E-Journal of Yaşar University
http://joy.yasar.edu.tr

Journal of Yasar University, 2015 10(37) 6381-6477

TELEVİZYON REKLAMLARINA YÖNELİK KAÇINMA DAVRANIŞI VE "BAŞKALARININ VARLIĞI"NIN ETKİSİ

TV ADVERTISING AVOIDING BEHAVIOR AND THE IMPACT OF "THE PRESENCE OF OTHERS"

Yeşim ULUSU, Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi, Türkiye, yesim.ulusu@comm.bahcesehir.edu.tr
Serap BATUHAN, Türkiye, serapbatuhan@windowslive.com
Hasan Kemal SUHER, Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi,Türkiye, kemal.suher@comm.bahcesehir.edu.tr

Öz: Bireyler her gün farklı medya kanallarından gönderilen binlerce mesaja maruz kalırlar ve bu mesajları almak istemediklerinde kaçınma davranışını benimserler. Özellikle reklam kampanyası planlama sürecinin önemli bir unsuru olarak reklamdan kaçınma konusu uzun zamandır reklam alanında çalışan akademisyenler için önemli bir araştırma alanı olmuştur. Reklamdan kaçınma üç boyutta gerçekleşir: davranışsal, mekanik ve bilişsel. Birey, reklam süresince odayı terk edebilir (davranışsal), kanalı değiştirebilir (mekanik) ya da reklamı gözardı edebilir (bilişsel). Reklamdan kaçınma davranışını etkileyen birçok değişken arasında bu çalışma özellikle "başkalarının varlığı" ile televizyon reklamlarına yönelik kaçınma davranışı arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektedir. "Başkalarının varlığı" insanların reklamları seyretmek yerine ailesi ya da arkadaşlarıyla iletişimde olma niyeti olarak açıklanabilir. Bu ilişkiyi incelemek amacıyla kolayda örneklem yoluyla yüzyüze anket yapılarak veriler toplanmış ve regresyon ve korelasyon analizleriyle değişkenler arasındaki ilişki incelenmiştir. Elde edilen bulgulara göre televizyon reklamlarına yönelik kaçınma davranışı ile "başkalarının varlığı" arasında anlamlı bir ilişki vardır. Ayrıca, "başkalarının varlığı" ile reklamdan kaçınma boyutları olan davranışsal, mekanik ve bilişsel kaçınma arasında da anlamlı ilişki bulunması önemli bir diğer bulgudur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Reklamdan Kaçınma, Davranışsal Kaçınma, Mekanik Kaçınma, Bilişsel Kaçınma, Başkalarının Varlığı

Abstract: Each day people are exposed to thousands of messages which they don't want to receive and they adapt an avoidance behavior towards messages coming from various media. Advertising avoidance is a research area between academicians in advertising field for a long time because it is the most challenging element in campaign planning process. The advertising avoidance behavior occurs in three dimensions: behavioral, mechanical or cognitive. The person may leave the room (behavioral), change the channel (mechanical) or ignore the commercial (cognitive). Among many other variables effecting the avoidance behavior, this study mainly examines the relationship between the "presence of others" and the "advertising avoidance" on television. The "presence of others" can be described as a people's intention to interact with family or friends rather than attending to commercials. With this aim, the data is collected by a face to face survey with convenience sampling method and applied correlation and regression analysis to examine the relationship between variables. According to the results obtained from the analysis are that there is a significant relationship between "advertising avoidance" and the "presence of others". Besides, there is also a significant relationship between the "presence of others" and respectively behavioral, mechanical and cognitive avoidance.

Keywords: Advertising Avoidance, Behavioral Avoidance, Mechanical Avoidance, Cognitive Avoidance, the Presence of Others

1. INTRODUCTION

Today increasing clutter and media fragmentation consumers are exposed to thousands of commercial messages every day. These messages are conveyed not only from traditional media, such as television and newspaper, but through guerrilla media campaigns, viral marketing online and other forms. As a consequence, consumers avoid both content and advertising messages which they are not interested in. Speck & Elliott (1997) suggest the term "advertising avoidance" to describe actions taken by consumers to reduce their exposure to advertisements. With other words, avoidance is the state in which consumers consciously avoid ads. (Tellis 2004, p. 31)

When people are distracted by undesirable and unnecessary messages, they want to get out of the situation as soon as possible (Suher and İspir 2010, p. 6). Consumers may avoid an ad for several reasons: First, it may be for low-priced, frequently purchased products which they want no more information. Second, they may be so focused on the program that they find the ad a distraction. Third, they may be so loyal to a rival brand that they do not want opposing information. Fourth, they may find the ad boring or offensive (Tellis 2004, p. 31). On the other hand, according to Roja-Mendez & Davies (2005), people may avoid advertisements for other reasons such as in search of relief from boredom and boring ads due to the excess of TV ads or zapping as a gratifying and enjoyable activity.

Advertisers should consider that ad avoidance is a real fact which cannot be ignored (Prendergast, Cheung and West, 2010). Therefore, they must take this avoidance into consideration in planning and executing advertising campaigns. Tse

and Lee (2001) found that %80,8 of viewers use various means to avoid advertisements. According to Speck &Elliot (1997), advertising avoidance is higher for television than other types of media.

In this study, ad avoiding behavior is studied in the context of TV advertisements and the term 'TV advertising avoiding behavior' refers to all actions by television viewers to reduce their exposure to the content of television advertisements (Speck & Elliott, 1997).

2. ADVERTISING AVOIDANCE

Advertising avoidance defined as *"all actions by media users that differentially reduce their exposure to ad content"* (Speck and Elliott 1997, p.61). The first strategic approach about advertising avoidance is presented by Abernethy (1991) and called physical and mechanical avoidance. Physical avoidance is defined as to leave the room and mechanical avoidance is switching the channels during the TV commercials. Speck and Elliott (1997) added a third strategy which is called "cognitive strategy". People can remove a television commercial simply by ignoring it as "a cognitive strategy", leaving the room as "a behavioral strategy" or switching channels as "a mechanical strategy" (Speck and Elliott 1997, p. 62)

Rojaz -Mendez, Davies and Madran (2009), studied mechanical and behavioral advertising avoidance on the base of demographic and attitudinal factors in television. The aim of the study was to get more consistent data on the base of demographic and attitudinal factors by conducting surveys in three different cultures, which are UK, Chile and Turkey. According to the findings of the research males use more mechanical avoidance methods, whereas females use more behavioral avoidance methods. More educated people generally report higher behavioral avoidance. Family size and age help to explain avoidance in some countries but not in others. Overall a negative attitude towards advertising is more important generally in explaining mechanical avoidance. Behavioral avoidance is more important and is best explained by a combination of demographic and attitudinal factors. Country of residence is significant in predicting behavioral avoidance.

