STOCKHOLM SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Department of Marketing and Strategy Master Thesis Spring 2016

# More Bang for the Buck

**ABSTRACT** The advertising industry is evolving. With increasing clutter, changing consumer behaviors and the rise of new advertising formats brands are forced to increasingly rely on consumers to voluntarily approach their advertising. Content marketing is especially interesting in connection to the evolving advertising industry. With more than 100 years of history and a core of generating value in the communication the intention has been to engage consumers and influence their behavior. The increased importance of content marketing has put a greater pressure on advertisers to understand how to create consumer-perceived value in the advertising and draw consumers towards it.

The purpose of this thesis was to understand if format attitude and advertising equity have an effect on message equity and consumers' approach behaviors (willingness to attend and willingness to co-create) towards a specific content message.

A quantitative laboratory experiment was conducted with 238 respondents with the questionnaires collected via an online panel. The result indicated that consumers' attitude towards the format which the content is distributed in has a positive effect on consumers' approach behaviors towards a specific content message, an effect mediated by message equity. Advertising equity does not have an effect on message equity or consumers' approach behaviors. In addition, the study reveals that the effect of format attitude on approach behaviors is not dependent on the brand's advertising equity equity

Keywords: Advertising Approach, Advertising Equity, Content Marketing, Format Attitude, Message Equity

Authors: Elisabeth Pålsson 50185 Josefine Wallin 50154

Supervisor: Sara Rosengren **Defense:** June 3<sup>rd</sup> 2016

Examiner: Magnus Söderlund

A Thesis Part of the Examination for a MSc in Business & Management at the Stockholm School of Economics

# THANK YOU

## SARA ROSENGREN

For your invaluable support, brilliant mind and laughs along the way

#### FRIENDS & FAMILY

For understanding our absence and encouragement at crucial moments

### ULP

For amazing insights and fun times

# OURSELVES

We made it!

# DEFINITIONS

| Advertising                                   | Brand-initiated communication intent on impacting people (Dahlén & Rosengren, in press) where content marketing is one type of communication.   |
|---|---|
| Advertising approach<br>behaviours            | Consumer actions that volitionally increase their exposure to advertising content (Rosengren, 2016)   |
| Advertising equity                            | Consumers' cumulative perceptions of the global value of a brand's past advertising (Rosengren & Dahlén, 2015).   |
| Advertising Format                            | All kinds of media and formats, whether they are paid or not, and whether the source<br>is identifiable or not, used to transmit advertising message, for example event and<br>podcast. Adapted from Dahlén & Rosengren (in press). |
| Content marketing                             | Marketing communication in which brands create and disseminate content to consumers with the intention that the content generates interest, engages consumers, and influences behavior (Stephen, Sciandra & Inman, 2015)            |
| Format attitude                               | A predisposition to respond in a consistently favorable or unfavorable manner toward<br>an advertising format, adapted from Burns (2003)  |
| Message equity                                | Consumer-perceived value of a specific marketing communication message<br>(Rosengren, Ljungberg & Palmberg, 2016)   |
| Willingness to attend<br>a content message    | Consumers willingness to increase their attention to a specific content message adapted from Rosengren (2016)   |
| Willingness to co-create<br>a content message | Consumers willingness to contribute to various aspects of the production of a content message, adapted from Prahalad & Ramaswamy (2004).  |

## TABLE OF CONTENT

| 1  |      | INTRODUCTION                                      | 5    |
|----|------|---|------|
|    | 1.1  | BACKGROUND  | 5    |
|    | 1.2  | PROBLEMATIZATION                                  | 6    |
|    | 1.3  | PURPOSE & RESEARCH QUESTIONS                      | 8    |
|    | 1.4  |   |      |
|    | 1.5  | DELIMITATIONS                                     | 9    |
|    | 1.6  | THESIS OUTLINE                                    | .10  |
| 2  |      | THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK & HYPOTHESIS GENERATION     | . 11 |
|    | 2.1  | THE CONCEPT OF CONTENT MARKETING                  | .11  |
|    | 2.2  | ADVERTISING APPROACH                              | .11  |
|    | 2.3  | FORMAT ATTITUDE                                   | .13  |
|    | 2.4  | ADVERTISING EQUITY                                | .14  |
|    | 2.5  |   |      |
|    | 2.6  |   |      |
|    | 2.7  |   |      |
| 3  |      | METHODOLOGY                                       | .21  |
|    | 3.1  | SELECTION OF TOPIC                                | .21  |
|    | 3.2  | SCIENTIFIC APPROACH                               | .21  |
|    | 3.3  | MAIN STUDY DESIGN                                 | .22  |
|    | 3.4  | SAMPLING  | .34  |
|    | 3.5  | STATISTICAL METHODS                               | .36  |
|    | 3.6  | RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY                          | .37  |
| 4  |      | RESULT & ANALYSIS                                 | 39   |
|    | 4.1  | MANIPULATION CHECK                                | . 39 |
|    | 4.2  |   |      |
|    | 4.3  |   |      |
|    | 4.4  |   |      |
|    | 4.5  |   |      |
| 5  |      | DISCUSSION  |      |
|    | 5.1  |   |      |
|    | 5.2  |   |      |
|    | 5.3  |   |      |
|    |      | MESSAGE EQUITY FOR A LOW ADVERTISING EQUITY BRAND | .54  |
|    | 5.4  |   |      |
|    | 5.5  | GENERAL DISCUSSION                                | . 56 |
| 6  |      | CONCLUSION  | 58   |
| 7  |      | IMPLICATIONS                                      | 59   |
|    | 7.1  | THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS                          | . 59 |
|    | 7.2  | PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS                            | . 59 |
| 8  |      | LIMITATIONS                                       | .61  |
|    | 8.1  | EXPERIMENT DESIGN                                 | .61  |
|    | 8.2  | QUESTIONNAIRE                                     | .62  |
|    | 8.3  | DATA COLLECTION & SAMPLE                          | .62  |
|    | 8.4  | ETHICAL CONCERNS                                  | .62  |
| 9  |      | FUTURE RESEARCH                                   | 63   |
| 10 |      | REFERENCES  | 64   |
| 11 |      | APPENDIX  | .71  |
|    | 11.  | 1 APPENDIX 1                                      | .71  |
|    | 11.2 | 2 APPENDIX 2                                      | .73  |
|    | 11.3 | 3 APPENDIX 3                                      | .75  |
|    | 11.4 | 4 APPENDIX 4                                      | .77  |
|    | 11.  |   |      |
|    | 11.0 | 6 APPENDIX 6                                      | .83  |

PÅLSSON & WALLIN

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

In this introductory chapter, a background to the chosen topic is provided followed by a problematization. The purpose of this thesis is explained and research questions are stated. We present our expected contributions before finalizing the chapter with definitions, delimitations and thesis outline.

## 1.1 BACKGROUND

The advertising industry is evolving (Dahlén & Rosengren, in press) even though it was predicted to die over 20 years ago (Rust & Oliver, 1994). The increasing level of advertising clutter<sup>1</sup> is likely to fuel the move of contemporary marketing away from traditional media into other forms of marketing communication (Rosengren, 2008). Simultaneously, consumers' behaviors have also changed as they have become more in charge of their own advertising consumption (Rosengren & Dahlén, 2015). In the world today streaming services, free from commercial breaks, replace traditional TV-watching and banner ads can be blocked in web browsers and never reach the eyes of the consumer. The evolution of advertising has come to a point where a sender and receiver perspective is no longer valid. Advertisers must now increasingly rely on consumers to voluntarily approach their advertising. The evolution makes it crucial to understand what components of a specific advertising message influence approach behaviors.

Content marketing is especially interesting in connection to the evolving advertising industry. With more than 100 years of history (Baines, Fill & Rosengren, in press) and a core of generating value for consumers in the communication, for example by being informative or entertaining (Ducoffe, 1995), the intention has been to engage consumers and influence their behavior (Stephen, Sciandra & Inman, 2015). One of the earliest examples of content marketing in Sweden, still around today, was created by the dairy cooperative Arla. Since 1975, Arla has used the side panels of milk cartons as a value carrier which has engaged consumers in all ages to partake in short stories, recipes and product information (Arla.se, n.d.). Interestingly, the production cost for content marketing in digital channels in Sweden has risen between the year 2013 and 2015, from 625 SEK to 744 SEK, an increase with 19 % (IRM 2014, 2015) which indicates its current rise in popularity despite the long history.

The increased importance of content marketing has put a greater pressure on advertisers to understand how to create consumer-perceived value in the advertising itself i.e. message equity (Rosengren, Ljungberg & Palmberg, 2016) to draw consumers towards it (e.g. Dahlén & Rosengren, in press; Rosengren & Dahlén, 2015). Consumer-perceived value of advertising has become an increasingly important topic, in particular since Rosengren & Dahlén (2015) identified the concept of advertising equity, a distinct facet of brand equity. The core of this construct is that consumer-perceived value does not only limit itself to a particular unit of advertising, it rather accumulates over time and gives unique positive effects on consumers' willingness to approach a brand's future advertising.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> "All marketing messages surrounding a marketing communications effort and the competition they cause" (Rosengren, 2008)

As consumers' attention to traditional advertising is decreasing and the cost of attention in these channels steadily increases (Teixeira, 2014), brands have shifted to create advertising content intended to draw consumers towards their own channels (Rosengren, 2016). Hence, advertising has gone from focusing on traditional mass media to leveraging a multitude of new advertising formats (Eisend, 2015). Consequently, there is a need to understand what influences consumers to approach content messages in these formats (Rosengren, 2016) where a particularly interesting concept is indicated to be consumers' attitude toward the format in which a content message is distributed in (format attitude) (Burns & Lutz, 2006).

#### 1.2 **PROBLEMATIZATION**

Dahlén & Rosengren (in press) point out dynamics related to the evolution of advertising: new media and formats, new consumer behavior and extended effects of advertising. These are stated as important to guide future advertising research. In light of the rise of content marketing we specifically see a need for research connecting the first two dynamics.

The new media and formats dynamic highlights that advertising formats no longer include only paid media (e.g. TV) but also own media (e.g. podcast) (Dahlén & Rosengren, in press). Whereas traditional advertising is typically concerned with paid media, content marketing has a strong connection to own media (Pulizzi, 2012). The new consumer behavior dynamic connects to this since advertisers are forced to rely on consumers voluntarily approaching the content message distributed in own media (Dahlén & Rosengren, in press). In extension, consumer-perceived value in advertising becomes crucial to generate these approach behaviors (Ducoffe, 1995). An interesting new conceptualization of consumer-perceived value in a specific communications message is message equity (Rosengren, Ljungberg & Palmberg, 2016).

Understanding the mechanisms behind voluntarily approach behaviors towards advertising is important, yet research is limited (Rayport, 2013). Consequently, as investments in content marketing increase (IRM 2014, 2015) research regarding what influences message equity and consumers' behaviors towards a content message in own media becomes essential.

The construct advertising equity (Rosengren & Dahlén, 2015) has gained considerable attention, especially due to its positive influence on consumers' *general* willingness to approach a brand's future advertising. Further research is needed to understand if and when advertising equity has a connection to different approach behaviors. In particular, there is scarce research concerning how advertising equity influences approach behaviors towards a *specific* content message. Also, due to the importance of value in content marketing, it is vital to discover if advertising equity and the expectations it builds (Chang, 2014) can influence message equity which in turn has been indicated to influence advertising approach (Ducoffe, 1995; Ducoffe & Curlo, 2000). The connection between these concepts is missing in current research.

Furthermore, there is a need to understand advertising approach behaviors in new formats (Rosengren, 2016). Interestingly, consumers' attitude towards the advertising format has been indicated to influence behaviors towards the specific advertisement yet this is an under-researched area (e.g. Burns & Lutz, 2006; Speck & Elliott, 1997). More work is crucial to understand how

consumers' attitude towards a format influences approach behaviors, which are crucial in a content marketing context.

Additionally, since the core of content marketing is to create value for the consumers, the choice of format needs to maximize this value creation. Rosengren, Ljungberg & Palmberg (2016) made a first glance and stated that message equity of a content message is higher if communicated on a brand's own website compared to a news site. Burns & Lutz (2006) showed that format attitude influences attitude towards the advertisement. This indicates that the format itself influences consumers' judgment of the specific content message, but if the use of a format which consumers' have a high attitude towards can increase message equity (and in turn approach behaviors) is to be discovered. Hence, we see a clear gap in academia today regarding guidance of format choice from this consumer perspective.

There are several approach behaviors of importance. Firstly, since advertising attention is a scarce resource in today's cluttered advertising industry (Rosengren, 2008) it is crucial to investigate influencing factors of consumers' willingness to attend a specific content message (Rosengren, 2016). Research connected to attentional approach behaviors has investigated attention to the same advertising again (Yang & Smith, 2009) or a *general* willingness to attend future advertising for a certain brand (Rosengren & Dahlén, 2015), but not attention towards a *specific* content message.

Secondly, the rise of co-creation has gained attention across a broad range of fields, including management and marketing (e.g. Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004; Vargo & Lusch, 2004). Advertisers are increasingly relying on consumers' contribution to the marketing message (e.g. Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004) by co-creating the communication design, contributing with information or jointly deciding a message's subject (Modig, 2014; Bacile, Ye & Swilley, 2014). However, co-creation only works when consumers are motivated to share their ideas and honestly state their preferences (Füller, 2006). These motivations have been researched in other areas such as new product development (Füller, 2010) but what makes consumers co-create a content message is yet unknown, despite the many benefits for a company such as increasing a message's relevance to consumers (Modig, 2014). Marketing Science Institute (2008) stated customer co-creation as an important paradigm to research and there is clearly a gap to close by further understanding what motivates consumers to approach advertising by co-creating a content message.

#### 1.3 PURPOSE & RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The purpose of this thesis is to understand if format attitude and advertising equity have an effect on message equity and consumers' approach behaviors (willingness to attend and willingness to co-create) towards a specific content message.

#### **Research Question 1**

Does

(1) consumers' attitude towards the format in which a content message is distributed and/or

(2) the brand's advertising equity,

have a positive effect on message equity, consumers' willingness to attend and/or willingness to co-create a specific content message?

#### **Research Question 2**

Will the use of a high attitude format to distribute the content message have a larger effect on consumers' willingness to attend, willingness to co-create and/or message equity for a low compared to a high advertising equity brand?

#### **Research Question 3**

Does message equity act as a mediator between:

(1) consumers' attitude towards the format in which a content message is distributed and approach behaviors, in terms of consumers' willingness to attend and/or willingness to co-create, towards a specific content message?
(2) the brand's advertising equity and approach behaviors, in terms of consumers' willingness to attend and/or willingness to co-create, towards a specific content message?

#### 1.4 EXPECTED CONTRIBUTIONS

This thesis will contribute to advertising research by specifically focusing on content marketing and studying topics related to the two dynamics new media and formats and new consumer behavior (Dahlén & Rosengren, in press). We aim to further understand the mechanisms that affect message equity and consumers' approach behaviors towards a specific content message distributed in own media. In other words, we will contribute to the understanding of which components of a content message generates effects in terms of increased consumer-perceived value and approach behaviors, hence "more bang for the buck".

Previous research has explained the positive relationship between a brand's level of advertising equity and consumers' *general* approach behaviors towards the brand's future advertising (Rosengren & Dahlén, 2015). We expect to build on this finding and understand if advertising equity has an effect on consumers' approach behaviors towards a *specific* future content message. In addition, if higher advertising equity generates an additional increase in message equity for this content message.

Moreover, we aim to contribute by studying the concept of format attitude in connection to consumers' behavior (e.g. Burns & Lutz, 2006). We expect to discover if consumers' attitude towards the format influences message equity and approach behaviors towards a content message.

Specifically, we enhance the understanding of two approach behaviors. First, how format attitude and advertising equity affects consumers' willingness to attend (Rosengren & Dahlén, 2015) a specific content message. Second, if format attitude and advertising equity act as motivational factors for consumers' willingness to co-create (Füller, 2006) a content message.

Additionally, we will study a possible interaction effect between advertising equity and format attitude. Specifically, we aim to understand if the use of a high attitude format to distribute the content message has a larger effect on consumers' approach behaviors or message equity for a low compared to a high advertising equity brand?

Moreover, as consumer-perceived value is core to understand in content marketing we will make an additional contribution by understating the role of message equity as a possible mediator.

#### 1.5 DELIMITATIONS

The scope of this thesis is restricted due to limited time and resources. The research is only conducted in Sweden with Swedish brands. Advertising approach behaviors and message equity is important in both traditional (e.g. TV) and own advertising formats (e.g. events), but this thesis will only focus on communication in terms of content marketing in a brand's own media channels.

We have limited the investigated behaviors to willingness to attend and co-create the content message even though a variety of approach behaviors could have been investigated, for example willingness to pass on the communication (Lee, Ham & Kim, 2013). Also, we have restricted the influencing factors on message equity and approach behaviors to advertising equity and format attitude. Furthermore, the study is limited to only include attitude towards the format and not other format related constructs such as familiarity. Additionally, we will not measure antecedents of format attitude and consumer-perceived value.

The quantitative experiment will be conducted using two product categories differing in product category involvement, four brands with different level of advertising equity and two formats which differ in consumer attitude. Additional operationalizations could be used for each manipulated variable, but this was deemed too resource demanding.

We will investigate a possible interaction effect between advertising equity and format attitude on message equity and approach behaviors. However, we have limited the mediation analysis to analyzing the independent factors separately since the scope of this thesis would become too large to also include moderated mediation.

#### 1.6 THESIS OUTLINE

The model below describes the disposition of this thesis.



Model 1 Thesis Outline

# 2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK & HYPOTHESIS GENERATION

In this chapter the theoretical framework is presented and hypotheses are generated continuously. First the concepts of content marketing and advertising approach are presented. The chapter continues by discussing format attitude's and advertising equity's connection to approach behaviors. Then the concept of message equity is introduced and its relation to the previously discussed concepts is presented. A research model and also a summary of generated hypotheses finalizes the chapter.

### 2.1 THE CONCEPT OF CONTENT MARKETING

Content marketing has a long history but has recently increased in popularity (IRM 2014; 2015). The definition of content marketing is debated (Neff, 2015) but we will in line with Stephen, Sciandra & Inman (2015) define content marketing as *"marketing communication in which brands create and disseminate content to consumers with the intention that the content generates interest, engages consumers, and influences behavior"*. Content marketing is concerned with owning, opposed to renting media and it can leverage all channels for example print, online, in-person, social or mobile (Pulizzi, 2012).

Content marketing is built on a pull-logic where the consumer is drawn towards the brand's advertising and willingly approaches it due to the value it offers (Baines, Fill & Rosengren, in press), hence the components of each message are important to consider to maximize value creation. Content marketing is especially relevant when discussing advertising value, a recurring topic in advertising.

## 2.2 ADVERTISING APPROACH

### 2.2.1 ADVERTISING APPROACH AND AVOIDANCE

Advertising research has primarily focused on consumers' behavior *away* from advertising i.e. advertising avoidance (e.g. Cho & Cheon, 2004; Edwards, Li & Lee, 2000) rather than their behavior *towards* advertising i.e. advertising approach (e.g. Rayport, 2013; Rosengren & Dahlén, 2015). Speck & Elliott (1997) define advertising avoidance as "*all actions by media users that differentially reduce their exposure to ad content*". Advertising approach can be defined as "*consumer actions that volitionally increase their exposure to ad content*" (Rosengren, 2016).

New technology, such as adblockers in web browsers, has made it possible for consumers to control what is shown (Kelly, Kerr & Drennan, 2010) which gives them power to decide how, when and if advertising messages will be received (Schultz 2006b). Baeck & Morimoto (2012) show that when consumers are given the choice to view advertising they often choose to avoid it. This results in a great challenge for advertisers to reach out with their message in traditional mass media as consumers' advertising attention decreases (Teixeira, 2014), which makes brands rely on the use of their own (digital, social and physical) media channels to a greater extent (Rosengren & Dahlén, 2015). As new advertising formats see the light of day, one must understand that advertising will be more dependent on consumers voluntarily seeking out the advertising (i.e. advertising approach) (Rosengren, 2016).

#### 2.2.2 ADVERTISING APPROACH BEHAVIORS

Advertising approach behaviors can take several forms such as consumers' willingness to process advertising (Puccinelli, Wilcox & Grewal, 2015) or attend advertising (Rosengren, 2016; Rosengren & Dahlén, 2015). Further, we argue that co-creation of advertising (e.g. Bacile, Ye & Swilley, 2014) can be seen as an approach behavior since it implies a further behavioral commitment to approach the advertising and also be a part of creating its value. The consumer will invest their time and not "only" pay attention. We will focus on the latter two in this thesis, but adapted to the context of content marketing. In this theses we define willingness to attend a content message as "consumers' willingness to increase their attention to a specific content message", adapted from Rosengren (2016). Willingness to co-create a specific content message is defined as "consumers' willingness to co-create a specific content message", adapted from Prahalad & Ramaswamy (2004).

#### 2.2.2.1 WILLINGNESS TO ATTEND A CONTENT MESSAGE

The first advertising approach behavior we include in this thesis is volitional attention i.e. willingness to attend a content message (Rosengren, 2016; Rosengren & Dahlén, 2015). Attention can be referred to as "*the general distribution of mental activity being assigned to a stimulus*" (MacInnis & Jaworski, 1989). It is a consequence of either (1) a stimulus attracting attention by itself (bottom-up attention) or (2) personal factors such as interest and goals (top-down attention) (e.g. Greenberg, 2012; Pieters & Wedel, 2004). Since advertising approach can be characterized as advertising attention that is volitional and focused it is likely to be driven by top-down factors (Rosengren, 2016).

Research connected to attentional approach behaviors has investigated attention to the same advertising again (Yang & Smith, 2009) or a general willingness to attend future advertising for a certain brand (Rosengren & Dahlén, 2015). Consumers' voluntary attention to advertising has the benefit of advertisers being able to avoid relying on forced attention through mainly bought media, instead they can use own channels such as mobile applications, which is important as advertising clutter is increasing (Rosengren, 2016). Logically, exposures of a marketing message in own channels increases when voluntary attention is high. This implies that the higher the attention, the more exposure and the larger the communication effects are likely to be (Dahlén & Lange, 2009).

#### 2.2.2.2 WILLINGNESS TO CO-CREATE A CONTENT MESSAGE

As argued above co-creation of advertising (Bacile, Ye & Swilley, 2014) can be referred to as an approach behavior. The rise of co-creation has gained attention across a broad range of fields, including management and marketing (e.g. Etgar, 2007; Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004; Vargo & Lusch, 2004). In the traditional world of marketing, companies and consumers have distinct roles. Companies create value in terms of products and services which they then sell to a consumer. Today, this distinct separation is starting to blur and consumers are increasingly engaged in defining and creating value together with companies (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004).

Advertisers are increasingly relying on consumers' ability to contribute for example by crafting marketing messages (e.g. Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). Consumers can be offered to co-create the communication design, contribute with information or jointly decide a message's subject

(Modig, 2014; Bacile, Ye & Swilley, 2014). However, co-creation only works when consumers are motivated to share their ideas and honestly state their preferences (Füller, 2006).

Consumers' motivational factors for specifically co-creation of advertising is quite scarce. However, for co-creation in new product development, Füller (2006) reasons based on social exchange theory (Emerson, 1981), that consumers engage in co-creation because they expect it to be rewarding. There are many proposed intrinsic and extrinsic motivations such as a perceived need for better product, interest in the co-creational task itself (Füller, 2006), a positive attitude towards the brand and involvement in the product category (Füller, 2010). Also, an increasing number of consumers are taking an active role in the creation of products which they consume (Roberts, Baker & Walker, 2005).

Several benefits are connected to the co-creation of value such as customized experiences (Rashid, Varey & Costley, n.d). Co-creation of advertising can evolve the marketing message by increasing its relevance to consumers (Modig, 2014). Also, it can help develop a close relationship with customers with the potential of creating emotional involvement between the brand and customer, build the brand and its reputation as well as generate word-of-mouth (Gamble & Gilmore, 2013; Hoyer, Chandy, Dorotic, Krafft & Singh, 2010).

#### 2.3 FORMAT ATTITUDE

Previous research has primarily focused on attitude towards advertising in general and its effect on consumer behaviors, without any reference to specific format (Briggs & Hollis, 1997; Bruner & Kumar, 2000). However, Burns & Lutz (2006) find that consumers differentiate between attitude towards the advertising format and the advertisement itself, highlighting the importance of selecting appropriate formats in content marketing.

We define format attitude as "*a predisposition to respond in a consistently favorable or unfavorable manner toward an advertising formal*", adapted from Burns (2003). This attitude is dependent on perceptions of the format (Burns & Lutz, 2006) similar to those used by Ducoffe (1996) to explore advertising value.

There is a wide range of content marketing formats for example mobile applications, videos, blogs, in-person events and podcasts (Content Marketing Institute, 2016). The choice of format affects the commitment the brand takes on; podcast and blogs usually requires continuous updates every week or month, while in-person events typically requires less (Linn, 2014). However, the potential reach can be higher for an online format, for example a podcast, while an offline format, for example an in-person event, is ideal to build a relationship (Harris, 2016). In essence, there are many parameters which formats differ by from the perspective of the company. However, formats also differ in the consumer's mind, and one of these constructs is consumer's attitude towards the format.

#### 2.3.1 FORMAT ATTITUDE AND APPROACH BEHAVIORS

A long tradition of attitude-behavior research indicates that consumers' attitude towards the format used to distribute the content message should, at least to some extent, predict approach behaviors

towards the message (Hoyer, MacInnis & Pieters, 2012). Studies concerning choice of media vehicle carrying the advertisement (i.e. format) show that the same message can have different effects depending on vehicle used (Freiden, 1982; Chaiken & Stangor, 1987).

#### 2.3.1.1 WILLINGNESS TO ATTEND A CONTENT MESSAGE

Format attitude can be referred to as a top-down factor (a trait and state of the consumer) influencing attention (Pieters & Wedel, 2004). Research by Speck and Elliott (1997) indicates that a negative attitude towards a medium, reflected by the anteceding perceptions towards that medium, explains the behavior of not attending the advertising (avoidance) by for example switching TV channel during commercials. We argue that format attitude is likely to influence consumers willingly attend a content message (approach). This is supported by Cho (1999) who finds that consumers with higher format attitude are more likely to have higher intention to click on online advertising. In addition, Burns & Lutz (2006) showed that consumers' attitude towards an online format was significantly related to attitude towards the advertising, and additionally to self-reported behaviors for example clicking on banner ads. Hence, we propose that consumers' who have a positive attitude towards the format which a content is distributed in, will be more likely to attend the content message.

#### 2.3.1.2 WILLINGNESS TO CO-CREATE A CONTENT MESSAGE

Previous research has indicated that when people like a brand or the product category it increases their motivation to engage in co-creation (Füller, 2010). Also, consumers seem to take an active role in the creation of products which they consume (Roberts, Baker & Walker, 2005). Taken together, this indicates that consumers are more motivated to co-create when the task is connected to something they like and wish to take part of. We use the underlying logic of the findings in this research and place it in the context of content marketing. Hence, when consumers have a favorable attitude towards the format which a content message is distributed in they will be more motivated to contribute, because they like the format and wish to "consume" content in it.

