

Interaction Effect Between Individual Regulatory Focus and Message Framing on Sustainability Advertisement: An Experimental Study

¹Rahab and ²Arthur Sitaniapessy

¹Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business, Jenderal Soedirman University, Purwokerto, HR. Boenyamin Street 708, 53122 Purwokerto, Central Java, Indonesia

²Department of Business Administration, Ambon State Polytechnique, Ir. M. Putuhena Street, Wailela, Ambon, Maluku, Indonesia

Abstract: Message framing by focus regulatory (promotion or prevention) have different persuasion effect on message recipient depends on individual regulatory orientation. This study aims to examine effect of regulatory fit and message framing interaction on not to leave food intention. We use prospect theory and regulatory focus theory to develop research model. Laboratory experiments conducted with 2 (promotion and prevention focus regulatory) × 2 (promotion and prevention framing) between subject factorial design. Participants were 204 students from 3 universities in Indonesia are Jenderal Soedirman University, UPN Veteran University, Ahmad Dahlan University. Data analysis was performed using independent sample t-test and one ways ANOVA. The results show that congruity between individual regulatory focus and message framing for environmental concern issues has a stronger effect on encouraging individual intention not to leave food. Participant with promotion regulatory focus have stronger intentions when given stimulus promotion framed message than prevention framed messages. This study also show that participant with preventive regulatory focus have stronger intentions when given prevention framed messages, rather than given promotion framed message. The findings confirm that regulatory fit increase persuasiveness of advertisement.

Key words: Regulatory fit, promotion, prevention, message framing, environmental

INTRODUCTION

One major factor of environmental damage is related to human behavior in consumption activities. Consumption behavior that not pay attention to environmental sustainability has triggered various problems that threaten environmental sustainability. One consumer behaviors that contribute significantly to degradation of environment is related to food left behavior. Leaving food behavior has led to a variety of resources are wasted. Leaving food behaviour in addition not only producing food waste that is harmful to environment but also has involved use of resources related to production and distribution process is wasted in vain. In fact from every process of making food and food distribution has significantly contributed to damage the environment. Wasted left overs all over world contribute green house gas emissions (FAO, 2013).

Each year approximately one third of all food for human consumption which amounts to about 1.3 billion tons, along with all wasted energy, water and various chemicals needed to produce and dispose of it. Nearly

30% of agricultural land in the world and amount of water equivalent to annual discharge of the Volga River in Europe wasted in vain. In a report titled “Traces of Wasted Food”, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in 2013 estimated that carbon footprint of wasted food is equivalent to 3.3 billion tons of carbon dioxide per year. If it is described as a state then it would be the third largest country’s of carbon emitters in the world after China and the United States. The condition shows that the more efficient use of food can make a substantial contribution to global efforts to cut green house gas emissions to limit global warming.

Impact of food waste is not only financial, food waste also cause environmental pollution, wasteful use of chemicals (fertilizers and pesticides), fuel consumption (which is used for transportation) wasted in vain. Left over food will decay and create more methane that is one of most dangerous greenhouse gases that contribute to climate change. Methane is 23 times more potent than CO₂ as a greenhouse gas. Large amount of food waste to landfills makes a significant contribution to global warming.

Wasted resources action including water, energy, land, labor, capital in food manufacturing process contributes to global warming and climate change. Magnitude of imbalance lifestyle (individual/community) and devastating effects of food waste in the environmental damage it is necessary to increase individual awareness about environmental impact of food left.

Individual acceptance to a message delivered on an advertisement is influenced in part by message framing. Presentation of a message in the form of message framing can increase persuasion power of a message and influence decision making process (Block and Keller, 1995; Maheswaran and Meyers-Levy, 1990; Meyerowitz and Chaiken, 1987; Rothman and Solovey, 1997). According to Wood, persuasion is caused by one's attitude gets exposure of written or verbal message information obtained from others. Effectiveness of message framing on changing attitudes and decision making has been widely tested in several previous studies (Block and Keller, 1995; Maheswaran and Meyers-Levy, 1990; Meyerowitz and Chaiken, 1987; Rothman and Solovey, 1997; Fatmawati, 2012). But so far has not obtained conclusive results about shape of message framing effect on decision-making (Cox and Cox, 2001). Not inclusive research related to messages framing due to difference of individual characteristics that affect receipt of message by message recipient. Therefore, it is important to consider differences in message recipient when designing a message.