Moriarty and Everett (1994) examined avoidance behaviors of audiences and their study pointed out that when the commercials starts 27% of the viewers ignore, 17% of the viewers leave the room, 14% of the viewers talk to each other, 23% of the viewers change the channel, 8% of the viewers mute audio (Moriarty and Everett 1994, p. 351). The viewers also might be doing something else while watching TV. For example 26% of the viewers eat something, 22% of the viewers read, 14% of the viewers chore, 8% of the viewers child care, 6% of the viewers do homework/paperwork (Clancey 1994, p. 84). According to another research, between 20% - 33% of the television viewers leave the room during the commercials (Soley 1984, pp. 141-148). Clancey (1994) reveals that only 31% of the viewers watch TV with full attention. All forms of avoidance increase substantially during television commercials, largely because people use that time to do other things (Speck and Elliott 1997, p. 62).

To be able to define the predictors of advertising avoidance Speck and Elliott (1997) examined the variables "demographic characteristics", "media-related variables", "advertising perceptions and attitudes" and "communication problems" in four media like magazines, newspaper, radio and television. According to the research findings "advertising perceptions" is the strongest predictors of ad avoidance and also is the best in differentiating print from broadcast media. The results indicate that age and income are the best demographic predictors across media.

Suher and İspir (2010), studied the factors that affect the advertising avoidance which are "demographic characteristics", "media-related variables", "attitudes toward advertising", "communication problems", "advertising clutter", "time pressure" and "the presence of others" in television and newspaper. As supported by related literature, in this study, "attitudes toward advertising" and "communication problems" are the most effective variables in explaining the advertising avoidance. Besides, there are a positive relationship between "the presence of others" and advertising avoidance.

Prendergast, Cheung and West (2010), proposes a new passive-active framework to explain observations of avoidance behavior. The research findings indicate that general attitudes towards advertising are an important predictor of advertising avoidance in both broadcast and print media. A more negative attitude towards advertising results in higher levels of advertising avoidance. The presence of others and individual time pressure are important predictors of advertising avoidance in the broadcast media.

The extended research on ad avoidance has been mostly restricted to traditional media such as television, radio, newspaper, magazines and there has been limited academic research on internet ad avoidance (Cho and Cheon 2004, p. 90). Most of the academic studies are all about on television (Abernethy 1991, Dannaher 1995, Heeter and Greenberg 1985, Lee and Lumpkin 1992, Ferguson and Perse 1993, Clancey 1994, Moriarty and Everett 1994, Kaplan 1985, Zufryden, Pedrick and Sankaralingam 1993, Yorke and Kitchen 1985, Speck and Elliott 1997, Suher and İspir 2010). Through the internet, people can watch broadcast programs, listen to the radio, read newspapers, read direct e-mail ads, exposed to scrolling banner ads and so forth. The internet can be used like traditional media for such purposes as an access to information and entertainment (Cho and Cheon 2004, p. 89).

Technological advances and different kinds of programs also led people to advertising avoidance. One of the best example of advertising avoidance is to use remote control devices. The advancement of technology makes more easy the avoidance behavior especially in broadcast media.

An online survey conducted by Vizu Market Research and Greg Stuart" (2008), was studied in order to gauge opinions of internet users on their attitudes towards ads associated with certain media and consumers' ad avoidance behavior. According to the study, 56% of respondents want to eliminate all advertising, while only 44% of respondents accept advertising as it is and 72% of respondents find advertising "annoying" or "extremely annoying". Internet is the most irritating advertisement (48.3%) among other media such as television (% 26.6), radio (% 9.2), magazines (% 2.9), newspapers (% 0.5), billboards (% 1.0), games (% 1.4), cell phones (5.8) and movies (4.3). Another finding is that the respondents make an effort to avoid an ad on the Internet (%36) more than they do on television (%27.5) in order to avoid the ad. TV remote controls and internet pop up blockers are the most used ad avoidance tools according to %80 of respondents. Another research conducted by SIFO Research International in Sweden (2002) indicates that, advertising avoidance in the lean backward is falling somewhat over time, while avoidance is increasing in the lean forward media.

3. THE PRESENCE OF OTHERS

The antecedents to advertising avoidance also have been examined in literature. The predictor variables are "demographic characteristics", "media-related variables", "advertising perceptions and attitudes", "communication problems", "advertising clutter", "time pressure" and "the presence of others" (Speck & Elliott, 1997; Rojaz- Mendez, Davies and Madran ,2009; Prendergast, Cheung and West ,2010).

The presence of others might serve as a general measure of people's intention to interact with family or friends rather than attend to commercials. Paying attention to friends and family should normally have a higher priority than paying attention to advertising as friends and family are more important. People's preference for to respect those around them rather than the advertising may be an underlying explanation for why advertising is avoided in such circumstances (Prendergast, Cheung and West 2010, p. 89).

Belk (1975), studied situational variables and consumer behavior and emphasized that specific situational variables influence the consumer behaviors. The following five groups of situational characteristics which are *"physical surroundings ", "social surroundings ", "temporal perspective", task definition"* and *"antecedent states"* , represent the general features consistent with the current definition of situation (Belk 1975, p. 159). *Physical surroundings* are geographical and institutional location, decor, sounds, aromas, lighting, weather and visible configurations of merchandise or other material surrounding the stimulus object. *Social surroundings* represents other persons presence, their characteristics, their apparent roles and interpersonal interactions. *Temporal perspective* is a dimension which may be specified in units ranging from time of day to season of the year. *Task definition* features of a situation include an intent or requirement to select, shop for or obtain information about a general or specific purchase. *Antecedent states* represents momentary moods such as acute anxiety, pleasantness, hostility and excitation or momentary conditions such as cash on hand, fatigue and illness (Belk 1975, p. 159).

