

Persuasive Message Pretesting Using Non-Behavioral Outcomes: Differences in Attitudinal and Intention Effects as Diagnostic of Differences in Behavioral Effects

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

1. Table of effect sizes analyzed

2. Reference citations for meta-analyses from which the effect sizes were drawn

1. Table of effect sizes analyzed

VARIABLE, META-ANALYSIS, & STUDY ID	attitude ES (<i>r</i>)	attitude n	intention ES (<i>r</i>)	intention n	behavior ES (<i>r</i>)	behavior n
gain-loss framing (O'Keefe & Jensen, 2006)						
Al-Jarboa (1996)	-.096	120	-.060	120		
Arora (1998) library	.069	141	.107	141		
Arora (1998) resort	.133	141	.057	141		
Arora (2000)	-.131	210	-.170	210		
Arora & Arora (2004)	.201	267	.029	267		
Banks et al. (1995)	-.021	133	.000	133		
Block (1993) self-exam	-.151	57	-.257	57		
Block (1993) sun exposure	.166	58	.178	58		
Brondino (1997)	.010	100	.046	98		
Brug et al. (2003) Study 2	.083	149	-.005	149		
Brug et al. (2003) Study 3	-.012	92	-.110	92		
Chebat et al. (1998) ATMs	.326	56	.218	56		
Chebat et al. (1998) student loans	-.043	56	-.216	57		
Detweiler et al. (1999)			.106	217	.184	217
Evans et al. (1970)	.207	234	.270	234		
Fischer & Nabi (2001) sunscreen	-.226	79	-.155	79		
Fischer & Nabi (2001) skin exam	.163	87	.125	87		
Grantham & Irani (2004)	.110	274	.092	274		
Hashimoto (2002)	.018	166	-.044	166		
Hessling (1996)	.151	273	.091	273		
Homer & Yoon (1992)	.053	239	.015	239		
Hsiao (2002) exercise-prevention	.841	49	.000	49		
Hsiao (2002) exercise-detection	.000	51	-.662	51		
Hsiao (2002) testing-prevention	.000	46	-.551	46		
Hsiao (2002) testing-detection	.000	46	.562	46		
Knapp (1989) health			.050	38	.044	38
Knapp (1989) social			-.144	40	-.054	40
Lawatsch (1987)	.020	72			.121	72
Lee et al.(2000) self-exam	-.193	137	-.018	137		
Lee et al.(2000) sunscreen/clothing	.079	132	.159	132		
Lemieux et al.(94) vivid high fear	.035	51	.043	51		
Lemieux et al.(94) pallid high fear	.117	50	.147	50		
Lemieux et al.(94) vivid low fear	.000	50	.139	50		
Lemieux et al.(94) pallid low fear	.024	50	.014	50		

Looker (1983)	.016	233	.017	233	-.017	227
Lord (1994)	.209	120			-.110	120
Maheswaran & Meyers-Levy (1990)	.045	98	.001	98		
Martin & Lawson (1998)	.045	177	-.143	177		
McArdle (1972)	-.082	80			-.077	80
Meyerowitz & Chaiken (1987)	-.296	44	-.203	91	-.296	44
Mitchell (2001)	-.009	125	-.004	125	-.017	125
Radecki (1997)			.007	125	-.031	385
Rothman et al. (1999) E2 detection			-.238	60	-.369	60
Rothman et al. (1999) E2 prevention			.162	60	.202	60
Schmitt (2004)	-.172	150	-.032	150	.040	150
Sheer (1995) threat-L	.154	205	.032	205		
Sheer (1995) threat-S	.233	205	.121	205		
Shiv airline on-time	.173	119	-.088	215		
Shiv airline on-time and amenities	-.110	215	.034	95		
Shiv detergent	-.123	287	-.098	93		
Smith (1996)	.049	390	.051	390		
Thorsteinson & Highhouse (2003) E1	.524	69	.643	70		
Thorsteinson & Highhouse (2003) E2	.313	100	.573	100		
Turner (2004)	.014	256	.029	246		
Tykocinski et al. (1994)			.038	39	.019	39
van Assema et al. (2001) low-fat	-.004	77	.073	75		
van Assema et al. (2001) fruit&veg	.088	69	.048	66		
Vasilias (1999)	-.054	270	.041	270		
Wenburg (1969)	.034	532	-.009	532		
Yates (1982) solar-isolated	-.035	58	-.090	58	-.044	58
Yates (1982) solar-integrated	.042	57	.120	57	.307	58
Yates (1982) insulation-isolated	-.236	30	-.053	30	-.131	31
Yates (1982) insulation-integrated	-.020	28	-.397	28	-.141	26
Ying (2001) concrete	.000	140	-.024	140		
Ying (2001) abstract	.060	140	.071	140		
depicted threat severity (de Hoog et al., 2007)						
Allen (1993)			.124	236	.182	236
Beck & Lund (1981)			.233	77	.318	72
Burnet (1981)	.418	78	.300	78		
Cameron & Leventhal (1995)			.153	127	.265	124
Dabbs & Leventhal (1966)			.119	134	.177	134
Das et al. (2003) one	.070	177	.050	177		
Das et al. (2003) two	.005	111	.055	111	.000	111
Das et al. (2003) three	.075	121	.060	121	.000	121
de Hoog et al. (2004) one	.055	104	.030	104		