Effect of message framing effects can be operated differently depend on fit between message framing and message recipient. According to regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997), there are two different targets of individual cognitive control processes is regulatory process focused on promotion and regulatory process focused on prevention aspects. Regulatory process focused on the advancement or promotion is individual efforts focus to achieve positive consequences by adjusting the final target that expected. Promotion focus is driven by individuals motivation to achieve progress and achievement with adjustment approach with the expected final target. The process of regulatory focus on prevention or called preventive focus that earned positive consequences to avoid incorrespondence with expected conditions. Preventive focus is driven by motivation of individuals to achieve protection and security to avoid mismatch with ultimate final target. Messages will have a greater impact on effectiveness of persuasion when target is in line with framing in regulatory orientation (Aaker and Lee, 2001).

In social marketing context, message framing by using regulatory focus (promotion or prevention) has a different persuasion power at message receiver depends on orientation of the arrangement which is owned by each message recipient. Matching between message framing with regulatory orientation then called regulatory fit that is stimulate promotion message framing to recipient with promotion orientation or stimulate prevention message framing to message recipient of prevention orientation will have different power of persuasion than if there is no correspondence between messages framing with individual orientation focus later called misfit regulatory that is stimulate promotion message framing to recipient with a prevention orientation or stimulate prevention messages framing to message recipient with promotion orientation.

Effectiveness of advertisement in order to convey sustainability messages can lead to message recipient intention to perform not leave food behavior. This study examined differences effects of regulatory fit and misfit on the intention not to leave food. The results of this study are expected to examine the effect of regulatory misfit and regulatory fit on individual intention to perform pro environmental behavior which is intention not to leave food.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Hypotheses development: Message framing theory derived from prospect theory introduced by Tversky and Kahneman (1981). According to prospect theory, a person's choices and decisions can be influenced not only by content of message being communicated but also by way information is presented. The information presented can emphasize potential benefits that would be obtained if information submitted obeyed or potential losses that will be encountered if information is complied with (Tversky and Kahneman, 1981). Postulate messages framing from prospect theory states that way in which information is presented in terms of benefit or harm can influence behavioral decisions differently. Message Framing is a strategically persuasion tactics used in communicating persuasive messages to others (Hamilton, 2001).

Framing theory describes how a persuasive message is delivered to recipient of message. Hallahan (1999) describes framing is used as a paradigm to understand and investigate related communication and behavior in a wide range of disciplines. In line with prospect theory, two statements about an issue that is logically equivalent but presented in a different way can lead to decision-makers choose different options (Rabin, 2003).

Individual decisions is systematically affected by problem way was presented (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979). Specifically, individuals tend to avoid risk when faced with problems that are presented in a positive framing (emphasizing benefits) and individuals tend to like risk when faced with problems that are presented in a negative framing (emphasizing loss).

In communication process, persuasive messages can be presented in a positive message framing (gain framed message) that emphasize aspects of benefits that would be obtained if the message is obeyed or in a negative message framing (loss framed message) which emphasizes aspects of risk that would occur if message is not fulfilled. There are two types of message framing. The first type is framing of message negatively/positively. Positive message emphasizes benefits received by consumers because they use product or carry out recommended behavior. Second type of framing explain the negative aspects or positive aspects of the message itself. Levin *et al.* (1998) made a taxonomist that distinguish effect of framing in three categories, namely, risk framing, attribute framing and target framing.

Research about regulatory fit states that relationship between regulatory focus and strategic way in process of achieving goals. When a match between target regulatory and strategic aligned then, the individual has a more positive feeling about desired option and has more negative feelings about options that are not desired, individuals evaluate the achievement of objectives in a more positive and the individual placing a higher value on object chosen (Higgins, 2000). Therefore, the value of the decision-making process can be achieved when strategic way to achieve objectives consistent with the focus settings. Individuals tend to have a higher motivation when their setting targets in accordance with its strategic way.

