q10. The size and shape of a CEF does not matter	Insiders	3.8167	1.4437	-.205	.000
	Outsiders	3.2203	1.5432		
Q13. I prefer to join contests that have a longer period left than… to end soon	Insiders	3.8167	1.4437	.071	.018
	Outsiders	3.4915	1.5466		
Q18. I prefer contests where I don't have to write slogans, draw, guess or count	Insiders	3.9167	2.0193	-.238	.252
	Outsiders	3.6271	2.1000		
Q19. I prefer CEFs that are printed in colour instead of just B&W	Insiders	4.6167	1.4739	.428	.388
	Outsiders	4.3898	1.3773		
Q20. I always read the R&R of a contest I intend to join	Insiders	4.3500	1.4937	.059	.227
	Outsiders	4.0847	1.4418		

Key for ratings: 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3= somewhat disagree; 4= somewhat agree; 5= agree; and, 6= strongly agree.

In the same manner as Table 5.4, a t-test was run to see if there were significant differences in the perceptions surrounding CEFs. The data showed no difference in perceptions for the tested items Q9, Q18, Q19 and Q20. Concurrently, two items in this data set showed differences in subsamples' perceptions. Items Q10 "The size and shape of a CEF does not matter" and Q13 "I prefer to join contests that have a longer waiting period left than those that are going to end soon" showed that the subsamples held differing views ($P<0.05$).

Result for item Q10 substantiates previous findings that occupational insights can contribute to a higher level of appreciation for the impact that visual devices in CEFs can have on our purchasing behaviours amongst the insiders. At the same time, the difference in perceptions for item Q13 seems to emphasize that compared to insiders, few outsiders are aware that although a longer contest period may be interpreted

according to the text producers' goals to mean more time to send in more entries for more winning opportunities. As detailed in the qualitative phase of the study, it can also be translated to a prolonged period to increase product sales as well as a longer waiting period for participants to receive the results of their participation in the consumer contest.

In addition, the relatively homogenous levels of perceptions for the balance of items in this data set could indicate a more urban preference for the use of English (Q9) but less awareness about the legal mandate to include a genuine test of skill in CEFs (Q18), and the importance of the R&R component (Q20). A shared preference for the use of colour in CEFs (Q19) by the subsamples further demonstrates the impact of the promotional and advertising industry's norm to employ colours to "influence the ways in which we accept or reject certain representations as reality or non-reality" (Scollon & Scollon, 2003, p. 91). Summary responses from the subsamples for the final item Q23 in this data set are presented in Tables 5.9 and 5.10. Consistent with the previous corresponding tables, results are organised in descending order, from most preferred (1), second most preferred (2) and so on. This item requested participants to "Please write your top 5 criteria preference in a contest" from 13 choices derived from the corpus.

Table 5.9 **Insiders' top 5 preferred contest mechanics: Summary responses on item Q23 by respondent subsamples (N = 60)**

Item descriptor	**N (%)**
1. Question & Answer (Q&A)	48 (80%)
2. Guess & Win	47 (78.3%)
3. Rank & Win	45 (75%)
4. Count & Win	36 (60%)
5. Creative Drawing / Creative Signature	35 (58.3%)

Table 5.10 **Outsiders' top 5 preferred contest mechanics: Summary responses on item Q23 by respondent subsamples (N = 59)**

Item descriptor	**N (%)**
1. Count & Win / Question & Answer (Q&A)	46 (78%)
2. Guess & Win	42 (71.2%)
3. Other/s	37 (62.7%)
4. Rank & Win	31 (52.5%)
5. X number	20 (34%)

Although the subsamples' top preferences for consumer contest mechanics appeared to be quite consistent at first where both groups indicated "Q&A" (Insiders 80%, Outsiders 78%) as their top preference followed with "Guess & Win" (Insiders 78.3%, Outsiders 71.2%), the difference in subsamples' views seem to widen at the third position. Notwithstanding that the addition of "Count & Win" (Outsiders 78%) at the top spot in their list, where most insiders agreed on "Rank & Win" as a third preferred choice (75%), most outsiders selected "Others" (62.7%). Where insiders settled on "Count & Win" as the fourth preferred contest mechanic (60%), outsiders selected "Rank & Win" (52.5%) and, where insiders opted for either "Creative Drawing/ Signature" (58.3%), outsiders added "X number" (34%) in their list of top 5 preferred contest mechanics.

