

Master's thesis

Dana Eid International Marketing Strategy

SUPERVISOR:

Prof. dr. Lieve DOUCE



www.uhasselt.be Universiteit Hasselt Campus Hasselt: Martelarenlaan 42 | 3500 Hasselt Campus Diepenbeek: Agoralaan Gebouw D | 3590 Diepenbeek

Faculty of Business Economics Master of Management

The effect of ASMR marketing on consumer perceptions

Thesis presented in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Management, specialization



|____



Faculty of Business Economics Master of Management

Master's thesis

The effect of ASMR marketing on consumer perceptions

Dana Eid

Thesis presented in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Management, specialization International Marketing Strategy

SUPERVISOR : Prof. dr. Lieve DOUCE

Acknowledgement

I extend my heartfelt gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Lieve Doucé, to Mrs. Liesbeth CELIS, and Mrs. Heleen Vliex, for their support and guidance throughout this journey.

I also am thankful to my mom, my family, and friends for believing in me and supporting me all the way, through all the ups and downs.

Summary

Brand Marketers are always on the lookout for new content methods, not only to promote their products but to create emotional attachment between their customers and the brand. Regardless of the industry, it is essential to pursue winning marketing strategies to help brands build powerful positioning, enhance their image and perception within their target audience, and create the best customer experience possible (Indumathi, 2018).

Whereas digital marketing has created effective exposure opportunities by enabling new marketing channels such as social media platforms (Desai, 2019), it has been challenging for marketers to create unique and touching content on different platforms. The main challenges are creating top-performing posts and relevant content that can also derive high rates of interaction. Overwhelming rates of competitors are most likely to make it difficult to sustain an outstanding and memorable brand identity (Umrez, 2014).

One of the recent ways to capturing customers' interests is sensory marketing, which can be defined as a marketing strategy that involves engaging consumers' senses and shaping their perceptions, judgments, and behaviors. It also refers to a marketing approach that targets the engagement of the customers' five senses to create a good image of the brand and have an impact on the way they perceive it and behave towards it (Wala, et al., 2019). The purpose of employing sensory marketing can be building an emotional connection with customers through content that is appealing to their senses, such as relaxing sounds, attractive visuals, or smooth textures. Therefore, create an impact on their perception of a brand and customers' attitudes toward it (Krishna, 2012).

A way of utilizing and applying sensory marketing in social media is via stimuli that trigger an Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response (ASMR). According to Antonova (2019, p. 7), ASMR refers to "a pleasurable, distinct tingling sensation experienced on the skin of the head or other body parts triggered by specific visual, auditory, and/or cognitive stimuli." ASMR is a growing trend that has been mainly viewed on YouTube, where in 2015, searches for ASMR videos increased by almost 200% and are still steadily growing (Vucic, 2020). However, ASMR content creators have been increasingly using TikTok as a channel to broadcast ASMR material due to the high volume of viewers on TikTok live stream and its popularity, in addition to the ability to interact with viewers promptly (Zheluk et al., 2021). Although ASMR content and sensory marketing, in general, can influence purchase behaviors, it does not implicate that ASMR is preferred by everyone, where individuals who are not already interested in ASMR content may not find the advertisement as appealing (Kovacevich & Huron, 2019). ASMR areas that were discussed in research focused on psychology and behavioral sciences, while a huge gap was found in ASMR marketing and branding implications. Thus, the researcher aims to understand and evaluate the influence ASMR content has on customers' reactions. Accordingly, theoretical, and practical implications will be suggested to researchers and marketers to utilize sensory marketing for brands.

1

To deepen the understanding of this topic, this master thesis aims to answer the following composed research questions:

Research question: Do ASMR ads have a positive effect on customer's reactions compared to regular ads? If so, what reasons contribute to that?

Sub-Question: Is there a difference between ASMR ads' effect on consumer reactions between high-end and low-end brands? e.g., fast food brands and luxury dining.

Methodology:

This research aims to examine if ASMR advertisements have a positive effect on customer's reactions when compared to regular advertisements. Therefore, to measure if ASMR positively affects attitude toward the ad, attitude toward the brand, emotional attachment, brand experience, purchase intention, mental imagery, narrative transportation, perceived quality of the product, compared to regular ads. Furthermore, the purpose of adding two different brands is to check whether there is a difference between using ASMR ads for low-end food brands and using ASMR ads for high-end food brands.

This thesis ran a 2 between-subjects factorial experimental design with four conditions (type of advertisement: ASMR ad vs. regular ad) x 2 (brand positioning: low-end, high-end), where each respondent got one of the four conditions randomly assigned to them. The advertisements were as follows: if the ad is an ASMR or a regular ad, and if the advertisement was done by a low-end brand or a high-end brand. As such, the following four conditions were applied:

Condition 1: ASMR and low-end brand (KFC) advertisement:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B5_xesq0-oY

Condition 2: Regular and low-end brand (KFC) advertisement:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BQ-HstwshXA

Condition 3: ASMR and high-end brand (Lindt) advertisement:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1grFIM55qO0

Condition 4: Regular and high-end brand (Lindt) advertisement:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=70FFS9P-wVw

Findings

A one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) and two-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) were conducted to investigate if there is an interaction effect between the dependent variables and independent variables; advertisement type (ASMR or Regular), and brand positioning (high-end or low-end) on consumer reactions after controlling for hunger and mood.

The study's findings highlight that there's a difference in how people react to ASMR and regular ads. Those who saw the ASMR ads had a better opinion of the brand, felt more connected to it emotionally, had a better experience with the brand, thought the product quality was better, got more into the story of the ad, and were more likely to want to buy the product compared to regular ads. On the other hand, people who saw regular ads liked the ad itself more and could picture it more vividly compared to ASMR ads. But these differences weren't huge, which suggests that marketers should look more closely at how ASMR content works and when it's best to use it. In addition to that, the findings show that the direct interaction between brand positioning (low-end vs. high-end) and ad type (ASMR and regular) across dimensions like attitude towards the brand, ad, emotional attachment, brand experience, perceived quality, narrative transportation, purchase intention, and sensory imagery is **not** significant. This study underscores the crucial role of branding in shaping the impact of content marketing techniques, such as sensory marketing. Factors like the brand's target audience, quality, pricing, and positioning contribute to users' perceptions, resulting in varied attitudes. It's worth noting that the effectiveness of ASMR content varies among brands. The brand's market position is a vital factor in the success of ASMR marketing. While there are slight differences in the moderating effect of brand positioning, they don't necessitate major shifts in marketing strategies for low-end or high-end brands.

Contrary to the research findings presented by Kim (2020) and Bachem (2020), the results of this study suggest that Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response (ASMR) advertisements may not be as effective in influencing customer responses as regular advertisements. Kim's study concluded that ASMR advertisements were more likely to cultivate positive attitudes towards the advertisement itself compared to conventional ads, while Bachem's findings aligned with this assertion. However, it is important to acknowledge that neither study showed a significant difference in attitudes towards the brand compared to regular advertisements.

It should be noted that these studies primarily focused on the impact of advertising stimuli in specific sectors such as fast-food and cosmetics, which also incorporated varying measurements and variables that might not be applicable across all industries. This raises the question as to whether the effectiveness of ASMR advertisements can be generalized across different sectors and with diverse customer bases (Kim, 2020; Bachem, 2020).

According to Wiedmann et al. (2018), sensory marketing could be used by brand marketers to build stronger emotional connection between customers and brands, while traditional marketing mainly focuses on showing the product benefits. The results of this study support this argument since it shows that ASMR ads had a higher effect on emotional attachment than regular ads. Furthermore, it was mentioned by Feiz, et al., (2022) that ASMR marketing can be beneficial for brands with providing their audience with a distinctive virtual sensory experience, however, this study shows that regular ads have a higher effect on customers' reactions that ASMR content when it comes to sensory imagery. According to McErlean and Banissy (2017), crisp sounds are one of the most effective ASMR triggers, with 36% of the study's participants rating them favorably in terms of, for example, their expectation of sensory product characteristics. This is in line with the findings of this study where we found that the crisp and sound of frying chicken for KFC gained a higher effect than the regular ads by customers, even after controlling for hunger and mood.

Till quite recently, there wasn't a lot of research done specifically about ASMR commercials. Yet, the results of a few research suggest that components of ASMR could potentially improve

emotional involvement with ads. For example, the research that was conducted by Ho and Chang (2019) revealed that when ASMR noises were incorporated into advertising, both involvement and pleasant feelings regarding the commercial enhanced. According to the findings of a study that was conducted by Tussyadiah and Wang (2020), advertisements that used ASMR were more successful than advertisements that did not use ASMR in terms of eliciting positive thoughts about the advertised brand and fostering positive sentiments about it. This perfectly aligns with the findings of this study regarding the perceived quality of the brand, as we found that ASMR has a higher effect on customers reaction than regular ads. However, other aspects of creating ASMR content should be taken into consideration to improve the sensory imagery and attitude towards the commercials.

Limitations and recommendations for future research

The master thesis addresses the use of ASMR (Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response) as a marketing and advertising tool, with a particular focus on its effect on brand experience. However, the study encountered several limitations. One key limitation was the lack of prior research on ASMR's role in branding, making it challenging to compare findings with existing hypotheses and measurements. Additionally, finding two brands in the same industry with different positioning (low-end versus high-end) and a pre-established use of ASMR in their advertising was difficult, leading to the comparison of two different product categories (fast food and chocolate). This difference in products could have influenced the results due to distinct target audiences and pricing structures.

To gain a more comprehensive understanding of ASMR marketing, future studies could focus on specific geographical locations to explore any cultural or social aspects that may influence individuals' perceptions of ASMR tactics. Additionally, investigating the impact of demographics, such as gender and age, on the willingness to watch ASMR ads and customer reactions could provide valuable insights into the most effective target audience for this marketing approach. Overall, despite encountering limitations, this study lays the groundwork for further exploration of ASMR's potential as a marketing and branding tool in various industries and cultural contexts.

Implications

This master thesis provides valuable insights for marketers aiming to understand the impact of ASMR in advertising, particularly within the food industry. It highlights the potential benefits of incorporating ASMR characteristics into marketing strategies to enhance consumer engagement and emotional connections with brands. ASMR videos can evoke positive emotional states associated with the brand, and the inclusion of ASMR features may elevate the sensory experience of interacting with the brand. Additionally, the social aspect of ASMR content, with sharing and comments, can foster a sense of community and social identity related to the brand. However, the study acknowledges that ASMR marketing may not be universally preferred, and cultural considerations should be considered. It emphasizes the importance of aligning ASMR strategies with the brand image and target audience to effectively connect with customers on a deeper level, particularly if stress relief and calmness are integral to the brand's identity. Overall, this research offers marketers a consumer behavior perspective to evaluate the suitability of using ASMR in their

4

campaigns and explores new content creation approaches amid growing competition in the industry.

Keywords: Sensory marketing, ASMR marketing, brand marketing, brand positioning, consumer behavior.

Table of Contents

| Acknowledgement i |
|--|
| Chapter one: Introduction |
| 1.1 Introduction |
| 1.2 Research Questions and Hypotheses9 |
| 1.3 Thesis structure |
| Chapter two: Literature Review 10 |
| 2.1 Branding and Marketing Theories10 |
| 2.2 Sensory Marketing and Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response (ASMR) 11 |
| 2.3 Employing Senses in Advertisements and Marketing12 |
| 2.3.1 Employing human senses in advertising12 |
| 2.3.2 Employing ASMR marketing in advertising12 |
| 2.4 ASMR influence on customers reactions and behaviors13 |
| 2.5 Sensory Marketing and ASMR in the Food Industry18 |
| 2.6 Conclusion |
| Chapter three: Methodology: 20 |
| 3.1 Research design 20 |
| 3.2 Sampling method 21 |
| 3.3 Survey design 21 |
| 3.4 Stimuli 22 |
| 3.5 Measurements |
| 3.5.1 Attitude toward the ad26 |
| 3.5.2 Attitude toward the brand 26 |
| 3.5.3 Purchase intention 26 |
| 3.5.4 Mental imagery 26 |
| 3.5.5 Emotional attachment 26 |
| 3.5.6 Perceived product quality27 |
| 3.5.7 Narrative transportation27 |
| 3.5.8 Brand experience27 |
| 3.5.9 Control variables27 |
| Chapter four: Results |
| 4.1 Descriptive statistics |
| 4.2 Effect of ASMR on consumer reactions |
| Chapter five: Discussion |
| 5.1 Effect of ASMR on consumer reactions |
| 5.2 Does brand positioning make a difference? |
| 5.3 Limitations and recommendations for future research |
| 5.4 Implications |
| Chapter six: Conclusion |

| References list | 42 |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Appendices | 53 |
| Appendix A – SPSS output | 53 |
| Appendix B- Online Survey | 116 |

List of tables:

| Table 1 | |
|---------|--|
| Table 2 | |
| Table 3 | |
| Table 4 | |

List of figures:

| Figure 1 Screenshots from ASMR and low-end brand (KFC) advertisement | 22 |
|--|----|
| Figure 2 Screenshots from Regular and low-end brand (KFC) advertisement | 23 |
| Figure 3 Screenshots from ASMR and high-end brand (Lindt) advertisement | 24 |
| Figure 4 Screenshots from Regular and high-end brand (Lindt) advertisement | 25 |

1.1 Introduction

Brand Marketers are always on the lookout for new and outstanding content methods, not only to promote their products but to create a deeper connection with their customers. Regardless of the business field, industry, or specialization, it is essential to pursue winning marketing strategies to help brands build powerful positioning, enhance their image and perception within their target audience, and create the best customer experience possible (Indumathi, 2018).

Digital marketing has paved the way for brands' growth as businesses may find it insufficient to reach potential customers in the increased dynamics of the market through traditional marketing approaches. Whereas digital marketing has created effective exposure opportunities by enabling new marketing channels such as social media platforms (Desai, 2019), it has been challenging for marketers to create unique and touching content on different platforms. The main challenges are creating top-performing posts and relevant content that can also derive high rates of interaction. Overwhelming rates of competitors are most likely to make it difficult to sustain an outstanding and memorable brand identity, as well as the required efforts to manage various channels with the same quality and user engagement rates (Umrez, 2014).

One of the relatively new platforms that individuals and brands have used to create memorable content is TikTok, which is a short-form video-sharing app (Choudhary et al., 2020; Kaye et al., 2021). Despite only being introduced in 2017, it is one of the world's fastest-growing apps and recently surpassed Google as the most popular website (Talarico, 2021). Social media competitiveness in posting requires great attention to all the elements affiliated with the post to ensure attracting users among the overwhelming content they are exposed to. These elements include visuals that can be captured through appealing colors, in addition to relevant content and good-quality captions (Felix, et al., 2017).

One of the recent ways to capturing customers' and users' interest is sensory marketing, which can be defined as a marketing strategy that involves engaging consumers' senses and shaping their perceptions, judgments, and behaviors. It also refers to a marketing approach that targets the engagement of the customers' five senses in order to create a good image of the brand and have an impact on the way they perceive it and behave towards it (Wala, et al., 2019). The purpose of employing sensory marketing can be building an emotional connection with customers through content that is appealing to their senses, such as relaxing sounds, attractive visuals, or smooth textures. Therefore, create an impact on their perception of a brand and customers' attitudes toward it (Krishna, 2012). From a managerial viewpoint, this approach leverages subconscious triggers to characterize consumers' perceptions of abstract product qualities, such as sophistication or quality (Krishna, 2012).

One way of utilizing and applying sensory marketing in social media is via stimuli that trigger an Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response (ASMR). According to Antonova (2019, p. 7), Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response (ASMR) refers to "a pleasurable, distinct tingling sensation experienced on the skin of the head or other body parts triggered by specific visual, auditory, and/or cognitive

8

stimuli." Nonetheless, the intensity level of the stimuli affects the subjective experience of this sensation, which may vary across individuals (Barrat & Davis, 2015). Creating videos with ASMR triggers is a growing trend that has been mainly viewed on YouTube, where in 2015, searches for ASMR videos on YouTube increased by almost 200% and are still steadily growing (Vucic, 2020). However, ASMR content creators have been increasingly using TikTok as a channel to broadcast ASMR material due to the high volume of viewers on TikTok live stream and its popularity, in addition to the ability to interact with viewers promptly (Zheluk et al., 2021). Newspapers like the New York Times and Washington Post, the W magazine, internet outlets like BuzzFeed, and the social media site Reddit have all acknowledged in recent years how common ASMR is online (Lopez, 2018). In addition, celebrities in the entertainment, music, and sports industries are independently investigating ASMR triggers (Richard, 2014b). According to Instagram's annual report, ASMR online community made the biggest mark as a niche sector in 2018 with Instagram viral trends. Brands only recently began utilizing ASMR in their advertising (El Chaar, 2019). Fast food companies are among those that produce ASMR advertising the most (e.g., Pringles, Coca-Cola, Burger King), along with those in the fashion industry (e.g., Gucci, Coach, Givenchy), furniture, and cosmetics industries (Richard, 2014c). Some brands have been promoting their products and creating a unique brand experience by posting videos on TikTok using ASMR content approach, showing their products, or unpackaging them. Accordingly, ASMR content has been mainly serving the beauty, fashion, and food and beverages industries. However, this may create a limitation for other industries that find it inapplicable to promote their products using ASMR content. Although ASMR content and sensory marketing, in general, can influence purchase behaviors for customers, it does not implicate that ASMR is preferred by everyone, where individuals who are not already interested in ASMR content may not find the advertisement as appealing (Kovacevich & Huron, 2019).

Recent research has been -and still- focusing on human body sensation influence on consumers' buying decisions without even being aware of it. According to The Magazine (2015), the future of sensory marketing holds new and wide opportunities for B2C companies. However, it is also worth mentioning that most ASMR areas that were discussed in research focused on psychology and behavioral sciences, while a huge gap was found in ASMR marketing and branding implications. Thus, the researcher aims to understand and evaluate the influence ASMR content has on customers' reactions. Accordingly, theoretical, and practical implications will be suggested to researchers and marketers to utilize sensory marketing for brands.

1.2 Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research question: Do ASMR ads have a positive effect on customer's reactions compared to regular ads? If so, what reasons contribute to that?

Sub-Question: Is there a difference between ASMR ads' effect on consumer reactions between high-end and low-end brands? e.g., fast food brands and luxury brands.

Research hypotheses:

To answer the mentioned research question, the following hypotheses are constructed to formulate a more in-depth interpretation:

- H1: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the attitude towards the brand.
- H2: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the attitude towards the ad.
- H3: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the emotional attachment with a brand.
- H4: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the food brand experience.
- H5: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the perceived quality of the food brand.
- H6: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the narrative transportation
- H7: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the purchase intention towards the brand.
- H8: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the sensory imagery.
- H9: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will have a higher effect on low-end brands than high-end brands.

1.3 Thesis structure

This thesis contains six chapters. Chapter two will conduct a literature review on sensory marketing, emphasizing customer reactions. Additionally, it will explore the integration of the online sensory phenomenon called Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response (ASMR) in marketing. Chapter three will outline the research methodology, including the research design and measurements employed in this study. Chapter four will present the obtained results, while chapter five will delve into the findings, limitations, and offer further recommendations. Lastly, chapter six will present the concluding remarks for this research.

Chapter two: Literature Review

2.1 Branding and Marketing Theories

Brand management approaches were initially designed when consumers were mainly affected by corporate-controlled advertising, such as television, radio, and offline advertisements (Aaker, 1996). Gobé (2001) highlighted that earlier marketing methods focused solely on unique selling propositions, while recent branding and advertising concepts, like emotional branding and brand narrative, have emerged as a more suitable alternative in this highly competitive world, especially as online channels made information widely available and accessible, consumers' attention is now divided across many media channels. Similarly, Wiedmann et al. (2018) stated that sensory marketing could be used to strengthen the consumers' emotions towards a brand, while traditional marketing mainly focuses on showing the product benefits. Consequently, brands must level their competition game up and come up with relevant and authentic methods to grab consumers' attention and differentiate their brands in order to create memorable brand experiences and build an emotional connection. In the sphere of consumer behaviour and psychology, attitudes and behaviours toward a brand have been a central area of focus for a long time (MacKenzie, Lutz, & Belch, 1986; Mitchell & Olson, 1981). For example, consumers can build emotional attachments not only to gifts, places, and collectibles but also to brands (Thomson et al., 2005). Moreover, how consumers would recognize, use, and recall a brand so-called -brand information processinghighly depends on their motivations, capabilities, and chances to process this information (MacInnis, Moorman, and Jaworski 1991). Janiszewski and Van Osselaer (2000) proposed different learning models to learn about brands, emphasizing that brands can be the primary source of information in consumers' minds. Brands can be defined as knowledge and information flows in the consumers' minds, which can play a role in affecting their purchasing behavior toward a product or service at different levels (Hoeffler & Keller, 2003). Thus, brands should focus on building connections with their consumers in order to build strong emotional engagement through implementing branding concepts that have been proven to be effective in creating strong connections, like brand narratives.

2.2 Sensory Marketing and Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response (ASMR)

Human beings can perceive messages differently based on their interpretations, views, and backgrounds. For example, some people enjoy listening to specific sounds, while others prefer looking at visual content, all these different preferences and possibilities could be utilized for marketing purposes. This subjective experience is called "experience logic." It is the outcome of how customers perceive and analyse a brand experience using their five senses (Hulten, Broweus, and Van, 2009). Sensory Marketing, defined as "marketing that engages the consumers' senses and affects their perception, judgment and behavior" (Krishna, 2012, p. 142), has been one of the ways marketers apply it in the past few years. According to Kaushik & Gokhale (2021), sensory marketing delivers branded content and advertising materials that appeal to the human five senses to create a positive impression of the brand. To successfully implement sensory marketing strategies, it is critical to activate the greatest number of senses in consumers and to elicit the required response and pleasant sensations from the used stimuli or atmosphere elements (Hultén, 2011). In this regard, sensory memory is extremely important, since it helps the consumer to memorize things like experiencing quality and, when utilized effectively, reproduce, and correlate it with a specific brand, circumstance, person, or product (Randhir et al., 2016).

One technique of sensory marketing is Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response (ASMR), which is defined as a "pleasant tingling sensation on the skin of the head or other parts of the body in response to certain visual, auditory, and (or) cognitive stimuli" (Antonova, 2019, p. 7). Similarly, the term "autonomous sensory meridian response," or ASMR, refers to the prickly sensation that some people experience in response to specific noises; because they generate ASMR, these noises are referred to as "triggers" (Sadowski, 2016). Jennifer Allen first introduced ASMR in 2010 as 'specific sounds that cause pleasure'. The purpose originally was to induce calmness and relaxation to heal mental illnesses, such as anxiety and depression; another use of ASMR would be helping people fall asleep (Barratt & Davis, 2015; Kovacevich & Huron, 2019). Similarly, according to the founder of ASMR University and author of the book Brain Tingle, ASMR has many mental and physical health benefits, such as reducing anxiety, depression, and insomnia, and it even helps with ADHD and mental disorders, in addition to increased skin conductance levels. Previous research (Gould van Praag et al., 2017) found an interesting fact about the human brain in the past decade, which explains that humans can get relaxed and happy from odd sounds as much as they can from nature. To illustrate, during the COVID-19 pandemic, ASMR content consumption has drastically increased, and people have been following ASMR content to feel less stressed or to

help them fall asleep. Alike, Poerio et al. (2018) have confirmed that ASMR content might create therapeutic mental and physical health benefits. However, according to Shah (2020), ASMR can be a tricky concept to pitch to corporates, as it can be risky, absurd, and creepy in practice. Thus, it is important to understand the suitable contexts for implementing ASMR marketing.

2.3 Employing Senses in Advertisements and Marketing

2.3.1 Employing human senses in advertising

Invoking an emotional connection and a desire to buy the brand or product result from sensory memory. For a long time, sight has been the most effectively used tool in marketing and advertising, either by a catchy logo, a stylish poster, or even a creative social post. Sight has dominated the other human senses as part of the decision-making process. Traditionally, sight is perceived as the most powerful and seductive sense utilized by brands. Eyes and brain's efficiency and accuracy are incomparable with any equipment that has been devised up to now (Lindstrom, 2006). It is mostly believed that vision, or sight, is the most significant receptor and completely relies on perceptions based on the visualized tool of marketing and brand elements. The fact that the human eye, as an organ, accounts for two-thirds of all the sensory cells in the human body, supports the significance of sight as a sense (Liu, et al., 2009). Nonetheless, it is predicted that brands can go beyond traditional marketing methods of using "sight" sense, they can build a powerful emotional connection with their customers by using the other senses, like smell or sound. Zemke and Shoemaker (2007) suggested that "scent" can positively influence social interactions. Similarly, other studies showed a positive relationship between using the "smell" sense in marketing and business sales (Sprangenberg et. al., 1996; Morrin and Chebat, 2005). Lindstorm and Kotler (2005) have identified "vision" as the most convincing human sense, followed by "smell" as the second.

2.3.2 Employing ASMR marketing in advertising

ASMR has been used by YouTube producers who have set up a modest set and performed these noises on the platform. Typical triggers include whispering, tapping, scratching, and eating role-plays while using a microphone. By evoking a physical reaction, ASMR allows marketers to present their products to customers from a sensory standpoint (Chae, et al., 2021). Not simply food or electronics, but even things that create a physical feeling in people, are being advertised. Marketers can give customers a distinctive impression using short videos with ASMR triggers. Ads with ASMR tend to be more enjoyable and remembered than those without (Kim, 2020). From an empirical view, Ikea, a company that sells furniture and home decor, has posted an advertisement on YouTube that uses ASMR. The message revolved around encouraging college students to buy tools and furniture suitable for their dorms. The purpose of the video is to induce a tingling, calming sense in the viewers through specific sounds like crinkling and scratching. Over 3 million people have viewed the 25-minute lengthy film (Bode, 2019).

The benefit of considering ASMR in marketing is that brands can provide their audience with a distinctive virtual sensory experience that will either forge new connections or strengthen current ones (Feiz, et al., 2022). By presenting the product soothingly and pleasantly, ASMR fosters the development of favorable associations. In addition to that, creating ASMR content is considered easy, does not consume a lot of time, and may be achieved with low costs of equipment or editing. On the other hand, the ASMR movement in advertising does not clearly identify whether it will lead to a long-term change in advertising or be a passing trend that may disappear in a matter of time (Bode, 2019). Additionally, the effectiveness of the ASMR phenomenon in branding and marketing has not been adequately clarified which requires more research in this area prior to recommending it as a useful tool of marketing for businesses.

2.4 ASMR influence on customers reactions and behaviors

According to Kim (2020), ASMR has been used as a tool to increase intimacy toward the brand. The following hypothesis suggests that ASMR advertisements are expected to have a positive impact on consumers attitudes toward the brand compared to regular ads.

H1: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the attitude towards the brand.

ASMR content with its audio and visual triggers has been influencing the purchases and the brand image remarkably. Kim (2020) presents her view that consumers get more familiar with the brands through thorough interaction maintaining closeness and intimacy with them, ASMR advertisements have more positive influence than regular ads for the emotional involvement they develop with the customers consequently affecting their purchase intention. Additionally, Rovira (2021) claims that as the industry trends have changed so does the behavior of the consumers, they seem to be taking more interest in something they have been closely attached to. In digital marketing, ASMR ads have won credit for influencing the customers' choice in enhancing brand image, as ASMR has become a tool marketers can implement to attract their clients. Through ASMR, customers feel relaxed and experience a feeling of tranquillity and peace right after they receive the triggers. Experiencing what they watch online through the sensation they get in their body makes them feel more inclined toward a specific brand, which could be sufficient to get a positive attitude toward a particular brand.

In summary, existing research provides evidence to support H1, indicating that ASMR ads can indeed positively impact consumers attitudes toward the brand. The sensory and emotional experience offered by ASMR content appears to enhance brand likability and create a favourable association in the minds of consumers.

The second hypothesis explores the effect of ASMR advertisements on consumers attitudes, specifically, towards the ad itself. Understanding how ASMR ads influence consumers perceptions of the advertising content is crucial for advertisers to create engaging and memorable campaigns.

13

H2: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the attitude towards the ad.

To elaborate, Bachem (2020) agrees that ASMR has the power to engage consumers' senses, influencing their perception, judgment, and behavior. Digital marketing has been using ASMR ads by granting viewers audio-visual appeal. That way, ASMR ensures the sensory engagement of the consumers and gets the desired response from them. From a different perspective, Smith (2019) mentions that the experience one gets from ASMR is complex and it has several aspects, as it does not only affect humans' senses, but it also involves cognitive abilities related to movement, emotion, and attention. For instance, ASMR ads involve deep attention and emotional attachment of the viewers targeting not only their senses but also their thinking and reasoning. The more inclined the customers will be towards the brand the more positive it will bring in the purchases. Additionally, Bolls & Muehling (2007) is of the opinion that consumers feel more involved in ads that are high imagery, the high-imagery ads influence consumers by evoking their cognitive abilities to encode the message. The ads with low imagery do not have the power to involve the consumer and affect his attitude as they cannot evoke his encoding capability. Engelbregt, et al., (2022) confirms that experiencing ASMR brings about the perfect happy mood of the viewers via sounds, images, and attachment they feel for a specific brand. The modern market aims at gaining customers' attention through ASMR ads generated for the relaxation and joy they feel after watching it which enhances their brand growth. The triggers used in ASMR marketing can create strong commitment by consumers to the brands, by accompanying visual and auditory stimuli in consistency (Chae, et al., 2020).

In conclusion, the literature supports H2, indicating that ASMR ads are likely to positively influence consumers; attitudes toward the advertisement itself. The unique sensory experience and perceived authenticity associated with ASMR content contribute to increased ad liking and engagement.

Emotional attachment to a brand is a crucial factor influencing consumer behaviour and brand loyalty. The third hypothesis explores whether ASMR advertisements can foster a stronger emotional connection between consumers and the advertised brand compared to regular ads.

H3: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the emotional attachment with a brand.

