

研
究
報
告
● ●
工 工
商 商
管 管
理 理
學 學
院 院
中 中
心 心

BRC Working Papers

**Offensive Advertising on the Web:
Asian Insights**

**Gerard Prendergast
Department of Marketing**

**Huang Chia Hwa
School of Business**

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

Business Research Centre



香港浸會大學

HONG KONG BAPTIST UNIVERSITY

OFFENSIVE ADVERTISING ON THE WEB: ASIAN INSIGHTS

Gerard Prendergast and Huang Chia Hwa

Address for correspondence:

Gerard Prendergast

Department of Marketing

School of Business

Hong Kong Baptist University

Hong Kong, CHINA

Email: Gerard@hkbu.edu.hk

Ph 3411 7570. Fax 3411 5586

Author biographies

Gerard Prendergast is Associate Professor of Marketing at Hong Kong Baptist University.

Before working in Hong Kong he held academic posts in the UK, Singapore, and New Zealand. His research interest is in the area of marketing communication, and his publications have appeared in a range of international journals such as the *Journal of Advertising*, *International Journal of Advertising*, *Journal of Marketing Communications*, and *Journal of Promotions Management*.

Huang Chia Hwa is a research associate in the School of Business, Hong Kong Baptist University.

OFFENSIVE ADVERTISING ON THE WEB: ASIAN INSIGHTS

ABSTRACT

The majority of research about offensive advertising has been conducted in western countries. However, little is known about consumers' perceptions of offensive advertising in an Asian context, especially offensive advertising on the web. This study, conducted in Hong Kong, furthers Prendergast et al's (2002) study by including the web as a medium, and aims to identify what types of web advertising consumers find offensive, consumers' tolerance of offensive (web) advertisements on the web relative to offensive advertisements in other media, and the effects of offensive web advertisements on consumers' purchase intention.

Results from a survey of 240 interviewees indicated that gambling and chat-line services were considered the most offensive products to be advertised on the web. In terms of appeals, consumers were most sensitive to advertisements that contained nudity or had a sexist attitude. Perceptions of offensiveness and how it affects purchasing behaviour were clearly related to demographic variables such as age, educational status and gender. Relative to other media, interviewees were least tolerant of offensive advertisements on the web.

INTRODUCTION

In order to draw the audience's attention to a product or service advertisement, there has been an increasing use of controversial advertising in recent years (Lyons, 1996; Matthews, 1997; Waller, 1999). This trend has occurred in Hong Kong as well (Schwartz, 2001; Tilles, 1998; Wong, 2000; "Thirteen complaints", 1999). A distinctive advertisement may be memorable to a target audience, but the effect may be either positive or negative. There have been cases where consumers have felt so offended by some advertisements that they have put pressure on advertisers to change their advertisements, encouraged the media to stop accepting the advertisements, or even boycotted the company and its products (Schwartz,

2001; Tilles, 1998; Wong, 2000).

Western research on offensive advertising is extensive, but research is limited in an Asian context, where research relating specifically to offensive advertising on the web is non-existent. Using a Hong Kong sample, this study examines what products/services and appeals that consumers feel are offensive in web advertising, the consumers' tolerance to offensive web advertising relative to other media, and how offensive web advertising affects the buying behaviour of the consumers.

BACKGROUND

The Web as an Advertising Medium

One could argue that the web is simply another medium, with the purpose of conveying information and advertising communication. But the interactive nature of the web enables the user to respond and react, and creates a totally new environment that changes the traditional parameters of mass communication. According to Dorsher (1996), "unlike the one way communication of other mass media, which have many message receivers and relatively few senders, computer networks let every user be a receiver and a sender; it allows two way communication, from the many to the many".

