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i. Abstract

Advertising’s purpose is to create a state of mind conducive to purchase (Colley, 1961).

This study seeks to identify, measure, and understand the intrinsic motivators communicated within print advertisements and quantify their intensities. The theory is that ads with more intense motivator content - distributed somewhat evenly across all four quadrants of the Whole Brain® Model - will be more effective in influencing that state of mind.

This research is the first step in identifying, quantifying, and visualizing motivators communicated within print advertisements. The study analyzed 15 print ads found in contemporary magazines.

The framework for this work is the research of Dr. Russell Osmond, who identified eight universal “Motivators” shared by all of us, regardless of age, culture, gender, ethnicity, geography, or education (Osmond, 2013). They are:

- **Esthetic** – People who are motivated by things that add value to their life, and by harmony, beauty, and appearance.

- **Independence** – Individuals who value personal freedom, being in control of their destiny, and self-reliance.

- **Dominance** – These people look for any advantage they can get to give them an edge. They love to be in charge, and they love to win.

- **Analysis** – People who thrive on data, clarity, and precision. They are logical, rational, and love to crunch the numbers to prove they are right.

- **Practicality** – These people love getting things done in a streamlined fashion and hate ambiguity. They love it when ideas are unfolded in a step-by-step fashion in ways that makes sense.

- **Structure** – People who try to create order and have discipline in everything they do. They value simplicity and become frustrated by chaos or unclear direction.

- **Humanitarian** – People who desire opportunities to be helpful to others and find solace in groups.

- **Transcendence** – Those who value unity and want to make a difference in the world. They love to be a part of something bigger than themselves.

Osmond’s work found that these motivators are learned very early in life and become embedded when we are around 13 years old. They form from nurture - our home and family dynamics, and nature - the environment and dominant social values of the geographic area we grew up in. Absent a significantly powerful emotional experience, these personal motivators seldom change as adults. You are what you are. As adults, we tend to rely on just one or two motivators as our dominant ways of interacting with the world. The motivators strengths and weaknesses become
the individuals modus operandi and frame the way they see, think, and react to the world. Once understood, they are the source of enlightenment for what makes each person unique and different.

Osmond’s work was influenced heavily by Dr. Ned Herrmann, who sought to apply brain-based research to the field of business and developed the Whole Brain® Model (Herrmann, 1999). This model is based on the neuroscientific premise that the brain works in four integrated systems - the key finding being that if we engage all four quadrants of “Thinking Styles” simultaneously when working on projects, we will arrive at better decisions. (See figure 1)

Figure 1:

Osmond found that the eight universal motivators align with the Whole Brain® model, identifying two motivators within each quadrant. (See figure 2)

Figure 2:
From a marketing perspective, the theory is that if we can design ads with motivators communicated strongly within all four Whole Brain® quadrants simultaneously, the more effective our advertising will be since individuals within the general population who engage with our ads are distributed among all four Whole Brain® Thinking Style quadrants and have different dominant Thinking Style preferences.

Using insights from these models, this research adapts Osmond’s motivators to identify and quantify motivators communicated within the sample of print ads. The result of this research is to develop a visualization to measure and quantify the eight motivators and their intensities within each ad.

One-hundred forty-nine people participated in the survey study. Each was shown 10 print ads from contemporary magazines (Sports Illustrated, Men’s Health, Vanity Fair, Oprah, People) and asked to evaluate the ad via a series of questions probing the eight universal motivators.

While further study is indicated, it appears that this research path may be a first step in providing advertising professionals with a quantitative assessment tool which can provide insight to improve an ad’s motivational effectiveness in creating a state of mind conducive to purchase.
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1. Introduction

“Half my advertising spend is wasted; the trouble is, I don't know which half.”

John Wanmker

The objective of this study is to test a method that seeks to understand the motivators communicated within print advertisements and quantify the intensity of each within the framework of MyMotivators™ / Whole Brain® Thinking methodology.

Advertising has three primary objectives: to inform, to persuade, and to remind (Kopylova).

- **Informative Advertising** creates awareness of brands, products, services, and ideas. It announces new products and programs and can educate people about the attributes and benefits of new or established products.

- **Persuasive Advertising** tries to convince customers that a company’s services or products are the best, and it works to alter perceptions and enhance the image of a company or product. Its goal is to influence consumers to take action and switch brands, try a new product, or remain loyal to a current brand.

- **Reminder Advertising** reminds people about the need for a product or service, or the features and benefits it will provide when they purchase promptly.

Dr. Viktor Frankl in his book “*Man’s Search for Meaning*”, acknowledged *meaning* as a central motivational force in human behavior (Frankl, 1946). Frankl’s theory of Logotherapy (meaning therapy) came to him as he was interred in a Nazi concentration camp, writing that life holds *meaning* regardless of one’s circumstance.

Using the work of Frankl as inspiration, Russell Osmond developed IP for Motivation Management, Behavior Modification, and Change Design (Osmond, 2013). He framed his motivation management tool within The Whole Brain® Model developed by Ned Herrmann, which is widely accepted in the scientific community to describe how humans process information – their “Thinking Style” (Herrmann, 1999).

Osmond modeled his work off the Allport-Vernon Study of Values which was designed to measure personal preferences of six types of values: theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious (Oles & Hermans, 2010). While adapting this model, Osmond’s work identified that there are eight universal “Motivators” shared by all of us, regardless of age, culture, gender, ethnicity, geography, or education. These Personal Motivators help give our lives meaning and guide our thoughts and actions. While all people possess all eight motivators, they hold each in varying intensities based on what they learned to value early in life and tend to rely on a preferred style (their dominant motivator), with a heightened reliance under stress. The eight motivators are:
**Esthetic** – People who are motivated by things that add value to their life, and by harmony, beauty, and appearance.

**Independence** – Individuals who value personal freedom, being in control of their destiny, and self-reliance.

**Dominance** – These people look for any advantage they can get to give them an edge. They love to be in charge, and they love to win.

**Analysis** – People who thrive on data, clarity, and precision. They are logical, rational, and love to crunch the numbers to prove they are right.

**Practicality** – These people love getting things done in a streamlined fashion and hate ambiguity. They love it when ideas are unfolded in a step-by-step fashion in ways that makes sense.

**Structure** – People who try to create order and have discipline in everything they do. They value simplicity and become frustrated by chaos or unclear direction.

**Humanitarian** – People who desire opportunities to be helpful to others and find solace in groups.

**Transcendence** – Those who value unity and want to make a difference in the world. They love to be a part of something bigger than themselves.

Personal motivation is that part of us that governs our private feelings and defines our thoughts about ourselves and others. We seldom discuss these personal motivators because we have neither a shared vocabulary for describing them nor an awareness of their pervasiveness and commonality in all of us. We suspect there may be something there, and we wonder about it, but we lack a standard template for exploring its complexity. Because of all that, we have spent very little time figuring out where this motivation comes from.

Morris Massey found that we develop our outlook on life around the time we reach our early teen years, age 13 or 14. Up until then, the world was all about just ourselves. But something happens when we get to our teen years. We see ourselves as part of the world. We socialize. And we begin to form our philosophy of life (Massey, 1979). Osmond found that development of our Personal Motivators follows a similar path. They are learned early in life and are usually set by the time we reach our early teens. They form from nurture - our home and family dynamics, and nature - the environment and dominant social values of the geographic area in which we grew up. Absent a significantly powerful emotional experience, these Personal Motivators seldom change as we age.

While all people possess all eight motivators, they hold each in varying intensities based on what they learned to value early in life and tend to rely on one or two dominant motivators, with a heightened reliance when under stress.

