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ABSTRACT

Bourdieu (1984) distinguishes the difference between low cultural capital and high cultural capital. According to Bourdieu, the cultural education of cultural consumers is inherently linked to their motivation to attend certain cultural outings. Within this cultural field, some research has been conducted on the motivations of visitors of comedians (Friedman, 2011; Kuipers, 2001; Kuipers, 2006; Friedman & Kuipers, 2013).

However, this sociocultural research has never been approached through marketing-related topics like branding. This thesis will research how the online brand images of four Dutch comedians relate to the motivations and evaluations of their visitors. Labrecque, Markos, and Milne (2011) state how every individual, (un)consciously brands themselves on social media. The notion of embodied cultural capital, which is how cultural capital manifests itself in a person, is comparable to the notion of brand image (Bourdieu, 1986). Both are constructed by internal and external processes that shape one’s place in society. This cross-over between different fields establishes a unique angle to the theoretical discussion of comedic cultural capital.

The online brand image is researched through a qualitative content analysis of the most popular social media platforms of four Dutch comedians. This data serves as the starting point for the interviews. The interviews confirm or reject the frame alignment between the online brand image and the perceived brand image by the respondents. Furthermore, their evaluations are related to the comedic cultural capital of the brands. The research mainly confirms the frame alignment, but shows the dangers of frame misalignment to the brand image of comedians. The conclusion confirms the trends set by Kuipers and Friedman of strong symbolic boundaries in comedic fields, but also adds another layer to the strong opposition of high and low comedic cultural capital. The respondents of one comedian show a vastly larger interest than either low or high comedic cultural capital. This mixed method approach therefore extends the diversity of comedic cultural capital in the Netherlands.
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1. Introduction

“Someone who loves André van Duin will not easily be entertained by Wim T. Schippers; fans of Hans Teeuwen will rarely like Tineke Schouten; Toon Herman’s audience wasn’t that fond of Wim Kan. There is even a division between the Netherlands’ biggest humorists; the most loved – Youp van ’t Hek, Freek de Jonge, Paul de Leeuw – are also the most hated”

- G. Kuipers (2001, p. 9)¹

Kees van Kooten, Wim de Bie, Andre van Duin, Tineke Schouten, but also Hans Teeuwen, Theo Maassen and Jochem Myjer, these names only represent a small part of the wide range of comedians in the vast landscape of the Netherlands. Right-wing and left-wing, traditionalist and liberalist, men and women, political and entertaining, every comedian has his own qualities and interests. This wide spectrum signifies the growing diversification of the Netherlands. This thesis will dig deeper into the diverse landscape of both Dutch comedy and the people that visit their shows. All of these comedians represent different values and types of comedy, which can be considered as their own ‘brand’. Over the years, social media has grown in opportunities for people and brands to communicate with their consumer and form an online brand image (Fournier & Avery, 2011). This research will focus on the online brand image of Dutch comedians and how they relate to their audience. Thus, this paper will reveal more in-depth on the branding processes of a small segment of Dutch culture that many Dutch people hold dear: comedy.

1.1. Research question

This thesis researches the motivations of comedic visitors for different sort of comedic styles, but also if comedians’ online image affects their motivations. However, Labrecque, Markos, and Milne (2011) state how an intended online brand image can sometimes be perceived differently by the consumer, which leads to either an alignment or misalignment between the online brand and the perception of the audience. This results in the research question: How does the online brand image of comedians relate to the audience’s motivations and evaluations of their current show? To answer this question, several sub questions must be considered first. First, the question ‘how does the brand image of comedians relate to their comedic cultural capital?’ has to be answered. Second, the question ‘how do the motivations

¹ Loosely translated from Dutch.
of the visitors relate to comedic cultural capital?’ will be researched. And last, to combine the two methods, the main research question ‘how do the motivations and evaluations of the visitors relate to the online brand image of the comedians?’ will conclude the research.

To determine the brand image of a comedian, and because research states that there’s a significant relation between self-branding and social media, a qualitative content analysis of their social media profiles is conducted (Centeno & Wang, 2017). Furthermore, to analyze the motivations of visitors of comedic performances in the theatre, interviews are conducted. This will lead to in-depth data on the matter. The data from the interviews and qualitative content analysis can be coded and compared, which will answer the question if the themes in the social media profiles resemble the themes of the motivation of the visitor, and if the brand image even affects the motivation of the visitor. To analyze this question, several topics must be addressed in this research. First of all, the varying landscape of comedy styles in the Netherlands will be clarified. With this knowledge, all future findings in this thesis can be contextualized. The different styles of comedy and its developments indicate certain themes and predictions for the outcome of the research. The concept of brand image and its effects on social media will also be outlined in the theoretical framework. More importantly, the concept of cultural capital, on which this thesis is built, will be clarified and related to comedic cultural capital. The methodology of both the qualitative content analysis and the interviews are outlined in the next chapter. This chapter illustrates the reasoning behind the mixed methods approach, the sampling, and the validity and reliability of the research.

1.2. Scientific relevance

To increase the validity of this thesis, as previously stated in the theoretical framework, this research discusses an already existing academic discussion about cultural capital and comedy. Kuipers (2006), Friedman (2011) and Claessens and Dhoest (2010) have written about this topic, but directed their research in other countries or towards another type of comedy.

This research takes a more industrial approach to a sociological topic, which makes the angle somewhat more uncommon, but even more interesting for the fields of marketing as well as sociocultural studies. The concept of brand image can identify the different brand attributes of the comedians. The combination of cultural consumption, the motivation of visitors and the possibility of the brand image affecting the motivation of visitors has not been researched yet. It’s an interesting and innovative angle on cultural consumption as well as branding, as branding is also a process that is performed by the audience (Nandan, 2004).
Bourdieu (1984) identifies embodied cultural capital as a personification of the different assets of one’s cultural capital. Thus, in a way, the audience is consuming a certain brand. Therefore, the combination of the two overarching themes will result in a new angle for both cultural consumption and branding.

As this connection between a comedian’s brand image and motivations has never been made before, it’s not only academically relevant, but also socially relevant to research this conjunction. The topic of motivations and for cultural outings is, according to Bourdieu, inherently linked to ‘cultural capital’, which makes the core part of this thesis a research with a cultural academic background. However, by orienting both the interview questions as well as the appeal of the comedian towards their brand image, the research will also be interesting as a marketing-related topic.

Furthermore, although it’s difficult to academically prove, every country and culture tends to have different kinds of humor. Even within one culture, people like to be captivated by different types of humor and entertainment. Comedy can be categorized as a form of art, as well as entertainment, but if often regarded as a product of popular culture (Friedman, 2011). This is also the case in the Netherlands, where the most popular directions of comedy are ‘cabaret’, ‘regular’ comedy, and stand-up comedy. These three different kinds of entertainment have distinct features and address different topics, as will be discussed in the theoretical framework. A style of comedy or a sense of humor has been researched in relation to motivations and social classes of audiences (Friedman, 2011; Kuipers, 2006; Friedman & Kuipers, 2013), but not yet as a part of personal branding of a comedian.

After the rise of the commercialized ‘culture industry’, a debate arose amongst cultural critics. The Frankfurt School stated that this commercialization of the popular and fine arts would result in the decline of democracy, however mass culture theorists mainly saw the rise of popular culture as forming one giant homogeneous mass with a lack of diversity of taste (Lizardo & Skiles, 2008). Both these theories portray the critical stance from the academic world, the consumption of fine and popular arts has been almost exempt from academic research until the 70’s. Afterwards, popular arts were more accepted in the academic world, although research into comedy still remains underrepresented. However, cultural consumption was still reduced to two types of consumption, researches either included fine arts for the elites or popular arts for the masses (Lizardo & Skiles, 2008). Consumption of comedy is one of the least researched sub-areas of popular culture. Although the relationship between cultural capital and cultural consumption had long been linked by Bourdieu (1984), Kuipers (2006) was one of the first academics that researched the two in relation to comedy in the
Netherlands. Claessens and Dhoest (2010) performed a similar research in Belgium, but the consumption of comedians in theatre had not yet been researched until Friedman (2011) released his essay on taste levels regarding British comedians. His research connects taste levels of comedy to three different types of ‘classes’ or backgrounds; low, high, and mixed. Furthermore, stand-up comedy and its audience in the United States has been analyzed exhaustively (Stewart, Wiley, McDermott & Thompson, 2016; Weaver, 2016; Michael, 2011). However, this type of research has not yet been conducted in the Netherlands, which has a similar landscape of different sort of comedic performers (hereafter summarized as comedians in general). So, although these researches analyze the link between cultural consumption and comedy, this type of research has not yet been applied to the Dutch comedic landscape. The results of this research will fit in the existing academic discussion on motivations for cultural outings that exist in different cultures. Will the Netherlands fit into the same notion as Friedman and have three different types of ‘classes’ or will the results demonstrate a vaster landscape of classes? The previous works will serve as a backbone for this research and the final results will build upon their results and contribute to the academic discussion. Furthermore, the inclusion of brand concepts is a new angle to the research that has not been included in this academic discussion. While research shows that brand image can affect the popularity of a celebrity, this has not yet been tested on the brand image of different comedians.

1.3. Social relevance

Desai and Basuroy (2005) take on the same angle in their research in which they analyze the effect of star power and critics’ reviews on the performance of the movie in the market. They combine cultural concepts like genre and the popularity of movie stars with commercial concepts like market performance, and as a result they conclude that movies, and specifically genres, are products or brands that compete with other products in the market. This shows the interesting angle and possible results of applying cultural things in a commercial framework.
2. Theoretical framework

2.1. The background of Dutch comedy

Comedy in the Netherlands has different branches, which all have their unique characterizations. To understand the context and format of this thesis, it’s important to understand the background of comedy in the Netherlands. The distinctions between these specific styles or variations of comedy are important to acknowledge in this research, because the research is more reliable when all aspects of comedy are covered and identified. Thus, the related scientific research, background information and historical approach on different comedy and humor styles provides the necessary framework in which this research is established. The theoretical framework introduces these theoretically and historically acclaimed distinctions in (Dutch) comedy, while also elaborating on several key concepts in theories on branding and cultural capital. The different styles can also relate to their online brand image and the motivations of the visitor.

2.1.1. History of Dutch comedy landscape

Wim Ibo (1982) describes in his book how Dutch ‘cabaret’ reinvents itself in the 20th century. Before the war, Dutch ‘cabaret’ was originally inspired by French ‘cabaret-artistique’ and German Uberbrettl. These distinctions were mainly centered on the traditional idea of cabaret, where ‘cabaretiers’ used chansons and scorn to criticize contemporary society. Wim Kan founded his ABC-cabaret in 1936. Kan, inspired by the French cabaret-artistique, used an alteration of anguish and humor, with an occasional critical hint. This criticizing note was mainly found in his impressions of traditional politician Luns. Even though his political stance was minor, Kan was criticized by the media: in 1936 Kan was too exciting, in 1947 he was too communistic, in 1956 too cowardly, and in 1969 too right-wing.

Ibo explains this sudden turn-around. In the ‘40’s and ‘50’s, only four or five cabaretiers traveled around the Netherlands, and as the art of cabaret was popular, they had millions of fans. Satire was new to the people, and Kan’s mild introduction into satire was understandable and well-received. However, in the ‘60’s the Dutch masses became more politically involved, television and radio showed students in protest and fighting the established elite. Satire was taken on as a way to stand up and ridicule this establishment. It became a product for the masses, and as Kan was only mildly critical, the critics deemed his stance too weak and traditional, and therefore right-wing.
In the same period, Wim Sonneveld and Toon Hermans were also on the rise. Together, these three comedians represented the three originators of the Dutch comedic landscape as we have it today. Sonneveld was known as a showman, he prided himself in his lyrical capabilities. His shows were based on sentimentality and identification, as he sang and narrated about human peculiarities and recognizable narratives. His showmanship, his ‘comedy on melody’ (“komedietjes op melodietjes”, p. 49), his charm and wit made him the godfather of the Dutch revue. He didn’t convey a general message or a political stance in his shows, as he didn’t believe this was the purpose of an entertainer (p. 50)

As Sonneveld was the originator of the revue, Hermans was the father of the one-man show in the Netherlands. Ibo describes Hermans as a comedian who could make the audience laugh with just one look. Even though he is often categorized as a ‘cabaretier’, he identified himself as a comedian, as an entertainer of the people. In 1959, he describes his own comedy as follows: “In Dutch cabaret, we always want to convey a message. And although this can be very funny, I prefer comedy without pretentions, the real uncomplicated pleasure, without discontentment about life itself” (p. 107) ².

He called ‘cabaretiers’ ‘wijsneuzen’, or know-it-alls, while he preferred calling himself ‘feestneus’, or merrymaker (Ibo, p.108) ³. Even though Hermans performed in the 60’s, a period of criticism and politicization, he still attracted a large audience.

Based on and inspired by these three comedians/cabaretiers, a diverse landscape of comedians sprouted in the Netherlands throughout the second half of the 20th century. In the ‘70’s and ‘80’s, comedians who grew up with these three men as their role models, often formed duos like Neerlands Hoop or Don Quishocking. Heavily inspired from their youth, the format was the anti-establishment society combined with the different comedic styles of the three comedic icons. This generation provided some of the most established comedians of the current comedic landscape, namely Freek de Jonge and Youp van ’t Hek. In turn, this now well-established generation serves as an example for the wide array of comedians and cabaretiers nowadays.

2.1.2. Cabaret

The Netherlands has a traditional sort of comedy, called ‘cabaret’, in which comedy, songs and social criticism are mixed together. Often cabaret is leaning more towards cynicism and

---

² Freely translated from Dutch.
³ Freely translated from Dutch.
satire. Cabaret is often regarded as a more artistic form of comedy. Furthermore, cabaret is often meant to be critical of the current society (Bakker & Ravesloot, 2014). It often crosses certain limits and knows no boundaries (Niemantsverdriet and van Wiechen, 2015). Furthermore, cabaret is often categorized as a version of comedy that pushes the boundaries of creativity. It can break conventional theatre codes or uses these codes to alienate the audience (Offerman, 1995).

In cabaret, there’s always been a tension between two important features of this form of comedy: societal involvement or entertainment. Throughout the years, these features have alternated their roles as important parts of cabaret. However, societal involvement or engagement did always qualify as one of the most important, if not the most important, characteristic of cabaret (Langenberg & IJdens, 1995). Nowadays, one of the most prominent cabaretiers Erik van Muiswinkel, reasons how cabaret has always followed society’s changes, and is therefore in no way a trendsetter (Langenberg & IJdens, p. 13). The more engaged society as a whole is to politics and current matters, the more cabaretiers discuss these matters. This engagement comes and goes throughout the years, therefore cabaretiers often change their style throughout the years.

Creative theatricality is another feature of cabaret, as cabaretiers often search for the absolute boundaries of theatrical rules (Ibo, 1982). This desire to provoke and engage the audience manifests itself in different ways. Cabaretiers experiment in their use of words, their interaction with the audience, or their use of musicality. The intention of the cabaretier ranges from intriguing the audience, e.g. Toon Hermans being silent for an uncommon amount of time, to scandalizing, e.g. Hans Teeuwen mimicking sexual actions on stage. A cabaretier looks at all times for a creative and original delivery of their content.

Throughout the 20th century, cabaret had transformed slightly. Cabaret shows often remained the same with a similar set-up: free-standing songs varied with stories with an overarching theme. The common rule is that there’s a quick change of topic or form every three minutes. However, the role of the cabaretier changed throughout the years. In the beginning, they portrayed characterizations. As their topic changed so quick, it resulted in a lack of time to portray a fully nuanced character, therefore they exaggerated based on common associations (Langenberg & IJdens, p.15).

Since then, this has changed into a more nuanced central role for the cabaretier in which the character they portray has enough time for an opportunity to transform or a redemption arc throughout the show. Besides, the cabaretier started having more interaction with the audience (Langenberg & IJdens, p. 16).
However, since the 80’s, the personality of the cabaretier is central on stage. Audience attend a certain comedian as they like their personality and the way they view society. The role the cabaretier plays on stage is more unique and exclusive than before, as the performance is more related to their own personality. Furthermore, topics change more from general observations to personal experiences (Langenberg & IJdens, p. 16). For the convenience of readability in this thesis, hereafter cabaret is included in the overarching sense of ‘comedy’, except when there’s a demonstration of emphasis on cabaret.

2.1.3. Pure comedy

Besides cabaret, the Netherlands also has a more traditional form of comedians. These comedians often display a sense of humor based on entertainment. One of the biggest comedians in the Netherlands is André van Duin, who has a career based on sketches and characters (Kuipers, 2006). Sketches are often based on stereotypes. King (2002) stresses how stereotypes help a comedian, because they instantly create recognizable characteristics, which quickly conveys information about this specific character (Wilson, Gútierrez, & Chao, 2002).

One of the most used characteristics of comedy is observational humor. This relates to anecdotes of everyday life used in a comedic manner. Observational comedy often begins with a sentence similar to “Have you ever noticed?” (Double, 2014, p. 208). It is usually based on a personal narrative disguised in a long monologue, but with a bizarre twist in the ending. The ending is often not expected (Friedman, 2009). This form of observational comedy is also often used in stand-up comedy.

2.1.4. Stand-up comedy

A variation of this type of comedy is stand-up comedy, which is primarily performed in smaller clubs. Stand-up performances are more oriented towards reaction, participation and engagement from the public, so it is more fitted to perform in smaller clubs. Moreover, the purpose of this type of comedy is entertainment. The most common features of stand-up comedy are the connection to the audience. The stand-op comedian is inspired by the audience and communicates with the audience; therefore, one of the key elements of stand-up comedy is improvisation (Langenberg and IJdens, 1995).

Brodie (2008) describes stand-up comedy as a modern alternative for contemporary story-telling, furthermore he underlines the importance of the audience. This type of comedy is dependent on the cooperation of the audience. Brodie emphasizes how this reliance on
interaction with the audience provides a level of intimacy between audience and comedian that is not achieved with other types of comedy. As stand-up comedy has a tendency to include the audience, the audience is more likely to interrupt. To hold the audience’s attention, the stand-up comedian is more likely to tell an engaging narrative. Brodie calls these narratives ‘legends’, as legends “depend in an overlapping worldview and builds on a shared understanding” (p. 162).

According to Scarpetta and Spagnolli (2009), stand-up comedy is more likely to use swear words, target the audience, and has a tendency for more racist or sexist content. Stand-up comedians tend to present more personal facts, and rely on an informal atmosphere. These sources on stand-up comedy research primarily stand-up comedy from the United States. This thesis would therefore be one of the first to analyze this phenomenon in the Netherlands.

**Four styles of humor**

Martin, Puhlik-Doris, Larsen, Gray and Weir (2003) distinguished different styles of humor in their research. These types of humor often relate to a certain type of comedy.

First, they distinguish ‘affiliative humor’. Martin et al. describe this form as a type of humor that is generally liked by the public. This comedy has one goal, to unite its audience by using non-offensive humor. The most discussed subjects are anecdotes from day-to-day life or animals. One of the American examples of this type of humor is Jerry Seinfeld. Martin et al. determined the goal of this type of comedy is to create a sense of joy and alliance amongst the audience.

Second, the writers categorize ‘aggressive humor’. Aggressive humor is based on insults and degrading other people. The main goal is to put someone else down. This is the type of humor that’s also often used by bullies, when intentionally threatening or harming others. Martin et al. mark Joan Rivers as one of the American examples of this type of comedy. The audience is often divided on this type, as some find this type hilarious and others think it crosses a boundary.

As the third style Martin et al. recognized ‘self-enhancing humor’, which is based on self-mockery. By ridiculing yourself in a positive manner and not taking yourself too serious, the comedian makes himself or herself the target of the joke in a good-hearted way. One of the American examples of this type of humor is Jon Stewart, who makes himself the target before ridiculing others, which makes him seem more relatable and less ‘offensive’.

And finally, Martin et al. distinguish ‘self-defeating humor’, which, instead of taking down others, a comedian will take down himself or herself in an aggressive manner. This is
the other end of the ‘aggressive humor’, to defend against aggressive humor, making yourself about yourself in a negative way will defeat the cause of others doing this. Martin et al. identify American comedian Rodney Dangerfield as one of the examples, who often says ‘I was an ugly baby’.

These four types of humor, in combination with the aforementioned traits of the different comedic styles, can help distinguish the differences between comedians, but also between the audience’s sense of humor.