Offensive Products/Services: The *Matter* of Advertising

Unmentionable products are those that are considered to be offensive, embarrassing, harmful, socially unacceptable, or controversial to some significant segment of the population. According to Wilson and West (1981), unmentionables are products, services or concepts that for reasons of delicacy, decency, morality, or even fear tend to elicit reactions of distaste, disgust, offence, or outrage when mentioned or when openly presented through the media. Katanis (1994) furthered this research and redefined unmentionables as "offensive, embarrassing, harmful, socially unacceptable or controversial to some significant segment of

the population”. The examples of unmentionables that he presented were: “products” such as items used in personal hygiene, birth control, warfare, and drugs for terminal illness; “services” such as abortion, sterilization, the treatment of VD and mental illnesses, funeral services, and artificial insemination; and “concepts” such as political ideas, palliative care, unconventional sexual practices, racial/religious prejudices and terrorism.

Geographic location is a factor affecting the perceived levels of offensiveness of the products/services. In western countries, Aaker and Bruzzone (1985) found that the three most disgusting commercials in the US were those encouraging consumers to purchase the following products: feminine hygiene products, women’s undergarments, and hemorrhoid treatment. Waller (1999) disclosed that the three most offensive products/services in Australia were those related to racially extremist groups, religious denominations and feminine hygiene products. Recent research carried out in Singapore (Phau and Prendergast, 2001) found that the three most offensive products were chat-line services, sexual diseases treatments/prevention and dating services. Phau and Prendergast (2001) also found that these attitudes vary according to demographics, particularly in terms of gender and education. The above research suggests that consumers’ attitudes towards offensive advertising might vary across cultures and demographic groups.

Offensive Appeals: The *Manner* of Advertising

If an advertisement is found to be offensive, it does not just depend on the product and the service itself, but also on the type of appeal and the manner of presentation. Objections include use of sex or fear, and silliness of presentation (Greyser, 1972). These emotions can lead to general consumer irritation (Sin and Cheng, 1984). Sexuality in advertising creates high attention value (LaTour *et al.*, 1990); but sometimes excessively offensive advertisements will generate a physiological arousal response and corresponding negative cognition (Blech *et al.*, 1981; La Tour, 1990), especially towards those advertisements that

adopt sexual appeals or nudity.

Several studies have found that advertisers can maximize the involvement and persuasiveness of an advertisement via the use of a fear appeal (Neal et al, 1999). But the use of a fear appeal may “expose a person against one’s will to harmful or seriously offensive images” (Henthorne et al, 1993). Products such as deodorants, dandruff shampoos and mouthwash are criticized for attempting to create anxiety and using fear of social rejection to increase sales (Belch and Belch, 1998).

Potential Effects on Purchase Behavior

Experiencing offensive advertising on the web may negatively effect the consumer’s buying decisions. Ford *et al.* (1997) hypothesized a model to examine female response to offensive sex role portrayals in advertising. The model suggested that potentially offensive advertisements damaged company image and are proportional to the purchase intention of the consumer. Once the customer feels uneasy or has a negative impression of the advertisement, he or she might not buy the products of the companies that are perceived of as using offensive advertisements. Phau and Prendergast (2001) found that while Singapore consumers with tertiary education may find the advertisements for one product offensive, this offending image does not spill over to other products from the same company. The study by Phau and Prendergast (2001), however, did not include the web as a potential medium for offensive advertising.

The Hong Kong Context

Hong Kong Chinese have maintained a strong cultural identity (Bond *et. al.* 1985). Hong Kong consumers are generally supportive of advertising, but the modern Western and the modern Chinese segments give a greater support than the traditional Chinese segment, who has a very critical attitude towards advertising (Martin et al. 1994).

Because Hong Kong is a place where there is a close interaction between Eastern and Western values, and because it is basically an international society (Chan, 1999), it is an interesting location to explore consumer perceptions of offensive advertisements on the web. Hong Kong is a source of social influence to neighboring countries in southeast Asia (Tse *et al.*, 1989), yet there has been no previous study of Hong Kong consumers' perception of offensive advertising on the web.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This research explores how Hong Kong consumers perceive potentially offensive advertising on the web and how it affects their purchase decisions. Specifically, this research addresses the following research questions:

- What are the products and services that consumers find offensive in web advertising (i.e. the *matter* of the web advertising)?
- What are the appeals that consumers feel are offensive in web advertising (i.e. the *manner* of the web advertising)?
- What is the degree of tolerance to offensive web advertisements compared with offensive advertisements in more traditional media (e.g. television, radio, magazines, etc.)?
- What are the effects of offensive web advertising on purchase intention?

