Attitudes and Preference of Generation Z Towards YouTube Advertising Formats

Author: Laszlo Szabo University of Twente P.O. Box 217, 7500AE Enschede The Netherlands

ABSTRACT,

This research was conducted with the aim of better understanding Generation Z within the online entertainment context. The research focuses on the differences found on the three attitudinal levels (Entertainment, Informativeness, Irritation) towards the YouTube advertising formats by applying the Ducoffe model, and provides practical information for advertisers and content creators based on the analyzed data and previous findings. The data to analyze was collected online, on a randomized between groups experimental basis where the six advertising formats were the independent variable and were changing per experimental group. The collected data was analyzed using SPSS 26, the research found that Overlay ads are the most disliked YouTube advertising format amongst Generation Z. Sponsored cards are the highest valued format, which still has room to improve regarding effectiveness. The study confirmed that Non-Skippable video advertisements are being the most effective advertising format, even when targeting Generation Z.

Graduation Committee members: First supervisor: Dr. Carolina Herrando Second supervisor: Dr. Efthymios Constantinides

Keywords Generation Z, YouTube, Advertising format, Attitude towards advertising, Video advertising, Online advertising

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



1. INTRODUCTION

The media and entertainment industry have changed significantly the last years; consumers have unlimited sources and availability of content (SocialB, 2018). Companies were required to adapt quickly to changeable conditions to stay competitive in the industry and multiple new platforms have been created in order to satisfy online consumer needs, which also created higher consumer empowerment (Brown, 2017). Marketeers have taken advantage of the newly risen opportunities and created several advertising formats on online entertainment platforms (YouTube, 2020). These Ad formats are customized to reach different campaign goals, such as to increase brand awareness, reach or sales, and have different appearance features. The increasing online video consumption combined with the ability to target audiences based on location, demographic characteristics or interests makes online video the fastest growing digital channel by advertising expenditure (Clement, 2020) (Carter, 2020). Based on global marketing professionals' response, skippable video advertisements played directly before a featured video are considered to be the most effective advertising format on YouTube (Guttmann, 2019). While the ad formats are shaped to achieve specific goals more effectively, it is not clear how the different types of ad formats affect the consumer attitude and behavior of the digital-native generation, the age group which consumes online entertainment the most (99firms, 2019).

As Generation Z consumers' behavior differs from any other generation, the current marketing practices might not achieve the same outcome as for older consumers. Digital natives are being technically more advanced and less tolerant for advertisements which makes them more likely to use Ad Blockers (Handley, 2017). To effectively target digital natives, more personalized, authentic and entertaining advertisements started to appear, ideally aligned with the interest of the target audience. It is clear that the content of advertisement plays an important role when marketeers target digital natives. However, it is not clear how this new generation of online consumers react to the way how the advertisements are delivered to them on YouTube, the second most visited website worldwide (Statista, 2019).

A study about the consumer responses to six online advertising formats revealed that the attitude towards an ad format is significantly related to attitude toward the advertisement itself, which has a well-established influence on brand attitude and purchase intention (Burns & Lutz, 2006) (Brown & Stayman, 1992). Filling the knowledge gap about how the target audience reacts to the way that advertisements are delivered to them, could further improve advertising effectiveness. Therefore, the objective the research is to identify how consumers react to the different types of advertising formats and to determine which are the formats which cause the least damage on consumer experience while can be effectively used to target Generation Z on YouTube.

This leads to the following research question:

RQ1: How do ad formats affect consumer attitude and behavior of Generation Z?

RQ2: Is there a preference between the advertising formats of the target group?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This section reviews the previous findings related to advertising formats, introduces the research model which the evaluation of YouTube advertising formats will be based on, and describes the currently available advertising formats used by YouTube.

2.1 The role of Advertising formats

Advertising formats have been described as "the manner in which an ad appears" (Rodgers & Thorson, 2000). A study confirmed that advertising formats have an effect on the perceived advertising value (depending on information, amusement/entertainment and irritation/annovance) and confirmed that there is a different level of irritation between ad Reijmersdal, 2012). formats (Tutaj & van Another research found that entertainment and annovance factors are significantly related to online ad formats, the evidence suggest that an Ad format mediates the effect of annoyance and entertainment on an advertisement. The respondents of the research differentiated between the format of the ad and the ad itself (Burns & Lutz, 2006). Burns in one of her previous researches also stated that since different online Ad formats possess unique features, studies measuring attitudes towards online advertising in general are usually not specific enough to provide practical value to advertisers. Furthermore, findings focusing on one online Ad format cannot be derived to other online Ad formats (Burns K. S., 2003).

Contrary to Burn's assertion about generalizing attitudes towards online advertising, a comprehensive global study of Generation Z made by Kantar Millward Brown; a multinational market research firm specialized in advertising effectiveness, found that Generation Z consumers are in general less positive towards all advertising formats than other generations (Brown, 2017). The report also states that younger generations are far more discriminating towards digital video advertisements than older consumers. They show a positive attitude when they are likely to be compensated for viewing an advertisement (i.e.: rewards in mobile games for watching a 15-30 seconds video) or when they have control over playing or not playing an ad. In general Generation Z is more open to advertisements when they are approached in a creative, subtle way with sponsored content within social media platforms and seem to be less forgiving when it comes to formats which do not offer user control, such as nonskippable, pop-ups and pre-roll formats. However it is not clear how the different ad formats used by YouTube influence the consumer experience of the "digital natives", who represent highest penetrated consumer segment in the U.S. (Statista, 2019).

2.2 Research model



Figure 1 Ducoffe model (1996)

To measure how consumers evaluate the experience of processing advertising (regardless of the content of the advertisement) Ducoffe's Advertising Value Model will be used, which is commonly applied in researches assessing Ad formats (Le & Vo, 2017) (Burns & Lutz, 2006) (Daugherty & Gangadharbatla, 2013). The model identifies three factors (Entertainment, Irritation/Annoyance, Information) as the most relevant dimensions to the understanding of attitude toward online advertising formats (Burns K. S., 2003). The dimensions are defined by Bauer and Greyser as follows:

Entertainment: "These are ads that give you a pleasant feeling for any reason whatsoever. They may be entertaining, amusing, especially attractive or well done. You might enjoy them whether or not you are interested in what is advertised. The main thing is that you like them and are pleased you saw or heard them" (Bauer & Greyser, 1968)

The entertainment value of advertising has been considered an important factor in advertising. Mehta, (2000) found that people with more favorable attitudes towards advertising, recall higher number of advertisements. Schlosser, Shavitt, & Kanfer (1999) defined enjoyment of advertising as the strongest predictor of attitude towards internet advertising, and plays a role in purchasing decisions. These studies imply that more entertaining advertisements result higher recall and stronger buying interest.

Informativeness: "These are ads that you learn something from that you are glad to know or know about. They may tell you about a new product or service or they may tell you something new about a product or service you were already familiar with. The main thing is that they help you in one way or another because of the information they provide (Bauer & Greyser, 1968)."

Informativeness is positively related to advertising value (Ducoffe, 1996). Delivering the right information on the right time results better decision making by consumers.

Irritation: "These are ads that irritate you. They may be annoying because of what they say or how they say it. They may annoy you because they are around so much, or because of when and where they appear. There may be other reasons for ads to be annoying—the main thing is that they bother or irritate you."

Irritation negatively affects advertising value, if advertising includes factors which are annoying, offensive or overly manipulative consumer are likely to perceive it as an irritating influence (Ducoffe, 1996). Based on a research about the diminishing and negative returns of advertisement, an ad can be found irritating based on two communication problems (Ha & Litman, 1997). First whenever an ad prevents a person's ability to read or see the media content, second if a person is disrupted from the media use experience.

These three factors contribute to the identification of advertising value which is seen as comprehensive representation of the worth of advertising to consumers (Ducoffe, 1996). To advertisers, advertising value functions as a potentially important measure of the market orientation which can be beneficial in understanding and satisfying consumer needs. Attitude toward advertising is being defined as "learned predisposition to respond in a consistently favorable or unfavorable manner toward advertising in general" (Lutz, 1985). In this research the three above mentioned factors will be used to measure the attitude toward the six advertising formats presented by YouTube.

Therefore H0= There is no difference between Generation Z's perceptions towards the six advertising formats, used by YouTube, on the three attitudinal factors. HA= There is a difference between Generation Z's perception towards the six advertising formats on the three attitudinal factors.

2.3 YouTube advertising formats

In 2019 YouTube has surpassed 2 billion active monthly users and has become a great marketing tool to reach wide audiences (Drummond-Butt, 2020). Currently YouTube offers 6 advertising formats to marketers to be used for their campaigns.

There are several metrics to measure the effectiveness of an advertising campaign on YouTube. The core performance metrics are: impressions, views, view rate, cost-per-view (CPV), clickthrough rate (CPR) and engagement rate (Google, n.d.).

