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Abstract
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Background: In order for marketers, brands and companies to be successful in the advertising environment the stress for well developed content and messages is a necessity. To have a competitive advantage it is all about the attention a advertisements gain by the audience and the public eye. Storytelling advertising is a marketing tool that during the past years have been highly recognized due to its effective and powerful ways to make market changes and branding. Stories can mediate various heightened emotions that could trigger and evoke emotional responses with the audience. Since companies all over the world spend hundreds of billions each year on marketing, it is important for marketing managers to understand how the advertisements affect the consumers in order for them to make decisions that are cost efficient and affect the consumers in the way they are intended. However, this research focus on the effect of two specific emotions when applied to video storytelling advertisements, humoristic and dramatic.

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to extend the understanding of the effect of video storytelling advertisements on consumers’ attitude towards the brand.

Methodology: A quantitative research was applied to collect the data using a online questionnaire in order to further analyze and describe the relationship between the different variables.

Conclusion: The findings of this research suggests that video advertisements positively influence the consumers’ attitude towards the brand. It also suggest that that the attitude towards humorous advertisement not only is affected by the affective and cognitive dimensions, it is also affected by the demographics of the viewer. This indicates that humor is perceived differently by different individuals which needs to be taken into consideration when it comes to marketing communication. Also, findings indicate that the attitude towards the brand is affected positively if the advertisement is seen as a story by the viewer, which shows that storytelling is an efficient approach to use within marketing communication.
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1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background

In a more cluttered advertising environment, it is not about how big the budgets are, it is rather how well content and messages are developed and the quality of them. In order for marketers, brands and companies to be successful it is all about the attention the advertisements, in this thesis also referred to as ads, may gain that will determine if they are successful or not (De Mooij & Hofstede, 2010). Storytelling advertising, also referred to as narrative advertising, is a marketing and communication tool that during the years have been widely recognized by different scholars and researchers due to its effective and powerful ways to make market changes and branding (Akgun et al., 2015). With an overall increased popularity in the usage of mediating a specific emotion in advertising, this is something that exists within storytelling advertising as well (Chung & Zhao, 2003).

Stories have a structure and aim to engage the listeners when the stories are shared, it is a way to paint a picture, inspire and motivate culture and values as well as it is a way to define who the company are and what they stand for (Fog et al., 2010). Since the stories are connected to narrative thinking they rely on specific heightened emotion and can range from dramatic, modest, humoristic etcetera, which is one of the reason why this marketing tool is widely considered as powerful and effective within advertising. Consumers can relate and develop a character identification to the stories (Gilliam, Flaherty & Rayburn, 2013). This is an intended effect in the usage of storytelling and why the importance of quality content and messages are highly stressed in order to gain attention with the storytelling advertising (Gilliam, Flaherty & Rayburn, 2013). The reaction to a story is explained as the narrative transportation in which has been shown to increase consumers enjoyment and have an affect on the attitude towards the brand (Lundqvist et al., 2012). Partly, due to the digitalization, marketers and companies have over the years become more creative in how to make consumers further interactive with advertisements in which storytelling advertising is considered as a creative tool (Bruce, Murthi & Ram, 2016). The tool can be used in different and in multiple creative formats and in various campaigns as for example in pictures or in videos (Bruce, Murthi & Ram, 2016). Storytelling advertising is a way to differentiate companies and brands from their competitors in today's competitive environment and are used as a branding concept in order to develop relationships between the company and the consumers (Fog et al., 2010).
Stories can mediate various heightened emotions that all have different characteristics and will affect the audience in various senses (Nie, Liang & Chen, 2017). This particular study will focus on two specific emotional approaches used within storytelling, humorous and dramatic. In the context of psychology, humor is defined as both a human activity and a social interaction and is an important as well as engaging aspect of behavior, when exposed to humor most of us tend to laugh at something that we as individuals consider as funny (Escalas & Stern, 2003). Applying humor into advertisements, Eisenberg & Strayer (1987) defines the phenomena as a way of gaining attention, enhance the source liking and have an effect on the attitude towards the brand with the main objective to evoke an emotional response with the audience in terms of laughter (Madden & Weinberger, 1982). Experiencing something dramatic is often connected to evoke emotional responses such as empathy and sympathy (Escalas & Stern, 2003). Empathy is described as to what extent a person unselfconsciously and involuntary can refer to another one's feelings and sympathy is a person's awareness of one another feelings (Eisenberg, 1989). In the context of advertisement, dramatic advertisements are defined as to the extent in which consumers experience the same emotion as the characters in the advertisement, this aims to further evoke feelings of sympathy and empathy from the viewer towards the advertisement and enhance the information processing (Escalas & Stern, 2003).

However, in order for a storytelling advertising to be successful it needs to gain attention, advertisers have come to an understanding of the vitality of well-produced content that could lead to increased awareness among consumers (Dehghani et al., 2016). Brands advertise to be more interactive and customized with consumers where the central role is the content being produced, constantly trying to attract more attention (Du Plessis, 2017). It is more a process of convincing consumers rather than it is about facts, recent studies have discussed and shown that storytelling can increase brand awareness and brand trust (Dehghani et al., 2016). According to prior research it also shows that the content of stories plays with consumers emotions and will often change brand attitude and the perception of brands (Lundqvist et al., 2012). Moreover, how different emotions used in storytelling advertisements affect consumers are not solely interesting from an academic and theoretical perspective, it is also of interest from a practical perspective. Since companies all over the world spend hundreds of billions each year on marketing (Statista, 2018), it is important for marketing managers to understand how the advertisements affect the consumers in order for them to make decisions that are cost efficient and affect the consumers in the way they are intended.
1.2 Problem discussion

It is natural for people to think narratively rather than in an argumentative way (Escalas & Stern, 2004; Holt, 2004) and therefore storytelling can affect the mind of consumers and help to clarify the way they think (Zaltman, 2003; Wang, Baker, Wagner & Wakefield, 2007; Woodside, Sood & Miller, 2008). Furthermore, it is indicated that storytelling can be used to influence the thoughts and behavior of consumers and guide them in the decision-making process by providing them with information that can be positively associated with for example a brand or product which can affect the attitude towards the object (Gilliam & Zablah, 2013; Gilliam & Flaherty, 2015; Nie, Liang & Chen, 2017).

Several studies with focus on storytelling have been conducted. These studies have been within various fields, such as the influence of storytelling on travel intentions (Hsu, Dehuang & Woodside, 2009; Akgun et al., 2015); the buyer-seller relationship within retail (Gilliam, Flaherty & Rayburn, 2013; Gilliam & Flaherty, 2015); the influence of storytelling on the entrepreneurial intentions of individuals (Dakoumi & Abdelwahed, 2014); the effect of consumer storytelling (Delgadillo & Escalas, 2012); and storytelling related to the brand experience of the consumer (Lundqvist et al., 2012). However, these studies focus either on storytelling in written text (e.g. Lundqvist et al., 2012; Akgun et al., 2015) or in a word-of-mouth communication (e.g. Delgadillo & Escalas, 2012; Gilliam & Flaherty, 2015). These studies neither focus on storytelling as advertising tool for marketers to use in order to affect the consumers nor focus on storytelling in form of video. Furthermore, Dessart (2017) researched storytelling as an advertising strategy and concluded that there is a positive relationship between a storytelling ad and the brand attitude. However, the research compared storytelling ads with factual ads and did not take into consideration that different types of storytelling ads cloud affect consumers differently. Lien and Chen (2011) state that the story could be of different types, such as humorous and dramatic, and Cartwright, McCormick and Warnaby (2015) emphasize that different types of advertising evoke different emotions among the consumers. Further, Lien and Chen (2011) argue that this is something that relatively few studies take into consideration, even though it is important for marketing managers to understand in order to make effective advertising decisions that create a positive attitude towards the brand among the consumers.
Thus, there are two clear research gaps. One being the lacking research of how storytelling advertisements in form of video affect consumers, which is supported by Fenger et al. (2015) and Nie, Liang and Chen (2017) who state that research regarding storytelling should expand and not only focus on words, but also include different mediums such as video and its effect on consumers’ attitude toward both the storytelling ad and the brand. The other one being the lack of research regarding how different types of storytelling advertisements affect consumers and their attitude (Lien & Chen, 2011).

1.3 Purpose

The purpose of this study is to extend the understanding of the effect of video storytelling advertisements on consumers’ attitude towards the brand.

1.3.1 Delimitations

As stated above, a story can be of different forms. This study will focus on humorous and dramatic video storytelling advertisements due to the clear differences between the emotions these two approaches evoke. Also, the emotions a story evokes can be enhanced by several factors, for example celebrity endorsements, however, this study will focus on the message the story delivers, not who delivers it.

1.4 Research questions

- How are humorous video storytelling advertisements related to consumers’ attitude towards the brand?
- How are dramatic video storytelling advertisements related to consumers’ attitude towards the brand?