Shah *et al.* (1998) found that when information relates to incentives in match with goal achievement, participants showed better performance on a given task. In particular, participants in prevention focus works better when given incentives framed promotively rather than framed preventively. On the other hand, participants with a prevention focus works better when incentives are framed preventively than when incentives are framed promotively. Shah *et al.* (1998) indicates that a person with a promotion focus find information about incentives easier to then respond to information that is framed promotively while those who prevention focus will be easier to find information about incentives are easier to respond to information that is framed preventively.

Crowe and Higgins (1997) and Higgins *et al.* (1994) concluded that when someone persuaded by goal regulatory, they are likely to be given message that corresponds to goal regulatory. Therefore, to increase persuasiveness of a message delivered to recipient, individual with a promotion focus will be receiving a message if given message is framed promotively while individuals with prevention focus will be receiving a message if given a framed preventively messages. Aaker and Lee (2001) showed that message that focused on promotion (for example: gain stamina) has a better persuasion for individuals with a promotion focus than an individual with a prevention focus while prevention focus messages (e.g., avoid heart disease) have a better level of persuasion for individuals with a prevention focus.

In context of ongoing delivery of messages, effectiveness of message depends on whether regulatory focus and message framing occurs alignment. Enabled recipient setting targets will be more responsive to ongoing advertisement framed in accordance with the orientation settings. Recipients of the message with promotion focus is likely to be affected in the message-oriented framed with regard to promotion. It contrast to consumer with a prevention focus is likely to be affected in case message is framed with prevention oriented. Referring to these ideas, arranged hypothesis:

- H₁: message recipient with promotion regulatory orientation will show a greater intention than recipients with prevention goal orientation when given a promotively framed message
- H₂: message recipient with regulatory orientation will show a greater intention than recipients with promotion goal orientation when given preventively framed message

Design and participants: Study use quantitative method with experimental approaches. Experimental approach was used to test effect of stimuli of a message in form of message framing (promotion and prevention framing) that interacts with goal orientation participants (promotion or prevention) difference intention not to leave food. The design used in this experiment using a between subject design. Implementation of the experiment using 2 factorial design (message framing: promotion vs. prevention)×2 (goal regulatory focus: promotion vs. prevention). Participant in the experiment were divided randomly into four conditions, namely: group given stimuli in the form of prime promotive-oriented advertising, promotion message framing, group given stimuli in the form of prime promotion-oriented advertising, prevention message framing, group given stimuli in the form of prime

prevention-oriented advertising, promotion message framing, groups are given stimuli in the form of prime prevention-oriented advertising, prevention message framing. Primary data are taken by experimental study to test hypothesis. Two hundred and four college students of took part in our experiment. Partisipant from Jenderal Soedirman University (UNSOED) are 71 (34.8%), UPN Veteran Yogyakarta are 52 (25.5%) and Ahmad Dahlan University are 81 (39.7%). Male participants are 93 (45.6%) and female participants are 111 (54.4%).

Experiment consists of two phases: first, to activate the participants regulatory focus, subjects were given stimuli in the form of a bulletin entitled “What’s with Food Waste” which is designed to emphasize the two information of regulatory focus is promotion orientation focus and prevention orientation focus. Goal orientation information with promotion emphasis on achievement or growth whereas the with promotion information orientation emphasis on protection and promotion of security. For 5 min, participants read bulletin carefully presented by researchers to participants then answered questions manipulation check.

The second phase, after participants perform first task, participants were shown advertisement that promotion or prevention framed for then evaluate it for 3 min. After evaluating advertisement, participants were given questions relating to dependent variable and respondents demographic questions. Observations carried out by measuring participants’ intention not to leave food. After a given task is completed, researchers checked to get conviction that there is no relationship between two tasks.