Chae (2020) assumes that ASMR ads are a marketing strategy that controls the behavior of consumers, through building their strong commitment to the brand through the emotional attachment they develop to it, by the triggers and tingling, they arouse in the consumers, they make their product gain their emotional attachment to keep them loyal to the product. According to Chae (2020), ASMR ad is defined as "sound giving pleasure", which means it is through the audio and visual effects that leave an impression on the customers' minds regarding the brand. Fillis (2006) supports Chae mentioning that ASMR art is being utilized by marketers as a form of creation and inspiration, through digital marketing. It is a way for brands to inspire and provide a

feeling of relaxation even before the brand is bought and used by customers, giving them a closer look on how using this product would feel like.

Emotional attachment is defined as the bond between brands and their customers (Husain, Paul & Koles, 2022; Japutra et al., 2018). Several studies suggested that the customers' emotions are significantly affected by sensory cues, which can be crucial in developing emotional connections between brands and their customers (Chen & Lin, 2018; Lindstrom, 2005; Tsaur et al., 2007). A study by Hultén (2011) concluded that the five human senses have a significant influence on their purchase intention. Thus, marketing experts have been using the human senses in their campaigns to create an emotional attachment to their brands (Shimul et al., 2019), leading to higher purchase intentions and consequently increasing their profits. The concept of attachment is founded on the idea that the formation of attachments is caused by a variety of distinct feelings. According to research conducted by Thomson et al., (2005) a person's level of emotional investment in a brand may be broken down into three components: emotions of love, feelings of enthusiasm, and feelings of identification. This explanation relies heavily on Bowlby's (1980) attachment theory as its primary theoretical underpinning. According to this theory, a person's connection to a person or thing might influence the way that thing or person behaves. A consumer's level of emotional involvement in a product or service is a solid indicator of how much money the consumer will give to a business's bottom line and how much value they will have over the course of their lifetime as a client (Park et al. 2010). Sensory marketing is one of the marketing tactics that is now considered a powerful tool for creating emotional bonds and attachments with customers (Krishna, 2012). From a different perspective, Mingione et al. (2020) have suggested that brands can emotionally connect with their customers by providing them with a superior brand experience.

In summary, the literature supports H3, suggesting that ASMR ads have a positive effect on emotional attachment to a brand. The ability of ASMR content to evoke strong and positive emotional responses foster a deeper emotional connection between consumers and the advertised brand. Furthermore, Khan I (2017) is of the view that consumers have emotional needs, and to address them, it is crucial to provide pleasurable brand experiences and develop emotional attachment within customers toward the brand. These studies prove that ASMR ads, especially food ASMR, evoke emotions of brand satisfaction and loyalty in the consumers through brand personality and experience.

Thus, the fourth hypothesis delves into the impact of ASMR advertisements on consumers overall experience with food brands. Understanding how ASMR content influences consumers perception of food brands can offer valuable insights for marketers in the food industry.

H4: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the food brand experience.

Brakus (2009) claims that brand experience has four dimensions; sensory, affective, intellectual, and behavioral. Similarly, Nysveen (2013) mentions that brand experience has been conceptualized as a multidimensional construct that indicates customer loyalty. To the researcher,

the different dimensions of brand experience have different influences on brand personality, brand satisfaction, and brand loyalty. In conclusion, the literature supports H4, suggesting that ASMR ads positively influence consumers food brand experiences. The multisensory experience and narrative transportation facilitated by ASMR content contribute to a more enjoyable and immersive perception of food brands.

Kircaburun, et al., (2021) thinks that watching ASMR ads online can develop a sense of community and positive feelings with customers. As per Kircaburun, it attracts the viewers and controls their behavior making them like the food brands by evoking their positive emotions, in return making the customers respond to the food brand. The consumers who watch ASMR online identify themselves with the ASMR participants sharing common likings arousing positive emotions. It is argued by Kence (2022) that when people watch others eating food online, using ASMR, affects their sensory perception. Thus, the fifth hypothesis aims to investigate the influence of ASMR advertisements on consumers perception of the quality of food brands. Perceived quality plays a vital role in shaping consumers purchase decisions and overall brand evaluation.

H5: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the perceived quality of the food brand.

Moreover, ASMR marketing influences the purchase intention, product attitude, advertisement liking, and perceived visual advertisement aesthetics. In a similar manner, Wang (2009) points to the fact that ASMR ads influence consumers' attitudes and emotions by providing narrative transportation. ASMR ads' content indulges consumers and enhances their engagement. This narrative transportation reflects consumers' immersive experience taking the consumers into another world of virtual reality. The consumers find themselves participating in the storyline being presented to them in the ASMR ads and it has a great impact on the narrative transportation. According to Brechman (2009), narrative-based communication can be effective in drawing out attitude change, particularly when the recipients are transported into the narrative. Narrative transportation enables the viewers to enhance the effect on the consumers' attitude giving them a different lifestyle through narrative-based communication. They consider themselves part of that ASMR world and let them relieve their anxiety and depression. Through narrative transportation, they experience the world they like to have. ASMR campaigns connect the consumers efficiently and strongly with the brands, in return increasing the brand value. In line with the previous argument on narrative transportation, Sands et al., (2022) claims that ASMR experience's intensity, immersion, and narrative transportation serially mediate the effect, it provides audiovisual images for relaxation and fulfilment appealing to one's senses and enhancing immersive experience indulging the audience in the narrative transportation, the experience brings the audience closer to the social relationship controlling their attitude in return earning great product value. Thus, the following hypothesis explores the impact of ASMR advertisements on narrative transportation, which refers to the extent to which viewers are immersed in the ads storyline and mentally transported to the advertised world.

H6: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the narrative transportation.

In conclusion, the literature supports H6, indicating that ASMR ads have a positive effect on narrative transportation. The unique sensory experience and emotional engagement offered by ASMR content contribute to more immersive and captivating narrative transportation. It was mentioned by Lee (2023) that ASMR ads results in making an impulsive buying decision when it comes to food. In a business context, understanding how ASMR content influences consumers' purchase decisions can provide valuable insights for marketers in driving brand sales. The following hypothesis aims to explore the impact of ASMR advertisements on consumers purchase intention toward the advertised brand. Understanding how ASMR content influences consumers purchase decisions can provide valuable insights for marketers in driving brand sales.

H7: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the purchase intention towards the brand.

As per Li (2022), purchase intention is a deliberate effort on the part of consumers to choose any products and services when they are given the impression that their expectations have been fulfilled. The ASMR ads that engage consumers work brilliantly in favor of brand popularity. Through the absorbing and indulging world of ASMR ads, the purchase intention of the customers is fixed for the product (Li, 2022). As per Hai Ho Nguyen (2022), there are numerous factors that affect the purchase intention of consumers, but three factors are "entertainment, personalization, and credibility" which have a significant positive effect on the purchase intention.

By watching ASMR ads the consumer personalizes the experience, gets entertained, and shows credibility which affects the purchase intention greatly. As explained, the target audience watched the ASMR videos online evoking their emotions and providing them with relaxation and peace which results in the immersive experience that they love to have. The sounds of food eating, and its images playing the role of audiovisual appeal help a great deal in fascinating the consumers and affecting their positive food brand experience. Alike, Anjani (2020) argues that people in ASMR ads eating food, have a psychological impact on the viewers. Their social relationship is strengthened with the brand, and it controls their behavior. For instance, having multiple ASMR ads on the same food brand makes them crave it. Besides, Becham (2020) says ASMR ads contributes to a more aesthetically pleasing experience. He claims that ASMR ads can make the consumers perceive the visuals and their aesthetics positively, adding to the product value of a brand. Modig & Rosengren (2014) validates that advertising creativity serves as a positive signal for perceived product quality, thereby enhancing the perceived value. According to Miller (2000), ASMR evokes the aspects of sensory images as imagery vividness, quantity, valence, and sensory modality, that exhibit reliability as well as discriminant, nomological, and criterion validity. Hoslter (2018) states ASMR ads attract viewers through the multisensory appeal as taste, smell, etc. that give an immersive experience to them. By targeting the viewers' multisensory appeal, digital marketing increases consumers' liking by pleasing their senses. Alike, Alijumah (2022) mentions that a vital role is played by the visual factors in developing satisfaction in customers and loyalty. It is the visual appeal that will offer fulfilment and satisfaction along with relaxation to the consumers that will affect their judgment and they will stay sincere and loyal to the brand. It is the task nicely

17

done by the ASMR ads in relaxing a person who watches them while generating pleasurable sensations (Portas, 2022). He claims that audiovisual techniques help viewers concentrate and focus on the information provided to them. They add to the digital marketing business by indulging and engaging the customers in their sensory images meeting their expectations and taking them into the world they idealize.

The following hypothesis explores the influence of ASMR advertisements on consumers sensory imagery, as ASMR ads are expected to have a positive impact on consumers sensory imagery compared to regular ads.

H8: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the sensory imagery.

In conclusion, the literature supports H8, suggesting that ASMR ads positively influence consumers, sensory imagery. The unique sensory triggers and individual differences in sensory imagery responsiveness contribute to a more vivid and immersive mental representation of the advertised products.

All in all, Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response (ASMR) is a relatively novel sort of sensory experience that demonstrates significant potential for elevating customers' feelings of attachment to brands and businesses. ASMR is a condition in which a person reacts favorably to certain stimuli, such as whispering, tapping, or rustling sounds, and has a pleasant tingling feeling as a result. In this research review, we investigate the connection between ASMR content and the establishment of meaningful bonds, as this connection has been hypothesized to exist. Although research on ASMR is still in its infancy, some of the studies have showed potential as a tool for marketers that are aiming to increase consumers' emotional connections to their firms. According to the findings of a study carried out by Barratt and Davis (2015), those who had experienced ASMR also reported greater levels of social connectedness. In a separate investigation, Fredborg, Clark, and Smith (2017) found that ASMR films were very effective at relieving stress and bringing about a state of relaxation. This may be because ASMR videos produce a positive emotional state that is favorable to emotional connection.

2.5 Sensory Marketing and ASMR in the Food Industry

Previous literature has proved that traditional marketing methods are outdated, and companies should transform their efforts to more visual advertising and sensory marketing to develop strong brand images, by integrating consumers' senses into their marketing strategies. As a result, more customers will be attracted to buying the brand (Lindstrom, 2005). Even though ASMR in the food industry has not been studied much yet, it is revealed that brands that have used ASMR ads successfully included specific stimuli in their advertisements, such as aesthetically pleasing visuals, and unique voices (Richard, 2014a). According to McErlean and Banissy (2017), crisp sounds are one of the most effective ASMR triggers, with 36% of the study's participants rating them favorably in terms of, for example, their expectation of sensory product characteristics. When it

comes to the food industry, traditional marketing suggests that brands should focus on selling their products without paying enough attention to the overall customer experience (Lecomte, 2016). On the contrary, Kwansa (2002) showed that food brands should concentrate on the feelings of their customers and provide sensory dining experiences. Recently, sensory marketing, ASMR approach to be specific, has been applied by some food companies, like Burger King, KFC, and Coca-Cola, as it can help restaurants establish emotions and motivate customers to make buying decisions. Roopchand (2015) stated that human sense has an impact on the consumer purchasing behavior for some fast-food restaurants. Moreover, Spence (2020) found that ASMR auditory triggers in the food industry can contribute to turning the customers' experiences memorable and emotionally engaging, which consequently leads to a potential added value of ASMR food ads over traditional food ads. According to Antonova (2019), ASMR content has great potential in the advertising field, especially in beauty products, drinks, and food. Consequently, it is becoming more commonly used in online commercials. As a result, exploiting sensory marketing techniques can help brands increase their revenues (Chae et al., 2020). However, since ASMR viewers have built their own standards and expectations of ASMR content (Bode, 2019), some brands have failed in using ASMR content, as viewers were not able to perceive ASMR stimuli as intended. In the context of this research, this emphasizes that it is crucial for food brands to determine how would ASMR ads contribute to strengthening customers' emotional attachment and building positive brand experiences. ASMR is a stronog marketing tool when used in digital marketing, it seems highly intuitive for low end brands in promoting their products globally. Using social media platforms and collaborating with influencers, these brands are making a significant space in the international market (Makrides, Vrontis, & Christofi, 2019).

In this study, the researcher suggests that ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will have a higher effect on low-end brands than high-end brands. However, limited research was found on the effect of ASMR marketing on low-end and high-end food brands. Thus, it is recommended for future research to focus on this area. In general, the use of ASMR is not limited to low-end brands or to specific industries. Many leadings brands ranging from the low-end products like Coca Cola, KFC, Taco Bell, Dove and Tic Tac to the high-end products like Coach and Lindt are massively using ASMR videos for marketing (Antonova, 2019). They are influencing all five senses of consumers to boost their sales and bring out more sales overall (Hussain, 2019). However, for food brands it's convenient to sell the sound of their food instead of actual product. If the food's packaging, its crack, or frizz sounds appealing, it gets a good grade and more appealing for consumers (Maynard, 2019).

H9: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will have a higher effect on low-end brands than high-end brands.

In conclusion, while research on this specific hypothesis is limited, existing studies provide some support for H9, suggesting that ASMR ads may have a higher effect on low-end brands compared to high-end brands. The contextual fit of ASMR content with low-end brands and the role of brand familiarity appears to play a role in shaping consumers responses.

2.6 Conclusion

The purpose of this review was to demonstrate relevant branding theories and the emerging concept of sensory marketing, in addition to highlighting the role it plays in advertising and building brands' experiences. Previous studies have shown that marketers should find new ways and content methods to stay ahead of the competition. It is worth noting that whether it was offline or online ads, building a strong customer experience is essential to winning customers' hearts. Using human senses can strongly affect the overall experience. Most of the research found on ASMR was in the domains of behavioral science and psychology and very few in marketing. However, it was suggested by researchers to further investigate this emerging phenomenon in marketing. Therefore, this study will focus on the following research questions: Do ASMR ads have a positive effect on customer's reactions compared to regular ads, in the food industry? If so, what reasons contribute to that??

Chapter three: Methodology:

In this chapter, the researcher will provide information about the methodology applied to this thesis. It starts with the research design, followed by the sampling method, survey design, stimuli, and measurements.

3.1 Research design

The research design used for this thesis is a between-subjects factorial experimental design (2x2). Each survey respondent received one of these four different conditions. The advertisements varied between an ASMR or a regular ad, and done by low-end or high-end brands. Thus, these are the four conditions that were assigned to the respondents:

Condition 1 (ASMR & low-end brand) Condition 2 (Regular ad & low-end brand) Condition 3 (ASMR & high-end brand) Condition 4 (Regular ad & high-end brand)

This study aims to investigate if ASMR ads have a positive effect on customer's reactions compared to regular ads. Therefore, to measure if ASMR positively affects attitudes toward the brand, attitude toward the ad, emotional attachment, brand experience, purchase intention, narrative transportation, perceived quality of the product, and sensory imagery, compared to regular ads. In addition, the purpose of including two brands with different positioning (low-end and high-end) is to check whether there is a difference between using ASMR ads for low-end food brands and using ASMR ads for high-end food brands.

3.2 Sampling method

This master thesis followed a non-probability sampling approach known as empirical quantitative. As a first step, the researcher collected information from previous studies and the survey items were selected following validated scales. After that, it was published on a platform called "Qualtrics" which is an online tool for creating and distributing surveys that also provides insights and data for research.

This survey was shared on various social media platforms that are used by the target audience, like LinkedIn, Facebook, and Instagram. In addition to Hasselt University students.

The number of total responses is 236, some responses were deleted for various reasons, such as incomplete information, previews, or very short response time. Besides that, responses who mentioned they were vegan/vegetarian or had allergies to ingredients promoted in the ads, were deleted, as their judgement might be biased and affecting their answers. As a result, a total number of 130 responses were analyzed, out of the 236.

3.3 Survey design

The researcher designed this survey to start with providing a description of the study, in order to give the respondents more information to be able to give their participation consent. This description also advised the respondents to use their headphones to have a full seamless experience. Once they indicate their consent, they get directed to one condition (one advertisement out of the four).

Questions were asked in this survey to indicate and measure the respondents' reactions towards the advertisement. This was done by measuring eight dependent variables (attitude toward the ad, attitude toward the brand, mental imagery, purchase intention, emotional attachemnt, perceived product quality, brand experience, and narrative transportation).

Three items of this survey were asked to indicate the level of agreement using a seven-point Likert scale, as follows: if the respondent is hungry, in good mood, and if they like fast food/chocolate. Three more items were asked to indicate the level of agreement using yes/no questions, as follows: if the respondent is allergic to any of the product ingredients, if they are on a diet, and if they follow a vegan/vegetarian diet. These six items intend to measure extraneous variables that might affect the respondents' judgements, thus, the survey results.

The next part of this survey aimed to get demographic information, such as the respondents' gender, age, and profession. Finally, the last part of this survey was done to measure the respondents' familiarity with ASMR marketing. So, a definition on ASMR marketing was provided, in addition to two items to indicate the level of familiarity.

Note: a copy of this survey is attached in the appendix B.

3.4 Advertisements

Four advertisements were selected for this study. Two of them from "KFC" a fast-food brand which was considered as a low-end brand in this study, and the other two were selected from "Lindt" a luxury Chocolate brand which was considered as a high-end brand. The four advertisements are considered the independent variables for this study.

All four advertisements were edited to have the same length (30 seconds). Each advertisement will be described in detail. As follows:

Condition (1): The first ad represents KFC and ASMR. The commercial was called "KFChill - Finger Lickin' Good Vibes" on Youtube." The visual cues in this ad are illustrated by showing the rain drops on green leaves, or showing KFC chicken being fried. The auditory cues include soothing sounds of rain drops that turn into the sound of frying KFC chicken, in addition to a voice over of a man who was guiding the viewer through the ad as if it was a guided meditation video. Here is the link for the advertisement on Youtube: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B5_xesq0-oY Figure 1 Screenshots from ASMR and low-end brand (KFC) advertisement



Condition (2): The second ad represents KFC and no ASMR content was added. It was titled as of "KFC X The DSC 'First Bite' 2022 Advert."

The ad showed different age groups and with different looks/physical appearances eating the first bite of their KFC fried chicken. With a music track in the background of the ad.

Here is the link for the advertisement on Youtube:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BQ-HstwshXA

Figure 2 Screenshots from Regular and low-end brand (KFC) advertisement





Condition (3): The third ad selected was done through ASMR content and represented Lindt. This ad "Lindt Excellence ASMR" was illustrated by zooming in Lindt chocolate melting and a female unpacking the chocolate and eating it. This is accompanied by auditory cues, which include a female whispering and guiding the viewer through the journey of unpacking the chocolate and tasting it, highlighting the quality of the chocolate with words like "sense the excellence." Furthermore, it included the sounds coming out from opening the chocolate.

It can be found on Youtube through this link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1grFIM55qO0

In this condition, the YouTube video was converted to MP3 format and was embedded in the survey using Vimeo to control the duration of the video where only 30 seconds were showed for consistency purposes.

Figure 3 Screenshots from ASMR and high-end brand (Lindt) advertisement



Condition (4): The fourth ad selected for Lindt, which did not include ASMR techniques, under the title of " Lindt LINDOR Truffles – Made to Melt You."

The video featured one of Lindt chefs and a female eating and enjoying the irresistible taste of Lindt chocolate, with music and a voice over in the background.

It can be found on Youtube through this link:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=70FFS9P-wVw 26

Figure 4 Screenshots from Regular and high-end brand (Lindt) advertisement



3.5 Measurements

This research investigated eight dependent variables. In this section, we will showcase each variable with the validated scales used, along with the measured reliability and the factor analysis results of the multi-item scales. Table (1) offers insights of the Cronbach's alphas.

3.5.1 Attitude toward the ad

This dependent variable was measured using a 7-point semantic differential scale, that had six items describing the customers attitude toward the ad. This variable was adopted from Bolls & Muehling (2007).

3.5.2 Attitude toward the brand

The brands highlighted in this study are KFC and Lindt (two food brands with different positioning; low-end and high-end). This variable aimed to measure the respondents overall attitude toward the brand, by a 7-point semantic differential scale, which was highlighted by Bolls & Muehling (2007).

3.5.3 Purchase intention

This variable was assessed by a 7-point Likert scale with 1 as no chance or almost no chance, and 7 as certain or practically certain. This scale was adopted from Bergkvist & Rossiter (2007; 2009).

3.5.4 Mental imagery

Mental imagery was measured using 20 items divided into four main categories: quantity of mental imagery, modality of mental imagery, vividness of mental imagery, and valence of mental imagery.

The quantity and modality of mental imagery were measured using a 7-point Likert scale with 1=strongly disagree and 7= strongly agree. While vividness and valence of mental imagery were measured using a semantic differential scale.

3.5.5 Emotional attachment

Emotional attachment is defined as the bond between brands and their customers (Husain, Paul & Koles, 2022; Japutra et al., 2018). It also refers to "consumers' subjective perceptions from a specific consumption setting" (Modig & Rosengren, 2014, p. 453). This variable was measured using a 7-point Likert scale with 1= strongly disagree, and 7= strongly agree that was adjusted Thomson et al. (2005) and Malär et al. (2011) with the following items: "I have a unique relationship with this brand" "I identify with what this brand stands for" "I feel a sense of belonging in regard to this brand" "I am proud to be a consumer of this brand" "This brand fits my personality."

3.5.6 Perceived product quality

This dependent variable was assessed using a 7-point Likert scale, with 1 as strongly disagree and 7 as strongly agree. This scale was adopted from Modig & Rosengren (2014).

3.5.7 Narrative transportation

Narrative transportation reflects consumers' immersive experience taking the consumers into another world of virtual reality. This variable was measured using a 7-point Likert scale with 1= strongly disagree, and 7= strongly agree that was adjusted from (Sands, Campbell, Mavrommatis, & Kadomskaia, 2022)

3.5.8 Brand experience

Brand experience can be defined as a multidimensional construct that indicates customer loyalty; it could be described by understanding the experience customers have with a specific brand throughout the purchase decision. This variable was measured using a 7-point Likert scale with 1= strongly disagree, and 7= strongly agree that was adjusted from Brakus et al. 2009, Nysveen et al. 2013. Brakus (2009) claims that brand experience has four dimensions; sensory, affective, intellectual/cognitive, and behavioral/relational.

3.5.9 Control variables

This study included five control variables, as follows; hunger, mood, diet, veganism, and love for fast food. These covariates were adjusted from Krishna, Morrin & Sayin (2014).

Using a seven-point Likert scale, they were measured with 1 to 7 scale, with 1=strongly disagree and 7= strongly agree. 33 responses were deleted as 10 had allergies to ingredients that were part of the food promoted in the ad, and 23 were vegan/vegetarian which might affect their judgement while filling the survey. However, people who were on a diet were still considered as being on a diet will not really affect their interest in the product/brand. The statements were as follows: "Currently I am hungry" "Currently I am in a good mood." "Are you allergic to certain ingredients of the product that is advertised?" "Are you on a diet now?" "Are you a vegetarian or a vegan?" "Do you like chocolate? OR do you like fast food?" (Depends on the ad).

Cronbach's Alpha

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's | |
|------------|------------|
| Alpha | N of Items |
| .873 | 49 |

The reliability analysis yielded a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.873 for a scale consisting of 49 items. This value indicates a strong level of internal consistency among the items within the scale, suggesting that these items reliably measure the same underlying construct. This high Cronbach's Alpha value signifies that the scale is likely to be a reliable measure for assessing the intended concept.

Table 1 Reliability Analysis

| Variable | N of | Mean | Standard | Cronbach Alpha |
|--------------------------------|-------|------|-----------|----------------|
| | items | | Deviation | |
| Attitude towards the brand | 3 | 5.20 | 1.412 | .943 |
| Attitude towards the ad | 6 | 5.26 | 1.316 | .928 |
| Emotional attachment | 5 | 3.47 | 1.538 | .918 |
| Brand experience | 10 | 3.82 | 1.352 | .922 |
| Perceived quality of the brand | 1 | 4.58 | 1.940 | NA |
| Narrative transportation | 3 | 4.36 | 1.501 | .712 |
| Purchase intention | 1 | 4.56 | 1.684 | .868 |
| Sensory imagery | 19 | 3.65 | .526 | NA |

Chapter four: Results

This chapter includes two sections, first one shows the descriptive results that describe the demographics of the survey respondents, while the second one answers the research questions. The results of this study were analyzed through SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) offered by Hasselt University.

The main research question is: do ASMR ads have a positive effect on customer's reactions compared to regular ads and the sub-question: is there a difference between ASMR ads' effect on consumer reactions between high-end and low-end brands? e.g., fast food brands and luxury brands.

4.1 Descriptive statistics

Among the total of 130 respondents, most of the respondents were females (n=80), followed by males (n=44) and (n=6) non-binary. In terms of occupation, employed participants with 65.5% form the biggest proportion of the sample (n=84), followed by students (n=32), unemployed (n=7), and others (n=7).

Concerning whether they have seen the advertisement before or not, 90.3% of respondents have <u>not</u> watched/heard the ad before and only 9.7% confirmed watching/hearing the ad before. Before

conducting the analysis, a chi-square test of independence was carried out to check how the proportion of the respondents, who answered "yes" to the question "have you seen/heard the ad before," were divided upon the advertisements, and to decide whether to delete them or not. However, no significant effect was obtained. Therefore, the analysis proceeded with a sample of 165 respondents.

4.2 Effect of ASMR on consumer reactions

A one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to investigate if there is an interaction effect between each dependent variable and the independent variable: advertisement type (ASMR or regular). with hunger and mood as control variables. In addition, a two-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to investigate the moderating effect of brand positioning (low-end and high-end), with controlling for hunger and mood. In this study, the researcher used KFC as a low-end brand and Lindt as high-end brand. Each dependent variable will be examined separately.

H1: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the attitude towards the brand.

| Dependent Va | ariable: Q1 | Q1 – Attitude towards the brand | | |
|--------------|-------------|---------------------------------|-----|--|
| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν | |
| ASMR Ad | 5.38 | 1.337 | 67 | |
| Regular Ad | 5.00 | 1.471 | 63 | |
| Total | 5.20 | 1.412 | 130 | |

Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics show the central tendency and variability of the ratings (dependent variable, attitude towards the brand) based on two types of ads, with controlling for hunger and mood. The mean rating for ASMR ads is 5.38, with a standard deviation of 1.337, based on 67 observations. For regular ads, the mean rating is 5.00, with a standard deviation of 1.471, from 63 observations. Overall, the combined mean rating for both ad types is 5.20, with a standard deviation of 1.412, from a total of 130 observations.

Levene's Test was conducted to assess the equality of error variances among groups for the attitude towards the brand. The obtained F-statistic is (0.720) resulting in a p-value of (0.398). The analysis includes an intercept and additional factors like HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad in the design.

Regarding the attitude for the brand, the results show that the difference is insignificant, as p-value= (0.398), which is above .05, when equality of variance assumed.

H2: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the attitude towards the ad.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent variable. | | | Q2 - Attitude towards the au | | |
|---------------------|------------|------|------------------------------|-----|--|
| | Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν | |
| | ASMR Ad | 5.17 | 1.450 | 67 | |
| | Regular Ad | 5.35 | 1.163 | 63 | |
| | Total | 5.26 | 1.316 | 130 | |

Dependent Variable: 02 – Attitude towards the ad

The descriptive statistics depict the central tendency and variability of ratings (dependent variable, attitude towards the ad) for two types of ads with controlling for hunger and mood. The mean for ASMR ads is 5.17, with a standard deviation of 1.450, based on 67 observations. For regular ads, the mean rating is 5.35, with a standard deviation of 1.163, derived from 63 observations. In total, the combined mean rating for both ad types is 5.26, with a standard deviation of 1.316, gathered from a total of 130 observations.

Levene's Test was conducted to assess the equality of error variances among groups for the attitude towards the ad. The calculated F-statistic is 1.070, resulting in a p-value of 0.303.

Regarding the attitude for the ad, the results show that the difference is insignificant, as p-value= (0.303), which is above .05, when equality of variance assumed.

H3: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the emotional attachment with a brand.

| Dependent Variable: | | Q3 – Emotional attachment | | |
|---------------------|------|---------------------------|-----|--|
| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | N | |
| ASMR Ad | 3.71 | 1.458 | 67 | |
| Regular Ad | 3.21 | 1.590 | 63 | |
| Total | 3.47 | 1.538 | 130 | |

Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics provide insights into the central tendency and variability of ratings (dependent variable, emotional attachment) for two types of ads with controlling for hunger and mood. The mean for ASMR ads is 3.71, with a standard deviation of 1.458, based on 67 observations. For regular ads, the mean rating is 3.21, with a standard deviation of 1.590, derived from 63 observations. In total, the combined mean rating for both ad types is 3.47, with a standard deviation of 1.538, gathered from a total of 130 observations.

Levene's Test was conducted to assess if the error variance of the emotional attachment with the brand is consistent across different groups. The obtained p-value (0.554) indicates that there is no significant difference in error variance between the groups since it is above .05.

H4: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the food general brand experience.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent variable. | | variable. | Q4 Diana experience | |
|---------------------|---------|-----------|---------------------|-----|
| | Ad Type | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
| | ASMR ad | 3.94 | 1.304 | 67 |
| | Regular | 3.70 | 1.402 | 63 |
| | ad | | | |
| | Total | 3.82 | 1.352 | 130 |

Dependent Variable: 04 – Brand experience

The descriptive statistics provide insights into the variable sensory imagery based on different types of ads while controlling for hunger and mood. The descriptive statistics display participants' responses to "the brand experience" based on different ad types. ASMR ads have a higher mean (3.94) than regular ads (3.70), suggesting more favorable perceptions. However, both types show relatively similar variability (Standard Deviation) around the mean. The combined mean (3.82) represents the overall response for all ad types (N = 130).

Levene's Test results for "Q4" examine if error variances are equal across groups. The obtained F-value of 3.134 with 1 and 128 degrees of freedom and a significance level of (0.079) indicates no significant departure from equal variances. Thus, there's no strong evidence to reject the hypothesis of equal error variances.

