Journal of Advertising

ISSN: 0091-3367 (Print) 1557-7805 (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ujoa20

The Third-Person Effect in Advertising: A Meta-Analysis

Martin Eisend

To cite this article: Martin Eisend (2017) The Third-Person Effect in Advertising: A Meta-Analysis, Journal of Advertising, 46:3, 377-394, DOI: 10.1080/00913367.2017.1292481

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2017.1292481

Journal of Advertising, 46(3), 377–394

ISSN: 0091-3367 print / 1557-7805 online
DOI: 10.1080/00913367.2017.1292481

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

Literature Review Corner

The Third-Person Effect in Advertising: A Meta-Analysis

Martin Eisend
European University Viadrina, Frankfurt, Germany

Prior meta-analyses have found evidence for differences in the third-person effect across message types, indicating that the third-person effect is a communication context-specific phenomenon. These meta-analyses do not explain why effects of the perceptual hypothesis in advertising are smaller when compared to communication in general; they do not address the broad range of consumer behavior variables that are affected by third-person perceptions; and they have not investigated whether the perceived effects on the self or on others are better predictors for behavioral responses than third-person perceptions in advertising. This meta-analysis addresses these issues and investigates the perceptual and behavioral hypotheses of the third-person effect in an advertising context. Findings indicate that third-person perceptions in product advertising are weaker when compared to other communication messages due to developments over time and the mixed gratifications provided by product advertising messages. Third-person perceptions in advertising can increase or decrease consumer behavior depending on whether the behavior is self related (e.g., body-related responses) or other related (e.g., support for regulation). Furthermore, perceived effects on self or on others are better behavioral predictors than third-person perceptions, providing managerial implications for advertising campaign pretesting.

Several advertising research studies have investigated the nature of the third-person effect (TPE) and have shown how the TPE influences consumer behavior (e.g., DeLorme, Huh, and Reid 2006; Kim 2013; Youn, Faber, and Shah 2000). The TPE consists of two hypotheses: perceptual and behavioral (Davison 1983). The perceptual hypothesis states people tend to believe that others are more influenced by communications than they are themselves, which is referred to as third-person perception (TPP). The behavioral hypothesis suggests that people act based on such perceptions. The TPE is a popular phenomenon in communication research and has received broad support. Four meta-analyses have been performed that summarize either findings on the perceptual hypothesis (Paul, Salwen, and Dupagne 2000; Sun, Pan, and Shen 2008) or the behavioral hypothesis (Feng and Guo 2012; Xu and Gonzenbach 2008). These meta-analyses have summarized findings across different communication contexts and found differences in TPP across message types, thus suggesting that the TPE is a communication context-specific phenomenon.

The findings of prior meta-analyses provide some guidance for advertising researchers but leave several open questions. First, the meta-analyses do not explain why effects of the perceptual hypothesis in advertising are weaker when compared to communication in general. Knowledge about the effect size of the TPE is important for advertising researchers who try to explain advertising effects by means of TPP. Second, prior meta-analytic findings on the behavioral hypothesis have ignored that TPP can affect a broad range of consumer behavior variables. Next to "other-related" variables, such as support for regulation, which has been the focus in prior meta-analyses, TPP in advertising also influences "self-related" variables, such as body-related responses and purchase behaviors. These variables must be accounted for to fully understand the TPE in an advertising context. Third, while one prior meta-analysis assumes the major point of the behavioral hypothesis is that the magnitude of TPP is a salient, if not optimal, predictor of behavioral outcomes (Xu and Gonzenbach 2008), the meta-analyses have not investigated whether the perceived effects on the self or on others are better predictors for behavioral responses than TPP in advertising. The findings are important to determine the predictive validity of perceptual advertising effects measures.

The current meta-analysis investigates both TPE hypotheses in advertising (i.e., product advertising and public service advertising) and contributes to the literature as follows: First, the findings enrich the third-person literature by not just showing that the TPP in advertising is weaker compared to other message types but providing an explanation why this is the case. Second, findings show that the TPP in advertising affects various types of behavioral intentions of consumers and that the direction and size of the effects depend on whether these behaviors are other or self related. Researchers can apply these findings as process explanations of advertising effects. Third,

Address correspondence to Martin Eisend, European University Viadrina, Grosse Scharrnstr. 59, 15230 Frankfurt (Oder), Germany. E-mail: eisend@europa-uni.de

Martin Eisend (PhD, Free University Berlin) is a professor of marketing, European University Viadrina.

perceived effects on either the self or on others are better behavioral predictors than TPP in an advertising context, a finding that has major implications for advertising campaign pretesting and other situations in which behavioral effect measures are difficult to apply.

THEORETICAL EXPLANATIONS

The Perceptual Hypothesis in Advertising

The third-person literature provides two distinct yet related mechanisms that explain why people perceive effects on themselves to be different from effects on others. While one explanation focuses primarily on motivational components, the other focuses more on cognitive roots (Perloff 2009).

The motivational perspective posits that TPPs are based on the universal human tendency to perceive the self in ways that make the self look good—or at least better than others. This self-serving bias or self-enhancement motive is the prevailing interpretation for TPP, and it has found broad empirical support (Andsager and White 2007). If people think being less influenced than others by communication is consistent with the feeling of superiority, they are likely to underestimate the effects on the self and/or overestimate effects on others (i.e., TPPs). However, if people think being less influenced than others by communication is inconsistent with such a feeling of superiority (e.g., for messages with desirable persuasive effects), they will likely estimate oppositely (i.e., reverse TPP, or first-person perception) (e.g., Hoorens and Ruiter 1996).

Cognitive accounts assume that people misperceive communication effects due to lack of information, insufficient processing of information, or false interpretation of information. People have better access to their own introspections than to others'; they know much more about the factors within themselves that can protect them from undue influences but know less about the internal dynamics of others that might protect others from external influence (Kitts 2003). Consequently, people apply lay psychology to explain the effects of communication on others. For instance, people refer to media schemas such as the idea of powerful media and passive audiences (Eveland et al. 1999), or attribute the reactions of others to less controllable external factors rather than dispositions (McLeod, Detenber, and Eveland 2001). The cognitive account suggests that people overestimate the effects on others of undesirable messages (i.e., when persuasion is considered undesirable). As for desirable messages, the cognitive account provides ambiguous answers. Negative media schemas might offset the positive effects of desirable messages, preventing first-person perceptions.

In an advertising context, the literature commonly distinguishes between undesirable and desirable advertising messages by referring to product advertising versus public service advertising. Product advertising is paid (mass) media communication from an identifiable sponsor to promote a good or service by persuading or influencing an audience (Richards and Curran 2002). Product advertising messages usually lead to a higher perceived susceptibility of others relative to selves, because recipients consider these messages and their persuasive effects undesirable. Public service advertisements are messages in the public interest disseminated by the media, either in paid or donated-media campaigns, to raise awareness, inform, educate, or change public attitudes and behaviors toward a social or personal issue. These messages and persuasion by public service advertising are usually considered desirable by researchers, because the messages and their persuasive intent are prosocial and, thus, socially desirable. Public service advertising may therefore lead to the same or even higher perceived effects on oneself compared to others.

How do these mechanisms of the TPE that have been developed in the context of mass media communication apply to advertising? TPP in advertising might differ from TPP in general media contexts for at least two reasons. First, extant research suggests people have media schemas that assume communications exert a strong, persuasive impact on a passive audience. In fact, however, the effectiveness of advertising has decreased over the years (Eisend 2015; Sethuraman, Tellis, and Briesch 2011). A common explanation is that the improved media socialization of consumers (Eagle 2007) might have increased consumers' capabilities to assess persuasive advertising effects over time. Second, although the influence of product advertising in general may be considered undesirable, product advertising can also provide desirable benefits (O'Donohoe 1994), such as information on product characteristics, entertainment, humor, and education on new technological developments. In fact, researchers have suggested that some product advertising messages, such as information on scarce products, might be considered desirable and smart to be influenced by (Eisend 2008). Because product advertising might not always by undesirable, TPP might be weaker than other message content that is strongly considered socially undesirable (e.g., pornography).

Knowledge on whether TPP in advertising differs from TPP in general is important for researchers, because the size of the effect provides guidance on its theoretical and practical value for the advertising research field (Eisend 2015). If researchers rely on findings in prior meta-analyses although the findings in advertising differ, they base their research on biased assumptions on the theoretical and practical value of the TPP in advertising. This leads to the first research question to be answered by this meta-analysis:

> **RQ1**: Does TPP in advertising differ from TPP in general? If so, how and why?

The Behavioral Hypothesis in Advertising

The behavioral hypothesis of TPE refers to the real-life consequences that may result from TPP. Extant research has provided evidence that as TPP increases so does certain

behavior (in particular, support for censorship of certain media content, such as pornography or violence). People support censorship as a result of perceptual differences due to paternalism or protection motivation (Nathanson et al. 2002). Thus, support for censorship can be understood as an other-related variable (i.e., the behavior mainly affects others and is driven by perceptions related to others). This behavioral variable is influenced by TPP because as TPP increases, the perceived effects on others increase. Thus, the need to "help" others increases as well.