### 2.2. Branding comedians

As stated earlier, every comedian or ‘cabaretier’ has a certain orientation within the field of comedy, whether it’s stand-up or more contemporary. According to Lury (2009), a brand is a set of conventions, which are set apart by differing from another set of conventions. In this sense, no comedian is exactly the same, because they create different shows based on different kinds of humor. Therefore, every comedian sets themselves and their ‘brand’ apart by being different than another comedian. A brand is a combination of its functions, possibilities, goals, historical and societal context, and the relationship to its consumers, which makes a brand an assemblage. The core of the process of branding is the actor-network theory. Law (1992) describes this phenomenon as brands being generated and a part of “the networks of the social” (p. 379). According to Law, branding is a process within a heterogeneous network, in which social, conceptual, technical, and textual pieces are part of a bigger puzzle, which leads to a single actor, namely the brand. Nandan (2004) explains how a certain brand image is the consumer’s perception of the brand. This brand likely has specific assets in their ‘personality’ that speak to the consumer. The consumer often forms an impression of this brand, based on associations with this brand. These associations are ‘assembled’ into one brand image.

Dobni and Zinkhan (1990) research the developments of the concept of brand image throughout the 20th century. They conclude that brand image is the perceived concept of the consumer. Therefore, it is mostly a subjective and perceptual concept, molded by marketing activities from the brand itself. Most importantly, brand image relies on the consumer’s perception of reality, not reality itself. Thus, this research does not claim to reveal the brand’s true image, but merely the perception of the brand that is created by the brand itself (the comedian) and the consumers of the brand (their audience).
2.2.1. Personal branding
Not much research has been done for the brand images of comedians specifically, however it falls within the same category as personal branding or self-branding. Khamis, Ang and Welling (2017) clarify how personal branding is similar to branding a commercial product, as they both center around a unique selling point or “a public identity that is singularly charismatic and responsive to the needs and interests of target audiences” (p. 191). To stand out in the labor market, a person has to portray a memorable image. Thomson (2006) defines a human brand as “any well-known persona who is the subject of marketing communication efforts” (p. 104).

Centeno and Wang (2017) explore the concept of the celebrity brand. The brand of a celebrity can be co-created or ‘assembled’ by humans and ‘non-humans’. According to the actor-network theory, different actors like organizations, machines and other people can interact and eventually result in one authority. For the brand image of a human, these processes are mostly through social interactions, experiences, perceptions and insights. According to Kamis, Lawrence, and Ang, social media is a method to portray the individual brand, as these aforementioned processes are actively sought out and portrayed by individuals on an online platform, for example through likes, photos, and posts.

2.2.2. Branding on social media
Nowadays, many celebrities use social media to reinforce their image. Fournier and Avery (2011) emphasize on the importance of social media for brands. Social media provided the opportunity for a two-way conversation with the consumer and was significantly cheaper for brands than traditional media. Because the consumer can participate and is socially linked to the brand, the branding process becomes a two-way street. It is a way for a brand to connect with their consumer. Fournier and Avery identify this as open source activity, where both the consumer and the brand itself dedicate to the notion of a brand. Furthermore, social media provides an opportunity for a high level of consumer engagement, for example commenting, evaluating or rating, which can strongly influence their image of a brand (Burhn, Schoenmueller, & Schäfer, 2012). According to Gummerus, Liljander, Weman, and Pihlstrom (2011), social media has been rising in popularity as an additional marketing channel to target new customers. Brands are no longer a one-way street, both their customers as the brand itself ‘co-create’ the meaning of the brand online (McCarthy, Rowley, Ashworth, & Pioch, 2014). Laroche, Habibi and Richard (2013) reinforce this claim by researching the effect of social media on brand loyalty. In the age of social media, an online presence by brands can enhance
brand trust and loyalty and even expand the brand community of fans and followers. Lis and Post (2013) conclude that a celebrity’s brand image is the biggest influence for a consumer to watch their television show. The factor of credibility of that celebrity’s brand image also has a direct impact on the reason to watch the show. This research can determine if and how the online presence of a comedian and the loyalty of their visitors affect their brand image.

Labrecque, Markos, and Milne (2011) research the processes, challenges and implications of online personal branding. They conclude that every individual on social media, either unconsciously or consciously, participates in self-branding through posting their content. Furthermore, there’s often a misalignment between the intention of the post and the reception of the post, as branding requires feedback mechanisms to be successful. This (mis)alignment is an integral part of this research. While the intended brand image of a comedian is researched through a qualitative content analysis of their social media, the perceived brand image is researched through interviewing the visitors of the comedians. The intended and perceived images combined create the network in which the brand is formed.

2.2.3. Frame alignment
Frame alignment is a regularly used method to find congruence between two different sorts of frames. Ketelaars, Walgrave and Wouters (2014) define the framing process as “the strategic use of frames by organizations” (p. 506). As a comedian frames their profile in a certain way, the frame is related to their online brand image. Furthermore, their visitors also frame the comedians in a certain way. This fits the statement that alignment is based on the perception and intention of both senders and receivers. Frame alignment links two different frames and analyzes if they are compatible or incompatible. Furthermore, frames can also partly align or reinforce each other, which Snow, Rochford, Worden and Benford (1986) call ‘frame amplification’. This research shows all aforementioned variations of frame alignment.

2.3. Cultural capital
An online brand image can align or misalign with a visitor’s brand image, however, there are several theories that need to be taken into consideration when researching cultural objects like comedy. Double (2005) encourages the recognition of comedy as an art form. Double acknowledges that the generation of the material, the connection to the audience, and the art of performance certainly result in a form of art, called comedy. For this research, comedy can be seen as a form of art or as a form of entertainment, but more importantly, as Friedman
(2011) states comedy is considered a cultural discourse. To dissect the motivations and inclinations to a comedian’s brand image, it’s essential to take the background of the respondent into account. After all, as stated earlier, a brand image is co-created by the brand as well as their consumers. The theoretical framework of the thesis is therefore based around the concept of ‘cultural capital’. Cultural capital is classified by Bourdieu (1984) as the result of cultural socialization, which starts at an early age. Children of upper-class families are raised with more cultural values than children from lower-class families, which results in a certain understanding of ‘legitimate art’, as Bourdieu calls it. This process is reinforced by the educational system, where students from higher class families are often received as worthier of further cultural education, due to their initial knowledge of art (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). This process results in a distinction between ‘high art’ and ‘low art’, where ‘high art’ often signifies the cultural forms that are supported by the government, because high-class and high-educated officials would classify this art as ‘superior’ (Bourdieu, 1984). Bourdieu reveals how cultural and financial background and upbringing have different effects on cultural taste. These distinctions that are brought about by the theory of cultural capital lay the groundwork for this research. Bourdieu, but also Claessens and Dhoest (2010) and Friedman (2011) have showed the importance of including the cultural background of a respondent when researching motivations and taste for different cultural content. Bourdieu (1984) summarizes this effect concisely: “Taste classifies, and it classifies the classifier” (p.106). A certain motivation for a comedian categorizes the visitors themselves into different groups of taste.

2.3.1. Embodied cultural capital

Moreover, Bourdieu (1986) also describes three types of cultural capital, of which one can be linked to the concept of branding. ‘Embodied cultural capital’ is the notion of cultural capital that influences a person’s character and way of thinking. It’s deeply rooted in a person’s ‘habitus’. A habitus is a set of dispositions that match the embodied cultural capital. It reflects their social and cultural life and upbringing, and is often shared by people with a similar background. According to Bourdieu, in this habitus, a person creates its own aesthetic dispositions, which can be opinions, tastes, mannerisms, voice movements or any other ways to present your ‘social space’ to the world (Bourdieu, 1984). Bourdieu (1991) explains that these uses of body and language are choices, often unconsciously and unwillingly made by the person itself, and formed by their social habitat. A comedian embodies certain cultural values and standards, which the comedian conveys in his shows and is thus received by an
audience, but also in his presence online, which the comedian creates himself. These cultural values and standards can be translated into a brand image. Their individual concept of aesthetic dispositions is strongly related to their concept of brand image. Brand images and aesthetic dispositions are both processes where a person’s characteristics are extended to display either a certain brand or a certain cultural capital. Both the process of branding and the embodiment of cultural capital are based on how a person presents itself to the outer world, either knowingly or unknowingly. Furthermore, they’re both based on the different aspects, e.g. mannerisms, opinions, looks, and other defining factors, that work together to form a unique profile. This angle of combining brand images with the embodiment of cultural capital is very uncommon in research on cultural capital or branding. Therefore, this research has a unique perspective for both the field of marketing as well as cultural studies.

These distinctions between people with different embodied cultural capital are defined by symbolic boundaries. Bourdieu (1989) explains these symbolic boundaries as the outlining of one’s social space. Symbolic boundaries are the results of processes that separate people into social groups. It explains one’s place in society as a way to distinguish oneself from other people (Friedman & Kuipers, 2013). Bourdieu explains that this placement into society is an automatic process, as hierarchy within society classifies and ranks the different values into order. However, Friedman and Kuipers claim that this distinction is mainly based on taste. Furthermore, they state that humor can be a way of bonding between the different classes, as there’s often an overlap in what different people think is funny.

Furthermore, the audience itself also has its own set of cultural values, or habitus. They all embody their own cultural capital. Either this cultural capital can correspond with the comedian of their choice or it can’t match at all. This is an interesting angle for this research, as the comedian’s brand is analyzed, and therefore it can be researched if a comedian appeals his brand to a public with a similar embodied cultural capital, or chooses to not include their cultural capital at all in their social media.

2.3.2. Legitimacy
As mentioned before, Bourdieu clarifies how higher-class families have a better understanding of ‘legitimate art’. This can also be described as how higher-class families have certain cultural values and standards, or ‘embodied cultural capital’, which Bourdieu relates to ‘legitimate’. According to Bourdieu (1989), this classification of ‘legitimacy’ is imposed by the ‘institution’. Bourdieu identifies this institution as official individuals like “an expert, physician or jurist, is someone who is appointed to produce a point of view which is
recognized as transcendent over particular points of view … which confers universally recognized rights on the holder of the certificate” (p. 22). So, these individuals with a higher degree or function often acknowledge the legitimacy of a cultural product, as they hold a monopoly on institutions and therefore establish the hierarchy of legitimacy. As an example, Bourdieu also states “a school diploma is a piece of universally recognized and guaranteed symbolic capital, good on all markets.” (p. 21).

This legitimacy is often translated into cultural products with more aesthetic dispositions (Bourdieu, 1985). Bourdieu relates these aesthetic dispositions to a deeper appreciation for a more abstract form of art, which often references an entire history of previous artistic structures in theatre. A formal aesthetic disposition is similar to a cultivated disposition, in which the consumer is aware of the different features of several movements in the art form, resulting in a more profound appreciation for the aesthetic of the art piece. Daenekindt (2017) summarizes this principle in a nutshell as “a capacity to appreciate form rather than function of cultural products” (p. 43).

With this, Daenekindt also introduces the disposition to appreciate the function of cultural products. In this case, it’s not about appreciating the artistry of the product, but how it serves the consumer. For example, Roose (2008) explains how this phenomenon works in the field of classical music. The functional disposition results in a more escapist attitude, where the consumer listens to classical music to break away from day-to-day life, whereas the consumer with a formal aesthetic disposition listens to classical music to enjoy the craftsmanship of the classical music, like the tonal system complex rhythm. Daenekindt concisely outlines the differences of these two dispositions:

Access to these principles is unequally distributed as the upper segments of society have the dispositional tools—i.e., the aesthetic disposition—for an art-for-art’s sake approach. The lower social strata, on the other hand, lack the cognitive resources to appreciate formal aspects of cultural products, and thus stress functional aspects of cultural objects—the so-called taste for necessity. According to this traditional Bourdieusian account, individuals have the dispositional resources to appreciate art in line with the highbrow, modernist aesthetic principle or in line with the popular, functional aesthetic principle” (p. 45).

As Daenekindt describes in this segment, consumers who are more highly cultivated often have a (formal) aesthetic disposition, whereas consumers who had less cultural education are often resorted to a more functional approach to cultural products.
Like Friedman (2011), Kuipers (2001) researches the comic cultural taste of a society, but she focuses on the reception and production of Dutch jokes. Her research reveals a distinct relationship between education levels and comedic taste in jokes. Lower-educated respondents prefer ‘simple’ jokes and specific comedians like Tineke Schouten and André van Duin who use these ‘simple’ jokes in sketches. While high-educated respondents prefer comedians and cabaretiers who rely less on jokes and more on an artistic and innovative oeuvre. Furthermore, Kuipers states that the artists in the last category are often unknown amongst lower-educated, and therefore the lower-educated are not able to express either an appreciation or a depreciation for these artists. Kuipers identifies these two tastes into two humor categories. The lower-educated taste of humor is more ‘volks’ (loosely translated from Dutch: ‘for the people’, or plain, common), while the higher-educated taste of humor can be categorized as elitist. Similar to Bourdieu’s theories, Kuiper’s research confirms that lower-educated consumer adopts a more functional disposition, where the consumer enjoys the effect of a comedian’s show. This effect is mostly based on the pure entertainment the comedian provides. Whereas, the higher-educated consumer adopts a formally aesthetic disposition, where the main goal is to not only be entertained, but also to stimulate the intellectual abilities of the audience by performing a more complex show.

2.4. Cultural consumption

Closely related to the phenomenon of ‘cultural capital’, is how consumers enjoy cultural objects like comedy shows, which introduces the concept of ‘cultural consumption’. Lynes (1976) also researched cultural taste in relation to cultural consumption. Similar to Friedman (2011), Lynes distinguishes different cultural classes and calls them ‘highbrow’, ‘middlebrow’, and ‘lowbrow’. Lynes also acknowledges the areas in the middle of these terms. Each cultural class has its own way of consuming culture. As participants are interviewed about their motivations for each comedy show, they each have their own form of consumption and motive and can ideally be sorted into different ‘brow’ categories.

2.4.1. Consumption practices

In general, there are several ways of consuming anything, including culture. Holt (1995) discussed these different consuming patterns. First, consuming can be seen as an experience, where the emphasis lies on the (changing) emotional state of the consumer. This pattern focuses more on the subjective consuming of aesthetics, and is therefore likely the most
fitting pattern for this research on aesthetic dispositions. However, Holt also describes consuming-as-classification, in which the consumer is categorized into groups after researching how meaning is structured and what this meaning means for them. Therefore, this pattern of consumption is also relevant for this research, as, similar to other scientific works, the audience is divided according to their comedic cultural capital.

2.4.2. Cultural consumption of comedy

Although Friedman acknowledges the ambiguity of the distinction of the different classes, Friedman (2011) uses Bourdieu’s theory of cultural capital to research the cultural consumption of British comedy. He concludes that comic cultural capital is fueled by different styles of ‘comic appreciation’. Friedman distinguishes three different cultural capital backgrounds in their preference for a certain type of comedy. This research can be used as comparison material to the findings in this thesis. Friedman has a slightly broader take on cultural capital by not only emphasizing on either high or low cultural capital, but also including a group of respondents with mixed cultural capital, who were raised in a low cultural capital family, but attended university and therefore gained more sources with a high cultural capital. The difference in tastes and sense of humor are various between the different comic cultural capitals. Interviewees with a high cultural capital liked a certain sophistication and complexity in comedy. For them, comedy shouldn’t be to an ‘easy laugh’. On the other hand, respondents with a low cultural capital used comedy as a sort of escapism. They prefer to use comedy as a method of relaxation after ‘a long day at work’. Therefore, simple amusement is the key to low cultural capital comedy. Finally, the preference of the mixed cultural capital group is slightly more complicated. They often start out with an appreciation for low cultural capital, but as they move on to university or a high-functioning position, they oriented towards a more highbrow appreciation. This results in a conflicting appreciation for both capitals, where they could not express appreciation for the opposing capital when surrounded by either high cultural capital or low cultural capital. Often, these mixed cultural respondents are regarded as cultural omnivores. However, Friedman characterizes them as ‘culturally homeless’. Instead of the stereotypical ‘omnivore’, they are not typically secure in their cultural consumption, and therefore float in between the two cultures of high and low capital.

More importantly, Friedman performed another research more recently, in collaboration with Kuipers (Friedman & Kuipers, 2013). They analyzed their already existent database of Dutch and British interviews and surveys to find out how symbolic boundaries
relate to taste differences. Although other research claimed a new generation of cultural omnivores, Friedman and Kuipers still found remarkably strong symbolic boundaries. Low cultural capital and high cultural capital respondents distinguished themselves from each other. High cultural respondents (HCC) looked down upon low cultural respondents (LCC), while LCC acknowledged the smugness of HCC. This finding is relevant for this research, as this distinguishing can affect their notion of a brand of the comedians.

2.4.3. Conclusion

These academic sources show how concepts as brand image and embodied cultural capital are intertwined. Both concepts describe an experience as well as an (intentional) emission of cultural values from the different comedians as well as different members of the audience. Different comedians can appeal to different backgrounds, and this research can analyze if comedians attract people within their own comedic cultural capital, or distance themselves from it. By establishing their own brand image through social media, they establish some sort of personal aesthetic disposition. However, they can emphasize their brand image, or weaken it, to appeal or match certain parts of their possible audience. The brand of a comedian can also appeal to different backgrounds. The qualitative content analysis and the motivations of the visitors in the interviews can reinforce this brand image, because as stated earlier, branding is a two-way process, in which the brand itself (the comedian) can establish their brand (their social media profiles), but the brand image is also shaped by its observer (the visitors of their shows). As stated earlier, social media can reinforce a brand image, these methods will establish if there’s an alignment between their intended brand image (their social media profile) and their perceived brand image (their visitors).
3. Methodology
Since this thesis researches both the social media brand of the comedians and the motivations of the visitors, findings are based on a mixed methodology. This mixed methods approach is based on qualitative analysis, as the research is based on an in-depth examination of both motivations and social media brands. For an in-depth examination, it is more suitable to use qualitative research rather than quantitative research. The two methods are adapted to the subjects of research.

3.1. Selection of comedians
The selection of comedians was dependent on the comedians who were on tour and performed near Rotterdam in April of 2018. Furthermore, to ensure the validity and reliability of the research, a wide range of comedians were selected. Based on these requirements, Tineke Schouten, Jochem Myjer, Tim Hartog, and Veldhuis and Kemper were selected. According to reviews of their shows and general knowledge, these comedians and cabaretiers represented different values of comedy, which will be elaborated on in the chapter about branding the comedians. For every comedian, three or four respondents were interviewed, which results in a total of fourteen respondents.

The qualitative content analysis was performed before the conduction of the interviews. The comedian who’s the subject of the qualitative content analysis will also be the subject of the interviews with the respondents. The resulting ‘image’ of the qualitative content analysis was used as the inspiration for the topic list of the interviews. This way, the interviews analyze if the brand image has an effect on the motivations and evaluations of the visitors.

3.2. Qualitative content analysis
This section explains the research design, the operationalization and the sampling of the qualitative content analysis. Furthermore, it contextualizes the data of the sampling.

3.2.1. Research design
To discover the brand image of each comedian, as mentioned before in the theoretical framework, their social media pages are analyzed with a thematic analysis. Theory indicates that one of the most significant ways a celebrity presents his or her brand, is through social media (Lis & Post, 2013; Centento & Wang, 2017). Their social media profiles often transfer
a certain ‘personality’ that speaks to their audience (Nandan, 2004). Every social media page consists of an enormous amount of data.

Schreier (2014) describes how this data can be categorized into a coding frame. According to Schreier, there are two key features of qualitative content analysis, which are both taken into account in this research. First, the coding helps classify categories relevant to the research question. This inductive reasoning is used to create the open codes, and subsequently to divide these open codes into categories. The process will consist of open coding and categorizing these open codes into general themes. Open coding is the categorizing of all data, in which similar sentiments or topics are selected into a category. Second, Schreier defines this method as highly systematic. For every comedian, the same steps of open coding are used. Several elements of the social media posts are taken into account. The categories that emerged from the open coding process mostly include different open codes from all comedians. All comedians are represented in one coding tree. This procedure shows how the comedians overlap or differ in their coding, and in which category they are the most prominent. The categories that result from the coding of the social media profiles are all shown in appendix A. Comedians can be representative of a certain open code category or be very present and have a variety of open codes in a certain category. In that case, that code or category contributes to the comedian’s assemblage and therefore their brand. The coding frame will mostly consist of data-driven categories, as the codes arise from the data.