H1 a) Consumers' willingness to attend the content message is higher when the content is distributed in a high attitude format, compared to a low attitude format

b) Consumers' willingness to co-create the content message is higher when the content is distributed in a high attitude format, compared to a low attitude format

#### 2.4 ADVERTISING EQUITY

#### 2.4.1 ADVERTISING AS AN EXCHANGE OF VALUE

Advertising messages can be seen as communication exchanges between a sender (advertiser) and a receiver (consumer) (Ducoffe, 1995) and involves passing value between the two parties (Houston & Gassenheimer, 1987). Ducoffe (1995) define advertising value as "a subjective evaluation of the relative worth or utility of advertising to consumers". Consumers give their time and cognitive effort to advertising and therefore expect to receive something of value in return (Rosengren, Modig & Dahlén, 2014).

The sources of consumer-perceived value have been explored repeatedly during last decade. Advertising value can derive from for example information (e.g. Ducoffe, 1995; McQuail, 1983, Ratchford, 1980) entertainment (e.g. Ducoffe, 1995; 1996; O'Donohoe, 1994), it being used to socialize with (Ritson & Elliott, 1999) or perceived as creative (Rosengren, Dahlén & Modig, 2013). Advertising which lacks in value tends to result in negative consumer response, for example tuning out, while advertising perceived to be high in value is likely to contribute to positive consumer response such as favorable attitudes (Ducoffe & Curlo, 2000).

### 2.4.2 THE CONCEPT OF ADVERTISING EQUITY

Advertising which creates consumer-perceived value does not only limit itself to a particular unit of advertising, it rather accumulates over time. Rosengren & Dahlén (2015) define this concept of advertising equity as "consumers' cumulative perceptions of the global value of a brand's past advertising".

Advertising equity is different from advertising attitudes and engagement due to its focal object (*total* advertising) and temporal focus (*past* advertising). In terms of focal object and temporal focus, advertising equity can be assumed to be similar to ad stock in which advertising spending is studied (e.g. Broadbent, 1979). However, even though advertising investments (ad stock) are needed to create value, ad stock does not take the actual value created into account and only assumes that every money spent equals value, which advertising equity does not.

Rosengren & Dahlén (2015) show that advertising equity is a distinct facet of brand equity, not covered by established measures of brand equity used in advertising and branding (e.g. Vakratsas & Ambler 1999; Veloutsou, Christodoulides & De Chernatony, 2013). Being separate from other brand equity constructs, for example attitudinal and behavioral brand loyalty, implies that a consumer can be fond of the advertising but not of the brand behind it (and vice versa).

Advertising equity leads to several benefits for a company such as the possibility to communicate more cost efficiently since consumers will perceive the advertising to be worth more attention, i.e. volitional attention increases (Rosengren & Dahlén, 2015) This opens up for the possibility to change the perception of the brand (Kntnt Sweden AB, 2016). Also, advertising equity signals positive qualities in the brand such as developing better products and can open up for new cooperations (Rosengren, 2014).

#### 2.4.3 ADVERTISING EQUITY AND APPROACH BEHAVIORS

#### 2.4.3.1 WILLINGNESS TO ATTEND A CONTENT MESSAGE

Rosengren & Dahlén (2015) show that advertising equity has a positive effect on consumer's willingness to attend a brand's future advertising in general. Hence, advertising equity seems to increase expectations about the brand's future communication. Chang (2014) shows consumers create expectations about a new commercial, based on a brand's previous advertising.

Consumers' expectations can in turn affect their evaluations. Previous research has shown that Coca-Cola was evaluated better when it was consumed from a branded cup rather than an unbranded, because consumers expect Coca-Cola to taste good (McClure, Li, Tomlin, Cypert &

Montague, 2004) and a slice of turkey is rated high if the consumer believe that it is from a popular brand compared to an unpopular (Makens, 1965). This speaks for high advertising equity generating an increase in consumers' expectations which in turn makes them evaluate the content message to be worth approaching. Hence, when the content message is created by a high advertising equity brand consumers will be more willing to approach it.

On the other hand, the expectancy-disconfirmation theory suggests that people evaluate, for example a product, based on how well their expectations about the product matches its actual performance and the discrepancy in-between. If the product performs better than expected the customer will be satisfied (positive disconfirmation), but if the performance is worse it leads to dissatisfaction (negative disconfirmation) (Hoyer, MacInnis & Pieters, 2012). The initial starting point regarding expectations on content from a brand will be dependent their level of advertising equity. However, with the same level of performance, for example the exact same message, the satisfaction will end on the same level for both brands. This due to positive disconfirmation for the low advertising equity brand since the content was above expectations and the opposite for the high advertising equity brand since they did not meet the high expectation (negative disconfirmation). Advertising equity will therefore have zero effect on the potential positive outcome.

However, we expect that advertising equity will be such as strong predictor of evaluations, since the expectations have been reinforced over time, that a high advertising equity brand will get a higher willingness to attend, compared to low advertising equity brand. As an extension of Rosengren & Dahlén (2015) we propose that higher advertising equity leads to a higher willingness to attend for a specific content message.

#### 2.4.3.2 WILLINGNESS TO CO-CREATE A CONTENT MESSAGE

In addition, we propose that advertising equity positively influences consumer's willingness to cocreate a content message based on several arguments. We believe that advertising equity will build positive expectations about being part of co-creational activities regarding future advertising. The expectations will in turn create motivation to engage in the creation of additional value since consumers perceive that they will contribute to something meaningful and want to make the advertising they received value from before better, which they will also benefit from in the future (Füller, 2006). Also, since a consumer is likely to be more motivated to co-create for a brand they like (Füller, 2010), it is also probable that they will co-create for a brand whose *advertising* they like. Furthermore, a brand which makes an effort to create advertising with equitable exchange of value is perceived to make an effort in other areas (Rosengren, 2014). We propose that this signaling effect also influences consumer's willingness to co-create in such a way that when advertising equity is high the brand is perceived to be likely to make an effort to integrate the co-creational ideas into their advertising, which motivates consumers to contribute.

H2 a) Consumers' willingness to attend the content message will be higher when the content is created by a brand with high advertising equity, compared to a brand with low advertising equity

b) Consumers' willingness to co-create the content message will be higher when the content is created by a brand with high advertising equity, compared to a brand with low advertising equity

# 2.5 FORMAT ATTITUDE, ADVERTISING EQUITY AND APPROACH BEHAVIORS

Advertising equity has been shown to have an effect on willingness to attend future advertising (Rosengren & Dahlén, 2015). Consumers develop expectations about a brand's communication based on their previous experience (Chang, 2014) which can affect their following evaluations (e.g. McClure *et al*, 2004).

Due to the expectations consumers have based on a brand's level of advertising equity, we argue that the baseline value of approach behaviors is higher for a brand with high advertising equity, as opposed to a brand with low advertising equity. Whereas advertising equity could provide approach behaviors towards future advertising by itself (in line with reasoning for H2a-b) for a high advertising equity brand, a low advertising equity brand would be more dependent on using a high attitude format to increase approach behaviors.

We specifically propose that the effect on consumers' approach behaviors of using a high attitude format is moderated by a brand's level of advertising equity. For a low advertising equity brand consumers' approach behaviors towards the content message would differ more depending on attitude towards the format used, compared to a high advertising equity brand. This would mean that a low advertising equity brand could gain a lot from using the right format, but also be more restricted to using these high attitude formats to gain higher approach behaviors. A high advertising equity brand would have the advantage of high approach behaviors regardless of format, and therefore be able to pick formats based on other important factors from a company perspective such as maintenance time (Linn, 2014) to a larger extent.

H3 a) The use of a high attitude format to distribute the content increases consumers' wilingness to attend the content message more for a low than a high advertising equity brand

b) The use of a high attitude format to distribute the content increases consumers' wilingness to co-create the content message more for a low than a high advertising equity brand

### 2.6 MESSAGE EQUITY

In the theoretical discussion so far we have proposed that consumers' approach behaviors towards a specific content message are influenced by the concepts (1) a brand's level of advertising equity and (2) consumers' attitude towards the format which the message is distributed in. In this section we will discuss that these concepts also are likely to influence consumer-perceived value (i.e. message equity) of the content message. In addition, we argue for message equity acting as a mediator.

#### 2.6.1 THE CONCEPT OF MESSAGE EQUITY

As stated above, advertising equity focuses on the consumer's subjective assessment of the cumulative value of all *past* advertising from a brand (Rosengren & Dahlén, 2015). Message equity is adapted from this construct can be referred to as "*consumer-perceived value of a specific marketing communication message*". Hence, the temporal focus of message equity is on the *present*, in comparison to advertising equity (Rosengren, Ljungberg & Palmberg, 2016).

#### 2.6.2 FORMAT ATTITUDE AND MESSAGE EQUITY

Previous research indicates on a connection between the format and the perceived value of a marketing communication message. Dahlén, Granlund & Grenros (2009) state that consumerperceived value of a marketing campaign is higher in non-traditional media (guerilla marketing) compared to traditional media (posters). In addition, message equity has been found to be higher when a content message is distributed in a brand's own media channel (own website) compared to in a bought media channel (news website) (Rosengren, Ljungberg & Palmberg, 2016).

Specifically related to format attitude, research by Burns & Lutz (2006) shows a positive relationship between a consumer's attitude towards the format and attitude towards the advertisement. They mean that the attitude to an advertising format is dependent on the perceptions of value in that format such as being informative or entertaining, perceptions also used in studies of advertising attitude (e.g. Ducoffe, 1996). We argue that favorable perceptions and hence high attitude towards a format which a content message is transmitted in spills over on message equity.

H4 Message equity is higher when the content is distributed in a high attitude format, compared to a low attitude format

#### 2.6.3 ADVERTISING EQUITY AND MESSAGE EQUITY

Since advertising equity is a cumulative measure of a brand's past advertising it is logical that the higher message equity a brand receives for a specific content message the larger increase the brand gains in advertising equity. As stated in section 2.4.3.1 above, the higher advertising equity a brand achieves the greater expectations a consumer has on the value of future advertising (Chang, 2014). Hence, higher advertising equity should lead to a higher consumer-perceived value of the content message.

According to the expectancy-disconfirmation theory (Hoyer, MacInnis & Pieters, 2012), as discussed in section 2.4.3.1, a high advertising equity brand can receive the same outcome in terms of message equity as a low advertising equity brand. This due to the initially higher expectations for the high advertising equity brand, which will be more difficult to live up to, the level of message equity would be the same regardless of a brands advertising equity.

However, we argue for a connection between consumers' expectations and a positive evaluation of a content message's value due to the brand's advertising equity, in line with 2.4.3.1. Specifically, consumer's higher expectations on a content message created by a brand with high advertising equity influences their judgment positively and the perceived value will be higher, compared to a low advertising equity brand. This means that if a brand has achieved a high level of advertising equity it would have the advantage of consumers perceiving the future content messages as more valuable and get an additional increase in advertising equity.

# **H5** Message equity is higher when the content message is created by a brand with high advertising equity, compared to a brand with low advertising equity

#### 2.6.4 FORMAT ATTITUDE, ADVERTISING EQUITY AND MESSAGE EQUITY

In similarity to the theoretical arguments in section 2.5, we reason that the baseline value of message equity is higher for a high advertising equity brand, compared to a low advertising equity brand. Whereas advertising equity generates message equity by itself for a high advertising equity brand, a low advertising equity brand will be more dependent on using a high attitude format to increase the consumer-perceived value in a specific content message.

**H6** The use of a high attitude format to distribute the content increases message equity more for a low than a high advertising equity brand

# 2.6.5 INDIRECT EFFECT ON APPROACH BEHAVIORS THROUGH MESSAGE EQUITY

Advertising which lacks in value tends to result in negative consumer response, for example tuning out, while advertising perceived to be high in value is likely to contribute to positive consumer response (Ducoffe & Curlo, 2000). Previous research indicates that the expected value of a specific advertisement affects consumer's attention to that advertising (Ducoffe, 1995). This speaks for a positive relationship between message equity and consumers' willingness to attend a content message. In line with motivational research for co-creation we argue that the perceived value of a content message can act as a motivation for consumers to be a part of creating additional value because they feel that they are contributing to something meaningful and want to make the advertising they value better, which they will benefit from in the future (Füller, 2006). Hence, there is a theoretical foundation for a positive relationship between message equity and consumer's approach behaviors towards the content message.

This theoretical connection of message equity's influence on approach behaviors is added to the previous theoretical arguments concerning format attitude's and advertising equity's connection to message equity and approach behaviors. We specifically propose that message equity acts as a mediator. Perceived value has been found to be a mediator in previous research (e.g. Arslanagić, Babić-Hodović & Mehić, 2013; Liu, Chang, & Tsai, 2015). Of specific interest to our thesis is research by Dahlén, Granlund & Grenros (2009) who found that consumer-perceived value of an advertisement mediated the effect of non-traditional media on purchase and word-of-mouth intentions. This specifically shows that perceived value of an advertisement can act as a mediator between a formats influence on consumer's behavior. In line with the above, we argue that there should be positive indirect effects of format attitude and advertising equity on consumers' approach behaviors through message equity.

H7 a) Format attitude has a positive, indirect effect on consumers' willingness to attend the content message through message equity

b) Format attitude has a positive, indirect effect on consumers' willingness to co-create the content message through message equity

H8 a) Advertising equity has a positive, indirect effect on consumers' willingness to attend the content message through message equity
b) Advertising equity has a positive, indirect effect on consumers' willingness to co-create the content message through message equity

#### 2.7 RESEARCH MODEL & HYPOTHESES SUMMARY

The generated hypotheses are summarized in the research model below.



Model 2 Research Model

|     | Y   |
|-----|---|
|     | a) Consumers' willingness to attend the content message is higher when the content is                 |
| H1  | distributed in a high attitude format, compared to a low attitude format                              |
|     | b) Consumers' willingness to co-create the content message is higher when the content is distributed  |
|     | in a high attitude format, compared to a low attitude format  |
|     | a) Consumers' willingness to attend the content message will be higher when the content is created    |
|     | by a brand with high advertising equity, compared to a brand with low advertising equity              |
| H2  | b) Consumers' willingness to co-create the content message will be higher when the content is         |
|     | created by a brand with high advertising equity, compared to a brand with low advertising equity      |
|     | a) The use of a high attitude format to distribute the content increases consumers' wilingness to     |
| H3  | attend the content message more for a low than a high advertising equity brand                        |
|     | b) The use of a high attitude format to distribute the content increases consumers' wilingness to     |
|     | co-create the content message more for a low than a high advertising equity brand                     |
|     | Message equity is higher when the content is distributed in a high attitude format, compared to a     |
| H4  | low attitude format   |
|     |   |
| H5  | Message equity is higher when the content message is created by a brand with high advertising         |
|     | equity, compared to a brand with low advertising equity   |
| H6  | The use of a high attitude format to distribute the content increases message equity more for a low   |
| 110 | than a high advertising equity brand  |
|     | a) Format attitude has a positive, indirect effect on consumers' willingness to attend the content    |
|     | message through message equity  |
| H7  | b) Format attitude has a positive, indirect effect on consumers' willingness to co-create the content |
|     | message through message equity  |
|     | a) Advertising equity has a positive, indirect effect on consumers' willingness to attend the         |
|     | content message through message equity  |
| H8  |   |
|     | b) Advertising equity has a positive, indirect effect on consumers' willingness to co-create the      |
|     | content message through message equity  |

Table 1 Hypotheses Summary

# **3 METHODOLOGY**

The purpose of this chapter is to explain the methodological decisions that were made in order to answer the research questions. Initially, we explain how the topic was chosen and the research design before the results from pre studies and scenario development are shown. Thereafter, the main study questionnaire, sampling and statistical method used are presented before this chapter is finished with the study's reliability and validity.

### 3.1 SELECTION OF TOPIC

During our third semester at the MSc program in Marketing and Media Management at Stockholm School of Economics, we studied the course Contemporary Research Issues in Marketing. We reviewed cutting-edge research within marketing, and specifically an associate professor introduced us to the evolution of advertising (e.g. Dahlén & Rosengren, in press). Our attention was caught and we decided to focus our thesis on issues of this revolution due to its impact on marketing strategy for companies today and in the future.

A highlighted issue due to the evolution, was the importance of content marketing for consumers' approach behaviors. Companies have been forced to increasingly rely on consumers to voluntarily approach their advertising (Rosengren, 2008). Therefore, companies need to provide value for the consumers in their advertising, the core of content marketing, to draw them towards the communication. These issues are in great need for further research, which made the area of great interest for us and also relevant to contribute to.

### 3.2 SCIENTIFIC APPROACH

Deductive approach was used in this thesis since the formed hypotheses are based on previous academic research and have been tested through empirical analysis in order to answer the research questions (Bryman & Bell, 2015). Criticism against deductive research often highlights the narrow data collection because only the current research questions in focus are explored. Thus, there is a risk that factors beyond the researched areas influence results and not covered in the conducted research (Jacobsen, 2002).

The research design is conclusive and we aimed to find causal relationships between format attitude, advertising equity and several dependent variables. A quantitative experiment approach was used to test the hypotheses (Bryman & Bell, 2015), which is deemed appropriate due to methodological fit with previous research in this area and also increase the result's generalizability (Malholtra, 2014). Malholtra (2014) suggests experiments as the primary method for establishing cause-and-effect relationships in marketing which was found suitable. An experiment is when individuals are randomly allocated to different groups, which receive different treatments, and then the groups' reactions after treatments are compared (Söderlund, 2010).

A scenario based laboratory experiment (Cooper & Schindler, 2014) was found appropriate since it enables us to control the experiment environment, make it identical between groups and manipulate the independent variables expected to affect investigated reactions. Using fieldexperiment (Cooper & Schindler, 2014) instead would not be possible due to limitations in time and resources but more importantly it is not likely that the brands used as operationalizations would like to create the content in reality. Moreover, our focus is to measure the reaction to future advertising where the content is not yet created which makes the experimental scenario-based design necessary.

#### 3.3 MAIN STUDY DESIGN

The main study design was a scenario-based experiment with a following self-reporting questionnaire (Söderlund, 2010). Hence, a 2x2x2 factorial design was used with a total of eight groups where three independent variables were manipulated (1) product category involvement, (2) advertising equity and (3) attitude towards the format. Operationalizations for these variables was determined with three pre studies.

| Product Category Involvement | Lov |      | Low |      | High |      |     |      |
|------------------------------|-----|------|-----|------|------|------|-----|------|
| Advertising Equity           | Lo  | w    | Hi  | gh   | Lo   | w    | Hi  | gh   |
| Format Attitude              | Low | High | Low | High | Low  | High | Low | High |
| Group                        | I   | 2    | 3   | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7   | 8    |
| THAT                         |     |      |     |      |      |      |     |      |

Table 2 Experiment Groups

We used stimulus sampling i.e. the use of multiple instances of a stimulus category in research. Using more than two stimuli instead of one is better to represent a category (Wells & Windschitl, 1999) which increases robustness and generalizability of our results. Two instances were found sufficient in this thesis due to limitations in time and scope. Therefore, each advertising equity level is represented by one low and one high involvement product category brand which means that the main study's result is analyzed in terms of a 2x2 design where advertising equity and format attitude were used as independent variables to investigate whether they have a causal relationship with the dependent variables (Bryman & Bell, 2015).

| Product Category Involvement | Low & High |      |     |      |
|------------------------------|------------|------|-----|------|
| Advertising Equity           | Lo         | w    | Hi  | gh   |
| Format Attitude              | Low        | High | Low | High |
| Group                        | Ι          | 2    | 3   | 4    |
|                              |            |      |     |      |

Table 3 Experiment Groups Used for Analysis

#### 3.3.1 PRE STUDIES

The aim for the pre studies was to find appropriate operationalizations for manipulated variables. To avoid repetition, the following aspects were common for all pre studies:

- Respondents were randomly allocated to experiment groups, answering questions with regard to only one aspect
- Division of respondents between groups are displayed in the table for respective study
- Each questionnaire was pretested on minimum two people to ensure understanding, any unclarity was adjusted
- All questionnaires ended with demographic questions: gender (male/female/other) and age
- Questionnaires were in Swedish and are available in its original language in appendix referred to in each study

• Data collection was performed at universities in Stockholm or via event on social media (Facebook)

#### 3.3.1.1 PRE STUDY 1: PRODUCT CATEGORY INVOLVEMENT

Pre study one's purpose was to find two product categories significantly different in terms of consumers' perceived level of involvement (low/high). Product category involvement is an important motivational factor that influences a broad range of consumer perceptions and behaviors (Dholakia, 2001) which motivates its use in choice of product categories. Therefore, product category involvement is used to increase the generalizability of our results, and not a theoretical variable.

#### Procedure

Consumers' level of involvement was measured in one of the following categories: food, interior decorating or consumer electronics. Categories were chosen based on two conditions. First, they must be present on a list with the 100 brands with largest media investments in Sweden 2015 (TNS-Sifo Reklammätningar, 2015) and second, at least two brands with high advertising spending needed to be found on the list. This to ensure the brands' broad relevance to respondents. We are aware that brands doing advertising in their own rather than paid media are not the list, but since we cannot access this data we have chosen the aforementioned list.

#### Questionnaire

Initially, the product category was defined to the respondent. *Product Category Involvement* was measured by asking: "What is your general opinion about purchase of [product category] at [brands X, Y, or Z]?" with three items on a seven-point semantic differential scale: (Very unimportant decision/Very important decision; Decision requires little thought/Decision requires a lot of thought; Little to lose if you choose the wrong brand/A lot to lose if you choose the wrong brand) (Dahlén, Rasch & Rosengren, 2003) (Cronbach's alpha = .70). Example of brands (ICA, Coop or Willys/IKEA, Mio or EM/ElGiganten, Media Markt or Siba) was provided for each product category to put all respondents in the same mindset. See questionnaire in appendix 1.

#### Sample

A convenience sample was used (Bryman & Bell, 2015) as 92 university students were asked to answer the questionnaire. The response rate (Bryman & Bell, 2015) was 98% and reasons for not answering was due to lack of time, hence, 90 respondents were valid (54.4 % men, 45.6 % women; average age = 21.8).

### Result

Multi-item measurement was calculated as a mean score for each respondent. An ANOVA was conducted to explore product category involvement in the product categories. Post-hoc comparisons (Tukey HSD) show that food was significantly different from interior decorating  $(M_{food} = 3.81; M_{interior} = 4.68; p = .021^{**})$ . Consumer electronics was not significantly different from the other categories.

| Product category             | Food              | Interior decorating | Consumer electronics |  |  |  |
|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| Group                        | А                 | В                   | С                    |  |  |  |
| n                            | 30                | 30                  | 30                   |  |  |  |
| Product category involvement |                   |                     |                      |  |  |  |
| F(2,87) = 4.05, p = .021**   |                   |                     |                      |  |  |  |
| Mean                         | 3.81 <sup>B</sup> | 4.68 <sup>A</sup>   | 4.48                 |  |  |  |
| SD                           | 1.28              | 1.29                | 1.17                 |  |  |  |

\* Significant at p < .1; \*\* Significant at p < .05; \*\*\* Significant at p < .01

Table 4 Pre Study 1 Product Category Involvement

#### **Chosen Operationalization**

Food was chosen to operationalize the low and interior decorating the high involvement product category.

#### 3.3.1.2 PRE STUDY 2: ADVERTISING EQUITY

Pre study two's purpose was to identify two brands, significantly different in advertising equity (low/high) within each of the two chosen product categories.

#### Procedure

Possible brands to analyze was generated through a convenience sample with an online questionnaire distributed via an event on social media (Facebook). Respondents were given a definition of the product category and advertising. Then they were asked to name a brand which they perceived to make good advertising within their respective product category (see appendix 2). We invited 198 people to the event and encouraged them to forward the event to their friends. In total, 62 of the 224 invited people chose to answer the questionnaire. 38 of them could name a brand and therefore valid to use (34.2 % men, 65.8% women; average age = 25.2) which lead to a response rate of 17 %. The most frequently named brand in food was ICA (n = 18) and in interior decorating IKEA (n = 11). These brands were matched with the aforementioned list (TNS-Sifo Reklammätningar, 2015) to ensure that they were big spenders in their category to ensure broad appeal. ICA and IKEA were the top spenders in their respective category. Additional brands within each category was chosen by selecting the second top spender (food: Coop; interior decorating: Mio). The four brands were investigated in terms of advertising equity.

#### Questionnaire

No stimuli, for example an ad, was shown since the value from past advertising (i.e. advertising equity) only can be connected to the brand if the consumer correctly can identify the sender without help. Furthermore, advertising equity is the sum of all past advertising, not just one particular ad for the specific brand.

Initially, the product category was defined. Screening was done by asking respondents: "Have you heard about [brand]?" (Yes/No) and "Have you heard or seen advertising from [brand]?" (Yes/No).

Thereafter, respondents were asked to think about advertising from the brand and were also introduced to a definition of advertising. In line with Rosengren & Dahlén (2015) the precise instructions were:

We will now ask you a couple of questions regarding what you think about [brand's] advertising. By "advertising" we mean communications from a company directed to you as a customer. It could, for example, be advertising you have seen on TV or in print media, but also branded events, websites, applications in your mobile phone, or YouTube clips. Think about all the advertising from [brand] that you have seen or heard earlier, for example on TV or web. In general, what do you think about the advertising?

Advertising equity was measured with three items on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). Respondents were asked "I think [brand's] advertising is typically..." (Interesting/Worth my attention/Worthwhile) (Rosengren, 2014; Rosengren & Dahlén, 2015) (Cronbach's alpha = .92).

*Brand equity* was measured to understand if the brands differed in terms of this construct and consequently must be included as a covariate in the main study. It was operationalized as brand loyalty in line with Dahlén & Rosengren (2015) and Grohmann (2009). Respondents were asked "To what extent to do you agree with the following statements in regard to [brand]?" measured on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree). *Attitudinal brand loyalty* was measured with two items: "I am committed to [brand]" and "I would be willing to pay a higher price at [brand] than other stores" (Cronbach's alpha = .60). *Behavioral brand loyalty* was measured with two items: "I will buy at [brand] next time I buy [product category]" and "I intend to keep shopping at [brand]" (Cronbach's alpha = .82). See questionnaire in appendix 3.

#### Sample

141 university students were asked to answer the questionnaire and 129 chose to do so (convenience sample). Reasons for not participating were due to lack of time or not understanding Swedish. Respondents who answered "Yes" in the screening were considered valid, resulting in valid 121 respondents (52.1 % men, 47.1 % women, 0.8 % other; average age = 22.8) Response rate was 85.8 %.

#### Result

Multi-item measurements were calculated as mean score for each respondent. Independent sample t-tests were run to compare the brands within each category in terms of the investigated measures. A Bonferroni adjustment (see section 3.5) was adopted and the significance level is then p < .025 to state a difference between brands in the measured variables.