Based on these metrics' marketeers are able to evaluate the success of their campaigns depending on the goal of their messages communicated through their advertisements. Google offers goal's guidance to advertisers and suggests which Ad format to use for the different goals, such as to increase sales, website traffic, brand awareness and reach or product and brand consideration. Content creators on YouTube also have a control over which Ad formats to use within their videos (BusinessInsider, 2020). Creators can decide the type and where to put advertisements within their videos. Display ads are exception of this, that type of advertisement will still appear on the platform even if the YouTuber has turned off monetization options, but has an audience which is in fit with an advertiser's target group. Videos which do not have a monetization setting have the possibility to show Skippable, Non-skippable or Display ads. The six YouTube advertising formats are discussed below (also see in Appendix 1).

• **Display ads** are picture or animation advertisements which appear above the video suggestions on the right side of the featured video. These ads do not have an



Figure 2 Display ad

auto play sound function in order to not interfere with the featured video, the length of the animation has a maximum of 30 seconds limit and the size of the ad is also limited. The purpose of these advertisement is to encourage the user to take a specific action by clicking through the advertisement (e.g. register to a trial version of a service, purchase a product) mainly targeted by search history (Whatley, 2019). Google's goal's guidance suggests the use of Display ads for every of the above-mentioned goals. The effectiveness of the advertisements is measured through impressions, clicks or conversions (Google, Standard Display Ads, n.d.). The advertiser is charged based on clicks or impressions, depending on the goal of the campaign.

• **Overlay ads** function very similar to Display ads. These are also picture or animation advertisements with limited size and without auto play sound, but



Figure 3 Overlay ad

popping up on the bottom 20 percent of the YouTube video player. As the ad appears overlaid the consumed content it might be more intrusive than Display ads, but still not as intrusive as video ads since it does not take up the whole video space and the viewer has the option

to close the ad directly after it showed up (Haslam, 2018). Overlay ads are used for the same purposes as Display ads and also charged based on clicks or impressions (Google, In-video Overlay Ads, n.d.).

• Skippable video ads are video advertisements which can appear before, during or after the featured video. The suggested minimum length of a Skippable ad by Google is 12 seconds, while the maximum length is suggested to not be more than 3 minutes. Skippable ads



Figure 4 Skippable video ad

might appear in bundles where 2 or more advertisements are played sequentially, however the viewer is able to skip the advertisement(s) after 5 seconds. Another unique feature of this Ad format is the way how the advertiser is being charged for using Skippable video ads. The so called TrueView scheme enables advertisers to only pay for a displayed ad if it has been viewed for at least 30 seconds (or the maximum duration if it is shorter than 30 seconds) or if the viewer interacts with the ad (Google, TrueView in-stream ads, n.d.). This cost-per-view bidding strategy makes Skippable video ads a relatively cheap and an attractive way for advertisers to reach wide audiences and to increase brand/product consideration or interest and drive engagement (Guttmann, 2019). Shortly after the introduction of Skippable ad format, Google found that 80% of the U.S. viewers prefer Skippable ads over Non-Skippable advertisements, nowadays this TrueView format has an implemented customisable call-to-action bottom within the advertisement (Google, 2012) (Google, 2019). When it comes to skipping an advertisement Generation Z seems to be the fastest to react, with more than 50 perfect of them already skipping the advertisement 2 seconds after the "skip" bottom has appeared (Vroegrijk, 2020).

• Non-skippable video ads must be watched before the featured video can be continued to view. The maximum length of the advertisement is 15-20 seconds



Figure 5 Non-Skippable video ad

and it can appear before, during or after the main video (Google, Non-skippable video ads, n.d.). As there is no option to skip the ad, this 15-20 second could be a

valuable timeframe for advertisers to communicate their whole message without the viewer interrupting it. The higher control on the advertiser's side also comes with higher costs. Non-skippable video ads are charged based on impressions, advertisers pay on a CPM (cost per thousand impressions) basis, which may generate more costs than other Ad formats. A study comparing Skippable and Non-Skippable video advertisements found that using a Non-Skippable video ad format leads to an increase in viewer's ad, brand and message recall, but this increase is limited to about 10 percentage points (Vroegrijk, 2020). The study suggests that retaining viewers' attention to about 8 seconds before they skip an ad makes more or less the same impact as a Non-Skippable ad, but comes at a lower price.

• **Bumper ads** are the shorter versions of Non-Skippable ads, these are non-skippable video ads with the maximum duration of 6 seconds placed before, during



Figure 6 Bumper ad

or after the featured video. Bumper ads are charged every time an ad is shown on CPM basis, just like the Non-skippable ads. The purpose of this format is to raise awareness and reach more people with a short memorable message (Google, 2017). This short nonskippable appearance perfectly can be used as a teaser for new products, announcements or as an additional tool for remarketing besides longer video campaigns. After the introduction of this ad format in 2017, Google found that 70 percent of the studied bumper ad campaigns drove a significant lift in brand awareness, and 90 percent of the campaigns drove a lift in ad recall globally with an average lift of over 30 percent (Lupei & Habig, 2017).

 The sixth advertising format available on YouTube is Sponsored cards, this ad format is the most interactive one and highly related to the content of the featured



Figure 7 Sponsored cards

YouTube video. Sponsored cards are also an unobtrusive way of advertising since the cards only show up when the viewer is interested in interacting with the announcement, product mentioned in the video. Sponsored cards are charged in a CPV basis, which in this case means that an advertiser gets charged when a viewer clicks on one of the featured cards. The purpose of the cards could be to drive visits to a website or to encourage viewers to check out the current offerings of the displayed product within the video (Google, About interactive video ads, n.d.) (Google, Add cards to videos, n.d.). As YouTubers have the exclusive control over Sponsored cards, this ad format is only functionable when there is a sponsorship or cooperation between a content creator and a brand.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research design

To evaluate how the different advertising formats affect the attitude and behavior of the target group, an online survey was conducted which had a randomly assigned between groups experimental design. The aim of this quantitative study is to present findings which are statistically likely to generalize the whole population of the selected sociodemographic group. The goal of this design is to compare the Ad formats, by randomly assigning participants to one of the experimental conditions (Ad formats) and measure their attitude and behavior according to the assigned experimental condition. Therefore, the independent variable is manipulated per group and the dependent variables are measured within each experimental condition. All of the respondents were asked to answer the same questions, the only condition which was different per experimental group is the type of advertising format shown. The randomization of the experimental conditions was done through symbols. Respondents were asked to choose one of the shown symbols (@, &, #, %, \aleph , \aleph , \aleph), each symbol had one of the YouTube Ad formats assigned to it. After choosing a symbol each respondent was asked to answer the questions which are aimed to measure their: Ad format perception, attitude towards online advertising format and behavior (see in Appendix 2). The survey scales used in the survey were retrieved from (Burns & Lutz, 2006). While 7-point scales are universally being used to measure attitude, literature about development of questionnaires suggest that 5-point scales are seem to be less confusing and to increase response rate (Hayes, 1992). In the researches of (Burns K. S., 2003) she argues for the use of 5-point scales based on researches where students on 7-point scales rarely selected the extremes. Due to the younger age orientation of this research, 5-point scales were used to measure the dependent variables.

3.2 Sampling

This research aims for a better understanding of Generation Z, therefore the selection of individuals were focused on age. The term Generation Z is used for the generation which was born from the mid 90's to the early 2000's. These people are perceived as being familiar with the internet from a very young age and currently they represent an attractive segment for many industries. While there are several different definitions about who belongs to the Z Generation, this research aimed to study the attitude and behavior of people who are currently between 16 and 25 years old in the first half of 2020.

A paper created by a marketing professor discusses the four main trends which are likely to characterize this segment as a consumer. The four trends are: Focus on innovation, Insistence on convenience, Desire for security and Tendency toward escapism (Wood, 2013).

Innovation: For these consumers the Internet has always existed and they have an innate comfort with the virtual world. This

generation is not surprised by product obsolescence and expects "more, smaller and better" versions of technological products. As consumers, Generation Z has always had alternatives to choose from in the marketplace.

<u>Convenience:</u> The increased pressure on today's youth to achieve at young ages can be reflected in the increased reliance on convenience in both products and attributes such as: time saving devices, product delivery (retail channels that increase the ease of acquisition), product experience (products that are convenient to use, "ready to go" to cook, to consume or to set-up) and product messaging. The research shows that the e-commerce characteristics which cause uncertainty to other generations (e.g.: being monitored by companies and privacy issues), do not have the same worry for Generation Z.

<u>Security:</u> Given the various parental influence and the current economic environment, Generation Z seems to be more pragmatic and scarcity-oriented, they may act more careful and discriminating in where they spend their money.

Escapism: Generation Z is likely to be a strong market for goods that serve to escapism. Young people nowadays report greater stress and pressure to achieve at a young age which creates a desire to "escape". Due to this desire, Generation Z is increasingly motivated to create or find virtual or produced ideal worlds.