Prendergast, Cheung and West (2010) studied the relationship between the advertising avoidance and the presence of others; individual time pressure in the broadcast media. The research was to examine the role of general psychological factors that explain advertising avoidance across a range of mass media. The presence of others is described as passive factor because it is generally beyond a viewer's control. As such, people may avoid advertising not because of they want to, but because of their environment leaves them little choice (Prendergast, Cheung and West 2010, p. 88).

According to Fishbein and Ajzen (1975), intentions are decisions to act in a particular way in the future. The impact of presence of others might be expected to depend on how filial or friendly people are. Paying attention to friends and family should normally have a higher priority than paying attention to advertising as friends and family are more important. People's preference for respecting those around them rather than the advertising may be an underlying explanation for why advertising is avoided in such circumstances (Prendergast, Cheung and West 2010, p. 89). Moriarty and Everett (1994), observed that during TV commercial breaks, talking increases by about 40 percent.

The presence of others is more likely to influence consumer avoidance of advertisements in broadcast media than in print media because print media requires focus and most people do not read and talk with others simultaneously. Prendergast, Cheung and West (2010) obtained that the presence of others has no meaningful affect in print media. Speck and Elliott (1997) have obtained that during commercial breaks people focus on things outside the medium such as conversation and then return their attention back to the television when the break is over. But with print media, people attend to other material in the media as a way to avoid ads, rather than engage in conversation with others. Prendergast, Cheung and West (2010) obtained that there is a positive relationship between the presence of others and advertising avoidance in television and radio. Suher and Ispir (2010) had obtained a similar result in the literature. Paying attention to friends and family has a higher priority than commercials.

On the other hand, *"Noise"* is a factor that prevents all communication process (Kreitner and others 2002, p. 297). The presence of others might be a reason to avoid advertising as a noise factor. As intentions are decisions to act in a particular way in the future, as a noise factor the presence of others may have an influence on intentions and behavior.

4. METHODOLOGY

The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between the presence of others and advertising avoidance on television. Hypotheses are presented as below:

H1: There is a significant relationship between the presence of others and total advertising avoidance on television

H2: There is a significant relationship between the presence of others and the behavioral, mechanical and cognitive advertising avoidance on television.

H3: Both demographic characteristics and presence of others have a significant relationship on the advertising avoidance on television

In order to analyze the hypotheses, the data is collected by using a face-to-face survey method. The survey is applied to 412 respondents with convenience sampling method in İstanbul. The questionnaire has divided in two parts. The first part of the questionnaire contains 12 scale questions for advertising avoidance and the presence of other. The first four of 12 questions measure "behavioral advertising avoidance" as shown on Table 1. The first tree questions modified from the study of *"Universal differences in advertising avoidance: A cross-cultural study"* by Rojaz-Mendez, Davies and Madran (2009). The 5th, 6th and 7th questions measure "mechanical advertising avoidance" and also modified from the study by Rojaz-Mendez, Davies and Madran (2009). In order to measure the "cognitive advertising avoidance" the 8th question was used and it was modified from the study of "*Variables that Affect Advertising Avoidance in Television and Newspaper"* by Suher and İspir (2010). The 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th questions measure the" presence of others" and modified from the study of "*Antecedents to Advertising Avoidance in China"* by Prendergast, Cheung and West (2010) and "*Variables that Affect Advertising Avoidance in Television and Newspaper"* by Suher and İspir (2010). The second part of the questionnaire has demographic characteristics as age, gender, marital status, family size, income, education and working status. In addition, smartphone usage, the number of TV sets in households and computer usage while watching TV were measured.

On the first hypothesis three dimensions of advertising avoidance (Behavioral, Mechanical and Cognitive) were combined as one variable labeled as "Total Advertising Avoidance" and measured with the mean of three dimensions which consist of 8 item scales.

The second hypothesis examined the relationship between the presence of others and each scale of Behavioral, Mechanical and Cognitive avoidance. As mentioned above Behavioral, Mechanical and Cognitive Dimensions were measured by 4, 3 and 1 item respectively. In all analysis Behavioral and Mechanical Avoidance dimensions were used with the mean of related items.

Third hypothesis examined the relationship among the variables of demographic characteristics of households, presence of others and the advertising avoidance. In this hypothesis it was tried to obtain the combined effects of demographic characteristics and presence of others on advertising avoidance. For the demographics characteristics the variables of gender, age, education, number of household members and the number of TV sets in the households were used. Same as with the first hypothesis, the "Total Advertising Avoidance" variable measured with the mean of three dimensions which consist of 8 item scale.

Before regression analyses, a correlation analysis was applied to figure out the relations between the variables. In this correlation analysis "Presence of others" variable was used as the mean of the 4 related items. In the all hypothesis "Presence of Others" was measured by four items separately as shown in Table 2 for observing the variances in detail.

In this study Advertising Avoidance itself and its dimensions were taken as dependent variables whereas Presence of Others and Demographic Characteristics were taken as independent variables.

The multi-item questionnaire was used in this study to measure the Dimensions of Advertising Avoidance and the Presence of Others. Constructs used were measured with a seven-point Likert type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The respondents were asked to choose a number ranging from 1-7 which measures the degree of their acceptance. The SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) was used for statistical evaluation. For the first and the second hypothesis correlation and four separate regression analysis were employed. One regression analysis was for overall advertising avoidance (first hypothesis), and three regression analyses were for the three dimensions of advertising avoidance (Behavioral, Mechanical and Cognitive) (second hypothesis). For the third hypothesis hierarchical regression analysis were used.