Advertising equity was significantly different between brands in both categories (food:  $M_{Coop} = 3.08$ ,  $M_{ICA} = 5.05$ ,  $p = .000^{***}$ ; interior decorating:  $M_{Mio} = 2.79$ ,  $M_{IKEA} = 4.71$ ,  $p = .000^{***}$ ). There was a significant difference in attitudinal brand loyalty of between brands in both categories (food:  $M_{Coop} = 1.85$ ,  $M_{ICA} = 3.19$ ,  $p = .000^{***}$ ; interior decorating:  $M_{Mio} = 2.27$ ,  $M_{IKEA} = 3.28$ ,  $p = .003^{***}$ ).

| Product Category Involvement | L                      | Low      |                        | igh      |
|------------------------------|------------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|
| Product Category             | Fo                     | od       | Interior dec           | orating  |
| Brand                        | Соор                   | ICA      | Mio                    | IKEA     |
| n                            | 30                     | 31       | 30                     | 30       |
| Advertising equity           |                        |          |                        |          |
|                              | t(59)=5.68, p =.000*** |          | t(58)=7.33, p =.000*** |          |
| Mean                         | 3.08                   | 5.05     | 2.79                   | 4.71     |
| SD                           | 1.35                   | 1.37     | .80                    | 1.20     |
| Attitudinal brand loyalty    |                        |          |                        |          |
|                              | t(59)=4.02, p          | =.000*** | t(58)=3.10, p          | =.003*** |
| Mean                         | 1.85                   | 3.19     | 2.27                   | 3.28     |
| SD                           | .91                    | 1.60     | 1.51                   | .97      |
| Behavioral brand loyalty     |                        |          |                        |          |
|                              | t(59)=4.54, p          | =.000*** | t(58)=6.94, p          | =.000*** |
| Mean                         | 2.80                   | 4.68     | 2.68                   | 5.10     |
| SD                           | 1.39                   | 1.81     | 1.51                   | 1.16     |

Also, there was a significant difference in behavioral brand loyalty (food:  $M_{Coop} = 2.80$ ,  $M_{ICA} = 4.68$ ,  $p = .000^{***}$ ; interior decorating:  $M_{Mio} = 2.68$ ,  $M_{IKEA} = 5.10$ ,  $p = .000^{***}$ ).

\* Significant at p < .1; \*\* Significant at p < .05; \*\*\* Significant at p < .01

Table 5 Pre Study 2 Advertising Equity

#### **Chosen Operationalization**

ICA and IKEA were confirmed to be high advertising equity brands and Coop and Mio low advertising equity brands in their respective category, thus, suitable to use in the main study. Since brands differ in brand equity it will be included as a covariate in the main study.

#### 3.3.1.3 PRE STUDY 3: FORMAT ATTITUDE

Pre study three's purpose was to find two suitable content marketing formats, different in terms of consumers' attitude towards them.

#### Procedure

We conducted research on different formats to ensure their fit with our experiment (e.g. contentmarketinginstitute.com). The chosen formats had to fit with the upcoming scenario content, but also be relevant and believable for the brands and product categories used as operationalizations. The formats had to be rather established, unknown formats would be difficult to imagine. Therefore, podcast and event was seen as suitable to investigate in terms of format attitude.

#### Questionnaire

Initially, respondents were given a definition of the format to ensure similar understanding between respondents:

- **Event** An occasion where you as a consumer is given the opportunity to interact with a company in person.
- **Podcast** A series of digital audio episodes, distributed over internet. The listener can access these via for example their smartphone or computer.

Attitude towards the format was measured using a three-item, seven-point semantic differential scale (e.g. Osgood, Suci & Tannenbaum, 1957; Simonin & Ruth, 1998; Lange, Rosengren & Blom, 2016). Format attitude has been measured specifically in Burns & Lutz (2006) but the scale has not been validated and was used in a study focused on online formats. In Speck & Elliott (1997) it was measured with only one item (negative/positive). Our chosen scale in line with Lange, Rosengren & Blom (2016), was considered more solid due to its robustness over time and use of multiple items which improve reliability. Specifically, participants were asked: "What is your general opinion towards [format]?" with the items (bad/good; negative/positive; unfavorable/favorable) (Cronbach's alpha = .88). See questionnaire in appendix 4.

#### Sample

An online questionnaire was distributed via an event on social media (Facebook) (convenience sample). In total, 253 people were invited to the event since people were encouraged to forward the event to their friends. In total, 126 persons chose to answer the questionnaire which resulted in a 49.8 % response rate (26.2 % men, 73.8 % women; average age = 27.4).

#### Result

| Multi-item measurement was calculated as a mean score for each respondent. Independent sample                          |
|--|
| t-tests were run to compare the formats in terms of consumers' attitude and there was a significant                    |
| difference in attitude scores between podcast and event ( $M_{podcast} = 5.34$ ; $M_{event} = 5.87$ ; $p = .004$ ***). |

| Content Marketing Format   | Podcast | Event |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| n  | 65      | 61    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Format Attitude  |         |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| t(124) = 2.90, p = .004***   |         |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean   | 5.34    | 5.87  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SD   | 1.15    | .91   |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Significant at $p < 1$ , ** Significant at $p < 0$ E, *** Significant at $p < 0$ |         |       |  |  |  |  |  |

\* Significant at p < .1; \*\* Significant at p < .05; \*\*\* Significant at p < .01

Table 6 Pre Study 3 Format Attitude

#### **Chosen Operationalization**

High attitude format was operationalized by event and low attitude format as podcast. It is noteworthy that both formats still have what can be considered a high attitude (mean score > 5). Hence possibly significant results in the main study would mean that approach behaviors and message equity are sensitive even to small differences in format attitude.

#### 3.3.1.4 SUMMARY OF PRE STUDIES

The results obtained in the pre studies are summarized in the table below with the study design used for analysis.

| Product Category Involvement |            |                            |         |       |  |  |
|------------------------------|------------|----------------------------|---------|-------|--|--|
| Product Category             | Food       | Food & Interior decorating |         |       |  |  |
| Advertising Equity           | Low        |                            | Hi      | gh    |  |  |
| Brand                        | Coop & Mio |                            | ICA & I | KEA   |  |  |
| Format Attitude              | Low        | High                       | Low     | High  |  |  |
| Content Marketing Format     | Podcast    | Event                      | Podcast | Event |  |  |
| Group                        | I          | 2                          | 3       | 4     |  |  |

Table 7 Summary of Pre Studies

#### 3.3.2 SCENARIO DEVELOPMENT

The aim of the scenario development was to construct four scenarios to be used in the main study.

#### Procedure

As many parameters as possible were kept equal between scenarios to limit the effects of external variables and keep the situation as stable as possible to receive reliable results (Bryman & Bell, 2011). However, some adjustments had to be done to keep the content relevant between categories and formats. Five persons were asked about topics which could be relevant to include in the scenario. Several topics was exemplified in scenario to create broad appeal and relevance among respondents. Also, scenarios was written to be neutral in emotional state to not affect the reader's opinion about the scenario.

Four scenarios were pre tested with different combinations of product category and format. Scenarios did not include a certain brand but examples of actors in the product category was given to the respondent to create a context.

#### Questionnaire

Initially, respondents were presented to one scenario before answering the questionnaire. All questions were measured on a seven-point semantic differential scale.

To measure *believability, relevance, perception of scenario* and *experience*, face validity was used to construct questions and items. Respondents were asked "What do you think about if an actor in [product category] for example [brand X, Y or Z] (ICA, Coop or Willys/IKEA, Mio or EM) would launch/arrange [format]? *Believability* regarding actors creating the event/podcast consisted of two items (believable/very believable; not at all convincing/very convincing) (Cronbach's Alpha = .90). *Relevance* of creating event/podcast was measured with three items (not relevant at all/very relevant; not at all realistic/very realistic; not likely at all/very likely) (Cronbach's Alpha = .70). *Perception of scenario* was measured with "What do you think about the situation described above?" and two

items (very hard to understand/very easy to understand; very hard to imagine/very easy to imagine) (Cronbach's Alpha = .87). *Experience* was assessed by asking respondents "How do you perceive your general experience about [format]?" with (I have little experience/I have much experience).

Respondents ability to correctly identify the scenario content was assessed by asking: "What product category was concerned in the text you just read?" and "Which of the following was concerned in the text you just read?". Extra answering alternatives were added to minimize the chance that the respondent guessing the right answer. See questionnaire in its original language in appendix 5.

#### Sample

130 university students were asked to answer the questionnaire (convenience sample). The response rate was 92.3 % and reasons for not participating in the study were due to lack of time and not understanding Swedish. After control of respondent's ability to answer the scenario content check correctly, 120 questionnaires were valid (47.5% men, 51.7% women, 0.8% other; average age = 22.3).

#### Result

Multi-item measurements were calculated as a mean score for each respondent. ANOVA was used to explore the four scenarios. There was no statistically significant difference except scenario perception. Post-hoc comparisons (Tukey HSD) reveal that the mean score for scenario perception was significantly different between food & podcast and interior decorating & event ( $M_{food, podcast} = 6.13$ ,  $M_{interior, event} = 4.97$ ;  $p = .003^{***}$ ).

| Involvement                        | Lo                | w     | н             | igh               |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|-------|---------------|-------------------|
| Product category                   | Foo               | od    | Interior deco | rating            |
| Format Attitude                    | Low               | High  | Low           | High              |
| Content Marketing Format           | Podcast           | Event | Podcast       | Event             |
| Group                              | А                 | В     | С             | D                 |
| n                                  | 30                | 30    | 30            | 30                |
| Believability                      |                   |       |               |                   |
| F(3, 116) = 0.10; p = .958         |                   |       |               |                   |
| Mean                               | 4.98              | 4.97  | 4.87          | 4.83              |
| SD                                 | 1.34              | 1.07  | 1.33          | 1.25              |
| Relevance                          |                   |       |               |                   |
| F(3, 116) = .63; p = .600          |                   |       |               |                   |
| Mean                               | 5.31              | 5.09  | 5.33          | 5.07              |
| SD                                 | .88               | 1.00  | 1.14          | .87               |
| Scenario perception                |                   |       |               |                   |
| $F(3, 116) = 4.30; p = .007^{***}$ |                   |       |               |                   |
| Mean                               | 6.13 <sup>D</sup> | 5.68  | 5.55          | 4.97 <sup>A</sup> |
| SD                                 | .99               | 1.28  | 1.20          | .55               |
| Experience                         |                   |       |               |                   |
| F(3, 116) = 2.00; p = .118         |                   |       |               |                   |
| Mean                               | 4.83              | 3.63  | 3.87          | 4.17              |
| SD                                 | 1.90              | 2.09  | 1.76          | 2.28              |

Table 8 Scenario Development

#### Conclusion

The absence of significant differences in terms of believability, relevance and experience show that scenarios were rigid to use in the main study. Also, the relative high mean score (approximately 5) indicate that the scenarios were found appropriate. Since experience did not differ between formats, it will not be included as covariate in the main study. The result shows a difference in scenario perception between two groups, but due to their high mean score, the scenarios were found to be sufficient to use in the main study.

The scenarios which will be used in the main study is specified in table 8 below. Please note that respondents will only answer questions about *one* brand, the table shows scenarios condensed version where brands are mention at the same time.

|                           | Low<br>Food  | High<br>Interior decorating   |
|---------------------------|--|---|
| Low<br>Podeast            | ICA/Coop will launch a podcast. The<br>podcast will be about everything you want to<br>know about food. A famous guest will be<br>invited in every podcast episode who both<br>has the knowledge and experience in food.   | IKEA/Mio will launch a podcast. The<br>podcast will be about everything you want to<br>know about interior decorating. A famous<br>guest will be invited in every podcast episode<br>who both has the knowledge and experience<br>in interior decorating decorating.  |
| $\operatorname{Lc}_{Poc}$ | In one episode, a pastry chef will be invited<br>to talk about the latest trends from the world<br>of pastries. ICA/Coop will also send an<br>episode with a BBQ school so the listeners<br>can become the BBQ champion of the block<br>During another episode will the home chef's<br>most important kitchenware to succeed in the<br>kitchen be discussed.       | In one episode, a home stylist will be invited<br>to talk about the latest trends from the<br>interior design. IKEA/Mio also send an<br>episode with a lighting school so the listeners<br>can become the lighting champion of the<br>block. During another episode will the home<br>fixer's most important kitchenware to<br>succeed at be discussed.                    |
| High<br>E <i>vent</i>     | ICA/Coop will launch a series of events in<br>their stores. The events will be about<br>everything about you want to know about<br>food. A famous guest will be invited on every<br>event who both has the knowledge and<br>experience in food.  | IKEA/Mio will launch a series of event in<br>their stores. The events will be about<br>everything you want to know about interior<br>decorating. A famous guest will be invited on<br>every event who both has the knowledge and<br>experience in food.   |
| [<br>]                    | At one event, a pastry chef will be invited to<br>demonstrate the latest trends from the world<br>of pastries. ICA/Coop will also arrange an<br>event with a BBQ school so the event visitors<br>can become the BBQ champion of the block<br>During another event will the home chef's<br>most important kitchenware to succeed in the<br>kitchen be demonstrated. | At one event, a home stylist will be invited to<br>demonstrate the latest trends from the world<br>of interior design. IKEA/Mio will also<br>arrange an event with a lighting school so the<br>event visitors can become the lighting<br>champion of the block. During another event<br>will the home fixer's most important tools to<br>succeed at home be demonstrated. |

#### Product Category Involvement Product Category

Table 9 Main Study Scenarios

Format Attitude Advertising Format

#### 3.3.3 MAIN STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

The main study questionnaire was kept as short as possible to minimize response bias and respondents becoming tired (Söderlund, 2005). Respondents could not go back in the questionnaire since we wanted their first, spontaneous response and only one question at the time was displayed to ensure focus. Instructions were intentionally written so respondents assessed them in a real context.

Order of the questions was carefully decided. General questions were displayed first to avoid respondents being affected by the upcoming scenario. Measures for dependent variables was placed in connection to scenario. Advertising equity and brand equity was placed after the scenario, decided after discussion with an associate professor at Stockholm School of Economics, to minimize the risk of the questionnaire of being perceived as "too heavy" before the scenario which could have caused respondents dropping out. Also, brand equity and advertising equity were not likely to be affected by just reading the scenario. Measurements from academia were translated to Swedish to fit the respondents. Technical marketing terms were avoided to increase understanding.

Approach behaviors (willingness to attend and co-create content message) will be investigated and measured as intentions in this experiment. Intentions have been shown to correlate with actual behavior, and can therefore be used as a proxy for actual behavior (Söderlund & Öhman, 2003).

The questionnaire was pre tested using a convenience sample of five people of different gender and age to ensure an acceptable length and a general understanding of the questionnaire. Minor adjustments were made according to comments.

#### 3.3.3.1 MANIPULATION CHECK

To ensure that manipulated variables would reflect the intended result as in pre study 1-3, questions for each independent variable was included.

*Product Category Involvement* was measured by asking: "What is your general opinion about purchase of [product category] at [brands X, Y, or Z]?" with three items on a seven-point semantic differential scale: (Very unimportant decision/Very important decision; Decision requires little thought/Decision requires a lot of thought; Little to lose if you choose the wrong brand/A lot to lose if you choose the wrong brand) (Dahlén, Rasch & Rosengren, 2003) (Cronbach's alpha = .71). Example of brands (ICA, Coop or Willys/IKEA, Mio or EM) was provided for each product category to put all respondents in the same mindset.

Advertising was defined in line with Rosengren & Dahlén (2015) (see below) before *Advertising equity* was measured with three items on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree). Respondents were asked "I think [brand's] advertising is typically..." (Interesting/Worth my attention/Worthwhile) (Rosengren, 2014; Rosengren & Dahlén, 2015) (Cronbach's alpha = .92).

We will now ask you a couple of questions regarding what you think about [brand's] advertising. By "advertising" we mean communications from a company directed to you as a customer. It could, for example, be advertising you have seen on TV or in print media, but also branded events, websites, applications in your mobile phone, or YouTube clips. Think about all the advertising from [brand] that you have seen or heard earlier, for example on TV or web. In general, what do you think about the advertising?

Attitude towards the format was measured using a three items on a seven-point semantic differential scale (Lange, Rosengren & Blom, 2016). Specifically, participants were asked: "What is your general opinion towards [format]?" with the items (bad/good; negative/positive; unfavorable/favorable). The investigated content marketing formats was defined, see below, to ensure similar understanding of the formats between respondents (Cronbach's Alpha =.97).

- **Event** An occasion where you as a consumer is given the opportunity to interact with a company in person.
- **Podcast** A series of digital audio episodes, distributed over internet. The listener can access these via for example their smartphone or computer.

#### 3.3.3.2 SCREENING

Screening was done by asking respondents: "Have you heard about [brand]?" (Yes/No) and "Have you heard or seen advertising from [brand]?" (Yes/No) with a definition of advertising in connection to the question, formulated as above. Respondents who answered "No" on one or both questions were filtered out since they could not answer the following questions accurately.

#### 3.3.3.3 SCENARIO CONTENT CHECK

The respondent was randomly assigned to read *one* scenarios displayed in table 8, with a following scenario content check to ensure that the respondents actively thought about the parameters before answering questions. Scenario content check concerning brand was not needed since it is repeated in every following question. We asked "Which product category was mentioned in the text you read" and for format: "Which of the following were mentioned in the text you read?". Additional answering alternatives were added to minimize the chance of the respondent guessing the right answer. Respondents who answered wrong, based on the experimental group they belonged to, were screened out.

#### 3.3.3.4 DEPENDENT VARIABLES

*Message Equity* was measured with a seven-point Likert-type scale (1=Strongly disagree, 7= Strongly agree) with three statements adapted from advertising equity (Rosengren, Ljungberg & Palmberg, 2016). Instead of a past temporal focus respondents were asked to state their opinion about the content in the scenario they just read. Respondents were asked "What is your opinion about the previously described [format] from [brand]?" (Interesting/Worth my attention/Worthwhile) (Cronbach's Alpha = .97).

*Willingness to Attend the Content Message* was adapted from Rosengren & Dahlén (2015). We asked "How well do the following statements fit your future expectations of the described future [format] from [brand]?" and a seven-point Likert-type scale (1=Strongly disagree, 7= Strongly agree) was used with three statements: "I look forward to attending/listening to this future [format] from [brand], "I will find that the future [format] from [brand] are worthwhile" and "I want to attend/listen to this future [format] from [brand]" (Cronbach's Alpha =.97).

To capture a more true indication of consumers willingness the attend the content, we included an open-ended question. Specifically, respondents were asked: "Do you wish to receive more information about how to attend/listen to [brand's] [format]? Please write your email address below and we will send you more information". The respondents had the option to voluntarily answer "Yes" and write their email address or answer "No". We argue that there is a larger barrier to give up personal information such as email, also more demanding in terms of effort compared to answer high scores on the willingness to attend construct. This will give us a better proxy for the will to attend/listen to the event/podcast.

*Willingness to Co-create the Content Message* was assessed by identifying five consumer co-creation activities, applicable and realistic for content messages in the chosen formats and product categories, this in line with (Fang, Palmatier & Evans, 2008). Several studies use a multidimensional approach to capture customer value co-creation behavior and consider it to consist of many distinctive components (Bove, Pervan, Beatty, & Shiu, 2008; Groth, 2005). Three people were asked about possible behaviors related to the scenarios and their answers were combined with the theoretical definition for consumer co-creation. This led to measuring co-creation on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1=Strongly disagree, 7= Strongly agree) by specifically asking: "To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the previously described [format] from [brand]?". There were five statements: "I would send in suggestions of how these [format] could be improved", "I would vote for which topics future [format] should be about", "I would send in comments about my experience of this [format]", "I would vote for which topics future [format] should be about", "I would send in a contest connected to the [format]" (Cronbach's Alpha =.94). Face validity was used to assess the scale in cooperation with an associate professor at the Stockholm School of Economics.

#### 3.3.3.5 COVARIATE

There is an infinite number of extraneous variables which could affect our result but most can safely be ignored. Some may influence the dependent variables but they are not the core problem we want to investigate (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). Pre study 2 shows that the brands differed in terms of brand equity, hence we measure this to be able to control for it and ensure that our results are not biased. *Brand equity* was operationalized as attitudinal and behavioral brand loyalty using a seven-point Likert type scale (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree) Grohmann (2009). *Attitudinal brand loyalty* was measured with two items: "I am committed to [brand]" and "I would be willing to pay a higher price for [brand] than other stores" (Cronbach's Alpha = .71). *Behavioral brand loyalty* was measured using two items: "I will buy [brand] next time I buy [product category]" and "I intend to keep shopping at [brand]" (Cronbach's Alpha= .87).

#### 3.3.3.6 DEMOGRAPHY, COMMENTS AND PURPOSE

Respondents stated their gender (man/woman/other) and age (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). They had the option to write comments about the questionnaire so we could check for unclarities and also forced to answer the question: "What do you think is the purpose of this questionnaire" to filter out respondents who stated the correct purpose of the experiment. This since their answers would have been affected by their understanding about experimental setting (Söderlund, 2010). See questionnaire in its original language in appendix 6.

#### 3.4 SAMPLING

Data collection was conducted via a Swedish online panel, provided by a market research company. A panel is composed of individuals who have self-selected to become part of a pool of individuals interested in participating in online research. There is much debate in whether this is considered a probability or a non-probability sample, but many cite the success of using a panel (Cooper & Schindler, 2014).

The questionnaire was coded with the research software Qualtrics (qualtrics.com, 2016) and the panelists received an email with a link to the questionnaire. Random sampling was used to assign respondents to one of the eight groups. The data was collected between March 21<sup>st</sup> and April 6<sup>th</sup> 2016. The collected sample is a national representation of Sweden's population, motivated to use since the investigated product categories, brands and formats are applicable to everyone.

Questionnaire checking was conducted as recommended by Malholtra (2015). After collecting 110 surveys (25 % of the target 440 responses) the data was checked for adequate sample requirements and that the survey was performing as it should. No inconsistencies were found and data collection continued.

#### 3.4.1 DATA QUALITY CHECK

In total 482 surveys were started, 448 finished. Quality check and data cleaning (Malholtra, 2015) of the collected data was conducted to ensure high quality results. No missing values were found. Respondents stating a close guess of the purpose or that it was a student thesis were excluded (n=20). People not answering the scenario content check correctly were screened out (n=71). The estimated survey time was calculated by clocking five people. A minimum limit of 3.5 minutes to conduct the survey was reasonable, respondents taking less time than this ("speeders") were excluded (n=69). Outliers in time were deleted (> 10 hours survey time) since it is unclear if these respondents had the scenario in mind when answering the questions (n=2). Summarizing, quality check and data cleaning deleted 162 respondents. Hence, the final sample was 286 respondents, a response rate of 59 % (Bryman & Bell, 2015).

| Collected responses (n)          | 482 |  |  |  |
|----------------------------------|-----|--|--|--|
| Reason for deleting respondent   |     |  |  |  |
| Not completed questionnarie      | 34  |  |  |  |
| Right guess of purpose           | 20  |  |  |  |
| Scenario content check incorrect | 71  |  |  |  |
| Speeders                         | 69  |  |  |  |
| Outliers                         | 2   |  |  |  |
| Sample after quality check (n)   | 286 |  |  |  |
| Percent of collected data used   | 59% |  |  |  |

Table 10 Quality Check & Data Cleaning Procedure

#### 3.4.2 SCREENING

Respondents were screened out if they answered "No" on at least one of the screening questions (n=48) and the final sample after quality check and screening was 238 respondents, 49% of the original data.

| Sample after quality check (n)             | 286 |  |  |  |  |
|--|-----|--|--|--|--|
| Reason for screening out respondent        |     |  |  |  |  |
| Do not know brand and/or                   | 40  |  |  |  |  |
| have not seen advertising                  | 48  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample after quality check & screening (n) | 238 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent of collected data used             | 49% |  |  |  |  |
|  |     |  |  |  |  |

Table 11 Screening

#### 3.4.3 DIVISION OF RESPONDENTS

Table 11 shows the distribution of respondents in total and for each group based on demographic variables. Groups are evenly distributed, except for the group answering the scenario describing a podcast for Mio. Analyze of screening reveals that Mio had the largest share of respondents that were excluded due to screening (n = 14), which can explain why the groups for Mio have fewer respondents. Table 12 displays the division of respondents in the groups used for analysis.

| Product Category Involvement | Low<br>Food          |       |         |            | High<br>Interior decorating |              |         |       |       |
|------------------------------|----------------------|-------|---------|------------|-----------------------------|--------------|---------|-------|-------|
| Product Category             |                      |       |         |            |                             |              |         |       |       |
| Advertising Equity           | Low High<br>Coop ICA |       | gh      | Low<br>Mio |                             | High<br>IKEA |         |       |       |
| Brand                        |                      |       | ICA     |            |                             |              |         |       |       |
| Format Attitude              | Low                  | High  | Low     | High       | Low                         | High         | Low     | High  |       |
| Content Marketing Format     | Podcast              | Event | Podcast | Event      | Podcast                     | Event        | Podcast | Event |       |
| Group                        | 1                    | 2     | 3       | 4          | 5                           | 6            | 7       | 8     | Total |
| n                            | 31                   | 27    | 37      | 35         | 21                          | 26           | 32      | 29    | 238   |
| Gender %                     |                      |       |         |            |                             |              |         |       |       |
| Men                          | 58                   | 52    | 49      | 43         | 24                          | 42           | 31      | 55    | 45    |
| Women                        | 42                   | 48    | 49      | 57         | 76                          | 54           | 69      | 45    | 54    |
| Other                        |                      |       | 3       |            |                             | 4            |         |       | .8    |
| Age                          |                      |       |         |            |                             |              |         |       |       |
| Min                          | 18                   | 18    | 18      | 20         | 23                          | 18           | 18      | 18    | 18    |
| Max                          | 63                   | 63    | 63      | 62         | 62                          | 61           | 65      | 62    | 65    |
| Mean                         | 42                   | 41    | 48      | 40         | 40                          | 34           | 40      | 42    | 39    |

Table 12 Division of Respondents: Experiment Groups

| Advertising Equity       | Lo      | w     | Hig      |       |       |
|--------------------------|---------|-------|----------|-------|-------|
| Brand                    | Coop,   | /Mio  | ICA/IKEA |       |       |
| Format Attitude          | Low     | High  | Low      | High  |       |
| Content Marketing Format | Podcast | Event | Podcast  | Event |       |
| Group                    | 1       | 2     | 3        | 4     | Total |
| n                        | 52      | 53    | 69       | 64    | 238   |
| Gender %                 |         |       |          |       |       |
| Men                      | 44      | 47    | 41       | 48    | 45    |
| Women                    | 56      | 51    | 58       | 52    | 54    |
| Other                    |         | 2     | 1        |       | 1     |
| Age                      |         |       |          |       |       |
| Min                      | 18      | 18    | 18       | 18    | 18    |
| Max                      | 63      | 63    | 65       | 62    | 65    |
| Mean                     | 41      | 38    | 39       | 41    | 39    |

Table 13 Division of Respondents: Groups for Analysis

#### 3.5 STATISTICAL METHODS

To perform statistical analysis IBM SPSS Statistics version 23 was used. Significance level at 95 % was used in order to reduce the risk of Type I error. The levels of significance will in this thesis be presented as follows: \*p < .1, \*\*p < .05 and \*\*\*p < .01. The reliability of multi-item measurements was tested with Cronbach's alpha where > .6 was considered accepted in line with Malholtra (1993) and Söderlund (1998).

Bonferroni adjustment was used in some analyzes (University of Essex, n.d.). This is when a stricter significance level is adopted to be able to use t-tests for analyses and not overstate the differences between groups. In a standard Bonferroni you divide the significance level with the number of pairs you want to compare to state that the they differ in the measured variables.

Statistical tests and tools used are:

- Between-groups analysis of variance (ANOVA)
- Cronbach's Alpha
- Cross tabulation with Chi-Square test
- Correlations (Pearson)
- Factorial analysis (Varimax Rotation)
- Factorial between-groups analysis of variance and covariance (ANCOVA)
- Factorial multivariate between-groups analysis of variance and covariance (MANCOVA)
- Independent sample t-test
- Simple mediation analysis (Hayes' PROCESS)

### 3.6 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

When conducting research, it is important to critically examine and assess the degree to which the results of the study provide an accurate picture of reality. To ensure this, two conditions must be met, empirical data must be valid and relevant (validity) and reliable and trustworthy (reliability) (Bryman & Bell, 2015).

### 3.6.1 VALIDITY

Validity concerns the integrity of the conclusions drawn in research and it is in many ways the most important criterion (Bryman & Bell, 2015).