To follow is a detailed explanation of each motivator:
Desire is for a personal and sensitive appreciation of things harmonious and beautiful.

People with dominant Esthetic Motivators love to create order and balance and are especially elated when they can do so in a way that “falls into place” elegantly. They are the type to find great enjoyment from walking outside, admiring the trees, and the fit into nature. They find comfort in beauty and appearance because it is a path to being something different. They feel good about looking good.

They like meeting multiple criteria at once, such as making the nice choice, the fair choice, and the right choice at the same time, all while being watched. The Esthetic Motivator is the motivator of integration. They are motivated by its value harmony, beauty, and appearance, at times waiting beyond what others are willing to tolerate to find a solution that can encompass their values. They dislike apathy and incongruity.

Those with the Esthetic Motivator can be a little duplicitous, deceiving with appearance and carefully selected wording. Facts don’t matter to them but looking good does. They will put a great deal of time and energy into rebalancing the world around them – lining things up just so. Sometimes the Esthetic Motivator can be mistaken for Structure – because they like things to look good and appear as if they are in order.

Esthetic-motivated individuals fear dissonance of any kind, which can be likened to fingernails on a blackboard to them. They especially dislike situations where they are incapable of righting the visual wrongs they see surrounding them.

People who try to force agreement with things that don’t “feel” right upset the Esthetic-motivated individual.

They tend to measure relationships by the ease of the flow.

**Probably Prefers:** Beauty and appearance

**May Avoid:** Distractions and apathy

**May Filter:** Distracting, annoying details

**Probably Will Do Well:** Make things look good

**Watch For:** May be creative but not bottom-line oriented

**Potential Fear:** Dissonance of any kind
Independence

*Desire is for personal freedom and self-determination. Self-reliance based on an “I want to be me” attitude is the hallmark.*

People with dominant Independence Motivators want to do everything on their own and seldom understand why others don’t see the world the same way they do. They value personal freedom above all and dislike using anyone else’s rules or standards of measurement. They find comfort in their independence because it insulates them from having to engage others in a way that confuses the output they seek. They take full responsibility for their behavior, but not on your timeline or in your way. They do whatever feels important to them and manifest zero concerns for others. However, this does not mean that they are bad. They can be highly motivated towards helping groups succeed. Someone with a dominant Independence Motivator is very tenacious.

To Independence-motivated individuals, now is often what matters most. They feel that others only slow them down. This superior attitude they often project causes them to chafe when others try to hold them accountable for their decisions. They are usually unaware that they are projecting a superior attitude. They enjoy criticizing the ruling systems and like to experiment with new ideas. They thrive on experiencing new things and trying out new things. They stay far away from any form of dependence or anything they don’t control.

The Independence-motivated individual’s greatest fear is the loss of personal freedom. They get really upset when they are stuck following the rules of anyone else for an extended period and they will check-out.

They tend to measure relationships by the mutuality of freedom.

**Probably Prefers:** Self-reliance and personal freedom

**May Avoid:** Dependency and group interaction

**May Filter:** Anything not on their agenda

**Probably Will Do Well:** Very “just-in-time” and specific

**Watch For:** May not engage or care

**Potential Fear:** Loss of freedom
**Dominance**

*Desire is acknowledgment, credit, and respect – they also don’t mind being in charge.*

People with dominant Dominance Motivators seek to win. They look for any advantage they can get to give them an edge. They love to be in charge and to get credit for what they do. They like total accountability, sole authority, and total credit for their work. They are driven to focus.

Dominance is the “muscle car” of the Motivators. Dominance-motivated individuals are big personalities that aren’t overly concerned with who get run over as they barrel towards their destination. Their modus operandi is instant reaction and taking control. They can be intentionally or unintentionally manipulative, often using surprise and a means of control.

Because control is so important to them, they will fight to maintain it. They are afraid to give up any arena they control, no matter its usefulness to them. They often get angry when they are not allowed to take control.

The Dominance Motivator often arises from frustration either of not mattering or not being noticed. They suffer when their contributions aren’t acknowledged.

Because they always want to put themselves in charge, Dominant-motivated individuals are often defensive without being aware of it. It can be hard for them to survive because they perceive others are constantly swiping at them, although sometimes they will not notice the swiping.

They tend to measure the quality and importance of relationships by how in-charge they are.

**Probably Preferences:** Doing things my way and taking credit

**May Avoid:** Randomness and taking direction from others

**May Filter:** Other people’s needs

**Probably Will Do Well:** Correction and improvement

**Watch For:** Timing of delivering a message that will be heard and not resisted

**Potential Fear:** Loss of control

**Analysis**

*Desire is for knowledge, the discovery of truth and the opportunity to grow intellectually.*

People with the dominant Analysis Motivator thrive on data and they love being right. They’re logical, rational, and thorough. They like digging into a problem and solving it. They find comfort in being thorough because it gives them a sense of accuracy. Unfortunately, once they’ve convinced themselves they’re right, they often mentally check-out.
In their relationships with others, they want brief, to-the-point information. They fear giving up access to information and will fight to maintain such access. This focus on information often discounts emotions. They have a strain of perfectionism in them – they always want to ask one more question. They take way too long because they never stop doing the research. They think awareness is action. In their discussions, they tend to think “If I can increase your awareness, you’ll agree with me.”

Their tendency is to try to evaluate all options which often causes them to avoid making decisions. The person with the dominant Analysis Motivator also avoids decisions because they fear being wrong. Proving a person with the Analysis Motivator wrong with later information in a public situation is especially mortifying to them.

They are often frustrated when others don’t see the logic of their arguments and when others don’t get to the point quickly and rationally enough. Though they may get frustrated, their frustration does not stop them. Debate, argument, and discussion are what they feel best doing. They think it’s what everybody wants.

Conflict doesn’t matter to them. They’ll create it and they’ll seek it. They have no sensitivity to the consequences of conflict. When you stop arguing, they think the accuracy of the data stands on its own. Winning and losing are very important to them. They control by refusing to listen.

They tend to measure relationships by being right. They value debate, argument, and accuracy more than they value relationship, cooperation, and collaboration.

**Probably Prefers:** Data and information

**May Avoid:** Closure and decisions

**May Filter:** Anything to do with emotions

**Probably Will Do Well:** Precision, details, and accuracy

**Watch For:** May wait too long or talk too much

**Potential Fear:** Being wrong

---

**Practicality**

*Desire is for practical accomplishment. Also, rewards and results must be linked together NOW!*

People with dominate Practicality Motivators love to get things done, and the like for others to look to them as a resource for how to get things done. They only feel good when they are dealing with tactile things they can touch. They are focused on the tangible, a trait that makes this Motivator increasingly rare in today’s digital world.
They like efficiency and a high volume of output. They enjoy not only getting results, but also spending time to document them. Their sense of self is derived from tallying their accomplishments on a daily basis. An unintended side effect of this is that they are often preoccupied with their legacy.

They get irritated when a situation forces them to think strategically in terms of long-term consequences, rather than jump in and do the obvious immediately. They don’t like to hear why; they like to hear what and how; they like to do. They are frustrated by generalities and vagueness, at times forcing a plan that does not fit to get started.

They can be so determined to complete a project that they ignore all other considerations, including arguments and conflict caused by their efforts to complete the project and the unintended negative consequences for others. They sometimes move forward before it’s appropriate in their effort to always be doing.

A common fear of the Practicality-motivated individual is things not working. They can feel especially embarrassed when they can’t make things work while everyone is watching.