Despite anomalies such as the absence of both "Creative drawing" and "Creative signature" and the position of "Count & Win" on the outsiders' list, that the outsiders included "Others" in their list indicates a strong preference for criteria-free contests. This assumption is strengthened not only when taking into account that respondents were requested to select their top 5 choices from an inventory of skill criteria compiled from the corpus of CEFs collected for the present research, but also that "X number" appeared on the outsiders' list. As put forward in the previous chapter 4 (pp.144-149), criteria such as the "X number, lucky draw, biggest spender and

earliest entry" may be regarded as questionable on the basis that they do not include a genuine test of skill to determine contest winners. In short, these results seem to draw attention towards a more "disadvantaged" (Janks, 1997, p. 28) point of view amongst the outsiders, particularly in relation to contest criteria that may not be legally sanctioned. Findings in this section also appear to support the validity of the contention that ideological assumptions with CEFs can be "turned into a universal belief through the process of naturalization" (Fairclough, 1989, p. 129).

5. 3 Views and preferences about consumer contest prizes

Results for this section were derived from a set of seven survey questions. The first five items Q11, Q12, Q14, Q15 and Q16 reflect ordinal data ratings based on the Likert scale. Table 5.11 present these results of subsamples' responses surrounding consumer contest prizes. Corresponding tests for normality of distribution performed for these items show that the scores follow a normal distribution. Results of these tests are shown in Figures 5.13 to 5.17 (App. XXIII). Tables 5.12 and 5.13 ensue to report subsamples' responses by mean ratings. These are followed with Table 5.14 to submit summary responses calculated via SPSS for standard deviation, t-test scores, and significant p-values at the critical value of 0.05. Results of the nominal, continuous data for items Q21 and Q22 were then presented in Tables 5.15, 5.16, 5.17 and 5.18 respectively. Item Q21 requested for respondents' top three factors for participation in a contest, and item Q22, respondents' top five preferred grand prizes. As in the previous tables, each item precedes the results. Proceeding to Table 5.11 on the next page, a surprising majority in both groups agreed with every item on the list. Regardless of occupational insights, most respondents agreed (Insiders 61.7%, Outsiders 54.2%) that prizes to be won could influence their decisions to participate

in a contest (Q11) and held (Insiders 93.3%, Outsiders 88.1%) that good contests were those that offered a greater number of prizes (Q12). Respondents from both groups also concurred (Insiders 86.7%, Outsiders 88.1%) that more expensive prizes could translate to better contests (Q14) although most people (Insiders 91.7%, Outsiders 88.1%) would only participate in contests where the prizes appealed to them (Q15). The majority of respondents (Insiders 96.7%, Outsiders 93.2%) went on to conclude that the chance to win prizes could add value to purchases (Q16).

Table 5.11 **Insiders' and outsiders' views on contest prizes: Summary responses by subsamples (N = 119: 60 Insiders, 59 Outsiders)**

Item descriptor/ subsamples	**Disagree (1-3) / (%)**	**Agree (4-6) / (%)**
Q11. The prizes to be won in a contest can influence my decision to participate		
Insiders	23 (38.3)	37 (61.7)
Outsiders	27 (45.8)	32 (54.2)
Q12. Good contests are those that offer a greater number of prizes to be won		
Insiders	4 (6.7)	56 (93.3)
Outsiders	7 (11.9)	52 (88.1)
Q14. The more expensive the prizes to be won, the better the contest		
Insiders	8 (13.3)	52 (86.7)
Outsiders	7 (11.9)	52 (88.1)
Q15. I will only participate in consumer contests where the prizes appeal to me		
Insiders	5 (8.3)	55 (91.7)
Outsiders	7 (11.9)	52 (88.1)
Q16. Contests add value to my purchase because they offer the chance to win prizes		
Insiders	2 (3.3)	58 (96.7)
Outsiders	4 (6.8)	55 (93.2)

Key for ratings: 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3= somewhat disagree; 4= somewhat agree; 5= agree; and, 6= strongly agree.