### 3.6.1.1 INTERNAL VALIDITY

Internal validity concerns the experiment's accuracy. It measures if the manipulation of the independent variables has an effect on the dependent variables or if effects have been confounded by extraneous variables (Malholtra, 2014). In this thesis, results have been statistically controlled for brand equity to increase internal validity. We have throughout this thesis used randomization to distribute respondents to experimental groups to increase internal validity by increasing control over confounding variables (Malholtra, 2014).

To reduce the effect of external factors, all subjects have received the same information. Questions and scenarios were identically phrased except for adjustments concerning product category, brands and formats. However, since some surveys was conducted online, we could not control external factors in the respondent's surroundings nor that the respondent is who s/he states. Screening was also used to ensure respondents in the data knew the brand and its advertising. Satisfactory internal validity was achieved by using the most common significance level of 95 % (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). Based on this discussion we argue that the internal validity in this thesis is satisfactory.

### 3.6.1.2 EXTERNAL VALIDITY

External validity refers to if the results of a study can be generalized beyond the specific research context. The experiment in this thesis was conducted in a laboratory setting which may have lowered external validity since it may have reduced the reflection of a real-life setting (Bryman & Bell, 2015). Given the scope of this thesis the laboratory setting was deemed necessary since a field study of needed size and use of brands would not have been feasible, therefore, it had to be chosen despite the reduction of external validity. However, stimulus sampling was used for advertising equity to increase external validity and generalization of our results (Wells & Windschitl, 1999).

A representative sample is important for external validity (Bryman & Bell, 2015) and was obtained by collecting data through a market research company, since panelists then are distributed by geographical location in Sweden, gender, age and occupation. The generalizability of our results for the Swedish population is high but could be lower in other countries. Summarizing, the external validity is deemed pleasing.

### 3.6.1.3 MEASUREMENT VALIDITY

In quantitative research measurement validity has to do with whether the measure of a concept really measures that concept. To increase measurement validity, we have used established, multiitem scales used in previous research as far as possible. For the measure of co-creation, we have used face validity (Bryman & Bell, 2015) in cooperation with an associate professor at Stockholm School of Economics. To ensure that the measurements of willingness to attend and co-create the content message actually were separate constructs we have conducted a factor analysis, see table 13, which showed a satisfactory result as the constructs generated different factors.

| Fa          | ictor   |
|-------------|---|
| 1           | 2   |
| .882        |   |
| .868        |   |
| .883        |   |
| .911        |   |
| .753        |   |
|             | .928  |
|             | .922  |
|             | .941  |
| t Analysis  |   |
| ormalizatio | 'n  |
|             |   |
|             |   |
|             | I<br>.882<br>.868<br>.883<br>.911<br>.753<br>t Analysis |

Table 14 Factor Analysis Willingness to Attend and Co-create

### 3.6.1.4 ECOLOGICAL VALIDITY

Ecological validity refers to whether or not scientific findings are applicable to people's everyday, natural social settings. If research is not ecologically valid it is limited in how it really captures everyday life conditions, values and attitude of the participants in the study (Bryman & Bell, 2015). We have increased ecological validity by using real brands in our study in similarity to other research (e.g. Dahlén, Granlund & Grenros, 2009).

### 3.6.2 RELIABILITY

Reliability has to do with if the results of a study are repeatable, a particularly important issue in quantitative research (Bryman & Bell, 2015). Due to time and resource limitations we could not administer this study twice and therefore stability is lowered. However, we have created a questionnaire which has been thoroughly edited and pre tested before collecting data which increase the reliability of this study (Jacobsen, 2002).

Multi-item measures were used in all applicable cases to ensure good internal consistency and high reliability (Söderlund, 2005). To ensure high internal consistency and reliability we have used the test of Cronbach's alpha. We accepted scales with alpha > .6 (Malholtra, 1993; Söderlund, 1998) and calculated a mean index of the measure. In summary the reliability in this study is satisfactory.

### 4 RESULT & ANALYSIS

This chapter begins with manipulation check and covariate analysis. Thereafter, the results and analysis for the hypotheses are presented. In the end of the chapter, the findings are summarized in the research model and list of hypotheses.

### 4.1 MANIPULATION CHECK

Manipulation check was conducted to ensure our intended study design. Independent samples ttests were run for all operationalizations representing each independent variable. 95 % significance was used except in the first manipulation test for advertising equity where a Bonferroni adjustment (see section 3.5) was adopted (p < .025).

| Product Category Involvement | Lo                         | w              | High                |               |  |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------|--|
| Product Category             | Fa                         | od             | Interior Decorating |               |  |
|                              | t(236) = 3.32, p = .000*** |                |                     |               |  |
| Mean                         | 4.78 5.27                  |                |                     |               |  |
| SD                           | 1.03 1.03                  |                |                     |               |  |
| n                            | 1                          | 30             | 1                   | 08            |  |
| Advertising Equity           | Low                        | High           | Low                 | High          |  |
| Brand                        | Соор                       | ICA            | Mio                 | IKEA          |  |
|                              | t(128) = 3.04              | ł, p = .003*** | t(106) = 2.5        | l, p = .014** |  |
| Mean                         | 3.90                       | 4.72           | 3.81                | 4.67          |  |
| SD                           | 1,31                       | 1.75           | 1.56                | 1.87          |  |
| n                            | 58                         | 72             | 47                  | 61            |  |
| Advertising Equity           | Lo                         | w              | н                   | igh           |  |
| Brand                        | Соор                       | & Mio          | ICA & IKEA          |               |  |
|                              |                            | t(236) = 3.86  | , p = .000***       |               |  |
| Mean                         | 3.                         | .87            | 4.                  | .70           |  |
| SD                           | I.                         | .42            | 1.                  | .80           |  |
| n                            | 1                          | 05             | 1                   | 33            |  |
| Format Attitude              | Le                         | w              | н                   | igh           |  |
| Content Marketing Format     | Pod                        | cast           | Eve                 | ent           |  |
|                              |                            | t(236) = 2.2   | l, p = .028**       |               |  |
| Mean                         | 5.                         | .02            | 5.                  | .45           |  |
| SD                           | I.                         | .61            | L.                  | .32           |  |
| n                            | 1                          | 21             | 1                   | 17            |  |

Table 15 Manipulation Check

The manipulated variables were viewed equally to the pre studies. This in terms of product category involvement ( $M_{food}$ = 4.78,  $M_{interior}$ = 5.27;  $p = .000^{***}$ ) and format attitude ( $M_{podcast}$  = 5.02,  $M_{event}$ = 5.45;  $p = .028^{**}$ ). Both formats had still a high mean score (above 5) thus respondents have high attitude overall but event was better evaluated. Brands were significantly different (p < .025) in terms of advertising equity within their respective category (food:  $M_{Coop}$ = 3.90,  $M_{ICA}$ = 4.72,  $p = .003^{***}$ ; interior decorating:  $M_{Mio}$ = 3.81,  $M_{IKEA}$ = 4.67,  $p = .014^{**}$ ). Since each level of advertising equity will be represented by two brands, one from each category, an additional independent sample t-test was conducted. There is still a significant difference (p < .05) between the two levels of advertising equity which makes them solid to use in analysis ( $M_{Mio \& Coop}$ = 3.87,  $M_{ICA \& IKEA}$ = 4.70;  $p = .000^{***}$ ).

Summarizing, we can conclude manipulations were successful.

## 4.2 FORMAT ATTITUDE, ADVERTISING EQUITY AND APPROACH BEHAVIORS

To test H1-H3 a factorial MANCOVA was used. First we conducted a correlation analysis between the dependent variables willingness to attend and co-create the content message. Message equity was added to understand if it could be included in the MANCOVA in preparation for H4-H6 below, but it was excluded from the MANCOVA, due to its high correlation (>.8) with the other dependent variables, recommended by Pallant (2004).

|                                | Message Equity                  | Willingness to Attend | Willingess to Co-create |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Message Equity                 | I                               | .887***               | .698***                 |
| Willingness to Attend          |                                 | 1                     | .733***                 |
| Willingess to Co-create        |                                 |                       | I                       |
| * Significant at p < 1: ** Sig | anificant at p < 05, *** Signif | icant at b < 01       |                         |

\* Significant at p < .1; \*\* Significant at p < .05; \*\*\* Significant at p < .01

Table 16 Correlation Dependent Variables

In the MANCOVA, independent variables were advertising equity (low/high) and format attitude (low/high), dependent variables were willingness to attend and willingness to co-create the content message. Attitudinal and behavioral brand loyalty were used as covariates but the latter was insignificant and excluded as covariate, yet attitudinal brand loyalty was used a covariate. In line with Pallant (2004), a Bonferroni adjustment (see section 3.5) was used, hence the alpha level is (p < .025) to determine statistical significance.

Our hypotheses show that we are interested in both main effects and a possible interaction effect. Therefore, we will start to interpret the main effects H1-H2 and then introduce H3. The results of H1 and H2 should be read with caution before H3 has been presented since a possible significant interaction effect would show that the relationships are more complex (Pallant, 2004). A summarizing analysis of H1-H3, which takes all hypotheses into account, will end this section.

### 4.2.1 H1A-B: FORMAT ATTITUDE AND APPROACH BEHAVIORS

H1a-b stated that consumers' willingness to attend the content message is higher when the content is distributed in a high attitude format, compared to a low attitude format.

There was a statistically significant difference between the format which consumers have a high attitude towards and the format they have a low attitude towards on the combined dependent variables (F(2, 233) = 16.89,  $p = .000^{***}$ ; Wilks'  $\lambda = .873$ ;  $\eta_p^2 = .127$ ). Considering the results for the dependent variables separately, we see that both approach behaviors are significantly higher when the content is transmitted in a high compared to a low attitude format (willingness to attend:  $M_{Low attitude format} = 3.26$ ,  $M_{High attitude format} = 4.39$ ,  $p = .000^{***}$ ; willingness to Co-create:  $M_{Low attitude format} = 4.32$ ,  $p = .000^{***}$ ). H1a and H1b are accepted.

The effect size (partial eta squared:  $\eta_p^2$ ) was moderate for both approach behaviors (Cohen, 1988). For willingness to attend, 11.7 % of the variance is attributable to format attitude, and for willingness to co-create 9.1 %, indicating that format attitude explains more of the variance in consumer willingness to attend.

|                         | n   | Adj. mean | Std. Error | Partial η2 | F     | Þ       |
|-------------------------|-----|-----------|------------|------------|-------|---------|
| Willingness to Attend   |     |           |            |            |       |         |
| Low attitude format     | 121 | 3.26      | .142       | 117        | 20.07 | .000*** |
| High attitude format    | 117 | 4.39      | .144       | .117       | 30.97 | .000    |
| Willingness to Co-creat | e   |           |            |            |       |         |
| Low attitude format     | 121 | 3.33      | .156       | 001        | 22.40 | 000***  |
| High attitude format    | 117 | 4.32      | .145       | .091       | 23.40 | .000*** |

\* Significant at p < .1; \*\* Significant at p < .05; \*\*\* Significant at p < .01

F(2, 233) = 16.89, p = .000\*\*\*; Wilks'  $\lambda$  = .873;  $\eta$ 2 =.127)

Covariate: Attitudinal Brand Loyalty

Table 17 Format Attitude & Approach Behaviors

H1 a) Consumers' willingness to attend the content message is higher when the content is distributed in a high attitude format, compared to a low attitude format
 ACCEPTED

b) Consumers' willingness to co-create the content message is higher when the content is distributed in a high attitude format, compared to a low attitude format **ACCEPTED** 

Hypothesis H1a was investigated deeper by studying respondents' wish to sign up their email to receive more information. Cross tabulation with Chi-Square test was used to analyze difference in submitted email (Yes/No) depending on format attitude. A significantly larger proportion of respondents ( $x^2(1) = 11.20$ ;  $p = .001^{***}$ ) wished to sign up when the content was transmitted in a high (37.6%) than in a low attitude format (18.2%), compared to the total percentage within the format (27.2%). The finding is interesting since it shows also when a more "true" and demanding willingness to attend, the effect of format attitude is present. Hence we have additional support for H1a. By conducting an independent t-test we see that respondents who sign up also have significantly higher mean for willingness to attend than those not stating their email ( $M_{Yes} = 5.08$ ,  $M_{No} = 3.15$ ,  $p = .000^{***}$ ) This validates the connection between the intentional measure for willingness to attend and the sign up question.

|                         |       |                 | Sig    | n up   |
|-------------------------|-------|-----------------|--------|--------|
|                         |       |                 | Yes    | No     |
| Format attitude         | Low   | Count           | 22     | 99     |
|                         |       | Expected Count  | 33.6   | 87.4   |
|                         |       | % Within format | 18.2 % | 81.8 % |
|                         | High  | Count           | 44     | 73     |
|                         |       | Expected Count  | 32.4   | 84.6   |
|                         |       | % Within format | 37.6 % | 62.4 % |
|                         | Total | Count           | 66     | 172    |
|                         |       | Expected Count  | 66     | 172    |
|                         |       | % Within format | 27.2 % | 72.3 % |
| $x^{2}$ (1) = 11.20 · b | = 00  | 1 ***           |        |        |

 $x^{2}$  (I) = I I.20 ; p = .001

n = 238

Table 18 Format Attitude & Sign Up

### 4.2.2 H2A-B: ADVERTISING EQUITY AND APPROACH BEHAVIORS

H2a-b stated that consumers' willingness to attend and co-create the content message will be higher when it is created by a brand with high advertising equity, compared to a brand with low advertising equity.

The result shows no significant difference between low and high advertising equity on the combined dependent variables (F(2, 233) = 2.29, p = .795; Wilks'  $\lambda = .998$ ;  $\eta_p^2 = .002$ ) and neither when approach behaviors were considered separately (willingness to attend:  $M_{Low advertising equity} = 3.88, M_{High advertising equity} = 3.76, p = .562$ ; willingness to co-create:  $M_{Low advertising equity} = 3.84, M_{High advertising equity} = 3.82, p = .926$ ). H2a and H2b are rejected.

|                         | n   | Adj. mean | Std. Error | Partial η2 | F    | Þ    |
|-------------------------|-----|-----------|------------|------------|------|------|
| Willingness to Attend   |     |           |            |            |      |      |
| Low advertising equity  | 105 | 3.88      | .153       | 001        | 220  | 573  |
| High advertising equity | 133 | 3.76      | .136       | .001       | .338 | .562 |
| Willingness to Co-creat | e   |           |            |            |      |      |
| Low advertising equity  | 121 | 3.84      | .156       | 000        | 000  | 027  |
| High advertising equity | 117 | 3.82      | .138       | .000       | .009 | .926 |
|                         |     |           |            |            |      |      |

\* Significant at p < .1; \*\* Significant at p < .05; \*\*\* Significant at p < .01

F(2, 233) = 2.29, p = .795; Wilks'  $\lambda$  = .998; Partial  $\eta$ 2 = .002

Covariate: Attitudinal Brand Loyalty

Table 19 Advertising Equity & Approach Behaviors

H2 a) Consumers' willingness to attend the content message will be higher when the content is created by
 a brand with high advertising equity, compared to a brand with low advertising equity
 REJECTED

b) Consumers' willingness to co-create the content message will be higher when the content is created by a brand with high advertising equity, compared to a brand with low advertising equity **REJECTED** 

Hypothesis H2a was analyzed deeper alike H1a, with Cross tabulation with Chi-Square test the difference in submitted email (Yes/No) depending on advertising equity. There was no significant difference ( $x^2(1) = .106$ ; p = .772) between the proportions of respondents who wished to sign up when the content was created by a low or high advertising equity brand. Hence we have additional support to reject H2a.

|       |                 | Sign up  |  |  |
|-------|-----------------|--|--|--|
|       |                 | Yes  | No   |  |
| Low   | Count           | 28   | 77   |  |
|       | Expected Count  | 29.1   | 75.9   |  |
|       | % Within format | 26.7 %   | 73.3 %   |  |
| High  | Count           | 38   | 95   |  |
|       | Expected Count  | 36.9   | 96.I   |  |
|       | % Within format | 28.6 %   | 71.4 %   |  |
| Total | Count           | 66   | 172  |  |
|       | Expected Count  | 66   | 172  |  |
|       | % Within format | 27.2 %   | 72.3 %   |  |
|       | High            | Expected Count           % Within format           High         Count           Expected Count           % Within format           Total         Count           Expected Count           Expected Count | Yes       Low     Count       Expected Count     29.1       % Within format     26.7 %       High     Count     38       Expected Count     36.9       % Within format     28.6 %       Total     Count     66       Expected Count     66 |  |

\* Significant at p < .1; \*\* Significant at p < .05;</p>

 $x^{2}$  (1)=.106; p = .772

n = 238

Table 20 Advertising Equity & Sign Up

4.2.3 FORMAT ATTITUDE, ADVERTISING EQUITY AND APPROACH BEHAVIORS H3a-b stated that the use of a high attitude format to transmit the content message will increase consumers approach behaviors towards the message more for a low than a high advertising equity brand. Thus, we expected an interaction effect.

|  | n  | Adj. mean | Std. Error | Partial η2 | F    | Þ    |
|--|----|-----------|------------|------------|------|------|
| Willingness to Attend                          |    |           |            |            |      |      |
| Low attitude format * Low advertising equity   | 53 | 3.35      | .22        |            |      |      |
| High attitude format * Low advertising equity  | 52 | 4.41      | .21        | .001       | .120 | .730 |
| Low attitude format * High advertising equity  | 64 | 3.26      | .18        | .001       | .120 | .730 |
| High attitude format * High advertising equity | 69 | 4.36      | .19        |            |      |      |
| Willingness to Co-create                       |    |           |            |            |      |      |
| Low attitude format * Low advertising equity   | 53 | 3.18      | .22        |            |      |      |
| High attitude format * Low advertising equity  | 52 | 4.49      | .22        | .010       | 2.33 | .128 |
| Low attitude format * High advertising equity  | 64 | 3.48      | .19        | .010       | 2.33 | .120 |
| High attitude format * High advertising equity | 69 | 4.16      | .20        |            |      |      |

 $(F(2, 233) = 2.57, p = .079^*; Wilks' \lambda = .978; Partial n2 = .022)$ 

 $(F(2, 233) = 2.57, p = .079^{\circ}; VVilks^{\circ} A = .978; Partial \eta 2 = .02$ 

Covariate: Attitudinal Brand Loyalty

Table 21 Format Attitude, Advertising Equity & Approach Behaviors

The result shows no significant interaction effect between format attitude and advertising equity on the combined dependent variables (F(2, 233) = 2.57,  $p = .079^*$ ; Wilks'  $\lambda = .978$ ;  $\eta_p^2 = .022$ ) and hence not when the dependent variables are considered separately. H3a and b are rejected.

H3 a) The use of a high attitude format to distribute the content increases consumers' wilingness to attend the content message more for a low than a high advertising equity brand
 REJECTED

b) The use of a high attitude format to distribute the content increases consumers' wilingness to co-create the content message more for a low than a high advertising equity brand

#### REJECTED

### 4.2.4 H1-H3: SUMMARIZING RESULTS & ANALYSIS

The results for H2-H3 show that the hypothesized main effect of advertising equity and interaction effect between advertising equity and format attitude were non-significant. However, H1 showed that format attitude had a significant main effect.

Consumers who were exposed to the content transmitted in a high attitude format had significantly higher approach behaviors in terms willingness to attend and willingness to co-create the message. Since effect size was moderate for both approach behaviors, our results indicate that format attitude can be considered as important to explain them. We also conclude that the use of a high attitude format to transmit the content message increases consumer's approach behaviors regardless of the brand's level of advertising equity.

### 4.3 FORMAT ATTITUDE, ADVERTISING EQUITY AND MESSAGE EQUITY

Message equity was not included in the MANCOVA due to risk of multicollinearity, instead an factorial ANCOVA was conducted. Independent factors were advertising equity (low/high) and

format attitude (low/high) and dependent variable was message equity. Attitudinal brand loyalty was used as covariate.

### 4.3.1 H4: FORMAT ATTITUDE AND MESSAGE EQUITY

In H4 we proposed that message equity is higher when the content is distributed in a high attitude format, compared to a low attitude format.

|                                | n   | Adj. mean       | Std. Error       | Partial η2 | F     | Þ    |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------|---|-----------------|------------------|------------|-------|------|--|--|--|--|
| Message Equity                 |   |                 |                  |            |       |      |  |  |  |  |
| Low attitude format            | 121                                       | 3.86            | .131             | .079       | 20.09 | 000  |  |  |  |  |
| High attitude format           | 117                                       | 4.69            | .132             | .079       | 20.09 | .000 |  |  |  |  |
| * Significant at p < .1; ** Si | gnificant                                 | at p < .05; *** | Significant at p | < .01      |       |      |  |  |  |  |
| F(1, 233) = 20.09, p = .000    | )***, Part                                | ial η2 = .079   |                  |            |       |      |  |  |  |  |
| Covariate: Attitudinal Brai    | nd Loyalty                                | Y               |                  |            |       |      |  |  |  |  |
| Table 22 Format Attitude &     | Table 22 Format Attitude & Message Equity |                 |                  |            |       |      |  |  |  |  |

The result shows a significantly higher message equity when the content is transmitted in a high compared to a low attitude format (F(1, 233) = 20.09,  $p = .000^{***}$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .079$ ; M<sub>Low attitude format</sub> = 3.86, M<sub>High attitude format</sub> = 4.69) hence H4 is accepted.

This means that consumers who are exposed to the content in a format they have a more favorable attitude towards also perceive the content message to be more valuable. The effect size  $(\eta_p^2)$  was moderate (Cohen, 1988), 7.9 % of the variance in message equity was attributable to format attitude.

H4 Message equity is higher when the content is distributed in a high attitude format, compared to a low attitude format

### ACCEPTED

#### 4.3.2 H5: ADVERTISING EQUITY AND MESSAGE EQUITY

H5 hypothesis states that message equity will be higher when the content message is created by a brand with high advertising equity, compared to a brand with low advertising equity.

|                                 | n         | Adj. mean       | Std. Error       | Partial ŋ2 | F   | Þ    |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|-----|------|
| Message Equity                  |           |                 |                  |            |     |      |
| Low advertising equity          | 105       | 4.37            | .140             | 004        | .92 | 220  |
| High advertising equity         | 133       | 4.18            | .125             | .004       | .92 | .339 |
| * Significant at p < .1; ** Sig | nificant  | at p < .05; *** | Significant at p | 10. >      |     |      |
| F(1, 233) = .92, p = .339, P    | artial η2 | = .004          |                  |            |     |      |
| Covariate: Attitudinal Bran     | d Loyalty | Y               |                  |            |     |      |

Table 23 Advertising Equity & Message Equity

There was no significant difference in message equity when the content message was from a low or high advertising equity brand (F(1, 233) = 20.09, p = .339,  $\eta_p^2 = .004$ ). Hence we reject

hypothesis 5. This highlights that a specific content message will not be perceived as more valuable depending on if the sender has a high or low advertising equity.

H5 Message equity is higher when the content message is created by a brand with high advertising equity, compared to a brand with low advertising equity

### REJECTED

4.3.3 H6: FORMAT ATTITUDE, ADVERTISING EQUITY AND MESSAGE EQUITY H6 stated that the use of a high attitude format to distribute the content increases message equity more for a low than a high advertising equity brand.

The result shows no significant interaction of format attitude and advertising equity in terms of message equity (F(1, 232) = .000, p = .983;  $\eta_p^2 = .000$ ), therefore H6 is rejected.

|                      |   |                         | n  | Adj. mean | Std. Error | Partial η2 | F    | Þ    |
|----------------------|---|-------------------------|----|-----------|------------|------------|------|------|
| Message Equity       |   |                         |    |           |            |            |      |      |
| Low attitude format  | * | Low advertising equity  | 53 | 3.95      | 2.00       |            |      |      |
|                      | * | High advertising equity | 52 | 3.77      | .17        |            | .000 | 000  |
| High attitude format | * | Low advertising equity  | 64 | 4.78      | .20        | .000       | .000 | .983 |
|                      | * | High advertising equity | 69 | 4.60      | 1.8        |            |      |      |

Table 24 Format Attitude, Advertising Equity & Message Equity

H6 The use of a high attitude format to distribute the content increases message equity more for a low than a high advertising equity brand
REJECTED

### 4.3.4 H4-H6: SUMMARIZING RESULTS & ANALYSIS

There was no significant result for H5-H6 which hypothesized a main effect of advertising equity on message equity and an interaction effect between advertising equity and format attitude. However, H4 concerning format attitude's effect on message equity was significant. The effect size was moderate which indicates format attitude's importance to explain this variable. We can conclude that by using a high attitude format the content will be perceived more valuable, regardless of the perceived value in the brand's past advertising.

### 4.4 INDIRECT EFFECTS ON APPROACH BEHAVIORS VIA MESSAGE EQUITY

In this section we will present results for H7a-b and H8a-b. To guide the reader through this analysis, the result will be given both in written text and in a table accompanied by a summarizing model following the template below. The paths between variables will be replaced with the regression coefficients. Values for willingness to attend will be shown *before* the parentheses and willingness to co-create will be shown *within*.

The two groups (low/high) in each independent variable (format attitude and advertising equity), are coded by a one unit difference (low = 1; high = 2), hence the overall effect can be interpreted

as a mean difference (Hayes, 2012). Consequently, results with a positive effect would be interpreted as approach behaviors being higher for a high attitude format/high advertising equity, and vice versa. We use 10 000 bootstrap samples and show unstandardized coefficients as recommended when using a dichotomous independent variable. Also, 95 % bias-corrected bootstrap confidence intervals are shown (Hayes, 2013).



Model 3 Simple Mediation Analysis Template

In total, four simple mediation analyses were done using PROCESS (Hayes, 2013) where the independent variable was either format attitude or advertising equity, dependent variables were either willingness to attend or willingness to co-create content message. Message equity was used as mediator in all four mediation analyses.

## 4.4.1 H7A-B: INDIRECT EFFECT OF FORMAT ATTITUDE ON APPROACH BEHAVIORS THROUGH MESSAGE EQUITY

H7a-b stated that format attitude has a positive, indirect effect on consumers' approach behaviors through message equity.

| Path               | В       | SE  | t     | Þ    | 95 % Conf. I | nterval | R <sup>2</sup> |
|--------------------|---------|-----|-------|------|--------------|---------|----------------|
| Willingness to     | Attend  |     |       |      | LLCI         | ULCI    |                |
| c Total effect     | 1.14    | .20 | 5.68  | .000 | 0.74         | 1.53    | .32***         |
| a                  | .84     | .18 | 4.5   | .000 | .47          | 1.20    | .28***         |
| b                  | .91     | .04 | 23.79 | .000 | .84          | .99     | .80***         |
| c' Direct effect   | .37     | .11 | 3.28  | .001 | .15          | .60     |                |
| ab Indirect effect | .77     | .17 |       |      | .45          | 1.10    |                |
| Willingness to     | Co-crea | te  |       |      |              |         |                |
| c Total effect     | .97     | .20 | 4.69  | .000 | .56          | 1.36    | .27***         |
| a                  | .84     | .18 | 4.5   | .000 | .47          | 1.20    | .28***         |
| b                  | .65     | .05 | 11.04 | .000 | .53          | .77     | .51***         |
| c' Direct effect   | .42     | .17 | 2.40  | .017 | .07          | .76     |                |
| ab Indirect effect | .55     | .14 |       |      | .29          | .84     |                |

\* Significant at p < .1; \*\* Significant at p < .05; \*\*\*Significant at p < .01

Independent: Format attiude

Mediator: Message equity

Covariate: Attitudinal Brand Loyalty \*\*\*

Boostrap samples: 10 000

n =238

Table 25 Mediation Analysis Format Attitude

H7a investigates the indirect effect of format attitude on consumers' willingness to attend the content message through message equity. Results show that format attitude has a positive total effect on willingness to attend and explains 32% of the variance in this variable (B = 1.14, p = .000\*\*\*, R<sup>2</sup> = .32). Including message equity as a mediator, the a-path result shows that format attitude has a positive effect on message equity (B = .84, p = .000\*\*\*, R<sup>2</sup> = .28) and analyzing the b-path, message equity has a positive effect on willingness to attend (B = .91, p = .000\*\*\*, R<sup>2</sup> = .80). Since both the a-path and b-path are significant we can assess the indirect effect (ab-path).

