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ABSTRACT

Brands have been advertising on platforms such as television, magazine and radio for decades. However, with the increase in technology and the lack of consumer attention to traditional media, brands must find new ways to break through the clutter. Drawing on Persuasion Knowledge Model (PKM), this thesis examined the influence of an expected and unexpected experiential promotional technique using real brands, McDonald’s and Coke. The dependent variables were brand image and behavioral intentions. This was accomplished with a 2 (expected vs. unexpected) x 2 (McDonald’s vs. Coke) mixed factorial experiment, using Amazon’s Mechanical Turk to recruit participants for the study. A total sample of 387 participants was obtained. Results revealed that unexpected versus expected experiential marketing techniques had a positive influence on brand image and, after controlling for prior brand attitudes, purchase intentions were higher for unexpected versus expected promotional techniques as well.

Keywords: brand loyalty, experiential marketing, promotional giveaways, events, promotions, sponsorship.
Chapter 1: Introduction

Brands have been promoting products and services using traditional platforms such as television, magazine and radio for decades, yet increases in technology use and lack of consumer attention have prompted brands to find new ways to break through the information clutter. Experiential marketing, where the focus is to prompt consumers to experience a brand, draws on both expected and unexpected persuasion tactics yet little research has examined this promotional technique, leaving gaps in our understanding. Nearly half of advertising budgets by the top 200 brands are spent on unmeasured media, which includes experiential marketing promotions even though experiential marketing is seldom measured (Johnson, 2015).

Through unexpected implementation of public relations, a company can generate positive brand attitudes among consumers, which then ideally creates brand loyalty. Public relations can have several different definitions including the professional maintenance of a favorable public image by a company, organization or individual. The Public Relations Society of America (PRSA) defines public relations as a strategic communication process that builds mutually beneficial relationships between organizations and their publics. For the purposes of this thesis, public relations is defined as a publicity campaign for a given product, organization or venture. The purpose of this research is to examine the effects of expected/unexpected experiential marketing promotions technique on brand image and brand loyalty. This was accomplished with a 2
mixed factorial experiment, administered online. There were two dependent variables: brand image and brand loyalty. One covariate, prior attitudes toward the brands, was measured.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Defining Experiential Marketing

Before providing the theoretical framework for the current study, it is important to establish the definition of the primary concept that drives the research, which is experiential marketing promotion. Experiential marketing is a promotional technique that seeks to develop a brand experience with the consumer by immersing consumers with the brand (Zarantonello, 2013). Brands use the term “experiential marketing” to emphasize their focus on building consumer relationships and emotional experiences with consumers (Zarantonello, 2013). Event execution, the type of experiential marketing promotion of the current research, is a public relations-centered approach that is often referred to as experiential marketing. There are various types of experiential events, ranging from product launches to fundraisers and press conferences to pop-up shops. Ultimately, brands want to reach users, or potential users, within the appropriate target audience with a specific message that will create a lifetime consumer without needing ongoing advertising labors (Blakeman, 2014).

The focus of this research is on the use of experiential marketing promotions events, specifically, give-aways, that are captured and shared through social media. Experiential promotions are designed as an attempt to prompt consumers to spend time with the brand beyond a purchase of the brand’s product or service. There are many types of experiential events but, in a
theoretical sense, this research will focus on expected (i.e., anticipated) and unexpected (i.e., unanticipated) give-away events that brands produce with the goal of enhancing brand image and enticing individuals to become loyal consumers. An example of an expected experiential marketing promotions event is McDonald’s long-standing Monopoly game.

An example of an unexpected experiential marketing promotions event is illustrated by Canadian airline, WestJet. WestJet created an experiential giveaway event during the holidays to employ what they called, “real-time giving.” The airline’s marketing team put together the Christmas Miracle campaign whereby employees arrived in the early morning to set up the “North Pole” at one of their flight gates. Guests were asked to scan their boarding passes to speak with Santa via a large interactive screen. As the guests told Santa what they wanted for Christmas, the WestJet team recorded guests’ answers.

While the passengers were in flight, the WestJet team at the landing site frantically ran errands to accurately purchase and wrap all the gifts the guests had requested from Santa. When the passengers landed and waited for their luggage, the team loaded up the conveyor belt with neatly wrapped presents, each topped with a bow and a tag so passengers knew which gifts were theirs. When the conveyor belt started up, guests slowly but surely found their names on the packages, and eagerly and excitedly unwrapped the gifts they had asked for just hours earlier.

Importantly, this promotional event was recorded and posted to YouTube where it quickly went viral. After the video was posted, it became the number one
trending topic on Twitter using the hashtag #WestJetChristmas. The experiential marketing event became so popular, it was mentioned by Jimmy Fallon on his talk show, tweeted by pop star sensation Justin Bieber, and was featured in more than 1,600 media stories. Before the video, WestJet’s YouTube channel had approximately 3,700 subscribers. Three days after the video was posted that number jumped 320 percent to over 12,000 subscribers. As of March 2015, WestJet’s YouTube channel had over 48,000 subscribers. According to SimpliFlying, within 30 days after the video was posted, WestJet received a Facebook engagement score of 120, more than four times the score of its closest competitor. Engagement was measured by the number of likes, comments, shares, and estimated impressions for each of the posts received. Within three weeks, the video had 3.5 million views in 230 countries around the world. Website traffic for WestJet increased by 100 percent, bookings went up by 77 percent, and revenues were up by 86 percent from the previous year.

In short, the WestJet example of experiential marketing promotions shows, first and foremost, what immersive brand marketing associated with a particular event can accomplish. Customers of WestJet had a deeply immersive and highly positive experience with WestJet as the result of this experiential promotions event. When combined with social media, the value of the “Christmas Miracle” event generated publicity for the brand well beyond its immediate reach of customers who flew that particular flight that provided the give-aways. What this example suggests is that experiential marketing promotions can be an effective way to target certain customers and provide them with a deeper brand
experience; but unless the event or promotions being experienced is captured and spread via social media, the expense involved with setting up an experiential moment with a brand may be difficult to justify.

However, despite the increased website and social media metrics used to determine the success of the WestJet experiential marketing promotions event, we cannot draw conclusions about the influence of the experiential marketing promotions event on WestJet’s brand image. Nor can we draw conclusions about whether the promotional event enhanced brand loyalty. In fact, experiential marketing – as a whole – represents an area of brand advertising that is typically not measured (Johnson, 2015). The current research fills this gap in the literature by examining the influence of expected and unexpected experiential marketing promotions techniques used via social media, specifically, YouTube videos. The theory guiding the research is the Persuasion Knowledge Model, or PKM, defined next.