Not all consumers will have the same attitudes towards offensive web advertising. It is usually believed that a person's background is a crucial determinant of his/her attitudes. For example, Cheung (1982) has suggested that women are often portrayed as sex objects. In addition, sexual discrimination against women is believed to be part of traditional Chinese culture. Considering these factors, it is possible that women will be more offended by certain advertisements. Sin and Cheng (1984) have found that there is a positive correlation between the level of educational attainment of the interviewees and concern over the

potential negative effects of advertising. Therefore, the educational level may also affect perceptions of offensive web advertising. Age is another factor that might affect perceptions of offensive web advertising, because younger people tend to be more open-minded. The main objective of this study, therefore, is to compare differences in perceptions of offensive web advertising across the demographic variables of gender (*Male and Female*), age (*16-29, 30-40, above 40*) and educational level (*Tertiary and Non-tertiary*).

METHOD

Sampling Technique

The questionnaire was circulated to a quota sample of 240 interviewees. Consistent with the research objectives, there were 120 males and 120 females, divided equally among 3 different age groups (16-29, 30-40, above 40), and two educational groups (tertiary and non-tertiary). To reach a higher percentage of Internet users, the questionnaires were distributed near cyber cafés in Hong Kong.

Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire was based on that used by Phau and Prendergast (2001) in their Singapore study and was slightly modified following a focus group and a pretest. There were five sections in the questionnaire, and each section used a six-point Likert scale in order to avoid central tendency and in order to secure a higher discriminatory power (Hair et al, 1998). Before the first section of the questionnaire, there was a screening question to ensure interviewees had used the web in the past six months. The questionnaire was translated into Chinese and translated back for accuracy. It was then pilot-tested on 24 people before distributing it to the full sample. The four sections of the questionnaire were as follows:

1. The first section was comprised of a list of potentially offensive products/services on the web. This list was based on past literature (Wilson and West, 1981; Triff *et al.*, 1987; Shao and Hill, 1994; Matthews, 1997; Prendergast and Phau, 2002) and on the response from a focus group. Interviewees were asked to indicate their degree of personal offence on a six point scale, where 1 = “Not at all offensive” and 6 = “Extremely offensive”.

2. The second section of the questionnaire suggested seven reasons for an advertisement to be considered offensive on the web. The interviewees were asked to indicate their degree of personal offence on a six point scale, where 1 = “Not at all offensive” and 6 = “Extremely offensive”. The list of the offensive reasons was also elicited from prior literature (Wilson and West, 1981; Triff *et al.*, 1987; Shao and Hill, 1994; Matthews, 1997; Phau and Prendergast, 2001) and responses from the focus group.

3. In section three ten kinds of media, including the web, were listed to determine the different levels of tolerance to offensive advertisements in different media. This scale was developed from prior research (Boddewyn, 1989) on sexism and decency in advertising. A six-point Likert scale measuring the level of tolerance to offensive advertisements in different media, where 1 = “Very tolerant” and 6 = “Very conservative”, was listed in this section.

4. The fourth section was comprised of four statements concerning the consequence of offensive web advertising on consumers’ buying intentions. The scale was adopted from Ford *et al.* (1997). A six-point Likert scale measuring the respondent’s buying intention in response to offensive web advertisements, where 1 = “Most unlikely” and 6 = “Most likely”, was listed in this section.

FINDINGS

List of Potentially Offensive Products/Services to be Advertised on the Web

Interviewees were asked to fill in a 6-point scale to show their level of offensiveness to a list of products/services that are common in many advertisements on the web. Table 1 presents the results including mean scores and standard deviations for the whole sample: male and female interviewees, 3 different age groups and 2 classes of educational level.