Materials: Manipulation pattern or treatment conducted by researchers in form of booklets are manipulated by activating regulatory focus is promotion regulatory focus using statement that “we can realize environmental sustainability by not leaving food” while prevention regulatory focus by using statement that “we can achieve environmental sustainability by not leaving food” (Appendix 1). In addition, researchers also provide treatment that is framed in the form of promotional advertising by using the statement: “achieve environmental sustainability by not leaving food” or advertisement that are framed by prevention using statement: “avoid damage to environment by not leaving food” (Appendix 2).

Stimulus material in this study consisted of four versions namely, Booklet with information that emphasizes importance of not leaving food behavior to achieve environmental sustainability (promotion priming),

Booklet with information that emphasizes importance of not leaving food behavior to avoid environmental sustainability, advertising appeal does not leave food with promotion framing, advertising appeals does not leave food with prevention framing.

Stimulus material design aims to develop a condition close to real conditions, so that participants provide an objective assessment. Stimulus material are: priming advertising with a focus on promotion and prevention goal orientation, stimulated advertisement of message framing either promotion or prevention, a questionnaire that will be used to determine how impact of activation of goal-oriented message (promotion vs. prevention) and framing of messages using regulatory focus (promotive vs. preventive) on participants’ intention not to leave food. Advertisement used of print advertisement.

Manipulation check: Manipulation check used between subject. Measurement manipulation checks performed by Tsai *et al.* (2006) by asking subject assess the following: level of subject confidence of message emphasize progress and positive outcomes when doing the actions promoted, level of subject confidence that message emphasizes protection and safety implications if you do promoted. Response to that statement is measured with a yes or no. Manipulation check performed on 85 participants. Participants were recruited from Jenderal Soedirman University (42 participants) and Muhammadiyah University of Purwokerto (43 participants). This manipulation check is to confirm that participants can distinguish between promotion advertisement stimulus (allurement and consequences) and prevention (invitation and consequences). Manipulation check analyzed using non-parametric statistics. Results of testing manipulation checks can be seen on Table 1 and 2. Table 1 shows that a total of 85

Table 1: Manipulation check allurement content for advertisement about not to leave food

Inviting content	Can not distinguish	Can distinguish	Total	χ^2
Promotion	9	76	85	52.812 Asymp. Sig. = 0.000
Prevention	8	77	85	56.026 Asymp. Sig. = 0.000

Table 2: Manipulation check of consequences content for advertisement of not to leave food

Content of action consequences	Can not distinguish	Can distinguish	Total	χ^2
Promotion	5	80	85	66.176 Asymp. Sig. = 0.000
Prevention	6	79	85	62.694 Asymp. Sig. = 0.000

participants who were asked to provide an assessment of allurements content of the stop leaving food advertisement, most of the participants were able to distinguish and classifying advertisement stimulus based on its orientation. This suggests that there is a misalignment of the participants answer because the stimulus is differently designed.

Table 3 shows that a total of 85 participants who were asked to provide an assessment, most of them can distinguish and classify consequences content of leaving food advertising. In other words, misalignment of participants answer is because it is a different stimulus (Table 4).

Social desirability tests: Social desirability tests conducted by compare between direct answer (direct questioning). Directly asking participants to answer questions about what he was thinking while indirect questions ask respondents about what “others” think/do about the issue/topic/specific problems (Jo *et al.*, 1997). Direct questions and indirect questions given in different participants. This SD-test was conducted on 85 participants that recruited from UPN Veteran University and Ahmad Dahlan University of Yogyakarta. In each

execution of experiments in class, each participant was given one of four systematic sampling stimulus (stimulus: prom_prom, nprom_prev, prev_prom and prev_prev). SD tests performed using t-test analysis to determine whether there is similarity response to a direct question and indirect questions. Based on for equality of means t-test showed significant value >0.05 . This means that there are no differences in the perception of the participants to direct statement or indirect questions that asked of participants. So can be concluded that there is no existence of social desirability on indicators of dependent variable. Questions items (Intention 1-9) related to the construct of intention not to leave food does not indicate normative answer.

Validity and reliability test: Construct validity testing for intention not to leave food variables indicators using discriminant validity approach. Discriminant validity refers to degree of mismatch between attributes that should be measured by research instrument and theoretical concepts of the variables. Researchers using the principal axis factor analysis method and varimax rotation to assess the underlying structure of nine item questionnaires of intentions variables.