**Theoretical Framework**

A logical and important way to proceed with the literature review is to present a theoretical framework that can help to explain the complex process of persuasion as it relates to experiential marketing promotions. The theory selected for the present research is Persuasion Knowledge Model, or PKM (Friestadt & Wright, 1994). In an attempt to describe, predict, and explain the various aspects of successful persuasion attempts, PKM explains how consumers use their existing knowledge to refine their attitudes toward products, advertising and advertisers (Friestadt & Wright, 1994). Friestadt and Wright
assert that every persuasion attempt is made up of three types of knowledge: persuasion knowledge, agent knowledge, and topic knowledge. A persuasion attempt can consist of a single advertisement (e.g., YouTube video) or an entire strategic communication campaign (e.g., YouTube video, television ads, billboards, radio, magazines, etc.). The term “persuasion knowledge” refers to knowledge of how persuasion tactics work (Friestadt & Wright, 1994). This includes knowledge about advertising and public relations tactics, such as experiential marketing, that are designed to immerse consumers and give consumers a brand experience.

As noted, two forms of experiential marketing will be examined in the current study: expected and unexpected. An expected experiential marketing promotions event is one that is anticipated by consumers. From the examples above, expected brand experiences are those that consumers have seen or experienced before, or that a brand has used and continues to use, so consumers come to associate a given event experience with a particular brand. Unexpected brand experiences are those that consumers do not anticipate or that they have not seen or experienced before. PKM predicts that consumers make sense of persuasion attempts the use experiential marketing promotions by drawing on their existing persuasion knowledge to determine whether or not they have experienced the marketing event before and, the extent to which that event is unique, novel or unanticipated.

Persuasion knowledge, in this case about experiential marketing promotions, is developed over time and with exposure to persuasion attempts by
marketers who want to gain attention to their brand (Friestadt & Wright, 1994). In this sense, persuasion knowledge is held not just by advertisers and marketers who create the advertising or promotion but also by consumers who are constantly bombarded by strategic communication techniques since the time they are born. Over time, consumers gain an understanding of brand promotions that may be outdated and expected and those that may be fresh, novel or unexpected.

While PKM serves as a basic framework for understanding what persuasion knowledge is, where it comes from, and how PKM may assist consumers in making sense of experiential marketing techniques, PKM cannot tell us how consumers psychologically process experiential marketing that is expected or unexpected, and what potential effects this processing may have on perceptions of brand image or behavioral intentions to purchase the brand’s product or service. To understand this process, two additional theories are proposed to understand information processing of experiential strategic communication that is expected or unexpected. Specifically, schema theory and congruity theory help to bridge the gap between PKM and information processing. First, schema theory assumes that memory is comprised of an associate network (Heckler & Chelders, 1992) in which knowledge (in this case, persuasion knowledge) is stored in the form of a schema. A schema is any mental presentation that is a knowledge structure (Mandler, 1982). There are different schemas defined at various abstract levels, such as brand schemas, media schemas, etc. (see Mandler, 1982). In the context of experiential
marketing, there are schemas, or sets of beliefs about expected and unexpected forms of experiential marketing. The extent to which information in the consumer’s brain about what constitutes an anticipated, or expected, experiential marketing technique matches with the technique used, this matching process is referred to as “congruity” (see Bellman & Rossiter, 2006).

A long and rich history in advertising scholarship has examined congruity theory in relation to sponsorships that are congruent versus incongruent with the sponsored event and brand (see Cornwell, 2014; Cornwell & Smith, 2001; Cornwell, Weeks, & Roy, 2005). Congruity refers to the psychological structures in the brain and how the brain organizes or comes to associate a given abstract structure with incoming information. Experiential marketing promotions that are expected consist of existing structures in the brain that are well established and associated with brands that, for example, rely on the same marketing tactics over a long period of time. For example, McDonald’s has historically used the Monopoly game to promote certain products. Consumers collect game pieces to play the game of “Monopoly” when they purchase certain products, like a Big Mac. This experiential marketing technique has been used by McDonald’s for many years, and consumers have come to expect that McDonald’s will use Monopoly to promote its brand.

Although congruity has been defined in many ways, depending on the context and the scholar, in this study, congruity is defined in terms of what the brand has historically or traditionally used to promote its product in comparison to what consumers’ expectations of what the brand uses to promote itself.
Returning to the Monopoly example, consumers, over the course of time and through the use of their persuasion knowledge, have come to expect McDonald’s to offer Monopoly as a way to develop a brand relationship with consumers (Monopoly offers a $1 million give-away to the person who completes the game). In contrast, an unexpected (or incongruous) experiential marketing promotions is one that is not anticipated by consumers. Incongruous promotions include those that may have existing structures in the brain but that are not associated with a particular brand. Alternatively, incongruous marketing promotions may include those that are new or novel and that have no existing abstract structures represented in the brain.

Research on sponsorship has extensively examined the effect of congruity theory. Sponsorship refers to “a cash and/or in-kind fee paid to a property (typically a sports, entertainment, non-profit event or organization) in return for access to the exploitable commercial potential associated with the property” (Cornwell, Weeks, & Roy, 2005, p. 21). Unfortunately, the vast literature on the topic of congruity has yielded mixed findings, leaving questions about whether the role of schema and congruity theory will yield positive or negative effects on psychological processing. The researcher argues that, in the case of experiential strategic communication, congruous (or anticipated, expected) techniques will diminish brand image and decrease purchase intentions. In contrast, incongruous (or unanticipated, unexpected) experiential techniques will enhance brand image and increase purchase intentions. This can be explained by understanding how brand image operates, the purpose of the next section.
Brand Image

To understand how brand image is affected by public relations, it is important to define brand image and understand how it is used. Blakeman defines brand image as a brand’s personality and status when compared to other brands (Blakeman, 2014). In her book, she states that brand image is created by the media, but is organized in the consumer’s mind. This means that a brand may try to communicate that they are genuine or authentic but it is ultimately the consumer who decides if this is true. For example, a consumer might think of Starbucks as socially responsible after the company sponsored RED, an organization devoted to fighting AIDS in Africa, by donating 50 percent of their profits made on RED-endorsed merchandise to RED. Therefore, when a consumer exposed to Starbucks’ partnership with RED thinks about Starbucks, that consumer will associate the concept of social responsibility with the brand (Blakeman, 2014).

While the Starbucks example may hold true, brands need consistency in messaging to have an effect on consumers. According to Blakeman, a brand personality should deliver the same, consistent messaging each time the product is purchased. It doesn’t change from fad to fad but rather acts as a “reliable old friend” (Blakeman, 2014).

There are many other factors that contribute to a brand’s image including friend recommendations, sustainability, marketing efforts and public relations. Building a brand image is a slow, subtle process that happens over time, which means it should resonate longer than any television or magazine campaign.
Kinsey (2008). Kinsey adds that traditional tactics, such as television spots, radio ads and print pieces, still have a strong effect on purchasing behaviors; however she suggests that public relations, in tandem with advertising, reminds consumers why they love the brands they do.