de Hoog et al. (2004) two	-.035	123	.010	123		
de Hoog et al. (2004) three	.158	126	.060	126	.153	126
Dembrowski et al. (1978) one	.000	84			.000	84
Dembrowski et al. (1978) two	.172	181			.000	181
Dziokonski & Weber (1977)	.050	181	.251	181		
Evans et al. (1970)			.000	150	.000	150
Griffeth & Rogers (1976)			.000	144	.681	144
Kantola et al. (1983)	-.158	171	.000	171		
Keesling & Friedman (1995)	.104	136	.114	136	.109	136
Kirscht & Haefner (1973)			.000	84	.010	84
Kohn et al. (1982)	.104	254			.000	254
Krisher et al. (1973)			.000	60	.000	60
Leventhal & Niles (1964)			.172	120	.015	144
Leventhal & Watts (1966)			.000	116	-.075	84
Leventhal et al. (1965)	0.233	148	0.153	144	-0.07	60
Leventhal et al. (1966)	.196	258	.114	256	.075	417
Leventhal et al. (1967)			.256	106	.050	106
Liberman & Chaiken (1992)	.403	175	.367	175		
Neuwirth et al. (2000)			.191	206	.292	206
Ramirez & Lasater (1976)			.000	462	.000	462
Ramirez & Lasater (1977)			.045	204	.114	204
Rogers & Deckner (1975) one	.224	119	.143	119	.000	119
Rogers & Deckner (1975) two	.158	159	.201	160	.000	160
Rosen et al. (1982)			.000	102	.000	102
Rozelle et al. (1973)			.035	394	.000	394
Siero et al. (1984)	.000	178	.000	178	.025	178
Smart & Fejer (1974) two	.479	194	.485	194		
Steffen et al. (1994)	.109	138	.000	138	.000	138
Struckman-Johnson et al. (1994)			.283	171	.040	171
Sutton & Hallet (1988)			.129	74	.279	74
Sutton & Hallet (1989)			.359	122	.134	122
Wurtele & Maddux (1987)			.050	160	.055	160
cultural value adaptation (Hornikx & O'Keefe, 2009)						
Gregory & Munch 1997 automobile	.034	316	.052	316		
Gregory & Munch 1997 gelatin	.004	316	.047	316		
Gregory et al. 2002 Colombia toothbrush	-.063	135	-.041	135		
Gregory et al. 2002 Colombia t-shirt	-.010	135	.056	135		
Gregory et al. 2002 Colombia watch	-.120	135	-.063	135		
Gregory et al. 2002 US toothbrush	-.147	141	.041	141		
Gregory et al. 2002 US t-shirt	-.071	141	.151	141		