3.3 Data collection

The data collection took place between the 27 April 2020 - 18 May 2020. During the 3 weeks period 217 responses were collected, all of the responses were within the age requirement of 16-25. The survey was created on Google forms and were distributed online through social networks and survey exchanging platforms. The sample of 217 people consists 57% of females. Nationality wise 39.6% of the sample is Dutch 16.1% German and 44.3% are mix of nationalities such as Indian, British, American, Belgian, French etc. The average age of the respondents is 22, about half of them are Bachelor students and currently unemployed. At the beginning of the survey, participants were informed about the anonymity of the questionnaire. All respondents participated in the survey on a voluntary basis with the option to continue later or to withdraw from participation at any time. After giving demographical details the respondents were asked to choose one of the showed symbols which served as a randomization option for the different experimental groups. During the data collection the "@" symbol was the most popular, while the """ symbol was chosen the least time. By temporarily disabling symbol options which already got balanced answers distributed across demographic groups, it was possible to drive the participants' attention to those symbols which lagged behind in the number of answers.

4. RESULTS

In this section the data collected through online survey is being evaluated using SPSS 26. First the reliability of the retrieved scales was tested. Following that, to see if the YouTube Ad formats have any effect on the consumer's attitude, four dependent variables were compared through the six experimental groups. Finally the 3 dependent variables related to consumer's behavior were compared between the groups. The results of the analyses are discussed further in the following subsections

Regarding to demographic characteristics, the collected data shows that age, gender, nationality and education do not have any statistically significant effect on the analyzed dependent variables (See Appendix 6). Therefore, the differences between the six groups are most likely to be the result of the experimental manipulation (the shown Advertising formats).

4.1 Reliability Analysis

After importing the collected data into SPSS 26, the internal consistency of the instruments were measured. The online survey included 19, 5-point Likert items which intended to measure 4 variables based on the publications of (Burns & Lutz, 2006). The reliability of the variable "Entertainment" was tested by including the items of: Amusing, Attractive, Different, Elaborate, Entertaining, Eye-Catching, Innovative and Sophisticated. The variable "Informativeness" was constructed of the items: Beneficial, Information, Useful. The last variable of the Ducoffe model "Irritation/Annoyance' was tested by combining the items of: Annoying, Disruptive, Intrusive, Overbearing. The reliability of the fourth variable "Attitude Towards Online Advertising Format" (ATOA) was tested by looking at four items: Likedbyme, Oneofthebest, Excellent, Iloveit. The results of the reliability analysis is shown below:

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	N of items
Entertainment	.788	8
Informativeness	.733	3
Irritation	.823	4
ATOA	.923	4

Table 1 Reliability Analysis

The Cronbach's Alpha for each variable is higher than .7, therefore the adopted constructs considered to be reliable. The SPSS Output of the reliability analysis can be found in Appendix 3.

4.2 Analysis of Variance

In the following part the results of the Analysis of Variance is reported. One-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of YouTube Ad formats on the 3 attitudinal variables of the Ducoffe model and on the variable of "Attitude Towards Online Advertising Format". All the four ANOVAs resulted a P value under .05, therefore the null hypothesis of the analysis is rejected which means that there are significant differences found between the Ad formats on each of the four dependent variables. The results show that respondents perceive the different Ad formats differently entertaining, informative, irritative and that there is a preference among the Ad formats.

	Mean	SD	F(5,211)	Sig.
Entertainment	2.48	.637	4.88	.000
Informativeness	2.72	.848	3.59	.004
Irritation	3.32	.937	8.21	.000
ATOA	2.80	1.026	6.07	.000

Table 2 Analysis of Variance

To get more detailed comparisons between the six Ad formats, Post-hoc comparisons using the Scheffe test was performed to determine where the difference exists among the groups. By conducting a Post-hoc test it is possible to compare each of the experimental conditions to every other conditions. In that way, the YouTube Ad formats can be compared to one another on each of the 4 variables. The SPSS output of the analyses can be found in Appendix 4, the significant differences are discussed in the subsubsections below.



Table 3 Mean scores of variables per Ad format

4.2.1 Entertainment

Within the entertainment factor most of the significance values are above .05, only one Ad format is significantly different than two other formats. Post hoc comparisons using the Scheffe test indicated that the mean score for the Skippabe video ad format (M = 2.6447, SD = .57431) was significantly different than for the Overlay ad format (M = 2.1531, SD = .66536). The other significant difference found is between Sponsored cards (M = 2.7917, SD = .71944) and Overlay ads (M = 2.1531, SD = .66536). The collected data shows that the Overlay ad group scored the lowest on the entertainment factor, although it is not significantly lower than the other three Ad formats, only significantly lower than Skippable video ads and Sponsored cards. Skippable video ads > Overlay ads, Sponsored Cards > Overlay ads.

4.2.2 Informativeness

Looking at the mean scores of the informativeness factor the Overlay format has the lowest score again. By looking at the Post hoc comparisons the only significant difference found is between Sponsored cards (M = 3.1444, SD = .89564) and Overlay ads (M = 2.3250, SD = .87539). The P values of the other comparisons are much higher than .05, therefore the other Ad formats are not significantly different from one another in terms of informativeness. **Sponsored cards > Overlay ads.**

4.2.3 Irritation

The irritation factor (compared to Entertainment and Informativeness) has the highest mean scores for almost every ad format. The only exception is Sponsored cards which has the lowest mean score on irritation. Compared to the other variables, Irritation has the most differences between the Ad Formats. There are six significant differences are found. These differences are related to two Ad formats, Display and Sponsored cards. Based on the collected data, participants consider Display ads (M = 2.8618, SD = .94027) significantly less irritating than Non-Skippable video ads (M = 3.7500, SD = .73013) Overlay ads (M = 3.5313, SD = .84956) and Bumper ads (M = 3.7014, SD = .73148). Sponsored cards (M = 2.7667, SD = 1.08860) are also perceived significantly less irritating than the above mentioned three Ad formats (Non-Skippable video ads, Overlay ads and

Bumper ads). Non-Skippable video ads > Display ads, Overlay ads > Display ads, Bumper ads > Display ads. Non-Skippable video ads > Sponsored cards, Overlay ads > Sponsored cards, Bumper ads > Sponsored cards.

4.2.4 Attitude Towards Online Advertising Format The fourth variable intended to measure the preference of the shown Ad format compared to the others. As it was expectable based on the Ducoffe model results, the Sponsored Cards format scored the highest (M = 3.4667, SD = .95532), the Post hoc test revealed two significant differences. These notable contrasts are between Sponsored Cards and Non-Skippable video ads (M =2.3214, SD = 1.05818), Overlay ads (M = 2.4938, SD = 1.05077). The results show that respondents prefer Sponsored Cards over Overlay and Non-Skippable video ads.



Table 4 Attitude Towards Online Advertising Formats

4.3 Consumer behavior

This section presents the results of the behavioral measure of the respondents. To get more insight how an Ad format affects the willingness to click on an advertisement or to later visit the advertised website, three items were retrieved from (Burns & Lutz, 2006). Two questions were dichotomous measures: "Have you ever clicked through on a [Ad format] ad to get more information?" and "Has a [Ad format] ad prompted you to later visit the site?". The third item measured the clickthrough frequency in the past month using a five-point ordinal scale. To assess the collected data, Chi Square tests and ANOVA was performed.

	Х	DF	Р
Clickthrough	12.26	5	.031
Visit later	11.38	5	.044

Table 5 Chi-Square results

The results show that the variables "Clickthrough" and "Visit later" are associated with the Ad formats. Therefore, there is a significant difference between the Ad formats regarding the willingness to clickthrough and to visit the advertised website later (see in Appendix 5)

The crosstabulations revealed that the Ad format with the highest clickthrough rate is Skippable video ads (44.7%) and the lowest is Overlay ads (10%). Further Chi-Square test found association between the willingness to clickthrough and the Entertainment variables, as well as the Information variable.

On making the consumer to visit the website later again the Skippable video ad format scored the best (50%) and Sponsored cards showed the worst ability to redirect consumers to the advertised website (16.7%). By testing multiple variables with the "Visit later" variable, there were no other associations found.



Table 6 Percentage of clicks and site visits

The third item (Clickthrough frequency in the past month) was compare with each of the other Ad formats. The comparisons revealed that Skippable video ads have generated significantly more clicks than any other of the ad formats in the past month of launch of the survey (see in Appendix 5, Table 14.5). This result is considered to be not valid. During the data collection it was recognized that respondents gave contradictory answers to the behavioral items. These answers were excluded from the data collection, but still those who have answered the first two questions with "yes", have given distinctly high scores on the frequency they have clicked on a Skippable ad in the past month. Due to the interactive feature of the Ad format (Skip bottom appearing after five seconds) it is suspected that respondents have given answers on the amount of time they have skipped a Skippable video ad. Therefore, the Skippable video ad format is excluded from the comparison of this item. After the exclusion. there are no significant differences found regarding to the amount of times an Ad format have been clicked on in the past month.

The overall scores on the three factors are added up and shown in the following table:



Table 7 Overall advertising value for Generation Z

5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this section the research question "How do ad formats affect consumer attitude and behavior of Generation Z?" and "Is there a preference between the advertising formats of the target group?" will be answered. The goal of the study is to investigate if Generation Z consumer perceive the way of an advertisement appearing on YouTube differently, and if yes do they have a preference between the Ad formats. To answer the research question a survey was created and the data collected through the survey was analyzed in SPSS 26.

