APPENDIX

1. Appendix 1: Interview guides

The next interview guides have been established in English and one interviewee preferred to answer in French. I wrote down the literal words of the person speaking based on my recordings of the interviews so some paragraphs may not always be grammatically correct.

We have decided to organise the interviews in a semi-structured way to have some prepared open questions to build up the interview but to keep some room for flexibility and to adapt our questions according to the responses of the interviewee. The bold and bold italic questions from the interview guide are the pre-established questions whereas the simple italic questions are the questions made up during the interview.

I always started the interviews by presenting myself as such:

Hello, my name is Cedric Couvreur and I am a student at the Université catholique de Louvain studying International Management. I am doing my thesis on 'the use of humour in socially responsible advertisements' – and more particularly concentrating on the Rainforest Alliance (an NGO). I would like to ask you some questions about CSR, humour and more specifically on the impacts of humour used in socially responsible advertisements.

A. Appendix 1.1.: Interview 1

Name: Mathieu Jahnich

Date: 8 June 2015

Time: 50 minutes

Language: Pre-established questions in English, questions asked during the interview in French and answers in French.

1. Questions

1.1. Person-related questions

- ***Could you present yourself and your job briefly?***

Je m'appelle Mathieu Jahnich, je suis formateur et gérant de Sircome, une agence française en stratégie et communication marketing. Je suis un ancien chercheur en sciences de l'information de la communication sur les questions environnementales et de la RSE.

Sircome est une agence où l'on accompagne des acteurs privés et publics dans leurs actions de communication et marketing et sur les enjeux de l'environnement. A côté de ça, Sircome est un type de réflexion sur la communication environnementale que j'anime depuis 2005. Dans lequel j'analyse des campagnes de communication de différents acteurs du monde entier.

- ***Do you have any experience in assessing the impact of humour in advertisements?***

Pas directement dans le sens où je n'ai pas accompagné d'entreprises ou une certaine campagne. Par contre c'est un sujet qui m'intéresse depuis longtemps. Je suis un expert reconnu en France sur le sujet de la communication, de la RSE et du greenwashing.

1.2. General questions regarding CSR, humour, advertisements and NGOs

- ***Do you think companies can advertise about CSR? What type of CSR is most appropriate?***

Oui les entreprises qui s'engagent sur une réelle stratégie RSE doivent communiquer. La publicité étant un des leviers de communication possible. Donc oui il faut communiquer. Maintenant si c'est juste publier un spot publicitaire de 30 secondes, je pense que c'est un peu risqué, même si l'entreprise fait des choses concrètes. Je pense qu'il est mieux que les entreprises s'expriment sur des réseaux et des plateformes expertes, plus larges et la pub peut venir par après bien sûr.

- *Si une entreprise ne base pas sa stratégie sur la RSE, est-ce qu'elle a toujours intérêt à communiquer à propos de la RSE ?*

Si elle ne fait rien ou rien de sérieux et si elle communique de manière disproportionnée elle n'a pas intérêt à le faire. Déjà parce qu'elle risque de se faire attaquer par la communauté greenwashing et deuxièmement vis-à-vis de ses salariés, il y a un décalage qui se crée entre le discours à l'extérieur et ce qu'il se passe vraiment en interne. Donc de toute façon à moyen terme, ce n'est pas avantageux de communiquer à ce sujet-là si on ne fait rien de sérieux.

- *Quel type de RSE est le plus approprié? Est-ce que vous trouvez qu'il y a différents types de RSE et est-ce que les entreprises peuvent parler de tous les différents sujets ?*

Chaque entreprise doit trouver une stratégie RSE qui correspond à son histoire, à son business, au milieu dans lequel elle est implantée, etc. A partir du moment où il y a des actions réelles, il y a une possibilité de communiquer dessus. Que ce soit de

l'environnemental ou du social, que ce soit le début ou une démarche très avancée, je crois qu'il y a des choses à dire et l'enjeu c'est de le dire bien.

- ***Can NGOs advertise about CSR? Do you think every sector can use humour in advertisement?***

D'une certaine manière on attend des associations la même transparence que les entreprises. Non seulement sur les fonds qui leur sont versés et la manière dont ils les réutilisent. On a vu en France la semaine dernière que la Croix-Rouge a été très critiquée pour la manière dont elle a géré son personnel.

Ce n'est pas parce qu'une ONG œuvre pour le bien public, qu'elle ne doit pas mettre en place une stratégie RSE solide. Et après elle peut communiquer dessus. Mais c'est vrai qu'on n'attend pas ça d'une ONG, mais pour moi c'est la moindre des choses.

- *Et plus spécifiquement sur les publicités RSE des ONG à propos de leur propre stratégie?*

Si elles font des choses, il n'y a pas de problèmes. Mais c'est vrai que souvent on ne les attend pas là-dessus. Que ce soit des entreprises, des institutions, des associations, des ONG,… tout acteur doit s'inscrire dans une démarche de développement durable et donc mettre en place une stratégie RSE et donc potentiellement communiquer dessus.

- *Est-ce que vous pensez qu'il y a une grande différence entre la manière dont les ONG communiquent sur leur stratégie RSE par rapport aux entreprises?*

Je ne connais pas beaucoup d'ONG qui communiquent à propos de leur stratégie RSE. C'est-à-dire que si vous prenez Greenpeace, leur communication est à propos de toutes leurs actions qu'ils entreprennent par rapport à l'environnement. Du coup, on ne sait pas les choses qui se passent au niveau social chez eux.

Je pense que les ONG communiquent beaucoup plus sur leurs champs d'actions, leurs objectifs, etc.

- *Est-ce que vous connaissez l'entreprise Rainforest Alliance ?*

Oui, tout à fait. Avec leur vidéo Follow the frog.

- *Quelque part ils parlent quand même de leur stratégie RSE ?*

Oui je vois ce que vous voulez dire. Là on est dans un cas particulier où l'ONG parle de son propre label, de son corps de métier. Elle est en train de promouvoir son propre produit, qui est un produit engagé on est d'accord. Effectivement comme une entreprise pourrait parler de son nouveau produit.

C'est un exemple que je montre très souvent en cours. Pour moi c'est un exemple très réussi de l'utilisation de l'humour. De prendre le message général de culpabilisation à contrepied tout en proposant un geste concret que j'espère efficace. Pour moi c'est un très bon exemple de créativité et de la communication sur le sujet de la RSE de manière positive, marrante et spectaculaire.

- *Est-ce que vous pensez que c'est mieux de parler de la RSE sur le ton de l'humour ou est-ce que c'est plus efficace de dénoncer les problèmes, montrer des enfants pauvres, etc. Quel type va plus attirer l'attention du consommateur et générer une action ?*

Je pense que les deux sont complémentaires et que ça dépend des associations etc. Ce qui est sûr c'est qu'uniquement montrer des images choquantes (par exemple la famine en Afrique ou les catastrophes naturelles), ça crée un sentiment d'urgence à un moment donné mais ce n'est pas un engagement qui dure dans le temps. Donc simplement montrer des effets négatifs, ce n'est pas nécessairement ça qui mène à changer le comportement mais ça peut mener à une certaine sensibilisation. Ce qui est intéressant avec la créativité et l'humour c'est que ça permet d'aborder ces thèmes d'une autre manière et l'humour permet de dédramatiser, d'enlever cette culpabilisation. Mais derrière il faut que ce soit supporté par un acteur qui est crédible et qui propose une solution responsable.

On a vu trop d'entreprises privées qui ont utilisé de l'humour pour dénigrer un certain geste écolo et qui continuent à vendre leurs produits conventionnels. Avec Rainforest on a un label qui est reconnu et une campagne qui a un ton différent. Leur clip est super, c'est très marrant. Le produit fini est très intéressant.

- ***Which message is more likely to be credible? A CSR message from a company or from an NGO?***

Ça dépend à quel sujet. En général comme ça on ne peut pas répondre. Tout dépend de la crédibilité de l'acteur. Pour une entreprise on va avoir l'impression qu'elle veut faire du business avec ses histoires de développement durable. Une ONG qui parle de ça, on aura plus

tendance à la croire. Maintenant, il ne faut pas oublier que pour Rainforest, le business est derrière aussi. Les gens ont plus confiance dans les ONG en général que les entreprises, ça c'est clair. Après, les deux sont légitimes pour parler de leurs engagements mais les deux peuvent aussi être critiqués d'une manière non appropriée.

- *Donc vous pensez qu'il n'y pas vraiment de différence entre les deux, ça dépend de la crédibilité ?*

Ca dépend de ce qu'ils font. Quel que soit l'organisation, si vous faites des choses solides sur le terrain avec des partenaires, vous avez des indicateurs. Si vous communiquez d'une manière proportionnée dessus il n'y a pas de soucis.

La réception c'est autre chose, ça dépend de tellement d'éléments, on ne peut pas dire qu'en général l'un est plus légitime que l'autre. La question de la légitimé c'est d'abord : est-ce qu'ils font des choses ou pas et si oui, s'ils sont réellement engagés, à ce moment-là on pourrait en parler.

Après, si j'ai une entreprise lambda qui suit une stratégie RSE, est-ce que quand c'est elle qui en parle ou une ONG (une partie prenante) qui a participée à l'élaboration de la stratégie, donc on parle bien du même objet, c'est différent. Je prends l'entreprise Lafarge qui parle de sa stratégie RSE ou si c'est WWF qui est en partenariat avec Lafarge, ben pour moi c'est sûr que les gens auront plus de confiance dans l'ONG parce que c'est une entité tierce qui est là pour vérifier que l'entreprise ne fasse pas n'importe quoi. Mais si c'est une entreprise ou une ONG qui parle de sa stratégie RSE, ben c'est difficile de dire qui est plus légitime.

- ***What types of humour exist?***

Je les ai plus en tête mais l'ADEME avait fait une étude sur l'humour

- *J'ai cité les 4 types d'humour. Et j'ai demandé si les 4 types d'humour sont complets ou s'il pense qu'il y a d'autres types d'humour.*

Je ne sais pas. Le mieux c'est de sortir du rationnel. Parfois c'est juste un jeu de mot, parfois c'est une parodie… Ce que je retiens dans l'humour c'est la volonté de toucher d'autres facettes de la perception du consommateur, toucher d'autres parties du cerveau.

- *Vous pensez que l'humour va toucher quelles parties du cerveau alors ?*

Une information rationnelle qui fait réfléchir doit faire jouer plutôt une partie du cerveau et quand on utilise l'humour ça joue plus sur l'émotion.

Ça permet de dédramatiser, de faire passer des messages un peu différemment, peut-être que la mémorisation est meilleure.

- *Quelles personnes seraient plus adeptes à aimer l'approche rationnelle ?*

C'est difficile. Il y a tellement de personnes différentes. Les gens n'ont pas forcément envie d'avoir des messages où il faut réfléchir énormément. L'humour est un moyen d'aborder ce sujet-là en n'actant pas en tant que moralisateur. Je pense que les personnes les plus engagées sont les plus adeptes à vouloir recevoir un message rationnel : tel produit émet tant de grammes de CO_2, ils connaissent déjà le thème. Mais pour le citoyen lambda il faut peut-être plus lui parler avec de l'émotion, de l'humour.

- *Donc vous croyez que quelqu'un qui est intéressé par la RSE, va préférer un message rationnel ?*

Je ne pense pas qu'ils vont préférer mais se sont eux à qui on peut proposer des informations plus rationnelles parce qu'ils sont déjà intéressé par l'info. Mais ils vont aussi apprécier des campagnes un peu décalées. Ce n'est pas exclusif parce qu'on est tous bombardé de messages et une entreprise peut nous toucher de manière différente. On va être attentif à différents messages à différents moments. Ce n'est pas catégorique, ce n'est pas absolu. C'est juste que si on prend un message rationnel et on le donne à un panel, peut-être que ceux qui sont déjà engagés auront plus de facilité à le lire et à le comprendre/ gérer mais ça ne veut pas dire qu'il ne faut leur donner que ça.

- ***Can and should humour be used in CSR advertisements? What type of humour is most appropriate?***

Ca dépend du message, il n'y a pas d'absolu. Ca dépend de ce que vous avez à dire, à quel moment et à qui et sous quel format. Il n'y a pas de solution unique.

Ce qui est certain c'est qu'avec l'humour il faut que ce soit compris et pas que ce soit mal compris par certaines tranches de la population.

- *Quels sont les effets de l'humour mal compris ?*

Prenez Hyundai et sa publicité sur son véhicule de piles à combustibles qui filme quelqu'un qui essaie de se suicider en reniflant le pot d'échappement mais qui n'y arrive pas parce qu'il n'y a que de l'eau qui est émise. Une anglaise l'a pas bien prise parce que son père s'est suicidé comme ça et ça ne s'est pas très bien passé pour Hyundai.

L'humour peut être dangereux. Après si l'objectif est de vendre et de faire le buzz, il y a un tas de marques qui font ça et peu importe s'ils choquent une partie de la population, parce que ceci leur permet de vendre plus.

1.3. Impacts of humour used in CSR advertisements

- ***What are the benefits and drawbacks of using humour in CSR advertisements? How do the consumers respond?***

L'effet dépend des consommateurs, de la publicité et du produit, donc je n'ai pas de réponse générale. Ce qui est sûr c'est que l'humour est un des moyens pour se différencier mais ça comporte également un risque de greenwashing, donc il faut faire attention.

- *Vous pensez qu'il y a plus de risque de se faire accuser de greenwashing avec un message humoristique qu'un message rationnel ?*

On ne peut pas rire de tout et n'importe quoi. Tout dépend du message, à qui on s'adresse. Si c'est une pub qui passe à la télé, il y a une audience très large. Une blague avec des gens en conférence est encore différente. Le ton sur lequel on communique un message dépend de qui on est, du message et à qui on s'adresse.

- ***Do you think humour used in CSR advertisements will induce the consumers to like the advertisements (and the brand more) – compared to non-humoristic CSR ads?***

Si c'est bien fait et de manière proportionnée, oui ça aide. Mais après, tout dépend de comment c'est fait. Mais oui je pense que c'est un des éléments qui peut plaire aux consommateurs ou renforcer sa relation avec le consommateur et la marque.

- *Est-ce qu'il y a une relation entre aimer la publicité et aimer la marque ?*

Je crois que les publicitaires le pensent. Après on a tous des campagnes publicitaires qui nous ont marquées sans pour autant avoir acheté le produit. J'imagine qu'il y a un lien.

- *Si je n'aime pas la marque, et elle montre une vidéo drôle, est-ce que je vais trouver ça drôle ?*

C'est comme dans la vie, si vous n'aimez pas une personne et elle dit une chose drôle, vous n'avez pas spécialement envie de rire parce que vous ne l'aimez pas.

L'humour dépend de la marque, qu'est-ce qu'elle a fait, la relation qu'on a avec la marque, etc. chaque réception est unique, c'est ça qui est compliqué.

- ***Do you think humour in CSR ads increases the credibility of the message?***

Je ne peux pas répondre en général comme ça. Ca dépend.