1.5 Report structure

In chapter 2 is a literature review presented, which is followed by the theoretical framework in chapter 3 presenting the theories used in this study. Also, in chapter 3 the hypotheses are formulated and the conceptual model is presented. Chapter 4 presents the methodology choices the researchers has done in order to conduct this study. Furthermore, the results are presented in chapter 5 and then discussed in chapter 6. Chapter 7 answers the purpose of this study by presenting the conclusion. Finally, chapter 8 presents the implications of this study, as well as the limitations and suggestions for future research.
2.0 Literature review

2.1 Branding and advertisement

Branding in advertising can be described as the audiovisual presence of the brand with the content being produced (Hartnett, Romaniuk & Kennedy, 2016). Prior theories state that good branding can be described as a response to an effective advertising and in order for the advertising to be successful, consumers in some extent need to register the brand on a level and relate to the brand in somehow in the advertising. This will in return according to theories influence consumers in their attitudes towards the brand, in practice this is referred to as the brand recall (Romaniuk, 2013). Connecting the so called mental processing, when trying to create a memory structure to cause a brand recall is a significant challenge within advertising (Kennedy et al., 2013). According to Keller (2007) to overcome challenges in the mental processing it is common to apply tactics that involves emotions such as drama or humor in the content being produced in order to ease the mental processing and draw attention to the advertising. This has also been shown to be difficult to find the right balance between branding and the creativity when developing the content, too much branding is found to be counterproductive and something that consumer will decline and filter out in the mental processing (Hartnett, Romaniuk & Kennedy, 2016). Further, researchers have found supporting evidence that brand elements in advertising will increase and have an impact on the actual brand recall (Keller, 2003). Other suggest that indirect branding is the most effective approach to be applied (Aitchison, 1999).

2.1 Storytelling

The definition of storytelling includes several of propositions that over the years have been proposed and are something that has developed from originally being a way of telling tales in terms of mythology, legends, folktales and fairytales often of supernatural beings and heroes (Gilliam, Flaherty, Rayburn, 2013). First and foremost stories have several factors that together creates the phenomena, according to Prince (1980) is it a narrative that coherent out of interrelated actions and consequences in a chronological order that are so called events, states or situations that together shapes a story. Gilliam & Flaherty (2015) further state that stories are the information that has been saved in one's mind and something that can be accessed through the memory. The concept of storytelling consists of two elements of importance, the chronological order which was mentioned before and serves the purpose to give stories a beginning, a middle and an end, the second element is the casual relationship and are the framework (Nie, Liang & Chen, 2017). According to Delgadillo & Escalas (2004) six propositions exists how to measure the quality of a good story,
these propositions comprises the extent of actions and what the goal is to achieve, the emotional aspect and how the story affect the audience, to what insight the consumers can develop, the background of the story, the story line lives up to the criteria with having a beginning, a middle, and an ending. A brand story that have the ability to touch and get the consumer emotionally involved is all developed with a purpose of convince and persuade the consumer through a process of negative cognitive responses, since the story will have a high realism it will affect in a strong affective response (Lin & Chen. 2015). Further, Lin and Chen (2017) state that the actual persuasion is highly important element in storytelling and the effect it will have in an advertisement all depends of the content and substance of the message the brand want to mediate and tell.

2.1.1 Narrative advertising

Storytelling or narrative advertising as it also can be referred to, are defined as when consumer stories and brand stories are linked together (Hirschman, 2010). Compared in contrast to ordinary factual advertising, narrative advertising go beyond in just representing a certain product or service, it instead aims to develop a stronger emotional connection with consumers (Dessart, 2017). The narrative advertising are a well discussed tool within marketing where more and more companies develop compelling storytelling in order to gain leverage on markets, a perspective is that narrative advertising is effective, since it engage consumers that will lead and contribute to the perceived value of the brand (Kim, Lloyd & Cervellon, 2016). In contrast to factual advertising, narrative advertising do not only aim to create a stronger emotional connection with consumers it as well affects consumers way of processing the advertisement. The process of factual ads are more analytical, cognitive and puts a demand on consumers to actively engage with the advertisement, narrative advertising on the other hand are more effective in nature and the processing of such advertising will be more unconsciously and less demanding (Dessart, 2017). This according to Escalas (2007) is referred to as the narrative transportation, where consumers relate to stories unconsciously and connects them with memories they once have experienced, and will affect the brand in a positive sense.

The narrative transportation do not only touch consumers emotionally it involves and activates a deep processing which has positive effect for the brands, however it is not only the content of an advertising that affect the consumers it is as well the character identification that has a play (Dessart, 2017). The character identification is defined as a cognitive state that connect similarity and proximity between the consumer and the character, where the identification is how the consumer relate to the character (Tal-or & Cohen, 2010).
Both the narrative transportation and the character identification is together, two elements that plays a big role in consumers involvement with a story where there is a link between transportation and identification (Dessart, 2017). The transportation enhances the identification since it emerges consumers with the story, something that is later developed into a consciousness what the story is all about and identifies the characters (Escalas, 2007). Since the consumer then can relate with what the character do, feel, want or experience in the story is the core in the narrative transportation and will lead to an increased identification (Green et al., 2005).
3.0 Theoretical framework

3.1 Attitude toward the brand

Attitude toward the brand is defined as “individual’s internal evaluation of the brand” (Mitchell & Olson, 1981, p. 318). This definition has two distinct characteristics of attitude which have remained constant in the definitions during the 20th century (Giner-Sorolla, 1999). The first is the attitude is directed towards an object, which in this case is represented by the brand. The second characteristic is that attitude in nature is evaluative, which means that it is, as described by Eagly and Chaiken (1993, p. 3) “imputation of some degree of goodness or badness” towards the attitudinal object. Mitchell and Olson’s (1981) definition also suggests that attitude is an internal state since it consists of a third component, the internal evaluation. Furthermore, Eagly and Chaiken (1973) argue that, besides the internal state, an attitude also is an enduring state. Thus, based on previous studies, Spears and Singh (2004, p. 55) define the concept as follows: “attitude toward the brand is a relatively enduring, unidimensional summary evaluation of the brand that presumably energizes behavior”.

The attitude towards the brand is to great extent formed by emotions and experiences consumers hold toward the brand and can be affected by, for example, advertisements (Walla, Brenner & Koller, 2011). The brand is more than just the product or service the company sells, De Chernatony, McDonald and Wallace (2011) describe it as a relationship with the consumer which provides an emotional and functional value for the consumer. Furthermore, Walla, Brenner and Koller (2011) argue that, from a company perspective, it is important to strive towards the creation of a positive attitude towards the brand. This is further supported by Spears and Singh (2004) and Lundqvist et al. (2012) who argue that a positive attitude towards the brand positively affects the consumers’ intention to purchase which in turn strengthens the prerequisites for the success of the company.

3.2 Humorous advertisements

Within psychology humor is defined as both a human activity and a social interaction, and when exposed to humor it tends to engage our behavior and we tend to laugh since we as individuals consider it as funny (Escalas & Stern, 2003). Humor figures according to Alden, Mukherjee and Hoyer (2000) as one of the most commonly applied emotions strategies in advertising. Even though it can be considered as a powerful message strategy to use, there are certain risks to be taken into consideration when applying it to an advertisement, since the effect of humor may vary pending on demographics on the targeted audience such as gender, culture and age (Madden & Weinberger,
However, Chattopadhyay and Basu (1990) state that applying humoristic message that are well integrated with the correct product category and the accurate audience that have a positive feeling towards the brand in advance has shown to have a positive effect and enhance the attention. This is further supported by Stewart and Furse (1986) that discuss the increased affect a humorous message can have on the consumers’ brand attitude from the advertisement to the brand. A humorous advertising campaign aims to deliver a humorous message with influenced cognitive components which aims to create a positive and favorable attitude towards the brand that advertise the campaign (Chung & Zhao, 2011). According to Gelb and Pickett (1983) there is a relationship between a humorous advertisement and the perception of the brand, as well as a correlation between the attitude towards the brand.

3.3 Dramatic advertisements
According to Escalas and Stern (2003) dramatic advertisements evoke emotional responses in terms of empathy and sympathy. Miller (2014) further argues that we as individuals are more likely to evoke an emotional response to dramas easier than any other since we tend to understand when another person is showing pain which makes drama in the context of advertisements a powerful tool. Sympathy is further described as the viewer awareness of the feelings of another person. More particularly feeling sorrow or having concern for another person's well-being (Escalas & Stern, 2003). Empathy is defined as an emotional response, when a person unselfconsciously and involuntary can refer and merge with another one's feelings (Escalas & Stern, 2003). According to prior research, dramatic advertisements will enhance information processing through both a cognitive and emotional response if the consumers can emotionally respond to the advertisement with sympathy and empathy (Eisenberg, 1989). Feeling empathy and sympathy towards an advertisement will ultimately lead to that the consumer give an emotional response to the given message and the characters in the advertisement (Chebat, Vercollier & Gélinas-Chebat, 2003). Prior research also supports the idea that a dramatic feeling in an advertisement have a relationship to sympathy and empathy and will connect the audience with the advertisement in a more firm way (Kincaid, 2002). These emotions will affect the persuasion process, create stronger feelings and have an effect on the outcomes of attitude towards the brand, the involvement and intention (Bae, 2008).
3.4 Attitude toward the ad

Attitude toward the ad is defined as “...a person’s favorable or unfavorable evaluation of an ad” (Spears & Singh, 2004, p. 56). Both Mackenzie, Lutz and Belch (1986) and Biehal, Stephens and Curlo (1992) have a more specific definition of the concept where they, besides the person’s response in a favorable or unfavorable way, also include that it is to a particular advertising during a particular situation of exposure. Furthermore, Solomon et al. (2013) argue that the attitude one has towards an object can affect one’s attitude towards a second object that is associated with the first object. In other words, the positive attitude a consumer has towards an ad can eventually be transferred to the brand that is being portrayed in the ad. Thus, attitude toward the ad is an important factor that may affect the attitude towards the brand in the mind of the consumer (Mitchell & Olson, 1981; Shimp, 1981; Spears & Singh, 2004; Sallam & Algammash, 2016).

3.5 Affective reaction and cognitive evaluation of advertisements

Shimp (1981) was one of the first authors to argue that attitude toward advertisements consisted of two distinct dimensions, a cognitive and an affective, with the argument that the two “dimensions of ATT A [attitude toward the advertisement] are non-equivalent in their impact on consumers, due to the different underlying mechanisms, one a conscious process and the other non-volitional” (p. 10). Further, Madden, Allen and Twible (1988) strengthen this argument by concluding that by only study the cognitive dimension it is difficult to know how the affective dimension influence the behavior and attitude of the consumer and vice versa.