5.1 Display ads

Display ads are found to be considered less irritating than Overlay ads, Non-skippable video ads and Bumper ads. On the Entertainment and Informativeness factors this type of Ad format did not have significant differences compared to other Ad formats. On the fifteen measured items this Ad format turned out to be the least eye-catching, and perceived to be very similar to Sponsored cards. While this Ad format does not have unique features like Sponsored cards, Google suggests this Ad format to be used for every type of campaigns and it is an ever-appearing type of advertisement on the platform. The analyzed data shows similar results to marketing experts' opinion as Display ads being the second most effective Ad format on YouTube (Guttmann, 2019).

5.2 Overlay ads

Between Display ads and Overlay ads the only main difference regarding to appearance is the location where it shows up. This variation makes a huge difference on how Generation Z evaluates this type of advertisement on the attitudinal factors. The results confirm Burns's (2003) statement that findings focusing on an online Ad format cannot be derived to another Ad format. Overlay ads are found to be less entertaining than Skippable video ads and Sponsored cards, less informative than Sponsored cards and more irritating than Display ads and Sponsored cards. Overlay ads deliver the least value to consumers and it is considered to be the least innovative, least attractive and the least entertaining. These distinct results between Display and Overlay ads could be explained by the demographics characteristics of Generation Z. As stated by Wood (2013) the focus on innovation and insistence on convenience are important trends for Generation Z as consumers. While Overlays ads are just a relocated version of Display ads, it is less convenient for viewers to watch their content and the caused disruption is not innovative. Respondents considered Skippable video ads to be more entertaining than Overlay ads, even though that type of advertisement takes up the whole size of the video and must be watched for at least five seconds, while Overlay ads only take 20% of the watched video, also the advertisement immediately can be closed. These attitudinal differences are considered to be the result of the lack of innovation delivered by Overlay ads, because the increased disruption caused by the relocation of a Display ad is not being compensated by a more innovative message appearance.

5.3 Skippable video ads:

Skippable video ads scored significantly higher than Overlay ads on the Entertainment factor and respondents described it as the most eye-catching advertising format. Compared to the other two video ads (Non-Skippable video ads and Bumper ads) there are no significant differences found between the attitudinal factors. However based on the collected data, Skippable video ads lead to about 10% higher Clickthrough rate and makes about 20% more viewers to visit the advertised site later than the other two video ads. Marketing experts consider Skippable video ads (played right before the actual YouTube video) the most effective advertising format on YouTube across all generations (Guttmann, 2019). The studied data is consistent with that statement, in addition another consulting company suggests that Generation Z is more positive to Skippable video ads (both before or during a YouTube video) than other generations (Brown, 2017). These findings make Skippable video ads an attractive Ad format to target young adult consumers for both advertisers and content creators.

5.4 Non-Skippable video ads

Non-Skippable video ads are seen as more Irritating than Display ads and Sponsored cards. This advertising format is viewed as the most disruptive and overbearing way of advertising among Generation Z consumers. While there are no significant differences found between the attitudinal factors of the video advertising formats, the overall advertising value of Non-Skippable video ads are 30% lower than it is for the Skippable video ads. This advertising format interrupts the viewer from watching their content for the longest time.

5.5 Bumper ads

Bumper ads being the shorter version of Non-Skippable video ads, are considered to be the most intrusive advertising format. Significant differences were found within the irritation factor, compared to Display ads and Sponsored cards, revealing that Bumper ads are seen more irritating. On the other attitudinal factors there were no significant differences found.

5.6 Sponsored cards

Sponsored cards show the most positive results regarding the attitudinal factors of the Ducoffe model. Sponsored cards have significantly scored higher on the entertainment and informativeness factor than Overlay ads. It was found to be less irritating than Non-skippable video ads, bumper ads and Overlay ads. Because of these differences, Generation Z also prefers Sponsored cards over Non-skippable video ads and Overlay ads. By looking at the 15 answered items, Sponsored cards could be labeled the best as "different". Even though the Sponsored cards are preferred over other advertising formats and positive attitudes shown towards them, there are no outstanding results found regarding the effectiveness of the advertising format. The studied data suggests that Sponsored cards hide unexploited potentials. The interactivity, the unobtrusive appearance and the informativeness of the ad format seems to be highly valued by Generation Z.

5.7 Conclusion

Overall Sponsored cards and Display ads seem to be most Generation Z friendly advertisement formats, especially Sponsored cards. Overlay ads show a great misfit with the studied demographic group, it represents the lowest advertising value and lower clickthrough rate than Display ads. Therefore, Overlay ads are interpreted as the least effective YouTube Ad format to target Generation Z consumers and Skippable video ads are confirmedly the most effective advertising format for advertisers, even when targeting digital natives. Between the video advertising formats there were no significant differences found regarding the attitudinal dimensions.

6. IMPLICATIONS

Online entertainment platforms recognize 3 key players: content creators, users and advertisers. Content creators make



Figure 8 YouTube key players

entertaining, educative or any kind of creative or somehow valuable videos which attract viewers (Anderson, 2018). The gained attention through their published videos is beneficial for advertisers since it gives them the ability to reach out their target audience in a more efficient way than in traditional media. For gaining viewers and maintaining their community, YouTube creators are able to receive financial compensations for their work. As the importance of video marketing is increasing, as well as the popularity of online media platforms, this study aimed to better understand the generation with the highest penetration rate of the online entertainment on the platform with the most monthly users (Chaffey, 2020) (Statista, 2019) (Brown, 2017) (Drummond-Butt, 2020). The implications will be discussed in the following subsections on the advertisers and creators perspective, based on the findings of previous studies and the analyzed data.

6.1 Advertisers

Skippable video ads work just as well or maybe even better than for other generations. Based on the study revealing that watching a Skippable ad for 8 seconds results nearly the same effect on brand and message recall as watching a Non-Skippable ad. The challenge is to retrain young adults' attention for three additional seconds after the "Skip" bottom has showed up (Vroegrijk, 2020). Even if the advertisement gets skipped after 5 seconds, the advertiser does not get charged. Due to the TrueView function of this Ad format, it is more cost-efficient than Non-Skippable video ads or Bumper ads. Besides its cost-efficiency Skippable video ads also show the best ability to generate clicks on an advertisement.

Regarding to young adults' attitude towards the video ad formats there are no significant differences found. Depending on the goal of the campaign, there are scenarios in which the other two video advertising formats might fit better than Non-Skippable video ads. In cases where the goal is to make the most impressions possible, making sure that the viewer does not skip the full message Non-Skippable video ads might fit better. However, (Brown, 2017) suggests that Generation Z consumer are generally less positive towards Non-Skippable video ads than other generations, and Non-skippable ads come at a higher cost. Overall, based on the analyzed data and previous findings, combined with the current TrueView pricing strategy, Skippable video ads seem to be the most effective video advertising format for advertisers when targeting Generation Z consumers. This ad format is win-win for advertisers and young adults as well. While it is the cheapest video ad format for advertisers, from the consumers side this video ad format gives the most freedom to watch or skip an advertisement. A research found that viewers perceive skippable advertising positively, which can increase their loyalty and motivation to the platform and enhance their overall experience (Raney, Arpan, Pashupati, & Brill, 2003). This could be one of the reasons why YouTube charges Skippable video ads on a TrueView basis and why is it an effective Ad format across all generations.

When considering to advertise on YouTube without having a video advertisement, it is suggested to choose Display ads and Sponsored cards over Overlay ads to avoid the potential negative effects of intrusive advertising on the advertised brand. Overlay ads was found to be more irritating than Display ads and Sponsored cards, moreover only 10% of the respondents claimed that they have ever clicked on an Overlay ad. Sponsored cards scored significantly better on all the three assessed attitudinal dimension and also being preferred over Overlay ads by Generation Z. While Sponsored cards are also being preferred over Non-Skippable video ads, there are no significant differences regarding to clicks. As Sponsored cards representing the highest advertising value to consumers, it is suggested to consider this advertising format whenever it comes to sponsored content or product placement within a video. As an addition to the current campaigns, Sponsored cards are advised to be enabled in most cases possible.

6.2 Creators

Given the unlimited content within and between online entertainment platforms and the diversity of Generation Z, it is important to well maintain the already existing audience of a YouTube channel. As nowadays teenagers are under more and more pressure, one of the main reasons for visiting YouTube is to take a break from the everyday stresses (Anderson, 2018). Knowing that escapism is being one of the main reasons for turning to YouTube, too many irritating factors could make the viewer to switch to another channel or platform. Therefore, it is suggested to content creators to take into account the relative value their content represents to viewers when making monetization decisions.