Gregory et al. 2002 US watch	.139	141	.341	141		
Gunaratne 2000 New Zealand	.267	140	.307	140		
Gunaratne 2000 Sri Lanka	.279	140	.317	140		
Han & Shavitt 1994 Korea clothes iron	.251	64	.394	64		
Han & Shavitt 1994 Korea detergent	.263	64	.394	64		
Han & Shavitt 1994 US chewing gum	.327	64	.377	64		
Han & Shavitt 1994 US clothes iron	.296	64	.292	64		
Han & Shavitt 1994 US detergent	.312	64	.256	64		
Han & Shavitt 1994 US running shoes	.345	64	.351	64		
Hoeken et al. 2003 combined Netherlands	.145	177	.157	76		
Hoeken et al. 2003 combined Spain	-.152	184	-.268	75		
Kirk 2003	-.097	24	-.078	24		
Lepkowska-White et al. (2003) US collectivistic	-.059	275	.068	275		
Lepkowska-White et al. (2003) US functional	-.174	278	-.214	278		
Sanderse 2004 Netherlands camera	-.183	80	-.040	81		
Sanderse 2004 Netherlands mp3 player	-.207	92	-.039	93		
Sanderse 2004 UK camera	.042	78	.185	81		
Sanderse 2004 UK mp3 player	-.049	73	-.227	78		
Van Hartingsveldt 2004 added attributes Belgium	.319	50	-.302	50		
Van Hartingsveldt 2004 added attributes Netherlands	-.111	50	-.172	50		
Van Hartingsveldt 2004 product attributes Belgium	-.017	50	-.168	50		
Van Hartingsveldt 2004 product attributes Netherlands	.219	50	-.095	50		
Y. Zhang et al. 1996 China camera	.574	80			.326	80
Y. Zhang et al. 1996 China toothbrush	.125	80			-.302	80
Y. Zhang et al. 1996 US camera	.067	80			.025	80
Y. Zhang et al. 1996 US toothbrush	.431	80			.275	80
threat appeal strength (Witte & Allen, 2000)						
Bang (1993)	.043	371	-.052	371		
Beach (1966)			.197	166	.137	166
Beck (1981)			.000	80	.000	80

Burnett (1981)	.157	161	.194	161		
Carey (1990)	.000	127	.000	127		
Dzionkowski (1977)	.062	181	.050	181		
Evans (1970)			.074	394	.074	394
Griffeth (1976)			.000	144	.706	144
Hale (1995)	.175	200	.200	200		
Keesling (1990)	.000	24	.000	24	.000	24
Kirscht (1973)			.183	120	.183	120
Krisher (1973)	.299	40	.150	40	.289	40
LaTour (1996)	.161	305	.186	305		
Lemieux (1995)	.155	200	.075	200		
Leventhal (1964)	.051	379	.051	379		
Leventhal62 (1966)	.160	410	.091	410		
Leventhal118 (1966)	.103	493	.034	493		
Leventhal (1967)			.261	103	.195	103
Ramirez (1976)			.000	926	.117	926
Ramirez (1977)			.120	204	.145	204
Rogers (1970)	.220	80	.316	80		
Rogers (1975)	.165	160	.211	160	.000	75
Stout (1994/1995)	.000	95	.000	95	.000	95
Sutton (1984)			.420	138	.460	138
Weinstein (1990)			.550	271	.310	271
Witte (1994)	-.090	138	.010	134	.090	54
Witte (1995)	.000	123	.000	123	.000	92
Witte (1998)	.020	100	.071	100	.127	100
sidedness (O'Keefe, 1999)						
Ahlawat 1990 refuted	-.053	264	.029	258		
Ahlawat 1990 unrefuted	-.059	264	-.081	258		
Belch 1981	-.026	230	-.066	230		
Cho 1995 computer	.068	148	.016	148		
Cho 1995 coffee	.057	148	-.007	148		
Crowley 1990 Study 1	-.519	175	-.408	175		
Crowley 1990 Study 2	-.519	104	-.527	104		
Etgar & Goodwin 1982	.082	120	.351	120		
Ferguson & Jackson 1982	-.100	394	-.058	372		
Ferrari & Leippe 1992	.112	98	.134	98	.064	42
Gardner & Levin 1982	-.223	40	-.261	40		
Hunt & Smith 1987	-.279	150	-.151	150		
Jones 1987	.113	120	-.105	120		
Kamins refutational	.266	192	.229	192		
Kamins 1989	.360	77	.249	77		
Kamins, Brand, Hoeke, & Moe 1989	.307	52	.273	52		