- ***According to you, does humour in CSR ads have an influence on the purchase intention of the company's product?***

C'est la base même de la publicité : si on aime bien une publicité, on est plus enclins à acheter un produit de cette marque. Après quel est le rôle de l'humour là-dedans, est-ce qu'une publicité avec de l'humour est plus efficace ou pas ? Je n'en sais rien. Mais les publicitaires nous bassinent avec leurs pubs parce que ça crée une certaine mémorisation (on crée un certain lien avec le produit ou avec la marque). Est-ce que l'humour augmente ce phénomène ? Je ne sais pas mais j'imagine parce que le but c'est de faire rire tout le monde. Il y a quand même beaucoup de pubs qui utilisent de l'humour donc j'imagine que ça doit améliorer les choses, sinon ils ne le feraient pas. Mais je n'ai pas d'études là-dessus.

- ***Are consumers going to donate more to an NGO if the NGO uses humorous CSR ads?***

Je ne sais pas, ça dépend des gens. Il y a des personnes qui voudront être rassurées et savoir comment leur argent est utilisé. Ca dépend du sujet.

- *Est-ce que vous connaissez le narrative storytelling ?*

Je connais le storytelling.

- *Est-ce que vous pensez qu'il y a du storytelling dans la vidéo follow the frog?*

Ah oui c'est clair. Il y en a un double. C'est une double histoire : une histoire de ce qu'on a plus ou moins en tête de ce qu'on voit quand on veut s'engager sur le terrain, concrètement etc. et après il y a une histoire associé au label lui-même.

- *Est-ce que vous pouvez définir le storytelling ?*

Le storytelling c'est raconter une histoire autour d'un produit. Et ça la pub le fait depuis très longtemps. Pour la pub follow the frog, ils décrivent la réaction qu'on a (fin je ne sais pas si on est nombreux à l'avoir) mais la culpabilité et l'impression que pour être vraiment efficace, on doit s'engager sur le terrain et il faut aller défendre les populations en difficultés. Et ils arrivent aussi à raconter une histoire autour de leur produit puisque ils disent qu'on peut changer les choses sans pour autant bouger de notre fauteuil.

Il y a beaucoup d'entreprises qui utilisent le storytelling. Exemple : Chipotle, les deux vaches

1.4. Advertisement-specific questions

For this part of the questionnaire I sent the interviewee the links of certain videos and I asked a couple of questions about them.

A. Follow the frog: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3iIkOi3srLo

- *Quel est le degré d'humour de 1 à 7 et 7 étant une publicité avec très beaucoup d'humour ?*

Je dirai 6.

B. The rainforest needs you: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vJmCphX9_o8

Ici il n'y a pas d'humour. C'est beaucoup plus descriptif, ils donnent la parole à leurs partenaires. C'est pédagogique et didactique. C'est très bien pour les gens qui ont déjà une sensibilisation, pour les gens qui connaissent déjà la marque et qui veulent en savoir plus et qui veulent renforcer le lien avec la marque. C'est complémentaire de la première pub. Ici ce n'est pas une pub, c'est plutôt un documentaire. Et donc il y a du storytelling dedans oui. Pour moi le storytelling c'est la base de la pub, c'est raconter une histoire

C. Follow the signs: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GKMdHJosqmY

Cette vidéo n'est pas très humoristique. C'est juste un traitement de message qui est différent. Sur le fond c'est intéressant. Après je pense qu'ils globalisent un peu trop. Donc celui-là j'aime moins que follow the frog.

Follow the frog vous prend tout de suite à la manière d'une série américaine, elle vous embarque. Celle-ci est plus dans le côté informatif et rationnel que follow the frog. On ne s'adresse pas au même public.

Ici, on fait réfléchir les gens. On est plutôt sur un côté rationnel. Follow the frog c'était plus le côté émotionnel qui prime. C'est plus proche d'une série, de ce que les gens aiment regarder à la télé.

Et encore une fois, dire que des petits gestes vont aider à améliorer la planète, je ne pense pas que ce soit efficace.

- *Quelle vidéo vous trouvez la plus crédible : follow the frog ou follow the signs ?*

La crédibilité c'est ce que j'accorde à la marque, pour moi les deux sont crédibles parce que c'est la même marque, Rainforest Alliance. Et puis le message n'est pas du tout le même. Dans follow the frog, ils mettent vraiment en avant le label Rainforest Alliance alors qu'ici ils parlent de labels en général et notamment aussi du transport par exemple, un domaine qu'ils ne traitent pas. Ici ils prennent un peu plus de recul.

D. The face of your chocolate: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5HXNifRyBsE

C'est un portrait d'un partenaire, c'est très intéressant quand on connait déjà ce qu'est la Rainforest Alliance. En plus le nom 'the face of your chocolate' est malignement choisi. Mais ce n'est pas pareil, je le mettrai plus dans le cadre de la vidéo : the rainforest needs you, parce que c'est un reportage. Mais après il y a un peu d'humour parce que le monsieur à l'air sympa. Mais pour moi ce n'est pas une pub.

Le degré d'humour ici est de 4.

E. Hidden consequences: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QuqHJBWsPgs

C'est intéressant mais c'est un peu caricatural. Oui il y a de l'humour, c'est sympathique. Je donnerai un score de 5. Mais après c'est un peu facile de dire 'achetez des produits Rainforest Alliance et les soucis vont disparaître'.

2. Conclude and thank

I thank you very much for your time. Your answers will help me for the further development of my thesis. Do you have any questions or remarks?

B. Appendix 1.2.: Interview 2

Name: Andrea Catellani

Date: 29 June 2015

Time: 45 minutes

Language: English

1. Questions

1.1. Person-related questions

- ***Could you present yourself and your job briefly?***

I am assistant professor at UCL in Louvain-la-Neuve. I am a teacher and a researcher. I teach courses on public relations and communication and other subjects linked to communication in organisations in particular. My researches are on environmental communication and the link between religion and communication. I have some other occupations at UCL but I think this is not relevant for now.

- ***Do you have any experience in assessing the impact of humour in advertisements?***

No. But there was a PhD thesis that was developed by someone about humour and the impact of humour but she did not finish it. She was reading articles and books on humour and the importance of humour in advertisement and these kinds of things but I did not do any research myself on the matter.

I handle more corporate communication, CSR reports and these kinds of things and also communication from NGOs but not advertising in particular.

1.2. General questions regarding CSR, humour, advertisements and NGOs

- ***Do you think <u>companies</u> can advertise about CSR? What type of CSR is most appropriate?***

Yes they can communicate about their CSR programs. The important thing today is to be careful because there is the problem of greenwashing: the perception of a difference between facts and words/ communication. At least a part of the public is critical today and businesses want to communicate about their CSR engagement. So they need to say something that is based on reality, on a real engagement, to avoid giving the impression that they are lying or saying something that is not completely true. So the best suggestion is to communicate after

the beginning of the development of a program and to develop interaction with the public and listen to them.

- *What type of CSR is most appropriate?*

I think that CSR has to become part of the basic strategy of the business. It should not be superficial or limited to marginal aspects of the activity. It should become an aspect of the basic strategy from a financial, economic, managerial and industrial point of view. I think it is better to be proactive than reactive for example about CSR: to try and position the business as a leader or discovering new ways of being responsible. The idea is to use CSR as the basic aspect of the identity for the communication of the business, so something that is linked to the core business of the company. Of course sometimes this can be difficult for some businesses but it would be the best.

- ***Can NGOs advertise about CSR?***

Yes of course. Advertisement is always there. I know that today advertisements are sometimes criticised and that for instance in France some people are 'publiphobe' as they say in French, so that they do not like advertisements. But I think that advertisements are always important to get the attention of consumers. I do not think it is a magical tool: it cannot change the mind of people nor the vision. But I think an advertisement is able to create good conditions and improve the knowledge about a campaign. I think it is an interesting tool but of course it is expensive so it might not be suitable for small NGOs.

- ***Which message is more likely to be credible? A CSR message from a company or from an NGO?***

Of course from NGOs. Nowadays the credibility part in NGOs is bigger (at least in Europe and in most countries). The environmental issues and CSR from NGOs have more credibility.

- *And if NGOs talk about their own products? For instance the follow the frog video of the Rainforest Alliance (he knows the video).*

I don't have scientific data on that. My impression is that it can always be interesting for an NGO. So it can be positive yes. But there are always risks if some aspects of the projects are not clear or if someone is not happy about some aspects but normally it is positive, it can be interesting for an NGO.

For example, Greenpeace also sells its own T-shirts etc. When you receive their brochure or marketing letters, there are announcements about their T-shirts etc. but it is not a case of classical advertisement.

Or Oxfam. Their business is Fairtrade so it is normal that they talk about their products.

- ***Do you think every company (and each sector) can use humour in advertisements?***

Yes. It can be a strategy if it is well done.

- *What could be the benefits and drawbacks from using humour in advertisements?*

Humour is a strategy tool to create a sort of link between the sender and receiver of communication. It builds common values and references. It can improve the relationship building between the two parts of the communication. There can be links to some aspects of our culture using second degree or irony or these kinds of things.

- ***Do you think NGOs could use humour in advertisements?***

Of course. They can use dark humour or sarcasm, it is also a strategy of humour.

- *Do you have any examples of NGOs using humour?*

It is not advertisement but you have viral videos on YouTube. The case of Greenpeace and their parody on Mattel, Volkswagen. Greenpeace uses a lot of sarcasm and humour in their campaigns.

- ***What types of humour do you know?***

There are books on humour and different types of humour. But I do not have specific and precise information at this moment. I remember this PhD student was creating a typology of different types of humour. You can have aggressive or less aggressive humour, humour against someone or not. You can have dark humour. You can also have different aspects to classify different types of humour. You can have humour on words, images, more cultural specific humour. Of course, in general I think humour is quite culture specific.

- ***Can and should humour be used in CSR advertisements? What type of humour is the most appropriate? And is there a difference between humour used in CSR messages for companies and NGOs?***

Of course. It should be coherent with the rest of the communication strategy. It is a good idea to create a link with the public as I said before. I do not know if there is a specific type of humour that you can use in particular.

It is interesting to use humour to talk about problems like climate change and pollution etc. to create a more positive, nicer atmosphere to get out of a dark picture of the situation. Because too dark pictures can have a negative effect on the public. The public can say that there is nothing to do so they do nothing because they think it is useless. Humour can participate to create a more positive attitude and atmosphere. I think Greenpeace is a good example because they use the tone of drama but also a more positive one. And a part of the communication is more positive. It leads to positive results. So humour can be an ingredient of all that and the other point is the link with the public that can be interesting.

Also, the humour can be a tool to create a criticism to put pressure on a business. E.g.: sarcasm to create a nice form of criticism against a business.

1.3. Impacts of humour used in CSR advertisements

- ***What are the benefits and drawbacks of using humour in CSR advertisements? How do the consumers respond?***

I have the impression that it depends on the link between different variables: the message and humour inside the message and also previous reputation and image of the business or NGO. The context is very important to influence the reception of the message based on humour. It really depends on the situation, which business, its history and which public. If it is a more cultivated public or a more popular one, etc. It depends on a lot of variables. I don't have any specific scientific data.

I think humour can be useful if it is well-done. If there is no suspicion of greenwashing behind the message, because otherwise there will be a lot of criticism.

- *Do you have examples of humour that is well-done as you say?*

Mattel and Volkswagen as explained before.

For the Mattel campaign they used a famous character: Barbie. She was destroying the jungle. In the end, the campaign was successful since Mattel changed its policy.

Good humorous ads convey a good narrative quality message, a good story, good characters and are able to make people laugh and create a good sense of humour as well as being in touch with the culture of the receiver. Everything has to be linked to a specific context.

- ***Do you think humour used in CSR advertisements will induce the consumers to like the advertisements (and the brand) more – compared to non-humoristic CSR ads?***

Yes it can be. If the conditions are good. I think it can be a good tool to create a good attitude. It can be an interesting tool.

- *Do you think there is a relation between a person liking an advertisement and liking a brand?*

Yes of course. The perception of an ad can influence the perception of a brand, this is clear in my mind.

- ***What is the impact of humour on the credibility of the message?***

It depends on the context. If it is an institution, it should communicate on a serious problem and then humour could be a bad solution. When the topic is less dramatic, humour can be a very good solution. If you communicate to a more educated public, using for instance the second degree, it can be useful.

In a pedagogical context perhaps humour or something more ludicrous can be interesting to make a serious topic easier understood and increase the credibility of the message. But it is difficult to give a general answer. It depends on the type of subject, on the context…

Humour creates a link with the receiver so you need to study the receiver before understanding if the message will be appropriate or not.

- *If a company or an NGO uses humour, do you think persons will see this as a way to manipulate them? And find the message less or more credible?*

It depends on the previous reputation and the image of the organisation and also on other information that is at the disposal of the receiver: if he wants to deepen information and he wants to learn more about it. This can be an interesting variable that can create suspicion of something that is just greenwashing or not.

Humour is an interesting tool but it should be used in a careful way. Corporations should use humour, other tools and other types of communication together. So humour is part of a

communication mix but they should also diffuse more serious messages. E.g. Greenpeace does this. And this also tackles different publics: a public that is amused of seeing the video and just wants to like it and share it and others who want to learn more about it.

- ***According to you, does humour in CSR ads have an influence on the purchase intention of the company's product?***

Yes it can have an influence of course.

- ***Do you think consumers that are sceptical about advertisements in general will like humorous ads more than non-humorous ads?***

No. I am just at the level of impressions, because I do not have scientific data on that. No, humour can be dangerous in this case. It can create a boomerang effect. It can be perceived as manipulation, deceptive communication.

- ***Do you think consumers interested in sustainability will have a more positive or negative attitude towards the ad thanks to humour used in the CSR ad? Will those people find the ad more or less credible?***

I don't know. It depends on the reputation of the organisation. If it is good perhaps it can have a positive effect. In the other case, it can have a boomerang effect. It depends on the perception of the sender of communication.

1.4. Advertisement-specific questions

Look at those ads and answer the questions below:

A. **Follow the frog: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3iIkOi3srLo**
B. **Follow the signs: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GKMdHJosqmY**
C. **Small actions = big changes: *https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G4TLxFvF15I***

- **Is this ad humorous? Give a rating on a scale from 1 to 7 with 1 = not at all and 7 = extremely humorous**
- **If yes, what type of humour is used?**

  (According to ADEME there are 4 types of humour in CSR advertisements:

  1. ***Sympathetic humour* (makes people laugh together, generates a smile rather than laughter)**

2. ***Caustic humour*** **(show something the viewer does not particularly want to see)**
3. ***Satirical humour*** **(reinforce the bond between company and viewer, laugh together)**
4. ***Absurd humour*** **(explaining the truth of a message by showing the absurdity of the contrary position or by deducing absurd consequences).**

- **Do you think this ad is appropriate for the Rainforest Alliance (being an NGO)?**

A. Follow the frog: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3iIkOi3srLo

- *Humour*: I would give a score of 5 – yes there was humour in this video.
- *What type of humour?* It is not dark. You create an identification with the person. There is a part of self-humour and introspection.
- *Appropriate?* Someone could think that the final answer to the problem follow the frog is not appropriate. Perhaps you should do something more. Some publics could find the answer given by the video a bit simplistic.

B. Follow the signs: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GKMdHJosqmY

- *Humour:* Yes even if it is less humorous, the message is less powerful. It is not a real story of a person so it creates less a sense of identification. It is more an invitation to do something: the humour is less intense so I would give something like 4.

C. Small actions = big changes: *https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G4TLxFvF15I*

- *Humour:* There is not a lot of humour. I would give a 2.
- *Appropriate?* It is more pedagogical with nice images.

