

A Work Project, presented as part of the requirements for the Award of a Master in  
Management from the NOVA – School of Business and Economics.

# **TV advertisement and Social Networks: an empirical study with young adults**

Luca Sigot, n° 1050

## **Booklet I**

A Project carried out on the Children Consumer Behavior course

Under the supervision of:

**Professor Luisa Agante**

**Professor Michele Quintano**

21/01/2013

## ABSTRACT

The aim of this research is to investigate the possible synergies between TV commercials and a brand Facebook profile. Different executional cues were tested to determine which one could create the greatest awareness of a brand profile and if, by choosing one cue over another, the intention to visit a brand profile could be influenced too. The experiment involved 400 young adults who were invited to watch a video online and, subsequently, to complete a survey. Results suggest that while the different cues were able to create different level of awareness, no effect could be observed on the intention to visit the brand profile.

**Keywords:** Cross-media synergies, executional cues, Young Adults, brand Facebook profile

## INTRODUCTION

Cross media campaigns are promotions that employ two or more communication vehicles. The aim of this typology of strategies is to create synergies, whereby the overall persuasion effect exceeds the sum of the single media effects (*Caywood, Schultz, & Wang, 1991; Naik & Raman, 2003 not in the references list*). The current dominant trend is moving away from the assumption that advertising effectiveness equals the simple media exposure and is inquiring about the role of media integration and media engagement (*Calder & Malthouse, 2005*). Since especially in the last decade new media have been introduced to the general public, several studies (*Ha & Chan-Olmsted, 2004; Trappey & Woodside, 2005; Wang, 2011*) have already started to investigate whether the new and the traditional media could be linked to obtain synergetic effects.

The aim of this study is to explore if by combining the TV commercials and the brand Facebook profiles there is some potential to achieve synergies. This has been done in two steps. At first it was investigated whether TV viewers could recognize and remember the invitation made in a commercial to visit the brand profile on the social network. Given that the majority of commercials are nowadays using several different executional cues to reach this objective, this study tends to verify which cue among the most utilized are used in the advertising world. As a further step, it was analyzed if those cues could also elicit different level of willingness to visit the brand Facebook profile.

## LITERATURE REVIEW AND FORMULATION OF AN HYPOTHESIS

Cross media campaigns are promotions that employ two or more communication vehicles. The aim of this typology of strategies is to create synergies, whereby the overall persuasion effect exceeds the sum of the single media effects (*Caywood, Schultz, & Wang, 1991; Naik & Raman, 2003*).

Today the vast majority of advertising campaigns are designed to reach consumers through several different media (*Bronner, Neijens & Van Raaij 2003*), but while advertisers are fervent to boost audiences' media experiences with cross-channel integration (*Ha & Chan-Olmsted, 2004; Trappey & Woodside, 2005; Wang, 2006b*), this field has received relatively little attention, since the prevailing focus has been the research on single medium campaigns (*Feichtinger, Hartl & Sethi, 1994*). Different sources of synergies have been identified over the years. Historically, the first one that had been under study was the repetition effect, followed by the positive effect of transmitting the same message through different sources. In the last decade the focus has been shifted to the integration of the different media, taking into account especially the various media engagements.

### The repetition effect

The repetition effect is the result of a repeated exposure of the same advertisement (*Pechmann & Stewart 1988*). The selective attention theory states that a repetition of the same ad leads to increased attention (*Kahneman, 1973*). This has been proven by several studies to strengthen the attitude toward the brand (*Petty et al., 1983; Chaiken & Maheswaran, 1994*). The side effect of this strategy is that as the consumers are exposed to the same commercial, they eventually reach a point from which they become worn out by it (*Pechmann & Stewart, 1988*). The introduction of a visually new

commercial, even though the approach or concept of the commercial is the same, will revive interest level, increasing significantly the viewer's cognitive response activity (*Grass and Wallace, 1969; McCullough & Ostrom, 1974*).

### **Transmitting the same message through different sources**

Synergies also occur by the simple reason that consumers are exposed to different sources of information. Consumers see the messages as independent bits of information and consider the media exposure as viewing the information from different orientations. Harkins & Petty (*1981a, 1981b, 1987*) were the firsts to conclude that by increasing the number of message sources there was an intensification of the consumer information and processing activity. For *Maheswaran & Chaiken (1991)* the notion that messages from different sources, regarding a brand or a product, could produce a stronger brand or product attitude, is based on the premise that consumers try to make sense of multiple-source messages..

The *Wang and Nelson (2006)* study extended those results, stating that different media, having in the same campaign varied messages for each media, resulted into an increase on consumers' purchase intentions.

*Chatterjee (2011)* observed that in the prior researches, synergy occurred only when media differed in modality or in the number of sensory modes they possessed, and concluded that even a simple variation of quantity and quality of information between relatively similar media is a reliable source of synergies.

*Dijkstra, Buijtsels and Van Raaij (2005)* challenged the concept that a multi-media campaign could be more effective than a single-media promotion. They revealed that multi media campaigns were stimulating more cognitive responses than Internet only campaigns, but they were second to the only TV campaigns. In their conclusion,

however, they recognized that in their experiment the participants in the TV-only group had been exposed three times, while the participants in the multiple-media group were only forced to see the ad once.

*Chang and Thorson (2004)* in their laboratory experiment found that exposing viewers once to TV and once to Web did produce an effect that was superior to exposing the viewer twice to the same media. To them cross media led not only to higher attention, higher perceived message credibility and a greater number of total and positive thoughts, but also to higher processing level than did repetition. The greater numbers of positive thoughts were generated by perceived brand credibility and message credibility, which resulted from the combined influence of both cognitive and social psychological factors.

### **The integration of the different media**

Media planners and advertising agencies need to grasp the strengths and weaknesses of each media so to successfully transmit a message in a cross media campaign advertisers. Of vital importance is a deep understanding about the process information intrinsic to each media (*Buchholz and Smith, 1991; Vakratsas and Ambler, 1999*) and the engagement level offered.

Synergy, in this optic, occurs when heterogeneous media with their particular strengths are able to complement each other in a campaign or when the strength of one media compensates for the weakness of another media (*Dijkstra, Buijtels & Van Raaij, 2005*).

A practical example of this concept is provided by *Wang (2007)*. Because of the greater media engagement and integration, consumers perceived stronger message strength from the cross media campaign and displayed a stronger brand attitude. Confirmation

about his results can be retrieved in his later work (*Wang, 2011*), when he additionally detected an improvement also of the attitude towards the media.

*Schultz, Block and Raman (2012)* recently tried to renovate the concept of cross media synergies. They observed that the historical and traditional method of their determination was primarily based on the marketers' expenditures and provided little useful knowledge about the consumers. They argued that, especially in the digital and interactive era, media synergy is as dependent on the actions of consumer as well as what the marketer does. They discovered that even from the consumer perspective synergies were clearly identifiable.

#### **Redirecting from one media to another one**

All those researches underline the role that one or more media held to direct a consumer to another, more engaging media. *Ha and Chan-Olmsted (2001)* were the firsts to study the possibility that the consumer could be redirected. In the specific case, their concern was whether the TV could be a driver to Web visits. Contrary to the expectations, the TV had no significant impact on the time invested on the web site. A different, even contrary, conclusion was reached in their following article (*Ha & Chan-Olmsted, 2001*), where they noticed that cable subscribers visited frequently and for a considerable amount of time their network web site. Those contrasting results between the two studies were explained by the authors as the result of the different designs of the two investigations.