H5: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the perceived quality of the food brand.

| Dependent Variable: | | Q5 - Perceived quality | | |
|---------------------|------|------------------------|-----|--|
| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν | |
| ASMR Ad | 4.61 | 1.930 | 67 | |
| Regular Ad | 4.56 | 1.966 | 63 | |
| Total | 4.58 | 1.940 | 130 | |

Descriptive Statistics

These descriptive statistics provide insights into the "Perceived Quality" (Q5) ratings based on different types of advertisements. The mean perceived quality rating for the "ASMR Ad" is 4.61, with a standard deviation of 1.930, based on data from 67 participants. For the "Regular Ad," the mean perceived quality rating is slightly lower at 4.56, with a standard deviation of 1.966, based on 63 participants. Across both types of ads, the overall mean perceived quality rating is 4.58, with a standard deviation of 1.940, considering data from a total of 130 participants. These statistics suggest that participants generally provided similar perceived quality ratings for both the "ASMR Ad" and the "Regular Ad."

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances examines whether the variability of "Perceived Quality" (Q5) ratings is consistent across different groups whilst controlling hunger and mood. In this case, the p-value is 0.711. Since the p-value is higher than the common significance threshold of 0.05, there is no strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis. This suggests that the assumption of

equal error variances across the groups is reasonable based on the provided data and model design.

H6: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the narrative transportation.

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Q6 – Narrative transportation

| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
|------------|------|----------------|-----|
| ASMR Ad | 4.39 | 1.581 | 67 |
| Regular Ad | 4.32 | 1.422 | 63 |
| Total | 4.36 | 1.501 | 130 |

These descriptive statistics provide insights into the Q6 responses based on different types of advertisements. The mean response for the "ASMR Ad" is 4.39, with a standard deviation of 1.581, based on data from 67 participants. For the "Regular Ad," the mean response is slightly lower at 4.32, with a standard deviation of 1.422, based on 63 participants. Across both types of ads, the overall mean response is 4.36, with a standard deviation of 1.501, considering data from a total of 130 participants. These statistics suggest that participants generally provided slightly higher responses for the "ASMR Ad" compared to the "Regular Ad."

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances assesses whether the variability of responses regarding the narrative transportation is consistent across different groups. While controlling for hunger and mood, the p-value of (0.833). Since the p-value is higher than the common significance level of 0.05, there is no strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis. This suggests that the assumption of equal error variances across the groups is reasonable based on the provided data and model design.

H7: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the purchase intention towards the brand.

Descriptive Statistics

brand

Dependent Variable: Purchase intention towards the

| brunu | | | |
|---------------|------|----------------|-----|
| Ad Type | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
| ASMR ad | 4.84 | 1.533 | 67 |
| Regular ad | 4.27 | 1.798 | 63 |
| Total | 4.56 | 1.684 | 130 |

The provided descriptive statistics concern the variable "purchase intention" and its distribution across distinct ad types. For ASMR ads, the mean is 4.84, with a standard deviation of 1.533, derived from 67 participants. Regular ads type yields a mean of 4.27, accompanied by a standard
deviation of 1.798, based on 63 participants. Overall, when considering all ad types, the combined mean response for purchase intention is 4.56, accompanied by a standard deviation of 1.684, drawing from a total sample size of 130 participants.

Levene's Test results for the purchase intention assess if error variances are uniform across groups. The obtained F-value of 2.207, with 1 and 128 degrees of freedom and a significance level of 0.140, suggests no significant departure from equal variances. This implies that there is no strong evidence to reject the assumption of equal error variances.

| Dependent Variable: | | Sensory imagery | | |
|---------------------|------|-----------------|-----|--|
| Ad Type | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν | |
| ASMR ads | 3.62 | .511 | 67 | |
| Regular ads | 3.69 | .544 | 63 | |
| Total | 3.65 | .526 | 130 | |

Descriptive Statistics

H8: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the sensory imagery.

The descriptive statistics offered here pertain to the dependent variable "sensory imagery" and its distribution across distinct ad types. For participants exposed to ASMR ads, the mean response stands at 3.62, showcasing a relatively low level of variability with a standard deviation of 0.511. Similarly, participants who experienced regular ads exhibit a slightly higher mean response of 3.69, accompanied by a standard deviation of 0.544. Combining responses across all ad types, the overall mean response for "Q8" is 3.65, and the standard deviation is 0.526. These statistics provide valuable insights into how participants perceive sensory imagery across different ad contexts, illustrating both the average sentiment and the degree of response variability.

Levene's Test results for sensory imagery evaluate whether error variances are equivalent across groups. The obtained F-value of 0.107, with 1 and 128 degrees of freedom, and a significance level of 0.744, suggests that there is no significant deviation from equal variances.

H9: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will have a higher effect on low-end brands than high-end brands.

The results present an analysis of the moderating effect of brand positioning (low-end vs. high-end) on consumer responses to ASMR (Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response) ads. The study examines the influence of brand positioning on consumers' attitudes, emotional attachment, brand experience, perceived quality, narrative transportation, purchase intention, and sensory imagery when exposed to ASMR ads. The findings suggest that brand positioning (low-end vs. high-end) interacts with the impact of ASMR ads on consumer responses. Depending on the construct, participants responded differently based on the brand's perceived positioning. These insights provide implications for marketers seeking to optimize the effectiveness of ASMR ads by considering the interplay between brand positioning and consumer responses.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent | | Brand | | | |
|----------------|---------|----------------|------|----------------|----|
| variable | Ad Type | Positioning | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
| Q1 – Attitude | ASMR | KFC Low End | 5.05 | 1.328 | 33 |
| towards the | | Lindt High End | 5.71 | 1.284 | 34 |
| brand | | Total | 5.38 | 1.337 | 67 |
| | Regular | KFC Low End | 4.53 | 1.462 | 35 |
| | | Lindt High End | 5.58 | 1.282 | 28 |
| | | Total | 5.00 | 1.471 | 63 |
| Q2 – Attitude | ASMR | KFC Low End | 5.29 | 1.190 | 33 |
| towards the ad | | Lindt High End | 5.06 | 1.674 | 34 |
| | | Total | 5.17 | 1.450 | 67 |
| | Regular | KFC Low End | 5.01 | 1.172 | 35 |
| | | Lindt High End | 5.76 | 1.027 | 28 |
| | | Total | 5.35 | 1.163 | 63 |
| Q3 – Emotional | ASMR | KFC Low End | 3.39 | 1.463 | 33 |
| attachment | | | | | |
| | | Lindt High End | 4.03 | 1.402 | 34 |
| | | Total | 3.71 | 1.458 | 67 |
| | Regular | KFC Low End | 2.79 | 1.438 | 35 |
| | | Lindt High End | 3.74 | 1.639 | 28 |
| | | Total | 3.21 | 1.590 | 63 |
| Q4 – Brand | ASMR | KFC Low End | 3.88 | 1.105 | 33 |
| experience | | | | | |
| | | Lindt High End | 3.99 | 1.487 | 34 |
| | | Total | 3.94 | 1.304 | 67 |
| | Regular | KFC Low End | 3.32 | 1.173 | 35 |
| | | Lindt High End | 4.17 | 1.537 | 28 |
| | | Total | 3.70 | 1.402 | 63 |
| Q5 - Perceived | ASMR | KFC Low End | 3.67 | 1.814 | 33 |
| quality | | | | | |
| | _ | Lindt High End | 5.53 | 1.581 | 34 |
| | | Total | 4.61 | 1.930 | 67 |
| | Regular | KFC Low End | 3.66 | 1.846 | 35 |
| | | Lindt High End | 5.68 | 1.492 | 28 |
| | | Total | 4.56 | 1.966 | 63 |
| Q6 – Narrative | ASMR | KFC Low End | 4.58 | 1.342 | 33 |
| transportation | | | | | |
| | | Lindt High End | 4.21 | 1.785 | 34 |

| | _ | Total | 4.39 | 1.581 | 67 |
|-------------------------|---------|------------------|------|-------|----|
| | Regular | KFC Low End | 4.14 | 1.324 | 35 |
| | | Lindt High End | 4.55 | 1.529 | 28 |
| | | Total | 4.32 | 1.422 | 63 |
| Q7 – Purchase | ASMR | KFC Low End | 4.85 | 1.584 | 33 |
| | | Lindt High End | 4 82 | 1 507 | 34 |
| | _ | Enfact high Enfa | 4.02 | 1.507 | 54 |
| | | Total | 4.84 | 1.533 | 67 |
| | Regular | KFC Low End | 3.80 | 1.795 | 35 |
| | | Lindt High End | 4.86 | 1.649 | 28 |
| | | Total | 4.27 | 1.798 | 63 |
| Q8 – Sensory imagery | ASMR | KFC Low End | 3.70 | .506 | 33 |
| | | Lindt High End | 3.53 | .509 | 34 |
| | _ | Total | 3.62 | .511 | 67 |
| | Regular | KFC Low End | 3.84 | .577 | 35 |
| | | Lindt High End | 3.49 | .437 | 28 |
| | | Total | 3.69 | .544 | 63 |

Table 2: Summary of one-way ANCOVA results for the eight dependent variables.

| Dependent | Model | | Hunger | | Mood | |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|
| variable | F (3,130) | P-value | F (1,130) | P-value | F (1,130) | P-value |
| Attitude towards the | 3.811 | .012 | 8.885 | .003 | .277 | .600 |
| brand | | | | | | |
| Attitude towards the | 4.504 | .005 | 12.845 | .000 | .774 | .381 |
| ad | | | | | | |
| Emotional | 3.589 | .016 | 6.286 | .013 | .188 | .665 |
| attachment | | | | | | |
| Brand experience | 5.511 | .001 | 6.772 | .010 | 6.440 | .012 |
| Perceived quality | .989 | .400 | 2.852 | .094 | .000 | .996 |
| Narrative | 5.168 | .002 | 11.331 | .001 | 1.967 | .163 |
| transportation | | | | | | |
| | 3.558 | .019 | 3.874 | .053 | .010 | .922 |
| Purchase intention | 1.017 | .392 | 2.977 | .090 | .001 | .979 |
| KFC/Lindt) | | | | | | |
| Sensory imagery | 2.921 | .037 | 7.618 | .007 | .120 | .729 |

Table 3

| Dependent variable | F | P-value | M (SD) | |
|--------------------------|-------|---------|--------------|--------------|
| | | | ASMR | Regular |
| Attitude towards the | .720 | .398 | 5.38 (1.337) | 5.00 (1.471) |
| brand | | | | |
| Attitude towards the ad | 1.070 | .303 | 5.17 (1.450) | 5.35 (1.163) |
| Emotional attachment | .352 | .554 | 3.71 (1.458) | 3.21 (1.590) |
| Brand experience | .172 | .679 | 5.00 (1.670) | 4.81 (1.544) |
| Perceived quality | .138 | .711 | 4.61 (1.930) | 4.56 (1.966) |
| Narrative transportation | .045 | .833 | 4.39 (1.581) | 4.32 (1.422) |
| | 1.367 | .246 | 4.85 (1.584) | 3.80 (1.795) |
| Purchase intention | .009 | .924 | 4.82 (1.507) | 4.86 (1.649) |
| KFC/Lindt) | | | | |
| Sensory imagery | .139 | .710 | 3.90 (1.671) | 4.08 (1.599) |

Table 4: the moderating effect of brand positioning

| Dependent variable | Low-end (KFC) | | High-end (Lindt) | |
|----------------------------|---------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|
| | M (SD) | | M (SD) | |
| | N = (68) | | N = (62) | |
| | ASMR | Regular | ASMR | Regular |
| | N= 33 | N= 35 | N= 34 | N= 28 |
| Attitude towards the brand | 5.05 | 4.53 (1.462) | 5.71 (1.284) | 5.58 (1.282) |
| | (1.328) | | | |
| Attitude towards the ad | 5.29 | 5.01 (1.172) | 5.06 (1.674) | 5.76 (1.027) |
| | (1.190) | | | |
| Emotional attachment | 3.39 | 2.79 (1.438) | 4.03 (1.402) | 3.74 (1.639) |
| | (1.463) | | | |
| Brand experience | 3.88 | 3.32 (1.173) | 3.99 (1.487) | 4.17 (1.537) |
| | (1.105) | | | |
| Perceived quality | 3.67 | 3.66 (1.846) | 5.53 (1.581) | 5.68 (1.492) |
| | (1.814) | | | |
| Narrative transportation | 4.58 | 4.14 (1.324) | 4.21 (1.785) | 4.55 (1.529) |
| | (1.342) | | | |
| Purchase intention | 4.85 | 3.80 (1.795) | 4.82 (1.507) | 4.86 (1.649) |
| | (1.584) | | | |
| Sensory imagery | 3.70 (.506) | 3.84 (.577) | 3.53 (.509) | 3.49 (.437) |

Chapter five: Discussion

As found in the previous literature, the main purpose out of using ASMR was to help people with mental disorders, like anxiety and insomnia, induce relaxing feelings and calmness due to its soothing sounds, in addition to that, many people watch ASMR videos regularly in order to help them fall asleep (Barrat & Davis, 2015; Kovacevich & Huron, 2019). Even though ASMR has huge potential in marketing contexts, it is not yet utilized by marketers, as a result, it has become an area of interest for marketing research.

According to Chae (2020), ASMR can be classified under sensory marketing. Nonetheless, the influence ASMR has on customers reactions and behaviors are still unclear and needs to be focused on further by marketing researchers. This study was conducted to contribute to investigating ASMR in marketing contexts. This study aimed to investigate if ASMR ads have a positive effect on customer's reactions compared to regular ads. In particular, customers attitude toward the ad, attitude toward the brand, purchase intention, mental imagery, emotional attachment, perceived product quality, narrative transportation, and brand experience. The study also examined whether there is a difference in the effect of ASMR ads on consumers' reactions when used by brands who have different positioning (low-end brand and high-end brand), while controlling the confounding variables; hunger and mood, and deleting responses who mentioned that they were on a diet, vegan, or vegetarian. The four conditions were as follows: the type of advertisement (ASMR vs. regular) and brand positioning (low-end vs. high-end).

5.1 Effect of ASMR on consumer reactions

The results indicate that there is a significant difference between the two types of ads: ASMR and regular ads, on customers' reactions. Respondents who watched the ASMR advertisement had a higher attitude toward the brand, emotional attachment, brand experience, perceived product quality, narrative transportation, and purchase intention compared to regular ads. Which means an overall more positive effect on their reactions. On the other hand, respondents who watched regular ads had a higher attitude on the ad and sensory imagery with it compared to ASMR ads. However, the differences were slightly different from each other (either higher or lower), which indicates that marketers should dig deeper into the effects of ASMR content and the right contexts on which to use it.

Contrary to the research findings presented by Kim (2020) and Bachem (2020), the results of this study suggest that Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response (ASMR) advertisements may not be as effective in influencing customer responses as regular advertisements. Kim's study concluded that ASMR advertisements were more likely to cultivate positive attitudes towards the advertisement itself compared to conventional ads, while Bachem's findings aligned with this assertion. However,

it is important to acknowledge that neither study showed a significant difference in attitudes towards the brand compared to regular advertisements.

It should be noted that these studies primarily focused on the impact of advertising stimuli in specific sectors such as fast-food and cosmetics, which also incorporated varying measurements and variables that might not be applicable across all industries. This raises the question as to whether the effectiveness of ASMR advertisements can be generalized across different sectors and with diverse customer bases (Kim, 2020; Bachem, 2020).

According to Wiedmann et al. (2018), sensory marketing could be used by brand marketers to build stronger emotional connection between customers and brands, while traditional marketing mainly focuses on showing the product benefits. The results of this study support this argument since it shows that ASMR ads had a higher effect on emotional attachment than regular ads. Furthermore, it was mentioned by Feiz, et al., (2022) that ASMR marketing can be beneficial for brands with providing their audience with a distinctive virtual sensory experience, however, this study shows that regular ads have a higher effect on customers' reactions that ASMR content when it comes to sensory imagery. According to McErlean and Banissy (2017), crisp sounds are one of the most effective ASMR triggers, with 36% of the study's participants rating them favorably in terms of, for example, their expectation of sensory product characteristics. This is in line with the findings of this study where we found that the crisp and sound of frying chicken for KFC gained a higher effect than the regular ads by customers, even after controlling for hunger and mood.

Till quite recently, there wasn't a lot of research done specifically about ASMR commercials. Yet, the results of a few research suggest that components of ASMR could potentially improve emotional involvement with ads. For example, the research that was conducted by Ho and Chang (2019) revealed that when ASMR noises were incorporated into advertising, both involvement and pleasant feelings regarding the commercial enhanced. According to the findings of a study that was conducted by Tussyadiah and Wang (2020), advertisements that used ASMR were more successful than advertisements that did not use ASMR in terms of eliciting positive thoughts about the advertised brand and fostering positive sentiments about it. This perfectly aligns with the findings of this study regarding the perceived quality of the brand, as we found that ASMR has a higher effect on customers reaction than regular ads. However, other aspects of creating ASMR content should be taken into consideration to improve the sensory imagery and attitude towards the commercials.

5.2 Does brand positioning make a difference?

Moving on to the sub-question, if there is a difference in the effect of ASMR ads on consumers' reactions when used by a low-end or a high-end brand.

The findings suggest that brand positioning (low-end vs. high-end) interacts with the impact of ASMR ads on consumer responses. Depending on the construct, participants responded differently

based on the brand's perceived positioning. These insights provide implications for marketers seeking to optimize the effectiveness of ASMR ads by considering the interplay between brand positioning and consumer responses.

The findings reveal that there is **no direct interaction** between brand positioning (low-end and high-end) and the type of ad (ASMR ads and regular ads), across various dimensions: attitude towards the brand, attitude towards the ad, emotional attachment, brand experience, perceived quality, narrative transportation, purchase intention, and sensory imagery. Based on the outcomes of this investigation, it becomes evident that branding plays a key role in determining the effect of content marketing techniques (like sensory marketing for example). In addition, the brand's target audience and other pertinent factors like its quality, pricing, brand positioning, are key determinants of their perception, resulting in higher or lower attitude from users. It's important to note that the effectiveness of ASMR content should not be universally assumed; its appropriateness varies across different brands. The market positioning of a brand also wields a significant influence on the success of ASMR marketing strategies. There are slight differences between the moderating effect of brand positioning. However, they are not major or enough effects to change marketing strategies for low-end or high-end brands.

5.3 Limitations and recommendations for future research

While conducting this thesis, the researched faced some challenges. Firstly, limited previous research was conducted on ASMR marketing, more specifically on ASMR effect on the food brand experience. In addition to almost no research on the moderating effect of brand positioning on ASMR marketing. Moreover, a limitation was found in the methodology part of this study; it was hard to find two brands in the same category that have different positioning (low-end versus high-end) and already used ASMR in their advertising strategy (e.g. KFC is a fast food chain that might be considered as a low-end for some people and high-end for others, depending on a comparison that can be done between fast food restaurants pricing, quality, and perceived image, which is not the point of focus for this research). Moreover, this had led to comparing two different product categories (fast food and chocolate), which might have affected the results, since each has its audience and pricing. Furthermore, future research could examine brands in different industries as the food industry has always used sounds in their advertisements, which can be limiting if the researcher wants to solely analyse the effect of ASMR marketing.

Since sounds play a dominant role in ASMR advertising, it was necessary for participants to watch the ads with their headphones on. An additional limitation is the possibility that respondents may not have followed the recommended guidelines for wearing headphones or adjusting the volume correctly. As a result, it is suggested that future research incorporate a control question regarding headphone usage. Moreover, some respondents indicated that they were on a diet, which might affect their judgement in the survey. However, those responses were not deleted as it is not certain that their judgement is unfair and deleting them would affect the sample of the study resulting in a smaller sample. It is advised for future research to collect a bigger sample to have more freedom with the control questions. It is advised for future research about ASMR marketing to employ a qualitative approach, conducting face-to-face interviews with respondents. This would enable them to gain a more comprehensive understanding of participant preferences, perceptions, and opinions. Moreover, the face-to-face interviews allowed the researchers to observe respondents' reactions while they watched the video. This was a limitation for this study, as the methodology used in this study is quantitative, utilizing self-administered surveys. However, self-administered surveys present certain limitations, such as fixed closed-ended questions, which may not provide extensive justification for responses. Additionally, researchers cannot control extraneous variables that could impact respondents' answers, as participants might fill out the survey in less conducive environments, potentially affecting their concentration levels.

Another interesting topic for further research could be investigating the effects of ASMR advertising in other fields, like hospitality. The original purpose of ASMR was helping people with anxiety, which could be utilized further in the marketing context. For instance, it can be used by hotels to improve the brand experience, as the relaxation experience in hotels could highly influence the overall customer experience. Additionally, future research can investigate ASMR usage on specific social media platforms. For example, ASMR has been increasingly used on TikTok, which gives marketers a great opportunity to explore reaching new and different audiences by using ASMR tactics.

This study was distributed to different geographical regions; however, it is recommended for future research to focus on specific locations to explore if any cultural or social aspects play a role in the perception of ASMR marketing tactics. For example, some culture might consider the sound of whispering or tapping awkward and creepy, while others are completely fine with it.

Another area for future research can be in examining the impact of demographics like gender and age on the willingness to watch ASMR ads and on the customers' reactions to it, which can help understand the best target audience for this marketing tool.

5.4 Implications

This master thesis will help marketers understand the effect of ASMR in advertising contexts and create deeper connections with customers, specifically in the food industry. Moreover, it gives a new perspective on utilizing different content creation approaches for marketing and advertising agencies as this industry is becoming more and more competitive.

Even though research on ASMR commercials is just getting started, the studies that have been done so far suggest that ASMR characteristics could be a beneficial tool for marketers and content creators who are aiming to increase consumers' engagement and emotional connections to their companies. Exposure to ASMR videos may help to build a positive emotional state connected with the brand, and the incorporation of ASMR characteristics may help to enhance the sensory experience of interacting with the brand. The sharing and comments that typically accompany ASMR content may further enhance emotional attachment, which in turn may foster a sense of community and a sense of social identity in relation to the brand. In addition, it helps them evaluate whether it is suitable to use ASMR in their campaigns based on the brand image and positioning in the market. To elaborate, ASMR marketing is still not preferred by everyone, some cultures/people might find it creepy or weird, while others can find it entertaining and relaxing. So, marketers should decide whether it suits their brand image and target audience. This research gives some insights to marketers, from a consumer behavior perspective. Furthermore, ASMR content is often associated with stress relief and calmness, so if the brand image aligns with that, it can be an effective tool to connect with the customers on a deeper level.

Chapter six: Conclusion

This research aims to investigate the effects of ASMR marketing in the advertising field, whether they are positive or negative, on the customers' attitudes and reactions. and contribute to the studies being done on this topic. In addition to investigating if there is a difference in the effect of ASMR ads on consumers' reactions when it is used by low-end or high-end brands in the food industry.

The study's findings highlight that there's a difference in how people react to ASMR and regular ads. Those who saw the ASMR ads had a better opinion of the brand, felt more connected to it emotionally, had a better experience with the brand, thought the product quality was better, got more into the story of the ad, and were more likely to want to buy the product compared to regular ads. On the other hand, people who saw regular ads liked the ad itself more and could picture it more vividly compared to ASMR ads. But these differences weren't huge, which suggests that marketers should look more closely at how ASMR content works and when it's best to use it. In addition to that, the findings show that the direct interaction between brand positioning (low-end vs. high-end) and ad type (ASMR and regular) across dimensions like attitude towards the brand, ad, emotional attachment, brand experience, perceived quality, narrative transportation, purchase intention, and sensory imagery is not significant. This study underscores the crucial role of branding in shaping the impact of content marketing techniques, such as sensory marketing. Factors like the brand's target audience, quality, pricing, and positioning contribute to users' perceptions, resulting in varied attitudes. It's worth noting that the effectiveness of ASMR content varies among brands. The brand's market position is a vital factor in the success of ASMR marketing. While there are slight differences in the moderating effect of brand positioning, they don't necessitate major shifts in marketing strategies for low-end or high-end brands.

Even though the concept of ASMR has been examined in previous studies, limited research studied ASMR in marketing contexts, to the best of our knowledge. Hence, this research attempts to fill the gaps in the existing literature. In order to develop our knowledge regarding ASMR marketing and its effect on customers reactions, an extensive model has been constructed as an extension to previous literature. This research used a quantitative data collection method where a survey was distributed online. The data collected was analysed through the employment of the software program SPSS. Furthermore, the research findings concluded that ASMR ads have a higher effect than regular ads on customers reactions for three variables; attitude towards the brand, emotional attachment, and brand experience, whereas regular ads have a higher effect than ASMR ads on other five variables; attitude towards the ad, perceived product quality, narrative transportation, and sensory imagery, which was explained by the researchers based on the brand image and position brands want to have and reflect, on the audience. Lastly, the findings of the current research provide both practical and theoretical implications that can be utilized by marketing managers in the future.

References list

1. Aaker David A. (1996), Building Strong Brands. New York: The Free Press.

2. Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 50(2), 179-211.

3. Algom, D., & Cain, W. S. (1991). Remembered odors and mental mixtures: tapping reservoirs of olfactory knowledge. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 17(4), 1104.

4. Aljumah, Ahmad & Nuseir, Mohammed & Refae, Ghaleb. (2022). The effect of sensory marketing factors on customer loyalty during Covid 19: Exploring the mediating role of customer satisfaction. International Journal of Data and Network Science. 6. 1359-1368. 10.5267/j.ijdns.2022.5.015. DOI: 10.5267/j.ijdns.2022.5.015

5. Alloza, A. (2008). Brand Engagement and Brand Experience at BBVA, the Transformation of a 150 Years Old Company. Corporate Reputation Review, 11(4), 371–379. https://doi.org/10.1057/crr.2008.31

6. Anjani, L., Mok, T., Tang, A., Oehlberg, L., & Goh, W. B. (2020, April). Why do people watch others eat food? An Empirical Study on the Motivations and Practices of Mukbang Viewers. In Proceedings of the 2020 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems (pp. 1-13). https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376567

7. Antonova, O. (2019). ASMR-ADVERTISING AS AN ELEMENT OF IKEA MARKETING STRATEGY. EASTERN EUROPEAN CONFERENCE OF MANAGEMENT AND ECONOMICS. Ljubljana. https://dspace.nuft.edu.ua/jspui/bitstream/123456789/32317/1/33.pdf 8. Antonova, O., & National University of Food Technologies. (2019). Three ways to use ASMR-technologies in modern advertising and marketing. Modern Economics, 17(1), 6-10. doi:10.31521/modecon.v17(2019)-01

9. Bachem, S. B. (2020). Food that tingles your brain?: Exploring the potential of ASMR fast food advertisements by gaining insights into their effects on consumers' product and ad evaluations as well as on their evaluation of voice, sounds and visuals (Bachelor's thesis, University of Twente). <u>https://purl.utwente.nl/essays/81674</u>

10. Barratt, Emma & Davis, Nick. (2015). Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response (ASMR): A flow-like mental state. PeerJ. 3. e851. 10.7717/peerj.851. <u>https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.851</u>

11. Barsalou, Lawrence W. (2008), "Grounded Cognition," Annual Review of Psychology, 59, 617–45.

12. Bode, M. (2019). Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response (ASMR) as a marketing tool : an examination of the online phenomenon' s potential in the promotion mix of slow tourism destinations.

13. Bolls, P. D., & Muehling, D. D. (2007). The effects of dual-task processing on consumers' responses to high- and low-imagery radio advertisements. *Journal of Advertising*, *36*(4), 35–47. https://doi.org/10.2753/JOA0091-3367360403

14. Brakus, J. J., Schmitt, B. H., & Zarantonello, L. (2009). Brand Experience: What is It? How is it Measured? Does it Affect Loyalty? Journal of Marketing, 73(3), 52–68. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.73.3.052

15. Brechman, Jean & Purvis, Scott. (2015). Narrative, transportation and advertising. International Journal of Advertising. 34. 366-381. 10.1080/02650487.2014.994803. https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2014.994803

16. Calvert, G., Spence, C., & Stein, B. E. (Eds.). (2004). The handbook of multisensory processes. MIT press.

17. Carroll, B. A., &Ahuvia, A. C. (2006). Some antecedents and outcomes of brand love. Marketing letters, 17(2), 79-89.

18. Chae, H., Baek, M., Jang, H., & Sung, S. (2021). Storyscaping in fashion brand using commitment and nostalgia based on ASMR marketing. Journal of Business Research, 130, 462–472. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.01.004

19. Chaudhuri, A., & Holbrook, M. B. (2001). The chain of effects from brand trust and brand affect to brand performance: the role of brand loyalty. Journal of marketing, 65(2), 81-93.

20. Chen, H. T., & Lin, Y. T. (2018). A study of the relationships among sensory experience, emotion, and buying behavior in coffeehouse chains. Service Business, 12(3), 551–573.

21. Choudhary, N., Gautam, C., & Arya, V. (2020). Digital marketing challenge and opportunity with reference to tiktok-a new rising social media platform. Editorial Board, 9(10).

22. Denning, S. (2006). Effective storytelling: strategic business narrative techniques. Strategy &Amp; Leadership, 34(1), 42–48. https://doi.org/10.1108/10878570610637885

23. Desai, V. (2019). Digital marketing: A review. International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development, 5(5), 196-200.

24. Dolbec, P. Y., &Chebat, J. C. (2013). The Impact of a Flagship vs. a Brand Store on Brand Attitude, Brand Attachment and Brand Equity. Journal of Retailing, 89(4), 460–466. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2013.06.003

25. El Chaar, A. (2019). Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response: The Phenomenon Behind The Tingling Sensation [Master Thesis, Notre Dame University-Louaize]. The Notre Dame University-Louaize Institutional Repository (DSpace). <u>http://ir.ndu.edu.lb/123456789/1060</u>

26. Engelbregt, H.J., Brinkman, K., van Geest, C.C.E. et al. The effects of autonomous sensory meridian response (ASMR) on mood, attention, heart rate, skin conductance and EEG in healthy young adults. Exp Brain Res 240, 1727–1742 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-022-06377-9

27. Esch, F., Langner, T., Schmitt, B.H. and Geus, P. (2006), "Are brands forever? How brand knowledge and relationships affect current and future purchases", Journal of Product & Brand Management, Vol. 15 No. 2, pp. 98-105. https://doi.org/10.1108/10610420610658938

28. Feiz, D., Alipour, S., &Asgharinajib, M. (2022). Investigating the Effect of Advertisements based on Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response (ASMR) on Brand Persona with Netnographic Approach. Quarterly Journal of Brand Management, 9(2), 13-42.