In a product advertising context, the behavioral hypothesis refers to a broader set of consumer behavior variables beyond the support for censorship and regulation. These behavioral variables can be either increased or decreased by TPP, depending on whether they are other- or self-related variables (i.e., the behavior mainly affects others or the self and is driven by perceptions of either others or oneself). Consumer researchers have long recognized that consumers behave in ways that are consistent with their sense of self (Reed et al. 2012; Sirgy 1982). Consumers have ideal images of themselves, and realizing these images (by buying certain products, for instance) boosts their self-esteem and helps them feel good about themselves. If the behavioral variable is self related (i.e., purchase intentions and body-related responses, such as the intention to go to the gym), then increasing TPP will decrease these behaviors, because the perceived effects on oneself decrease and consumers behave consistent with their sense of self. The behavioral hypothesis in public service advertising relates to socially desirable consequences that can be either other related or self related or both (e.g., quitting smoking, making donations). Hence, it is unclear whether TPP increases or decreases such behaviors. This leads to our second research question:

RQ2: Does TPP in an advertising context affect different behavioral consequences in different ways?

People who are asked to assess influences on themselves and on others make these inferences separately. This is suggested by prior research that found nonsignificant order effects of the respective third-person questions (i.e., perceived effects on self and perceived effects on others) independent of whether these questions were asked alone or together in one survey (David, Liu, and Myser 2004; Price and Tewksbury 1996). Because assessments of advertising effects on self and others occur independently, it is questionable whether the perceptual difference that requires a joint assessment of perceptions and integrated evaluation of the effects on self and others is the main driver of behavioral effects. Gunther and Storey (2003) have introduced a more general concept of the presumed influence of media on others, based on prior TPE research that primarily focused on other-related behavioral consequences. The presumed influence of media on others can be positive or negative, with either direction resulting in some reaction and behavioral consequences. The presumed influence on others leads to behavioral consequences, independent of the assessments of effects on self.

In an advertising context, other- and self-related variables are distinguished depending on whether the behavioral consequences refer mainly to oneself or to others. These variables are also driven by perceptions related to the self or to others. For instance, research shows that perceptions of the self (i.e., the self-concept) are major drivers of consumer behavior and play a major role for advertising effects on consumers (Reed et al. 2012; Zinkhan and Hong 1991). The third research question therefore refers to whether the assessment of effects on the self or on others provide more explanatory power for behavioral consequences in advertising than TPP:

RQ3: Are behavioral consequences in an advertising context triggered by TPP or perceived effects on the self or on others?

The answer to this question is important for advertising researchers who use perceptions as proxy variables for behaviors.

METHOD

To investigate research question 1, the findings of prior meta-analyses on TPP are compared with the findings in the current meta-analysis on TPP in advertising. A moderator analysis is applied that controls for moderator variables from prior meta-analyses and adds new moderator variables (publication year, desirability of message) to provide explanations for the peculiarities of TPP in advertising. To answer research questions 2 and 3, a meta-analysis on the behavioral hypothesis of the TPE is applied and the effects across categories of consumer behavior variables are compared, as well as between TPP, perceived effects on the self, and perceived effects on others.

Study Retrieval

For this meta-analysis, studies were selected that provided estimates on TPP and its behavioral consequences related to product and public service advertising. To be considered for analysis, studies must have (a) measured TPP and/or the relationship between TPP and behavioral consequences in (b) product or public service advertising as defined previously (i.e., political advertising was excluded). To identify relevant studies, a keyword search of electronic databases (e.g., Communication and Mass Media Complete, EBSCO, Emerald, Elsevier, PsycINFO, PubMed, Proquest Dissertations and Theses) was performed first, using "third-person perception," "third-person effect," "first-person perception," and "first-person effect" as keywords, followed by an Internet search on Google Scholar. Then, a manual search of journal outlets that turned out to be major sources for journal articles dealing with the meta-analytic topic was performed. Once a study was

identified, references were examined in a search for further studies. The search period covered all manuscripts that were available by the end of August 2016. The publication date of the earliest study was 1988 and, thus, the meta-analysis covers 28 years of research on the TPE in advertising. The study retrieval approach is consistent with recommendations in the literature (e.g., Lipsey and Wilson 2001) and closely follows the steps taken in other meta-analyses in the advertising literature (e.g., Capella, Taylor, and Webster 2008; Schmidt and Eisend 2015). While the approach cannot guarantee that all available studies are included for several reasons (e.g., some journals are not listed in the major electronic databases), the literature search led to quite an exhaustive list of manuscripts with both published and unpublished studies. If studies are missing, they are missing at random rather than systematically and should not affect the findings.

The search resulted in 78 usable manuscripts. A manuscript was usable when it reported sufficient data to compute an effect size for either TPP or the relationship between TPP and its behavioral consequences or for which the necessary data could be retrieved from the authors if they were not provided in the manuscript. Some manuscripts reported on more than one relevant study, while two manuscripts reported estimates that were based on data from a single sample (e.g., dissertations that were included in published articles). Eventually, 84 independent studies were identified and used in the analysis. The manuscripts and studies included in the meta-analysis are listed in the appendix.

Coding

Coding includes TPP and related perceptual variables, behavioral consequences, and moderator variables that examine the conditions under which TPP varies. All variables are described in Table 1. This table provides the description or definition of variables and their operationalization. The variables were coded for all studies by two independent coders (the author and a student assistant). Table 1 provides the coding reliability for each variable that was assessed by Krippendorff's alpha reliability coefficient and computed by the KALPHA macro, applying 5,000 bootstrapping samples (Hayes and Krippendorff 2007). Some low-inference coding reached full intercoder agreement (TPP, perceptual variables, year, country, measure, and source). All other variable coding is considered acceptable, as the averages of Krippendorff's alpha are bigger than 0.8. Any inconsistencies in coding were resolved by discussion.

TPP and perceptual variables. TPP is the difference between perceived advertising effects on others and the perceived effect on self. In addition, both perceived advertising effects on self and perceived advertising effects on others were coded as separate variables.

Behavioral variables. Behavioral variables which represent the consequences of TPP in an advertising context and which were found in the primary studies were categorized in four major categories: purchase-related responses, support for regulation, body-related responses, and socially desirable engagement. The last category is a variable used in a public service advertising context, while prior categories are used in a product advertising context.

Moderator variables. Moderator variables were chosen from prior TPE meta-analyses that distinguished between moderators related to research, message, and referent characteristics (Sun, Pan, and Shen 2008). These moderator variables are complemented by some additional moderator variables.

The selection of moderators was driven by several considerations. First, research characteristics can lead to methodological artifacts that influence the effect-size estimate. For instance, convenience sampling might lead to stronger effects when respondents are purposely selected that deviate from the average in terms of receptiveness to advertising effects. Effect-size estimates based on single-item measures might be attenuated more by measurement unreliability than multiple-item measures (Sun, Pan, and Shen 2008). Second, referent and message characteristics capture theoretical accounts of TPP provided in the literature. For instance, social distance is assumed to increase TPP (Cohen et al. 1988). Third, some additional variables were added to explore the research questions of this meta-analysis and to provide further avenues for research. For instance, the development of TPP over time has not been considered in prior research, nor have the concepts of advertisement specificity or product familiarity.

The exploration of moderating variables in a meta-analysis is limited by the characteristics of the primary studies. Thus, not all moderators from prior meta-analyses could be considered because they were either constants, showed low variation, or did not provide sufficient coding information in the primary study. The following moderators used by Sun, Pan, and Shen (2008) had to be dropped: domain of perceived effects (due to insufficient information provided in the primary studies), message topic domain (due to the fact that the meta-analysis deals with advertising only), functional focus (due to the fact that most advertisements have a mixed focus), persuasive intent (because advertisements in general have persuasive intent), vulnerability and likely audience (because advertisements were almost always targeted toward the respondent and others), and factorial design (because almost all designs were "within" designs, and differences between "within" and "between" designs were considered when computing the effect sizes).

The moderators of geographic and sociodemographic distance were combined in this meta-analysis, because they were highly correlated. Paul, Salwen, and Dupagne (2000) further added the moderator method (surveys versus experiments), which is highly correlated with the variable study setting and was therefore excluded. They further added the variable source

TABLE 1
Variables Used in the Meta-Analysis

Variable	Description/Definition	Operationalization/ Related Variables	Krippendorff's Alpha (95% CI)
TPP and Perceptual Variables			
TPP	Difference between perceived advertising effects on others and the perceived effect on self	Sample mean difference between referent other and self, standardized by pooled standard error	1.000
Self	Perceived advertising effects on self	Standardized sample mean values for perceptions of effects on self	
Others	Perceived advertising effects on others	Standardized sample mean values for perceptions of effects on referent others	
Behavioral Variables			
Purchase-related responses	Consumer responses toward the product and the purchase of the product	Attitude toward the brand; purchase intention; willingness to recommend	0.938 (0.885; 0.982)
Support for regulation	Support for restrictive, corrective, and promotional measures from third-party groups (e.g., government) to restrict and to correct advertisers' practices	Support for the regulation of advertising/certain advertisements; ban of advertisements; support for censorship, legislation, restriction of advertising	
Body-related responses	Consumer perceptions of their body and responses related to changes of their body	Intention to lose weight, to go to the gym, to go on a diet; acceptability of plastic surgery; body image disturbance	
Socially desirable engagement	Consumer likelihood to engage in behavior that is promoted by public service ads (or avoid behavior that is criticized by public service ads)	Likelihood to engage in socially desirable behavior; intention of/ likelihood of safe driving/ protection against sexually transmitted diseases/donating/ volunteerism; intention to use alcohol/cigarettes/drugs (reverse coded); support for measures that further behavior promoted by public service ads or restrict behavior that is criticized by public service ads	
Moderator Variables			
Ad type	Distinguishes between product advertising (i.e., paid [mass] media communication from an identifiable sponsor about the promotion of a good or service to persuade or influence an audience) and public service advertising (i.e., messages in the public interest disseminated by	Identified by description in manuscript (e.g., advertising, commercial, public service ad); 0 = product advertising; 1 = public service advertising	0.974 (0.908; 1.000)