Starting with the video advertising formats, the Skippable ad format is a generally acceptable advertising format to be used for YouTubers whose main audience consist of digital natives. It gives the option to the viewers to skip the advertisement, in that case the creator will not receive any financial rewards, but this advertising format has the highest likeliness that a viewer will click on it. While non-skippable ads mean a constant revenue for YouTubers, it is still an intrusive ad format which retrains the viewer from consuming their desired content. Based on the findings of (Brown, 2017) it is suggested to place non-interactive video ads in videos where the value of the content outweighs the cost of watching a 15-20 seconds advertisement. In practice it means that Non-Skippable video ads are advised to be placed only before videos which are expected to gain relatively high number of views (compared to the channel's average views per video) due to the uniqueness, or trendiness of that video. The same way Bumper ads are advised to be placed in videos which contain valuable or interesting announcements/content, right before the interesting part. In that way, consumers directly get "rewarded" after watching the advertisement and lowers the chance of boredom or leaving the channel.

Regarding to the display advertising formats, Overlay ads are suggested to be used the least. Based on the collected data, this advertising format has the lowest clickthrough rate. Regardless the method of income (clicks or CPM) Overlay ads are considered to be more irritating than Display ads. As Display ads are an always enabled monetizing option, based on the results of money generated on that advertising format it can be decided if it worth to enable Overlay ads, knowing that the audience considers it to be more irritating than Display ads. Finally, Sponsored cards are the most Generation Z friendly income generating way of advertising. It is found to be preferred over Non-Skippable video ads and Overlay ads; however, it only pays on a click basis. Because Sponsored cards representing the highest advertising value for Generation Z consumers, it is recommended to use this advertising format and even refer to the existence of these cards within the video, in the right moment, to generate more clicks on them. That way the disruption caused is minimal and the viewer has the ability to decide if they are interested in it or not.

7. LIMITATIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The first mentionable limitation of the study is that it does not focus on the content of the advertisement. The study aimed to compare the attitude towards the YouTube advertising formats without considering the content of the shown advertisement. Attitudes towards the advertisement could differ based on personal interest and the content of the advertisement. As this study solely focused on how Generation Z perceives the YouTube advertising formats available on desktop, the results across generations, platforms and devices could differ.

During the data collection it was recognized that respondents give contradictory answers to the questions of "Have you ever clicked through on a Skippable video ad to get more information?" and "I have clicked through a Skippable ad times in the past month.". While multiple times the first question was answered with "No" the respondents answered to the second question mostly as "7 or more". This inconsistency only arisen in the experimental group of Skippable video ads. Most likely respondents meant to give an answer on the number of times they have skipped a Skippable ad in the past month, but this is not what the statement was intended to measure. Since this misunderstanding only occurred at one of the ad formats it might be noteworthy for further researches to consider the features of a specific Ad format when it comes to a creation of survey statements/questions. Even though that the questioners were retrieved from previous research papers, and five out of six formats received consistent answers to the statements, the sentence "I have clicked through a Skippable ad times in the past month." could have been created differently considering that this specific ad format has a "Skip" bottom showing up after 5 seconds the advertisement is started to play.

8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all I would like to thank to the coordinators of the BMS faculty of University of Twente for making it possible to graduate despite the COVID-19 pandemic. I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Carolina Herrando for guiding through the steps of this research. I would like to thank all the people between 16-25 years old who took their time to fill in my survey, thereby contributing to success of the research. Lastly, I would like to thank to the members of my graduation circle for cooperating during the making of the several parts of this paper.

9. REFERENCES

- 99firms. (2019). Retrieved from https://99firms.com/blog/youtube-demographics/#gref
- Anderson, M. (2018, August). Understanding Gen Z through the lens of YouTube. Retrieved from https://www.thinkwithgoogle.com/advertisingchannels/video/gen-z-and-youtube/
- Bauer, R. A., & Greyser, S. A. (1968). Advertising in America: The consumer view. Boston.
- Brown. (2017, January). AdReaction Gen X, Y and Z. Retrieved from https://iabeurope.eu/wpcontent/uploads/2019/08/AdReaction-Gen-X-Y-and-Z_Global-Report_FINAL_Jan-10-2017.pdf
- Brown, S. B., & Stayman, D. M. (1992). Antecedents and Consequences of Attitude Toward the Ad: A Meta-Analysis. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/24098725_ Antecedents_and_Consequences_of_Attitude_Towar d_the_Ad_A_Meta-Analysis
- Burns, K. S. (2003). Attitude Toward the Online Advertising Format: Reexamination of the Attitude Toward the Ad Model in an Online Advertising Context. University of Florida. Retrieved from https://ufdc.ufl.edu/AA00013638/00001/1j
- Burns, K. S., & Lutz, R. J. (2006). THE FUNCTION OF FORMAT: Consumer Responses to Six On-Line Advertising Formats. Journal of Advertising. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/250174265_ The_function_of_format_-_Consumer_responses_to_six_online_advertising formats
- BusinessInsider. (2020, February 19). *How YouTubers Decide Where To Put Ads With Natalie Barbu*. Retrieved from YouTube:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=88hzVjTFjMM

- Carter, J. (2020, February 11). Video marketing statistics to know for 2020. Retrieved from Smartinsights: https://www.smartinsights.com/digital-marketingplatforms/video-marketing/video-marketing-statisticsto-know/
- Chaffey, d. (2020, February 11). Video marketing statistics to know for 2020. Retrieved from SmartInsights: https://www.smartinsights.com/digital-marketingplatforms/video-marketing/video-marketing-statisticsto-know/
- Clement, J. (2020, February). *Statista*. Retrieved from https://www.statista.com/statistics/289658/youtube-global-net-advertising-revenues/
- Daugherty, T., & Gangadharbatla, H. (2013). Advertising Versus Product Placements: How Consumers Assess the Value of Each. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237201264_ Advertising_Versus_Product_Placements_How_Cons umers_Assess_the_Value_of_Each
- Drummond-Butt, S. (2020, March). YouTube's top stats for 2020 tell who's watching what, when [Infographic]. Retrieved from https://www.impactbnd.com/blog/youtubes-top-statsfor-2020-infographic
- Ducoffe, R. H. (1996, October). Advertising Value and Advertising on the Web. Advertising Reserach, 22.

Retrieved from https://slidelegend.com/advertisingvalue-and-advertising-on-the-web-blogmanagement_5a85ffde1723dd53ce733391.html

- Google. (n.d.). Retrieved 2020, from https://support.google.com/youtube/answer/2375431? hl=en
- Google. (2012, February). *TrueView Ads: Getting Viewers to Watch, Not Skip.* Retrieved from https://www.thinkwithgoogle.com/consumerinsights/trueview-search/
- Google. (2017). Retrieved from https://www.thinkwithgoogle.com/intl/engb/advertising-channels/video/youtube-bumper-adsmaking-big-impact-small-stories/
- Google. (2019, November). YouTube Ads Leaderboard: TrueView for Action. Retrieved from https://www.thinkwithgoogle.com/advertisingchannels/video/youtube-trueview-for-actionleaderboard-2019/
- Google. (n.d.). About interactive video ads. Retrieved from https://support.google.com/googleads/answer/150471?hl=en
- Google. (n.d.). Add cards to videos. Retrieved from https://support.google.com/youtube/answer/6140493? visit_id=637253402116816869-1535050775&rd=1
- Google. (n.d.). *In-video Overlay Ads*. Retrieved from https://support.google.com/displayspecs/answer/1870 95?hl=en&ref_topic=4588474
- Google. (n.d.). *Non-skippable video ads*. Retrieved from https://support.google.com/youtube/answer/188038?h l=en
- Google. (n.d.). *Standard Display Ads*. Retrieved from https://support.google.com/displayspecs/answer/1874 49?hl=en&ref_topic=4588474
- Google. (n.d.). *TrueView in-stream ads*. Retrieved from https://support.google.com/displayspecs/answer/6055 025?hl=en&ref_topic=4588474
- Guttmann, A. (2019, May). Most effective ad formats on YouTube worldwide 2019. Retrieved from Statista: https://www.statista.com/statistics/1102764/effectiveyoutube-ad-formats-world/
- Ha, L., & Litman, B. R. (1997). Does Advertising Clutter Have Diminishing and Negative Returns. Journal of Advertising. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/009133 67.1997.10673516
- Handley, L. (2017, January 11). *Marketing Media Money*. Retrieved from CNBC: https://www.cnbc.com/2017/01/11/generation-zavoids-advertising-uses-ad-blockers-and-skipscontent.html
- Haslam, G. (2018, July 22). YouTube Advertising: How to Choose The Right Ad Format. Retrieved from https://championsdigital.agency/blog/youtubeadvertising-how-choose-right-ad-format
- Hayes, B. (1992). Measurement Customer Satisfaction: Development and Use of Questionnaire. ASQC. Retrieved from https://archive.org/details/measuringcustome00haye/p age/n183

