











Vulgarity	.086	.040	.088	2.179	.030
Impropriety	.048	.045	.045	1.066	.287
Moral	.115	.042	.114	2.773	.006
Religious	.610	.043	.576	14.121	.000

In table (3) above, multiple regression was employed and it revealed that the F value was significant at 0.05 level, this result meant "*Shockvertising has the ability to influence consumer behavior*", with high correlation (R) = 0.872 as well as the independent variables explained 76.1% of the variance in the dependent variable.

**Sub-hypotheses:**

**H1: Disgusting Images has the ability to influence consumer behavior**

**H2: Sexual references has the ability to influence consumer behavior**

**H3: Profanity has the ability to influence consumer behavior**

**H4: Vulgarity has the ability to influence consumer behavior**

**H5: Impropriety has the ability to influence consumer behavior**

**H6: Moral offensiveness has the ability to influence consumer behavior**

**H7: Religious taboos has the ability to influence consumer behavior**

Table 4. Sub-hypotheses Testing

Sub-hypotheses	R	R Square	F	Sig.
1	.593	.351	232.076	.000
2	.641	.411	299.035	.000
3	.724	.524	472.326	.000
4	.672	.452	353.384	.000
5	.705	.496	422.747	.000
6	.711	.505	437.906	.000
7	.833	.693	970.455	.000

Linear Regression was used to test each of the sub hypothesis; following results were found:

1<sup>st</sup> hypothesis: it was found that F value was significant at 0.05 level, this gave an indication that "*Disgusting Images has the ability to influence consumer behavior*" with medium correlation (R) = 0.593, as well as the independent variable explains 35.1% of the variance in the dependent variable.

2<sup>nd</sup> hypothesis: it was found that F value was significant at 0.05 level meaning that "*Sexual references has the ability to influence consumer behavior*", and with a medium correlation (R) = 0.641, as well as the independent variable explained 41.1% of the variance in the dependent variable.

3<sup>rd</sup> hypothesis: it was found that F value was significant at 0.05 level and "*Profanity has the ability to influence consumer behavior*", with high correlation (R) = 0.724, as well as the independent variable explained 52.4% of the variance in the dependent variable.

4<sup>th</sup> hypothesis: it was found that F value was significant at 0.05 level and that "*Vulgarity has the ability to influence consumer behavior*" with high correlation (R) = 0.672, as well as the independent

variable explains 45.2% of the variance in the dependent variable.

5<sup>th</sup> hypothesis: it was found that F value was significant at 0.05 level, this indicated that "*Impropriety has the ability to influence consumer behavior*", with high correlation (R) = 0.705 as well as the independent variable explains 45.2% of the variance in the dependent variable.

6<sup>th</sup> hypothesis: it was found that F value was significant at 0.05 level, and that "*Moral offensiveness has the ability to influence consumer behavior*", with high correlation (R) = 0.711, as well as the independent variable explains 50.5% of the variance in the dependent variable.

7<sup>th</sup> hypothesis: it was found that F value was significant at 0.05 level, it was indicated that "*Religious taboos has the ability to influence consumer behavior*", with high correlation (R) = 0.833, as well as the independent variable explains 69.3% of the variance in the dependent variable.

**4.2 Discussion**

Current study aimed at examining the influence of shockvertising on consumer behavior from perspective of Jordanian consumers in Jordan.

Utilizing a questionnaire; (431) individuals responded to statements of questionnaire and SPSS was used in order to analyze gathered data. Results of study found out that individuals had high awareness of shockvertising as their responses appeared to be higher than mean of scale 3.00 which was positively seen from a statistical perspective.

The main hypothesis of study was accepted and study results indicated that "**Shockvertising has the Religious taboos** scored a variance relationship of (69.3%).

consumer behavior through shockvertising; this variable scored a relationship variance of (52.4%)

Other variables also appeared to be influential which included (**Moral offensiveness, Vulgarity, Impropriety, Sexual references and Disgusting Images**) which scored a relationship variance of (50.5%, 45.2%, 45.2%, 41.1% and 35.1%) respectively.