2. Conclude and thank

I thank you very much for your time. Your answers will help me for the further development of my thesis. Do you have any questions or remarks?

C. Appendix 1.3.: Interview 3

Name: Anita Neville

Date: 30 June 2015

Time: 50 minutes

Language: English

1. Questions

1.1. Person-related questions

- ***Could you present yourself and your job briefly?***

I have been working for the Rainforest Alliance as a consultant in the communications and marketing division and as a member of the certification team for 9 years in total (3 in the UK and 6 in Australia) and I work across 2 divisions: communications and marketing and research.

- ***Do you have any experience in assessing the impact of humour in advertisements?***

Yes. But I would say it is limited. I have been involved in a number of ad campaigns. But I have not done any research in the field.

1.2. General questions regarding CSR, humour, advertisements and NGOs

- ***Do you think <u>companies</u> can advertise about CSR? What type of CSR is most appropriate?***

Ok course they can. But it is very rare that a company talks about their corporate social responsibility agenda by itself. As opposed to embedded in a brand experience or product attribute.

Can companies advertise about their corporate social actions, of course they cannot. But why would they, what would be the value in that?

To be successful, sustainability communication has to come from an authentic place. And that authentic place has to be embedded in the company value and the attributes of the products and services that the company is offering. In this case, yes they can talk about sustainability through that kind of advertisement.

- *So you can communicate about your CSR actions if you have a whole strategy behind it and not one isolated event?*

I think it has to be imbedded in brand values and product attributes. You don't advertise CSR, you advertise your product or service and you speak of this attribute to talk about CSR. You have to place things in a context. I think consumers are increasingly savvy and aware when companies are kind of jumping on green things or socially responsible things. Their radar is really well developed for that.

Companies do have to think about the authenticity of their communication when they are looking to promote their CSR agenda, whether it is through a product, service or event.

- ***Can NGOs advertise about CSR?***

NGOs generally advertise about issues to raise money for themselves or to find support for their mission. NGOs don't tend to advertise CSR.

I don't consider the videos (below) as advertisement, they are content but they are not advertising something to make you buy something. The videos were created to induce certain consumer behaviours but to my mind that is quite different to running an advertising campaign.

I think in the digital age we are more talking about both organisational generated content and user generated content. This is a form of self-publishing: we get out and communicate to encourage engagement with the topic. But when you look at the difference between content marketing and advertising I think you would find they have a distinct definition.

The call to action in our videos is not explicit. We posted them on our website, we pushed them out through our own channel, through email through our Twitter feed and Facebook social media. So it is much more a digital marketing approach than a pure advertising approach.

- ***Which message is more likely to be credible? A CSR message from a company or from an NGO?***

Neither will be credible unless they come from an authentic, transparent, humble and verifiable place. I spent 20 years working in sustainability communications and the core tendency is authenticity, people can smell a rat very quickly. CSR communications have to come from an authentic place: if you are not really doing something you should not say you

are doing something. People can feel this very quickly if you are not invested in it especially with the digital communication available to us.

It is really important you are transparent in your communication and that you are consistent as well. It is important not to over claim whether you are an NGO or a company. The Rainforest Alliance has a challenge: we communicated and we still communicate a trust in the seal message and that's right and proper. And this also has a risk of defining the seal as being 'advertly' bullet proof. And that if something has our seal on it that it is an equivalent of a guarantee. We are trying to avoid this. If a farm or a forest that has been certified through the Rainforest Alliance turns out not to be in conformance with the standards that are behind the seal you are accused of greenwashing or not having good systems etc. So you have to watch out not to over claim. Acknowledge that it is hard and that a certifying tool is one tool/ a toolkit, it is not a silver bullet: we cannot be everywhere, every day of the week, every week of the year, but they are the best systems available to provide these kind of necessary checks.

There are an increasing number of companies making claims based on their own policies and systems and those claims deserve to be questioned in most cases when they have not been verified by a third party. So, both can be credible but neither an NGO nor a company will be credible if they do not meet the criteria for sustainability communication.

- ***Do you think every company (and each sector) can use humour in advertisements?***

Quite possibly. If it is done appropriately. I think humour can be a great tool. In theory, yes, you can use humour across every sector.

- ***Do you think NGOs could use humour in advertisements?***

Definitely. They don't do it often enough. This is a tool that should be in every communicator's toolbox.

- *Why is humour so useful/ important?*

With communication you have to use the right channel to reach the appropriate people and you also need to make sure you use the right approach. Humour can be part of that toolkit. Humour has some benefits for those working in the environmental/ sustainability area because we do have a reputation for being gloom, 'everything is a disaster'.

Negative messaging can have a really counterproductive impact on getting consumers to support actions for climate change and to change their own behaviours. If you paint a too dark picture, which people working in the environmental community often want to do, you can

stop people from listening to you. Sometimes taking a lighter, more positive approach is a better way to engage with the public.

- *If you use a lot of humour, can this have a negative effect?*

You need to choose very carefully what type of humour and how you use it. The issue is about balance. If I would say everything is bad, you have to stop doing this, stop doing that, very soon I will sound very nagging and boring and you will stop listening to me. It is all about framing positive messages. Human beings drive on hope and less on doom and gloom and despair.

- ***What types of humour do you know?***

Comedy: slapsticks, satire, toilet humour, you can have the kind of Mr Bean very physical humour. I am sure there are many more.

- ***Can and should humour be used in CSR advertisements? What type of humour is the most appropriate? And is there a difference between humour used in CSR messages for companies and NGOs?***

It depends on the subject. You have to start with what you want to communicate, to whom do you want to communicate to and what do you expect them to do as a result? From there you might determine what might be the best way to communicate that. And humour could be part of the solution. I do not think you can dictate that one is better than the other without contextualising the subject and the audience.

The follow the frog video is a really funny video and one of the reasons why it really worked is because people can see themselves in the protagonist. It is an exaggerated version of thoughts or actions we can all imagine ourselves having taken.

'You do not have to do all the stuff in the video, because there are organisations like ours that do it for you. All you have to do is stay at home and buy the right things.'

You really have to be defined by your purpose and your audience and then take the right choices of what type of humour may or may not be appropriate.

- *You said you just have to stay at home and buy the right products, don't you think some people might think this is too simplistic?*

It is a simplistic message but you need to consider the message in the context. It is not the only message we put out there. This video is 3 years old now and communications and the

nature of it change very quickly. We really moved on from that in terms of our content marketing around more mindful conceptions.

If we only push people to purchase things with the seal on it, then they can still mindlessly buy more products than they need and that does not help us address the sustainable consumption and production that we are facing. These videos need to be seen in a broader context as well. You cannot communicate about everything in one single video, especially not in 3 minutes.

1.3. Impacts of humour used in CSR advertisements

- ***What are the benefits and drawbacks of using humour in CSR advertisements? How do the consumers respond?***

Keeping in mind the limits of my expertise, it needs to be appropriate to the context and people will smell out this kind of thing very quickly.

The 2015 follow the frog week video also intended to have a humorous aspect but it didn't really work. It did not have this viral appeal that the 2012 video had, the humour was more gentle, smug. I think the humour was not as universally accessible as the 2012 video. I received emails from different people from all around the world telling me they could connect with the humour of the 2012 video and much less with the 2015 video.

If you are going to use humour you need to be mindful it will not necessarily going to work with everybody. It needs to be appropriate to the message, the audience, etc.

- ***Do you think humour used in CSR advertisements will induce the consumers to like the advertisements (and the brand) more – compared to non-humoristic CSR ads?***

The context is everything. Humour is quite context dependent. It really depends on the ad.

I think of PG Tips who did an infomercial, a commercialized mini documentary thing on how tea was made etc. and we talk about what happens on Rainforest Alliance certified farms and it has funny bits in it.

That uses a particular type of humour that some people will love, especially if you are British and if you know the history of Monkey (the knitted monkey puppet) but I know that some of my colleagues did not find this funny. But it worked really well for PG Tips and they explained their collaboration with the Rainforest Alliance in a nice way. And they backed it up with more TV advertisements with Monkey and the comedian talking about their tea.

- ***What is the impact of humour on the credibility of the message?***

It depends on the appropriateness of humour as a vehicle to spread that message. The credibility will be assessed on whether or not the humour used is appropriate for delivering your message.

- *Do you think the humour in the follow the frog video is appropriate?*

I do because people can see themselves in that protagonist, in an exaggerated way. The feedback was that there were touchpoints that the audience could relate to. So the video was appropriate to the audience and the overall message around 'you do not need to start a revolution in the Amazon, you can just choose the right products when shopping and you can contribute in that way'. That is an acceptable and appropriate type of message. We would not use that same kind of humour to talk about human rights abuses on tea farms, this would be inappropriate.

The critical thing across all of your questions is if the humour is an appropriate vehicle for the message you are trying to convey. The starting point on CSR messaging should always be around that authentic, transparent, humble, verifiable subset and then you can see if humour is an appropriate way to convey that message.

- *Don't you think that people might think the message is less credible due to the humour?*

If people are sceptical about certification in general, it does not really matter what type of message or video you are delivering in the market place. This scepticism will remain until they will see some hard date. I do not think it is the right means to change the hard core sceptics. You will need a different way to reach sceptics.

- *What way would be the right one to address the sceptics?*

I think they would prefer hard data, an impact study, global channels. A funny video will not change a true sceptics' mind.

- *Do you think real sceptics will actively research more information about the subject?*

I think that if they are sceptical about certification or if they are sceptical about the Rainforest Alliance certification versus Fairtrade, they are probably already engaged in the subject so they will do more investigation on the topic.

- ***According to you, does humour in CSR ads have an influence on the purchase intention of the company's product?***

I could not say. I am not an expert in that field.

- ***Do you think consumers that are sceptical about advertisements in general will like humorous ads more than non-humorous ads?***

It depends if the humour appeals to them. If they are already sceptical about advertisements, it would probably not really make a difference.

If what you are asking is if consumers that are sceptical about the CSR company claims are likely or less likely to like humorous ads, then I think that if they are already sceptical about the company then humorous ads may not be the best option.

- ***Do you think consumers interested in sustainability will have a more positive or negative attitude towards the ad thanks to humour used in the CSR ad? Will those people find the ad more or less credible?***

It depends on the nature of the humour, if they are more interested in sustainability, etc… Possibly, it may be, if it is about a product or a service they are interested in.

If the humour used in the advertisement is badly perceived, I think this ad will do wrong, even though the person is interested in sustainability.

The credibility depends on what the ad is based on and if the company has the ability to use humour and communicate appropriately. But I would say humour could also distract the consumer and influence the consumer in a bad way.

1.4. Advertisement-specific questions

Look at those ads and answer the questions below:

A. **Follow the frog: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3iIkOi3srLo**

B. **Follow the signs: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GKMdHJosqmY**

C. **Small actions = big changes: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G4TLxFvF15I**

- **Is this ad humorous? Give a rating on a scale from 1 to 7 with 1 = not at all and 7 = extremely humorous**

- **If yes, what type of humour is used?**

(According to ADEME there are 4 types of humour in CSR advertisements:

1. **Sympathetic humour (makes people laugh together, generates a smile rather than laughter)**
2. **Caustic humour (show something the viewer does not particularly wants to see)**
3. **Satirical humour (reinforce the bond between company and viewer, laugh together)**
4. **Absurd humour (explaining the truth of a message by showing the absurdity of the contrary position or by deducing absurd consequences).**

- **Do you think this ad is appropriate for the Rainforest Alliance (being an NGO)?**

A. Follow the frog: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3iIkOi3srLo

- *Humour on a scale from 1-7*: I would give that a 7. I think it is very funny
- *What type of humour is used?* I think it is satirical. It gives an exaggerated view of how people might feel and you bond with the protagonist, you can see yourself in it.
- *Appropriate?* Yes I think the humour used is appropriate.

B. Follow the signs: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GKMdHJosqmY

- *Humour from 1-7*: I do not find this particular funny. I give it a 2
- *Appropriate?* I think it is fine but it is one of the videos that I like the least that we made.

C. Small actions = big changes:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G4TLxFvF15I

- *Humour from 1-7*: I give this a 1. I do not think it is funny at all.
- *Appropriate?* Yes I think so.

2. Conclude and thank

I thank you very much for your time. Your answers will help me for the further development of my thesis. Do you have any questions or remarks?

D. Appendix 1.4.: Interview 4

Name: Silvia Steisel

Date: 3 July 2015

Time: 40 minutes

Language: English

1. Questions

1.1. Person-related questions

- ***Could you present yourself and your job briefly?***

I am a philanthropist and sustainability advisor at Bank Degroof. This means that I am advising clients and also running the Bank Degroof foundation. I have been working for Bank Degroof for two years now.

- ***Do you have any experience in assessing the impact of humour in advertisements?***

No not really.

1.2. General questions regarding CSR, humour, advertisements and NGOs

- ***Do you think <u>companies</u> can advertise about CSR? What type of CSR is most appropriate?***

Yes, it is important if it is totally true and coherent with the business they are in, if it is not just marketing it does make sense.

- *Can every single company communicate about CSR?*

Every company should communicate about CSR.

- ***Can <u>NGOs</u> advertise about CSR?***

Yes. But CSR should be inherent in the strategy of the business and not something additional, it has to drive the business. And an NGO is not a corporate entity, so it is different. NGOs communicate how they are organised and how they spend their resources. So they should be

transparent. If you mean being green or something else with CSR, then they should also advertise about it. So I think every organisation should talk about CSR and their actions.

- *So every company and NGO should talk about CSR?*

Yes. And even more NGOs because if they want to 'do no harm and do well' they should talk about their CSR strategy.

- ***Which message is more likely to be credible? A CSR message from a company or from an NGO?***

Both are important but when people think about NGOs, they think it is normal they do CSR. But for a company it is maybe easier to communicate because you can really differentiate your business. So if your company communicates about CSR it is sometimes more surprising than if an NGO would do it. If people are thinking of an NGO, they think they are doing it properly and in good ways, it is completely inherent in their activity while with the businesses it is not inherent in their strategy so if they show they have a CSR policy, it is even better and more powerful.

- *Do you think the CSR strategy from a company might be perceived as a way to influence consumers or accuse them of greenwashing?*

If you use it as a greenwashing (and many companies do it) it is completely stupid because consumers can easily see if they do respect all their promises or engagements and it is easy to know what is really behind it. There is too much risk for the companies to talk about CSR if they are not really doing it, if they are just greenwashing. We have seen many companies claiming that they are really responsible but then 2-3 journalists or even a person on Internet finds out they are doing this and that and you see their reputation falls apart in 5 minutes. So there is too much risk if you are not completely doing it.

- *Do companies have a bigger risk to lose credibility or lead brand damage compared to an NGO?*

It is risky for both. It is just a matter of being relevant in your message and the activity you have. Because if there is a gap between what you are really doing and how you communicate about it, both for an NGO and a company, it makes no sense and the consumers are not stupid and they will not follow the company.

- ***Do you think every <u>company</u> (and each sector) can use humour in advertisements?***

Yes, my sector is a little bit different because it is not a really creative business. It is more about trust and confidence so humour is maybe not appropriate in the banking sector. But I think it could be possible even though I do not think it is something that is already done.

- *So you think no banks have used humour in advertisements until know?*

I think it is not humoristic but more sarcastic some times.