Table 3 shows that of nine indicators used have a loading factor above 0.4. According to Hair, value of loading factor between 0.30-0.40 are considered as the minimum acceptance limit for structure interpretation. Based on acceptance limit, then nine indicators is valid and measurement of intention variables using of the nine indicators.

Reliability tests performed with the Cronbach alpha (α) statistical test. According to Table 5, known that the value of Cronbach alpha (α) for intention variable of = 0.759 and value of Cronbach's alpha if item deleted for each indicator >0.6 . This means the intention not to leave food variable is reliable. According Nunally by Fan and Le (2011), constructs can be said reliable if Cronbach alpha value >0.6 .

Tabel 3: Factor loading value

Indicators	Loading factor (1)
Intention_1	0.479
Intention_2	0.464
Intention_3	0.536
Intention_4	0.694
Intention_5	0.653
Intention_6	0.671
Intention_7	0.604
Intention_8	0.612
Intention_9	0.601

Table 4: Result of intention variable test

Variable	Cronbach's alpha	Cronbach's alpha based on standardized items	No. of items
Intention not to leave food	0.760	0.759	9

Table 5: Item-total statistics

Indicators	Scale mean if item deleted	Scale variance if item deleted	Corrected item-total correlation	Squared multiple correlation	Cronbach's alpha if item deleted
Intention_1	32.20	12.640	0.295	0.297	0.757
Intention_2	32.15	12.433	0.365	0.315	0.748
Intention_3	32.76	11.815	0.333	0.216	0.756
Intention_4	32.89	11.060	0.548	0.445	0.720
Intention_5	32.79	11.642	0.467	0.435	0.733
Intention_6	32.82	11.142	0.534	0.441	0.722
Intention_7	32.69	11.687	0.422	0.333	0.740
Intention_8	32.37	11.180	0.482	0.473	0.730
Intention_9	32.35	11.141	0.503	0.491	0.727

RESULTS

Influence of regulatory fit on intention not to leave food: Table 6 shows intention average for group participants with promotional setting focus that got promotional messages framing stimulus (regulatory fit) of 4.3264 and a participants group with promotional setting focus that got a preventive message framing treatment (regulatory misfit) of 3.8400 with a value of t-test showed significance value of 0.000 (<0.05). Meanwhile, the average test results of the intention to preventive participants group who received stimulus promotion framing (regulatory misfit) of 3.8422 with value of t-test showed significance value of 0.000 (<0.05). Furthermore, one way ANOVA analysis results for two groups of regulatory fit and misfit regulatory known $F(21, 369) = 0.000$ (<0.05) and $F(38, 650) = 0.000$ (<0.05) which means that there are differences of intention between subjects with promotion orientation settings when getting promotion message framing stimulus and subject with promotion regulatory oriented that get stimulus combinations that do not have a match (prevention preventive). Thus, hypothesis 1 which states there is a difference between the participants' intention with promotion regulatory focus who get promotion framing with participants with a promotive regulatory focus who get preventive framing, supported. Test of hypotheses 2 which states that message recipient with prevention regulatory orientation have greater intention than recipients with promotion regulatory orientation when given preventively framed messages are presented in Table 6.

Table 7 shows average for group of participants who received treatment with a combination of prevention

priming stimulus and prevention framing (regulatory fit) of 4.1548 and group of participants who received treatment with a combination of prevention priming stimulus and promotion framing (regulatory misfit) of 3.8400. As for results of the levene test at 0.907 and t-test value showed significance value of 0.000 (<0.05). Further, analysis with one way ANOVA, it is known that $F(21, 369) = 0.000$ (<0.05) which means that there are intention differences between subjects with prevention regulatory orientation when getting stimulus which match (prevention framing) and subject with prevention regulatory orientation that get stimulus combinations that mismatch (promotion framing).