The theoretical framework provides sources for sensitizing topics, which can be used as categories for the coding (Boeije, 2014). These categories can concern any type of characteristics of a certain type of comedy, for example word play or sarcasm. Notably, the coding for the humor categories is therefore more deductive, as it derives from the theoretical knowledge of different types of humor and comedy. Furthermore, as the researcher will have preconceived notions before doing the coding, due to theory and background knowledge of the subject, this will not be a conventional content analysis, but rather a summative content analysis, according to Hsieh and Shannon (2005). The summative content analysis uses the context of the words in combination with the frequency, this analyzes the relevance and the underlying meaning of the word within the data. Finally, the open codes in the humor categories are not as easily retrieved in the method of thematic analysis. Therefore, instead of focusing on the themes these codes portray, the focus lies more on the underlying discourse of the humor. Willig (2013) clarifies that a discourse analysis is based on the assumption that the words and pictures used by the comedians display a certain type of how they see the world,
and most importantly use their humor. Accordingly, the discourse of the type of humor as well as the content is coded separately in the coding tree. For example, Jochem Myjer tells an everyday anecdote about his son, but also uses word play. The codes are divided into both the category of family as well as word play.

To achieve unidimensionality, categories can only cover one aspect of the material. Therefore, the overlap between categories has been avoided. Moreover, every part of the data is represented in a category, as to ensure the concept of exhaustiveness. To guarantee that the coding is as unbiased and reliable as possible, a trial coding was conducted, where a fellow student without preconceived knowledge on Dutch comedy analyzed the codes in a similar manner. After this trial, the coding was adapted to the feedback of this student. When the final coding frame is created, the categories are ‘assembled’ and represent the brand of the comedian.

3.2.2. Sampling of the social media posts

The comedian’s brands are explored by coding their three social media platforms with the most original content. All four comedians posted on Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. Most comedians shared the majority of their posts on all three of these platforms, resulting in similar posts. In this case, these posts are counted as one post. Of every comedian, around 50 different posts were posted on the three platforms between January 1st, 2018 till the end of March 2018. These posts were analyzed. Tim Hartog is the exception, as he had a social media break in the beginning of January, so older posts were also taken into account to complete the amount of 50 posts. Longer blogposts and videos count as multiple posts, as their content is more elaborate than a regular text or photo post. For example, Tineke Schouten posted less during the first three months of 2018, but her posts did include videos of her sketches, which on average had the duration of 11 minutes. The number of videos and the duration of these videos results in a larger amount of data to open code. This larger amount of data is compensated by including a smaller number of posts for that specific comedian. As for Jochem Myjer, his posts contained either short texts or photos, and had only three videos. Therefore, Myjer’s number of posts is higher than 50. For Myjer, 63 posts were analyzed in the selected period. Veldhuis and Kemper had an amount of 47 posts in the same time period, as they had eleven longer columns included in their social media posts. Hartog’s posts extended a longer time period, because of his aforementioned social media break, and as he mainly has simple social media posts, the number of posts analyzed ended at 54. After comparing all codes, the codes and categories were inserted in the coding tree (appendix A).
3.3. Interviews
This section explains the operationalization, the research design and the sampling of the second method: interviews. Furthermore, it elaborates on how it builds on the results of the qualitative content analysis.

3.3.1. Operationalization
While the interviews do go in-depth, the average time of the interviews is around 30 minutes per person. The setting of the interview are open and informal, because the respondent discusses their personal motivations. The questions are semi-structured, as it allows the interviewer to ask direct, but open questions (Showkat & Parveen, 2017). Furthermore, the interviews resemble a normal conversation, as that makes the respondents most likely more at ease. As Showkat and Parveen suggest, the position of the interviewer is of a ‘traveler metaphor’, where the interviewer ‘travels’ through the journey of the respondent, which leads to new insights during the conversation. The method resembles a narrative interview. The narrative interview focuses on the stories of the subjects, and the interviewer remains in a listening position. During the conversation, the interviewer can decide in which direction to steer the discussion. In this version, the interviewer is co-producer of the narrative (Kvale, 2011). Furthermore, the use of probe questions allows the interviewer to uncover more meaning in the story (Hermanowicz, 2002). The topic list and probe questions were based on the findings from the qualitative content analysis and are therefore deductive. The topic list is included in appendix B.

The interviews consist of four parts. First, the respondent is asked about their general comedic preferences and motivations and expectations before visiting a comedic show. Second, the respondent is asked about their idea of the comedian’s image and the aspects they associate with the comedian. Third, the results of the qualitative content analysis are indirectly tested on the respondents. By showing them social media posts of the comedian that reflect the most important assets of their online brand, the respondent is challenged to respond to these specific assets and either confirm or deny if it matches their perception of the comedian. Fourth, the respondents are asked about the other comedians included in this research. Their assessment and related associations are also included into the brand of the comedians.

After the interviews are conducted, the interviews are transcribed and coded. Overall, the same methods were used as the qualitative content analysis. The data was thematically
analyzed, which resulted in a high number of open codes. These codes were thereafter categorized into categories based on the topic list, as can be seen in the coding tree in appendix C. However, contrary to the qualitative content analysis, four coding trees were generated, instead of one general coding tree. This way, each comedian has its own coding tree, which shows the most important aspects of their brands.

3.3.2. Sampling of respondents
As a second method, interviews are conducted on several visitors of comedic shows in theatres and small clubs. As a way to limit the range of the research, the comedic venues are narrowed down to theatres in Rotterdam. Furthermore, the venues in Rotterdam have the facilities that host several types of comedians. The subjects of the interview are asked after visiting one of these shows to participate in the research. Random sampling was applied when asking the visitors to participate, making sure there still was an even divide between age and gender, which also represented the overall set-up of the audience. An entirety of 10 visitors per comedian was asked to participate in the research anonymously. Due to anticipated drop-outs in respondents, at least 40 visitors in total were invited to participate. Of the 40 visitors, three or four visitors per comedian were excited to participate in the research. This adds up to fourteen respondents in total.

3.4. Comparison of results
When both methods are finalized, both sets of codes are compared to the notion of brand image. This research analyzes if respondents were prone to the brand image of a comedian, and include this image into the set of motivations that resulted from the research. The qualitative content analysis provides context and information about the comedian that can be used in the interviews, and possibly even confront the visitor with the comedian’s brand. The brand image of the comedian can be therefore confirmed or denied in the interviews. Furthermore, the interviews will provide more information concerning the conception of the different comedians, which will add to their ‘brand image’, as a brand image is formed by its beholder. Moreover, the interviews can confirm if the brand image of different comedians has an effect on the motivation and evaluation of the visitor.

Finally, the different codes of both the content analysis and the interviews are primarily analyzed thematically. However, as the topic of humor is more difficult to transform
into themes, the humor is researched in a discourse analysis based on the theoretical framework. The different types of humor are then sorted and related to the theory.

4. Results content analysis

4.1. Similarities

Unsurprisingly, some codes were consistent for every comedian. For example, every comedian used their social media platforms as a way of promoting their material, which can
range from books to theatre shows to television appearances. Most comedians post behind-the-scenes pictures of their dressing rooms and their life on the road combined with a link to their ticket sale as a reminder for their followers that they are touring or performing in another city. Occasionally, comedians like Tineke Schouten use a video or a sketch to refer to their touring dates or appearances.

This category also shows the variety of methods to promote their material. While Tineke Schouten uses direct links to videos of her shows on her YouTube channel, Jochem Myjer shares recommendations of his followers to promote his children’s book, Veldhuis & Kemper show videos of themselves recording songs for their show and Tim Hartog promotes his appearances by attending radio shows and podcasts. Although they all have their own way of promoting their material, their use of these social media platforms in this case is (partly) commercial.

Another aspect that’s remarkably similar is the use of wordplay in their posts. These comedians were selected because of their inherently different styles of performing and their different styles of comedy. However, all comedians had an inclination to use wordplay as a way to lighten up their posts. Therefore, wordplay is a common denominator of all styles of humor. However, wordplay is used in different contexts, which will be elaborated on later in this chapter.

Additionally, every comedian has a ubiquity in multiple sets of categories and codes, but when analyzing these codes more in depth, it either shows a different angle for every comedian or a higher variety of codes. A higher variety of codes in a category connotes a higher level of relevance of this specific category to a certain comedian. For example, ‘family life’ appears in the profiles of all comedians, but Tim Hartog has a significantly lower amount of open codes dedicated to this category (“brother” and “cousins”), while Tineke Schouten discusses a vast variety of elements that connote to ‘family life’ (three different generations, family pictures, family dog, family videos, etc.). This leads to the result that ‘family life’ plays a larger part in Schouten’s brand than it does in Hartog’s brand.

This phenomenon appears in several categories: “health”, “pastime”, “sports”, “culture” and “traditional media”. The variety and difference within these categories will be taken into account for each comedian that has the highest variety or a relevantly different angle within the category. More importantly, the category of “culture” has a seemingly similar variety amongst all comedians. However, when examined up close, each comedian has their own angle on cultural aspects. Therefore, these different cultural aspects are
discussed at the end of each comedian’s paragraph, to show how they each embody different cultural values.

4.2. Tineke Schouten

Schouten has been performing in theatres since her high school graduation. Her first job was assisting Herman Berkien, a ‘cabaretier’ from Utrecht, on stage from 1974 till 1979. She started doing one-woman shows in 1980. Since then she has had multiple appearances on different television and radio shows. Her current show ‘T-splitsing’ is her 23rd show and showcases the popular highlights of her career so far.

Tineke Schouten uses her different social media platforms in very different ways. Most of her Twitter and Facebook profiles are dedicated to promoting her previous shows and her current tour. Through the means of behind-the-scenes photos and spontaneous sketches, she reminds her followers that tickets for her show are still available. Her Facebook has the largest number of followers (26,515), while her Twitter has only 6,437 followers. Unsurprisingly, Schouten posts more frequently on Facebook (around two or three times a week). Her Facebook is mainly dedicated to posting videos of previous shows, which are on an average length of 11 minutes. Her Instagram tends to be more personal. On her Instagram, Schouten posts more family-related and pastime-related posts. She posts around three times a week for her 5,668 followers on Instagram.

The theme of family is therefore consistent throughout her online presence. Although most of this family-related content is posted on Instagram, some posts on Facebook and Twitter also relate to family. For example, the post below shows a family video of her playing with her grandchild.

*Figure 1. ‘#children songs Tineke and Rocco’.*
The different family-related posts discuss a variety of aspects of family life. She proudly shows the three generations of her family, her sisters, but also discusses family expectations. This focus on family adds a more human side to her brand, as most of her posts are dedicated towards work-related topics. Showing her family and her home life connotes a more personal touch to her brand, which makes her brand more relatable. Furthermore, as shown in figure 2 below, family takes up 25% of all her posts on social media between January 1st and the end of March.

*Figure 2. Tineke Schouten’s social media categories (n = 41)*
Upon analyzing the circle diagram (Figure 2), the element of family is remarkable when compared to the other popular themes. The themes of (traditional) media, rehearsal/behind-the-scenes, and experience take up 47% of all posts. Although most comedians use their social media as a way of self-promotion, Schouten does it more than any other comedian. Her social media is more dedicated to different levels of her professional life, e.g. self-promotion through posting sketches or media appearances, than any other actor that contributes to her network. This most apparent theme of ‘professional life’ has multiple facets.

First, posts on promotion of her appearances on several (traditional) media outlets can’t be ignored. Tineke Schouten features in magazines, television shows, and newspapers, and references these appearances on her social media as a way to promote her show as well as her personality or ‘brand’. This self-promotion is part of her ‘professional’ brand.

Figure 3. ‘Visiting Pernille la Lau for Comedy Concert on March 11 and 12, (…)’
Second, posts that show rehearsal or behind the scenes footage are common on Schouten’s feed. They often display Schouten alone or with her co-stars preparing for the show, wearing part of a costume. These posts emphasize on the promotion of the show as well as the amount of preparation that precedes every show.
Third, Schouten has dedicated several posts to her experience as a comedian and the 35-year anniversary of her life as a comedian. This aspect underlines her professional accomplishments.

Figure 5. ‘#35yearsinthebusiness 35 more shows and the two seasons of T-splitsing are done. Performed 215 times, laughed 215 times. Buy the last tickets …’
These three aspects lead to an underlying theme of professionalism. As a whole, her social media feed is interwoven with her professional career. She brands herself as a comedian that’s dedicated to her job and spends most of her time, onstage and offstage, focusing on her career, as shown by the amount of behind the scenes posts. The dualism of professional life and family life emphasizes the strong contrast between the two.

One theme cannot be overlooked in her social media and in the graph, which is the most important part of her professionalism, namely her sketches. Videos of sketches take up 31% of her social media presence. These sketches count as a way of self-promotion as well as the discourse of her style of humor. In these sketches, she often plays stereotypes in day-to-day situations. She underlines these stereotypes even further by using exaggerated dialects from different parts of the Netherlands. For example, her most popular persona is a toilet lady from Utrecht. King (2002) stresses how stereotypes help a comedian, because they instantly create recognizable characteristics, which quickly conveys information about this specific character (Wilson, Gutiérrez, & Chao, 2002). This specific set of character traits serves as a base for stereotype-based humor. Park, Gabbadon & Chernin (2006) research racial stereotypes, and even though Schouten specifically plays Dutch stereotypes, the writers underline how stereotypes invite a non-critical stance towards jokes. Audiences naturalize these character traits without critically questioning their origins. These sources specify the non-critical and ‘effortless’ consumption of this type of comedy. Very similar to this experience of comedy is Friedman’s description of how respondents with low cultural capital enjoy comedy (2011).

As opposed to the other comedians that were researched, Tineke Schouten is noticeably missing in a couple categories. Although she posts some stuff about religion, mostly in relation to her mother, she shows no form of societal engagement in her online presence. Furthermore, besides her dedication to several Dutch dialects, she shows no affection towards either the Netherlands or a certain home city. As the other comedians dedicated a significantly higher amount of posts to these categories, it can be concluded that Schouten knowingly doesn’t include these categories in her brand. She has the style of a ‘true comedian’ that only provides ‘pure entertainment’ and no reflection on society.
4.3. Jochem Myjer

Another household name in the Dutch comedic landscape is Jochem Myjer. He has been performing since he won the Groninger Cabaret Festival in 1997, but the first show that appeared on television was Adéhadé in 2003, which launched his national career. This show focused on his experience living with his disorder ADD. Since then, the titles of his four shows have been a play on the word ADD or a referral to his energetic personality.

In March 2018, when this research was conducted, Myjer had three very popular social media profiles. His Twitter profile has around 1.3 million followers, his Facebook 544,000 followers, and his Instagram has 198,000 followers. On all these platforms, Myjer consistently posts a couple times a week. He mostly shares the posts on all three platforms with the same description, hashtags, and visuals, so there is no distinction of conduct on these three different platforms. For this research, 63 posts were analyzed and coded from January 1st, 2018 until March 23rd, 2018. Three of these posts were short videos. As Myjer mostly posts pictures with short texts as opposed to long blog posts or longer videos, more posts were coded to ensure a similar amount of data to the other comedians. These 63 posts were coded and categorized into different themes. The graph below shows the frequency of the different themes.

*Figure 6. Jochem Myjer’s social media categories (n = 63)*
When examining this graph, the factor of ‘positive referral’ appears to be the most prominent. Almost half of Myjer’s posts referred to different events, people and organizations in a positive light. The largest share of these posts was dedicated to recommending or admiring other comedians, acknowledging Dutch celebrities in his audience or displaying pride for friends and family. The category of referral is combined with the category of positive expressions, as these categories were continuously intertwined. When referring to other elements, Myjer used expressions similar to gratitude, enthusiasm, appreciation, amazement and admiration. In this category of positive expressions, Myjer shows a large and diverse variety of positive emotions, which results in a larger significance of this positivity to his brand. Out of the 63 posts, nine posts positively refer to celebrities, eight to other comedians, five to his family and friends, and five to events like concerts.

**Figure 7. ‘Very lovely people and a very skilled man in my audience today! : )’**

This post is a typical example of celebrity appearances. Myjer shows admiration for this actor and his wife for attending his show by giving them compliments about their personality and their talent. This functions as a two-sided celebrity endorsement. Myjer endorses these celebrities as an honor to have in his audience, while the celebrities endorse him by attending his show. Celebrity endorsements serve as a way to connect an individual with public recognition to a brand (McCracken, 1989). This connection combines the two images and
supplements to the company’s brand image (Kaikati, 1987). In this way, the many celebrities that are included profiles and positively referred to on Myjer’s social media, lead to a more inclusive and widely known brand for Jochem Myjer. As these celebrities function as actors in his network, they contribute to his brand. He portrays himself amongst these celebrities, which leads to viewing Myjer himself as a celebrity.

Figure 8. ‘Rehearsing with my heroes! #Throwbackfriday (Photo Anne Reitsma)’ (Shown in the picture: Youp van ‘t Hek, Bert Visscher, Paul van Vliet, and Herman van Veen)

However, although seemingly similar to the celebrity endorsement, the admiration he shows for his fellow comedians adds another angle to his brand. The positive emotions that are most prominent in this category are admiration and pride. These several posts show the community pride that exists amongst these group of comedians (shown in the example above). The community pride links them together instead of presenting them as competitors to each other. Fellow comedians are portrayed as heroes and icons, which adds to the ‘positivity’ of Myjer’s brand. This positivity is also underlined by Myjer’s undeniable presence in the ‘benevolence’ category. This category depicts a comedian’s dedication to charitable organizations and initiatives. Only Schouten appears in this category, but, compared to Schouten, Myjer has a vastly larger variety of codes in this category. While Schouten mentions benefit galas, Myjer shows himself visiting hospitals, classrooms, and mentions different charities several times. This variety underlines the significance of this aspect to Myjer’s brand.
Similar to Tineke Schouten, the topic of family is also apparent on Myjer’s social media, although Myjer often approaches this topic from a different angle. As a parent, he primarily mentions his children in a funny, daily anecdote (as shown in the example below) rather than Schouten’s non-comedic posts about her family.

Figure 9. ‘Melle Myjer (7) heard something in catholic school. “So, the pastor is not allowed to kiss girls?” I said: “No, because he’s married to God.” His eyes grow larger. “So he’s gay. That’s how you call that, right?” #Imomentarilywalkedoutoftheroom’

His own children are prominent on his social media profiles, but he also mentions the general topic of children more frequently than the other comedians. Myjer looks for lost stuffed animals, takes selfies with young fans, and visits children’s hospitals and school classes. 19% of his posts mention family, but 11% of his posts specifically mention the topic of children. This large dedication to family and children connotes in his ‘family friendly’ image. Furthermore, he often mentions his children combined with an observational joke, another asset that appears throughout his feed. Observational anecdotes refer to day-to-day, ordinary happenings and are often portrayed in a humorous manner.

The other large component on Myjer’s social feed is ‘nature’. Nineteen percent of his posts refer to nature, often in an admiring and loving manner.
Besides the high frequency, this code also has a high variety on Myjer’s feed. Myjer posts pictures of skies, dunes, sunsets, and all kinds of weather conditions. These outside scenes are often accompanied by another important category in Myjer’s brand, namely ‘Heimat’. This category is named after the love for a home country. As displayed in the post above, Myjer correlates nature with appreciation for the Netherlands, which is a common trend in more of Myjer’s posts. This love is divided into multiple assets on his social media. On the one hand, Myjer shows his appreciation to several typically Dutch matters, such as Dutch music, Dutch icons, Dutch television shows, and Dutch grammar. On the other hand, Myjer displays his appreciation for certain parts in the Netherlands, primarily his home town of Leiden. This affection for the Netherlands and its nature connotes into the ‘Dutchness’ of his brand.
Finally, some categories Myjer has little to no appearance in as opposed to the other researched comedians. For example, Myjer has no social media posts concerning ‘presentation’, or ‘consumption’, which represent the more capitalistic habits in life, for example new purchases or stylish appearances. This absence leads to the connotation of Myjer not minding his physical appearance or any other commercial purchases. Furthermore, in the category of humor, Myjer is the only comedian who doesn’t make sexual jokes. Myjer stays away from vulgarity, which adds to his ‘family friendly’ brand, as it doesn’t cross the line for content for children.

