

A comparison of how Generation X and Generation Y are being influenced by celebrity endorsement in advertisements for sportswear

A NIKE case

Student Name: Rinske Lichtendahl

Student Number: 481109

Supervisor: Dr. S. J. Opree

Master Media Studies - Media & Business
Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Master's Thesis

June 2018

A COMPARISON OF HOW GENERATION X AND GENERATION Y ARE BEING INFLUENCED BY CELEBRITY
ENDORSEMENT IN ADVERTISEMENTS FOR SPORTSWEAR

ABSTRACT

This study concentrates on advertising in the sportswear industry and aims to see if there is a difference in how Generation X and Generation Y are being influenced by the use of celebrity endorsement in sport advertisements. Due to inconsistent research about the effects of celebrity endorsement, and a gap in scientific literature regarding the effects of sport advertisements on Generation X and Y, the following research question was created: To what extent do the effects of sport advertising on Awareness, Interest, Desire, and Action differ between Generation X and Y consumers, and between advertisements with and without celebrity endorsements? A 2 by 3 quasi-experimental designed survey was employed to conduct the study. The determined factor was the generation to which the respondents belonged. The three conditions were the following: An advertisement of Nike with a brand ambassador, an advertisement of Nike without celebrity endorsement, and the last survey contained no advertisement at all in order to see if the advertisements would have any effect in the first place. The results showed that sport advertisements overall have a more positive effect on members of Generation Y than on Generation X: After being exposed to an advertisement, Generation Y scored significantly higher on Interest, Desire and Action than Generation X. There was no difference for Awareness between the two generations. These results imply that Generation Y is probably easier to persuade by sport advertisements, and a change in their behavior would be more likely after watching a sport advertisement than Generation Y. However, adding a celebrity to the advertisement did not cause a higher extent of Awareness, Interest, Desire, and Action, and no differences were found between Generation X and Y regarding AIDA after they were exposed to a sport advertisement containing celebrity endorsement.

KEYWORDS: *Celebrity Endorsement, Advertising, Generation X, Generation Y, AIDA*

Table of contents

ABSTRACT	2
1. Introduction	5
2. Theory and previous research.....	9
2.1 Advertising effects in general.....	9
2.2 The skeptical attitude of Generation X.....	10
2.2.1 Characteristics of Generation X and Y in general.....	11
2.2.2 The attitudes of the generations towards advertising.....	11
2.2.3 The effects of attitudes	13
2.2.4 The effects of the skeptical attitude of Generation X.....	15
2.3 Celebrity endorsement.....	16
2.4 Interaction effects.....	21
3. Research design.....	23
3.1 Procedure section: Selecting the relevant respondents.....	23
3.1.1 2x3 quasi-experimental designed survey.....	23
3.1.2 Sampling method	24
3.1.3 Stimulus material.....	25
3.2 Sampling Section	26
3.3 Measurement section	27
3.3.1 Attitude towards advertising in general.....	27
3.3.2 Attitude towards Celebrity Endorsement	28
3.3.3 Attitude towards the advertisement.....	28
3.3.4 Attitude towards the brand	29
3.3.5 Awareness	30
3.3.6 Interest.....	31
3.3.7 Desire.....	31
3.3.8 Action.....	32
4. Results	33
4.1 The effects of advertisements on Brand Attitude and AIDA.....	33
4.2 Attitude towards advertising in general.....	34
4.3 The different effects regarding the attitude towards advertising	35
4.4 The different effects of the attitude towards the two advertisements.....	36
4.5 The influence of advertisements on Generation X and Y.....	37
4.6 The influence of celebrity endorsement	39

4.7 The relation between the attitude towards celebrity endorsement and the effects of celebrity endorsement	41
4.8 The difference between the attitude towards celebrity endorsement between Generation X and Y.....	43
4.9 The effects of celebrity endorsement on Generation X and Y.....	43
5. Conclusion and Discussion	47
5.1 Conclusion	47
5.1.1 The effects of advertisements on Brand Attitude and AIDA.....	47
5.1.2 Generation X is more skeptical towards advertising than Generation Y	48
5.1.3 The different effects regarding the attitude towards advertising	48
5.1.4 The different effects of the attitude towards the two advertisements.....	49
5.1.5 The influence of advertisements on Generation X and Y.....	49
5.1.6 The influence of celebrity endorsement	50
5.1.7 The relation between the attitude towards celebrity endorsement and the effects of celebrity endorsement	51
5.1.8 The difference in the attitude towards celebrity endorsement between Generation X and Y	51
5.1.9 The effects of celebrity endorsement on Generation X and Y.....	52
5.2 Limitations, recommendations for further research, and strengths	52
5.2.1 Limitations	52
5.2.2 Recommendations for future research	53
5.2.3 Strengths	53
6. References	56
Appendix	63
Appendix A – Survey	63
Condition: Survey with advertisement containing Celebrity Endorsement.....	65
Condition: Survey with advertisement without Celebrity Endorsement.....	66
Condition: Survey without advertisement	67
Continuation of the survey for everyone	67

1. Introduction

“Just do it”. The slogan and trademark of NIKE.inc., created by Dan Wieden, an American advertising executive, is inspired by Gary Gilmore’s last words: “Let’s do it”. The “Just do it” campaign led to an increase in worldwide sales from 877 million dollar to 9.2 billion in the timeframe 1988 to 1998 (Lutz, 2015). Nike is the largest supplier of sports shoes and clothes in the world and also a leading manufacturer of sports equipment. Nike was valued at 19 billion dollars in 2014, which makes it the most valuable brand in the sport industry. Also, their worldwide marketing and sales belong to their principal business activity (Nike, Inc., 2017). Nike is known for its creative, powerful, and meaningful way of advertising, and this part of their business activity has played an essential role in the brand’s success (Carbasha, 2011). Nike is also known for their advertisements with many famous and most talented athletes (Woods, 2017) and they spend a lot of money on those endorsers: Cristiano Ronaldo – 8 million dollars a year, Roger Federer – 10 million dollars a year, and Michael Jordan – 60 million dollars a year (Alberstadt, 2018). Nike alone spends 475 million dollars per year on athletes to endorse the brand (Sokolovska, 2016). This raises the question to what extent consumers are really being inspired by these celebrities or that these marketing efforts are not really worth those enormous investments. This study will concentrate on advertising in the sportswear industry and aims to see if there is a difference in how Millennials (Generation Y) and Generation X are being influenced by the use of celebrity endorsement in sport advertisements.

This research focusses on two generations: Generation X, also called the ‘lost generation’, and Generation Y, also called the ‘millennials’ (van der Goot, Rozendaal, Oprea, Ketelaar & Smit, 2016). Generation X consists of the people born between 1965 and 1976. Generation Y consists of the people born between 1977 and 1995 (van der Goot et al., 2016). Mannheim (1953) argues that a generation can be defined as a cohort: A group of people raised in the same time and in the same chronological, social, and historical context. Therefore, growing up in a certain time and the effect of certain common experiences and occurrences leads to similarities regarding people that belong to the same generational cohort (Mannheim, 1953). Edmunds and Turner (2015) build on his work by arguing that these groups carry similarities in attitudes, emotions, personal temperament, and preferences. Furthermore, Twenge (2010) argues that generations are influenced by the context they live in: Living in a shared context creates certain shared ethics. This causes them differ from people from other generational cohorts (Twenge, 2010). It is presumable that there are also differences in how Generation X and Y perceive celebrity endorsement and how they are being influenced by advertisements about sportswear. For example, Generation X is believed to be more skeptical, also towards advertisements and celebrity endorsement, than Generation Y (Kotler, Keller, Brady, Goodman, and Hansen, 2012). This, and other characteristics of the two generations, will be discussed elaborately in the theoretical framework.

Sportswear companies are spending millions of dollars in endorsement deals each year to associate their products or brands with some of the biggest names in sport (Bower & Mateer, 2008). According to Kotler and colleagues (2012), celebrity endorsement in general is a very common marketing strategy nowadays. The theoretical framework will explain that celebrity endorsement seems to have a positive influence on the purchase intention of consumers. There are multiple theoretical models that support the positive effect celebrity endorsement has in advertising (Gnanapragash & Sekar, 2013). However, the persuasion ability celebrity endorsement is meant to have is questioned by multiple researchers, for example because of the vampire effect it could have on brands: A decline in brand recall caused by a celebrity endorser that dominates the advertisement and therefore overshadows the brand being endorsed (Erfgen, Zenker, & Sattler, 2015). Also, using a variety of celebrities to endorse the same brand can lead to confusion for the consumers. Furthermore, as celebrity endorsement in advertising has become so popular, the consumer feels skeptic about those messages (Gnanapragash & Sekar, 2013).

An advertisement, according to Kotler and colleagues (2012), is “any paid form of non-personal presentation and promotion of ideas, goods or services by an identified sponsor” (Kotler et al., 2012, 964). The goals of advertisements are to increase brand awareness among the target audience, making sure that they get interested in the brand, assuring that the target audience develops desire towards the brand, and eventually making sure consumers proceed to the purchase of the product or service the company is promoting. This process is being visualized by a well-known marketing model: The AIDA-model, which stands for Awareness, Interest, Desire, and Action (the actual purchase) (Lemon & Verhoef, 2016).

Loroz and Helgeson (2013) found differences in how different generations perceive advertisements – focusing on Millennials and Baby Boomers, the people born just after World War II (Loroz & Helgeson, 2013). Also, multiple studies focus on the demographics, psychographics, and consumption behaviors of Generation X and Y consumers. However, there has been no research conducted yet regarding the differences in perceiving sport advertisements for Generation X and Y: Little researchers focused on a direct comparison of these two groups within the context of a single study. Moreover, studies have shown different results regarding the effects of celebrity endorsement. Many studies prove the positive effects advertisements containing celebrities can have on the customer journey process. For example, Kotler and colleagues (2012) show increases in companies’ turnover after using celebrities in their campaigns. However, research conducted by Costanzo and Goodnight (2005) for example, showed that celebrity endorsement in advertisements in a magazine didn’t boost the ability of consumers to remind the brand being endorsed. This raises critical questions regarding the believed positive effects celebrity endorsement have to enhance purchase intention. These researches will be discussed in the theoretical framework in more detail. Earlier, it has been

emphasized that famous athletes are often used in advertisements in the sport industry, and that companies in sport clothing and equipment spend a lot of money on those endorsers. However, there is a lack of published research that investigates the effects these famous athletes have on the target market (Bush, Martin & Bush, 2004). This is also not investigated in relation to the different effects on Generation X and Y. The aim of this study is therefore to show the effects sport celebrities have in advertisements about sportswear, and if there are any differences between those effects for Generation X and Y.

From a social perspective, a study showing the effects of sport advertisements on Generation X and Y is relevant for companies in the sport industry: For them it is more relevant to focus on these younger generations, as creation of awareness among young people could lead to lifetime consumers of their products (Bennet, Sagas, & Dees, 2006). It is essential for those to be aware of the differences in how these Generation X and Y perceive their advertisements, so that they are able to fine-tune their advertisement as much as possible. By knowing the differences between different generations, companies are able to target more specifically and adapt their advertisements to different target audiences. This study might also be beneficial for the consumers in the end, as they receive more content that they will like: advertisements adjusted to their needs, values, and interests.

Moreover, it is arguable that celebrity endorsement really enhances the ability of consumers for brand recall and awareness. As awareness is the first phase of the AIDA model, and increased awareness will eventually lead to an increased purchase intention (action), it is also arguable that celebrity endorsement has a positive impact on purchase intention. The research question for this study will be as follows: To what extent do the effects of sport advertising on awareness, interest, desire, and action differ between Generation X and Y consumers, and between advertisements with and without celebrity endorsements? In order to conduct this study, a 2 by 3 quasi-experimental designed survey is employed. Whether people belong to Generation X or Y will be the determined factor in this study. The different conditions will be the following: An advertisement of Nike with a brand ambassador, an advertisement of Nike without celebrity endorsement, and the last survey will contain no advertisement at all in order to see if the advertisements will have any effect in the first place. I will elaborate in more detail on the survey and distribution in chapter three, the research design.

After the introduction, the theoretical framework is being presented. This chapter includes the hypotheses that will be tested in this research. The effects of advertising will be discussed in more depth. Also, literature about the effects of celebrity endorsement will be discussed in this chapter, just like the differences between Generation X and Y and how members of both cohorts differ in perceiving advertisements and celebrity endorsement. Then the research design will follow, with more information about the methodology, sampling, data collection and analysis, stimulus material, the operationalization, and the validity and reliability of the study. Then the results will follow, where the

hypotheses will be tested. Thereafter, the conclusion and discussion will be presented, in which the limitations and strengths of this study, and recommendations for research in the future will also be discussed. The last part will include the references.

2. Theory and previous research

2.1 Advertising effects in general

As already mentioned in the introduction, the differences in how Generation X and Generation Y are being influenced by advertisements with or without celebrity endorsement is researched from the perspective of the AIDA model. The AIDA model is a well-known model and used among marketers (Joseph, 2018). The AIDA model is a well-known and common used tool for marketers and used to persuade potential customers to move from the brand Awareness stage, to brand Interest and Desire, which could eventually lead to Action: the actual purchase (Lemon & Verhoef, 2016).

The AIDA model is a model with an approach where advertising has the purpose to communicate (van der Ven & Verhallen, 1998) and this communication task is focused on the hierarchy of effects of the communication process. Traditional hierarchy-of-effect-models, as AIDA, suppose that purposes focused on behavior can be accomplished when the goals on the level of cognitive effects as knowledge, and brand- and product awareness are already reached (van der Ven & Verhallen, 1998). The traditional hierarchy-of-effects-models assume that advertising has to be able to persuade people in order to be effective. This process consists of three phases: the cognitive, the affective, and the conative phase. In every phase of this process, there are different effects and purposes of advertising. At first, information has to be transferred and processed (the cognitive effect), whereafter a positive or negative feeling towards the product or brand will grow (the affective phase), which will eventually influence the purchase intention and purchase behavior (van der Ven & Verhallen, 1998). However, van Raaij (1984) argued that there is also a primary affective reaction immediately after seeing an advertisement that determines if the further process, the cognitive process, would be useful in the first place. The effects of this primary affective reaction will be discussed in more detail later on.

Also Hoeken, Hornikx, and Hustinx (2012) discuss the positive effect advertising can have on consumers' behavior. They show that advertisements cause a positive or negative feeling at consumers which has a direct influence on consumers' attitudes towards the product or brand. Subsequently, they argue that the more positive the attitude towards a product or brand is, the higher the chance that one buys the product. The general advertising effects are also confirmed by empirical research. Research conducted by Teng, Laroche, and Zhu (2007) illustrated that advertisements can indeed have a positive influence on the attitude towards the brand and on consumers' behavior, when the attitude towards the advertisement itself is positive as well.

So, one can derive from the principles of the AIDA model and from the principle that attitudes towards an advertisement and therefore attitudes towards a product or brand influence consumer

behavior, that advertising, when done well, has a positive influence on consumers' purchase intention. Therefore, the following hypotheses can be created:

H1a: The scores will be higher for Brand Attitude after people watched an advertisement.

H1b: The scores will be higher for Awareness after people watched an advertisement.

H1c: The scores will be higher for Interest after people watched an advertisement.

H1d: The scores will be higher for Desire after people watched an advertisement.

H1e: The scores will be higher for Action after people watched an advertisement.

2.2 The skeptical attitude of Generation X

As described in the introduction, this research focusses on two generations: Generation X, people born between 1965 and 1976, and Generation Y, people born between 1977 and 1995 (van der Goot et al., 2016). People that belong to a certain generational cohort are raised in the same context and time often carry similarities in attitudes, emotions, temperament and preferences (Edmunds & Turner, 2015). Because those people are influenced by the context they live in, which created certain shared ethics (Twenge, 2010), they often differ in attitudes, emotions, temperament and preferences from other generational cohorts (Twenge, 2010). This is also confirmed by multiple studies.

For example, Loroz and Helgeson (2013) conducted a study to unravel the differences between Generation Y and Baby Boomers, people born between 1946 and 1964. They focused on consumer values, personality traits, and responses to various advertising appeals. The study illustrated that members of Generation Y showed a higher extent of materialism. Also, the study showed that the people of this generation found brands more important, and members of Generation X were overall less religious than the Baby Boomer generation. In relation to advertisements, Generation Y proved to have more favorable attitudes towards image, extravagance, sex, and greed appeals than Baby Boomers had.

Also, Strutton, Taylor, and Thompson (2011) conducted a study to discover the differences between generations. This study was focused on Generation X and Y and researched whether differences between generations are being reflected in consumer behavior related to electronic word-of-mouth (e-Wom). By means of focus groups, behavior in relation to e-Wom and attitudes towards this concept were researched among members of both Generation X and Y. The findings of this research illustrated that members of Generation Y are more strongly engaged with social media, while members of Generation X rely more heavily on email. There were also a few differences found in attitudes towards technology: Members of Generation X for example, were more skeptical towards digital media than members of Generation Y. Also, messages containing advertisements, except for

mass emails, were more appreciated by members of Generation Y. Members of Generation X on the other hand, were more likely to avoid advertisement passing by on e-devices (Strutton, Taylor & Thompson, 2011).