A related research study, conducted by Zarantonello and Schmitt (2013), evaluated consumers’ opinions on brand equity before and after attending particular events. This included pop-up shops in addition to event sponsorship. Their findings indicated that event sponsorship plays a large role in the development of brand equity as consumers’ image of brand equity increased from pre-event to post-event. The study also found that consumers’ buying behavior is often decided by brand-related variables, such as brand attitudes and experiences (Zarantonello, 2013). However, with the number of options when choosing where to advertise, it is important to reach consumers today in a unique and memorable way, which is where sponsorship can be a useful tool.

When it comes to consumers, Kinsey indicates that they want brands to communicate with them as they would communicate with their peers and understand their underlying needs (Kinsey, 2008). Her research showed that 60 percent of consumers now turn to friends and family for everything from personal life advice to product recommendations in what she labels “friendpertise”. However, to create this friendpertise, the individual must be an ambassador of a brand and, as mentioned earlier, they must identify with the brand’s image. Based on the research, it appears that public relations have become an integral part of not only reaching consumers, but molding their perceptions of brands. It
provides the public with important information without the need for a sales pitch (Stein, 2012).

In short, brand image is an integral part of experiential marketing promotions because the primary goal is to affect how consumers think about a brand by immersing them into an emotional brand experience that can share the values and personality of the brand. Brands that use tried and true techniques may be playing it safe – what has worked in the past, may work in the future so they assume – but such expected techniques may reach a saturation point, psychologically speaking, whereby consumers “file” away the technique as unoriginal or boring. Therefore, it is predicted that expected experiential techniques will not provide added value to the brand, and brand image may not be enhanced beyond its current state. Alternatively, unexpected experiential marketing techniques are new and novel and, therefore, act as a driver of new information in association with the brand, represented by schemas in the brain. New and unexpected experiences with a brand may prompt positive reactions and higher brand image perceptions among those that experience the novel technique. Put another way, using incongruent, or unexpected, marketing techniques helps to improve favorability toward the tactic and this enhances how individuals perceive the brand’s image. In turn, this affects individuals’ brand loyalty for a brand.

Based on this review of the literature, the following hypotheses are presented:
H1: Brand image will be higher for unexpected versus expected PR techniques

H2: Brand loyalty will be higher for unexpected versus expected PR techniques.

Prior Attitudes Toward the Brand as a Control Variable

Existing brand attitudes play an important role in examining the influence of experiential marketing techniques on psychological processing. Individuals who have made a prior purchase with a brand, formulate an attitude toward the brand, which can influence any subsequent exposure to persuasion tactics undertaken by that brand. To illustrate this point, a research study by Low and Lichtenstein explored how “double deals,” offering a free or discounted premium on a product or service with a purchase, influenced consumer attitudes. The study was designed to identify if a positive or negative attitude toward a brand or its products is present when a retailer offers more than one promotion on a product or service. For example, this could be a lower advertised price and a free premium with a purchase. There are many retailers such as WalMart, Walgreens and Target that offer such sales promotions in hopes to influence consumer purchasing, be it through things like coupons, rebates, samples and sweepstakes.

Subjects in Low and Lichtenstein’s study were asked to evaluate an advertisement for a calculator from a retailer in a neighboring state. They were asked if the advertised price in the advertisement they were shown was fair. After, they were told that with the purchase of the calculator they would also
receive a free backpack. In one condition, the backpack was valued at $7.95 and in the other condition the backpack was valued at $15.95. What Low and Lichtenstein found was that when the value of the second premium was too high, consumers had less positive attitudes toward the quality of the product/service. Therefore, in this example when the backpack was valued at $15.95, participants had a negative attitude toward the original product. However, if the free premium was moderate in value and was paired with a higher ticket item, perceived attitudes were much higher (Low, 1993). This study implies that the first promotional deal, the advertised one, must have a higher price than the free premium as to avoid being seen as a low quality product. For example, if a consumer were looking to purchase a piece of furniture, such as a sectional, and found a particular store that was offering a promotion where not only was the sectional on sale but if the consumer purchased said sectional he or she would also receive a free recliner. However, if the recliner was valued at a higher ticket price than the sectional, the consumer might view the sectional as "cheap."

Another study that explored the area of public relations and brand image was conducted by Chia-Hung Hung. His study of 367 consumers tested how public relations influences brand image and consumer loyalty. He conducted this study by surveying consumers that had experience purchasing insurance. Hung used Likert scales to measure consumers’ feelings toward public relations perception, brand image and loyalty toward the selected insurance brands. What he found was that the higher the consumer’s perception of public relations, the more favorable the brand image was along with a stronger consumer loyalty
(Hung, 2008). With this, he states that paying close attention to public relations is worthwhile and does indeed enhance brand image and consumer loyalty. Hung concluded that while a favorable brand image might lead to brand loyalty, an unfavorable brand image might lead to consumers switching brands (Hung, 2008). This study suggests the importance of public relations to brands. Public relations has the ability to provide a competitive advantage if done correctly (Hung, 2008).

This discussion leads to the following research question:

RQ1: Do the effects of unexpected and expected PR tactics on brand image and brand loyalty improve when prior attitudes toward the brands used in the study are controlled?

Study Context

Within the field of public relations, attention must be paid to how each individual tactic will contribute to what image the brand is trying to achieve. Each one must be evaluated, whether it’s experiential marketing, sponsorships or guerilla marketing, so that it fits seamlessly in the overall plan (Katz, 2010). For example, if a brand wants to appear as “green” the events the brand sponsors should align with that message. If a brand wants to be portrayed as giving, it might sponsor a local charity. This must be determined before selecting the nontraditional tactics to utilize.

Prindle discusses the importance of business authenticity and how public relations can influence this desire. He specifically talks about storytelling. Prindle says that storytelling should have a thread through every facet of an organization
and communicate this to consumers (Prindle, 2011). This helps create a genuine, long-lasting connection between the public and the organization (Herskovitz, 2010). Herskovitz says that “persona-focused” storytelling is crucial to successful branding. This is because creating a persona is essentially narrating a brand to an audience. Every brand may have a different persona. For example, a brand may take the persona of a “mentor,” acting as a valuable resource and continuously providing quality products and services. However, the list of personas goes on ranging from “the underdog,” the brand that takes advantage of being continually underrated, to “the rebel,” always standing up to authority (Herskovitz, 2010). A brand persona must be easy to recognize and clearly explain the connection between what the brand says and what it does. If this is done properly, the persona creates an emotional and enduring relationship with consumers (Herskovitz, 2010). Herskovitz makes the claim that individuals naturally identify with a brand persona that is realistic to them and that consistently makes this connection apparent. When the brand can appeal to the desires of consumers, it further fosters this relationship. When a brand persona is one that consumers can recognize and care about, they tend to view the brand as someone you start to “know” just like you would a friend (Herskovitz, 2010). Herskovitz found that this is especially important because it can create strong emotions from consumers that include loyalty and trust.