- ***Do you think <u>NGOs</u> could use humour in advertisements?***

Yes they could and should. It depends on trends. The last couple of years NGOs were using shocking images. Now the business is changing and we see more happy people, positive messages, in these positive messages you can have humour as well. Humour is sometimes difficult because it is elegant and NGOs are sometimes talking about sad problems. But they should show nice solutions and they should show it in a nice and funny way, in a way people want to look at it and people want to adhere to. So, I would say not using humour just for humour but making it fun and happy.

- *Do you think humorous messages are more appealing than shocking messages?*

I think nowadays people are bored of shocking images because they see them all the time on the Internet, on the television, etc. so humour and a bit of creativity in the message can touch people easier.

I am personally a bit annoyed when I see a shocking image, but when I see a solution-driven positive image it is more appealing to me, but that is more personal.

- ***What types of humour do you know?***

Sarcastic, third degree, second degree, first degree, basic, stupid, aggressive. You can have different forms but for me the different degrees of humour (first, second and third) are more interesting.

- ***Can and should humour be used in CSR advertisements? What type of humour is the most appropriate? And is there a difference between humour used in CSR messages for companies and NGOs?***

I personally think that communication with humour works better than just a simple message, it is powerful. I see it more as a tool than a goal to connect people that listen or look at your communication.

The topics companies are talking about are not always funny. Sometimes there are strong and important problems they are facing so it is not something you can 'prendre à la légère' as we say in French. So the story is quite heavy but if you can get people's attention with something nice and funny then I think it is OK.

When I see humour in a communication, I am more inclined to listen and to give attention to it, that's more a personal matter. But I think a lot of people would prefer a humorous message than a normal message.

1.3. Impacts of humour used in CSR advertisements

- ***What are the benefits and drawbacks of using humour in CSR advertisements? How do the consumers respond?***

The benefits are that you can have a positive message and as such people want to adhere to the brand.

A negative point is that humour does not talk to everyone in the same way. We have to be careful how we use humour to not convey a wrong message.

- *How do you think consumers will respond to humour in CSR ads?*

Probably they are quite surprised because humour is not the main feature that you would expect in CSR communication but it could definitely grab their attention.

- ***Do you think humour used in CSR advertisements will induce the consumers to like the advertisements (and the brand) more – compared to non-humoristic CSR ads?***

Yes. Maybe. Probably. When you see an advertisement on television you want to watch the ones that are funny and the others you just want to skip them.

- *Do you think there is a relation between liking the advertisement and liking the brand?*

If the message is good people will like the advertisement. CSR communicated in advertisement is a bit strange. I'd rather do CSR actions than just show what we did. It is

something that has to be subliminal. You have to have a normal campaign but everything has to be relevant to be close to CSR. It means showing respect for the people you are working with, showing you have a vision. But just saying you do CSR to do CSR is not interesting.

- *Don't you think advertising about a new product that respects the environment or so would be beneficial for the company? (e.g. a car that does not emit any CO_2 emissions)*

Yes that's what I mean. If it is inherent in the business model then it is interesting but if a car company says we helped children in Africa, it is nice but it is not interesting. What is interesting to me is to see how each company shows in his advertisement his core business and how his core business leads to sustainability and innovation in the end.

- ***What is the impact of humour on the credibility of the message?***

It depends if you have a nice way of using humour. It should be elegant and not misunderstood. If you handle humour in a good way, it might increase the credibility of the message and you can be respected because it is not easy to use humour appropriately.

- *Do you have an example of companies or NGOs using humour in communications?*

It is not an advertisement but I think more of a general conception. For instance a company like Danone. They are very engaged in sustainability, they try to have a product line as natural as possible and they explain where their ingredients come from. Ben & Jerry's as well: they have a strong communication about sustainability and they have a fair way of paying their milk providers.

For an NGO, WWF has a strong commitment with other companies. They have a strong partnership with them and see how they can collaborate together. For instance WWF working together with Exki. Exki communicates a lot about their sustainability approach. They are very relevant in their whole message: healthy, fresh, engaged, responsible, nice, and friendly. The whole business makes it a friendly company. And because they have a friendly approach they could use humour I think. It is linked to the company's DNA.

- *Do you have examples of Exki using humour?*

Not really humour for humour but I do not know how they communicate outside their shops, because they use their shops as primary tool to advertise. Just having a friendly and nice approach, it is not humour as such.

- ***According to you, does humour in CSR ads have an influence on the purchase intention of the company's product?***

If it contributes to making the brand friendly, yes. Humour makes the brand look friendly. Liking the product will contribute to the image of the brand. And if they like the product they are maybe more incline to buy the product, it is probably related.

- ***Do you think consumers that are sceptical about advertisements in general will like humorous ads more than non-humorous ads?***

Yes, probably, otherwise they are annoyed. If someone laughs about something he has seen, he is happy to see it again and to share it with someone.

- ***Do you think consumers interested in sustainability will have a more positive or negative attitude towards the ad thanks to humour used in the CSR ad? Will those people find the ad more or less credible?***

It depends what is in the message. I think humour is not connected to sustainability so if someone is interested in sustainability he will listen to your message. I am not sure he is going to like it more if there is humour. If he is interested in sustainability the sustainability aspect will grab his attention, maybe not the humorous part. Humour might distract him from the real message he is interested in and he might not like the advertisement in the end.

The credibility depends on the quality of the advertisement.

1.4. Advertisement-specific questions

Look at those ads and answer the questions below:

A. **Follow the frog: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3iIkOi3srLo**
B. **Follow the signs: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GKMdHJosqmY**
C. **Small actions = big changes: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G4TLxFvF15I**

- **Is this ad humorous? Give a rating on a scale from 1 to 7 with 1 = not at all and 7 = extremely humorous**
- **If yes, what type of humour is used?**

(According to ADEME there are 4 types of humour in CSR advertisements:

1. **Sympathetic humour (makes people laugh together, generates a smile rather than laughter)**
2. **Caustic humour (show something the viewer does not particularly wants to see)**
3. **Satirical humour (reinforce the bond between company and viewer, laugh together)**
4. **Absurd humour (explaining the truth of a message by showing the absurdity of the contrary position or by deducing absurd consequences).**

- **Do you think this ad is appropriate for the Rainforest Alliance (being an NGO)?**

A. Follow the frog: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3iIkOi3srLo

- *Humour?* Yes of course. I would give a 6.
- *Type of humour?* Kind of caricature. Thinking of the ADEME typology, I would say sympathetic humour.
- *Appropriate?* Yes. It can be a bit shocking for some people. For instance, some dreamers that think they can change the world, the ad might make fun of them.

B. Follow the signs: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GKMdHJosqmY

- *Humour?* Not really. Just fun and friendly not humorous. I would give 3 out of 7.
- *Appropriate?* Yes. Nice and well shown video

C. Small actions = big changes: *https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G4TLxFvF15I*

- *Humour?* No not at all. I would give a 1.
- *Appropriate?* Yes.

2. Conclude and thank

I thank you very much for your time. Your answers will help me for the further development of my thesis. Do you have any questions or remarks?

2. Appendix 2 : Questionnaire survey

Bonjour, je suis un étudiant de l'Université catholique de Louvain étudiant le Management International. J'aimerais vous poser quelques questions à propos de publicités en ligne. Votre aide me serait précieuse dans la réalisation de mon mémoire de fin d'études.

Répondre à ce questionnaire vous prendra environ 10 minutes. Il n'y a pas de bonnes ou de mauvaises réponses et veuillez répondre à toutes les questions s'il vous plaît. L'anonymat est garanti.

Je vous remercie d'avance pour votre aide.

Cedric Couvreur

Questionnaire

Veuillez cliquer sur la vidéo ci-dessous et regardez-là jusqu'à la fin.

[Vidéo humoristique ou non humoristique]

Questions à propos de la publicité

1. **Avez-vous vu déjà vu cette publicité ?**
   - Oui, plusieurs fois (3 fois ou plus)
   - Oui, quelques fois (moins de 3 fois)
   - Non

2. **Comment percevez-vous cette publicité?**

Répondez à la question sur une échelle de 1 à 7. Plus votre réponse se rapproche d'une extrémité, plus vous êtes d'accord avec la proposition. Le milieu, étant 4, est une réponse neutre.

Pas humoristique	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Humoristique
Pas drôle	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Drôle
Pas gai	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Gai
Pas amusant	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Amusant
Ennuyeuse	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Pas ennuyeuse

3. La publicité que je viens de voir est:

Répondez à la question sur une échelle de 1 à 7. Plus votre réponse se rapproche d'une extrémité, plus vous êtes d'accord avec la proposition. Le milieu, étant 4, est une réponse neutre.

Désagréable	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Agréable
Déplaisante	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Plaisante
Irritante	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Pas irritante
Pas intéressante	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Intéressante

4. La publicité transmet un message :

Répondez à la question sur une échelle de 1 à 7. Plus votre réponse se rapproche d'une extrémité, plus vous êtes d'accord avec la proposition. Le milieu, étant 4, est une réponse neutre.

Abstrait	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Concret
Emotionnel	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Rationnel
Choquant	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Plaisant
Répulsif	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Attirant
Ennuyant	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Intéressant
Pas informatif	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Informatif

5. Comment percevez-vous la marque Rainforest Alliance après avoir regardé la publicité?

Répondez à la question sur une échelle de 1 à 7. Plus votre réponse se rapproche d'une extrémité, plus vous êtes d'accord avec la proposition. Le milieu, étant 4, est une réponse neutre.

Mauvaise	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Bonne
Pas agréable	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Agréable
Pas aimable	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Aimable

6. **Après avoir vu(e) la publicité, dans quelle mesure seriez-vous prêt(e) à acheter un produit certifié par le label de la Rainforest Alliance?**

Répondez à la question sur une échelle de 1 à 7. Plus votre réponse se rapproche d'une extrémité, plus vous êtes d'accord avec la proposition. Le milieu, étant 4, est une réponse neutre.

Peu plausible	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Plausible
Improbable	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Probable
Impossible	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Possible

7. **Pensez-vous que la publicité est crédible? La publicité fournit :**

Répondez aux propositions sur une échelle de 1 à 7 avec 1 = pas du tout d'accord et 7 = tout à fait d'accord.

	Pas du tout d'accord (1)	**Pas d'accord (2)**	**Plutôt pas d'accord (3)**	**Neutre (4)**	**Plutôt d'accord (5)**	**D'accord (6)**	**Tout à fait d'accord (7)**
1. De l'information réelle à propos de la Rainforest Alliance							
2. De l'information réaliste à propos de la Rainforest Alliance							
3. De l'information exacte à propos de la Rainforest Alliance							
4. De l'information honnête à propos de la Rainforest Alliance							

<u>Questions à propos de la Rainforest Alliance</u>

8. **A quel point êtes-vous familier avec la marque Rainforest Alliance?**

Répondez à la question sur une échelle de 1 à 7. Plus votre réponse se rapproche d'une extrémité, plus vous êtes d'accord avec la proposition. Le milieu, étant 4, est une réponse neutre.

Pas familier	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	Familier

9. Avez-vous déjà acheté un produit certifié de la marque Rainforest Alliance?

Exemples de produits certifiés par la Rainforest Alliance: Banacol, Bristot, Chiquita, Cornetto, Costa Coffee, Côte d'Or, Daim, Dole, Lipton, Magnum, One, etc.

- Oui
- Non
- Je ne sais pas

Questions à propos de la durabilité et l'écologie

10. A quel point êtes-vous intéressé(e) par la durabilité et l'écologie?

Répondez aux propositions sur une échelle de 1 à 7 avec 1 = pas du tout d'accord et 7 = tout à fait d'accord.

	Pas du tout d'accord (1)	**Pas d'accord (2)**	**Plutôt pas d'accord (3)**	**Neutre (4)**	**Plutôt d'accord (5)**	**D'accord (6)**	**Tout à fait d'accord (7)**
1. Les espaces naturels méritent davantage d'attention.							
2. J'éprouve un certain réconfort quand j'évite de gaspiller de l'énergie.							
3. Je pense qu'il faudrait favoriser de plus en plus la consommation des produits biologiques.							
4. J'éprouve un plaisir à participer en groupe au nettoyage des rivières et des forêts.							
5. Les débats sur la protection de notre environnement font partis de mes centres d'intérêts.							
6. Il m'inquiète de penser qu'une bonne partie de la nourriture que je mange est contaminée par les pesticides.							
7. Il me dérange vraiment de penser que le gouvernement ne fait rien pour aider à contrôler la pollution de l'environnement.							
8. Quand je pense à la façon dont les industriels							

causent la pollution, je me sens frustré.							
9. J'éprouve du mépris vis-à-vis des gens qui jettent des papiers par terre.							
10. Je pense que les gens devraient s'inquiéter en ce qui concerne les pesticides utilisés dans les produits alimentaires.							

<u>Questions personnelles</u>

11. Est-ce que l'humour est important pour vous?

Répondez aux propositions sur une échelle de 1 à 7 avec 1 = pas du tout d'accord et 7 = tout à fait d'accord.

	Pas du tout d'accord (1)	**Pas d'accord (2)**	**Plutôt pas d'accord (3)**	**Neutre (4)**	**Plutôt d'accord (5)**	**D'accord (6)**	**Tout à fait d'accord (7)**
1. Les gens attendent de moi que je dise des choses amusantes.							
2. Parfois j'invente des blagues ou des histoires drôles.							
3. Je peux souvent faire rire fortement des gens avec les choses que je dis.							
4. J'aime les situations où des gens peuvent exprimer leur sens de l'humour.							
5. J'aime être entouré(e) de gens qui ont un sens de l'humour.							
6. J'aime entendre quelqu'un raconter une blague.							

12. En général, êtes-vous sceptique par rapport aux publicités?
Répondez aux propositions sur une échelle de 1 à 7 avec 1 = pas du tout d'accord et 7 = tout à fait d'accord.

	Pas du tout d'accord (1)	**Pas d'accord (2)**	**Plutôt pas d'accord (3)**	**Neutre (4)**	**Plutôt d'accord (5)**	**D'accord (6)**	**Tout à fait d'accord (7)**
1. Je doute souvent de la véracité des messages publicitaires.							
2. Je crois difficilement les promesses publicitaires.							
3. Je ne suis pas convaincu par les mérites vantés d'un produit ou d'un service dans les publicités.							
4. En général, les publicités disent des mensonges.							

13. Êtes-vous un homme ou une femme?

- o Homme
- o Femme

14. Quel âge avez-vous?

- o Moins de 18 ans
- o 18-30
- o 31-50
- o 51-70
- o Plus de 70 ans

15. Êtes-vous belge?

- o Oui
- o Non

16. En pensant à votre situation financière, où vous situez-vous ?

Répondez à la question sur une échelle de 1 à 7. Plus votre réponse se rapproche d'une extrémité, plus vous êtes d'accord avec la proposition. Le milieu, étant 4, est une réponse neutre.

Faibles moyens financiers □ □ □ □ □ □ □ Moyens financiers élevés

17. Avez-vous des commentaires par rapport aux questions du questionnaire ?

……
……
……

Je vous remercie pour votre participation.

Vos réponses m'aideront pour la réalisation de mon mémoire de fin d'études.