So, earlier research showed that generational differences exist. To gain more insights into the differences between Generation X and Y, the following paragraph will discuss their characteristics in general.

2.2.1 Characteristics of Generation X and Y in general

Keeping in mind that not all the members of a generation can be tarred with the same brush, there are some characteristics that are considered typically for members of Generation X and Y. The characteristics which stand out in earlier research about Generation X and Y are discussed below. In general, members of Generation X are often seen as annoyed, skeptical, pessimistic, and worried people who have no interest in political and social affairs (Zill & Robinson, 1995). They grew up during an arising drug culture, increasing crime rates, and multiple economic crises in a row (Ryan, 1993). This generation was the very first with a high divorce rate among their parents. Therefore, a lot of members of this generation had to take care of themselves at a young age which made them very responsible individuals (Zill & Robinson, 1995). They often had to conduct shopping tasks for their household which enabled an early access for them into the marketplace (Ritchie, 1995).

Members of generation Y are the latest people who really became part of the labor market, and are getting more and more economic influence. In general, people who belong to this generation are often seen as independent, pro-active, autonomous, passionately, intellectually expressive, creative, and curious (Napoli & Ewing, 2001).

2.2.2 The attitudes of the generations towards advertising

In order to see to what extent sport advertising (with or without celebrity endorsement) has an effect on every stage of AIDA for Generation X and Y, it is needed to do research into the attitude people from both generations have towards advertising. The skeptical attitude members of Generation X have, can also be seen in their attitude towards advertising. Many of their attitudes towards advertising in general come from experiences from their youth: Generation X had grown up with television, whereby they were exposed to a big amount of advertisements. Therefore, they are now critical adults who are irritated by redundant hype (Cohen & Simons, 1995). Giles (1994) even argues that the whole Generation X believes advertising consists of lies and hype. However, this can be nuanced in some ways. One should keep in mind that scholars can be quite bold in their statements, but Freeman (1995) argues that in general, members of Generation X often want to see specific specifications about the promoted products or services in advertisements. According to Freeman (1995), they also tend to like an uncommon theme and special, obscure information in advertising. And, when the mass media start to like the same thing, most members of Generation X tend to move

on to something else (Horovitz, 1995). Horovitz (1995) also argues that members of this generation are generally looking for fast satisfaction all the time. In order to seek this, some of them constantly channel-hop television and surf the internet. They will often easily lose their interest if they do not see what they like and leave the channel (Horovitz, 1995). The generation before the X generation, the Baby Boomers, wants to be overloaded with positive and entertaining messages. Members of Generation X contrarily, have a too skeptical attitude for this approach and will often be more enthusiastic when they are told the truth (Lienert, 1995). Because they have been overloaded with advertisements when they were young, many of them are very smart consumers and know exactly when they deal with untrustworthy advertising and honest deals (Ritchie, 1995).

Generation Y grew up with the online world. They are downloading music, connecting with friends via social media and instant messaging apps, and do their purchases often online. Although Generation Y faced a couple of years of economic recession, their youth in general has known little economic fallbacks. This led to the case that lots of members of Generation Y have been spoiled by their parents (Kotler et al., 2012). Therefore, some of them feel like they deserve more than others and those have developed a selective, confident, and impatient mindset: When they have something in their mind what they want, they want it as fast as possible (Kotler et al., 2012). That Generation Y consists of many impulse buyers is also confirmed by Herhold (2018). This study shows that this generation consists mainly of impulse buyers and that the members of this generation are more likely to make purchases after seeing advertisements compared to older generations: Approximately 81% of Generation Y made a purchase after seeing or hearing an advertisement in the last thirty days. However, one should keep in mind that the studies about Generation X and Y that have been discussed here are mostly American. It would not have to be the case that the outcomes are true for all members of the generations in every culture, as culture is also a factor which distinguishes one group of people from another (Compare countries - Hofstede Insights, 2018). Namely, the concept “culture” is seen as “the collective mental programming of the human mind” (Compare countries - Hofstede Insights, 2018), which influences thinking patterns of people that express themselves in the values and standards people have in life. Those values and standards in their turn become characteristics of a certain society (Compare countries - Hofstede Insights, 2018).

So, Generation X is known as the weary and cynical youth with a rebellious attitude (Kotler et al., 2012). This is also confirmed by earlier research. Holtz (2013) argues that Generation X was often neglected by their parents, the Baby Boomers. Baby Boomers were mainly busy with working and accomplishing their own personal goals (Holtz, 2013). That is why most members of Generation X developed a survivor mentality and have a very cynical and skeptical attitude (Conger, 1998) as they grew up in a world that was much less pleasant as other generations, such as the Baby Boomers (Conger, 1998). Thus, regarding the fact that Generation X is known for a skeptical attitude, also

towards advertising, while Generation Y consists of more materialistic people / impulse buyers who are easier to convince by advertising, the following hypotheses can be made:

H2: Generation X has a more skeptical attitude towards advertising than Generation Y.

2.2.3 The effects of attitudes

So, as shown in the previous section, it is expected that Generation X will be more skeptical towards advertising than Generation Y. Therefore, it is needed to see if those different attitudes towards advertising in general influence the rest of the customer journey, in other words, on the different stages of the AIDA model. For that reason, this process will be discussed in more detail below.

Persuasive messages, like advertisements, have the purpose to convince people (Hoeken et al., 2012). According to O’Keefe (2002), persuasion is only the case when the mental state of the other has changed. This mental state is often equalized to the concept ‘attitude’ (Hoeken et al., 2012), which would mean that persuasion is focused on changing the attitudes of people. A common used definition of the concept ‘attitude’ is the one of Eagly and Chaiken (1993, 1): “a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor”. However, lots of persuasion attempts are not only focused on changing someone’s state of mind / attitude, but also on changing someone’s behavior (Hoeken et al., 2012). For example, the ultimate goal of advertising efforts is to increase consumers’ purchase intention (so to change their behavior), rather than only positively influence their attitude (Hoeken et al., 2012). In order to clarify this dissonance, it is needed to look into the process of persuasion in more detail.

The process of persuasion happens because of the transmission of information. In the first place, transmission of information has an effect on people’s minds, in other words, on their attitudes. Once this has taken place, it is possible that people’s behavior will be influenced as well. So, communication can shape or change attitudes, and those attitudes can influence one’s behavior. Therefore, persuasive communication is often focused on influencing one’s attitude with the underlying goal to influence one’s behavior (Hoeken et al., 2012). This is why also marketers try to make sure the target group will think as positive as possible about their products/services and brand, with the underlying goal to positively affect consumers’ purchase intention (Hoeken et al., 2012).

Hoeken and colleagues (2012) argue that some variables are the determinants of behavior. One of those direct variables is someone’s attitude. It is important to distinguish automatic behavior and reasoned behavior. Automatic behavior is behavior conducted unconsciously by contextual elements (for example: One drinks when one is thirsty). Reasoned behavior on the other hand, is the result of a process where attitude and the consideration of the advantages and disadvantages play an important

role (Hoeken et al., 2012). This form of behavior is easier to influence by communication than automatic behavior.

Dual process models, like the Elaboration Likelihood Model, consist of two routes people can take to process a message: The central route, when people process the message in a rational, critical, and pro-active way, and the peripheral route, when people process the message more in a superficial way (Hoeken et al., 2012). However, Meyers-Levy and Malaviya (1999) introduced a new way of processing advertisements: Experiential processing. During the experiential process, the person who gets exposed to the advertisement translates the feeling that he or she gets during processing the message into an attitude towards the advertisement. So in this process, the emphasis is not on the positive or negative properties of the product itself (like real arguments or cues, which are the principles of dual process models), but on the feeling people get by watching the advertisement which results in the appreciation for the advertisement itself. The appreciation for the advertisement is also called the attitude towards the advertisement. Brown and Stayman (1992) showed in a meta-analysis that this attitude towards the advertisement can influence the attitude towards the product and brand itself. What is said about the product or brand is therefore not that important in advertisements, what matters is the way how it is told. This is what actually influences the attitude towards the product or brand itself. So, when people get a nice or good feeling because of an advertisement, this feeling will be translated into a positive attitude towards the advertisement.

As explained before, Hoeken and colleagues (2012) argued that a positive attitude towards an advertisement has a direct influence on consumers' attitudes towards the product or brand. Subsequently, this positive attitude towards the product or brand will lead to a higher purchase intention of the consumers – which is the last phase of the AIDA model. And as AIDA is a hierarchy-of-effects-model, that would mean that, when the score on Action increases, that the phases that will lead to the last phase, will also increase. The only stage attitude probably won't influence is Awareness. According to Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Finkenauer, and Vohs (2001) argue that the principle "Negative is stronger than positive" is often true. Their empirical research was focused on the news and it showed that people tend to react more extreme on negative news items than on positive ones. Furthermore, from an advertising perspective, research showed that consumers pay more attention to advertisements or information they consider as negative than to advertisements or information they consider as positive (Ahluwalia & Shiv, 1997). In addition, student Janssens (2012) considers the Brand Attitude and Brand Awareness as two separate things which both influence the progress of the persuasion process of consumers apart from each other. Keeping in mind that attitude and Awareness will not influence each other, but attitude will influence Interest, Desire, and Action, the following hypotheses can be created:

H3a: The more positive the attitude towards advertising in general, the more positive the attitude towards the advertisements of Nike will be.

H3b: The more positive the attitude towards advertising in general, the more positive the attitude towards the brand Nike will be after watching one of the advertisements.

H3c: The attitude towards advertising in general will not have an effect on the score on brand Awareness regarding Nike after watching one of the Nike advertisements.

H3d: The more positive the attitude towards advertising in general, the higher the score on brand Interest for Nike will be after watching one of the Nike advertisements.

H3e: The more positive the attitude towards advertising in general, the higher the score on Desire for Nike will be after watching one of the Nike advertisements.

H3f: The more positive the attitude towards advertising in general, the higher the score on Action regarding Nike will be after watching one of the Nike advertisements.

As explained above, the positive attitude towards an advertisement has a direct influence on consumers' attitudes towards the product or brand and will therefore lead to higher scores on every stage of the AIDA model, except for Awareness. Therefore, the following hypotheses can be created as well:

H4a: The more positive the attitude towards the Nike advertisement, the higher the score on Brand Attitude towards Nike will be.

H4b: The attitude towards the Nike advertisement will not have an effect on the score on Awareness regarding Nike.

H4c: The more positive the attitude towards the Nike advertisement, the higher the score on Interest for Nike will be.

H4d: The more positive the attitude towards the Nike advertisement, the higher the score on Desire for Nike will be.

H4e: The more positive the attitude towards the Nike advertisement, the higher the score on Action regarding Nike will be.

2.2.4 The effects of the skeptical attitude of Generation X

As explained, members of Generation X have a more skeptical attitude towards advertising, which will probably result in the outcome that they do not like the advertisements of Nike as much as members of Generation Y do. Also, most people would not like to admit that they got influenced by

persuasive communication (Liebrecht, 2017) and when people have a more skeptical attitude towards advertising, it would possibly be even harder to influence them by advertising. Therefore, the attitude towards the advertisements will be more positive regarding Generation X than the attitude of Generation Y. As explained before, the attitude towards an advertisement has a direct relation with the attitude towards the brand / product itself and the more positive the attitude towards a product or brand is, the higher the intention / the chance that one actually buys the product will be (Hoeken et al., 2012). In other words, it is presumable that the higher the attitude towards Nike is, the higher the score on 'action', the purchase intention, will be. "Action", on the other hand, is influenced by the three earlier stages of the AIDA-model: Awareness influences "Interest", which influences "Desire", which influences "Action". A higher score on "Action" will therefore mean that the score on the other stages is also higher. However, the score on Awareness does not specifically has to be higher for Generation Y: It is expected that the score on Awareness will be approximately the same for Awareness, as both generations have been exposed to the advertisement and the attitude towards this advertisement will not influence the Awareness stage. This leads to the following hypotheses:

H5a: Generation Y has a more positive attitude towards the Nike advertisements after watching it than Generation X.

H5b: Generation Y has a more positive attitude towards the brand Nike after watching a Nike advertisement than Generation X.

H5c: There will be no difference between the scores on Awareness after watching a Nike advertisement between Generation X and Generation X.

H5d: Generation Y scores higher on Interest after watching a Nike advertisement than Generation X.

H5e: Generation Y scores higher on Desire after watching a Nike advertisement than Generation X.

H5f: Generation Y scores higher on Action after watching a Nike advertisement than Generation X.

2.3 Celebrity endorsement

As already mentioned in the introduction, sportswear companies are spending millions of dollars in endorsement deals each year to associate their products or brands with some of the biggest names in sport (Bower & Mateer, 2008). Nike alone for example, spends 475 million dollars per year on athletes to endorse the brand (Sokolovska, 2016). Also according to Kotler and colleagues (2012), celebrity endorsement has become a very common marketing strategy. They argue that international advertisements with celebrities who enjoy worldwide fame and recognition can eliminate obstacles that are caused by cultural differences: When the audience can identify itself with the celebrity being used, the celebrity can appeal to people from different countries and cross cultural borders. Celebrities' international fame and recognition is essential to use them successfully as brand

ambassadors. The use of celebrities as brand ambassadors can empower a brand with genuineness and credibility. That is why more and more companies use celebrities in their global branding (Kotler et al., 2012). Yu (2005) pointed out that, within the sport industry, more and more organizations are using the most prestigious, best, and famous athletes in the world to endorse their product or brand. Also, Yu (2005) argues that celebrities with worldwide recognition and fame are able to cross cultural borders by grabbing the attention of people from different countries or cultures. Moreover, Yu (2005) emphasizes the effect celebrity endorsement often has on the customer journey. According to Yu (2005), prestigious athletes with worldwide fame can enhance brand recall, boost the reputation of the brand or company, make the message of the advertisement more credible and reliable, increase the attractiveness of the brand's products, enhance recall of the advertisement, positively influence the attitude consumers have towards the advertisement, and most importantly, increase the purchase intention of the brand's products.

So, using celebrity endorsement as a marketing strategy has become very common amongst companies. This is in line with the findings of Kotler and colleagues (2012), as they argue that using celebrity endorsement in a correct way has many advantages for a brand. According to Kotler and colleagues (2012), celebrity endorsement can have the following advantages for a brand. At first, just like Yu (2005) mentioned, celebrities can boost the image of the organization and attitudes towards the brand. This is a great benefit as a positive attitude towards the brand can also enhance the extent of Interest and Desire consumers have towards the product and brand, which could eventually lead to an increased purchase intention. Secondly, using celebrities cause that the advertising efforts of the company stay fresh and recent, which could also lead to a more positive attitude towards the product or brand. Also using successful personalities gives a brand more character and celebrity endorsement can also make sure that advertising campaigns stand out from the rest causing an increased attention from the audience whereby the extent of Awareness will increase among the target audience. Lastly, Kotler and colleagues (2012) argue that celebrity endorsement can lead to increased profit and sales. This last point will be discussed in more detail later in this section.

Also, research conducted by Premeaux (2009) showed that celebrity endorsement in relation to the AIDA model has a positive impact. He found that the most important influence on AIDA celebrity endorsement causes, is getting and holding the attention of the consumer. One must keep in mind that the celebrity must have expertise about the product or brand he or she endorses. This characteristic can overcome some weaknesses the celebrity might have, such as lack of likeability or personal preference of the consumer. The respondents of this research indicated that celebrities in advertisements create attention, brand awareness, and interest and that they make advertisements more memorable. However, this research also showed that celebrity endorsers seemed less effective regarding desire and purchase intention (action). However, numbers from other studies showed that celebrity endorsement could actually lead to an increase in purchase intention. An example showing the effectiveness of

celebrity endorsement is a study conducted by the Institute of Practitioners (Kotler et al., 2012). They provide a table with the most successful celebrity campaigns in the United Kingdom. The table shows that a lot of campaigns including celebrity endorsement are campaigns with a positive Return of Investment (ROI) which have caused an incremental value of millions or even billions of pounds. For example, using Jamie Oliver in a campaign has led to an incremental value of 1.12 billion for the company Sainsbury's and the campaign had a ROI of 27:1, which means that every pound invested in the campaign has led to 27 pounds turnover.