Affective reaction

Lantos (2011) and Schiffman and Wisenblit (2015) state that the affective reaction is either the positive or negative emotional responses to an attitude object. Moreover, Edell and Burke (1987), Madden, Allen and Twible (1985) and Burner (2009) argue that the distinct difference between positive and negative affection differs from cognitive evaluation which is seen as a single bipolar construct. Allen and Madden (1985), Gresham and Shimp (1985), and Lutz (1985) argue that the affective reaction has a significant impact on the attitude toward the ad and its influence on brand attitude. Furthermore, it is stated that the emotional response of consumers play an important role in the effectiveness of the advertisement and how the attitude changes (Morris, Woo & Cho, 2003; Morris et al., 2009). Also, affective reactions are highly spontaneous (Batra & Ray, 1986; Slovic, 2004) and the dominant response evoked when one is exposed to an advertisement (MacKenzie, Lutz & Belch, 1986; Slovic, 2004).
Cognitive evaluation

The cognitive evaluation refers to the perception and knowledge an individual has toward an attitude object that has been gained from experiences. Also, it is described as the beliefs one has toward the attitude object (Breckler, 1984; MacKenzie, Lutz & Belch, 1986; Solomon et al., 2013; Schiffman & Wisenblit, 2015). Moreover, the beliefs are often held towards the different characteristics of the object, for example the values, attributes and goals. These beliefs of the object have a direct impact on the attitude of an individual since an evaluative aspect is included in all beliefs (Fishbein, 1963). Lantos (2011) and Schiffman and Wisenblit (2015) further argue that an individual’s beliefs towards an object often are related to the physical features of the product or the consumer benefits it provides. Furthermore, Breckler (1984) and Burton and Lichtenstein (1988) conclude that a cognitive evaluation of an attitude object can develop through communication, such as advertisements, from a company.

3.6 Conceptual framework

Previous research have concluded the spontaneous feelings evoked when exposed to an advertisement influence the attitude toward the ad (Allen & Madden, 1985; Gresham & Shimp, 1985; Lutz, 1985; Spears & Singh, 2004; Morris et al., 2009). Also, Shimp (1981) argues that the attitude towards the ad consists of two dimensions, one being the affective reaction, which is considered to have a significant impact on the attitude towards the ad (Allen & Madden, 1985; Gresham & Shimp, 1985; Lutz, 1985). This emotional response plays an important role in how the attitude changes (Morris, Woo & Cho, 2003; Morris et al., 2009). Further, Escalas (2007) and Dessart (2017) argue that individuals emotionally relate to advertisements that are built up like stories. Moreover, Chung and Zhao (2002) state that the use of humor in advertisements increase the liking of the advertisement. This is further supported by Chung and Zhao (2011) who argue that humor is an important antecedent of attitude toward the ad since humor influence the viewers’ affective reaction to the ad. By taking this in consideration, the following was hypothesized:

\textbf{H1a: The affective reaction to the use of humor has a positive relationship with the attitude towards humorous video storytelling ads.}

Also, as stated before, attitude toward the ad consists of a cognitive dimension (Shimp, 1981). It is argued that the cognitive evaluation of an attitude object can be developed through advertisements. Furthermore, Belch and Belch (1983) and Gelb and Pickett (1983) concluded that humor positively influence the cognitive dimension of the attitude toward the ad. This is further supported by Chung
and Zhao (2011) who argue that humorous messages influence the cognitive components which create a positive attitude. Thus, the following hypothesis was developed:

**H1b:** The cognitive evaluation of the use of humor has a positive relationship with the attitude towards humorous video storytelling ads.

With the previous discussion around the affective reaction in relation to the attitude towards the ad in mind, it is suggested in previous studies that dramatic narratives evoke strong feelings among the viewers and that these feelings in turn is linked to the attitude toward the ad (Escalas & Stern, 2003; Bae, 2008; Chang, 2008). Further, Escalas and Stern (2003) and Miller (2014) argue that when exposed to a drama people tend to relate to and understand the emotions of the characters, which affect their involvement and in turn the attitude towards the attitude object. Thereby, the following was hypothesized:

**H2a:** The affective reaction to the use of drama has a positive relationship with the attitude towards dramatic video storytelling ads.

To taking the previous discussion regarding cognitive evaluation and its effect on the attitude towards the ad into consideration, it is also stated by Kincaid (2002), that besides the emotional involvement, the cognitive involvement in drama has a greater impact on the viewers than other communication types. Thus, the following hypothesis was developed:

**H2b:** The cognitive evaluation of the use of drama has a positive relationship with the attitude towards dramatic video storytelling ads.

It is argued that the attitude an individual has toward an object may affect the individual’s attitude towards another object that is associated with the first object (Solomon et al., 2013). Furthermore, several studies state that one’s attitude towards the ad may influence the attitude one has toward the brand that is portrayed in the ad (Mitchell & Olsen, 1981; Shimp, 1981; Spears & Singh, 2004; Sallam & Algammash, 2016). Moreover, Dessart (2017) argues that narrative advertisements involve the viewers emotionally which in turn has positive effects for the brand. Additionally, Chung and Zhao (2011) conclude that by using humor in advertisements may increase the liking of brand that is being advertised. This is supported by Stewart and Furse (1986) who argue that a humorous message can have an effect on consumers’ attitude towards the brand that is being portrayed in the advertisements. Thus, the following was hypothesized:

**H3:** The attitude towards humorous video storytelling ads has a positive relationship with the attitude towards the brand.
By taking the arguments for H3 into consideration, and adding the conclusions by Escalas and Stern (2003) that a drama evoke sympathy and empathy among the viewers which connects them to the characters and the advertisement. Further, Bae (2008) argues that these emotions evoked when exposed to a drama affect the persuasion process and involvement, which in turn can affect the attitude towards the brand portrayed in the ad. Moreover, Eisenberg (1989) state that cognitive and emotional response to dramatic advertisements can enhance processing of the information delivered in the advertisements. Furthermore, Chang (2008) that dramatic narrative advertisements may affect attitude, the following hypothesis was developed:

**H4:** The attitude towards dramatic video storytelling ads has a positive relationship with the attitude towards the brand.

Based on the hypotheses stated above, the following model has been drawn:

![Conceptual model](image)

Figure 3.1: *Conceptual model.*
4.0 Methodology

4.1 Research approach and research design
Research within the field of storytelling advertisement and its constructs together with consumer attitude and attitude towards objects, in this case ads and brands, was studied and used as a foundation for this study through which the hypotheses were developed. This gave the study a deductive approach (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). Since attitudes towards ads and brands are a well-researched and mature field (e.g. Madden, Allen & Twible, 1988; Spears & Singh, 2004; Sallam & Algammash, 2016) a quantitative approach was used. This approach allowed a data collection through which it was possible to draw general conclusions about the population due to the large sample that is collected with a quantitative approach (Hyde, 2000; Creswell, 2014). Regarding the research design, a cross-sectional research was chosen for this study. A cross-sectional research design means that the data is collect from multiple cases at the same time. By following this research design it was possible to explain the cause and effect between the different variables (Bryman & Bell, 2011), and thus fulfill the purpose of this study.

4.2 Data sources
This study uses primary data. By using primary data it is possible to gather accurate and relevant information about the topic investigated. Also, when research within the field is limited it may be difficult to collect relevant data from secondary sources (Hox & Boeije, 2005). Since the research on video storytelling advertisements and its effect on consumers’ attitude is limited, collecting primary data was a more accurate and reliable way to collect the information needed to answer the purpose of the study (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

4.3 Data collection method
Since this study aimed to get generalizable results of the population a large enough sample were required. Therefore, a self-completion questionnaire was used to collect data. The use of questionnaire enable an efficient distribution to the population which gave a sample from which it was possible to draw general conclusions of the population. Also, a questionnaire is both cheaper and quicker to administer in comparison to, for example, an interview, and the risk of the respondents to be affected by the interviewer is eliminated (Bryman & Bell, 2011). However, there are some disadvantages with a self-completion questionnaire, such as if the respondents have questions regarding the questionnaire there is no one present to answer these questions (Bryman & Bell, 2011). To minimize the risk of this problem to occur a pre-test was done (see 4.5 Pre-test).
The questionnaire was uploaded to Facebook where it then was shared by the authors in order to reach their individual networks. When uploading a questionnaire to Facebook it is more difficult to measure the response rate than when, for example sending a questionnaire to respondents by post. The authors are aware of this issue and handled it by reminding those who had not answered the questionnaire one week after it was first sent out. By sending out a reminder the response rate may increase (Bryman & Bell, 2011), however it is still difficult to measure and therefore it is impossible to know for sure.

The questionnaire began with a video storytelling advertisement, either humorous or dramatic, that the respondent were supposed to watch. Two storytelling advertisements from Volvo and two from Volkswagen, one humorous and one dramatic for each brand, were chosen for this study. The reason for the use of two brands was to minimize potential effect of other factors, such as brand familiarity. However, there are contradictory studies regarding the effect of brand familiarity on the relationship between attitude toward the ad and attitude toward the brand (Edell & Burke, 1986; Machleit & Wilson, 1988). These advertisements were divided into two questionnaires with the same questions, one questionnaire with one dramatic ad from Volvo and one humorous ad from Volkswagen and vice versa in the second questionnaire. The reason for this was to shorten the questionnaires and reduce the risk of respondent fatigue, which is increased with a longer questionnaire (Bryman & Bell, 2011). After the advertisement, the respondents were asked if they had watched the video and if they consider it to be a story using Escalas’ (2004) items “The ad told a story” and “The ad had a beginning, middle, and end”, these items later created the variable Perception (story) in the results. To measure if the ad was seen as humorous the three items “not humorous/very humorous”, “not funny/very funny, and “not amusing/very amusing” were used on a seven point semantic differential scale (Zhang, 1996), these items later created the variable Perception (humor) in the results. For the dramatic advertisements the sympathy and empathy response were measured with Escalas and Stern’s (2003) items for sympathy and empathy ad response, these items later created the variable Perception (drama) in the results. All of the variables described above were used as control variables in the analysis.