They tend to measure relationships by volume of output.

**Probably Prefers:** Results and measurement

**May Avoid:** Generalities and procrastination

**May Filter:** Anything not on a “to-do” list or that can’t be seen, touched, and counted

**Probably Will Do Well:** Define exact error pragmatically

**Watch For:** May be impatient if monetary and practical rewards don’t come quickly

**Potential Fear:** Things not working or not finishing

---

**Structure**

*Desire is for structure, rules, and a “niche” in which they feel secure. Generally, is rules-oriented and has a low tolerance for ambiguity.*

People with dominant Structure Motivators try to create order and discipline in everything they touch. They like the reliability of repetition and enjoy the predictability of consistent inputs generating consistent outputs. They find comfort in organization because it protects them from surprise, change, and the need to be flexible. It also protects them from being blamed.

They excel at creating systems and processes and are often intolerant of problems created when others ignore the rules. Because they are upset by surprises, they generally avoid variety.

They dislike those who don’t follow through, especially when it disrupts their anticipated activities and routines. They probably won’t bring it up, however, because they hate conflict.
Structure-motivated people are frustrated by chaos and doubt themselves when their systems and rules are ignored or discounted. They seek refuge from their troubles in their routines, because when they are following routines, they don’t have to think or take responsibility – they just DO. Doing the same thing again and again brings stability, though they seldom recognize that there are consequences for other people.

They tend to measure relationships by consistency and predictability.

**Probably Prefers:** Discipline and order

**May Avoid:** Variety or ambiguity

**May Filter:** Anything subtle, irregular, or unpredictable

**Probably Will Do Well:** Defining processes and steps

**Watch For:** Timing because of lack of clarity. Assumes need for structure is obvious

**Potential Fear:** Chaos in all forms

---

**Humanitarian**

*Desire is to share and for an opportunity to be helpful to others. Kindness, sympathy, and unselfishness are trademarks.*

People with dominant Humanitarian Motivators love to help others and are especially elated when they can help another person do something they couldn’t do for themselves or by themselves. The Humanitarian Motivator is the motivator of emotion. Those with this motivator find comfort in helping others because it allows them to deflect the pain and pointedness of accountability.

The Humanitarian-motivated individual will often soften their conversations by using “should” and “we”. This is one way they avoid consequences which they find very uncomfortable. They value sharing and relationships. They seek to create inclusion and involvement for everyone, sometimes eschewing practical considerations. They feel good when they are included and involved because being part of a group or cause makes them feel safe, secure, and protected.

The Humanitarian-motivated individual is unusually sensitive to being hurt (as they perceive it) or not valued. They can feel this acutely when others are disappointed in them, and they see no way to rectify the situation immediately. They want to avoid being blamed.

People who manifest calloused and uncaring attitudes towards the less fortunate upset the Humanitarian-motivated individual. More than any of the other Motivator patterns and styles, the Humanitarian-motivated person hates and avoids conflict by talking, making sure everyone is comfortable, and making sure no one feels stuck with being responsible or blamed.
They tend to measure relationships by the degree of empathetically shared emotion.

**Probably Prefers**: Sharing and relationships

**May Avoid**: Confrontation or disagreement

**May Filter**: Any detail, date, or fact that is uncomfortable

**Probably Will Do Well**: Creating a helpful environment

**Watch For**: May not give feedback in a timely manner to avoid conflict

**Potential Fear**: Being hurt or not being valued

---

**Transcendence**

*Desire is for unity, peaceful acceptance, and inner calm. May use faith to transcend reason.*

People with dominant Transcendence Motivators think in a grand scale. They feel the need to be a part of something larger than themselves, value unity, and want to make a difference. They find comfort in joining causes because they have a need to belong.

They enjoy working in teams and are comfortable in positions where they can follow. Once they are involved in a cause, they are unlikely to doubt it or stray from it. The thought that they might be supporting a cause that is in some way flawed is distressing, so they will activate a significant level of cognitive dissonance that will lead them to find a justification to belong.

The Transcendence-motivated person views self-centeredness with disdain, and they are especially appalled by hypocrisy. They will often feel guilt when they are not meeting the obligations they have to their team or cause.

They fear not mattering and can be insulted when others challenge what they believe to be right and more important than themselves. They can be frustrated by others that don’t follow the rules because to Transcendence-motivated individuals, the rules that make sense apply to everyone.

They tend to measure relationships by shared beliefs in something more important than any one individual or any one thing.

**Probably Prefers**: Larger context and unity

**May Avoid**: Doubt or self-centeredness

**May Filter**: Anything not consistent with their paradigm or what they perceive as good

**Probably Will Do Well**: Willingness to facilitate

**Watch For**: Timing because of lack of clarity. Assumes need for structure is obvious
Potential Fear: Not mattering

Whole Brain® Thinking

Osmond framed his work within the Whole Brain® Thinking model developed by Dr. Ned Herrmann.

Herrmann conceptualized this theory in 1976 as he researched the brain as the source of creativity. At that time, he discovered the groundbreaking research that had been conducted by Roger Sperry, Paul MacLean, Joseph Bogen and Michael Gazzaniga (Sperry, 1975, pp. 30-33) (Bogen, 1975, pp. 132-143) (MacLean, 1973) (Gazzaniga, 1975, pp. 9-12). Their work identified four specialized and distinct structures within the brain that defined four distinct types of thinking. From this research Herrmann created a model for “Thinking Styles” which he termed The Whole Brain® Model. (See figure 3)

Figure 3:

![Whole Brain® Model Diagram](image)

The model is based on the neuroscientific premise that the brain works in four integrated systems that, based on theoretical rationale and empirical evidence, help explain personal and professional actions (Bogen, 1975). (e.g., Bunderson, Newby, Olsen, & Wendt, n.d.; Bunderson, Olsen, & Herrmann, 1982; Ho, 1988).

The approach emphasizes that we, as humans, are designed to be whole. Even so, we are all different. Our brains develop with their own set of preferences. The premise behind The Whole Brain® Model is that if you can actively problem solve using techniques that engage all four quadrants simultaneously, you’ll arrive and better solutions.

Whole Brain® thinking allows us to understand how each quadrant affects how we see the world and react to it:
Experimental (Yellow)

Keywords: visual, holistic, intuitive, innovative, conceptual.

Preferred activities: looking at the big picture, taking the initiative, challenging assumptions, visuals, metaphoric thinking, creative problem solving, long-term thinking.

Those with an experimental preference excel at thought exercises. They are often the ones coming up with new ideas and planning out their approach with mind maps, collages, illustrations, and other visual stimulation. They can grasp ideas and learn more effectively when the approach tailors to their creative nature.

Analytical (Blue)

Keywords: logical, factual, critical, technical, quantitative.

Preferred activities: collecting data, analysis, understanding how things work, judging ideas based on facts, criteria, and logical reasoning.

Those with analytical preferences love facts, numbers, and figures. This group likes to learn in a structured, step-by-step laid out process. They love setting goals and following specific objectives. When delivering information, analytical thinkers use data and figures, charts, images, and infographics.

Practical (Green)

Keywords: safekeeping, structured, organized, complexity or detailed, planned.


Those with a practical preferred thinking style are detailed in their approach, taking extra time to plan their process. They prefer step-by-step instruction and procedures to help them work more effectively. Valuable feedback also goes a long way in assisting them to become more efficient. They love planning and hate surprises.

Relational (Red)

Keywords: empathy, emotional, team-oriented, peacekeepers

Preferred activities: cooperation, teamwork, discussion, positivity, storytelling, visual learning, engaging.