- Le, T. D., & Vo, H. (2017). Consumer attitude towards website advertising formats: A comparative study of banner, pop-up & in-line display advertisements. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318952765_ Consumer_attitude_towards_website_advertising_for mats_A_comparative_study_of_banner_pop-up_inline_display_advertisements
- Lupei, Z., & Habig, J. (2017, April 27). Say It in Six: Why marketers and creatives are embracing the newest video ad length. Retrieved from https://www.blog.google/products/ads/say-it-in-sixwhy-marketers-and/
- Lutz, R. J. (1985). Affective and cognitive antecedents of attitude toward the ad: A conceptual framework. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Mehta, A. (2000). Advertising attitudes and advertising effectives. Journal of Advertising Research 40(3):67-72. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279672923_ Advertising_attitudes_and_advertising_effectives
- Raney, A. M., Arpan, L. M., Pashupati, K., & Brill, D. A. (2003). At the movies, on the Web: An investigation of the effects of entertaining and interactive Web content on site and brand evaluations. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 38-53. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/ S1094996803701455
- Rodgers, S., & Thorson, E. (2000). *The Interactive Advertising Model: How People Perceive and Process Interactive Ads.* Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/258357564_ The_Interactive_Advertising_Model_How_People_P erceive_and_Process_Interactive_Ads
- Schlosser, A., Shavitt, S., & Kanfer, A. (1999). Survey of internet users' attitudes toward internet advertising. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*. Retrieved from https://www.scopus.com/record/display.uri?eid=2s2.0-0001975497&origin=inward&txGid=00f2576d7a3a4 d0f701c2bd26f58c6ec
- SocialB. (2018, November 2). *The Effects Of Online Platforms On The Entertainment Industry*. Retrieved from https://socialb.co.uk/blog/the-effects-of-onlineplatforms-on-the-entertainment-industry/
- Statista. (2019, November 25). Internet usage worldwide. Retrieved from https://www-statistacom.ezproxy2.utwente.nl/chart/17613/most-popularwebsites/
- Statista. (2019). YouTube usage penetration in the United States 2019, by age group. Retrieved from https://www.statista.com/statistics/296227/usyoutube-reach-age-gender/
- Tutaj, K., & van Reijmersdal, E. A. (2012). Effects of online advertising format and persuasion knowledge on audience reactons. Amsterdam School of Communication. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/135272 66.2011.620765
- Vroegrijk, M. (2020, April 7). ONLINE VIDEO ADVERTISEMENTS: HOW TO BRIDGE THE GAP BETWEEN SKIPPABLE AND NON-SKIPPABLE? Retrieved from https://www.dvj-insights.com/online-

video-advertisements-how-to-bridge-the-gapbetween-skippable-and-non-skippable/

- Whatley, T. (2019, July 3). *What Are Display Ads? The Complete Guide*. Retrieved from Acquisio: https://www.acquisio.com/blog/agency/what-are-display-ads-5-steps-to-effective-visual-advertising/#
- Wood, S. (2013, January). Generation Z as Consumers: Trends and Innovation. NC State University, Institute for

10. APPENDIX 1:



Figure 1 Ducoffe model (1996)

Emerging Issues. Retrieved from https://iei.ncsu.edu/wpcontent/uploads/2013/01/GenZConsumers.pdf

YouTube. (2020). Retrieved from https://support.google.com/youtube/answer/2467968? hl=en&ref_topic=1115890

YouTube advertising formats

There are several types of ads that may appear next to your videos when you've turned on video monetization.

Ad format	Placement	Platform	Specs
Display ads	Appears to the right of the feature video and above the video suggestions list. For larger players, this ad may appear below the player.	Desktop	300x250 or 300x60
Overlay ads	Semi-transparent overlay ads that appear on the lower 20% portion of your video.	Desktop	468x60 or 728x90 image ads or text
Skippable video ads	Skippable video ads allow viewers to skip ads after 5 seconds, if they choose. Inserted before, during, or after the main video. If you turn on this option, you may see a combination of skippable and bumper ads play back to back.	Desktop, mobile devices, TV, and game consoles	Plays in video player.
Non-skippable video ads	Non-skippable video ads must be watched before your video can be viewed. These ads can appear before, during, or after the main video.	Desktop and mobile devices	Plays in video player. 15 or 20 seconds in length, depending on regional standards.
Bumper ads	Non-skippable video ads of up to 6 seconds that must be watched before your video can be viewed. If you turn on this option, you may see a combination of skippable and bumper ads play back to back.	Desktop and mobile devices	Plays in video player, up to 6 seconds long
Sponsored cards	Sponsored cards display content that may be relevant to your video, such as products featured in the video. Viewers will see a teaser for the card for a few seconds. They can also click the icon in the top right corner of the video to browse the cards.	Desktop and mobile devices	Card sizes vary

For very short videos (around 30 seconds), certain video ad formats like non-skip, skippable, and bumper ads may be less likely to serve. We do this to better optimize overall viewer engagement and revenue over the course of a viewer's session on YouTube.

Figure 9 YouTube advertising formats

11. APPENDIX 2: QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire

1. In general, this type of advertising format is... *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Amusing	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Annoying	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Attractive	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Beneficial	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Different	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Disruptive	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Elaborate	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Entertaining	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Eye-catching	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Informative	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Innovative	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Intrusive	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Overbearing	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Sophisticated	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Useful	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

2. Compared to other advertising formats used by YouTube, how would you describe this type of ad? *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	З	4	5	
Disliked by me	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	Liked by me

 Compared to other advertising formats used by YouTube, how would you describe this type of ad? *

Mark only one oval.



4. Compared to other advertising formats used by YouTube, how would you describe this type of ad? *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
A poor ad format	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	An excellent ad format

5. Compared to other advertising formats used by YouTube, how would you describe this type of ad? *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I hate it	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	I love it

6. Have you ever clicked through on an Overlay ad to get more information? *

Mark only one oval.

Yes

7. Has an Overlay ad prompted you to later visit the site? *

Mark only one oval.

Yes No

8. | have clicked through an Overlay ad _____ times in the past month. *

Mark only one oval.

None
1-2
3-4
5-6
7 or more

12. APPENDIX 3: SPSS OUTPUT (RELIABILITY) Reliability :

RELIABILITY

/VARIABLES=Amusing Attractive Different Elaborate Entertaining Eyecatching Innovative Sophisticated

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's

Alpha	N of Items
.788	8

RELIABILITY

/VARIABLES=Beneficial Informative Useful

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's

Alpha	N of Items
700	2
./ 33	3

RELIABILITY

/VARIABLES=Annoying Disruptive Intrusive Overbearing

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's	
Alpha	N of Items
.823	4

RELIABILITY

/VARIABLES=Likedbyme Oneofthebest Excellent Iloveit

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's	
Alpha	N of Items
.923	4

13. APPENDIX 4: SPSS OUTPUT (ANOVA)

13.1 TABLE: ENTERTAINEMNT

Descriptives

Entertainment						
	Ν	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Minimum	Maximum
Skippable	38	2.6447	.57431	.09317	1.00	3.88
Non-Skippable	35	2.5929	.61188	.10343	1.38	4.00
Display	38	2.3980	.56716	.09201	1.38	3.75
Overlay	40	2.1531	.66536	.10520	1.00	4.00
Sponsored cards	30	2.7917	.71944	.13135	1.00	3.88
Bumper	36	2.4132	.51653	.08609	1.13	3.38
Total	217	2.4844	.63656	.04321	1.00	4.00

ANOVA

Entertainment					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	9.077	<mark>5</mark>	1.815	<mark>4.883</mark>	.000
Within Groups	78.449	<mark>211</mark>	.372		
Total	87.526	216			

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Entertainment

Scheffe

		Mean Difference		
(I) Ad Format	(J) Ad Format	(I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Skippable	Non-Skippable	.05188	.14285	1.000
	Display	.24671	.13989	.683
	Overlay	.49161*	.13813	<mark>.030</mark>
	Sponsored cards	14693	.14892	.964
	Bumper	.23154	.14182	.751
Non-Skippable	Skippable	05188	.14285	1.000
	Display	.19483	.14285	.867
	Overlay	.43973	.14113	.089
	Sponsored cards	19881	.15171	.886
	Bumper	.17966	.14474	.908
Display	Skippable	24671	.13989	.683
	Non-Skippable	19483	.14285	.867
	Overlay	.24490	.13813	.678
	Sponsored cards	39364	.14892	.226
	Bumper	01517	.14182	1.000
Overlay	Skippable	49161 [*]	.13813	<mark>.030</mark>

	Non-Skippable	43973	.14113	.089
	Display	24490	.13813	.678
	Sponsored cards	63854 [*]	.14727	.003
	Bumper	26007	.14008	.632
Sponsored cards	Skippable	.14693	.14892	.964
	Non-Skippable	.19881	.15171	.886
	Display	.39364	.14892	.226
	Overlay	.63854*	.14727	<mark>.003</mark>
	Bumper	.37847	.15073	.282
Bumper	Skippable	23154	.14182	.751
	Non-Skippable	17966	.14474	.908
	Display	.01517	.14182	1.000
	Overlay	.26007	.14008	.632
	Sponsored cards	37847	.15073	.282