(*Continued on next page*)

TABLE 1
Variables Used in the Meta-Analysis (*Continued*)

Variable	Description/Definition	Operationalization/ Related Variables	Krippendorff's Alpha (95% CI)
	the media, either in paid or donated-media campaigns, with the objective of raising awareness, informing, educating, or changing public attitudes and behavior toward a social issue)		
Advertising specificity	Distinguishes whether the responses refer to advertising in general or to a specific commercial	Identified by description in manuscript (e.g., advertising in general, brand name mentioned); 0 = specific commercial; 1 = advertising in general	0.917 (0.817; 0.977)
Desirability	Distinguishes whether product advertising provides an undesirable or desirable message (e.g., scarcity claim)	Identified by description in manuscript (e.g., scarcity claim); 0 = undesirable; 1 = desirable	0.933 (0.844; 1.000)
Familiarity	Distinguishes whether the product or service advertised is known or unknown to the respondent/ fictitious	Identified by description in manuscript (e.g., fictitious brand, familiar brand); 0 = unknown; 1 = known	0.919 (0.828; 0.978)
Distance	Distinguishes between close (low distance) or distant (high distance) others based on both sociodemographic distance (similarity) and geographic distance (e.g., community versus general public)	Identified by description in manuscript (e.g., friends, community, general public); 0 = low distance; 1 = high distance	0.896 (0.802; 0.978)
Year	Measures the time the third-person perceptions have been assessed	Identified by the publication year of the manuscript	1.000
Country	Distinguishes between studies conducted in the United States and those conducted in other countries	Identified by description in manuscript (e.g., U.S. university); 0 = United States; 1 = other country	1.000
Study setting	Distinguishes between a natural setting and a laboratory study setting	Identified by method description in manuscript (e.g., laboratory experiment, field experiment); 0 = natural setting; 1 = lab setting	0.886 (0.779; 0.960)
Data collection method	Distinguishes between self-administered and interviewer-administered data collection methods	Identified by method description in manuscript (e.g., interviewer asked respondents or respondents filled in a questionnaire); 0 = self-administered; 1 = interviewer administered	0.896 (0.588; 1.000)

(*Continued on next page*)

TABLE 1
Variables Used in the Meta-Analysis (*Continued*)

Variable	Description/Definition	Operationalization/ Related Variables	Krippendorff's Alpha (95% CI)
Study population	Type of respondents that distinguishes between college or high school students and the general public	Identified by sample description in manuscript (e.g., students, consumers); 0 = general public; 1 = college or high school students	0.938 (0.848; 1.000)
Sampling method	Method of sampling that distinguishes between nonrandom and random sampling	Identified by sample description in manuscript (e.g., random, convenience); 0 = nonrandom; 1 = random	0.913 (0.789; 1.000)
Measure	Measurement scale of the perceptual variables that distinguishes between single- and multi-item measures	Identified by measure description in manuscript (number of items); 0 = single-item measure; 1 = multi-item measure	1.000
Source	Type of manuscript that distinguishes between published and unpublished manuscripts	Identified by publication type (e.g., journal article versus doctoral thesis); 0 = published; 1 = unpublished	1.000

(published versus unpublished), which is considered in this meta-analysis to test for the possibility of a publication bias. They also differentiated among different kinds of media, which was dropped due to the high variety of media types used in advertising. However, the basic distinction by Paul, Salwen, and Dupagne (2000) between specific media and media in general is captured by the variable advertising specificity.

Analytical Procedure

Following the approach in prior TPP meta-analyses (Paul, Salwen, and Dupagne 2000; Sun, Pan, and Shen 2008), the effect-size metric for third-person perceptions is the standardized mean difference *d*. It is calculated as the mean difference between the perceived effects on the referent other and the self and standardized by the pooled standard error. A positive value indicates that the perceived effect on others is greater than the perceived effect on self (third-person perception), and a negative effect indicates that the perceived effect on self is greater than the perceived effect on others (first-person perception). Because most studies used "within" designs, the correlations between repeated measures were considered when computing *d* and its sampling error variance (Dunlap et al. 1996; Morris and DeShon 2002). If the correlation was not reported or could not be computed from other statistics (e.g., *t* statistics), the correlation was imputed following recommendations in the literature (Morris and DeShon 2002). Overall, the meta-analysis provides 529 estimates on TPP in advertising.

Similar to prior meta-analyses on TPE (Sun, Pan, and Shen 2008), the effect estimates were treated as units of analysis, allowing multiple effect estimates reported in a study. The literature suggests several ways for dealing with multiple estimates from a single study and with the dependencies between effect-size estimates. The preferable procedure to account for dependencies is to deal with the nested error structure; the approach is superior to treating these estimates as independent and preferable over procedures that represent each study by a single value (e.g., by an average), because the approach correctly computes the meta-analytic mean and avoids loss of information and statistical power that occurs when only a single value from each study is considered (Bijmolt and Pieters 2001). Therefore, this meta-analysis accounts for dependencies of effect sizes as well as the nested structure of meta-analytic data by running a mixed-effects multilevel model procedure in Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) (Raudenbush and Bryk 2002). Because the sampling variance of each study is given in the mixed-effects multilevel model, this is called a variance-known model for meta-analysis. The unconditional model (or intercept-only model) reflects a random-effects model for meta-analysis.

If the homogeneity test indicates heterogeneity of TPP estimates, that is, the variation in estimates cannot be explained by sampling error alone, a moderator analysis

can be applied. To test for the effects of the suggested moderator variables (see Table 1) on TPP, the effect estimates were modeled as a linear function of the moderator variables. The model was estimated in HLM. A multilevel model including moderator variables is termed a conditional model. The conditional model is a mixed-effects model because fixed effects for the moderators are considered in addition to random components. The model includes moderators at both the effect-size level (i.e., moderator variables that vary within studies: ad type, advertising specificity, desirability, and distance) and the study level (i.e., moderator variables that vary between studies: familiarity, year, country, study setting, data collection method, study population, sampling method, measure, and source).

As effect size for the behavioral consequences of the TPP, the correlation coefficient is used, which is the statistical result that was usually reported when assessing the behavioral consequences of TPP (Feng and Guo 2012; Xu and Gonzenbach 2008). The correlation coefficient indicates the effect of either TPP, perceived effects on self, or perceived effects on others on various dependent variables (see behavioral variables in Table 1). If studies reported other measures, those measures were converted to correlation coefficients following common guidelines for meta-analysis (see Lipsey and Wilson 2001). To integrate the effect sizes, the same procedure as for the integration of TPP estimates was used (i.e., a variance-known mixed-effects multilevel model in HLM). Overall, the meta-analysis provides 49 estimates on the behavioral consequences of TPP, 45 estimates on consequences of the perceived effects on self, and 72 estimates on consequences of the perceived effects of others.

RESULTS

Findings on the Perceptual Hypothesis in Advertising

Table 2 presents the meta-analytic findings on the perceptual hypothesis in advertising. The integrated TPP is 0.309. This average is based on 529 effect sizes. The integrated effect size for TPP in product advertising is 0.526, and the integrated effect size for TPP in public service advertising is −0.092. These findings show that product advertising leads to TPP. Public service advertising leads to neither first- nor third-person perceptions. The nonsignificant effects related to public service advertisements in our meta-analysis are in line with the theoretical assumptions on diminishing TPP of desirable messages.

To compare the effect sizes with the results found in prior meta-analyses, the overlap of independent confidence intervals (CIs) is tested following the procedure suggested by Cumming (2009), where significance of $p < .05$ is reached when the overlap of the 95% CI is no more than about half the average of the two arms that overlap (provided the group size is sufficient and the arm length is not excessive). Because prior meta-analyses include advertising effects, their findings are also not completely independent from the present study's findings, and the lack of overlap between CIs can be considered a conservative test of differences. Compared with the results from previous meta-analyses (Table 2) that relied on a broader set of topics (e.g., news, pornography, political advertising), this meta-analysis yields smaller effects. Sun, Pan, and Shen (2008) found in their meta-analysis of 372 effect sizes an average $d = 0.646$, which is significantly bigger than the overall effect size in the current meta-analysis as indicated by the CI in Sun, Pan, and Shen's study, which does not overlap with the

TABLE 2
Third-Person Perceptions in Advertising: Meta-Analytic Standardized Mean Differences

Studies	k	m	Total N	Average d	95% CI		Homogeneity Test Q
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
This meta-analysis							
TPP, all	529	83	20,252	.309***	.185	.433	9,197.305***
TPP, product advertising	359	60	14,990	.526***	.397	.655	6,383.718***
TPP, public service advertising	170	30	7,418	−.092	−.292	.108	3,254.512***
Sun et al., 2008							
TPP, all	372		87,058	.646***	.56	.73	—
TPP, undesirable messages	171		47,568	.862***	.76	.96	—
TPP, desirable messages	54		10,901	−.168+	−.34	.01	—
Paul et al., 2000							
TPP, all	121		45,729	1.155***	.74	1.57	2,845.36***
TPP, undesirable messages	30		10,888	1.065***	.52	1.61	—
TPP, desirable messages	11		3,733	.430	−.42	1.28	—

Note. TPP = third-person perception; k = number of effect size estimates; m = number of studies (independent samples); total N = cumulative sample size. $^{+}p < .1$; $^{*}p < .05$; $^{**}p < .01$; $^{***}p < .001$.