These folks love people and being around people. They are empathetic towards others and prefer to work as a team bouncing ideas off one another. Storytelling, personal experiences and reimagining are effective ways for them to learn.
Every human has access to all four quadrants within their brain, but over time we develop individualized preferences and tend to lean into one quadrant as dominant. The Whole Brain® Model helps people better understand the four integrated systems, better understand their preferences for each of the systems, and ultimately provides a framework for understanding their personal thinking style and preferences.

Osmond’s MyMotivators™ and Hermann’s Whole Brain® Model align, with two MyMotivators™ contained within each of the Whole Brain® quadrants:

- **Yellow**: Esthetic, Independence
- **Blue**: Dominance, Analysis
- **Green**: Practicality, Structure
- **Red**: Humanitarian, Transcendence

### 2. Literature Review / Conceptual Development

The first evidence of advertising was found among the ancient Babylonian Empire which dates to 3000 BC. The first advertisement in English went into print in 1472. The profession of advertising began in the United States in 1841, and although it has been modified a great deal, is still around today (Hayko, 2010, pp. 78-82).

Some psychologists believe that advertising is subliminally manipulative. Kanner stated that commercials manipulate people’s strongest desires and greatest fears to convince them to buy the preferred products (Kanner, 2004).

Petty, Cacioppo, Strathman and Priester noted in their paper “To think or not to think?” that advertising persuasion can occur at different points along a continuum and the processes that influence attitudes can also vary along this continuum (Petty, Cacioppo, Strathman, Priester, 2005).

A core component of advertising persuasion is the time and attention a consumer devotes to it. In the paper “Think you can’t be persuaded by ads you ignore? Think again” Sedivy found that people rarely devote their full brainpower to the ads that are lobbed at them. But this doesn’t mean that the ads have no impact. Sometimes it can mean the opposite (Sedivy, 2010, pp. 47-49).

Developing persuasive advertising which can create a state of mind conducive to purchase is the objective of every marketer and advertising agency. The key to effective advertising is effective persuasiveness – which is synonymous with effective motivation. This research tests the hypothesis that the MyMotivators™/Whole Brain® models can be adapted to measure the intrinsic motivations contained within a print advertisement. The hope is that this can be a tool to help marketers and ad agencies evaluate and adjust creative to maximize persuasion (motivation) within the framework of The Whole Brain® Model before paying to place it in the marketplace.
3. Method

Using Osmond’s eight universal motivators (re: MyMotivators™) as a means of dissecting an ads motivation communication, this study creates a MyMotivators™ profile for fifteen print advertisements pulled from current magazines including Sports Illustrated, Men’s Health, Vanity Fair, Oprah, and People.

The survey research for this experiment was conducted in the Jon M. Huntsman School of Business Consumer Behavior Lab at Utah State University under the supervision of Dr. Matthew Meng.

149 college age students participated in the study – 90 male, 57 female, and 2 non-binary individuals. Each person in the study was asked to rate ten ads in total. Five ads that appeared in men’s magazines were shown exclusively to men. Five ads that appeared in women-targeted magazines were shown exclusively to women. All participants were shown an additional five ads that appeared in non-gender specific targeted magazines.

For each ad, respondents answered two different questions that probed each of the eight motivators (16 questions in total for each ad). Since each MyMotivators™ had two separate questions that probed different sub-topics within that motivator, only the top result from among the two questions was visualized as the highest-rated question addressed that particular MyMotivators™ most effectively.

Responses for all four questions within the quadrant (Yellow, Blue, Green, Red) were then totaled and averaged to determine The Whole Brain® Model communication intensity of each ad.

The data was used to visualize the results in two different dimensions:

MyMotivators™

1. A chart was created showing relative presence and intensities of MyMotivators™ within each ad.

2. A graphic chart was created in visual form to display the data collected.

3. Calculation of an “AdEvaluator” score. This was based on an average of all eight of the top motivators within each MyMotivators™ using a 1-80 scale.

4. An evaluation of the AdEvaluator score based on a five-point Likert scale. Natural breaks were present in the results. Ads scoring 67 or above were rated “Excellent”; 60-66 “Above Average”; 50-59 “Average”; 40-49 “Below Average”; 39 or below “Very Poor”. These “breaks” were determined by classifying ads into brackets.
The Whole Brain® Model

A separate graphic was developed showing the average score from among all four questions posed within each quadrant to calculate a Whole Brain® Model score.

The raw data from the survey is included on this page.

All of these charts can all be found in the appendix.

Survey Questions

Survey questions were developed in consultation with Dr. Osmond to ensure alignment with the eight MyMotivators™. To follow are the questions that were developed for each:

YELLOW QUADRANT

**Esthetic** – People who are motivated by things that add value to their life, and by harmony, beauty, and appearance.

Questions:

a. The benefit claimed by this product has a "WOW" factor offering me something meaningful that I perceive will add value to my life. 
  b. The ad is visually appealing, using fonts, pictures and layout that add to the ease of understanding.

**Independence** – Individuals who value personal freedom, being in control of their destiny, and self-reliance.

Questions:

a. Using this product will make me feel more confident and self-reliant.
  b. Using this product will make me feel more in-control of my life and well-being.

BLUE QUADRANT

**Dominance** – These people look for any advantage they can get to give them an edge. They love to be in charge, and they love to win.

Questions:

a. Using this product will give me an advantage over those that don't use it. 
  b. This product offers advantages versus competitors.
**Analysis** – People who thrive on data, clarity, and precision. They are logical, rational, and love to crunch the numbers to prove they are right.

Questions:

a. This ad has well-articulated ideas and facts presented in a logical format.
b. The ad has brief, clear and precise information.

**GREEN QUADRANT**

**Practicality** – These people love getting things done in a streamlined fashion and hate ambiguity. They love it when ideas are unfolded in a step-by-step fashion in ways that makes sense.

Questions:

a. The ad has a structured explanation of how it works.
b. The way this product is described to me makes sense.

**Structure** – People who try to create order and have discipline in everything they do. They value simplicity and become frustrated by chaos or unclear direction.

Questions:

a. The ad is presented in a logical format and sequence that I can easily understand.
b. Using this product simplifies my life.

**RED QUADRANT**

**Humanitarian** – People who desire opportunities to be helpful to others and find solace in groups.

Questions:

a. This product helps serve the needs of others.
b. This product makes me feel safe, secure, and protected.

**Transcendence** – Those who value unity and want to make a difference in the world. They love to be a part of something bigger than themselves.

Questions:
a. Using this product will add to my sense of community and connection to others.
b. This product makes me feel inspired or emotionally engaged.

4. Results

Using the data generated from each ad, they were compared one-to-another using the MyMotivators™ intensity as the discriminating factor. The dashboards that follow were created showing the three top-performing ads and the three worst-performing ads on each of the sixteen MyMotivators™ questions asked.

Four dominant trends emerged:

1. The “Esthetic” Motivator is strong in virtually every ad. All ads were visually appealing, as you would expect from large ad agencies developing ads for popular magazines.

2. It’s very hard to get a good score in the “Red” quadrant (Humanitarian / Transcendence). Outside of the charities, all others performed below-average. The one exception was Land’s End, which noted that their jackets were eco-friendly and ethically sourced.

3. Ads that contained very little ad copy (words) generated low MyMotivators™ scores. This seems to indicate that that creating an aesthetically pleasing ad doesn’t necessarily translate into communication effectiveness, though more research needs to be done on this topic.