Ley messages	.191	180			.264	46
Smith, Morrison et al. 1994	-.042	103			-.066	103
Swanson 1983 1987 automobile	.091	311	.002	311		
Swanson 1983 1987 car wax	.047	311	.038	311		
Swinyard 1981	-.123	155			-.037	1000
Winkel 1984			.051	189	.060	193
depicted threat vulnerability (de Hoog et al., 2007)						
Beck & Lund (1981)			.075	77	.075	72
Cameron & Leventhal (1995)			-.060	127	-.060	124
Das et al. (2003) one	.172	177	.247	177		
Das et al. (2003) two	.224	111	.557	111	.399	111
Das et al. (2003) three	.060	121	.270	121	.261	121
de Hoog et al. (2004) one	.035	104	.274	104		
de Hoog et al. (2004) two	.030	123	.305	123		
de Hoog et al. (2004) three	-.085	126	.363	126	.292	126
de Hoog et al. (2005a)	.104	124	.322	124	.359	124
de Hoog et al. (2005b)	-.040	120	.387	120	.359	120
de Hoog et al. (2005c)	-.020	279	.447	279	.371	279
Griffeth & Rogers (1976)			.000	144	-.085	144
Leventhal & Niles (1964)			.172	171	.035	151
Leventhal & Watts (1966)			.000	161	-.119	134
Liberman & Chaiken (1992)	-.339	175	.055	175		
Neuwirth et al. (2000)			.065	206	.065	206
Reed & Aspinwall (1998)	-.168	66			-.177	66
Siero et al. (1984)	.000	178	.000	178	.020	178
Wurtele & Maddux (1987)			.313	160	.134	160
Wurtele (1988)			.355	80	.343	80
humor (Walter et al., 2018)						
Belch & Belch (1984)	.348	184	.074	184		
Brooker (1981)	.128	160	.079	160		
Chan (2011)	.060	254	.075	254		
Chattopadhyay & Basu (1990)	.178	80	.321	80	.022	80
Chung & Zhao (2011)	.310	162	.328	162		
Conway & Dube (2002)	.167	136	.022	136		
Duncan & Nelson (1985)	.217	138	.057	138		
Jin & Villegas (2007)	.313	185	.380	185		
McGraw, Schiro & Fernbach- study 2	-.121	64	-.113	64		
Nabi (2015)	-.143	248	-.014	248	-.050	248
O'Quin & Aronoff (1981)	.153	252			.129	252
Peng (2015)a-thesis	-.456	204	-.447	204		

Pressgrove, McKeever & Collins 2015	.221	101	.406	101		
Yoon & Mayer (2014)	-.054	343	.042	343		
Yoon & Tinkham study 1 (2013)	.546	88	-.240	88		
Yoon & Tinkham study 2 (2013)	-.154	390	-.070	390		
Yoon (2010)-dissertation	.088	100	-.100	100		
Yoon (2015a)	-.335	100	-.100	100		
Zhang & Zinkhan (2006)	.527	240	.143	240		
Zhang (1996a)	.421	240	.253	240		
ividness (Blondé & Girandola, 2016)						
Amos & Spears (a) 2010	.182	220	.191	220		
Amos & Spears (b) 2010	.433	84	.414	84		
Amos & Spears (c) 2010	.605	53	.387	53		
Blonde & Girandola (a) 2015	.261	42	.351	42		
Blonde & Girandola (b) 2015	.261	93	.292	93		
Blonde & Girandola (c) 2015	.220	77	.229	77		
Blonde & Girandola (d) 2015	-.010	142	-.055	142		
Burns, Biswas, & Babina 1993	.163	377	.148	377		
Ci 2008	.129	445	.095	445		
He(a) 2008	.309	56	-.124	56		
He(b) 2008	.201	96	.030	96		
He (c) 2008	.020	111	.075	111		
Macklin, Bruvold, & Shea 1985	.045	127	.050	127		
Nagaraj 2007	.429	160	.559	160		
Petrova & Cialdini 2005	.070	135	.060	135		
Stafford (a) 1996	.100	80	.134	80		
Stafford (b) 1996	.085	89	.201	89		
depicted response efficacy (Witte & Allen, 2000)						
Brouwer (1993)			.079	155	.079	155
Dabbs (1966)			.000	182	.000	182
Leventhal (1965)	.220	141	.220	141		
Rogers (1970)	.220	80	.261	80		
Rogers (1975)	.000	160	.122	160	.242	75
Smalec (1996)	.510	44	.670	44		
Stanley (1986)			.510	195	.105	195
Sutton (1984)			.420	138	.200	138
Witte (1994)	.500	138	.320	134	.430	54
Witte (1998)	.315	100	.253	100	.290	100
Wurtele (1987)			.000	160	.000	160