Table 1 here

The overall results indicated that the most offensive product/service to be advertised is gambling (mean=3.62), followed by chat-line service, condoms and feminine hygiene products. The least offensive item is alcoholic drinks (mean=2.93).

In terms of gender, results are consistent with the overall results. Both males and females ranked gambling as the most offensive. However, females ranked chat-line services (mean=3.61) as the second most offensive item while males indicated that feminine hygiene products (mean=3.45) are the second most offensive item. Generally, most of the products/services were quite similar in terms of the offensiveness perceived by both female and male. From a t-test, only 3 items were found to be significantly different. In particular, females found chat-line service, male undergarments and alcoholic drinks to be more offensive.

Regarding the educational level, both tertiary and non-tertiary interviewees ranked gambling as the most offensive item, followed by chat-line services. T-tests suggested that consumers with tertiary educational level felt more offended by sexual disease treatments/prevention advertisements.

According to the age groups, both the 16-29 and above 40 age groups considered

gambling to be the most offensive, but the 30-40 age group chose chat-line services to be the most offensive. A One-Way ANOVA showed significant differences between the different age groups. In particular, the above 40 group considered both gambling and funeral services to be more offensive than the other two age groups.

Offensive Appeals in Web Advertising

Interviewees were asked to fill in a 6-point scale to indicate their level of offensiveness towards the appeal used in web advertising. Table 2 indicates that the three most offensive appeals were nudity (mean=4.08), sexist attitudes (mean=3.94) and indecent language (mean=3.85) respectively. With respect to gender, educational level and age, the ranking of the reasons are quite consistent with the overall list. A t-test indicated that females are more likely to be offended by appeals with “sexual connotations” and “sexist attitudes”. However the ANOVA test indicated that, in terms of age group, there are significant differences for both “nudity” and “evoking unnecessary fear” between the above 40 group and other age groups: basically the level of offensiveness increases with the age group.

Table 2 here

For educational level, interviewees with tertiary education ranked “nudity” (mean=4.35) as the most offensive appeal while the non-tertiary educational group thought “sexist attitudes” (mean=3.91) was the most offensive. A t-test identified four items with significant differences: tertiary interviewees found that appeals with subjects that were too personal, or contained nudity, sexual connotations and cultural insensitivity were more offensive than non-tertiary interviewees.

Level of Tolerance towards Offensive Advertisements in Different Media

Interviewees were asked to fill in a 6-point scale to show their level of tolerance towards offensive advertisements in different media. Results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3 here

The web had the lowest tolerance with a mean of 3.72, while the media with the highest tolerance to offensive advertising are both men's (mean=3.03) and women's magazines (mean=3.10). After running the t-test and one-way ANOVA, there was no significant difference between different gender or age groups. However, a t-test indicated that interviewees with tertiary education are less tolerant towards potentially offensive web advertisements than those without tertiary education.

The Impact of Offensive Web Advertising on Buying Intention

Interviewees were asked to indicate how offensive web advertising might effect their purchase intentions. Table 4 shows the mean values of the four questions in detail.

Table 4 here

According to the first statement: *“If a new product is introduced with advertisements via the web that I find offensive, I might not make a purchase even if it offers me benefits which I find attractive.”*, interviewees were quite unlikely (mean=3.90) to buy the products with offensive advertisements on the web. Only the age groups showed significant differences regarding this statement, with the ANOVA indicating that the above 40 group are more unlikely to make such a purchase.

For the second statement: *“If the products or services that I use adopts an advertising*

campaign via the web which I find offensive, I will discontinue using it.”, interviewees were somewhat likely (mean=3.73) to refuse the usage of products/services using offensive web advertising. Again, only the age group showed a significant difference in response. The ANOVA indicated that those above 40 tend to be more likely to react negatively than the other two age groups.

For the third statement *“Even though I may see an advertisement via the web which is offensive for one product, I would continue to purchase other products that I have been using from the same company.”*, the overall result from the interviewees showed that they are more likely (mean=3.58) to maintain their loyalty towards a brand even though the advertising on the web may offend them. Except for the education level, there was no significant difference among the other demographic groups about this statement. A t-test suggested that non-tertiary consumers would be more likely to continue purchasing in this situation.