29. Felix, R., Rauschnabel, P. A., &Hinsch, C. (2017). Elements of strategic social media marketing: A holistic framework. Journal of Business Research, 70, 118-126.

30. Fetscherin, M., 2014. What type of relationship do we have with loved brands?. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *31*(6/7), pp.430-440.

31. Fillis, Ian. (2006). Art for Art's Sake or Art for Business Sake: An exploration of artistic product orientation. The Marketing Review. 6. 29-40. 10.1362/146934706776861573 https://doi.org/10.1362/146934706776861573

32. Fredborg, B., Clark, J. and Smith, S.D., 2017. An examination of personality traits associated with autonomous sensory meridian response (ASMR). *Frontiers in psychology*, *8*, p.247.

33. Gallagher, R. (2016). Eliciting Euphoria Online: The Aesthetics of "ASMR" Video Culture. Film Criticism,40(2). <u>https://www.jstor.org/stable/48731235</u> 34. Gobe, M. (2001) Emotional Branding: The New Paradigm for Connecting Brands to People. Allworth Press, New York.

Gould van Praag, C. D., Garfinkel, S. N., Sparasci, O., Mees, A., Philippides, A. O., Ware,
 M., Ottaviani, C., & Critchley, H. D. (2017). Mind-wandering and alterations to default mode
 network connectivity when listening to naturalistic versus artificial sounds. Scientific Reports, 7(1).
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/srep45273</u>

36. Hai Ho Nguyen, Bang Nguyen-Viet, Yen Thi Hoang Nguyen & Tin Hoang Le (2022) Understanding online purchase intention: the mediating role of attitude towards advertising, Cogent Business & Management, 9:1 <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2022.2095950</u>

37. Herskovitz, S., & Crystal, M. (2010). The essential brand persona: storytelling and branding. Journal of Business Strategy, 31(3), 21–28. https://doi.org/10.1108/02756661011036673

38. Hoeffler, S., & Keller, K. L. (2003). The marketing advantages of strong brands. Journal of brand management, 10(6), 421-445.

39. Hostler, T. J., Poerio, G. L., & Blakey, E. (2018). Still more than a feeling: Commentary onCashet al., "Expectancy effects in theAutonomous Sensory Meridian Response" and recommendations for measurement infuture ASMR research. Peer Journal. https://peerj.com/preprints/27303/

40. Huang, X. I., Huang, Z. T., & Wyer, R. S. (2017). The Influence of Social Crowding on Brand Attachment. Journal of Consumer Research, 44(5), 1068–1084. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucx087

41. Hultén, B. (2011). Sensory marketing: the multi-sensory brand-experience concept. European business review, 23(3), 256-273.

42. Hultén, B., Broweus, N., Dijk, M. van, & Dijk, M. van. (2009). Sensory Marketing. Springer.

43. Husain, R., Paul, J., & Koles, B. (2022). The role of brand experience, brand resonance and brand trust in luxury consumption. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 66, 102895.

44. Hussain, Sharafat. (2019). Sensory Marketing Strategies and Consumer Behavior: Sensible Selling Using All Five Senses. International Journal of Business Strategy. 16. 34-44. <u>https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337198711 Sensory Marketing Strategies and Consumer Behavior Sensible Selling Using All Five Senses</u>

45. Indumathi, R. (2018). Influence of digital marketing on brand building. International Journal of Mechanical Engineering and Technology (IJMET), 9(7), 235-243.

46. Ishak, F. and Abd Ghani, N.H., 2013. A review of the literature on brand loyalty and customer loyalty

47. Janiszewski, C., & Van Osselaer, S. M. (2000). A connectionist model of brand-quality associations. Journal of Marketing Research, 37(3), 331-350.

48. Japutra, A., Ekinci, Y. and Simkin, L. (2018), "Positive and negative behaviours resulting from brand attachment: The moderating effects of attachment styles", European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 52 No. 5/6, pp. 1185-1202. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-10-2016-0566

49. Johnson, A.R., Thomson, M. and Jeffrey, J. (2015), "What Does Brand Authenticity Mean? Causes and Consequences of Consumer Scrutiny toward a Brand Narrative", Brand Meaning Management (Review of Marketing Research, Vol. 12), Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Bingley, pp. 1-27. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1548-643520150000012001

50. Kaushik, S., & Gokhale, N. (2021). Online Sensory Marketing: Developing Five-Dimensional Multi-Sensory Brand Experiences and its Effectiveness. REVISTA GEINTEC-GESTAO INOVACAO E TECNOLOGIAS, 11(4), 5375-5391.

51. Kaye, D. B. V., Chen, X., & Zeng, J. (2021). The co-evolution of two Chinese mobile short video apps: Parallel platformization of Douyin and TikTok. Mobile Media & Communication, 9(2), 229-253.

52. Kence, Esil Sonmez1,; Ülker, Selami Varol2; Canan, Sinan3. NeuroPsychophysiological Investigation of ASMR Advertising Experience. The Journal of Neurobehavioral Sciences 9(3):p 114-120, Sep–Dec 2022. | doi: **10.4103/jnbs.jnbs_32_22**

53. Khan, I., & Rahman, Z. (2017). Brand experience and emotional attachment in services: The moderating role of gender. Service Science, 9(1), 50-61. <u>https://doi.org/10.1287/serv.2016.0169</u>

54. Kim (2020). ASMR in advertising and its effects : the moderating role of product involvement and brand familiarity. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.26153/tsw/10139</u>

55. Kircaburun, K., Harris, A., Calado, F. et al. The Psychology of Mukbang Watching: A Scoping Review of the Academic and Non-academic Literature. Int J Ment Health Addiction 19, 1190–1213 (2021). <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-019-00211-0</u>

56. Kovacevich, A., & Huron, D. (2019). Two studies of autonomous sensory meridian response

57. Krishna, A. (2012). An integrative review of sensory marketing: Engaging the senses to affect perception, judgment and behavior. Journal of consumer psychology, 22(3), 332-351.

58. Kumar, V., & Kaushik, A.K. (2018). Building consumer–brand relationships through brand experience and brand identification. Journal of Strategic Marketing, 28, 39 - 59.

59. Kwansa, A. P. F. H. G. (2014). Quick Service Restaurants, Franchising, and Multi-Unit Chain Managemen. Taylor & Francis.

https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781315864945/quick-service-restaurants-fr anchising-multi-unit-chain-management-francis-kwansa-parsa

60. Kwansa, F. (2002). Quick Service Restaurants, Franchising, and Multi-Unit Chain Management | Taylor & Francis Group

61. Lecomte, S. (2016, August 8). Sensory marketing, a new weapon for restaurant owners. RestoConnection.

https://www.restoconnection.com/sensory-marketing-new-weapon-restaurant-owners/

62. Lee, D., & Wan, C. (2023). The Impact of Mukbang Live Streaming Commerce on Consumers' Overconsumption Behavior. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 58(2–3), 198–221. https://doi.org/10.1177/10949968231156104

63. Lee, J. and Hong, I.B., 2016. Predicting positive user responses to social media advertising: The roles of emotional appeal, informativeness, and creativity. *International Journal of Information Management*, *36*(3), pp.360-373.

64. Li, J., Guo, F., Xu, J., & Yu, Z. (2022). What influences consumers' intention to purchase innovative products: Evidence from China. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 838244. <u>https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyq.2022.838244</u>

Liberman, N., Trope, Y., & Stephan, E. (2007). Psychological distance. In A. W. Kruglanski&E. T. Higgins (Eds.), Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles (pp. 353383). New York, NY:Guilford Press.

66. Lindstrom, M. (2005). Brand Sense: How to Build Powerful Brands Through Touch, Taste, Smell, Sight and Sound. (2005). Journal of Product & Brand Management, 14(4), 278–279. https://doi.org/10.1108/10610420510609311

67. Lindstrom, M. (2005). Broad sensory branding. Journal of Product and Brand Management, 14, 84–87.

68. Lindstrom, M. (2006). Brand sense: How to build powerful brands through touch, taste, smell, sight and sound. Strategic Direction, 22(2).

69. Liu, H., Li, Z., Yang, M., Tian, X., Pei, L., & Li, C. (2009). Sensory innervation of the anterior eye segment in rats: a retrograde tracing study. Frontiers of Medicine in China, 3(3), 352-356.

70. Lopez, G. (2018). ASMR, explained: why millions of people are watching YouTube videos of someone whispering. Vox. Retrieved from

https://www.vox.com/2015/7/15/8965393/asmr-video-youtube-autonomous-sensory-meridian-res ponse

71. Lundqvist, A., Liljander, V., Gummerus, J. et al. The impact of storytelling on the consumer brand experience: The case of a firm-originated story. J Brand Manag 20, 283–297 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1057/bm.2012.15

72. MacInnis, D. J., & Folkes, V. S. (2017). Humanizing brands: When brands seem to be like me, part of me, and in a relationship with me. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 27(3), 355–374. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2016.12.003

73. MacInnis, D. J., Moorman, C., & Jaworski, B. J. (1991). Enhancing and measuring consumers' motivation, opportunity, and ability to process brand information from ads. The Journal of Marketing, 32-53.

74. MacKenzie, S. B., Lutz, R. J., & Belch, G. E. (1986). The Role of Attitude toward the Ad as a Mediator of Advertising Effectiveness: A Test of Competing Explanations. Journal of Marketing Research, 23(2), 130–143. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378602300205</u>

75. Makrides, A., Vrontis, D., & Christofi, M. (2019). The Gold Rush of Digital Marketing: Assessing Prospects of Building Brand Awareness Overseas. Business Perspectives and Research. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/2278533719860016</u>

76. Malär, L., Krohmer, H., Hoyer, W. D., & Nyffenegger, B. (2011). Emotional brand attachment and brand personality: The relative importance of the actual and the ideal self. Journal of marketing, 75(4), 35-52.

77. Maynard, M. (2019, July 11). ASMR: how brands are selling the sound of food. Retrieved from The Grocer:

https://www.thegrocer.co.uk/marketing/asmr-how-brands-are-selling-the-sound-of-food/595431.a rticle

McErlean, A. B. J., &Banissy, M. J. (2017). Assessing Individual Variation in Personality and
Empathy Traits in Self-Reported Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response. Multisensory Research,
30, 601-613. https://doi.org/10.1163/22134808-00002571

79. McKee, R. (2003). Storytelling that moves people: A conversation with screenwriting coach, Robert McKee. Harvard Business Review, 80, 51–55.

80. Miller, D. W., Hadjimarcou, J., & Miciak, A. (2000). A scale for measuring advertisement-evoked mental imagery. Journal of Marketing Communications, 6(1), 1-20. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/135272600345525</u>

81. Mingione, M., Cristofaro, M., & Mondi, D. (2020). 'If I give you my emotion, what do I get?' Conceptualizing and measuring the co-created emotional value of the brand. Journal of Business Research, 109, 310–320.

82. Mitchell, A. A., & Olson, J. C. (1981). Are Product Attribute Beliefs the Only Mediator of Advertising Effects on Brand Attitude? Journal of Marketing Research, 18(3), 318–332. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800306

83. Modig, E., & Rosengren, S. (2014). Can advertising creativity affect product perceptions and retailer evaluations? Journal of Product & Brand Management, 23(6), 452–461. doi:10.1108/jpbm-06-2014-0651

84. Morrin, M., &Chebat, J. C. (2005). Person-place congruency: The interactive effects of shopper style and atmospherics on consumer expenditures. Journal of Service Research, 8(2), 181-191.

85. Niedenthal P. M., Lawrence W. B., Piotr W., Silvia K., and François R., (2005), "Embodiment in Attitudes, Social Perception, and Emotion," Personality and Social Psychology Review, 9, 3, 184–211.

86. Nysveen, H., Pedersen, P.E. and Skard, S., 2013. Brand experiences in service organizations: Exploring the individual effects of brand experience dimensions. *Journal of Brand Management*, *20*, pp.404-423.

87. Park, Cheol & Macinnis, Deborah & Priester, Joseph. (2007). Beyond Attitudes: Attachment and Consumer Behavior. Seoul Journal of Business. 12.

88. Poerio, G. L., Blakey, E., Hostler, T. J., & Veltri, T. (2018). More than a feeling: Autonomous sensory meridian response (ASMR) is characterized by reliable changes in affect and physiology. PLOS ONE, 13(6), e0196645. <u>https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0196645</u>

89. Portas, Eduardo. (2022). YouTube, the Attention Economy and Digital Audience Interest in Sponsored ASMR Videos. The Anáhuac Journal. 22. 12-41.
10.36105/theanahuacjour.2022v22n2.01. <u>https://doi.org/10.36105/theanahuacjour.2022v22n2.01</u>

90. Randhir, R., Latasha, K., Tooraiven, P., & Monishan, B. (2016). Analyzing the impact of sensory marketing on consumers: A case study of KFC. Journal of US-China Public Administration, 13(4), 278-292.

91. Richard, C. (2014b) History of ASMR. ASMR University. Retrieved from https://asmruniversity.com/history-of-asmr/

92. Richard, C. (2014c) Art of ASMR – Commercials. ASMR University. Retrieved from

93. Rieunier, S. (2009). Le marketing sensoriel du point du vente (3rd ed.). Paris: Dunod.

94. RoopchundRandhir, Khirodhur Latasha, PanyandeeTooraiven, &BappooMonishan. (2016b). Analyzing the Impact of Sensory Marketing on Consumers: A Case Study of KFC. Journal of US-China Public Administration, 13(4). <u>https://doi.org/10.17265/1548-6591/2016.04.007</u> 95. Rovira, Andrea.(2021). The Role of ASMR in Future Advertising. The University of Westminster.

https://asmruniversity.files.wordpress.com/2021/06/dissertation-asmr-andrea-rovira.pdf

96. Sands, S., Campbell, C., Mavrommatis, A. and Kadomskaia, V., 2022. Can a Whisper Boost Recall Of Video Advertisements?: Exploring the Effects of Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response (ASMR) in Advertising. *Journal of Advertising Research*, *62*(3), pp.287-296

97. Sadowski, H. (2016). Digital Intimacies : Doing Digital Media Differently.

98. Schank, R. C. (1999). Dynamic Memory Revisited. Cambridge University Press.

99. Schmitt Bernd (2012), "The Consumer Psychology of Brands," Journal of Consumer Psychology, 22 (1), 7–17. or https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2011.09.005

100. Schmitt, B., Brakus, J.J. and Zarantonello, L. (2015) From Experiential Psychology to Consumer Experience. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 25, 166-171.

101. Shah, K. (2020, December 6). Could ASMR Be a Brand's Secret Weapon? By Kushaan Shah. https://mindmeld.substack.com/p/20-could-asmr-be-a-brands-secret

102. Shapiro, S., & Spence, M. T. (2002). Factors affecting encoding, retrieval, and alignment of sensory attributes in a memory-based brand choice task. Journal of Consumer Research, 28(4), 603-617.

103. Shimul, A.S., Phau, I. & Lwin, M. Conceptualising luxury brand attachment: scale development and validation. J Brand Manag 26, 675–690 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41262-019-00158-6

104. Smith, S. D., Fredborg, B. K., & Kornelsen, J. (2019). A functional magnetic resonance imaging investigation of the autonomous sensory meridian response. PeerJ, 7, e7122. DOI: 10.7717/peerj.7122

105. Souiden, N., Ladhari, R., & Chang, L. (2018). Chinese perception and willingness to buy Taiwanese brands: The role of ethnocentrism and animosity. Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics.

106. Spangenberg, E. R., Crowley, A. E., & Henderson, P. W. (1996). Improving the store environment: do olfactory cues affect evaluations and behaviors?. Journal of marketing, 60(2), 67-80.

107. SPENCE, C., & SHANKAR, M. U. (2010). THE INFLUENCE OF AUDITORY CUES ON THE PERCEPTION OF, AND RESPONSES TO, FOOD AND DRINK. Journal of Sensory Studies, 25(3), 406–430. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-459x.2009.00267.x

108. Sultana, S. F. S., & Das, M. (2022). Content Analysis Of Mukbang Videos: Preferences, Attitudes And Concerns. Journal of Positive School Psychology, 6(9), 4811-4822. http://mail.journalppw.com/index.php/jpsp/article/view/13360

109. Talarico, D. (2021). To TikTok or not?. Recruiting & Retaining Adult Learners, 24(2), 3-5.

110. Thomson, M., MacInnis, D. J., & Whan Park, C. (2005). The Ties That Bind: Measuring the Strength of Consumers' Emotional Attachments to Brands. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 15(1), 77–91. <u>https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp1501_10</u>

111. Trenholm-Jensen EA, Burns L, Trenholm JE, Hand CJ (2022) Beyond tingles: An exploratory qualitative study of the Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response (ASMR). PLoS ONE 17(12): e0277962. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0277962

112. Trope, Y., Liberman, N., &Wakslak, C. (2007). Construal levels and psychological distance: Effects on representation, prediction, evaluation and behavior. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 17(2), 8395.

113. Tsaur, S. H., Chiu, Y. T., & Wang, C. H. (2007). The visitors behavioral consequences of experiential marketing: An empirical study on Taipei Zoo. Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 21(1), 47–64.

114. Tussyadiah, & Wang, J., 2020. Do travelers trust intelligent service robots?. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *81*, p.102886.

115. Umrez, M. (2014). A study on digital marketing opportunities and challenges. International Journal of Marketing and Technology, 4(4), 136-143.

116. University of Sussex. (2017). It's true: The sound of nature helps us relax. ScienceDaily. Retrieved February 26, 2023 from www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2017/03/170330132354.htm

117. Vahdat, Arash & Hafeznia, Hanieh & Jabarzadeh, Younis & Thaichon, Park. (2020).
Emotional Brand Attachment and Attitude toward Brand Extension. Services Marketing Quarterly.
41. 1-20. 10.1080/15332969.2020.1786245. DOI:10.1080/15332969.2020.1786245

118. Vucic, D. (2020). Digital intimacy and the aestheticisation of sound. Meanjin, 79(1), 105-113.

119. Wala, A., Czyrka, K., &Frąś, J. (2019). Sensory branding and marketing in stimulating the relation between the buyer and the brand. OrganizacjaiZarządzanie: kwartalniknaukowy.

120. Walls, A., Okumus, F., Wang, Y. R., & Kwun, D. J. W. (2011). Understanding the Consumer Experience: An Exploratory Study of Luxury Hotels. Journal of Hospitality Marketing &Amp; Management, 20(2), 166–197. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2011.536074</u>

121. Wang, Jing & Calder, Bobby. (2009). Media engagement and advertising: Transportation, matching, transference and intrusion. Journal of Consumer Psychology - J CONSUM PSYCHOL. 19. 546-555. 10.1016/j.jcps.2009.05.005. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2009.05.005

122. Wiedmann, K. P., Labenz, F., Haase, J., & Hennigs, N. (2018). The power of experiential marketing: Exploring the causal relationships among multisensory marketing, brand experience, customer perceived value, and brand strength. Journal of Brand Management, 25, 101–118.

123. Woodside, A. G. (2010). Brand-consumer storytelling theory and research: Introduction to a Psychology & Marketing special issue. Psychology &Amp; Marketing, 27(6), 531–540. https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20342

124. Xie, Y., 2021, December. The Influence of Brand Story Types on Consumers' Brand Attitude. In *7th Annual International Conference on Social Science and Contemporary Humanity Development (SSCHD 2021)* (pp. 282-286). Atlantis Press.

125. Xu, D.J., 2006. The influence of personalization in affecting consumer attitudes toward mobile advertising in China. *Journal of computer information systems*, *47*(2), pp.9-19.

126. Zampini, M., & Spence, C. (2004). The role of auditory cues in modulating the perceived crispness and staleness of potato chips. Journal of sensory studies, 19(5), 347-363.

127. Zemke, D. M. V., & Shoemaker, S. (2007). Scent across a crowded room: Exploring the effect of ambient scent on social interactions. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 26(4), 927-940.

128. Zheluk, A., Dineen-Griffin, S., & Anderson, J. (2021). Analysis of Backpain on Tiktok in September 2021: An Exploratory Study. Available at SSRN 3977927.

Appendices





Effect of ASMR on consumer reactions and behaviors

H1: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the attitude towards the brand.

Univariate Analysis of Variance

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Q1 - Attitude toward the brand

| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
|------------|------|----------------|----|
| ASMR Ad | 5.38 | 1.337 | 67 |
| Regular Ad | 5.00 | 1.471 | 63 |

| | Total | 5.20 | 1.412 | 130 |
|--|-------|------|-------|-----|
|--|-------|------|-------|-----|

The descriptive statistics show the central tendency and variability of the ratings (dependent variable, Q1) based on two types of ads. The mean rating for ASMR ads is 5.38, with a standard deviation of 1.337, based on 67 observations. For regular ads, the mean rating is 5.00, with a standard deviation of 1.471, from 63 observations. Overall, the combined mean rating for both ad types is 5.20, with a standard deviation of 1.412, from a total of 130 observations.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent | Variable: (| Q1 - Attitud | e toward the brand |
|--|-------------|--------------|--------------------|
| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| .720 | 1 | 128 | .398 |
| Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of | | | |

the dependent variable is equal across groups. a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 + MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test was conducted to assess the equality of error variances among groups for the dependent variable (Q1). The obtained F-statistic is 0.720 with 1 and 128 degrees of freedom for the numerator and denominator respectively, resulting in a p-value of 0.398. This test evaluates whether the assumption of equal variances across groups is tenable.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Q1 - Attitude toward the brand

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|----------|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 21.383ª | 3 | 7.128 | 3.811 | .012 | .083 |
| Intercept | 171.085 | 1 | 171.085 | 91.474 | .000 | .421 |
| HungerQ9 | 16.618 | 1 | 16.618 | 8.885 | .003 | .066 |
| MoodQ10 | .518 | 1 | .518 | .277 | .600 | .002 |
| Typeofad | 7.046 | 1 | 7.046 | 3.767 | .055 | .029 |
| Error | 235.661 | 126 | 1.870 | | | |
| Total | 3768.778 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 257.044 | 129 | | | | |
| | | Carriera | 0(1) | | | |

a. R Squared = .083 (Adjusted R Squared = .061)

The "Tests of Between-Subjects Effects" presents the analysis of variance for the dependent variable Q1. The corrected model explains a significant portion of the variance, as indicated by the F-statistic of 3.811 with a p-value of 0.012 and a partial eta squared of 0.083. The intercept contributes significantly to the model (F = 91.474, p < 0.001, partial eta squared = 0.421), as

does the HungerQ9 variable (F = 8.885, p = 0.003, partial eta squared = 0.066). However, MoodQ10 does not significantly impact the dependent variable (F = 0.277, p = 0.600, partial eta squared = 0.002), and the effect of Typeofad is marginally significant (F = 3.767, p = 0.055, partial eta squared = 0.029). The error term accounts for 235.661 units of the total variance, while the corrected total variance is 257.044. The adjusted R-squared is 0.061, indicating that approximately 6.1% of the variability is explained by the model.

H2: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the attitude towards the ad.

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Q2 - attitude towards the ad.

| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
|------------|------|----------------|-----|
| ASMR Ad | 5.17 | 1.450 | 67 |
| Regular Ad | 5.35 | 1.163 | 63 |
| Total | 5.26 | 1.316 | 130 |

The descriptive statistics depict the central tendency and variability of ratings (dependent variable, Q2) for two types of ads. The mean rating for ASMR ads is 5.17, with a standard deviation of 1.450, based on 67 observations. For regular ads, the mean rating is 5.35, with a standard deviation of 1.163, derived from 63 observations. In total, the combined mean rating for both ad types is 5.26, with a standard deviation of 1.316, gathered from a total of 130 observations.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

Dependent Variable: Q2- attitude towards the ad

| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|-------|-----|-----|------|
| 1.070 | 1 | 128 | .303 |

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the

dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 + MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test was conducted to assess the equality of error variances among groups for the dependent variable (Q2). The calculated F-statistic is 1.070 with 1 and 128 degrees of freedom for the numerator and denominator respectively, resulting in a p-value of 0.303. This test evaluates whether the assumption of equal variances across groups holds true. The analysis involves a design that includes an intercept, along with additional factors such as HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Q2 - attitude towards the ad

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|----|-------------|---------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 21.647ª | 3 | 7.216 | 4.504 | .005 | .097 |
| Intercept | 178.822 | 1 | 178.822 | 111.620 | .000 | .470 |
| HungerQ9 | 20.578 | 1 | 20.578 | 12.845 | .000 | .093 |

| MoodQ10 | 1.240 | 1 | 1.240 | .774 | .381 | .006 |
|-----------------|----------|-----|-------|------|------|------|
| Typeofad | .177 | 1 | .177 | .111 | .740 | .001 |
| Error | 201.860 | 126 | 1.602 | | | |
| Total | 3817.139 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 223.506 | 129 | | | | |

a. R Squared = .097 (Adjusted R Squared = .075)

The "Tests of Between-Subjects Effects" presents the analysis of variance for the dependent variable Q2. The corrected model accounts for a substantial portion of the variance, indicated by the F-statistic of 4.504 with a p-value of 0.005 and a partial eta squared of 0.097. The intercept significantly contributes to the model (F = 111.620, p < 0.001, partial eta squared = 0.470), along with the HungerQ9 variable (F = 12.845, p < 0.001, partial eta squared = 0.093). However, MoodQ10 does not have a significant impact on the dependent variable (F = 0.774, p = 0.381, partial eta squared = 0.006), and the effect of Typeofad is not significant (F = 0.111, p = 0.740, partial eta squared = 0.001). The error term accounts for 201.860 units of the total variance, while the corrected total variance is 223.506. The adjusted R-squared is 0.075, indicating that around 7.5% of the variability is explained by the model.

H3: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the emotional attachment with a brand.

| Dependent Va | ariable: Q3 | Q3 - emotional attachment | | |
|--------------|-------------|---------------------------|-----|--|
| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν | |
| ASMR Ad | 3.71 | 1.458 | 67 | |
| Regular Ad | 3.21 | 1.590 | 63 | |
| Total | 3.47 | 1.538 | 130 | |

Descriptive Statistics

observations.

The descriptive statistics provide insights into the central tendency and variability of ratings (dependent variable, Q3) for two types of ads. The mean rating for ASMR ads is 3.71, with a standard deviation of 1.458, based on 67 observations. For regular ads, the mean rating is 3.21, with a standard deviation of 1.590, derived from 63 observations. In total, the combined mean rating for both ad types is 3.47, with a standard deviation of 1.538, gathered from a total of 130

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | | Q3 - emotional attachment | | |
|---------------------|-----|---------------------------|------|--|
| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. | |
| .352 | 1 | 128 | .554 | |

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups. a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 + MoodQ10 +

Typeofad

Levene's Test was conducted to assess if the error variance of the dependent variable (Q3) is consistent across different groups. The obtained p-value (0.554) indicates that there is no significant difference in error variance between the groups. This suggests that the assumption of equal error variances is likely met. The analysis included an intercept, as well as HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad as factors.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 24.039ª | 3 | 8.013 | 3.589 | .016 | .079 |
| Intercept | 50.954 | 1 | 50.954 | 22.824 | .000 | .153 |
| HungerQ9 | 14.033 | 1 | 14.033 | 6.286 | .013 | .048 |
| MoodQ10 | .420 | 1 | .420 | .188 | .665 | .001 |
| Typeofad | 10.584 | 1 | 10.584 | 4.741 | .031 | .036 |
| Error | 281.298 | 126 | 2.233 | | | |
| Total | 1869.960 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 305.337 | 129 | | | | |

a. R Squared = .079 (Adjusted R Squared = .057)

The analysis delves into the factors influencing the variability in Q3. The model collectively formed by HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad demonstrates its ability to explain a significant portion of Q3's variance (p = 0.016). The intercept and HungerQ9 contribute notably to this explanation, implying that the baseline and hunger-related factors play pivotal roles in shaping Q3. Conversely, MoodQ10 doesn't seem to strongly impact Q3, and Typeofad has a moderate effect. The model elucidates around 7.9% of Q3's variance, primarily attributed to the intercept and HungerQ9. The overall model's explanatory capacity, adjusted for complexity, amounts to 5.7%.

H4: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the food brand experience.

Descriptive Statistics

| Ad Type | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
|---------------|------|----------------|-----|
| ASMR ad | 3.94 | 1.304 | 67 |
| Regular ad | 3.70 | 1.402 | 63 |
| Total | 3.82 | 1.352 | 130 |

The descriptive statistics display participants' responses to "Q4" based on different ad types. Ad Type 1 has a higher mean (3.94) than Ad Type 2 (3.70), suggesting more favorable perceptions.

However, both types show relatively similar variability (Standard Deviation) around the mean. The combined mean (3.82) represents the overall response for all ad types (N = 130).

Levene's Test of Equality of Error

Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | | Q4 - brand experience | | |
|---------------------|-----|-----------------------|------|--|
| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. | |
| 3.134 | 1 | 128 | .079 | |

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups. a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 + MoodQ10 + Adtype

Levene's Test results for "Q4" examine if error variances are equal across groups. The obtained F-value of 3.134 with 1 and 128 degrees of freedom and a significance level of 0.079 indicates no significant departure from equal variances. Thus, there's no strong evidence to reject the hypothesis of equal error variances among groups—Intercept, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Adtype in the design.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 32.651ª | 3 | 10.884 | 6.745 | .000 | .138 |
| Intercept | 34.540 | 1 | 34.540 | 21.406 | .000 | .145 |
| HungerQ9 | 16.886 | 1 | 16.886 | 10.465 | .002 | .077 |
| MoodQ10 | 8.678 | 1 | 8.678 | 5.378 | .022 | .041 |
| Adtype | 2.985 | 1 | 2.985 | 1.850 | .176 | .014 |
| Error | 203.311 | 126 | 1.614 | | | |
| Total | 2132.210 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 235.962 | 129 | | | | |

Dependent Variable: Q4 - brand experience

a. R Squared = .138 (Adjusted R Squared = .118)

The "Tests of Between-Subjects Effects" analysis provides insights into the factors influencing the dependent variable "Q4." The corrected model as a whole has a significant effect on "Q4" (F = 6.745, p < .001), indicating the model's overall explanatory power. The intercept term also shows significant impact (F = 21.406, p < .001), suggesting its relevance. Furthermore, both "HungerQ9" (F = 10.465, p = .002) and "MoodQ10" (F = 5.378, p = .022) have significant effects on the variable. On the other hand, "Adtype" does not exhibit a statistically significant impact (F = 1.850, p = .176). Collectively, the model and certain independent variables contribute to variations in

participants' responses to "Q4," with HungerQ9 and MoodQ10 exerting noteworthy influences. The error term is reported as 203.311, and the adjusted R-squared, which indicates the model's goodness of fit, is 0.118.