CI provided in the current meta-analysis. Their meta-analysis provides a distinction between desirable and undesirable messages. The average effect across 171 estimates for undesirable messages is 0.862, significantly larger than the effect for product advertising in the current study. The average effect across 54 estimates for desirable messages in Sun, Pan, and Shen's meta-analysis is −0.168. Although this estimate is marginally significant ($p < .10$) and the current meta-analysis found a nonsignificant effect, the estimates do not differ significantly.

Paul, Salwen, and Dupagne (2000) found $d = 1.155$ across 121 effect sizes with an estimated 95% CI that does not overlap with the CIs for the overall effect size in the current meta-analysis. They further found $d = 1.065$ across 30 effect estimates for undesirable messages and $d = 0.430$ across 11 effect estimates for desirable messages. While the effect size for undesirable messages is marginally significant larger than the one for product advertising in the current meta-analysis, the effect sizes for desirable messages and public service advertising do not differ.

All integrated effect sizes in the current meta-analysis are heterogeneous (Table 2); hence, a moderator analysis can be applied. Table 3 presents the results of the metaregression analysis. The findings related to all effect-size estimates (all advertising) show that distance increases TPP, and less specific advertising and desirability decreases TPP. These findings relate to product advertising, too, and except for the effect of desirability also to public service advertising. Furthermore, year shows a marginal negative influence on TPP. To answer research question 1, we include an interaction term between ad type and year that reveals a significant effect. The nature of the interaction effect is described by the influence of year in the product advertising and public service advertising model. The influence of year is marginally significant in the model for product advertising but not in the public service advertising model. Considering that only TPP related to product advertising differs from TPP in other meta-analyses but not TPP related to public service advertising, the developments over time provide a reasonable explanation for smaller TPP in product advertising: Advertising became less powerful over time, and its (perceived) effectiveness might have decreased. At the same time, product advertising that is desirable leads to lower TPP, indicating that the mixed functionality of advertising messages can explain the weaker effects too.

The methodological moderators indicate only small influences of method characteristics. Laboratory settings lead to stronger TPP in public service advertising, and multi-item measures lead to weaker TPP for all advertising and public service advertising, as expected. The meta-analysis included both published and unpublished studies. The nonsignificant influence of source type reveals that the effect sizes do not differ

TABLE 3
Effects of Moderators on Third-Person Perception: Metaregression Estimates (HLM)

	All Advertising	Product Advertising	Public Service Advertising
Ad type	−.292 (.109)**	—	—
Advertising specificity	−.249 (.036)***	−.170 (.039)***	−.061 (.159)
Desirability	−.352 (.107)***	−.351 (.108)**	constant
Familiarity	.115 (.130)	−.061 (.181)	.324 (.202)
Distance	.273 (.018)***	.410 (.025)***	.124 (.027)***
Year	−.018 (.010)$^{+}$	−.025 (.014)$^{+}$	.005 (.014)
Country	.069 (.130)	.026 (.176)	.160 (.255)
Study setting	−.015 (.137)	.018 (.197)	.153 (.213)$^{+}$
Data collection method	.190 (.278)	.130 (.363)	.221 (.451)
Study population	.093 (.178)	.099 (.242)	.182 (.310)
Sampling method	.290 (.206)	.108 (.270)	.498 (.418)
Measure	−.341 (.158)*	−.104 (.219)	−.648 (.275)**
Source	−.001 (.155)	−.111 (.224)	.220 (.242)
Ad type × Year	.029 (.005)***	—	—
Model descriptives			
No. of effect-size estimates (k)	529	359	170
No. of studies (m)	83	60	30
ΔD (df)	1,361.609 (15)***	465.063 (13)***	34.689 (12)***

Note. Unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors in brackets are provided. Desirability is excluded from the model with estimates related to public service advertising because it is a constant (i.e., effects of public service advertising are always considered desirable). ΔD refers to the change in deviance between the unconditional model (intercept-only model without moderator variables) and the conditional model (model with moderator variables) and follows a chi-square distribution. $^{+}p < .1$; $^{*}p < .05$; $^{**}p < .01$; $^{***}p < .001$.

between published and unpublished studies, showing that publication bias is not evident in the data set.

These findings provide an answer to research question 1: Do TPPs in advertising differ from TPPs in general; and if so, how and why? Compared to prior meta-analyses, TPP in advertising as assessed in this meta-analysis are smaller than in communication contexts in general. In particular, the difference applies to product advertising and undesirable messages in general, but not to public service advertising and desirable messages in general where the findings are similar. The weaker effect sizes can be explained by developments over time (e.g., advertising became less powerful) and the various functionalities of product advertising messages that can lead to undesirable and desirable message contents and persuasive effects.

Findings on the Behavioral Hypothesis in Advertising

Table 4 presents the mean correlations for the behavioral consequences of TPP. In product advertising, TPP reduces the magnitude of purchase-related responses, increases support for regulation, and reduces the magnitude of body-related responses. In public service advertising, TPP increases socially desirable engagement. The findings related to support for regulation in advertising are in line with the findings of prior meta-analyses on third-person effects. Xu and Gonzenbach (2008) integrated 26 effect sizes on various positive behavioral consequences of TPP related to different topics and found an integrative effect of $r = 0.15$ (95% CI from 0.12 to 0.20). Feng and Guo (2012) conducted a meta-analysis of TPP effects related to the censorship of undesirable content, integrating 94 effect sizes in 35 articles. They found that, after controlling for several moderator variables, the mean effect size (intercept) corresponds to 0.16 (with an estimated 95% CI from 0.10 to 0.22). The findings in both prior meta-analyses are consistent with (i.e., not significantly different from) the finding of the positive effect on support for regulation in the current meta-analysis.

The findings in Table 4 further show that the magnitude of the effect size for purchase-related responses is stronger than that for body-related responses, socially desirable engagement, and support for regulation. The findings provide an answer to research question 2: Does TPP in an advertising context affect different behavioral consequences in different ways? Both the magnitude of the effect and the direction of the effect does differ significantly: Self-related variables are decreased and other-related variables are increased by TPP, with the effect on purchase-related responses being stronger than that on other variables.

TABLE 4
Third-Person Effects in Advertising: Meta-Analytic Correlations

					95% CI		
	k	*m*	Total *N*	Average *r*	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Homogeneity Test *Q*
Product advertising							
TPP, purchase-related responses	5	4	827	$-.333^{***}$	−.439	−.227	10.761^{*}
Self, purchase-related responses	2	2	673	$.514^{***}$	.406	.622	3.365^{+}
Other, purchase-related responses	3	2	673	−.225	−.609	.159	47.311^{***}
TPP, support for regulation	15	8	2,151	$.141^{**}$	.053	.229	53.421^{***}
Self, support for regulation	9	7	2,744	−.037	−.227	.153	297.109^{***}
Other, support for regulation	14	7	2,744	$.288^{***}$	.172	.404	366.939^{***}
TPP, body-related responses	10	3	368	$-.193^{**}$	−.287	−.099	4.932^{+}
Self, body-related responses	16	5	624	$.320^{***}$	.230	.410	16.694^{**}
Other, body-related responses	43	5	788	$.096^{+}$	−.035	.227	98.265^{***}
Public service advertising							
TPP, socially desirable engagement	19	7	2,578	$.114^{+}$	−.035	.263	193.379^{***}
Self, socially desirable engagement	18	4	1,231	$.332^{***}$	.195	.479	336.250^{***}
Other, socially desirable engagement	12	3	935	$.146^{**}$	.101	.191	6.174^{**}

Note. TPP = third-person perception; *k* = number of effect size estimates; *m* = number of studies (independent samples); total *N* = cumulative sample size. $^{+}p < .1$; $^{*}p < .05$; $^{**}p < .01$; $^{***}p < .001$.

The overlap of independent CIs as suggested by Cumming (2009) helps decide which perceptions drive the behavioral effects, that is, whether the effect of TPP, of perceived effects on self, or of perceived effects on others is largest. As for purchase-related responses, the perceived advertising effect on self is significantly stronger than TPP. As for support for regulation, perceived advertising effects on others have a stronger influence than perceived advertising effects on self and TPP. As for body-related responses, perceived advertising effects on self have a significantly stronger influence than TPP and perceived advertising effects on others. As for socially desirable engagement, perceived advertising effects on self have a significant stronger influence than the perceived advertising effects on others and a marginally significant stronger effect than TPP.

These findings provide an answer to research question 3: Are behavioral consequences in an advertising context triggered by TPP, by perceived effects on the self, or by perceived effects on others? The perceived advertising effects on self provide a superior explanation than TPP for self-related behavioral variables, and the perceived effects on others provide superior explanatory power for other-related variables.

DISCUSSION

The current meta-analysis has summarized 28 years of research on the perceptual and behavioral hypotheses of TPE in advertising. The findings provide several major contributions to theory and practice.

First, TPE research indicated that TPP differs across message types (Paul, Salwen, and Dupagne 2000; Sun, Pan, and Shen 2008) but did not provide an explanation as to why TPP in advertising is weaker compared to other message types. TPPs in advertising are weaker, presumably due to weakening effects over time and product advertising messages that sometimes can be perceived as clever to be influenced by. The size of an effect is an important indicator for judging the theoretical and practical importance of a concept (Eisend 2015). The overall TPE in advertising is $d = 0.309$ and can be considered a small effect size (Cohen 1988). This questions the value of the TPP as a variable in advertising research, which has been used, for instance, as a mediator to explain advertising effects (Eisend 2008; Sharma and Roy 2016). The comparatively weaker explanatory power of the TPE in advertising explains why the TPE, which is a popular research topic in communication research, has achieved less attention from advertising researchers. In fact, the majority of the studies that have been included in this meta-analysis have been published in communication journals rather than advertising journals.