Both studies acknowledged that cross-promotion on TV is to be considered the most important source of awareness for a networks web site; with search engines and peer's recommendations as distant second and third sources. *Deloitte (2012)* recently pointed

out that the order of the driver to a web site is exactly the opposite, with word of mouth being at the first place and TV at the third.

*Calder and Malthouse (2005)*, discovered the existence of 22 different types of engagement possible with the Web media. In a second moment, they widened their research to ascertain how much the print media and the internet media were affecting each other. According to their conclusions, the more printed usage- the stronger online experiences related to online usage become, but it does not correlate otherwise with online usage.

*Trappey and Woodside (2005)* attempted to discover the possibility to use SMS in a cross media strategy. In their findings, a conspicuous part of the respondents reported that they actually followed a TV program as a consequence of having received a SMS prompting them to follow the show, and a small but relevant percentage even admitted to have encouraged friends to behave in the same way.

Even if the simple reception of SMS encouraged viewer to watch an upcoming TV program and significantly increased their abilities to report awareness, SMS was found not suitable to provoke a change in people's attitudes toward the brand. The SMS media appeared to be effective only in the function of redirecting the viewer to the more engaging and effective media.

Indirectly complementing the previous study, *Wouters and Wetzels (2006)* evinced that TV commercial and online advertisements were able to redirect consumers to the SMS media, hence refusing the impossibility that SMS could become the engaging media.

### **Features to enhance redirecting**

What has not been studied until now is which characteristics of one media are effective into redirecting customer to another media. In the specific case, this research will



analyze which feature of a TV commercial are the most entitled to create awareness of the brand Facebook page and if different executional cues will have different impacts on the willingness to visit the brand page on the social network.

There are already studies that have explored the TV advertisement cues, identifying the most effective ones. However, the focus has solely been on the brand itself, and not on other informative elements, like a fair trade logo, a sponsorship to the Olympic Games or, as it will be under evaluation on this study, the link to the brand Facebook profile.

### **Logo VS text**

From the branding literature, it can be deduced that visual symbols are an effective tool to communicate with customers (*MacInnis et al., 1999*). Generally, symbols can convey more substantial benefits than text or names (*Park et al., 2012*).

Esthetically attractive symbols promote favorable attitude formation and memory retrieval by enabling brands to become more prominent and vivid in the consumers' minds (*Fischer et al., 1991; Henderson & Cote, 1998*). Furthermore they stimulate strong affective and behavioral responses (*Bloch, 1995*). Nonetheless, *Chandon et al. (2003)* found the presence of the image not producing any significant impact.

RQ 1: The Facebook logo has a higher positive impact on the awareness of the link to the brand Facebook page than the text reference.

### **Audio VS video**

Studies about television communication (*Gunter, 1983; Katz, Adoni, & Parness, 1977*) pointed out that the dominant information is generally carried by audio channels, while the transmission of visual information is relegated to a secondary and subordinate role.

Confirmation of the primacy of the audio mode over the video mode was offered by *Kyffin (1988)*, who discerned that the former stimulation prevailed over the latter in terms of easiness to remember. *Grimes (1994)* results contrast with the previous analysis, offering evidence that visual advisories were the most effective in helping viewers to remember and recommended the use of distinctive video to draw the consumer attention. However, since the advent of multitasking, audio is once more regarded as the most effective channel (*Voorveld et al., 2011*).

RQ2: The audio reference to the Facebook page has a higher positive impact on the awareness of the brand Facebook page than the text reference.

RQ3: The audio reference to the Facebook page has a higher positive impact on the awareness of the brand Facebook page than a logo reference.

### **Dual mode**

Dual mode is the execution of both visual and verbal cues. Earlier researches did show a partial effectiveness, although the results were indirectly contrasting. *Gupta and Lord (1998)* witnessed that when the visual clue was prominent, the verbal clue did not add any incremental benefit. *Brennan and Babin (2004)* contemplated that dual mode scored higher level of awareness only when compared to the sole visual modality, but not against the verbal-only modality. However, more recent researches (*Romaniuk, 2008; Romaniuk & Lock, 2008; Romaniuk, 2009*) supported the hypothesis that dual mode produced a stronger impact on viewers that the sum of the two cues would achieve separately, not only in forced –viewing environments, such experimental designs, but also in natural-viewing conditions.

RQ4: Dual mode, or the presence of both visual and verbal cues of the link to the Facebook page, has a greater impact on the awareness of the brand Facebook page than any of the audio/video only mode.

### **Duration**

Duration as an executional clue has been researched over the years with different outcomes. The first to assess its impact were *Stewart and Furse (1986)*, who did not find any correlation between the variable and the level of consumer awareness. In *Stewart and Koslow (1989)* the authors reached the same conclusion: more branding does not mean more effective branding. More recently *Romaniuk (2008)* at first seemed to converge at the same verdict, but in *Romaniuk and Lock (2008)* it was discovered that positive effects on awareness became statistically significant if the logo appeared in the TV commercial for more than 10 seconds and seemed to be the most efficient executional clue.

Therefore:

RQ 5: The duration of the link to the Facebook page has the strongest positive impact on the awareness of the brand Facebook profile.

Finally, this study will investigate whether by using different executional cues TV commercial could redirect the viewers to the Social Networks, creating in this way significant synergies. Since the different executional cues do have different impacts on the consumers, it is expected that choosing a given clue, it will also vary the level of intention to visit the Brand Facebook profile.

RQ6: Different executional cues have a different impact on the intention to visit the Brand Facebook profile.

## **Methodology**

The population we chose to study was the young adults. The literature has different definitions of this population age range, with the upper limit ranging from the age of 24 years to the age of 36 years. We adopted the most used definition of Young Adults from *Freedman et al. (2012)*, since it appears to be the most common in practice, and which defines them as people aged between 18 and 25 years old,.

## **Proceeding**

The experiment was designed in order to deliver a natural experience of TV viewing (*Chang & Thorson, 2004; Dijkstra et al., 2005; Voorveld, Neijens & Smith, 2011*). We requested each participant to watch a short collection of news. They were divided into 5 groups, one for each stimulus under study. All groups were exposed to a total of three news stories, with a cluster of four commercials inserted between the second and the third stories. The first new story was related to the revived interest in Japan of the traditional national game in the younger generation, while the second one described the addiction fighting through the use of sports. The third and last news story reported the results of the Unicef educational program in Sri-Lanka. All the news stories were in English and taken from the CNN or BBC channels.