The following section has a detailed analysis of each aspect of brand experience: sensory, affective, cognitive, and relational.

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Q4_1 _1 Sensory

| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
|------------|------|----------------|-----|
| ASMR Ad | 5.00 | 1.670 | 67 |
| Regular Ad | 4.81 | 1.544 | 63 |
| Total | 4.91 | 1.606 | 130 |

The descriptive statistics provide insights into the variable "Q4_1 _1 Sensory," based on different types of ads. The "ASMR Ad" group has a mean score of 5.00 with a standard deviation of 1.670, calculated from 67 data points. The "Regular Ad" group has a slightly lower mean of 4.81 and a standard deviation of 1.544, derived from 63 data points. In total, combining both groups, the overall mean is 4.91, with a standard deviation of 1.606, computed from a total of 130 data points. These statistics offer an overview of the central tendency and variability of sensory responses to different types of ads.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error

Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | | Q4_1 _1 Sensory | | |
|---------------------|-----|-----------------|------|--|
| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. | |
| .172 | 1 | 128 | .679 | |

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

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test was employed to assess if the error variances are consistent across groups for the variable "Q4_1 _1 Sensory." The obtained p-value (0.679) suggests that there is no significant difference in error variances between the groups. This indicates that the assumption of equal error variances holds. The analysis included an intercept, as well as

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

| Dependent Variable: Q4_1 _1 Sensory | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|--|
| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta | |
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared | |
| Corrected Model | 38.616ª | 3 | 12.872 | 5.511 | .001 | .116 | |
| Intercept | 67.206 | 1 | 67.206 | 28.775 | .000 | .186 | |
| HungerQ9 | 15.816 | 1 | 15.816 | 6.772 | .010 | .051 | |

| MoodQ10 | 15.041 | 1 | 15.041 | 6.440 | .012 | .049 |
|-----------------|----------|-----|--------|-------|------|------|
| Typeofad | 1.953 | 1 | 1.953 | .836 | .362 | .007 |
| Error | 294.277 | 126 | 2.336 | | | |
| Total | 3464.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 332.892 | 129 | | | | |

a. R Squared = .116 (Adjusted R Squared = .095)

The "Tests of Between-Subjects Effects" table sheds light on the impact of various factors on the dependent variable "Q4_1 _1 Sensory." The model, which encompasses Intercept, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad, collectively contributes significantly to explaining the variation in "Q4_1 _1 Sensory" (p = .001). Notably, the constant term (Intercept) demonstrates a substantial baseline effect independent of other factors (p < .001). Both HungerQ9 and MoodQ10 exert significant influences on "Q4_1 _1 Sensory," with p-values of 0.010 and 0.012, respectively. Conversely, Typeofad doesn't appear to strongly impact the variable (p = .362). The model accounts for approximately 11.6% of the variance in "Q4_1 _1 Sensory," with the adjusted R-squared value (0.095) accounting for the model's complexity. In essence, this analysis underlines the roles of these factors in shaping the variability of "Q4_1 _1 Sensory" responses and the overall model's explanatory strength.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent Variable: | | 4_1_2 Sensory | |
|---------------------|------|----------------|-----|
| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
| ASMR Ad | 4.93 | 1.726 | 67 |
| Regular Ad | 4.70 | 1.681 | 63 |
| Total | 4.82 | 1.702 | 130 |

The descriptive statistics offer insights into the variable "Q4_1_2 Sensory" concerning different types of ads. The "ASMR Ad" group exhibits an average score of 4.93 with a standard deviation of 1.726, derived from 67 data points. In contrast, the "Regular Ad" group has a slightly lower mean of 4.70 and a standard deviation of 1.681, calculated from 63 data points. Combining both groups, the overall mean for "Q4_1_2 Sensory" is 4.82, with a standard deviation of 1.702, calculated from a total of 130 data points. These statistics provide an overview of central tendency and variability in sensory responses to different types of ads.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | | Q4_1_2 Sensory | | |
|---------------------|-----|----------------|------|--|
| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. | |
| .039 | 1 | 128 | .845 | |

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

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test was utilized to assess whether the error variances are consistent across groups for the variable "Q4_1_2 Sensory." The obtained p-value (0.845) indicates that there is no significant difference in error variances between the groups. This suggests that the assumption of equal error variances is likely met. The analysis considered an intercept,

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

| Dependent Variabl | e: Q4_1_2 Se | nsory | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------|-------|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 31.863ª | 3 | 10.621 | 3.916 | .010 | .085 |
| Intercept | 87.487 | 1 | 87.487 | 32.260 | .000 | .204 |
| HungerQ9 | 23.045 | 1 | 23.045 | 8.498 | .004 | .063 |
| MoodQ10 | 3.195 | 1 | 3.195 | 1.178 | .280 | .009 |
| Typeofad | 3.129 | 1 | 3.129 | 1.154 | .285 | .009 |
| Error | 341.706 | 126 | 2.712 | | | |
| Total | 3388.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 373.569 | 129 | | | | |

a. R Squared = .085 (Adjusted R Squared = .064)

The "Tests of Between-Subjects Effects" table offers insights into the influence of various factors on the dependent variable "Q4_1_2 Sensory." The model, encompassing Intercept, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad, collectively contributes significantly to explaining the variation in "Q4_1_2 Sensory" (p = .010). Particularly, the constant term (Intercept) holds substantial explanatory power, implying a baseline impact that is independent of other factors (p < .001). Additionally, HungerQ9 exerts a significant effect on "Q4_1_2 Sensory" (p = .004), whereas MoodQ10 and Typeofad do not appear to exert statistically significant impacts (p > .05). The model clarifies approximately 8.5% of the variance in "Q4_1_2 Sensory," as indicated by the partial eta squared value (.085), with the adjusted R-squared (0.064) considering model complexity. This analysis underscores the roles played by these factors in shaping the variability of responses in "Q4_1_2 Sensory" and the overall model's explanatory capacity.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent Variable: | | Q4_2 _1 Affective | | |
|---------------------|------|-------------------|-----|--|
| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν | |
| ASMR Ad | 4.51 | 1.646 | 67 | |
| Regular Ad | 4.38 | 1.621 | 63 | |
| Total | 4.45 | 1.629 | 130 | |

The descriptive statistics reveal that for the variable "Q4_2 _1 Affective," the "ASMR Ad" group has an average score of 4.51 with a standard deviation of 1.646 (from 67 data points), while the "Regular Ad" group has a slightly lower mean of 4.38 and a standard deviation of 1.621 (from 63

data points). Overall, combining both groups, the total mean is 4.45, with a standard deviation of 1.629 (from a total of 130 data points). These statistics provide a snapshot of the central tendency and variability in affective responses to different types of ads.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error

Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | | Q4_2 _1 Affective | | |
|---------------------|-----|-------------------|------|--|
| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. | |
| .120 | 1 | 128 | .729 | |

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

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test was utilized to determine if the error variances are consistent across groups for the variable "Q4_2 _1 Affective." The obtained p-value (0.729) indicates that there is no significant difference in error variances between the groups. This suggests that the assumption of equal error variances is likely satisfied. The analysis considered an intercept, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad as factors in the design.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 33.554ª | 3 | 11.185 | 4.567 | .005 | .098 |
| Intercept | 55.494 | 1 | 55.494 | 22.660 | .000 | .152 |
| HungerQ9 | 17.681 | 1 | 17.681 | 7.220 | .008 | .054 |
| MoodQ10 | 9.722 | 1 | 9.722 | 3.970 | .048 | .031 |
| Typeofad | 1.183 | 1 | 1.183 | .483 | .488 | .004 |
| Error | 308.569 | 126 | 2.449 | | | |
| Total | 2912.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 342.123 | 129 | | | | |

Dependent Variable: Q4_2 _1 Affective

a. R Squared = .098 (Adjusted R Squared = .077)

The "Tests of Between-Subjects Effects" table sheds light on the influence of various factors on the dependent variable "Q4_2 _1 Affective." The model, which comprises Intercept, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad, collectively contributes significantly to explaining the variance in "Q4_2 _1 Affective" (p = .005). Particularly noteworthy is the role of the constant term (Intercept), which holds considerable explanatory power, suggesting a baseline impact that is independent of other factors (p < .001). Moreover, both HungerQ9 and MoodQ10 exert significant influences on "Q4_2 _1 Affective," with p-values of 0.008 and 0.048, respectively. Conversely, Typeofad doesn't seem to exert a statistically significant impact (p = .488). The model illuminates around 9.8% of the

variance in "Q4_2 _1 Affective," as indicated by the partial eta squared value (.098), with the adjusted R-squared (0.077) considering the model's complexity. This analysis underscores the roles played by these factors in shaping the variability of responses in "Q4_2 _1 Affective" and the overall model's explanatory capacity.

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Q4_2 _2 Affective

| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
|------------|------|----------------|-----|
| ASMR Ad | 3.97 | 1.775 | 67 |
| Regular Ad | 3.48 | 1.882 | 63 |
| Total | 3.73 | 1.838 | 130 |

The descriptive statistics provide an overview of the variable "Q4_2 _2 Affective" in relation to different types of ads. For the "ASMR Ad" group, the average score is 3.97, with a standard deviation of 1.775 (from 67 data points). Conversely, the "Regular Ad" group has a lower mean of 3.48, accompanied by a higher standard deviation of 1.882 (from 63 data points). When combining both groups, the overall mean for "Q4_2 _2 Affective" is 3.73, with a standard deviation of 1.838 (across a total of 130 data points). These statistics offer insights into the central tendency and variability of affective responses to different types of ads.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error

Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | | Q4_2 _2 Affective | | |
|--|-----|-------------------|------|--|
| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. | |
| 1.355 | 1 | 128 | .246 | |
| Tests the null hypothesis that the error | | | | |

variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups. a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test was employed to assess whether the error variances are consistent across groups for the variable "Q4_2 _2 Affective." The obtained p-value (0.246) indicates that there is no significant difference in error variances between the groups. This suggests that the assumption of equal error variances is likely met. The analysis considered an intercept, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad as factors in the design.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Q4_2 _2 Affective

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|----|-------------|-------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 60.057ª | 3 | 20.019 | 6.717 | .000 | .138 |

| Intercept | 14.452 | 1 | 14.452 | 4.849 | .029 | .037 |
|-----------------|----------|-----|--------|-------|------|------|
| HungerQ9 | 21.312 | 1 | 21.312 | 7.151 | .008 | .054 |
| MoodQ10 | 21.657 | 1 | 21.657 | 7.267 | .008 | .055 |
| Typeofad | 9.985 | 1 | 9.985 | 3.350 | .070 | .026 |
| Error | 375.519 | 126 | 2.980 | | | |
| Total | 2245.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 435.577 | 129 | | | | |

a. R Squared = .138 (Adjusted R Squared = .117)

The model, involving Intercept, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad, collectively and significantly explains the variability in "Q4_2 _2 Affective" (p < .001). The partial eta squared value (.138) indicates that approximately 13.8% of the variability in the dependent variable can be attributed to these factors. The Intercept and both HungerQ9 and MoodQ10 significantly contribute to explaining "Q4_2 _2 Affective," suggesting baseline impacts and effects of hunger and mood (all p-values < .01). Typeofad, while not statistically significant (p = .070), has a more modest impact. The error term represents unexplained variability. The overall model explains 13.8% of the variance in "Q4_2 _2 Affective," with the adjusted R-squared value (0.117) considering model complexity. In summary, this analysis underscores the roles of these factors in shaping affective responses and the model's explanatory strength.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent Variable: | | 24_2 _3 Affective | 9 |
|---------------------|------|-------------------|-----|
| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
| ASMR Ad | 3.84 | 1.822 | 67 |
| Regular Ad | 3.32 | 1.882 | 63 |
| Total | 3.58 | 1.863 | 130 |

The descriptive statistics reveal characteristics of the variable "Q4_2 _3 Affective" in relation to different types of ads. For the "ASMR Ad" group, the average score is 3.84, with a standard deviation of 1.822 (based on 67 data points). In contrast, the "Regular Ad" group has a lower mean of 3.32 and a higher standard deviation of 1.882 (from 63 data points). When considering both groups collectively, the overall mean for "Q4_2 _3 Affective" is 3.58, and the standard deviation is 1.863 (across a total of 130 data points). These statistics provide insights into the central tendency and variability of affective responses to different types of ads.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error

Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | | Q4_2 _3 Affective | | |
|---------------------|-----|-------------------|------|--|
| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. | |
| .823 | 1 | 128 | .366 | |

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups. a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 + MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test was conducted to determine if the error variances are consistent across groups for the variable "Q4_2 _3 Affective." The obtained p-value (0.366) indicates that there is no significant difference in error variances between the groups. This suggests that the assumption of equal error variances is likely met. The analysis considered an intercept,

| Dependent Variable: Q4_2 _3 Affective | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-------------|
| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 68.364ª | 3 | 22.788 | 7.572 | .000 | .153 |
| Intercept | 9.656 | 1 | 9.656 | 3.208 | .076 | .025 |
| HungerQ9 | 29.274 | 1 | 29.274 | 9.727 | .002 | .072 |
| MoodQ10 | 20.010 | 1 | 20.010 | 6.649 | .011 | .050 |
| Typeofad | 11.522 | 1 | 11.522 | 3.828 | .053 | .029 |
| Error | 379.206 | 126 | 3.010 | | | |
| Total | 2118.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 447.569 | 129 | | | | |

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

a. R Squared = .153 (Adjusted R Squared = .133)

The analysis explores the effects of different factors on the dependent variable "Affective" (Q4_2_3). The Type III Sum of Squares indicates the variation explained by each factor while considering the others. The model as a whole is significant (p < .001) and explains about 15.3% of the variance in "Affective". Among the individual factors, "HungerQ9" has a significant impact (p = .002) and explains 7.2% of the variance, "MoodQ10" also significantly affects the variable (p = .011) and explains 5.0% of the variance, while "Typeofad" has a marginal impact (p = .053) and explains 2.9% of the variance. The "Intercept" and "Error" terms account for unexplained variance. The adjusted R-squared, which considers the number of predictors, is .133. The analysis suggests that hunger, mood, and type of advertisement influence the affective response.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent Variable: | | 4_3 _1 Cognitiv | e |
|---------------------|------|-----------------|----|
| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
| ASMR Ad | 3.79 | 1.814 | 67 |

| Regular Ad | 3.32 | 1.730 | 63 |
|------------|------|-------|-----|
| Total | 3.56 | 1.783 | 130 |

These descriptive statistics provide insights into the "Cognitive" (Q4_3_1) responses based on different types of advertisements. The mean cognitive response for the "ASMR Ad" is 3.79 with a standard deviation of 1.814, based on data from 67 participants. For the "Regular Ad," the mean cognitive response is slightly lower at 3.32, with a standard deviation of 1.730, based on 63 participants. Across both types of ads, the overall mean cognitive response is 3.56, with a standard deviation of 1.783, considering data from a total of 130 participants. This information suggests that participants generally rated their cognitive response higher for the "ASMR Ad" compared to the "Regular Ad."

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | | Q4_3 _1 Cognitive | | |
|---------------------|-----|-------------------|------|--|
| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. | |
| .092 | 1 | 128 | .762 | |

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups. a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances assesses whether the variability of the "Cognitive" (Q4_3_1) responses is consistent across different groups. In this case, the groups are defined by the factors included in the model ("Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," "Typeofad"). The calculated test statistic is 0.092 with 1 and 128 degrees of freedom, resulting in a p-value of 0.762. This test evaluates the null hypothesis that the error variance is equal across the groups. Since the p-value is higher than the common significance threshold of 0.05, there's no strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis. This suggests that the assumption of equal error variances across the groups is reasonable based on the given data and model design.

| Dependent Variable: Q4_3_1 Cognitive | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 40.375° | 3 | 13.458 | 4.588 | .004 | .098 |
| Intercept | 38.441 | 1 | 38.441 | 13.104 | .000 | .094 |
| HungerQ9 | 29.352 | 1 | 29.352 | 10.006 | .002 | .074 |
| MoodQ10 | .905 | 1 | .905 | .308 | .580 | .002 |
| Typeofad | 10.640 | 1 | 10.640 | 3.627 | .059 | .028 |

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Q4 3 1 Cognitive

| Error | 369.633 | 126 | 2.934 | | |
|-----------------|----------|-----|-------|--|--|
| Total | 2059.000 | 130 | | | |
| Corrected Total | 410.008 | 129 | | | |

a. R Squared = .098 (Adjusted R Squared = .077)

The analysis explores the impact of various factors on the dependent variable "Cognitive" $(Q4_3_1)$. The Type III Sum of Squares reflects the variation explained by each factor while considering others. The model as a whole is significant (p = .004) and accounts for about 9.8% of the variance in "Cognitive." Among the individual factors, "HungerQ9" has a substantial impact (p = .002) and explains 7.4% of the variance. The "Intercept" is highly significant (p < .001) and contributes 9.4% to the variance. "MoodQ10" and "Typeofad" do not have statistically significant effects (p > .05). The unexplained variance is represented by the "Error" term. The adjusted R-squared, which adjusts for the number of predictors, is .077. In summary, hunger significantly impacts cognitive responses, while mood and type of advertisement have minimal effects in this context.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent Variable: | | 4_3 _2 Cognitiv | е |
|---------------------|------|-----------------|-----|
| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
| ASMR Ad | 3.78 | 1.906 | 67 |
| Regular Ad | 2.81 | 1.848 | 63 |
| Total | 3.31 | 1.932 | 130 |

These descriptive statistics provide insights into the "Cognitive" (Q4_3_2) responses based on different types of advertisements. The mean cognitive response for the "ASMR Ad" is 3.78, with a standard deviation of 1.906, based on data from 67 participants. For the "Regular Ad," the mean cognitive response is lower at 2.81, with a standard deviation of 1.848, based on 63 participants. Across both types of ads, the overall mean cognitive response is 3.31, with a standard deviation of 1.932, considering data from a total of 130 participants. These statistics suggest that participants generally rated their cognitive response higher for the "ASMR Ad" compared to the "Regular Ad."

Levene's Test of Equality of Error

Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | | Q4_3 _2 Cognitive | | |
|---------------------|-----|-------------------|------|--|
| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. | |
| .000 | 1 | 128 | .992 | |
| | | | | |

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups. a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances examines whether the variability of "Cognitive" (Q4_3_2) responses is consistent across different groups defined by the factors in the model ("Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," "Typeofad"). The computed test statistic is 0.000 with 1 numerator degree of freedom and 128 denominator degrees of freedom, leading to a p-value of 0.992. This test assesses the null hypothesis that the error variance is equal across the groups. Since the p-value is considerably higher than the typical significance level of 0.05, there is no strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis. This suggests that the assumption of equal error variances across the groups is reasonable based on the provided data and model design.

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 61.692ª | 3 | 20.564 | 6.169 | .001 | .128 |
| Intercept | 27.377 | 1 | 27.377 | 8.213 | .005 | .061 |
| HungerQ9 | 25.878 | 1 | 25.878 | 7.763 | .006 | .058 |
| MoodQ10 | 1.987 | 1 | 1.987 | .596 | .442 | .005 |
| Typeofad | 35.953 | 1 | 35.953 | 10.786 | .001 | .079 |
| Error | 420.000 | 126 | 3.333 | | | |
| Total | 1904.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 481.692 | 129 | | | | |

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Q4_3 _2 Cognitive

a. R Squared = .128 (Adjusted R Squared = .107)

The analysis examines the effects of different factors on the dependent variable "Cognitive" (Q4_3_2). The Type III Sum of Squares represents the variance explained by each factor while accounting for the others. The model as a whole is statistically significant (p = .001) and explains about 12.8% of the variance in "Cognitive." Among the individual factors, both "HungerQ9" (p = .006) and "Typeofad" (p = .001) have significant impacts, explaining 5.8% and 7.9% of the variance, respectively. The "Intercept" is also significant (p = .005) and contributes 6.1% to the variance. However, "MoodQ10" doesn't significantly impact the variable (p > .05). The unexplained variance is represented by the "Error" term. The adjusted R-squared, which accounts for the number of predictors, is .107. In summary, hunger and the type of advertisement appear to significantly influence cognitive responses, while mood has a negligible effect in this context.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent Variable: | | 4_4 _1 Relation | al |
|---------------------|------|-----------------|-----|
| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
| ASMR Ad | 3.22 | 1.774 | 67 |
| Regular Ad | 3.46 | 1.821 | 63 |
| Total | 3.34 | 1.794 | 130 |
These descriptive statistics provide insights into the "Relational" (Q4_4_1) responses based on different types of advertisements. The mean relational response for the "ASMR Ad" is 3.22, with a standard deviation of 1.774, based on data from 67 participants. For the "Regular Ad," the mean relational response is slightly higher at 3.46, with a standard deviation of 1.821, based on 63 participants. Across both types of ads, the overall mean relational response is 3.34, with a standard deviation of 1.794, considering data from a total of 130 participants. These statistics suggest that participants provided slightly higher relational responses for the "Regular Ad" compared to the "ASMR Ad."

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | | Q4_4 _1 Relational | | |
|---------------------|-----|--------------------|------|--|
| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. | |
| 1.904 | 1 | 128 | .170 | |

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

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances assesses whether the variability of "Relational" (Q4_4_1) responses is consistent across different groups. In this case, the groups are defined by the factors included in the model ("Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," "Typeofad"). The computed test statistic is 1.904 with 1 numerator degree of freedom and 128 denominator degrees of freedom, leading to a p-value of 0.170. This test evaluates the null hypothesis that the error variance is equal across the groups. Since the p-value is higher than the common significance threshold of 0.05, there is no strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis. This suggests that the assumption of equal error variances across the groups is reasonable based on the provided data and model design.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 21.852ª | 3 | 7.284 | 2.334 | .077 | .053 |
| Intercept | 27.850 | 1 | 27.850 | 8.923 | .003 | .066 |
| HungerQ9 | 8.074 | 1 | 8.074 | 2.587 | .110 | .020 |
| MoodQ10 | 8.440 | 1 | 8.440 | 2.704 | .103 | .021 |
| Typeofad | 1.237 | 1 | 1.237 | .396 | .530 | .003 |
| Error | 393.256 | 126 | 3.121 | | | |
| Total | 1864.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 415.108 | 129 | | | | |

Dependent Variable: Q4_4 _1 Relational

a. R Squared = .053 (Adjusted R Squared = .030)

The analysis explores the effects of different factors on the dependent variable "Relational" $(Q4_4_1)$. The Type III Sum of Squares indicates the variation explained by each factor while considering the others. The model as a whole is not highly significant (p = .077) and explains about 5.3% of the variance in "Relational." Among the individual factors, only the "Intercept" is significant (p = .003) and contributes 6.6% to the variance. "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," and "Typeofad" do not show significant effects (p > .05). The unexplained variance is represented by the "Error" term. The adjusted R-squared, which considers the number of predictors, is .030. This analysis suggests that the model's predictors have limited ability to explain the variance in the "Relational" responses.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent Va | ariable: Ç | 4_4 _2 Relation | al |
|--------------|----------------|-----------------|-----|
| Type of ad | Std. Deviation | Ν | |
| ASMR Ad | 3.24 | 1.606 | 67 |
| Regular Ad | 3.44 | 1.730 | 63 |
| Total | 3.34 | 1.664 | 130 |

These descriptive statistics provide insights into the "Relational" (Q4_4_2) responses based on different types of advertisements. The mean relational response for the "ASMR Ad" is 3.24, with a standard deviation of 1.606, based on data from 67 participants. For the "Regular Ad," the mean relational response is slightly higher at 3.44, with a standard deviation of 1.730, based on 63 participants. Across both types of ads, the overall mean relational response is 3.34, with a standard deviation of 1.664, considering data from a total of 130 participants. These statistics suggest that participants provided slightly higher relational responses for the "Regular Ad" compared to the "ASMR Ad."

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: Q4_4 _2 Relational | | | | | | |
|--|------------|---------------|------------|--|--|--|
| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. | | | |
| 2.151 | 1 | 128 | .145 | | | |
| Tests the null hypothesis that the error | | | | | | |
| variance of | the depend | lent variable | e is equal | | | |
| across groups. | | | | | | |
| a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 + | | | | | | |
| MoodQ10 + Typeofad | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances examines whether the variability of "Relational" (Q4_4_2) responses is consistent across different groups. In this case, the groups are defined by

the factors included in the model ("Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," "Typeofad"). The computed test statistic is 2.151 with 1 numerator degree of freedom and 128 denominator degrees of freedom, leading to a p-value of 0.145. This test evaluates the null hypothesis that the error variance is equal across the groups. Since the p-value is higher than the common significance threshold of 0.05, there is no strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis. This suggests that the assumption of equal error variances across the groups is reasonable based on the provided data and model design.

| Dependent Variable: Q4_4 _2 Relational | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|--|
| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta | |
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared | |
| Corrected Model | 16.026ª | 3 | 5.342 | 1.973 | .121 | .045 | |
| Intercept | 33.624 | 1 | 33.624 | 12.421 | .001 | .090 | |
| HungerQ9 | 4.403 | 1 | 4.403 | 1.627 | .205 | .013 | |
| MoodQ10 | 7.744 | 1 | 7.744 | 2.861 | .093 | .022 | |
| Typeofad | 1.037 | 1 | 1.037 | .383 | .537 | .003 | |
| Error | 341.081 | 126 | 2.707 | | | | |
| Total | 1806.000 | 130 | | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 357.108 | 129 | | | | | |
| | 337.100 | 129 | | | | | |

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Q4 4 2 Relational

a. R Squared = .045 (Adjusted R Squared = .022)

The analysis investigates the effects of different factors on the dependent variable "Relational" $(Q4_4_2)$. The Type III Sum of Squares represents the variation explained by each factor while accounting for others. The overall model is not highly significant (p = .121) and explains approximately 4.5% of the variance in "Relational." Among the individual factors, only the "Intercept" is significant (p = .001) and contributes 9.0% to the variance. "MoodQ10" has a marginal impact (p = .093) and explains 2.2% of the variance, while "HungerQ9" and "Typeofad" do not show significant effects (p > .05). The unexplained variance is represented by the "Error" term. The adjusted R-squared, which considers the number of predictors, is .022. Overall, the model's predictors have limited ability to explain the variance in "Relational" responses.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent Va | ariable: Q | 4_4 _3 Relation | al |
|--------------|------------|-----------------|-----|
| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
| ASMR Ad | 3.09 | 1.790 | 67 |
| Regular Ad | 3.24 | 1.811 | 63 |
| Total | 3.16 | 1.795 | 130 |

These descriptive statistics offer insights into the "Relational" (Q4_4_3) responses based on

different types of advertisements. The mean relational response for the "ASMR Ad" is 3.09, with a standard deviation of 1.790, based on data from 67 participants. For the "Regular Ad," the mean relational response is slightly higher at 3.24, with a standard deviation of 1.811, based on 63 participants. When considering both types of ads, the overall mean relational response is 3.16, with a standard deviation of 1.795, taking into account data from a total of 130 participants. These statistics suggest that participants provided slightly higher relational responses for the "Regular Ad" compared to the "ASMR Ad."

Levene's Test of Equality of Error VariancesªDependent Variable:Q4_4 _3 RelationalFdf1df2Sig..7001128.404

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

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances examines whether the variability of "Relational" (Q4_4_3) responses is consistent across different groups. In this case, the groups are defined by the factors included in the model ("Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," "Typeofad"). The computed test statistic is 0.700 with 1 numerator degree of freedom and 128 denominator degrees of freedom, leading to a p-value of 0.404. Since the p-value is higher than the common significance threshold of 0.05, there is no strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis. This suggests that the assumption of equal error variances across the groups is reasonable based on the provided data and model design.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

| Dependent Variable: Q4_4 _3 Relational | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-------------|--|
| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta | |
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared | |
| Corrected Model | 23.881ª | 3 | 7.960 | 2.560 | .058 | .057 | |
| Intercept | 18.948 | 1 | 18.948 | 6.095 | .015 | .046 | |
| HungerQ9 | 6.962 | 1 | 6.962 | 2.239 | .137 | .017 | |
| MoodQ10 | 12.241 | 1 | 12.241 | 3.937 | .049 | .030 | |
| Typeofad | .434 | 1 | .434 | .139 | .709 | .001 | |
| Error | 391.726 | 126 | 3.109 | | | | |
| Total | 1715.000 | 130 | | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 415.608 | 129 | | | | | |

a. R Squared = .057 (Adjusted R Squared = .035)

The analysis explores the effects of different factors on the dependent variable "Relational" $(Q4_4_3)$. The Type III Sum of Squares indicates the variation explained by each factor while considering others. The overall model is not strongly significant (p = .058) and explains about 5.7% of the variance in "Relational." Among the individual factors, only the "Intercept" is significant (p = .015) and contributes 4.6% to the variance. "MoodQ10" has a marginal impact (p = .049) and explains 3.0% of the variance, while "HungerQ9" and "Typeofad" do not show significant effects (p > .05). The unexplained variance is represented by the "Error" term. The adjusted R-squared, which considers the number of predictors, is .035. The analysis suggests that the model's predictors have limited ability to explain the variance in "Relational" responses.

H5: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the perceived quality of the food brand.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent Va | ariable: Q | 5 - Perceived qu | ality |
|--------------|------------|------------------|-------|
| Type of ad | Mean | Ν | |
| ASMR Ad | 4.61 | 1.930 | 67 |
| Regular Ad | 4.56 | 1.966 | 63 |
| Total | 4.58 | 1.940 | 130 |

These descriptive statistics provide insights into the "Perceived Quality" (Q5) ratings based on different types of advertisements. The mean perceived quality rating for the "ASMR Ad" is 4.61, with a standard deviation of 1.930, based on data from 67 participants. For the "Regular Ad," the mean perceived quality rating is slightly lower at 4.56, with a standard deviation of 1.966, based on 63 participants. Across both types of ads, the overall mean perceived quality rating is 4.58, with a standard deviation of 1.940, considering data from a total of 130 participants. These statistics suggest that participants generally provided similar perceived quality ratings for both the "ASMR Ad" and the "Regular Ad."

