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Purpose: This research aims to outline if Guerrilla marketing is more efficient than other types of marketing when shared by third party in the online atmosphere in order to reach the Millennials. It will also examine the reasons behind the results in order to give an answer to why or why not that is the case.

Frame of reference: Theory of the general subject online communication will be discussed alongside theories connected to characteristics of the Millennials. Furthermore, theories connected to the main subject Guerrilla marketing and its chosen components Ambient marketing, Ambush marketing and Viral marketing are also discussed.

Delimitations: Guerrilla marketing is considered to contain three important components; a surprise effect, a diffusion effect and low cost effect. The low cost effect will not be considered as it is more of an economical aspect and does not belong in this marketing oriented study.

Method: A quantitative deductive approach has been applied in form of an online survey resulting in general findings, these served as a base for later performed semi-structured qualitative interviews. By using two different data gathering methods in-depth knowledge behind the answers in the quantitative survey was achieved and also contributed to a methodological triangulation.

Empirical framework: The empirical data was collected by using both a quantitative online survey and four qualitative e-mail interviews.

Conclusion: Previous studies already have shown high internet involvement by the Millennials, this study confirms that since the results show that the average person spend over 20% of their time awake being online. Theories also say that the attention of the Millennials is hard to get and when this study gave the results of the Millennials not showing any general interest towards online marketing they were confirmed. However, according to the quantitative survey made together with the qualitative interviews in addition to previous scientific studies, this study can prove that Guerrilla marketing is an effective way to get attention online. The elements behind the success are contents that are humoristic, unusual or have a special connection to their own or their friends’ interests.
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1. Introduction Chapter

This chapter contains and discusses the problem background in order to declare the field of inquest. It also contains the purpose of the study, definitions that will clarify the important expressions that will be used throughout the study and delimitations that narrow down the area examined.

1.1 Introduction

When taking the courses of Marketing, one term got stuck in our memories; Guerrilla marketing. It was presented as an effective and experimental way of marketing, but our professors did not go further into the subject and moved on quickly. Since the presentation did not give a clear view of the concept it was decided to study this interesting subject further and to find out how it could be used in the modern society.

Many different definitions on how to tell generations apart has been found and the closest one to the desired target group is called the Millennials. They are also known as early Generation Y and late Z, these individuals are commonly hard to characterize as they are a very diverse and divided generation with many different lifestyles and values. They still seemed to have a lot in common since the rise of internet and online technology have strongly influenced their childhoods and set a new standard in their way of living.

There have not been conducted a lot of researches about how Guerrilla marketing nor its different elements are adapted to internet. Even fewer that say how well Guerrilla marketing works online or how effective it is towards different generations.

1.2 Background

The marketsphere today is filled with a lot of noise, especially in the internet-medium. Marketers today are facing the problem to find their way, to be seen and noticed by the right cohort and consumer, especially in the vast internet space (Schroeder, 2002). The many choices of websites and ways to be seen on them are overwhelming, so the challenge lies in choosing the places with the highest perception-rate without having to pay large amounts of money for small or hard to notice spaces and staying out of untrafficked websites (Margolis & Garrigan, 2008).

The latest generations, Y and Z, has well-trained minds which are processing and sorting out information faster. They are aware of the constant exposure of online marketing and tend to react only when they are entertained or emotionally engaged, this also includes the importance and preference of environmentally sustainable products and campaigns (Hoyer & Macinnis, 2008). To be noticed and be the one who stands out from the crowd is the key to attract Generation Y and Z (Laduque, 2009), getting the attention required will generate a positive spread online linked to the company brand which in turn will grow in the consumers mind (ibid.).

Emotional content and participation are attention getters and to close the deal the traditional special offers and branded goods are the most efficient ways to reach Generation Y and Z (Schroeder, 2002). This is a fact since they tend to be price sensitive but still very concerned about their visible image, in other words showing their personality through the brand values of their products (ibid.). Since Generation Y and Z tend to be trend followers, but still flexible when it comes to taste (Hoyer & Macinnis, 2008), the method to reach these upcoming opinion leaders and household decision makers is varying broadly. Both Laduque (2009) and
Raymond (2012) mention the same characteristics of marketing methods appealing to Generation Y and Z. According to Margolis and Garrigan (2008) these are the very same as the core values of Guerrilla marketing.