Table 1:

Most Successful Celebrity Campaigns in the United Kingdom (Table Adapted from Kotler et al., 2012, 546)

Celebrity	Company	ROI	Incremental value (£)
Prunella Scales and Jane Horrocks	Tesco	2.25:1	2.2 billion
Jamie Oliver	Sainsbury's	27:1	1.12 billion
Stephen Fry and High Laurie	Alliance & Leicester	30:1	656 million
Bob Hoskins	BT	6:1	297 million
Vice Reeves and Bob Mortimer	First Direct	18:1	223 million
Ian Wright, Martin Luther King, Kate Moss, Elvis Presley, John McCarthy, Yuri Gagarin	One2One	5.4:1	199 million
Martin Clunes, Caroline Quentin, Jonah Lomu, Caprice, Jonathan Ross	Pizza Hut	3:1	55 million
Pauline Quirke and Linda Robson	Surf	2:1	42 million
George Best, Chris Eubank, Rolf Harris, Prince Naseem	The Dairy Council	2:5	21 million
The Simpsons	Domino's Pizza	5:3	13 million

So, according to the advantages that Kotler and colleagues (2012) mention, it seems like celebrities have an actual influence on the turnover of a company. Other examples of celebrity endorsement also show the effectiveness of this marketing method. In 2016, Selena Gomez had become the face of the posh fashion brand Louis Vuitton and the advertisement was posted on Instagram, which got more than a million likes within two hours (Sokolovska, 2016). Also, Chanel named Nicole Kidman to be the brand's face in 2003. By this action, Chanel's global sales of the perfume that was promoted by Nicole Kidman, increased with 30%. Also, when Nike used Tiger

Woods as an endorser of their products in 2000, their global market share increased from 0.9% to 4% in half a year (Sokolovska, 2016). On average, only a plain announcement from a brand naming a celebrity or famous athlete as their new endorser can cause an increase in sales by 4% (Sokolovska, 2016).

The examples of Kotler and colleagues (2012) and Sokolovska (2016) imply that celebrity endorsement has an impact on the purchase intention of consumers, in other words, on the *action phase* in the AIDA model. According to Sokolovska (2016) celebrity endorsement has also a direct influence on Awareness amongst consumers and that it is also an effective strategy to build credibility and increase the interest in the products being promoted. These factors are all essential in the customer journey process consumers are going through while making the decision to purchase a product or not. Celebrity endorsement will make sure the consumer associates the celebrity's success, beauty, or in the case of Nike, athletic skills, with the products being promoted. When the celebrity is a person the audience can relate to or identify itself with, consumers are more likely to feel more sympathetic towards the brand (Sokolovska, 2016).

However, there are also some researches that deny the effectiveness of celebrity endorsement as a marketing strategy to boost the company's business. Research conducted by Costanzo and Goodnight (2005) showed that celebrity endorsement in advertisements in a magazine did not boost the ability of consumers to remind the brand being endorsed: Participants of this experiment were not able to name the brand in a correct way once they had been exposed to the advertisement. Therefore, the results of this research raise critical questions regarding the believed positive effects celebrity endorsement has to enhance purchase intention. However, research conducted by Misra and Beatty (1990) showed that the effectiveness of advertisement will be enhanced when the celebrity that endorses the brand is in line with the brand being endorsed. They found that when the endorser and brand fit, the characteristics of the endorser will be identified with the brand, and the attitude towards the brand will be more positive. Also, the research conducted by Premeaux (2009) showed that celebrity endorsement in relation to the AIDA model has a positive impact. The divergent results of the different studies regarding the successful or failing effects celebrity endorsement in advertisements could cause, asks for more research regarding this subject. Therefore, this research aims to determine to what extent celebrity endorsement has an impact on Brand Attitude, Awareness, Interest, Desire, and Action (AIDA) in relation to the brand.

Thus, despite there are some divergent results in studies about celebrity endorsement, most studies argue that celebrity endorsement in advertising seems to have a direct influence on Interest. Also, as a lot of numbers show that celebrity endorsement actually does influence the purchase intention of the consumer, it is expectable that also the action phase of AIDA will be positively influenced by the use of celebrities in advertisements. Moreover, as action is directly a result of the

desire phase of AIDA, I also expect a higher score for this stage after respondents have watched the video containing celebrity endorsement. Again, celebrity endorsement could cause a more positive attitude towards the brand, but there will probably be no difference for Awareness, as both advertisements really clearly promote the brand itself. This leads to the following hypotheses:

H6a: The video with celebrity endorsement will lead to a more positive attitude towards the advertisement than the video without celebrity endorsement.

H6b: The video with celebrity endorsement will lead to a more positive attitude towards the brand Nike than the video without celebrity endorsement.

H6c: The video with celebrity endorsement will not lead to a higher score on Awareness regarding Nike than the video without celebrity endorsement.

H6d: The video with celebrity endorsement will lead to a higher score on Interest for Nike than the video without celebrity endorsement.

H6e: The video with celebrity endorsement will lead to a higher score on Desire for Nike than the video without celebrity endorsement.

H6f: The video with celebrity endorsement will lead to a higher score on Action regarding Nike than the video without celebrity endorsement.

In order to understand to what extent the effect of celebrity endorsement will differ between Generation X and Y, it is important to investigate how members of both generations perceive celebrity endorsement in general. Just like the attitude towards advertising in general, also the attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general could influence the attitude they have towards the advertisement containing celebrity endorsement after watching it. This could influence the attitude towards the brand, which could influence the three last stages of the AIDA model. As a positive attitude will have a positive influence on those three last stages, the following hypotheses can be created:

H7a: The more positive the attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general, the more positive the attitude towards the advertisement with celebrity endorsement will be.

H7b: The more positive attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general, the more positive the attitude towards the brand Nike will be after watching the video with celebrity endorsement.

H7c: A more positive attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general will not lead to a higher score on Awareness after watching the video with celebrity endorsement.

H7d: The more positive the attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general, the higher the score on Interest will be after watching the video with celebrity endorsement.

H7e: The more positive the attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general, the higher the score on Desire will be after watching the video with celebrity endorsement.

H7f: The more positive the attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general, the higher the score on Action will be after watching the video with celebrity endorsement.

2.4 Interaction effects

As demonstrated in 2.1, Generation X consists of people with a more skeptical and rebellious mindset, whereby they might be a more difficult target audience to convince by advertising. On the other hand, Generation Y consists of more materialistic people / impulse buyers who are also easier to convince by advertising and is therefore more likely to score higher at the last three stages of the AIDA model. Keeping this in mind, the remaining question is what the differences are between Generation X and Y after they are being exposed to an advertisement containing celebrity endorsement. In order to investigate this, it is needed to define what kind of attitude members of both generations have towards celebrity endorsement in general, as this could, just like the attitude towards advertising in general, influence the rest of the persuasion process of consumers.

According to Kotler and colleagues (2012), it is essential to make sure the consumers are convinced that the celebrity who performs as brand ambassador has good intentions and is not doing it just for money. As already mentioned, members of Generation X have in general a more skeptical and rebellious attitude than Generation Y. Therefore, it is also more likely that it is harder to persuade Generation X of the good intentions of a celebrity who performs as a brand ambassador. Multiple studies showed that this skepticism can also be seen in relation to celebrity endorsement in advertising. A survey conducted by Barton, Koslow, and Beauchamp (2014) showed that in comparison to Generation X, members of Generation Y were twice as likely to say that they are influenced by celebrities. This research also showed that the influence celebrities have on Generation Y has increased since the same research was conducted in 2012, especially in relation to lifestyle, clothing, equipment, and luxury products and brands. In addition, Banister and Cocker (2013) illustrated that young consumers tend to develop their own identity, character and appearance based on celebrities they like. Therefore, this age group tends to be more affected by celebrity endorsement than older age groups. Lastly, Nielsen (2015) found there are differences in trust in certain advertising efforts among different generations. In the case of celebrity endorsement, Nielsen (2015) found that younger generations, namely Generation Y and Z, trust celebrity endorsement more strongly than older generations. All these researches support the idea that younger generations are more likely to have a positive attitude towards celebrity endorsement than older generations. Therefore, the following hypothesis can be created:

H8: Generation Y will have a more positive attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general than Generation X.

So, members of Generation X, will probably have a more skeptical attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general, just like they have towards advertising in general. Therefore, they will probably not like the advertisements of Nike containing celebrity endorsement as much as members of Generation Y will, whereby the attitude towards that advertisement will be higher for Generation Y than for Generation X. As illustrated by for example Kotler and colleagues (2012), once people can identify themselves with the celebrity functioning as endorser, the extent of Interest and Desire people have towards the endorsed product will increase, which will also lead to an increased purchase intention. This is also supported by the numbers of sales figures in paragraph 2.3. However, as Generation X will be probably more skeptical towards celebrity endorsement and will therefore develop a less favorable attitude towards the advertisement itself, their extent of Interest and Desire, will be also less favorable than the scores of Generation Y. This will also have an influence on the last stage of the AIDA model, namely Action. No difference however is expected for Awareness, as attitudes do not have an influence on this stage. This leads to the following hypotheses:

H9a: Generation Y will have a more positive attitude towards the advertisement with celebrity endorsement than Generation X.

H9b: Generation Y will have a more positive attitude towards the brand Nike after watching the video with celebrity endorsement than Generation X.

H9c: There will be no significant difference for Awareness regarding Nike after watching the video with celebrity endorsement between Generation Y and X

H9d: Generation Y scores higher on Interest for Nike after watching the video with celebrity endorsement than Generation X

H9e: Generation Y scores higher on Desire for Nike after watching the video with celebrity endorsement than Generation X

H9f: Generation Y scores higher on Action regarding Nike after watching the video with celebrity endorsement than Generation X

3. Research design

This chapter explains the method of the study. The first section, the procedure section, elaborates on the type of the study, how it was conducted and why it was conducted in that particular way, and will explain more about the stimulus material. The second section, the sample section, will elaborate on the total amount of respondents (How many people were reached, how many respondents gave consent, met the criteria, etc.) and on the demographics of both Generation X and Y. The last section contains more information about the measures and scales used in the survey. Every measure of the survey will be discussed.

Considering the fact that all measures are derived from earlier research, they are more likely to be valid and the results will be more reliable. Also the fact that the research is conducted by random sampling, increases the chance to a true representation of the population. However, one should keep in mind mainly people from the Netherlands have been recruited, as that was the country the research was conducted in. Therefore the sample will be representative in its own context.

3.1 Procedure section: Selecting the relevant respondents

3.1.1 2x3 quasi-experimental designed survey

In order to answer the research question, a 2 (Generation X or Y) by 3 (advertisement without celebrity endorsement, advertisement with celebrity endorsement, and no advertisement at all) quasi-experimental designed survey has been employed (Neuman, 2014). Whether people belong to Generation X or Y was the pre-determined factor in this study. The different random conditions are the following: An advertisement of Nike with a brand ambassador, an advertisement of Nike without celebrity endorsement, and the last survey will contain no advertisement at all in order to see if the advertisements had any effect in the first place. The survey with the different conditions can be found in Appendix A. As shown in Appendix A, the first part of the survey is the same for all the respondents, then the respondents are randomly assigned to one of the three conditions: either to the condition containing the advertisement with celebrity endorsement, the condition containing the advertisement without celebrity endorsement, or the condition without an advertisement at all. Both the conditions with an advertisement contain extra questions after the respondents are being exposed to one of the videos. In Appendix A, first the condition with the advertisement containing celebrity endorsement is shown after the first part of the survey which is the same for every respondent. Thereafter, the condition containing the advertisement without celebrity endorsement is presented. Then, the condition without an advertisement, which contains no extra questions, is shown. Lastly, the last part of the survey is presented, which is just like the beginning of the survey equal for all the respondents.

The survey has been distributed among six groups which consist of approximately thirty respondents per group. Three groups consist of Generation Y, people born between 1977 and 1995, and the other three groups consist of Generation X, people born between 1965 and 1976 (van der Goot et al, 2016). The first groups of both generations have been exposed to the advertisement including celebrity endorsement, the second groups have seen the video without celebrity endorsement, and the third groups have not been exposed to an advertisement at all. So, in total, 180 respondents were needed to conduct the research. As already mentioned in the introduction, Generation X and Y have been chosen, because creation of awareness among young people could lead to lifetime consumers of the products of companies (Bennet et al., 2006).

3.1.2 Sampling method

The tool Qualtrics is used to create the online surveys and collect the data. This tool randomly assigns one of the three surveys to a respondent. The recruitment technique used was random sampling, as random sampling leads to samples most likely to truly represent the entire population (Neuman, 2014). The respondents were collected on different places around the Netherlands (Vlaardingen, Rotterdam, Maastricht, and Braamt), during different days and on different times, which could lead to a sample that is more representative for the total amount of members of Generation X and Y. However, as the respondents were only collected on four different locations in the Netherlands, the sample does not represent the entire population who belong to Generation X and Y. Random persons who passed by were asked whether they were willing to participate in a research for a master's thesis about sportswear. All the respondents' answers were collected on a tablet and phone.

In order to make sure the research was complete, respondents were being asked about their demographics, including their age, gender, and education. In this way, a difference can be made between respondents from Generation X and Y and the researcher is able to determine to what extent the sample is representative for the population. People who did not meet the criteria were being excluded from the study ($N = 13$). This concerns people who did not belong to Generation Y or X: People born after 1995 or before 1965. To make sure whether the respondents have actually seen the video of their condition, a manipulation check has been conducted. The following question was asked after showing one of the videos: "Did you see men or women in the video?" Respondents who said they saw only men or women in the video and respondents who were not able to watch the video at all ($N = 4$), were excluded from the study. After the video containing celebrity endorsement, the question was asked whether the respondents had seen a famous athlete in the video and whether they could give the name of the athlete. In this way, it is clear whether the manipulation is noticed by the respondents. Lastly, the persons whose age did not match their year of birth ($N=4$) were excluded from the study as well. To cover the true aim of the experiment, also some mock questions were being included, namely questions regarding respondents' sport habits, their favorite sport brand and how often they buy new

sport clothing or equipment. It took approximately 3 to 7 minutes (depending on which survey one got) to complete the survey.

3.1.3 Stimulus material

As mentioned before, the manipulation consisted of one Nike advertisement including celebrity endorsement and one video of Nike without celebrity endorsement. Both videos are quite recent and released in more or less the same time period: The video without celebrity endorsement was uploaded on YouTube in May 2016 and the video with celebrity endorsement was uploaded in July 2016. Both advertisements contained athletes: one video contained a famous athlete and the other one did not. The following paragraphs will explain more about the advertisements and argue why the video with celebrity endorsement is a good example of the use of a celebrity.

The video with celebrity endorsement is part of the campaign “Nikecourt” (Nike, 2017). It was uploaded on their YouTube channel at the 29th of June 2017. The video has 7,033,285 views, 2,000 likes, 66 dislikes, and it is 1:36 minutes long. The video shows a tennis match of Roger Federer, who is wearing Nike sport clothes and shoes, and an opponent. While he is slowly winning the game, the whole audience, including the referee and the reporters, is being inspired by the game, and in particular by Roger Federer and the way how he is winning the game. When the game is almost won, it becomes clear that the audience wears Nike sport clothes under their normal clothes which they are taking off. Also a lot of people have suddenly tennis rackets and head bands, while they are still watching the game. When Federer serves for the last time, the whole audience is in ecstasy, everyone is silent, and when he wins, everyone is running outside and music starts playing. Federer gets his trophée, and everyone who was in the tennis hall is running across the city, looking for tennis fields to play the game by themselves. When Federer is leaving the hall satisfied, two people who hid themselves start playing at the tennis court Federer just won on. The video ends with the link “nike.com/nikecourt”. So, the video implies that all the people who watched the game of Federer, are getting inspired by what he does and start playing tennis as well.¹

The video without celebrity endorsement is part of the campaign ‘Sustainable Innovation’ (Nike, 2016). It was uploaded on their YouTube channel at the 16th of May 2016. The video has 90,956 views, 1,000 likes, 32 dislikes, and it is 1:07 minutes long. The video shows different kinds of people, conducting different sports, like soccer, baseball, fitness, and cross fit. It also shows the backsides of sports, like sitting in a bath filled with ice after training. In the meantime, scenes of employees of Nike who are developing, creating and improving sportswear are being showed. Subsequently, one sees the athletes wear these sportswear whereby the audience gets an idea of the quality of the products. For example, one sees employees of Nike working on a t-shirt, and subsequently a scene is showed of a soccer player who is wearing this shirt and another soccer player

¹ The link to the video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zv9daYDOCIY>

is pulling at this t-shirt. The video ends with an exhausted runner who wears Nike sportswear and, after stopping for a moment, runs further. The final screen of the video is a link to [nike.com/sustainable-innovation](https://www.nike.com/sustainable-innovation). The video is accompanied by music and a voice over. The voice explains that every athlete is in essence the same: They use for example the same muscles and they share the same air. The voice also explains that athletes need to work hard to achieve more and that for example every fraction of a second and every milligram of material matters. The conclusion is that Nike takes this into account by using limited resources and light weight material (Nike, 2016).²

Kotler and colleagues (2012), give certain recommendations in order to use celebrities successfully in advertisements. They argue that the celebrities used in advertisements should enjoy a high recognition and they have a clear and popular image. Furthermore, it is essential that consumers are convinced of the celebrity's good intentions to be an ambassador of a brand in order for the advertisement to be believed. Also, the image of the brand, and the image of the celebrity have to be aligned with each other in order to be persuasive. When analyzing the video of Federer on the basis of these recommendations, it can be concluded that Nike conducted celebrity endorsement in a good way regarding this video. Federer has a really high recognition, as he won his 20th grand slam singles title the 28th of January 2018 and has become the first male star who achieved this milestone. Federer is perceived as the greatest tennis player of our time because of all his achievements in tennis. Furthermore, "He comes across as down to earth, manages to avoid the tabloids for all the wrong reasons and still gets emotional when victorious on court – this goes against the macho label attached to sport" (Bojan, 2018). Considering the fact that Roger Federer is an outstanding successful athlete and he is the endorser of one of the most well-known and successful brands in the fields of sportswear and equipment, his image and Nike's image are probably a good match. Moreover, considering the fact that "he comes across as down to earth" (Bojan, 2018), it might be assumable that consumers trust his motives for endorsing the brand. Lastly, as Roger Federer is born August 8, 1981 (Hancock, 2017), what makes him neither extremely young or extremely old, there might be a higher chance that members of both Generation X and Y can identify themselves with this athlete. However, the effectiveness of the advertisement shall be clear after conducting this research.