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of questions regarding the affective reaction and cognitive evaluation of the advertisement, as well as the attitude towards the advertisement and the attitude towards the brand. The items of the affective reaction were measured by the use of a seven point Likert scale (1 Not at all, 7 Very much so). The items for the cognitive evaluation and the attitude towards the ad were measured in a similar way on a seven point semantic differential scale
but with the statement “I found the ad…” and then an adjective (e.g. 1 Not believable, 7 Believable; 1 Unpleasant, 7 Pleasant). The items for attitude toward the brand were measured with an adjective in the same way as cognitive evaluation and attitude toward the ad but the respondents were asked to describe their overall feelings about the brand in the advertisement (e.g. 1 Unappealing, 7 Appealing). Finally, the questionnaire ended with questions regarding the gender, nationality, occupation and education level of the respondent.

4.4 Operationalization and data collection instrument

The theoretical framework was operationalized in order to collect and later analyze the data. An operationalization allows for the theoretical concepts to be broken down in order for them to be measured (Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2005; Bryman & Bell, 2011). The operationalization was divided into four dimensions; Attitude toward the brand, Attitude toward the ad, Affective reaction and Cognitive evaluation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Conceptual definition</th>
<th>Origin of items</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward the brand</td>
<td><em>Attitude toward the brand is a relatively enduring, unidimensional summary evaluation of the brand that presumably energizes behavior (Spears &amp; Singh, 2004).</em></td>
<td>Spears and Singh (2004)</td>
<td><em>Please describe your overall feelings about the brand described in the ad you just watched.</em>&lt;br&gt;AB1. unappealing/appealing&lt;br&gt;AB2. bad/good&lt;br&gt;AB3. unpleasant/pleasant&lt;br&gt;AB4. unfavorable/favorable&lt;br&gt;AB5. unlikable/likable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward the ad</td>
<td><em>Attitude toward the ad is a person’s favorable or unfavorable evaluation of an ad (Spears &amp; Singh, 2004).</em></td>
<td>Madden, Allen and Twible (1988)</td>
<td><em>I found the ad…</em>&lt;br&gt;AAD1. unpleasant/pleasant&lt;br&gt;AAD2. unlikable/likable&lt;br&gt;AAD3. boring/interesting&lt;br&gt;AAD4. tasteless/tasteful&lt;br&gt;AAD5. artless/artful&lt;br&gt;AAD6. bad/good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective reaction</td>
<td><em>Affective reaction is either the positive or negative emotional responses to an attitude object (Lantos, 2011; Schiffman &amp; Wisenblit, 2015).</em></td>
<td>Madden, Allen and Twible (1988)</td>
<td><em>Did the ad for [stimulus brand] make you feel…</em>&lt;br&gt;AR1. good&lt;br&gt;AR2. cheerful&lt;br&gt;AR3. excited&lt;br&gt;AR4. comfortable&lt;br&gt;AR5. calm&lt;br&gt;AR6. insulted&lt;br&gt;AR7. irritated&lt;br&gt;AR8. repulsed&lt;br&gt;AR9. sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive evaluation</td>
<td><em>The cognitive evaluation refers to the perception and knowledge and beliefs an individual has toward an attitude object that has been gained from experiences. (Breckler, 1984; MacKenzie, Lutz &amp; Belch, 1986; Solomon et al., 2013; Schiffman &amp; Wisenblit, 2015).</em></td>
<td>MacKenzie, Lutz and Belch (1986); Burton and Lichtenstein (1988)</td>
<td><em>I found the ad…</em>&lt;br&gt;CE1. not believable/believable&lt;br&gt;CE2. not informative/informative&lt;br&gt;CE3. not persuasive/persuasive&lt;br&gt;CE4. not ingenious/ingenious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Operationalization.
4.5 Pre-test

Before the questionnaire was sent out a pre-test was conducted. By doing a pre-test valuable information about the relevance of the questions and the design of the questionnaire can be generate (Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2005). Also, when respondents answer a self-completion questionnaire there is no moderator who can help the respondents if they have questions or are confused. Thus, a pre-test enhances the validity of the research and helps to minimize the issue of invalid questionnaires that cannot be used in the study (Bryman & Bell, 2011). To ensure that the questions were understandable and formulated correctly, and if there were questions that needed to be excluded or added the questionnaire was reviewed by two lectures at Linnaeus University in Växjö. Additionally, 8 representatives of the sample were asked to complete the questionnaire and give feedback in order to avoid confusion and misunderstanding among the respondents when the questionnaire was sent out.

4.6 Sample

A convenience sampling method which is a type of non-probability sampling technique was used for this research due to its accessibility and since it was suitable when taking the time frame into consideration (Bryman & Bell, 2011). However, the disadvantages of using a convenience sampling method is that the sampling process lacks randomness, which is preferred in order to get results that generalizable and representative for the whole population (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Nevertheless, Malhotra and Birks (2010) argue that if the data is collected over a longer period and at different times of the week the diversity of the population is increased which enhances the credibility and it is possible to generalize the results to a greater extent. Since this research investigates the consumer perspective and their attitudes there were no specific criteria for the respondents to fulfill before submitting the questionnaire. The respondents were only required to watch the advertisement in the beginning of the questionnaire.

In order to be able to get results that are generalizable for the population an appropriate size of the sample is required (Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2005; Hair et al., 2010). Furthermore, Green (1991) and Pallant (2010) argue that the sample size should consist of a foundation of 50 respondents and then add eight times the number of independent variables. This gives the formula $N > 50 + 8 \times m$, where $m$ is the number of independent variables. Applying this formula in this study it gives a sample size of at least 74 respondents. However, a larger sample strengthens the quality of the study (Pallant,
After the data collection, there were 138 questionnaires, however six of these were invalid, which resulted in 132 complete questionnaires that were used in the analysis.

4.7 Data analysis method

To analyze the data collected from the questionnaires the statistical program SPSS were used. SPSS helped to first organize the collected data and then test the hypotheses in this study. Bryman and Bell (2011) state that SPSS is common to use among researchers who conduct studies that are quantitative since it gives accurate results when analyzes are performed. The paragraphs presented below describe what needs to take into account when doing analysis in SPSS. Since the items AR6-9 are negative, they were recoded before any analyzes were done.

*Descriptive statistics*

Descriptive statistics are used to describe and summarize the data collected from the questionnaires and in order to give simplified overview of the data it is usually presented in tables or graphs. By presenting the statistics this way it gives a clear picture of how the respondents had answered the questionnaire and the distribution of the characteristics of the sample (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2008). Therefore, to give an overview of the sample the findings of this research is based on, the descriptive data was categorized into age, gender, nationality, education level and occupation, and presented in Table 5.1. Also, when doing the regression analysis, these demographic factors were used as control variables. According to Bryman and Bell (2011) control variables are used to see if the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variables might be influenced by these additional variables.

*Regression analysis*

In order to test the hypotheses, multiple linear regression analyzes were conducted. The analysis was conducted in two steps. First, the influence of affective reaction as an independent variable on attitude towards humorous video storytelling ads and attitude towards dramatic video storytelling ads as dependent variables was tested. In the first step the influence of cognitive evaluation as an independent variable was also tested on the dependent variables mentioned above. Second, the influence of attitude towards humorous video storytelling ads and attitude towards dramatic video storytelling ads as independent variables was tested towards attitude towards the brand as an dependent variable. Richardsson (2011) states that for the relationship between the independent and dependent variables to be statistically significant it must show \( p < 0.05 \). Furthermore, when a regression analysis is conducted it is possible, by studying the beta value, to see the effect of one
variable on another variable. Pallant (2010) states that the beta value shows the relative strength of the relationship between the two variables and if this relationship is positive or negative. Moreover, the adjusted $R^2$ should also be taken into account when conducting regression analysis since it suggests to what extent the independent variable can predict the dependent variable.

4.8 Quality criteria

It consists several types of measurements to ensure the quality of the study. Hair et al. (2010) and Bryman and Bell (2011) argue that the two most vital quality criteria to use when conducting a quantitative study is reliability and validity.

Reliability

External reliability are conducted in order for other researchers to make it possible to replicate the study (Gray, 2009). Thus, the methodological choices are presented and described in a careful and proper sense in this chapter. An external reliability can be ensured when the same measurements generate the same result on various occasions (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Accordingly, the researchers of this study present all the steps that was done upon measuring all the different variables in order for others to be able to replicate the study in the future. According to Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill (2009), both reliability and validity is strengthened when questions from other researchers are used since those already have been tested and accepted, therefore, this study used items from prior research to measure the variables (see Table 4.1).