4. Many ads tended to be strongly “left brain” (Blue / Green Quadrants). Of the 15 ads tested, ten had high intensities in some combination of Dominance, Analysis, Practicality, and Structure within their ad copy.
**Esthetic  Benefit / Wow Factor**

**Top 3 Ads**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Benefit / Wow Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Jackets</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedilyte</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeti Backpacks</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land's End</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerios</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM Juice</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChildFund</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Red Cross</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZZzQuill Pure ZZs</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatorade Zero</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tazo Tea</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Girl</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraft Lunchables</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lego - Adults</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skechers Streetwear</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Insight:**
You must explain the benefit of what you are selling. Pretty pictures alone do nothing. Include both the benefit and the reason why from the brand positioning.

---

**Esthetic  Visually Appealing**

**Top 3 Ads**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Visually Appealing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tazo Tea</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeti Backpacks</td>
<td>8.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatorade Zero</td>
<td>8.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerios</td>
<td>7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Jackets</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedilyte</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM Juice</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land's End</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZZzQuill Pure ZZs</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraft Lunchables</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Red Cross</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skechers Streetwear</td>
<td>6.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChildFund</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Girl</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lego - Adults</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Insight:**
You must have bold, meaningful headlines that capture the consumers attention and explain the wonder of the product.
### Independence  In-Control

#### Top 3 Ads
- Cheerios 6.24
- Pedialyte 5.95
- ZzzQuil Pure Zzzs 5.7
- POM Juice 5.48
- Yeti Backpacks 4.91
- Columbia Jackets 4.49
- American Red Cross 4.36
- Land's End 3.74
- ChildFund 3.59
- Gatorade Zero 3.4
- Tazo Tea 2.88
- Lego - Adults 2.33
- Kraft Lunchables 1.73
- Cover Girl 1.68
- Skechers Streetwear 1.51

#### Bottom 3 Ads

#### Key Insight:
You must tell the consumer how the product will add to their personal well-being.

### Independence  Confident / Self Reliant

#### Top 3 Ads
- Yeti Backpacks 5.21
- Pedialyte 5.19
- Cover Girl 4.88
- Land's End 4.51
- Cheerios 4.41
- Columbia Jackets 4.39
- POM Juice 4.37
- American Red Cross 4.11
- ZzzQuil Pure Zzzs 3.95
- ChildFund 3.56
- Skechers Streetwear 2.76
- Tazo Tea 2.68
- Gatorade Zero 2.62
- Kraft Lunchables 1.46
- Lego - Adults 1.44

#### Bottom 3 Ads

#### Key Insight:
You must tell the consumer how the product will fit into their life in a way that will make their life better! Don’t make them work to figure it out for themselves. Be overt.
**Dominance**  
Offers Advantage

### Top 3 Ads

- **Pedilyte**: 6.79
- **Columbia Jackets**: 6.57
- **Yeti Backpacks**: 5.83
- **Cheerios**: 5.61
- **POM Juice**: 5.33
- **ZzzQuil Pure Zzzs**: 5.28
- **Land’s End**: 4.26
- **Cover Girl**: 3.37
- **Gatorade Zero**: 2.81
- **American Red Cross**: 2.12
- **Kraft Lunchables**: 1.94
- **Tazo Tea**: 1.89
- **ChildFund**: 1.73
- **Skechers Streetwear**: 1.73
- **Lego - Adults**: 1.04

### Bottom 3 Ads

**Key Insight:**
It’s important to explain in plain and simple terms the benefit the product provides. Confusion is not a success strategy.

---

**Dominance**  
Specific, Numeric Advantage

### Top 3 Ads

- **Pedilyte**: 7.89
- **Cover Girl**: 5.63
- **Cheerios**: 5.55
- **POM Juice**: 5.23
- **Columbia Jackets**: 4.13
- **Gatorade Zero**: 3.47
- **Yeti Backpacks**: 3.06
- **ZzzQuil Pure Zzzs**: 2.49
- **American Red Cross**: 2.46
- **Land’s End**: 2.33
- **Tazo Tea**: 1.56
- **ChildFund**: 0.94
- **Kraft Lunchables**: 0.92
- **Lego - Adults**: 0.6
- **Skechers Streetwear**: 0.3

### Bottom 3 Ads

**Key Insight:**
To create a compelling, meaningful benefit, the ad should quantify using specific, numeric metrics, i.e., 3x the electrolytes; get 4x longer lashes.
Analysis Logical

Top 3 Ads

Bottom 3 Ads

Key Insight:
The “Reason Why” in brand positioning creates the credibility and trust with the customer. Explain how your product is able to deliver the benefit in plain and simple terms.

Analysis Brief, Precise Information

Top 3 Ads

Bottom 3 Ads

Key Insight:
If you are lucky, the consumer might give you three-seconds to look at your ad. Be explicit and communicate quickly. The consumer will read your ad copy, but it has to be precise and to the point. Use bullets, not long paragraphs.
**Practicality** Explains How It Works

**Top 3 Ads**

**Bottom 3 Ads**

---

**Practicality** Makes Sense

**Top 3 Ads**

**Bottom 3 Ads**

---

**Key Insight:**
Don’t make the consumer have to figure out what you are selling. Show your product and package. World-class advertising share three commonalities: Product the hero or object of desire, touch an emotion, relevant yet unexpected.

---

**Key Insight:**
Don’t let the ad agency go wild with the creative. In the Lego ad it looks like she’s playing video games, not building a Lego! The Lunchables ad looks like a toy, not a meal!
### Structure: Easy to Understand

**Top 3 Ads**

- Gatorade Zero: 8.06
- Pedialyte: 7.93
- American Red Cross: 7.82
- Columbia Jackets: 7.7
- Land’s End: 7.67
- Yeti Backpacks: 7.42
- Tazo Tea: 7.39
- Cheerios: 7.33
- Cover Girl: 7.14
- POM Juice: 6.55
- ZzzQuil Pure Zzzs: 6.04
- ChildFund: 5.07
- Kraft Lunchables: 4.65
- Skechers Streetwear: 4.27
- Lego - Adults: 3.7

**Bottom 3 Ads**

**Key Insight:**

Explain using data the benefits of the product boldly and explicitly. Zero Sugar; Every 2 seconds someone needs blood; 5 times the electrolytes.

### Structure: Simplifies My Life

**Top 3 Ads**

- Yeti Backpacks: 6.37
- ZzzQuil Pure Zzzs: 5.43
- Columbia Jackets: 5.1
- Cheerios: 4.87
- Pedialyte: 4.42
- POM Juice: 3.93
- Land’s End: 3.63
- Kraft Lunchables: 3.42
- Cover Girl: 2.95
- Gatorade Zero: 2.37
- Tazo Tea: 1.89
- Skechers Streetwear: 1.81
- American Red Cross: 1.68
- Lego - Adults: 1.44
- ChildFund: 1.28

**Bottom 3 Ads**

**Key Insight:**

Let the customer know how easy it is to derive the benefit your product offers. Warm jacket, a good night’s sleep, easy to find your stuff.
Humanitarian  Feel Safe and Secure

Top 3 Ads

Bottom 3 Ads

Key Insight:
It’s interesting that the three top rated ads all had to do with the outdoors. Warm jackets, backpack equipment. This illustrates that integrating feeling safe and secure is an overlooked motivator oftentimes.