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

13.2 TABLE: INFORMATIVENESS

Descriptives

Informativeness						
	Ν	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Minimum	Maximum
Skippable	38	2.7982	.78476	.12731	1.00	4.00
Non-Skippable	35	2.6952	.83381	.14094	1.00	4.00
Display	38	2.6667	.73112	.11860	1.00	4.33
Overlay	40	2.3250	.87539	.13841	1.00	4.33
Sponsored cards	30	3.1444	.89564	.16352	1.00	5.00
Bumper	36	2.7870	.82482	.13747	1.00	4.33
Total	217	2.7174	.84801	.05757	1.00	5.00

ANOVA

Informativeness					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	12.168	5	2.434	3.587	<mark>.004</mark>
Within Groups	143.163	<mark>211</mark>	.678		
Total	155.331	216			

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Informativeness

Scheffe

		Mean Difference		
(I) Ad Format	(J) Ad Format	(I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Skippable	Non-Skippable	.10301	.19298	.998
	Display	.13158	.18897	.993
	Overlay	.47325	.18660	.271
	Sponsored cards	34620	.20118	.706
	Bumper	.01121	.19158	1.000
Non-Skippable	Skippable	10301	.19298	.998
	Display	.02857	.19298	1.000
	Overlay	.37024	.19065	.584
	Sponsored cards	44921	.20494	.443
	Bumper	09180	.19553	.999
Display	Skippable	13158	.18897	.993
	Non-Skippable	02857	.19298	1.000
	Overlay	.34167	.18660	.646
	Sponsored cards	47778	.20118	.347
	Bumper	12037	.19158	.995
Overlay	Skippable	47325	.18660	.271
	Non-Skippable	37024	.19065	.584
	Display	34167	.18660	.646
	Sponsored cards	81944*	.19894	<mark>.006</mark>
	Bumper	46204	.18923	.314
Sponsored cards	Skippable	.34620	.20118	.706
	Non-Skippable	.44921	.20494	.443
	Display	.47778	.20118	.347
	Overlay	.81944*	.19894	<mark>.006</mark>
	Bumper	.35741	.20363	.688
Bumper	Skippable	01121	.19158	1.000
	Non-Skippable	.09180	.19553	.999
	Display	.12037	.19158	.995
	Overlay	.46204	.18923	.314
	Sponsored cards	35741	.20363	.688

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

13.3 TABLE: IRRITATION

Descriptives

I	rrita	ti O	n
•	1110	i ii O	

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Minimum	Maximum
Skippable	38	3.2434	.84727	.13744	1.75	5.00
Non-Skippable	35	3.7500	.73013	.12341	2.50	5.00
Display	38	2.8618	.94027	.15253	1.00	5.00
Overlav	40	3.5313	.84956	.13433	2.25	5.00
Sponsored cards	30	2.7667	1.08860	.19875	1.00	5.00
Bumper	36	3 7014	73148	12191	1 75	5.00
Total	217	3.3214	.93669	.06359	1.00	5.00

ANOVA

Irritation					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	30.877	5	6.175	<mark>8.214</mark>	.000
Within Groups	158.641	<mark>211</mark>	.752		
Total	189.518	216			

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Irritation

Scheffe

		Mean Difference		
(I) Ad Format	(J) Ad Format	(I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Skippable	Non-Skippable	50658	.20314	.290
	Display	.38158	.19892	.597
	Overlay	28783	.19642	.828
	Sponsored cards	.47675	.21177	.411
	Bumper	45797	.20167	.400
Non-Skippable	Skippable	.50658	.20314	.290
	<mark>Display</mark>	.88816*	.20314	<mark>.002</mark>
	Overlay	.21875	.20069	.946
	Sponsored cards	.98333*	.21574	<mark>.001</mark>
	Bumper	.04861	.20583	1.000
Display	Skippable	38158	.19892	.597
	Non-Skippable	88816*	.20314	.002
	Overlay	66941*	.19642	<mark>.044</mark>
	Sponsored cards	.09518	.21177	.999
	Bumper	83955*	.20167	<mark>.005</mark>
Overlay	Skippable	.28783	.19642	.828
	Non-Skippable	21875	.20069	.946

	Display	.66941*	.19642	<mark>.044</mark>
	Sponsored cards	.76458*	.20942	<mark>.023</mark>
	Bumper	17014	.19920	.981
Sponsored cards	Skippable	47675	.21177	.411
	Non-Skippable	98333 [*]	.21574	<mark>.001</mark>
	Display	09518	.21177	.999
	Overlay	76458*	.20942	<mark>.023</mark>
	Bumper	93472*	.21435	<mark>.003</mark>
Bumper	Skippable	.45797	.20167	.400
	Non-Skippable	04861	.20583	1.000
	Display	.83955*	.20167	.005
	Overlay	.17014	.19920	.981
	Sponsored cards	.93472*	.21435	.0 <mark>03</mark>

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

13.4 TABLE: ATOAF

Descriptives

Attitude Towards Online Advertising Format

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Minimum	Maximum
Skippable	38	2.9408	.99055	.16069	1.00	4.75
Non-Skippable	35	2.3214	1.05818	.17887	1.00	5.00
Display	38	3.0395	.83327	.13517	1.00	4.25
Overlay	40	2.4938	1.05077	.16614	1.00	5.00
Sponsored cards	30	3.4667	.95532	.17442	1.00	5.00
Bumper	36	2.6736	.91382	.15230	1.00	4.50
Total	217	2.8041	1.02611	.06966	1.00	5.00

ANOVA

Auture Towarus Off	Autude Towards Online Adventising Format				
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	28.605	<mark>5</mark>	5.721	<mark>6.071</mark>	.000
Within Groups	198.822	<mark>211</mark>	.942		
Total	227.426	216			

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Attitude Towards Online Advertising Format Scheffe

		Mean Difference		
(I) Ad Format	(J) Ad Format	(I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Skippable	Non-Skippable	.61936	.22742	.196
	Display	09868	.22270	.999
	Overlay	.44704	.21990	.532
	Sponsored cards	52588	.23708	.428
	Bumper	.26718	.22577	.924
Non-Skippable	Skippable	61936	.22742	.196
	Display	71805	.22742	.081
	Overlay	17232	.22468	.988
	Sponsored cards	-1.14524*	.24152	. <mark>001</mark>
	Bumper	35218	.23043	.800
Display	Skippable	.09868	.22270	.999
	Non-Skippable	.71805	.22742	.081
	Overlay	.54572	.21990	.295
	Sponsored cards	42719	.23708	.662
	Bumper	.36586	.22577	.757
Overlay	Skippable	44704	.21990	.532
	Non-Skippable	.17232	.22468	.988
	Display	54572	.21990	.295
	Sponsored cards	97292 [*]	.23445	<mark>.005</mark>
	Bumper	17986	.22301	.985
Sponsored cards	Skippable	.52588	.23708	.428
	Non-Skippable	1.14524*	.24152	<mark>.001</mark>
	Display	.42719	.23708	.662
	Overlay	.97292*	.23445	. <mark>005</mark>
	Bumper	.79306	.23997	.057
Bumper	Skippable	26718	.22577	.924
	Non-Skippable	.35218	.23043	.800
	Display	36586	.22577	.757
	Overlay	.17986	.22301	.985
	Sponsored cards	79306	.23997	.057

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

14. APPENDIX 5: SPSS OUTPUT (CORSSTABS, ANOVA)14.1 Table: CLICKTHROUGH

Chi-Square Tests				
			Asymptotic	
			Significance (2-	
	Value	df	sided)	
Pearson Chi-Square	12.263ª	5	.031	
Likelihood Ratio	13.659	5	.018	
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.464	1	.116	
N of Valid Cases	217			

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.99.



Ad Format * Clickthrough Crosstabulation

			Clickth	irough	
	-		Yes	No	Total
Ad Format	Skippable	Count	17	21	38
		% within Ad Format	44.7%	55.3%	100.0%
		% within Clickthrough	26.2%	13.8%	17.5%
Non-Skippable		Count	11	24	35
		% within Ad Format	31.4%	68.6%	100.0%
		% within Clickthrough	16.9%	15.8%	16.1%
Display	Count	13	25	38	
	% within Ad Format	34.2%	65.8%	100.0%	
		% within Clickthrough	20.0%	16.4%	17.5%
	Overlay	Count	4	36	40

		% within Ad Format	10.0%	90.0%	100.0%
		% within Clickthrough	6.2%	23.7%	18.4%
	Sponsored cards	Count	8	22	30
		% within Ad Format	26.7%	73.3%	100.0%
		% within Clickthrough	12.3%	14.5%	13.8%
	Bumper	Count	12	24	36
		% within Ad Format	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		% within Clickthrough	18.5%	15.8%	16.6%
Total		Count	65	152	217
		% within Ad Format	30.0%	70.0%	100.0%
		% within Clickthrough	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

14.2 TABLE: VISITLATER

Chi-Square Tests			
			Asymptotic
			Significance (2-
	Value	df	sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.375ª	5	.044
Likelihood Ratio	11.213	5	.047
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.499	1	.034
N of Valid Cases	217		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.12.