Taking into account results from previous analyses that suggested a more positive level of awareness on the side of insiders, these results are somewhat remarkable. Insiders who possess insights about the production of promotional advertising texts are expected to demonstrate more scepticism surrounding the texts they encode for clients aimed at increasing product sales. Further analysis was thus hoped to shed more light on the influence of contest prizes on participants.

Tables 5.12 and 5.13 present results of analysis by mean rating for the respective items on the subsamples.

Table 5.12 **Insiders' views on contest prizes: Mean ratings (N = 60)**

Item descriptor	Median	Mean	Std. Dev.
Q12. Good contests… greater number of prizes…	5.0000	5.1500	1.1472
Q15. I will only participate… prizes appeal to me	5.0000	5.0000	1.2350
Q16. Contests add value… chance to win prizes	5.0000	4.9167	1.0933
Q14. …more expensive the prizes… the better…	4.5000	4.5667	1.2936
Q11. The prizes… can influence my decision…	5.0000	4.2333	1.8899

Key for ratings: 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3= somewhat disagree; 4= somewhat agree; 5= agree; and, 6= strongly agree.

Table 5.13 **Outsiders' views on contest prizes: Mean ratings (N = 59)**

Item descriptor	Median	Mean	Std. Dev.
Q12. Good contests… greater number of prizes…	6.0000	5.0508	1.3054
Q16. Contests add value… chance to win prizes	5.0000	4.9153	1.2217
Q15. I will only participate… prizes appeal to me	5.0000	4.8136	1.3954
Q14. …more expensive the prizes… the better…	5.0000	4.5424	1.4893
Q11. The prizes… can influence my decision…	5.0000	4.2203	1.9124

Key for ratings: 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3= somewhat disagree; 4= somewhat agree; 5= agree; and, 6= strongly agree.

Overall rankings in Tables 5.12 and 5.13 were consistent with results in the previous Table 5.11. Respondents from both groups registered a high level of approval for contest prizes. Despite results from previous analysis that suggested insiders possessed a higher level of awareness in relation to promotional advertising discursive devices, their response to item Q12 "Good contests are those that offer a greater number of prizes to be won" barely showed a higher level of disagreement when compared with the outsiders (Insiders 5.1500, Outsiders 5.0508). Likewise, although the difference in the hierarchical order of items Q15 and Q16 seem to reveal a higher degree of scepticism amongst insiders who placed greater priority in prizes that appeal to them than the chance to win prizes, the ratings are very close. For item Q15 "I will only participate in consumer contests where the prizes appeal to

me" the insiders showed a comparatively small degree (Insiders 5.0000, Outsiders 4.8136) of more disagreement with the statement. The difference in ratings is even smaller (Insiders 4.9167, Outsiders 4.9153) for item Q16 "Contests add value to my purchase because they offer the chance to win prizes." The following two items Q14 "The more expensive the prizes to be won, the better the contest" and Q11 "The prizes to be won in a contest can influence my decision to participate" respectively reflect the second lowest (Insider 4.5667, Outsider 4.5424) and lowest ratings (Insider 4.2333, Outsider 4.2203) in the list. Results here seem to offer only more support that subsamples' perceptions border on similar when it comes to prizes. As detailed in chapter 4, the first point in R&R components often stipulates that insiders are restricted from participating in consumer contests they help to produce. With regards to this stipulation as well as the grouses raised by insiders via the verbatim comments, it is interesting to find that the insiders' enthusiasm for contest prizes almost seem to match those of the outsiders. A possible reason could be ascribed to the greed appeal. In many ways, overall results point to the effectiveness of the greed appeal (Taflinger, 1996) in promotional advertisements as deliberated in the preceding chapters 3 and 4. Since the greater number of prizes may explicitly be interpreted as a greater number of winning opportunities, most people, regardless of occupations would be more willing to forget about their reservations and participate in contests that make it seem easier to acquire money or property, which is often the culmination of hard work.