There is a significant, positive direct effect of format attitude on willingness to attend (B = .37,  $p = .001^{***}$ ) and a positive indirect effect (B = .77). None of the 95% confidence intervals overlap zero, hence the effects are significant. Noteworthy is that when we include message equity as a mediator we explain 80 % of the variance in willingness to attend compared to the initial 32 %. Summarizing, the total effect of format attitude on willingness to attend the content message is partially mediated by message equity. Hence we accept H7a.

H7b stated that format attitude has an indirect effect on consumers' willingness to co-create the content message through message equity. Format attitude has a positive total effect on willingness to co-create the content message, which explains 27% of the variance in willingness to co-create (B = .96,  $p = .000^{***}$ , R<sup>2</sup>=.27). When including message equity as a mediator and analyzing the a-path, results show that format attitude has a positive effect on message equity (B = .84,  $p = .000^{***}$ , R<sup>2</sup>= .28) and, analyzing the b-path, message equity has a positive effect on willingness to co-create (B = .65,  $p = .000^{***}$ , R<sup>2</sup>= .51). Since both the a-path and b-path are significant we can assess the indirect effect (ab).

There is a significant, positive direct effect of format attitude on willingness to co-create (B = .42,  $p = .017^{**}$ ) and a positive indirect effect (B = .55). The 95% confidence intervals of do not overlap zero, hence the effects are significant. When message equity is included as a mediator, we explain 51% of the variance in willingness to co-create compared to the initial 27%. In summary, the total effect of format attitude on willingness to co-create the content message is partially mediated by message equity. Therefore, we accept H7b.



Model 4 Mediation Analysis Format Attitude

H7 a) Format attitude has a positive, indirect effect on consumers' willingness to attend the content message through message equity
 ACCEPTED

b) Format attitude has a positive, indirect effect on consumers' willingness to co-create the content message through message equity

ACCEPTED

## 4.4.2 H8A-B: INDIRECT EFFECT OF ADVERTISING EQUITY ON APPROACH BEHAVIORS THROUGH MESSAGE EQUITY

H8a-b stated that advertising equity has a positive, indirect effect on consumers' approach behaviors.

| Path                  | В       | SE  | t     | Þ    | 95 % Conf. Ir | nterval | R <sup>2</sup>  |  |  |
|-----------------------|---------|-----|-------|------|---------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| Willingness to Attend |         |     |       |      |               |         |                 |  |  |
| c Total effect        | 15      | .22 | 67    | .504 | 58            | .28     | .23***          |  |  |
| a                     | 20      | .20 | -1.02 | .308 | 59            | .19     | .22***          |  |  |
| ь                     | .95     | .04 | 25.17 | .000 | .88           | 1.03    | .7 <b>9</b> *** |  |  |
| c' Direct effect      | .04     | .11 | .39   | .696 | 18            | .27     |                 |  |  |
| ab Indirect effect    | 19      | .19 |       |      | 54            | 19      |                 |  |  |
| Willingness to C      | Co-crea | te  |       |      |               |         |                 |  |  |
| c Total effect        | 04      | .22 | 19    | .850 | 47            | .39     | .20***          |  |  |
| а                     | 20      | .20 | -1.02 | .308 | 59            | .19     | .22***          |  |  |
| Ь                     | .69     | .06 | 12.10 | .000 | .58           | .80     | .51***          |  |  |
| c' Direct effect      | .10     | .17 | .56   | .573 | 24            | .44     |                 |  |  |
| ab Indirect effect    | 14      | .14 |       |      | -'.41         | .13     |                 |  |  |

Mediator: Message equity

Covariate: Attitudinal Brand Loyalty \*\*\*

Boostrap samples: 10 000

n =238

Table 26 Mediation Analysis Advertising Equity

H8a argued that there will be an indirect effect of advertising equity on consumers' willingness to attend the content message through message equity. Advertising equity did not have a significant total effect on willingness to attend the content message (B = -.15, p = .504). Including message equity as a mediator and analyzing a-path, results show that advertising equity does not have an effect on message equity (B = -.20, p = .308). The b-path is significant (B = .95,  $p = .000^{***}$ ), however since a-path is not significant we can not assess an indirect effect, and consequently the confidence intervals overlap zero. We reject H8a.

H8b said that there will be an indirect effect of advertising equity on consumers' willingness to cocreate the content message through message equity. Advertising equity did not have a significant total effect on willingness to co-create the content message (B = - .04, p = .850). When including message equity as a mediator, analyzing the a-path, results show that advertising equity does not have a significant effect on message equity (B = -.20, p = . 308). The b-path is significant (B = .69, p = .000\*\*\*). But as stated above, since a-path is not significant we can not assess an indirect effect, and consequently the confidence intervals overlap zero. We reject H8b. As clarification, the models are significant for advertising equity (represented by  $R^{2***}$ ) because attitudinal brand loyalty has a significant positive relationship with the dependent variables.



Model 5 Simple Mediation Analysis Advertising Equity

**H8** a) Advertising equity has a positive, indirect effect on consumers' willingness to attend the content REJECTED message through message equity

b) Advertising equity has a positive, indirect effect on consumers' willingness to co-create the content message through message equity

### REJECTED

#### H7-H8: SUMMARIZING RESULTS & ANALYSIS 4.4.3

In summary, results show that the effect of format attitude on approach behaviors towards a specific content message is partially mediated by message equity, we accepted H7a-b. However, there is neither a direct nor an indirect effect of advertising equity on approach behaviors, we rejected H8a-b.

#### 4.5 **RESEARCH MODEL AND HYPOTHESES SUMMARY WITH RESULTS**

Below the research model is displayed with accepted hypotheses in black and rejected in grey.



Model 6 Research Model with Accepted Hypotheses

|     | a) Consumers' willingness to attend the content message is higher when the content is distributed<br>in a high attitude format, compared to a low attitude format                                 | Accepted |
|-----|---|----------|
| H1  | <ul> <li>b) Consumers' willingness to co-create the content message is higher when the content is distributed<br/>in a high attitude format, compared to a low attitude format</li> </ul>         | Accepted |
| H2  | a) Consumers' willingness to attend the content message will be higher when the content is created<br>by a brand with high advertising equity, compared to a brand with low advertising equity    | Rejected |
| 112 | b) Consumers' willingness to co-create the content message will be higher when the content is<br>created by a brand with high advertising equity, compared to a brand with low advertising equity | Rejected |
| H3  | a) The use of a high attitude format to distribute the content increases consumers' wilingness to attend the content message more for a low than a high advertising equity brand                  | Rejected |
| пэ  | b) The use of a high attitude format to distribute the content increases consumers' wilingness to<br>co-create the content message more for a low than a high advertising equity brand            | Rejected |
| H4  | Message equity is higher when the content is distributed in a high attitude format, compared to a low attitude format   | Accepted |
| H5  | Message equity is higher when the content message is created by a brand with high advertising<br>equity, compared to a brand with low advertising equity  | Rejected |
| H6  | The use of a high attitude format to distribute the content increases message equity more for a low than a high advertising equity brand  | Rejected |
| H7  | a) Format attitude has a positive, indirect effect on consumers' willingness to attend the content<br>message through message equity  | Accepted |
| 11/ | b) Format attitude has a positive, indirect effect on consumers' willingness to co-create the content<br>message through message equity   | Accepted |
| H8  | a) Advertising equity has a positive, indirect effect on consumers' willingness to attend the<br>content message through message equity   | Rejected |
| 110 | b) Advertising equity has a positive, indirect effect on consumers' willingness to co-create the<br>content message through message equity  | Rejected |

Table 27 Hypotheses Summary with Results

PÅLSSON & WALLIN

### 5 DISCUSSION

In this chapter we discuss the results of this thesis. First, we cover effects of format attitude and advertising equity on message equity and consumers' approach behaviors. Following is a discussion about indirect effects on approach behaviors through message equity. The chapter ends with a general discussion.

# 5.1 FORMAT ATTITUDE HAS A POSITIVE EFFECT ON APPROACH BEHAVIORS AND MESSAGE EQUITY

### 5.1.1 FORMAT ATTITUDE HAS A POSITIVE EFFECT ON APPROACH BEHAVIORS

When a content message is transmitted in a high attitude format consumers' approach behaviors towards the message are higher (H1a-b). This is in line with research studying the connection between attitude and behavior (Hoyer, MacInnis & Pieters, 2012) and specifically the connection between format attitude and behavior (e.g. Burns & Lutz, 2006). We generated the insight that format attitude is not only related to advertising avoidance (Speck & Elliott, 1997) but also advertising approach. Thus, the concept of format attitude has been shown to be an important conceptual variable to consider in studies focusing on how to increase the effect of a content message.

It is noteworthy that even when the difference in attitude between formats is not very large, (approximately .5), see section 5.1, there is still a difference in approach behavior which is indicated to be larger than the difference in format attitude.

The increase of willingness to attend due to format attitude is an interesting finding since consumers' attention is a scarce resource in today's cluttered advertising industry (Rosengren, 2008). Our findings become more substantial when considering that respondents not only had higher intention to pay attention to the specific message when transmitted in a high attitude format, but they also gave up personal information (email) to gain additional information on how to take part of the content message. This implies that weighing in consumers' format attitude in the choice of format to distribute a content message can help advertisers overcome issues of advertising clutter since voluntary attention can be increased. In turn communication effects are likely to be greater due to the increased exposures (Lange & Dahlén, 2008). Hence, format attitude can be a way to take up a larger portion of consumers' limited time and attention to advertising from competing advertising messages.

Additionally, consumers' willingness to co-create the content message was higher when using a high attitude format. This supports our theoretical argument that in similarity to favorable attitudes towards a brand or a product category acting as motivating factors (Füller, 2010), a format that consumers' have a favorable attitude towards can act as a motivational factor to co-create a content message.

In light of willingness to attend being higher when the content is transmitted in a high attitude format, it is interesting that consumers also are more willing to co-create the content message. We think that the explanation could be that if the message is perceived to be worth the effort to pay attention to, it is also motivating to co-create content since they want to take part of it. In extension, format attitude also contributes to the benefits of co-creation. The messages' relevance to consumers increase (Modig, 2014) and consequently as people are attracted to contribute the better the content message becomes, creating an upward spiral in which an increasing number of people take part due to the increased relevance. Moreover, co-creation can help to develop a closer relationship with consumers, build the brand's reputation and generate positive word-of-mouth (Gamble & Gilmore, 2013; Hoyer, MacInnis & Pieters, 2012).

Another perspective is when a brand wishes to include its consumers in the creation of the communication the chance of getting response is greater when using high attitude format. This implies that the use of a high attitude format makes the investment in setting up co-creational activities, such as an online platform to submit ideas, more worth the invested resources.

### 5.1.2 FORMAT ATTITUDE HAS A POSITIVE EFFECT ON MESSAGE EQUITY

Message equity is higher when the content is transmitted in a high attitude format (H4). This result contributes to research about the effects of format attitude (e.g. Burns & Lutz, 2006). This finding is particularly relevant in the context of content marketing where value creation is key to pull consumers towards the brand's advertising i.e. approach it (Rosengren, Baines & Fill, in press). The result supports our argumentation that higher attitude towards the format which the content message is transmitted in, based on the perceptions of that format (e.g. Burns & Lutz, 2006), has a positive spillover-effect on message equity.

Additionally, basing the choice of format partly on format attitude is important in connection to building advertising equity. Using a high attitude format generates higher consumer-perceived value, i.e. message equity, hence, it is logical that advertising equity can be built by format attitude as an implication of increased message equity. In extension, format attitude strengthens advantages that come with a higher advertising equity such as opening up for collaborations between brands (Rosengren, 2014). Also, more importantly in the context of content marketing, advertising equity generates an advantage in terms of increased exposures due to an increase in consumers' *general* willingness to attend (Rosengren & Dahlén, 2015) the advertising.

## 5.1.3 THE IMPORTANCE OF FORMAT ATTITUDE TO APPROACH BEHAVIORS AND MESSAGE EQUITY

As discussed, consumers' attitude towards the format which the content message is distributed in generates differences in both message equity and approach behaviors. This means that since value creation and the increased attention it generates (Ducoffe, 1995) are most likely goals of the content message, format attitude can be used as a guidance for companies on how to choose between formats to increase the effects of a content message

Our result indicates that in content marketing the choice of format should be partly considered from a consumer perspective. When choosing a format there are of course other factors to be aware of such as the cost of reach in that format. For example, a podcast is likely to reach more people at less cost than building up in-store events to reach the same number of people. This might hinder the use of format attitude for choosing which format to transmit the content message in. However, it is important to realize that this could be overcome by technology which today can for example can live-stream an event held at a specific location. The cost of using an event to reach the same number of people could be decreased, even if of course participants engaging from home might not receive the full intended experience of the content message.

Since there seems to be a larger threshold to get people to approach a low attitude format, advertisers need to be aware of the attitude towards the format they use in order to know when they have an additional challenge and need to overcome this barrier. However, it can still be worth to use a low attitude format if the cost of getting people over the threshold of approaching it is less than the resources needed to use a high attitude format. If appropriate for the content message, to get people over this threshold could for example be to invest in advertising in traditional media to spread knowledge of the existence of the content message.

### 5.2 ADVERTISING EQUITY DOES NOT HAVE AN EFFECT ON APPROACH BEHAVIORS OR MESSAGE EQUITY

Our results show that a brand's level of advertising equity does not generate differences in consumers' approach behaviors (H2a-b) or message equity (H5). We have contributed to the scarce research concerning advertising equity (e.g. Rosengren & Dahlén, 2015) and its effects by showing that advertising equity in fact does *not* have an effect on consumer-perceived value of a specific content message or approach behaviors towards this message.

The results of advertising equity not influencing willingness to attend (H2a) or message equity (H5) oppose the theoretical argument concerning expectations and positive evaluations (e.g. Mitra & Golder, 2006). Consumers' positive expectations from perceived value in past advertising (Chang, 2014) i.e. advertising equity does not seem to translate into a more favorable evaluation or an increased willingness to attend the content message.

Instead, these results can be explained by the expectancy-disconfirmation theory since the same content (the performance) generates the same message equity and willingness to attend regardless of the different starting points in expectations due to advertising equity (high expectations for a high advertising equity brand and vice versa). To clarify, a possible explanation is that consumers who see the content message from a brand with high advertising equity had so high expectations that their expectations were not met (negative disconfirmation), but if the content message was created by a low advertising equity brand expectations may instead have been exceeded (positive disconfirmation). Consequently, the actual outcome became the same. In extension this means that a brand with high advertising equity might have a greater challenge of meeting the expectations of consumers and the brand does not get a free-pass to value creation or voluntary attention. They need to put as much effort, if not more, into the creation of content messages as low advertising equity brands.

With regards to the hypothesized outcome that consumers' willingness to co-create would be higher when the content was created by a high advertising equity brand (H2b) our result opposed that advertising equity acts as a motivating factor. The value from previous advertising does not seem to make consumers perceive that they would contribute to something meaningful which they would benefit from by improving (Füller, 2006). Also it does not seem like a brand's' *advertising* can act as a motivational factor for co-creation like the *brand* itself (Füller, 2010) We can also then rule out that advertising equity signals that it is more worth to co-create a specific message for this brand because it is more likely that they will make a larger effort (Rosengren, 2014) to integrate the ideas, compared to a low advertising equity brand. This means that a brand with high advertising equity does not have the benefit of consumers being motivated to co-create a content message to a greater extent compared to a low advertising equity brand.

### 5.3 A HIGH ATTITUDE FORMAT DOES NOT GENERATE A LARGER INCREASE IN APPROACH BEHAVIORS OR MESSAGE EQUITY FOR A LOW ADVERTISING EQUITY BRAND

The use of a high attitude format does *not* generate a larger increase in approach behaviors (H3ab) or message equity (H6) for a low compared to a high advertising equity brand. Since the approach behaviors and message equity did not differ depending on the brands' advertising equity (H2a-b; H5) it is not surprising that the interaction effect did not occur. It is logical to conclude that the theoretically motivated difference in baseline approach behavior and message equity to a specific content message is *not* higher for a high advertising equity brand, compared to a low advertising equity brand.

This means that a high advertising equity brand does not have the advantage of gaining higher approach behaviors and message equity regardless of the attitude towards the format they choose to transmit their content message in. They do not have the luxury of being able to choose formats on other factors, such as maintenance time and cost (Linn, 2014), to a greater extent than a low advertising equity brand. Hence, low and high advertising equity brands have the same preconditions to create content which consumers judge equally, assuming that they do not differ in another aspect which might influence, such as brand equity which has been controlled for in this thesis.

# 5.4 INDIRECT EFFECT ON APPROACH BEHAVIORS THROUGH MESSAGE EQUITY

Format attitude has a positive indirect effect on approach behaviors through message equity (H7ab) but advertising equity does not (H8a-b). Before we discuss these results we will start with an additional finding concerning message equity's positive effect on approach behaviors.

## 5.4.1 MESSAGE EQUITY HAS A POSITIVE RELATIONSHIP WITH APPROACH BEHAVIORS

Worth mentioning, even if not directly related to the stated hypotheses, is that message equity has a significant relationship with both approach behaviors (b-path). This was the case, which is logical, both when format attitude and advertising equity were used as independent variables. In both cases a one-unit increase in message equity increased willingness to attend more than willingness cocreate (as can be seen by the confidence intervals not overlapping each other), but is important to explain both behaviors. This means that by creating value in a specific message advertisers get people to pay more attention to the content message which supports previous research (e.g. Ducoffe, 1995). Message equity seems to be a motivational factor for consumers' willingness to co-create a specific content message. This can be seen as similar to the motivation of creating better products to benefit from them, which is co-creational motivation for new product development (Füller, 2006). This shows the importance for advertisers of creating value in their content messages to increase the response in co-creational activities.

## 5.4.2 ADVERTISING EQUITY DOES NOT HAVE AN INDIRECT EFFECT ON APPROACH BEHAVIORS THROUGH MESSAGE EQUITY

First of all, the rejection of 8a-b is not surprising since we also rejected H2a-b and H5 above. Hence there is no total, direct or indirect effect of advertising equity on approach behaviors through message equity. In light of the discussion revolving the non-significant connection between advertising equity, message equity and approach behaviors we will continue this part of the discussion with the additional findings from the mediation analysis regarding format attitude.

## 5.4.3 FORMAT ATTITUDE HAS AN INDIRECT EFFECT ON APPROACH BEHAVIORS THROUGH MESSAGE EQUITY

An interesting finding is that format attitude has an indirect effect on both approach behaviors through message equity. The result that format attitude has a positive total effect on approach behaviors (c-path) and a positive relationship with message equity (a-path) was not surprising since we accepted H1a-b and H4 above. However, the additional contribution is that message equity partially mediates the effect of format attitude and that there still is a direct effect of format attitude on consumers' approach behaviors towards a specific content message, which highlights a more complex relationship between the studied variables. This result specifically adds knowledge of how consumer-perceived value acts as a mediator between format effects and consumer behavior, also studied by Dahlén, Granlund & Grenros (2009).

### 5.4.3.1 FORMAT ATTITUDE HAS AN INDIRECT EFFECT ON WILLINGNESS TO ATTEND THROUGH MESSAGE EQUITY

H7a was accepted. Specifically, the results showed that using a high attitude format to transmit the content makes consumers 1.14 units more willing to attend the content message on average compared to when using a low attitude format. Particularly interesting is that this total effect consists partly of a direct effect of format attitude on willingness to attend, which stands for a .37 increase in willingness to attend on average, and also an indirect effect with .77 increase. However, since the confidence intervals between the effects overlap (.15 - .60; .45 - 1.10) we can not say which effect is stronger, but conclude that they both exist and are at least equally important to explain consumer's willingness to attend a specific content message. Therefore consumers seem to pay attention to a content message partly because of the format itself, but are additionally influenced by the value that the specific format generates to the content message.

This result shows further support for research by Ducoffe & Carlo (2000) whose findings indicated that higher perceived value in an advertisement influenced people to approach it to a greater extent. Noteworthy is that we explain 80 % of the variance of willingness to attend, compared to the initial 32 %, when we include message equity in the model. Hence, it is clear that the inclusion of message

equity as a mediator is important to explain consumer's willingness to attend a content message as an effect of format attitude.

### 5.4.3.2 FORMAT ATTITUDE HAS AN INDIRECT EFFECT ON WILLINGNESS TO CO-CREATE THROUGH MESSAGE EQUITY

In addition, H7b was accepted, hence format attitude has an indirect effect on willingness to cocreate through message equity. The result specifically shows that on average consumers have a .97 units higher willing to co-create the message when it is transmitted in a high attitude format than a low attitude format. This effect consists partly of a direct effect (.42) and an indirect effect (.55). However since the confidence intervals overlap we can not conclude which of these effects are stronger.

It seems that consumers are motivated to co-create content partly because they have a favorable attitude to the format which the content is transmitted in, but also because they perceive the message to be more valuable. Since we can explain 51 % of the variance in co-creation when adding message equity as a mediator, compared to the initial 27 %, it seems that format attitude is worth considering in choice of format to increase consumers' willingness to co-create the content through increased value.

### 5.4.3.3 THE INDIRECT EFFECT OF FORMAT ATTITUDE THROUGH MESSAGE EQUITY DOES NOT DIFFER BETWEEN APPROACH BEHAVIORS

Result shows that the confidence intervals for the indirect effects (.45 - 1.10; .29 - .84) and the direct effects (.15 - .60; .07 - .76) overlap between willingness to attend and willingness to co-create. This means that there is not a difference in these effects between the approach behaviors. However, there is a difference of 29 percentage points in how much variance in the approach behaviors we explain when we include message equity as a mediator (willingness to attend = 80% vs. willingness to co-create = 51%). This indicates that format attitude and message equity are more important to explain willingness to attend.

### 5.5 GENERAL DISCUSSION

Our discussion generates the insight that by choosing a format which consumers have a high attitude towards advertisers get direct effects on approach behaviors as well as indirect effects through message equity. Hence the effectiveness of the content message increases. Specifically, it is increased due to consumers' attention to the specific content message being higher. A greater number of consumers will take part of the content message and in turn the intended communication effects are likely to be greater (Lange & Dahlén, 2009). Also, consumers' willingness to co-create the content message is higher when using a high attitude format. This comes with additional benefits such as helping a brand develop a closer relationship with its customers, build the brand's reputation and generate word of mouth (Gamble & Gilmore, 2013; Hoyer, MacInnis & Pieters, 2012). On top of this, using a high attitude format generates higher message equity. This additional value builds the brand's level of advertising equity to a greater extent, compared to when using a low attitude format.

As our results show, advertising equity does not increase message equity or approach behaviors towards a *specific* message. As we have seen from previous research (Rosengren & Dahlén, 2015) it does come with a crucial advantage since it positively influences consumers to voluntarily acknowledge of the core of a content message. In other words, consumers become more willing to expose themselves to the brand's future advertising in *general* and do not avoid advertising which may contain information about the specific content message (Rosengren & Dahlén, 2015). In fact, consumers may even make a voluntarily effort, for example going to the brand's website, to gain information about new content being created due to the expectations high advertising equity creates on future advertising. However, once consumers' have understood this core of the content message they make a judgment if it is worth an additional effort to approach in the future, and this judgment is *not* influenced by advertising equity but, as we have seen, partly by attitude towards the format which the content is distributed in.

This means that a high advertising equity brand has an advantage in that a greater number of people will make the judgment and *if* the brand has created a content worth approaching further they will then get more response than a low advertising equity brand, which had fewer people make the judgment initially. Yet, one must not forget that the high advertising equity brand may have a larger challenge in that people have such high expectations on the advertising (Chang, 2014) and easily become disappointed, which can reduce the actual response.

### 6 CONCLUSION

The advertising landscape continues to change. New formats see the light of day, consumers' behaviors change and the cost of attention increases. Advertisers have been pushed to rely on consumers voluntarily seeking out advertising in the brand's own channels. Content marketing is on the rise but the challenge is how to increase effectiveness of the content message by pulling consumers towards it.

This thesis provides an important contribution by understanding the effect of advertising equity and format attitude on message equity and consumers' approach behaviors towards a specific content message. The findings of this study can provide guidance for both practitioners and future research. It is now time to answer our research questions.

### **Research Question 1**

Does (1) consumers' attitude towards the format in which a content message is distributed and/or (2) the brand's advertising equity, have a positive effect on message equity, consumers' willingness to attend and/or willingness to co-create a specific content message?

Consumers' attitude towards the format in which a content message is distributed *does have* a positive effect on message equity, consumers' willingness to attend and willingness to co-create a specific content message. Advertising equity *does not* have an effect on message equity, consumers' willingness to attend or willingness to co-create a specific content message.

### **Research Question 2**

Will the use of a high attitude format to distribute the content message have a larger effect on consumers' willingness to attend, willingness to co-create and/or message equity for a low compared to a high advertising equity brand?

The answer is no, the effects of using a high attitude format *does not* have a larger effect for a low advertising equity brand.

### **Research Question 3**

Does message equity act as a mediator between:

(1) consumers' attitude towards the format in which a content message is distributed and approach behaviors, in terms of consumers' willingness to attend and/or willingness to co-create, towards a specific content message?
(2) the brand's advertising equity and approach behaviors, in terms of consumers' willingness to attend and/or willingness to co-create, towards a specific content message?

Message equity *partially meditates* the positive effect of format attitude on consumers' willingness to attend and willingness to co-create a specific content message. Advertising equity did not have an effect on message equity or approach behaviors, hence message equity *does not mediate* an effect between advertising equity and approach behaviors.

In essence, our research shows that advertising equity does not make a specific content message more effective once consumers have seen the core of it. On the other hand, format attitude increases both message equity and approach behaviors, which leads to the conclusion – by weighing in format attitude when choosing format to distribute a content message in an advertiser can get **"more bang for the buck**".

### 7 IMPLICATIONS

In this chapter we will highlight implications for theory and practice based on our findings.

### 7.1 THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

Attitude towards the format was shown to have a positive effect on message equity and consumers' approach behaviors and is therefore indicated to be an important conceptual variable when studying content marketing effects. The mediating role of message equity shows the need to consider value in research explaining the connection between a content message's structural dimensions and consumers' behaviors towards the message.

In this thesis we have contributed with a scale for co-creation which should be used in other studies to understand its usefulness. In addition, willingness to attend and the recently developed construct message equity have been found to be important. The construct advertising equity has been shown to limit itself to generating approach behaviors towards a brand's advertising in general but does not influence evaluation of a specific message.

### 7.2 PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

The overarching implication is that the content itself is not the only important part of the message, it also needs to be distributed in a way that makes consumers perceive it as valuable and worth approaching. To increase message equity and approach behaviors advertisers should take consumers' format attitude into account when deciding in which format to distribute content. Hence, companies should use this construct to guide content messages towards being created in the format which gives the "most bang for the buck".

