

Advertisement do more harm than good – essay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The Instigator Pro (for) melorules Losing 0 Points The Contender

Con (against) DanT Winning 4 Points -----

Advertisements do more harm than good Add to My FavoritesReport this

DebateShare with My Friends Do you like this debate? NoYes+2 Vote Here

----- Top of Form | | Pro| Tied| Con| | Who did you

agree with before the debate? | | | | Who did you agree with after the

debate? | | | | Who had better conduct? | | | | Who had better spelling and

grammar? | | | | Who made more convincing arguments? | | | | Who used the

most reliable sources? | | | | Reasons for your voting decision 500 Characters

Remaining Bottom of Form The voting period for this debate does not end.

Started:| 9/22/2011| Category:| Entertainment| Updated:| 3 months ago|

Status:| Voting Period| Viewed:| 472 times| Debate No:| 18434| Debate

Rounds (4) Comments (4) Votes (1) ProAdvertising has grown to be an

industry worth many billions of dollars across the world. Almost all public

space has some advertisements in sight and all forms of media, from

newspapers to the Internet, are also filled with adverts.

Whilst this helps companies sell their produces, and helps consumers to

learn what is on offer, many believe that this huge amount of advertising can

be harmful. It may make people want too much, or things that they cannot

have, or it might make them feel inadequate when they don't have

something. Research shows that children can be particularly open to these

kinds of risk. Throughout the last 10 years levels of advertisements have

raised to ridicules levels. Every ten minuets on T. V you see about four

advertisements for cosmetics, fast food, and many other things.

Throughout this debate I will discuss how advertisements are directed towards gullible kids, stress that they can cause, and how it puts small businesses at a disadvantage. Report this Argument
Con
Advertisement is a essential tool for small businesses to get off the ground, and compete with larger companies. Research on Monkeys have shown that Primates in general envy other primates as a survival mechanism, advertisements simply play on already existing sentiments, and inform the viewer of the product available. Children are most open to advertisements, because they are most open to envy and other emotions.

Unlike working adults, they have not yet matured, and it's the parent's job to help them mature mentally, and emotionally, it is the company's job to promote, and sell their product. Through out this debate I will focus on how Small businesses rely on advertisements, and how advertisements are not at fault for envy. Report this Argument | | Pro
My opponent says that “ Advertisement is a essential tool for small businesses to get off the ground. ” most small businesses can not afford advertisements and even if they do, do they make a difference?

A study put two advertisements in a paper for the same product with a large well known company putting it as 5% off and the not well know putting the same product at 50% off, 30 percent more people went to large business then the small one. Also my opponent stated that it's the company's job to promote and sell their product. This does not help either of our arguments. Companies manipulate there mind to sell them products that can be harmful, like cigeretes companies make funny logos like Camel and that makes kids think that it is “ cool” to smoke.

<https://assignbuster.com/advertisement-do-more-harm-than-good-essay/>

The brain is not fully mature until 21 years old and by then people will have seen millions of advertisements. At some point they will look at something bad for their body and think that they should do it because somehow the company made the picture appealing or the kids can connect to in some way. I look forward to your next posting. Report this ArgumentConMy

Opponent claims small businesses “ can’t afford advertisements”, but I never said a business had to pay for ads initially, flyers are advertisements, and can be printed relatively cheap, there are also relatively cheap web advertisements.

My opponent claims that the larger Business achieves 30% more customers from advertisements than smaller businesses, but he fails to mention, the customers who decided to go to the new businesses, use to be the customers of the older business. Every business has to start somewhere, and compete against much larger companies, who have already earned and maintained a good reputation. Taking away the right to advertise your business would not give the smaller business the edge, it would only act as a speed bump to the smaller company.

My opponent has made the claim that “ the company’s job to promote and sell their product” has no relevance to the debate, however is just as every bit as relevant as the child’s role in the debate. A salesman’s job is to sell the product. If a salesman tells you, “ buy X-deodorant is smells like x” but than says, “ it leaves a messy stain on your clothes”, how many people will buy the product? To the same degree, say they just came out with a toothpaste capable of restoring tooth enamel, how any would buy the toothpaste over

their current brand, let alone know it can restore enamel, unless they advertise the new product?

No offense intended but my opponent seem to have the idea children are incapable of resisting advertisements, while at the same time being financially dependent enough to be the one writing the check. As I stated before, envy is a survival mechanism in all primates, advertisements only play on preexisting sentiments, thus the only problem would be a fiscal one. I have never met someone who started smoking because of a mascot, I have met someone who have started smoking because of a PSA telling them not to smoke.