The sense of humor in Myjer’s social feed is limited to observational anecdotes, as mentioned before, and different kinds of wordplay. Wordplay is generally seen as a less aggressive form of comedy, or as Sturges (2010) calls it ‘playful comedy’. Zirker and Winterfroemel (2015) describe the different functions of wordplay in their book. In Myjer’s case, wordplay functions as a comical and entertaining manner, rather than a comment on society or reveal a taboo. His wordplay often refers to his own energetic behavior or the different cities he performs in.

4.4. Veldhuis & Kemper

Similar to Jochem Myjer, the duo of Remco Veldhuis and Richard Kemper started performing in 1997. They also performed in a cabaret festival in 1999, but ended up in second place. Their name became more well-known across the country in 2002, when a single from their show ‘Ik wou dat ik jou was’, reached the second spot in the Dutch Top 40 music chart. Although this duo is most famous for this song, they identify more as ‘cabaretiers’ than as musicians.4

Veldhuis and Kemper conduct their online brand as a duo. Their public profiles on Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram represent their combined personas, identical to how they perform on stage. Their ‘voice’ is combined, but they promote their individual columns on both their Twitter and their Facebook. Their online popularity isn’t equal to Myjer or Schouten, but they have a constant engagement rate of an average of 10 likes on every tweet, and around 90 likes on every Instagram and Facebook post. On March 28, 2018, they had 6,100 followers on Facebook, 16,332 followers on Twitter, and 1,540 followers on Instagram. In general, they post the same content on all three platforms, which is a mix of day-to-day observations, societal criticism, and promotions of their tour. They post a couple times a

4 https://www.veldhuisenkemper.nl/
week, which results in a medium to high density of posts. To ensure the same time period as
the other researched comedians, data was collected between January 1st and March 28th, 2018.
This resulted in 47 posts across the three platforms. Three out of 47 posts were videos. More
importantly, eleven out of 47 posts refer to their individual blog posts, which are essentially
longer than a regular post on Twitter, Facebook, or Instagram. Thus, although the amount of
posts is smaller than Schouten or Myjer, the amount of data is similar. All data was coded and
categorized into themes. The figure below shows the frequency of every theme on all three
social media platforms.

Figure 11. Veldhuis and Kemper’s social media categories (n = 47)

As mentioned before, Veldhuis and Kemper present their combined brand on all three social
media platforms. As this pair’s main pastime is their profession, their social media feed is
largely devoted to professional and promotional purposes. As the graph shows, 26% of all
posts is dedicated to promoting their current tour or show. Their significance in the traditional
media category leads to the conclusion that Veldhuis and Kemper promote themselves on
social as well as traditional media. Just like Schouten, they have a variety of ways to promote
their tour. Veldhuis and Kemper mostly use a referral to a website and saying there are still
tickets available. However, what distinguishes them from Schouten, is the high frequency of

5 In their current show, they even admitted to not seeing each other for a year during their
2017 hiatus.
sharing positive reviews. Six out of 47 posts display a positive review for their current show. Combined with the ticket sales and television appearance promotions, their social feed has an overarching professional sphere.

Figure 12. ‘Five stars in the Algemeen Dagblad for our new show ‘Just believe us!’

However, as opposed to Schouten’s professional theme, which is emphasized by her dualism with private matters, Veldhuis and Kemper keep the rest of the posts on their feed rather profession-related. Where Schouten is very present and has various codes in the day-to-day category and the family category, Veldhuis and Kemper exclusively discuss family-related or private matters in their columns. As opposed to Schouten and Myjer, they use a different angle to discuss these matters. First, these columns use observational comedy, in which they ‘observe’ and comment on the day-to-day occurrences. Second, even in their social media feed, Veldhuis and Kemper do not show pictures of their family or private surroundings. These two aspects establish a distance between Veldhuis and Kemper and their personal matters. This results in a theme called ‘non-personal’.

Most notably, political criticism is equally significant as the promotion of their tour. 26% of the posts refer to political situations in a critical manner. More importantly, in the
general category of ‘societal engagement’, of all five comedians, Veldhuis and Kemper are predominantly present. Compared to the other comedians, they have a high variety of codes in the categories of ‘national politics’, ‘religion’, and ‘equality’. Furthermore, special categories ‘economy’ and ‘dangers to society’ almost solely rely on the codes from Veldhuis and Kemper’s data. All these categories show a certain interest in society as a whole. Thus, this prominence in ‘societal engagement’ combined with the frequent appearance of a distinction within ‘societal engagement’, namely ‘political criticism’, signifies their more informed and intellectual character. To understand and enjoy the social media of these comedians, their followers require a certain level of societal knowledge.

Underlining this intellectual character is the notion of ‘Dutch identity’. As Veldhuis and Kemper discuss society as a whole, they mainly limit themselves to Dutch society. This results in a high variety of codes within the category of ‘Dutch identity’. Even though Myjer also discusses this aspect, Veldhuis and Kemper provide a different angle. As Myjer approaches the ‘Dutchness’ from a more popular angle, mainly discussing Dutch music and television, Veldhuis and Kemper approach from a more intellectual angle by discussing overall trends within Dutch society, namely unification and patriotism. Again, this underlines the intellectual character of their brand, as it requires a certain understanding of current events.

The intellectual angle is supported and augmented by their significance in the category of honest and/or positive emotions. The graph shows that positive or honest emotions take up 13% of their posts. The honesty is in line with the opinionated columns they write, and is therefore connected to societal engagement. However, these honest and positive emotions have another considerable aspect, which is related to their more emotional, vulnerable side. As Veldhuis and Kemper had to cancel some performances due to illness in the period the data was collected, they stated multiple times their regret and gratitude for their audience. Furthermore, as the example below shows, they show a more vulnerable side by stating their relieve for still having positive ratings after these canceled shows. Therefore, even though the majority of posts discuss serious and society relevant topics, this vulnerability adds to a sense of humanity to their personas.
Figure 13. ‘After two canceled shows due to voice problems, we went to Drachten on Saturday with a heavy heart... But the Leeuwarder Courant gave us four stars! Pfew.’

However, Veldhuis and Kemper are also noticeable absent in some other popular categories. For example, similar to Myjer, Veldhuis and Kemper are not present in the ‘presentation’ or ‘consumption’ categories, which leads to the same connotation of not minding their physical appearance or any other commercial purchases. More remarkably, while Veldhuis and Kemper are most known for their music, their social feed only mentions their music or music production four times out of 47 posts. All researched comedians have the same variety in this category. Thus, with this lack of the notion of music, Veldhuis and Kemper emphasize their well-rounded artistry more, as opposed to their musical talents.

Overall, the humoristic discourse throughout these different themes, their main style of conduct was using sarcasm. Their columns are often based on their sarcasm as seen in the
example below. Attardo et. al. (2003) write that the most significant markers of sarcasm are intonation and facial expression, which is hard to detect in text, but they also claim that there are syntactic, lexical, and typographical markers for sarcasm. Haiman (1998) discusses these markers. First, sarcasm is a type of pretense which produces a ‘meta-message’, which expresses a ‘hostile or ridicule’ directive. Using these criteria, the example below shows a column of Richard Kemper, in which they ridicule the residents of a southern province in the Netherlands for wanting to make their local celebrations a national holiday. By using similar terminology to how media describe Dutch immigrants, they provide a ‘double entendre’. Double entendre is a type of wordplay where the words have a double meaning, and by understanding the second layer of this text, the hearer or reader connects to the speaker or writer of the text and creates a bond, whereas the reader who doesn’t understand the double layer is excluded from this bond (Zirker and Winterfroemel, 2015). This is a form of aggressive humor, as it puts down and insults a group of individuals (Martin et al., 2003).

*Figure 14. Column on the irony of transforming a regional holiday into a national holiday*

**BRABANTISERING**

20-01-2018 Richard Kemper

Het stomste nieuws van afgelopen week kwam uit Brabant: Binnen 2 dagen waren er al 100.000 handtekeningen voor de petitie om van carnaval een nationale feestdag te maken. Volgens de initiatiefnemers (waaronder Bavaria) zouden hiermee de carnavalsmaandag en -dinsdag tot vrije dagen moeten worden gebombardeerd. Waar zal ik eens beginnen?

Ik vind het allemaal prima hoor, dat die Brabanders hier zijn, maar ik vind gewoon; ze moeten zich wel aanpassen aan de meerderheid. Maar dat doen ze niet. Sommigen wonen zelfs al hun hele leven in Nederland en kunnen nog steeds niet fatsoenlijk ABN praten. En je pikt ze er toch zo uit, met hun accent. Ze klitten altijd samen en lopen dan in driehoekige groepjes over straat. Met hun zachte g. En ze kunnen het huis wel hoor, zonder, maar ze wigen het gewoon! Kijk, vroeger wist je wel dat ze er waren, maar je hoorde er niet zoveel van. Ze liepen een beetje onder elkaar. Maar nu? Waar je ook gaat of staat, Brabanders zijn overal. En dat zullen we weten!

This double entendre is based on a mutual knowledge and is therefore another confirmation for the ‘societal engagement’ category. Furthermore, when it comes to style of humor based on the high significance of societal engagement, they use a type of informed comedy. Informed comedy and aggressive humor often work together, as they often expose ‘pomposity and smug self-deception, and undermine dull and inhuman mores’ (Henkle, 1980). By disposing these authorities, Henkle states that this type of comedy encourages the audience to understand these human behaviors and, in a way, how it mirrors contemporary society.
4.5. Tim Hartog

As opposed to the popularity of other comedians, Tim Hartog is not necessarily nationally known. Hartog is first and foremost a stand-up comedian, and he performs in small theatres across the country. Although he did have some appearances on national, commercial television, most people know him as a stand-up comedian. This means Hartog represents a niche distinction within the landscape of Dutch comedy. This comedian is included to show a wider range of popularity and to research if popularity affects the notion of a brand.

Even though Hartog is a lesser-known comedian, he still distinguishes his social media profiles between a private and a public one. On Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram he had around 500 followers at the time of research. His posting schedule is very irregular. On average, on Instagram Hartog posts 1 to 4 times a week, on Twitter he posts once a week, and on Facebook he posts from a couple time a week to not posting anything for months. Therefore, to obtain a similar amount of data to the other researched comedians, the period of research is longer and stretches from August 2017 till March 2018. Moreover, as his posts often don’t coincide on the several social media outlets like the other comedians, every single post from this period is considered and analyzed. The total of Hartog’s data is 56 posts, of which one long blog post and three videos. Because the blogpost and videos count as multiple posts, his data ends up similar to the other comedians.

As shown in the graph (figure 15), Hartog’s themes are more divided than the other comedians. He discussed a larger range and variety of subcategories. The graph shows themes from fitness to politics. Additionally, these subcategories could not be categorized into the same overarching theme.
However, when examining the graph up close, the first three categories all relate to local aspects. Local football, pride, and political commentary take up 34% of all posts, and therefore the largest share. Hartog shows the pride of his heritage. The posts show a significant identification with his home city Rotterdam and its residents. Similar to Myjer’s love for the Netherlands, Hartog shows appreciation for his native city. However, a third of his social media feed is dedicated towards this pride, and is therefore more significant to his brand. Hartog displays his pride multiple assets of the city: its buildings, the characteristics of people from Rotterdam, and the Rotterdam icons. Furthermore, the category of ‘local politics’ was solely created to fit Hartog’s codes.

Figure 16. ‘57,4% in Rotterdam is against the referendum. Makes sense, as we are never in favor of anything. #GR18 #gr2018 (Local elections 2018) #Rotterdam’.

As the post above shows, Hartog identifies himself with the people from Rotterdam by including himself in the narrative (‘we are …’), so as Myjer has his ‘Dutchness’, Hartog frequently displays his ‘Rotterdammerness’ on his social media feed.
Furthermore, unlike the other comedians, Hartog minimally discusses or shows his family. However, his personal life doesn’t go unnoticed, but it has a different angle. Hartog significantly focusses on health, fitness and appearance. 26% of his posts discuss these qualities. His emphasis on health and presentation gives him a more ‘narcissistic’ angle to his brand. His feed focuses on looks, working out, and changes in appearance. Fourteen out of 56 posts show selfies, which many theories relate to modern narcissism (Halpern, Valenzuala, and Katz, 2016; Sorokowski et al, 2015; Weiser, 2015). However, selfies and the high variety in the social media category can also relate to his age, and his modern use of social media. As Hartog is the youngest of all researched comedians, this usage of social media might be more targeted towards his own generation, namely the millennials. Flashbacks to his youth, games, hobbies, childhood bands relate to this generation on multiple levels and provides a possibility to identify with Hartog. Thus, on one side the self-related topics result in narcissism, on the other hand it displays his ‘millennialism identification’.

Overall, Hartog is also missing in several categories that are popular amongst the other researched comedians. Besides the engagement to local politics, Hartog is noticeably missing in the societal engagement category. This emphasizes his dedication to his city even further, as it connotes a lack of interest in national society, but underlines his interest in local society. Furthermore, unlike the other comedians, Hartog doesn’t refer to other comedians, events or instances, and he doesn’t display emotions on his social feed. His feed remains strictly humorous, as he handles vulnerable or tough situations by making sarcastic comments.
Unsurprisingly, Hartog shows his main stance in humor is sarcastic. Similar to Veldhuis and Kemper, he ridicules certain members of society. However, unlike Veldhuis and Kemper, Hartog mainly ridicules himself in a positive way. The post shown above is an example of self-enhancing humor (Martin et al, 2003). He makes fun of his old photos, while he also compares himself to a famous football player. This shows that Hartog doesn’t take life and his humor to seriously. Furthermore, Hartog occasionally shows his appreciation for slapstick, which is often viewed as a less aggressive and more physical form of comedy (Sturges, 2010).
5. Results interviews

5.1. Tineke Schouten

The four respondents selected for these interviews all visited Schouten’s latest show ‘T-splitsing’ in the Nieuwe Luxor theatre in Rotterdam on April 20, 2018. ‘T-spiting’, which translates to T-junction, is her 23rd show in 35 years. It opened January 2017 and due to very positive reviews from, amongst others, the Algemeen Dagblad, it reopened for a second season in 2018. The Algemeen Dagblad (hereafter mentioned as AD) described this last show as ‘possible the best show Schouten has ever done’ (Gelder, 2017). In this review, the AD emphasizes on her capability to draw laughs from the audience based on a variation of characters. From her traditional character from Utrecht ‘Bep Lachebek’ to a secret girlfriend of Dutch prime minister Mark Rutte, every funny aspect of the characters is magnified. However, the AD also expresses their surprise for the mildly and well dosed societal engagement. Besides the characters, Schouten also discusses tolerance by singing for her granddaughter, who is half-Moroccan, and addressing the PVV and Geert Wilders. She doesn’t take a tough political stance, but she does acknowledge the importance of tolerance. According to the AD, this varied content and message makes this show one of her best.

5.1.1. Schouten’s audience

Upon visiting Schouten’s show to inquire respondents, Schouten’s audience were largely above 50 years old. This observation was confirmed by respondents who visited the other comedians in this research, e.g. Myjer, Veldhuis and Kemper, or Hartog (hereafter referred to as ‘other respondent’), as they characterized Schouten’s audience as ‘somewhat older’. Furthermore, one external respondent admired her ability to build up a loyal fan base. Schouten’s own respondents also primarily describe her audience as ‘elderly’. Besides the age, respondents related the typical audience member to a lower- or medium classed education, as higher educated people would deem Schouten ‘too crude’. In addition, respondents also classified her audience as ‘purely looking for entertainment’. This aspect of Schouten’s brand is elaborated on in the chapter on her brand image as formed by other respondents. Thus, Schouten’s audience can be characterized as a loyal fan base who is above 50 years old, who is looking for non-offensive entertainment. To mirror this audience, the four respondents

---

6 Transcript, Schouten respondent 4, p. 21.
7 Transcript, Schouten respondent 1, p. 3.
were primarily older than 50, with one respondent in her 40’s. This group of respondents consisted of one female and three males.

These respondents were all asked about their sense of humor and their expectations for a comedy show. Their sense of humor was divided into their liked and dislikes in comedy. As the most prominent ‘liked’ factor, the respondents stated ‘recognizable’ content. When asked for the reasoning, one respondent stated: “Somehow I just have more feeling with it. I like it more, it appeals to me.”

The respondents claimed this identification takes place when a comedian exaggerates actions from daily life, which the audience can recognize itself in. As a style, they deemed a ‘non-obvious sense of humor’ to be important. This type of joke often has a double meaning to challenge the audience to understand the second layer before they understand the entirety of the joke. Two respondents also preferred a comedian with ‘dry’, humorous facial expressions, similar to classical comedian Toon Hermans, who famously made the audience laugh by just looking at them.

However, the respondents also showed a firm disliking towards a vulgar form of humor. For Schouten’s respondents, cursing, yelling and offending people or minorities crosses a line “For example, Hans Teeuwen, the only thing he does is hurting other people. I don’t like that at all. Tineke Schouten would never do that.”

The same respondent emphasized that he wasn’t fond of energetic comedians like Jochem Myjer and Hans Teeuwen at all. More respondents declared their dislike for energetic comedians. As a matter of fact, all respondents had a definite dislike towards Jochem Myjer, as he was found too energetic to enjoy. However, this aspect will be elaborated on in Myjer’s chapter. One respondent also showed a distaste for societal engaged comedians, and categorized them as narcissistic. This shows that Schouten’s respondents have clear symbolic boundaries towards Myjer.

Nonetheless, the overall trend amongst all respondents was their expectations for a comedy show, which was first and foremost ‘pure entertainment’. All respondents agreed on this topic. They all confirmed they expect a ‘nice evening out of the house’, where, most importantly, they could laugh and be entertained. Two respondents also expressed a preference to have a period of reflection after the show, which means that the show makes them rethink and reflect on their own life. This provides a second layer to the reasoning of
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8 Transcript, Schouten respondent 1, p. 1.
9 Transcript, Schouten respondent 2, p. 9.
10 Transcript, Schouten respondent 4, p. 23.
‘pure entertainment’, where the audience requires some sort of contemplation and not merely wants to be entertained. However, when directly asked what was most important to them, reflection or entertainment, one respondent’s answer summarized the overall sentiment of the group: “I would rather be entertained, I’d rather go to a show to relax and to come home and feel like: gosh, that was fun” 11.

Furthermore, the respondents expressed a certain animosity towards social media, particularly private matters on social media. When compared to the other respondents, this aspect must be taken into consideration, as their animosity for social media somewhat altered their stance towards Tineke’s social media post. This animosity towards social media can be related to the average age of Schouten’s respondents (on average 60 years old), because the older, or ‘baby-boom’ generation, is not as adapted to social media and the internet.

5.1.2. Tineke’s brand on social media
Although the respondents did have a certain animosity or distrust for social media, the posts that were used based on the results of the thematic coding of her social media profile were largely similar. Respondents perceived Schouten as a family person, even though some respondents admitted they didn’t commemorate an element about family in the show. Professionalism was also confirmed by the respondents, but they viewed her in a different light than as a career woman pur sang. Her professionalism is primarily perceived as her craftsmanship as a comedian. The audience admires her ‘ability to star in a revue’, and applauded her showmanship, not necessarily her focus on her career: “She’s been in the business for so long and she knows exactly what she can do and what she can’t do. She can feel it in her fingertips how the audience will react” 12.

Related to this subject of professionalism, is the respondents’ confirmation of how important her sketches and her impersonations are. They identify the sketches and impersonations as ‘pure humor’: “This picture is just pure humor. By only looking at this picture, I think: O, how I would have loved to see that.” 13

These factors show a frame alignment between her social media brand and her brand as perceived by her audience. However, one subject showed a misalignment. The subject of religion was not the most frequent theme that emerged from the social media data, but it did

11 Transcript, Schouten respondent 2, p. 10.
12 Transcript, Schouten respondent 4, p. 23.
13 Transcript, Schouten respondent 3, p. 15.
have a high variety of codes. All respondents confirmed that they didn’t correlate Schouten to the theme of religion. Most respondents couldn’t picture her in a church and rejected the idea of her mentioning her religion. This mentioning of religion led to an understanding amongst some respondents, in which they realized they did not know that much of her background. This realization results in the connotation of Schouten as a pure performer, where she plays, amongst the other characters, a characterization of herself on stage.