For the commercial cluster, special attention was paid to avoid the bias existing from prior knowledge of a brand or commercial, proven to influence people's information processing and message elaboration (*Celsi and Olson 1988; Yang et al., 2004*). Adhering to the procedure established by antecedent studies on the topics (*Chang &*

*Thorson, 2004; Voorveld, Neijens & Smith, 2012*), the possible bias was minimized with the adoption of commercial with unfamiliar brands. Only North American and Eastern commercials brands were deployed in the experiment. The brands were not advertised in Europe and a manipulation check revealed that none of the participants had seen the ads before. The TV commercials were in English and lasted about 30s. Following *Voorveld et al. (2012)* methodology the target commercial (Exel) was shown in the third position. The stimuli were placed in the commercial in the following way:

For the text reference, a written invitation “Follow us on Facebook.com/Exel” was added in the top right of the screen. The duration of the text coincided with the last scene of the commercial and lasted 2.11 seconds started at minute 5.34 of the entire video. The actual screenshot can be seen in the Annex, Fig. 1.

For the logo reference, a symbol of Facebook was placed in the bottom right of the screen, appearing in the commercial only for the final 2.11 seconds and started at minute 5.34 of the entire video. The actual screenshot can be seen in Annex, Fig. 2.

For the audio reference, a female voiceover invited the viewers to “Follow us on Facebook”. The sentence had length of 2.25 seconds, and started at minute 5.33. The actual screenshot can be seen in the Annex, Fig. 3.

The Dual mode variable was the simple combination of the logo reference and the audio reference. Finally, to test the duration cues, the Facebook symbol employed in the logo reference was shown for the whole duration of the commercial (of 30 seconds), which started at the 5.06 minute of the video.

## Variables

### Attention to the commercial

The attention to the commercial was measured with *Bulchoz (1991)* and *Lacziak (1993)* methodology. The participants were required to answer five different questions, evaluating the answers with 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The questions were: “How much attention did you pay to the third (Exel) commercial?”, “How much did you notice the third (Exel) commercial?”, “How much thought did you put into evaluating the third (Exel) commercial?”, “How much were you involved with the third (Exel) commercial”, “How much did you concentrate on the third (Exel) commercial?”.

In order not to create too much awareness about the target commercial in the participants and distorting the results of this study, the attention to the commercial cluster was also tested by assessing the attention paid to the Dove commercial (located in the second position).

### Recognition

For the recognition measure, it was employed the methodology developed by *Shapiro et al. (1997)*. Participants were exposed to four different characteristics that could have been showed in the commercials and were asked to select the ad that was in the target commercial. Only one had been actually showed and the other three were shown only as distracters. Specifically, the distracters were the Fair Trade logo, the 2012 Olympic game sponsor logo and a boat logo present in the first commercial.

All distracters needed to be relevant to the buying situation. The distracter ads needed to be sufficiently different from one another and from the target ad in order to make it unlikely that subjects, who actually saw the ad, could not discriminate which variant in the recognition set was the one they saw.

The recognition measure was supplemented by a confidence measure asking subjects to indicate how confident they were in identifying the correct reference (1 = not at all confident; 9 = very confident). With the aim to construct the weighted recognition measure, it was given to the recognition scores a code of 0 if subjects did not correctly identify the target ad and a code of 1 if they did it. This value was then multiplied by the confidence rating response.

#### **Intention to visit the Brand profile on Facebook**

The intention to visit the Brand profile on Facebook was estimated with two different approaches. The first, suggested by *Rise, Kovac, Kraft, and Moan (2008)*, inquired about the general intention, the expectation and the possibility to visit the brand profile. The second, as per *Wong and Capella (2009)*, asked the participants the likeness in a specific time-frame, the following week, to enact this decision. All the responses were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very unlikely) to 5 (very likely).

#### **Facebook usage**

To provide a measure of Facebook usage, participants were asked to estimate their time spent on Facebook as well as how often they checked Facebook (*Junko, 2012*). They were asked, in a first moment, to estimate the time spent on an average day and the time spent the day before. The response options were categorized into five groups: less than 1 hour, 1 to 2 hours, 2 to 3 hours, 3 to 4 hours and more than 4 hours. Similarly, the average number of times they logged in Facebook was also measured both on the daily and on the day before basis. The answers ranged from none to more than 8 times.

#### **Attitude toward brand profiles on Facebook**

The evaluation of this variable was adapted from several previous studies regarding the attitude towards online advertisement (*Pollay & Mittal, 1993; Yang et al., 2004; Azeem & Haq, 2012*). A 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly

agree) was developed for several items chosen from different dimensions of belief including informative (The brand profiles on Facebook are a valuable source of information), materialistic (The brand profiles on Facebook promote a materialistic society), irritating (The brand profiles on Facebook are annoying), consumers' welfare (The brand profiles on Facebook are essential ), hedonic (The brand profiles on Facebook are entertaining and enjoyable), credible (The brand profiles on Facebook are trustworthy and believable), manipulative (The brand profiles on Facebook persuade people to buy things they should not buy), values distortion (The brand profiles on Facebook promote undesirable values in our society).

### **Descriptive results**

The survey comprehended 427 respondents, of which only 400 were considered valid since they reached completion. The sample was composed by young adults, split quite evenly in the gender (50,2 females and 49,8 males), having a mean age corresponding to 21,2 years (SD=0,996) and having 19 different nationalities, of which the majority being from the European Union<sup>1</sup>.

The effect of prior brand knowledge can be considered inexistent, since only 5 people of the 45 participants that stated to know one or more of the brands shown, declared some familiarity with the Exel brand<sup>2</sup>.

### **Mean comparisons**

Anova tests were employed to verify the research questions<sup>3</sup>. In order to proceed with an Anova homoscedastic test, a Levene's test for homogeneity of variances was run beforehand to ensure its adequacy. The Levene statistic resulted to be 0,81, having a p

---

<sup>1</sup> Only x participants were from non-EU countries. See Tables 1, 2 and 4 in Appendix aa – Booklet 2:

<sup>2</sup> See Table 3 in Appendix aa – Booklet 2

<sup>3</sup> For more details, please refer to the Section 2 in Appendix 2.2 – Booklet 2



value equal to 0,519, validating the acceptability of the selected tests. There was a statistically significant difference at the  $p < 0.001$  level in LOT scores for the 5 different variable:  $F(5; 394) = 18,107$ ,  $p < 0,001$ . Once differences were ascertained, further post-hoc comparisons were made to compare the effects of the various stimuli and to determine their significance. All the complete results can be seen in the Booklet 2: Appendix 2.2. The main results can be seen in table 1, resuming the mean differences between the various stimuli and highlighting them when significant.

Table 1 – Main Results

Mean Differences								
	Text		Logo		Audio		Dual Mode	
Text	-							
Logo	-0,32991	RQ1 <b>X</b>	-					
Audio	-1,24426	RQ2 <b>V</b>	-0,91435	RQ3 <b>X</b>	-			
Dual Mode	-2,87958		-2,54968	RQ4 <b>V</b>	-1,63533	RQ4 <b>V</b>	-	
Duration	-2,80799		-2,47808		-1,56373		0,0716	RQ5 <b>X</b>

**V** Research Hypothesis accepted    **X** Research Hypothesis rejected

The difference was calculated as Mean of the Column minus the mean of the row, and the significance level threshold was set with  $p=0,05$ .

On those basis, the assumption made in RQ1, stating that the Facebook logo has significantly higher positive impact on the awareness to the brand Facebook profile than a text reference, is to be refused since the mean difference between the text reference (1,6076) and the logo (1,9375) was non-significant ( $p=0,947$ ).