Children are defiant, and what they perceive as “cool” more has to do with peers, than it has to do with the media. Peers did not get the idea of what’s cool from advertisements either, more or less they got the idea from watching role models do it; for example an older brother, an uncle, or someone they see on the street who looks and acts “cool”. They are not fully matured until 21, and because of that they are more perceptive to envy, lust, and anger but they outgrow that, just as they outgrow crying in a store, or yelling in a movie theater. I look forward to seeing your counter argument.

Report this Argument | ProThank you for responding. The argument is if advertisements do more harm than good, not if adverts should go away, which they never will. Also When you say that fliers are a cheap way of advertising you are right but few people look at them. I know I speak for a lot of people when I say that if someone leaves a flier at my front door, I throw it

away. Also advertising leads to many people being overwhelmed by the endless need to decide between competing demands on their attention – this is known as the tyranny of choice or choice overload.

Recent research suggests that people are on average less happy than they were 30 years ago – despite being better off and having much more choice of things to spend their money on. The claims of adverts crowd in on people, raising expectations about a product and leading to inevitable disappointment after it is bought. Shoppers feel that a poor purchase is their fault for not choosing more wisely, and regret not choosing something else instead. Some people are so overwhelmed that they cannot choose at all. Plus many adverts do more than just advertising products.

Some try to make people feel inferior if they don't have the product, or if they have something which the product would change. Perceptions of beauty and fashion in particular have been terribly distorted. Many young people have low-self esteem, and lead unhealthy lifestyles because they feel they should be thinner and more attractive like the models they see in adverts. This leads to serious problems like eating-disorders and self-harm. Thank you for such a good debate and I look forward to what you say next.

Report this ArgumentConMy opponent says” The argument is if advertisements do more harm than good, not if adverts should go away, which they never will. “, but the reason why advertisements would never go away is because they are essential to the economy, without advertisement, the economy would suffer, as sales would be down, and when sales go down unemployment would increase. When I speak of flyers which my opponent

has agreed is a cheap source of advertisements, I am not speaking of the flyers in the mail, I am talking about the flyers on lamp posts, that people see when on the side walk.

Or flyers handed out in front of the store or restaurant. My opponent has tried to draw a connection between increase in advertisement and increase in discontent, but discontent usually is a result of changes in society, rather than changes in what we buy. For example happiness in 1960's plummeted due to the Vietnam war, and growing discontent, we remained about the same since the 1970's, but we are slightly less unhappy than in the 1970's because of the gradual decline.

After the Vietnam war in 1975, happiness gradually increased until the Early 1980s recession, which lead to a gradual decline. We also had a decline of happiness from the Early 1990s recession, the Early 2000s recession, and the Late-2000s recession. In other words, happiness is related to the state of the economy, not the production of advertisements. My opponent claims that, " Shoppers feel that a poor purchase is their fault for not choosing more wisely, and regret not choosing something else instead. ".

That does not change with a reduction of advertisements, in fact advertisements inform the consumer about the product. Without advertisements less people would know about the better product. Let's say 30 people buy flip phones, while 70 people buy I-phones, without advertisements, 50 would buy I-phones, and 50 would buy flip phones, because 20 people didn't hear about the features of the I-phone. Now when

those 20 people see the people with the I-phone, they would become upset that they did not opt for the I-phone over their flip phone.

My opponent has tried to draw connections between advertisements and the fascination with Skinny models, but the fact of the matter is, the advertisers already play on per-existing sentiments. Centuries ago being over weight was a sign of beauty because it was a sign of wealth, and advertisers used the idea of beauty of the time to sell items. In 19th century a hour glass shape was seen as beautiful by society, and advertisers again used society's idea of beauty to sell products. In more recent years skinny is seen as beautiful, so advertisers, use what SOCIETY has said is beautiful, in order to SELL products.

If 80% of people decided to go out and get dread locks, than a month later an actor decides to go along with the fad, would you believe the actor started the fad, or would you believe he hopped on the band wagon? The fact of the matter is, Advertisements are meant to SELL products. Selling the product means they have to APPEAL to society. In order for advertisements to appeal to society they need to use the per-existing ideals SOCIETY has created, and they must be able to use PER-EXISTING sentiments to their advantage.

Report this Argument| | Promelorules forfeited this round. ConTo summarize, the job of the advertiser is to use preexisting sentiments of society, to sell products. Advertisements is essential to small businesses, and advertisements help inform customers of products, as well as the products' new features. Without advertisements sales would suffer, and so would the

economy. When the economy suffers so does the general happiness of the population. Advertisements do more good, than harm| |