Table 1: The scales of the items and avoidance strategies

NO	THE ITEMS ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE FORM	VARIABLE	SCALE	AVOIDANCE STRATEGIES
1	I leave the room when TV commercials start	Dependent variable	Rojaz-Mendez and Davies (2009)	Behavioral Avoidance
2	I read newspaper, magazines etc. when TV commercials start	Dependent variable	Rojaz-Mendez ve Davies (2009)	Behavioral Avoidance
3	I make phone calls when TV commercials start	Dependent variable	Rojaz-Mendez ve Davies (2009)	Behavioral Avoidance
4	I prefer to deal with electronic tools as computer, I-pad, phones when TV commercials start	Dependent variable	Formed in consistent with literature	Behavioral Avoidance

5	I switch to another channel when TV commercials start	Dependent variable	Rojaz-Mendez and Davies (2009)	Mechanical avoidance
6	I switch the television set off when TV commercials start	Dependent variable	Rojaz-Mendez and Davies (2009)	Mechanical avoidance
7	I mute the sound when TV commercials start	Dependent variable	Rojaz-Mendez and Davies (2009)	Mechanical avoidance
8	I ignore the commercials when TV commercials start	Dependent variable	Suher and İspir (2010)	Cognitive avoidance
9	When watching TV, I would prefer to talk to the people I am with when there is an advertisement on	Independent variable	Prendergast, Cheung and West (2010)	The presence of others
10	When watching TV, my friends would prefer to talk to me when there is an advertisement on	Independent variable	Prendergast, Cheung and West (2010)	The presence of others
11	When watching TV, it is preferable to initiate talking with friends when there is an advertisement on	Independent variable	Prendergast, Cheung and West. (2010)	The presence of others
12	When watching TV with my friends and family, the commercial breaks are opportunity for me to chat with them	Independent variable	Suher and İspir (2010)	The presence of others

5. FINDINGS

Table 2 shows the mean and standard deviation of the Behavioral, Mechanical, Cognitive Advertising Avoidance and The Presence of Others variables. Cronbach's Alpha coefficients were computed for the reliability test. According to the Alpha coefficients, reliability is accepted for the presence of others as 0,834 (Cronbach's Alpha=0,834) and total advertising avoidance is (Behavioral+Mechanical+Cognitive) as 0,772 (Cronbach's Alpha=0,772). According to these figures it could be decided that the both of the scales were reliable (Nunnally 1978, Plant 2013 p. 6, DeVellis 2003, Hair et al 1998, Kalaycı 2006 p. 405).

Table 2: Mean, Standard Deviation and Reliability of the scales

		Mean	**Stand Dev.**	**Avoidance**		**Alpha**
1	I leave the room when TV commercials start	3,23	1,904	Behavioral Avoidance	Total Advertising Avoidance	0,772
2	I read newspaper, magazines etc. when TV commercials start	3,22	1,938			
3	I make phone calls when TV commercials start	4,30	1,958			
4	I prefer to deal with electronic tools as computer, I-pad, phones when TV commercials start	4,99	1,931			
5	I switch to another channel when TV commercials start	5,73	1,653	Mechanical Avoidance		
6	I switch the television set off when TV commercials start	1,93	1,529			
7	I mute the sound when TV commercials start	3,74	2,109			
8	I ignore the commercials when TV commercials start	3,84	1,899	Cognitive Avoidance		
9	When watching TV, I would prefer to talk to the people I am with when there is an advertisement on	5,12	1,737	The Presence of Others		0,834
10	When watching TV, my friends would prefer to talk to me when there is an advertisement on	4,87	1,711			
11	When watching TV, it is preferable to initiate talking with friends when there is an advertisement on	5,00	1,808			
12	When watching TV with my friends and family, the commercial breaks are opportunity for me to chat with them	4,91	1,975			

When the means of scales were observed in Table 2; In the Behavioral Avoidance respondents prefer to make phone calls or play with other electronic devices such as ipad, computers and smartphones when the commercials start. In Mechanical Avoidance respondents prefer to switch channels during advertising breaks. According the result of cognitive avoidance the respondents do not totally ignore the commercials. When the items of Presence of Others were analyzed, respondents prefer to interact with others during commercials. According to the research results; Table 3 shows the demographic profile. The age interval is changing between19-50. The percentage of gender variable is 54% female and 46%

male; The Martial Status is 46% married and 54% single. Most of the respondents' income level is about 3500 TL and below. Most of the respondents' education level is under graduate. The number of household members are between 3-5 with the percentage of 63,59. The numbers of TV sets in households are between 1- 4. Most of the respondents are employed. Consistent with their age group, great majority of the respondents are using smartphones. The respondents are using computer at the same time while they are watching TV.

Table 3: Demographic Profile (%)

N=412	CATEGORIES	FREQENCY	PERCENT	N=412	CATEGORIES	FREQENCY	PERCENT
GENDER	Female	222	53,90	SMARTPHONE USAGE	Yes	323	78,40
	Male	190	46,10		No	89	21,60
MARITAL STATUS	Married	189	45,90	USING COMPUTER WHİLE WATCHING TV	Yes	309	75,00
	Single	223	54,10		No	103	25,00
HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS	<= 2	144	34,95	WORKING STATUS	Yes	341	82,80
	3 - 5	262	63,59		No	71	17,20
	6 - 8	4	0,97				
	9+	2	0,48				
INCOME	<= 2000 TL	142	34,46				
	2001-3500 TL	125	30,33				
	3501-5000 TL	66	16,01				
	5001-7000 TL	37	8,98				
	7001 YTL and over	42	10,19				
EDUCATION	Primary education	18	4,36				
	Secondary education	11	2,66				
	High school	97	23,54				
	Associate degree	43	10,43				
	Undergraduate	167	40,53				
	Graduate	76	18,44				
TV SETS İN HOUSEHOLDS	<= 1	194	47,09				
	2 - 4	213	51,70				
	5 - 7	4	0,97				
	8+	1	0.24				
AGE	<= 18	8	1,94				
	19 - 34	246	59,71				
	35 - 50	128	31,07				
	51 - 65	25	6,07				
	66+	5	1,21				

Hypothesis Testing of the Data (Correlation and Regression analyses)

To test the hypotheses correlations, regression and hierarchal regression analyses were used. Correlation Analysis is the beginning of the analyses to figure out the relationships between presence of others and advertising avoidance in general

Table 4: Correlations Between The Presence of Others and Behavioral, Mechanical, Cognitive and Total Advertising Avoidance

	The Presence of Others	Behavioral Advertising Avoidance	Mechanical Advertising Avoidance	Cognitive Advertising Avoidance (Item 8)	Total Advertising Avoidance Behavioral, Mechanical, Cognitive)
The Presence of Others					
Behavioral Advertising Avoidance	0,488**				
Mechanical Advertising Avoidance	0,522**	0,550**			

Cognitive Advertising Avoidance (Item 8)	0,437**	0,375**	0,501**		
Total Advertising Avoidance Behavioral, Mechanical, Cognitive)	0,591**	0,895**	0,835**	0,630**	