3. Appendix 3: Summary of the items used in the questionnaire

Question	Concept	Scale	Items	Reference
1	Familiarity with the advertisement	Multiple choice question (3 options)	Oui, plusieurs fois (3 fois ou plus); Oui, quelques fois (moins de 3 fois); Non	Translated and adapted from Escalas et al. (2004). I added (3 fois ou plus) and (moins de 3 fois)
2	Perceived humour	7-point semantic differential scale	5 items (Pas humoristique/ Humoristique-Pas drôle/ Drôle- Pas gai/ Gai-Pas amusant/ Amusant-Ennuyeuse/ Pas ennuyeuse)	Translated from Zhang & Zinkhan (2006); Cline & Kellaris (2007); Chattopadhyay & Basu (1990) and Zhang (1996) and modified into a 7-point scale.
3	Attitude towards the ad	7-point semantic differential scale	4 items (Désagréable/ Agréable-Déplaisante/ Plaisante-Irritante/ Pas irritante-Pas intéressante/ intéressante)	Translated from Zhang & Zinkhan (2006); Chattopadhyay & Basu (1990); Zhang (1996); Geuens, De Pelsmacker & Faseur (2011) and modified into a 7-point scale.
4	Characteristics of the advertising message *control question*	7-point semantic differential scale	6 items (Abstrait/ Concret-Emotionnel/ Rationnel- Choquant/ Plaisant- Répulsif/ Attirant- Ennuyant/ Intéressant-Pas informatif/ Informatif)	Own source
5	Attitude towards the brand	7-point semantic differential scale	3 items (Mauvaise/ Bonne- Pas agréable/ Agréable- Pas aimable/ Aimable)	Translated from Zhang & Zinkhan (2006); Chattopadhyay & Basu (1990); Zhang (1996) and modified into a 7-point scale
6	Purchase intention	7-point semantic differential scale	3 items (Peu plausible-plausible/ Improbable-probable/ Impossible-possible)	Translated from Zhang & Zinkhan (2006); Chattopadhyay & Basu (1990); Zhang (1996) and modified into a 7-point scale
	Credibility of the advertisement	7-point Likert scale (1 = pas du tout d'accord, 7 = tout à fait d'accord)	La publicité fournit : 1. De l'information réelle à propos de la Rainforest Alliance 2. De l'information	Translated from Sabri & Michel (2014)

7			réaliste à propos de la Rainforest Alliance 3. De l'information exacte à propos de la Rainforest Alliance 4. De l'information honnête à propos de la Rainforest Alliance	
8	Familiarity with the brand	7-point semantic differential scale	1 item (Unfamiliar-familiar)	Translated from Chung & Zhao (2011) and modified into a 7-point scale
9	Previous buying behaviour	Multiple choice question (3 options)	Oui ; Non ; Je ne sais pas	Own source
10	Interest in sustainability and the ecology	7-point Likert scale (1 = pas du tout d'accord, 7 = tout à fait d'accord)	1. Les espaces naturels méritent davantage d'attention. 2. J'éprouve un certain réconfort quand j'évite de gaspiller de l'énergie. 3. Je pense qu'il faudrait favoriser de plus en plus la consommation des produits biologiques. 4. J'éprouve un plaisir à participer en groupe au nettoyage des rivières et des forêts. 5. Les débats sur la protection de notre environnement font partis de mes centres d'intérêts. 6. Il m'inquiète de penser qu'une bonne partie de la nourriture que je mange est contaminée par les pesticides. 7. Il me dérange vraiment de penser que le gouvernement ne fait rien pour aider à contrôler la pollution de l'environnement. 8. Quand je pense à la façon dont les industriels causent la pollution, je me sens frustré. 9. J'éprouve du mépris	Imed (2005)

			vis-à-vis des gens qui jettent des papiers par terre. 10. Je pense que les gens devraient s'inquiéter en ce qui concerne les pesticides utilisés dans les produits alimentaires.	
11	Need for humour (NFH)	7-point Likert scale (1 = pas du tout d'accord, 7 = tout à fait d'accord)	1. Les gens attendent de moi que je dise des choses amusantes. 2. Parfois j'invente des blagues ou des histoires drôles. 3. Je peux souvent faire rire fortement des gens avec les choses que je dis. 4. J'aime les situations où des gens peuvent exprimer leur sens de l'humour. 5. J'aime être entouré(e) de gens qui ont un sens d'humour. 6. J'aime entendre quelqu'un raconter une blague.	Translated from Cline, Kellaris & Machleit (2011)
12	General scepticism of advertisements	7-point Likert scale (1 = pas du tout d'accord, 7 = tout à fait d'accord)	1. Je doute souvent de la véracité des messages publicitaires. 2. Je crois difficilement les promesses publicitaires. 3. Je ne suis pas convaincu par les mérites vantés d'un produit ou d'un service dans les publicités. 4. En général, les publicités disent des mensonges.	Boyer (2010)
13	Gender	Multiple choice question (2 options)	Êtes-vous un homme ou une femme? - Homme - Femme	Own source
14	Age	Multiple choice question (5 options)	Quel âge avez-vous? - Moins de 18 ans - 18-30 - 31-50	Own source

			- 51-70 - Plus de 70 ans	
15	Nationality	Multiple choice question (2 options)	Êtes-vous belge? - Oui - Non	Own source
16	Social status	7-point semantic differential scale	1 item (Faibles moyens financiers/ moyens financiers élevés)	Own source
17	Remarks	Open question	Avez-vous des commentaires par rapport aux questions du questionnaire?	Own source

4. Appendix 4-7: Tables SPSS

4.1. Appendix 4: Factor analyses and reliability tests

- Appendix 4.1.: Perceived humour

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Analysis N
Humour Pas humor/ Humor	3,904	2,1763	115
Humour Pas drôle/ Drôle	3,843	2,0157	115
Humour Pas Gai/ Gai	4,322	1,5703	115
Humour Pas Amusant/ Amusant	4,591	1,6591	115
Humour Ennuyeuse/ Pas Ennuyeuse	4,626	1,5698	115

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,801
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	560,288
	df	10
	Sig.	,000

The KMO is bigger than 0.7, so this is a good sign.

Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
Humour Pas humor/ Humor	1,000	,785
Humour Pas drôle/ Drôle	1,000	,823
Humour Pas Gai/ Gai	1,000	,658
Humour Pas Amusant/ Amusant	1,000	,808
Humour Ennuyeuse/ Pas Ennuyeuse	1,000	,807

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

All items have an extraction > 0.6 so we think we will keep all the items to regroup them into a new variable.

The table below shows that 77.624% of the variance is explained if we regroup all the items into one variable. This is a good percentage.

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3,881	77,624	77,624	3,881	77,624	77,624
2	,621	12,429	90,053			
3	,267	5,334	95,387			
4	,171	3,417	98,804			
5	,060	1,196	100,000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

All the previous data showed us that it is likely that all the items to measure the perceived humour will be regrouped into one variable. Let's look at the reliability of this new variable.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,923	5

The Cronbach's Alpha is > 0.7 so the factor is reliable.

We will thus regroup the 5 items to create a new variable: perceived humour.

- Appendix 4.2.: Attitude towards the ad (Aad)

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Analysis N
Aad Désagreable/ Agréable	5,148	1,2721	115
Aad Déplaisante/ Plaisante	4,939	1,3526	115
Aad Irritante/ Pas Irritante	4,861	1,6378	115
Aad Pas intéressante/ Intéressante	5,417	1,2634	115

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,784
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	248,415
	df	6
	Sig.	,000

The KMO is > 0.7, so this is a good sign.

Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
Aad Désagreable/ Agréable	1,000	,804
Aad Déplaisante/ Plaisante	1,000	,840
Aad Irritante/ Pas Irritante	1,000	,753
Aad Pas intéressante/ Intéressante	1,000	,426

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

All the items have an extraction > 0.6 except the last one who has a score of 0.426. We think this item might be redundant and thus removed. But let's analyse the next steps to be sure.

The table below shows that 70.558% of the variance is explained if we regroup all the items into one variable. This is a good percentage.

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2,822	70,558	70,558	2,822	70,558	70,558
2	,677	16,921	87,479			
3	,327	8,186	95,665			
4	,173	4,335	100,000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,853	4

Cronbach's Alpha is > 0.7. So, even though we had one item with an extraction score < 0.6, we will keep all the items.

We will thus regroup the 4 items to create a new variable: attitude towards the ad.

- Appendix 4.3.: Attitude towards the brand (Ab)

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Analysis N
Ab Mauvaise/ Bonne	5,730	1,1944	115
Ab Pas agréable/ Agréable	5,304	1,2007	115
Ab Pas aimable/ Aimable	5,400	1,1301	115

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,726
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	249,315
	df	3
	Sig.	,000

The KMO is bigger than 0.7, so this is a good sign.

Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
Ab Mauvaise/ Bonne	1,000	,787
Ab Pas agréable/ Agréable	1,000	,898
Ab Pas aimable/ Aimable	1,000	,867

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

All items have an extraction > 0.6 so we think we will keep all the items to regroup them into a new variable.

The table below shows that 85.072% of the variance is explained if we regroup all the items into one variable. This is a good percentage.

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2,552	85,072	85,072	2,552	85,072	85,072
2	,312	10,388	95,461			
3	,136	4,539	100,000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

All the previous data showed us that it is likely that all the items to measure the attitude towards the brand will be regrouped into one variable. Let's look at the reliability of this new variable.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,911	3

The Cronbach's Alpha is > 0.7 so the factor is reliable.

We will thus regroup the 3 items to create a new variable: attitude towards the brand.

- Appendix 4.4: Purchase intention (PI)

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Analysis N
PI Peu plausible/ Plausible	5,435	1,1708	115
PI Improbable/ Probable	5,461	1,0453	115
PI Impossible/ Possible	5,609	1,0234	115

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,756
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	231,660
	df	3
	Sig.	,000

The KMO is bigger than 0.7, so this is a good sign.

Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
PI Peu plausible/ Plausible	1,000	,831
PI Improbable/ Probable	1,000	,858
PI Impossible/ Possible	1,000	,862

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

All items have an extraction > 0.6 so we think we will keep all the items to regroup them into a new variable.

The table below shows that 85.037% of the variance is explained if we regroup all the items into one variable. This is a good percentage.

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2,551	85,037	85,037	2,551	85,037	85,037
2	,251	8,353	93,389			
3	,198	6,611	100,000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

All the previous data showed us that it is likely that all the items to measure the purchase intention will be regrouped into one variable. Let's look at the reliability of this new variable.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,910	3

The Cronbach's Alpha is > 0.7 so the factor is reliable.

We will thus regroup the 3 items to create a new variable: purchase intention.

- <u>Appendix 4.5.: Credibility of the advertisement</u>

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Analysis N
Crédibilité info réelle	4,913	1,3609	115
Crédibilité info réaliste	4,835	1,2769	115
Crédibilité info exacte	4,435	1,1857	115
Crédibilité info honnête	4,704	1,1000	115

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,780
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	206,609
	df	6
	Sig.	,000

The KMO is bigger than 0.7, so this is a good sign.

Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
Crédibilité info réelle	1,000	,722
Crédibilité info réaliste	1,000	,765
Crédibilité info exacte	1,000	,674
Crédibilité info honnête	1,000	,629

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

All items have an extraction > 0.6 so we think we will keep all the items to regroup them into a new variable.

The table below shows that 69.769% of the variance is explained if we regroup all the items into one variable. This is a good percentage.

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2,791	69,769	69,769	2,791	69,769	69,769
2	,546	13,642	83,412			
3	,413	10,319	93,730			
4	,251	6,270	100,000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

All the previous data showed us that it is likely that all the items to measure the credibility of the advertisement will be regrouped into one variable. Let us look at the reliability of this new variable.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,854	4

The Cronbach's Alpha is > 0.7 so the factor is reliable.

We will thus regroup the 4 items to create a new variable: credibility of the advertisement.

- Appendix 4.6.: Interest in sustainability and the ecology

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Analysis N
Sust espaces naturels	6,313	,7877	115
Sust évite de gaspiller	5,835	1,1542	115
Sust produits bio	5,435	1,3451	115
Sust nettoyage riv et forêts	3,861	1,4979	115
Sust débats protection envi	4,461	1,6399	115
Sust contaminée pesticides	4,835	1,7113	115
Sust gvt contrôler pollution	5,278	1,3800	115
Sust industiels pollution	5,235	1,4828	115
Sust papiers par terre	6,409	,9449	115
Sust pesticides PR alim	5,339	1,3630	115

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,824
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	475,989
	df	45
	Sig.	,000

The KMO is bigger than 0.7, so this is a good sign.

Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
Sust espaces naturels	1,000	,644
Sust évite de gaspiller	1,000	,534
Sust produits bio	1,000	,406
Sust nettoyage riv et forêts	1,000	,380
Sust débats protection envi	1,000	,576
Sust contaminée pesticides	1,000	,733
Sust gvt contrôler pollution	1,000	,588
Sust industiels pollution	1,000	,663
Sust papiers par terre	1,000	,559
Sust pesticides PR alim	1,000	,730

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

4 items have an extraction > 0.6 and 6 have an extraction of < 0.6. This is not a good thing so let's analyse further.

We can see on the table below that 2 components have been created, whereas our variable 'interest in sustainability and the ecology' is one factor so we expected to have one. Both factors explain 58.137% of the variance.

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4,456	44,561	44,561	4,456	44,561	44,561	3,850	38,502	38,502
2	1,358	13,577	58,137	1,358	13,577	58,137	1,964	19,636	58,137
3	,934	9,337	67,474						
4	,770	7,702	75,176						
5	,684	6,839	82,016						
6	,552	5,522	87,538						
7	,435	4,350	91,888						
8	,355	3,551	95,439						
9	,246	2,461	97,900						
10	,210	2,100	100,000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

We will analyse whether we can delete some items to have a good variable composed of less items.

Rotated Component Matrix[a]

	Component	
	1	2
Sust pesticides PR alim	,854	,021
Sust contaminée pesticides	,834	-,195
Sust industiels pollution	,728	,364
Sust gvt contrôler pollution	,724	,254
Sust débats protection envi	,693	,308
Sust produits bio	,588	,244
Sust nettoyage riv et forêts	,527	,320
Sust espaces naturels	,278	,753
Sust papiers par terre	-,085	,743
Sust évite de gaspiller	,426	,594

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

We see 'sust espaces naturels', 'sust papiers par terre' and 'sust évite de gaspiller' have a high score for component 2 and a weaker score for component 1. We will start by eliminating 'sust espaces naturels' because it has the highest score (0.753).

After redoing a factor analysis without 'sust espaces naturels' we still have 2 components as seen in the table below.

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4,176	46,396	46,396	4,176	46,396	46,396	3,714	41,271	41,271
2	1,163	12,923	59,318	1,163	12,923	59,318	1,624	18,048	59,318
3	,924	10,267	69,586						
4	,762	8,464	78,050						
5	,554	6,150	84,200						
6	,526	5,847	90,047						
7	,428	4,754	94,801						
8	,246	2,738	97,539						
9	,221	2,461	100,000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
Sust évite de gaspiller	1,000	,584
Sust produits bio	1,000	,396
Sust nettoyage riv et forêts	1,000	,451
Sust débats protection envi	1,000	,585
Sust contaminée pesticides	1,000	,700
Sust gvt contrôler pollution	1,000	,588
Sust industiels pollution	1,000	,657
Sust papiers par terre	1,000	,648
Sust pesticides PR alim	1,000	,729

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Here 5 items have an extraction below 0.6 and 4 have and extraction above 0.6.

