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Abstract: The study was conducted in order to develop an understanding of how advertisements in different Web task environments are being attended to as well as how attention to advertisements varies between different attention getting techniques that are being used in Web advertising. Furthermore, a model which describes the relationship between context, attention getting techniques and attention to advertising was developed and tested. In order to address the research issues a theoretical framework was assembled. Five hypotheses were formulated deriving from the framework. To test the hypotheses and the model, an experimental research design was employed. Three experiments were designed to study the hypotheses formulated. 702 individual experiments were conducted.

Introduction

Advertising

The pursuit to attract attention is a complex one and has many paths. Part of it is the message that is being transferred to the consumer and in particular the properties of the advertisement. That size plays a major role and has a positive correlation with attention is a general notion in advertising (Finn, 1988; Abernethy & Laband, 2004) and has recently also been supported by research on Web site advertising (Baltas, 2003). Except for size, there are many other characteristics of an advertisement that have been studied by researchers. In the work of Finn, other characteristics (for print ads) have been shown as in the figure below.

Of the characteristics listed in figure 1, not unexpectedly, advertisement size was in fact the property that had shown a significant effect most frequently in the material that Finn reviewed.
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However, aside of the characteristics stated above later researchers have pointed at a few central characteristics of an advertisement that are important to take into consideration. According to Pieters and Wedel (2004) there are three key elements that can be identified in an advertisement, the brand, the picture and the text. Their position is that these three elements have distinct effects on attention.

In Pieters’ and Wedel’s study they found that the pictorial was superior in attracting attention, independently of its size. Other researchers are also reporting that the pictorial is by far the “most important structural element in magazine advertising” (Rossiter & Percy, p. 295, 1997) and studies (with eye movement tracker) are in fact showing that around 90% of the viewers fixate the main picture in an advertisement before they start focusing on the copy text (Kroeber-Riel, 1984). The enduring effect after viewing the advertisement is the formation of a visual memory of the advertisement that enables subsequent recognition (Finn, 1988). These findings presented here should lead us to convert to the standpoint that advertisements should seldom be designed without adding a pictorial element to it. In that case (without picture) we would suffer the benefit of base line attention to the pictorial element. Furthermore, the pictorial element is also supposed to lead the reader or viewer to the other elements of the advertisement. The purpose is not only to attract attention but to propel readers to engage in reading the brand and text elements.

Web and advertising

When studying different World Wide Web advertisements and what various authors have written about Web advertising one will soon discover a diversity of types of advertisements and also a general lack of classification. Most authors are referring to and studying the banner advertisement, hitherto few are describing its properties. Yet, development of the WWW has brought new advertisement tools, which in turn has made it evident that these tools have to be classified. Classifications have however been poor or at least not up to date with the rapid development in terms of advertisement design and also development of information technology infrastructure, making it possible with larger and more demanding advertisements on the Web.

Despite the rapid development in some parts of the world, researchers are still referring to the banner advertisements as, “…the most common form of advertising currently” (Danaher and Mullarkey, 2003, p. 253), which is a small billboard-like graphic that appears on a Website that is clickable (Hoffman and Novak, 2000), and furthermore, “…is a rectangular shaped image typically located at the top of a Web page” (Chandon, Chotourou and Fortin, 2003, p.217).

Attention to advertising

In a media world with increasing din and media clutter, advertisers are struggling to break through the noise and get the customers to attend to their messages. Advertisers are using different tactics to make their advertising to become attention getting or attention grabbing (Campbell, 1995). The quest for attention is part of the competition and refined techniques may result in a competitive edge. However, according to Pieters, Rosbergen and Hartog the main focus of consumer research has been on “information processing and on the effects of advertising on attitude change” (1996, p. 242). They are furthermore stating that “…little is known about processes of attention, in particular of visual attention to advertising” (ibid). This statement supports this study and that research in this area would be appreciated by the research community.

In line with Pieters et al, the importance of the attention construct has been highlighted and emphasized by other researchers. For instance, Rossiter and Percy (2001, p. 167) are revealing their stance by stating “Before anything else can occur, you must first pay attention to the advertising.” This indicates that attention is a prerequisite that is taking place prior to all other constructs, that advertising researchers aim to study.