Meanwhile, the results of average test of intentions for the group of participants who received treatment with a combination of prevention priming stimulus and prevention framing (match) of 4.1548 and a group of participants who received treatment with a combination of promotion priming stimulus and promotion framing (mis match) amounted to 3.8422 with result of levene test of 0.502 and values of t-test showed significance value of 0.000 (<0.05). Further analysis using one-way ANOVA, it is known that $F(21, 369) = 0.000$ (<0.05) which means that there are intention differences between subjects with the prevention regulatory orientation when getting stimulus which match (prevention framing) and subject to the promotion regulatory orientation who get stimulus combinations that mismatch (prevention framing). It means that the hypothesis 2 which states that message recipient with the prevention regulatory orientation will show a greater intention to not leave food compared with message recipient with promotion regulatory orientation when given preventively framed messages, supported.

Table 6: Result hypotheses test of promotion regulatory fit

Treatments	N	Mean	SD	Levene test		t-test for equality means		ANOVA	
				F-values	Sig.	t-values	Sig.	F-values	Sig.
Promotion priming and promotion framing (prom_prom)	48	4.3264	0.25871	4.925	0.045	7.850	0.000*	21.369	0.000
Promotion priming and prevention framing (prom_prev)	50	3.8400	0.34642			7.896	0.000**		
Promotion priming and promotion framing (prom_prom)	48	4.3264	0.25871	4.133	0.045	6.217	0.000*	38.650	0.000
Prevention priming and promotion framing (prev_prom)	50	3.8422	0.47624			6.287	0.000**		

*Variance assumed same; **variance assumed not same

Table 7: Result of hypotheses test for prevention regulatory fit

Treatments	N	Mean	SD	Levene test		t-test for equality means		Uji ANOVA	
				F-values	Sig.	t-values	Sig.	F-values	Sig.
Prevention priming dan prevention framing (prev_prev)	56	4.1548	0.35307	0.014	0.907	4.623	0.000*	7.916	0.006
Prevention priming and promotion framing (prev_prom)	50	3.8400	0.34642			4.628	0.000**		
Prevention priming and prevention framing (prev_prev)	56	4.1548	0.35307	0.454	0.502	3.864	0.000*	21.369	0.000
Promotion priming and prevention framing (prom_prev)	50	3.8422	0.47624			3.801	0.000**		

*Variance assumed same; **variance not same

DISCUSSION

Supported hypothesis 1 and 2 indicate that fit between individual regulatory focus and messages framing can improve individual intentions to act in an environmental friendly (not leaving food). Matching between messages framing and individual regulatory orientation will increase motivation to perform recommended behavior (Lee *et al.*, 2000; Lockwood *et al.*, 2002; Evans and Petty, 2003; Jain *et al.*, 2007). Matching between individual regulatory focus with message contents (regulatory fit) affect persuasion through motivation to process information carefully and systematically (Aaker and Lee, 2001; Evans and Petty, 2003). Existence of regulatory fit encourage message recipients for processing such information seriously so would increase influence of quality of arguments on positive attitudes and perceptions (Evans and Petty, 2003).

These findings support previous studies which states that fit between individual regulatory focus dan content of message positively effect for strengthening of individual attitudes and intention to implement of message content. Wang and Lee (2006) in his research found that fit between individual regulatory focus and message framing effect on persuasiveness level of messages to recipient. Freitas and Higgins (2002) state that when an individual receives message that is framed based on regulatory focus and fit with regulatory focus then that individual will feel comfortable to conducting what is recommended from the message.

Other studies related to regulatory fit, Cho *et al.* (2011) found that matching between regulatory focus with message framing will encourage participants' attitudes and intentions to save. Interaction between promotion regulatory focus and positive messages framing reinforcing attitudes and intentions message recipient to saving. Individuals with a promotion regulatory focus when given advertisement about importance of saving that positively framed influence motivation of people to saving. Ho *et al.* (2011) in his research on preventive measures online game addiction among teenagers confirm that matching between individuals promotion regulatory focus with favorable framing (gain framing) affect participants (teenage fans of game online) to perform self control to reduce game online addiction.