The audio reference alone (mean = 2,8519) had a higher impact on the awareness than the text reference, being this difference significant ( $p= 0,047$ ). A different outcome was

observed with the logo reference, since the mean difference resulted to be non-significant ( $p=0,237$ ). Therefore, while RQ2 was accepted, RQ3 was rejected.

RQ4 enunciated that dual mode, or the presence of both a visual and audio cues, had a greater impact than any of the single variable taken alone. The dual mode mean (4,4872) differed significantly from the logo variable ( $p = 0$ ) and from the Audio variable ( $p = 0$ ). Hence, RQ4 was validated.

RQ5 considered the duration (mean = 4,4156) as the most effective variable. Since against the dual mode no significant difference was observable ( $p=1$ ), this hypothesis has to be rejected. Nevertheless, substantial disparity could be found when comparing the duration either with the text reference ( $p=0,000$ ), the logo ( $p=0,000$ .) or the audio stimuli ( $p=0,005$ ), confirming its overall efficacy.

The analysis of the impact on the intentions to visit the Facebook page, depending on the different variables was conducted with the same initial procedures described in the previous paragraph<sup>4</sup>. Levene's test results were 0,169, and the p value (0,954) allowed the use of the Anova test. The Anova test rejected the possibility of the different features to have significant different impacts on the intention to visit the Brand Facebook profiles. The result of the test was  $F(5, 394)= 2,124$ , but, inexpertly, at this point the p value (0,077) was well above the accepted limit of 0,05. Moreover, the multiple comparisons did not find any significant difference in the outcomes of the different cues<sup>5</sup>. Therefore RQ6 is to be considered rejected.

---

<sup>4</sup> For more details, please refer to the Section 3 in Appendix 2.3 – Booklet 2

<sup>5</sup> For more information, please see Table 12 in the Appendix 2.3 – Booklet 2

## Discussion

This study had two different focuses. In the first part of this work several different executional cues were compared in order to find which ones were the most apt to create awareness in the viewers and in the second part it was inspected whether different cues could have different persuasive impact on the willingness to visit the Brand Facebook profile.

When comparing the two visual cues taken into consideration, no difference on the consumers' level of awareness was discerned. Whether in the last second of a TV commercial a text reference, like the written internet address, or the Facebook logos appeared, the ex-post recollection of the aforementioned cues remained unchanged. Those results differ with the previous researches since the added benefits that an image could have over the text, promoted by several authors (*Park et al., 2012 not in the list, Fischer et al., 1991; Henderson & Cote, 1998*), did not find any support ground in this study.

Regarding the audio reference, enacted through voice over, it was validated that it had a significant higher impact on the viewer than the text reference, following the same pattern found in *Gunter (1983) and Voorveld et al. (2011)*. At the same time, the use of a logo reference or of a voice over could be considered equivalent since they had the same impact on the awareness of the viewers.

Dual mode, or the presence of both visual and audio executional cues, was proven to be the most effective modality to create awareness in the viewer. Contrary to *Brennan and Babin (2005)* findings, it scored not only higher level of awareness when compared to the visual-only modality, but also against the verbal-only modality. Furthermore, as the most recent researches (*Romaniuk, 2008; Romaniuk & Lock, 2008; Romaniuk, 2009*)

pointed out, the impact on viewers resulted to be stronger than the sum of the two cues would achieve separately.

Duration also appeared to be a particularly effective executional clue, showing a significant better performance than the text reference, the logo and the audio mode, confirming the findings of the recent study of *Romaniuk and Lock (2008)*.

Therefore, advertisers that want their audience to be aware of the Brand profile on the social networks should opt either for the dual mode or for the Facebook logo with duration of 10 seconds or more. However, since space and time are precious for TV commercials, especially in the 30 seconds format, having executional cues for an extended period of time may impose some opportunity costs, deriving for example from the possible deviation of important attention from the product itself.

The second part of this research suggests that different executional cues do not possess the ability to stimulate different levels of intention to visit the brand Facebook profile. This study was unable to observe any significant difference on the willingness to visit the brand profiles, and no apparent synergy between the television media and the social media was found. This notion could be particularly helpful when considering that an increasing number of TV commercial are promoting their Facebook profile. If this link is, as investigated, insufficient to redirect consumers from one platform to another, improvements or other alternative actions should be taken into consideration.

### **Limitation and further research**

This study explored the effect on the awareness of the Brand Facebook profile and on the intention to visit it. The results presented in this paper provide insights to researchers and marketers about executional clue, pointing out which one has the better

capability of informing the TV viewer about a brand profile on a social network. Nevertheless, neither a link nor some synergy was individuated between the TV commercial and the profile on the social Networks. Consumers may be affected by the first and may visit the second, but they are not redirected from one to the other.

This study has several limitations. For example, different results could be obtained with a bigger sample of the population. Moreover, investigations taking into consideration not only the young adults segment but the more mature adults as well could bring further benefits. Indeed, while the young adults are considered the heaviest user of the new media, they appear, in the literature, to be also the ones with the shortest attention span. Furthermore, the subjects were tested only in a normal and traditional viewing experience. Further research could investigate whether in presence of multitasking or interactive television, the responses to the TV commercial would differ. Finally, to the author knowledge, this is the first study that tries to investigate the potential synergies that social media could have with other media. Synergies could be possibly discovered between the social networks and more involving media, such as Blogs or specialized Website, or more targeting media, like SMS.

## References

- Azeem A. and Haq Z., 2012, *Perception towards Internet Advertising: A Study With Reference to Three Different Demographic Groups*, in "Global Business and Management Research: An International Journal", Vol. 4, N. 1.
- Bloch P. H., 1995, *Seeking the Ideal Form: Product Design and Consumer Response*, in "Journal of Marketing", Vol. 59, N. 3, p 16–29.
- Brennan I. and Babin L. A., 2004, *Brand Placement Recognition: The Influence of Presentation Mode and Brand Familiarity*, in "Handbook of Product Placement in the Mass Media", Vol 10, N 1
- Bronner A. E., Neijens P.C. and Van Raaij W.F., 2003, *Multimedia campagnes: Populair maar weinigonderzocht*, in "Ontwikkelingen in marktonderzoek. Jaarboek MarktOnderzoekAssocatie", 25–39,
- Buchholz L. M. and Smith R. E., 1991, *The role of consumer involvement in determining cognitive response to broadcast advertising*, in "Journal of Advertising" Vol 20, N1. 4 – 17.