In order to further ensure the strength and quality of all the collected data a reliability test was conducted. This was done to test if statements that are developed around a variable investigate the same type of area (Bryman & Bell, 2011). To test this a statistical tool referred to as the Cronbach's alpha was used to ensure the internal reliability. Further, Bryman & Bell (2011) state that the alpha score varies between 1 to 0, where a score of 1 indicates perfect internal reliability and 0 indicates that there is no internal reliability. In order for the test to be significant a score of at least 0.6 is preferable otherwise it cannot be considered as reliable (Malhotra & Birks, 2010). Thus, if a variable achieved an alpha score of 0.6 or lower, the items related to that construct were evaluated and deleted in order to acquire a valid value.
Validity

There are different types of measurements to use in order to ensure the validity of the study, for example construct validity and face validity (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Construct validity can be achieved when the hypothesis are generated from relevant theories and connected to the given concepts Saunder, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009; Bryman & Bell, 2011). To ensure the construct validity in this particular study, a set of various constructs in the operationalization was carried out from prior research and relevant theories. Further, this was measured through a correlation analysis in SPSS which is mentioned and known as a Pearson's r correlation coefficient. According to Richardson (2011) this is done to see the actual direction and strength of the relationship of the various constructs. In this research, the variables affective reaction and cognitive evaluation, as well as attitude towards humorous video storytelling ads and attitude towards dramatic video storytelling ads, were tested against each other. Richardson (2011) states that a Pearson’s r correlation analysis generates a value between -1 and 1, where the former indicates a perfectly negative correlation and the latter a perfectly positive correlation. A value of 0 indicates no correlation between the constructs. Furthermore, Hair et al. (2010) argue that a value of 0.3 or less is a weak correlation. Also, the value should neither exceed 0.9 nor be below -0.9 since it indicates that the constructs may measure the same thing. Regarding the face validity, it is used ensure that the measurement reflects the concepts that are being investigated (Bryman & Bell, 2011). To assure the face validity of this research a pre-test was done (see 4.5 Pre-test).

4.8.1 Quality Data Control

In general when conducting regressions, they are sensitive to very low or very high values. Therefore, preliminary analysis were conducted in order to test that there were no violation of normality, multicollinearity, homoscedasticity and linearity (Pallant, 2010). By doing regression analysis with residuals plots this was observed. Furthermore, by observing the variance inflation factors and the coefficients for tolerance it was possible to look for multicollinearity, Pallant (2010) argues that variance inflation factor should be below 10 and the tolerance value should not exceed 0.1. All of the independent variables met these criteria and thus there was no violation of multicollinearity. When looking for outliers using Mahalanobis distance (Pallant, 2010), it was indicated that four of the respondents were outliers. However, since it was these respondents’ opinions the data was not excluded for analysis.
4.9 Methodology summary

The choices of methodology for this study are presented and summarized in table 4.2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Approach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-sectional design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Sources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection Method</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-probability sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Analysis Method</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple linear regression analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality data control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Methodology summary.
5.0 Results

5.1 Descriptive statistics

To get a simplified overview of the sample in this study, the respondents was categorized into five demographics; age, gender, education level, occupation and nationality (see Table 5.1). Regarding the age distribution of the 132 respondents, it is noticeable that a clear majority were in the age group of 23-27 (65.2 %). However, the distribution of the age was not widely diverse since 97 % of the respondents was between 18 and 32 (18-22, 19.7 %; 28-32, 12.1 %), while none was in the age group of 33-37 and only 3 % was 38+. Moreover, the distribution between the genders were relatively equal, where 43.9 % were females and 54.5 % were males. Regarding the level of education, a majority were graduates (48.5 %), then there were a relatively equal distribution between high school (12.1 %), undergraduate (16.7 %) and master’s degree (19.7 %), while PhD was a clear minority (3.0 %). Furthermore, a clear majority were students (72.7 %), followed by respondents with a full time employment (25.8 %) and then unemployed respondents (1.5 %). Finally, regarding the nationality of the respondents, 66.7 % were Swedish and 33.3 % had another nationality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-27</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work full time</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N=132; percentages are rounded to the nearest tenth.

Table 5.1: Descriptive statistics of the sample.
5.2 Reliability and validity

To assure the quality of the study, the measurements for reliability and validity is presented below (see Table 5.2). In the first column is the Cronbach’s alpha of variable presented, which measures the internal reliability (Bryman & Bell, 2011). A value of at least 0.6 indicates that the test is reliable (Malhotra & Birks, 2010). As presented in table 5.2, the variable Attitude toward the brand showed the highest alpha value (.910), followed by Affective reaction (.886), Attitude toward the ad (.834), and Cognitive evaluation (.784). Thus, all of the variables showed an acceptable level of internal reliability and none of the items had to be removed before further analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attitude toward the brand</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Attitude toward the ad</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.707*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Affective reaction</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.602*</td>
<td>.538*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cognitive evaluation</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.751*</td>
<td>.528*</td>
<td>.254*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Cronbach’s alpha and Pearson’s r correlation.

The validity of this study was measured by the use of Pearson’s r correlation, which made it possible to ensure that the variables measure what they are supposed to measure. As shown in table 5.2, all of the correlations are positive and significant (p<0.01), ranging from the strongest correlation (.751) between the variables Attitude toward the brand and Cognitive evaluation to the weakest (.254) between Affective reaction and Cognitive evaluation. The results indicate a relatively strong correlation between the other variables, ranging from .528 to .707. None of the correlations exceeded the value of 0.9 which indicate that the variables do not measure the same area, thus the construct validity was ensured (Hair et al., 2010).

5.3 Hypothesis testing

5.3.1 Attitude toward humorous advertisements

The results from the multiple regression analysis regarding the attitude towards humorous ads are presented in table 5.3. In model 1, the control variables; age, gender, nationality, perception (story) and perception (humor) tested against the dependent variable attitude toward the ad. The control variable age showed a significant relationship with the attitude toward the ad, which indicates that 1 increase in standard deviation of the age variable would lead to a decrease (-.168) of the attitude toward the ad. Also, the variable perception (story) showed a significant relationship and the model
suggests that an increase by 1 in the standard deviation of the perception (story) variable would lead to an increase (.410) of the attitude toward the ad.

Model 2 in table 5.3 presents the results when the control variables together with affective reaction as an independent variable were tested against attitude toward the ad. All of the control variables, expect perception (humor) showed a significant relationship with the dependent variable attitude toward the ad. Also, the independent variable affective reaction showed a significant relationship with attitude toward the ad ($p<0.01$), indicating that an increase by 1 in the standard deviation of affective reaction leads to an increase of attitude toward the ad by .731. Furthermore, it is suggested that 62.7 % of the total variability in attitude toward the ad can be predicted by the model since adjusted $R^2$ showed a value of .627.

In model 3 in table 5.3 are the results of the control variables together with the independent variable cognitive evaluation tested against attitude toward the ad presented. Again, the control variables age and considered as a story a significant relationship with the dependent variable. Also, cognitive evaluation as an independent variable showed a significant and positive relationship with the dependent variable attitude toward the ad since the $p<0.01$ and the beta being .473.

Model 4 in table 5.3 presents the results when the control variables together with both the independent variables affective reaction and cognitive evaluation against the dependent variable attitude toward the ad. All of the control variables showed a significant relationship with the dependent variable. The independent variable affective reaction showed significant ($p<0.01$) and positive relationship with the dependent variable, indicating that an increase by 1 in the standard deviation of affective reaction leads to an increase of attitude toward the ad by .654. Also, cognitive evaluation showed a significant ($p<0.01$) and positive relationship with attitude toward the ad, displaying a beta value of .247, which indicates that if the standard deviation of cognitive evaluation increases by 1, attitude toward the ad would increase by .247. Moreover, since the adjusted $R^2$ showed a value of .668 it is suggested that 66.8 % of the total variability in attitude toward the ad is explained by this model, which is the highest out of the four models. Hence, both hypotheses 1a and 1b are accepted.
### Table 5.3: Regression analysis of attitude toward humorous advertisements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.945** (1.157)</td>
<td>-.054 (.806)</td>
<td>1.152 (1.078)</td>
<td>-.678 (.776)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Control variables**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.168** (.127)</td>
<td>-.170*** (.085)</td>
<td>-.154** (.113)</td>
<td>-.162*** (.080)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.035 (.193)</td>
<td>-.139** (.130)</td>
<td>-.076 (.173)</td>
<td>-.150*** (.122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>.088 (.212)</td>
<td>-.118** (.147)</td>
<td>.046 (.190)</td>
<td>-.118** (.138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception (story)</td>
<td>.410*** (.073)</td>
<td>.201*** (.051)</td>
<td>.179** (.075)</td>
<td>.103* (.053)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception (humor)</td>
<td>.042 (.185)</td>
<td>.084 (.124)</td>
<td>.083 (.166)</td>
<td>.101* (.117)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Independent variables**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective reaction</td>
<td>.731*** (.059)</td>
<td>.654*** (.059)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive evaluation</td>
<td>.473*** (.088)</td>
<td>.247*** (.066)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in R²</td>
<td><strong>.454</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>.171</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>.495</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Attitude toward the ad. N=132; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. Std. Error is presented within parentheses for each variable.

5.3.2 Attitude toward dramatic advertisements

Regarding the attitude toward dramatic ads, the results are presented in table 5.4. As before, model 1 presents the results from when the control variables; age, gender, nationality, perception (story), and perception (drama) are tested against the dependent variable attitude toward the ad. Only the variable perception (story) showed a significant relationship with attitude toward the ad with a beta value of .400, which indicates that an increase by 1 in standard deviation of perception (story) would lead to an increase by .400 in attitude toward the ad.

In model 2 are the results for when the control variables together with the independent variable affective reaction are tested against the dependent variable attitude toward the ad presented. Similar to model 1, in model 2 the variable perception (story) showed a significant and positive relationship with attitude toward the ad with a beta value of .369. Also, the control variable nationality showed a significant relationship the dependent variable with a beta value of -.152. The independent variable affective reaction displayed a significant (p<0.05) and positive relationship (.201).