3.2 Sampling Section

After collecting the data via Qualtrics the data has been analysed in SPSS. Below you will find a description about the size of the groups and their demographics. In total, 205 Respondents were reached. All of these respondents declared that they were willing to participate in this research. There were 13 respondents who did not meet the criteria of year of birth and 4 respondents whose age did not fit the year of birth and were therefore excluded from the study. Also, the 4 respondents that were not able to watch the video were excluded from the study. In total, 184 people completed the full

² The link of the video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D2t6yc1t9KY>

survey and belong to the valid sample. Of the valid sample, 48.9% is male ($N=90$), 50.5% is female ($N=93$), and 0.5% chose the option “other” ($N=1$).

Generation Y consisted of 99 respondents. The minimum age of the respondents who belong to Generation Y is 22. The maximum age of this group is 40. The mean age of respondents from Generation Y is 26.69 with a standard deviation of 4.09. Of this group, 47.5% is male ($N=47$), 51.5% is female ($N=51$), and 1.0% chose the option “other” ($N=1$).

Generation X consisted of 85 respondents. The minimum age of the respondents who belong to Generation X is 41. The maximum age of this group is 53. The mean age of respondents from Generation X is 46.80 with a standard deviation of 2.95. Of this group, 50.6% is male ($N=43$) and 49.4% is female ($N=42$).

3.3 Measurement section

3.3.1 Attitude towards advertising in general

In order to understand the extent of skepticism of the respondents towards advertising, it was needed to measure the attitude respondents have towards advertising in general. Therefore, the SKEP scale with 9 items, developed by Obermiller and Spangenberg (1998) was used. This scale was specifically developed to measure consumer skepticism towards advertising. Respondents had to indicate to what extent they agree with the 9 statements with the help of a 7-point-likert scale, where 1 reflected “Fully disagree” and 7 stood for “Fully agree”. The items of the scale were: “We can depend on getting the truth in most advertising,” “Advertising’s aim is to inform the consumer,” “I believe advertising is informative,” “Advertising is in generally truthful,” “Advertising is a reliable source of information about the quality and performance of products,” “Advertising is truth well told,” “In general, advertising presents a true picture of the product being advertised,” “I feel I’ve been accurately informed after viewing most advertisements,” and “Most advertising provides consumers with essential information”. A high scale score would mean that respondents have a positive attitude towards advertising, a low scale score would mean that they have a negative attitude.

In order to create a new variable for the attitude towards advertising in general, a factor analysis has been conducted. The 9 items, which were measured by a seven points scale, were entered into factor analysis using Principal Components extraction with Varimax rotation based on Eigenvalues (> 1.00), $KMO = .895$, $X^2 (N = 184, 36) = 859.12$, $p < .001$. All items loaded on one factor. The factor found explained 56.5 % of the variance in attitude towards advertising. The factor found was called “Attitude towards advertising in general” and had a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.90. This means that the reliability is sufficient for this scale (Pallant, 2013). Therefore, a new variable had been created and the mean scale score was calculated. The mean of this scale is 3.16, which indicates that the

respondents overall have a slightly negative attitude towards advertising in general, and the standard deviation is 1.01.

3.3.2 Attitude towards Celebrity Endorsement

In order to measure the extent of skepticism towards celebrity endorsement, a seven-point semantic differential scale was copied from a study conducted by Vaghela (2013). In the survey, respondents got some additional information about what celebrity endorsement contains and got to indicate what they think of this concept by filling out a semantic differential scale with 7 items, which embodied: “uninteresting / interesting,” “unpleasant / pleasant,” “unlikeable / likeable,” “bad / good,” “useless / useful,” “unappealing / appealing,” and “unattractive / attractive”. A low scale score would represent a less favorable attitude towards celebrity endorsement and a high scale score would represent a more favorable attitude.

In order to create a new variable for the attitude towards advertising in general, a factor analysis has been conducted. The 7 items, which were measured by a seven-point semantic differential scale, were entered into factor analysis using Principal Components extraction with Varimax rotation based on Eigenvalues (> 1.00), $KMO = .923$, $X^2 (N = 184, 21) = 1182.72$, $p < .001$. All items loaded on one factor. The factor found explained 76.0% of the variance in attitude towards celebrity endorsement. The factor found was called “Attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general” and had a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.95. This means that the reliability is sufficient for this scale (Pallant, 2013). Therefore, a new variable had been created and the mean scale score was calculated. The mean of this scale is 4.55, which indicates that the respondents overall have a neutral attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general, and the standard deviation is 1.23.

3.3.3 Attitude towards the advertisement

In order to measure the attitude respondents have towards the advertisements they have seen, a scale used by Spears and Singh (2012) is copied, which measured respondents evaluative judgments of one of the two videos on a six-item, seven-point semantic differential scale. At the study of Spears and Singh (2012), the first point of the seven-point scale represented a positive adjective and the seventh point represented a negative adjective. In this study, this has been reversed, as the rest of the scales go all from negative to positive: Being consistent occurs respondents being confused. The adjectives were “unpleasant / pleasant,” “unlikeable / likeable,” “boring / interesting,” “tasteless / tasteful,” “artless / artful,” and “bad / good”. A high scale score indicates that respondents have a positive attitude towards the advertisement they have seen and a low scale score indicates a more negative attitude towards this advertisement.

This question was asked in two of the three surveys: The third survey did not contain this question as no video was shown. The measure, defining the attitude respondents have towards the advertisement they have seen, consists of six items. Two factor analyses have been conducted in order

to create new variables for both the question part of the survey with celebrity endorsement and the question part of the survey without celebrity endorsement.

In the survey containing the video with celebrity endorsement, the 6 items, which were measured by a seven-point semantic differential scale, were entered into factor analysis using Principal Components extraction with Varimax rotation based on Eigenvalues (> 1.00), $KMO = .870$, $X^2 (N = 50, 15) = 262.21$, $p < .001$. All items loaded on one factor. The factor found explained 76.7% of the variance in attitude towards the advertisement containing celebrity endorsement. The factor found was called “Attitude towards advertisement with celebrity endorsement” and had a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.93. This means that the reliability is sufficient for this scale (Pallant, 2013). Therefore, a new variable had been created and the mean scale score was calculated. The mean of this scale is 5.28, which indicates that the respondents had a positive attitude towards the advertisement of Nike with Roger Federer as celebrity, and the standard deviation is 1.06.

In the survey containing the video without celebrity endorsement, the 6 items were entered into factor analysis using Principal Components extraction with Varimax rotation based on Eigenvalues (> 1.00), $KMO = .918$, $X^2 (N = 60, 15) = 365.27$, $p < .001$. All items loaded again on one factor. The factor found explained 81.9% of the variance in attitude towards the advertisement without celebrity endorsement. The factor found was called “Attitude towards advertisement without celebrity endorsement” and had a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.96. This means that the reliability is sufficient for this scale (Pallant, 2013). Therefore, a new variable had been created and the mean scale score was calculated. The mean of this scale is 4.26, which indicates that the respondents had a less positive attitude towards this advertisement in comparison to the advertisement with celebrity endorsement, and the standard deviation is 1.29.

3.3.4 Attitude towards the brand

In order to measure the extent of positivism consumers perceive towards the brand, it is needed to measure the attitude of the consumers towards Nike and to make a comparison between the respondents who saw the advertisement without celebrity endorsement, the respondents who saw the video with celebrity and the people who didn’t see an advertisement at all. In order to measure this attitude, seven seven-point semantic differential items will be used: “unappealing / appealing,” “bad / good,” “unpleasant / pleasant,” “unfavorable / favorable,” “unlikeable / likeable,” “unsatisfactory / satisfactory,” and “disagreeable / agreeable”. This scale was copied from Spears and Singh (2012). A high scale score would represent a favorable attitude towards the brand Nike and a low scale score would represent an unfavorable attitude towards the brand.

In order to create a new variable for the attitude towards the brand Nike, a factor analysis has been conducted. The 7 items, which were measured by a seven-point semantic differential scale, were entered into factor analysis using Principal Components extraction with Varimax rotation based on

Eigenvalues (> 1.00), $KMO = .918$, $X^2 (N = 184, 15) = 365.27$, $p < .001$. All items loaded on one factor. The factor found explained 81.9% of the variance in attitude towards the brand Nike. The factor found was called “Attitude towards the brand” and had a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.97. This means that the reliability is sufficient for this scale (Pallant, 2013). Therefore, a new variable had been created and the mean scale score was calculated. The mean of this scale is 5.12, which indicates that the respondents overall have a positive attitude towards the brand Nike, and the standard deviation was 1.17.

3.3.5 Awareness

The first stage in the AIDA model, brand awareness, measures the accessibility of the brand in a consumers’ memory. There are two methods to measure brand awareness, which are brand recall, and brand recognition (Chandon, 2013). Brand recall demonstrates the capacity of respondents to remember a certain brand after naming the product category, the needs being fulfilled by the product or category, or some other related hints (Chandon, 2013). Brand recognition demonstrates the capacity of respondents to validate earlier exposure to a specific brand. It can be measured by asking the respondents if they have seen the brand before, after they were being exposed to the stimulus material (Chandon, 2013). However, this study will measure the brand awareness by using brand recall, as Nike is a very famous brand and one could assume that people are capable to come up with the brand when they have been exposed to the stimulus material, but also when they have not seen an advertisement related to the brand. Also, brand recognition is not possible in this case, as one third of the respondents will not be exposed to any stimulus material at all. The following exercise was given to the respondents after exposure to the stimulus material or after the demographic and mock questions: “Please mention the first three brands related to sport clothing / equipment that come to mind.” The earlier the brand Nike is mentioned, the higher the extent of brand awareness is.

Of all the respondents, 67.3% named Nike as the first brand that came to mind, 14.1% put Nike in second place, and 10.8% named it thirdly. Only a little percentage, namely 7.8%, did not mention Nike at all. Those respondents received an extra question, namely: “Have you ever heard of the sport brand Nike?” The reason for this extra question was that if people would not be familiar with the brand Nike, they would not be capable of answering the next question, namely the question asking to their attitude towards the brand. Therefore, all the respondents that were not familiar with the brand Nike, would be forwarded to the end of the survey and their participation would not count. However, all of the respondents indicated that they were familiar with the brand Nike.

Considering the fact that so little people have not mentioned the brand Nike at all (only 7.8%), it would not be suitable to code brand awareness as a dummy variable (0 = Nike has not been mentioned / 1 = Nike is mentioned). Therefore, a new, continuous variable had been created: Respondents who had mentioned the brand Nike as first, got the highest scale score (namely a score of

3), respondents who had mentioned the brand secondly got a score of 2, and respondents who had mentioned Nike as third got a score of 1. Respondents who had not mentioned the brand at all, got a score of 0. The mean scale score of this new variable was calculated. A high scale score would mean that the brand is really on top of mind, so a high brand awareness, and a low scale score would mean a low extent of brand awareness. The mean of this scale is 2.41, which indicates that the brand Nike is really on top of mind at the majority of the respondents, and the standard deviation was 0.96.

3.3.6 Interest

Churchill (1979, p. 78) stated that “by incorporating slightly different nuances of meaning in statements in the item pool, the researcher provides a better foundation for the eventual measure”. In order to measure the brand interest, Machleit, Madden, and Allen (1990) developed an eleven-item scale with slight differences in meaning in every item. After they refined the measure, a four-item scale was created. Because this measure proved to be reliable, they measured brand interest again with the same four-item scale used at their next research (Machleit, Allen & Madden, 1993). Because this scale seemed reliable, it will be used for this study as well, which will lead to the following items: “I am intrigued by Nike,” “I’d like to know more about Nike,” “Learning more about Nike would be useless,” and “I am a little curious about Nike.” The words ‘a little’ will be removed from the fourth item, as this might be confusing for respondents when they have to say if they agree or not. When they are for example very curious, they should fill out that they do not agree, but this could also mean that they are not curious at all. The scale of the third item, ‘Learning more about Nike would be useless’, has been reversed, as this item has a negative wording in contrary to the rest of the items of this measure. A high scale score would indicate a high extent of interest in the brand Nike, a low scale score would indicate a low extent of interest.

In order to create a new variable for the extent of interest in the brand Nike, a factor analysis has been conducted. The 4 items, which were measured by a four-point scale, were entered into factor analysis using Principal Components extraction with Varimax rotation based on Eigenvalues (> 1.00), $KMO = .782$, $X^2(N = 184, 6) = 349.49$, $p < .001$. All items loaded on one factor. The factor found explained 70.0% of the variance in interest in the brand Nike. The factor found was called “Interest in the brand” and had a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.85. This means that the reliability is sufficient for this scale (Pallant, 2013). Therefore, a new variable had been created and the mean scale score was calculated. The mean of this scale is 2.36, which indicates that the respondents overall have an average amount of interest in the brand Nike, and the standard deviation is 0.59.

3.3.7 Desire

Ward and Dahl (2014) measured the desire of the consumers to be seen wearing products from a brand by using a 7-point Likert scale: A scale score of 1 represented a low desire and a scale score of 7 represented a high desire. Although this research is more about the desirability to be in the

possession of the brand's products rather than the desirability to be seen wearing the products, the desirability will also be measured by a 7-point Likert scale. The scale will be introduced by the statement "I would like to be in the possession of one of the products of Nike." A scale score of 1 stands for "Fully disagree" and a scale score of 7 stands for "Fully agree." So, a high scale score would represent a high extent of desire to the brand, a low scale score would represent a low extent of desire. The mean of this measure is 4.83; the standard deviation is 1.59. The mean indicates that respondents have an average to a slight desire to be in the possession of one of the brand's products.

3.3.8 Action

In order to measure the action stage, or in other words, the purchase intention, a seven-point scale from "definitely would buy" to "definitely would not buy" is derived from Batra and Ray (1986). While staying close to this scale, the two extremes will be exchanged in order to create a logical order: So, the scale will be a seven-point scale from "I would definitely not buy it" to "I would definitely buy it". The question is: "How likely is it that you would buy a Nike product?" A high scale score would indicate a high purchase intention of one of the products of Nike, a low scale score indicates a low purchase intention. The mean of this measure is 4.48, the standard deviation is 1.59. The mean indicates that respondents overall have a neutral purchase intention of products of Nike.

4. Results

In this section, the hypotheses presented in chapter 2 are being tested. In H1a – H1e, H2, H5a – H5f, H6a – H6f, and H8, two independent groups will be compared. Therefore, these hypotheses will be tested using Independent T-tests, as this is a suitable test for comparing two unrelated groups (Pallant, 2013). The dependent variables were measured on a continuous scale. When analyzing the Independent T-tests, first the Levene’s test will be analyzed to see which numbers have to be reported. For hypotheses H3a – H3f, H4a - H4e, and H7a – H7f causality is assumed. Therefore, these hypotheses will be tested by means of multiple regression analyses, as this is a suitable method to demonstrate the relation between different variables (Pallant, 2013). Both the independent variables and the dependent variables are measured at a continuous level. In order to test the interaction effects, 2-way ANOVAS have been conducted for hypotheses H9a – H9f.

4.1 The effects of advertisements on Brand Attitude and AIDA

The first hypotheses regarding the main effects of advertising assume that the scores will be higher for Brand Attitude (H1a), Awareness (H1b), Interest (H1c), Desire (H1d), and Action (H1e) after people were exposed to one of the advertisements.

The dependent variables of these hypotheses are the respondents’ scores on Brand Attitude, Awareness, Interest, Desire, and Action after people watched an advertisement. Respondents who did see an advertisement while filling out the survey (either the one with celebrity endorsement or the one without) versus respondents who got the third survey and did not see an advertisement at all formed the independent variable.

Table 2.

Sample Descriptives Using T-Test for Brand Attitude, Awareness, Interest, Desire, and Action after Watching an Advertisement versus Not Being Exposed to an Advertisement.