In the marketing space, sponsorship is defined as “an investment, in cash or in kind, in an activity, person or event (sponsee), in return for access to the exploitable commercial potential associated with that activity, person or event by
the investor (sponsor),” (Cornwell, 2014). Many brands utilize sponsorship as part of their integrated marketing campaigns to reach audiences in this unconventional way – outside of television, print advertising or radio. Cornwell makes the claim that sponsorship allows for brands to have an overarching theme in their messaging but identify it with several different celebrities or events. This allows the brand to have consistency in their messaging but diversity in their sponsorships (Cornwell, 2014).

Cornwell highlights the brand Procter & Gamble as a success story of sponsorship during the Olympics. During the 2010 Vancouver Olympics, P&G sponsored the event with a Tide Laundry Station, providing free laundry services. The brand also set up a “Pampers Village” that provided a play area for kids as well as diapers with the five Olympic rings printed on them. They continued this sponsorship during the 2012 London Olympics where they also targeted an at-home audience with the “Proud Sponsor of Moms” campaign. It was consistent with the sacrifices made when an athlete dedicates their talents to the Olympics (Cornwell, 2014). Therefore, it is fair to conclude that P&G’s sponsorship of the Olympics was relatable not only to the those attending the event, but also to the target P&G was trying to reach outside of where the Olympic events were physically taking place.

Ruth and Simonin conducted a study to view the effects of multiple brands sponsoring one event. They first surveyed participants to measure their opinions of highly recognizable brands, like Coca-Cola. Participants were then given a scenario of an event with multiple sponsors, Coca-Cola included. They were
surveyed for their opinion on the event as a whole. After, attitudes of the primary sponsoring brand, Coca-Cola, the cosponsor and then the attitudes toward the event were evaluated on three seven-point bipolar semantic differential scales. Attitudes were measured with anchors such as negative/positive, bad/good, etc. For example, "Overall, my attitude toward the parade sponsored by Coca-Cola and Marlboro is negative/positive" (Ruth, 2003). The study revealed that the image of one sponsoring brand might transfer over to the other sponsoring brand, meaning, that one image might be shared between both brands. In this example, Coca-Cola received a more negative attitude after it was paired with Marlboro. However, it was revealed that this might not be consistent over all types of sponsorships. Instead, what was more important was the relevance of the brand to the event. This is because during a typical sponsorship, brands do not have the opportunity to showcase their products or services but rather just advertise their name overall (Ruth, 2003). This further enforces the idea that to influence positive brand image, the pairing must make sense.

However, in order for event sponsorship to be successful, attendees must have some prior knowledge of the brand (Close, 2006). Close conducted a study that measured event attendees’ relation to the event, how the consumer felt about the sponsor’s involvement in the community, their perceptions of the sponsoring brand, as well as their likelihood of purchasing from the brand. Five-point Likert scales were used to measure the above in a survey format. In Close’s study, it was unveiled that when a consumer has some knowledge of the
brand already they are more engaged with the brand and have higher purchase intentions (Close, 2006).

Providing consumers with brand experiences has also proven to be a successful public relations tactic. Joachimisthaler’s article capitalizes on the idea that it is important to not only keep a consistent brand image but to also involve consumers in “brand-building experiences” (Joachimisthaler, 1997). This study looked at Cadbury’s theme park, Cadbury World, built in England. The park included a museum, restaurant, gift shop and the option to tour the packaging plant. Not only were consumers immersed in the park, but also the rich history behind Cadbury. The idea gained press and word of mouth, which ultimately lead to a positive brand identity. That year, Cadbury was named most admired company in the United Kingdom (Joachimisthaler, 1997). Joachimisthlaer notes that there is a lot to be learned from Cadbury World. Perhaps not that building a theme park is the be-all, end-all, but that creating a heritage-rich experience can be a tool of brand building. With this research, an updated version of what Joachimisthaer argues in his article might be what we today call “humanizing” a brand, meaning creating a personality around a brand to make it feel familiar and likeable to consumers.
Chapter 3: Methods

Experimental Design

The method for this study was an online experiment. Online experiments are considered a sound method in which to examine social-psychological concepts (Wimmer & Dominick, 2003). Online experiments often produce richer data and provide better options when testing with graphics, text or participant interaction (Hewson, 2003). They are also cost and time efficient and access a diverse population of participants (Hewson, 2003).

The online experiment for the current study was a 2 (PR technique: expected vs. unexpected) x 2 (brand: coke and McD’s) mixed factorial, post-test only, design. There was one between-subjects factor (PR technique) and one within-subjects factor (brand). The within-subjects factor, brand, was a replication variable. There were two dependent variables: brand image and behavioral intentions to try the product. A within-subjects design means that participants viewed each level of the independent variable (Wimmer & Dominick, 2003). In this case, participants saw both a promotional video for McDonald’s and Coke. However, participants saw only an expected or an unexpected PR technique. This was done to reduce the possibility that a carry-over effect would occur if participants were exposed to both levels of the PR technique. Within-subjects designs are ideal since they account for individual differences and require a small N to be collected (Wimmer & Dominick, 2003).
Operational Definitions of Independent Variables

Experiential promotions marketing. Experiential promotions marketing was defined as providing an experience to relate with customers in order to promote brands, products or services (Schmitt, 1999). Experiential promotions marketing had two levels: expected and unexpected. Public relations tactics that provide an anticipated benefit to the consumer were defined as expected and PR tactics that provide an unanticipated benefit to the consumer were defined as unexpected experiential promotions tactics.

Replication factor. One replication factor, brand, was included in the study. A replication factor allows for generalization across more than one factor. In the present study, a brand was the replication factor. Brand refers broadly to how consumers perceive and interact with a given company or corporate entity. Specifically, a brand is a company’s reputation, “which ultimately lives in the minds of your customers” (Ross, 2010, p. 6). The two brands used for the present study were Coke and McDonald’s. Using two known (versus fictitious) brands enhances external validity.

Description of the Stimulus Videos

A lengthy process was undertaken to identify existing promotional videos that used experiential promotions marketing techniques that included expected and unexpected benefits. The process began by culling all relevant videos for McDonald’s and Coke (using search engines in YouTube and Google). Additional searches on McDonald’s and Coke’s websites were conducted. Once the
researcher was satisfied that the bulk of the videos were collected, all videos were watched to identify which, if any, would fit the researcher’s definitions of expected and unexpected benefits. The two videos that fit the researcher’s definition of experiential marketing with unexpected benefits for consumers was Coca-Cola’s Where Will Happiness Strike Next (WWHSN) campaign and the McDonalds’ Pay With Lovin’ campaign.