5.1.3. ‘Een lach en een traan’

Besides the fact that the majority of the codes were aligned with her online brand image, the audience gave more remarkable insights into their perception of her image. It adds another layer to her brand image, which is called frame amplification (Snow, Rochford, Worden and Benford, 1986). By far, the largest and most agreed upon element was her ability to convey messages with a dualism of emotion. The respondents concurred to the enormous laughter they enjoyed at her show, while also agreeing on the emotional moments, which could be translated in Dutch to ‘Een lach en een traan’. They acknowledged that the laughter was more important, as they also classified ‘pure entertainment’ as one of the largest factors in her image, but they admired her ability to also speak to the audience’s emotion.

When asked how she achieves this emotional identification, respondents answered by saying she creates recognizable situations in which she sometimes twists or magnifies it. Either she twists the narrative of the story into a comical matter, or she twists it into a more emotional story. But, the respondent could recognize and identify with both narratives. When asked why he adores her, one respondent answered: “Maybe the recognizable stories, or her hard work. Maybe also the fact that she could’ve been my mother (laughs), or my sister in this case. She’s very close to the people. (...) She could also be my neighbor, let’s put it that way.”

Respondents can envision Schouten as part of their family, which makes the emotional identification even more relevant. When describing her character, respondents also stated that Schouten is approachable, open and sincere, which underlines this idea of her as ‘close to the people’.

14 Transcript, Schouten respondent 2, p. 12.
15 Transcript, Schouten respondent 1, p. 6.
5.1.4. Tineke as a ‘pure comedian’

The comical side of this dualism is also heavily emphasized on in the interviews. Respondents point out how her impersonations are a large part of what makes her a good comedian. Schouten’s comedy for the masses is the main reason that her audience visits her shows. Her comedy is described by one of the respondents: “It can be described as: comedy for everybody. Everybody understands it, and everybody will like it in their own way.” 16

This statement stresses the general accessibility of Schouten’s humor. Respondents think of Schouten as a comedian with a low barrier to watch. They also recognized the lack of societal engagement by Schouten. However, they enjoy this aspect. Audience doesn’t need prior knowledge on societal matters to enjoy the show. Another aspect that adds to her image as a ‘pure comedian’ is that the respondents classified her as non-offensive. An earlier quote showed how she doesn’t offend anybody. Finally, Schouten is occasionally compared to André van Duin, who is a classic example of the ‘pure’, non-offensive comedian. Van Duin is also known for his sketches and characters and his avoidance of any topic that is societally relevant.

5.1.5. ‘The simple comedian’: Schouten described by other respondents

The other respondents (respondents who attended other comedians than Tineke Schouten) generally didn’t have a positive attitude towards Schouten like her own respondents did. When asked about Schouten, the external respondent replied either with a resolute dislike or a general disinterest. She was characterized as a ‘simple comedian’, with a negative stance towards her characterizations. In all but one instance, the characterizations were referred to in negative manner. Furthermore, the majority specifically referred to her characterizations from Utrecht. This is remarkable, as Schouten’s respondents only mentioned her Utrecht characterizations a few times. Also, in her online brand, Schouten was one of the comedians who didn’t discuss her love for the Netherlands or her city pride. Schouten’s connection to Utrecht is therefore inherently linked to how she is perceived by the general public.

The notion of the ‘simple comedian’ is already a degrading term in itself. Other respondents relate her to a more ‘common’ style of humor or ‘corny humor’. They claim that her humor relates to the lower-educated and people of the streets, as this audience recognized themselves in her characterizations. When asked how to describe her typical audience members, other respondents evaded the question: “I don’t want to say that, but she has a

16 Transcript, Schouten respondent 2, p. 10.
A possible explanation for this evasion is that the respondent attempts to avoid sounding degrading. Another example shown below states how education plays a part in this ‘simple humor’.

“Look, I don’t have a higher education than Mavo (currently VMBO), I’m not an intellectual whatsoever, but I think there’s a difference on an intellectual level. Schouten says three times that her pussycat is on fire and the whole audience roars with laughter. Sorry, but I’m out of that period. I just think she’s corny and not funny”.

This example characterizes the degrading simplicity they relate to Schouten. They also claim Schouten has repetitive content, so her audience is expectant of the same formula every show. To conclude, external audiences identify Schouten as a non-innovative, simple and corny comedian.

5.2. Jochem Myjer

The three respondents for Jochem Myjer all attended his new show ‘Adem in, Adem uit’ on April 12, 2018 in the Nieuwe Luxor in Rotterdam. This show opened October 2017 and represents Myjer’s sixth show to date. The NRC, a Dutch newspaper, rated this show four out of five stars. The NRC applauds his ability to balance his energetic acts with calm, emotional monologues. In this show, he discusses his childhood, his family and his admiration for nature. NRC calls his type of comedy ‘feelgood cabaret’, in which Myjer twists even the sad stuff, like death, into something beautiful. However, they emphasize that Myjer didn’t trade his signature comedian style in to be a more engaged ‘cabaretier’, as he still uses silly voices, sound effects, raps and crazy dances (Zijp, 2017). This review demonstrates how Myjer identifies himself as a comedian, but he also has a wide range of talents to his disposal, from music to storytelling.

5.2.1. Myjer’s audience

Three respondents were selected to represent Myjer’s audience. Although many male attendants were asked, three female members from the audience accepted the request to be

---

17 Transcript, Hartog respondent 1, p. 77.
18 Transcript, Veldhuis and Kemper respondent 2, p.57.
interviewed. The respondents were all between 30 and 45 years old. Upon visiting the show in the Nieuwe Luxor on April 12, there was no apparent target group for Myjer. This was confirmed by the respondents, who stated that Myjer appeals to an audience of all ages.

The respondents show a similar preference of style of humor as Schouten’s respondents, but aren’t as vocal in their preferences and dislikes. The codes had no specific outlier that was mentioned more than twice (which is the average of all codes divided by the number of quotes). They prefer recognizable content, which they can identify with. However, they do explicitly state the admiration for the craftsmanship of a good comedian. They elaborate on the different talents and skills one most acquire to tell a good story: “How he addresses an audience, how he uses his voice. It’s a certain way of telling a story”.

As for the dislikes, Myjer’s respondents dismiss vulgar and unkind jokes as non-preferable. They describe how other comedians make use of dismissive and rude jokes about minorities, which crosses the line. Furthermore, respondents dislike non-innovative comedians who don’t adapt to the test of time. They identify Tineke Schouten as an example of a non-innovative comedian.

However, as opposed to Schouten, Myjer’s respondents only expect one type of feeling before they go to a show, which is ‘pure amusement’. One respondent stated she just like “pure, very loud laughter. No moment for reflection or anything”. For them, visiting a Jochem Myjer show is a way of escapism.

5.2.2. Myjer’s brand on social media
One of the aspects that was significantly represented on social media, was ‘nature’. This theme is also one of the topics that was heavily confirmed in the interviews. Not only did respondents identify this topic as a typical subject for Myjer when they were confronted with the social media picture that represented the theme of ‘nature’, but they even brought up the topic themselves. Notably, Myjer’s respondents were the only respondents that followed their respective comedian on social media, which could influence their perception of his brand image due to their already existent knowledge of his social media. Nonetheless, when encountered with one of Myjer’s ‘nature’ posts, they all identified this aspect as typical for Myjer. They categorized him as a ‘nature person’, who is often outside. This love for nature

---

19 Transcript, Myjer respondent 2, p. 32.
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was often linked to his hobby of fishing, which is also represented in his online brand. In this case, Myjer’s online brand and his perceived brand are aligned.

Furthermore, this alignment also appeared in the category of ‘family’. His social media image had a high variety and a high frequency in the theme of ‘family’. When confronted with a ‘typical’ Myjer-anecdote on his son, respondents classified Myjer as a family man. They underlined that they identify as a family-man, because he often mentions his family and this type of anecdotes in his show. The respondents acknowledged that this was one of the facets that Myjer’s content recognizable. This facet of ‘family’ was supported by the confirmation of the theme ‘anecdotes day-to-day life’, which the respondents also recognized from Myjer’s shows.

However, Myjer’s prominent presence in the ‘heimat’ category in his social feed was somewhat thwarted. Respondents didn’t identify this pure love for his home country, but did elaborately state his love for his home town Leiden. In this case, Myjer is still aligned with a love and pride for his heimat, but this heimat is limited to his home town. Nonetheless, all respondents confirmed Myjer’s dedication to Leiden. One respondent expressed how this was also a source for identification, as she also lives in Leiden and recognizes the spots and the accent he often mentions.

Similar to Schouten’s case, one severe case of frame misalignment appeared in the interviews. When asked about Myjer’s inclination to photograph with celebrities or (positively) refer to other celebrities, respondents were hesitant if this fit in their image of Myjer. Even though they hadn’t mentioned this aspect before, all respondents abruptly contemplated his authenticity. Even though they also describe him as sincere, all respondents had doubts when it came to the sincerity of his mentioning and showing of other celebrities. One respondent even called him a hypocrite, as he portrays a certain kind of sincerity, but also only shows celebrities in his social feed as if they are his friends. Another respondent contemplated if these celebrity appearances were his method to enliven his social media and entertain his followers. The overall sentiment was the skepticism towards his intentions, but also that Myjer ‘doesn’t need this kind of celebrity acknowledgement’. The following respondent shows this divide in this quote.

“I’m on a fence. Because I still think he does it authentically, and it doesn’t seem like ‘look at me leading a jet set life, and everybody is my best friend’. But on the other hand, I don’t think he needs this”.21

__________________________

21 Transcript, Myjer respondent 1, p.30.
The respondents do emphasize that although they are on the fence about this sincerity, his overall impression is always positive. However, the theme of celebrity endorsement that rose from the social media data, is not acknowledged as such by his audience. Their main stance is thus misaligned with his framing on social media; he doesn’t need the celebrity endorsement, because they already see him as a celebrity.

5.2.3. Myjer as a vulnerable, average Dutch person
Besides the social media posts, Myjer’s respondents elaborated on their image of him. Somewhat contradictory to the last paragraph, they identified Myjer as a ‘vulnerable, sincere representation of an average Dutch person’. Despite their hesitation towards his authenticity, this leads to a connotation where the majority of Myjer’s image is after all still concentrated on his sincerity. Furthermore, supporting this statement, the respondents describe Myjer first and foremost as recognizable: “He stays personal and he tells about real life and doesn’t make it up, at least I don’t think he makes it up. I have the feeling what he’s saying is ‘real’.”

This respondent characterizes Myjer as a ‘real’ person, which is in the same narrative as recognizable, but also as his depiction of an ‘average Dutch person’. One respondent heavily emphasized on this aspect of Myjer’s image.

“I think his father has a high-functioning job, but overall he appears to originate from an average, modal, maybe just above average family. (...) Furthermore, he must have a lot of money because of his success, but he’s not showcasing his money or leading a jet set life. He stayed regular, despite his success (...) He could be like: look at me drive my Ferrari in Saint-Tropez. But he’s just regularly fishing on Texel, which makes him accessible”.

Another facet to this ‘accessible identification’, is his vulnerability. All respondents claimed that they enjoyed Myjer’s more vulnerable stance in his shows and on television, mainly referring to his previous show, in which he discussed his battle with cancer. Similar to Schouten, they love the variation between laughing and being seized with emotion, however, they relate more to Myjer on his personal level. As Schouten’s tells recognizable stories which relate to sad experiences in the lives of audience members, Myjer tells recognizable stories specifically about himself. As he is a beloved character by his audience, they identify
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and emphasize with Myjer on a more personal level. This is represented by two quotes. An aforementioned quote showed how Schouten is ‘close to the people’, while Myjer’s respondent claims that ‘he lets the people come close to him’.\footnote{Transcript, Myjer respondent 1, p. 29.} Schouten identifies with the people, as the people identify with Myjer.

Furthermore, people added another aspect to his ‘heimat’ category. In his social presence, Myjer mainly dedicates his appreciation to Leiden. However, all respondents mentioned multiple times how Myjer also appreciates Texel. Texel even exceeded the mentioning of Leiden. Therefore, Texel is also accounted for in the ‘heimat’ category of Myjer. This is another example of frame amplification.

### 5.2.4. The art of not taking yourself too seriously

Upon asking about his sense of humor, respondents primarily confessed their admiration for his well-built shows, his underlying themes, his ‘planned’ improvisations, and the link between his stories. They appreciate his craftsmanship as a comedian and a storyteller: “Sometimes you think: o, something went wrong, or, oh what a spontaneous situation, what a nice improvisation, but I understood that it’s all a part of the show, and I think he’s a master in timing”\footnote{Transcript, Myjer respondent 1, p. 27.}.

Similar to Schouten, respondents also admired his ability to stay non-offensive and his impersonations. However, unalike Schouten, respondents claimed how Myjer can mock himself. This aspect of self-mocking humor is the largest element of Myjer’s comedy as compared to the other researched comedians.

### 5.2.5. (Too) energetic – Myjer perceived by other respondents

When the other respondents were asked about Myjer, a distinct dichotomy between respondents appeared, but they were united in Myjer’s main feature, namely energy. As mainly Schouten’s respondents showed a deep aversion for Myjer and claimed he was too energetic, other respondents generally appreciated and were even enthusiastic about Myjer and his energy. Even though Schouten’s respondents showed a similar taste in humor and a similar dislike in vulgarity as Myjer’s respondents, upon mentioning his name they showed a sentiment of disgust towards Myjer. Schouten’s respondents stated that Myjer was simply
‘too energetic’, which to them, was an annoying feature. Two respondents claimed this
disgust was so significant, they couldn’t watch Myjer more than five minutes.

On the other side of the spectrum were the other other respondents, who often
appreciated his energy on stage. They related his energy to a qualitative and funny
performance. Taking into account this energy and quality of the performance, one respondent
identified Myjer more as a comedian than as a ‘cabaretier’.

Similar to Schouten, Jochem was perceived as a comedian with impersonations.
However, 50% of the respondents appreciated his impersonations, while the others disliked
this aspect. Often this dislike was displayed in combination with his abundance of energy.
Unlike Schouten, the characterization of Myjer as a pure comedian was more questionable to
the other respondents. One respondent calls Myjer: “A comedian for commercial television,
who tend to go for the easy guys”. 26

When asked about what makes a comedian ‘easy’, this respondent answered
‘characterizations’. Thus, half of the respondents categorize Myjer more in the easily
entertained, ‘pure comedic’ side of Schouten. However, the other other respondents
appreciated his honesty and vulnerability, similar to Myjer’s own respondents. Furthermore,
they also admire his sense for absurdism, in which he twists ordinary actions into something
bizarre.

Finally, they confirm the different themes that fit in Myjer’s brand, namely ‘family’,
‘craftmanship’, ‘heimat’ (both Leiden and Texel), and ‘anecdotes daily life’. To conclude, a
larger alignment emerges from the external data than the data from Myjer’s respondents,
which results in a larger overall public knowledge on Myjer.

5.3. Veldhuis and Kemper
The four respondents for Veldhuis and Kemper all attended their new show ‘Geloof ons nou
maar’, which opened in January 2018. Veldhuis and Kemper have been performing for fifteen
years, but were on a yearlong hiatus since their last show. The AD gave their returning show
five out of five stars. In this show, Veldhuis and Kemper discussed how they personally
experienced their hiatus, emphasizing on the differences between the two. The AD
emphasizes on the layered elements of the show, where the two comedians jump back and
forth in time to relate their current stories to their stories from the past, or where they perform
their ‘beautiful’ songs. The AD identifies Veldhuis and Kemper as typical ‘cabaretiers’, who

26 Transcript, Hartog respondent 3, p. 85.
use humor as their weapon to battle displeasure, inability and discomfort. All in all, the AD applauds Veldhuis and Kemper for staying relevant in the zeitgeist (Gelder, 2018).

5.3.1. Veldhuis and Kemper’s audience
The four respondents were asked to participate in this research while attending Veldhuis and Kemper’s show in the Oude Luxor on April 19, 2018. Out of the respondents, two female and two male respondents were willing to participate. Three out of four are just above 50, while one respondent is in her 40’s. Upon examination of the audience on April 19, this representation mirrors the audience of that night. Furthermore, Veldhuis and Kemper’s typical audience was mainly identified as middle-aged, which means, according to the respondents, between 30 and 65 years old. The audience was also categorized as having mixed educational backgrounds. Only one respondent remarkably stated that when Veldhuis and Kemper performed in smaller towns, their audience was more likely to be a cultural elite. According to this respondent, people who visit smaller, local theatres are more prone to be culturally educated, as opposed to the larger audiences in the big cities, who are not necessarily high educated. This remark can be an interesting topic for future research on comedic audiences in rural and urban areas.

When analyzing the sense of humor of the participants, it can be concluded that they differ from the previous comedians. Besides the fact that they also dislike vulgarity, although with less density, the audience mainly prefers a variation of comedic styles, where they could be entertained but also reflect on some more serious matters. One respondent even stated that he likes to be disarmed by the sincerity of a comedian. Furthermore, as Schouten and Myjer’s respondents heavily disliked unkind jokes, Veldhuis and Kemper’s respondents enjoy a somewhat ‘sharper, more crude’ humor. Where Myjer and Schouten’s respondents drew a line between utmost sincerity and potentially hurting people, Veldhuis and Kemper’s respondents enjoy a mild ridiculing. They name several examples of comedians that personify this type of comedy, namely Neerlands Hoop, Theo Maassen, and Hans Teeuwen.

Not surprisingly, unlike the respondents of the other comedians, ‘pure entertainment’ was not their main expectance for a comedy show. The respondents expressed an interest to have a moment of reflection during and after the show. They were more open to broadening their view of the world or looking at things differently, while also enjoying and being entertained by a comedy show. The following respondent clarifies this motivation.
“I’m not into laughing just to laugh, it’s not necessary for me. But if they hold up a mirror for you, you tend to laugh at yourself too. It makes you think, like: yes, maybe I could broaden my view a bit more.”\textsuperscript{27}

Furthermore, instead of visiting already established comedians, they enjoyed discovering new comedic talent in smaller theatres. There was a strong sentiment amongst respondents to give lesser-known talent ‘a chance’. Veldhuis and Kemper are often categorized in the middle, as they are not nationally well-known, but they’ve established themselves amongst a loyal following. Therefore, it’s not surprising Veldhuis and Kemper perform in the Oude Luxor, which is a more traditional, smaller theatre than the Nieuwe Luxor in Rotterdam.

\textbf{5.3.2. Veldhuis and Kemper on social media}

The largest frame alignment with their social media brand is the confirmation of their day-to-day observations. Respondents stated that Veldhuis and Kemper often underlined own ‘regular’ experiences with a bit of humor, which makes them also more relatable. When asked about these day-to-day observations, respondents often spontaneously initiated an anecdote from their own daily life, as if to show the similarity between them and Veldhuis and Kemper. Sarcasm was also confirmed as one of their humor styles. The respondents weren’t surprised when asked about if sarcasm fit in their image of Veldhuis and Kemper.

A similar sort of frame alignment is related to the inclusion of celebrities, often other comedians, on their social media. As opposed to Myjer’s respondents, who formed a distrust on his authenticity when the celebrity post was shown, Veldhuis and Kemper’s respondents characterized this referral as an admiration for more established comedians. As the specific post pictured Youp van ‘t Hek, who is a well-established ‘cabaretier’, who has been performing for over thirty years, respondents introduced this admiration to initiate a conversation about the more ‘oldtimer’ comedians, and how different generations of comedians educate and help each other. Furthermore, they imagined Veldhuis and Kemper to be nervous when Youp van ‘t Hek was in their audience. This signifies that Veldhuis and Kemper are perceived as ‘less than’, the classical ‘cabaretiers’, and are still educating themselves, while the classical ‘cabaretiers’ are the ‘crème-de-la-crème’.

However, when asked about their societal and political engagement, respondents were very contradictory in their answers. Half of the respondents stated that they didn’t envision them as political critics, but they acknowledged that they did envision them as societal critics:

\textsuperscript{27} Transcript, Veldhuis and Kemper respondent 1, p. 59.
“It (political criticism) is not a big part of what they do, but it’s good that it’s included”. 28 The other half confirmed their image of Veldhuis and Kemper did include political criticism. Overall, societal engagement was often mentioned more frequently as fitting to their brand than political engagement, which aligns with the frame of their social media brand, as societal engagement is an overarching theme that includes political criticism. But, it is important to take into account that Veldhuis and Kemper are not considered as politically engaged as their online brand portrays.