As an extension, a high attitude format should be chosen, if possible, to gain the additional benefits from message equity and approach behaviors. Companies that want to use co-creation of advertising to increase the relevance of their messages can increase participation by creating content in a format which consumers have a favorable attitude towards. Also, companies which have the goal of building advertising equity can gain an additional boost in this construct by using using a high attitude format to increase message equity, which in turns builds advertising equity.

This study also highlights the additional challenges an advertiser takes on depending on the format used, since it is harder to get people to approach content in a low attitude format. This can be an indication of the difficulty of using new formats since consumers will not have developed a favorable attitude towards them yet, not taking into account that they may be intrigued by this new format. When using low attitude or new formats, a company may need to make an additional investment to get consumers over the threshold to approach them and perceive the content as valuable.

Advertising equity is a great advantage for content marketers since it generates a *general* willingness to attend a brand's future content message. However, our study shows that even a high advertising equity brand needs to deliver value in the specific content message, they do not have a free-pass to message equity and approach behaviors. This means that brands can not suddenly invest less in the design of the content message since this could move consumers towards approaching a competing

brand's, possibly more valuable, content message instead. In fact, a high advertising equity brand may even have to increase investments to not risk consumers' expectations to not be met.

Further this study gives implications in a business to business perspective. Companies that specialize in producing content leveraging a specific format, for example events, should understand how the attitude towards their format compares to other formats. This information can be presented in connection to our results as a way of convincing advertisers to use this specific format instead of a competitor's.

### 8 LIMITATIONS

In this chapter we describe the limitations of the thesis.

### 8.1 EXPERIMENT DESIGN

We have limited the focus to content marketing in own media and not traditional advertising in bought media and we can therefore not express whether the effects only are applicable to content marketing in these formats.

The use of a scenario based laboratory experiment generates high internal validity but the external validity could be improved by performing the experiment in a real setting (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Creating an event and podcast containing the manipulated variables, with the investigated brands could practically be done, but would have been outside the scope of this thesis. Additionally, the used brands are not likely to be interested in creating the content since it would need to be exactly as the competitors. Generalizability would have been increased by including additional product categories, formats and brands as operationalizations of each independent variable. Despite the effort of creating a scenario with broad appeal and neutral in emotions, people can have different ideas about the content. Although, since we were interested in differences between groups this effect was eliminated as the different ideas are present in all experimental groups.

Only retail brands were used therefore the results are only applicable to the retail industry. The chosen brands may differ in other aspects besides advertising equity which could influence results. However, we controlled for brand equity, which has improved the validity of our results. Also, we can not add everything to the experiment as the design would become too complex and the survey too burdensome for respondents to answer. However, the non-inclusion of some variables is necessary in a deductive approach, but also criticism against it.

Format attitude is used to distinguish formats, but there are other factors which could differentiate between an event and a podcast, which could influence the results. However, during the scenario development we measured believability, relevance and perception of the scenario to rule out that these factors differed when a specific format was used. Previous experience can influence behaviors (Hoyer, MacInnis & Pieters, 2012), hence we made sure that previous experience of the format did not significantly differ between experimental groups. These factors could have been incorporated in the survey for the main study, but it was deemed to make the survey too long which would have affected results negatively. Additional factors could be controlled for, but as stated, this is always the case in a deductive approach.

Moreover, one could criticize that we have chosen one offline and one online format. But this was necessary since the formats needed to fit with the content, the chosen brands, be relevant in the chosen product categories and easy to understand while reading about it. Also, we needed to make sure that consumers generally seem to have at least some previous experience of the formats, even if this was not to differ, to be able to understand the scenario. A format operationalization with one online and one offline format in each level of attitude would have been beneficial to neutralize the differences and increase generalizability. Some brands have used the formats before the study, for example IKEA have had a podcast and ICA and Coop have arranged events in their stores, which possibly could have influenced the results.

Perceptions of the format are antecedents of format attitude (Burns & Lutz, 2006), one could argue that we should measure these perceptions. But when format attitude is measured the difference in these format perceptions are accounted for and also this would have been outside the scope of this study.

### 8.2 QUESTIONNAIRE

A question similar to "sign up" for willingness to attend to measure willingness to co-create would have given a more representative picture between the behaviors. Respondents could have been asked to write a suggestion of a guest. The order of questions could be criticized since advertising equity and brand equity were placed at the end of the questionnaire, the reason for this was expressed in the methodology. This could be affected by the scenario content, especially as brand equity was used as a covariate in the analysis. Also we measure self-reported intentions and can not state results in terms of actual approach behaviors.

Scales were translated from English to Swedish which may have affected the results. Additionally, scales have been adapted (willingness to attend) and created (willingness to co-create). These need to be further validated to ensure the reliability of our results even if Cronbach's alpha was sufficient.

### 8.3 DATA COLLECTION & SAMPLE

The sample in each group in the main study can not be seen as completely representative of the Swedish population despite the use of an online survey panel. Since respondents are offered a compensation for participating in studies distributed via the panel, one can argue such panels attract reward seeking people which could affect the actual representation of the population. Also, the use of an online panel can be criticized since we can not explain uncertainties for them or know who is actually taking the survey. Questionnaires were collected using different methods between pre studies and the main study (online and offline) which could have affected respondents answers between collection methods.

### 8.4 ETHICAL CONCERNS

In the main study, respondents were asked to write their email if they wished for more information about how to attend the content message. This could be seen as a violation towards anonymous respondents but since this was completely voluntarily this violation is not severe but should be noted.

## 9 FUTURE RESEARCH

The studied results in this thesis should be replicated using a larger sample to be able to split the results into different product categories and specifically investigate possible differences. Additionally, future studies should include additional approach behaviors such as willingness to process the content message (Puccinelli, Wilcox & Grewal, 2015) to understand if format attitude has an effect on these, and if advertising equity does influences some approach behaviors towards a specific content message but not all.

A future study should focus on specifically on mapping consumer's attitudes to a wide variety of formats to serve as guidance for advertisers investing in content marketing to base their format choice partly on format attitude. We suggest a study that investigates the antecedents of format attitude. The understanding of what factors affect format attitude, both positively and negatively, would provide marketers with an understanding of the limitations of a format and what factors need to be overcome. We also propose a study to specifically analyze the expectations from advertising equity influencing the reactions to a future content message, to further understand how these mechanisms work.

### **10 REFERENCES**

Arla.se.(n.d.).Mjölkbaksidor.[online]Availableat:http://www.arla.se/evenemang/mjolkbaksidor/ [Accessed 9 Mar. 2016].

Arslanagić, M., Babić-Hodović, V. & Mehić, E. (2013). Customer perceived value as a mediator between corporate reputation and word of mouth in business markets. International Journal of Multidisciplinarity in Business and Sceince 1(1), 6-11

Bacile, T., Ye, C. & Swilley, E. (2014). From Firm-Controlled to Consumer-Contributed: Consumer Co-Production of Personal Media Marketing Communication. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 28(2), 117-133.

Baek, T. and Morimoto, M. (2012). Stay Away From Me. Journal of Advertising, 41(1), 59-76.

Baines, Fill & Rosengren, in press. Marketing 4th ed., Oxford University Press

Bove, L. L., Pervan, S. J., Beatty, S. E., & Shiu, E. (2008). Service worker role in encouraging customer organizational citizenship behaviors. Journal of Business Research, 62, 698–705.

Briggs, R. & Hollis, N. (1997). Advertising on the web: Is there response before click-through? Journal Of Advertising Reserach, 37, 2, 33-45

Broadbent, S. (1979), Spending advertising money: An introduction to media planning, media buying and the uses of media research (3rd ed.). London: Business Books.

Bruner, G. C., and A. Kumar. 2000. "Web Commercials and Advertising Hierarchy-of Effects." Journal of Advertising Research 40 (1/2): 35–42. Bryman, A. & Bell, E. (2015): Business Research Methods. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Burns, K. (2003). Attitude toward the online advertising format: A reexamination of the attitude toward the ad model in online advertising context. Ph.D. University of Florida.

Burns, K. & Lutz, R (2006) The Function of Format: Consumer Responses to Six On-line Advertising Formats, Journal of Advertising, 35(1), 53-61

Chaiken, S. & Stangor, C. (1987) Attitudes and attitude change. Annual review of psychology, 38(1), 575-630

Chang, C. (2014). When New Commercials Do Not Meet Expectations. Journal of Advertising, 43(4), pp.359-370.

Cho, C. (1999). How Advertising Works on the WWW: Modified Elaboration Likelihood Model. Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising, 21(1), 34-50.

Cho, C., & Cheon, H. J. (2004). Why do people avoid advertising on the internet? Journal of Advertising, 33(4), 89-97.

Content Marketing Institute. (2016). 75 Examples To Spark Your Content Marketing Creativity. [online] Available at: http://contentmarketinginstitute.com/education/great-content-marketing-examples/ [Accessed 20 Feb. 2016].

Cooper, D. & Schindler, P. (2014). Business research methods (12th ed). McGraw-Hill/Irvin

Dahlén, M. & Lange, F. (2009). Optimal marknadskommunikation. Malmö: Liber.

Dahlén, M. & Rosengren, S. (in press). If advertising won't die, what will it be? Towards a new definition of advertising. Journal of Advertising, 45(3).

Dahlén, M., Granlund, A. & Grenros, M. (2009). The consumer-perceived value of non-traditional media: effects of brand reputation, appropriateness and expense. Journal of Consumer Marketing, 26(3),155-163.

Dahlén, M., Rasch, A. and Rosengren, S. (2003). Love At First Site?. Journal of Advertising Research, 43(1), 25-33.

Dholakia UM. (2001). A motivational process model of product involvement and consumer risk perception. European Journal of Marketing 35(11/12): 1340–1360.

Ducoffe, R. H. (1995). How consumers assess the value of advertising. Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising, 17(1), 1-18.

Ducoffe, R. H., & Curlo, E. (2000). Advertising value and advertising processing. Journal of Marketing Communications, 6(4), 247-262.

Ducoffe, R.H. (1996) Advertising value and advertising on the web. Journal of Advertising Research, 36(5) 21–35.

Edwards, S. M., Li, H., & Lee, J.-H. (2002). Forced exposure and psychological reactance: Antecedents and consequences of the perceived intrusiveness of pop-up ads. Journal of Advertising, 31, 83-95

Eisend, M. (2015) "Have We Progressed Marketing Knowledge? A Meta-Meta-Analysis of Effect Sizes in Marketing Research.", Journal of Marketing, 79 (3), 23-40.

Emerson, R.(1981), "Social Exchange Theory," in Social Psychology: Sociological Perspectives, M. Rosenberg and R. H. Turner, Eds. New York: Basic.

Etgar, M. (2007). A descriptive model of the consumer co-production process. J. of the Acad. Mark. Sci., 36(1), 97-108.

Fang, E., Palmatier, R. & Evans, K. (2008). Influence of customer participation on creating and sharing of new product value. J. of the Acad. Mark. Sci., 36(3), 322-336.

Freiden, J. (1982). An evaluation of spokesperson and vehicle source effects in advertising. Current issues and research in advertising 5(1). 77-87

Füller, J. (2006). Why Consumers Engage in Virtual New Product Developments Initiated By Producers. Advances in Consumer Research. 33(1), 639-646.

Füller, J. (2010). Refining Virtual Co-Creation from a Consumer Perspective. California Management Review, 52(2), 98-122.

Gamble, J. and Gilmore, A. (2013). A new era of consumer marketing?. European Journal of Marketing, 47(11/12), 1859-1888.

Greenberg, A. S. (2012). The role of visual attention in internet advertising: Eleven questions and a score of answers. Journal of Advertising Research, 52(4), 400-404.

Grohmann, B (2009), "Gender Dimensions of Brand Personality," Journal of Marketing Research, 46 (1), 105–19.

Groth, M. (2005). Customers as good soldiers: Examining citizenship behaviors in internet service deliveries. Journal of Management, 31, 7–27.

Harris, J. (2016). 24 Plays That Will Up Your Content Marketing Game. [online] Content Marketing Institute. Available at: http://contentmarketinginstitute.com/2016/04/tactical-content-marketing-playbook/ [Accessed 30 Apr. 2016].

Hayes, A. (2013). Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis. New York: Guilford Publications.

Houston, F. and Gassenheimer, J. (1987). Marketing and Exchange. Journal of Marketing, 51(4), 3.

Hoyer, W., Chandy, R., Dorotic, M., Krafft, M. & Singh, S. (2010). Consumer Cocreation in New Product Development. Journal of Service Research, 13(3), 283-296.

Hoyer, W., MacInnis, D. & Pieters, R. (2012). Consumer Behavior (6th ed). South-Western College Pub

IRM: Institutet för Reklam- och Mediastatistik, (2014). IRM:s Årsrapport - Svensk Reklammarknad 2014. Stockholm.

IRM: Institutet för Reklam- och Mediastatistik, (2015). IRM:s Årsrapport - Svensk Reklammarknad 2015. Stockholm.

Jacobsen, D. (2002). Vad, hur och Varför?. Edited by: Hellström, C., 1st ed. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Kelly, L., Kerr, G. & Drennan, J. (2010). Avoidance of Advertising in Social Networking Sites. Journal of Interactive Advertising, 10(2), 16-27.

Kntnt Sweden AB, (2016). Värdeskapande reklam och kommunikationskapital. [podcast] Kntnt Radio. [Accessed 1 Mar. 2016].

Lange, F., Rosengren, S. & Blom, A. (2016). Store-window creativity's impact on shopper behavior. Journal of Business Research, 69(3), 1014-1021.

Lee, J., Ham, C.-D., & Kim, M. (2013). Why people pass along online video advertising: From the perspectives of the interpersonal communication motives scale and the theory of reasoned action. Journal of Interactive Advertising, 13(1), 1-13.

Linn, M. (2014). A Guide to Creating Content in the Formats Your Audience Loves. [online]

Content Marketing Institute. Available at: http://contentmarketinginstitute.com/2014/06/guide-creating-content-in-formats-your-audience-loves/ [Accessed 18 Mar. 2016].

Liu, J., Chang, J. & Tsai, J. (2015) Does Perceived Value Mediate the Relationship between Service Traits and Client Satisfaction in the Software-as-a-Service (SaaS)?. Open Journal of Social Sciences, 3, 159-165.

MacInnis, Deborah J., & Bernard J. Jaworski (1989), "Information Process- ing from Advertisements: Toward an Integrative Framework," Journal of Marketing, 57 (4), 1–23.

Makens, J.C. (1965). Effect of brand preference upon consumers' perceived taste of turkey meat. Journal of Applied Psychology, 49, 261–263.

Malholtra, N. (1993). Marketing Research. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Malhotra, N. (2014). Essentials of Marketing Research. Boston: Pearson Education.

Marketing Science Institute (2008), 2008-2010 Research Priorities. Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute.

McClure, S., Li, J., Tomlin, D., Cypert, K., Montague, L. & Montague, P. (2004). Neural Correlates of Behavioral Preference for Culturally Familiar Drinks. Neuron, 44(2), 379-387.

McQuail, D. (1985). Sociology of Mass Communication. Annual Review of Sociology, 11(1), 93-111.

Mitra, D. & Golder, P.N. (2006), "How does objective quality affect perceived quality? Short-term effects, long- term effects, and asymmetries", Marketing Science, 25(3), 230-47.

Modig, E. (2014). "Är detta något för mig?" Om relevant reklam. In: M. Söderlund, ed., Marknadsföring och påverkan på konsumenten, 1st ed. Lund: Studentlitteratur AB, 113-129.

Neff, J. (2015). Is It Content or Is It Advertising?. AdAge. [online] Available at: http://adage.com/article/ad-age-research/content-advertising/300858/ [Accessed 3 May 2016].

Nordfält, J. (2007). Marknadsföring i butik. Malmö: Liber.

O'Donohoe, S. (1994). Advertising Uses and Gratifications. European Journal of Marketing, 28(8/9), 52-75.

Osgood, C., Suci, G. & Tannenbaum, P. (1957). The Mea-surement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Pallant, J. (2004). SPSS survival manual. Crows Nest, N.S.W.: Allen & Unwin.

Pieters, R. and Wedel, M. (2004). Attention Capture and Transfer in Advertising: Brand, Pictorial, and Text-Size Effects. Journal of Marketing, 68(2), 36-50.

Prahalad, C. & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creating unique value with customers. Strategy & Leadership, 32(3), 4-9.

Puccinelli, N., Wilcox, K. & Grewal, D. (2015). Consumers' Response to Commercials: When the Energy Level in the Commercial Conflicts with the Media Context. Journal of Marketing, 79(2),1-18.

Pulizzi, J. (2012). Six Useful Content Marketing Definitions. [online] Content Marketing Institute. Available at: http://contentmarketinginstitute.com/2012/06/content-marketing-definition/ [Accessed 18 Mar. 2016].

Rashid, Y., Varey, R. & Costley, C. (n.d.) Features of value co-creation process: A multiple actors view

Ratchford, B. (1980). The Value of Information for Selected Appliances. Journal of Marketing Research, 17(1), 14.

Rayport, J. F. (2013). Advertising's new medium: Human experience. Harvard Business Review, 91(5), 76-84.

Ritson, M. & Elliott, R. (1999). The Social Uses of Advertising: An Ethnographic Study of Adolescent Advertising Audiences. Journal of Consumer Research, 26(3), 260-277.

Roberts, D., Baker, S. & Walker, D. (2005). Can we Learn Together? Co-Creating with Consumers. International Journal of Market Research, 47 (4), 407-27.

Rosengren, S. (2008). Facing Clutter On Message Competition in Marketing Communications. Ph.D. Stockholm School of Economics.

Rosengren, S. (2014). Reklamkapital – en förbisedd tillgång. In: M. Söderlund, ed., Marknadsföring och påverkan på konsumenten, 1st ed. Lund: Studentlitteratur AB, 93-109

Rosengren, S. (2016). From Advertising Avoidance to Advertising Approach: Rethinking Attention in New Advertising Formats. In: P. de Pelsmacker, ed., Advertising in New Formats and Media: Current Research and Implications for Marketers, 1st ed. United Kingdom: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Rosengren, S. & Dahlén, M. (2015). Exploring Advertising Equity: How a Brand's Past Advertising May Affect Consumer Willingness to Approach Its Future Ads. Journal of Advertising, 44(1), 1-13.

Rosengren, S., Dahlén, M. & Modig, E. (2013). Think Outside the Ad: Can Advertising Creativity Benefit More Than the Advertiser?. Journal of Advertising, 42(4), 320-330.

Rosengren, S., Ljungberg, V. & Palmberg, F. (2016) Content or Advertising: What Difference Does it Make?, to be presented at EMAC, Oslo, May 24th-27th.

Rosengren, S., Modig, E. & Dahlén, M. (2014). The value of ambient communication from a consumer perspective. Journal of Marketing Communications, 21(1), 20-32.

Rossiter, John and Percy, Larry (1998) Advertising Communications & Promotion Management Second Edition, Irwin McGraw-Hill, Singapore.

Rust, R. & Oliver, R. (1994), "Notes and comments: death of advertising", Journal of Advertising, 23(4), pp.71-78.

Schultz, P. (2006b). "Integration's New Role Focuses on Customers," Marketing News, 40 (15), 8.

Simonin, B.L., & Ruth, J.A. (1998). Is a company known by the company it keeps? Assessing the spillover effects of brand alliances on consumer brand attitudes. Journal of Marketing Research, 35(1), 30–42.

Speck, P. S., & Elliott, M. T. (1997). Predictors of advertising avoidance in print and broadcast media. Journal of Advertising, 26(3), 61-76.

Stephen, A., Sciandra, M. & Inman, J. (2015). Is it What You Say or How You Say it? How Content Characteristics Affect Consumer Engagement with Brands on Facebook. SSRN Electronic Journal.

Söderlund, M. (2005). Mätningar och mått. Malmö: Liber ekonomi.

Söderlund, M. (2010). Experiment med människor. Malmö: Liber.

Söderlund, M. & Öhman, N. (2003). Behavioral intentions in satisfaction research revisited. Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior, 16, 53-66.

Teixeira, T. S. (2014). The rising cost of consumer attention: Why you should care, and what you can do about it. Harvard Business School Working Paper Series 14-055.

University of Essex, (n.d.). A more sophisticated Bonferroni adjustment. [online] Privateessex.ac.uk. Available at: http://privatewww.essex.ac.uk/~scholp/bonferroni.htm [Accessed 19 Apr. 2016].

Vakratsas, D & Ambler, T. (1999), "How Advertising Works: What Do We Really Know?," Journal of Marketing, 63 (1), 26–43.

Vargo, S. & Lusch, R. (2004). Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing. Journal of Marketing, 68(1), 1-17.

Veloutsou, C., Christodoulides, G. & de Chernatony, L. (2013). A taxonomy of measures for consumer-based brand equity: drawing on the views of managers in Europe. Journal of Product & Brand Management, 22(3), 238-248.

Wells, G. L. & Windschitl, P. D. (1999). Stimulus sampling and social psychological experimentation. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25 (9), 1115–1125.

Yang, X., & Smith, R. E. (2009). Beyond attention effects: Modeling the persuasive and emotional effects of advertising creativity. Marketing Science, 28(5), 935-949.

### **11 APPENDIX**

#### 11.1 APPENDIX 1

PRE STUDY 1 QUESTIONNARIE PRODUCT CATEGORY: FOOD

Hej!

Vi är två studenter som gör en studie om produktkategorin MAT.

Med MAT avser vi alla produkter som du kan äta förutom läkemedel.

Det finns inga svar som är rätt eller fel, vi är endast intresserade av dina åsikter. Dina svar kommer att behandlas anonymt.

Stort tack för din värdefulla hjälp /Elisabeth Pålsson & Josefine Wallin.

#### Vad anser du om KÖP AV MAT på till exempel ICA, COOP eller Willys?

| Ett mycket viktigt beslut                            | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Ο | 0 | Ett mycket oviktigt beslut                         |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Beslutet kräver mycket tankeverksamhet               | 0 | 0 | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Beslutet kräver lite tankeverksamhet               |
| Det är mycket att förlora om man väljer<br>fel butik | 0 | 0 | 0 | Ο | 0 | 0 | 0 | Det är lite att förlora om man väljer fel<br>butik |

Vänligen ange din ålder: Vad identifierar du dig som?

0

Man 0 Kvinna

 $\mathbf{O}$ Annat

Tack för din medverkan!

### 11.1.1 PRODUCT CATEGORY: HOME ELECTRONICS

Hej!

Vi är två studenter som gör en studie om produktkategorin HEMELEKTRONIK.

Med HEMELEKTRONIK avser vi elektroniska apparater i hemmet förutom hushållsapparater som exempelvis mikrovågsugnar.

Det finns inga svar som är rätt eller fel, vi är endast intresserade av dina åsikter. Dina svar kommer att behandlas anonymt.

Stort tack för din värdefulla hjälp /Elisabeth Pålsson & Josefine Wallin.

#### Vad anser du om KÖP AV HEMELEKTRONIK på till exempel ElGiganten, Media Markt eller Siba?

| Ett mycket viktigt beslut                            | Ο | Ο | 0 | Ο | 0 | 0 | Ο | Ett mycket oviktigt beslut                         |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Beslutet kräver mycket tankeverksamhet               | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Ο | Beslutet kräver lite tankeverksamhet               |
| Det är mycket att förlora om man väljer<br>fel butik | 0 | 0 | 0 | Ο | 0 | 0 | 0 | Det är lite att förlora om man väljer fel<br>butik |

Vänligen ange din ålder: Vad identifierar du dig som?

- 0 Man
- О Kvinna 0
- Annat

Tack för din medverkan

### PRODUCT CATEGORY: INTERIOR DECORATING

Hej!

Vi är två studenter som gör en studie om produktkategorin HEMINREDNING.

Med HEMINREDNING avser vi alla produkter som kan användas för att dekorera eller möblera en bostad.

Det finns inga svar som är rätt eller fel, vi är endast intresserade av dina åsikter. Dina svar kommer att behandlas anonymt.

Stort tack för din värdefulla hjälp /Elisabeth Pålsson & Josefine Wallin.

#### Vad anser du om KÖP AV HEMINREDNING på till exempel IKEA, Mio eller EM?

| Ett mycket viktigt beslut                            | 0     | 0       | О       | 0        | 0   | 0 | 0 | Ett mycket oviktigt beslut                         |
|--|-------|---------|---------|----------|-----|---|---|--|
| Beslutet kräver mycket tankeverksamhet               | 0     | Ο       | Ο       | 0        | 0   | Ο | 0 | Beslutet kräver lite tankeverksamhet               |
| Det är mycket att förlora om man väljer<br>fel butik | 0     | 0       | 0       | 0        | 0   | 0 | 0 | Det är lite att förlora om man väljer fel<br>butik |
| Vänligen ange  | Vad i | dentifi | erar dı | ı dig so | om? |   |   |  |

0 Man

- О Kvinna
- 0 Annat
# 11.2 APPENDIX 2

# PRE STUDY 2: STEP 1 QUESTIONNARIE PRODUCT CATEGORY: FOOD

Välkommen!

Vi är två studenter som gör en studie om produktkategorin **LIVSMEDEL**. Med **LIVSMEDEL** avser vi alla produkter som du kan äta <u>förutom</u> läkemedel.

Enkäten tar ungefär 3 minuter. Läs frågorna noggrant. Det finns inga svar som är rätt eller fel, vi är endast intresserade av dina åsikter. Dina svar kommer att behandlas anonymt.

Stort tack för din värdefulla hjälp! Elisabeth Pålsson & Josefine Wallin

Nu kommer vi ställa frågor om reklam i produktkategorin livsmedel.

Med "reklam" avser vi kommunikation från ett företag riktat åt dig som konsument. Det kan exempelvis vara reklam som du har sett på TV eller i tryckt media, men även event kopplade till ett varumärke, webbsidor, applikationer i din mobiltelefon eller YouTube-klipp. Vi ber dig att inte tänka på reklam från ett företag som du är anställd av.

Kom ihåg att det finns inga svar som är rätt eller fel, vi är endast intresserade av dina åsikter.

När du svarar på frågorna nedan vill vi att du tänker på ett exempel på reklam som du verkligen tycker om.

O Ett livsmedelsföretag som gör BRA reklam i produktkategorin livsmedel är:

O Jag tycker inte att något företag i produktkategorin livsmedel gör bra reklam

Vänligen ange din ålder: Vad identifierar du dig som?

- O Man
- O Kvinna
- O Annat

## PRODUCT CATEGORY: INTERIOR DECORATING

Välkommen!

Vi är två studenter som gör en studie om produktkategorin HEMINREDNING. Med HEMINREDNING avser vi alla produkter som kan användas för att dekorera eller möblera en bostad.

Enkäten tar ungefär 3 minuter. Läs frågorna noggrant. Det finns inga svar som är rätt eller fel, vi är endast intresserade av dina åsikter. Dina svar kommer att behandlas anonymt.

Stort tack för din värdefulla hjälp! Elisabeth Pålsson & Josefine Wallin

Nu kommer vi ställa frågor om reklam i produktkategorin heminredning.

Med "reklam" avser vi kommunikation från ett företag riktat åt dig som konsument. Det kan exempelvis vara reklam som du har sett på TV eller i tryckt media, men även event kopplade till ett varumärke, webbsidor, applikationer i din mobiltelefon eller YouTube-klipp. Vi ber dig att inte tänka på reklam från ett företag som du är anställd av.

Kom ihåg att det finns inga svar som är rätt eller fel, vi är endast intresserade av dina åsikter.