Again, using real brands and real campaigns has the advantage of being high quality (i.e., they were produced by experts from industry), which enhances external validity of the study (see Wimmer & Dominick, 2003). This makes it easier to create an attitude around a brand that consumers are already familiar with. Coca-Cola’s WWHSN campaign features a Coca-Cola machine strategically placed on a college campus. However, rather than just dispensing one soda at a time, the machine surprised consumers with a nearly never-ending supply of Cokes to share with friends. The machine also surprised consumers with other items such as flowers and a pizza. McDonalds’ Pay With Lovin’ campaign was a commercial, which aired during the 2015 Super Bowl. It centered around real consumers who visited their local McDonalds and instead of paying for their food monetarily, they were asked to pay with lovin’. For example, one featured consumer was asked to call his mother and tell her that he loved her to pay for his meal. Another was asked to do a quick dance.

The two videos that did not include experiential marketing but rather expected, traditional promotions were the Share a Coke campaign for Coca-Cola and McDonalds Monopoly for McDonalds. The “Share a Coke” campaign allowed
consumers to buy and share Coke bottles personalized with their name. “McDonalds Monopoly” was the other “expected” campaign, which has run for years. The video includes consumers receiving peel off game pieces that play into the classic Monopoly board game. With these pieces, consumers have the opportunity to win prizes ranging from a gaming console to a brand new car. With both of these promotions, consumers have an idea of what it is they will be receiving when they participate in the promotion.

There were two separate conditions to create the manipulation. Condition 1 showed McDonalds’ Pay With Lovin’ campaign as well as Coca-Cola’s Where Will Happiness Strike Next Campaign. Condition two showed McDonalds’ Monopoly promotion video and Coca-Cola’s Share A Coke video.

**Data Collection Procedure**

Data were collected with a Qualtrics survey and disseminated via Amazon’s Mechanical Turk system, also known as mTurk. Qualtrics is a private research software company that allows users to conduct various types of online data collection and analysis. mTurk is a crowdsourcing Internet resource that allows individuals to coordinate the use of human intelligence tasks or “HITs”. Using mTurk allowed the researcher to include a diverse national crowd of participants.

**Participants**

Participants were recruited via mTurk. This was done via an mTurk ad requesting the participation of users to complete a survey about fast food and soft drinks to understand more about public relations in advertising. An initial
sample pool of 830 responded to the mTurk ad; however, only 387 met the filter criteria and subsequently completed the survey. The primary filter criteria was about participants’ familiarity with the brand campaigns used. Although it was argued earlier that familiar brands were necessary to enhance external validity, it was important to ensure that participants were unfamiliar with the actual campaigns used in this study. This helped to control for a potential rehearsal effect. The filter was accomplished with a single item, designed to measure familiarity with the campaigns (see below). The final sample size, accounting for those that did not meet the screener question, was 387. Participants were offered an incentive of one dollar ($1) if they complied with the screeners and completed the survey.

It should be noted that an a priori G*power analysis was conducted to determine the necessary sample size with an alpha of 0.05. The analysis revealed that 377 was the required sample size to power the design. Thus, the final sample size more than meets these minimum criteria.

**Internal Review Board and Treatment of Human Subjects**

As with all research projects involving human subjects, IRB approval was gained prior to the start of the experiment. Each participant viewed the online consent form and provided informed consent prior to participation. All materials and measures used in the experiment and in developing the stimulus materials were approved by IRB prior to the start of the study. All IRB procedures were followed.
**Questionnaire Description**

There were two questionnaires: a pre-questionnaire that participants filled out prior to viewing the experimental conditions, and a post-questionnaire (see Appendix C). The pre-questionnaire had screener question(s) to ensure participants were qualified to participate in the study. The pre-questionnaire also contained control measures designed to parse out the effects of brand loyalty and brand attitudes, to be used in the statistical analysis (see below). The post-questionnaire contained the dependent variables and demographic measures to be used to categorize participants according to responses.

**Screener question.** Because this study concerns the use of promotional techniques that are unexpected and expected, it was crucial to ensure that the promotional techniques that were shown were, indeed, unknown or unfamiliar to participants (otherwise, participants would expect the unexpected). Thus, a screener question was provided to ensure that participants understood that only certain participants would qualify for this particular experiment. Participants were screened for familiarity with the experiential campaigns utilized in this study, only accepting those who were unfamiliar with the campaign. While the researcher could have measured for prior exposure to the campaigns, and then controlled for prior exposure in the experimental design, it was potentially better to screen out those who had indicated that they had not seen the campaigns, enhancing the opportunity that the campaigns (which reflected the main manipulations of the
IVs) could potentially shape opinions, attitudes and perceptions of the brand/campaign.

**Dependent Variables**

There were two dependent variables in this study: Brand image perception and behavioral intention. Brand image perception was defined as how a brand is viewed and accepted in a consumer’s mind. Brand image perception was measured using seven established scales, associating the brands with terms including insightful, giving, genuine and authentic. Items were measured on a 5-point scale ranging from (1) not at all to (5) very much so. (Cronbach’s alpha = .964). Specifically, the scale items were as follows (Bearden, 1999):

*To what degree would you associate the following words with McDonald’s?*

- **Insightful:** Not at all …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so
- **Authentic:** Not at all …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so
- **Giving:** Not at all …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so
- **Generous:** Not at all …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so
- **Altruistic:** Not at all …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so
- **Genuine:** Not at all …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so
- **Considerate:** Not at all …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so

Behavioral intention was defined as the consumer’s desire to act upon their perceptions. Behavioral intention was measured using one measure per brand to determine how likely the participants are to either eat at McDonald’s or drink a Coca-Cola. Because it is not possible to measure repeated purchases, only one measure of behavioral intentions was included: “How likely are you to
eat at McDonald’s?” and “How likely are you to purchase from Coca-Cola?” Both items were measured on a 5-point scale ranging from (1) not very likely to (5) very likely.

**Control Variables**

A number of control variables were also measured before the experiment, during the screener questions. Specifically, participants were asked to indicate their attitudes toward both brands, i.e., McDonald’s and Coke.

**Attitude toward the brand.** Attitude toward the brand was defined as the consumer’s evaluation of a brand depending on their intention to purchase (Rossiter, 2014). Attitude toward the brand was measured using several Likert scales. This was accomplished with four scales, including:

*How positive do you feel about McDonald’s?*

Not very positive …1…2…3…4…5… Very positive

**Additional questionnaire items.** Additional questionnaire items were included such as demographic information and brand loyalty measurements. Participants were asked a series of questions to measure their level of brand loyalty and any reason why they would switch from a brand they were loyal to. Participants were also asked to indicate demographic information such as their gender, age, income, marital status, race/ethnicity, education level, household income and current state of residence.

**Procedure**

The procedure for the experiment was as follows. Participants were asked to respond to a questionnaire about fast food and soft drinks. They were then
asked a series of screener questions to determine if they were users of the brands McDonald’s and Coca-Cola. In order to move forward participants had to be non-rejecters of the brands, indicating that they would be open to consuming products of both brands. They also had to be unfamiliar with the two experiential campaigns in the study – McDonalds’ Pay With Lovin’ and Coca-Cola’s Where Will Happiness Strike Next. After the screener questions, participants then watched two videos, one of McDonald’s and another of Coca-Cola. In condition one, they watched the two unexpected experiential videos, Pay With Lovin’ and WWHSN. Condition two watched the expected experiential videos, McDonald’s Monopoly and Share a Coke. After watching each video they were asked a series of questions to measure their attitude toward the brands. Participants were also asked about their purchase behaviors in regard to motivation to switch brands. The questionnaire was not timed. Most participants completed the survey in approximately 11 minutes.