The meta-analysis finds a significant TPP for product advertising that is considered socially undesirable. TPPs disappear for public service advertising that is considered desirable. While the findings are in line with various theoretical accounts in the TPE literature, the advertising literature provides a prominent concept that can add an alternative explanation of the findings. Involvement is a key moderating variable in explaining the processing of advertising messages by consumers. The topics of public service advertising are important and lead to higher consumer involvement than product advertising that has more trivial consequences for consumers (Rothschild 1979). High-involved consumers usually spend more time processing advertising messages and might be less prone to biased evaluations. As a result, the difference between perceived influences on self and on others might become smaller, as indicated by the nonsignificant TPP for public service advertising in this meta-analysis. Further research is needed to test the combined effect of involvement and desirability of advertising messages on TPP to find out whether involvement provides a meaningful alternative explanation for variations in TPP due to desirability.

One caveat refers to the concept and meaning of desirability. Most TPE researchers have determined desirability of the advertisement stimuli themselves, and the same approach has been applied in the current meta-analysis. Few studies also asked recipients about the desirability of a message, and the recipients did not always validate the researchers' categorization (Andsager and White 2007). For instance, the idea that scarce advertising messages might be smart to be persuaded by can be questioned by consumers once they notice that scarcity appeals do not hold the truth. Hence, further research needs to more carefully distinguish between the property of desirability in an advertising context that can refer to the message, the product, or the prospect of influence and validate desirability as perceived by the recipients and consumers. Instead of using a dichotomization of desirable and undesirable message types, desirability could be conceptualized as a continuous variable, depending on the various functionalities of a message type and the perceptions of the recipients and consumers. For example, people might consider the persuasiveness of some pieces of valuable information in an advertisement to be desirable, while other pieces of information might be considered undesirable.

The findings for product advertising further suggest that TPP can change over time. Effects over time have not been considered in TPE research and might apply to other message types, too, that have experienced dramatic changes. For instance, with the ubiquity of social media people today have more options and different sources of news to choose from or combine. As a result, the perception of media power or the perceived vulnerability of others might have decreased, thus reducing TPP over time.

Second, the findings show that TPP in advertising affects different behavioral intentions of consumers in various ways, depending on whether these consumer behaviors are other or self related. So far, research has mainly focused on support for censorship and regulation as an other-related variable. With increasing TPP, the perceived effects on others increases, and thus the likelihood that a person will want to "help" and

protect others. Consumer behavior, however, is mostly self related, because consumers purchase and use products and services in a way that is consistent with their sense of self and that helps them support their self-image and to boost their self-esteem (Reed et al. 2012; Sirgy 1982). When the perceived influence on self increases, these self-related behaviors increase as well. As a result, the behaviors decrease with increasing TPP due to the increased differential between perceived effects on self and others. The distinction between self- and other-related consumer responses as referring to behavior that mainly affects others or the self and is driven by perceptions of either others or oneself is not as clear-cut as it might seem, though. In particular, the case of public service advertisements can relate to behaviors that affects both the self and others and the perceptions of both self and others. In fact, while this meta-analysis found that the effect on self in public service advertising was stronger than the effect on others, both effects were positive and thus different from other TPE in advertising, where the effect on self and others have opposite signs. Neuwirth and Frederick (2002) have introduced the idea of a second-person effect: People believe that media has the same mutual influences on self and others. The idea of mutual influence occurs when communication content harms all of us or when it affects common interest. Desirable messages provided by public service advertising (e.g., environment protection, safe driving) oftentimes refer to common interests. They are not only self related but also other related, and a mutual influence on self and others might provide more benefits than opposite effects on self and on others, thus increasing biased optimism in the recipient. For instance, public service advertising that tries to prevent drunk driving or to support safer sex is more beneficial for an individual if other individuals follow the advice. The findings suggest that both influences are related, which provides support for practice of social marketing campaigns that use social norms (i.e., the perceived influence on others) as a trigger to increase the influence on individuals.

The distinction between self- and other-related variables can apply to other communication contexts too. For instance, political advertising can lead to TPP that can influence support for regulation (other related) but also political voting behavior (self related). The perceived effect on the self can complement the concept of presumed influence on others that was introduced by Gunther and Storey (2003). For self-related variables, the presumed influence on self can lead to behavioral consequences independent of the assessments of effects on others.

Third, findings on the consequences of TPE indicate that perceived advertising effects on the self or on others are better predictors for behavior than the other–self discrepancy that measures TPP. Prior research has assumed the magnitude of TPP is the main predictor of behavioral outcomes (Xu and Gonzenbach 2008). However, people who are asked to assess influences on themselves and on others make these inferences separately and independently (David, Liu, and Myser 2004; Price and Tewksbury 1996). Thus, it is questionable whether the perceptual difference that requires a joint assessment of perceptions and integrated evaluation of the effects on self and others is the main driver of behavioral effects. The findings of the current meta-analysis support these doubts and question the explanatory power and practical value of the behavioral hypothesis of TPE in an advertising context. This has major implications for advertising campaign pretesting and other situations in which behavioral effect measures are difficult to apply, as indicated by Dillard, Weber, and Vail (2007), who have asked whether perceived communication effects related to the self or to others are better predictors of actual communication effects. If behavioral consequences are considered as actual communication effects, the current meta-analysis shows that the answer to this question depends on whether the consequence variable is other or self related. For instance, for purchase-related variables, the perceived effect on the self is a better predictor than the perceived effect on others or TPP. According to Dillard, Weber, and Vail (2007), perceived effect measures are sometimes necessary, because direct measures of advertising effects can be impractical. For example, for long-term trends of a particular consumer behavior, such as tobacco consumption, change cannot be measured by short-term attitude measures, and some behaviors are difficult to measure for reasons of consumer privacy (e.g., condom use). Perceived effect measures are also less expensive and time-consuming than actual effect measures, which is important for campaign pretesting. It is therefore helpful to know what referent estimate (self or others) can be used to assess the actual behavioral effects of advertising. Hence, the findings of this meta-analysis provide an alternative way of assessing advertising effects for practitioners and scholars dealing with situations in which behavioral effect measures are difficult to apply.

REFERENCES

Andsager, Julie L., and H. Allen White (2007), *Self Versus Others: Media, Messages, and the Third-Person Effect*, Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bijmolt, Tammo H.A., and Rik G.M. Pieters (2001), "Meta-Analysis in Marketing When Studies Contain Multiple Measurements," *Marketing Letters*, 12 (2), 157–69.

Capella, Michael L., Charles R. Taylor, and Cynthia Webster (2008), "The Effect of Cigarette Advertising Bans on Consumption: A Meta-Analysis," *Journal of Advertising*, 37 (2), 7–18.

Cohen, Jacob (1988), *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd ed., New York: Academic Press.

Cohen, Jeremy, Diana Mutz, Vincent Price, and Albert Gunther (1988), "Perceived Impact of Defamation: An Experiment on Third-Person-Effects," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 52 (2), 161–73.

Cumming, Geoff (2009), "Inference by Eye: Reading the Overlap of Independent Confidence Intervals," *Statistics in Medicine*, 28 (2), 205–20.

David, Prabu, Kaiya Liu, and Michael Myser (2004), "Methodological Artifact or Persistent Bias? Testing the Robustness of the Third-Person and Reverse Third-Person Effects for Alcohol Messages," *Communication Research*, 31 (2), 206–33.

Davison, W. Phillips (1983), "The Third-Person Effect in Communication," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 47 (1), 1–15.

DeLorme, Denise E., Jisu Huh, and Leonhard N. Reid (2006), "Perceived Effects of Direct-to-Consumer (DTC) Prescription Drug Advertising on Self and Others: A Third-Person Effect Study of Older Consumers," *Journal of Advertising*, 35 (3), 47–65.

Dillard, James Price, Kirsten M. Weber, and Renata G. Vail (2007), "The Relationship between the Perceived and Actual Effectiveness of Persuasive Messages: A Meta-Analysis with Implications for Formative Campaign Research," *Journal of Communication*, 57 (4), 613–31.

Dunlap, W.P., Jose M. Cortina, J.B. Vaslow, and M.J. Burke (1996), "Meta-Analysis of Experiments with Matched Groups or Repeated Measures Designs," *Psychological Methods*, 1 (2), 170–77.

Eagle, Lynne (2007), "Commercial Media Literacy: What Does It Do, to Whom—And Does It Matter?," *Journal of Advertising*, 36 (2), 101–10.

Eisend, Martin (2008), "Explaining the Impact of Scarcity Claims in Advertising: The Mediating Role of Perceptions of Susceptibility," *Journal of Advertising*, 37 (3), 33–40.

——— (2015), "Have We Progressed Marketing Knowledge? A Meta-Meta-Analysis of Effect Sizes in Marketing Research," *Journal of Marketing*, 79 (3), 23–40.

Eveland, William P., Amy I. Nathanson, Benjamin H. Detenber, and Douglas M. McLeod (1999), "Rethinking the Social Distance Corollary: Perceived Likelihood of Exposure and the Third-Person Perception," *Communication Research*, 26 (3), 275–302.

Feng, Guangchao Charles, and Steve Zhongshi Guo (2012), "Support for Censorship: A Multilevel Meta-Analysis of the Third-Person Effect," *Communication Reports*, 25 (1), 40–50.

Gunther, Albert C., and J. Douglas Storey (2003), "The Influence of Presumed Influence," *Journal of Communication*, 53 (2), 199–215.