For the last statement *“When 2 companies offer the same products with similar benefits, I will not buy from the one using an advertisement via the web which I find offensive.”*, the results show that the overall mean value of this statement is higher (mean=4.29) than the other statements. Generally, if there is an alternative brand or products offered by a company not using offensive web advertising, interviewees were more likely to chose this option. A t-test showed that the tertiary group is more likely to choose this. Age and gender groups, however, showed no difference in their attitude towards this statement.

DISCUSSION

The most offensive product/service (matter) to be advertised on the web was gambling. The least offensive product/service was alcohol (mean=2.93), and this is in accordance with the finding by Prendergast et al (2002) in Hong Kong. The most offensive web advertising appeal was one that used nudity. The least offensive web advertising appeal was one using sexual connotations. Advertisers should try to downplay those offensive elements including

“sexist themes”, “nudity” and “indecent language” if they do not want to offend the public. Ambitious marketers who would like to utilize offensive web advertising should either use a less offensive appeal, such as sexual connotations, or ensure that the demographic profile of their audience is less sensitive to offensive advertising.

Comparing the overall offensiveness of matter versus manner, it has been found that generally interviewees were offended more by the appeal than the product or service itself. This result is quite consistent with Sin and Cheng (1984) and Prendergast et al's (2002) finding in Hong Kong. In other words, the common criticisms of advertising mainly relate to the *manner* of advertising rather than the *matter* of advertising.

With respect to gender, gambling is the most offensive product/service to be advertised for both males and females. This is different from the finding of Prendergast et al (2002) in Hong Kong. According to Prendergast et al (2002) chat-line services were the most offensive product/service for the interviewees, especially for females, because the advertisements for these services are usually presented in a poor taste. Why is gambling found to have the highest levels of offensiveness in this study? It may be because gambling is currently a big issue in Hong Kong, with recent legislation making football gambling illegal. Second, it seems that gambling penetrates the web more than any other media, so the perceived offensiveness may be media specific.

Females feel more offended by web advertising using a “sexist theme” or “nudity”. As women are often portrayed as sex objects and in supporting roles (Sin and Cheng, 1984), especially on the web, this corrodes the status of being female. Such a finding is consistent with the result of a previous study in the US (Greyser, 1972).

Generally, in terms of educational status, interviewees with a tertiary education level perceive a higher degree of offensiveness towards potentially offensive products/services and appeals than interviewees without a tertiary education level. This is different from the study by Prendergast et al (2002) in Hong Kong, which indicated that higher education levels

perceived lower levels of offensiveness to potentially offensive products and appeals. Again, this difference may be media specific: tertiary interviewees are more aware of the privacy and intellectual properties of the web.

For the age groups, the above 40 group is more offended by both the matter and manner of web advertising than the other two groups. That is similar to the finding of Sin and Cheng (1984), in that this age group was more critical about the social effects of offensive advertising, even on the web.

Demographic groups aside, generally interviewees hold a critical view toward offensive web advertising. But interviewees are more likely to accept offensive advertising if it is in men's or women's magazines. This may be because these media are more targeted, and therefore their content is more suited to their audience. The web, however, which is truly a mass-market media that attracts all demographic groups, is the medium that shows the least tolerance to offensive advertising. Furthermore, it is very difficult to monitor what kind of information that is being provided on the web.

Looking at the effect of offensive advertising on purchase intention, the above 40 age group showed a higher likelihood of boycotting a company using offensive advertising on the web than did the other age groups. In addition, if compared to the other the two age groups, the interviewees aged 40 or above held a relatively conservative view about buying products with offensive advertising on the web, even if they were loyal customers of the company. Since consumers can search for similar products via the search engine on the web and since the switching cost is low in terms of information searching, advertisers with close substitutes should minimize the adoption of offensive advertising on the web in order to avoid offending customers who might look elsewhere for a similar product.

CONCLUSIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Conventional wisdom in the advertising industry holds that a certain amount of irritation or so-called “creativity” enhances the effectiveness of advertising. However, this study has shown that for certain demographic groups offensive advertising on the web may be negatively perceived, to the extent that it effects their purchase behavior. More crucially, this study has shown that consumers are least tolerant of offensive advertising on the web relative to other media.

The above conclusions, however, should be tempered by the recognition of two limitations in this research. First, the non-probabilistic sample may affect the generalisability of the results. Second, this study relates to the examination of the offensive advertising on the web, which is only one part of the Internet. Further research may specify other components of the Internet, such as offensive advertising via e-mail.

Limitations aside, this study provides valuable information for advertisers to know what products and appeals cause offensive advertising on the web, the sensitivity of consumers to offensive web advertising relative to offensive advertising in other media, and how the offensiveness of the advertising on the web affect the customers’ purchase behavior.

REFERENCES

- Aaker, D. and D.E. Bruzzone. 1985. “Causes of irritation in advertising”. *Journal of Marketing* 5 (Summer?): 47-57.
- Boddewyn, J. J. 1989. “Sexism and decency in advertising: government regulation and industry self-regulation in 47 countries”. New York: International Advertising Association
- Belch, M. A., B.E Belch, and J.K Holgerson. 1981. “Psychophysiological and cognitive response to sex in advertising”. *Advances in Consumer Research* 9, Andrew Mitchell, ed., Association for Consumer Research: 424-427.

Bond, M. H., K.C Wan, K. Leung, and R. Giacalone. 1985. "How are responses to verbal insult related to cultural collectivism and power distance?". *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 16: 111-127.

Cheung, O. 1982. "Advertising and Consumer." *Hong Kong Manager* June: 30-31

Dorsher, M. 1996. "Whither the public sphere" Prospects for cyber sphere." Paper presented at the conference of the Mass Communication and Society Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Grand Forks, ND.

Ford, J. B., M. S LaTour and E.D Honeycutt Jr. 1997. "An examination of the cross-cultural female response to offensive sex role portrayals in advertising". *International Marketing Review* 14 (6): 409-423.

Greyser, S.A. 1972. "Advertising: Attacks and Counters." *Harvard Business Review*, March: 22-28

Hair, J.F., R.E. Anderson, R.R. Tatham and W.C. Black. 1998. "Multivariate Analysis" (5 ed). New Jersey. Prentice-Hall Inc.

Henthorne, T. L., M.S LaTour and R. Natarajan. 1993. "Fear appeal in print advertising: An analysis of arousal and ad response". *Journal of Advertising* 22 (2): 59-68.

LaTour, M. S. 1990. "Female nudity in print advertising: An analysis of gender differences in arousal and ad response". *Psychology and Marketing* 7 (1): 65-81.

Lyons, K. 1996. "Offensive, titillating, outrageous?". *Australian Professional Marketing* (Australian Marketing Association): 8-10.

Martin, E. F., Jr., Y. M. Cheng, G. B. Wilson, and Y. W. Tsui. 1994. "Advertising images among Hong Kong Chinese: Use of individual modernity and western orientation clusters in determining in market segmentation". *Asian Journal of Communications* 4(1): 12-32

Matthews, T. 1997. "Lost causes in advertising", B&T, 11 July, 21.

Neal, C., P. Quester and D. Hawkins. 1999. "Consumer Behaviour: Implications for Marketing Strategy". New York. McGraw-Hill.

Phau, I. & G. Prendergast. 2001. "Offensive advertising: A View from Singapore". *Journal of Promotion Management* 7(1): 71-89.

Prendergast G., B. Ho and I. Phau (2002), "Offensive advertising: A View from Hong Kong". *Journal of Marketing Communications* (forthcoming)

Shao, A. T. and J. S Hill. 1994. "Global television advertising restrictions: the case of socially sensitive products". *International Journal of Advertising* 13 (3): 347-366.

Sin, L. and D. Cheng. 1984. "Advertising in Hong Kong: The consumer view", Faculty of Business Administration, The Chinese University of Hong Kong. Unpublished.