Horace Schwerin (1967, p. 56-57) states in a somewhat similar fashion as Rossiter and Percy that, “The opening sequence of any commercial is of key importance, since advertisers must capture and hold the attention of viewers”. Janiszewski and Bickart (1994, p. 329) are equally concerned about the importance of attention when they argue that “Despite the tremendous amount of money spent on buying consumer attention, little to no research is done on consumer attention”.

Additional reasons why attention is important is for instance that, “Catching the consumer’s attention can keep her or him from mentally tuning out,
switching focus to an alternative activity, or zapping to another channel.” (Campbell, 1995, p. 226). Furthermore, increased processing attention has been found to lead to increased information processing and more positive attitudes (Cialdini, Petty & Cacioppo, 1981, Petty, Cacioppo & Schumann, 1983). Increased attention and processing also make attitudes more persistent and more resistant to negative information (Haugtvedt & Strathman, 1990).

Research Methodology

First section - Attention effects of context

In the theoretical chapter it has been elaborated on how the setting or the context in which the advertising resides can influence the impact of advertising. It is important to study this contextual dimension to understand how it affects advertising and whether it is powerful or can be neglected. Extending Kahneman, Janiszewski, Milliken, Tipper and Treisman’s theories of attention to an advertising context may provide insight to how attention is affected by context and activity mode. In the theory section, the Web environment was described as a task environment where the primary task is the program content transmitted to the receiver. The secondary task in this context is then the advertisement. Furthermore, a secondary task will be affected by the demand structure of the primary task in such a way that a more demanding primary task will reduce performance on the secondary task and all other events calling for attention. Therefore;

H1: A situation where respondents are exhibiting a less goal oriented surfing behavior will elicit more attention to an advertisement than what a more goal oriented surfing behavior will.

To be rejected…

[H0H1 A situation where respondents are exhibiting a less goal oriented surfing behavior will elicit equal or less attention to an advertisement than what a more goal oriented surfing behavior will.]

If H1 is correct, we can conclude that individuals set to search mode, pay less attention to an advertisement than what a respondent in a surf mode does.

Another contextual dimension that has been elaborated on is the physical appearance of the environment where an advertisement is presented. This physical environment that was described as a task environment may also influence advertising. One aspect of this task environment is its inherent complexity which can be manifested in a number of ways. One such way is the complexity of the search system on a Web site and the search depth that it has. Given what has been learned in the theory it is plausible to state that; as complexity increases, the demand on the primary task will increase and thereby reducing the attention to the secondary task. Hence:

H2: A Web environment that is less complex, with regard to its search depth, will elicit more attention to an advertisement than what a more complex Web environment does.

To be rejected…

[H0H2: A Web environment that is less complex, with regard to its search depth, will elicit equal or less attention to an advertisement than what a more complex Web environment does]

If hypothesis H1 and H2 will be supported then there is reason to consider an alteration of the advertising models displayed in the theoretical chapter. If H1 and H2 are correct then the models studied can be elaborated. More specifically, the attention construct should be described more in detail taking into account what is happening between the advertisement, context, attention getting etc and the attention construct. What is lacking in the models is a more elaborate description of the attention construct. If Thorson’s models are taken as an example to compare with, it can be said that what is lacking is an environment or setting construct that takes into account the environment’s effect on an individual’s attention. There is also a lack of a construct that can impede the incoming stimuli. These issues that have been pointed at in the previous paragraph will be further addressed under the section “Modeling attention to advertising”.

Second section - Advertisements and their respective attention effect

In the previous chapter it was argued around different attention getting techniques and that one and the same advertisement using different attention getting may receive different amounts of attention from individuals. Chandon’s study indicated that animation gave a greater response measured as click-through frequency compared to non-animated advertisements. He also recognized that many advertisers had stopped using non-animated
advertisements. Many studies referred were studying the phenomena of attracting attention on a very basic level where these basic features were studied. In advertising these basic features are put together on a greater scale and the exposure times are much longer. It is therefore important to understand how attention getting works on a “macro” level.