Humanitarian  Serves Others

Top 3 Ads

Bottom 3 Ads

Key Insight:
Try to have your brand make a positive contribution to people or the world at large (environmentally conscious, support charities, etc.)
## Transcendence - Community & Connection

### Top 3 Ads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Name</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Red Cross</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChildFund</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land's End</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeti Backpacks</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lego - Adults</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerios</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Jackets</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM Juice</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedilyte</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraft Lunchables</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skechers Streetwear</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZzzQuil Pure Zzzs</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatorade Zero</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tazo Tea</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Girl</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bottom 3 Ads

### Key Insight:
Try to integrate being part of something bigger; helping your community; or being part of a larger helpful movement into advertising rather than focused on self.

## Transcendence - Feel Inspired / Engaged

### Top 3 Ads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Name</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Red Cross</td>
<td>7.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChildFund</td>
<td>6.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land's End</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedilyte</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeti Backpacks</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerios</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lego - Adults</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM Juice</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tazo Tea</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraft Lunchables</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Jackets</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZzzQuil Pure Zzzs</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatorade Zero</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Girl</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skechers Streetwear</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bottom 3 Ads

### Key Insight:
Let the consumer feel like they are contributing in a small but impactful way to a cause by purchasing your product.
**AdEvaluator Scores Analysis**

The AdEvaluator metric uses the average across all four questions within each of the 8 motivators to calculate a score. The ads that were the most “Whole Brain” scored the highest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Ranking</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Qualitative Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedialyte</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerios</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeti Backpacks</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land's End</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Jackets</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Red Cross</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM Juice</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatorade Zero</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZzzQuil Pure Zzzs</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Girl</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChildFund</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tazo Tea</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraft Lunchables</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lego - Adults</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skechers Streetwear</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male Ads</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>Qualitative Evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeti Backpacks</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Jackets</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatorade Zero</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChildFund</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skechers Streetwear</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Female Ads</strong></th>
<th><strong>Score</strong></th>
<th><strong>Qualitative Evaluation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedialyte</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land's End</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Girl</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tazo Tea</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lego - Adults</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>All Respondents</strong></th>
<th><strong>Score</strong></th>
<th><strong>Qualitative Evaluation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheerios</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Red Cross</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM Juice</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZzzQuil Pure Zzzs</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraft Lunchables</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pedialyte came the closest to having strong motivator intensity in all 4 quadrants, exceeding the norm in all but the RED (Humanitarian / Transcendence) quadrant.

5. Discussion

1. Whereas this study was conducted exclusively amongst college-aged students, results are likely not representative of a nationwide, randomized group.

2. The study indicates that motivators within a print ad can be measured and quantified. What we do not know is if this correlates to purchase intent. A follow-up study should be conducted to measure each ad by its effectiveness in moving a consumer down the AIDA funnel (attention, interest, desire, action). This will allow for a correlation study linking back to this research which can answer the question of persuasiveness / motivation which creates a state of mind conducive to purchase.
Further research should be conducted to understand how a person’s preferred/dominant thinking style influences their response to advertising. Do people rate ads more highly which are more aligned to their dominant personal motivators?
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Appendix

This appendix visualizes each advertisement measuring the presence and intensity of MyMotivators™ and Whole Brain® Thinking Styles:

Exhibit 1:

Exhibit 2:
Exhibit 3:

Exhibit 4:
Exhibit 5:

MyMotivators™

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivator</th>
<th>Strength by Quadrant</th>
<th>Index Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Esthetic</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicality</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcendence</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 6:

Columbia Jackets (90 Male Respondents)

MyMotivators Description | Mean | Std Dev |
--------------------------|------|---------|
Dominance: Offers Advantage | 6.57 | 3.11    |
Dominance: Specific Numeric Advantage | 4.33 | 3.73    |
Analysis: Logical | 7.08 | 2.7     |
Analysis: Brief, Precise Information | 7.31 | 2.39    |

MyMotivators Description | Mean | Std Dev |
--------------------------|------|---------|
Practicality: Explanation of How it Works | 8.24 | 2.32    |
Practicality: Makes Sense | 7.51 | 2.77    |
Structure: Formatted Easy to Understand | 7.7  | 2.22    |
Structure: Simplifies My Life | 5.1  | 3.15    |

MyMotivators Description | Mean | Std Dev |
--------------------------|------|---------|
Logical: Hermann Brain Dominance (HBDI) Thinking Styles Analysis | 63 |         |
Experimental | 57 |         |
Practical | 71 |         |
Relational | 37 |         |

MyMotivators Description | Mean | Std Dev |
--------------------------|------|---------|
Esthetic: Benefit / Wow Factor | 6.6  | 3.09    |
Esthetic: Visually Appealing | 7.44 | 2.42    |
Independent: Confident / Self Reliant | 4.39 | 3.06    |
Independent: In-Control | 4.49 | 3.26    |

MyMotivators Description | Mean | Std Dev |
--------------------------|------|---------|
Humanitarian: Serves Others | 5.17 | 3.63    |
Humanitarian: Feel Safe and Secure | 4.97 | 3.33    |
Transcendence: Community and Connection | 1.97 | 2.22    |
Transcendence: Inspired / Engaged | 3.26 | 2.77    |
Exhibit 7:

Skechers Streetwear (Male - 90 Respondents)

MyMotivators™

Motivator Strength by Quadrant

- **ESTHETIC**
  - **YELLOW**: 95 – Excellent
  - **BLUE**: 96 – Above Average
  - **GREEN**: 83 – Average
  - **RED**: 39 – Poor

- **INDEPENDENCE**
  - **YELLOW**: 77 – Below Average
  - **BLUE**: 56 – Below Average
  - **GREEN**: 83 – Average
  - **RED**: 39 – Poor

- **DOMINANCE**
  - **YELLOW**: 67 – Below Average
  - **BLUE**: 56 – Below Average
  - **GREEN**: 50 – Below Average
  - **RED**: 48 – Below Average

- **ANALYSIS**
  - **YELLOW**: 95 – Excellent
  - **BLUE**: 96 – Above Average
  - **GREEN**: 83 – Average
  - **RED**: 39 – Poor

- **PRACTICALITY**
  - **YELLOW**: 95 – Excellent
  - **BLUE**: 96 – Above Average
  - **GREEN**: 83 – Average
  - **RED**: 39 – Poor

- **STRUCTURE**
  - **YELLOW**: 72 – Average
  - **BLUE**: 83 – Average
  - **GREEN**: 50 – Below Average
  - **RED**: 48 – Below Average

- **TRANSCENDENCE**
  - **YELLOW**: 95 – Excellent
  - **BLUE**: 96 – Above Average
  - **GREEN**: 83 – Average
  - **RED**: 39 – Poor

Ad Evaluation Score: 33

Exhibit 8:

Skechers Streetwear (90 Male Respondents)

The Whole Brain® Model

MyMotivator | Description | Mean | Std Dev
--- | --- | --- | ---
Dominance | Offers Advantage | 1.73 | 2.23
Dominance | Specific Numeric Advantage | 0.3 | 0.72
Analysis | Logical | 3.79 | 2.39
Analysis | Brief, Precise Information | 3.92 | 3.39

MyMotivator | Description | Mean | Std Dev
--- | --- | --- | ---
Practicality | Explanation of How It Works | 2.14 | 2.03
Practicality | Makes Sense | 4.09 | 3.4
Structure | Formatted Easy to Understand | 4.27 | 3.07
Structure | Simplifies My Life | 1.81 | 2.2

MyMotivator | Description | Mean | Std Dev
--- | --- | --- | ---
Esthetic | Benefit / Wow Factor | 2.48 | 2.73
Esthetic | Visually Appealing | 6.34 | 2.9
Independent | Confident / Self-Reliant | 2.76 | 2.79
Independent | In-Control | 1.51 | 1.81