- Calder B. J. and Malthouse E. C., 2005, *Managing media and advertising change with integrated marketing*, in "Journal of Advertising Research", Vol 45, N.4, 356– 361.
- Caywood C. L., Schultz D. E. and Paul Wang, 1991, *A Survey of Consumer Goods Manufacturers*, New York: American Association of Advertising Agencies.
- Celsi R. and Olson J., 1988, *The role of involvement in attention and comprehension processes*, in "The Journal of consumer research", Vol 15, 210 - 224.
- Chaiken S. and Maheswaran D., 1994, *Heuristic Processing Can Bias Systematic Processing: Effects of Source Credibility, Argument Ambiguity and Task Importance on Attitude Judgment*, in "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology", Vol 66, N. 3, 460–73.
- Chandon J. L., Chtourou M. S., and Fortin D. R., 2003, *Effects of configuration and exposure levels on responses to web advertisements*, in "Journal of Advertising Research", Vol 43, N. 2, 217-229.
- Chang Y. and Thorson E., 2004, *Television and web advertising synergies*, in "Journal of Advertising", Vol. 33, N. 2, 75–84.
- Chan-Olmsted S.M., 2004, *In search of partnerships in a changing global media market: Trends and drivers of international strategic alliances*, in "Strategic Responses to Media Market Changes", Picard, R. G., ed. Jonkoping, Sweden: Jonkoping International Business School, Ltd
- Chatterjee P., 2012, *The role of varying information quantity in ads on immediate and enduring cross-media synergies*, in "Journal of Marketing Communications", Vol. 18, N. 3, 217-240
- Coffey S., and Stipp H., 1997, *The interactions between computer and television usage*, in "Journal of Advertising Research", Vol. 37, N. 2, 61-67.
- Deloitte, 2012, State of media democracy 2012, available at <http://www.deloitte.com/assets/Dcom-UnitedKingdom/Local%20Assets/Documents/Industries/TMT/uk-tmt-state-of-the-media-democracy-report-2012.pdf>
- Dijkstra M., 2002, *An experimental investigation of synergy effects in multiple-media advertising campaigns*, PhD diss., University of Tilburg. 170 P.C. Neijens and P. de Pelsmacker
- Dijkstra M., Buijtels H. and Van Raaij W. F., 2005, *Separate and joint effects of medium type on consumer responses: A comparison of television, print, and the Internet*, in "Journal of Business Research", Vol. 58,N. 3, 377–86.
- Edell J.A. and Keller K. L., 1989, *The information processing of coordinated media campaigns*, in "Journal of Marketing Research", Vol. 26, N. 2, 149–63.
- Edell J.A. and Keller K. L., 1999, *Analyzing media interactions: The effects of coordinated TV-print advertising campaigns*, Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute.
- Enoch G. and Johnson K., 2010, *Cracking the Cross-Media Code: How to Use Single-Source Measures to Examine Media Cannibalization and Convergence*, in "Journal of Advertising Research", Vol. 50, N. 2 125–136.
- Feichtinger G., Hartl R. and Sethi S. P., 1994, *Dynamic Optimal Control Models in Advertising: Recent Developments*, in Management Science, Vol. 40, N. 2, 195–226.
- Fischer P. M., Schwartz M. P., Richards J. W., Jr., Goldstein A. O. and Rojas T. H., 1991, *Brand logo recognition by children aged 3 to 6 years*, in "The Journal of the American Medical Association", N. 266, 3145–3148.

- Freedman K. S., Nelson N. M. and Feldman L. L., 2012, *Smoking initiation among young adults in the United States and Canada, 1998-2010: a systematic review.*, available at [http://www.cdc.gov/pcd/issues/2012/11\\_0037.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/pcd/issues/2012/11_0037.htm)
- Gilder G., 1994, *Life After Television, Updated*, in "Forbes", February 28.
- Grass R. C. and Wallace W. H., 1969, *Satiation Effects of TV Commercials*, in "Journal Advertising Research", Vol. 9, N. 3, 3-8.
- Grimes T., Rimmerb T. and Boiarskyc G. , 1994, *TV news simulations and their interaction with viewer memory*, in "Communication Reports" , Vol. 7, Issue 1.
- Gunter B., 1983, *Forgetting the news*, in E. Wartella & D.C. Whitney (Eds.), *Mass Communication*
- Gupta P. B. and Lord K. R., 1998, *Product Placement in Movies: The Effect of Prominence and Mode on Audience Recall*, in "Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising", Vol. 20, N. 1, 47-59.
- Ha L. and Chan-Olmsted S. M., 2001, *Enhanced television as brand extension: Television viewers' perception of enhanced television features and television commerce on broadcast networks' Web sites*, in "International Journal on Media Management", Vol. 3, N. 4, 202–213.
- Harkins S. G. and Petty R. E. , 1981a, *Effects of Source Magnification of Cognitive Effort on Attitudes: An Information-Processing View*, in "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology", Vol. 40, N. 3, 401-413.
- Harkins S. G. and Petty R. E. , 1981b, *The Multiple Source Effect in Persuasion: The Effects of Distraction*, in "Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin", Vol. 7, N. 4, 627-635.
- Harkins S. G. and Petty R. E. , 1987, *Information Utility and the Multiple Source Effect*, in "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology", Vol. 52, N. 2, 260-268.
- Henderson P.W. and Cote J.A, 1998, *Guidelines for selecting or modifying logos*, in "Journal of Marketing", Vol. 62, N. 2, 14-30.
- Havlena, W., R. Cardarelli, and M. De Montigny. 2007. Quantifying the isolated and synergistic effects of exposure frequency for TV, print, and internet advertising. *Journal of Advertising Research* 47: 215–21.
- Junco R., 2012, *The relationship between frequency of Facebook use, participation in Facebook activities, and student Engagement*, in "Computers & Education", Vol. 58, N. 1, 162–171
- Kahneman D., 1973, *Attention and effort*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kyffin D., 1988, *Direct marketing: Plugging the phone*, *Marketing*, 55
- Katz E., Adoni H. and Parness P., 1977, *Remembering the news: What the picture adds to recall*, In "Journalism Quarterly", Vol. 54, 231–239
- Lacziak R. N., 1993, *The relationship between experimental manipulations and tests of theory in an advertising message involvement context*, in "Journal of Advertising", Vol. 22, N. 3.
- MacInnis D. J., Moorman C. and Jaworski B. J., 1991, *Enhancing and Measuring Consumers Motivation, Opportunity, and Ability to Process Brand Information From Ads*, in "Journal of Marketing", Vol. 55, N. 4, 32-53.
- Maheswaran D. and Chaiken S., 1991, *Promoting systematic processing in low involvement settings: Effect of incongruent information on processing and judgment*, in "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology", Vol. 61, N. 1, 13–25.
- McCullough, J. L. and Ostrom T. M., 1974, *Repetition of highly similar messages and attitude change*, In "Journal of Applied Psychology", Vol. 59, N. 3, 395-397.