The experiment was self-administered online through mTurk, using Qualtrics for the questionnaire platform. Participants were given seven days to complete the experiment. All participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions, represented by Figure 1. Random assignment is necessary to ensure that individual differences are equally disbursed across the four conditions of the experiment (Wimmer & Dominick, 2003).

After viewing two conditions (unexpected/brand and expected/brand), participants responded to a series of questions (in the post-questionnaire)
designed to capture the dependent variables in the study. Demographics were also included in the post-questionnaire.

Participants were randomly assigned to 1 of 4 two main conditions, representing the main independent variable: expected (N = 162) and unexpected (N = 225). The combinations of the condition were rotated so that half (or nearly half) of participants saw Coke first, then McDonald’s and then the other half saw McDonald’s first and then Coke. This helped to control for a possible ordering effect that may influence individuals’ subsequent processing of message stimuli (see Wimmer & Dominick, 2003).

**Statistical Analysis**

As this is a mixed factorial experiment using one between-subjects factor and one repeated (replication) factor, a repeated measures MANOVA is an appropriate statistical method to run. A repeated measures MANOVA was used to determine if varying levels of the independent variable has a significant effect on a dependent variable either by themselves or in combination with one another (Anderson, 2003). IBM SPSS Version 22 was used to analyze the results. Significance levels (p-values) were obtained for all statistical analyses, and a p-value of 0.05 or less was set as the criteria, as is common of social psychological experiment (Wimmer & Dominick, 2003). A one-way repeated measure MANOVA was selected as the primary statistical method to examine the main effects. This is an appropriate method given that: 1) promotional type is a within-subjects factor, which means that participants gave responses to both levels of the IV, and 2) the dependent variables were closely related and correlated with
one another, so a univariate ANOVA would not be appropriate due to the increased chance of inflating Type I error (Anderson, 2003).

Participant demographics were determined with a simple frequency count (see Table 1). Descriptive statistics were run to determine means and standard deviations for the dependent variables. An exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the seven items measuring brand image perception following the experiment. Results showed that the seven items loaded on a single factor with an eigenvalue of 5.781, explaining 82.58% of the total variance. A subsequent reliability analysis was conducted and a Cronbach’s alpha of .964 was achieved, thus demonstrating a high level of reliability. Based on these results, the seven items comprising brand image were summed to form an overall index for each of the brands. Two separate independent samples t-tests were conducted to test hypothesis 1 and hypothesis 2. A correlation of the dependent variables was conducted, and it was determined that both dependent variables significantly correlate. Therefore, it was appropriate to run a MANOVA as a further, more sophisticated, test of the hypotheses. Results are reported below.
Chapter 4: Results

Examination of Replication Factor

The replication factor, brand, was examined to determine whether or not it yielded significant differences on the dependent participants’ attitudes toward the brand. It was utilized to measure the within-subjects portion of this study. Using a replication factor allows the researcher to draw conclusions from more than one message. This was accomplished by conducting a paired samples t-test (since participants saw both Coke and McDonald’s) using Coke and McDonald’s as the independent variables and attitude toward the brand as the dependent variable. The results revealed significant differences in that individuals expressed higher positive attitudes toward Coke ($M = 3.65$, $SD = 1.20$) than McDonald’s ($M = 3.20$, $SD = 1.35$) ($t(386) = 8.08, p < .0001$). This suggests that, despite attempts to control for attitudes toward brand (by selecting similar expected and unexpected promotional techniques for both brands), participants came away from the experiment with more positive attitudes toward Coke than McDonald’s. What this means for the experiment is that the data associated with the replication factor cannot be combined and must be treated separately in the subsequent analyses.

Participant Demographics

A total of 387 participants were included in the data, 196 of which were male (60.5%) and 191 were female (49.4%). Most participants were between the ages of 18 and 40 and were white/Caucasian (see Appendix A). The largest participating U.S. state was California at 9.8 percent. The majority of participants
were single, however, they were evenly divided between obtaining a bachelor’s degree or higher while the other half had an associate’s degree or less. Thirty eight percent held a bachelor’s degree.

**Tests of Hypotheses and Research Question**

There were two hypotheses. The first hypothesis predicted that brand image would be higher for unexpected versus expected PR techniques. The results of an independent samples t-test supported the hypothesis revealing that unexpected PR techniques did, in fact, generate more positive perceptions of brands than expected PR techniques (see Appendix B). Specifically, the unexpected condition yielded a significantly higher mean score ($M = 41.74$, $SD = 19.23$) on brand image as compared to the expected condition ($M = 34.34$, $SD = 24.10$), $t(385) = 14.194$, $p < .001$.

The second hypothesis predicted that behavioral intentions would be higher for unexpected versus expected PR techniques. The results of an independent samples t-test revealed no significant differences between the expected and unexpected conditions ($p = .258$). However, the means for unexpected ($M = 7.38$, $SD = 2.52$) and expected ($M = 7.10$, $SD = 2.17$) were in the anticipated direction.

**Repeated Measures MANOVA Results**

An additional repeated measures MANOVA was conducted as a further test of the hypotheses. Experiential marketing promotions, the primary independent variable, was entered as the IV, and the two dependent variables (brand image and behavioral intentions) were entered simultaneously as the
DVs. Results showed, once again, a significant result but only for brand image 
\( (F(1, 385) = 11.268, p < .001) \). Specifically, the results showed that brand image 
was higher for unexpected \( (M = 41.74, SD = 19.23) \) versus expected \( (M = 34.34, 
SD = 24.10) \) experiential promotional techniques. The repeated measures 
MANOVA did not yield significant results for behavioral intentions \( (p = .258) \).

However, after entering initial attitudes toward the brand as a control 
variable \( (RQ1) \), differences emerged for behavioral intentions. Specifically, the 
results of an ANOVA using expected/unexpected as the IV, behavioral intentions 
as the DV, and initial attitudes toward the brands \( (Coke and McDonald’s) \), 
measured at the beginning of the study, results revealed a significant difference 
on the PR technique \( (F(3, 383) = 8.364, p < .01) \). Specifically, behavioral 
intentions \( \) (after controlling for prior held attitudes toward Coke and McDonald’s) 
was significantly higher for unexpected \( (M = 7.38, SD = 2.52) \) than expected \( (M = 
7.10, SD = 2.17) \) PR techniques. Adding prior attitudes toward the brand as a 
control variable in a separate ANOVA further enhanced the effects of 
expected/unexpected PR techniques on brand image as well \( (F(3, 383) = 20.05, 
p < .0001) \).
Chapter 5: Discussion

The purpose of this research was to examine the effects of two forms of experiential marketing promotions, i.e., unexpected and expected, on perceptions of brand image and brand loyalty. This was accomplished with a 2 (PR technique: expected vs. unexpected) x 2 (brand: Coke vs. McDonald’s) mixed factorial experiment, conducted online. Results revealed that brand image was increased for brands that used unexpected versus expected experiential marketing promotions techniques. However, it should be noted that a manipulation check was not in place to test the stimuli. No significant main effects were found for expected vs. unexpected PR techniques on brand loyalty, represented here as purchase intentions. However, after controlling for prior attitudes toward the brands, a significant effect in the predicted direction was achieved.