MyMotivator | Description | Mean | Std Dev
--- | --- | --- | ---
Humanitarian | Serves Others | 2.25 | 2.61
Humanitarian | Feels Safe and Secure | 0.89 | 1.52
Transcendence | Community and Connection | 1.61 | 2.13
Transcendence | Inspired / Engaged | 1.32 | 1.86
Exhibit 9:

Exhibit 10:
Exhibit 11:

Exhibit 12:

### Cover Girl (57 Female Respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MyMotivator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>Offers Advantage</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>Specific Numeric Advantage</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Logical</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Brief, Precise Information</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MyMotivator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practicality</td>
<td>Explanation of How It Works</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicality</td>
<td>Makes Sense</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Formatted Easy to Understand</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Simplifies My Life</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MyMotivator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Esthetic</td>
<td>Benefit / Wow Factor</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esthetic</td>
<td>Visually Appealing</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Confident / Self Reliant</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>In-Control</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MyMotivator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian</td>
<td>Serves Others</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian</td>
<td>Feel Safe and Secure</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcendence</td>
<td>Community and Connection</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcendence</td>
<td>Inspired / Engaged</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 13:

Exhibit 14:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MyMotivator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>Offers Advantage</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>Specific Numeric Advantage</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Logical</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Brief, Precise Information</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practically</td>
<td>Explanation of How it Works</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practically</td>
<td>Makes Sense</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Formatted Easy to Understand</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Simplifies My Life</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MyMotivator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Esthetic</td>
<td>Benefit / Wow Factor</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esthetic</td>
<td>Visually Appealing</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Confident / Self Reliant</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>In-Control</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MyMotivator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian</td>
<td>Serves Others</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian</td>
<td>Feel Safe and Secure</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcendence</td>
<td>Community and Connection</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcendence</td>
<td>Inspired / Engaged</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Exhibit 18:
Exhibit 21:

Exhibit 22:
Exhibit 23:

- MyMotivators Results:
  - ESTHETIC: 70
  - DEPENDENCY: 57
  - DOMINANCE: 53
  - ANALYSIS: 65
  - PRACTICABILITY: 59
  - STRUCTURE: 60
  - HUMANITARIAN: 54
  - TRANSCENDENCE: 25

- MyMotivator Strength by Quadrant:
  - ESTHETIC: 127
  - BLUE: 118
  - GREEN: 119
  - RED: 79

- Alleviator Score: 55

Exhibit 24:

- ZzzQuil Pure Zzzs (149 Unisex Respondents)

- MyMotivator Description | Mean | Std Dev
- Dominance Offers Advantage | 5.28 | 3.18
- Dominance Specific Numeric Advantage | 2.49 | 3.04
- Analysis Logical | 5.05 | 3.07
- Analysis Brief, Precise Information | 6.55 | 2.7

- MyMotivator Description | Mean | Std Dev
- Practicality Explanation of How It Works | 3.77 | 3.17
- Practicality Makes Sense | 5.91 | 3.2
- Structure Formatted Easy to Understand | 6.04 | 2.92
- Structure Simplifies My Life | 5.43 | 3.17

- Herman Brain Dominance (HBDI) Thinking Styles Analysis

- Logical: 48
- Relational: 32
- Experimental: 54
- Practical: 53

- The Whole Brain® Model

- MyMotivator Description | Mean | Std Dev
- Esthetic Benefit / Wow Factor | 4.75 | 3.22
- Esthetic Visually Appealing | 7.07 | 2.54
- Independent Confident / Self-Reliant | 3.95 | 3.11
- Independent In-Control | 5.7 | 3.2

- MyMotivator Description | Mean | Std Dev
- Humanitarian Serves Others | 5.37 | 3.5
- Humanitarian Feel Safe and Secure | 3.83 | 3.09
- Transcendence Community and Connection | 1.31 | 2.12
- Transcendence Inspired / Engaged | 2.48 | 2.77
Exhibit 25:

Exhibit 26:
Exhibit 27:

Kraft Lunchables
(Unisex - 149 respondents)

MyMotivators™

MyMotivators Strength by Quadrant

Evaluation Score: 39
Very Poor

Exhibit 28:

Kraft Lunchables (149 Unisex Respondents)

Hemmann Brain Dominance (HBDI)
Thinking Styles Analysis

Logical: 26
Experimental: 34
Practical: 37
Relational: 23

MyMotivator Description Mean Std Dev

Dominance Offers Advantage 1.94 2.69
Dominance Specific Numeric Advantage 0.92 1.95
Analysis Logical 2.56 2.81
Analysis Brief, Precise Information 5.17 3.58

MyMotivator Description Mean Std Dev

Practicality Explanation of How it Works 1.84 2.55
Practicality Makes Sense 4.85 3.31
Structure Formatted Easy to Understand 4.65 3.3
Structure Simplifies My Life 3.42 3.31

MyMotivator Description Mean Std Dev

Humanitarian Serves Others 2.92 3.07
Humanitarian Feel Safe and Secure 3.4 2.25
Transcendence Community and Connection 1.69 2.46
Transcendence Inspired / Engaged 3.11 3.2

The Whole Brain™ Model

CEREBRAL MODE

LOGICAL ANALYTICAL FACT-BASED QUANTITATIVE

HOLISTIC INTEGRATIVE INTEGRATING SYNTHESIZING

ORGANIZED TEMPORAL PLANNED DETAILED

INTERPERSONAL FEELING BASED KINETIC EMOTIONAL

LIMBIC MODE

LEFT MODE

RIGHT MODE

D

A

B

C
Exhibit 29:


MyMotivators™

Motivational Strength by Quadrant

- **Esthetic**
  - Yellow: 129
- **Independence**
  - Blue: 120
- **Dominance**
  - Green: 130
- **Humane**
  - Red: 75

**MyMotivators Ratings**

- 67 of Above Excellent
- 60-69 Acceptable
- 50-59 Average
- 40-59 Below Average
- 39 or Below Very Poor

AdEvaluations Score: 56

Average: 44

Exhibit 30:

POM Juice (149 Unisex Respondents)

[Hermann Brain Dominance (HBDI) Thinking Styles Analysis]

- Logical: 59
- Experimental: 57
- Practical: 57
- Relational: 34

MyMotivator Description | Mean | Std Dev |
--- | --- | --- |
Dominance Offers Advantage | 5.33 | 3.04 |
Dominance Specific Numeric Advantage | 5.23 | 3.41 |
Analysis Logical | 6.22 | 2.79 |
Analysis Brief, Precise Information | 6.71 | 2.61 |

MyMotivator Description | Mean | Std Dev |
--- | --- | --- |
Practicality Explanation of How It Works | 5.81 | 2.94 |
Practicality Makes Sense | 6.48 | 2.9 |
Structure Formatted Easy to Understand | 6.55 | 2.78 |
Structure Simplifies My Life | 3.93 | 3.05 |

MyMotivator Description | Mean | Std Dev |
--- | --- | --- |
Esthetic Benefit / View Factor | 5.59 | 3.1 |
Esthetic Visually Appealing | 7.41 | 2.65 |
Independent Confident / Self Reliant | 4.37 | 3.21 |
Independent In-Control | 5.48 | 3.12 |

MyMotivator Description | Mean | Std Dev |
--- | --- | --- |
Humanitarian Serves Others | 4.05 | 3.38 |
Humanitarian Feel Safe and Secure | 4.21 | 3.24 |
Transcendence Community and Connection | 1.87 | 3.65 |
Transcendence Inspired / Engaged | 3.29 | 3.11 |
Subject: **Capstone Summary & Reflection**

This summarizes key learning and experiences from working on the Capstone research project titled “Measuring the Intensity of Whole Brain Thinking / MyMotivators in Print Advertising” and my participation in the Honors Program.