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | | Q5 - Perceived quality | | | |
|---------------------|-----|------------------------|------|--|--|
| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. | | |
| .138 | 1 | 128 | .711 | | |

```
Tests the null hypothesis that the error
variance of the dependent variable is equal
across groups.
a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +
MoodQ10 + Typeofad
```

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances examines whether the variability of "Perceived Quality" (Q5) ratings is consistent across different groups. In this case, the groups are defined by the factors included in the model ("Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," "Typeofad"). The computed test statistic is 0.138 with 1 numerator degree of freedom and 128 denominator degrees of freedom, leading to a p-value of 0.711. Since the p-value is higher than the common significance threshold of 0.05, there is no strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis. This suggests that the assumption of equal error variances across the groups is reasonable based on the provided data and model design.

| Tests | of | Between-Subjects | Effects |
|-------|----|-------------------------|---------|
|-------|----|-------------------------|---------|

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 11.173ª | 3 | 3.724 | .989 | .400 | .023 |
| Intercept | 124.680 | 1 | 124.680 | 33.115 | .000 | .208 |
| HungerQ9 | 10.738 | 1 | 10.738 | 2.852 | .094 | .022 |
| MoodQ10 | 9.148E-5 | 1 | 9.148E-5 | .000 | .996 | .000 |
| Typeofad | .479 | 1 | .479 | .127 | .722 | .001 |
| Error | 474.396 | 126 | 3.765 | | | |
| Total | 3218.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 485.569 | 129 | | | | |

a. R Squared = .023 (Adjusted R Squared = .000)

The analysis examines the effects of different factors on the "Perceived Quality" (Q5) ratings. The Type III Sum of Squares represents the variation explained by each factor while accounting for the others. The model as a whole is not statistically significant (p = .400) and explains about 2.3% of the variance in "Perceived Quality." Among the individual factors, only the "Intercept" is highly significant (p < .001) and contributes 20.8% to the variance. "HungerQ9" has a marginal impact (p = .094) and explains 2.2% of the variance, while "MoodQ10" and "Typeofad" do not show significant effects (p > .05). The unexplained variance is represented by the "Error" term. The adjusted R-squared, which accounts for the number of predictors, is close to 0. This analysis suggests that the model's predictors have limited ability to explain the variance in "Perceived Quality" ratings.

H6: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the narrative transportation.

Descriptive Statistics

| | Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
|--|------------|------|----------------|-----|
| | ASMR Ad | 4.39 | 1.581 | 67 |
| | Regular Ad | 4.32 | 1.422 | 63 |
| | Total | 4.36 | 1.501 | 130 |

Dependent Variable: 06 - narrative transportation

These descriptive statistics provide insights into the "Q6" responses based on different types of advertisements. The mean response for the "ASMR Ad" is 4.39, with a standard deviation of 1.581, based on data from 67 participants. For the "Regular Ad," the mean response is slightly lower at 4.32, with a standard deviation of 1.422, based on 63 participants. Across both types of ads, the overall mean response is 4.36, with a standard deviation of 1.501, considering data from a total of 130 participants. These statistics suggest that participants generally provided slightly higher responses for the "ASMR Ad" compared to the "Regular Ad."

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent | Variable: | Q6 - narrative transportation | | | |
|-----------|-----------|-------------------------------|------|--|--|
| F df1 | | df2 Sig. | | | |
| .045 | 1 | 128 | .833 | | |

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups. a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 + MoodQ10 +

Typeofad

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances assesses whether the variability of "Q6" responses is consistent across different groups. In this context, the groups are defined by the factors included in the model ("Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," "Typeofad"). The calculated test statistic is 0.045 with 1 numerator degree of freedom and 128 denominator degrees of freedom, resulting in a p-value of 0.833. Since the p-value is higher than the common significance level of 0.05, there is no strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis. This suggests that the assumption of equal error variances across the groups is reasonable based on the provided data and model design.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 31.825ª | 3 | 10.608 | 5.168 | .002 | .110 |
| Intercept | 61.610 | 1 | 61.610 | 30.012 | .000 | .192 |
| HungerQ9 | 23.260 | 1 | 23.260 | 11.331 | .001 | .083 |
| MoodQ10 | 4.038 | 1 | 4.038 | 1.967 | .163 | .015 |
| Typeofad | .722 | 1 | .722 | .352 | .554 | .003 |

Dependent Variable: Q6 - narrative transportation

| Error | 258.661 | 126 | 2.053 | | |
|-----------------|----------|-----|-------|--|--|
| Total | 2757.667 | 130 | | | |
| Corrected Total | 290.486 | 129 | | | |

a. R Squared = .110 (Adjusted R Squared = .088)

The analysis explores the effects of different factors on the "Q6" responses. The Type III Sum of Squares represents the variation explained by each factor while accounting for the others. The overall model is statistically significant (p = .002) and explains approximately 11.0% of the variance in "Q6." Among the individual factors, the "Intercept" is highly significant (p < .001) and contributes 19.2% to the variance. "HungerQ9" also has a substantial impact (p = .001) and explains 8.3% of the variance, while "MoodQ10" and "Typeofad" do not show significant effects (p > .05). The unexplained variance is represented by the "Error" term. The adjusted R-squared, which considers the number of predictors, is .088. This analysis suggests that the model's predictors have a moderate ability to explain the variance in "Q6" responses.

H7; ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the purchase intention towards the brand.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent Variable: | | | Q7 - purchase intention | | | |
|---------------------|--------------|-------|-------------------------|-----|--|--|
| | Ad Type Mean | | Std. Deviation N | | | |
| | ASMR ad | 4.84 | 1.533 | 67 | | |
| Regular 4.27 | | 1.798 | 63 | | | |
| | au | | | | | |
| | Total | 4.56 | 1.684 | 130 | | |

The provided descriptive statistics concern the variable "purchase intention" and its distribution across distinct ad types. For ASMR ads, the mean is 4.84, with a standard deviation of 1.533, derived from 67 participants. Regular ads type yields a mean of 4.27, accompanied by a standard deviation of 1.798, based on 63 participants. Overall, when considering all ad types, the combined mean response for purchase intention is 4.56, accompanied by a standard deviation of 1.684, drawing from a total sample size of 130 participants.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | | Q7 - purchase intention | | | |
|---------------------|-----|-------------------------|-----|--|--|
| F | df1 | df2 | Sig | | |

| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|-------|-----|-----|------|
| 2.207 | 1 | 128 | .140 |

```
Tests the null hypothesis that the error
variance of the dependent variable is equal
across groups.
a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +
MoodQ10 + Adtype
```

Levene's Test results for the purchase intention assess if error variances are uniform across groups. The obtained F-value of 2.207, with 1 and 128 degrees of freedom and a significance level of 0.140, suggests no significant departure from equal variances. This implies that there is no strong evidence to reject the assumption of equal error variances among groups, defined by the design factors: Intercept, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Adtype.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 28.562ª | 3 | 9.521 | 3.555 | .016 | .078 |
| Intercept | 103.725 | 1 | 103.725 | 38.730 | .000 | .235 |
| HungerQ9 | 16.659 | 1 | 16.659 | 6.220 | .014 | .047 |
| MoodQ10 | .239 | 1 | .239 | .089 | .766 | .001 |
| Adtype | 13.307 | 1 | 13.307 | 4.969 | .028 | .038 |
| Error | 337.446 | 126 | 2.678 | | | |
| Total | 3071.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 366.008 | 129 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 366.008 | 129 | | | | |

Dependent Variable: Q7 - purchase intention

a. R Squared = .078 (Adjusted R Squared = .056)

The analysis of "Tests of Between-Subjects Effects" regarding the dependent variable "Q7" sheds light on its relationship with various factors. The corrected model demonstrates significant overall impact (F = 3.555, p = .016), indicating its ability to explain variability. The influential role of the intercept term is strongly evident (F = 38.730, p < .001), exerting substantial influence. "HungerQ9" also significantly contributes (F = 6.220, p = .014), while "MoodQ10" (F = 0.089, p = .766) and "Adtype" (F = 4.969, p = .028) show comparatively weaker impacts. The error term is 337.446, and the adjusted R-squared is 0.056, indicating the model's explanatory power. In summary, the model and specific factors significantly influence responses to "Q7," with the intercept and "HungerQ9" being prominent contributors, and the model's goodness of fit is reasonably explained by the adjusted R-squared.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent Variable: | | | Q7 (KFC/low-end) | | | |
|---------------------|------|--|------------------|---|--|--|
| Type of ad | Mean | | Std. Deviation | Ν | | |

| ASMR Ad | 4.85 | 1.584 | 33 |
|------------|------|-------|----|
| Regular Ad | 3.80 | 1.795 | 35 |
| Total | 4.31 | 1.764 | 68 |

These descriptive statistics provide insights into the "Q7" responses related to KFC or low-end advertisements. The mean response for the "ASMR Ad" is 4.85, with a standard deviation of 1.584, based on data from 33 participants. For the "Regular Ad," the mean response is lower at 3.80, with a standard deviation of 1.795, based on 35 participants. When considering both types of ads, the overall mean response is 4.31, with a standard deviation of 1.764, considering data from a total of 68 participants. These statistics suggest that participants generally provided higher "Q7" responses for the "ASMR Ad" in the context of KFC or low-end advertisements.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error

Variances^a

Dependent Variable: Q7 (KFC/low-end)

| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|-------|-----|-----|------|
| 1.367 | 1 | 66 | .246 |

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

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances assesses whether the variability of "Q7" responses related to KFC or low-end advertisements is consistent across different groups. The groups are defined by the factors included in the model ("Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," "Typeofad"). The calculated test statistic is 1.367 with 1 numerator degree of freedom and 66 denominator degrees of freedom, resulting in a p-value of 0.246. Since the p-value is higher than the common significance level of 0.05, there is no strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis. This suggests that the assumption of

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 29.809ª | 3 | 9.936 | 3.558 | .019 | .143 |
| Intercept | 57.897 | 1 | 57.897 | 20.735 | .000 | .245 |
| HungerQ9 | 10.817 | 1 | 10.817 | 3.874 | .053 | .057 |
| MoodQ10 | .027 | 1 | .027 | .010 | .922 | .000 |
| Typeofad | 21.395 | 1 | 21.395 | 7.662 | .007 | .107 |
| Error | 178.706 | 64 | 2.792 | | | |
| Total | 1471.000 | 68 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 208.515 | 67 | | | | |

Dependent Variable: Q7 (KFC/low-end)

a. R Squared = .143 (Adjusted R Squared = .103)

The analysis explores the effects of different factors on the "Q7" responses related to KFC or low-end advertisements. The Type III Sum of Squares represents the variation explained by each factor while accounting for others. The overall model is statistically significant (p = .019) and explains approximately 14.3% of the variance in "Q7." Among the individual factors, the "Intercept" is highly significant (p < .001) and contributes 24.5% to the variance. "Typeofad" is also significant (p = .007) and explains 10.7% of the variance. "HungerQ9" has a marginal impact (p = .053) and explains 5.7% of the variance, while "MoodQ10" does not show a significant effect (p > .05). The unexplained variance is represented by the "Error" term. The adjusted R-squared, which accounts for the number of predictors, is .103. This analysis suggests that the model's predictors have a moderate ability to explain the variance in "Q7" responses related to KFC or low-end advertisements.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent Variable: | | Q7 (Lindt/high-en | d) |
|---------------------|------|-------------------|----|
| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
| ASMR Ad | 4.82 | 1.507 | 34 |
| Regular Ad | 4.86 | 1.649 | 28 |
| Total | 4.84 | 1.560 | 62 |

These descriptive statistics offer insights into the "Q7" responses related to Lindt or high-end advertisements. The mean response for the "ASMR Ad" is 4.82, with a standard deviation of 1.507, based on data from 34 participants. For the "Regular Ad," the mean response is slightly higher at 4.86, with a standard deviation of 1.649, based on 28 participants. When considering both types of ads, the overall mean response is 4.84, with a standard deviation of 1.560, considering data from a total of 62 participants. These statistics suggest that participants generally provided similar "Q7" responses for both the "ASMR Ad" and the "Regular Ad" in the context of Lindt or high-end advertisements.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error

Variances^a

Dependent Variable: Q7 (Lindt/high-end)

| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|------|-----|-----|------|
| .009 | 1 | 60 | .924 |

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups. a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances assesses whether the variability of "Q7" responses related to Lindt or high-end advertisements is consistent across different groups. In this case, the

groups are defined by the factors included in the model ("Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," "Typeofad"). The computed test statistic is 0.009 with 1 numerator degree of freedom and 60 denominator degrees of freedom, resulting in a p-value of 0.924. Since the p-value is higher than the common significance level of 0.05, there is no strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis. This suggests that the assumption of equal error variances across the groups is reasonable based on the provided data and model design.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

| Dependent Variable: Q | 7 (Lindt/high-end) |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
|-----------------------|--------------------|

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 7.413ª | 3 | 2.471 | 1.017 | .392 | .050 |
| Intercept | 53.185 | 1 | 53.185 | 21.881 | .000 | .274 |
| HungerQ9 | 7.235 | 1 | 7.235 | 2.977 | .090 | .049 |
| MoodQ10 | .002 | 1 | .002 | .001 | .979 | .000 |
| Typeofad | .038 | 1 | .038 | .016 | .900 | .000 |
| Error | 140.974 | 58 | 2.431 | | | |
| Total | 1600.000 | 62 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 148.387 | 61 | | | | |

a. R Squared = .050 (Adjusted R Squared = .001)

The analysis explores the effects of different factors on the "Q7" responses related to Lindt or high-end advertisements. The Type III Sum of Squares represents the variation explained by each factor while accounting for others. The overall model is not statistically significant (p = .392) and explains approximately 5.0% of the variance in "Q7." Among the individual factors, the "Intercept" is highly significant (p < .001) and contributes 27.4% to the variance. "HungerQ9" has a marginal impact (p = .090) and explains 4.9% of the variance, while "MoodQ10" and "Typeofad" do not show significant effects (p > .05). The unexplained variance is represented by the "Error" term. The adjusted R-squared, which accounts for the number of predictors, is .001. This analysis suggests that the model's predictors have limited ability to explain the variance in "Q7" responses related to Lindt or high-end advertisements.

H8: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will positively affect the sensory imagery.

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Q8 - Sensory imagery

| Ad Type | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
|----------|------|----------------|-----|
| ASMR ads | 3.62 | .511 | 67 |
| Regular | 3.69 | .544 | 63 |
| ads | | | |
| Total | 3.65 | .526 | 130 |

The descriptive statistics offered here pertain to the dependent variable "sensory imagery" and its distribution across distinct ad types. For participants exposed to ASMR ads, the mean response stands at 3.62, showcasing a relatively low level of variability with a standard deviation of 0.511. Similarly, participants who experienced regular ads exhibit a slightly higher mean response of 3.69, accompanied by a standard deviation of 0.544. Combining responses across all ad types, the overall mean response for "Q8" is 3.65, and the standard deviation is 0.526. These statistics provide valuable insights into how participants perceive "Q8" across different ad contexts, illustrating both the average sentiment and the degree of response variability.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | | Q8 - Sensory imagery | | |
|---------------------|-----|----------------------|------|--|
| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. | |
| .107 | 1 | 128 | .744 | |

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups. a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 + MoodQ10 + Adtype

Levene's Test results for sensory imagery evaluate whether error variances are equivalent across groups. The obtained F-value of 0.107, with 1 and 128 degrees of freedom, and a significance level of 0.744, suggests that there is no significant deviation from equal variances. In other words, the evidence doesn't strongly support the idea that error variance significantly varies among groups defined by the design factors: Intercept, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Adtype.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

| • | - | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------------|---------|------|-------------|
| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | .721ª | 3 | .240 | .864 | .462 | .020 |
| Intercept | 116.212 | 1 | 116.212 | 418.015 | .000 | .768 |
| HungerQ9 | .519 | 1 | .519 | 1.868 | .174 | .015 |
| MoodQ10 | .002 | 1 | .002 | .008 | .929 | .000 |
| Adtype | .240 | 1 | .240 | .864 | .354 | .007 |
| Error | 35.029 | 126 | .278 | | | |
| Total | 1767.867 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 35.750 | 129 | | | | |

Dependent Variable: Q8 - Sensory imagery

a. R Squared = .020 (Adjusted R Squared = -.003)

The "Tests of Between-Subjects Effects" analysis for the variable "Q8" indicates that the overall impact of the corrected model on response variability is limited (F = 0.864, p = .462), with an associated Partial Eta Squared value of 0.020. The intercept has a substantial and significant influence (F = 418.015, p < .001, Partial Eta Squared = 0.768), whereas "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," and "Adtype" exhibit minor effects. The error term amounts to 35.029, and the adjusted R-squared is -0.003, suggesting the model's limited explanatory power. In summary, while the model and certain factors moderately affect "Q8" responses, the intercept remains the most significant contributor, and the model's overall explanatory ability is constrained.

The following section has a detailed analysis of each aspect of sensory imagery: quantity, modality, vividness, and valence.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent Variable: Q8_1_1 Quantity | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------|----------------|-----|--|--|
| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν | | |
| ASMR Ad | 3.90 | 1.671 | 67 | | |
| Regular Ad | 4.08 | 1.599 | 63 | | |
| Total | 3.98 | 1.633 | 130 | | |

These descriptive statistics provide insights into the "Q8_1_1 Quantity" responses based on different types of advertisements. The mean response for the "ASMR Ad" is 3.90, with a standard deviation of 1.671, based on data from 67 participants. For the "Regular Ad," the mean response is slightly higher at 4.08, with a standard deviation of 1.599, based on 63 participants. Across both types of ads, the overall mean response is 3.98, with a standard deviation of 1.633, considering data from a total of 130 participants. These statistics suggest that participants provided slightly higher "Q8_1_1 Quantity" responses for the "Regular Ad" compared to the "ASMR Ad."

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | | Q8_1_1 Quantity | | |
|---------------------|-----|-----------------|------|--|
| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. | |
| .139 | 1 | 128 | .710 | |

Tests the null hypothesis that the error

variance of the dependent variable is equal

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances assesses whether the variability of "Q8_1_1 Quantity" responses is consistent across different groups defined by the factors included in the model ("Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," "Typeofad"). The calculated test statistic is 0.139 with 1 numerator degree of freedom and 128 denominator degrees of freedom, resulting in a p-value of 0.710. Since the p-value is higher than the common significance level of 0.05, there is no strong

across groups.

evidence to reject the null hypothesis. This suggests that the assumption of equal error variances across the groups is reasonable based on the provided data and model design.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Q8_1_1 Quantity

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 22.364ª | 3 | 7.455 | 2.921 | .037 | .065 |
| Intercept | 69.608 | 1 | 69.608 | 27.271 | .000 | .178 |
| HungerQ9 | 19.444 | 1 | 19.444 | 7.618 | .007 | .057 |
| MoodQ10 | .307 | 1 | .307 | .120 | .729 | .001 |
| Typeofad | .310 | 1 | .310 | .121 | .728 | .001 |
| Error | 321.605 | 126 | 2.552 | | | |
| Total | 2408.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 343.969 | 129 | | | | |

a. R Squared = .065 (Adjusted R Squared = .043)

The analysis examines the impact of different factors on the "Q8_1_1 Quantity" responses. The Type III Sum of Squares represents the variation explained by each factor while accounting for others. The overall model is statistically significant (p = .037) and explains approximately 6.5% of the variance in "Q8_1_1 Quantity." Among the individual factors, the "Intercept" is highly significant (p < .001) and contributes 17.8% to the variance. "HungerQ9" is also significant (p = .007) and explains 5.7% of the variance, while "MoodQ10" and "Typeofad" do not show significant effects (p > .05). The unexplained variance is represented by the "Error" term. The adjusted R-squared, which accounts for the number of predictors, is .043. This analysis suggests that the model's predictors have a moderate ability to explain the variance in "Q8_1_1 Quantity" responses.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent Variable: Q8_1_2 Quantity | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------|----------------|-----|--|--|
| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | N | | |
| ASMR Ad | 4.79 | 1.543 | 67 | | |
| Regular Ad | 4.21 | 1.743 | 63 | | |
| Total | 4.51 | 1.662 | 130 | | |

These descriptive statistics provide insights into the "Q8_1_2 Quantity" responses based on different types of advertisements. The mean response for the "ASMR Ad" is 4.79, with a standard deviation of 1.543, based on data from 67 participants. For the "Regular Ad," the mean response is slightly lower at 4.21, with a standard deviation of 1.743, based on 63 participants. When considering both types of ads, the overall mean response is 4.51, with a standard deviation of 1.662, considering data from a total of 130 participants. These statistics suggest that participants

provided slightly higher "Q8_1_2 Quantity" responses for the "ASMR Ad" compared to the "Regular Ad."

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: (| Q8_1 | L_2 | Quantity |
|-----------------------|------|-----|----------|
|-----------------------|------|-----|----------|

| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|-------|-----|-----|------|
| 3.144 | 1 | 128 | .079 |

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

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances assesses whether the variability of "Q8_1_2 Quantity" responses is consistent across different groups defined by the factors included in the model ("Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," "Typeofad"). The computed test statistic is 3.144 with 1 numerator degree of freedom and 128 denominator degrees of freedom, resulting in a p-value of 0.079. The p-value is slightly higher than the common significance level of 0.05, suggesting a borderline result. While not strongly significant, this test indicates that there might be some evidence of variability differences across groups. It's advisable to consider the p-value in the context of the research question and other analyses to make a more informed interpretation.

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 21.641ª | 3 | 7.214 | 2.714 | .048 | .061 |
| Intercept | 153.613 | 1 | 153.613 | 57.802 | .000 | .314 |
| HungerQ9 | 7.825 | 1 | 7.825 | 2.945 | .089 | .023 |
| MoodQ10 | 4.469 | 1 | 4.469 | 1.682 | .197 | .013 |
| Typeofad | 8.501 | 1 | 8.501 | 3.199 | .076 | .025 |
| Error | 334.851 | 126 | 2.658 | | | |
| Total | 2998.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 356.492 | 129 | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Q8_1_2 Quantity

a. R Squared = .061 (Adjusted R Squared = .038)

The analysis examines the impact of different factors on the "Q8_1_2 Quantity" responses. The Type III Sum of Squares represents the variation explained by each factor while accounting for others. The overall model is statistically significant (p = .048) and explains approximately 6.1% of the variance in "Q8_1_2 Quantity." Among the individual factors, the "Intercept" is highly significant (p < .001) and contributes 31.4% to the variance. "HungerQ9" is marginally significant (p = .089) and explains 2.3% of the variance. "MoodQ10" and "Typeofad" do not show significant effects (p > .05). The unexplained variance is represented by the "Error" term. The adjusted

R-squared, which considers the number of predictors, is .038. This analysis suggests that the model's predictors have a moderate ability to explain the variance in "Q8_1_2 Quantity" responses.

| Dependent Variable: Q8_2_1 Modality | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------|----------------|-----|--|
| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν | |
| ASMR Ad | 4.90 | 1.549 | 67 | |
| Regular Ad | 4.41 | 1.915 | 63 | |
| Total | 4.66 | 1.746 | 130 | |

These descriptive statistics provide insights into the "Q8_2_1 Modality" responses based on different types of advertisements. The mean response for the "ASMR Ad" is 4.90, with a standard deviation of 1.549, based on data from 67 participants. For the "Regular Ad," the mean response is slightly lower at 4.41, with a standard deviation of 1.915, based on 63 participants. When considering both types of ads, the overall mean response is 4.66, with a standard deviation of 1.746, considering data from a total of 130 participants. These statistics suggest that participants provided slightly higher "Q8_2_1 Modality" responses for the "ASMR Ad" compared to the "Regular Ad."

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | Q8_2_1 Modality |
|---------------------|-----------------|
|---------------------|-----------------|

| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|-------|-----|-----|------|
| 5.009 | 1 | 128 | .027 |

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

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances assesses whether the variability of "Q8_2_1 Modality" responses is consistent across different groups defined by the factors included in the model ("Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," "Typeofad"). The calculated test statistic is 5.009 with 1 numerator degree of freedom and 128 denominator degrees of freedom, resulting in a p-value of 0.027. The p-value is less than the common significance level of 0.05, suggesting evidence of variability differences across groups. This indicates that the assumption of equal variances may not hold for the groups defined by the independent variables in the model. Researchers should consider the results when interpreting the findings from subsequent analyses.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Q8_2_1 Modality

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|--------|--------------|----|-------------|---|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |

| Corrected Model | 27.760ª | 3 | 9.253 | 3.191 | .026 | .071 |
|-----------------|----------|-----|--------|--------|------|------|
| Intercept | 81.577 | 1 | 81.577 | 28.134 | .000 | .183 |
| HungerQ9 | 9.043 | 1 | 9.043 | 3.119 | .080 | .024 |
| MoodQ10 | 7.607 | 1 | 7.607 | 2.623 | .108 | .020 |
| Typeofad | 8.870 | 1 | 8.870 | 3.059 | .083 | .024 |
| Error | 365.348 | 126 | 2.900 | | | |
| Total | 3218.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 393.108 | 129 | | | | |

a. R Squared = .071 (Adjusted R Squared = .048)

The analysis investigates the impact of various factors on the "Q8_2_1 Modality" responses. The Type III Sum of Squares reflects the variation explained by each factor when accounting for other factors in the model ("Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," "Typeofad"). The model as a whole is statistically significant (p = .026) and explains about 7.1% of the variance in "Q8_2_1 Modality." Among the individual factors, the "Intercept" is highly significant (p < .001) and contributes 18.3% to the variance. "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," and "Typeofad" are not individually statistically significant (p > .05). The unexplained variance is represented by the "Error" term. The adjusted R-squared, which considers the number of predictors, is .048. This analysis suggests that the model's predictors have limited ability to explain the variance in "Q8_2_1 Modality" responses.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent Variable: Q8 | _2 | _2 | Modality | |
|------------------------|----|----|----------|--|
|------------------------|----|----|----------|--|

| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
|------------|------|----------------|-----|
| ASMR Ad | 4.70 | 1.875 | 67 |
| Regular Ad | 5.30 | 1.541 | 63 |
| Total | 4.99 | 1.741 | 130 |

These descriptive statistics provide information about the "Q8_2_2 Modality" responses based on different types of advertisements. The mean response for the "ASMR Ad" is 4.70, with a standard deviation of 1.875, based on data from 67 participants. On the other hand, for the "Regular Ad," the mean response is higher at 5.30, with a lower standard deviation of 1.541, based on 63 participants. When considering both types of ads together, the overall mean response is 4.99, with a standard deviation of 1.741, considering data from a total of 130 participants. These statistics indicate that participants provided slightly higher "Q8_2_2 Modality" responses for the "Regular Ad" compared to the "ASMR Ad."

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | Q8_2_2 Modality |
|---------------------|-----------------|
| | |

| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|-------|-----|-----|------|
| 2.770 | 1 | 128 | .098 |

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

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 + MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances assesses whether the variability of "Q8_2_2 Modality" responses is consistent across different groups defined by the factors included in the model ("Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," "Typeofad"). The computed test statistic is 2.770, with 1 numerator degree of freedom and 128 denominator degrees of freedom, leading to a p-value of 0.098. As the p-value is greater than the common significance level of 0.05, there is limited evidence to suggest significant variability differences across groups. This implies that the assumption of equal variances is not strongly violated for the groups defined by the independent variables in the model. However, researchers should carefully consider this result within the context of their analysis and research question.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 56.133ª | 3 | 18.711 | 7.041 | .000 | .144 |
| Intercept | 82.793 | 1 | 82.793 | 31.153 | .000 | .198 |
| HungerQ9 | 35.047 | 1 | 35.047 | 13.187 | .000 | .095 |
| MoodQ10 | 3.905 | 1 | 3.905 | 1.470 | .228 | .012 |
| Typeofad | 7.764 | 1 | 7.764 | 2.921 | .090 | .023 |
| Error | 334.859 | 126 | 2.658 | | | |
| Total | 3631.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 390.992 | 129 | | | | |

Dependent Variable: Q8_2_2 Modality

a. R Squared = .144 (Adjusted R Squared = .123)

The analysis of "Tests of Between-Subjects Effects" for the dependent variable "Q8_2_2 Modality" reveals that the model is significant (F = 7.041, p < 0.001), indicating the collective influence of the included factors on the variable. The factors "Intercept," "HungerQ9," and "Typeofad" exhibit statistically significant effects (p < 0.05), while "MoodQ10" does not. The model explains a substantial proportion of variance (R-squared = 0.144) and suggests researchers consider these findings when interpreting the impact of independent variables on the dependent variable.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent Variable: | | | 3_2_3 Modality | |
|---------------------|------------|------|----------------|-----|
| | Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
| | ASMR Ad | 4.57 | 1.786 | 67 |
| | Regular Ad | 4.56 | 1.966 | 63 |
| | Total | 4.56 | 1.868 | 130 |

The descriptive statistics for the dependent variable "Q8_2_3 Modality" indicate that the mean perceived modality for both the ASMR Ad and Regular Ad conditions is quite similar, with mean

scores of 4.57 and 4.56, respectively. The standard deviations for these means are also relatively close, at 1.786 for ASMR Ad and 1.966 for Regular Ad. These results suggest that participants' perceptions of modality in response to both types of advertisements are relatively consistent. The overall mean for the total dataset is 4.56, reflecting the central tendency of the modality ratings across the sample of 130 participants.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | | Q8_2_3 Mod | dality |
|---------------------|-----|------------|--------|
| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| 3.052 | 1 | 128 | .083 |

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

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances was conducted for the dependent variable "Q8_2_3 Modality." The result of the test is a p-value of 0.083, which indicates that the assumption of equal error variances across different groups might not be met. This suggests a potential variance difference in the modality ratings between the groups defined by the independent variables (Intercept, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad). Researchers should consider this information when interpreting the results of subsequent analyses involving this dependent variable.

| Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|
| 3.578ª | 3 | 11.193 | 3.387 | .020 | .075 |
| 17.114 | 1 | 117.114 | 35.435 | .000 | .220 |
| 3.517 | 1 | 33.517 | 10.141 | .002 | .074 |
| 568 | 1 | 1.568 | .474 | .492 | .004 |
| 88 | 1 | .588 | .178 | .674 | .001 |
| 16.430 | 126 | 3.305 | | | |
| 155.000 | 130 | | | | |
| 50.008 | 129 | | | | |
| 3 1 3 5 1 1 5 | .578° 7.114 .517 568 38 6.430 55.000 0.008 | .578° 3 .578° 3 7.114 1 .517 1 568 1 38 1 6.430 126 55.000 130 0.008 129 | 1.578°311.1937.1141117.114.517133.51756811.568381.5886.4301263.30555.000130 | 1.578°311.1933.3877.1141117.11435.435.517133.51710.141.66811.568.474.881.588.178.6.4301263.30555.000130008129 | 1 1 |

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Q8_2_3 Modality

a. R Squared = .075 (Adjusted R Squared = .053)

For the dependent variable "Q8_2_3 Modality," a Tests of Between-Subjects Effects was conducted. The results show that the model is statistically significant with an F-statistic of 3.387 and a p-value of 0.020. The analysis assesses the effects of different independent variables (Intercept, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad) on the dependent variable. The partial eta squared value is 0.075, indicating a moderate effect size. Specifically, the Intercept and HungerQ9 have statistically significant effects on the dependent variable (p < 0.001 and p = 0.002, respectively), while MoodQ10 and Typeofad do not have statistically significant effects (p = 0.492 and p = 0.674, respectively). The adjusted R-squared value suggests that around 5.3% of the variance in the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variables in the model.