Hayes, Andrew F., and Klaus Krippendorff (2007), "Answering the Call for a Standard Reliability Measure for Coding Data," *Communication Methods and Measures*, 1 (1), 77–89.

Hoorens, Vera, and Suzanne Ruiter (1996), "The Optimal Impact Phenomenon: Beyond the Third-Person Effect," *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26 (4), 599–610.

Kim, Hyo Jung (2013), "'They Will Help, So I Don't Need To?': Behavioral Hypothesis of the Third-Person Effect in Donation Aid Advertising," *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 34 (1), 93–106.

Kitts, J.A. (2003), "Egocentric Bias or Information Management? Selective Disclosure and the Social Roots of Norm Misperception," *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 66 (3), 222–37.

Lipsey, Mark W., and David T. Wilson (2001), *Practical Meta-Analysis*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McLeod, Douglas M., Benjamin H. Detenber, and William P. Eveland (2001), "Behind the Third-Person Effect: Differentiating Perceptual Processes for Self and Others," *Journal of Communication*, 51 (4), 678–95.

Morris, Scott B., and Richard P. DeShon (2002), "Combining Effect Size Estimates in Meta-Analysis with Repeated Measures and Independent-Group Designs," *Psychological Methods*, 7 (1), 105–25.

Nathanson, Amy I., William P. Eveland, Jr., Heungsoo Park, and Bryant Paul (2002), "Perceived Media Influence and Efficacy as Predictors of Caregivers' Protective Behaviors," *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 46 (3), 385–410.

Neuwirth, Kurt, and Edward Frederick (2002), "Extending the Framework of Third-, First-, and Second-Person Effects," *Mass Communication and Society*, 5 (2), 113–40.

O'Donohoe, Stephanie (1994), "Advertising Uses and Gratifications," *European Journal of Marketing*, 28 (8/9), 52–75.

Paul, Bryant, Michael B. Salwen, and Michel Dupagne (2000), "The Third-Person Effect: A Meta-Analysis of the Perceptual Hypothesis," *Mass Communication and Society*, 3 (1), 57–85.

Perloff, Richard M. (2009), "Mass Media, Social Perception, and the Third-Person Effect," in *Media Effects: Advances in Theory and Practice*, Jennings Bryant, and Mary Beth Oliver, eds., New York: Routledge, 252–68.

Price, Vincent, and David Tewksbury (1996), "Measuring the Third-Person Effect of News: The Impact of Question Order, Contrast, and Knowledge," *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 8 (2), 120–41.

Raudenbush, Stephen W., and Anthony S. Bryk (2002), *Hierarchical Linear Models. Application and Data Analysis Methods*, 2nd ed., Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Reed, Americus, II, Mark R. Forehand, Stefano Puntoni, and Luk Warlop (2012), "Identity-Based Consumer Behavior," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 29 (4), 310–21.

Richards, Jef I., and Catharine M. Curran (2002), "Oracles on 'Advertising': Searching for a Definition," *Journal of Advertising*, 31 (2), 63–77.

Rothschild, Michael L. (1979), "Marketing Communications in Nonbusiness Situations or Why It's So Hard to Sell Brotherhood Like Soap," *Journal of Marketing*, 43 (2), 11–20.

Schmidt, Susanne, and Martin Eisend (2015), "Advertising Repetition: A Meta-Analysis on Effective Frequency in Advertising," *Journal of Advertising*, 44 (4), 415–28.

Sethuraman, Raj, Gera'rd J. Tellis, and Richard A. Briesch (2011), "How Well Does Advertising Work? Generalizations from Meta-Analysis of Brand Advertising Elasticities," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 48 (3), 457–71.

Sharma, Piyush, and Rajat Roy (2016), "Looking Beyond First-Person Effects (FPEs) in the Influence of Scarcity Appeals in Advertising: A Replication and Extension of Eisend (2008)," *Journal of Advertising*, 45 (1), 78–84.

Sirgy, Joseph M. (1982), "Self-Concept in Consumer Behavior: A Critical Review," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9 (3), 287–300.

Sun, Ye, Z. Pan, and L. Shen (2008), "Understanding the Third-Person Perception: Evidence from a Meta-Analysis," *Journal of Communication*, 58 (2), 208–300.

Xu, Jie, and William J. Gonzenbach (2008), "Does a Perceptual Discrepancy Lead to Action? A Meta-Analysis of the Behavioral Component of the Third-person Effect," *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 20 (3), 375–85.

Youn, Seounmi, Ronald J. Faber, and Dhavan V. Shah (2000), "Restricting Gambling Advertising and the Third-Person Effect," *Psychology and Marketing*, 17 (7), 633–49.

Zinkhan, George M., and Jae W. Hong (1991), "Self-Concept and Advertising Effectiveness: A Conceptual Model of Congruency Conspicuousness, and Response Mode," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 18 (1), 348–54.

APPENDIX

TABLE A1
List of Manuscripts and Studies Used for the Meta-Analysis

Study No.	Author(s), Year of Publication	Source	Advertising Message Topic
1	Anker 2007	Unpublished thesis	Blood donation ads
2	Banning 1997	Unpublished thesis	Diverse cigarette, beer, and brand ads
3	Begin 2005	Unpublished thesis	Alcohol advertising in general
4	Borzekowski et al. 1999	*Journal of Health Communication*	Cigarette advertising in general
5	Brosius and Engel 1996	*International Journal of Public Opinion Research*	TV commercials in general
6	Carr 2014	Unpublished thesis	Diverse product and brand placements
7	Chapin 1999a	Conference paper	Safer sex/HIV ads
8	Chapin 1999b	Conference paper	Safer sex/HIV ads
9	Chia 2007, 2009	*Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*; *Mass Communication and Society*	Diverse product and brand advertisements
10	Chia and Wen 2010	*Sex Roles*	Diverse product and brand ads
11	Cho and Boster 2008	*Communication Research*	Anti-drug ads
12–13	Cho and Han 2004	*Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*	Beer/liquor advertising in general
14	Chock and Lee 2005	Conference paper	Anti-tobacco ads
15	Chock et al. 2007	*Communication Research*	Anti-smoking public service ads
16	Choi, Leshner, and Choi 2008	*American Behavioral Scientist*	Diverse product and brand ads
17	Dahlén et al. 2014	*European Journal of Marketing*	Sport shoe ad
18	David et al. 2002	*Communication Research*	Fashion ads
19	Day 2008 (same as Day 2006)	*American Behavioral Scientist*	Ads for fuel, company public affairs
20	Day, Mitrook, and Lieber 2008	Conference paper	Ads for company public affairs
21	DeLorme, Huh, and Reid 2006 (also Huh 2003)	*Journal of Advertising*	Direct-to-consumer advertising in general
22	Douglas, Sutton, and Stathi 2010	*Social Influence*	Ads for everyday products
23	Duck, Hogg, and Terry 2006	*Journal of Applied Social Psychology*	Safer sex/HIV ads
24–25	Duck and Mullin 1995	*European Journal of Social Psychology*	Drunk driving, safe sex, wear seat-belts ads
26	Duck, Terry, and Hogg 1995	*Basic and Applied Social Psychology*	Safe sex/HIV ads
27	Eckstein 2012	Unpublished thesis	TV drama ad, anti-cyberbullying ad
28	Eisend 2008	*Journal of Advertising*	Sunglass ad
29–30	Eisend 2015	*International Journal of Advertising*	Licorice ad, financial investment ad
31	Golan and Banning 2008	*American Behavioral Scientist*	Diverse product, brand, and public service ads

(*Continued on next page*)

TABLE A1
List of Manuscripts and Studies Used for the Meta-Analysis (*Continued*)

Study No.	Author(s), Year of Publication	Source	Advertising Message Topic
32	Grier and Brumbaugh 2007	*Journal of Consumer Behaviour*	Slippers and snack food ads
33	Gunther and Mundy 1993	*Journalism Quarterly*	Diverse product, brand, and public service ads
34	Gunther and Thorson 1992	*Communication Research*	Diverse product, brand, and public service ads
35–36	Henriksen and Flora 1999	*Communication Research*	Cigarette advertising in general, diverse anti-smoking ads
37	Huh 2008	Conference paper	Direct-to-consumer advertising in general
38	Huh, DeLorme, and Reid 2004 (also Huh 2003)	*Communication Research*	Direct-to-consumer advertising in general
39	Huh, DeLorme, and Reid 2006 (also Huh 2003)	*Journal of Consumer Affairs*	Direct-to-consumer advertising in general
40	Hwang, Pan, and Sun 2006	Conference paper	Public service ads
41	Innes and Zeitz 1988	*European Journal of Social Psychology*	Drunk-driving public service ads
42–43	Jensen and Collins 2008 (also Jensen 2003)	*American Behavioral Scientist*	Diverse product and brand ads
44	Johnston and Bourgeois 2015	*Sport, Business, and Management: An International Journal*	Gambling sponsorship advertising in general
45	Kim 2013	*Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*	Red Cross donation public service ad
46	Lambe and McLeod 2005	*Journal of Communication*	Beer advertising in general
47	Leung and Lo 2015	*Youth and Society*	Anti-drug public service ad
48	Lewis, Watson, and Tay 2007	*Transportation Research*	Drunk-driving, speeding public service ads
49	Lewis, Watson, and White 2008	*Transportation Research*	Drunk-driving public service ad
50	Mackert et al. 2014	*American Journal of Infection Control*	Hand hygiene ads
51	Maruniak 2009	Unpublished thesis	Diverse product, brand, and public service ads
52	Meirick 2005	*Communication Research*	Anti-tobacco, drunk-driving, cigarette (public service) advertising in general
53	Meirick 2006	*Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*	Cigarette, alcohol ads; anti-tobacco, anti-drunk-driving public service ads
54	Meirick 2008	*Media Psychology*	Anti-drug public service ads
55	Meng, Gonzenbach, and Pan 2014	*Journal of Medical Marketing*	Cosmeceutical product ad
56	Nelson, Desphande, and Vilela 2015	*Journal of Global Fashion Marketing*	Product placements in movies in general
57	Nelson and McLeod 2005	*International Journal of Consumer Studies*	Product placements in general
58	Paek et al. 2012	*Media Psychology*	Against child abuse public service ads