Rotated Component Matrix[a]

	Component	
	1	2
Sust pesticides PR alim	,853	,042
Sust contaminée pesticides	,826	-,133
Sust gvt contrôler pollution	,745	,183
Sust industiels pollution	,738	,336
Sust débats protection envi	,678	,353
Sust produits bio	,584	,234
Sust nettoyage riv et forêts	,480	,469
Sust papiers par terre	-,111	,797
Sust évite de gaspiller	,402	,650

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

We will continue deleting a new item since our analysis is not good yet. We will delete 'sust papiers par terre' since it has the highest score for component 2 (0.797).

After redoing a factor analysis without 'sust papiers par terre' we obtain one component as seen in table below. Here the component explains 51.773% of the variance.

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4,142	51,773	51,773	4,142	51,773	51,773
2	,998	12,477	64,250			
3	,838	10,476	74,725			
4	,564	7,049	81,775			
5	,529	6,615	88,390			
6	,442	5,522	93,911			
7	,266	3,319	97,231			
8	,222	2,769	100,000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
Sust évite de gaspiller	1,000	,378
Sust produits bio	1,000	,397
Sust nettoyage riv et forêts	1,000	,389
Sust débats protection envi	1,000	,587
Sust contaminée pesticides	1,000	,514
Sust gvt contrôler pollution	1,000	,578
Sust industiels pollution	1,000	,650
Sust pesticides PR alim	1,000	,648

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

6 out of 8 extraction scores are below 0.6.

Since the results obtained are not convincing, we have decided to continue eliminating item by item until we reach good results. So we eliminated ‘sust évite de gaspiller’, then ‘sust nettoyage riv et forêts’ and lastly ‘sust produits bio’.

We obtain these results:

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Analysis N
Sust débats protection envi	4,461	1,6399	115
Sust contaminée pesticides	4,835	1,7113	115
Sust gvt contrôler pollution	5,278	1,3800	115
Sust pesticides PR alim	5,339	1,3630	115
Sust industiels pollution	5,235	1,4828	115

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,787
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	281,975
	df	10
	Sig.	,000

The KMO is bigger than 0.7, so this is a good sign.

Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
Sust débats protection envi	1,000	,524
Sust contaminée pesticides	1,000	,579
Sust gvt contrôler pollution	1,000	,668
Sust pesticides PR alim	1,000	,734
Sust industiels pollution	1,000	,716

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

2 items have an extraction < 0.6 but they have an extraction bigger than 0.5 so it is not that bad. 3 other extractions have a score higher than 0.6.

The table below shows that 64.435% of the variance is explained if we regroup all the items into one variable. This is a good percentage.

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3,222	64,435	64,435	3,222	64,435	64,435
2	,732	14,635	79,070			
3	,547	10,932	90,002			
4	,274	5,484	95,487			
5	,226	4,513	100,000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix[a]

	Component
	1
Sust pesticides PR alim	,857
Sust industiels pollution	,846
Sust gvt contrôler pollution	,817
Sust contaminée pesticides	,761
Sust débats protection envi	,724

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.

All scores are > 0.6.

So, even though 2 extraction scores were below 0.6 (but above 0.5), the other data shows us that the items are likely to measure the interest in sustainability and the ecology and that we can regroup them into one variable. Let's look at the reliability of this new variable.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
,854	,861	5

The Cronbach's Alpha is > 0.7 so the factor is reliable.

We will thus regroup the 5 items to create a new variable: interest in sustainability and the ecology.

- Appendix 4.7.: Need for humour (NFH)

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Analysis N
NFH attendent de moi	5,052	1,2485	115
NFH j'invente des blagues	4,522	1,6295	115
NFH faire rire	5,130	1,3214	115
NFH exprimer sens humour	6,183	,9232	115
NFH entouré de gens sens humour	6,435	,7851	115
NFH entendre blague	6,052	,9257	115

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,813
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	318,420
	df	15
	Sig.	,000

The KMO is bigger than 0.7, so this is a good sign.

Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
NFH attendent de moi	1,000	,774
NFH j'invente des blagues	1,000	,720
NFH faire rire	1,000	,773
NFH exprimer sens humour	1,000	,769
NFH entouré de gens sens humour	1,000	,837
NFH entendre blague	1,000	,673

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

All items have an extraction > 0.6 so we think we will keep all the items to regroup them into a new variable.

But, the table below shows that we have 2 components and together they explain 75.787% of the variance.

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3,479	57,979	57,979	3,479	57,979	57,979	2,317	38,622	38,622
2	1,068	17,807	75,787	1,068	17,807	75,787	2,230	37,164	75,787
3	,485	8,077	83,864						
4	,403	6,715	90,579						
5	,319	5,315	95,893						
6	,246	4,107	100,000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix[a]

	Component	
	1	2
NFH exprimer sens humour	,806	-,347
NFH faire rire	,787	,392
NFH j'invente des blagues	,785	,323
NFH entouré de gens sens humour	,769	-,495
NFH entendre blague	,726	-,383
NFH attendent de moi	,690	,546

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 2 components extracted.

Rotated Component Matrix[a]

	Component	
	1	2
NFH entouré de gens sens humour	,897	,177
NFH exprimer sens humour	,821	,310
NFH entendre blague	,788	,228
NFH attendent de moi	,117	,872
NFH faire rire	,295	,829
NFH j'invente des blagues	,341	,777

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

We see ‘NFH attendent de moi’, ‘NFH faire rire’ and ‘NFH j’invente des blagues’ have a high score for component 2 and a weaker score for component 1. We will start by eliminating ‘NFH attendent de moi’ because it has the highest score (0.872).

This gives us the following results:

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,777
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	252,008
	df	10
	Sig.	,000

The KMO is bigger than 0.7, so this is a good sign.

Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
NFH j'invente des blagues	1,000	,568
NFH faire rire	1,000	,550
NFH exprimer sens humour	1,000	,714
NFH entouré de gens sens humour	1,000	,680
NFH entendre blague	1,000	,581

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

3 items have an extraction < 0.6 but their extraction is > 0.5 so we think we will keep all the items to regroup them into a new variable.

Now we only have one component left and the table below shows that 61.848% of the variance is explained if we regroup all the items into one variable. This is a good percentage.

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3,092	61,848	61,848	3,092	61,848	61,848
2	,843	16,860	78,708			
3	,479	9,589	88,297			
4	,339	6,772	95,070			
5	,247	4,930	100,000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix[a]

	Component
	1
NFH exprimer sens humour	,845
NFH entouré de gens sens humour	,825
NFH entendre blague	,762
NFH j'invente des blagues	,753
NFH faire rire	,741

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.

All scores are > 0.6.

All the previous data showed us that it is likely that all the items to measure the need for humour will be regrouped into one variable. Let's look at the reliability of this new variable.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
,815	,845	5

The Cronbach's Alpha is > 0.7 so the factor is reliable.

We will thus regroup the 5 items to create a new variable: need for humour.

- Appendix 4.8.: General scepticism towards advertisements

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Analysis N
Scepticism doute véracité	5,383	1,0889	115
Scepticism promesses pubs	5,487	1,1575	115
Scepticism mérites vantés	5,287	1,1904	115
Scepticism pubs mensonges	4,304	1,4028	115

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,804
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	198,409
	df	6
	Sig.	,000

The KMO is bigger than 0.7, so this is a good sign.

Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
Scepticism doute véracité	1,000	,725
Scepticism promesses pubs	1,000	,747
Scepticism mérites vantés	1,000	,780
Scepticism pubs mensonges	1,000	,494

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

All the items have an extraction > 0.6 except the last one who has a score of 0.494. We think this item might be redundant and thus removed. But let's analyse the next steps to be sure.

The table below shows that 68.631% of the variance is explained if we regroup all the items into one variable. This is a good percentage.

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2,745	68,631	68,631	2,745	68,631	68,631
2	,622	15,555	84,186			
3	,343	8,582	92,767			
4	,289	7,233	100,000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,836	4

The Cronbach's Alpha is > 0.7. So, even though we had one item with an extraction score < 0.6, we will keep all the items.

We will thus regroup the 4 items to create a new variable: general scepticism towards advertisements.

4.2. Appendix 5: Sample analyses

- Appendix 5.1.: Homogeneity of sub-groups

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Homme	51	44,3	44,3	44,3
	Femme	64	55,7	55,7	100,0
	Total	115	100,0	100,0	

- **Appendix 5.1.1.: Gender**

We will now test with a chi-square if both sub-groups are composed of the same proportion of men and women.

H0: the proportions of both groups are equal (no dependence relation)

H1: there is one proportion that is different (dependence relation)

58 people saw the non-humorous video and 57 people saw the humorous video.

Video type * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Homme	Femme	
Video type	Non humorous	Count	28	30	58
		Expected Count	25,7	32,3	58,0
		% within Video type	48,3%	51,7%	100,0%
		% within Gender	54,9%	46,9%	50,4%
		% of Total	24,3%	26,1%	50,4%
	Humorous video	Count	23	34	57
		Expected Count	25,3	31,7	57,0
		% within Video type	40,4%	59,6%	100,0%
		% within Gender	45,1%	53,1%	49,6%
		% of Total	20,0%	29,6%	49,6%
Total		Count	51	64	115
		Expected Count	51,0	64,0	115,0
		% within Video type	44,3%	55,7%	100,0%
		% within Gender	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	44,3%	55,7%	100,0%

Since the p-value is > 0.05, we cannot reject H0. There is no dependence relation. This means there is the same proportion of men and women in each group.

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	,732[a]	1	,392		
Continuity Correction[b]	,446	1	,504		
Likelihood Ratio	,732	1	,392		
Fisher's Exact Test				,454	,252
Linear-by-Linear Association	,725	1	,394		
N of Valid Cases	115				

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 25,28.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

- **Appendix 5.1.2.: Age**

We will now test the same for the age (new age groups).

Video type * Q14_age Crosstabulation

			Q14_age			Total
			18-30	31-50	50+	
Video type	Non humorous	Count	37	5	16	58
		Expected Count	38,8	4,5	14,6	58,0
		% within Video type	63,8%	8,6%	27,6%	100,0%
		% within Q14_age	48,1%	55,6%	55,2%	50,4%
		% of Total	32,2%	4,3%	13,9%	50,4%
	Humorous video	Count	40	4	13	57
		Expected Count	38,2	4,5	14,4	57,0
		% within Video type	70,2%	7,0%	22,8%	100,0%
		% within Q14_age	51,9%	44,4%	44,8%	49,6%
		% of Total	34,8%	3,5%	11,3%	49,6%
Total		Count	77	9	29	115
		Expected Count	77,0	9,0	29,0	115,0
		% within Video type	67,0%	7,8%	25,2%	100,0%
		% within Q14_age	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	67,0%	7,8%	25,2%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	,530[a]	2	,767
Likelihood Ratio	,530	2	,767
Linear-by-Linear Association	,475	1	,491
N of Valid Cases	115		

a. 2 cells (33,3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4,46.

P-value > 0.05, so there is no dependence relation. The proportion of the different age groups is well distributed over the sub-groups.

- **Appendix 5.1.3.: Need for humour**

Now we will test the same for the need for humour.

Q11_Med_NFH * Video type Crosstabulation

			Video type		
			Non humorous	Humorous video	Total
Q11_Med_NFH	Low NFH	Count	29	22	51
		Expected Count	25,7	25,3	51,0
		% within Q11_Med_NFH	56,9%	43,1%	100,0%
		% within Video type	50,0%	38,6%	44,3%
	High NFH	Count	29	35	64
		Expected Count	32,3	31,7	64,0
		% within Q11_Med_NFH	45,3%	54,7%	100,0%
		% within Video type	50,0%	61,4%	55,7%
Total		Count	58	57	115
		Expected Count	58,0	57,0	115,0
		% within Q11_Med_NFH	50,4%	49,6%	100,0%
		% within Video type	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

P-value > 0.05 so H0 is not rejected.

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1,515[a]	1	,218		
Continuity Correction[b]	1,088	1	,297		
Likelihood Ratio	1,518	1	,218		
Fisher's Exact Test				,262	,148
Linear-by-Linear Association	1,502	1	,220		
N of Valid Cases	115				

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 25,28.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

- **Appendix 5.1.4.: Interest in sustainability and the ecology**

We do the same for the interest in sustainability.

Q10_Med_Sust * Video type Crosstabulation

			Video type		
			Non humorous	Humorous video	Total
Q10_Med_Sust	Low interest in sust	Count	25	33	58
		Expected Count	29,3	28,7	58,0
		% within Q10_Med_Sust	43,1%	56,9%	100,0%
		% within Video type	43,1%	57,9%	50,4%
	High interest in sust	Count	33	24	57
		Expected Count	28,7	28,3	57,0
		% within Q10_Med_Sust	57,9%	42,1%	100,0%
		% within Video type	56,9%	42,1%	49,6%
Total		Count	58	57	115
		Expected Count	58,0	57,0	115,0
		% within Q10_Med_Sust	50,4%	49,6%	100,0%
		% within Video type	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Since the p-value is > 0.05, we cannot reject H0 and so there is no dependence relation. Both sub-groups have the same proportion of people with high and low interest in sustainability and the ecology.

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2,516[a]	1	,113		
Continuity Correction[b]	1,959	1	,162		
Likelihood Ratio	2,525	1	,112		
Fisher's Exact Test				,137	,081
Linear-by-Linear Association	2,494	1	,114		
N of Valid Cases	115				

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 28,25.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

- **Appendix 5.1.5.: General scepticism towards advertisements**

Then, we will do the same for the general scepticism towards advertisements.

Q12_Med_Scept * Video type Crosstabulation

			Video type		Total
			Non humorous	Humorous video	
Q12_Med_Scept	Low scepticism	Count	28	29	57
		Expected Count	28,7	28,3	57,0
		% within Q12_Med_Scept	49,1%	50,9%	100,0%
		% within Video type	48,3%	50,9%	49,6%
	High scepticism	Count	30	28	58
		Expected Count	29,3	28,7	58,0
		% within Q12_Med_Scept	51,7%	48,3%	100,0%
		% within Video type	51,7%	49,1%	50,4%
Total		Count	58	57	115
		Expected Count	58,0	57,0	115,0
		% within Q12_Med_Scept	50,4%	49,6%	100,0%
		% within Video type	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Since the p-value is > 0.05, we cannot reject H0 and so there is no dependence relation. Both sub-groups have the same proportion of people with a high and low scepticism towards advertisements.

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	,078[a]	1	,780		
Continuity Correction[b]	,009	1	,926		
Likelihood Ratio	,078	1	,780		
Fisher's Exact Test				,853	,463
Linear-by-Linear Association	,077	1	,781		
N of Valid Cases	115				

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 28,25.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

- **Appendix 5.1.6.: Social status**

We do the same for the social status. But this time we perform an ANOVA since it is one qualitative and a quantitative variable.

H0: µNH (mean of the non-humorous video) = µH (mean of the humorous video)

H1: There exists a difference between µNH and µH

Descriptives

Status social

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Non humorous	58	4,776	1,1089	,1456	4,484	5,067	2,0	7,0
Humorous video	57	4,860	1,2455	,1650	4,529	5,190	1,0	7,0
Total	115	4,817	1,1742	,1095	4,600	5,034	1,0	7,0

Here H0: there is homogeneity of the variances

H1: there is no homogeneity of the variances

The p-value of the test of homogeneity of variances is > 0.05. So we do not reject H0. The hypothesis of the homogeneity of the variances is respected.