	No Ad		After Ad		Sig.	t	df	Sig. (two-tailed)
	M	SD	M	SD				
Brand Attitude	4.95	1.21	5.20	1.14	0.082	-1.38	182,00	0.170
Awareness	1.75	1.12	2.76	0.63	0.000	-6.65	83.090	0.000
Interest	2.12	0.60	2.49	0.55	0.449	-4.16	182.000	0.000
Desire	4.44	1.69	5.02	1.51	0.078	-2.37	182.000	0.019
Action	4.51	1.65	5.01	1.54	0.224	-2.04	182.000	0.043

Five independent-samples t-tests were conducted to compare the scores on Brand Attitude, Awareness, Interest, Desire, and Action between the respondents who were exposed to an advertisement and respondents who were not. The Levene's test indicated that the variances are equal across the groups for Brand Attitude ($p=.082$), Interest ($p=.449$), Desire ($p=.078$), and Action ($p=.224$). On the contrary, for Awareness, the Levene's test indicated that the variances are not equal across the two groups ($p<.001$). Regarding Brand Attitude, no significant difference was found in scores for people who were exposed to an advertisement ($M = 5.20, SD = 1.14$) and people who were not ($M = 4.95, SD = 1.21$); $t(182.00) = -1.38, p = .170$ (two-tailed). This was against the expectations. The rest of the hypotheses however, have been confirmed. For Awareness, the t-test did reveal a significant difference in scores for people who were exposed to an advertisement ($M = 2.76, SD = 0.63$) and people who were not ($M = 1.75, SD = 1.12$); $t(83.09) = -6.65, p < .001$ (two-tailed). The t-test also revealed a significant difference for the scores for Interest between respondents who did see one of the video's ($M = 2.49, SD = 0.55$), and the respondents who did not ($M = 2.12, SD = 0.60$); $t(182,00) = -4.16, p < .001$ (two-tailed). Also the differences in scores for Desire were significant between the respondents who were exposed to a video ($M = 5.02, SD = 1.51$) and the ones who did not ($M = 4.44, SD = 1.69$); $t(182,00) = -2.37, p = .019$ (two-tailed). Lastly, the t-test showed that there is a significant difference in scores for Action between the group who saw an advertisement ($M = 5.01, SD = 1.54$) and the group who did not ($M = 4.51, SD = 1.65$); $t(182,00) = -2.04, p = .043$ (two-tailed). This means the following for the hypotheses:

H1a has to be rejected: The scores for Brand Attitude after people watched an advertisement are not significantly higher than when people did not see an advertisement. However, H1b, H1c, H1d, and H1e have been confirmed: The scores for Awareness, Interest, Desire and Action are indeed significantly higher after people watched an advertisement compared to the scores of people who were not exposed to an advertisement.

4.2 Attitude towards advertising in general

The second hypothesis was about the expectation that Generation X has a more skeptical attitude towards advertising in general than Generation Y. The generation where the respondents belong to formed the independent variable. The dependent variable is the attitude respondents have towards advertising in general and was measured on a continuous scale.

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the attitude towards advertising in general of both generations. The Levene's test indicated that the variances are not equal across the groups ($p = .001$). The t-test revealed a significant difference in scores for Generation Y ($M = 3.52, SD = 1.03$) and Generation X ($M = 2.75, SD = 0.82$); $t(180.86) = -5.66, p < .001$ (two-tailed). This means that H2 has been confirmed: Generation X has indeed a more skeptical attitude towards advertising than Generation Y.

4.3 The different effects regarding the attitude towards advertising

The third hypothesis was about the effects of the attitude towards advertising in general. Its subhypotheses assume that the more positive the attitude towards advertising in general is, the more positive the attitude towards the specific advertisements (H3a) and towards the brand (H3b) will be, and the higher the score on Interest (H3d), Desire (H3e), and Action (H3f) will be. For Awareness (H3c), there was no significant effect expected.

The results of the regression tests show that respondents' scores on the attitude towards advertising predict 18.8% of the variance in scores on the attitude towards the advertisement, 21.8% of the variance in scores on the attitude towards brand, 4.1% of the variance in scores on Awareness after being exposed to an advertisement, 19.6% of the variance in scores on Interest after being exposed to an advertisement, 15.2% of the variance in scores on Desire after being exposed to an advertisement, and 15.6% of the variance in scores on Action after being exposed to an advertisement. The results of the F-tests, which show if the predicted amount of variance is significant, are provided in Table 3.

Table 3.

Summary of Multiple Regression Analyses for Attitude towards Advertising Presenting the Unstandardized Results

	Attitude towards ad	Brand Attitude after ad	Awareness after ad	Interest after ad	Desire after ad	Action after ad
(Constant)	3.24***	3.52***	2.36*	1.72***	3.17***	3.09***
Attitude towards advertising	0.55***	0.54***	0.13***	0.25***	0.60***	0.62***
R2	0.19	0.22	0.01	0.20	0.15	0.16
F	25.00	33.14	5.03	29.00	21.37	22.01
DF	(1, 108)	(1, 119)	(1, 119)	(1, 119)	(1, 119)	(1, 119)
Sig (F-test)	0.000	0.000	0.027	0.000	0.000	0.000

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

The table above shows that every step increase in attitude towards advertising in general causes an increase in the scores on attitude towards the advertisement ($B = 0.55$), attitude towards the brand after being exposed to an advertisement ($B = 0.54$), Awareness after being exposed to an advertisement ($B = 0.13$), Interest after being exposed to an advertisement ($B = 0.25$), Desire after

being exposed to an advertisement ($B = 0.60$), and Action after being exposed to an advertisement ($B = 0.62$). The difference is significant for all the scores: the p -value for attitude towards the advertisement, attitude towards the brand, Interest, Desire, and Action, is all <0.001 . For Awareness, the p -value is 0.027. Again, for all scores applies that it concerns the score after being exposed to one of the advertisements. The effect size is small for Awareness ($\beta = 0.20$), and medium for Attitude towards the advertisement ($\beta = 0.43$), Brand Attitude ($\beta = 0.47$), Interest ($\beta = 0.44$), Desire ($\beta = 0.39$), and Action ($\beta = 0.40$).

This means that all the hypotheses H3a, H3b, H3d, H3e, and H3f are being confirmed: Respondents who have a more positive attitude towards advertising in general, were more likely to score higher on attitude towards the advertisement, brand attitude, Interest, Desire, and Action (These scores are the scores after respondents were being exposed to an advertisement). However, hypothesis H3c has to be rejected as the attitude towards advertising does have an effect on the score on brand Awareness after watching one of the advertisements, but the effect size is smaller than for the rest of the variables.

4.4 The different effects of the attitude towards the two advertisements

The fourth hypothesis assumed a positive relation between the attitude towards the advertisement, and the score on Brand Attitude (H4a), Interest (H4c), Desire, (H4d), and Action (H4e). The expectation is that there is no relation between the attitude towards an advertisement and the score on Awareness (H4b).

The independent variable of these hypotheses is the attitude towards the advertisement respondents have been exposed to. The dependent variables are the respondent's scores attitude towards the brand Nike, Awareness, Interest, Desire, and Action. All of these scores concern the scores after watching one of the advertisements. The results of the test show that respondents' scores on the attitude towards an advertisement predict 40.1% of the variance in scores on the attitude towards brand, 3.9% of the variance in scores on Awareness after being exposed to an advertisement, 19.3% of the variance in scores on Interest after being exposed to an advertisement, 22.8% of the variance in scores on Desire after being exposed to an advertisement, and 21.6% of the variance in scores on Action after being exposed to an advertisement. The results of the F-tests, which show if the predicted amount of variance is significant, are provided in Table 4.

Table 4.

Summary of Multiple Regression Analyses for Attitude towards the Advertisements Presenting the Unstandardized Results

	Brand Attitude after ad	Awareness after ad	Interest after ad	Desire after ad	Action after ad
(Constant)	2.37***	2.32*	1.50***	2.10***	2.14***
Attitude towards ad	0.58***	0.10***	0.20***	0.59***	0.58***
R2	0.40	0.04	0.19	0.23	0.22
F	72.34	4.35	25.78	31.85	29.70
DF	(1, 108)	(1, 108)	(1, 108)	(1, 108)	(1, 108)
Sig (F-test)	0.000	0.039	0.000	0.000	0.000

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

The table above shows that every step increase in the attitude towards the advertisements causes an increase in the scores on attitude towards the brand after being exposed to an advertisement ($B = 0.58$), Awareness after being exposed to an advertisement ($B = 0.10$), Interest after being exposed to an advertisement ($B = 0.20$), Desire after being exposed to an advertisement ($B = 0.59$), and Action after being exposed to an advertisement ($B = 0.58$). The difference is significant for all the scores: for attitude towards the brand ($p < 0.001$), Awareness ($p = 0.039$), Interest ($p < 0.001$), Desire ($p < 0.001$), and Action ($p < 0.001$). Again, for all scores applies that it concerns the score after being exposed to one of the advertisements. The effect size is small for Awareness ($\beta = 0.20$), medium for Interest ($\beta = 0.44$), Desire ($\beta = 0.48$), and Action ($\beta = 0.46$), and high for Brand Attitude ($\beta = 0.63$).

This means that the hypotheses H4a, H4c, H3d, and H4e are being confirmed: Respondents who have a more positive attitude towards one of the advertisements, were more likely to score higher on attitude towards the brand, Interest, Desire, and Action. However, hypothesis H4b has to be rejected: The attitude towards the advertisement does have an effect on the score on Awareness, despite the effect size is the smallest on this variable. All the scores are again the scores after respondents were being exposed to an advertisement.

4.5 The influence of advertisements on Generation X and Y

The fifth hypothesis was about the differences between Generation X and Y after they have been exposed to one of the advertisements. After watching one of the advertisements, the expectations are that Generation Y, compared to Generation X, has a more positive attitude towards the

advertisement (H5a), a more positive attitude towards the brand (H5b), no higher score on Awareness (H5c), a higher score on Interest (H5d), a higher score on Desire (H5e), and a higher score on Action (H5f).

The generation where the respondents belong to formed the independent variable. The dependent variables are the attitudes towards the Nike advertisements, Brand Attitude after being exposed to one of the advertisements, Awareness after being exposed to one of the advertisements, Interest after being exposed to one of the advertisements, Desire after being exposed to one of the advertisements, and Action after being exposed to one of the advertisements.

Table 5.

Sample Descriptives Using T-Tests for Attitude Towards the Advertisement, Brand Attitude, Awareness, Interest, Desire, and Action after Watching an Advertisement for Generation X and Y.

	Gen Y		Gen X		Sig.	t	df	Sig. (two-tailed)
	M	SD	M	SD				
Attitude towards ad	5.19	1.14	4.63	1.26	0.258	-2.48	108,000	0.015
Brand Attitude	5.58	0.97	4.78	1.18	0.209	-4.11	119,000	0.000
Awareness	2.66	0.76	2.88	0.43	0.000	1.94	119,000	0.055
Interest	2.67	0.51	2.29	0.53	0.865	-4.01	119,000	0.000
Desire	5.67	1.26	4.30	1.43	0.538	-5.60	119,000	0.000
Action	5.58	1.32	4.37	1.53	0.325	-4,67	119,000	0.000

Six independent-samples t-tests were conducted to compare the scores for the respondents from Generation X and Y who have been exposed to an advertisement on attitude towards the advertisement, Brand Attitude, Awareness, Interest, Desire, and Action. The Levene's test indicated that the variances are equal across the groups for attitude towards the advertisement ($p=.258$), Brand Attitude ($p=.209$), Interest ($p=.865$), Desire ($p=.538$), and Action ($p=.325$). On the contrary, for Awareness, the Levene's test indicated that the variances are not equal across the two groups ($p<.001$).

For all scores, significant differences were found, which means that all the hypotheses have been confirmed. For the scores on the attitude towards the advertisements, the t-test revealed a significant difference for people from Generation X ($M = 4.63$, $SD = 1.26$) versus people from Generation Y ($M = 5.19$, $SD = 1.14$); $t(108,00) = -2.48$, $p = .015$ (two-tailed). Regarding Brand

Attitude, the t-test revealed also a significant difference for people from Generation X ($M = 4.78$, $SD = 1.18$) versus people from Generation Y ($M = 5.58$, $SD = 0.97$); $t(119,00) = -4.11$, $p < .001$ (two-tailed). For Awareness, no significant difference was found in scores for people from Generation X ($M = 2.88$, $SD = 0.43$) and Generation Y ($M = 2.66$, $SD = 0.76$); $t(119,00) = 1.94$, $p = .055$ (two-tailed). The t-test also revealed a significant difference for the scores for Interest between respondents from Generation X ($M = 2.29$, $SD = 0.53$) and Generation Y ($M = 2.67$, $SD = 0.51$); $t(119,00) = -4.01$, $p < .001$ (two-tailed). Also the differences in scores for Desire were significant between the respondents from Generation X ($M = 4.30$, $SD = 1.43$) Generation Y ($M = 5.67$, $SD = 1.26$); $t(119,00) = -5.60$, $p < .001$ (two-tailed). Lastly, the t-test showed that there is a significant difference in scores for Action between respondents from Generation X ($M = 4.37$, $SD = 1.53$) and Generation Y ($M = 5.58$, $SD = 1.32$); $t(119,00) = -4.67$, $p < .001$ (two-tailed). This means the following for the hypotheses:

H5a, H5b, H5c, H5d, H5e, and H5f have all been confirmed. Of all the respondents who have been exposed to a video, Generation Y scored significantly higher for attitude towards the advertisements, Brand Attitude, Interest, Desire, and Action. For Awareness, as expected, there was no significant difference for Generation X versus Generation Y.

4.6 The influence of celebrity endorsement

The sixth hypothesis was about the different effects the different advertisements cause. The subhypotheses assume, compared to the video without celebrity endorsement, that the video containing celebrity endorsement will lead to a more positive attitude towards the advertisement (H6a), a more positive attitude towards the brand (H6b), will not lead to a higher score on Awareness (H6c), and will lead to a higher score on Interest (H6d), on Desire (H6e), and on Action (H6f).

The condition that determined to which advertisements the respondents were exposed to formed the independent variable. The dependent variables are the attitudes towards the Nike advertisement, Brand Attitude, Awareness, Interest, Desire, and Action. Six independent-samples t-tests were conducted to compare the scores for the respondents who have been exposed to an advertisement with celebrity endorsement with the scores for the respondents who have been exposed to an advertisement without celebrity endorsement on those variables.

Table 6.

Sample Descriptives Using T-Tests for Attitude Towards the Advertisement, Brand Attitude, Awareness, Interest, Desire, and Action¹

	Ad with celeb		Ad without celeb		Sig.	t	df	Sig. (two-tailed)
	M	SD	M	SD				
Attitude towards ad	4.63	1.29	5.28	1.06	0.198	-2.89	108,000	0.005
Brand Attitude	4.84	1.16	5.58	1.01	0.828	-3.74	119,000	0.000
Awareness	2.72	0.66	2.80	0.61	0.213	-0.68	119,000	0.496
Interest	2.35	0.57	2.63	0.50	0.423	-2.85	119,000	0.005
Desire	4.69	1.58	5.37	1.37	0.190	-2.53	119,000	0.013
Action	4.64	1.58	5.38	1.42	0.271	-2,73	119,000	0.007

¹ The scores concern the scores after watching the advertisement containing celebrity endorsement versus the scores after watching the advertisement without celebrity endorsement.

The Levene's test indicated that the variances are equal across the groups for attitude towards the advertisement ($p=.198$), Brand Attitude ($p=.828$), Awareness ($p=.213$), Interest ($p=.423$), Desire ($p=.190$), and Action ($p=.217$).

For the scores on the attitude towards the advertisements, the t-test revealed a significant difference for people who were exposed to the video containing celebrity endorsement ($M = 4.63$, $SD = 1.29$) versus people who were exposed to the video without celebrity endorsement ($M = 5.28$, $SD = 1.06$); $t(108,000) = -2.89$, $p = .005$ (two-tailed). However, the mean for people who saw the video without celebrity endorsement is higher than the mean for people who saw the video with celebrity endorsement. Therefore, H6a has to be rejected. Regarding Brand Attitude, the t-test revealed also a significant difference for people exposed to the advertisement with celebrity ($M = 4.84$, $SD = 1.16$) versus people who saw the video without celebrity ($M = 5.58$, $SD = 1.01$); $t(119,000) = -3.74$, $p < .001$ (two-tailed). Also here it is the case that the mean for people who saw the video without celebrity is higher than for people who saw the video with celebrity, whereby H6b needs to be rejected as well. For Awareness, no significant difference was found in scores for people who saw the video with celebrity endorsement ($M = 2.72$, $SD = 0.66$) and people who saw the video without celebrity endorsement ($M = 2.80$, $SD = 0.61$); $t(119,000) = -0.68$, $p = .496$ (two-tailed). This is in line with the expectation, which means H6c has been confirmed. The following hypotheses have all been rejected.