Theoretical Implications

The findings have implications for the theories used to guide the research. First, the findings help to explain that individuals possess persuasion knowledge about different persuasion tactics. In this case, experiential marketing promotions tactics – specifically, expected and unexpected – were used. Presumably, individuals hold schemas about different marketing tactics in memory. Marketing tactics that align with existing information structures represented in the mind are assumed to be congruent or expected; those that misalign are assumed to be unexpected or incongruent. Although the literature has yielded mixed results with
regard to the use of congruent/incongruent sponsorships, the current study shows that using an unexpected persuasion tactics yielded higher brand image and, after controlling for prior brand attitudes, it also yielded higher expressed purchased intentions for those brands. This is not to suggest that brand image and purchase intentions could not work independent from one another. In fact, the initial results that revealed no significant main effects of expected/unexpected on purchase intentions suggests that these concepts may operate both independently and simultaneously. For instance, a consumer may feel good about McDonald’s and Coca-Cola as a company but it does not mean they like the products and/or will purchase the products the next time that consumer is considering fast food and soft drink options. In this case, prior attitudes toward the brands served as an important covariate that helped to crystalize the effects of expected/unexpected on purchase intentions. This study adds to the persuasion knowledge model as it is evident that having prior attitudes toward a brand does indeed influence perceived brand image and even behavioral intentions.

**Practical Implications**

Many brands utilize techniques to generate and maintain a brand image in consumers’ minds. As noted in the literature review, many brands hope that their products are thought of most when consumers are faced with purchase needs. Even more so, the ultimate goal is to cultivate consumer loyalty to their products and services. What this study unveils is the use of creating and maintaining a brand image and how it interacts with purchase intentions. As the results have
shown, while a better brand image was created by the unexpected PR techniques, it did not have any influence on purchase intentions. Just because consumers may like a brand as a company does not mean they will regularly purchase items from the brand. Therefore, when utilizing these techniques it should be understood that the main intention of using unexpected PR techniques will be more effective when maintaining or creating a brand image rather than aiming for an increase in sales. This may influence the way PR and advertising professionals attempt to reach their audiences depending on their goals.

**Limitations and Future Directions for Research**

There are a few limitations to this research that should be considered for further research, should this study be replicated. First, the study provided a weak link between brand image and behavioral intentions. Ultimately, the study intended to understand how the creation and maintenance of a positive brand image influences brand loyalty, however, this was measured in the questionnaire as “How likely are you to eat at McDonald’s?” which is more useful when determining purchase intentions. The idea was that brand loyalty leads to repeat purchases and top-of-mind awareness. A more conclusive way to measure behavioral intentions would be to ask “What is the likelihood you would purchase from McDonald’s the next time you want fast food?”

Another limitation to this study was complications with mTurk. While the study was live, the McDonald’s Pay With Lovin’ video was not functioning correctly and was replaced with a substitute Pay With Lovin’ spot. This may have resulted in some participants not being able to view the video, thus making their
answers inaccurate. Other technical issues with the videos, depending on the device users activated the survey on and the web browser being used, may have prompted the videos to not load or load incorrectly.

The lack of a manipulation check is perhaps the biggest limitation for without it, there is no way to validate whether the conditions of the questionnaire videos actually met the criteria being tested. If this study should be repeated the minimum manipulation check to be included should be, “How expected was this video/promotion?” after participants watched each video. Asking this question provides a validation check of the stimulus, verifying that the stimulus measured what it was supposed to. That said, this study is unique in that it relied on existing YouTube videos, which enhances external validity. However, should this study be conducted again, a manipulation check should be included.

Lastly, the use of brands solely in the food category may pose another limitation. Perhaps in a future study it would be worthwhile to compare two brands from two separate categories (i.e. food versus clothing). This way the researcher could separate any differences that may surface between the two categories. Therefore, asking if unexpected PR has a higher influence on fast food or clothing lines.

Conclusion

Strategic communication practitioners use many types of techniques and tactics all with very specific goals in mind, often to generate conversation around their brand. However, what significant evidence proves that their particular tactics actually do what they are intended to do? This research study adds to the
evidence that not all techniques work like they’re supposed to, as just because a consumer thinks highly of a brand does not mean they are regular purchasers of the brand’s products or services. This could severely disrupt techniques and plans intended to attract higher sales, which ultimately wastes time and resources. There are many scenarios that may challenge this result, for example, are consumers more likely to be influenced by brand image if the product is a service such as real estate or health care? Perhaps. This research aims to provide insight into these practices and encourage further research on what could be a potentially powerful strategic communication technique.
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APPENDIX A

Frequencies and Percentages of Participant Demographics

Table 1

Frequencies and Percentages of Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African Am.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian/Alaskan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marital Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma/GED</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s degree</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B

Results of a T-test to Examine Hypotheses 1 and 2

### Table 2

Results of a T-test to Examine Hypotheses 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotional Technique</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-cal</th>
<th>t-crit</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unexpected</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>41.74</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>24.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>297.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Survey

SCREENER: *Red disqualifies participant from the survey

1. Do you or any of your immediate family members work in/study any of the following fields? (Check all that apply)
   - Education
   - Nursing
   - Public Relations
   - Fashion/Clothing
   - Financial Services
   - Advertising/Marketing
   - Automotive
   - Food and Beverage
   - Sales
   - Grocery/Department Stores
   - Market Research
   - Journalism
   - None of the above

Now we’d like to ask you a few questions about fast food.
Which of the following fast food establishments do you frequent? (Check all that apply)
   - Hardee’s
   - Wendy’s
   - Taco Bell
   - McDonald’s – must be selected to advance
   - Jimmy John’s
   - Arby’s
   - Burger King
   - Subway
   - I do not frequent fast food restaurants

Which of the following fast food establishments would you never visit? (Check all that apply)
   - Hardee’s
   - Wendy’s
   - Taco Bell
   - McDonald’s
   - Jimmy John’s
   - Arby’s
   - Burger King
   - Subway
   - I would visit all of the above
How positive do you feel about McDonald’s?
Not very positive    …1…2…3…4…5…   Very positive