Wurtele (1988)			.077	89	.000	89
depicted self-efficacy (Witte & Allen, 2000)						
Beck (1981)			.692	80	.396	80
Brouwers (1993)			.079	155	.079	155
Dabbs (1966)			.000	182	.000	182
Leventhal (1965)	.220	141	.220	141		
Smalec (1996)	.510	44	.670	44		
Stanley (1986)			.410	195	.105	195
Witte (1994)	.500	138	.320	134	.430	54
Witte (1998)	.315	100	.253	100	.290	100
Wurtele (1987)			.000	160	.000	160
Wurtele (1988)			.077	89	.000	89
narrative vs. non-narrative (Shen, Sheer, & Li, 2015)						
Dunlop, Wakefield, and Kashima (2010) Study 2	.132	82	.024	82		
Gray and Harrington (2011) gain messages	-.101	134	.012	134		
Gray and Harrington (2011) Loss messages	.028	141	.141	141		
Greene and Brinn (2003)			.071	100	-.037	100
Hopfer (2011) Peer			.006	253	.129	253
Hopfer (2011) Peer/Expert			.017	253	.194	253
Hopfer (2011) Expert			-.003	253	-.173	253
Kreuter et al. (2010)			.123	489	.100	489
Volkman and Parrott (2012) Study 3, 1st hand	.163	153	.147	153		
Volkman and Parrott (2012) Study 3, 2nd hand	.264	153	.164	153		
sexual ad content (Lull & Bushman, 2015)						
Bello, Pitts, and Etzel (1983)	-.129	217	.095	217		
Dudley (1999)	.030	378	.143	378		
LaTour and Henthorne (1994)	-.153	199	-.238	199		
Lynn (1995)	-.206	243	-.163	243		
Putrevu (2008) Study 1	-.055	103	.080	103		
Putrevu (2008) Study 2	-.045	99	.060	99		
Simpson, Horton, and Brown (1996)	-.109	341	-.104	341		

recommendation specificity (O'Keefe, 2002)						
Greene 1992 Passage-A	-.069	252	-.089	252		
Greene 1992 Passage-B	.004	240	.028	240		
Leventhal, Singer, & Jones 1965	.113	148	-.055	144	.337	59
Nova 1990 specificity			-.022	111	.176	111
Stout & Sego 1994a Study 1	.107	116	-.097	116		
Stout & Sego 1994a Study 2	-.148	95	-.246	95		
conclusion explicitness (O'Keefe, 2002)						
Biddle 1966	.372	160			.462	160
Chebat et al 2001 ATM card	-.200	57	-.038	57		
Chebat et al 2001 student loan	.152	55	-.100	55		
Nova 1990 omission			.061	163	.045	163
Sawyer & Howard 1991	-.203	360	-.143	344	-.080	360
metaphor (Van Stee, 2018)						
Chang & Yen (2013) Study 1	.380	408	.240	408		
Chang & Yen (2013) Study 2	.240	312	.230	312		
Jeong (2008)	.160	261	.110	261		
Van Stee, Noar, & Harrington (2013)	-.180	362	-.060	362		
pictorial vs. text warnings (Noar et al., 2016)						
Golmier (2007) [40]	.210	186	.119	186		
Malouf (2012) [69]			.247	56	.080	56
Racela (2012) [72]	.129	205	.215	205		
Sabbane (2009a) [73]	.335	168	.070	168		
negative political advertising (Lau et al., 2007)						
Brader 2005	.070	286	-.070	286		
Lau & Redlawsk 2005	.020	407			-.030	407
Shen & Wu 2002	.270	150	.270	150		
argument completeness (O'Keefe, 1998)						
Gill et al. 1988	.064	109	.005	109		
Kavanoor et al. 1997 Study 2	.303	98	.282	98		
Knouse 1983 [argument completeness]	.174	98	.247	98		
guilt (O'Keefe, 2000)						