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Q8_2_4 Modality

| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
|------------|------|----------------|-----|
| ASMR Ad | 4.46 | 1.861 | 67 |
| Regular Ad | 4.52 | 1.839 | 63 |
| Total | 4.49 | 1.844 | 130 |

The descriptive statistics present the characteristics of the "Q8_2_4 Modality" variable across different types of advertisements. The mean ratings for the ASMR Ad and Regular Ad are 4.46 and 4.52, respectively, suggesting that participants perceived both types of ads similarly in terms of modality. The standard deviations of 1.861 and 1.839 for the ASMR Ad and Regular Ad indicate some variability in participants' ratings within each group. Overall, when considering all observations, the total mean rating for the modality of the ads is 4.49, with a total standard deviation of 1.844. These statistics provide an overview of the perceived modality of the ads in the study.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

Dependent Variable: Q8_2_4 Modality

| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|------|-----|-----|------|
| .052 | 1 | 128 | .819 |

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

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 + MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's test of equality of error variances was conducted to assess whether the error variances of the "Q8_2_4 Modality" variable are equal across different groups defined by the independent variables included in the design (Intercept, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad). The results of the test, with an F statistic of 0.052 and a corresponding p-value of 0.819, indicate that there is no significant evidence to reject the null hypothesis of equal error variances. This suggests that the assumption of homogeneity of variances is met, indicating that the variability of the "Q8_2_4 Modality" variable is consistent across the different groups defined by the independent variables in the study design.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 21.799ª | 3 | 7.266 | 2.197 | .092 | .050 |
| Intercept | 70.087 | 1 | 70.087 | 21.193 | .000 | .144 |
| HungerQ9 | 8.796 | 1 | 8.796 | 2.660 | .105 | .021 |
| MoodQ10 | 9.071 | 1 | 9.071 | 2.743 | .100 | .021 |
| Typeofad | .012 | 1 | .012 | .004 | .952 | .000 |
| Error | 416.693 | 126 | 3.307 | | | |
| Total | 3062.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 438.492 | 129 | | | | |

Dependent Variable: Q8_2_4 Modality

a. R Squared = .050 (Adjusted R Squared = .027)

The analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) for the "Q8_2_4 Modality" variable indicated that the model, including the Intercept, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad as independent variables, exhibited a marginally significant overall effect (F = 2.197, p = 0.092). The Intercept had a highly significant impact on the dependent variable (F = 21.193, p < 0.001), suggesting significant differences between groups. However, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad did not contribute significantly to the model (p > 0.05). The partial eta squared values, which represent the proportion of variance explained by each factor, were relatively small (ranging from 0.021 to 0.144), indicating limited practical significance. The model's goodness of fit, as indicated by the R-squared and adjusted R-squared values, was also modest, suggesting that the model may not fully explain the variation in the data.

Descriptive Statistics

| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | N | | |
|------------|------|----------------|-----|--|--|
| ASMR Ad | 3.73 | 1.863 | 67 | | |
| Regular Ad | 3.70 | 1.793 | 63 | | |
| Total | 3.72 | 1.822 | 130 | | |

Dependent Variable: Q8_3_1 Vividness

The descriptive statistics for the "Q8_3_1 Vividness" variable indicate that the mean vividness ratings for the ASMR Ad and Regular Ad groups were 3.73 and 3.70, respectively. The standard deviations were 1.863 for the ASMR Ad group and 1.793 for the Regular Ad group. The total sample size was 130 participants. Overall, the mean vividness ratings were quite similar between the two types of ads, with the ASMR Ad group slightly higher by a small margin. The standard deviations suggest that there was variability in participants' ratings within each group.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

Dependent Variable: Q8_3_1 Vividness

| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|------|-----|-----|------|
| .136 | 1 | 128 | .713 |

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups. a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 + MoodQ10 + Typeofad

The Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances conducted on the "Q8_3_1 Vividness" variable resulted in an F-statistic of 0.136 with 1 and 128 degrees of freedom for the numerator and denominator, respectively. The associated p-value was 0.713. This test examines whether the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups defined by the independent variables included in the model. In this case, the design included intercept, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad as independent variables. Since the p-value is greater than the typical significance level of 0.05, there is no strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis of equal error variances across the groups.

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 17.414ª | 3 | 5.805 | 1.779 | .154 | .041 |
| Intercept | 194.762 | 1 | 194.762 | 59.700 | .000 | .321 |
| HungerQ9 | 11.910 | 1 | 11.910 | 3.651 | .058 | .028 |
| MoodQ10 | 2.874 | 1 | 2.874 | .881 | .350 | .007 |
| Typeofad | .022 | 1 | .022 | .007 | .934 | .000 |
| Error | 411.056 | 126 | 3.262 | | | |
| Total | 2223.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 428.469 | 129 | | | | |

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Q8_3_1 Vividness

a. R Squared = .041 (Adjusted R Squared = .018)

The "Q8_3_1 Vividness" variable was subjected to an analysis of between-subjects effects, utilizing an ANOVA model. The results indicate that the model's corrected R-squared value is 0.041, suggesting that approximately 4.1% of the variance in the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variables (Intercept, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad) included in the model. However, the F-statistic is 1.779 with a corresponding p-value of 0.154, which is above the usual significance threshold of 0.05. This implies that the observed F-statistic is not statistically significant, and there is no compelling evidence to conclude that the independent variables have a significant impact on the dependent variable in terms of vividness perception. The partial eta-squared values provide additional context, indicating that the effect size of the independent variables is relatively small, with HungerQ9 having the largest effect (partial eta-squared = 0.028), followed by MoodQ10 (partial eta-squared = 0.007), and Typeofad (partial eta-squared = 0.000).

| Dependent Variable: | | Q8_3_2 Vividness | |
|---------------------|------|------------------|-----|
| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
| ASMR Ad | 3.46 | 1.735 | 67 |
| Regular Ad | 3.60 | 1.828 | 63 |
| Total | 3.53 | 1.775 | 130 |

Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics for the "Q8_3_2 Vividness" variable were calculated based on the type of ad shown. The mean vividness rating for the ASMR Ad was 3.46, with a standard deviation of 1.735, and the sample size was 67. For the Regular Ad, the mean vividness rating was slightly higher at 3.60, with a standard deviation of 1.828, and the sample size was 63. The overall mean vividness rating across both types of ads was 3.53, with a standard deviation of 1.775, based on a total sample size of 130 respondents.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | 08 3 2 Vividness |
|---------------------|------------------|
| | |

| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|------|-----|-----|------|
| .175 | 1 | 128 | .677 |

Tests the null hypothesis that the error

variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

The Levene's test of equality of error variances for the "Q8_3_2 Vividness" variable indicates that the obtained p-value is .677, which is greater than the typical significance level of .05. This suggests that we do not have sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis, which implies that the error variance of the dependent variable is likely equal across different groups defined by the independent variables (Intercept, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad) in the model.

| Dependent Variable: Q8_3_2 Vividness | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 7.446ª | 3 | 2.482 | .784 | .505 | .018 |
| Intercept | 156.800 | 1 | 156.800 | 49.524 | .000 | .282 |
| HungerQ9 | 1.567 | 1 | 1.567 | .495 | .483 | .004 |
| MoodQ10 | 4.133 | 1 | 4.133 | 1.305 | .255 | .010 |
| Typeofad | .753 | 1 | .753 | .238 | .627 | .002 |
| Error | 398.930 | 126 | 3.166 | | | |

92

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

| Total | 2027.000 | 130 | | |
|-----------------|----------|-----|--|--|
| Corrected Total | 406.377 | 129 | | |

a. R Squared = .018 (Adjusted R Squared = -.005)

The statistical analysis explores the influence of different variables on the "Vividness" of experiences. The model, collectively, does not show significant impact on "Vividness," as the overall F-test is not significant (p = 0.505). The intercept, representing the baseline, significantly affects "Vividness" (p < 0.001). However, individual variables like "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," and "Typeofad" do not significantly influence "Vividness" (all p > 0.05). The model explains a minor portion (1.8%) of variability in "Vividness," but this explanation might not be practically significant.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent Va | ariable: (| 28_3_3 Vividness | |
|--------------|------------|------------------|-----|
| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
| ASMR Ad | 4.12 | 1.619 | 67 |
| Regular Ad | 4.00 | 1.685 | 63 |
| Total | 4.06 | 1.646 | 130 |

The descriptive statistics show the characteristics of the "Vividness" variable based on different types of advertisements. For the "ASMR Ad" group, the average "Vividness" rating is 4.12, with a standard deviation of 1.619, calculated from a sample size of 67. Similarly, for the "Regular Ad" group, the average "Vividness" rating is 4.00, with a slightly higher standard deviation of 1.685, based on a sample size of 63. The combined average "Vividness" rating for all groups is 4.06, with a standard deviation of 1.646, calculated from a total sample size of 130. This provides an overview of how "Vividness" ratings differ between the two types of advertisements.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: Q8_3_3 Vividness | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|--------------|-------|--|--|
| F | df1 df2 Sig. | | | | |
| .067 | .067 1 128 .796 | | | | |
| Tests the n | ull hypothes | sis that the | error | | |
| variance of the dependent variable is equal | | | | | |
| across groups. | | | | | |
| a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 + | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test examines the equality of error variances for the "Vividness" variable (Q8_3_3) among different groups based on the predictors "Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," and "Typeofad." The calculated F-value is 0.067, with degrees of freedom (df) of 1 and 128. The associated p-value (Sig.) is 0.796, indicating that the error variances are not significantly different

across the groups. This means that the assumption of equal variances, which is important for certain statistical tests, is likely met in this case.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Q8_3_3 Vividness

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 17.199ª | 3 | 5.733 | 2.174 | .094 | .049 |
| Intercept | 201.770 | 1 | 201.770 | 76.504 | .000 | .378 |
| HungerQ9 | 14.978 | 1 | 14.978 | 5.679 | .019 | .043 |
| MoodQ10 | .391 | 1 | .391 | .148 | .701 | .001 |
| Typeofad | .065 | 1 | .065 | .025 | .875 | .000 |
| Error | 332.308 | 126 | 2.637 | | | |
| Total | 2494.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 349.508 | 129 | | | | |

a. R Squared = .049 (Adjusted R Squared = .027)

The statistical analysis evaluates the influence of predictors on the "Vividness" variable (Q8_3_3). The model, comprising "Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," and "Typeofad," is moderately significant (p = 0.094), suggesting some combined effect. The baseline "Intercept" significantly impacts "Vividness" (p < 0.001), as does "HungerQ9" (p = 0.019), while "MoodQ10" and "Typeofad" do not (p > 0.7 and p > 0.8, respectively). The model explains about 4.9% of variance in "Vividness," with adjusted R-squared at 0.027, indicating limited overall explanatory power.

| Descriptive | Statistics |
|-------------|------------|
|-------------|------------|

| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|------------|------|----------------|-----|
| ASMR Ad | 3.60 | 1.643 | 67 |
| Regular Ad | 3.67 | 1.675 | 63 |
| Total | 3.63 | 1.653 | 130 |

The descriptive statistics present characteristics of the "Vividness" variable (Q8_3_4) based on different types of advertisements. For the "ASMR Ad" group, the average "Vividness" rating is 3.60, with a standard deviation of 1.643, calculated from a sample size of 67. In contrast, the "Regular Ad" group has an average "Vividness" rating of 3.67, with a slightly higher standard deviation of 1.675, based on a sample size of 63. The combined average "Vividness" rating for all groups is 3.63, with a standard deviation of 1.653, computed from a total sample size of 130. This provides insights into how "Vividness" ratings vary between the two types of advertisements.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | Q8_3_4 | Vividness |
|---------------------|--------|-----------|
|---------------------|--------|-----------|

| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|------|-----|-----|------|
| .133 | 1 | 128 | .716 |

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

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test examines the equality of error variances for the "Vividness" variable (Q8_3_4) among different groups based on the predictors "Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," and "Typeofad." The computed F-value is 0.133, with degrees of freedom (df) of 1 and 128. The associated p-value (Sig.) is 0.716, suggesting that the error variances are not significantly different across the groups. This implies that the assumption of equal variances (homoskedasticity) of errors holds for this analysis, which is important for certain statistical tests.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Q8_3_4 Vividness

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 8.651ª | 3 | 2.884 | 1.057 | .370 | .025 |
| Intercept | 149.421 | 1 | 149.421 | 54.790 | .000 | .303 |
| HungerQ9 | 7.575 | 1 | 7.575 | 2.777 | .098 | .022 |
| MoodQ10 | .211 | 1 | .211 | .077 | .781 | .001 |
| Typeofad | .478 | 1 | .478 | .175 | .676 | .001 |
| Error | 343.626 | 126 | 2.727 | | | |
| Total | 2066.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 352.277 | 129 | | | | |

a. R Squared = .025 (Adjusted R Squared = .001)

The statistical analysis examines the impact of predictors on "Vividness" (Q8_3_4). The overall model is not significant (p = 0.370), indicating that the predictors ("Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," and "Typeofad") collectively have a weak influence on "Vividness." However, the baseline "Intercept" significantly affects "Vividness" (p < 0.001), while "HungerQ9" and "Typeofad" also show some influence (p = 0.098 and p = 0.676, respectively). The effect of "MoodQ10" is not significant (p = 0.781). The model explains approximately 2.5% of the variance in "Vividness," suggesting limited practical significance.

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable:Q8_3_5 VividnessType of adMeanStd. Deviation | N

| ASMR Ad | 3.45 | 1.449 | 67 |
|------------|------|-------|-----|
| Regular Ad | 3.70 | 1.775 | 63 |
| Total | 3.57 | 1.614 | 130 |

The descriptive statistics provide information about the "Vividness" variable (Q8_3_5) based on different types of advertisements. For the "ASMR Ad" group, the average "Vividness" rating is 3.45, with a standard deviation of 1.449, calculated from a sample size of 67. Conversely, the "Regular Ad" group has an average "Vividness" rating of 3.70, with a slightly higher standard deviation of 1.775, based on a sample size of 63. When considering all groups, the combined average "Vividness" rating is 3.57, with a standard deviation of 1.614, computed from a total sample size of 130. These statistics provide insights into how "Vividness" ratings vary across the two types of advertisements.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

Dependent Variable: Q8_3_5 Vividness

| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|-------|-----|-----|------|
| 2.048 | 1 | 128 | .155 |

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

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test examines the equality of error variances for the "Vividness" variable (Q8_3_5) among different groups based on the predictors "Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," and "Typeofad." The computed F-value is 2.048, with degrees of freedom (df) of 1 and 128. The associated p-value (Sig.) is 0.155, suggesting that the error variances are not significantly different across the groups. This indicates that the assumption of equal variances (homoskedasticity) of errors is likely met for this analysis, which is important for certain statistical tests.

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 9.956ª | 3 | 3.319 | 1.283 | .283 | .030 |
| Intercept | 138.286 | 1 | 138.286 | 53.461 | .000 | .298 |
| HungerQ9 | 7.526 | 1 | 7.526 | 2.909 | .091 | .023 |
| MoodQ10 | .018 | 1 | .018 | .007 | .934 | .000 |
| Typeofad | 2.975 | 1 | 2.975 | 1.150 | .286 | .009 |
| Error | 325.920 | 126 | 2.587 | | | |

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Q8_3_5 Vividness

| Total | 1992.000 | 130 | | |
|-----------------|----------|-----|--|--|
| Corrected Total | 335.877 | 129 | | |

a. R Squared = .030 (Adjusted R Squared = .007)

The analysis examines the influence of predictors on "Vividness" (Q8_3_5). The combined effect of predictors ("Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," and "Typeofad") is not significant (p = 0.283), suggesting they have limited impact on "Vividness." However, the baseline "Intercept" significantly affects "Vividness" (p < 0.001), and "HungerQ9" also has a minor impact (p = 0.091). Conversely, "MoodQ10" and "Typeofad" do not significantly influence "Vividness" (p > 0.9 and p > 0.2, respectively). The model explains approximately 3.0% of the variance in "Vividness," indicating modest practical importance.

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Q8_3_6 Vividness

| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
|------------|------|----------------|-----|
| ASMR Ad | 3.19 | 1.520 | 67 |
| Regular Ad | 3.75 | 1.713 | 63 |
| Total | 3.46 | 1.634 | 130 |

The descriptive statistics provide information about the "Vividness" variable (Q8_3_6) based on different types of advertisements. For the "ASMR Ad" group, the average "Vividness" rating is 3.19, with a standard deviation of 1.520, calculated from a sample size of 67. In contrast, the "Regular Ad" group has an average "Vividness" rating of 3.75, with a slightly higher standard deviation of 1.713, based on a sample size of 63. Combining all groups, the overall average "Vividness" rating is 3.46, with a standard deviation of 1.634, calculated from a total sample size of 130. These statistics provide insights into the variability of "Vividness" ratings across the two types of advertisements.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: Q8_3_6 Vividness | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|------|--|--|
| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. | | |
| .828 | 1 | 128 | .364 | | |
| Tests the null hypothesis that the error | | | | | |
| variance of the dependent variable is equal | | | | | |

across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test examines the equality of error variances for the "Vividness" variable (Q8_3_6) among different groups based on the predictors "Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," and "Typeofad." The computed F-value is 0.828, with degrees of freedom (df) of 1 and 128. The

associated p-value (Sig.) is 0.364, indicating that the error variances are not significantly different across the groups. This implies that the assumption of equal variances (homoskedasticity) of errors

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Q8_3_6 Vividness

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 19.990ª | 3 | 6.663 | 2.589 | .056 | .058 |
| Intercept | 144.604 | 1 | 144.604 | 56.180 | .000 | .308 |
| HungerQ9 | 8.752 | 1 | 8.752 | 3.400 | .068 | .026 |
| MoodQ10 | .386 | 1 | .386 | .150 | .699 | .001 |
| Typeofad | 11.810 | 1 | 11.810 | 4.588 | .034 | .035 |
| Error | 324.318 | 126 | 2.574 | | | |
| Total | 1902.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 344.308 | 129 | | | | |

a. R Squared = .058 (Adjusted R Squared = .036)

The analysis investigates the impact of predictors on "Vividness" (Q8_3_6). While the overall effect of the combined predictors ("Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," and "Typeofad") is marginally significant (p = 0.056), suggesting a moderate influence on "Vividness," individual effects vary. The baseline "Intercept" significantly impacts "Vividness" (p < 0.001), and "Typeofad" also has a significant effect (p = 0.034). "HungerQ9" moderately affects "Vividness" (p = 0.068), while "MoodQ10" does not have a substantial impact (p = 0.699). The model explains around 5.8% of the variance in "Vividness," indicating limited overall practical significance.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent variable: Qo_5_7 vividness | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------|----------------|-----|--|--|
| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν | | |
| ASMR Ad | 4.24 | 1.671 | 67 | | |
| Regular Ad | 4.10 | 1.820 | 63 | | |
| Total | 4.17 | 1.739 | 130 | | |

Dependent Variable: Q8_3_7 Vividness

The descriptive statistics offer insights into the "Vividness" variable (Q8_3_7) based on different types of advertisements. For the "ASMR Ad" group, the average "Vividness" rating is 4.24, with a standard deviation of 1.671, computed from a sample size of 67. In contrast, the "Regular Ad" group has an average "Vividness" rating of 4.10, with a slightly higher standard deviation of 1.820, based on a sample size of 63. The combined average "Vividness" rating for all groups is 4.17, with a standard deviation of 1.739, calculated from a total sample size of 130. This provides an overview of how "Vividness" ratings differ between the two types of advertisements.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a Dependent Variable: Q8_3_7 Vividness

| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|------|-----|-----|------|
| .347 | 1 | 128 | .557 |

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

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's Test assesses the equality of error variances for the "Vividness" variable (Q8_3_7) among different groups based on the predictors "Intercept," "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," and "Typeofad." The computed F-value is 0.347, with degrees of freedom (df) of 1 and 128. The associated p-value (Sig.) is 0.557, indicating that the error variances are not significantly different across the groups. This suggests that the assumption of equal variances (homoskedasticity) of errors holds for this analysis, which is important for certain statistical tests.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 7.707ª | 3 | 2.569 | .846 | .471 | .020 |
| Intercept | 112.478 | 1 | 112.478 | 37.045 | .000 | .227 |
| HungerQ9 | 2.681 | 1 | 2.681 | .883 | .349 | .007 |
| MoodQ10 | 5.488 | 1 | 5.488 | 1.807 | .181 | .014 |
| Typeofad | .298 | 1 | .298 | .098 | .755 | .001 |
| Error | 382.570 | 126 | 3.036 | | | |
| Total | 2650.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 390.277 | 129 | | | | |

Dependent Variable: Q8_3_7 Vividness

a. R Squared = .020 (Adjusted R Squared = -.004)

The ANOVA analysis assessed the impact of various independent variables on the dependent variable "Q8_3_7 Vividness." The results indicated that only the baseline condition demonstrated a significant difference from the group means (p < 0.001). However, the independent variables "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," and "Typeofad" did not yield statistically significant effects (p > 0.05) on the perception of vividness. The model's limited explanatory power, indicated by the low Adjusted R-squared value (even negative), suggests that the chosen variables may not adequately explain variations in vividness perception. In summary, while the baseline condition stood out, the studied independent variables showed insignificant influences on "Q8_3_7 Vividness," underscoring the need to explore other potential factors.

Descriptive Statistics Dependent Variable: Q8_4_1 Valence Type of ad Mean Std. Deviation N

| ASMR Ad | 2.67 | 1.501 | 67 |
|------------|------|-------|-----|
| Regular Ad | 2.76 | 1.456 | 63 |
| Total | 2.72 | 1.475 | 130 |

The descriptive statistics provide an overview of the valence perception ("Q8_4_1 Valence") for two types of advertisements: "ASMR Ad" and "Regular Ad." The mean valence score for the "ASMR Ad" type was 2.67 (SD = 1.501) based on 67 observations, while the "Regular Ad" type had a slightly higher mean score of 2.76 (SD = 1.456) from 63 observations. Overall, both ad types had comparable mean valence scores, with the entire dataset of 130 observations yielding an average score of 2.72 (SD = 1.475). These statistics offer initial insights into how viewers perceived the emotional valence of the ads, suggesting that both types evoked similar average emotional responses, though with varying levels of variability in the scores.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | Q8_4_1 Valence | |
|---------------------|----------------|--|
| | | |

| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|------|-----|-----|------|
| .090 | 1 | 128 | .764 |
| | | | |

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

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's test assessed the equality of error variances for the dependent variable "Q8_4_1 Valence." The test yielded an F-statistic of 0.090 with 1 and 128 degrees of freedom for the numerator and denominator, respectively. The associated significance level (p-value) was 0.764. This test evaluates the null hypothesis that the variability of errors in the dependent variable is consistent across groups. The design for this analysis included an intercept and the independent variables HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad. The non-significant result (p > 0.05) suggests that the assumption of equal error variances across groups is likely met, allowing for more robust interpretations of group differences in subsequent analyses.

| Dependent Variable: Q8_4_1 Valence | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------|----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 8.875ª | 3 | 2.958 | 1.372 | .254 | .032 |
| Intercept | 108.765 | 1 | 108.765 | 50.459 | .000 | .286 |
| HungerQ9 | 3.538 | 1 | 3.538 | 1.642 | .202 | .013 |
| MoodQ10 | 3.558 | 1 | 3.558 | 1.651 | .201 | .013 |
| Typeofad | .436 | 1 | .436 | .202 | .654 | .002 |

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

| Error | 271.595 | 126 | 2.156 | | |
|-----------------|----------|-----|-------|--|--|
| Total | 1239.000 | 130 | | | |
| Corrected Total | 280.469 | 129 | | | |

a. R Squared = .032 (Adjusted R Squared = .009)

The table presents results from an ANCOVA examining the impact of independent variables on "Q8_4_1 Valence." While the model was significant (p = 0.254) and explained 3.2% of variance, only the intercept significantly affected valence (p < 0.001). Independent variables "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," and "Typeofad" showed no significant effects. The overall model had limited explanatory power (Adjusted R-squared = 0.009), suggesting potential unexplored factors contributing to valence perception.

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Q8_4_2 Valence

| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|------------|------|----------------|-----|
| ASMR Ad | 2.55 | 1.318 | 67 |
| Regular Ad | 2.65 | 1.322 | 63 |
| Total | 2.60 | 1.315 | 130 |

The descriptive statistics provide insights into the dependent variable "Q8_4_2 Valence" across different types of advertisements. For the "ASMR Ad" type, the mean valence score was 2.55 with a standard deviation of 1.318, based on 67 observations. In contrast, the "Regular Ad" type had a slightly higher mean valence score of 2.65 and a standard deviation of 1.322, derived from 63 observations. Overall, across both ad types, the mean valence score was 2.60, and the standard deviation was 1.315, considering a total of 130 observations. These statistics offer an initial glimpse into how viewers perceived the emotional valence of the ads, suggesting relatively similar mean valence scores for both types, with slight variability in their scores.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | | Q8_4_2 Valence | | | |
|---------------------|-----|----------------|------|--|--|
| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. | | |
| .036 | 1 | 128 | .850 | | |

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

across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's test examined the equality of error variances for the dependent variable "Q8_4_2 Valence." The test yielded an F-statistic of 0.036 with 1 degree of freedom in the numerator and 128 degrees of freedom in the denominator, resulting in a p-value of 0.850. This test evaluates the null hypothesis that the variability of errors in the dependent variable is uniform across groups.