To further clarify these results, the following Table 5.14 shows the perceived value of contest prizes presented as consumer ratings. A t-test was run to see if there were significant differences in the perceived value of contest prizes by the subsamples.

With the exceptions of item Q12 "Good contests are those that offer a greater number of prizes to be won" which showed a significant p-value of 0.004 ($p < 0.05$) and item Q15 "I will only participate in consumer contests where the prizes appeal to me" which showed a significant p-value of 0.009 ($p < 0.05$), details of the data show that there were no differences in the remaining items tested. In both cases, perceptual differences may be ascribed to occupational insights. As opposed to those who may be less aware, a greater number of prizes may conceivably be translated to a less impressive grand prize and thus, a higher level of disagreement. At the same time, less impressive grand prizes may translate to a higher level of disagreement amongst those who are more open to participating in contests, or who are not restricted by industry norms to participate in contests they helped to produce.

Table 5.14 **Perceived value of contest prizes presented as consumer ratings by respondent subsamples: N=119 (60 Insiders; 59 Outsiders)**

Item descriptor	Subsamples	Mean	Std. Dev.	t.	Sig. p
Q12. Good contests… greater number of prizes to be won	Insiders	5.0500	1.2545	.427	.004
	Outsiders	5.0678	1.3113		
Q11. The prizes… contest can influence my decision…	Insiders	4.1833	1.8640	.266	.118
	Outsiders	4.2373	1.9239		
Q14. The more expensive the prizes… the better the contest	Insiders	4.5667	1.2401	.000	.193
	Outsiders	4.5593	1.5002		
Q15. I will only participate… where the prizes appeal to me	Insiders	4.8167	1.3715	.394	.009
	Outsiders	4.8136	1.3955		
Q16. Contests add value to my purchase… chance to win prizes	Insiders	4.8333	1.1813	.352	.682
	Outsiders	4.8983	1.2275		

Key for ratings: 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3= somewhat disagree; 4= somewhat agree; 5= agree; and, 6= strongly agree.

Still, remaining results demonstrate that despite job-related insights, insiders are almost as susceptible as other consumers to the advertising appeals or tricks of the trade (Taflinger, 1996; Edney, 2005; Sirgy, 1991) they employ to influence consumers' purchasing decisions. In this light, it may also be reasonable to surmise

that the verbal and visual strategies employed to appeal to readers' sense of greed are perhaps more powerful than the text encoders themselves believed. As explained in the previous analysis, more prizes could be deciphered along text producers' goals as more opportunities to win more prizes for more participants instead of reaping more product sales. Proceeding to the next item in this data set, Q21 requested subsamples to "Please write the top 3 factors in a contest entry form that can influence your decision to participate in a contest." Summary responses presented in Tables 5.15 and 5.16 show that while both groups selected the same top three factors out of the nine choices provided in the questionnaire, differences in the hierarchical order of their responses could suggest some differences in their perceptions.

Table 5.15 **Insiders' top 3 factors for participation in contests: Summary responses on item Q21 by respondent subsamples (N = 60)**

Item descriptor	**N (%)**
1. Attractive prizes	50 (83.3)
2. Affordable POP	43 (71.7)
3. Easy to join	40 (66.7)

Table 5.16 **Outsiders' top 3 factors for participation in contests: Summary responses on item Q21 by respondent subsamples (N = 59)**

Item descriptor	**N (%)**
1. Attractive prizes	48 (81.4)
2. Easy to join	46 (78)
3. Affordable POP	25 (42.4)