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In Table 4 the relationships between The Presence of Others and Behavioral, Mechanical, Cognitive and Total Advertising Avoidance was investigated using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality linearity and homoscedasticity. There was a medium to strong positive correlations between The Presence of Others and Behavioral, Mechanical, Cognitive and Total Advertising Avoidance with high levels of Presence of Others associated with high levels of Advertising Avoidance (both total and separate) (Pallant, 2013 p.139) These are r=0,488, r=0.522, r=0,437 and r=0,591 respectively. (n=412, p<.001)

For the first and second hypothesis four separate regression analyses were conducted. "Presence of Others" was measured with using the four items separately in these regression analyses for better reporting. For the dependent variables the means of the related items were used as shown in Table 2. The regression analyses and variables were explained below

A. *"The presence of Others"* independent variable (four item) and *"Total Advertising Avoidance"* (behavioral, mechanical and cognitive) dependent variable
B. *"The presence of Others"* independent variable (four item) and *"Behavioral Advertising Avoidance"* dependent variable
C. *"The presence of Others"* independent variable (four item) and *"Mechanical Advertising Avoidance"* dependent variable
D. *"The presence of Others"* independent variable (four item) and *"Cognitive Advertising Avoidance"* dependent variable

Before start out to regression analyses preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality (P-P plot), linearity, multicollinearity (Tolerance and VIF) and homoscedasticity for each regression analysis and no serious violations reported. Secondly, the sufficiency of sample was checked for the assumption of regression analysis. The formulation is "N≥50 + 8x independent variable" (Tabachnick and Fidell 2014, p. 159). According to this formulation in this study, the sample of 412 is enough for 12 independent variables. In addition, there is no missing data.

A. The Presence of Others and the Total Advertising Avoidance (Behavioral, Mechanical and Cognitive) regression analysis

The four items for the Presence of Others were used in a standard regression analysis to predict the Total Advertising Avoidance (Behavioral, Mechanical and Cognitive). The prediction model was statistically significant, F (4, 407) = 61,142 p < 0,001, n=412, and accounted for approximately 38% of the variance of Total Advertising Avoidance (R^2 = 0,375, Adjusted R^2 = 0,369) The raw and standardized regression coefficients of the predictors with their correlations with the Total Advertising Avoidance, their semipartial correlations and their structure coefficients are shown in Table 5. "When watching TV, I would prefer to talk to the people I am with when there is an advertisement on" had the strongest significant standardized regression coefficient with the Total Advertising Avoidance, (beta = 0,379, p < 0,001), and explained about 7 % of the unique variance in the Total Advertising Avoidance. (When the part or semipartial correlation coefficient values are squared, it is an indication of the contribution of that variable to the total R square, in other words it tells how much of the total variance in the dependent variable is uniquely explained by that variable. Part or semipartial correlations values represent only the unique contribution of each variable, with any overlap or shared variance removed or partialled out, the total R square value however includes unique variance explained by each variable and also that shared. (Tabachnick & Fidel, 2014, Pallant, 2013). "When watching TV with my friends and family, the commercial breaks are opportunity for me to chat with them" had the second strongest significant standardized regression coefficient (beta = 0,135, p < 0,05) and explained 1% unique variance. "When watching TV, my friends would prefer to talk to me when there is an advertisement on" had the third strongest significant standardized regression coefficient (beta = 0,133, p < 0,05) and explained 1% unique variance. The total variance explained by all four predictors as The Presence of Others is about 38% for the Total Advertising Avoidance. This analysis is a major finding for this research that the presence of others considerably explains the avoidance behavior. By the regression analysis applied further ,each avoidance variables will be analyzed.

Table 5: Coefficient Table (The Presence of Others and Total Advertising Avoidance (Behavioral, Mechanical, Cognitive)

Model	**Unstandardized Coefficients**		**Standardized Coefficients**	**t**	**Sig.**	**Correlations**		**Collinearity Statistics**	
	B	**Std.**	**Beta**			**Zero-**	**Part**	**Tolerance**	**VIF**

		Error				Order			
Constant	1,501	0,161		9,331	0,000				
When watching TV, I would prefer to talk to the people I am with when there is an advertisement on	0,254	0,036	0,379	6,975	0,000	0,576	0,273	0,519	1,928
When watching TV, my friends would prefer to talk to me when there is an advertisement on	0,090	0,037	0,133	2,430	0,016	0,481	0,095	0,516	1,939
When watching TV, it is preferable to initiate talking with friends when there is an advertisement on	0,049	0,035	0,076	1,379	0,169	0,450	0,054	0,507	1,974
When watching TV with my friends and family, the commercial breaks are opportunity for me to chat with them	0,079	0,030	0,135	2,680	0,008	0,437	0,105	0,607	1,647
Dependent Variable: Total Advertising Avoidance (Behavioral, Mechanical, Cognitive)									

B. The Presence of Others and the Behavioral Advertising Avoidance Regression Analysis

The four items for the Presence of Others were used in a standard regression analysis to predict the Behavioral Advertising Avoidance. The prediction model was statistically significant, F (4, 407) = 33,186 p < 0,001, n=412, and accounted for approximately 25% of the variance of the Behavioral Advertising Avoidance (R^2 = 0,246, Adjusted R^2 = 0,239) The raw and standardized regression coefficients of the predictors with their correlations with the Behavioral Advertising Avoidance, their semipartial correlations and their structure coefficients are shown in Table 6. "When watching TV, I would prefer to talk to the people I am with when there is an advertisement on" had the strongest significant standardized regression coefficient with the Behavioral Advertising Avoidance, (beta = 0,248, p < 0,001), and explained about 3 % of the unique variance in the Behavioral Advertising Avoidance. "When watching TV, my friends would prefer to talk to me when there is an advertisement on" had the second strongest significant standardized regression coefficient (beta = 0,145, p < 0,05) and explained 1% unique variance. "When watching TV with my friends and family, the commercial breaks are opportunity for me to chat with them" had the third strongest significant standardized regression coefficient (beta = 0,116, p < 0,05) and explained 1% unique variance. The total variance explained by all four predictors as The Presence of Others is about 25% for the Behavioral Advertising Avoidance