**Background:** I was accepted into the Huntsman Scholar Program as an early-admit before I started my senior year of high school. I simultaneously applied to the Honors Program and was also admitted.

Knowing that each program operates independently and has separate requirements over-and-above required classes, I decided to stay in both – understanding that there would be extra work required in each. It’s been hard, but I am graduating with my bachelor’s degree after only three years, successfully completing both the Huntsman Scholar and Honors requirements, and will be matriculating to grad school here at USU in the Fall (master’s in data analytics).

**Reflections from the Capstone Project**

1. **Developing a survey, conducting the research, and analyzing the results was an adrenaline rush.** It was fun to dream up something to study and get the opportunity to do so. I enjoyed meeting with Dr. James Davis (Department Head, Marketing & Strategy) to discuss the study and get some pointers, and then interacting with Dr. Matthew Meng (Marketing Dept) to develop and execute the survey. I appreciated Dr. Meng’s extremely detailed feedback, both as I was developing the survey and after submission of Draft 1. His feedback helped me make it much better than I had originally envisioned.

2. **Interacting with Dr. Russell Osmond was awesome.** Dr. Osmond was very kind and gracious in his time and patience as I thought through how to structure and develop the questions. I got the idea to do this study from a MyMotivators profile that Dr. Osmond did on my thinking style when I was 13 years old. I’ve always appreciated the insight that his profile offered, and it has made a significant contribution to my life. Thanks to his work, I’m able to adjust my communication style to align with others thinking styles so that there is less friction and more cooperation. It’s a tremendous tool for getting to better solutions by engaging all four thinking quadrants simultaneously and by leveraging different motivators.

3. **Building dashboards to visualize the data aided the understanding.** Once the survey results were in, I became paralyzed and a bit confused, staring a sea of numbers to parse through. There were 16 measurements taken for each of the 15 print ads that were tested. The data was broken across eight motivators, with two questions within each motivator. My dad suggested that I create a visual dashboard to summarize the data. Here too Dr. Osmond was a great help, as he guided me to realize that the two questions within each motivator were probing different dimensions within the motivator, so taking the highest
score from the two was a valid way to measure the ad’s effectiveness within the motivator.

4. **I created a new measurement tool I called the “AdEvaluator Score” to compare the ads in a quantitative manner.** Once the data was analyzed, I still didn’t have a good way to measure the ads versus one another. My dad challenged me to come up with a new metric. Leaning into the challenge, I developed the AdEvaluator score by taking the average from among the 8 motivators, which yielded a score that could be compared ad-to-ad, apple to apple. I also created a second unique measurement that I modeled on the Brand Development Index I learned in my marketing classes. Using “100” as the average response, I was able to create a MyMotivators Index to measure the ads relative strength within each of the Whole Brain Quadrants. It was a great way to visualize the intensity of the Whole Brain communication for each ad and serve as a comparison tool.

5. **Doing a “top 3” versus “bottom 3” ad analysis for each of the sixteen MyMotivators questions helped me understand the dimensions of the research.** My roommate suggested this approach. The survey instrument offered the ability to quantitatively assess an ads strength and weakness by each of the eight universal motivators.

6. **This research is a first step in potentially developing a new tool to diagnose and evaluate advertising so as to suggest improvements to an ad BEFORE it is placed and money spent.** On each of the “top 3 / bottom 3” comparisons, I offered a key learning that can help those developing ads to communicate in all four quadrants and incorporate key motivators more effectively. The study indicates that motivators within a print ad can be measured and quantified. What we do not know is if this correlates to persuasiveness and purchase intent. A follow-up study should be conducted to measure each ad by its effectiveness in moving a consumer down the AIDA funnel (attention, interest, desire, action). This will allow for a correlation study linking back to this research which can answer the question of persuasiveness / motivation that creates a state of mind conducive to purchase.
Honors Program Reflection

1. **While the Honors Program is a lot of extra work, it’s worthwhile.** I enjoyed the Honors English course and “Dog’s in Art” course, both of which counted toward General Education requirements. I enjoyed creating my first research project in the “Dogs” class and having the opportunity to present it during the 2020 Fall Student Research Symposium. My paper titled “How Pop Culture Shaped Momiji Inubashiri” wasn’t a big hit at the symposium, but interestingly is now the 2nd most downloaded paper from the event (354 downloads + 50 abstract views since March 2020) and ranks in the top 30 most downloaded student research papers all-time at USU.

2. **Being in the Honors Program played a significant role in my being named 2022 “Scholar of the Year” for the Jon M. Huntsman School of Business.** One of the required selection criteria is being in the Honors Program.

3. **Out-of-class experiences are far more valuable than classroom learning.** Before I started my freshman year, my father counseled me that just going to class isn’t enough. That good grades aren’t the end-all or the end goal. He told me I needed to stretch myself and participate in multiple extracurricular activities offered by the University, the Honors Program, and the Huntsman School. He recommended that I join some clubs (I am a member of the Huntsman Marketing Association, ProSales, Pre-Ph.D. Club and the USU eSports Club), and participate in business competitions (I was in 11 of them). He suggested that I take part in a Global Learning Experience offered by the Huntsman School (I went to London). He also suggested that I become a TA to assist one of the marketing professors and volunteer to help any of the professors doing research (Dr. Sterling Bone and Dr. Deanne Brocato). He advised me to participate in class, make smart comments that aid the discussion, and get to know the professors.

I did all these things, and I admit that at times I felt a bit overwhelmed and stressed. But now as I near the finish line, I can see that these extra experiences outside the classroom were the most meaningful of my undergraduate experience.

The faculty I worked with have mentored me and taken an interest in my future success. Dr. Davis has been a huge advocate, and I am eternally grateful for his selecting me as the Scholar of the Year in the Marketing / Strategy department. Dr. Davis advised that the capstone research project will be a huge plus for Ph.D. program applications, and Dr. Meng has offered to help me get it published in a scholarly publication. Dr. Davis has also offered to let me teach a class as a graduate assistant next Fall so that I can get a taste of what being a college professor in the future might look like.

None of these opportunities would have been possible if it weren’t for the extracurricular programs offered by Utah State University, the Honors Program, and the Huntsman School.

4. **Being able to register for classes before the general student population each semester is a HUUUGE benefit of the Honors Program.** That’s one of the best perks
of the program and helps eliminate a lot of stress when registering for classes. That perk is largely responsible for my being able to graduate in just three years, as I was able to get the classes I needed when I wanted to take them.

5. **One suggestion – partner with the Huntsman Scholars Program so that they aren’t completely separate programs.** Huntsman Scholars has four labs required in their program aligned to the pillars of the Huntsman School – Analytical Rigor, Entrepreneurial Spirit, Ethical Leadership, and Global Vision. These are 1 credit courses that should count as honors points. They are over-and-above regular student coursework and in two of them there is a book to study and discuss.

I have found in talking to other Huntsman Scholars that there are very few who are also members of the Honors Program. There are a lot of excellent students in the Huntsman Scholars Program, and it seems like it would be a benefit to the Honors Program to have these students jointly participating.

**Closing - Thank You!**

In closing, thank you for allowing me to be a part of the Honors Program. I know I took a very different path than most to getting the required points accumulated, and I appreciate your willingness to work with me on my unique journey. Thank you for the opportunities you provided to me. I am forever grateful.

Tanner Schulz
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