(*Continued on next page*)

TABLE A1
List of Manuscripts and Studies Used for the Meta-Analysis (*Continued*)

Study No.	Author(s), Year of Publication	Source	Advertising Message Topic
59	Pan, Meng, and Zhou 2012	*Journal of Promotion Management*	Body shape and energy ads
60	Robinson and Umphrey 2006	*International Journal of Aging and Human Development*	Coffee, teeth, beauty, clothes ads
61	Samson 2013	Unpublished thesis	Diverse product and brand ads
62	Shah, Faber, and Youn 1999	*Communication Research*	Cigarette, beer, liquor advertising in general
63	Shin and Kim 2011 (also Kim 2008)	*Television and News Media*	Alcohol product placements in movies
64	Smith 2008	Unpublished thesis	Amnesty for illegal immigrants
65	Sun, Shen, and Pan 2008	*Communication Research*	Donation and community public service ads
66	Tal-Or 2007	*Mass Communication and Society*	Energy bar ads
67–68	Tal-Or and Drukman 2010	*Media Psychology*	Medication, chewing gum, water saving device ads
69–70	Tal-Or and Tsfati 2007	*Media Psychology*	Soft drink, internet service ads
71	Tang 2015	Unpublished thesis	Online game advertising in general
72	Taylor, Bell, and Kravitz 2011	*Depression and Anxiety*	Medication ad
73–74	Wan, Faber, and Fung 2003	*Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*	Advertising in general
75	Wan 2002	Unpublished thesis	Advertising in general
76–77	Wan and Wells 2005	Conference paper	Diverse product and brand ads
78	White and Dillon 2000	*Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*	Organ and tissue donation ads
79–80	Xie 2016	*Journal of Marketing Communications*	Weight loss, bottled drink ads
81–82	Xie and Johnson 2015	*Psychology and Marketing*	Headphones, bottled water ads
83	Xue 2015	Unpublished thesis	Alcohol advertising in general
84	Youn, Faber, and Shah 2000	*Psychology and Marketing*	Casinos, lottery in general

1. Anker, Ashley E. (2007), "Influencing Intentions to Donate Blood: The Use of Threat and First-Person Effects," unpublished master's thesis, State University of New York at Buffalo.
2. Banning, Stephen A. (1997), "Cigarette and Alcohol Advertising, Self-Esteem, and Societal Opinion: First-Person and Third-Person Effects in Relation to Perceived Stigma, Product Use, and Self-Esteem," unpublished doctoral thesis, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.
3. Begin, Georgia (2005), "Attitudinal Antecedents of the First- and Third-Person Effect of Alcohol Advertising on College Students," unpublished master's thesis, University of South Florida.
4. Borzekowski, Dina L.G., June A. Flora, Ellen Feighery, and Caroline Schooler (1999), "The Perceived Influence of Cigarette Advertisements and Smoking Susceptibility among Seventh Graders," *Journal of Health Communication*, 4 (2), 105–18.
5. Brosius, Hans-Bernd, and Dirk Engel (1996), "The Causes of Third-Person Effects: Unrealistic Optimism, Impersonal Impact, or Generalized Negative Attitudes towards Media Influence?," *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 8 (2), 142–62.
6. Carr, D. Jasun (2014), "Perceived Influence, Parasocial Relationships, and the Power of Product Placement," unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wisconsin–Madison.
7. Chapin, John (1999a), "Advertising vs. Public Service Announcements: The Role of Message Type in Safer Sex Campaigns and Third-Person Perception," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, August, New Orleans, LA.
8. ——— (1999b), "Third-Person Perception, Optimistic Bias, Safe-Sex Campaigns, and Sexual Risk-Taking among Minority 'At-Risk' Youth," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, August, New Orleans, LA.
9. Chia, Stella C. (2007), "Third-Person Perceptions about Idealized Body Image and Weight-Loss Behavior," *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 84 (4), 677–94.
10. ——— (2009), "When the East Meets the West: An Examination of Third-Person Perceptions about Idealized Body Image in Singapore," *Mass Communication and Society*, 12 (4), 423–45.

11. ———, and Nainan Wen (2010), "College Men's Third-Person Perceptions about Idealized Body Image and Consequent Behavior," *Sex Roles*, 63 (7), 542–55.
12. Cho, Hyunyi, and Franklin J. Boster (2008), "First- and Third-Person Perceptions on Anti-Drug Ads among Adolescents," *Communication Research*, 35 (2), 169–89.
13. ———, and Miejeong Han (2004), "Perceived Effects of the Mass Media on Self vs. Other: A Cross-Cultural Investigation of the Third-Person Effect Hypothesis," *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 14 (2), 299–318.
14. Chock, T. Makana, Julia R. Fox, James R. Angelini, Seungjo Lee, and Annie Lang (2007), "Telling Me Quickly: How Arousing Fast-Paced PSAs Decrease Self–Other Differences," *Communication Research*, 34 (6), 618–36.
15. ———, and Sungkyoung Lee (2005), "The Impact of Appeal Type and Message Structure on First-Person and Third-Person Judgments," paper presented at the annual conference of the International Communication Association, May, New York, NY.
16. Choi, Yoonhyeung, Glenn Leshner, and Jounghwa Choi (2008), "Third-Person Effect of Idealized Body Image in Magazine Advertisements," *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52 (2), 147–64.
17. Dahlén, Micael, Henrik Sjödin, Helge Thorbjornsen, Håvard Hansen, Johanna Linander, and Camilla Thunell (2014), "'What Will 'They' Think?' Marketing Leakage to Undesired Audiences and the Third-Person Effect," *European Journal of Marketing*, 47 (11–12), 1825–40.
18. David, Prabu, Glenda Morrison, Melissa A. Johnson, and Felecia Ross (2002), "Body Image, Race, and Fashion Models: Social Distance and Social Identification in Third-Person Effects," *Communication Research*, 29 (3), 270–94.
19. Day, Anita G. (2006), "Public Affairs Advertising: Corporate Influence, Public Opinion, and Vote Intentions Under the Third-Person Effect," unpublished doctoral thesis, Louisiana State University.
20. ——— (2008), "Out of the Living Room and into the Voting Booth: An Analysis of Corporate Public Affairs Advertising under the Third-Person Effect," *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52 (2), 243–60.
21. ———, Michael A. Mitrook, and Paul S. Lieber (2008), "Advertising Corporate Social Responsibility Initiatives: Linking Third-Person Perceptions with Behavioral Intentions," paper presented at the annual conference of the International Communication Association, May, Montreal, Canada.
22. DeLorme, Denise E., Jisu Huh, and Leonhard N. Reid (2006), "Perceived Effects of Direct-to-Consumer (DTC) Prescription Drug Advertising on Self and Others: A Third-Person Effect Study of Older Consumers," *Journal of Advertising*, 35 (3), 47–65.
23. Douglas, Karen M., Robbie M. Sutton, and Sofia Stathi (2010), "Why I Am Less Persuaded Than You: People's Intuitive Understanding of the Psychology of Persuasion," *Social Influence*, 5 (2), 133–48.
24. Duck, Julie M., Michael A. Hogg, and Deborah J. Terry (2006), "Social Identity and Perceptions of Media Persuasion: Are We Always Less Influenced Than Others?," *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29 (9), 1879–99.
25. ———, and Barbara-Ann Mullin (1995), "The Perceived Impact of the Mass Media: Reconsidering the Third-Person Effect," *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 25 (1), 77–93.
26. ———, Deborah J. Terry, and Michael A. Hogg (1995), "The Perceived Influence of AIDS Advertising: Third-Person Effects in the Context of Positive Media Content," *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17 (3), 305–25.
27. Eckstein, Jacqueline M. (2012), "Parents' Biased Perceptions about Media Influence: Examining Perceived Effects of One's Own Child, Other Children, and Other Parents from Violent TV Ads and PSAs to Stop Cyberbullying," unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oklahoma.
28. Eisend, Martin (2008), "Explaining the Impact of Scarcity Claims in Advertising: The Mediating Role of Perceptions of Susceptibility," *Journal of Advertising*, 37 (3), 33–40.
29. ——— (2015), "Persuasion Knowledge and Third-Person Perceptions in Advertising: The Moderating Effect of Regulatory Competence," *International Journal of Advertising*, 34 (1), 54–69.
30. Golan, Guy J., and Stephen A. Banning (2008), "Exploring a Link between the Third-Person Effect and the Theory of Reasoned Action: Beneficial Ads and Social Expectations," *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52 (2), 208–24.
31. Grier, Sonya A., and Anne M. Brumbaugh (2007), "Compared to Whom? The Impact of Status on Third-Person Effects in Advertising Persuasion in a South African Context," *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 6 (1), 5–18.
32. Gunther, Albert C., and Paul Mundy (1993), "Biased Optimism and the Third-Person Effect," *Journalism Quarterly*, 70 (1), 58–67.
33. ———, and Esther Thorson (1992), "Perceived Persuasive Effects of Product Commercials and Public Service Announcements: Third-Person Effects in New Domains," *Communication Research*, 19 (5), 574–96.
34. Henriksen, Lisa, and June A. Flora (1999), "Third-Person Perception and Children: Perceived Impact of Pro- and Anti-Smoking Ads," *Communication Research*, 26 (6), 643–65.
35. Huh, Jisu (2003), "Perceived Effects, Mediating Influences, and Behavioral Outcomes of Direct-to-Consumer Prescription Drug Advertising: Applying the Third-Person Effect Framework," unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Georgia.
36. ——— (2008), "Physician Perceptions of Third-, Second-, and First-Person Effects of DTC Prescription Drug Advertising and Behavioral Consequences," paper presented at the conference of the International Communication Association, May, Montreal, Canada.
37. ———, Denise E. DeLorme, and Leonhard N. Reid (2004), "The Third-Person Effect and Its Influence on Behavioral Outcomes in a Product Advertising Context: The Case of Direct-to-Consumer Prescription Drug Advertising," *Communication Research*, 31 (5), 568–99.
38. ———, ———, and — (2006), "Perceived Third-Person Effects and Consumer Attitudes on Preventing and Banning DTC Advertising," *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 40 (1), 90–116.
39. Hwang, Hyunseo, Zhongdang Pan, and Ye Sun (2006), "Question-Order Effect Revisited: An Exploration of Anchoring Effect in the Third-Person Perceptions," paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, June, Dresden, Germany.
40. Innes, J.M., and H. Zeitz (1988), "The Public's View of the Impact of the Mass Media: A Test of the 'Third Person' Effect," *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 18 (5), 457–63.
41. Jensen, Keith (2003), "An Examination of Third-Person Effect in the Context of Controversial Product Advertising," unpublished master's thesis, University of Central Florida.
42. ———, and Steve Collins (2008), "The Third-Person Effect in Controversial Product Advertising," *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52 (2), 225–42.
43. Johnston, Margaret A., and Luc R. Bourgeois (2015), "Third-Person Perceptions of Gambling Sponsorship Advertising," *Sport, Business, and Management: An International Journal*, 5 (5), 413–34.