Table 6: Coefficient Table (The Presence of Others and Behavioral Advertising Avoidance)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		Colinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-Order	Part	Tolerance	VIF
Constant:	1,618	0,211		7,682	0,000				
When watching TV, I would prefer to talk to the people I am with when there is an advertisement on	0,198	0,048	0,248	4,152	0,000	0,449	0,179	0,519	1,928
When watching TV, my friends would prefer to talk to me when there is an advertisement on	0,117	0,049	0,145	2,414	0,016	0,408	0,104	0,516	1,939
When watching TV, it is preferable to initiate talking with friends when there is an advertisement on	0,067	0,046	0,087	1,446	0,149	0,383	0,062	0,507	1,974
When watching TV with my friends and family, the commercial breaks are opportunity for me to chat with them	0,081	0,039	0,116	2,093	0,037	0,363	0,090	0,607	1,647
Dependent Variable: Behavioral Advertising Avoidance									

C. The Presence of Others and the Mechanical Advertising Avoidance Regression Analysis

The four items for the Presence of Others were used in a standard regression analysis to predict the Mechanical Advertising Avoidance. The prediction model was statistically significant, F (4, 407) = 46.066 p < 0.001, n=412, and accounted for

approximately 31% of the variance of the Mechanical Advertising Avoidance (R^2 = 0,312 Adjusted R^2 = 0,305) The raw and standardized regression coefficients of the predictors with their correlations with the Mechanical Advertising Avoidance, their semipartial correlations and their structure coefficients are shown in Table 7. "When watching TV, I would prefer to talk to the people I am with when there is an advertisement on" had the strongest significant standardized regression coefficient with the Mechanical Advertising Avoidance, (beta = 0.405, p < 0.001), and explained about 9 % of the unique variance in the Mechanical Advertising Avoidance. The total variance explained by all four predictors as The Presence of Others is about 31% for the Mechanical Advertising Avoidance

Table 7: Coefficient Table (The Presence of Others and Mechanical Advertising Avoidance)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		Colinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-Order	Part	Tolerance	VIF
Constant:	1,516	0,182		8,323	0,000				
When watching TV, I would prefer to talk to the people I am with when there is an advertisement on	0,293	0,041	0,405	7,101	0,000	0,539	0,292	0,519	1,928
When watching TV, my friends would prefer to talk to me when there is an advertisement on	0,078	0,042	0,106	1,849	0,065	0,425	0,076	0,516	1,939
When watching TV, it is preferable to initiate talking with friends when there is an advertisement on	0,017	0,040	0,024	0,418	0,676	0,379	0,017	0,507	1,974
When watching TV with my friends and family, the commercial breaks are opportunity for me to chat with them	0,066	0,034	0,103	1,956	0,051	0,377	0,080	0,607	1,647
Dependent Variable: Mechanical Advertising Avoidance									

D. The Presence of Others and the Cognitive Advertising Avoidance regression analysis

The four items for the Presence of Others were used in a standard regression analysis to predict the Cognitive Advertising Avoidance. The prediction model was statistically significant, F (4, 407) = 27,669 p < 0,001, n=412, and accounted for approximately 21% of the variance of the Cognitive Advertising Avoidance (R^2 = 0,214 Adjusted R^2 = 0,206) The raw and standardized regression coefficients of the predictors with their correlations with the Cognitive Advertising Avoidance, their semipartial correlations and their structure coefficients are shown in Table 8. "When watching TV, I would prefer to talk to the people I am with when there is an advertisement on" had the strongest significant standardized regression coefficient with the Cognitive Advertising Avoidance, (beta = 0,330, p < 0,001), and explained about 6 % of the unique variance in the Cognitive Advertising Avoidance. "When watching TV with my friends and family, the commercial breaks are opportunity for me to chat with them" had the second strongest significant standardized regression coefficient (beta = 0,118, p < 0,05) and explained 1% unique variance. The total variance explained by all four predictors as The Presence of Others is about 21% for the Cognitive Advertising Avoidance

Table 8: Coefficient Table (The Presence of Others and Cognitive Advertising Avoidance (Item 8))

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		Colinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-Order	Part	Tolerance	VIF
Constant:	0,984	0,295		3,340	0,001				
When watching TV, I would prefer to talk to the people I am with when there is an advertisement on	0,361	0,067	0,330	5,412	0,000	0,441	0,238	0,519	1,928
When watching TV, my friends would prefer to talk to me when there is an advertisement on	0,019	0,068	0,017	0,279	0,780	0,322	0,012	0,516	1,939
When watching TV, it is preferable to initiate talking with friends when there is an advertisement on	0,072	0,065	0,069	1,113	0,266	0,336	0,049	0,507	1,974

When watching TV with my friends and family, the commercial breaks are opportunity for me to chat with them	0,113	0,054	0,118	2,087	0,037	0,336	0,092	0,607	1,647
Dependent Variable: Cognitive Advertising Avoidance									

For the third hypothesis, a hierarchical multiple regression was used to examine the effect of Demographic factors, Household Factors and the Presence of Others on the Total Advertising Avoidance. A total of 9 independent variables, grouped in 3 separate blocks were included in the analysis. (Table 9). Hierarchical multiple regression is used to determine how much variance in the criterion, dependent or outcome variable is explained by predictors (independent variables) when they are entered in a particular sequence. The more variance that a predictor explains, the potentially more important that variable may be. The variables may be entered in a particular sequence on practical or theoretical grounds. (Howitt and Cramer, 2011, p. 341) From a practical view, first it would be logical to observe how much basic demographic variables explain the total advertising avoidance such as age, sex and education, next it can be considered whether household variables as the extension of demographics made any difference to explaining total advertising avoidance beyond age, sex and education. Finally the effects of the variables of presence of others were examined on the total advertising avoidance. Entering these variables in a sequence like this will enable to see how much each group or block of variables adds to how well it can be predicted the total advertising avoidance. Thus, in the first stage of the regression analysis age, sex, and education were entered as the demographic variables. In the second stage the number of household members and the number of TV sets in household were entered as the Household Variables. In the third stage separate variables of the Presence of Others were entered as the last block as seen Table 9. Preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity and homoscedasticity.

In the first step demographic variables (age, sex and education) as the only predictors explained 1 % of variance and was not significant. ($F (7,404) = 0,822$, $p = 0.569$). Among the predictors, the demographic variables that were used in this study were ordinal in scale. Regression analysis can be used with either continuous or dichotomous independent variables. A variable that is initially discrete can be used if it is first converted into set of dichotomous variables by dummy variable coding with 1s and 0s. (Tabachnick & Fidel 2014, p. 155) In the second step, household factors, "the number of household members" and "the number of TV sets in household" were added and explained no significant extra variance. ($F (2, 402) = 0,097$, $p = 0,908$). In the third step the presence of other variables were added and explained the only significant variance increase, ($R^2 = 0,380$ change, $F (4,398) = 62,315$, $p < 0.001$). The third step explained 39.4 % of the variance in the total advertising avoidance (Adjusted $R^2 = 0,374$) and was significant ($F (13, 398) = 19,907$, $p < 0,001$).