Hutter and Hoffmann (2011) mention that academic researches already made have referred to Guerrilla marketing when they only have examined the different instruments under the Guerrilla marketing-umbrella. The tool Viral marketing has been defined as Guerrilla marketing by Van der Lans, Van Bruggen, Eliashberg and Wierenga (2010) while Ambush marketing has been referred to as Guerrilla marketing by McKelvey and Grady (2004). Hutter and Hoffmann (2011) are putting them together alongside other instruments and describe Guerrilla marketing as of three important components; a surprise effect, a diffusion effect and low cost effect.

Guerrilla marketing is unconventional marketing methods (Levinson, 2007) which stand out from the crowd and thereby the receivers will get the surprise effect, the diffusion effect (Hutter & Hoffman, 2011) means that the receivers will be amazed by the marketing method and spread it to friends (also known as the buzz- and viral effect). The amount of capital spent on these kinds of methods is surprisingly low in comparison to the result and that is explained by the amount of time and creativity spent instead of cash (Levinson, 2007). This makes Guerrilla marketing attractive since less capital is spent on marketing meanwhile it will generate a great effect which in time will turn into profits (ibid.).

1.3 Problem discussion

A way to learn how the Millennials think and act is to study the way they are exposing themselves online. Internet was once an anonymous channel where you acted anonymously but nowadays it has turned into a social atmosphere where you communicate personal values and interests, often linked to social networks and/or forums (Margolis & Garrigan, 2008). This makes internet not only a tool for marketing but a source of information to act as a base for future decision making in marketing activities (ibid.).

Late Generation Y is entering adulthood and early Generation Z is entering adolescent, being constantly exposed to marketing messages. Together they form the Millennials, a group who is getting used to the marketing climate and to get their attention is the increasing challenge future marketers have to face (Laduque, 2009). Research has shown that companies reach success in attracting the Millennials by delivering marketing campaigns that are exclusive and entertaining, by offering something interacting and experience enhancing (Hoyer & Macinnis, 2008). This will in turn be something that they would spread and that increases the credibility of the message (Raymond, 2012).

These are characteristics of Guerrilla marketing and especially three tools described by Levinson (2007); Ambient marketing, Ambush marketing and Viral marketing. However, while ambient marketing just generates responses for a certain situation, Ambush marketing is using noticeable places that are taking advantage of other companies’ ads and/or situations to gain more attention. Viral marketing is all about the spread and how many it reaches through online sharing (Van der Lans et al., 2010).

Humoristic and emotionally engaging content is concerned as positive activities and leads to a viral spread, but different types of spread can ruin or praise a company brand which is of importance to the Millennials (Noble, Haytko & Phillips, 2009). The origin of the posts spread is where companies can influence the content and it can be in terms of images, videos, interactive websites etcetera (Raymond, 2012). Since the Millennials are aware of the
constant marketing exposure the message has to be coded in a way that does not allow the main purpose to shine through. There are also other options, for example; to let the purpose shine through ridiculously much in a humoristic way, effecting the emotions or concentrations on brand values and characteristics (Margolis & Garrigan, 2008).

1.4 Problem and Purpose
The problem is to reach the Millennials in their most active field; the online atmosphere. Research by Hoyer and Macinnis (2008) has shown that the Millennials respond to unconventional ideas, things that are out of the ordinary and when they are emotionally engaged. Raymond (2012) says that the Millennials spend a lot of time online and share nearly every experience in social networks online.

The purpose of this study is therefore to examine the Millennials and outline if the Guerrilla marketing concept has better effect on them than traditional marketing when shared and received in the online atmosphere. The reasons behind why it is like this or not will also be examined in order to find out what is desired within the segment, if marketing material is to be shared. An additional purpose is to test whether Ambient-, Ambush- and Viral marketing works well together in order to reach the Millennials.