"Thirteen complaints made to CTV's TVC (trans.). March 26, 1999. *Apple Daily*: A06.

Tilles, D. 1998. "DDB France pulls religious VW ads". *Adweek* 39 (7). New York, Eastern Edition: 5.

Triff, M., D. Benningfield., and J.H Murphy. 1987. "Advertising ethics: a study of public attitudes and perceptions". Proceedings of the 1987 Conference of the American Academy of Advertising, Columbia, SC.

Tse, D. K., R. W Belk, and N. Zhou. 1989. "Becoming a consumer society: longitudinal and cross-cultural content analysis of print ads from Hong Kong, the People's Republic of China, and Taiwan". *Journal of Consumer Research* 15 (4): 457-472.

Waller, D. 1999. "Attitudes towards offensive advertising: an Australian study". *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 16 (3): 288-294

Wilson A., C. West. 1981. "The marketing of unmentionables". *Harvard Business Review* January/February: 91-102

Wong C. K. 2000. "Sexual connotations in advertising (trans.)". *Next Magazine*, June 1: 162-163

Table 1
List of Potentially Products/Services to be Advertised on the Web

Product/Services	Total		Gender		Education Level		Age Group		
	N=240		Male N=120	Female N=120	Tertiary N=114	Non-Tertiary N=126	16-29 N=80	30-40 N=80	Above 40 N=80
Chat-line Services	3.45	(1.02)	3.28*	3.61*	3.53	3.37	3.40	3.53	3.41
Sexual Diseases treatments/prevention	3.11	(1.34)	3.10	3.13	3.38*	2.87*	3.18	2.98	3.19
Dating Services	3.10	(1.29)	3.02	3.18	3.11	3.10	3.00	3.28	3.03
Male Undergarment	3.01	(1.28)	2.88*	3.15*	3.02	3.01	2.96	2.99	3.09
Alcoholic Drinks	2.93	(1.35)	2.73*	3.13*	2.87	2.98	2.86	2.86	3.06
Hair Replacement Products	2.97	(1.35)	2.93	3.02	3.05	2.90	3.03	2.91	2.98
Feminine Contraceptives	3.25	(1.28)	3.23	3.27	3.32	3.18	3.30	3.13	3.31
Female Undergarment	3.14	(1.27)	3.11	3.18	3.11	3.17	3.11	3.13	3.19
Woman Hygiene Products	3.32	(1.40)	3.45	3.18	3.34	3.29	3.38	3.30	3.28
Condom	3.32	(1.34)	3.30	3.34	3.40	3.25	3.36	3.33	3.28
Gambling	3.62	(1.31)	3.60	3.64	3.67	3.58	3.49*	3.45*	3.93*
Pharmaceuticals	2.99	(1.27)	2.98	3.00	3.04	2.95	3.06	2.83	3.09
Weight Loss Products	3.08	(1.38)	2.96	3.19	3.03	3.12	3.06	2.96	3.20
Funeral Services	3.19	(1.27)	3.28	3.10	3.25	3.13	3.15*	2.86*	3.56*

Key: * Sig at p<0.05
1 = “Not at all offensive” and 6 = “Extremely offensive”

Table 2
Offensive Appeals in Web Advertising

Reasons	Total N=240		Gender		Education Level		Age Group		
			Male N=120	Female N= 120	Tertiary N=114	Non-tertiary N=126	16-29 N=80	30-40 N=80	Above 40 N= 80
Sexual Connotations	3.42	(1.33)	3.21*	3.63*	3.59*	3.27*	3.40	3.35	3.51
Subject Too Personal	3.73	(1.16)	3.67	3.79	3.94*	3.54*	3.76	3.78	3.65
Evoking Unnecessary Fear	3.64	(1.28)	3.63	3.64	3.57	3.70	3.38*	3.49*	4.05*
Cultural Insensitivity	3.45	(1.20)	3.51	3.39	3.68*	3.25*	3.34	3.53	3.49
Indecent Language	3.85	(1.11)	3.83	3.87	3.88	3.82	3.75	3.80	3.99
Sexist Attitude	3.94	(1.11)	3.73*	4.15*	3.96	3.91	3.89	3.94	3.99
Nudity	4.08	(1.15)	4.04	4.11	4.35*	3.83*	3.84*	4.06*	4.33*