Table 9: Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Total Advertising Avoidance with Demographic Variables, Household Variables and Presence of Others Items

Hierarchical step	**Predictor Variables**		**Total R^2**	**Incremental R^2**
1	Demographic Variables	Age	0,014	0,014
		Sex		
		Education		
2	Household Factor	The number of household members	0,014	0,000
		The number of TV Sets in household		
3	Presence of Others	When watching TV, I would prefer to talk to the people I am with when there is an advertisement on	0,394*	0,380*
		When watching TV, my friends would prefer to talk to me when there is an advertisement on		
		When watching TV, it is preferable to initiate talking with friends when there is an advertisement on		
		When watching TV with my friends and family, the commercial breaks are opportunity for me to chat with them		

**p < 0.01*

The results of the hierarchical regression used to estimate the incremental and the total variances associated with dependent variable groups for each step and final coefficients were reported in Table 10. As final coefficients, betas of the third step and their respective significance values were seen in Table 10. The significant predictors in third step according to their strength were "When watching TV, I would prefer to talk to the people I am with when there is an advertisement on", "When watching TV, my friends would prefer to talk

to me when there is an advertisement on", "When watching TV with my friends and family, the commercial breaks are opportunity for me to chat with them" as the variables of Presence of Others. "Undergraduate education" and "high school education" as education variables followed the above predictors. These significant education variables are negative predictors.

Table 10: Final Coefficient Table of the Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Total Advertising Avoidance with Demographic Variables, Household Variables and Presence of Others Items

	Final Beta	**R^2**	**Sig.**
Age	0,052		0,198
Sex (Male)	0,044		0,273
Education (Primary School)	0,002		0,956
Education (Secondary School)	-0,047		0,267
Education (High School)	-0,108*		0,041
Education (Associate Degree)	-0,032		0,492
Education (Undergraduate)	-0,117*		0,033
R^2		**0,014**	
The number of household members	-0,035		0,424
The number of TV Sets in household	0,026		0,547
R^2 change		**0,000**	
R^2 after step 2		**0,014**	
When watching TV, I would prefer to talk to the people I am with when there is an advertisement on	0,382**		0,000
When watching TV, my friends would prefer to talk to me when there is an advertisement on	0,135*		0,014
When watching TV, it is preferable to initiate talking with friends when there is an advertisement on	0,082		0,137
When watching TV with my friends and family, the commercial breaks are opportunity for me to chat with them	0,135*		0,008
R^2 change		**0,380**	
R^2 after step 3		**0,394**	

**p < 0.05 **p < 0,001*

6. CONCLUSION

According to the correlation and regression analysis, hypothesis 1 and 2 were supported; the presence of others has a significant effect on the total and the separate (behavioral, mechanical and cognitive) advertising avoidance. According to the hierarchical regression analysis hypothesis 3 was partially supported. In hypothesis 3 demographics and household variables had no significant effect on the total advertising avoidance, but as being in hypothesis 1 and 2 the variables of presence of others has an effect on the total advertising avoidance.

In a detailed examination of the independent items as shown Table 11, the presence of others explains the variation on the total advertising avoidance 38%, and on the behavioral advertising avoidance 25%, on the mechanical advertising avoidance 31% and on the cognitive advertising avoidance 21% separately. In summary, advertising avoidance (dependent variable) can be explained by the total advertising avoidance and by the separate indicators of advertising avoidance with the variables of presence of others as independent variables.

The most explanatory independent variable in the presence of others was ***"When watching TV, I would prefer to talk to the people I am with when there is an advertisement on"*** *This item had the strongest beta values on 4 separate regression analysis.* The statement of *"When watching TV, I would prefer to talk to the people I am with when there is an advertisement on"* indicates that a conscious choice is made by people. In the mechanical advertising avoidance analysis this item had the highest significant beta value (0,405). If the person is with his family or friends, he or she changes the channel, switch the television set off or mute the sound when the TV commercials has started. This statement becomes major determinant between independent variables of the presence of others.

As Suher and İspir (2010), Prendergast, Cheung and West (2010) has indicated the positive relationship between the presence of others and advertising avoidance (Suher and İspir 2010, p. 21; Prendergast, Cheung and West 2010, p. 95), likewise this study is supported by the literature according to the results obtained .

In the literature, the presence of others is described as passive factors because it is generally beyond a viewer's control because people may avoid advertising not because of they want to, but because their environment leaves them little choice

(Prendergast, Cheung and West 2010, p. 88). However, in this study the findings show that people talk to others consciously as they want it to. Because the statement of ***"When watching TV, I would prefer to talk to the people I am with when there is an advertisement on"*** is the strongest item among the other independent variables.

Advertising avoidance is increasingly getting more complex and difficult problem for advertisers and advertising agencies. Because there are different variables causing advertising avoidance, it becomes really hard to create a definite solution. It is crucial to analyze and understand the consumers' needs correctly to conduct a proper communication strategy, and to be the right time and at the right place. For example, to be the first or the last commercial on television can be an effective factor that impede audience to avoid the commercial. In this sense, advertising creativity stands on a very crucial point on this matter. It seems to be a better solution to use creative message tactics in advertising strategies rather than placing strategies in commercials.

According the results of this study, the "presence of others" is both triggering and a catalyzing factor for advertising avoidance behavior. Another reason for advertising avoidance behavior is that commercial breaks have an intrusive character as its nature and resulting negative behavior toward advertising on the part of the audience. Other reason for ad avoidance is crowdsourcing. The media companies, in order to get more share form overall advertising budget, are inserting more and more advertising messages in commercial breaks resulting audience's negative response.

The triggering and catalyzing effect of presence of others on advertising avoidance behavior can be minimized by using creative strategies. Through creative message strategies by using advertising appeals like humor, love, music or using celebrities, the message effectiveness can be increased and this can lead people to talk about commercial during the break. Also, by conducting integrated communication strategies, the message effect can be multiplied by using social media or mobile advertising applications in order to minimize the negative impact of the avoidance behavior and the presence of others.