Ad Format * Visit later Crosstabulation

			Visit la	ater	
			Yes	No	Total
Ad Format	Skippable	Count	19	19	38
		% within Ad Format	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Visit later	28.8%	12.6%	17.5%
	Non-Skippable	Count	9	26	35
Display Overlay	% within Ad Format	25.7%	74.3%	100.0%	
	% within Visit later	13.6%	17.2%	16.1%	
	Count	13	25	38	
	% within Ad Format	34.2%	65.8%	100.0%	
	% within Visit later	19.7%	16.6%	17.5%	
	Count	9	31	40	
		% within Ad Format	22.5%	77.5%	100.0%
		% within Visit later	13.6%	20.5%	18.4%
	Sponsored cards	Count	5	25	30
		% within Ad Format	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%
		% within Visit later	7.6%	16.6%	13.8%
	Bumper	Count	11	25	36
		% within Ad Format	30.6%	69.4%	100.0%
		% within Visit later	16.7%	16.6%	16.6%
Total		Count	66	151	217
		% within Ad Format	30.4%	69.6%	100.0%
		% within Visit later	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

14.3 TABLE: ENTERTAINMENT *CLICKTHROUGH



Entertainment * Clickthrough Crosstabulation

Count

		Clickth	rough	
	<u>.</u>	Yes	No	Total
Entertainment	1.00	0	3	3
	1.13	0	1	1
	1.25	0	1	1
	1.38	1	7	8
	1.50	1	4	5
	1.63	4	4	8
	1.75	0	3	3
	1.88	0	8	8
	2.00	2	14	16
	2.13	2	9	11
	2.25	2	27	29
	2.38	3	14	17
	2.50	4	10	14
	2.63	8	8	16
	2.75	6	5	11
	2.88	4	7	11
	3.00	8	7	15
	3.13	4	7	11
	3.25	2	5	7
	3.38	2	2	4
	3.50	4	1	5
	3.63	3	1	4

	3.75	3	2	5
	3.88	1	1	2
	4.00	1	1	2
Total		65	152	217

Chi-Square Tests

			Asymptotic
			Significance (2-
	Value	df	sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	45.510ª	24	.005
Likelihood Ratio	50.577	24	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	22.803	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	217		

a. 35 cells (70.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .30.

Bar Chart Clickthrough

14.4 TABLE: CLICKTHROUGH INFORMATION

Chi-Square	Tests

			Asymptotic
			Significance (2-
	Value	df	sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.898ª	11	.002
Likelihood Ratio	32.918	11	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	25.754	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	217		

Information * Clickthrough Crosstabulation

Count

		Clickth		
	- <u>.</u>	Yes	No	Total
Information	1.00	0	13	13
	1.33	1	5	6
	1.67	2	10	12
	2.00	4	22	26
	2.33	6	22	28
	2.67	7	27	34
	3.00	12	18	30
	3.33	9	17	26
	3.67	10	9	19
	4.00	11	7	18
	4.33	2	2	4
	5.00	1	0	1
Total		65	152	217

14.5 TABLE: ANOVA FREQUENCY:

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable:	endent Variable: Clickthrough frequency					
Ad Format	Mean	Std. Deviation	Ν			
Skippable	1.91	1.329	32			
Non-Skippable	1.25	.508	32			
Display	1.34	.539	35			
Overlay	1.11	.319	36			
Sponsored cards	1.24	.636	29			
Bumper	1.21	.410	34			
Total	1.34	.735	198			

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Clickthro	ough frequency				
	Type III Sum of				
Source	Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	13.299 ^a	5	2.660	5.490	.000
Intercept	355.268	1	355.268	733.226	.000
Pleasechooseoneofthesymb	13.299	5	2.660	5.490	.000
ols					
Error	93.029	192	.485		
Total	461.000	198			

Corrected Total	106.328	197		

a. R Squared = .125 (Adjusted R Squared = .102)

Pairwise Comparisons

Dependent Variable:	e: Clickthrough frequency				
		Mean Difference			
(I) Ad Format	(J) Ad Format	(I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	
Skippable	Non-Skippable	.656*	.174	.003	
	Display	.563*	.170	.017	
	Overlay	.795*	.169	.000	
	Sponsored cards	.665*	.178	.004	
	Bumper	.700*	.171	.001	
Non-Skippable	Skippable	656*	.174	.003	
	Display	093	.170	1.000	
	Overlay	.139	.169	1.000	
	Sponsored cards	.009	.178	1.000	
	Bumper	.044	.171	1.000	
Display	Skippable	563*	.170	.017	
	Non-Skippable	.093	.170	1.000	
	Overlay	.232	.165	.930	
	Sponsored cards	.101	.175	1.000	
	Bumper	.137	.168	1.000	
Overlay	Skippable	795*	.169	.000	
	Non-Skippable	139	.169	1.000	
	Display	232	.165	.930	
	Sponsored cards	130	.174	1.000	
	Bumper	095	.166	1.000	
Sponsored cards	Skippable	665*	.178	.004	
	Non-Skippable	009	.178	1.000	
	Display	101	.175	1.000	
	Overlay	.130	.174	1.000	
	Bumper	.035	.176	1.000	
Bumper	Skippable	700 [*]	.171	.001	
	Non-Skippable	044	.171	1.000	
	Display	137	.168	1.000	
	Overlay	.095	.166	1.000	
	Sponsored cards	035	.176	1.000	

Based on estimated marginal means

*. The mean difference is significant at the .050 level.





15. APPENDIX 6: DEMOGRAPHICS 15.1 TABLE: EDUCATION

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Entertainment	Between Groups	2.256	2	1.128	2.831	.061
	Within Groups	85.270	214	.398		
	Total	87.526	216			
Information	Between Groups	2.830	2	1.415	1.986	.140
	Within Groups	152.501	214	.713		
	Total	155.331	216			
Irritation	Between Groups	.195	2	.098	.110	.896
	Within Groups	189.323	214	.885		
	Total	189.518	216			
Attitude Towards Online	Between Groups	.315	2	.157	.148	.862
Advertising	Within Groups	227.111	214	1.061		
	Total	227.426	216			
Clickthrough frequency	Between Groups	.389	2	.194	.358	.700
	Within Groups	105.940	195	.543		
	Total	106.328	197			

15.2 TABLE: AGE

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Irritation	Between Groups	2.997	9	.333	.370	.949
	Within Groups	186.521	207	.901		
	Total	189.518	216			
Entertainment	Between Groups	4.242	9	.471	1.172	.315
	Within Groups	83.283	207	.402		
	Total	87.526	216			
Information	Between Groups	11.356	9	1.262	1.814	.067
	Within Groups	143.975	207	.696		
	Total	155.331	216			
Attitude Towards Online	Between Groups	9.796	9	1.088	1.035	.413
Advertising	Within Groups	217.631	207	1.051		
	Total	227.426	216			
Clickthrough frequency	Between Groups	3.075	9	.342	.622	.777
	Within Groups	103.253	188	.549		
	Total	106.328	197			

15.3 TABLE: NATIONALITY

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Entertainment	Between Groups	2.969	16	.186	.468	.959
	Within Groups	67.373	170	.396		
	Total	70.342	186			
Information	Between Groups	15.932	16	.996	1.473	.115
	Within Groups	114.941	170	.676		
	Total	130.873	186			
Irritation	Between Groups	15.974	16	.998	1.200	.273
	Within Groups	141.444	170	.832		
	Total	157.418	186			
Attitude Towards Online	Between Groups	10.421	16	.651	.569	.904
Advertising	Within Groups	194.608	170	1.145		
	Total	205.028	186			
Clickthrough frequency	Between Groups	9.236	16	.577	1.007	.453
	Within Groups	88.285	154	.573		
	Total	97.520	170			

15.4 TABLE: GENDER

15.4.1 Gender*Entertainment

Chi-Square Tests

			Asymptotic
			Significance (2-
	Value	df	sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	76.922ª	72	.324
Likelihood Ratio	59.555	72	.853
N of Valid Cases	217		

a. 84 cells (84.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .00.

15.4.2 Gender * Information

C	chi-Square	Tests	
			Asymptotic
			Significance (2-
	Value	df	sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.344 ^a	33	.920
Likelihood Ratio	19.494	33	.970
N of Valid Cases	217		

a. 31 cells (64.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .00.

15.4.3 Gender* Irritation

Chi-Square Tests					
			Asymptotic		
			Significance (2-		
	Value	df	sided)		
Pearson Chi-Square	40.607 ^a	48	.767		
Likelihood Ratio	30.418	48	.978		
N of Valid Cases	217				

a. 47 cells (69.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .01.

15.4.4 Gender * Attitude Towards Online Advertising Format

Chi-Square Tests

			Asymptotic
			Significance (2-
	Value	df	sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	41.322ª	48	.741
Likelihood Ratio	35.196	48	.916
N of Valid Cases	217		

a. 46 cells (67.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .01.

15.4.5 Gender* Clickthrough Frequency

Chi-Square Tests				
			Asymptotic	
			Significance (2-	
	Value	df	sided)	
Pearson Chi-Square	16.308 ^a	12	.178	
Likelihood Ratio	8.343	12	.758	
N of Valid Cases	198			

a. 16 cells (80.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .01.