The analysis was based on a design including the intercept, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad as independent variables. With a non-significant p-value (p > 0.05), there's an indication that the assumption of consistent error variance across different levels of independent variables holds, which enhances the reliability of interpreting group differences in subsequent analyses.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Q8_4_2 Valence

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 3.927ª | 3 | 1.309 | .752 | .523 | .018 |
| Intercept | 73.148 | 1 | 73.148 | 42.033 | .000 | .250 |
| HungerQ9 | 3.340 | 1 | 3.340 | 1.919 | .168 | .015 |
| MoodQ10 | .037 | 1 | .037 | .021 | .885 | .000 |
| Typeofad | .576 | 1 | .576 | .331 | .566 | .003 |
| Error | 219.273 | 126 | 1.740 | | | |
| Total | 1102.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 223.200 | 129 | | | | |

a. R Squared = .018 (Adjusted R Squared = -.006)

The table "Tests of Between-Subjects Effects" displays results for the dependent variable "Q8_4_2 Valence." The analysis indicated a non-significant overall model effect (p = 0.523) with an Adjusted R-squared value of -0.006. Notably, the intercept significantly influenced valence (p < 0.001), while "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," and "Typeofad" did not have significant effects. Given the low explanatory power, these independent variables may not fully account for valence variations, suggesting the potential influence of other unexamined factors.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent Variable: Q8_4_3 Valence | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------|----------------|-----|--|--|
| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν | | |
| ASMR Ad | 2.58 | 1.339 | 67 | | |
| Regular Ad | 2.78 | 1.313 | 63 | | |
| Total | 2.68 | 1.325 | 130 | | |

The descriptive statistics provide insights into the dependent variable "Q8_4_3 Valence" across different types of advertisements. For the "ASMR Ad" type, the mean valence score was 2.58 with a standard deviation of 1.339, based on 67 observations. On the other hand, the "Regular Ad" type had a slightly higher mean valence score of 2.78 and a standard deviation of 1.313, derived from 63 observations. Overall, considering both ad types, the mean valence score was 2.68, and the standard deviation was 1.325, with a total of 130 observations. These statistics provide initial insights into how viewers perceived the emotional valence of the ads, indicating moderately similar mean valence scores for both types, but with varying degrees of variability in their scores.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | Q8_4_3 Valence |
|---------------------|----------------|
|---------------------|----------------|

| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|------|-----|-----|------|
| .045 | 1 | 128 | .832 |

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

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's test examined the equality of error variances for the dependent variable "Q8_4_3 Valence." The test yielded an F-statistic of 0.045 with 1 degree of freedom in the numerator and 128 degrees of freedom in the denominator, resulting in a p-value of 0.832. This test assesses whether the variability of errors in the dependent variable is consistent across groups. The analysis was based on a design that included the intercept, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad as independent variables. With a non-significant p-value (p > 0.05), there is an indication that the assumption of uniform error variance across different levels of independent variables is likely met. This strengthens the reliability of interpreting group differences in subsequent analyses.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 14.191ª | 3 | 4.730 | 2.808 | .042 | .063 |
| Intercept | 120.166 | 1 | 120.166 | 71.338 | .000 | .362 |
| HungerQ9 | 5.071 | 1 | 5.071 | 3.010 | .085 | .023 |
| MoodQ10 | 5.602 | 1 | 5.602 | 3.326 | .071 | .026 |
| Typeofad | 1.644 | 1 | 1.644 | .976 | .325 | .008 |
| Error | 212.240 | 126 | 1.684 | | | |
| Total | 1158.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 226.431 | 129 | | | | |

Dependent Variable: Q8_4_3 Valence

a. R Squared = .063 (Adjusted R Squared = .040)

The "Tests of Between-Subjects Effects" table reveals that the model analyzing the effects of independent variables on "Q8_4_3 Valence" was significant (p = 0.042), explaining 6.3% of the variance. The intercept significantly impacted valence (p < 0.001), while "HungerQ9" and "MoodQ10" displayed trends without reaching significance (p = 0.085 and p = 0.071, respectively). "Typeofad" didn't significantly influence valence (p = 0.325). Overall, the model modestly explains valence variance, with potential contributions from unexplored factors indicated by the Adjusted R-squared value of 0.040.

| Dependent Variable: | | | 3_4_4 Valence | |
|---------------------|------|--|----------------|-----|
| Type of ad | Mean | | Std. Deviation | Ν |
| ASMR Ad | 2.55 | | 1.490 | 67 |
| Regular Ad | 2.97 | | 1.425 | 63 |
| Total | 2.75 | | 1.468 | 130 |

Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics provide insights into the dependent variable "Q8_4_4 Valence" across different types of advertisements. For the "ASMR Ad" type, the mean valence score was 2.55 with a standard deviation of 1.490, based on 67 observations. On the other hand, the "Regular Ad" type had a higher mean valence score of 2.97 and a standard deviation of 1.425, derived from 63 observations. Overall, considering both ad types, the mean valence score was 2.75, and the standard deviation was 1.468, with a total of 130 observations. These statistics provide initial insights into how viewers perceived the emotional valence of the ads, indicating a notable difference in mean valence scores between the two types, along with variability in their scores.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | | Q8_4_4 Valence | | | |
|---------------------|-----|----------------|------|--|--|
| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. | | |
| .373 | 1 | 128 | .542 | | |

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

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's test assessed the equality of error variances for the dependent variable "Q8_4_4 Valence." The test yielded an F-statistic of 0.373 with 1 degree of freedom in the numerator and 128 degrees of freedom in the denominator, resulting in a p-value of 0.542. This test evaluates whether the variability of errors in the dependent variable is consistent across groups. The analysis was based on a design including the intercept, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad as independent variables. With a non-significant p-value (p > 0.05), there is an indication that the assumption of uniform error variance across different levels of independent variables is likely met. This strengthens the reliability of interpreting group differences in subsequent analyses.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Q8_4_4 Valence

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 22.210ª | 3 | 7.403 | 3.645 | .015 | .080 |
| Intercept | 127.653 | 1 | 127.653 | 62.851 | .000 | .333 |
| HungerQ9 | 10.372 | 1 | 10.372 | 5.107 | .026 | .039 |
|-----------------|----------|-----|--------|-------|------|------|
| MoodQ10 | 3.567 | 1 | 3.567 | 1.756 | .188 | .014 |
| Typeofad | 7.046 | 1 | 7.046 | 3.469 | .065 | .027 |
| Error | 255.913 | 126 | 2.031 | | | |
| Total | 1264.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 278.123 | 129 | | | | |

a. R Squared = .080 (Adjusted R Squared = .058)

The "Tests of Between-Subjects Effects" table highlights the impact of independent variables on "Q8_4_4 Valence." The model was significant (p = 0.015), explaining 8.0% of variance. The intercept significantly influenced valence (p < 0.001), while "HungerQ9" had a significant effect (p = 0.026), suggesting that hunger levels influenced valence. "MoodQ10" and "Typeofad" showed trends without significance (p = 0.188 and p = 0.065, respectively). The model modestly explains valence variation, but potential contributions from unexamined factors are indicated by the Adjusted R-squared value of 0.058.

Dependent Variable: Q8_4_5 Valence

| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
|------------|------|----------------|-----|
| ASMR Ad | 2.54 | 1.418 | 67 |
| Regular Ad | 2.71 | 1.337 | 63 |
| Total | 2.62 | 1.377 | 130 |

The descriptive statistics provide insights into the dependent variable "Q8_4_5 Valence" across different types of advertisements. For the "ASMR Ad" type, the mean valence score was 2.54 with a standard deviation of 1.418, based on 67 observations. Conversely, the "Regular Ad" type had a slightly higher mean valence score of 2.71 and a standard deviation of 1.337, derived from 63 observations. Overall, considering both ad types, the mean valence score was 2.62, and the standard deviation was 1.377, with a total of 130 observations. These statistics provide initial insights into how viewers perceived the emotional valence of the ads, indicating relatively similar mean valence scores for both types, along with some variability in their scores.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | Q8_4_5 | Valence |
|---------------------|--------|---------|
|---------------------|--------|---------|

| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|------|-----|-----|------|
| .485 | 1 | 128 | .487 |

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

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 + MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Descriptive Statistics

Levene's test examined the equality of error variances for the dependent variable "Q8_4_5 Valence." The test yielded an F-statistic of 0.485 with 1 degree of freedom in the numerator and 128 degrees of freedom in the denominator, resulting in a p-value of 0.487. This test evaluates whether the variability of errors in the dependent variable is consistent across groups. The analysis was based on a design including the intercept, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad as independent variables. With a non-significant p-value (p > 0.05), there is an indication that the assumption of uniform error variance across different levels of independent variables is likely met, enhancing the reliability of interpreting group differences in subsequent analyses.

| Dependent Variable: Q8_4_5 Valence | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|--|
| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta | |
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared | |
| Corrected Model | 13.304ª | 3 | 4.435 | 2.416 | .070 | .054 | |
| Intercept | 104.705 | 1 | 104.705 | 57.056 | .000 | .312 | |
| HungerQ9 | 8.978 | 1 | 8.978 | 4.892 | .029 | .037 | |
| MoodQ10 | 1.597 | 1 | 1.597 | .870 | .353 | .007 | |
| Typeofad | 1.686 | 1 | 1.686 | .919 | .340 | .007 | |
| Error | 231.227 | 126 | 1.835 | | | | |
| Total | 1139.000 | 130 | | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 244.531 | 129 | | | | | |

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

a. R Squared = .054 (Adjusted R Squared = .032)

The "Tests of Between-Subjects Effects" table for "Q8_4_5 Valence" indicates a marginally significant model effect (p = 0.070), explaining 5.4% of variance. The intercept significantly influenced valence (p < 0.001), while "HungerQ9" had a significant effect (p = 0.029), suggesting hunger levels impact valence. However, "MoodQ10" and "Typeofad" did not significantly influence valence (p = 0.353 and p = 0.340, respectively). The model offers a modest explanation for valence variation, with potential contributions from unexplored factors implied by the Adjusted R-squared value of 0.032.

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependent Variable: Q8_4_6 Valence | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------|----------------|-----|--|--|--|
| Type of ad | Mean | Std. Deviation | N | | | |
| ASMR Ad | 2.69 | 1.479 | 67 | | | |
| Regular Ad | 2.60 | 1.302 | 63 | | | |
| Total | 2.65 | 1.391 | 130 | | | |

The descriptive statistics provide insights into the dependent variable "Q8_4_6 Valence" across different types of advertisements. For the "ASMR Ad" type, the mean valence score was 2.69 with

a standard deviation of 1.479, based on 67 observations. Conversely, the "Regular Ad" type had a slightly lower mean valence score of 2.60 and a standard deviation of 1.302, derived from 63 observations. Overall, considering both ad types, the mean valence score was 2.65, and the standard deviation was 1.391, with a total of 130 observations. These statistics provide initial insights into how viewers perceived the emotional valence of the ads, indicating relatively similar mean valence scores for both types, with moderate variability in their scores.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

| Dependent Variable: | Q8_4_6 Valence |
|---------------------|----------------|
|---------------------|----------------|

| F | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|------|-----|-----|------|
| .005 | 1 | 128 | .946 |

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

a. Design: Intercept + HungerQ9 +

MoodQ10 + Typeofad

Levene's test examined the equality of error variances for the dependent variable "Q8_4_6 Valence." The test yielded an F-statistic of 0.005 with 1 degree of freedom in the numerator and 128 degrees of freedom in the denominator, resulting in a p-value of 0.946. This test assesses whether the variability of errors in the dependent variable is consistent across groups. The analysis was based on a design including the intercept, HungerQ9, MoodQ10, and Typeofad as independent variables. With a non-significant p-value (p > 0.05), there is an indication that the assumption of uniform error variance across different levels of independent variables is likely met, strengthening the reliability of interpreting group differences in subsequent analyses.

| | Type III Sum | | | | | Partial Eta |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|-------------|
| Source | of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Squared |
| Corrected Model | 4.980ª | 3 | 1.660 | .855 | .467 | .020 |
| Intercept | 63.838 | 1 | 63.838 | 32.865 | .000 | .207 |
| HungerQ9 | 4.596 | 1 | 4.596 | 2.366 | .127 | .018 |
| MoodQ10 | .590 | 1 | .590 | .304 | .582 | .002 |
| Typeofad | .041 | 1 | .041 | .021 | .885 | .000 |
| Error | 244.744 | 126 | 1.942 | | | |
| Total | 1160.000 | 130 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 249.723 | 129 | | | | |

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

| Dependent Variable: | Q8_4_ | _6 Valence |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
|---------------------|-------|------------|

a. R Squared = .020 (Adjusted R Squared = -.003)

The "Tests of Between-Subjects Effects" table for "Q8_4_6 Valence" reveals a non-significant model (p = 0.467), explaining 2.0% of variance. The intercept significantly impacted valence (p < 0.001), but "HungerQ9," "MoodQ10," and "Typeofad" displayed non-significant effects (p = 0.127, p = 0.582, p = 0.885, respectively). The model offers limited explanation for valence variance, indicating the possibility of unexplored factors, as indicated by the Adjusted R-squared value of -0.003.

H9: ASMR ads (vs regular ads) will have a higher effect on low-end brands than high-end brands.

Attitude towards the brand:

Descriptive Statistics

| De | pendent | Variable: | 01 - | Attitude | towards | the | brand |
|----|---------|-----------|------|------------|---------|------|-------|
| DC | pendene | variablei | Q.+ | / iccicaac | comunus | circ | brunu |

| Ad Type | Brand positioning | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
|---------|-------------------|------|----------------|-----|
| ASMR | KFC Low End | 5.05 | 1.328 | 33 |
| | Lindt High End | 5.71 | 1.284 | 34 |
| | Total | 5.38 | 1.337 | 67 |
| Regular | KFC Low End | 4.53 | 1.462 | 35 |
| | Lindt High End | 5.58 | 1.282 | 28 |
| | Total | 5.00 | 1.471 | 63 |
| Total | KFC Low End | 4.78 | 1.413 | 68 |
| | Lindt High End | 5.65 | 1.274 | 62 |
| | Total | 5.20 | 1.412 | 130 |

Attitude towards the ad:

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Q2 – Attitude towards the ad

| Ad Type Brand positioning | | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
|---------------------------|----------------|------|----------------|-----|
| ASMR | KFC Low End | 5.29 | 1.190 | 33 |
| | Lindt High End | 5.06 | 1.674 | 34 |
| | Total | 5.17 | 1.450 | 67 |
| Regular | KFC Low End | 5.01 | 1.172 | 35 |
| | Lindt High End | 5.76 | 1.027 | 28 |
| | Total | 5.35 | 1.163 | 63 |
| Total | KFC Low End | 5.15 | 1.180 | 68 |
| | Lindt High End | 5.38 | 1.451 | 62 |
| | Total | 5.26 | 1.316 | 130 |

Emotional Attachment:

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Q3 – Emotional attachment

| Ad Type | Brand positioning | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
|---------|-------------------|------|----------------|-----|
| ASMR | KFC Low End | 3.39 | 1.463 | 33 |
| | Lindt High End | 4.03 | 1.402 | 34 |
| | Total | 3.71 | 1.458 | 67 |
| Regular | KFC Low End | 2.79 | 1.438 | 35 |
| | Lindt High End | 3.74 | 1.639 | 28 |
| | Total | 3.21 | 1.590 | 63 |
| Total | KFC Low End | 3.08 | 1.471 | 68 |
| | Lindt High End | 3.90 | 1.508 | 62 |
| | Total | 3.47 | 1.538 | 130 |

Brand experience:

Descriptive Statistics

| Dependen | t Variable: | Q4 – Bran | d experience | 2 |
|----------|-------------|-----------|--------------|---|
| Ad Type | Brand nos | itioning | Moan | c |

| Ad Type Brand positioning | | Mean Std. Dev | | viation N | |
|---------------------------|----------------|---------------|-------|-----------|--|
| ASMR | KFC Low End | 3.88 | 1.105 | 33 | |
| | Lindt High End | 3.99 | 1.487 | 34 | |
| | Total | 3.94 | 1.304 | 67 | |
| Regular | KFC Low End | 3.32 | 1.173 | 35 | |
| | Lindt High End | 4.17 | 1.537 | 28 | |
| | Total | 3.70 | 1.402 | 63 | |
| Total | KFC Low End | 3.59 | 1.168 | 68 | |
| | Lindt High End | 4.07 | 1.500 | 62 | |
| | Total | 3.82 | 1.352 | 130 | |

Perceived quality:

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Q5 - Perceived quality

| Ad Type | Brand positioning | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
|---------|-------------------|------|----------------|----|
| ASMR | KFC Low End | 3.67 | 1.814 | 33 |
| | Lindt High End | 5.53 | 1.581 | 34 |

| | Total | 4.61 | 1.930 | 67 |
|---------|----------------|------|-------|-----|
| Regular | KFC Low End | 3.66 | 1.846 | 35 |
| | Lindt High End | 5.68 | 1.492 | 28 |
| | Total | 4.56 | 1.966 | 63 |
| Total | KFC Low End | 3.66 | 1.817 | 68 |
| | Lindt High End | 5.60 | 1.531 | 62 |
| | Total | 4.58 | 1.940 | 130 |

Narrative transportation:

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Q6 – Narrative transportation

| Ad Type Brand positioning | | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
|---------------------------|----------------|------|----------------|-----|
| ASMR | KFC Low End | 4.58 | 1.342 | 33 |
| | Lindt High End | 4.21 | 1.785 | 34 |
| | Total | 4.39 | 1.581 | 67 |
| Regular | KFC Low End | 4.14 | 1.324 | 35 |
| | Lindt High End | 4.55 | 1.529 | 28 |
| | Total | 4.32 | 1.422 | 63 |
| Total | KFC Low End | 4.35 | 1.341 | 68 |
| | Lindt High End | 4.36 | 1.670 | 62 |
| | Total | 4.36 | 1.501 | 130 |

Purchase intention:

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Q7 – Purchase intention

| Ad Type | Brand positioning | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν |
|---------|-------------------|------|----------------|-----|
| ASMR | KFC Low End | 4.85 | 1.584 | 33 |
| | Lindt High End | 4.82 | 1.507 | 34 |
| | Total | 4.84 | 1.533 | 67 |
| Regular | KFC Low End | 3.80 | 1.795 | 35 |
| | Lindt High End | 4.86 | 1.649 | 28 |
| | Total | 4.27 | 1.798 | 63 |
| Total | KFC Low End | 4.31 | 1.764 | 68 |
| | Lindt High End | 4.84 | 1.560 | 62 |
| | Total | 4.56 | 1.684 | 130 |

Sensory imagery:

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Q8 – Sensory imagery

| Ad Type Brand positioning | Mean | Std. Deviation N | |
|---------------------------|------|------------------|--|
|---------------------------|------|------------------|--|

| ASMR | KFC Low End | 3.70 | .506 | 33 |
|---------|----------------|------|------|-----|
| | Lindt High End | 3.53 | .509 | 34 |
| | Total | 3.62 | .511 | 67 |
| Regular | KFC Low End | 3.84 | .577 | 35 |
| | Lindt High End | 3.49 | .437 | 28 |
| | Total | 3.69 | .544 | 63 |
| Total | KFC Low End | 3.77 | .545 | 68 |
| | Lindt High End | 3.52 | .474 | 62 |
| | Total | 3.65 | .526 | 130 |

Cronbach's Alpha

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's | |
|------------|------------|
| Alpha | N of Items |
| .873 | 49 |

The reliability analysis yielded a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.873 for a scale consisting of 49 items. This value indicates a strong level of internal consistency among the items within the scale, suggesting that these items reliably measure the same underlying construct. This high Cronbach's Alpha value signifies that the scale is likely to be a reliable measure for assessing the intended concept.

Attitude towards the brand - Q1 Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's | |
|------------|------------|
| Alpha | N of Items |
| .943 | 3 |

The reliability statistics indicate strong internal consistency among the three items, with a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.943, suggesting that they effectively measure a common trait or construct. This high value underscores the reliability of the scale.

| Attitude towards the ad - Q2 Reliability Statistics | | | |
|---|------------|--|--|
| Cronbach's | | | |
| Alpha | N of Items | | |
| .928 | 6 | | |

Reliability statistics show that the scale comprising six items exhibits good internal consistency, as indicated by a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.928. This suggests that the items are reliably measuring a consistent underlying trait or concept.

| Emotional attachment - Q3 Reliability Statistics | | | |
|--|------------|--|--|
| Cronbach's | | | |
| Alpha | N of Items | | |
| .918 | 5 | | |

The reliability statistics indicate favorable internal consistency among the five items in the scale, as denoted by a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.918. This suggests that the items are reliably measuring a shared underlying trait or concept within the scale.

| Brand experience - Q4 Reliability Statistics | | | |
|--|------------|--|--|
| Cronbach's | | | |
| Alpha | N of Items | | |
| .922 | 10 | | |

The reliability statistics reveal a commendable level of internal consistency within the scale of ten items, with a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.922. This implies that the items effectively measure a coherent underlying attribute or concept, enhancing the scale's dependability.

Perceived quality – Cronbach alpha for Q5 cannot be calculated as it is a single-item measure.

| Narrative transportation - Q6 Reliability Statistics | | | |
|--|------------|--|--|
| Cronbach's | | | |
| Alpha | N of Items | | |
| .712 | 3 | | |

The reliability statistics indicate moderate internal consistency among the three items in the scale, with a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.712. While this suggests some reliability, there might be room for improvement to ensure a more robust measurement of the underlying trait or concept.

Purchase intention - Cronbach alpha for Q7 cannot be calculated as it is a single-item measure.

Sensory imagery - Q8 Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's | |
|------------|------------|
| Alpha | N of Items |
| .525 | 19 |

The reliability statistics show a low level of internal consistency among the nineteen items in the scale, with a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.525. This indicates that the items might not be effectively measuring a consistent underlying trait or concept, and further assessment or refinement of the scale may be needed.

| | | Scale Variance | Corrected | Cronbach's |
|--------------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|
| | Scale Mean if | if Item | Item-Total | Alpha if Item |
| | Item Deleted | Deleted | Correlation | Deleted |
| Type of ad | 189.28 | 870.413 | 197 | .874 |
| Q1_1 | 185.99 | 813.686 | .560 | .867 |
| Q1_2 | 186.10 | 811.019 | .591 | .866 |
| Q1_3 | 185.94 | 815.041 | .577 | .867 |
| Q2_1 | 185.74 | 824.347 | .486 | .868 |
| Q2_2 | 185.53 | 830.790 | .469 | .869 |
| Q2_3 | 185.49 | 825.537 | .491 | .868 |
| Q2_4 | 185.43 | 823.383 | .508 | .868 |
| Q2_5 | 185.96 | 831.028 | .337 | .870 |
| Q2_6 | 185.75 | 817.743 | .494 | .868 |
| Q3_1 | 187.74 | 791.780 | .662 | .864 |
| Q3_2 | 187.37 | 807.997 | .553 | .866 |
| Q3_3 | 187.97 | 803.551 | .619 | .865 |
| Q3_4 | 187.71 | 803.464 | .665 | .865 |
| Q3_5 | 187.79 | 804.076 | .583 | .866 |
| Q4_1 _1 Sensory | 185.96 | 819.505 | .493 | .868 |
| Q4_1_2 Sensory | 186.00 | 806.537 | .610 | .866 |
| Q4_2 _1 Affective | 186.43 | 816.338 | .558 | .867 |
| Q4_2 _2 Affective | 187.50 | 807.149 | .605 | .866 |
| Q4_2 _3 Affective | 187.57 | 806.099 | .585 | .866 |
| Q4_3 _1 Cognitive | 187.47 | 811.298 | .530 | .867 |
| Q4_3 _2 Cognitive | 187.63 | 815.609 | .433 | .868 |
| Q4_4 _1 Relational | 187.78 | 805.160 | .586 | .866 |
| Q4_4 _2 Relational | 187.62 | 811.643 | .544 | .867 |
| Q4_4 _3 Relational | 188.06 | 801.638 | .638 | .865 |
| Q5 - Perceived | 187.13 | 809.042 | .508 | .867 |
| quality | | | | |

Item-Total Statistics

| Q6_1 | 186.82 | 813.789 | .427 | .869 |
|------------------|--------|---------|------|------|
| Q6_2 | 185.94 | 831.877 | .313 | .871 |
| Q6_3 | 186.56 | 814.728 | .448 | .868 |
| Q8_1_1 Quantity | 187.07 | 814.756 | .523 | .867 |
| Q8_1_2 Quantity | 186.25 | 863.534 | 016 | .876 |
| Q8_2_1 Modality | 186.13 | 817.400 | .429 | .869 |
| Q8_2_2 Modality | 185.99 | 815.985 | .454 | .868 |
| Q8_2_3 Modality | 186.21 | 811.061 | .458 | .868 |
| Q8_2_4 Modality | 186.32 | 818.222 | .421 | .869 |
| Q8_3_1 Vividness | 187.12 | 883.837 | 210 | .880 |
| Q8_3_2 Vividness | 186.99 | 880.015 | 174 | .879 |
| Q8_3_3 Vividness | 186.82 | 853.789 | .093 | .874 |
| Q8_3_4 Vividness | 186.71 | 878.151 | 172 | .878 |
| Q8_3_5 Vividness | 186.96 | 877.804 | 164 | .878 |
| Q8_3_6 Vividness | 187.29 | 875.703 | 143 | .878 |
| Q8_3_7 Vividness | 186.31 | 841.918 | .207 | .872 |
| Q8_4_1 Valence | 187.82 | 877.759 | 178 | .878 |
| Q8_4_2 Valence | 187.93 | 877.233 | 183 | .877 |
| Q8_4_3 Valence | 187.79 | 879.360 | 210 | .878 |
| Q8_4_4 Valence | 187.74 | 878.257 | 185 | .878 |
| Q8_4_5 Valence | 187.93 | 884.726 | 273 | .879 |
| Q8_4_6 Valence | 188.03 | 880.775 | 236 | .878 |
| Q7 | 186.49 | 817.567 | .438 | .868 |

The "Item-Total Statistics" table offers valuable insights into the individual items' relationships with the overall scale. Each row presents information on how the scale's characteristics would change if a specific item were removed. The "Scale Mean if Item Deleted" indicates the average score of the entire scale without the respective item, allowing us to understand the potential impact of that item on the overall scale's score. The "Scale Variance if Item Deleted" column illustrates how removing an item influences the variability of scores across the scale. The "Corrected Item-Total Correlation" reveals the strength and direction of the correlation between each item and the total scale score, considering the item's removal. Higher values signify that the item is well-aligned with the overall scale. Lastly, the "Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted" showcases the reliability of the scale if a particular item is excluded. This statistic helps gauge the item's contribution to the scale's internal consistency. By assessing these values, researchers can pinpoint items that contribute strongly to the scale's reliability and content validity and identify potential areas for improvement.

Appendix B- Online Survey



Hey there!

Thanks in advance for your participation in this survey.

My name is Dana Eid and I am currently doing my master's degree in International Marketing Strategy at Hasselt University - Belgium.

The objective of my research is to examine consumer reactions towards advertising. The survey will take approximately 5 minutes to complete, and you can be assured that all your information will be kept private.

**Note: during the survey, you will need to watch an advertisement (preferably via headphones).

By submitting this form, you confirm that you have read the purpose of the study and you're willing to participate.

Thanks again, enjoy!

O l agree to the collection, processing and use of this data for the research purpose described.

▶ UHASSELT

Please watch and listen carefully to the following ad (with headphones). After watching the ad, an arrow will appear to go to the next page.



Timing

These page timer metrics will not be displayed to the recipient.

 First Click
 4.722 seconds

 Last Click
 4.722 seconds

 Page Submit
 0 seconds

 Click Count
 1 clicks



Have you seen the ad before?

O Yes

O No

Below you will find six pairs of adjectives. Indicate how well one or the other adjective in each pair describes your

overall attitude toward the ad?



Below you will find three pairs of adjectives. Indicate how well one or the other adjective in each pair describes your overall **attitude towards the brand** promoted in the ad?



If you were going to buy fast food, how likely would you want to try KFC?

| Certain or practically certain |
|---------------------------------|
| 🔿 Very probable |
| O Probable |
| O Fairly good possibility |
| Some possibility |
| Slight possibility |
| ○ No chance or almost no chance |

While I watched the ad ...

| | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------|
| A lot of images came to my mind | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc |
| I experienced very few images | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | 0 |

While I watched the ad ...

| | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |
|--------------------------|----------------------|------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------|
| I imagined sounds | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc |
| I imagined tastes | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc |
| I imagined scents | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc |
| l imagined visual scenes | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc |



The images that came to mind while I watched the ad were...

The images that came to mind while I watched the ad were...

| Pleasant | 0000000 | Unpleasant |
|-----------|----------|---------------|
| Good | 0000000 | Bad |
| Nice | 00000000 | Awful |
| Likable | 0000000 | Not likable |
| Positive | 0000000 | Negative |
| Enjoyable | 0000000 | Not enjoyable |

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

| | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |
|---|----------------------|------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------|
| 1. I have a unique relationship with this brand. | 0 | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc |
| 2. I identify with what this brand stands for. | 0 | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc |
| 3. I feel a sense of belonging in regard to this brand. | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc |
| 4. I am proud to be a consumer of this brand. | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc |
| 5. This brand fits my personality. | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc |

I consider the product in the ad to be of high quality.

| Strongly disagree |
|------------------------------|
| O Somewhat disagree |
| O Disagree |
| O Neither agree nor disagree |
| Agree |
| 🔾 Somewhat agree |
| Strongly agree |
| |





To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

| | Strongly disagree | Somewhat disagree | Disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Agree | Somewhat agree | Strongly agree |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|------------|-------------------------------------|------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1. I could picture myself in the scene shown in the advertisement | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | 0 | 0 | \bigcirc |
| 2. I could easily picture the events in it taking place, | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | 0 | \bigcirc | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3. I was mentally involved in the advertisement. | 0 | \bigcirc | 0 | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | 0 | 0 |

 \rightarrow



To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

| | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |
|---|----------------------|------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------|
| This ad makes a strong impression on my senses. | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | 0 | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | 0 |
| This ad appeals strongly to my senses. | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | 0 | \bigcirc |

| | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |
|---|----------------------|------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------|
| This ad induces my feelings | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc |
| I have strong emotions for this ad | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc |
| This ad often strongly engages me emotionally | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc |

| | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |
|--|----------------------|------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------|
| I engage in a lot of thinking as a part of this ad | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | 0 |
| This ad often challenges my way of thinking | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc |

| | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |
|--|----------------------|------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------|
| As customer I feel like I am part of a community | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | 0 | \bigcirc | 0 |
| As a customer I never feel being left alone | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | 0 | \bigcirc | 0 | \bigcirc | 0 |
| As a customer I feel like I am part of this brand family | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | 0 |

| •• | UHASSELT |
|--------|-------------------------|
| Curre | ntly I am hungry |
| ⊖ Stre | ongly disagree |
| 🔿 Dis | agree |
| ⊖ Sor | newhat disagree |
| ⊖ Nei | ther agree nor disagree |
| ⊖ Sor | newhat agree |
| () Ag | ree |
| ⊖ Stre | ongly agree |

Currently I am in a good mood

| ○ Strongly disagree | |
|------------------------------|--|
| O Disagree | |
| 🔿 Somewhat disagree | |
| O Neither agree nor disagree | |
| ○ Somewhat agree | |
| O Agree | |
| ○ Strongly agree | |
| | |

Are you allergic to certain ingredients of the product that is advertised?

○ Yes

🔿 No

Are you on a diet now?

⊖ Yes

🔿 No

Are you a vegetarian or a vegan?

O Yes
O No

| •• | UHASSELT |
|--------|--------------------------|
| Do yo | u like fast food? |
| ⊖ Stro | ongly disagree |
| | agree |
| ⊖ Sor | mewhat disagree |
| ⊖ Nei | ither agree nor disagree |
| () Sor | mewhat agree |
| ⊖ Agr | ree |
| ⊖ Stro | ongly agree |

→

►► UHASSELT

Could you please add your email address (if you want to be considered for a thank-you voucher :))

 \rightarrow



What is your gender?

🔿 Female

🔿 Male

○ Non-binary

() Other

How old are you? (please enter only numbers)

What is your current profession?

| ○ Student | | |
|------------|--|--|
| O Employed | | |
| | | |
| O Other: | | |
| | | |

ASMR stands for Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response. This term describes the pleasurable, relaxing and tingling sensation that certain people experience on the scalp or on the rest of the body. In order to experience this relaxing sensation, a visual, auditory or cognitive trigger must be present (Richard, 2019, p. 16). Examples of such triggers include: whispering sounds, eating or drinking sounds, sounds of opening jars or playing with beads, watching someone open a package, painting or undergoing a haircut, etc. Several brands are currently experimenting with using ASMR in commercials.

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements.

| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither disagree now agree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |
|--|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------|
| Based on your own experience and the description you've just read, would you consider yourself capable of experiencing ASMR? | 0 | 0 | 0 | \bigcirc | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ASMR in an advetising context is new to me | 0 | 0 | 0 | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc |

I think I have never seen an ASMR ad before this research.

| ⊖ Yes | | | |
|-------|--|--|--|
| 🔿 No | | | |



We thank you for your time spent taking this survey. Your response has been recorded.