Results corroborated with previous findings relating to the power of the greed appeal to convince consumer purchases. A majority of respondents in both subsamples selected "Attractive prizes" (Insiders 83.3%, Outsiders 81.4%) as their first choice. While insiders selected "Affordable POP" as their second choice, outsiders gave it the least priority of the three (Insiders 71.7%, Outsiders 42.4%). At the same time, "Easy to join" was the insiders' last choice, but the outsiders' second choice (Insiders

66.7%, Outsiders 78%). As opposed to earlier results, these results seem to point towards a wider gap in subsamples' levels of awareness. More affordable POP hints at a deeper level of understanding about promotional advertising "discourse as a practice, not just of representing the world, but of signifying the world, constituting and constructing the world in meaning" (Fairclough, 1993, p. 64). Since no POP means instant disqualification, being able to afford to buy the required products to participate in the contest relates directly to a participant's winning chances. At the same time, "Easy to join" is a subjective clause, which may be differently interpreted by different people. As previous results suggest, while outsiders may see a skill-criteria free contest as easy to join, insiders may see more affordable POP.

The final item Q22 in this data set was intended to address consumers' preferences about the kinds of prizes that could influence their participation in a contest. The item asked the subsamples to "Please write the top 5 types of grand prizes that could interest you to participate in a contest. Respondents were given a list of 12 different grand prizes derived from the corpus of CEFs to choose from. Tables 5.17 and 5.18 present the summary responses on the items. With the exception of PC/Computer products in the outsiders' list, people from both groups seemed to share the similar ideals in their top five preferred grand prizes.

Table 5.17 **Insiders' preferred top 5 grand prizes for participation in contests: Summary responses on item Q22 by respondent subsamples (N = 60)**

Item descriptor	**N (%)**
1. Car	60 (100)
2. Cash	58 (96.7)
3. House	53 (88.3)
4. Shopping spree	38 (63.3)
5. Holidays	31 (51.7)

Table 5.18 **Outsiders' preferred top 5 grand prizes for participation in contests: Summary responses on item Q22 by respondent subsamples (N = 59)**

Item descriptor	**N (%)**
1. House	56 (94.9)
2. Cash / Car	55 (93.2)
3. Shopping spree	35 (59.3)
4. Holidays	26 (44.1)
5. PC/ Computer products	13 (22)

As in the previous results, the differences in hierarchical order by which the prizes were selected may reveal some differences in priorities. The insiders selected car as their number one preferred grand prize, while the same item surfaced as the second choice on the outsiders' list (Insiders 100%, Outsiders 93.2%). Both groups selected cash as their second choice (Insiders 96.7%, Outsiders 93.2%). While insiders selected house as their third choice, it was the outsiders' first choice (Insiders 88.3%, Outsiders 94.9%). Fourth on the insiders' list is shopping spree, which materialised as the outsiders' third choice (Insiders 63.3%, Outsiders 59.3%), and while the insiders added holidays as their fifth choice, the same emerged as the outsiders' fourth choice (Insiders 51.7%, Outsiders 44.1%). Outsiders added PC/Computer products as their fifth preferred grand prize (22%). While subsamples' grand prize preferences showed that the majority in both groups tend to select prizes perceived as expensive, the insiders also appeared to prefer prizes that seemed easier to cash-in. For most people, selling a car may seem a less formidable task when compared to selling a house. Moreover, a possible reason why the insiders appear to be less interested in PC/Computer may stem from the demands of their profession, which may cause them to lean towards supporting specific brands they believed were more capable in helping them to perform their occupational tasks. It should also be noted that while some of the results seem to represent an opportunity for promotional advertisers to explore more effective ways to appeal to their consumers, this research

is aimed at supporting consumers' interests. More specifically, in suggesting ways that consumers may engage with, to carve out insights into common, taken for granted assumptions embedded within these kinds of promotional advertising texts that may encourage their growth towards becoming more astute consumers.