När du svarar på frågorna nedan vill vi att du tänker på ett exempel på reklam som du verkligen tycker om.

- O Ett heminredningsföretag som gör BRA reklam i produktkategorin heminredning är:
- **O** Jag tycker inte att något företag i produktkategorin heminredning gör bra reklam

Vänligen ange din ålder: Vad identifierar du dig som?

\_\_\_\_\_

- O Man O Kvinna
- O Annat

# 11.3 APPENDIX 3

# PRE STUDY 2: STEP 2 QUESTIONNARIE BRANDS: ICA & COOP

Hej,

Den här studien handlar om varumärken och reklam. Det finns inga svar som är rätt eller fel - vi är endast intresserade av vad du tycker. Dina svar kommer naturligtvis behandlas anonymt.

Med produktkategorin MAT avser vi alla produkter som du kan äta förutom läkemedel.

Stort tack för din värdefulla hjälp /Elisabeth Pålsson & Josefine Wallin.

Har du hört talas om ICA/COOP? Ja \_\_\_\_\_ Nej\_\_\_\_\_

Har du sett/hört reklam för ICA/COOP? Ja \_\_\_\_\_ Nej\_\_\_\_\_

Vi kommer nu att ställa ett par frågor om vad du tycker om **ICA/COOPs** reklam. Med "reklam" menar vi den kommunikation du möts av i egenskap av kund. Det kan till exempel vara reklam på TV eller i tidningar, olika typer av event i/utanför butiker eller kanske sajter, appar eller filmklipp på nätet.

Tänk på all reklam från **ICA/COOP** som du tidigare har sett eller hört, exempelvis på TV eller webben. Vad tycker du generellt sett om denna reklam?

#### Jag tycker att ICA/COOP brukar göra...

Vänligen svara på en skala 1-7 där 1 = "Stämmer inte alls" och 7 = "Stämmer mycket bra".

|                                     | Instärr  | Instä | Instämme <del>r</del><br>helt och hållet |   |   |   |   |
|-------------------------------------|----------|-------|--|---|---|---|---|
|                                     | inte all | helt  |  |   |   |   |   |
|                                     | 1        | 2     | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Intressant reklam                   | Ο        | Ο     | О  | О | О | О | Ο |
| Reklam som är värd att uppmärksamma | Ο        | Ο     | Ο  | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο |
| Reklam som är givande att ta del av | О        | О     | О  | О | О | О | О |

#### Hur väl instämmer du i följande påståenden med avseende på ICA/COOP?

Vänligen svara på en skala 1-7 där 1 = "Instämmer inte alls" och 7 = "Instämmer helt och hållet".

|   | Instämmer<br>inte alls | 1 |   | Instämmer<br>helt och hållet |   |   |   |
|---|------------------------|---|---|------------------------------|---|---|---|
|   | 1                      | 2 | 3 | 4                            | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Jag är hängiven till <u>ICA/COOP</u>  | 0                      | О | 0 | 0                            | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Jag skulle vara villig att betala ett högre<br>pris på <u>ICA/COOP</u> än andra<br>matbutiker | Ο                      | 0 | 0 | 0                            | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Jag kommer att handla på <u>ICA/COOP</u><br>nästa gång jag köper mat                          | Ο                      | Ο | Ο | Ο                            | Ο | Ο | 0 |
| Jag avser att fortsätta handla på<br><u>ICA/COOP</u>  | О                      | 0 | Ο | Ο                            | Ο | Ο | 0 |

Vänligen ange din ålder: \_\_\_\_\_

Vad identifierar du dig som? O Man O Kvinna O Annat

# BRANDS: IKEA & MIO

Hej,

Den här studien handlar om varumärken och reklam. Det finns inga svar som är rätt eller fel - vi är endast intresserade av vad du tycker. Dina svar kommer naturligtvis behandlas anonymt.

Med produktkategorin HEMINREDNING avser vi alla produkter som kan användas för att dekorera eller möblera en bostad.

Stort tack för din värdefulla hjälp /Elisabeth Pålsson & Josefine Wallin

Har du hört talas om IKEA/MIO? Ja \_\_\_\_\_ Nej\_\_\_\_\_

Har du sett/hört reklam för IKEA/MIO? Ja \_\_\_\_\_ Nej\_\_\_\_\_

Vi kommer nu att ställa ett par frågor om vad du tycker om **IKEA/MIOs** reklam. Med "reklam" menar vi den kommunikation du möts av i egenskap av kund. Det kan till exempel vara reklam på TV eller i tidningar, olika typer av event i/utanför butiker eller kanske sajter, appar eller filmklipp på nätet.

Tänk på all reklam från **IKEA/MIO** som du tidigare har sett eller hört, exempelvis på TV eller webben. Vad tycker du generellt sett om denna reklam?

#### Jag tycker att IKEA/MIO brukar göra...

Vänligen svara på en skala 1-7 där 1 = "Stämmer inte alls" och 7 = "Stämmer mycket bra".

|                                     | Stämm    | Stämmer |            |   |   |   |   |
|-------------------------------------|----------|---------|------------|---|---|---|---|
|                                     | inte all | mycl    | mycket bra |   |   |   |   |
|                                     | 1        | 2       | 3          | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Intressant reklam                   | О        | Ο       | Ο          | Ο | Ο | О | Ο |
| Reklam som är värd att uppmärksamma | О        | О       | Ο          | О | О | О | Ο |
| Reklam som är givande att ta del av | О        | Ο       | Ο          | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο |

### Hur väl instämmer du i följande påståenden med avseende på IKEA/MIO?

Vänligen svara på en skala 1-7 där 1 = "Instämmer inte alls" och 7 = "Instämmer helt och hållet".

|   | Instämmer<br>inte alls | Instämmer<br>inte alls |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
|   | 1                      | 2                      | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |  |
| Jag är hängiven till <u>IKEA/MIO</u>  | Ο                      | Ο                      | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Ο |  |  |
| Jag skulle vara villig att betala ett högre<br>pris på <u>IKEA/MIO</u> än andra<br>heminredningsbutiker | Ο                      | Ο                      | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο |  |  |
| Jag kommer att handla på <u>IKEA/MIO</u><br>nästa gång jag köper heminredning                           | Ο                      | Ο                      | О | Ο | О | О | 0 |  |  |
| Jag avser att fortsätta handla på<br><u>IKEA/MIO</u>  | Ο                      | Ο                      | О | О | Ο | 0 | 0 |  |  |

Vänligen ange din ålder:

Vad identifierar du dig som? O Man O Kvinna O Annat

# **11.4 APPENDIX 4** PRE STUDY 3 QUESTIONNARIE FORMAT: EVENT

Hej!

Den här undersökningen handlar om event.

Vänligen läs frågorna noggrant och svara på alla frågor.

Det finns inga svar som är rätt eller fel, vi är endast intresserade av dina åsikter. Dina svar kommer självklart att behandlas anonymt.

Stort tack för din värdefulla hjälp /Elisabeth Pålsson & Josefine Wallin

Vi inleder med en fråga om formatet EVENT.

Med EVENT avses ett tillfälle där du som konsument får möjlighet att interagera med ett företag.

#### Vad är din generella inställning till EVENT?

|                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |             |
|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------------|
| Dåligt         | 0 | О | О | 0 | О | О | Ο | Bra         |
| Negativ        | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | О | О | Ο | Positiv     |
| Ej tilltalande | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | О | Ο | Tilltalande |

Avslutningsvis har vi några korta frågor om dig!

Vad identifierar du dig som? O Man O Kvinna O Annat

Vänligen ange din ålder: \_\_\_\_\_

# FORMAT: PODCAST

Hej!

Den här undersökningen handlar om pocasts.

Vänligen läs frågorna noggrant och svara på alla frågor.

Det finns inga svar som är rätt eller fel, vi är endast intresserade av dina åsikter. Dina svar kommer självklart att behandlas anonymt.

Stort tack för din värdefulla hjälp /Elisabeth Pålsson & Josefine Wallin

Vi inleder med en fråga om formatet PODCAST.

PODCAST är en serie av digitala ljudavsnitt som distribueras över Internet. Lyssnaren kan ta del av dessa via exempelvis sin smartphone eller dator.

| Vad ar din generella installning till PODCAS1? |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |             |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------------|--|--|--|--|
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |             |  |  |  |  |
| Dåligt   | Ο | О | О | О | О | О | О | Bra         |  |  |  |  |
| Negativ  | Ο | О | О | О | О | О | О | Positiv     |  |  |  |  |
| Ej tilltalande                                 | Ο | Ο | О | О | О | О | О | Tilltalande |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |             |  |  |  |  |

# Vad är din generella inställning till PODCAST?

Vad identifierar du dig som?

O Man

O Kvinna

O Annat

Vänligen ange din ålder: \_\_\_\_\_

# **11.5 APPENDIX 5** SCENARIO DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNARIE FOOD & PODCAST

#### Föreställ dig följande:

En aktör inom livsmedelsbranschen (exempelvis ICA, Coop eller Willys) ska lansera en podcast\*.

Podcasten kommer att handla om allt man skulle vilja veta om mat. I varje podcast kommer en känd gäst att bjudas in som har både kunskap och erfarenhet inom mat.

I ett podcastavsnitt kommer en konditor vara inbjuden för att berätta de senaste trenderna från bakverkens värld. Det kommer även att ges ut ett avsnitt med en grillskola för att lyssnarna ska bli kvarterets grillmästare. I ett annat avsnitt ska hemmakockens viktigaste köksredskap för att lyckas i köket diskuteras.

Nu följer några frågor om podcasten.

\* Podcast är en serie av digitala ljudavsnitt som distribueras över Internet. Lyssnaren kan ta del av dessa via exempelvis sin smartphone eller dator.

# Vad tycker du om att en aktör inom livsmedelsbranschen (exempelvis ICA, Coop eller Willys) skulle lansera den beskrivna podcasten?

| Inte alls trovärdigt  | О          | 0     | 0       | Ο   | Ο | 0 | 0 | Mycket trovärdigt             |  |  |
|---|------------|-------|---------|-----|---|---|---|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Inte alls övertygande   | О          | 0     | Ο       | Ο   | Ο | 0 | 0 | Mycket övertygande            |  |  |
| Inte alls relevant  | О          | 0     | 0       | О   | 0 | О | 0 | Mycket relevant               |  |  |
| Inte alls realistiskt   | О          | Ο     | Ο       | Ο   | Ο | Ο | 0 | Mycket realistiskt            |  |  |
| Inte alls sannolikt   | О          | 0     | 0       | Ο   | Ο | Ο | 0 | Mycket sannolikt              |  |  |
| Vad tycker du om situationen som beskrevs?  |            |       |         |     |   |   |   |                               |  |  |
| Mycket svår att förstå  | О          | Ο     | Ο       | Ο   | Ο | Ο | Ο | Mycket lätt att förstå        |  |  |
| Mycket svår att leva sig in i   | О          | Ο     | Ο       | Ο   | Ο | Ο | Ο | Mycket lätt att leva sig in i |  |  |
| Vad anser du om din generella erf   | arenhet av | podca | st?     |     |   |   |   |                               |  |  |
| Jag har lite erfarenhet   | О          | Ο     | Ο       | Ο   | Ο | Ο | Ο | Jag har mycket erfarenhet     |  |  |
| Vilken bransch berördes i texten o<br>O Mat O Hemelektronik                                 |            | dning | O Ann   | at: |   |   |   |                               |  |  |
|   |            | anng  | 0 71111 | at  |   |   |   |                               |  |  |
| Vilket av följande berördes i texten du läste?   O Podcast O Applikation   O Event O Annat: |            |       |         |     |   |   |   |                               |  |  |
| Vänligen ange din ålder:  |            |       |         |     |   |   |   |                               |  |  |
| Vad identifierar du dig som? O Man O Kvinna O Annat   |            |       |         |     |   |   |   |                               |  |  |

# INTERIOR DECORATING & PODCAST

#### Föreställ dig följande:

En aktör inom heminredningsbranschen (exempelvis IKEA, Mio eller EM) ska lansera en podcast\*.

Podcasten kommer att handla om allt man skulle vilja veta om heminredning. I varje podcast kommer en känd gäst att bjudas in som har både kunskap och erfarenhet inom heminredning.

I ett podcastavsnitt kommer en heminredningsdesigner vara inbjuden för att berätta om de senaste trenderna ifrån inredningens värld. Det kommer även att ges ut ett avsnitt med en belysningsskola för att lyssnarna ska bli kvarterets belysningsexpert. I ett annat avsnitt ska hemmafixarens viktigaste verktyg för att lyckas i hemmet diskuteras.

Nu följer några frågor om podcasten.

\* Podcast är en serie av digitala ljudavsnitt som distribueras över Internet. Lyssnaren kan ta del av dessa via exempelvis sin smartphone eller dator.

# Vad tycker du om att en aktör inom heminredningsbranschen (exempelvis IKEA, Mio eller EM) skulle lansera den beskrivna podcasten?

| Inte alls trovärdigt                       |                              | 0       | 0      | 0     | 0   | 0  | 0     | 0        | Mycket trovärdigt             |  |
|--|------------------------------|---------|--------|-------|-----|----|-------|----------|-------------------------------|--|
|  | Inte alls övertygande        | Ο       | Ο      | Ο     | Ο   | Ο  | Ο     | Ο        | Mycket övertygande            |  |
|  | Inte alls relevant           | О       | Ο      | Ο     | 0   | О  | 0     | О        | Mycket relevant               |  |
|  | Inte alls realistiskt        | Ο       | Ο      | Ο     | Ο   | 0  | 0     | 0        | Mycket realistiskt            |  |
|  | Inte alls sannolikt          | Ο       | 0      | Ο     | Ο   | Ο  | Ο     | Ο        | Mycket sannolikt              |  |
| Vad tycker du om situationen som beskrevs? |                              |         |        |       |     |    |       |          |                               |  |
| Mycket                                     | svår att förstå              | Ο       | Ο      | Ο     | Ο   | Ο  | Ο     | Ο        | Mycket lätt att förstå        |  |
| Mycket                                     | svår att leva sig in i       | 0       | Ο      | 0     | Ο   | Ο  | 0     | 0        | Mycket lätt att leva sig in i |  |
| Vad anser                                  | du om din generella erfarer  | nhet av | podcas | st?   |     |    |       |          |                               |  |
| Jag har l                                  | ite erfarenhet               | Ο       | Ο      | Ο     | Ο   | Ο  | Ο     | Ο        | Jag har mycket erfarenhet     |  |
|  | nsch berördes i texten du lä |         |        | ~ .   |     |    |       |          |                               |  |
| O Mat                                      | O Hemelektronik O H          | leminre | edning | O Ann | at: |    |       |          |                               |  |
| Vilket av fö                               | öljande berördes i texten du | läste?  |        |       |     |    |       |          |                               |  |
| O Podcast                                  | O Applikation                |         | O Ever | nt    |     |    |       | O Annat: |                               |  |
| Vänligen a                                 | nge din ålder:               |         |        |       |     |    |       |          |                               |  |
| Vad identifierar du dig som? O Man         |                              |         |        |       | ına | 0. | Annat |          |                               |  |

FOOD & EVENT

#### Föreställ dig följande:

En aktör inom livsmedelsbranschen (exempelvis ICA, Coop eller Willys) ska arrangera en serie av event\* i sina butiker.

Eventen kommer att handla om allt man skulle vilja veta om mat. På varje event kommer en känd gäst att bjudas in som har både kunskap och erfarenhet inom mat.

På ett event kommer en konditor vara inbjuden som ska demonstrera de senaste trenderna ifrån bakverkens värld. Det kommer även arrangeras ett event med en grillskola för att deltagarna ska bli kvarterets grillmästare. Under ett annat event ska hemmakockens viktigaste köksredskap för att lyckas i köket demonstreras.

Nu följer några frågor om eventen.

\* Event är ett tillfälle där du som konsument får tillfälle att interagera med ett företag

| Vad tycker du<br>beskrivna serie |  | n livsme | delsbr | ansche | en (exe | mpelvis | ICA, | Соор | eller Willys) skulle arrangera den |  |
|----------------------------------|--|----------|--------|--------|---------|---------|------|------|------------------------------------|--|
| Inte                             | alls trovärdigt                                    | Ο        | Ο      | Ο      | 0       | Ο       | 0    | Ο    | Mycket trovärdigt                  |  |
| Inte                             | alls övertygande                                   | 0        | 0      | 0      | 0       | О       | 0    | 0    | Mycket övertygande                 |  |
|                                  | Inte alls relevant                                 | Ο        | Ο      | Ο      | Ο       | Ο       | 0    | Ο    | Mycket relevant                    |  |
|                                  | Inte alls realistiskt                              | О        | Ο      | Ο      | Ο       | Ο       | 0    | Ο    | Mycket realistiskt                 |  |
|                                  | Inte alls sannolikt                                | Ο        | 0      | 0      | 0       | 0       | 0    | 0    | Mycket sannolikt                   |  |
| Vad tycker du                    | om situationen som be                              | eskrevs? |        |        |         |         |      |      |                                    |  |
| Mycket svår                      | att förstå   | О        | Ο      | Ο      | Ο       | Ο       | Ο    | Ο    | Mycket lätt att förstå             |  |
| Mycket svår                      | att leva sig in i                                  | Ο        | 0      | Ο      | 0       | 0       | 0    | 0    | Mycket lätt att leva sig in i      |  |
| Vad anser du o                   | om din generella erfare                            | nhet av  | event? |        |         |         |      |      |                                    |  |
| Jag har lite ei                  | rfarenhet  | Ο        | Ο      | Ο      | Ο       | Ο       | 0    | Ο    | Jag har mycket erfarenhet          |  |
| <b>Vilken bransch</b><br>O Mat   | <b>berördes i texten du</b> I<br>O Hemelektronik O |          | dning  | O Ann  | at:     |         |      |      |                                    |  |
| ,                                | de berördes i texten d                             | u läste? |        |        |         |         |      |      |                                    |  |
| O Podcast                        | O Applikation                                      |          |        | O Ever | nt      |         |      |      | O Annat:                           |  |
| Vänligen ange din ålder:         |  |          |        |        |         |         |      |      |                                    |  |
| Vad identifiera                  | r du dig som? O Man                                |          |        | O Kvir | ina     | O A     | nnat |      |                                    |  |

# INTERIOR DECORATING & PODCAST

#### Föreställ dig följande:

En aktör inom heminredningsbranschen (exempelvis IKEA, Mio eller EM) ska arrangera en serie av event\* i sina butiker.

Eventen kommer att handla om allt man skulle vilja veta om heminredning. På varje event kommer en känd gäst att bjudas in som

har både kunskap och erfarenhet inom heminredning.

På ett event kommer en heminredningsdesigner vara inbjuden för att demonstrera de senaste trenderna ifrån inredningens värld. Det kommer även arrangeras ett event med en belysningsskola för att deltagarna ska bli kvarterets belysningsexpert. Under ett annat event demonstreras hemmafixarens viktigaste verktyg för att lyckas i hemmet.

Nu följer några frågor om eventen.

\* Event är ett tillfälle där du som konsument får tillfälle att interagera med ett företag

| Vad tycker du om att en aktör inom heminredningsbranschen (exempelvis IKEA, Mio eller EM) skulle arrangera den<br>beskrivna serien av event? |   |        |       |       |     |   |   |   |                               |  |
|--|---|--------|-------|-------|-----|---|---|---|-------------------------------|--|
| Inte alls trovärd  | igt   | Ο      | Ο     | Ο     | Ο   | Ο | Ο | Ο | Mycket trovärdigt             |  |
| Inte alls övertyg  | gande   | Ο      | 0     | 0     | 0   | 0 | Ο | 0 | Mycket övertygande            |  |
| Inte alls re   | levant  | О      | Ο     | О     | 0   | 0 | О | 0 | Mycket relevant               |  |
| Inte alls re   | alistiskt   | О      | Ο     | Ο     | Ο   | Ο | Ο | 0 | Mycket realistiskt            |  |
| Inte alls sa   | nnolikt   | Ο      | Ο     | Ο     | Ο   | Ο | Ο | Ο | Mycket sannolikt              |  |
| Vad tycker du om situationen som beskrevs?   |   |        |       |       |     |   |   |   |                               |  |
| Mycket svår att förstå   |   | Ο      | Ο     | Ο     | Ο   | Ο | О | Ο | Mycket lätt att förstå        |  |
| Mycket svår att leva sig   | in i  | Ο      | Ο     | Ο     | Ο   | Ο | Ο | 0 | Mycket lätt att leva sig in i |  |
| Vad anser du om din gen  | erella erfaren                                      | het av | event |       |     |   |   |   |                               |  |
| Jag har lite erfarenhet  |   | Ο      | 0     | Ο     | 0   | Ο | 0 | 0 | Jag har mycket erfarenhet     |  |
| Vilken bransch berördes<br>O Mat O Heme  | <b>i texten du lä</b><br>elektronik O H             |        | dning | O Ann | at: |   |   |   |                               |  |
| Vilket av följande berördes i texten du läste?   O Podcast O Applikation   O Event O Annat:  |   |        |       |       |     |   |   |   |                               |  |
|  |   |        |       |       |     |   |   |   |                               |  |
| Vänligen ange din ålder:   |   |        |       |       |     |   |   |   |                               |  |
| Vad identifierar du dig so   | Vad identifierar du dig som? O Man O Kvinna O Annat |        |       |       |     |   |   |   |                               |  |

# **11.6 APPENDIX 6** MAIN STUDY QUESTIONNARIE FOOD & EVENT

Hej!

Den här undersökningen handlar om mat och event.

Vänligen läs frågorna noggrant och svara på alla frågor.

Det finns inga svar som är rätt eller fel, vi är endast intresserade av dina åsikter. Dina svar kommer självklart att behandlas anonymt.

Stort tack för din tid!

Vi inleder med en fråga om EVENT.

Med EVENT avses ett tillfälle där du som konsument får möjlighet att interagera med ett företag.

#### Vad är din generella inställning till EVENT?

|                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |             |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------------|
| Dåligt            | О | О | О | Ο | О | О | О | Bra         |
| Negativ           | О | О | О | Ο | О | О | О | Positiv     |
| Ej<br>tilltalande | Ο | О | О | О | О | О | О | Tilltalande |

Nu kommer några frågor om KÖP AV MAT. Med MAT avses alla produkter som du kan äta <u>förutom</u> läkemedel.

#### Vad anser du generellt om KÖP AV MAT på till exempel ICA, Coop eller Willys?

|   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Ett mycket<br>oviktigt beslut                         | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | 0 | Ett mycket<br>viktigt beslut                               |
| Beslutet kräver<br>lite<br>tankeverksamhet            | 0 | Ο | 0 | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Beslutet kräver<br>mycket<br>tankeverksamhet               |
| Det är lite att<br>förlora om man<br>väljer fel butik | Ο | 0 | Ο | Ο | Ο | 0 | 0 | Det är mycket<br>att förlora om<br>man väljer fel<br>butik |

Nu kommer några frågor om livsmedelsföretaget ICA/Coop.

#### Känner du till ICA/Coop?

O Ja

O Nej

#### Har du sett eller hört reklam för ICA/Coop?

Med "reklam" menar vi den kommunikation du möts av i egenskap av kund. Det kan till exempel vara reklam på TV eller i tidningar, olika typer av event i/utanför butiker eller kanske sajter, appar eller filmklipp på nätet.

O Ja O Nej

#### Vänligen läs texten nedan noggrant!

Föreställ dig följande:

ICA/Coop ska arrangera en serie av event\* i sina butiker. Eventen kommer att handla om allt man skulle vilja veta om mat. På varje event kommer en känd gäst att bjudas in som har både kunskap och erfarenhet inom mat.

På ett event kommer en konditor vara inbjuden för att demonstrera de senaste trenderna ifrån bakverkens värld. ICA/Coop kommer även arrangera ett event med en grillskola för att deltagarna ska bli kvarterets grillmästare. Under ett annat event demonstreras hemmakockens viktigaste köksredskap för att lyckas i köket.

Nu följer några frågor om ICA/Coops event.

\* Event är ett tillfälle där du som konsument får möjlighet att interagera med ett företag

#### Vilken produktkategori berördes i texten du läste?

- O Mat
- O Hemelektronik
- **O** Heminredning
- O Annat

#### Vilket av följande berördes i texten du läste?

- **O** Event
- **O** Mobilapplikation
- O Podcast
- O Annat

#### Vad är din uppfattning om de tidigare beskrivna eventen från ICA/Coop?

Svara på en skala 1-7 där 1 = "Instämmer inte alls" och 7 = "Instämmer helt och hållet".

|                        |     | Instämmer<br>inte alls<br>1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Instämmer<br>helt och hållet<br>7 |
|------------------------|-----|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| Intressanta            |     | 0                           | О | О | О | 0 | 0 | 0                                 |
| Värda<br>uppmärksamhet | min | Ο                           | О | О | 0 | Ο | 0 | Ο                                 |
| Givande                |     | 0                           | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | 0                                 |
|                        |     |                             |   |   |   |   |   |                                   |

# Hur väl stämmer följande påståenden in på dina förväntningar på de tidigare beskrivna framtida eventen från ICA/Coop?

Svara på en skala 1-7 där 1 = "Instämmer inte alls" och 7 = "Instämmer helt och hållet".

| Instämmer<br>inte alls |   |   |   |   |   | Instämmer<br>helt och hållet |
|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|
| 1                      | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7                            |

| Jag ser fram emot att<br>besöka dessa framtida<br>event från ICA/Coop                 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Ο | 0 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jag kommer att tycka<br>att dessa framtida<br>event från<br>ICA/Coop är<br>värdefulla | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Jag vill besöka dessa<br>framtida event från<br>ICA/Coop                              | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Ο | 0 |

# Hur väl instämmer du i följande påståenden om de tidigare beskrivna eventen från ICA/Coop?

Svara på en skala 1-7 där 1="Instämmer inte alls" och 7="Instämmer helt och hållet"

## Jag skulle kunna tänka mig att...

|   | Instämmer<br>inte alls<br>1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Instämme <del>r</del><br>helt och hållet<br>7 |
|---|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Skicka in förslag på<br>hur dessa event kan<br>förbättras                   | Ο                           | 0 | 0 | Ο | Ο | Ο | 0   |
| Rösta på vilka<br>framtida ämnen som<br>dessa event ska<br>handla om        | 0                           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   |
| Skicka in<br>kommentarer om hur<br>jag upplevde dessa<br>event              | 0                           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   |
| Rösta på vilka<br>framtida gäster som<br>jag vill ska besöka<br>dessa event | 0                           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   |
| Delta i en tävling<br>kopplad till dessa<br>event                           | 0                           | Ο | Ο | Ο | 0 | Ο | 0   |

### Önskar du att få mer information om hur du deltar på ICA/Coops event?

Vänligen skriv in din mejladress i rutan nedan så skickar vi mer information!

Din mailadress kommer självklart inte delas med en tredje part, utan används endast för att skicka information om eventen.

- O Ja tack, jag vill ha mer information om ICA/Coops event \_
- O Nej tack, jag vill inte ha mer information om ICA/Coops event

Vi kommer nu att ställa några frågor om vad du tycker om ICA/Coop och deras reklam.

Med "reklam" menar vi den kommunikation du möts av i egenskap av kund. Det kan till exempel vara reklam på TV eller i tidningar, olika typer av event i/utanför butiker eller kanske sajter, appar eller filmklipp på nätet.

Tänk på all reklam från ICA/Coop som du tidigare har sett eller hört, exempelvis på TV eller webben.

#### Hur väl beskriver följande påståenden din generella uppfattning om ICA/Coops reklam?

Svara på en skala 1-7 där 1 = "Stämmer inte alls" och 7 = "Stämmer mycket bra".