5.3.3. Sincere as a duo

Overall, the respondents felt the social media posts represented Veldhuis and Kemper’s image well. However, there are components to add to this image. Many codes that were given to Veldhuis and Kemper were the same as to other comedians, but also didn’t appear as often as with other comedians. For example, Veldhuis and Kemper were considered to be recognizable, personable, while their content depicted everyday life scenarios with underlying themes. Nonetheless, Veldhuis and Kemper were considered as ‘sincere’ the most frequent out of all comedians. Their sincerity aligns with honesty in their social media brand and is thus far not surprising.

Regardless, one aspect did not arise from their social media feed, namely the chemistry they achieved as a duo. Many respondents applauded their way of anticipating on each other, and viewed it as intriguing to look at. They challenged each other, which the audience appreciated. However, when asked which one was Veldhuis and which one Kemper, none of the respondents had a clear answer. This signifies their strong brand as a duo. Even though they tell individual stories, they stand together as artists. Their chemistry is part of their brand.

5.3.4. Ridiculing themselves and others

Respondents didn’t state one specific form of humor as typical for Veldhuis and Kemper. Instead, they gave a whole range of comedy styles. First, they gave a general style of ridiculing certain groups of society. Respondents take this lightly, as the general tone of their ridiculing is mostly light and taken with a grain of salt. Similar to their aforementioned general sense of humor, they don’t take offense when it slightly crosses a boundary: “There

28 Transcript, Veldhuis and Kemper respondent 3, p. 77
was a sketch (...) A couple of students boasting: let’s jokily fight a group of immigrants. That’s what I can remember, that was a funny scene, apart from the topic”.29

Even though they recognize the offense of the sketch, the respondents take the scene lightly. Along the same line, similar to Myjer, respondents stated that Veldhuis and Kemper don’t take themselves that seriously. So, mockery, either for themselves or other groups, wasn’t a surprising aspect of Veldhuis and Kemper’s brand.

Respondents also acknowledged Veldhuis and Kemper’s talents in impersonations. When asked if they mean impersonations like Myjer or Schouten, the respondents immediately stated the difference, as Veldhuis and Kemper only used their impersonations as part of a punchline. They confirmed that impersonations were not an integral part of their humor.

However, wordplay was one of the traits that did characterize Veldhuis and Kemper, according to one respondent. He emphasized on how it relates to their intelligence.

“They play with language, play with words. I can’t think of an example right now, but you can clearly see that these people also participate in De Slimste Mens (Dutch game show, loosely translated to: The Smartest Human), they are really smart guys. They have a lot of general knowledge. I love it when they play with language, play with words, but also when they incorporate events from news programs”.

This admiration for their intellectual jokes relate back to the topic of societal engagement. It strengthens the argument that their intelligence is part of their brand.

5.3.5. Serious singers – Other respondents’ perception of Veldhuis and Kemper

Compared to the aforementioned comedians, the other respondents had significantly less information or data to analyze on Veldhuis and Kemper. Taken into account that four of the ten respondents did not know Veldhuis and Kemper, the lack of usable codes is not extraordinary. Most of the respondents only knew Veldhuis and Kemper from their one hit song in 2003 and thus characterized them primarily as singers rather than ‘cabaretiers’ or even comedians. With only the mere knowledge of that song, they did identify them as ‘recognizable’.

Furthermore, they acknowledged the chemistry between them and their performance as a duo. One respondent enjoyed and admired their back and forth on stage: “Most of the
time, when there’s more than one ‘cabaretier’ on stage, it quickly gets annoying or too polished. But yes, they do it very well, as they anticipate to each other in a pleasant manner.”

Their societal engagement is also discussed, but the other respondents call it a ‘serious undertone’. Two different respondents categorized them into serious, which had a negative undertone. Respondents emphasized that seriousness was not a part of their ideal comedy evening, as it requires reflection.

5.4. Tim Hartog
Tim Hartog is a comedian of a different capacity. A young stand-up comedian from Rotterdam, who has not had his national break (yet). He performs solo, but also as MC and presenter of stand-up comedy nights. The organization of these stand-up nights describes him as ‘hometown hero’, who’s endearing, enthusiastic and highly-strung. He reached the finals of the prestigious Leids Cabaret Festival and appeared for three episodes in a Dutch improvisation show. Naturally, his reach is far smaller than the other comedians, which results in a lesser-known image, which may affect the notion of his brand.

5.4.1. Tim Hartog’s audience
As he doesn’t currently have one solo program on tour, Hartog is primarily performing as presenter of the stand-up comedy nights. These stand-up comedy nights in Rotterdam are organized by one organization and performed in multiple small theatres throughout Rotterdam. Stand-up comedy nights are often comprised by many stand-up performers with different styles of performances, so audience members don’t attend these nights for one performer as the other audience members. However, several of the respondents stated that they appreciate Hartog as a presenter, and confirm that he is a constant factor in this evenings, which contributes to their motivation to come.

The respondents were selected on the evening of April 5 in the Walhalla theatre in Rotterdam South, on one of the monthly stand-up evenings in Rotterdam. Three diverse respondents were willing to participate: one female in her 20’s, one male in his 50’s, and one female in her 60’s. Upon examining the entirety of the audience, this group represents the
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audience moderately, as the age ranges from 20 until 70-year olds, and the gender is evenly represented.

As for the sense of humor, similar to the composition of the audience, is very varied. Recognizable themes are the most mentioned amongst the respondents. Comparable to the respondents of other comedians, they recognize the narrative from their own experiences and identify with the comedian.

The respondents also confirmed they prefer a more ‘absurdist’ type of humor, where Hartog tells a story that’s out of the box. Along the same line of absurdism is the preference for ordinary actions that get twisted by the storyteller. A third and similar aspect is misleading humor. Where the audience might think the story is going to end a certain way, but is being misled. One respondent connects this to corny humor, and gives comedian Herman Finkers as an example. This is an example of observational comedy.

“Yes, Finkers comes from the same city, so I know his humor a bit. It’s that dry, corny, Twents sense of humor. In the beginning, I didn’t like it at all, but I realized it’s an acquired taste, when your dry humor misleads the audience (...) A bit confronting, a bit taking you along for the ride, and a bit misleading”.

On the other hand, the respondents also preferred societal engagement in the storyline of the comedians. One respondent claims comedy is the funniest when it’s societal engaged.

“Comedy might be the funniest when it’s societal engaged. That strikes me the most at those Correspondence dinners. It’s funny whether it’s from the left wing or the right wing. (Interviewer asks why). Well, it appeals to a certain world view, where something that’s not right can be improved, it’s always nice to wind yourself up over something”.

Later in the interview, the respondent repeated how relieving it is to wind yourself up and make yourself angry on societal topics. He explained that if a comedian winds himself up on stage, the comedian serves as a substitute for the expression of societal frustrations of the audience. In this way, the respondent identifies with the comedian and his ‘anger’ on society.

Upon asked what they expected from a comedy show, the respondents stated pure entertainment as one of the motivations. However, they also did emphasize that they enjoy discovering new artists, similar to Veldhuis and Kemper’s respondents. Furthermore, the
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respondents like to be surprised by comedians. This leads to a combination where they would like to be surprised by new talent.

5.4.2. Hartog on social media

Hartog was the only one of the researched comedians, where an almost complete frame misalignment appeared between his perceived image by his audience and his online brand. All but one theme was discarded by the respondents.

First and foremost, Rotterdam was the only theme that emerged both from the interview data and the social media data. All respondents replied multiple times that Hartog discusses Rotterdam as well as embodies Rotterdam. As two of the respondents were also from Rotterdam themselves, an overall sentiment of pride was displayed for both Rotterdam and Hartog as a typical Rotterdam comedian. They even remembered specific jokes he told about Rotterdam: “For example, that the Germans didn’t bomb South Rotterdam in May 1940, because they thought they had already done that (laughs)”.

Furthermore, the respondent from The Hague also characterized him as a typical ‘Rotterdamer’: “Well, it’s a bit ... Rotterdam is a bit self-chastening, that fits Rotterdam. I think this post is typically Rotterdams and I think he’s also typically Rotterdams”.

Respondents didn’t envision political criticism as one of Hartog’s features. In their eyes, Hartog was apolitical, as he never mentioned any politics in his performances. Furthermore, according to the respondents, Hartog also never displayed a love for the local football club, or football in general. The themes of fitness and sarcasm were denounced as much as they were confirmed. This strong trend of acknowledging and discarding themes shows the limited possibilities of a lesser known comedian. As they know Hartog only from stand-up evenings, he’s not engrained in public memory as a certain brand, it’s difficult for the respondents to exactly specify their perceived image of Hartog. Nonetheless, this lack of cohesive codes does prove that the respondents of the other researched comedians perceive their image of the comedians mostly through media and the public image, rather than through their shows. As the other comedians have a more cohesive frame alignment, it can be assumed that their brand is more widely known.
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5.4.3. Hartog as a stand-up comedian

The same phenomenon takes place when the respondents are asked to generally describe Hartog. All themes mentioned are in a wide range of different codes, which can’t easily be categorized. Respondents mention ‘absurdism’, ‘family’, ‘poor upbringing’, ‘repetitive’, ‘underlying themes’, ‘societal engagement’, ‘twisting ordinary actions’, all these themes were more popular with other comedians and also mentioned only by one respondent. None of the respondents agreed on these themes. This proves the aforementioned statement of the lesser-known comedian who equals a lesser-known and a less specific brand.

However, there were a few themes that were repeated by more than one respondent. Coincidentally, these are all traits of a stand-up comedian, as they all include the audience themselves. For example, themes as ‘inspired by the audience’ and ‘interaction with the audience’ are related to how a stand-up comedian gets his material from responses in the audience. ‘Abruptly changing subjects’ is another feature of a stand-up comedian, as they often don’t have an overall theme for their set. More importantly, Hartog is described as sharp-witted. Stand-up comedians are often quick on their feet, as they have to outsmart and surprise their audience. Although as a stand-up comedian, Hartog ridicules members of his audience, respondents admire his inoffensiveness and his ability to make one joke a running gag.

“He anticipates and plays the audience like no other, like when he outwits someone in the audience and makes this a running gag, that it comes back later in the show. And that the story still fits, I like that in a comedy show”.\(^{37}\)

So, even though his brand his hard to grasp for the audience, he does establish himself primarily as a resourceful stand-up comedian from Rotterdam.

5.4.4. Tim Hartog explained by other respondents

As mentioned before, Hartog is not as well-known as other comedians, so unsurprisingly eight out of eleven respondents didn’t know Tim Hartog and could therefore not explain his image. The other respondents that did (vaguely) know Hartog supported the aforementioned brand as a ‘stand-up comedian’. They acknowledged both his wit and the interaction with the audience. One respondent expressed a dislike for his corny humor and claimed it was too rehearsed.

\( ^{37}\) Transcript, Hartog respondent 1, p. 82.
5.5. **Comparing the final brand of the comedians**

As can be seen in Table 1, the combined themes of both the codes from social media and the interviews show how these different perspectives can form a more inclusive brand. As they all play as actors in a never-ending network of interacting elements, by combining the data of both the qualitative content analysis and the interviews, the final brand becomes more well-rounded. The bold themes represent the themes that appeared in their social media, which, with the exception of one comedian, were nearly all confirmed by their own respective audiences. However, the audiences often elaborated on these aspects or displayed another facet of their brand, which created other themes (the ones in normal font) and presents a more inclusive brand. The three first comedians (or duos) exemplify how frame amplification works, the initial online frame is extended by the perception of the respondents. Finally, other respondents often exposed an angle that was often portrayed as more generally known by the public. These themes are shown in italic.

As the chapter about Tim Hartog showed, when the brand of a comedian is more well-known, it becomes easier to identify this brand. However, when it comes to the motivations of the visitors, whether it’s pure entertainment, reflection or discovering new talent, a spectrum can be made from purest comedian to purest ‘cabaretier’, which reflects the motivations of their visitors.

Table 1. Comparing brands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comician</th>
<th>Combined brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tineke Schouten</td>
<td>‘pure comedian’, ‘family’, ‘emotional identification’, ‘simple comedian’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Hartog</td>
<td>‘Rotterdam’, ‘Pure stand-up comedian’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6. Comparing the audiences

The interview respondents were also asked to name their favorite comedians. The figure shown (figure 18) displays the preferences of each audience. This figure summarizes several trends in this research.

On the one hand, it depicts the popularity of more crude and line crossing cabaretiers amongst the audience members of both Veldhuis and Kemper and Hartog, namely Theo Maassen and Hans Teeuwen. These audiences are more inclined to prefer comedians who are more shocking. Furthermore, both audiences enjoy finding new, lesser-known, but talented artists, hence the category of ‘unknown comedians’ being linked to both audiences. However, Hartog’s audience is more prone towards the same comedians that Schouten’s audience prefer (Kaandorp & Finkers), who have the same comedic style of observatory anecdotes mixed with emotional and absurdist songs. Moreover, Veldhuis and Kemper’s audience was more prone to name traditional, societal engaged cabaretiers like Jan-Jaap van der Wal and Claudia de Breij. They also tend to like more cabaretier duos, like Van der Laan and Woe. These preferences show Veldhuis and Kemper belong in a more traditional ‘cabaret’-category, as Hartog fits somewhere between comedian and cabaretier.
On the other hand, the audiences of Myjer, and specifically Schouten, show appreciation for an older generation of comedians and cabaretiers. Schouten’s audience, most likely due to their older age, names classic comedian Toon Hermans, which fits her brand of ‘pure comedy’. It’s important to note that Schouten’s respondents named several comedians they liked, but acknowledged they only visited Schouten in the theatre. Remarkably, although Myjer and Schouten’s audience seem to have a somewhat similar taste in comedians, Schouten’s respondents dismissed Myjer as ‘too energetic’. This notion fits their typical public, as Schouten’s is categorized as ‘older’, and Myjer as ‘all ages’, and his brand is specifically family friendly.
6. Discussion & conclusion

This current study focuses on a mixed methods approach, in which the brand of four comedians is analyzed and tested on visitors of their most current show. This provides an in-depth evaluation of both the motivation of the visitor and the brand image of the comedian. To connect these two aspects, the discussion will first elaborate on the brands of the comedians, how these brands relate to each other’s symbolic boundaries, and how they fit within the scheme of their comedic cultural capital. Afterwards, the brands and their embodied cultural capital are analyzed in relation to the evaluations of the respondents.

6.1. Discussion

6.1.1. Comedians

After assessing the intended and perceived sides of the brand images, all four comedians have their own substantial brand. Surprisingly, three of the four comedians fit within the historical trend of Dutch comedians. Even though the three originators of modern Dutch cabaret and comedy, Kan, Sonneveld, and Hermans, were in the height of their popularity at least 60 years ago, three of the researched comedians show similarities with the features of these ‘original comedians’.

Tineke Schouten’s key features of her brand are her affinity to her family, the recognizability she evokes by appealing to the audience’s feelings, and most importantly, her role as a ‘pure comedian’. On her social media, her references to her sketches and characterizations are the largest part of her self-promotional posts. Both her respondents and the other respondents refer to her, either in an admiring or a degrading manner, as a comedian pur sang. Furthermore, the respondents also admired her showmanship, and identified her show as a revue multiple times. With these brand traits, she falls in the same category as Wim Sonneveld, the originator of the Dutch comedic revue. Sonneveld also appealed to his audience through sentimental, recognizable stories (Langenberg & IJdens, 1995). Schouten and Sonneveld both use affiliative humor to appeal to their audience (Martin et al, 2003). It can be identified as light, non-societal engaged humor that bonds the audience. Respondents also place her more amongst the likeness of traditional comedians like Toon Hermans and Youp van ‘t Hek, as can be seen in figure 18. According to Kuipers (2001), this result is not surprising. The appreciation for these older, more traditional comedians often comes from more senior people, which is the average audience of Schouten. Besides her likeness to Sonneveld, Schouten diverts somewhat more to the left side of the comedic spectrum (as seen
in figure 19) than Sonneveld originally did. As Sonneveld’s brand was more of a showman, Schouten’s brand relies more on her characterizations and her sketches, which are one of the key qualities of ‘pure’ comedy (Kuipers, 2006; King, 2002; Wilson, Gútierrez, & Chao, 2002).

Figure 19. the placement of comedians within the range of comedy to cabaret.

Having some similarities with Schouten’s comedic brand, Myjer is on the same end of the spectrum. Myjer’s brand also relies on the aspect of family. Moreover, also similar to Schouten, one of the main key features of Myjer’s appeal to the public is that the audience can identify with Myjer. The respondents identified Myjer as a down-to-earth, typically Dutch person, who appears to be ‘one of them’. Myjer appeals to the audience by discussing the most insignificant topics: “When he talks about Texel, and he’s about to go there by boat. That kind of stuff, I have that too when I’m in the car on vacation, that holiday feeling”. 38 Myjer’s positivity adds to his affiliative humor, where he’s not vulgar or offensive, but he discusses day-to-day anecdotes. However, the way he discusses these topics is different than Schouten. Since Myjer uses observational comedy to narrate his day-to-day activities, which

38 Transcript, Myjer respondent 3, p. 40.
is another example of ‘pure comedy’ (Double, 2014). He surprises the audience with a twist in the end of his story. Similar to Toon Hermans, Myjer can be seen as an ‘entertainer of the people’. Hermans was often praised for his ability to make the audience laugh with just one look. Like Hermans, Myjer’s mimicry and timing is also praised by his audience: “his acte de présence is already funny, how he looks, how he talks, the complete package”. This admiration for his craftsmanship as a comedian fits more within the limits of a cabaretier. As cabaret pushes more boundaries in the format and the creativity of the show. Furthermore, in the network of figure 18, the respondents place Myjer amongst more crude comedians and cabaretiers. This results in Myjer being a more hybrid version, somewhere on the spectrum between a comedian and a cabaretier (see figure 19). One aspect in Myjer’s brand makes his audience question his authenticity, which is his inclusion of other famous Dutch people on his social media. This is a very important form of misalignment to take into account for this research, as it endangers his positive brand. According to Labrecque, Markos, and Milne (2011), this instance is a clashing of different brand identities, as his positive brand clashes with the consumer’s perception of a ‘shallow fame hunter’. According to these academics, this misalignment and the rising need for authenticity from consumers, can lead to negative repercussions on his brand image. This misalignment shows how important and significant appropriate online self-branding is to consumers.

As their audiences prefer to be entertained rather than enlightened, and thus overall respect the function of the show more than the form, both Schouten’s and Myjer’s audiences can be considered as having functional dispositions. Their desire to be purely entertained leads to a more escapist attitude towards a comedy show (Daenekindt, 2017). Furthermore, the audience’s appeal to the content of recognizability and family-related matters also establishes their functional disposition.

Holbrook (1999) compares a more popular approach versus the expert judgment on film in his research on film consumption. His approach to a ‘popular appeal’ can be compared to Bourdieu’s approach to functional dispositions, as he links the popular appeal to a somewhat lower class. Even though Holbrook analyzes the consumption of films, his conclusion matches the results of this research. According to Holbrook, popular appeal has a tendency to be more favorable of non-offensive entertainment, that focusses on family. This can be compared to Myjer’s and Schouten’s dedication to narratives about family. Furthermore, popular appeal also responds more favorably towards American-made movies.

---

39 Transcript, Myjer respondent 3, p. 39.
as they create more familiar settings, which is similar to Myjer’s dedication to the ‘heimat’ category and his identification as a ‘regular, Dutch person’. This way, Myjer creates a familiar setting for his audience. Holbrook emphasizes on how popular appeal relies on the familiarity in movies, which can be compared to the recognizability in both Myjer’s and Schouten’s brand.

However, the dislike of Schouten’s respondents towards Myjer cannot go unnoticed. If Myjer and Schouten are so similar in appeal to their brand, how can Schouten’s respondents despise Myjer that much? Bryson (1997) explains this phenomenon in his research on musical dislikes amongst lower-educated Americans. In his research, less educated people tend to dislike more genres than high educated respondents. According to Bryson, low-educated listeners of a certain genre developed a group identity, in which they bonded with other listeners of the same genre, but dismissed other genres. A similar trend appears amongst Schouten’s audience, where the respondents disliked Myjer, but often didn’t know more ‘legitimate’ artists like Veldhuis and Kemper. This conclusion is congruent with Kuiper’s statements on lower-educated respondents who often don’t know more artistic or innovative comedians, so they are not able to express an opinion on these artists (Kuiper, 2001).