Coulter & Pinto 1995	-.412	60	-.166	60		
Dembroski & Pennebaker 1972 Study 1			-.271	41	.000	41
Zemach 1966	-.157	124			.049	85
exemplar vs. no-exemplar (Bigman, Bigby, & Martinez Gonzales, 2018)						
El-Khoury & Shafer (2016)	.891	117	.871	117		
Gray & Harrington (2011)	.451	345	.749	345		
information-source citation (O'Keefe, 1998)						
Berger 1998 final study	.169	180	.110	180		
narrative vs. statistical evidence (Zebregs et al., 2015)						
Gray & Harrington (2011)	-.028	345	.075	345		

2. Reference citations for meta-analyses from which the effect sizes were drawn

Bigman, C. A., Bigsby, E., & Martinez Gonzalez, A. (2018, May). *A meta-analysis of the effects of exemplars on emotional, attitudinal, and behavioral intention responses to messages* [Paper presentation]. International Communication Association Annual Conference, Prague, Czech Republic.

Blondé, J., & Girandola, F. (2016). Revealing the elusive effects of vividness: A meta-analysis of empirical evidences assessing the effect of vividness on persuasion. *Social Influence, 11*(2), 111-129. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15534510.2016.1157096>

De Hoog, N., Stroebe, W., & de Wit, J. (2007). The impact of vulnerability to and severity of a health risk on processing and acceptance of fear-arousing communications: A meta-analysis. *Review of General Psychology, 11*(3), 258-285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.11.3.258>

Hornikx, J., & O'Keefe, D. J. (2009). Adapting consumer advertising appeals to cultural values: A meta-analytic review of effects on persuasiveness and ad liking. *Annals of the International Communication Association, 33*(1), 39-71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2009.11679084>

Lau, R. R., Sigelman, L., & Rovner, I. B. (2007). The effects of negative political campaigns: A meta-analytic reassessment. *Journal of Politics, 69*(4), 1176-1209. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2508.2007.00618.x>

Lull, R. B., & Bushman, B. J. (2015). Do sex and violence sell? A meta-analytic review of the effects of sexual and violent media and ad content on memory, attitudes, and buying intentions. *Psychological Bulletin, 141*(5), 1022-1048. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000018>

Noar, S. M., Hall, M. G., Francis, D. B., Ribisl, K. M., Pepper, J. K., & Brewer, N. T. (2016). Pictorial cigarette pack warnings: A meta-analysis of experimental studies. *Tobacco Control, 25*, 341-354. <https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2014-051978>

O'Keefe, D. J. (1998). Justification explicitness and persuasive effect: A meta-analytic review of the effects of varying support articulation in persuasive messages. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 35*(2), 61-75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00028533.1998.11951621>

O'Keefe, D. J. (1999). How to handle opposing arguments in persuasive messages: A meta-analytic review of the effects of one-sided and two-sided messages. *Annals of the International Communication Association, 22*(1), 209-249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.1999.11678963>

O'Keefe, D. J. (2000). Guilt and social influence. *Annals of the International Communication Association, 23*(1), 67-101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2000.11678970>

O'Keefe, D. J. (2002). The persuasive effects of variation in standpoint articulation. In F. H. van Eemeren (Ed.), *Advances in pragma-dialectics* (pp. 65-82). Sic Sat.

O'Keefe, D. J., & Jensen, J. D. (2006). The advantages of compliance or the disadvantages of noncompliance? A meta-analytic review of the relative persuasive effectiveness of gain-framed and loss-framed messages. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 30(1), 1-43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2006.11679054>

Shen, F., Sheer, V. C., & Li, R. (2015). Impact of narratives on persuasion in health communication: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Advertising*, 44(2), 105-113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2015.1018467>

Van Stee, S. K. (2018). Meta-analysis of the persuasive effects of metaphorical vs. literal messages. *Communication Studies*, 69(5), 545-566. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2018.1457553>

Walter, N., Cody, M. J., Xu, L. Z., & Murphy, S. T. (2018). A priest, a rabbi, and a minister walk into a bar: A meta-analysis of humor effects on persuasion. *Human Communication Research*, 44(4), 343-373. <https://doi.org/10.1093/hcr/hqy005>

Witte, K., & Allen, M. (2000). A meta-analysis of fear appeals: Implications for effective public health programs. *Health Education and Behavior*, 27(5), 591-615. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109019810002700506>

Zebregs, S., van den Putte, B., Neijens, P., & de Graaf, A. (2015). The differential impact of statistical and narrative evidence on beliefs, attitude, and intention: A meta-analysis. *Health Communication*, 30(3), 282-289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2013.842528>