#### Jag tycker att ICA/Coop generellt sett brukar göra...

|  | Instämmer<br>inte alls |   |   |   |   |   | Instämmer<br>helt och hållet |
|--|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|
|  | 1                      | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7                            |
| Intressant reklam                      | 0                      | Ο | 0 | Ο | 0 | 0 | Ο                            |
| Reklam som är värd att<br>uppmärksamma | 0                      | 0 | 0 | 0 | Ο | Ο | 0                            |
| Reklam som är givande<br>att ta del av | 0                      | Ο | Ο | Ο | 0 | 0 | Ο                            |
|  |                        |   |   |   |   |   |                              |

#### Hur väl instämmer du i följande påståenden med avseende på ICA/Coop?

Svara på en skala 1-7 där 1 = "Instämmer inte alls" och 7 = "Instämmer helt och hållet".

|   | Instämmer<br>inte alls<br>1 | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5      | 6      | Instämmer<br>helt och hållet<br>7 |
|---|-----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------------------------|
| Jag är engagerad i<br>ICA/Coop  | I<br>O                      | 2<br>O | о<br>О | 4<br>O | о<br>О | 0<br>O | 0                                 |
| Jag skulle vara villig<br>att betala ett högre<br>pris på ICA/Coop än<br>andra matbutiker | Ο                           | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0                                 |
| Jag kommer att<br>handla på ICA/Coop<br>nästan gång jag köper<br>mat                      | 0                           | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0                                 |
| Jag avser att fortsätta<br>handla på ICA/Coop   | Ο                           | Ο      | Ο      | Ο      | Ο      | Ο      | Ο                                 |

Avslutningsvis har vi några korta frågor om dig!

# PÅLSSON & WALLIN

| Vad identifierar du sig  | Man | Kvinna | Annat |
|--|-----|--------|-------|
| som?   |     |        |       |
|  | О   | О      | О     |
|  |     |        |       |
| Vänligen ange din ålder  |     |        |       |
| Har du några övriga<br>kommentarer, vänligen<br>ange dessa här |     |        |       |
| Vad tror du att denna<br>undersökning gick ut på?              |     |        |       |

## INTERIOR DECORATING & EVENT

Hej!

Den här undersökningen handlar om heminredning och event.

Vänligen läs frågorna noggrant och svara på alla frågor.

Det finns inga svar som är rätt eller fel, vi är endast intresserade av dina åsikter.

Dina svar kommer självklart att behandlas anonymt.

Stort tack för din tid!

Vi inleder med en fråga om EVENT.

Med EVENT avses ett tillfälle där du som konsument får möjlighet att interagera med ett företag.

#### Vad är din generella inställning till EVENT?

|                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |             |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------------|
| Dåligt            | Ο | О | О | О | О | О | Ο | Bra         |
| Negativ           | Ο | О | О | О | О | О | Ο | Positiv     |
| Ej<br>tilltalande | Ο | Ο | О | Ο | Ο | Ο | О | Tilltalande |

Nu kommer några frågor om KÖP AV HEMINREDNING. Med HEMINREDNING avses alla produkter som kan användas för att dekorera eller möblera en bostad.

#### Vad anser du generellt om KÖP AV HEMINREDNING på till exempel IKEA, Mio eller EM?

|   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Ett mycket<br>oviktigt beslut                         | Ο | О | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ett mycket<br>viktigt beslut                               |
| Beslutet kräver<br>lite<br>tankeverksamhet            | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Beslutet kräver<br>mycket<br>tankeverksamhet               |
| Det är lite att<br>förlora om man<br>väljer fel butik | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Ο | 0 | 0 | Det är mycket<br>att förlora om<br>man väljer fel<br>butik |

Nu kommer några frågor om heminredningsföretaget IKEA/Mio.

#### Känner du till IKEA/Mio?

O Ja

O Nej

Med "reklam" menar vi den kommunikation du möts av i egenskap av kund. Det kan till exempel vara reklam på TV eller i tidningar, olika typer av event i/utanför butiker eller kanske sajter, appar eller filmklipp på nätet.

O Ja

O Nej

Vänligen läs texten nedan noggrant!

Föreställ dig följande: IKEA/Mio ska arrangera en serie av event\* i sina butiker. Eventen kommer att handla om allt man skulle vilja veta om heminredning. På varje event kommer en känd gäst att bjudas in som har både kunskap och erfarenhet inom heminredning.

På ett event kommer en heminredningsdesigner vara inbjuden för att demonstrera de senaste trenderna ifrån inredningens värld. IKEA/Mio kommer även arrangera ett event med en belysningsskola för att deltagarna ska bli kvarterets belysningsexpert. Under ett annat event demonstreras hemmafixarens viktigaste verktyg för att lyckas i hemmet.

Nu följer några frågor om IKEA/Mios event.

\* Event är ett tillfälle där du som konsument får möjlighet att interagera med ett företag

#### Vilken produktkategori berördes i texten du läste?

- O Mat
- O Hemelektronik
- O Heminredning
- O Annat

#### Vilket av följande berördes i texten du läste?

- O Event
- O Mobilapplikation
- O Podcast
- O Annat

#### Vad är din uppfattning om de tidigare beskrivna eventen från IKEA?

Svara på en skala 1-7 där 1 = "Instämmer inte alls" och 7 = "Instämmer helt och hållet".

|                            | Instämmer<br>inte alls |   |   |   |   |   | Instämmer<br>helt och hållet |
|----------------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|
|                            | 1                      | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7                            |
| Intressanta                | Ο                      | О | 0 | Ο | 0 | Ο | 0                            |
| Värda min<br>uppmärksamhet | 0                      | Ο | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0                            |
| Givande                    | Ο                      | 0 | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο                            |

# Hur väl stämmer följande påståenden in på dina förväntningar på de tidigare beskrivna framtida eventen från IKEA/Mio?

Svara på en skala 1-7 där 1 = "Instämmer inte alls" och 7 = "Instämmer helt och hållet".

|   | Instämmer<br>inte alls<br>1 | 2 | 3 | 4      | 5 | 6 | Instämmer<br>helt och hållet<br>7 |
|---|-----------------------------|---|---|--------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| Jag ser fram emot att<br>besöka dessa framtida<br>event från<br>IKEA/Mio              | 0                           | 0 | 0 | ч<br>О | 0 | 0 | 0                                 |
| Jag kommer att tycka<br>att dessa framtida<br>event från<br>IKEA/Mio är<br>värdefulla | 0                           | 0 | 0 | 0      | 0 | 0 | 0                                 |
| Jag vill besöka dessa<br>framtida event från<br>IKEA/Mio                              | 0                           | 0 | 0 | 0      | 0 | Ο | 0                                 |

Hur väl instämmer du i följande påståenden om de tidigare beskrivna eventen från IKEA/Mio?

Svara på en skala 1-7 där 1="Instämmer inte alls" och 7="Instämmer helt och hållet"

# Jag skulle kunna tänka mig att...

|   | Instämmer<br>inte alls<br>1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Instämmer<br>helt och hållet<br>7 |
|---|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| Skicka in förslag på<br>hur dessa event kan<br>förbättras                   | 0                           | 0 | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο                                 |
| Rösta på vilka<br>framtida ämnen som<br>dessa event ska<br>handla om        | 0                           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0                                 |
| Skicka in<br>kommentarer om<br>hur jag upplevde<br>dessa event              | 0                           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0                                 |
| Rösta på vilka<br>framtida gäster som<br>jag vill ska besöka<br>dessa event | 0                           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0                                 |
| Delta i en tävling<br>kopplad till dessa<br>event                           | 0                           | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | 0                                 |

# Önskar du att få mer information om hur du deltar på IKEA/Mios event?

Vänligen skriv in din mejladress i rutan nedan så skickar vi mer information!

Din mailadress kommer självklart inte delas med en tredje part, utan används endast för att skicka information om eventen.

- O Ja tack, jag vill ha mer information om IKEA/Mios event \_
- O Nej tack, jag vill inte ha mer information om IKEA/Mios event

Vi kommer nu att ställa några frågor om vad du tycker om IKEA/Mio och deras reklam.

Med "reklam" menar vi den kommunikation du möts av i egenskap av kund. Det kan till exempel vara reklam på TV eller i tidningar, olika typer av event i/utanför butiker eller kanske sajter, appar eller filmklipp på nätet. Tänk på all reklam från IKEA/Mio som du tidigare har sett eller hört, exempelvis på TV eller webben.

#### Hur väl beskriver följande påståenden din generella uppfattning om IKEA/Mios reklam?

Svara på en skala 1-7 där 1 = "Stämmer inte alls" och 7 = "Stämmer mycket bra". Jag tycker att IKEA generellt sett brukar göra...

|  | Instämmer<br>inte alls |   |   |   |   |   | Instämme <del>r</del><br>helt och hållet |
|--|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|
|  | 1                      | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7  |
| Intressant reklam                      | О                      | О | О | О | О | О | О  |
| Reklam som är värd att<br>uppmärksamma | О                      | О | О | О | О | О | О  |
| Reklam som är givande<br>att ta del av | 0                      | О | Ο | О | О | О | Ο  |
|  |                        |   |   |   |   |   |  |

#### Hur väl instämmer du i följande påståenden med avseende på ICA/Coop?

Svara på en skala 1-7 där 1 = "Instämmer inte alls" och 7 = "Instämmer helt och hållet".

|   | Instämmer<br>inte alls<br>1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Instämme <del>r</del><br>helt och hållet<br>7 |
|---|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jag är engagerad i<br>IKEA/Mio  | Ο                           | Ο | О | Ο | 0 | О | Ο   |
| Jag skulle vara villig att<br>betala ett högre pris på<br>IKEA/Mio än andra<br>heminredningsbutiker | Ο                           | Ο | 0 | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο   |
| Jag kommer att handla på<br>IKEA/Mio nästan gång<br>jag köper heminredning                          | Ο                           | Ο | О | Ο | Ο | О | О   |
| Jag avser att fortsätta<br>handla på IKEA/Mio   | О                           | Ο | Ο | Ο | О | Ο | Ο   |

Avslutningsvis har vi några korta frågor om dig!

| Vad identifierar du sig | Man | Kvinna | Annat |
|-------------------------|-----|--------|-------|
| som?                    |     |        |       |
|                         | О   | О      | О     |

Vänligen ange din ålder \_\_\_\_\_

Har du några övriga kommentarer, vänligen ange dessa här

Vad tror du att denna undersökning gick ut på?

## FOOD & PODCAST

Hej!

Den här undersökningen handlar om mat och podcast.

Vänligen läs frågorna noggrant och svara på alla frågor.

Det finns inga svar som är rätt eller fel, vi är endast intresserade av dina åsikter. Dina svar kommer självklart att behandlas anonymt.

Stort tack för din tid!

Vi inleder med en fråga om PODCAST.

Med PODCAST avses en serie av digitala ljudavsnitt som distribueras över internet. Lyssnaren kan ta del av dessa via exempelvis sin smartphone eller dator.

#### Vad är din generella inställning till PODCAST?

|                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |             |
|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------------|
| Dåligt         | Ο | О | О | О | 0 | 0 | О | Bra         |
| Negativ        | 0 | О | О | Ο | О | О | О | Positiv     |
| Ej tilltalande | Ο | Ο | О | О | О | О | О | Tilltalande |
|                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |             |

Nu kommer några frågor om KÖP AV MAT. Med MAT avses alla produkter som du kan äta förutom läkemedel.

#### Vad anser du generellt om KÖP AV MAT på till exempel ICA, Coop eller Willys?

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ett mycket oviktigt<br>beslut                      | 0 | Ο | 0 | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ett mycket viktigt beslut                               |
| Beslutet kräver lite<br>tankeverksamhet            | 0 | Ο | 0 | Ο | Ο | Ο | О | Beslutet kräver mycket<br>tankeverksamhet               |
| Det är lite att förlora om<br>man väljer fel butik | 0 | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Det är mycket att<br>förlora om man väljer<br>fel butik |

Nu kommer några frågor om livsmedelsföretaget ICA/Coop.

#### Har du sett eller hört reklam för ICA/Coop?

Med "reklam" menar vi den kommunikation du möts av i egenskap av kund. Det kan till exempel vara reklam på TV eller i tidningar, olika typer av event i/utanför butiker eller kanske sajter, appar eller filmklipp på nätet.

O Ja

O Nej

Känner du till ICA/Coop? O Ja O Nej

#### Vänligen läs texten nedan noggrant!

Föreställ dig följande:

ICA/Coop ska lansera en podcast\*. Podcasten kommer att handla om allt man skulle vilja veta om mat. I varje podcast kommer en känd gäst att bjudas in som har både kunskap och erfarenhet inom mat.

I ett podcastavsnitt kommer en konditor vara inbjuden för att berätta om de senaste trenderna från bakverkens värld. ICA/Coop kommer även att ge ut ett avsnitt med en grillskola för att lyssnarna ska bli kvarterets grillmästare. I ett annat avsnitt ska hemmakockens viktigaste köksredskap för att lyckas i köket diskuteras.

Nu följer några frågor om ICA/Coops podcast.

\* Podcast är en serie av digitala ljudavsnitt som distribueras över Internet. Lyssnaren kan ta del av dessa via exempelvis sin smartphone eller dator.

#### Vilken produktkategori berördes i texten du läste?

- O Mat
- O Hemelektronik
- O Heminredning
- O Annat

#### Vilket av följande berördes i texten du läste?

- O Event
- **O** Mobilapplikation
- **O** Podcast
- O Annat

#### Vad är din uppfattning om den tidigare beskrivna podcasten från ICA/Coop?

Svara på en skala 1-7 där 1 = "Instämmer inte alls" och 7 = "Instämmer helt och hållet".

|                            | Instämmer<br>inte alls |   |   |   |   |   | Instämmer<br>helt och hållet |
|----------------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|
|                            | 1                      | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7                            |
| Intressanta                | О                      | О | О | О | О | О | О                            |
| Värda min<br>uppmärksamhet | О                      | О | Ο | О | О | О | О                            |
| Givande                    | О                      | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | О                            |
|                            |                        |   |   |   |   |   |                              |

Hur väl stämmer följande påståenden in på dina förväntningar på den tidigare beskrivna framtida podcasten från ICA/Coop?

Svara på en skala 1-7 där 1 = "Instämmer inte alls" och 7 = "Instämmer helt och hållet".

|   | Instämmer<br>inte alls |   |   |   |   |   | Instämmer<br>helt och hållet |
|---|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|
|   | 1                      | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7                            |
| Jag ser fram emot att<br>lyssna på denna<br>framtida podcast från<br>ICA/Coop | Ο                      | 0 | Ο | Ο | Ο | 0 | Ο                            |

| Jag kommer att tycka<br>att denna framtida<br>podcast från<br>ICA/Coop är<br>värdefull | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Ο |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jag vill lyssna på<br>denna framtida<br>podcast från<br>ICA/Coop                       | Ο | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Ο | 0 |

#### Hur väl instämmer du i följande påståenden om den tidigare beskrivna podcasten från ICA/Coop?

Svara på en skala 1-7 där 1="Instämmer inte alls" och 7="Instämmer helt och hållet"

Jag skulle kunna tänka mig att...

|  | Instämmer inte<br>alls |   |   |   |   |   | Instämmer helt<br>och hållet |
|--|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|
|  | 1                      | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7                            |
| Skicka in förslag på hur<br>denna podcast kan<br>förbättras                | Ο                      | Ο | Ο | Ο | О | Ο | О                            |
| Rösta på vilka framtida<br>ämnen som denna<br>podcast ska handla om        | Ο                      | Ο | Ο | 0 | О | Ο | О                            |
| Skicka in kommentarer<br>om hur jag upplevde<br>denna podcast              | Ο                      | Ο | Ο | О | О | Ο | О                            |
| Rösta på vilka framtida<br>gäster som jag vill ska<br>besöka denna podcast | Ο                      | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο                            |
| Delta i en tävling<br>kopplad till denna<br>podcast                        | Ο                      | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | О                            |

#### Önskar du att få mer information om hur du lyssnar på ICA/Coops podcast?

Vänligen skriv in din mejladress i rutan nedan så skickar vi mer information!

Din mailadress kommer självklart inte delas med en tredje part, utan används endast för att skicka information om podcasten.

- O Ja tack, jag vill ha mer information om ICA/Coops podcast \_\_\_\_
- O Nej tack, jag vill inte ha mer information om ICA/Coops podcast

Vi kommer nu att ställa några frågor om vad du tycker om ICA/Coop och deras reklam.

Med "reklam" menar vi den kommunikation du möts av i egenskap av kund. Det kan till exempel vara reklam på TV eller i tidningar, olika typer av event i/utanför butiker eller kanske sajter, appar eller filmklipp på nätet.

Tänk på all reklam från ICA som du tidigare har sett eller hört, exempelvis på TV eller webben.

## Hur väl beskriver följande påståenden din generella uppfattning om ICA/Coopss reklam?

Svara på en skala 1-7 där 1 = "Stämmer inte alls" och 7 = "Stämmer mycket bra".

## Jag tycker att ICA/Coop generellt sett brukar göra...

|  | Instämmer inte<br>alls |   |   |   |   |   | Instämmer helt<br>och hållet |
|--|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|
|  | 1                      | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7                            |
| Intressant reklam                      | О                      | Ο | О | О | О | О | О                            |
| Reklam som är värd att<br>uppmärksamma | О                      | Ο | Ο | О | О | О | О                            |
| Reklam som är givande<br>att ta del av | О                      | Ο | Ο | О | О | О | О                            |
|  |                        |   |   |   |   |   |                              |

#### Hur väl instämmer du i följande påståenden med avseende på ICA/Coop?

Svara på en skala 1-7 där 1 = "Instämmer inte alls" och 7 = "Instämmer helt och hållet".

|   | Instämmer<br>inte alls |   |   |   |   |   | Instämmer helt<br>och hållet |
|---|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|
|   | 1                      | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7                            |
| Jag är engagerad i<br>ICA/Coop  | Ο                      | О | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | 0                            |
| Jag skulle vara villig att<br>betala ett högre pris på<br>ICA/Coop än andra<br>matbutiker | 0                      | 0 | Ο | 0 | Ο | 0 | 0                            |
| Jag kommer att handla<br>på ICA/Coop nästan<br>gång jag köper mat                         | 0                      | Ο | Ο | 0 | Ο | 0 | 0                            |
| Jag avser att fortsätta<br>handla på ICA/Coop   | Ο                      | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | 0 | 0                            |

Avslutningsvis har vi några korta frågor om dig!

| Vad identifierar du sig som?                                   | Man<br>O | Kvinna<br>O | Annat<br>O |
|--|----------|-------------|------------|
| Vänligen ange din ålder  |          |             |            |
| Har du några övriga<br>kommentarer, vänligen ange<br>dessa här |          |             |            |
| Vad tror du att denna<br>undersökning gick ut på?              |          |             |            |

# **INTERIOR DECORATING & PODCAST**

Hej!

Den här undersökningen handlar om heminredning och podcast.

Vänligen läs frågorna noggrant och svara på alla frågor.

Det finns inga svar som är rätt eller fel, vi är endast intresserade av dina åsikter. Dina svar kommer självklart att behandlas anonymt.

Stort tack för din tid!

Vi inleder med en fråga om PODCAST.

Med PODCAST avses en serie av digitala ljudavsnitt som distribueras över internet. Lyssnaren kan ta del av dessa via exempelvis sin smartphone eller dator.

#### Vad är din generella inställning till PODCAST?

|                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |             |
|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------------|
| Dåligt         | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Bra         |
| Negativ        | Ο | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Ο | Positiv     |
| Ej tilltalande | Ο | Ο | 0 | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Tilltalande |

Nu kommer några frågor om KÖP AV HEMINREDNING. Med HEMINREDNING avses alla produkter som kan användas för att dekorera eller möblera en bostad.

#### Vad anser du generellt om KÖP AV HEMINREDNING på till exempel IKEA, Mio eller EM?

|   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ett mycket<br>oviktigt beslut                         | О | О | О | О | Ο | О | Ο | Ett mycket<br>viktigt beslut                            |
| Beslutet kräver<br>lite<br>tankeverksamhet            | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | О | Beslutet kräver<br>mycket<br>tankeverksamhet            |
| Det är lite att<br>förlora om man<br>väljer fel butik | 0 | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Det är mycket att<br>förlora om man<br>väljer fel butik |

Nu kommer några frågor om heminredningsföretaget IKEA/Mio.

- Känner du till IKEA/Mio?
- 0

Ja O Nej

#### Har du sett eller hört reklam för IKEA/Mio?

Med "reklam" menar vi den kommunikation du möts av i egenskap av kund. Det kan till exempel vara reklam på TV eller i tidningar, olika typer av event i/utanför butiker eller kanske sajter, appar eller filmklipp på nätet.

Ο Ja

O Nej

#### Vänligen läs texten nedan noggrant!

#### Föreställ dig följande:

IKEA/Mio ska lansera en podcast\*. Podcasten kommer att handla om allt man skulle vilja veta om heminredning. I varje podcast kommer en känd gäst att bjudas in som har både kunskap och erfarenhet inom heminredning.

I ett podcastavsnitt kommer en heminredningsdesigner vara inbjuden för att berätta om de senaste trenderna ifrån inredningens värld. IKEA/Mio kommer även att ge ut ett avsnitt med en belysningsskola för att lyssnarna ska bli kvarterets belysningsexpert. I ett annat avsnitt ska hemmafixarens viktigaste verktyg för att lyckas i hemmet diskuteras.

Nu följer några frågor om IKEA/Mios podcast.

\* Podcast är en serie av digitala ljudavsnitt som distribueras över Internet. Lyssnaren kan ta del av dessa via exempelvis sin smartphone eller dator.

#### Vilken produktkategori berördes i texten du läste?

- O Mat
- Hemelektronik
- O Heminredning
- O Annat

#### Vilket av följande berördes i texten du läste?

- O Event
- **O** Mobilapplikation
- **O** Podcast
- O Annat

#### Vad är din uppfattning om den tidigare beskrivna podcasten från IKEA/Mio?

Svara på en skala 1-7 där 1 = "Instämmer inte alls" och 7 = "Instämmer helt och hållet".

|                        |     | Instämmer<br>inte alls |   |   |   |   |   | Instämme <del>r</del><br>helt och hållet |
|------------------------|-----|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|
|                        |     | 1                      | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7  |
| Intressanta            |     | Ο                      | О | О | О | О | О | О  |
| Värda<br>uppmärksamhet | min | О                      | О | О | О | О | О | О  |
| Givande                |     | О                      | О | О | О | О | О | О  |
|                        |     |                        |   |   |   |   |   |  |

Hur väl stämmer följande påståenden in på dina förväntningar på den tidigare beskrivna framtida podcasten från IKEA? Svara på en skala 1-7 där 1 = "Instämmer inte alls" och 7 = "Instämmer helt och hållet".

|   | Instämmer inte<br>alls | Instämmer helt<br>och hållet |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
|   | 1                      | 2                            | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Jag ser fram emot att<br>lyssna på denna<br>framtida podcast från<br>IKEA/Mio | Ο                      | 0                            | Ο | Ο | 0 | Ο | Ο |
| Jag kommer att tycka<br>att denna framtida                                    | Ο                      | Ο                            | О | О | О | Ο | О |

|   | podcast frå<br>IKEA/Mio ä<br>värdefull                      | in<br>är |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|----------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hur väl instämmer<br>du i följande<br>påståenden om den | Jag vill lyssna på denr<br>framtida podcast frå<br>IKEA/Mio |          | О | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο |

tidigare beskrivna podcasten från IKEA/Mio?

Svara på en skala 1-7 där 1="Instämmer inte alls" och 7="Instämmer helt och hållet"

#### Jag skulle kunna tänka mig att...

|   | Instämmer<br>inte alls |   |   |   |   |   | Instämme <del>r</del><br>helt och hållet |
|---|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|
|   | 1                      | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7  |
| Skicka in förslag på<br>hur denna podcast<br>kan förbättras                   | О                      | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο  |
| Rösta på vilka<br>framtida ämnen som<br>denna podcast ska<br>handla om        | Ο                      | Ο | Ο | 0 | Ο | Ο | 0  |
| Skicka in<br>kommentarer om hur<br>jag upplevde denna<br>podcast              | 0                      | Ο | Ο | 0 | 0 | О | 0  |
| Rösta på vilka<br>framtida gäster som<br>jag vill ska besöka<br>denna podcast | Ο                      | Ο | Ο | 0 | Ο | О | 0  |
| Delta i en tävling<br>kopplad till denna<br>podcast                           | Ο                      | 0 | Ο | 0 | Ο | 0 | Ο  |

#### Önskar du att få mer information om hur du lyssnar på IKEA/Mios podcast?

Vänligen skriv in din mejladress i rutan nedan så skickar vi mer information!

Din mailadress kommer självklart inte delas med en tredje part, utan används endast för att skicka information om podcasten.

- O Ja tack, jag vill ha mer information om IKEA/Mios podcast \_
- **O** Nej tack, jag vill inte ha mer information om IKEA/Mios podcast

Vi kommer nu att ställa några frågor om vad du tycker om IKEA/Mio och deras reklam.

Med "reklam" menar vi den kommunikation du möts av i egenskap av kund. Det kan till exempel vara reklam på TV eller i tidningar, olika typer av event i/utanför butiker eller kanske sajter, appar eller filmklipp på nätet. Tänk på all reklam från IKEA/Mio som du tidigare har sett eller hört, exempelvis på TV eller webben.

### Hur väl beskriver följande påståenden din generella uppfattning om IKEA/Mios reklam?

Svara på en skala 1-7 där 1 = "Stämmer inte alls" och 7 = "Stämmer mycket bra".

## Jag tycker att IKEA generellt sett brukar göra...

|  | Instämmer<br>inte alls |   |   |   |   |   | Instämme <del>r</del><br>helt och hållet |
|--|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|
|  | 1                      | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7  |
| Intressant reklam                      | О                      | О | О | О | О | Ο | О  |
| Reklam som är värd att<br>uppmärksamma | Ο                      | О | О | О | О | О | О  |
| Reklam som är givande<br>att ta del av | О                      | О | О | О | О | 0 | О  |
|  |                        |   |   |   |   |   |  |

## Hur väl instämmer du i följande påståenden med avseende på ICA/Coop?

Svara på en skala 1-7 där 1 = "Instämmer inte alls" och 7 = "Instämmer helt och hållet".

|   | Instämmer<br>inte alls<br>1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Instämmer<br>helt och hållet<br>7 |
|---|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| Jag är engagerad i IKEA/Mio   | О                           | О | О | О | О | О | О                                 |
| Jag skulle vara villig att betala<br>ett högre pris på IKEA/Mio<br>än andra<br>heminredningsbutiker | Ο                           | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο | Ο                                 |
| Jag kommer att handla på<br>IKEA/Mio nästan gång jag<br>köper heminredning                          | О                           | Ο | О | О | О | Ο | Ο                                 |
| Jag avser att fortsätta handla<br>på IKEA/Mio   | О                           | 0 | Ο | Ο | О | Ο | О                                 |

Avslutningsvis har vi några korta frågor om dig!

| Vad identifierar du sig som?                                   | Man | Kvinna | Annat |
|--|-----|--------|-------|
|  | 0   | 0      | О     |
| Vänligen ange din ålder  | _   |        |       |
| Har du några övriga<br>kommentarer, vänligen ange<br>dessa här |     |        |       |
| Vad tror du att denna<br>undersökning gick ut på?              |     |        |       |