Have you heard of the Pay With Lovin’ campaign from McDonald’s?
- Yes
- No

Now we’d like to ask you a few questions about soft drinks
Which of the following do you drink on a regular basis (once a week or more)? (Check all that apply)
- Sierra Mist
- Pepsi
- Sprite
- Fanta
- Dr. Pepper
- Coca-Cola – must be selected to advance
- Mountain Dew
- I do not consume soft drinks

Which of the following soft drinks would you never consume? (Check all that apply)
- Sierra Mist
- Pepsi
- Sprite
- Fanta
- Dr. Pepper
- Coca-Cola
- Mountain Dew
- I would drink any of the above

How positive do you feel about Coca-Cola?
Not very positive    …1…2…3…4…5…   Very positive

Have you heard of the Where Will Happiness Strike Next Campaign from Coca-Cola?
- Yes
- No

SURVEY, CONDITION 1 (Unexpected PR):
We’re about to show you some videos. After each video you will be asked a series of questions. Please click continue when you are ready.
How do you feel about McDonald's as a company?
Not at all favorable ...1...2...3...4...5... Very favorable

How likely are you to eat at McDonald's?
Not likely at all ...1...2...3...4...5... Very likely

To what degree would you associate the following words with McDonald's?
Insightful: Not at all ...1...2...3...4...5... Very much so
Authentic: Not at all ...1...2...3...4...5... Very much so
Giving: Not at all ...1...2...3...4...5... Very much so
Generous: Not at all ...1...2...3...4...5... Very much so
Altruistic: Not at all ...1...2...3...4...5... Very much so
Genuine: Not at all ...1...2...3...4...5... Very much so
Considerate: Not at all ...1...2...3...4...5... Very much so

VIDEO: Where Will Happiness Strike Next
How do you feel about Coca-Cola as a company?
Not at all favorable   …1…2…3…4…5…   Very favorable

How likely are you to drink Coca-Cola?
Not likely at all   …1…2…3…4…5…   Very likely

To what degree would you associate the following words with Coca-Cola?
Insightful: Not at all   …1…2…3…4…5…   Very much so
Authentic: Not at all   …1…2…3…4…5…   Very much so
Giving: Not at all   …1…2…3…4…5…   Very much so
Generous: Not at all   …1…2…3…4…5…   Very much so
Altruistic: Not at all   …1…2…3…4…5…   Very much so
Genuine: Not at all   …1…2…3…4…5…   Very much so
Considerate: Not at all   …1…2…3…4…5…   Very much so

CONCLUSION QUESTIONS:
I would purchase a product, even it weren’t the cheapest or easiest to obtain, if the brand aligned with my values?
Not at all   …1…2…3…4…5…   Very much so

I consider myself a brand loyal consumer.
Not at all   …1…2…3…4…5…   Very much so

I put a lot of consideration toward my purchase decisions.
Not at all   …1…2…3…4…5…   Very much so
What would influence you to switch from brands that you are loyal to? (Check all that apply)
- Coupon
- Recommendation from a friend or family member
- To try a new product on the market
- If the brand gave me or my friends free, unexpected products or services
- Another brand was cheaper
- A new package design

Which would be the most influential reason for you to switch from brands that you are loyal to? (Check one)
- Coupon
- Recommendation from a friend or family member
- To try a new product on the market
- If the brand gave me or my friends free, unexpected products or services
- Another brand was cheaper
- A new package design

Have you ever received a free product or service from a brand?
- Yes
- No

If you heard of a friend or family member receiving a free product or service from a brand, how likely would you be to purchase from that brand?
Not at all likely …1…2…3…4…5… Very likely

SURVEY, CONDITION 2 (Expected PR):
We’re about to show you some videos. After each video you will be asked a series of questions. Please click continue when you are ready.
How do you feel about McDonald’s as a company?
Not at all favorable  …1…2…3…4…5… Very favorable

How likely are you to eat at McDonalds?
Not likely at all  …1…2…3…4…5… Very likely

To what degree would you associate the following words with McDonald’s?
Insightful: Not at all  …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so
Authentic: Not at all  …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so
Giving: Not at all  …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so
Generous: Not at all  …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so
Altruistic: Not at all  …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so
Genuine: Not at all  …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so
Considerate: Not at all  …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so
How do you feel about Coca-Cola as a company?
Not at all favorable …1…2…3…4…5… Very favorable

How likely are you to drink Coca-Cola?
Not likely at all …1…2…3…4…5… Very likely

To what degree would you associate the following words with Coca-Cola?
Insightful: Not at all …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so
Authentic: Not at all …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so
Giving: Not at all …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so
Generous: Not at all …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so
Altruistic: Not at all …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so
Genuine: Not at all …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so
Considerate: Not at all …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so

CONCLUSION QUESTIONS:
I would purchase a product, even if it weren’t the cheapest or easiest to obtain, if the brand aligned with my values?
Not at all …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so

I consider myself a brand loyal consumer.
Not at all …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so

I put a lot of consideration toward my purchase decisions.
Not at all …1…2…3…4…5… Very much so
What would influence you to switch from brands that you are loyal to? (Check all that apply)
- Coupon
- Recommendation from a friend or family member
- To try a new product on the market
- If the brand gave me or my friends free, unexpected products or services
- Another brand was cheaper
- A new package design

Which would be the most influential reason for you to switch from brands that you are loyal to? (Check one)
- Coupon
- Recommendation from a friend or family member
- To try a new product on the market
- If the brand gave me or my friends free, unexpected products or services
- Another brand was cheaper
- A new package design

Have you ever received a free product or service from a brand?
- Yes
- No

If you heard of a friend or family member receiving a free product or service from a brand, how likely would you be to purchase from that brand?
Not at all likely  …1…2…3…4…5… Very likely

DEMOGRAPHICS
What is your gender?
- Male
- Female

What is your age?
- Under 18
- 18-30
- 31-40
- 41-50
- 51-60
- 61+
What is your race or ethnic background? Please select all that apply.
- White/Caucasian
- Black/African American
- Hispanic/Latino
- American Indian/Alaska native
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Prefer not to answer

Please indicate the state you live in.

What is your marital status?
- Single
- Married
- Prefer not to answer

What is your highest level of education?
- Some high school
- High school diploma/GED
- Some college
- Associate’s degree
- Bachelor’s degree
- Master’s degree
• Doctorate degree
• Prefer not to answer

*Please indicate your annual household income before taxes.*

- Less than $5,000
- $5,000 - $9,999
- $10,000 - $14,999
- $15,000 - $19,999
- $20,000 - $24,999
- $25,000 - $29,999
- $30,000 - $34,999
- $35,000 - $39,999
- $40,000 - $44,999
- $45,000 - $49,999
- $50,000 - $54,999
- $55,000 - $59,999
- $60,000 - $64,999
- $65,000 - $69,999
- $70,000 - $74,999
- $75,000 - $79,999
- $80,000 - $89,999
- $90,000 - $99,999
- $100,000 - $124,999
- $125,000 - $149,999
- More than $150,000
- Prefer not to answer