An animated advertisement is actually using some of the basic features that our experimental psychologists have studied in attention experiments. An animated advertisement will by nature have the possibility to present new objects in the visual field since the animation itself is not stationary. It also has motion or flicker since animation is adding motion to an object that otherwise would be static. Taken together it seems plausible that animation will evoke greater attention than what a non-animated advertisement will. Hence:

H3: An animated advertisement will elicit more attention than a static advertisement.

To be rejected…

[H0H3: An animated advertisement will elicit equal or less attention than a static advertisement]

As was stated already in the theoretical framework, a pop-up advertisement is merely a special case of an animated advertisement from a visual perspective. When the pop-up advertisement appears in a certain location it creates “motion” where it appears. This could be seen as an “abrupt onset” as Yantis described it theoretically, since the pop-up appears in an empty area (sometimes also in other areas than empty areas). Cropper & Evans and Smith & Goodwin found in their study support for animation as a means to attract attention from one area of the screen to another area because of the “visual distinctiveness”.

Relevant in the case of pop-up advertisements, since it can be perceived as a special case of an animated advertisement, is of course all the arguments presented in favour of animation in hypothesis 3. With this said:

H4: A pop-up (traditional pop-up, over-the-page) advertisement will elicit more attention than a static advertisement.

To be rejected…

[H0H4: A pop-up (traditional over-the-page pop-up) advertisement will elicit equal or less attention than a static advertisement]

It is also expected that that a pop-up advertisement will elicit more attention than an advertisement that is just animated. The reason for this is that the pop-up advertisement is not only animated but also that it appears in an empty area creating extra “motion” in the area where it appears compared to its animated counterpart that is just animated and staying in the same area the whole time. It is expected to be easier to inhibit the animated advertisement than what it is inhibiting a pop-up advertisement that is unexpectedly popping-up in the viewers’ visual field. Therefore:

H5: A pop-up advertisement will elicit more attention than an animated advertisement.

To be rejected…

[H0H5: A pop-up advertisement will elicit equal or less attention than an animated advertisement]

Analysis

First section

Table 1 & Table 2, exhibit frequencies for the main variables. These two tables are presented to obtain a quick overview of how the respondents scored on recognition, which was the main measure and used to study the effects of the various treatments. The tables are presenting the frequencies and percentages of the respondents that recognized or did not recognize the advertisements in the respective treatments. Table1 is related to hypotheses H1 and H2 that are targeting the context dimension.

The first hypothesis is a comparison between treatment 3 and treatment 4 for the first round of data that was collected. The hypothesis expects that a lower level of internal drive will demand less cognitive resources and thereby increase attention to the advertisement. It was thereby expected that treatment 4 would have less recognition than treatment 3. In table 5.1 the results are distributed into the various cells and the expectation expressed in hypothesis 1 is in line with the raw data.

Hypothesis two is a comparison between treatment 5 and treatment 3. In treatment 5 the advertisement was embedded in a less complex context compared to treatment 3. The context that is referred to here is the difference in complexity in the Web setting or Web environment between the two treatments. The direction of the hypothesis is such
that treatment 5 is expected to have a higher level of recognition than treatment 3. The figures in table 1 are indeed pointing in this direction.

Hypothesis number three, which is a comparison between the two treatments, expects there to be a greater recognition for the animated advertisement compared to the static advertisement. Table 2 above discloses that the Table 2 exhibits the figures related to hypotheses H3, H4, and H5 that are the hypotheses connected to various attention getting techniques.

Hypothesis number three, which is a comparison between the two treatments, expects there to be a greater recognition for the animated advertisement compared to the static advertisement. Table 2 above discloses that the differences between treatments 1 and 2 are miniscule, hence, the notion expressed in hypothesis three seem to be unsupported.

The fourth hypothesis is expecting treatment 1, a static advertisement to be less effective than treatment 3, an expectation that is in line with the figures exhibited.

In hypothesis five it is expected that the pop-up advertisement will elicit more recognition than the animated advertisement, a position supported by the figures.