Model 3 in table 5.4 presents the results from when the control variables together with cognitive evaluation as an independent variable are tested against attitude toward the ad. Similar to previous
models, the variable perception (story) showed a significant and positive relationship with the dependent variable in model 3. Also, the independent variable cognitive evaluation displayed a significant (p<0.01) and positive relationship with attitude toward the ad, showing a beta value of .370.

Model 4 illustrates the results of when the control variables together with both of the independent variables are tested against the dependent variable attitude toward the ad. In this model the control variable perception (story) showed a significant and positive relationship with the dependent variables. Also, both of the independent variables showed a significant and positive relationship with attitude toward the ad, but at different levels of significance, p<0.05 for affective reaction and p<0.01 for cognitive evaluation. The model indicates that an increase by 1 in the standard deviation of affective reaction would lead to an increase by .190 in attitude toward the ad. For cognitive evaluation the beta value was .362, which indicate that if the standard deviation of cognitive evaluation is increased by 1, attitude toward the ad would increase by .362. Furthermore, the adjusted R² displayed the highest value out of the four model with a value of .275. This suggests that 27.5 % of the total variability in attitude toward the ad can be predicted by this model. Hence, both hypotheses 2a and 2b are accepted.
### Table 5.4: Regression analysis of attitude toward dramatic advertisements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.976 (1.250)</td>
<td>1.728 (1.231)</td>
<td>.475 (1.231)</td>
<td>.271 (1.211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.026 (.108)</td>
<td>-.009 (.108)</td>
<td>.006 (.102)</td>
<td>-.026 (.102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.047 (.165)</td>
<td>.024 (.163)</td>
<td>.045 (.155)</td>
<td>.024 (.153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>-.108 (.182)</td>
<td>-.152* (.183)</td>
<td>-.022 (.177)</td>
<td>-.066 (.178)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception (story)</td>
<td>.400*** (.093)</td>
<td>.369*** (.092)</td>
<td>.227** (.100)</td>
<td>.201** (.099)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception (drama)</td>
<td>.031 (.183)</td>
<td>.016 (.180)</td>
<td>.056 (.173)</td>
<td>.042 (.170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective reaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.201** (.075)</td>
<td>.190** (.071)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.370*** (.098)</td>
<td>.362*** (.097)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted ( R^2 )</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in ( R^2 )</td>
<td>.036**</td>
<td>.099***</td>
<td>.131***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Attitude toward the ad. \( N=132; \) \*\( p<0.1; \) \*\*\( p<0.05; \) \*\*\*\( p<0.01. \) Std. Error is presented within parentheses for each variable.

### 5.3.3 Attitude toward the brand

The results from the multiple regression analysis regarding the attitude toward the brand are presented in table 5.5. In model 1 the control variables; age, gender, nationality, and perception (story), tested against the dependent variable attitude toward the brand. Only the variable perception (story) showed a significant (\( p<0.01 \)) and positive (.454) relationship.

In model 2, besides the control variables, the independent variable attitude toward humorous ads is tested against attitude toward the brand. As in model 1, the variable perception (story) showed a significant (\( p<0.01 \)) and positive (.241) relationship with attitude toward the brand. Also, attitude toward humorous ads displayed a significant (\( p<0.01 \)) and positive (.534) relationship with the dependent variable. Moreover, the adjusted \( R^2 \) was .418, which indicates that 41.8 % of the total variability in attitude toward the brand can be explained by this model.

Model 3 included the control variables and the independent variable attitude toward dramatic ads and was tested against attitude toward the brand. Once again, the control variable perception (story) showed a significant (\( p<0.01 \)) and positive (.346) relationship with the dependent variable. Furthermore, attitude toward dramatic ads displayed a significant and positive relationship with the
independent variable attitude toward the brand with a p<0.01 and a beta value of .387. Also, the model displayed an adjusted $R^2$ of .316.

In model 4 in table 5.5 are the control variables together with both of the independent variables tested against attitude toward the brand. Similar to previous model, the variable perception (story) showed a significant and positive (.169) relationship with attitude toward the brand, but at a different significance level, p<0.05. Both of the independent variables showed a significant (p<0.01) and positive relationship with attitude toward the brand. Attitude toward humorous ads displayed a beta value of .487, while attitude toward dramatic ads showed a beta value of .322. This indicates that an increase by 1 in standard deviation of attitude toward humorous ads would lead to an increase of .487 in attitude toward the brand. With the same assumption for attitude toward dramatic ads, attitude toward the brand would increase by .322. Moreover, the adjusted $R^2$ was .510 which indicates that 51% of the total variability in attitude toward the brand can be predicted by this model, which is the highest out of the four models. Hence, the hypotheses H3 and H4 are accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.590*** (.523)</td>
<td>1.517*** (.465)</td>
<td>1.315** (.540)</td>
<td>.550 (.470)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.055 (.102)</td>
<td>.020 (.087)</td>
<td>-.044 (.093)</td>
<td>.023 (.080)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.040 (.155)</td>
<td>.071 (.131)</td>
<td>.004 (.143)</td>
<td>.039 (.121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>-.034 (.172)</td>
<td>-.075 (.145)</td>
<td>.003 (.158)</td>
<td>-.040 (.134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception (story)</td>
<td>.454*** (.087)</td>
<td>.241*** (.080)</td>
<td>.346*** (.083)</td>
<td>.169** (.075)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward humorous ads</td>
<td>.534*** (.061)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.487*** (.056)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward dramatic ads</td>
<td>.387*** (.074)</td>
<td>.322*** (.063)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in $R^2$</td>
<td>.233***</td>
<td>.135***</td>
<td>.325***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Attitude toward the brand. N=132; *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. Std. Error is presented within parentheses for each variable.

Table 5.5: Regression analysis of attitude toward the brand.
5.4 Summary of hypothesis testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1a</strong> The affective reaction to the use of humor has a positive relationship with the attitude towards humorous video storytelling ads.</td>
<td>Accepted***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1b</strong> The cognitive evaluation of the use of humor has a positive relationship with the attitude towards humorous video storytelling ads.</td>
<td>Accepted***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2a</strong> The affective reaction to the use of drama has a positive relationship with the attitude towards dramatic video storytelling ads.</td>
<td>Accepted**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2b</strong> The cognitive evaluation of the use of drama has a positive relationship with the attitude towards dramatic video storytelling ads.</td>
<td>Accepted***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3</strong> The attitude towards humorous video storytelling ads has a positive relationship with the attitude towards the brand.</td>
<td>Accepted***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4</strong> The attitude towards dramatic video storytelling ads has a positive relationship with the attitude towards the brand.</td>
<td>Accepted***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 5.6: Summary of hypothesis testing.
6.0 Discussion

6.1 Attitude toward the brand

As stated by Walla, Brenner and Koller (2013) the attitude towards the brand is formed by the consumers’ emotions and experiences, which can be affected by advertisements. This is in accordance to the results in table 5.5, which suggests that the attitude towards advertisements has a positive relationship with the attitude towards the brand on significance level of p<0.01. Also, this confirms the argument by Solomon et al. (2013) that one’s attitude towards an object can affect the attitude one has towards a second object, if the objects are associated with each other. This is also in line with the findings of Mitchell & Olson (1981), Shimp (1981), Spears and Singh (2004), and Sallam and Algammash (2016) who found that the attitude towards the ad may affect the attitude towards the brand.

Furthermore, the brand is according to Spears and Singh (2004), De Chernatony, McDonald and Wallace (2011), and Lundqvist et al. (2012) more than a product or a service, it has a relationship with the consumer which is based on a functional and emotional value from the consumer towards the brand. This is applicable to this study since the researchers have measured video advertisements that focus on two specific emotions, humorous and dramatic. As seen in table 5.5, both the attitude towards humorous ads and the attitude towards dramatic ads showed a positive beta value, indicating a positive relationship with the attitude towards the brand for both of the emotional messages in advertising. The results indicate that attitude toward humorous ads has a stronger relationship with attitude toward the brand compared to attitude toward dramatic ads, with beta values of .487 and .322, which has not been investigated in prior research. However, the effect of humorous and dramatic advertisements has been researched in separate studies and has shown to have a positive relationship with the attitude towards the brand (e.g. Chung & Zhao, 2011; Chebat, Vercollier & Gélinas-Chebat, 2003), which also is confirmed in this study.

Moreover, the results suggest that whether the viewer sees the advertisement as a story or not also affects the attitude towards the brand, which is in accordance to Kim, Lloyd and Cervellon (2016) who state that advertisements that tell a story are effective when building the brand since they engage the consumers. This is further supported by Dessart (2017) who argues that storytelling advertisements creates a stronger emotional connection with the viewer, compared to factual advertisement. Furthermore, Dessart (2017) states that by using stories in advertisements consumers are able to process the content more effective since it happens more unconsciously. The results of
this study also correspond to Escalas’ (2007) findings that the narrative transportation that occurs when stories are told affects the brand and the attitude towards it in a positive way.

6.2 Attitude toward humorous advertisements

As seen in table 5.3, the results of this study indicate that the affective reaction and the cognitive evaluation of advertisements have a positive relationship with the attitude towards humorous advertisements at a significance level of p<0.01. This is in accordance to prior research by Shimp (1981) and Madden, Allen and Twible (1988) who argue that these two dimensions, the affective reaction and the cognitive evaluation, affect the attitude towards the advertisement. Furthermore, the results suggest that the affective reaction has a stronger relationship with the attitude towards humorous ads, compared to the cognitive evaluation. The affective reaction showed a beta value of .654, indicating that an increase by 1 in standard deviation of affective reaction would increase attitude toward humorous ads by .654. Meanwhile, the cognitive evaluation displayed a beta value of .247, indicating a weaker, yet positive, relationship with the attitude towards humorous advertisements. This corresponds to the arguments that the affective reaction is the dominant response when exposed to an advertisement (MacKenzie, Lutz & Belch, 1986; Slovic, 2004) and that the emotional response to the advertisement plays an important role in how the attitude changes (Morris, Woo & Cho, 2003; Morris et al., 2009).