- Naik P. A. and Raman K., 2003, *Understanding the Impact of Synergy in Multimedia Communications*, in *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 40, N. 4, 375-388.
- Park C.W., et al., 2012, *The role of brand logos in firm performance*, in "Journal of Business Research", available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.07.011>
- Pechmann C. and Stewart D. W., 1988, *Advertising Repetition: A Critical Review of Wearing and Wearout*, in "Current Issues and Research in Advertising", Vol. 11, N. 2, 285-329.
- Petty R. E., Cacioppo J. T. and Schumann D., 1983, *Central and Peripheral Routes to advertising Effectiveness: The Moderating Role of Involvement*, in "Journal of Consumer Research", Vol. 10, 135-146.
- Pollay R. W. and Mittal B., 1993, *Here's the beef: Factors, determinants and segments in consumer criticism of advertising*, in "Journal of Marketing", Vol. 57, N. 7, 99-114.
- Rise J., Kovač V. B., Kraft P. and Moan I. S., 2008, *Predicting the intention to quit smoking and quitting behaviour: extending the theory of planned behavior*, in "British Journal of Health Psychology", Vol. 13, 291-310.
- Romaniuk J., 2008, *The Effectiveness of Branding Execution Tactics within Television Advertisements*, Ehrenberg-Bass Institute Working Paper.
- Romaniuk J. and Lock C., 2008, *The Recall of Brand Placements with Television Shows*, Ehrenberg-Bass Institute Working Paper.
- Romaniuk J., 2009, *The Efficacy of Brand-Execution Tactics in TV Advertising, Brand Placements, and Internet Advertising*, in "Journal of Advertising Research", Vol. 49, N. 2, 143-159.
- Schultz D.E., Block M.P. and Raman. K., 2009b, *Media synergy comes of age, part 2*, in "Journal of Direct, Data and Digital Marketing Practice", Vol. 11, N. 2, 88-99.
- Schultz D.E., Block M.P. and Raman. K., 2012, *Understanding consumer-created media synergy*, in "Journal of Marketing Communications", Vol. 18, N. 3, 173-187.
- Sengupta J. and Johar G. V., 2002, *Effects of inconsistent attribute information on the predictive value of product attitudes: Toward a resolution of opposing perspectives*, in "Journal of Consumer Research", Vol. 29, N.2, 39-56.
- Shapiro S., MacInnis D. J. and Heckler S. E., 1997, *The Effects of Incidental Ad Exposure on the Formation of Consideration Sets*, in "Journal of Consumer Research", Vol. 24, N. 1, 94-104.
- Stewart D. W. and Furse D. H., 1986, *Effective Television Advertising: A Study of 1000 Commercials*, Lexington, MA: Lexington Books
- Stewart D. W. and Koslow S., 1989, *Executional Factors and Advertising Effectiveness: A Replication*, in "Journal of Advertising", Vol. 18, N. 3, 21-32.
- Trappey R. J. and Woodside A. G., 2005, *Consumer responses to interactive advertising campaigns coupling short-message-service direct marketing and TV commercials*, in "Journal of Advertising Research", Vol. 45, N. 4, 382-401.
- Vakratsas D. and Ambler T., 1999, *How advertising works: what do we really know?*, in "Journal of Marketing", Vol 63, N. 1, 26-43.
- Voorveld H. A., Neijens P. C. and Smit E. G., 2011, *Opening the black box: Understanding cross-media effects*, in "Journal of Marketing Communications", Vol. 17, N. 2, 69-85.



Wang A., 2006b, *When synergy in marketing communication online enhances audience response: The effects of varying advertising and product publicity messages*, in “Journal of Advertising Research”, Vol. 46, N. 2, 160–170.

Wang A., 2007, *Branding over mobile and internet advertising: The cross-media effect*, in “International Journal of Mobile Marketing”, Vol. 2, N. 1, 34–42.

Wang A., 2011, *Branding over Internet and TV Advertising*, in “Journal of Promotion Management”, Vol. 17, 275–290.

Wang A. and Nelson R. A., 2006, *The Effects of Identical Versus Varied Advertising and Publicity Messages on Consumer Response*, in “Journal of Marketing Communications”, Vol. 12, N. 2, 109–123.

Wong N. and Cappella J.N., 2009, *Antismoking Threat and Efficacy Appeals: Effects on Smoking Cessation Intentions for Smokers with Low and High Readiness to Quit*, in “Journal of Applied Communication Research”, Vol. 37, N. 1, 1-20.

Wouters J. and Wetzels M., 2006, *Recall effect of short message service as a complementary marketing communications instrument*, in “Journal of Advertising Research”, Vol. 46, N. 2, 209–216.

Yang M., Roskos-Ewoldsen B. and Roskos-Ewoldsen D. R., 2004, *Mental models for brand placement*. In L. J. Shrum (Ed.), *The psychology of entertainment media: Blurring the lines between entertainment & persuasion*, 79–98, Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

## Annex

Fig. 1 Text reference



Fig 2: Logo reference



Fig. 3 Audio reference



Voiceover: Visit Us on Facebook!

A Work Project, presented as part of the requirements for the Award of a Master  
Management from the NOVA – School of Business and Economics.

# **TV advertisement and Social Networks: an empirical study with young adults**

Luca Sigot, n° 1050

Booklet II: Appendix

21/01/2012

## Table of Contents (Appendix)

<b>1. Survey</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>2. SPSS Output</b> .....	<b>16</b>
2.1 Section 1: Descriptive .....	16
Table 1: <i>Age of the participants</i> .....	16
Table 2: <i>Gender of participants</i> .....	16
Table 3: <i>Brand prior knowledge</i> .....	16
Table 4: <i>Participant Home Countries</i> .....	17
2.2 Section 2: Awareness of the brand Facebook profile .....	18
Table 5: <i>Descriptive of the executional clues</i> .....	18
Table 6: <i>Test of homogeneity of variances</i> .....	18
Table 7: <i>ANOVA Test</i> .....	18
Table 8: <i>Robust tests of equality of means</i> .....	18
Table 9: <i>Means Comparisons</i> .....	19
2.3 Section 3: Intentions to visit the brand Facebook profile .....	20
Table 10: <i>Test off homogeneity of variances</i> .....	21
Table 11: <i>ANOVA Test</i> .....	21
Table 12: <i>Roust tests of equality of means</i> .....	21
Table 13: <i>Multiple comparison</i> .....	22
Table 14: <i>Intention 3</i> .....	23
Table 15: <i>Kruskal-Wallis test</i> .....	23

## 1. Survey

**NOVA**  
School  
of Business  
& Economics

Shaping  
powerful  
minds

This research is part of a Master thesis done by Luca Sigot, student of the University [Luiss Guido Carli](#) (Rome) and of the University of Nova, School of business and economics (Lisbon).

The objective of this study is to observe some of the possible reaction from TV viewing.

All the surveys will be anonymous, and no name will be requested. Any data gathered though it will be exclusively employed for the purpose of this research, and no further or secondary ends will be pursued.

No answer is to be considered invalid or incorrect answer, and any choice that sincerely reflects the participant preference is to be considered the best. Furthermore, any question can be skipped and the survey can be abandoned in any moment.

Thank you for your participation, without it this study would not be possible

Luca Sigot

For any doubt, clarification or further information please write to [sigot.luca@tiscali.it](mailto:sigot.luca@tiscali.it)

>>

[Survey Powered By Qualtrics](#)

**NOVA**  
School  
of Business  
& Economics

Shaping  
powerful  
minds

Please, watch the following video before proceeding with the survey

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d2slhqYmi1Q>

After watching the video, please check which video you have watched. The number is on the title of the [youtube](#) video, For example: Survey video N° "X". Then please clic the "next" button

1

2

3

4

5

>>

[Survey Powered By Qualtrics](#)



**Q1: Please rank the three news stories in order of appearance**

- 1 The revival of a tradition game in Japan
- 2 Scott Strode uses sports to help addicts
- 3 The UNICEF educational program in Sri Lanka



[Survey Powered By Qualtrics](#)



**Please, watch the following video before proceeding with the survey**

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d2slhqYmi1Q>

**After watching the video, please check which video you have watched. The number is on the title of the youtube video, For example: Survey video N° "X". Then please clic the "next" button**

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5



[Survey Powered By Qualtrics](#)



Shaping powerful minds

Q8: You have also seen some advertisements in the middle of the news. Which of those brands were already familiar to you before seeing the advertising, that means, that you already knew before? You may choose more than one brand

- Old Spice
- Exel
- Dove Chocolate
- Molson
- None



Survey Powered By Qualtrics



Shaping powerful minds

Q9: How much attention did you pay to the second (Dove chocolate) commercial ?