The last data presented in figure 2 is connected with treatments 3, 1 and 6. Hypothesis 6a expected a traditional pop-up to elicit more attention than a pop-up without a frame. Hypothesis 6b expected a static advertisement to elicit more attention than a pop-up without a frame. The figures in table 2 seem to indicate that this notion is correct.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for treatment 3 & 4 connected with hypothesis 1 and treatment 3 & 5 connected with hypothesis 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment 3:</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Treatment 4:</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>H1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No recognition</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>No recognition</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment 3:</th>
<th>Treatment 5:</th>
<th>H2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No recognition</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Descriptive statistics for hypotheses 3 through 6. The next last column on the right indicates at what occasion the data was collected, in the first round of experiments, in the second or in both. The last column on the right indicates the relation between hypotheses and treatments. It is worth to point out that the figures in the tables above are merely telling the distribution of data and provides a brief overview of the treatments tested in the experiments. When summarizing table 5.1 and 5.2 it can be concluded that the data, at a basic level, is pointing in the direction that the hypotheses expressed. However, the actual testing of the hypotheses is yet to be done and the result from that will be disclosed in the following.

Second section

– Attention effects of context and mode

H1: A situation where respondents are exhibiting a less goal oriented surfing behavior will elicit more attention to an advertisement than what a more goal oriented surfing behavior will.

H1: \( \text{Exp (B)} > 1 \)

\( H_0 \) \( H_1 \) \( \text{Exp (B)} = 1 \)

The analysis of hypothesis H1 was performed on the first collected data set comprising of 410 respondents since one of the treatments compared was only conducted in the first round of experiments. There were two groups with 80 and 81 respondents respectively that were subjected to the two different treatments. In the test of hypothesis H1 treatments number 3 and number 4 are compared.
In treatment 3 the situation was such that the respondents were free to surf around and look and read anything they wanted to and got interested in. This mode that they were in was described as a surf mode since the respondents could surf to any destination they wanted to, inside of the Website. Treatment 3 received the A-instructions (less goal oriented). The odds of attending to the advertisement in treatment 3 were 3.211:1.

The likelihood of attending to the advertisement is considerably higher in treatment 3 compared to treatment 4. In the other treatment in this analysis, treatment 4, the respondents received the B-instructions (more goal oriented). The respondents were thereby set to a search mode. The odds for attending to the advertisement in treatment 4 were 0.884:1. This means that in treatment 4 the odds was slightly lower than 1:1 to attend to the advertisement. The respondents were clearly less attentive to the

Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment:</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Treatment:</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rond</th>
<th>Hyp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No recognition</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>No recognition</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1&amp;2</td>
<td>H4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No recognition</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>No recognition</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No recognition</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No recognition</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T6:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>H6A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No recognition</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>No recognition</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T6:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>H6b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No recognition</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>No recognition</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Output from a binomial logistic regression comparing treatment 3 and 4, in the figure calculated odds for treatment 3 and 4 are presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Odds to attend in T3 compared to T4</td>
<td>1.290</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.633**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odds to attend in Treatment 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.211 (61/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odds to attend in Treatment 4</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td></td>
<td>(38/43)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The value is signification at the .05 level.
**The value is signification at the .01 level.
stimulus advertisement in treatment 4 compared to treatment 3. When the mode or internal drive is changed from surf to search, as is the case when switching from treatment 3 to treatment 4, a radical change in the attentiveness to the advertising occurs. When analyzing the data between the two treatments in a logistic regression there is in fact a 3.633:1 odds to attend to the advertisement in treatment 3 compared to treatment 4. This result is significant at a 99% confidence level, hence the null hypothesis can be rejected. Taken together, the results support hypothesis H1 and it is reasonable to attribute the effect observed to the change of mode or task environment.

The results that have been found are following the same pattern as those presented by researchers in experimental psychology. In the words of Kahneman one could say that the mental effort or cognitive capacity allocated to the task, to search for answers, limits the possibility to allocate cognitive capacity to another task such as attending to an advertisement that is presented in the same task environment. So, when more cognitive capacity is needed in order to solve the first task, less capacity will be left for performing any other task.