The t-test revealed a significant difference for the scores for Interest between respondents who were exposed to the advertisement with celebrity ($M = 2.35$, $SD = 0.57$) and respondents who were exposed to the advertisement without celebrity ($M = 2.63$, $SD = 0.50$); $t(119,000) = -2.85$, $p = .005$ (two-tailed). Also here yet, it is the case that the mean for respondents who were exposed to the video with celebrity is higher than for respondents who were exposed to the video with celebrity endorsement. Also the differences in scores for Desire were significant between the respondents who saw the advertisement with celebrity ($M = 4.69$, $SD = 1.58$) and respondents who saw the advertisement without celebrity ($M = 5.37$, $SD = 1.37$); $t(119,000) = -2.53$, $p = .013$ (two-tailed). However, also for Desire, the mean for respondents who saw the video without celebrity is higher than for the respondents who saw the video with celebrity. Lastly, the t-test showed a significant difference in scores for Action between respondents who saw the video with celebrity endorsement ($M = 4.64$, $SD = 1.58$) and respondents who saw the video without celebrity endorsement ($M = 5.38$, $SD = 1.42$); $t(119,000) = -2.73$, $p = .007$ (two-tailed). However, also here it proved to be the other way around: The mean for respondents who saw the video without celebrity endorsement is higher than the mean for respondents who saw the video with the celebrity.

So, H6a, H6b, H6d, H6e, and H6f have all been rejected. Of all the respondents who have been exposed to one of the advertisements, the respondents who saw the advertisement containing celebrity endorsement scored significantly lower for attitude towards the advertisements, Brand Attitude, Interest, Desire, and Action. For Awareness, as expected, there was no significant difference for the respondents who were exposed to the advertisement containing celebrity endorsement versus the respondents who were exposed to the advertisement without celebrity endorsement. Hypothesis H6c has therefore been confirmed.

4.7 The relation between the attitude towards celebrity endorsement and the effects of celebrity endorsement

The seventh hypotheses assume that a more positive attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general, causes a more positive attitude towards the advertisement containing celebrity endorsement (H7a), a more positive attitude towards the brand (H7b), will not cause a higher score on Awareness after watching the video with celebrity endorsement (H7c), will cause a higher score on Interest after watching the video with celebrity endorsement (H7d), a higher score on Desire after watching the video with celebrity endorsement (H7e), and a higher score on Action after watching the video with celebrity endorsement (H7f).

The independent variable of these hypotheses is the attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general ($M = 4.55$). The dependent variables are the respondent's scores on attitude towards the advertisement containing celebrity endorsement, attitude towards the brand Nike, Awareness, Interest, Desire, and Action. All of these scores concern the scores after watching the advertisement containing

celebrity endorsement. The results of the test show that respondents' scores on the attitude towards celebrity endorsement predict 22.9% of the variance in scores on the attitude towards the advertisement, 29.5% of the variance in scores on the attitude towards brand, 4.2% of the variance in scores on Awareness after being exposed to the advertisement containing celebrity endorsement, 11.5% of the variance in scores on Interest after being exposed to the advertisement containing celebrity endorsement, 18.6% of the variance in scores on Desire after being exposed to the advertisement containing celebrity endorsement, and 12.1% of the variance in scores on Action after being exposed to the advertisement containing celebrity endorsement. The results of the F-tests, which show if the predicted amount of variance is significant, are provided in Table 7.

Table 7. Summary of Multiple Regression Analyses for Attitude towards Celebrity Endorsement

	Attitude towards ad with celeb	Brand Attitude after ad with celeb	Awareness after ad with celeb	Interest after ad with celeb	Desire after ad with celeb	Action after ad with celeb
(Constant)	3.42***	3.40***	2.32	1.96**	3.01***	3.40**
Attitude towards celebrity endorsement	0.39***	0.45***	0.10***	0.14***	0.48***	0.40***
R2	0.23	0.30	0.04	0.12	0.19	0.12
F	13.92	23.87	2.47	7.40	13.02	7.87
DF	(1, 47)	(1, 57)	(1, 57)	(1, 57)	(1, 57)	(1, 57)
Sig (F-test)	0.001	0.000	0.122	0.009	0.001	0.007

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

The chart above shows that every step increase in attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general causes an increase in the scores on attitude towards the advertisement ($B=0.39$), attitude towards the brand after being exposed to the advertisement ($B=0.45$), Awareness after being exposed to the advertisement ($B=0.10$), Interest after being exposed to the advertisement ($B=0.14$), Desire after being exposed to the advertisement ($B=0.48$), and Action after being exposed to the advertisement ($B=0.40$). The difference is significant for the scores attitude towards the advertisement ($p=0.001$), attitude towards the brand ($p < 0.001$), Interest ($p=0.009$), Desire ($p=0.001$), and Action ($p=0.007$). The difference was not significant for the relation between the attitude towards celebrity endorsement and Awareness ($p=0.122$). Again, for all scores applies that it concerns the score after being exposed to the advertisement containing celebrity endorsement. The effect size was small for Awareness ($\beta = 0.20$),

medium for attitude towards the advertisement ($\beta = 0.48$), Interest ($\beta = 0.34$), Desire ($\beta = 0.43$), and Action ($\beta = 0.35$), and high for Brand Attitude ($\beta = 0.54$).

This means that all the hypotheses H7a, H7b, H7c, H7d, H7e, and H7f have been confirmed: Respondents who have a more positive attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general, were more likely to score higher on attitude towards the advertisement, Brand Attitude, Interest, Desire, and Action, but not for Awareness. These scores are the scores after respondents were being exposed to an advertisement.

4.8 The difference between the attitude towards celebrity endorsement between Generation X and Y

The eighth hypothesis assumes that Generation Y will have a more positive attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general than Generation X (H8). The generation where the respondents belong to formed the independent variable. The dependent variable is the attitude respondents have towards celebrity endorsement in general.

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general of both generations. The Levene's test indicated that the variances are equal across the groups ($p = .620$). The t-test revealed a significant difference in scores for Generation Y ($M = 5.17$, $SD = 1.00$) and Generation X ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 1.09$); $t(179) = -8.49$, $p < .001$ (two-tailed). This means that H8 has been confirmed: Generation X has indeed a more skeptical attitude towards celebrity endorsement than Generation Y.

4.9 The effects of celebrity endorsement on Generation X and Y

The ninth hypotheses were about the interaction effects regarding generation and type of advertisement. The hypotheses assume, compared to Generation X, that Generation Y will have a more positive attitude towards the advertisement with celebrity endorsement (H9a), a more positive attitude towards the brand (H9b), will not have a higher score on Awareness (H9c), will have a higher score on Interest (H9d), Desire (H9e), and Action (H9f).

The independent variable of this hypothesis consists of two unrelated groups, namely the generation where the respondents belong to and the type of advertisement they have been exposed to. The dependent variables are the attitudes towards the Nike advertisements, Brand Attitude after being exposed to one of the advertisements, Awareness after being exposed to one of the advertisements, Interest after being exposed to one of the advertisements, Desire after being exposed to one of the advertisements, and Action after being exposed to one of the advertisements. The dependent variables were measures on a continuous scale. In order to test these hypotheses, 2-way ANOVA tests are appropriate (Pallant, 2013).

Table 8. Summary of 2-way ANOVA's for Generation and type of advertisement

		Attitude towards ad	Brand Attitude	Awareness	Interest	Desire	Action
Generation	F	6.28	19.86	3.64	17.79	34.31	23.99
	df	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Error	106	117	117	117	117	117
	Sig.	0.014	0.000	0.059	0.000	0.000	0.000
Advertisement type	F	9.32	16.83	0.39	9.67	9.42	9.85
	df	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Error	106	117	117	117	117	117
	Sig.	0.003	0.000	0.534	0.002	0.003	0.002
Gen X	M	4.63	4.78	2.89	2.29	4.30	4.37
	SD	1.26	1.18	0.43	0.53	1.44	1.53
Gen Y	M	5.19	5.58	2.66	2.67	5.67	5.58
	SD	1.14	0.97	0.76	0.51	1.26	1.32
Ad with celeb	M	5.28	5.58	2.80	2.63	5.37	5.38
	SD	1.04	1.01	0.61	0.50	1.37	1.42
Ad without celeb	M	4.62	4.84	2.72	2.35	4.69	4.64
	SD	1.29	1.16	0.66	0.57	1.58	1.58
Interaction	F	1.03	0.02	0.78	0.73	1.39	0.76
	df	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Error	106	117	117	117	117	117
	Sig.	0.313	0.877	0.780	0.734	0.241	0.385

For attitude towards the advertisement, the main effects were significant. The main effect for Generation yielded an F ratio of $F(1, 106) = 6.28, p = 0.014$, indicating a significant difference between Generation X ($M = 4.63, SD = 1.26$) and Generation Y ($M = 5.19, SD = 1.14$). The main effect for type of advertisement yielded an F ratio of $F(1, 106) = 9.32, p = 0.003$, indicating a significant difference between the video with celebrity endorsement ($M = 5.28, SD = 1.04$) and without celebrity endorsement ($M = 4.62, SD = 1.29$). The interaction effect was not significant, $F(1, 106) = 1.03, p = 0.313$. This means that H9a has been rejected: Generation Y does not have a more positive attitude towards the advertisement with celebrity endorsement than Generation X.

For the attitude towards the brand, the main effects were significant. The main effect for Generation yielded an F ratio of $F(1, 117) = 19.86, p < 0.001$, indicating a significant difference between Generation X ($M = 4.78, SD = 1.18$) and Generation Y ($M = 5.58, SD = 0.97$). The main effect for type of advertisement yielded an F ratio of $F(1, 117) = 16.83, p < 0.001$, indicating a significant difference between the video with celebrity endorsement ($M = 5.58, SD = 1.01$) and without celebrity endorsement ($M = 4.84, SD = 1.16$). The interaction effect was not significant, $F(1, 117) = 0.02, p = 0.877$. This means that H9b has been rejected: Generation Y does not have a more positive attitude towards the brand Nike after watching the video with celebrity endorsement than Generation X.

For Awareness, the main effects were not significant. The main effect for Generation yielded an F ratio of $F(1, 117) = 3.64, p = 0.059$, indicating that there is no significant difference between Generation X ($M = 2.89, SD = 0.43$) and Generation Y ($M = 2.66, SD = 0.76$). The main effect for type of advertisement yielded an F ratio of $F(1, 117) = 0.39, p = 0.534$, indicating that there is also no significant difference between the video with celebrity endorsement ($M = 2.80, SD = 0.61$) and without celebrity endorsement ($M = 2.72, SD = 0.66$). The interaction effect was also not significant, $F(1, 117) = 0.78, p = 0.780$. This means that H9c has been confirmed: There is no significant difference for Awareness after watching the video with celebrity endorsement between Generation Y and X.

For Interest, the main effects were significant. The main effect for Generation yielded an F ratio of $F(1, 117) = 17.79, p < 0.001$, indicating a significant difference between Generation X ($M = 2.29, SD = 0.53$) and Generation Y ($M = 2.67, SD = 0.51$). The main effect for type of advertisement yielded an F ratio of $F(1, 117) = 9.67, p = 0.002$, indicating that there is also a significant difference between the video with celebrity endorsement ($M = 2.63, SD = 0.50$) and without celebrity endorsement ($M = 2.35, SD = 0.57$). The interaction effect was not significant, $F(1, 117) = 0.73, p = 0.734$. This means that H9d has been rejected: Generation Y does not score higher on Interest after watching the video with celebrity endorsement than Generation X.

For Desire, the main effects were significant. The main effect for Generation yielded an F ratio of $F(1, 117) = 34.31, p < 0.001$, indicating a significant difference between Generation X ($M = 4.30, SD = 1.44$) and Generation Y ($M = 5.67, SD = 1.26$). The main effect for type of advertisement yielded an F ratio of $F(1, 117) = 9.42, p = 0.003$, indicating that there is also a significant difference between the video with celebrity endorsement ($M = 5.37, SD = 1.37$) and without celebrity endorsement ($M = 4.69, SD = 1.58$). The interaction effect was not significant, $F(1, 117) = 1.39, p = 0.241$. This means that H9e has been rejected: Generation Y does not score higher on Desire after watching the video with celebrity endorsement than Generation X.

For Action, the main effects were significant. The main effect for Generation yielded an F ratio of $F(1, 117) = 23.99, p < 0.001$, indicating a significant difference between Generation X ($M = 4.37, SD = 1.53$) and Generation Y ($M = 5.58, SD = 1.32$). The main effect for type of advertisement yielded an F ratio of $F(1, 117) = 9.85, p = 0.002$, indicating that there is also a significant difference between the video with celebrity endorsement ($M = 5.38, SD = 1.42$) and without celebrity endorsement ($M = 4.64, SD = 1.58$). The interaction effect was not significant, $F(1, 117) = 0.76, p = 0.385$. This means that H9f has been rejected: Generation Y does not score higher on Action after watching the video with celebrity endorsement than Generation X.

5. Conclusion and Discussion

5.1 Conclusion

The introduction of this thesis illustrated that it is arguable that celebrity endorsement really enhances the ability of consumers for brand recall and awareness. As awareness is the first phase of the AIDA model, and increased awareness will eventually lead to an increased purchase intention (action), it is also arguable that celebrity endorsement has a positive impact on purchase intention. The research question for this study was as follows: To what extent do the effects of sport advertising on Awareness, Interest, Desire, and Action differ between Generation X and Y consumers, and between advertisements with and without celebrity endorsements? The results showed that sport advertisements overall have a more positive effect on members of Generation Y than on Generation X: After being exposed to an advertisement, Generation Y scored significantly higher on Interest, Desire and Action than Generation X. There was no difference for Awareness between the two generations. These results imply that Generation Y is probably easier to persuade by sport advertisements, and a change in their behavior would be more likely after watching a sport advertisement than Generation X. However, adding a celebrity to the advertisement did not cause a higher extent of Awareness, Interest, Desire, and Action, and also no differences were found between Generation X and Y regarding AIDA after they were exposed to a sport advertisement containing celebrity endorsement.

A 2 by 3 quasi-experimental designed survey was employed to conduct the study. The determined factor was the generation respondents belonged to. The three conditions were the following: An advertisement of Nike with a brand ambassador, an advertisement of Nike without celebrity endorsement, and the last survey contained no advertisement at all in order to see if the advertisements will have any effect in the first place. In order to give an answer on the research question, nine main hypotheses have been created and tested. The hypotheses are repeated below and the results will be discussed for every hypothesis in order to show if the results are in line with the literature and researches discussed in the theoretical framework.

5.1.1 The effects of advertisements on Brand Attitude and AIDA

The first hypotheses regarding the main effects of advertising assumed that the scores would be higher for Brand Attitude (H1a), Awareness (H1b), Interest (H1c), Desire (H1d), and Action (H1e) after people were exposed to one of the advertisements. The results showed that the first sub hypothesis needed to be rejected: The attitude towards the brand did not differ between people who were exposed to an advertisement and people who were not. This could have to do with the fact that Nike is already a very famous brand. This was also proved in this study, as in the survey, 67.3% of the respondents named Nike as the first brand that came to mind, 14.1% put Nike in second place, and 10.8% named it thirdly. From the 7.8% that did not mention Nike at all, every respondent indicated to be familiar with the brand. Therefore, it might be the case that people already formed their attitudes

towards the brand Nike, and seeing one extra advertisement might be not enough to have a significant influence on those attitudes.

The other hypotheses have all been confirmed: The extent of Awareness, Interest, Desire, and Action was higher after people were exposed to an advertisement. So, these results are in line with the theory presented in the theoretical framework: Advertising can have a positive effect on consumers' behavior (e.g. Hoeken et al., 2012).

5.1.2 Generation X is more skeptical towards advertising than Generation Y

The second hypothesis was about the expectation that Generation X has a more skeptical attitude towards advertising in general than Generation Y. This hypothesis has been confirmed: The results showed that there was indeed a significant difference in the extent of skepticism towards advertising between Generation X and Y. This is in line with the literature presented in this study. Earlier research showed that many members of Generation X are known for their skeptical attitude, both in general as towards advertising (e.g. Ritchie, 1995; Kotler et al., 2012). In the meantime, Generation Y consists of more impulse buyers and materialistic people who are easier to influence by advertising (e.g. Herhold, 2018; Kotler et al., 2012).

5.1.3 The different effects regarding the attitude towards advertising

The third hypothesis was about the effects of the attitude towards advertising in general. Its subhypotheses assume that the more positive the attitude towards advertising in general is, the more positive the attitude towards the specific advertisements (H3a) and towards the brand (H3b) will be, and the higher the score on Interest (H3d), Desire (H3e), and Action (H3f) will be. For Awareness (H3c), there was no significant effect expected.

The results illustrated that H3a, H3b, H3d, H3e, and H3f have all been confirmed: Respondents who have a more positive attitude towards advertising in general, were more likely to score higher on attitude towards the advertisement, Brand Attitude, Interest, Desire, and Action. However, H3c had to be rejected as the attitude towards advertising did have a significant effect on the score on brand Awareness after watching one of the advertisements.