Same findings also show that fit between promotion regulatory focus and loss framing (loss of framing) which also has a stronger influence on the intention to reduce the addiction to online games of the condition that is not match between regulatory focus and framing of target. It

is different from research (Ho *et al.*, 2011) with this study is that this study uses messages framing with reference to regulatory focus (promotion framing vs. prevention framing) while Ho *et al.* (2011) using framing risk (gain vs. loss). The findings of this study corroborate previous findings stating that fit between individual regulatory focus and message framing of the will strengthen persuasiveness of message by recipient (Lee *et al.*, 2000; Evans and Petty, 2003; Cesario *et al.*, 2004; Florack and Scarabis, 2006; Kim, 2006; Jain *et al.*, 2007).

CONCLUSION

Matching between individual regulatory focus and message framing (regulatory fit) deals with environmental sustainability issues has a positive effect in encouraging individual intention to perform actions that are beneficial to environment. Individuals with a promotion regulatory focus has a stronger intention when given promotion framed messages stimulus which emphasizes aspects of progress, hopes and dreams than when given prevention framed messages stimulus which emphasizes prevention, obligations and responsibilities. Another finding of this study is that individuals with a prevention regulatory focus have stronger intentions when given stimulus message is framed preventively, rather than given preventively framed stimulus.

LIMITATIONS

This study has the following limitations. First, experiment stimulus is written educational interventions that may be too short given consideration of possibility of saturation of subject if time required to read too long. However, researchers have sought so that message is really able to convey idea completely corresponding time allotted.

Second, advertisement written given on subject is leaflets form, without is not publised through really print media such as magazines, daily newspapers, tabloids, so nature of message becomes weaker than if designed together with existing media. However, researchers have attempted to design these advertisement are interesting both in quality of images, fonts and colors used. Third, stimulus publish by really print media, so ability of persuasive is less than when presented through audio-visual media. Stimulus in audio-visual message format possible more effectively than is presented through written media. Fourth, researchers did not measure existing cronical regulatory focus in each study subject. Researchers used contextual focus regulatory

approach by using priming intervention to direct promotion regulatory focus or prevention regulatory focus.

SUGGESTIONS

Some suggestions for future research, first it is possible to test orientation value in environmental friendly behavior models as a moderating variable or mediation variables. Second, next course of a study between subject can combines between subject design and within subject design so that intention changes effect can be observed before and after getting treatment. Third, it is needed to develop research to explore how effect of message framing on intention to implement goals.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks for Mr. BM Purwanto and Mr. Basu Swastha Dharmestha from Gadjah Mada University for encouraged and supported, we also thank to anonymous reviewers and review editor for valuable suggestions.

APPENDIX



Appendix 1: Promotion framed advertisement



Appendix 2: Prevention framed advertisement

REFERENCES

- Aaker, J.L. and A.Y. Lee, 2001. I seek pleasures and we avoid pains: The role of self-regulatory goals in information processing and persuasion. *J. Consum. Res.*, 28: 33-49.
- Block, L.G. and P.A. Keller, 1995. When to accentuate the negative: The effects of perceived efficacy and message framing on intentions to perform a health-related behavior. *J. Marketing Res.*, 32: 192-203.
- Cesario, J., H. Grant and E.T. Higgins, 2004. Regulatory fit and persuasion: Transfer from feeling right. *J. Personality Soc. Psychol.*, 86: 388-404.
- Cho, S.H., L. Geistfeld and C. Loibl, 2011. The role of regulatory fit for savings behavior. *Asian Pacific Adv. Consumer Res.*, 9: 34-45.
- Cox, D. and A.D. Cox, 2001. Communicating the consequences of early detection: The role of evidence and framing. *J. Marketing*, 65: 91-103.
- Crowe, E. and E.T. Higgins, 1997. Regulatory focus and strategic inclinations: Promotion and prevention in decision-making. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Processes*, 69: 117-132.
- Evans, L.M. and R.E. Petty, 2003. Self-guide framing and persuasion: Responsibly increasing message processing to ideal levels. *Personality Soc. Psychol. Bull.*, 29: 313-324.
- FAO., 2013. The food waste footprint: Impacts on natural resources. Summary Report, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), French.
- Fan, S. and Q. Le, 2011. Developing a valid and reliable instrument to evaluate users' perception of web-based learning in an Australian University context. *J. Online Learn. Teach.*, 7: 366-379.
- Florack, A. and M. Scarabis, 2006. How advertising claims affect brand preferences and category-brand associations: The role of regulatory fit. *Psychol. Mark.*, 23: 741-755.
- Freitas, A.L. and E.T. Higgins, 2002. Enjoying goal-directed action: The role of regulatory fit. *Psychol. Sci.*, 13: 1-6.
- Hallahan, K., 1999. Seven models of framing: Implications for public relations. *J. Public Relat. Res.*, 11: 205-242.
- Hamilton, R.W., 2001. Strategic framing: The art and science of influencing others. *Adv. Consum. Res.*, 28: 450-450.
- Higgins, E.T., 1997. Beyond pleasure and pain. *Am. Psychol.*, 52: 1280-1300.
- Higgins, E.T., 2000. Making a good decision: Value from fit. *Am. Psychol.*, 55: 1217-1230.