#### **Shockvertising can Severely Influence Consumer Behavior**

The study found that there is a statistically significant effect of the negative trend towards "shock advertising" and about the "advertised brand" on the consumer behavior to the advertisement from not buying, negative verbal communication and boycott, which confirms the psychological impact stages of the advertising message of the shocking advertisement and that the ads don't not lead to desire and persuasion, which led to changing the formula of the psychological effect stages of the advertising message to AISDA, namely Attention, Insert, Share, Desire, and Action. Results of study indicated that shockvertising plays on the emotional and cognitive part of human comprehension which plays a role in developing emotions of gross, passion, disgust, anger and humiliation when seeing the ad. From that point, the way shockvertising appear is through penetrating the conscious of individuals and travel into their subconscious causing their feeling to appear on the surface. Study also revealed that sharing of the advertisement came after attention and interest, which is what the shocking advertisement seeks, i.e. attracting attention by penetrating the competitive chaos, but when the consumer shares the advertisement through social networking sites and those ads spread like buzz viruses, in this case, they provoke the consumer, which results in negative feelings and in that case no desire and persuasion develop. Also, among the results of the study is the formation of a negative trend towards the shocking advertisement and the declared mark for the study sample, most of which according to the analysis, and the expected reaction for each category, the

**ability to influence consumer behavior**" which was explained by a variance of (76.1%).

Among the chosen variables of shockvertising including (Disgusting Images, Sexual References, Profanity/Obscenity, Vulgarity, Impropriety, Moral Offensiveness and Religious Taboos) it was revealed that all variables were found to influential on consumer behavior, the most influential variable of all appeared

In the 2<sup>nd</sup> rank of influence; it appeared that **Profanity** played a role in changing conscious consumer is the consumer who has awareness of the advertiser's tactic and that it does not convince him, and in that case the advertisement is not effective, which is what the study actually found in the presence of a statistically significant effect of the negative trend towards shocking advertising on the consumer's response to the advertisement from not buying negative verbal communication and boycott, indicating that the shocking advertisement is fraught with danger.

#### **When It Comes to Religion; It's A Shock!**

When comparing and contrasting between influences of shockvertising through its variables on consumer behavior; it appeared that the most influential variable of all is religious taboos. Results indicated that the hypothesis articulated "**Religious taboos has the ability to influence consumer behavior**" was able to explain (69.3%) of the variance in the dependent variable and appeared to be the strongest of all, meaning that consumers' behavior in terms of purchasing, repurchasing and word of mouth would be deeply influenced if the advertisement touched their religion or any of its sacred symbols as it appeared in *table (12)*. This result was totally predictable considering the environment in which current study was applied (Jordanian consumer) where there is a deep consideration to religions and respect to holy believes.

### **4.3 Conclusion and Recommendations**

A successful advertisement is the advertisement that fulfills its functions of attracting attention, arousing interest and desires, up to persuading the content of the advertising message and responding to it, and because shockvertising is one of the multiple means of drawing attention to an issue, idea, product or service, many organizations have resorted to it through the element of trauma.

Study showed that although the use of shockvertising is a growing phenomenon that has spread in the recent period significantly, but the results related to it in terms of positive or negative impact on individuals are still disparate between

supporters and opponents, but its superior ability to attract attention is clear and cannot be discussed.

Based on previously presented results and discussion, current study recommended the following:

- In order for the shockvertising to have a positive impact, it must be away from religious symbols and sacred ideas of individuals because using their sanctities makes them feel offended
- Shockvertising needs to be understandable, simple and not complex in order to have the desired impact on consumers.
- Shockvertising should be used in a way that approximates the truth and not in a catastrophic manner that will alienate the person and show negative feelings within them.