Finally, it is notable that Myjer’s respondents main reason to visit him was to enjoy ‘pure entertainment’, which indeed is a functional disposition. However, there’s a deviating trend amongst Myjer’s respondents in which they distinctly admire his craftsmanship as a comedian, which signifies their appreciation for the form of the show. This leans more towards an aesthetic disposition. Therefore, his placement in the network of comedians (figure 18) and this admiration for his craft, places him somewhere more to the middle in the spectrum between comedian and cabaretier.

6.1.2. Cabaretiers

On the other side of the spectrum, there’s the cabaretiers. Veldhuis and Kemper’s brand is very congruent with the key features of cabaret. Cabaret leans more towards a satirical and cynical sense of humor, which can be characterized as a more aggressive humor (Martin et al., 2003).

Veldhuis and Kemper’s use of ridiculing falls in the same category of aggressive humor. Satire, cynicism, and ridiculing are all based on degrading other people to entertain your audience. Furthermore, cabaret is often based on societal engagement (Bakker & Ravesloot, 2014). Veldhuis and Kemper’s societal engagement is shown in their online brand image as well as their perceived brand image. The format of their show is somewhat more innovative.
than the other comedians, which is admired by the respondents. Breaking theatrical boundaries and including free-standing songs in their show is a feature of Veldhuis and Kemper as well as cabaret (Langenberg & IJdens, 1995). This critical note is also reminiscent of one of the original comedians, namely Wim Kan. Kan uses an alternation of anguish and humor to criticize society and politics (Ibo, 1982). This also relates to a more aggressive kind of humor. All these features fit within the brand of a cabaretier. This brand is even more emphasized when looking at their placing in the network of comedians (figure 18), which shows their connection to more innovative, more societal engaged comedians.

As Veldhuis and Kemper’s respondents didn’t solely expect and desire pure entertainment in a comedy show, but also expect some type of reflection after the show, these respondents belong in the category of a more formally aesthetic disposition. Respondents with an aesthetic disposition appreciate the form, the aesthetic and the craftsmanship of the cultural product more than the function (Daenekindt, 2017). They expect to be amazed and provoked by the content of the show. Veldhuis and Kemper’s respondents evidently fall in this category: “I don’t want to laugh just to laugh, but also ponder, maybe also look at things from a different perspective”.40 This relates to a more cultivated disposition of an audience who wants to be enlightened by a cultural product and intellectually stimulated (Kuipers, 2001). This attitude towards Veldhuis and Kemper makes their content and brand more ‘legitimate’, as opposed to the other comedians. The often degrading attitude towards Schouten confirms this opposition of comedy as illegitimate, and cabaret as legitimate. Schouten is described as ‘corny’ and simple.

“Look, I don’t have a higher education than Mavo (currently VMBO), I’m not an intellectual whatsoever, but I think there’s a difference on an intellectual level. Look, Schouten says three times that her pussycat is on fire and the whole audience roars with laughter. Sorry but I’m out of that period. I just think she’s corny and not funny”.41

This proves the opposition that Kuipers (2001) introduces, where a more higher educated type of humor can be identified as more elitist. According to Friedman and Kuipers (2013) this elitist attitude establishes a sense of exclusivity, which is “central to their enjoyment” (p. 184). Even though in some categories, like word play, all comedians are present. Veldhuis and Kemper’s respondents approach their word play from a more intellectual angle. They

40 Transcript, Veldhuis and Kemper respondent 3, p. 60.
41 Transcript, Veldhuis and Kemper respondent 2, p. 57.
identify their word play as a mark of intelligence. This preference for intelligent humor suggests that intelligence is a significant symbolic boundary for their respondents.

The ‘legitimacy’ of Veldhuis and Kemper is further underlined in their similarity to Myjer in the category of including other celebrities, however, dissimilar to Myjer, respondents didn’t question their authenticity. However, they limited the appearance of famous people to the admiration of other, already established comedians. As opposed to Myjer, whose inclusion of famous people presented him with a case of misalignment and misbranding, Veldhuis and Kemper appear to be ‘legitimate’ enough to include this in their brand, as their respondents didn’t question their authenticity. Veldhuis and Kemper’s admiration of other, already established comedians resulted in respondents acknowledging that Veldhuis and Kemper belong amongst the other ‘legitimate’ comedians and cabaretiers.

Their elitist status is also comparable to Holbrook’s (1999) ‘expert judgment’ on films. According to Holbrook, respondents with an expert judgment (the antithetical response to the ‘popular appeal’) appreciate deviations and departures from conventional and familiar settings, and enjoy a more artistic approach to cinema. This desire to be provoked and surprised is also a feature of cabaret and Veldhuis and Kemper.

6.1.3. Stand-up comedians

Tim Hartog’s brand and humor don’t fit within the conventions of either ‘pure comedy’ or cabaret, but are somewhat congruent with the features of stand-up comedy. His respondents do establish his categorization as a stand-up comedian by underlining his connection to the audience (Brodie, 2008). The respondents also acknowledged his observational comedy, which is also a feature of stand-up comedy. Most importantly, Hartog’s dedication to his home city of Rotterdam was the only congruent aspect of both his online brand image as his perceived brand image. As stated earlier in this research, Hartog’s brand image included an extended array of actors in his network, which were different for both the online brand image and the perceived image of the respondents. This resulted in frame misalignment, which means that his brand cannot easily be framed. This could be the result of his lesser-known identity, and therefore his brand image not being displayed in traditional media ad widely as the other comedians. The respondents can only have a perception of him through his shows, which results in the only memorable feature of his affection for Rotterdam. However, upon doing more research, Khamis, Ang, and Welling (2017) study the effects of self-branding in the social media age, with a specialization in the effects on millennials. One of Hartog’s features in his online brand was the apparent presence in the categories of consumption and
presentation. According to Khamis, Ang and Welling, younger people are more receptive towards “good looks, good living and conspicuous consumption (through artfully composed images of outfits, make-up, meals, holiday resorts, etc.)” (p. 199). This trend results in a more image-centric focus on social media, which avoids substance and depth. This trend is similar to Hartog’s approach to social media. It is a possibility that Hartog tries to appeal his brand image to the younger generation. However, his audience is characterized as ‘of all ages’, so there’s a misconnection in his target group. Hartog’s attempt to appeal to a younger audience, while he is popular amongst a wide range of ages, leads to a case of misbranding. In addition to Myjer’s questionable authenticity, this underlines the importance of synchronizing the online brand image with the perceived brand image.

As for the motivations and evaluations of the respondents, Hartog’s respondents fall more in the category of aesthetic dispositions. His placement in the comedic network (see figure 18) shows the most variety of all. His respondents have the most overlapping choice of comedians with the respondents of the other comedians. They show an appreciation for more traditional comedians, as well as cabaretiers, but also show an interest in lesser-known and international comedians. According to Bryson (1997), a wider range of taste results in a higher status of cultural capital. Moreover, Hartog’s respondents show an appreciation for discovering new talents: “To be amused, to listen to surprising thoughts, to see new people”. Even more importantly, besides entertainment, they express a desire to be surprised and discover new talent: This willingness to be surprised connotes into an openness to all kinds of comedic experiences, which translates more into a formally aesthetic disposition, as it displays a wide range of taste and more knowledge of the comedic landscape. Although Hartog doesn’t show specific attributes of either cabaret or comedy, but merely plays within his own category of stand-up comedy, his respondents still show a tendency for an aesthetic disposition, which places Hartog more on the righter side of the spectrum of comedy, albeit on its own level of stand-up comedy (see figure 19).

6.2. Limitations and future research

Although this research fits well within the theoretical discussion on comedic cultural capital, poses an interesting angle of branding in the discussion on cultural capital, and answers the main research question, some limitations were encountered. This section shows these different limitations and poses suggestions for future research.

42 Transcript, Hartog respondent 1, p. 74.
First, due to the limitations in time and to keep the research as relevant and contemporary as possible, the only comedians that were suitable to ask were the comedians that were touring in April of 2018. This limited the range of comedians significantly, and restricted the possibilities of choosing a wider array of comedians and cabaretiers. Furthermore, this limited the time of asking the respondents if they were willing to participate in this research. For future research, a longer period of approaching participants would result in a larger sample and hence, in a more valid research.

Second, respondents stated multiple times how they experienced difficulty in expressing their sense of humor, their motivations for a show or their image of a comedian. Even after probe questions, respondents often had difficulties formulating their thoughts. For future research, interviews could be conducted by more experienced interviewers who are efficient in evoking a wider range of emotions and feelings from respondents.

Third, older respondents (above 60 years old) showed a distinct aversion against social media, which resulted in an overall negativity towards the social media posts presented in the interview. This could have culminated in a more negative assessment of the social media posts. Furthermore, the average age of respondents was around 50 years old, which represents the combined audiences of these comedians somewhat sufficiently (according my own estimates). This shows how comedy and cabaret are more popular amongst the older generation. While social media, one of the key aspects of this research, is more popular amongst the younger generation (Khamis, Ang, & Welling, 2017). This poses a misalignment of target audience. I suggest waiting ten more years before starting a similar research, as there’s an uncertainty of comedy getting more popular amongst youngster or social media becoming more popular amongst elderly.

Finally, for future research, I suggest taking Najib Amhali as the central comedian of the research, as he is named as one of the favorite comedians of all respondents (as can be seen in figure 18). His popularity amongst all respondents suggest a lack of symbolic boundaries in his embodied cultural capital. It would be interesting to find out what makes his brand image so appealing to all respondents of different cultural capital.

6.3. Conclusion

This research shows how brand image is connected through the concept of cultural capital. Bourdieu’s theory of embodied cultural capital is similar to the notion of brand image, as they
both embody certain cultural values and standards, formed by their surroundings (1991). Although in Bourdieu’s theory, the features that characterize this embodied cultural capital are called dispositions, and distinguish themselves from other dispositions by establishing symbolic boundaries (Bourdieu, 1989). While in branding, one’s position within society is established by the actor-network theory (Law, 1992). However, both these processes are influenced by external and internal forces and shape an image in a similar manner.

This angle is not only unique in both the sociocultural as marketing research fields, it also provides an uncommon view into the discussion of comedic cultural capital. In 2001, Kuiper’s research stated how simple jokes were more well-received amongst a lower educated audience (for the masses), while more intricate narratives are more beloved by a higher educated audience (for the elite). In this research, Kuiper is obviously inspired by Bourdieu’s theory of different cultural experiences based on different levels of cultural education. However, Friedman’s research in 2011 shows a larger variety of cultural capital. Besides lowbrow and highbrow comedic cultural capital, his respondents also appear to have mixed cultural capital. Nevertheless, Friedman and Kuiper’s combined their researches in 2013. Together, they debunked the emerging theory that the cultural elite is in decline, and confirmed that there are still strong symbolic boundaries in comedy taste in both Britain and the Netherlands. This thesis continues in the same trend as their conclusion. Interviews show how respondents express large symbolic boundaries between the ‘pure comedy’ of Tineke Schouten and the cabaret of Veldhuis and Kemper. Highbrow respondents express a certain disdain for ‘simple comedy’ and lowbrow respondents express their lack of knowledge on ‘legitimate’ comedy. These results are not a surprise within this theoretical discussion.

However, although Myjer brands himself as a comedian rather than a cabaretier, his respondents don’t portray the same low cultural capital as Schouten’s respondents. For their comedic preferences, they showed a vastly larger interest in current comedians as well as cabaretiers. More importantly, two out of three respondents of Myjer admitted that they would visit Veldhuis and Kemper’s show later that month. Although theories and history show that pure comedy’s more reminiscent of low cultural capital, because of the preference for pure, simple entertainment, his respondents show that Myjer doesn’t fit that image completely. Furthermore, they also showed a combination of a functional and aesthetic disposition. Therefore, Myjer can be considered as a comedian with a more highbrow cultural capital. This shows that for some comedians, these strong symbolic boundaries are not as evident.
Furthermore, this research includes stand-up comedy, which is both less researched in the Netherlands and less popular. Hartog’s lack of a brand image shows how important traditional media or a good estimated target audience can be for the establishment of your brand. As his brand is quite unknown, respondents could not identify the key features or aesthetic dispositions that belonged to his brand, which resulted in frame misalignment between the codes of the qualitative content analysis and the interviews. In the same trend of frame misalignment, because Myjer included celebrities in his brand, respondents started questioning his authenticity. These results show how important it is as a comedian, or any self-branded individual, to know your brand and portray it accordingly online and offline, so the intended and perceived image align.

Ultimately, this study shows how brand image and cultural capital can intertwine, and how these two approaches can supplement and benefit from each other. For the comedians, to know their audience is to know their brand image. As Veldhuis and Kemper’s online brand would not appeal to Schouten’s fans and vice versa. Thus, a specific cultural capital requires a specific online branding process.
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Appendix A

Coding tree content analysis
Red = Tim Hartog
Blue = Jochem Myjer
Green = Tineke Schouten
Black = Veldhuis en Kemper
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Open code category</th>
<th>Open coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-advertising</td>
<td>Promotion performances</td>
<td>Preparations new show, pre-show, tour, ticket sales, promotion show, promotion new song, promo radio show, guest radio show, promo comedy festival, promo performance, promo own Facebook post, promotion theatre show, week review, promotion podcast, behind-the-scenes, working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theatre, ticket sale, new show announcement, current show, behind-the-scenes, pre-show, radio show, comedy festival, new show, tour, Recommendation own book, audience, working, writing, promo TV show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion new show, outdoors performance, promotion latest show, rehearsal, behind-the-scenes, theatre, play, pre-show, ticket sale, promotion documentary, dressing room, new show, set, camera, comedy concert, promotion YouTube channel, preparation show, character preparation, audience, promotion interview,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Show promotion, program show, tour, enjoying touring, new show. Empty theatre, working, behind-the-scenes, promoting book from local theatre, promoting tv show, promotion open-air show, ticket sale, post-show, audience, theatre, promotion column, review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional life</td>
<td>Accomplishments</td>
<td>Job anniversary, amount of shows, experience, Experience, independence,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedian problems</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage fright, insecurities, Embarrassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canceled shows, break, performance problems, nervousness, comeback, recovery, apology,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Candy, diet, unhealthy food, medical surgery, alcohol, going out, coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sugar rush, party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Health complaints, doctor, nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Health issues, medical emergencies, care package, fruits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal fitness</td>
<td>Individual sports record, workout, personal achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal sports record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day-to-day, routine</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pastime</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gaming, personal hobby, vintage artefact, concert, childhood band, friend,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pastime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal hobby, fan, writing book, pleasure, coffee, bar, relax day, leisure, pastime, puzzle, newspaper, pizza, kitchen, chicken, cooking,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vacation, leisure time, dinner, baking, Kitchen, hotel, food, pool, reading, beach,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter holiday, summer holidays, nightlife,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local football club, sports ticket sales, love for football, the worth of supporters, hooligans, dedication of supporters, local sports event, competition, fan supporters, sports, comparison sports, national sports, football club rivalry, football match, rival football club song, international football game</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fishing, football, billiards, sports, ice skating, Olympics, tennis, tennis icon, tournament, swimming, jogging,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Olympics, competitiveness, ice skating, sport, professional sports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skiing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumption</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New car, personal purchase, clothes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White furniture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surroundings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suburban life, home, commute, urban environment,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekend, neighbor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small town life, schoolyard discussions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anecdotes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily struggles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day-to-day observations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>stormy weather, snow,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sunny weather, outside, nature, water, spring, sunset, clouds, snow, sky, sunset, water, storm, dunes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tropical weather, sun</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional media</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public broadcaster</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TV appearance, public broadcaster, photoshoot, children’s program, TV program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>Positive review, newspaper, reality tv, column, tv appearance, commercial broadcaster, panel member, game show, interview newspaper, talkshow guests, trending television program, commentary on tv show, Women’s magazine,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family life</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Cousins, brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Heimat’</td>
<td>Dutch identity</td>
<td>Dutch characteristics, Dutch slang language, Dutch music, love for the Netherlands, tourists in the Netherlands, Dutch television icon, Dutch grammar, Dutch tv-show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native city pride</td>
<td>Rotterdam pride, local subway, local event, Rotterdam icon, characteristics people from Rotterdam, Leiden pride, Leiden, Texel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal engagement</td>
<td>Idealism</td>
<td>Bonding different generations, elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Being an example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>Charity, ambassador charity, hospital, open day hospital, school visit, condolences, in memoriam, helping fans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charity, raising money, benefit,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | National politics | Immigration, anti-polarization of politics, political figure, current political situation,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political discussion, current news topic, shortage of food</td>
<td>Current news topic, political figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent elections, political opinion, political criticism, referendum, governmental spending, encouraging governmental initiative, criticizing policy changes, politicians, recent political crisis, abundance of political opinions, political polarization, party alliances,</td>
<td>Local politics Local political party, local politics, local community, local elections, local election results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Expenses private banks, virtual financial developments, BitCoin, fraud,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Religious holidays, religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>Animal rights issues, human rights issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Musical reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National holiday</td>
<td>National holiday, costumes, Decorations, gifts, toys, birthday, celebration, decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community pride</td>
<td>Quoting other comedians, international comedian, comedic icon, fellow comedian impersonation, fellow stand-up comedian, Fellow comedian, fellow comedian recommendation, colleague pride, fellow celebrity, personal hero Fellow comedians collaboration, fellow comedian, fellow singer, Fellow singer, celebrity, fellow comedian,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive referral</td>
<td>Recommendation, tribute, compliments, pride Recommendation museum, tribute musical icon, Admiration, recommendation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>Gratitude, enthusiasm, energy, appreciation, happy, tears of happiness, amazement, excited, inspiring, silliness, admiration Happiness, emotional song, dreams, Gratitude, happiness, tears of happiness, honored, optimism,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest expressions</td>
<td>Straightforward, honesty, confession,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
<td>Childhood memories, children’s book, Home video, throwback, memories, old photo, Nostalgia Throwback, children’s photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old photos</td>
<td>Black and white picture Black-and- white picture Black and white picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Changes in appearance, posing, fancy dress Style, classy outfit Machoism, celebrity lookalike, picture as teenager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Machoism, celebrity lookalike, picture as teenager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styles of humor</td>
<td>Indian stereotypes Police officer stereotype, elderly person stereotype, cleaning lady stereotype, nudist stereotypes, handyman stereotype, fat person stereotype, Utrecht dialect, Brabant dialect, Frysian dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slapstick</td>
<td>Slapstick Fart sounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarcasm</td>
<td>Fake advice Sarcasm, exaggeration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wordplay</td>
<td>Wordplay Misunderstanding joke, riddle joke, word play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Musing sayings, mispronunciation, word play, misunderstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Word play</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sketch comedy</strong></td>
<td>Characters, sketch, gag, yelling, prosthetics, group sketch, dialect, impersonation, costume, accents,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vulgar</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sexual joke</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sexual joke</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sexual joke</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Topic list interviews

Topic list Jochem Myjer

Deel 1:
1. Welke comedians volg je/kijk je vaak naar?
2. Welke bezoek je ook echt in het theater?
3. Is er een type comedy dat je leuk vindt?
   a. Waarom?
4. Wat verwacht je wanneer je een comedy show bekijkt?

Deel 2. Open vragen
5. Wat vind je van deze comedian?
6. Waarom?
7. Welke thema’s vind je bij deze comedian passen?/Als je aan deze comedian denkt, wat is dan het eerste wat in je opkomt?
8. Waarom?
9. Kan je jezelf vinden in deze dingen die je hebt opgenoemd? Zijn dit ook thema’s die bij u passen?
10. Welk type publiek trekt deze comedian volgens u aan?
11. Volgt u deze comedian op social media?

1. Probes/cues:
   - Anecdotal humor
   - Family
   - Nature
   - Heimat
   - Positivity

Deel 3. Social media posts
1. Anecdote, observationele humor

   ![Anecdote example](image)

   a. Wat zie je?
b. Wat vind je ervan?
c. Past dit bij de comedian?
d. Komt het overeen met uw beeld?

2. Flauw humor/natuur

3. Family

Ik ♥ mijn vader!
#omhelzingnadeshow
[foto Anne Raitema]
a. Wat zie je?
b. Wat vind je ervan?
c. Past dit bij de comedian? Komt het overeen met uw beeld?