- |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| None (1)              | 2                     | 3                     | 4                     | A Lot (5)             |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Q10: How much did you notice the second (Dove chocolate) commercial ?

- |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| None (1)              | 2                     | 3                     | 4                     | A Lot (5)             |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Q11: How much thought did you put into evaluating the second (Dove chocolate) commercial ?

- |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| None (1)              | 2                     | 3                     | 4                     | A Lot (5)             |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Q12: How much were you involved with the second (Dove chocolate) commercial ?

- |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| None (1)              | 2                     | 3                     | 4                     | A Lot (5)             |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Q13: How much did you concentrate on the second (Dove chocolate) commercial ?

- |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| None (1)              | 2                     | 3                     | 4                     | A Lot (5)             |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |



Survey Powered By Qualtrics  
Survey Powered By Qualtrics

Q8: You have also seen some advertisements in the middle of the news. Which of those brands were already familiar to you before seeing the advertising, that means, that you already knew before? You may choose more than one brand

- Old Spice
  Molson  
 Exel
  None  
 Dove Chocolate

&gt;&gt;

[Survey Powered By Qualtrics](#)

Q9: How much attention did you pay to the second (Dove chocolate) commercial ?

- |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| None (1)              | 2                     | 3                     | 4                     | A Lot (5)             |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Q10: How much did you notice the second (Dove chocolate) commercial ?

- |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| None (1)              | 2                     | 3                     | 4                     | A Lot (5)             |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Q11: How much thought did you put into evaluating the second (Dove chocolate) commercial ?

- |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| None (1)              | 2                     | 3                     | 4                     | A Lot (5)             |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Q12: How much were you involved with the second (Dove chocolate) commercial ?

- |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| None (1)              | 2                     | 3                     | 4                     | A Lot (5)             |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Q13: How much did you concentrate on the second (Dove chocolate) commercial ?

- |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| None (1)              | 2                     | 3                     | 4                     | A Lot (5)             |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

&gt;&gt;

[Survey Powered By Qualtrics](#)



Q14: How much attention did you pay to the third (Exel) commercial?

None (1)      2      3      4      A Lot (5)  
                       

Q15: How much did you notice the third (Exel) commercial?

None (1)      2      3      4      A Lot (5)  
                       

Q16: How much thought did you put into evaluating the third (Exel) commercial?

None      A Lot  
                       

Q17: How much were you involved with the third (Exel) commercial?

None (1)      2      3      4      A Lot (5)  
                       

Q18: How much did you concentrate on the third (Exel) commercial?

None (1)      2      3      4      A Lot (5)  
                       

>>

Survey Powered By Qualtrics



Q19: At the end of the second commercial (Dove chocolate) which of these logo or references did you notice?

Fair Trade       2012 Olympic Games  
 Facebook       A Boat

Q20: How confident are you of your last response?

Not so Confident (1)      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      Very Confident (9)  
                                               

Q21: At the end of the third commercial (Exel) which of these logo or references did you notice?

Fair Trade       2012 Olympic Games  
 Facebook       A Boat

Q22: How confident are you of your last response?

Not so Confident (1)      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      Very Confident (9)  
                                               

>>

Survey Powered By Qualtrics



**Q23: I intend to visit Exel profile on Facebook**

[Very Unlikely \(1\)](#)   
 [Unlikely \(2\)](#)   
 [Somewhat Unlikely \(3\)](#)   
 [Somewhat Likely \(4\)](#)   
 [Likely \(5\)](#)   
 [Very likely \(6\)](#)

  
   
   
   
   

**Q24: I expect to visit Exel profile on Facebook**

[Very Unlikely \(1\)](#)   
 [Unlikely \(2\)](#)   
 [Somewhat Unlikely \(3\)](#)   
 [Somewhat Likely \(4\)](#)   
 [Likely \(5\)](#)   
 [Very likely \(6\)](#)

  
   
   
   
   

**Q25: I may visit Exel profile on Facebook**

[Very Unlikely \(1\)](#)   
 [Unlikely \(2\)](#)   
 [Somewhat Unlikely \(3\)](#)   
 [Somewhat Likely \(4\)](#)   
 [Likely \(5\)](#)   
 [Very likely \(6\)](#)

  
   
   
   
   

**Q26: How likely will you be willing to visit Exel profile on Facebook in the next week?**

[Very Unlikely \(1\)](#)   
 [Unlikely \(2\)](#)   
 [Somewhat Unlikely \(3\)](#)   
 [Somewhat Likely \(4\)](#)   
 [Likely \(5\)](#)   
 [Very likely \(6\)](#)

  
   
   
   
   

&gt;&gt;

Survey Powered By Qualtrics

**Q27: How much time do you spend daily on Facebook?**

[Less than 1 h](#)   
[1 to 2 h](#)   
[2 to 3 h](#)   
[3 to 4 h](#)   
[More than 4 h](#)

  
   
   
   

**Q28: How much time did you spend yesterday on Facebook**

[Less than 1 h](#)   
[1 to 2 h](#)   
[2 to 3 h](#)   
[3 to 4 h](#)   
[More than 4 h](#)

  
   
   
   

**Q29: How many times do you usually log in on Facebook in a day?**

[None](#)   
[1](#)   
[2](#)   
[3](#)   
[4](#)   
[5](#)   
[6](#)   
[7](#)   
[8](#)   
[More than 8](#)

  
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   

**Q30: How many times did you log in yesterday on Facebook?**

[None](#)   
[1](#)   
[2](#)   
[3](#)   
[4](#)   
[5](#)   
[6](#)   
[7](#)   
[8](#)   
[More than 8](#)

  
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   

&gt;&gt;

Survey Powered By Qualtrics

**Q31: The brand profiles on Facebook are a valuable source of information**

Strongly Disagree (1)    Disagree (2)    Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)    Agree (4)    Strongly Agree (5)

                                                                                      

**Q32: The brand profiles on Facebook promote a materialistic society**

Strongly Disagree (1)    Disagree (2)    Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)    Agree (4)    Strongly Agree (5)

                                                                                      

**Q33: The brand profiles on Facebook are annoying**

Strongly Disagree (1)    Disagree (2)    Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)    Agree (4)    Strongly Agree (5)

                                                                                      

**Q34: The brand profiles on Facebook are essential**

Strongly Disagree (1)    Disagree (2)    Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)    Agree (4)    Strongly Agree (5)

                                                                                      

&gt;&gt;

Survey Powered By Qualtrics

**Q35: The brand profiles on Facebook are entertaining and enjoyable**

Strongly Disagree (1)    Disagree (2)    Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)    Agree (4)    Strongly Agree (5)

                                                                                      

**Q36: The brand profiles on Facebook are trustworthy and believable**

Strongly Disagree (1)    Disagree (2)    Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)    Agree (4)    Strongly Agree (5)

                                                                                      

**Q37: The brand profiles on Facebook persuade people to buy things they should not buy**

Strongly Disagree (1)    Disagree (2)    Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)    Agree (4)    Strongly Agree (5)

                                                                                      

**Q38: The brand profiles on Facebook promote undesirable values in our society**

Strongly Disagree (1)    Disagree (2)    Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)    Agree (4)    Strongly Agree (5)

                                                                                      

&gt;&gt;

Survey Powered By Qualtrics



Q40: Please indicate your age

- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

Q41: What is your gender?