#### References

1. Banyte, J., Paskeviciute, K., & Rutelione, A. Features of shocking advertising impact on consumers in commercial and social context. *Innovative Marketing*, Vol 10, No 2, 2014, pp. 35-46.
2. Cockrill, A., & Parsonage, I. Shocking people into action: Does it still work?: An empirical analysis of emotional appeals in charity advertising. *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol 56, No 4, 2016, pp. 401-413.
3. Dahl, D. W. (2018). Shock charity campaigns: Building our understanding on their effectiveness: Comments on "Emotions and Prosocial Behaviors: A Study of the Effectiveness of Shocking Charity Campaigns" by Jeanne Albouy. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing (English Edition)*, Vol, 33, No, 1, 2018, pp. 88-91.
4. Du Plessis, N. *Examining Shock Advertising in a South African context*, research paper, Vega School of Brand Leadership. 2016
5. Friendly Stock. *Shockvertising by united colors of Benetton* [Image]. Retrieved from <https://friendlystock.com/top-ten-controversial-united-colors-of-benetton-ads/>, 2020
6. Ghose, A., & Todri, V. Towards a digital attribution model: Measuring the impact of display advertising on online consumer behavior. *Available at SSRN 2672090*, 2015
7. Giroux, H. A., & Robbins, C. G. Consuming Social Change: The "United Colors of Benetton". In *Giroux Reader* (pp. 97-116). Routledge, 2015
8. Hagenbuch, D. J. Should Advertising Shock? *Journal of Biblical Integration in Business*, Vol 18, No. 2, 2015.
9. Handley, L. Burger King's moldy Whopper ad is dividing marketing experts. *CNBC*. Retrieved from <https://www.cnn.com/2020/02/20/burger-kings-moldy-whopper-ad-is-dividing-marketing-experts.html>, 2020
10. Hashem, T. How Do Customers Digest Pictorial ADS from A Psychological Perspective? *Global Journal of Business Research*, Vol, 10, No, 4, 2016, pp. 43-54.
11. Hashem, T. Impact of using humor advertisement on airline customers' mental image. *Innovative Marketing*, Vol 13, No 3, 2017, pp. 25-32.
12. Hashem, T. N., & Hamdan, F. I. Measuring service quality level in the Jordanian telecommunication sector from its customers' perspective using the SERVPERF scale. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, Vol, 5, No 12, 2017, pp. 15-27.
13. Lee, M. S., Septianto, F., Frethey-Bentham, C., & Gao, E. Condoms and bananas: Shock advertising explained through congruence theory. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol 57, 2020, 102228.
14. Machová, R., Huszárík, E. S., & Tóth, Z. The role of shockvertising in the context of various generations. *Problems and perspectives in management*, Vol, 13, No, 1, 2020, pp. 104-112.
15. Machova, R., Seres, H. E., & Toth, Z. Shockvertising in selected European countries: Hofstede's dimensions analysis. *Актуальні проблеми економіки*, Vol 5, No 11, 2015, pp. 32-42.
16. Madni, A. R., Hamid, N. A., & Rashid, S. M. Influence of Controversial Advertisement on Consumer Behavior. *The Journal of Commerce*, Vol 8, No, 1-2, 2016, pp. 14.
17. Matusitz, J., & Forrester, M. PETA making social noise: A perspective on shock advertising. *Portuguese Journal of Social Science*, Vol, 12, No, 1, 2013, pp. 85-100.
18. Parry, S., Jones, R., Stern, P., & Robinson, M. 'Shockvertising': An exploratory investigation into attitudinal variations and emotional reactions to shock advertising. *Journal of Consumer*

- Behaviour*, Vol, 12, No, 2, 2015, pp. 112-121.
19. Rogers, K., & Weber, M. Shock Tactics: Perceived Controversy in Molleindustria Persuasive Games. In *International Conference on Persuasive Technology*, 2018 (pp. 193-199). Springer, Cham.
  20. Srivastava, R. K. Comparing the three types of approach of advertising in brand building in emerging markets. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 2020, pp. 1-14.
  21. Ulman, M. Benetton i shockvertising. *Marketing w praktyce*, Vol, 3, No 1, 2017, pp. 38-39.
  22. Virvilaite, R., & Matuleviyiene, M. The impact of shocking advertising on consumer buying behavior: empirical study of Lithuanian consumers. *Innovative Marketing*, Vol, 9, No, 2, 2013, pp. 47-56.
  23. Yan, S., & Chapa, S. Exploring the use of shock advertising by for-profit and nonprofit organisations in China. *Journal of Cultural Marketing Strategy*, Vol, 5, No, 1, 2020, pp. 11-21.

**Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0  
(Attribution 4.0 International, CC BY 4.0)**

This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0

[https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.en\\_US](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.en_US)