Moreover, Madden and Weinberger (1982) state that the effect of humor may vary depending on demographics variables, such as age and gender, since what is considered as humorous is personal. The results of this study confirm this argument since all of the control variables in model 4 in table 5.3 showed a significant relationship with the attitude towards humorous advertisements, however at different levels of significance. Interesting to note is also that, similar to the results in table 5.5, whether the advertisement is seen as a story or not affects the attitude towards the advertisement, which confirms the theories that storytelling is a powerful tool to affect the consumers and their attitudes (Escalas, 2007; Akgun et al., 2015).

6.3 Attitude toward dramatic advertisements

The results in table 5.4 indicate that both the affective reaction and the cognitive evaluation has a significant and positive relationship with the attitude towards dramatic advertisements, however at different level of significance. Similar to the results in table 5.3, this is in line with previous research regarding affective reaction, cognitive evaluation and their effect on the attitude towards advertisements (Shimp, 1981; Madden, Allen & Twible, 1988). However, the cognitive evaluation
showed a stronger relationship with the attitude towards dramatic advertisements with a beta value of .362, compared to the affective reaction which displayed a beta value of .190. This is not in accordance to MacKenzie, Lutz and Belch (1986) and Slovic (2004) who state that the affective reaction is the dominant response when exposed to an advertisement. Also, this do not correspond with the results in table 5.3 where affective reaction showed a stronger relationship with the attitude towards the ad than the cognitive evaluation. This implies that dramatic advertisements evoke different emotions among the viewers compared to humorous advertisements, which confirms previous studies arguing that dramas evoke sympathy and empathy (Escalas, 2003) while humor makes the viewer laugh (Madden & Weinberger, 1982).

Furthermore, in accordance to the results in table 5.3 and 5.5 it is also indicated in table 5.4 that whether the advertisement is considered to be a story or not has a relationship with the attitude towards the ad. Once again, this confirms previous studies regarding the effect of storytelling and the emotional connection a story creates (Escalas, 2007; Dessart, 2017), which in turn affects the attitude of the consumers (Akgun et al., 2015). However, the adjusted $R^2$ for model 4 showed a value of .275, which compared to the adjusted $R^2$ of model 4 in table 5.3 (.668) and model 4 in table 5.5 (.510) is fairly low. This indicates that model 4 in table 5.4 cannot predict the dependent variable to the same extent as model 4 in table 5.3 and model 4 in table 5.5. It is possible that the attitude towards dramatic ads is more complex and thus difficult to predict with the variables used in the model. Therefore, adding variables could potentially increase the explanatory power of the model. Another possible explanation for the low adjusted $R^2$ is that several psychological factors can influence the attitude and thus people can be fairly unpredictable.

6.4 Attitude toward humorous and dramatic advertisements - a comparison

As discussed before, the affective reaction showed a stronger relationship with attitude toward humorous advertisements (.654) than with attitude toward dramatic advertisements (.190). One possible explanation for this may be that the affective reaction is considered to be either positive or negative (Lantos, 2011; Schiffman & Wisenblit, 2015) and that there is a distinct difference between positive and negative affection (Madden, Allen & Twible, 1985; Burner, 2009). An advertisement that is found to be humorous will most likely evoke laughter which is a clear positive affective reaction. In comparison, dramatic advertisements evoke sympathetic and empathetic feelings where the viewer is concerned about the well-being of the characters in the ad and can relate to their feelings (Escalas & Stern, 2003). The sympathetic and empathetic response to the advertisement cannot be as clearly divided into a positive or negative affective reaction as the
laughter from a humorous advertisement, which suggests that dramatic advertisements evoke feelings that are more complex than humorous advertisements. This difficulty to clearly divide the affective reaction into positive or negative when exposed to a dramatic humorous advertisement may also lead to difficulties forming a positive or negative the attitude towards the brand that is being portrayed in the advertisement, which the results also indicate showing a fairly weak relationship between affective reaction and attitude towards dramatic advertisements (.190).

Furthermore, the cognitive evaluation showed a fairly weak relationship with both attitude toward humorous advertisements (.247) and attitude toward dramatic advertisements (.362). It may depend on that the affective reaction is considered to be highly spontaneous (Batra & Ray, 1986; Slovic, 2004), while the cognitive evaluation is the perception and knowledge that has been gained from experiences (Solomon et al., 2013; Schiffman & Wisenblit, 2015) and thus is more evaluative and not as spontaneous as the affective reaction, therefore it may not affect the attitude towards the ad to the same extent as the affective reaction.
7.0 Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to extend the understanding of the effect of video storytelling advertisements on consumers’ attitude towards the brand. The findings suggest that video advertisements positively influence the consumers’ attitude towards the brand. Furthermore, the findings suggest that the emotional message in the advertisements affects consumers’ attitude towards the brand differently. An advertisement of humorous nature evokes a more positive affective reaction compared to one of dramatic nature, while the cognitive evaluation is more positive when exposed to a dramatic advertisement. The findings also suggest that the attitude towards humorous advertisement not only is affected by the affective and cognitive dimensions, it is also affected by the demographics of the viewer. This indicates that humor is perceived differently by different individuals which needs to be taken into consideration when it comes to marketing communication. Also, findings indicate that the attitude towards the brand is affected positively if the advertisement is seen as a story by the viewer, which shows that storytelling is an efficient approach to use within marketing communication.
8.0 Research implications

8.1 Theoretical implications
The topics attitude toward the brand and attitude towards the ad have been explored in prior branding literature (e.g. Shimp, 1981; Madden, Allen & Twible, 1988; Spears & Singh, 2004; Lundqvist et al. 2012; Solomon et al. 2013; Walla, Brenner & Koller, 2013). However, prior research have not explored how different emotional messages in video storytelling advertisements affects consumers’ attitude. Therefore, the present study tried to enlighten this in order to broaden the perspective in branding literature. This research contributes to branding literature by extend the understanding for how different emotional message in video storytelling advertisements affect consumers’ attitude towards the brand. The findings suggest that advertisements of humorous nature has a stronger relationship with the attitude towards the brand compared to advertisements of dramatic nature. Furthermore, it is suggested that the affective reaction evoked when one is exposed to an humorous advertisement has the strongest relationship with the attitude towards the ad, while when exposed to a dramatic advertisement the cognitive evaluation as a stronger relationship with the attitude towards the ad. Also, this study confirms findings from previous studies that storytelling can be used to affect the attitude of consumers (Escalas, 2007; Dessart, 2017).

8.2 Managerial implications
Through the findings of this study, information about how consumers’ attitude towards the brand is affected by different emotion messages in storytelling advertisements been generated. Since hundreds of billions are spent every year on advertising (Statista, 2018), marketing managers need to know how different advertisements affect the attitude towards their brand in order for them to know how to use their resources efficiently. Thus, this information can be of value for them. Moreover, based on the findings of this study, it is suggested that companies should produce video advertisements with a humorous message since it showed the strongest positive relationship with the attitude towards the brand. Also, an advertisement of humorous nature evokes the strongest and most positive affective reaction, which is dominant response when exposed to advertisement and an important factor in forming the attitude both towards the ad and the brand (e.g. Lutz, 1985; Slovic, 2004; Morris et al., 2009). Furthermore, the advertisement should also tell a story since the findings of this study indicate that an advertisement that is seen as a story has a positive relationship with both the attitude towards the brand and the attitude towards the ad. Also, marketing managers should be aware of that the attitude towards humorous ads is affected by demographic variables,
such as age, gender and nationality, which needs to be taken into consideration when creating the advertisement.

To summarize, marketing managers should aim to create humorous video advertisements that tell a story in order to affect the attitude towards the brand in the most positive way. Also, they should have knowledge about the targeted audience that is going to see the advertisement since attitude towards humorous advertisement is affected by demographic variables.

8.3 Limitations and future research

Even though the researchers tried to ensure the quality of this study by different measurement of validity and reliability this research has some limitations. First, this study used a convenience sampling method to collect the data which inhibit the randomness of the sample. The sample consisted of a clear majority in the age range 18-32. Also, a majority of respondents were Swedish.

For future research it is recommended to use of a sampling method that is random since could generate a more diverse sample, which in turn could generate results that are generalizable to a greater extent. Also, since the findings of this study indicate that the attitude towards humorous advertisements is affected by demographic variables, such as age, gender, and nationality, which is supported by Madden and Weinberger (1982), it could be of interest to specify the sample to specific demographics to investigate if attitudes is affected by cultural values. Second, this study choose to research two emotional messages in advertisements, since there were a difference in how these emotions affected the attitude towards the brand it could be of interest in the future to investigate how other emotional messages affect the attitude. Third, the researchers tried to minimize the risk of brand familiarity by include two advertisements from each brand, one humorous and one dramatic. However, since two well-known brands were used to the risk of brand familiarity and respondents having a preference of a particular brand cannot be excluded. Therefore, further research where different and/or fictitious brand are used is needed in order to further validate the findings of this study. Also, the attitude towards the brand was measured after the respondents viewed the advertisement and therefore one cannot know for sure that the advertisement affected their attitude towards the brand. Therefore, in order to try to validate the results of this study it is suggested that in future research measure the attitude towards the brand before the advertisement is viewed and then again after to see if the advertisement affected the attitude, since there are contradictory studies whether brand familiarity affects the relationship between attitude toward the ad and attitude toward the brand or not (Edell & Burke, 1986; Machleit, & Wilson, 1988).
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Appendices

Appendix 1

Hi,

Before we get started we would initially like to extend our greatest appreciation that you are taking the time to fill out this survey.