5.4 Summary and suggestions

Strategies that underlie the rhetorical verbal and visual components in promotional advertising media including CEFs are seamlessly integrated to convince readers that if only they complied with a simple list of formalities, they would earn the fulfilment of their desires and win dream prizes. At the same time, the harsh reality that by the end of a contest period most participants stand to lose out is hidden. The probability of losing out is resolved for fantasying consumers led to believe that they really lose nothing since they already have added value in terms of top-notch quality products and the chance to win prizes. Deceptive terms such as "It's so easy to win" and "Join now to win" are exceedingly easy to accept without question because they have become normalized via being used and re-used for generations. The rise in visibility of CEFs in shopping outlets and public media shows that these strategies are being adapted by commercial institutions that see fiscal advantages in capitalising on accepted norms to extend product and brand recognition. Findings also disclosed that promotional advertisers employ underlying verbal and visual strategies that work alongside the AIDA funnel model (Lewis, 1908) to compel readers to fulfil their desires by acting quickly to buy more products than they normally would. As a growing society of consumers, we need to learn to recognise that spending additional time, efforts and money to respond to calls for participation in contests is no guarantee of winning prizes. Results from both analytical phases also demonstrate

that CEFs are part of a media that propagates “interests and choices” (Herman & Chomsky, 1988, p. 2) bent on manufacturing consumer consent via “relations of domination based consent rather than coercion” (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. 24). Hence, while some may argue that a CEF is doing its job by harmlessly stating in less explicit terms that joining a contest is an advantageous endeavour to add more value to product purchases, the reality points towards costly damages. The reality that more consumers are encouraged to send in as many entries as they can to increase their chances of winning contradicts the goal of the skill criteria component. As more CEFs with questionable skill criteria flood our markets, the component may ultimately become a mere blanket to provide some cover of legitimacy and not as consumers suppose, actually legitimate. It is time we learn to see pass foregrounded messages in CEFs designed to whet our greed for more things we may not even need and recognise the CEF for what it is: a sales device produced to increase product sales within a contest’s period.

Findings also show that each CEF is representative of the other in foregrounded texts that seem set on urging consumers to win amazing rewards via participation. From satisfying desires for more things to overcoming fears of losing out, boosting self-esteem and personal enjoyment, the journey with CEFs always begin with product purchases. Consequently, consumers are guided to accept the belief that there is nothing to lose by participating. As put forward in chapter 2, this process could be attributed to the production of meanings “at an unconscious level, such that conscious decisions are typically understood to be natural, objective and common sense” (Herman & Chomsky, 1988, p. 2). Thoughts of winning remain playing out in the minds of consumers as intended by the text producers while less appetising

outcomes from spending more money on extra products that may be better spent elsewhere are pushed aside. It is these less appetising alternatives to fronted promotional advertising messages that the present study is set on addressing with hopes to raise "consciousness of exploitative social relations, through focussing upon language" (Fairclough, 1989, p. 4). A widely accepted view that most insiders subscribe to is that consumers are focussed on one question that helps promotional advertisers achieve their goals: What's in it for me? This question is an alternative to the second principal strategy discussed in chapters 2 and 4, which is directed at arousing readers' interest via the question, why are you talking to me? In response to this question, promotional advertisers are steadfast on getting people to focus on the rewards of participation. The intention is to make the rewards seem so irresistible that consumers will not come to think about potential damages any additional purchases may cause their daily expenses.

For potential contest participants, whether they come to accept these findings or not, all the sweet nothings manufactured to fill their hearts and minds may melt into bitter nothings. Yet to date nothing has been said for those who have lost out. The reality remains that as more people come across more CEFs on a daily basis, these messages become increasingly easier to accept and succumb to. The concept of naturalization, which emphasizes the importance of ideology in achieving and maintaining relations of domination (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. 24) support these assumptions. Even now, the processes of producing meaning as well as the strategies identified continue to allow promotional advertising discourse practices to diffuse "constructed meaning" (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 2002) into our social belief systems and manipulate us as a society of consumers to adjust our behaviours.