It can be said that Turkish culture gives importance to the presence of others and that importance may change attitudes and behaviors of people. For the further study, the relationship between the presence of others and advertising avoidance may be studied in cross cultural context or on different technological devices such as smartphones and computers.

.Table 11: Regression Summary Table

The Presence of Others The Independent Variables	**Total Advertising Avoidance**		**Behavioral Advertising Avoidance**		**Mechanical Advertising Avoidance**		**Cognitive Advertising Avoidance**	
	R^2=0,375		R^2=0,246		R^2=0,312		R^2=0,214	
	Beta	**Sig.**	**Beta**	**Sig.**	**Beta**	**Sig.**	**Beta**	**Sig.**
When watching TV, I would prefer to talk to the people I am with when there is an advertisement on	**0,379**	**0,000**	**0,248**	**0,000**	**0,405**	**0,000**	**0,330**	**0,000**
When watching TV, my friends would prefer to talk to me when there is an advertisement on	**0,133**	**0,016**	**0,145**	**0,016**	**0,106**	**0,065**	**0,017**	**0,780**
When watching TV, it is preferable to initiate talking with friends when there is an advertisement on	**0,076**	**0,169**	**0,087**	**0,149**	**0,024**	**0,676**	**0,069**	**0,266**
When watching TV with my friends and family, the commercial breaks are opportunity for me to chat with them	**0,135**	**0,008**	**0,116**	**0,037**	**0,103**	**0,051**	**0,118**	**0,037**

As a limitation of the study, like with most similar research in this field, the use of a convenience sample severely limits the generalizations. In addition, measurement instruments were adopted from a previous research. In this regard, despite pre-testing, there may have been some linguistic and cultural influences in the translation from English to Turkish.

REFERENCES

Abernethy A. M., (1991). Television exposure: Programs vs. Advertising. *Advertising Current Issues and Research in Advertising.* **13** (Spring), pp.61-78.

Belk, R. W., (1975). Situational variables and consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research.* 2 (December), pp. 157-164.

Cho C. & Cheon H. J., (2004). Why do people avoid advertising on the internet. *Journal of Advertising.* 33 (4), pp. 89-97.

Clancey, M., (1994). The television audience examined. *Journal of Advertising Research.* 34 (July/August), pp. 78-87.

Dannaher P. J., (1995). What happens to television ratings during commercial breaks? *Journal of advertising Research.* 35 (January/February), pp. 37-48.

DeVellis F. Robert. (2003). Scale Development: Theory and Applications. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication

Ferguson D. A. & Perse E. M., (1993). Media and audience influences on channel repertoire. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media.* 37 (Winter), pp. 31-47.

Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I., (1975). *Beliefs, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research, reading,* MA: Addison-Westley.

Hair, Jr. F. Joseph., Anderson, E. Rolph, Tatham, L. Ronald and Black, C. Willams., (1998). Multivariate Data Analysis. America: NJ Prentice Hall Inc.

Heeter C. & Greenber B. S., (1985). Profiling the zappers. *Journal of Advertising Research.* 25 (April/May)**,** pp. 15-19.

Howitt, D. and Cramer D., (2011). Introduction to SPSS Statistics in Psychology for Version 19 and Earlier. Fifth Edition. England: Pearson Education Limited

Kalaycı, Şeref., (2010). SPSS Uygulamalı Çok Değişkenli İstatistik Teknikleri, 5. Baskı., Ankara: Asil Yayın Dağıtım

Kaplan B. M., (1985). The real issue is communication. *Journal of Advertising.* 16 (1), pp. 64-72.

Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A., & Buelens, M., (2002). *Organizational Behaviour.* America: McGraw Hill Publishing.

Lee S. & Lumpkin J. R., (1992). Differences in attitude toward TV advertising. VCR usage as a moderator. *International Journal of Advertising.* 11 (4)**,** pp. 333-342.

Moriarty, S. E. & Everett, S., (1994). Commercial breaks: A viewing behavior study. *Journalism Quartely.* 71 (2), pp. 346-345.

Nunnally, Jum C., (1978). Psychometric Theory, Third Edition, New York: McGraw Hill.

Pallant, J., (2013). SPSS Survival Manual. 5rd Edition. New York: Open University Press.

Prendergast, G. & Cheung, W. & West, D., (2010). Antecedents to advertising avoidance in China. *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising.* 32 (2), pp. 87-99.

Rojaz-Mendez J. I. & Davies G. (2005). Avoiding television advertising: Some explanations from time allocation theory. *Journal of Advertising Research.* 45 (1) pp. 34-48.

Rojaz-Mendez J. I. & Davies G. & Madran C., (2009). Universal differences in advertising avoidance behavior: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Business Research.* 62 (1) pp. 947-954.

SIFO Research International, The quiet consumer revolt, (2002), (Download Date: 16 January 2014). (www.sifo.reserach-int.se).

Soley, L., (1984). Factors affecting television attentiveness: A research note. *Current Issues & Research in Advertising.* 7(1), pp. 141-148.

Speck P. S. & Elliott M. T. (1997). Predictors of advertising avoidance in print and broadcast media. *Journal of Advertising.* 26 (3), pp. 61-76.

Suher, H. K. & İspir, N. B., (2010). Televizyon ve gazetede reklamdan kaçınmayı etkileyen değişkenler. *Journal of Selçuk Communication* 6 (2), pp. 5-23

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S., (2014). Using multivariate statistics. 6th Edition. Newyork: Pearson.

Tellis, G., (2004). *Effective advertising: Understanding when, how and why advertising work.* America: Sage Publications

Tse, A. & Lee, R. (2001). Zapping behavior during commercial breaks. Journal of Advertising Research, 41(3), 25-29.

Vizu Corporation, Market Research Report, 2008. (Download Date: 16 January 2014). http://brandlift.vizu.com/knowledge-resources/research/pdf/Why_Consumers_Hate_Ads.pdf

Yorke D. A., & Kitchen P. J., (1985). Channel flickers and video speeders. *Journal of Advertising Research.* 25 (April/May) pp. 21-25.

Zufryden F. S., Pedrick J. H. and Sankaralingam A., (1993). Zapping and its impact on brand purchase behavior. 33 (January/February) pp. 58-66.