We are two masters students in marketing enrolled at the School of Business and Economics at Linnaeus University in Växjö, Sweden. Currently we are conducting our masters thesis that focus on to extend the understanding of the effect of video storytelling advertisements on consumers’ attitude towards the brand. The survey consists of two videos and you will be asked to answer the same type of questions correlated to each of the videos.

All the collected data will be kept strictly confidential.

If you have any further questions or considerations feel free to contact us.
Once again, thank you!

Sincerely.

Pontus Liljenberg, MSc. student in marketing.
Pl222id@student.lnu.se

Oskar Bloom, MSc. student in marketing.
Ob222cv@student.lnu.se
Part 1

Please watch this video:
Volvo Dramatic https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NLqerrzVpEM
I just watched the video above:
- Yes
- No

In the following two statement you will be asked to rate on a scale 1-7 how you experienced to advertisement.

1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Slightly Disagree, 4 = Neither Agree, 5 = Slightly Agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly Agree

The ad told a story:
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

The ad had a beginning, middle, and end:
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

For the advertisement you just saw, please rate how descriptive each of the following statements is of how you personally reacted to this ad:

Based on what was happening in the advertisement, I understood what the characters were feeling.
not at all descriptive  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  very descriptive

Based in what was happening in the advertisement, I understood what was bothering the characters.
not at all descriptive  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  very descriptive

I was able to recognize the problems that the characters in the ad had.
not at all descriptive  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  very descriptive
While watching the ad, I experienced feeling as if the events were really happening to me.

*not at all descriptive* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very descriptive*

While watching the ad, I felt as though the events in the ad were happening to me.

*not at all descriptive* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very descriptive*

While watching the ad, I experienced many of the same feelings that the characters portrayed.

*not at all descriptive* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very descriptive*

**Part 2**

In order to answer the following questions you have to choose a number on the scale rating from one to seven, depending on how you relate to the questions being asked.

1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Slightly Disagree, 4 = Neither Agree, 5 = Slightly Agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly Agree

Did the ad for Volvo make you feel good?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volvo make you feel cheerful?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volvo make you feel comfortable?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volvo make you feel excited?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volvo make you feel calm?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volvo make you feel insulted?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Did the ad for Volvo make you feel irritated?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volvo make you feel repulsed?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volvo make you feel sad?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I found the ad:
*not believable* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *believable*

*not informative* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *informative*

*not persuasive* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *persuasive*

*not ingenious* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *ingenious*

*unpleasant* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *pleasant*

*unlikable* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *likable*

*boring* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *interesting*

*tasteless* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *tasteful*

*artless* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *artful*

*bad* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *good*
Please describe your overall feelings about the brand described in the ad you just watched.

unappealing 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 appealing

bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good

unpleasant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 pleasant

unfavorable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 favorable

unlikable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 likable

Part 3

Please watch this video:
Volkswagen humoristic https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YdZMypElBpo
I just watched the video above:
- Yes
- No

In the following two statement you will be asked to rate on a scale 1-7 how you experienced to advertisement.

1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Slightly Disagree, 4 = Neither Agree, 5 = Slightly Agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly Agree

The ad told a story:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

The ad had a beginning, middle, and end:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I found the ad:
not humorous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very humorous
Part 4

In order to answer the following questions you have to choose a number on the scale rating from one to seven, depending on how you relate to the questions being asked.

1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Slightly Disagree, 4 = Neither Agree, 5 = Slightly Agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly Agree

Did the ad for Volkswagen make you feel good?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volkswagen make you feel cheerful?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volkswagen make you feel comfortable?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volkswagen make you feel excited?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volkswagen make you feel calm?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volkswagen make you feel insulted?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volkswagen make you feel irritated?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volkswagen make you feel repulsed?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Did the ad for Volkswagen make you feel sad?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I found the ad:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>believable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persuasive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ingenious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interesting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tasteful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>artful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please describe your overall feelings about the brand described in the ad you just watched.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>appealing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

unappealing
bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
unpleasant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 pleasant
unfavorable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 favorable
unlikable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 likable

Part 5

Control questions:

Age
- 18-22
- 23-27
- 28-32
- 33-37
- 38+

Gender
- Female
- Male
- Prefer not to say

Nationality
Please write

Highest level of education
- High school graduate
- Under graduate
- Gradute
- Masters degree
- PhD
5. Occupation
   - Student
   - Work half time
   - Work full time
   - Unemployed
   - Other

Thank you for your participation!

Best regards,
Oskar & Pontus
Appendix 2

Hi,
Before we get started we would initially like to extend our greatest appreciation that you are taking the time to fill out this survey.

We are two masters students in marketing enrolled at the School of Business and Economics at Linnaeus University in Växjö, Sweden. Currently we are conducting our masters thesis that focus on to extend the understanding of the effect of video storytelling advertisements on consumers' attitude towards the brand. The survey consists of two videos and you will be asked to answer the same type of questions correlated to each of the videos.

All the collected data will be kept strictly confidential.

If you have any further questions or considerations feel free to contact us.
Once again, thank you!

Sincerely.

Pontus Liljenberg, MSc. student in marketing.
PI222id@student.lnu.se

Oskar Bloom, MSc. student in marketing.
Ob222cv@student.lnu.se
Part 1

Please watch this video:
Volkswagen dramatic https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O7Nh7IAIOVA

I just watched the video above:
- Yes
- No

In the following two statement you will be asked to rate on a scale 1-7 how you experienced to advertisement.

1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Slightly Disagree, 4 = Neither Agree, 5 = Slightly Agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly Agree

The ad told a story:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

The ad had a beginning, middle, and end:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

For the advertisement you just saw, please rate how descriptive each of the following statements is of how you personally reacted to this ad:

Based on what was happening in the advertisement, I understood what the characters were feeling.

*not at all descriptive* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very descriptive*

Based in what was happening in the advertisement, I understood what was bothering the characters.

*not at all descriptive* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very descriptive*

I was able to recognize the problems that the characters in the ad had.

*not at all descriptive* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very descriptive*
While watching the ad, I experienced feeling as if the events were really happening to me.

*not at all descriptive*  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  *very descriptive*

While watching the ad, I felt as though the events in the ad were happening to me.

*not at all descriptive*  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  *very descriptive*

While watching the ad, I experienced many of the same feelings that the characters portrayed.

*not at all descriptive*  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  *very descriptive*

**Part 2**

In order to answer the following questions you have to choose a number on the scale rating from one to seven, depending on how you relate to the questions being asked.

1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Slightly Disagree, 4 = Neither Agree, 5 = Slightly Agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly Agree

Did the ad for Volkswagen make you feel good?
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Did the ad for Volkswagen make you feel cheerful?
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Did the ad for Volkswagen make you feel comfortable?
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Did the ad for Volkswagen make you feel excited?
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Did the ad for Volkswagen make you feel calm?
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Did the ad for Volkswagen make you feel insulted?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volkswagen make you feel irritated?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volkswagen make you feel repulsed?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volkswagen make you feel sad?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I found the ad:
not believable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 believable
not informative 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 informative
not persuasive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 persuasive
not ingenious 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ingenious
unpleasant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 pleasant
unlikable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 likable
boring 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 interesting
tasteless 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 tasteful
artless 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 artful
bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
Please describe your overall feelings about the brand described in the ad you just watched.

| unappealing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | appealing |
| bad         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | good      |
| unpleasant  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | pleasant  |
| unfavorable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | favorable |
| unlikable   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | likable   |

**Part 3**

Please watch this video:
Volvo humoristic https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=avpNpB1xChw

I just watched the video above:
- Yes
- No

In the following two statement you will be asked to rate on a scale 1-7 how you experienced to advertisement.

1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Slightly Disagree, 4 = Neither Agree, 5 = Slightly Agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly Agree

The ad told a story:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

The ad had a beginning, middle, and end:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I found the ad:
not humorous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very humorous
not funny 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very funny
not amusing 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very amusing

Part 4

In order to answer the following questions you have to choose a number on the scale rating from one to seven, depending on how you relate to the questions being asked.

1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Slightly Disagree, 4 = Neither Agree, 5 = Slightly Agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly Agree

Did the ad for Volvo make you feel good?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volvo make you feel cheerful?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volvo make you feel comfortable?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volvo make you feel excited?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volvo make you feel calm?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volvo make you feel insulted?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volvo make you feel irritated?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Did the ad for Volvo make you feel repulsed?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Did the ad for Volvo make you feel sad?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I found the ad:
not believable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 believable
not informative 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 informative
not persuasive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 persuasive
not ingenious 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ingenious
unpleasant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 pleasant
unlikable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 likable
boring 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 interesting
tasteless 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 tasteful
artless 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 artful
bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
Please describe your overall feelings about the brand described in the ad you just watched.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unappealing</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>appealing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unpleasant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfavorable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlikable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>likable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part 5**

Control questions:

**Age**
- 18-22
- 23-27
- 28-32
- 33-37
- 38+

**Gender**
- Female
- Male
- Prefer not to say

**Nationality**
*Please write*

**Highest level of education**
- High school graduate
- Under graduate
- Graduate
- Masters degree
- PhD

5. Occupation
- Student
- Work half time
- Work full time
- Unemployed
- Other

Thank you for your participation!

Best regards,

Oskar & Pontus