- Higgins, E.T., C.J.R. Roney, E. Crowe and C. Hymes, 1994. Ideal versus ought predilections for approach and avoidance distinct self-regulatory systems. *J. Personality Soc. Psychol.*, 66: 276-286.
- Ho, S.H., C. Putthiwanit and C.Y. Lin, 2011. May I continue or should I stop? the effects of regulatory focus and message framings on video game players' self-control. *Int. J. Bus. Soc. Sci.*, 2: 194-200.
- Jain, S.P., C. Lindsey, N. Agrawal and D. Maheswaran, 2007. For better or for worse? Valenced comparative frames and regulatory focus. *J. Consum. Res.*, 34: 57-65.
- Jo, M.S., J. Nelson and P. Kiecker, 1997. A model for controlling social desirability bias by direct and indirect questioning. *Market. Lett.*, 8: 429-437.
- Kahneman, D. and A. Tversky, 1979. Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47: 263-292.
- Kim, Y.J., 2006. The role of regulatory focus in message framing in antismoking advertisements for adolescents. *J. Advertis.*, 35: 143-151.
- Lee, A.Y., J.L. Aaker and W.L. Gardner, 2000. The pleasures and pains of distinct self-construals: The role of interdependence in regulatory focus. *J. Personality Soc. Psychol.*, 78: 1122-1134.
- Levin, I.P., S.L. Schneider and G.J. Gaeth, 1998. All frames are not created equal: A typology and critical analysis of framing effects. *Organiz. Behav. Hum. Dec. Proces.*, 76: 149-188.
- Lockwood, P., C.H. Jordan and Z. Kunda, 2002. Motivation by positive or negative role models: Regulatory focus determines who will best inspire us. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, 83: 854-864.
- Maheswaran, D. and J. Meyers-Levy, 1990. The influence of message framing and issue involvement. *J. Marketing Res.*, 27: 361-367.
- Meyerowitz, B.E. and S. Chaiken, 1987. The effect of message framing on breast self-examination attitudes, intentions and behavior. *J. Personality Soc. Psychol.*, 52: 500-510.
- Rabin, M., 2003. The nobel memorial prize for Daniel Kahneman. *Scand. J. Econ.*, 105: 157-180.
- Rothman, A.J. and P. Salovey, 1997. Shaping perceptions to motivate healthy behavior: The role of message framing. *Psychol. Bull.*, 121: 3-20.
- Shah, J., T. Higgins and R.S. Friedman, 1998. Performance incentives and means: How regulatory focus influences goal attainment. *J. Personality Soc. Psychol.*, 74: 285-290.
- Tsai, J.L., B. Knutson and H.H. Fung, 2006. Cultural variation in affect valuation. *J. Personality Soc. Psychol.*, 90: 288-307.
- Tversky, A. and D. Kahneman, 1981. The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science*, 211: 453-458.
- Wang, J. and A.Y. Lee, 2006. The role of regulatory focus in preference construction. *J. Market. Res.*, 43: 28-38.