FOREIGN RESEARCH ON ADVERTISING PLACEMENT STRATEGIES AND AVOIDANCE OF ADVERTISING IN SOCIAL NETWORKS.

Nigina Bakhtiyorova
Bukhara State University
Faculty of Economics and Tourism,
70310501- "Digital Economy",
master

Abstract: *This article provides information on conflicting foreign research data on ad placement and social media ad avoidance strategies.*
Key words: *About ad placement and ad avoidance strategies, cognitive method, mechanical method, physical method, cognitive, affective and behavioral methods.*

Speck and Elliot back in 1997 has defined advertisement avoidance as 'all actions by media users that differentially reduce their exposure to ad content,' later this research and definition was admitted by scholar as the classic of ad avoidance. Advertisement placement studies and ad avoidance strategies have travelled long way from advertisements in newspapers and magazines (Sãvulescu, 2011 and Speck and Elliot 1997). One of the classical works treats ad avoidance strategies as part of advertisement coping strategy (Friestad, M. and Wright, P.,1994). One of the first researches (theoretical) conducted this was later proven by the same author in 2009.

Speck and Elliot (1997) has evaluated classical trio of methods of ad avoidance which were later modified to modern realties:

• cognitive method which includes the processes going in the mind when, the mind seems 'blind' to the advertisement. Although eyes can see the information, the information is not later analyzed in the mind. For example, ignoring the ads.

• mechanical method involves use of special technologies or clicking on x button in order to avoid the ad. Unlike another method this asks from the person to commit a physical action with certain technology, for example, using ad blocks. In addition to ignoring or swiping past adverts on a cognitive and behavioral level, the internet has provided mechanical ways in the form of ad blockers (Jung, 2017).

• physical method is highly connected with the omission of a person to do something. For example, not to look at the advertisement.

Later these methods introduced by Speck and Elliot (1997) were modified. Bang et al. (2018) with refer to Duff and Faber (2011) stated that there are 3 main methods of ad avoidance: 'cognitive, affective, and behavioral.' While the gist of methods remain the same the wordings were changed: physical became behavioral and mechanical affective.

Becker-Olsen (2003) concluded that 'when the ad has a high product fit with the audience, advertisers can benefit more from an in-stream ad placement compared to a banner ad placement due to an increased cognitive effort.'

Speck and Elliot (1997), and the same opinion was generally accepted by Edwards et al., (2002) states that certain people may find television advertising to be irritating or invasive, while others may possess a negative emotions and attitude directed to any sort of advertisements. Shavitt et al. (1998) divided attitude to advertisements into two: deceptive and misleading advertising may be deemed when individuals believe that it insults their intelligence, or when it encourages them to purchase items they don't need or supports ideals they don't agree with. On the other hand, positive attitudes toward advertising, which was developed further by Heyder et al. in 1992, is argued to include the perception that advertising can be "informative" and can "reduce future search time among other things."

Ad-avoidance theories and methods are gaining popularity in both popular and scholarly literature, and internet users are becoming increasingly aware of the necessity of using ad-avoidance techniques (Bang & Lee, 2016; Strong, 2013). As argued by Jung (2107) in recent years, it has risen to the top of the list of the most pressing challenges facing online marketers (also stated by Cho & Cheon).

The decision to circumvent from watching TV or social media commercials could be prompted by a range of factors. Schumann et al., (199) stating that television commercials can be "overabundant," have evaluated several factor or reasons on why people avoid TV commercial, which include:

1)   in an effort to escape the monotony and boringness of ads,

2)   out of curiosity to see what else is on, and

3)   out of a strong emotional attachment to television, in which case the very act of zapping may be rewarding and serve as an enjoyable activity for the viewer.

According to Rojas-Mendez and Davies (2005), attitudes toward advertising can be described as either positive or negative, depending on

whether people believe that advertising is good or damaging to their well-being.

In addition to demographic factors such as age, gender, education, and the size of a person's family, avoidance behavior appears to be influenced by their attitude toward advertising. When it comes to demographic features, the results, on the other hand, are a little more mixed (Speck and Elliot,1997).

But before mentioning the findings of Speck and Elliot (1997) it is worth mentioning that his research was mainly concentrated on TV commercials, while internet commercials can have a slightly different indicator. The internet has made it easier to avoid advertising by providing ad blockers, as well as cognitive and behavioral ways to avoid being targeted by advertisements (Jung et al., 2017; Kelly et al., 2010; Strong et al., 2013). Ad blockers may be installed by users who have had negative experiences with advertising in the past, which may result in the installation of an ad blocker and the avoidance of any future advertising. As a result of the proliferation of ad blocking and other ad avoidance technologies, advertisers have turned their attention to providing the best possible advertising experiences (Interactive Advertising Bureau, 2016, 2017).