This relation between attitude towards advertising in general and respondents' scores on Awareness was not expected. However, the fact that this relation is certainly present, calls for the need to look into this from another perspective. The hypothesis was based on earlier research that illustrated that negative attention is attention as well and will not influence Awareness negatively. A negative or positive attitude towards advertising can therefore cause a negative or positive attitude towards the attitude, which can influence the extent of Interest, Desire, and the purchase intention consumers have towards a product or brand. This is also supported by this study, as the other subhypotheses are confirmed. However, according earlier research used in this study, a positive or negative attitude

towards advertising would not have an effect on Awareness, as a positive or negative attitude would not matter for this variable. However, the actual research shows that there is a relation. This could be explained by the theory that a positive attitude towards advertising in general causes more motivation to actually watch the advertisement and process it with more attention (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981), whereby the extent of Awareness could increase. However, more research is needed to make sure why this relation exists.

5.1.4 The different effects of the attitude towards the two advertisements

The fourth hypothesis assumed a positive relation between the attitude towards the advertisement, and the score on Brand Attitude (H4a), Interest (H4c), Desire, (H4d), and Action (H4e). The expectation was that there is no relation between the attitude towards an advertisement and the score on Awareness (H4b).

Testing these hypotheses showed that there were indeed positive relations between on the one hand the attitude towards the advertisement consumers have, and on the other hand the attitude towards the brand consumers have, and the scores on Interest, Desire, and on Action. This means that H4a, H4c, H3d, and H4e are all confirmed: Respondents who had a more positive attitude towards one of the advertisements, were more likely to score higher on attitude towards the brand, Interest, Desire, and Action. However, there proved to be a positive relation between the attitude towards the advertisement consumers have and Awareness as well: Respondents who had a more positive attitude towards one of the advertisements, were more likely to score higher on Awareness. Therefore, hypothesis H4b had to be rejected. Just like at the third hypotheses, this relation could also be explained by the theory that a positive attitude towards a message could lead to more motivation to actually process an advertisement more deeply (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981), whereby the extent of Awareness could increase. However, as said, more research is needed to make sure why this relation exists.

5.1.5 The influence of advertisements on Generation X and Y

The fifth hypothesis was about the differences between Generation X and Y after they have been exposed to one of the advertisements. After watching one of the advertisements, the expectations were that Generation Y, compared to Generation X, has a more positive attitude towards the advertisement (H5a), a more positive attitude towards the brand (H5b), no higher score on Awareness (H5c), a higher score on Interest (H5d), a higher score on Desire (H5e), and a higher score on Action (H5f).

H5a, H5b, H5c, H5d, H5e, and H5f had all been confirmed. Of all the respondents who have been exposed to a video, Generation Y scored significantly higher for attitude towards the advertisements, Brand Attitude, Interest, Desire, and Action. For Awareness, as expected, there was no significant difference between Generation X and Generation Y. These results were all in line with the

presented theory which assumed that most people would not like to admit that they got influenced by persuasive communication (Liebrecht, 2017) and when people have a more skeptical attitude towards advertising, it would possibly be even harder to influence them by advertising. And keeping in mind that Generation X would be more skeptical towards advertising, they would be a more difficult target audience to influence by advertising than Generation Y.

5.1.6 The influence of celebrity endorsement

The sixth hypothesis was about the different effects the different advertisements cause. The subhypotheses assume, compared to the video without celebrity endorsement, that the video containing celebrity endorsement would lead to a more positive attitude towards the advertisement (H6a), a more positive attitude towards the brand (H6b), would not lead to a higher score on Awareness (H6c), and would lead to a higher score on Interest (H6d), on Desire (H6e), and on Action (H6f).

For Awareness, as expected, there was no significant difference for the respondents who were exposed to the advertisement containing celebrity endorsement versus the respondents who were exposed to the advertisement without celebrity endorsement. Hypothesis H6c has therefore been confirmed. However, the rest of the subhypotheses needed to be rejected, as there also proved to be no positive relation between on the one hand celebrity endorsement, and on the other hand attitude towards the advertisement, attitude towards the brand, Interest, Desire, and Action. It is even the other way around: Of all the respondents who have been exposed to one of the advertisements, the respondents who saw the advertisement containing celebrity endorsement scored significantly lower for attitude towards the advertisements, Brand Attitude, Interest, Desire, and Action. This negative relation between those variables is really in contrast with the expectations.

An explanation for this dissonance could be that the advertisement without celebrity endorsement was simply more exciting or reliable in the eyes of the respondents. This video was focused on the quality of Nike products, by showing how they are being made, but also that dedicated athletes use them. This could cause that this video seemed more credible, compared to the video with celebrity endorsement, as in this video a whole stadium starts to play Tennis after seeing Roger Federer win a game. Another explanation could be that the famous athlete who played in the video with celebrity endorsement (Roger Federer) was not someone the respondents could identify themselves with in a sufficient way, whereby they did not like the video and developed a negative attitude towards the brand. This negative attitude towards the brand could then lead to lower scores for Interest, Desire, and Action. As this is in contrast with earlier research that has been presented in this study, further research should investigate this case in more detail with different advertisements related to sport clothing and equipment.

5.1.7 The relation between the attitude towards celebrity endorsement and the effects of celebrity endorsement

The seventh hypotheses assumed that a more positive attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general, caused a more positive attitude towards the advertisement containing celebrity endorsement (H7a), a more positive attitude towards the brand (H7b), would not cause a higher score on Awareness after watching the video with celebrity endorsement (H7c), would cause a higher score on Interest after watching the video with celebrity endorsement (H7d), a higher score on Desire after watching the video with celebrity endorsement (H7e), and a higher score on Action after watching the video with celebrity endorsement (H7f).

The results of testing these hypotheses illustrated that all H7a, H7b, H7c, H7d, H7e, and H7f have been confirmed: Respondents who had a more positive attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general, were more likely to score higher on attitude towards the advertisement, Brand Attitude, Interest, Desire, and Action, but not on Awareness. In other words, there proved to be a positive relation between the attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general and attitude towards the advertisements containing celebrity endorsement, brand attitude, Interest, Desire, and Action. The relation does not exist between the attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general and Awareness.

These results were in line with the presented literature. Earlier research presented in this thesis showed namely that celebrity endorsement in advertisements has a positive effect on Awareness and Interest (Sokolovska, 2016), and the purchase intention of consumers (Action) (Kotler et al., 2012; Sokolovska, 2016).

5.1.8 The difference in the attitude towards celebrity endorsement between Generation X and Y

The eighth hypothesis assumes that Generation Y will have a more positive attitude towards celebrity endorsement in general than Generation X (H8). Testing this hypothesis illustrated that H8 has been confirmed. As expected, Generation X proved to have a more skeptical attitude towards celebrity endorsement than Generation Y.

This result is also in line with the literature presented, building on the earlier presented research, that members of Generation X tend to have a more skeptical and cynical attitude in general compared to members of Generation Y. According to the literature, this skeptical attitude was also expected to be seen towards celebrity endorsement: Nielsen (2015) for example, found that younger generations, namely Generation Y and Z, trust celebrity endorsement more strongly than older generations.

5.1.9 The effects of celebrity endorsement on Generation X and Y

The ninth hypotheses were about the interaction effects regarding generation and type of advertisement. The hypotheses assumed, compared to Generation X, that Generation Y would have a more positive attitude towards the advertisement with celebrity endorsement (H9a), a more positive attitude towards the brand (H9b), would not have a higher score on Awareness (H9c), would have a higher score on Interest (H9d), Desire (H9e), and Action (H9f).

The results of testing these hypotheses illustrated that H9a, H9b, H9d, H9e, and H9f have been rejected. Generation Y does not significantly score higher on attitude towards the advertisement, attitude towards the brand, Interest, Desire, and Action. H9c however, has been confirmed: There is no significant difference for Awareness between Generation X and Y after watching the video with celebrity endorsement.

5.2 Limitations, recommendations for further research, and strengths

5.2.1 Limitations

One should keep in mind that this study is conducted in the Netherlands only and is not generalizable for other cultures. The Netherlands for example is a very individualistic and feminine country compared to other cultures (Compare countries - Hofstede Insights, 2018). Also, sport clothing and equipment are not really neutral products. When people do not like sports or do not like the sports shown in the video, this might have an effect on the outcomes of the study. Therefore, it would have been better to choose a more neutral product.

Also, there could be other factors that played a role for the outcomes of the research. For example, the study was focused on the brand Nike. Nike is already a very well-known brand, whereby Awareness might already be the case amongst most people and attitudes towards the brand could already have been shaped: Therefore, exposing respondents to one extra advertisement might be too little to change the attitudes towards the brand. Also, Nike is a quite expensive sport brand (Silbert, 2018). The price of Nike's products might also play a role when respondents had to answer the question focused on purchase intention.

Lastly, the stimulus material was quite specific. One of the videos was about Roger Federer and people who were being inspired by him to play tennis. The fact that the advertisement was focused on one specific sport and on one specific athlete, might influence the outcomes of the study. When people do not like tennis or are a huge fan of Rafael Nadal, the greatest rival of Federer, the advertisement might not be perceived that positive as expected.

5.2.2 Recommendations for future research

Keeping in mind that some of the results of this study were not consistent with the results of earlier research, more research is needed for the following aspects. Firstly, the relation between exposure to advertisements and the attitude consumers' have towards the brand needs more attention in future research, as in this study, the expected positive relation was not there. As said before, this could have to do with the fact that Nike was chosen for this study. Nike is a very well-known brand, whereby brand attitudes may already be shaped and exposure to one advertisement only would maybe not be enough to change those attitudes. Therefore, I would like to recommend to repeat this research with a different sport brand, which is less well-known than Nike and is also cheaper, as the price could also have an influence on the purchase intention. For example, Fabletics could be a good case, as this is not a very famous sport brand and way cheaper than Nike (Activewear, Fitness & Workout Clothes | Fabletics by Kate Hudson, 2018).

Another aspect that needs more research, is the relation between the attitude towards advertising in general and the attitude towards a specific advertisement, and the extent of Awareness. No relation was expected, but nonetheless there proved to be a relation. As explained earlier, this could be clarified by the theory that a positive attitude towards advertising in general causes more motivation to actually watch the advertisement and process it with more attention (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981), whereby the extent of Awareness could increase. However, more research is needed to make sure if this relation really exists.

The last element that is needed to be investigated in more detail consists of the effects of celebrity endorsement. Many studies show the positive effects celebrities have for the brand they endorse, but this study showed no difference between the effects caused by the advertisement without celebrity endorsement and the advertisement containing a celebrity. Therefore, the research could be repeated with different stimulus material, to see if a different famous athlete in an advertisement would lead to different results. Maybe a less specific sport as subject of the advertisement could lead to more positive results. For example, running is the most popular sport in the world (Cregan-Reid, 2016), thus it would make sense to pick a famous athlete who is known for running, like Usain Bolt. Perhaps, the audience could identify itself more with an athlete who conducts a more popular sport. An option would be to ask respondents to what extent they identify themselves with the presented celebrity and control for that.

5.2.3 Strengths

Despite the limitations of this research, there are also some strengths. At first, a strong point regarding the operationalization of the study was that the study was conducted by means of random sampling. This recruitment technique leads to samples most likely to truly represent the entire population (Neuman, 2014). Another strength of the survey was that it also contained some mock

questions to cover the true aim of the study. Those mock questions focused on the sport habits of the respondents, their favorite sport brand and how often they buy new sport clothing or equipment. Otherwise, it might become too clear that the research is about being influenced by advertisements, which could lead to resistance among the respondents: People wouldn't like to admit that they got influenced by persuasive communication (Liebrecht, 2017). Also, the questions used in the survey to measure the essential aspects needed to give an answer on the research question were all derived from earlier studies, which made the measures more reliable.

Moreover, the conclusion gave some valuable new insights for both social and scientific purposes. Scientifically, there was a gap in research: There was no research conducted yet regarding the differences in perceiving sport advertisements for Generation X and Y. Also, those two generations were only a few times compared within the context of a single study. Moreover, there were some inconsistencies in research about celebrity endorsement which needed more clarification. Some researches proved the effectiveness of celebrity endorsement (e.g. Kotler et al., 2012), but others proved otherwise (e.g. Costanzo & Goodnight, 2005). Also, in the sport clothing and –equipment industry there was a lack of published research investigating the effects famous athletes have on the target market (Bush, Martin & Bush, 2004). This was also not investigated in relation to the different effects on Generation X and Y. The aim of this study was therefore to show the effects sport celebrities have in advertisements about sportswear, and if there are any differences between those effects for Generation X and Y.

Also from a social perspective, a study showing the effects of sport advertisements on Generation X and Y was relevant for companies in the sport industry. It is essential for those to be aware of the differences in how these Generations perceive their advertisements, so that they are able to fine-tune their advertisement as much as possible. By knowing the differences between different generations, companies are able to target more specifically and adapt their advertisements to different target audiences. This study might also be beneficial for the consumers in the end, as they receive more content that they will like: advertisements adjusted to their needs, values, and interests.

The valuable insights this study gave for both scientific and social purposes were the following: The effects of sport advertising on Interest, Desire, and Action did significantly differ between Generation X and Y. Of all the respondents who have been exposed to a video related to sportswear and -equipment, Generation Y scored significantly higher for attitude towards the advertisements, Brand Attitude, Interest, Desire, and Action. For Awareness, as expected, there was no significant difference when comparing Generation X with Generation Y. This could be an indication for sportswear and –equipment companies to target their marketing efforts more on the younger generation than on Generation X, as the last ones are harder to convince by advertising. So when

marketers of sportswear companies ever hesitated to focus on the younger generations, I would say:
“Just do it.”

6. References

- Activewear, Fitness & Workout Clothes | Fabletics by Kate Hudson. (2018). Retrieved from <https://www.fabletics.com/>
- Ahluwalia, R., & Shiv, B. (1997). The effects of negative information in the political and marketing arenas: Exceptions to the negativity effect, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 24(1), 222-222. Retrieved 1 June 2018, from <http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/8045/volumes/v24/NA-24>
- Alberstadt, B. (2018). *Top 12 Biggest Nike Endorsement Deals of All-Time*. *TheRichest*. Retrieved 28 April 2018, from <https://www.therichest.com/sports/top-12-biggest-nike-endorsement-deals-of-all-time/>
- Baltar, F., & Brunet, I. (2012). Social research 2.0: Virtual snowball sampling method using Facebook. *Internet Research*, 22(1), 57-74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/10662241211199960>
- Banister, E., & Cocker, H. (2013). A cultural exploration of consumers' interactions and relationships with celebrities. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 30(1-2), 1-29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0267257x.2013.807863>
- Barton, C., Koslow, L., & Beauchamp, C. (2014). *How Millennials Are Changing the Face of Marketing Forever*. <https://www.bcg.com>. Retrieved 14 April 2018, from <https://www.bcg.com/publications/2014/marketing-center-consumer-customer-insight-how-millennials-changing-marketing-forever.aspx>
- Batra, R., & Ray, M. (1986). Affective responses mediating acceptance of advertising. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13(2), 234-249. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/209063>
- Baumeister, R., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., & Vohs, K. (2001). Bad is stronger than good. *Review of General Psychology*, 5(4), 323-370. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037//1089-2680.5.4.323>
- Belch, G. E. & Belch, M.A (1995). *Introduction to Advertising and Promotion: An Integrated Marketing Communication Perspective* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Bennet, G., Sagas, M., & Dees, W. (2006). Media preferences of action sports consumers: Differences between Generation X and Y. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 15(1), 40-49. Retrieved 14 April 2018, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308309604_Media_Preferences_of_Action_Sports_Consumers_Differences_Between_Generation_X_and_Y

- Bojan, A. (2018). Roger Federer is the greatest tennis player ever. *UNILAD*. Retrieved 29 January 2018, from <https://www.unilad.co.uk/featured/roger-federer-is-the-greatest-tennis-player-ever/>
- Bower, J., & Mateer, N. (2008). 'The white stuff?': An investigation into consumer evaluation of the Scottish celebrity milk marketing campaign. *Nutrition & Food Science*, 38(2), 164-174. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00346650810863046>
- Brown, S. P. & Stayman, D. M. (1992). Antecedents and consequences of attitude toward the ad: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21(1), 48-78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/209284>
- Bush, A., Martin, C., & Bush, V. (2004). Sports celebrity influence on the behavioral intentions of generation Y. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 44(1), 108-118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s0021849904040206>
- Carbasha, T. (2011). *Nike* (p. 10). Ahmedabad [India]: Jaico Publishing House.
- Chandon, P. (2013). *Note on measuring brand awareness, brand image, brand equity and brand value*. Fontainebleau: INSEAD.
- Churchill, G. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16(1), 64-73. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3150876>
- Cohen, W., & Simons, J. (1995). A New Spin On the Economy: Generation X Contributes to Economic Growth. *U.S. News & World Report*, 118(18), 54-55.
- Conger, J. (1998). *Winning 'em over*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Costanzo, P. J. & Goodnight, J. E. (2005). Endorsements: Matching celebrity and endorsed brand in magazine advertisements. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 11 (4), 49-62. https://doi.org/10.1300/J057v11n04_05
- Cregan-Reid, V. (2016). Why running is fast becoming the most popular way to exercise. *The Independent*. Retrieved 31 May 2018, from <https://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/health-and-families/why-running-is-fast-becoming-the-most-popular-way-to-exercise-a7056481.html>
- Eagly, A. H. & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The Psychology of Attitudes*. Forth Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