Milliken and Tipper argue that attention can be used to generate expectation and to concentrate on ongoing processing demands of a primary task. Attention can furthermore be used to direct behavior selectively toward an event among competing events. However, attempting to perform too many tasks simultaneously in a certain task environment will have a negative impact on how these tasks are being performed. This would then be the effect that can be observed when comparing treatment 3 and 4 with each other and everything else being equal. In treatment 4 the task is more demanding than in treatment 3 resulting in a reduced performance in recognizing the advertisement.

Unlike, for instance, Wolfe, Mack and Rock, Yantis and others have conducted their experiments in experimental psychology, the stimuli onset asynchrony in this experiment was considerably longer and can be seen as being on a macro level. In Mack and Rock’s experiments (as well as in other studies in this category) the times were generally in the range of 10 - 100 milliseconds, under an inattentional paradigm, whereas in the experiments conducted in this study the times were potentially lasting up to 345 000 milliseconds and thereby to a greater extent resembling a natural setting.

Despite the differences in stimuli presentation time, the results here follow the general idea that an internal drive has an impact on attention. It is apparent that an increased goal orientation or focus will produce a greater inhibition of information presented outside of the focal area. In line with Kahneman’s observations the performance of a secondary task will be constrained by the resources needed for the primary task. Thus, there are reasons to believe that findings in psychology, on a micro level have its macro counterpart as is observed in this study.

**Impact of external context factors on attention**

H2: A Web environment that is less complex, with regard to its search depth, will elicit more attention to an advertisement than what a more complex Web environment does.

An experiment with treatment 5 and treatment 3 was set up focusing on an external context factor. As in the previous experiment, treatment 5 was compared to treatment 3. Hence, treatment 3 is a reference point or baseline in this case as well.

A total of 281 respondents participated in this experiment with respectively 140 and 141 individuals in treatments 3 and 5. The respondents in Treatment 5 were exposed to a different physical Web environment. It was less complex with regard to its search depth structure.

The analysis of treatment 3 and 5, see figure 5.5, is revealing that the odds of attending to the advertisement in the more complex environment, treatment 3, is 3 to 1 and that the odds of attending to the advertisement in the less complex environment, treatment 5, is 6.421 to 1. When analyzing the data using logistic regression the difference between the two treatments are 2.140:1 to attend to the advertisement in treatment 5 compared to treatment 3. The results are significant at the .05 level.

The statistical analysis shows that a change in the complexity of an environment or setting has a great impact on the attention to an advertisement. Individuals that are using an environment that is less complex, in regards to the search depth, has a higher attentiveness to the advertisement as opposed to what they had in a more complex environment.

The difference in effect that has been measured...
resources that can be spent elsewhere. Thus, a higher attention level to the advertising stimulus was recorded. This also confirmed the properties of the proposed model; namely that the permeability of a filtering mechanism is dependent on for instance level of goal orientation and complexity of the physical task environment i.e. the complexity of the Web site. The study revealed that attention getting techniques such as pop-up advertisements increase the attention to advertising. However, it was found that pop-up advertisements are effective, not mainly because of their abrupt presentation, but because of the distinct properties of the frame. It was found that the frame has a negative meaning for Web users and when the frame comes into the visual field it will attract their attention. At the same time attention will also be distributed towards the advertisement itself. This is recorded as an increase in attention towards the advertising message. The results show that the click-through measure is not an appropriate method when measuring advertising effect. The click-through measure may severely underestimate the advertising effect. Consequently, using click-through frequencies as a basis for pricing is inappropriate, unless the effects at play have been well understood and taken into consideration.
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### Table 4. Output from a binomial logistic regression comparing treatment 3 and 4. In the figure calculated odds for treatment 3 and treatment 5 are presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Odds to attend in T3 compared to T5</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.140*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odds to attend in Treatment 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.000 (105/35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odds to attend in Treatment 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.421 (122/19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The value is signification at the .05 level.

**The value is signification at the 0.01 level.