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Status social

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
,646	1	113	,423

The p-value of the ANOVA is > 0.05. So we do not reject H0. The mean of the non-humorous video is not significantly different than the mean of the humorous video.

ANOVA

Status social

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	,202	1	,202	,145	,704
Within Groups	156,963	113	1,389		
Total	157,165	114			

- Appendix 5.2.: Perceived humour

The mean for the non-humorous video is 2.96 whereas the mean for the humorous video is 5.58.

H0: μH (mean of the humorous video) ≤ μNH (mean of the non-humorous video)

H1: μH > μNH

Descriptives

Perceived humour

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Non humorous	58	2,9586	,88952	,11680	2,7247	3,1925	1,00	4,60
Humorous video	57	5,5789	,89657	,11875	5,3411	5,8168	3,80	7,00
Total	115	4,2574	1,58806	,14809	3,9640	4,5508	1,00	7,00

Here H0: there is homogeneity of the variances

H1: there is no homogeneity of the variances

The p-value of the test of homogeneity of variances is > 0.05. So we do not reject H0. The hypothesis of the homogeneity of the variances is respected.

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Perceived humour

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
,108	1	113	,743

When looking at the ANOVA table, we see the p-value is < 0.05 so we reject H0.

ANOVA

Perceived humour

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	197,386	1	197,386	247,511	,000
Within Groups	90,115	113	,797		
Total	287,501	114			

- Appendix 5.3.: Control variables

H0: µNH (mean of the non-humorous video) = µH (mean of the humorous video)

H1: There exists a difference between µNH and µH

Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Charact Abstrait/ Concret	Non humorous	58	5,845	,7903	,1038	5,637	6,053	4,0	7,0
	Humorous video	57	5,947	1,0925	,1447	5,657	6,237	3,0	7,0
	Total	115	5,896	,9494	,0885	5,720	6,071	3,0	7,0
Charact Emotionnel/ Rationnel	Non humorous	58	4,741	1,4577	,1914	4,358	5,125	2,0	7,0
	Humorous video	57	4,579	1,9268	,2552	4,068	5,090	1,0	7,0
	Total	115	4,661	1,7008	,1586	4,347	4,975	1,0	7,0
Charact Choquant/ Plaisant	Non humorous	58	4,828	1,2303	,1615	4,504	5,151	1,0	7,0
	Humorous video	57	4,456	1,4647	,1940	4,068	4,845	2,0	7,0
	Total	115	4,643	1,3585	,1267	4,393	4,894	1,0	7,0
Charact Répulsif/ Attirant	Non humorous	58	4,914	1,1127	,1461	4,621	5,206	1,0	7,0
	Humorous video	57	5,070	1,0997	,1457	4,778	5,362	3,0	7,0
	Total	115	4,991	1,1042	,1030	4,787	5,195	1,0	7,0
Charact Ennuyant/ Intéressant	Non humorous	58	5,328	1,2338	,1620	5,003	5,652	1,0	7,0
	Humorous video	57	5,702	1,0685	,1415	5,418	5,985	2,0	7,0
	Total	115	5,513	1,1650	,1086	5,298	5,728	1,0	7,0
Charact Pas informatif/ Informatif	Non humorous	58	5,983	,8884	,1166	5,749	6,216	4,0	7,0
	Humorous video	57	5,544	1,2546	,1662	5,211	5,877	2,0	7,0
	Total	115	5,765	1,1029	,1028	5,561	5,969	2,0	7,0

Here H0: there is homogeneity of the variances

H1: there is no homogeneity of the variances

For Charact Emotionnel/ Rationnel and Charact Pas informatif/ Informatif the p-value is < 0.05 so we will look at the Welch for these variables. For the other variables, the p-value is > 0.05 so we will analyse the ANOVA table. For the ANOVA, H0 is not rejected so the hypothesis of the homogeneity of the variances is respected.

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Charact Abstrait/ Concret	1,859	1	113	,175
Charact Emotionnel/ Rationnel	6,960	1	113	,010
Charact Choquant/ Plaisant	3,192	1	113	,077
Charact Répulsif/ Attirant	,213	1	113	,645
Charact Ennuyant/ Intéressant	1,336	1	113	,250
Charact Pas informatif/ Informatif	9,179	1	113	,003

We can see from the table below that all the p-values are > 0.05 (except the last one but we have to look at Welch for this variable) so H0 is not rejected. The different characteristics do not differ according to the video type.

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Charact Abstrait/ Concret	Between Groups	,302	1	,302	,333	,565
	Within Groups	102,446	113	,907		
	Total	102,748	114			
Charact Emotionnel/ Rationnel	Between Groups	,758	1	,758	,261	,611
	Within Groups	329,015	113	2,912		
	Total	329,774	114			
Charact Choquant/ Plaisant	Between Groups	3,966	1	3,966	2,171	,143
	Within Groups	206,416	113	1,827		
	Total	210,383	114			
Charact Répulsif/ Attirant	Between Groups	,703	1	,703	,574	,450
	Within Groups	138,288	113	1,224		
	Total	138,991	114			
Charact Ennuyant/ Intéressant	Between Groups	4,025	1	4,025	3,018	,085
	Within Groups	150,706	113	1,334		
	Total	154,730	114			
Charact Pas informatif/ Informatif	Between Groups	5,538	1	5,538	4,701	,032
	Within Groups	133,123	113	1,178		
	Total	138,661	114			

For Charact Emotionnel/ Rationnel and Charact Pas informatif/ Informatif we needed to look at Welch. The first variable has a p-value of 0.612 so > 0.05. Here H0 is not rejected. For the other variable the p-value is < 0.05 so H0 is rejected.

Robust Tests of Equality of Means

		Statistic[a]	df1	df2	Sig.
Charact Abstrait/ Concret	Welch	,332	1	101,926	,566
Charact Emotionnel/ Rationnel	Welch	,259	1	104,298	,612
Charact Choquant/ Plaisant	Welch	2,165	1	109,065	,144
Charact Répulsif/ Attirant	Welch	,575	1	112,996	,450
Charact Ennuyant/ Intéressant	Welch	3,025	1	111,246	,085
Charact Pas informatif/ Informatif	Welch	4,673	1	100,752	,033

a. Asymptotically F distributed.

- **Appendix 5.3.1.: ANCOVA**

The P-value is < 0.05.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the ad

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	43,488[a]	2	21,744	22,255	,000
Intercept	31,289	1	31,289	32,024	,000
Q4Charact_6	20,341	1	20,341	20,819	,000
Condition	31,532	1	31,532	32,273	,000
Error	109,429	112	,977		
Total	3133,875	115			
Corrected Total	152,916	114			

a. R Squared = ,284 (Adjusted R Squared = ,272)

4.3. Appendix 6: Hypotheses analyses

- Appendix 6.1.: Hypothesis 1

To test the three first hypotheses, we have performed an ANOVA.

H0: μH (mean of the humorous video) ≤ μNH (mean of the non-humorous video)

H1: μH > μNH

Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Attitude towards the ad	Non humorous	58	4,6466	1,23990	,16281	4,3205	4,9726	2,00	7,00
	Humorous video	57	5,5439	,86747	,11490	5,3137	5,7740	3,50	7,00
	Total	115	5,0913	1,15818	,10800	4,8774	5,3053	2,00	7,00
Attitude towards the brand	Non humorous	58	5,3506	1,03246	,13557	5,0791	5,6220	2,00	7,00
	Humorous video	57	5,6082	1,12709	,14929	5,3091	5,9072	2,33	7,00
	Total	115	5,4783	1,08339	,10103	5,2781	5,6784	2,00	7,00
Purchase intention	Non humorous	58	5,3218	,96925	,12727	5,0670	5,5767	2,00	7,00
	Humorous video	57	5,6842	,99686	,13204	5,4197	5,9487	2,33	7,00
	Total	115	5,5014	,99548	,09283	5,3176	5,6853	2,00	7,00

Here H0: there is homogeneity of the variances

H1: there is no homogeneity of the variances

For the attitude towards the ad (Aad) the p-value is < 0.05 so we will look at the Welch for this variable. For the other variables, the p-value is > 0.05 so we will analyse the ANOVA table since H0 is not rejected. The hypothesis of the homogeneity of the variances is respected for the last case.

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Attitude towards the ad	13,377	1	113	,000
Attitude towards the brand	1,342	1	113	,249
Purchase intention	,389	1	113	,534

Since we are performing an unilateral hypothesis test, the P-value = sig./2. So the p-value for Ab is 0.102 and for PI is 0.0255. The p-value for the Ab is > 0.05 so the H0 is not rejected. The p-value for the PI is < 0.05, so H0 is rejected.

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Attitude towards the ad	Between Groups	23,147	1	23,147	20,155	,000
	Within Groups	129,770	113	1,148		
	Total	152,916	114			
Attitude towards the brand	Between Groups	1,908	1	1,908	1,634	,204
	Within Groups	131,899	113	1,167		
	Total	133,807	114			
Purchase intention	Between Groups	3,775	1	3,775	3,906	,051
	Within Groups	109,197	113	,966		
	Total	112,972	114			

For the Aad we can see the p-value is < 0.05 so H0 is rejected.

Robust Tests of Equality of Means

		Statistic[a]	df1	df2	Sig.
Attitude towards the ad	Welch	20,277	1	102,131	,000
Attitude towards the brand	Welch	1,632	1	111,769	,204
Purchase intention	Welch	3,905	1	112,765	,051

a. Asymptotically F distributed.

- Appendix 6.2.: Hypothesis 2a

To test this, we did an ANOVA.

H0: µH (mean of the humorous video) ≤ µNH (mean of the non-humorous video)

H1: µH > µNH

Descriptives

Credibility

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Non humorous	58	4,9828	,88712	,11648	4,7495	5,2160	3,00	6,50
Humorous video	57	4,4561	1,10308	,14611	4,1635	4,7488	1,75	6,25
Total	115	4,7217	1,03012	,09606	4,5314	4,9120	1,75	6,50

Here H0: there is homogeneity of the variances

H1: there is no homogeneity of the variances

The p-value of the test of homogeneity of variances is > 0.05. So we do not reject H0. The hypothesis of the homogeneity of the variances is respected.

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Credibility

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
3,012	1	113	,085

On the ANOVA table below, we can see that the p-value is < 0.05 (0.006/2), so we do reject H0.

ANOVA

Credibility

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	7,973	1	7,973	7,973	,006
Within Groups	112,998	113	1,000		
Total	120,971	114			

- Appendix 6.3.: Condition 1

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,474[a]	,225	,218	1,02442

a. Predictors: (Constant), Perceived humour

P-value > 0.05.

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B		Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	3,620	,274		13,194	,000	3,077	4,164		
	Perceived humour	,346	,060	,474	5,720	,000	,226	,465	1,000	1,000

a. Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the ad

- Appendix 6.4.: Condition 2

The p-value of the ANOVA table is > 0.05 so we will reject H0. There is **no linear regression** model between both variables.

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2,798	1	2,798	2,676	,105[b]
	Residual	118,172	113	1,046		
	Total	120,971	114			

a. Dependent Variable: Credibility

b. Predictors: (Constant), Perceived humour

- Appendix 6.5.: Hypothesis 2b

The R^2 is 0.026, so 2.6% of the Aad (dependent variable) is being explained by the credibility of the ad (independent variable).

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,162[a]	,026	,018	1,14790

a. Predictors: (Constant), Credibility

H0: $R^2 = 0$

Ha: $R^2 \neq 0$

The p-value of the ANOVA table is between 0.05 and 0.1 so it is marginally significant. There is a linear regression model between both variables.

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4,018	1	4,018	3,049	,083[b]
	Residual	148,898	113	1,318		
	Total	152,916	114			

a. Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the ad

b. Predictors: (Constant), Credibility

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B		Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	4,231	,504		8,390	,000	3,232	5,230		
	Credibility	,182	,104	,162	1,746	,083	-,025	,389	1,000	1,000

a. Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the ad

- Appendix 6.6.: Hypothesis 2c

Linear regression with Ab as the dependent variable and credibility as the independent variable. The R^2 is 0.317, so 31.7% of the Ab (dependent variable) is being explained by the credibility (independent variables).

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,317[a]	,101	,093	1,03189

a. Predictors: (Constant), Credibility

H0: $R^2 = 0$

Ha: $R^2 \neq 0$

The p-value of the ANOVA table is < 0.05 so we will reject H0. There is a linear regression model between both variables.

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	13,484	1	13,484	12,663	,001[b]
	Residual	120,323	113	1,065		
	Total	133,807	114			

a. Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the brand

b. Predictors: (Constant), Credibility

H0: $\beta = 0$

Ha: $\beta \neq 0$

The p-value is < 0.05 for the credibility variable so we will reject H0.

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B		Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	3,902	,453		8,607	,000	3,004	4,800		
	Credibility	,334	,094	,317	3,559	,001	,148	,520	1,000	1,000

a. Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the brand

- Appendix 6.7.: Additional ANCOVA

The Levene's test of equality of error variances has a P-value > 0.05

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the brand

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	19,266[a]	2	9,633	9,419	,000
Intercept	64,014	1	64,014	62,594	,000
Q7_Credibility_ad	17,358	1	17,358	16,973	,000
Condition	5,782	1	5,782	5,653	,019
Error	114,541	112	1,023		
Total	3585,111	115			
Corrected Total	133,807	114			

a. R Squared = ,144 (Adjusted R Squared = ,129)

The p-value is < 0.05.

- Appendix 6.8.: Hypothesis 2d

R^2 = 0.268. 26.8% of the purchase intention is being explained by the credibility.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,268[a]	,072	,064	,96318

a. Predictors: (Constant), Credibility

P-value is < 0.05 so we will reject H0. There is a linear regression model between the two variables.

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	8,140	1	8,140	8,774	,004[b]
	Residual	104,832	113	,928		
	Total	112,972	114			

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase intention

b. Predictors: (Constant), Credibility

The regression model is: PI = 4.277 + 0.259 (credibility)

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B		Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	4,277	,423		10,107	,000	3,438	5,115		
	Credibility	,259	,088	,268	2,962	,004	,086	,433	1,000	1,000

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase intention

- Appendix 6.9.: Hypothesis 3a

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Credibility

Video type	Q12_Med_Scept	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Non humorous	Low scepticism	5,0982	,91878	28
	High scepticism	4,8750	,85790	30
	Total	4,9828	,88712	58
Humorous video	Low scepticism	4,3879	1,24209	29
	High scepticism	4,5268	,95583	28
	Total	4,4561	1,10308	57
Total	Low scepticism	4,7368	1,14313	57
	High scepticism	4,7069	,91544	58
	Total	4,7217	1,03012	115

The Levene's test of equality of error variances has a P-value of 0.114 (> 0.05) and an F = 2.027. So the homogeneity of the variances is respected.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances[a]

Dependent Variable: Credibility

F	df1	df2	Sig.
2,027	3	111	,114

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + Condition + Med_Scepticism + Condition * Med_Scepticism

The interaction effect between both variables (Med_scepticism and video type) is not significant (F = 0.933, P-value = 0.336).