Zufryden et al. (1993) discovered some relationships between demographic variables and ad zapping frequency, however Siddarth and Chattopadhyay (1998) discovered no significant associations between demographic traits and ad zapping proclivity. So it's difficult to predict with certainty whether or not a viewer's demographic characteristics will have an impact on their decision to disregard commercials. If demographic variables are culturally specific, they may have an impact on advertising behavior, but not in the same way in different civilizations. This is one explanation that might be given. The ability to determine whether or not particular demographic traits are connected with avoidance is important for both adversaries and researchers. Avoidance has been researched extensively within the boundaries of a specific cultural environment, which has limited its use. A combination of "government regulation, self-regulation, and differences in information processing and communication style" results in advertising that differs significantly from one culture to the next (De Mooij, 2004). Advertising during the commercial breaks of television programmes is forbidden in a number of jurisdictions. Another country's television broadcasts feature advertisements on practically every channel, while another has only a few stations that are devoid of advertisements. Non-BBC channels are limited to 9 minutes each hour of broadcasting time by the

Independent Television Commission of the United Kingdom, which is 15 percent of the total broadcasting time for non-BBC channels. The average number of commercials seen on television channels in Chile is 7 percent, with another 13 percent going to informational commercials, according to Nielsen data. The result may be a divergence of opinion on the subject of advertisements. In addition, cultural norms may be relevant in some cases. It is possible that the impact of gender will be less visible in countries where men and women have equal duties than in civilizations where the female role is more oriented on the home and family. We are currently exploring whether demographic and attitudinal variables may be used as marketing universals, or whether they cannot be consistently predicted as previously indicated. We intend to explore the influence of demography, nation of residence, and attitude on behavior in three culturally distinct contexts, each with its own unique collection of variables.

According to studies on newspaper (Smit, Neijens, and Heath, 2013; Speck and Elliott, 1997) and web page (Cho and Cheon, 2004, Duff and Faber, 2011; Ying, Korneliussen, and Grnhaug, 2009) advertisements, the placement of an advertisement has an impact on ad exposure, brand evaluations, perceived intrusiveness, and ad avoidance. Given how essential ad placement is on traditional advertising platforms, more study should be conducted on the effect of ad placement on how people evaluate and avoid commercials on social media platforms in general (Bang & Lee, 2016; Yu, 2014).

According to Baek and Morimoto (2012), there are a variety of indicators that can predict ad avoidance, including media consumption. The same theory was supported by Cho & Cheon (2004) and was originally stated by Speck and Elliot (1997). On the other hand, Baek and Morimoto (2012), as well as, Cho and Cheon (2004) indicate the social media usage as the factor which can predict ad avoidance behaviour.

Considering the fact that personalization is a distinguishing element of the Facebook platform, it should come as no surprise that privacy-related variables are widely examined and have been found to be key predictors of the refusal to click on Facebook ads (Boerman, Kruikemeier, and Borgesius 2017 and Smit and van Noort and Voorveld 2014). For advertising on social media, Van den Broeck and colleagues discovered that ad placement played an even greater effect than other factors that have been researched previously, such as privacy. According to the present study, the main focus is on ad avoidance on Facebook, with the goal of building on those findings. Moreover, According to Joinson (2008), as well as, Taylor,

Lewin, and Strutton (2011) there are two common reasons for using Facebook that have been studied: browsing and looking for information (Bang and Lee (2016) also pays emphasizes on this). We investigate how product engagement, as well as these two objectives, affects these consequences of the study. In an experimental design, advertisements were displayed in the Facebook message stream as well as in the right sidebar.

REFERENCES

1. Bang, H.J., Lee, W.-N., 2016. Consumer response to ads in social network sites: an exploration into the role of ad location and path. J. Curr. Issues Res. Advertising 37(1), 1–14.

2. Hyejin Bang, Jooyoung Kim, Dongwon Choi, (2018). Exploring the Effects of Ad-Task Relevance and Ad Salience on Ad Avoidance: The Moderating Role of Internet Use Motivation, Computers in Human Behavior

3. Bleier, A., Eisenbeiss, M., 2015. Personalized online advertising effectiveness: the interplay of what, when, and where. Market. Sci. 34 (5), 669–688

4. Duff, B. R., and Faber, R. J. (2011). Missing the mark. Journal of Advertising,40(2), 51-62.

5. Fan, S., Lu, Y., Gupta, S., 2017. Social media in-feed advertising: the impacts of consistency and sociability on ad avoidance. PACIS 2017 Proc. 190.

6. Pieters, R., and Wedel, M. (2004). Attention capture and transfer in advertising: Brand, pictorial,

7. and text-size effects. Journal of Marketing, 68(2), 36-50

8. Speck, P.S. and Elliott, M.T., (1997). Predictors of advertising avoidance in print and broadcast media. J. Advertising 26 (3), 61–76.

9. Friestad, M. and Wright, P. (1994). The persuasion knowledge model: how people cope with persuasion attempts. J. Consumer Res. 21 (1), 1–31.

10. Becker-Olsen, K.L., 2003. And now, a word from our sponsor–a look at the effects of sponsored content and banner advertising. J. Advertising 32 (2), 17–32

11. Edwards SM, Li H, Lee JH. Forced exposure and psychological reactance: antecedents and consequences of the perceived intrusiveness of pop-up ads. J Advert 2002;31(3):83–95.