4. **Heimat (NL/Leiden /nature**

[Image of sunset with street lamp]

De zonsondergang was weer buitenaards mooi vandaag.
#Ik❤️nederland #liemers #krokusvakantie

a. Wat zie je?
b. Wat vind je ervan?
c. Past dit bij de comedian?
d. Komt het overeen met uw beeld?

5. Positive expressions/other comedians
Deel 4.

1. Kent u Tineke Schouten?
   a. Wat vindt u van?
   b. In welke opzichten verschilt Tineke Schouten van Jochem Myjer?

2. Kent u Veldhuis en Kemper?
   a. Wat vindt u van?
   b. In welke opzichten verschilt Veldhuis en Kemper van Jochem Myjer?

3. Kent u Tim Hartog?
a. Wat vindt u van?
b. In welke opzichten verschilt Tim Hartog van Jochem Myjer
Deel 1:
1. Welke comedians volg je/kijk je vaak naar?
2. Welke bezoek je ook echt in het theater?
3. Is er een type comedy dat je leuk vindt?
   a. Waarom?
4. Wat verwacht je wanneer je een comedy show bekijkt?

Deel 2. Open vragen

2. Wat vind je van deze comedian?
   a. Waarom?
3. Welke thema’s vind je bij deze comedian passen?/Als je aan deze comedian denkt, wat is dan het eerste wat in je opkomt?
   a. Waarom?
4. Kan je jezelf vinden in deze dingen die je hebt opgenoemd? Zijn dit ook thema’s die bij u passen?
5. Welk type publiek trekt deze comedian volgens u aan?
6. Volgt u deze comedian op social media?

Probes/cues:
- Stereotype/sketches
- Family
- No societal engagement
- Experience

Deel 2. Social media posts

1. Stereotype/sketches

   a. Wat zie je?
b. Wat vind je ervan?
c. Past dit bij de comedian?
d. Komt het overeen met uw beeld?

2. Family

a. Wat zie je?
b. Wat vind je ervan?
c. Past dit bij de comedian?
d. Komt het overeen met uw beeld?

3. No societal engagement/no heimat/wel religie

a. Wat zie je?
b. Wat vind je ervan?
c. Past dit bij de comedian?
d. Komt het overeen met uw beeld?
4. Humaniteit/idealism/experience

a. Wat zie je?

b. Wat vind je ervan?

c. Past dit bij de comedian?

d. Komt het overeen met uw beeld?

Deel 3.

5. Kent u Jochem Myjer?
   a. Wat vindt u van deze comedian?
   b. In welke opzichten verschilt Jochem Myjer van Tineke Schouten?

6. Kent u Veldhuis en Kemper?
   a. Wat vindt u van deze comedian?
   b. In welke opzichten verschilt Veldhuis en Kemper van Tineke Schouten?

7. Kent u Tim Hartog?
   a. Wat vindt u van deze comedian?
   b. In welke opzichten verschilt Tim Hartog van Tineke Schouten?
**Topic list Tim Hartog**

**Deel 1:**
1. Welke comedians volg je/kijk je vaak naar?
2. Welke bezoek je ook echt in het theater?
3. Is er een type comedy dat je leuk vindt?
   a. Waarom?
4. Wat verwacht je wanneer je een comedy show bekijkt?

**Deel 2. Open vragen**
5. Wat vind je van deze comedian?
   a. Waarom?
6. Welke thema’s vind je bij deze comedian passen? Als je aan deze comedian denkt, wat is dan het eerste wat in je opkomt?
   a. Waarom?
7. Kan je jezelf vinden in deze dingen die je hebt opgenoemd? Zijn dit ook thema’s die bij u passen?
8. Welk type publiek trekt deze comedian volgens u aan?
9. Volgt u deze comedian op social media?

- **Probes/cues**
  - Rotterdam, city,
  - Local football club (Feyenoord)
  - Political commentary, both local and national
  - Appearance, ‘younger’

**Deel 3. Social media posts**
1. Slapstick/sarcasm/personal fitness
Cabaretiers zeggen wel eens dat ze dood gingen op het podium. Dat bedoelen ze uiteraard figuurlijk. Anders zou het cabaretlandschap nogal aan veranderingen onderhevig zijn. Wil je een keer een cabaretier letterlijk dood zien gaan? Dan kun je mij aanmoedigen op 8 april tijdens de NN Marathon Rotterdam.

Mijn startnummer is 11150 en kun je invoeren op de app, zodat je mij overal kunt volgen op onderstaande route, maar verder ben ik tegen de sleepwet.

DISCLAIMER: De onverlaat die op kilometer 5 roept dat het nog maar een ‘klein stukkie’ is, krijgt een stomp op z’n neus!

1. Wat zie je?
2. Wat vind je ervan?
3. Past dit bij de comedian?
4. Komt het overeen met uw beeld?

2. (local) political commentary
1. Wat zie je?
2. Wat vind je ervan?
3. Past dit bij de comedian?
4. Komt het overeen met uw beeld?

3. Lifestyle (image)/consumption/insecurities

a. Wat zie je?
b. Wat vind je ervan?
c. Past dit bij de comedian?
d. Komt het overeen met uw beeld?

4. Native city pride, local politics (Rotterdam)

a. Wat zie je?
b. Wat vind je ervan?
c. Past dit bij de comedian?
5. Football/sarcasm

a. Wat zie je?

b. Wat vind je ervan?

c. Past dit bij de comedian?

d. Komt het overeen met uw beeld?

Deel 4.

6. Kent u Jochem Myjer?
   a. Wat vindt u van deze comedian?
   b. In welke opzichten verschilt Jochem Myjer van Tim Hartog?

7. Kent u Veldhuis en Kemper?
   a. Wat vindt u van deze comedian?
   b. In welke opzichten verschilt Veldhuis en Kemper van Tim Hartog?

8. Kent u Tineke Schouten?
   a. Wat vindt u van deze comedian?
   b. In welke opzichten verschilt Tineke Schouten van Tim Hartog?
**Topic list Veldhuis en Kemper**

Deel 1:
1. Welke comedians volg je/kijk je vaak naar?
2. Welke bezoek je ook echt in het theater?
3. Is er een type comedy dat je leuk vindt?
   a. Waarom?
4. Wat verwacht je wanneer je een comedy show bekijkt?

Deel 2. Open vragen

5. Wat vind je van deze comedian?
   a. Waarom?
6. Welke thema’s vind je bij deze comedian passen/?Als je aan deze comedian denkt, wat is dan het eerste wat in je opkomt?
   a. Waarom?
7. Kan je jezelf vinden in deze dingen die je hebt opgenoemd? Zijn dit ook thema’s die bij u passen?
8. Welk type publiek trekt deze comedian volgens u aan?
9. Volgt u deze comedian op social media?

- **Probes/cues:**
  - Comedian insecurities
  - Political issues/criticism
  - Day-to-day observations
  - Honesty
  - Sarcasm

Deel 3. Social media posts

1. **Sarcasm/societal commentary**

**BRABANTISERING**

*20-01-2018  Richard Kemper*

Het stomste nieuws van afgelopen week kwam uit Brabant. Binnen 2 dagen waren er al 100.000 handtekeningen voor de petitie om van carnaval een nationale feestdag te maken. Volgens de initiatiefnemers (waaronder Bavaria) zouden hiermee de carnavalsmaandag en –dinsdag tot vrije dagen moeten worden gebombarder. Waar zal ik eens beginnen?

Ik vind het allemaal prima hoor, dat die Brabanders hier zijn, maar ik vind gewoon; ze moeten zich wel aanpassen aan de meerderheid. Maar dat doen ze niet. Sommigen wonen zelfs af hun hele leven in Nederland en kunnen nog steeds niet fatsoenlijk ABN praten. En je pikt ze er toch zo uit, met hun accent. Ze klitten altijd samen en lopen dan in dreigende groepjes over straat. Met hun zachte g. En ze kunnen het heus wel hoor, zonder, maar ze weigeren het gewoon! Kijk, vroeger wist je wel dat ze er waren, maar je hoorde er niet zoveel van. Ze bleven een beetje onder elkaar. Maar nu? Waar je ook gaat of staat; Brabanders zijn overal. En dat zullen we weten!

   a. Wat zie je?
b. Wat vind je ervan?
c. Past dit bij de comedian?
d. Komt het overeen met uw beeld?

2. Day to day observations/recognizable

ANTIE!
28-01-2018 Remco Veldhuis

Het schijnt al een tijd aan de gang te zijn, maar het was/is mij nog nooit zo opgevallen. Dat het blijkbaar het nu, nu, nu de tijd is om je zomervakantie te boeken! De kalkoen is nog niet eens helemaal uit m’n spijsterveringskanaal en ik moet nu al beslissen over de zomervakantie? Dat je je kind moet inschrijven voor een goeie school op de middag vóór de avond dat je misschien seks gaat hebben is al erg genoeg. Elke radio-spot, elk billboard, elke commercial break is het raak. Ook langs het hok bij het schoolplein voel ik de druk...

Toen de zwaveldamp van vuurwerk nog te ruiken was, kreeg ik al triomfantelijk blikken in m’n gezellige kok-dorp…


Kun je tijdens je ‘vak’ lekker ‘powerposten’. Ideale plaatjes op Instagram zetten, #forvorenendd!!” Ik vertel dat ik ‘s ochtends boodschappen doen voor het avondeten al een ondoenlijk stijf toilet vooruitdenken vind. Laat staan dit. Een van de twee vakverwoorden van net komt er weer bij staan. Ze begin tot fluisteren. “Even eerlijk, ik heb net de krokusvak bevestigd…” Een golf van opluchting gaat door me heen! Ze zat net gewoon op te scheppen!? Net als over dat “hoog sensitieve” kind van dfr! Met een cynisch ‘Zo, living on the edge!!!’ maskeer ik m’n opluchting. ‘Edge? De krokusvak ‘19 hè… Skiiën!” Gelukkig komen m’n dochters naar buiten en ben ik bevrijd van dit verschrikkelijke gesprek. Als ik langs de andere bonmuts loop groet ze me vriendelijk “Nou, succes met boeken vanavond het” ik knik bevestigend maar hoor mezelf mompelen… “ah vak you.” Ik verliet het. Ik ben antie…

a. Wat zie je?
b. Wat vind je ervan?
c. Past dit bij de comedian?
d. Komt het overeen met uw beeld?

3. Comedian problems/insecurities

112
Na twee wegens stemproblemen afgezegde voorstellingen gingen we zaterdag met lood in de schoenen op in Drachten... En de Leeuwarder Courant gaf 4 sterren!! Pffeww... 😁

Laveren tussen een lach en een traan

Gebeurtenis: Veldhuis & Kemper met Geloof ons nou maar Gezien 24/03 in De Lave te Drachten Publiek, 750
Regie: Geert Laveeven Nog te zien: 17/04 Sneek, 31/05 Leeuwarden

a. Wat zie je?
b. Wat vind je ervan?
c. Past dit bij de comedian?
d. Komt het overeen met uw beeld?

4. Societal engagement/criticism
Wat waren we boos hé, met z’n allen. Zo maar 2 x zoveel verdienen. We hadden nog nooit van hele Ralph Hamers gehoord, maar dit ging te ver! Het was een mooie demonstratie van de totale overbodigheid van het referendum waarvan we er volgende week maar weer eens eentje hebben. De bonuskwestie lost zichzelf op. Het (sociale) mediacircus dat op gang kwam na het nieuws uit de ING burelen, bracht een stroomvloed van verontwaardiging op gang. Binnen week was het voorstel afweer van tafel, inclusief publiek applaus van uiteenlopend VVD politici. U weet wel, de liberale visionairs die zweren bij een vrije, europese marktwerking en zo min mogelijk bemoeienis van de overheid. Afgelopen week bewees in ieder geval: dat referendum hebben we helemaal niet nodig. Een beetje publieke amok bereikt binnen een week meer dan waar dat helaas Oekraïnevormaat langer dan een jaar voor nodig had. Om over de kosten nog maar te zwijgen. Die waren bij het Oekrafereferendum € 30.000.000,00. Daar kan je 20 topmannen een extraatje voor geven.

a. Wat zie je?
b. Wat vindt je ervan?
c. Past dit bij de comedian?
d. Komt het overeen met uw beeld?

5. Other comedians/celebrity appearances

![Image](image1.jpg)

a. Wat zie je?
b. Wat vind je ervan?
c. Past dit bij de comedian?
d. Komt het overeen met uw beeld?

Deel 4.

6. Kent u Tineke Schouten?
   a. Wat vindt u van deze comedian?
   b. In welke opzichten verschilt Tineke Schouten van Veldhuis en Kemper?
7. Kent u Jochem Myjer?
   a. Wat vindt u van deze comedian?
   b. In welke opzichten verschilt Jochem Myjer van Veldhuis en Kemper?
8. Kent u Tim Hartog?
   a. Wat vindt u van deze comedian?
   b. In welke opzichten verschilt Tim Hartog van Veldhuis en Kemper?
## Appendix C

Coding tree Interviews

When pressed bold, this code has appeared more than three times throughout the data, which is the average (amount of statements divided by the amount of codes). The bold font refers to the density of the code. The green font refers to a positive emotion regarding this code, whereas the red font refers to a negative emotion regarding this specific code.

### Tineke Schouten

The average post presence is 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Subcategories</th>
<th>Code names</th>
<th>Open Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How the respondents describe Tineke Schouten</td>
<td>Tineke Schouten in general</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Emotional identification, pure entertainment</td>
<td>Variation seriousness and comedy (‘Een lach en een traan’), No societal engagement, Pure entertainment, Recognizable, Repetitive repertoire, Twisting ordinary actions, Utrecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Honest and open</td>
<td>Approachable, Positive, Sincerity, Strong woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>Comedian in the purest sense</td>
<td>Absurdism, Comparison to André van Duin, Impersonations, Non-offensive, Pure comedian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Beautiful woman</td>
<td>Beautiful woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set-up show</td>
<td>Revue performer</td>
<td>Songs, show performer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tineke Schouten on social media</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>Experience, professionalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Religion*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sketches</td>
<td>Sketches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Audience’s sense of humor | Content | Societal engagement, Vulgarity, Exaggerating everyday actions, Recognizable, Unkind jokes |
| | Style | Energy, Humorous facial expressions, Non-obvious sense of humor |

| Typical audience | | Elderly audience, medium-educated audience, lower-educated audience, looking for entertainment, AVRO TROS audience |

<p>| What to expect from a show | Content | Obvious sense of humor, Pure amusement, Reflection for the audience |
| | | Singing, Repetitive content, |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How other respondents describe Tineke Schouten</th>
<th>Humor</th>
<th>Pure entertainment, (Utrecht) characterizations**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attracts an older audience, Attracts a loyal audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘simple comedian’, Not interested in Tineke, Annoying</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Social media | Social Media as a privacy matter |

*The subject of religion was denounced as well as it was confirmed, however it was confirmed by more respondents than it was denounced.

** When the other respondents referred to her characterizations, they also predominantly referred to her characterizations from Utrecht. All but one instance, the characterizations were referred to in a negative manner.
**Jochem Myjer**
The average post presence is 2.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Subcategories</th>
<th>Code names</th>
<th>Open Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How the respondents describe Jochem Myjer</td>
<td>Jochem Myjer in general</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Recognizable day-to-day themes</td>
<td>Family, Een lach en een traan (Variation serious and comedy), nature, No societal engagement, personable, <strong>Recognizable, Texel</strong>, Twisting ordinary actions, Underlying themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Identifiable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appreciative, Approachable, energetic, honest, positive, <strong>Representation of an average Dutch person, Sincerity, Vulnerable/humane</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Humorous mimicry, Impersonations, Non-offensive, Self-mockery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-up show</td>
<td>Good comedy</td>
<td></td>
<td>The craft of good comedy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jochem Myjer on social media</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native city pride</td>
<td>Leiden, (love for the Netherlands) *</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positivity</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Positivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Celebrities</td>
<td>Questioning the authenticity of appearance celebrities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience’ sense of humor</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Recognizable, Vulgar jokes, Unkind jokes, Repetitive content</td>
<td>Style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Craft of good comedy, interaction with audience, Simple/corny comedy, Variation of comedic styles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Audience of all ages, Non-culturally diverse audience</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to expect from a show</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pure Amusement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How other respondents describe Jochem Myjer</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Commercial style, Family, Anecdotes daily life, Leiden, Texel, <strong>Underlying theme</strong>, Over the top, Questioning Jochem’s authenticity, twisting ordinary actions</td>
<td>Humor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Absurdism, comedic craft, Impersonations ***, wordplay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td><strong>Energetic yet qualitative, Personal disliking for Myjer, Too energetic, Vulnerable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social media**
Passively using social media

*Love for the Netherlands was actually denounced more than confirmed, but it’s still included in the coding tree to compare the density of the referrals to Leiden to the one for the Netherlands.

** The same number of respondents deemed Myjer’s impersonations a positive as well as a negative feature.
The average post presence is 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Subcategories</th>
<th>Code names</th>
<th>Open Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How the respondents describe Veldhuis &amp; Kemper</td>
<td>Veldhuis &amp; Kemper in general</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Recognizable day-to-day themes</td>
<td>Anecdotes everyday life, contemporary, original angle, Underlying themes, Personable, Recognizable, Sincerity, societal engagement, Twisting ordinary actions, mirroring current society, unexpected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Down-to-earth duo</td>
<td>Differences between the two comedians, Duo chemistry, Down to earth, grateful,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>Degrading</td>
<td>Corny, Ridiculing, Self-mockery, Humorous mimicry, Wordplay, Impersonations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-up show</td>
<td>Variety of content</td>
<td>Singing, Variation of comedic content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Veldhuis & Kemper on social media | Admiring | Admiring more established comedians, celebrity, Questioning their authenticity with other celebrities, |
| Socio-political engagement | No political criticism*, Societal engagement |
| Sarcasm | Sarcasm |

| Audience’ sense of humor | Content | Vulgarity, Unkind jokes, Songs, Overstimulation of the audience, Disarming |
| Style | Variation of comedic styles, Stand-up comedy, Interaction with the audience |

| Typical audience | Audience of all ages, Middle-aged audience, Audience with mixed educational backgrounds, Cultural elite |

| What to expect from a show | Pure amusement, Discovering new artists, Reflection for the audience |

<p>| How other respondents describe Veldhuis &amp; Kemper | Content | Undertone too serious, Gender differences, Personal anecdotes, Recognizable situations, Singers, Underlying themes |
| Humor |
| Audience | x |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>Dislike Veldhuis &amp; Kemper, Don’t know Veldhuis &amp; Kemper, Duo chemistry,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>Social media as self-advertising, Unspar ing on social media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One respondent did confirm the political criticism, three denounced it.*
Tim Hartog
The average post presence is 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Subcategories</th>
<th>Code names</th>
<th>Open Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How the respondents describe Tim Hartog</td>
<td>Tim Hartog in general</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Twisting recognizable themes</td>
<td>Absurdism, Anecdotes day-to-day life, Distancing but also connecting to the people, Family, Inspired by the audience, Original angle, Personable, Poor upbringing, Recognizable, Repetitive repertoire, Societal engagement, Twisting ordinary actions, Underlying themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>Resourceful</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-offensive, Sharp-witted, The craft of good comedy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Scrawny</td>
<td>Scrawny looks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-up show</td>
<td>Adapting to the audience</td>
<td>Abruptly changing subjects, Interaction with the audience, Variation of comedic content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Hartog on social media</td>
<td>No political commentary</td>
<td>No (local) political commentary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No football</td>
<td>No football</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No narcissism</td>
<td>Image, Personal Fitness*, no personal reflection, Rotterdam</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarcasm</td>
<td>Sarcasm**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience’ sense of humor</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Societal engagement, Recognizable, Extreme societal criticism, Twisting ordinary events, Vulnerable, Corny humor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Absurdism, British humor, Disarming, Misleading humor, Wordplay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical audience</td>
<td></td>
<td>Audience of all ages, Younger audience, Rotterdam audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to expect from a show</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pure Amusement, Discovering new artists, To be surprised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How other respondents describe Tim Hartog</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Interaction with the audience</td>
<td>Corny humor, Sharpwitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Don’t know Tim Hartog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ability to show multiple sides on social media, Unsparing on social media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Personal fitness was both denounced and confirmed.
** Sarcasm was also equally denounced and confirmed.