Female

Male

Q42: What is your nationality?

>>

[Survey Powered By Qualtrics](#)



We thank you for your time spent taking this survey.  
Your response has been recorded.

[Survey Powered By Qualtrics](#)

## 2. SPSS Output

### 2.1 Section 1: Descriptive

---

*Table 1: Age of the participants*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Newage	400	18,00	25,00	21,2200	1,99287
Valid N (listwise)	400				

*Table 2: Gender of the participants*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Male	199	49,8	49,8	49,8
Valid Female	201	50,3	50,3	100,0
Total	400	100,0	100,0	

*Table 3: Brand Prior knowledge*

	Old Spice	Exel	Dove Chocolate	Molson	None
N Valid	13	5	11	9	341

*Table 4: Participant Home Countries*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Albania	1	,3	,3	,3
Australia	10	2,5	2,5	2,8
Austria	2	,5	,5	3,3
Belgium	10	2,5	2,5	5,8
Bhutan	1	,3	,3	6,0
Canada	4	1,0	1,0	7,0
Finland	1	,3	,3	7,3
France	25	6,3	6,3	13,5
Germany	24	6,0	6,0	19,5
Greece	5	1,3	1,3	20,8
Valid India	16	4,0	4,0	24,8
Italy	150	37,5	37,5	62,3
Netherlands	3	,8	,8	63,0
Poland	5	1,3	1,3	64,3
Portugal	112	28,0	28,0	92,3
Romania	1	,3	,3	92,5
Spain	18	4,5	4,5	97,0
Thailand	1	,3	,3	97,3
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	11	2,8	2,8	100,0
Total	400	100,0	100,0	

## 2.2 Section 2: Awareness of the brand Facebook profile

**Table 5: Descriptives of the executional cues**

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 – Text reference	79	1,6076	2,65261	,29844	1,0134	2,2017
2 – Logo reference	80	1,9375	2,69244	,30102	1,3383	2,5367
3 – Voiceover	81	2,8519	2,75731	,30637	2,2422	3,4615
4 – Dual mode	78	4,4872	3,01831	,34176	3,8067	5,1677
5 - Duration	77	4,4156	2,91254	,33192	3,7545	5,0767
Total <sup>a</sup>	395	3,0456	3,04250	,15308	2,7446	3,3465

<sup>a</sup> The total number is given by the sample N (400) minus the number of variables under study (5)

**Table 6: Test of Homogeneity of Variances**

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
,810	4	390	,519

**Table 7: ANOVA test**

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	571,246	4	142,812	18,107	,000
Within Groups	3075,934	390	7,887		
Total	3647,180	394			

**Table 8: Robust Tests of Equality of Means**

SeeFb

	Statistic <sup>a</sup>	df1	df2	Sig.
Welch	17,659	4	194,656	,000
Brown-Forsythe	18,081	4	384,850	,000

Table 9: Multiple Comparisons

(I) After watching the video, please check which video you have watched. The number is on the title of t...	(J) After watching the video, please check which video you have watched. The number is on the title of t...	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
1 – text reference	2 – Logo reference	-,32991	,44545	,947
	3 – Voiceover	-1,24426*	,44408	,042
	4 – Dual mode	-2,87958*	,44828	,000
	5 – Duration	-2,80799*	,44974	,000
2– Logo reference	1 - Text reference	,32991	,44545	,947
	3– Voiceover	-,91435	,44267	,237
	4– Dual mode	-2,54968*	,44688	,000
3– Voiceover	5– Duration	-2,47808*	,44835	,000
	1- Text reference	1,24426*	,44408	,042
	2– Logo reference	,91435	,44267	,237
	4– Dual mode	-1,63533*	,44552	,003
4– Dual mode	5– Duration	-1,56373*	,44699	,005
	1- Text reference	2,87958*	,44828	,000
	2– Logo reference	2,54968*	,44688	,000
	3– Voiceover	1,63533*	,44552	,003
5– Duration	5– Duration	,07160	,45116	1,000
	1- Text reference	2,80799*	,44974	,000
	2– Logo reference	2,47808*	,44835	,000
	3– Voiceover	1,56373*	,44699	,005
	4– Dual mode	-,07160	,45116	1,000

### Section 3: Intentions to visit the brand Facebook profile

---

*Table 10: Test of Homogeneity of Variances*

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
,237	4	387	,917

*Table 11: ANOVA*

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	11,591	4	2,898	1,989	,095
Within Groups	563,679	387	1,457		
Total	575,270	391			

*Table 12: Robust Tests of Equality of Means*

	Statistic <sup>a</sup>	df1	df2	Sig.
Welch	1,901	4	193,258	,112
Brown-Forsythe	1,991	4	382,992	,095

a. Asymptotically F distributed.



Table 13: Multiple Comparisons

(I) After watching the video, please check which video you have watched. The number is on the title of t...	(J) After watching the video, please check which video you have watched. The number is on the title of t...	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
1- Text reference	2- Logo reference	-,11185	,19267	,978
	3- Voiceover	-,28555	,19023	,562
	4- Dual mode	-,49280	,19267	,080
	5- Duration	-,11185	,19267	,978
2- Logo reference	1- Text reference	,11185	,19267	,978
	3- Voiceover	-,17369	,19209	,895
	4- Dual mode	-,38095	,19450	,288
3- Voiceover	5- Duration	,00000	,19450	1,000
	1- Text reference	,28555	,19023	,562
	2- Logo reference	,17369	,19209	,895
	4- Dual mode	-,20726	,19209	,817
4- Dual mode	5- Duration	,17369	,19209	,895
	1- Text reference	,49280	,19267	,080
	2- Logo reference	,38095	,19450	,288
	3- Voiceover	,20726	,19209	,817
5- Duration	5- Duration	,38095	,19450	,288
	1- Text reference	,11185	,19267	,978
	2- Logo reference	,00000	,19450	1,000
	3- Voiceover	-,17369	,19209	,895
	4- Dual mode	-,38095	,19450	,288

*Table 14: Intention3*

After watching the video, please check which video you have watched. The number is on the title of t...	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05
		1
1- Text reference	80	3,2042
5- Duration	77	3,3160
2- Logo reference	77	3,3160
3- Voiceover	81	3,4897
4- Dual mode	77	3,6970
Sig.		,081

*Table 15: Kruskal-Wallis Test*

	N	Mean Rank
After watching the video, please check which video you have watched. The number is on the title of t...		
1- Text reference	80	174,78
2- Logo reference	77	190,22
3- Voiceover	81	205,68
4- Dual mode	77	221,97
5- Duration	77	190,22

**Test Statistics**

	Intention3
Chi-Square	7,902
Df	4
Asymp. Sig.	,095