- Edmunds, J. & Turner, B. (2005). Global generations: social change in the twentieth century. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 56(4), 559-577.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2005.00083.x>
- Erdogan, B. (1999). Celebrity Endorsement: A Literature Review. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15(4), 291-314. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1362/026725799784870379>
- Erfgen, C., Zenker, S., & Sattler, H. (2015). The vampire effect: When do celebrity endorsers harm brand recall?. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 32(2), 155-163.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2014.12.002>
- Festinger, L., & Maccoby, N. (1964). On resistance to persuasive communications. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 68(4), 359-366. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0049073>
- Fishbein, M. & Yzer, M.C. (2003). Using theory to design effective health behavior interventions. *Communication Theory*, 14 (2).
<http://dx.doi.org/164-183>. 10.1111/j.1468-2885.2003.tb00287.x
- Freeman, L. (1995, February 6). Advertising's mirror is cracked. *Advertising Age*, pp. 30.
- Giles, J. (1994, June 6). Generalizations X. *Newsweek*, pp. 63-72.
- Gnanapragash, T. J., & Sekar, P. C. (2013). Celebrity-aided brand recall and brand-aided celebrity recall: An assessment of celebrity influence using the hierarchy of effects model. *IUP Journal of Brand Management*, 10(3), 47-67. Retrieved 14 April 2018, from <https://search-proquest-com.eur.idm.oclc.org/docview/1466131940?accountid=13598>
- van der Goot, M., Rozendaal, E., Oprea, S., Ketelaar, P., & Smit, E. (2016). Media generations and their advertising attitudes and avoidance: A six-country comparison. *International Journal of Advertising*, 37(2) 289-308. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2016.1240469>
- Hancock, E. (2017). The incredible life of Roger Federer, the highest-paid tennis player on earth. *Business Insider*. Retrieved 14 April 2018, from <https://www.businessinsider.nl/the-incredible-life-of-roger-federer-2017-1/?international=true&r=UK>
- Herhold, K. (2018). *How Consumers View Advertising: 2017 Survey* | Clutch.co. Clutch.co. Retrieved 31 January 2018, from <https://clutch.co/agencies/resources/how-consumers-view-advertising-survey-2017>
- Hoeken, H., Hornikx, J., & Hustinx, L. (2012). *Overtuigende teksten* (2nd ed., pp. 40-44). Bussum, the Netherlands: Coutinho.

- Compare countries - Hofstede Insights*. (2018). *Hofstede Insights*. Retrieved 5 December 2017, from <https://www.hofstede-insights.com/product/compare-countries/>
- Holtz, G. (2013). *Welcome to the jungle*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Horovitz, B. (1995, May 17). X marks moving target for marketers. *USA Today*, pp. 41-46.
- Ilieva, J., Baron, S., & Healey, N. (2002). Online surveys in marketing research. *International Journal of Market Research*, 44(3), 1-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/147078530204400303>
- Janssens, C. (2012). *Brand awareness and brand attitude in location based advertisements: related to persuasiveness and consumer acceptance*. Tilburg: Universiteit van Tilburg. Communicatie en Informatie.
- Joseph, C. (2018). *A.I.D.A model in marketing communication*. *Smallbusiness.chron.com*. Retrieved 31 January 2018, from <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/aida-model-marketing-communication-10863.html>
- Kotler, P., Keller, K., Brady, M., Goodman, M., & Hansen, T. (2012). *Marketing management* (2nd ed.). Harlow, England: Pearson.
- Lemon, K., & Verhoef, P. (2016). Understanding customer experience throughout the customer journey. *Journal of Marketing*, 80(6), 69-96. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jm.15.0420>
- Liebrecht, C. (2017). Contentmarketing: Praktijkaanname experimenteel getoetst. In F. Bronner, E. Brüggem, P. Dekker, E. Leeuw, B. Nauta & A. Smidts et al., *Ontwikkelingen in het Marktonderzoek: MOA Jaarboek 2017* (14th ed., pp. 149-167). Haarlem: Spaar en Hout. Retrieved June 18, 2018 from http://moa04.artoo.nl/clou-moaweb-images/images/bestanden/pdf/Jaarboeken_MOA/MOA_JAARBOEK_2017_HFST10.pdf
- Lienert, A. (1995, March 5). Car ads bridging generation X gap. *Chicago Tribune*, pp. 17-1,17-7.
- Loroz, P., & Helgeson, J. (2013). Boomers and their babies: An exploratory study comparing psychological profiles and advertising appeal effectiveness across two generations. *The Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 21(3), 289-306. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2753/mtp1069-6679210304>
- Lutz, A. (2015). The slogan that made Nike billions was inspired by a convicted murderer. *Business Insider*. Retrieved January 7, 2018 from <http://www.businessinsider.com/nike-just-do-it-inspired-by-a-murderer-2015-3?international=true&r=US&IR=T>

- Machleit, K., Allen, C., & Madden, T. (1993). The mature brand and brand interest: An alternative consequence of ad-evoked affect. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(4), 72-82.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1252220>
- Machleit, K., Madden, T., & Allen, C. (1990). Measuring and modeling brand interest as an alternative ad effect with familiar brands. In M. Goldberg, G. Gorn & R. Pollay, *Advances in Consumer Research* (pp. 223-230). Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Mannheim, K. (1953). *Essays on sociology and social psychology*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Meyers-Levy, J. & Malaviya, P. (1999). Consumers' processing of persuasive advertisements: An integrative framework of persuasion theories. *Journal of Marketing*, 63(4) 45-60.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1252100>
- Misra, S. & Beatty, S. E. (1990). Celebrity spokesperson and brand congruence: An assessment of recall and affect. *Journal of Business Research*, 21(2), 159-171.
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963\(90\)90050-N](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(90)90050-N)
- Napoli, J. & Ewing, M. Y. (2001). The Net generation: An analysis of lifestyles, attitudes and media habits. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 13(1), 21-34.
https://doi.org/10.1300/J046v13n01_03
- Neuman, W. L. (2014). Chapter 9. Experimental research. In: Neuman, W. L., *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (7th Ed.) (pp. 281-313). Essex: Pearson.
- Nielsen. (2015). *Global Trust in Advertising. Winning Strategies for an Evolving Media Landscape*. New York City. Retrieved 31 May 2018, from
<https://www.nielsen.com/content/dam/niensenglobal/apac/docs/reports/2015/nielsen-global-trust-in-advertising-report-september-2015.pdf>
- Nike, Inc. (2017). *Form 10-K*. Washington D.C: Securities and Exchange Commission. Retrieved 7 Januari 2018, from https://s1.q4cdn.com/806093406/files/doc_financials/2017/ar/docs/nike-2017-form-10K.pdf
- Nike. (2016). Nike Sustainable Innovation – More with Less. Retrieved 7 January 2018, from
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D2t6yc1t9KY>
- Nike. (2017). Nike: The Roger Effect. Retrieved 7 January 2018, from
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zv9daYDOCIY>

- Obermiller, C., & Spangenberg, E. (1998). Development of a scale to measure consumer skepticism toward advertising. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 7(2), 159-186.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp0702_03
- O’Keefe, D.J. (2002). *Persuasion: Theory and research* (2nd ed.). Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS survival manual*. London, UK: McGraw-Hill.
- Petty, R. E. & Cacioppo, J.T. (1981). *Attitudes and persuasion: Classic and contemporary approaches*. Dubuque, IO: Brown.
- Premeaux, S. R (2009). The attitudes of middle-class versus upper class male and female consumers regarding the effectiveness of celebrity endorsers. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 15(1/2), 2-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10496490902854820>
- Raaij, W. (1984). *Affektieve en cognitieve effecten van reclame*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Nederlandse Vereniging van Erkende Reclame-Adviesbureaux.
- Ritchie, K. (1995). Marketing to Generation X. *American Demographics*, 17(4), 34-39.
- Ryan, N. (1993, December 12). Generation X. *Chicago Tribune*, pp. C1-C8.
- Sokolovska, A. (2016). Impact of Celebrity Endorsement on Consumer Buying Behavior. Retrieved 31 May 2018, from <https://www.guided-selling.org/impact-of-celebrity-endorsement-on-consumer-buying-behavior/>
- Silbert, J. (2018). Nike Is the World's Most Valuable Apparel Brand. Retrieved from <https://hypebeast.com/2018/3/nike-most-valuable-apparel-brand>
- Spears, N., & Singh, S. (2012). Measuring attitude toward the brand and purchase intentions. *Journal of Current Issues & Research In Advertising*, 26(2), 53-66.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10641734.2004.10505164>
- Strutton, D., Taylor, D., & Thompson, K. (2011). Investigating generational differences in e-WOM behaviors. *International Journal of Advertising*, 30(4), 559-586.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2501/ija-30-4-559-586>
- Teng, L., Laroche, M., & Zhu, H. (2007). The effects of multiple-ads and multiple-brands on consumer attitude and purchase behavior. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 24(1), 27-35.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/07363760710720966>

- Twenge, J. (2010). A review of the empirical evidence on generational differences in work attitudes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), 201-210. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9165-6>
- Vaghela, P. (2013). A study on consumer attitude perception about celebrity endorsement. *IJMT*, 2(12), 150-163.
- Ven, M., van der & Verhallen, T. (1998). *Cognitieve effecten van reclame* (pp. 58-69). Deventer, the Netherlands: Kluwer Bedrijfsinformatie.
- Ward, M., & Dahl, D. (2014). Should the devil sell Prada? Retail rejection increases aspiring consumers' desire for the brand. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41(3), 590-609. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/676980>
- What is celebrity endorsement? definition and meaning.* (2018). *BusinessDictionary.com*. Retrieved 14 January 2018, from <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/celebrity-endorsement.html>
- Woods, L. (2017). *Why Nike Uses Endorsements & Sponsorships*. *Bizfluent.com*. Retrieved 28 April 2018, from <https://bizfluent.com/about-6465548-nike-uses-endorsements-sponsorships.html>
- Yu, C. (2005). Athlete endorsement in the international sports industry: a case study of David Beckham. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, 6(3), 45-55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/ij sms-06-03-2005-b007>
- Zill, N., & Robinson, J. P. (1995). The Generation X Difference. *American Demographics*, 17 (4), 24-33.

Appendix

Appendix A – Survey

Q1

Dear participant,

Thank you very much for participating in this research. My name is Rinske Lichtendahl, I am a student at Erasmus University Rotterdam. This research is part of my master thesis of the Media master's programme of the University and is focused on sport clothing and equipment. The questions will for example ask you about your sport habits and your opinion about certain statements.

Please be aware that your participation is completely voluntarily, meaning that you can quit at any time during your participation. Furthermore, your personal information will be kept strictly confidential and the findings of this survey will be used solely for the master thesis. Hence, your anonymity is guaranteed at any time. This research will last for approximately 5 minutes. If you have any questions during or after your participation, please feel free to contact me:

481109rl@student.eur.nl.

- I understand the above and agree in participating in this research.

<Page break>

Q2

Before entering the main survey, we ask to you to complete the question below to determine whether you are eligible for participation.

In what year were you born?

- < 1964
- 1965 - 1976
- 1977 - 1995
- 1996 >

<Page break>

Q3

Thank you for your answer. You fit the target group of interest and can continue with the survey.

Can you please specify your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Other

Q4

What is your exact age? (Please give your answer in numbers, e.g. "23")

....

Q5

What is the highest educational level you have attended?

- High school
- Intermediate Vocational Education (MBO)
- Bachelor degree
- Master degree
- MBA degree, PhD degree, or other postgraduate training
- Other

<Page break>

Q6

Now you will be asked some questions about your sport habits.

How often do you practice sports?

- 0 – 1 time per week
- 2 – 3 times per week
- 4 – 5 times per week
- 6 or more times per week

Q7

What is your favorite kind of sport to practice?

...

Q8

How often do you buy new sport clothes / equipment?

- 0 - 1 times per year

- 2 - 4 times per year
- 5 - 7 times per year
- 8 or more times per year

<Page break>

Condition: Survey with advertisement containing Celebrity Endorsement

On the next page you will find a video. The video will last for 1:37 minutes. Please watch the video until the end. When the video has come to an end, you will automatically be forwarded to the next page. Thereafter, you will be asked a couple of questions about the content of the video.

<Page break>

<Show video with celebrity endorsement>

<Page break>

Q9.1

Did you see males or females in the video?

- Only males
- Only females
- Both males and females
- I was not able to watch the video

<Page break>

Q10.1

Did you see a famous athlete in the video?

- Yes
- No

<Page break>

Q11.1

Do you know the name of the athlete?

- Yes, namely ...
- No

<Page break>

Q12.1

Please provide your opinion on the video using the following criteria. The video was...

Unpleasant								Pleasant
Unlikeable								Likeable
Boring								Interesting
Tasteless								Tasteful
Artless								Artful
Bad								Good

<Page break>

Condition: Survey with advertisement without Celebrity Endorsement

On the next page you will find a video. The video will last for 1:07 minutes. Please watch the video until the end. When the video has come to an end, you will automatically be forwarded to the next page. Thereafter, you will be asked a couple of questions about the content of the video.

<Page break>

<Show video without celebrity endorsement>

<Page break>

Q9.2

Did you see males or females in the video?

- Only males
- Only females
- Both males and females
- I was not able to watch the video

<Page break>

Q12.2

Please provide your opinion on the video using the following criteria. The video was...

Unpleasant								Pleasant
Unlikeable								Likeable
Boring								Interesting

Tasteless								Tasteful
Artless								Artful
Bad								Good

<Page break

Condition: Survey without advertisement

Thank you for your answers. Now you will be asked some questions related to sport clothing and equipment.

<Page break>

Continuation of the survey for everyone

Q13

You're now on the half of the questionnaire. Please mention the first three brands related to sport clothing / equipment that come to mind.

1. ...
2. ...
3. ...

<Page break>

<When respondents did not call Nike> --> **Q14**

Have you heard of the sport brand Nike?

- Yes, I have
- No, I haven't

<Page break>

Q15

Now we would like to ask you some more questions about the sport brand Nike. Please provide your opinion on the brand Nike using the following criteria:

Unappealing								Appealing
Bad								Good
Unpleasant								Pleasant
Unfavorable								Favorable

Unlikeable								Likeable
Unsatisfactory								Satisfactory
Disagreeable								Agreeable

<Page break>

Q16

On a scale of 1 to 4, to what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Fully disagree	Disagree	Agree	Fully Agree
I am intrigued by Nike.				
I'd like to know more about Nike.				
Learning more about Nike would be useless.				
I am curious about Nike.				

Q17

I would like to be in the possession of one of the products of Nike.

Fully disagree								Fully agree
----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-------------

<Page break>

Q18

How likely is it that you would buy a Nike product?

I would definitely not buy it								I would definitely buy it
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---------------------------

<Page break>

Q19(1)

You have almost reached the end of this questionnaire. Now, we would like to ask you more about your opinion on advertising in general. Companies often promote their products by creating advertisements. Please give your opinion on this fact by showing to what extent you agree with the following statements.

	Fully disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Slightly agree	Agree	Fully Agree
We can depend on getting the truth in most advertising							
Advertising's aim is to inform the consumer							
I believe advertising is informative							
Advertising in general is truthful							
Advertising is a reliable source of information about the quality and performance of products							

<Page break>

Q19(2)

	Fully disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Slightly agree	Agree	Fully Agree
Advertising is truth well told							

In general, advertising presents a true picture of the product being advertised							
I feel I've been accurately informed after viewing most advertisements							
Most advertising provides consumers with essential information							

<Page break>

Q20

You have reached the very last question of this survey. This question will be about celebrity endorsement. Companies often use celebrities in their advertisements. This is called 'celebrity endorsement'. Please provide you opinion on celebrity endorsement using the following criteria.

Celebrity endorsement is...

Uninteresting								Interesting
Unpleasant								Pleasant
Unlikeable								Likeable
Bad								Good
Useless								Useful
Unappealing								Appealing
Unattractive								Attractive

<Page break>

Q21

You have now completed the questionnaire. Thank you for your time and effort. Your help is highly appreciated! If you have questions or comments about this questionnaire, please list them below.

...

Q22

Also, if you would like to receive an update on the study's results once it has been completed, then leave your e-mail address below. Your e-mail address will be stored separately from your answers to this survey and will be deleted after I have contacted you.

...

Q23

PLEASE PRESS THE NEXT BUTTON TO STORE ALL YOUR ANSWERS.