44. Kim, Hyo Jung (2013), "'They Will Help, So I Don't Need To?': Behavioral Hypothesis of the Third-Person Effect in Donation Aid Advertising," *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 34 (1), 93–106.
45. Kim, Jun Kyo (2008), "Perceived Effects of Alcohol Product Placement in Youth-Oriented Movies on Self and Others: A Third-Person Effect Study of College Students," unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Alabama.
46. Lambe, Jennifer L., and Douglas M. McLeod (2005), "Understanding Third-Person Perception Processes: Predicting Perceived Impact on Self and Others for Multiple Expressive Contexts," *Journal of Communication*, 55 (2), 277–91.
47. Leung, Wan Chi, and Ven-Hwei Lo (2015), "Perceived Harm of Online Drug-Encouraging Messages: Third-Person Effect and Adolescents' Support for Rectifying Measures," *Youth and Society*, 47 (6), 850–72.
48. Lewis, Ioni, Barry Watson, and Richard Tay (2007), "Examining the Effectiveness of Physical Threats in Road Safety Advertising: The Role of the Third-Person Effect, Gender, and Age," *Transportation Research Part F*, 10 (1), 48–60.
49. ———, ———, and K.M. White (2008), "An Examination of Message-Relevant Affect in Road Safety Messages: Should Road Safety Advertisements Aim to Make Us Feel Good or Bad?," *Transportation Research Part F*, 11 (6), 403–17.
50. Mackert, Michael, Allison Lazard, Sara Champlin, Ming-Ching Liang, Amanda Mabry, Stephanie Stroever, Marie Guadagno, and Lynda Watkins (2014), "'Take Time. Save Lives. Clean Hands Protect': A Comparison of Two Hand Hygiene Health Promotion Posters," *American Journal of Infection Control*, 42 (5), 530–32.
51. Maruniak, Andrea (2009), "A Mediation Model of the Impact of For- and Non-Profit Environmental Advertising," unpublished master's thesis, University of Missouri–Columbia.
52. Meirick, Patrick C. (2005), "Rethinking the Target Corollary: The Effects of Social Distance, Perceived Exposure, and Perceived Predispositions on First-Person and Third-Person Perceptions," *Communication Research*, 32 (6), 822–43.
53. ——— (2006), "Media Schemas, Perceived Effects, and Person Perceptions," *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 83 (3), 632–49.
54. ——— (2008), "Targeted Audiences in Anti-Drug Ads: Message Cues, Perceived Exposure, Perceived Effects and Support for Funding," *Media Psychology*, 11 (2), 283–309.
55. Meng, Juan, William J. Gonzenbach, and Po-Lin Pan (2014), "Third-Person Perception of Cosmeceutical Product Advertising: The Moderating Role of Body Esteem," *Journal of Medical Marketing*, 14 (2–3), 163–71.
56. Nelson, Michelle R., Sameer Desphande, and Alexandra M. Vilela (2015), "Exploring First- versus Third-Person Perceptions of Product Placement Influence on Consumption and Fashion in India," *Journal of Global Fashion Marketing*, 6 (2), 103–19.
57. ———, and Laurie Ellis McLeod (2005), "Adolescent Brand Consciousness and Product Placements: Awareness, Liking, and Perceived Effects on Self and Others," *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 29 (6), 515–28.
58. Paek, Hye-Jin, Thomas Hove, Mikyoung Kim, Hyun Ju Jeong, and James Price Dillard (2012), "When Distant Others Matter More: Perceived Effectiveness for Self and Other in the Child Abuse PSA Context," *Media Psychology*, 15 (2), 148–74.
59. Pan, Po-Lin, Juan Meng, and Shuhua Zhou (2012), "Examining Third-Person Perceptions in the Context of Sexually Oriented Advertising," *Journal of Promotion Management*, 18 (2), 189–208.
60. Robinson, Tom, and Don Umphrey (2006), "First- and Third-Person Perceptions of Images of Older People in Advertising: An Inter-Generational Evaluation," *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 62 (2), 159–73.
61. Samson, Lelia (2013), "Heuristic-Systematic Processing and the Third-Person Perception of Sexual Appeals in Persuasive Messages," unpublished doctoral thesis, Indiana University.
62. Shah, Dhavan V., Ronald J. Faber, and Seounmi Youn (1999), "Susceptibility and Severity: Perceptual Dimensions Underlying the Third-Person Effect," *Communication Research*, 26 (2), 240–67.
63. Shin, Dong-Hee, and Jun Kyo Kim (2011), "Alcohol Product Placements and the Third-Person Effect," *Television and New Media*, 12 (5), 412–40.
64. Smith, Patricia J. (2008), "A Relationship-Based Approach to Understanding the Role of Race Cues in Third-Person Perception," unpublished master's thesis, University of Texas at El Paso.
65. Sun, Ye, Lijiang Shen, and Zhongdang Pan (2008), "On the Behavioral Component of the Third-Person Effect," *Communication Research*, 35 (2), 257–78.
66. Tal-Or, Nurit (2007), "Age and Third-Person Perception in Response to Positive Product Advertisements," *Mass Communication and Society*, 10 (4), 403–22.
67. ———, and Dorit Drukman (2010), "Third-Person Perceptions as an Impression Management Tactic," *Media Psychology*, 13 (3), 301–22.
68. ———, and Yariv Tsfati (2007), "On the Substitutability of the Third-Person Perception," *Media Psychology*, 10 (2), 231–49.
69. Tang, Yan (2015), "Online Game Advertising and Chinese College Students: Attitudes, First- and Third-Person Effects," unpublished master's thesis, University of South Florida.
70. Taylor, Laramie D., Robert A. Bell, and Richard L. Kravitz (2011), "Third-Person Effects and Direct-to-Consumer Advertisements for Antidepressants," *Depression and Anxiety*, 28 (2), 160–65.
71. Wan, Fang (2002), "The Impact of Idealized Images in Advertising: A Model of Third-Person Effect," unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Minnesota.
72. ———, Ronald J. Faber, and Anthony Fung (2003), "Perceived Impact of Thin Female Models in Advertising: A Cross-Cultural Examination of Third-Person Perception and Its Impact on Behaviors," *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 15 (1/2), 51–73.
73. ———, and Williams Wells (2005), "Are Men Susceptible to the Third-Person Gaze? Two Exploratory Studies of the Impact of Muscular Male Images in Advertising," paper presented at the conference of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada, May, Toronto, Canada.
74. White, H. Allen, and John F. Dillon (2000), "Knowledge about Others' Reaction to a Public Service Announcement: The Impact on Self-Persuasion and Third-Person Perception," *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 77 (4), 788–803.
75. Xie, Guang-Xin (2016), "Deceptive Advertising and Third-Person Perception: The Interplay of Generalized and Specific Suspicion," *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 22 (5), 494–512.
76. ———, and Jessie M. Quintero Johnson (2015), "Examining the Third-Person Effect of Baseline Omission in Numerical Comparison: The Role of Consumer Persuasion Knowledge," *Psychology and Marketing*, 32 (4), 428–49.
77. Xue, Dong (2015), "First- and Third-Person Effects of Alcohol Advertising on Chinese College Students," unpublished master's thesis, University of South Florida.
78. Youn, Seounmi, Ronald J. Faber, and Dhavan V. Shah (2000), "Restricting Gambling Advertising and the Third-Person Effect," *Psychology and Marketing*, 17 (7), 633–49.