Key: * Sig at p<0.05
1 = “Not at all offensive” and 6 = “Extremely offensive”

Table 3
Level of Tolerance to offensive advertising in Different Media

Media	Total N=240		Gender		Education Level		Age Group		
			Male N=120	Female N=120	Tertiary N=114	Non-tertiary N= 126	16-29 N=80	30-40 N=80	Above 40 N= 80
Broadcast Television	3.37	(1.36)	3.47	3.28	3.50	3.25	3.41	3.44	3.26
Cable Television	3.44	(1.25)	3.32	3.56	3.38	3.49	3.26	3.59	3.46
Web	3.72	(1.17)	3.68	3.75	3.96*	3.49*	3.64	3.66	3.85
Posters/Billboards	3.45	(1.20)	3.53	3.38	3.56	3.36	3.48	3.49	3.40
Newspapers	3.41	(1.23)	3.53	3.29	3.59*	3.25*	3.49	3.45	3.30
General Magazines	3.30	(1.14)	3.38	3.22	3.32	3.28	3.34	3.29	3.26
Women’ s Magazines	3.10	(1.13)	3.00	3.20	3.11	3.09	3.04	3.16	3.10
Men’ s Magazines	3.03	(1.08)	2.96	3.10	3.02	3.04	3.08	2.94	3.08
Direct Mail	3.45	(1.26)	3.61*	3.28*	3.57	3.33	3.48	3.55	3.31
Radio Broadcasting	3.56	(1.31)	3.73*	3.39*	3.73*	3.41*	3.70	3.66	3.33

Key: * Sig at p<0.05
1 = “Very Tolerant” and 6 = “Very Conservative”

Table 4
Mean Values of Purchase Intention towards Web Offensive Advertising

1. Even though I may see an advertisement via the web which is offensive for one product, I would continue to purchase other products that I have been using from the same company.							
Total	Male N=120	Female N=120	Tertiary N=114	Non-tertiary N=126	16-29 N=80	30-40 N=80	Above 40 N=80
3.58 (1.15)	3.62 (1.32)	3.53 (1.26)	3.25* (1.26)	3.87* (1.08)	3.49 (1.31)	3.78 (1.21)	3.46 (1.07)
2. When 2 companies offer the same products with similar benefits, I will not buy from the one using an advertisement that I find offensive.							
Total	Male N=120	Female N=120	Tertiary N=114	Non-tertiary N=126	16-29 N=80	30-40 N=80	Above 40 N=80
4.29 (1.03)	4.26 (1.11)	4.33 (1.15)	4.46* (0.83)	4.13* (1.33)	4.15 (1.23)	4.31 (1.23)	4.41 (0.90)
3. If a new product is introduced with advertisements via the web that I find offensive.							
Total N=240	Male N=120	Female N=120	Tertiary N=114	Non-tertiary N=126	16-29 N=80	30-40 N=80	Above 40 N=80
3.90 (1.26)	3.88 (1.25)	3.92 (1.29)	3.96 (1.28)	3.84 (1.25)	3.54* (1.40)	3.89* (1.32)	4.26* (0.92)
4. If the products or services that I use adopts an advertisements campaign via the web that I find offensive, I will discontinue using it.							
Total N=240	Male N=120	Female N=120	Tertiary N=114	Non-tertiary N=126	16-29 N=80	30-40 N=80	Above 40 N=80
3.73 (1.05)	3.71 (1.07)	3.75 (1.02)	3.76 (1.15)	3.70 (0.95)	3.59* (1.26)	3.63* (1.17)	3.98* (0.50)

Key: * Sig at p<0.05

1 = "Most unlikely" and 6 = "Most likely"