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Credibility

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	8,969[a]	3	2,990	2,963	,035
Intercept	2562,065	1	2562,065	2539,148	,000
Condition	8,046	1	8,046	7,974	,006
Med_Scepticism	,051	1	,051	,051	,822
Condition * Med_Scepticism	,941	1	,941	,933	,336
Error	112,002	111	1,009		
Total	2684,875	115			
Corrected Total	120,971	114			

a. R Squared = ,074 (Adjusted R Squared = ,049)

- Appendix 6.10.: Hypothesis 3b

To test this hypothesis, we did a univariate ANOVA test with Aad as the dependent variable. The video type (condition) and the Med_scepticism were the independent variables.

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the ad

Video type	Q12_Med_Scept	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Non humorous	Low scepticism	4,5446	1,12228	28
	High scepticism	4,7417	1,35265	30
	Total	4,6466	1,23990	58
Humorous video	Low scepticism	5,8362	,75674	29
	High scepticism	5,2411	,88318	28
	Total	5,5439	,86747	57
Total	Low scepticism	5,2018	1,14802	57
	High scepticism	4,9828	1,16779	58
	Total	5,0913	1,15818	115

The Levene's test of equality of error variances has a P-value < 0.001 and an F = 6.836. So we reject H0: the hypothesis of homogeneity of the variances is not respected. But, since the test is robust we will do the ANOVA anyways to look at the results and be careful with the interpretation of them.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances[a]

Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the ad

F	df1	df2	Sig.
6,836	3	111	,000

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + Condition + Med_Scepticism + Condition * Med_Scepticism

The interaction effect between both variables (Med_scepticism and video type) is significant (F = 4.029, P-value = 0.047).

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the ad

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	28,754[a]	3	9,585	8,569	,000
Intercept	2978,037	1	2978,037	2662,348	,000
Condition	23,035	1	23,035	20,594	,000
Med_Scepticism	1,138	1	1,138	1,018	,315
Condition * Med_Scepticism	4,507	1	4,507	4,029	,047
Error	124,162	111	1,119		
Total	3133,875	115			
Corrected Total	152,916	114			

a. R Squared = ,188 (Adjusted R Squared = ,166)

- Appendix 6.11.: Hypothesis 3c

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the brand

Video type	Q12_Med_Scept	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Non humorous	Low scepticism	5,1786	1,07528	28
	High scepticism	5,5111	,98157	30
	Total	5,3506	1,03246	58
Humorous video	Low scepticism	5,9080	1,06866	29
	High scepticism	5,2976	1,11974	28
	Total	5,6082	1,12709	57
Total	Low scepticism	5,5497	1,12421	57
	High scepticism	5,4080	1,04675	58
	Total	5,4783	1,08339	115

The Levene's test of equality of error variances has a P-value of 0.926 and an F = 0.156. So we do not reject H0: the hypothesis of homogeneity of the variances is respected.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances[a]

Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the brand

F	df1	df2	Sig.
,156	3	111	,926

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + Condition + Med_Scepticism + Condition * Med_Scepticism

The interaction effect between both variables (Med_scepticism and video type) is significant (F = 5.671, P-value = 0.019).

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the brand

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	8,818[a]	3	2,939	2,610	,055
Intercept	3442,906	1	3442,906	3057,565	,000
Condition	1,912	1	1,912	1,698	,195
Med_Scepticism	,555	1	,555	,493	,484
Condition * Med_Scepticism	6,386	1	6,386	5,671	,019
Error	124,989	111	1,126		
Total	3585,111	115			
Corrected Total	133,807	114			

a. R Squared = ,066 (Adjusted R Squared = ,041)

- Appendix 6.12.: Hypothesis 3d

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Purchase intention

Video type	Q12_Med_Scept	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Non humorous	Low scepticism	5,0357	1,10121	28
	High scepticism	5,5889	,75141	30
	Total	5,3218	,96925	58
Humorous video	Low scepticism	5,8046	,84758	29
	High scepticism	5,5595	1,13331	28
	Total	5,6842	,99686	57
Total	Low scepticism	5,4269	1,04607	57
	High scepticism	5,5747	,94651	58
	Total	5,5014	,99548	115

The Levene's test of equality of error variances has a P-value of 0.300 and an F = 1.236. So we do not reject H0: the hypothesis of homogeneity of the variances is respected.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances[a]

Dependent Variable: Purchase intention

F	df1	df2	Sig.
1,236	3	111	,300

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + Condition + Med_Scepticism + Condition * Med_Scepticism

The interaction effect between both variables (Med_scepticism and video type) is significant (F = 4.888, P-value = 0.029).

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Purchase intention

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	9,062[a]	3	3,021	3,227	,025
Intercept	3472,334	1	3472,334	3709,271	,000
Condition	3,928	1	3,928	4,196	,043
Med_Scepticism	,682	1	,682	,728	,395
Condition * Med_Scepticism	4,576	1	4,576	4,888	,029
Error	103,910	111	,936		
Total	3593,556	115			
Corrected Total	112,972	114			

a. R Squared = ,080 (Adjusted R Squared = ,055)

- Appendix 6.13.: Hypothesis 4a

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the ad

Video type	Q11_Med_NFH	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Non humorous	Low NFH	4,2845	1,34251	29
	High NFH	5,0086	1,02749	29
	Total	4,6466	1,23990	58
Humorous video	Low NFH	5,5682	,90364	22
	High NFH	5,5286	,85700	35
	Total	5,5439	,86747	57
Total	Low NFH	4,8382	1,32837	51
	High NFH	5,2930	,96625	64
	Total	5,0913	1,15818	115

The hypothesis of homogeneity of the variances is not respected since the P-value is < 0.05 (F = 3.427, P-value = 0.020). But, because the test is robust, we will continue the analysis and look at the results. But, we will be careful when interpreting the results.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances[a]

Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the ad

F	df1	df2	Sig.
3,427	3	111	,020

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + Condition + Med_NFH + Condition * Med_NFH

The P-value is between 0.05 and 0.1 (F = 3.707, P-value = 0.057). We can thus say the interaction effect between Med_NFH and the video type is marginally significant.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the ad

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	30,771[a]	3	10,257	9,321	,000
Intercept	2907,489	1	2907,489	2642,198	,000
Condition	22,751	1	22,751	20,675	,000
Med_NFH	3,277	1	3,277	2,978	,087
Condition * Med_NFH	4,079	1	4,079	3,707	,057
Error	122,145	111	1,100		
Total	3133,875	115			
Corrected Total	152,916	114			

a. R Squared = ,201 (Adjusted R Squared = ,180)

- Appendix 6.14.: Hypothesis 4b

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the brand

Video type	Q11_Med_NFH	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Non humorous	Low NFH	5,1264	1,23254	29
	High NFH	5,5747	,73946	29
	Total	5,3506	1,03246	58
Humorous video	Low NFH	5,5909	1,16352	22
	High NFH	5,6190	1,12064	35
	Total	5,6082	1,12709	57
Total	Low NFH	5,3268	1,21379	51
	High NFH	5,5990	,95983	64
	Total	5,4783	1,08339	115

The hypothesis of homogeneity of the variances is respected since the P-value is > 0.05 (F = 2.520, P-value = 0.062).

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances[a]

Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the brand

F	df1	df2	Sig.
2,520	3	111	,062

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + Condition + Med_NFH + Condition * Med_NFH

There is no interaction effect since P-value > 0.05.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the brand

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	4,832[a]	3	1,611	1,386	,251
Intercept	3357,518	1	3357,518	2889,600	,000
Condition	1,810	1	1,810	1,558	,215
Med_NFH	1,587	1	1,587	1,366	,245
Condition * Med_NFH	1,234	1	1,234	1,062	,305
Error	128,974	111	1,162		
Total	3585,111	115			
Corrected Total	133,807	114			

a. R Squared = ,036 (Adjusted R Squared = ,010)

- Appendix 6.15.: Hypothesis 4c

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Purchase intention

Video type	Q11_Med_NFH	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Non humorous	Low NFH	5,0230	1,17152	29
	High NFH	5,6207	,59578	29
	Total	5,3218	,96925	58
Humorous video	Low NFH	5,7424	,85407	22
	High NFH	5,6476	1,08749	35
	Total	5,6842	,99686	57
Total	Low NFH	5,3333	1,09747	51
	High NFH	5,6354	,89229	64
	Total	5,5014	,99548	115

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances[a]

Dependent Variable: Purchase intention

F	df1	df2	Sig.
2,172	3	111	,095

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + Condition + Med_NFH + Condition * Med_NFH

The P-value of the interaction effect between the vide type and Med_NFH is 0.61. The P-value is between 0.05 and 0.1 so the interaction effect is marginally significant.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Purchase intention

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	9,076[a]	3	3,025	3,232	,025
Intercept	3395,201	1	3395,201	3627,368	,000
Condition	3,896	1	3,896	4,162	,044
Med_NFH	1,769	1	1,769	1,890	,172
Condition * Med_NFH	3,354	1	3,354	3,583	,061
Error	103,896	111	,936		
Total	3593,556	115			
Corrected Total	112,972	114			

a. R Squared = ,080 (Adjusted R Squared = ,055)

- Appendix 6.16.: Additional ANOVA

Descriptives

Perceived humour

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Low NFH	29	3,0552	,93945	,17445	2,6978	3,4125	1,00	4,60
High NFH	29	2,8621	,84194	,15634	2,5418	3,1823	1,00	4,00
Total	58	2,9586	,88952	,11680	2,7247	3,1925	1,00	4,60

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Perceived humour

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
,807	1	56	,373

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Perceived humour

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
,807	1	56	,373

P-value > 0.05. We do not reject H0.

ANOVA

Perceived humour

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	,541	1	,541	,680	,413
Within Groups	44,560	56	,796		
Total	45,101	57			

- Appendix 6.17.: Hypothesis 5a

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the ad

Video type	Q10_Med_Sust	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Non humorous	Low interest in sust	4,4100	1,18559	25
	High interest in sust	4,8258	1,26782	33
	Total	4,6466	1,23990	58
Humorous video	Low interest in sust	5,7348	,82665	33
	High interest in sust	5,2813	,87013	24
	Total	5,5439	,86747	57
Total	Low interest in sust	5,1638	1,18890	58
	High interest in sust	5,0175	1,13178	57
	Total	5,0913	1,15818	115

The hypothesis of homogeneity of the variances is not respected since the P-value is < 0.05 (F = 3.964, P-value = 0.010). But, because the test is robust, we will continue the analysis and be careful when analysing the results.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances[a]

Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the ad

F	df1	df2	Sig.
3,964	3	111	,010

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + Condition + Med_Sust + Condition * Med_Sust

The interaction effect between Med_Sust and the video type is significant (F = 4.738, P-value = 0.032). The P-value is < 0.05, so we will reject H0.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the ad

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	28,464[a]	3	9,488	8,462	,000
Intercept	2882,757	1	2882,757	2571,158	,000
Condition	22,278	1	22,278	19,870	,000
Med_Sust	,010	1	,010	,009	,925
Condition * Med_Sust	5,312	1	5,312	4,738	,032
Error	124,452	111	1,121		
Total	3133,875	115			
Corrected Total	152,916	114			

a. R Squared = ,186 (Adjusted R Squared = ,164)

- Appendix 6.18.: Hypothesis 5b

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Credibility

Video type	Q10_Med_Sust	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Non humorous	Low interest in sust	4,9800	,86277	25
	High interest in sust	4,9848	,91843	33
	Total	4,9828	,88712	58
Humorous video	Low interest in sust	4,4470	1,20182	33
	High interest in sust	4,4687	,97611	24
	Total	4,4561	1,10308	57
Total	Low interest in sust	4,6767	1,09325	58
	High interest in sust	4,7675	,96924	57
	Total	4,7217	1,03012	115

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances[a]

Dependent Variable: Credibility

F	df1	df2	Sig.
1,769	3	111	,157

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + Condition + Med_Sust + Condition * Med_Sust

P-value is > 0.05 so there is no interaction effect.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Credibility

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	7,979[a]	3	2,660	2,613	,055
Intercept	2505,581	1	2505,581	2461,427	,000
Condition	7,736	1	7,736	7,600	,007
Med_Sust	,005	1	,005	,005	,944
Condition * Med_Sust	,002	1	,002	,002	,965
Error	112,991	111	1,018		
Total	2684,875	115			
Corrected Total	120,971	114			

a. R Squared = ,066 (Adjusted R Squared = ,041)

4.4. Appendix 7: Additional analyses

- Appendix 7.1.: Purchase intention

The R^2 is 0.034, so 3.4% of the purchase intention (dependent variable) is being explained by the familiarity with the brand (independent variable).

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,185[a]	,034	,026	,98266

a. Predictors: (Constant), Unfamiliar/ Familiar brand

H0: $R^2 = 0$

Ha: $R^2 \neq 0$

The p-value of the ANOVA table is < 0.05 so we will reject H0. There is a linear regression model between variables.

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3,857	1	3,857	3,994	,048[b]
	Residual	109,115	113	,966		
	Total	112,972	114			

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase intention

b. Predictors: (Constant), Unfamiliar/ Familiar brand

172.

H0: $\beta = 0$

Ha: $\beta \neq 0$

The p-value is < 0.05 so we will reject H0. The impact of the familiarity with the brand on the purchase intention is significant.

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B		Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	5,195	,179		29,068	,000	4,841	5,549		
	Unfamiliar/ Familiar brand	,091	,045	,185	1,999	,048	,001	,181	1,000	1,000

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase intention

The linear regression is: Purchase intention = 5.195 + 0.091 (brand familiarity)

- Appendix 7.2.: Credibility

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,186[a]	,035	,026	1,01660

a. Predictors: (Constant), Unfamiliar/ Familiar brand

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4,187	1	4,187	4,051	,047[b]
	Residual	116,784	113	1,033		
	Total	120,971	114			

a. Dependent Variable: Credibility

b. Predictors: (Constant), Unfamiliar/ Familiar brand

P-value < 0.05.

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B		Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	4,402	,185		23,811	,000	4,036	4,769		
	Unfamiliar/ Familiar brand	,095	,047	,186	2,013	,047	,001	,188	1,000	1,000

a. Dependent Variable: Credibility

- Appendix 7.3.: Attitude towards the brand

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,160[a]	,026	,017	1,07408

a. Predictors: (Constant), Unfamiliar/ Familiar brand

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3,444	1	3,444	2,985	,087[b]
	Residual	130,363	113	1,154		
	Total	133,807	114			

a. Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the brand

b. Predictors: (Constant), Unfamiliar/ Familiar brand

P-value is between 0.05 and 0.1.

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B		Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	5,188	,195		26,562	,000	4,801	5,575		
	Unfamiliar/ Familiar brand	,086	,050	,160	1,728	,087	-,013	,184	1,000	1,000

a. Dependent Variable: Attitude towards the brand

- Appendix 7.4.: Informative and credibility

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,396[a]	,157	,149	,95026

a. Predictors: (Constant), Charact Pas informatif/ Informatif

R^2 = 0.157. This means 15.7% of the credibility (dependent variable) is being explained by the informative character of the ad (independent variable).

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	18,933	1	18,933	20,967	,000[b]
	Residual	102,038	113	,903		
	Total	120,971	114			

a. Dependent Variable: Credibility

b. Predictors: (Constant), Charact Pas informatif/ Informatif

P-value < 0.05 and the regression model is: Credibility = 2.591 + 0.370 (Charact).

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	2,591	,474		5,472	,000		
	Charact Pas informatif/ Informatif	,370	,081	,396	4,579	,000	1,000	1,000

a. Dependent Variable: Credibility