The purpose is to examine the Millennials since their attention is hard to catch but they still are of great importance to marketers by being the next generation of purchasers and household decision makers (Hoyer & Macinnis, 2008).

1.5 Research question
When it comes to Online marketing, is it appealing to the Millennials* when encountering the Guerrilla marketing concept*? Why or why not?

* See definitions.

1.6 Definitions

1.6.1 The Millennials

The lines to be drawn between generations has been always been discussed and different researchers and academics think differently. The closest definition of the desirable cohort is the Millennials, sometimes described as late Generation Y and early Generation Z. Howe and Strauss (2003) defines the Millennials as those born in 1982 and approximately the 20 years thereafter. In this study the Millennials refers to those born between 1985 and 1995 who lives in Sweden.

This is the middle of the cohort defined by Howe and Strauss (2003) which also is the decade in which internet usage has become a part of the everyday living (Budden, Anthony, Budden & Jones, 2007).

1.6.2 Traditional marketing

To be able to separate Guerrilla marketing from other methods of marketing in this study, all other marketing methods are therefore referred to as traditional marketing, even though they may contain other aspects that differentiate themselves from what is considered as traditional.
1.6.3 The Guerrilla marketing concept

When speaking of the Guerrilla marketing concept in this study, it refers to the different elements of effect: the surprise effect, the diffusion effect and the low cost effect. But as the delimitations state below, only the first two effects are taken in consideration. Therefore the Guerrilla marketing concept is a reference only to the surprise effect and the diffusion effect, this will be consistent throughout the entire study.

1.7 Delimitations

As mentioned earlier, Hutter and Hoffmann (2011) describe Guerrilla marketing as of three important components; a surprise effect, a diffusion effect and low cost effect. This study will concentrate on the surprise effect in terms of Ambient- and Ambush marketing and also put focus on the diffusion effect in terms of Viral marketing. The low cost effect is an economical aspect and will not be examined in this marketing oriented study. The low cost effect is interesting to the companies providing the marketing and therefore is not a priority in this consumer behavioural study. By focusing on Ambient-, Ambush- and Viral marketing together with the general characteristics of Guerrilla marketing the other elements under Guerrilla marketing are excluded. The other elements according to Levinson (2007) and Mayners (2013) are; Wild posting, Experiential-, Undercover-, Alternative-, Presence- and Presume marketing.

The original definitions of the Millennials have been cut down to the ones born between the years 1985 and 1995 since different theories have different definitions of their year span. This study’s findings can therefore not be applied to all definitions of the Millennials. The focus of their behaviour has been towards their actions online and not their complete consumer behaviour, but since the research field is the online atmosphere, real life behaviour and actions are of minor importance.
2. Frame of reference

This chapter presents the theoretical framework that serve as base for this study. It includes theories about general online communication and characteristics of the Millennials. Theories regarding the subject Guerrilla marketing is listed together with the examined parts Ambient-Ambush- and Viral marketing.

2.1 Online Communication

The estimated number of internet users in 2013 is 38.8 percent of the world population (International Telecommunication Union, 2014). Internet gives marketers the possibility to work with new communication channels that gives them the ability to reach new consumers and to become more competitive, but so can their competitors and this makes internet and online activity both an opportunity and a threat for marketers (Chaffey, Ellis-Chadwick & Mayer, 2009). On the positive side, consumers have a greater demand of a wider product range as the electronic globalization is rapidly growing, but at the same time this globalization opens up for new competitors and the consumer power is growing thanks to forums, social networks and price comparing webpages (ibid.).

Internet have influence on business, social activities, shopping- and purchase habits because of the wide range of users in different social classes (Budden et al., 2007). Since young people have an online-life rather than using internet as a complement, businesses have to go in the same direction. The way marketing is being done is going through a paradigm when people are spending more time online and different industries are finding ways to move their sales, or part of their sales, online as well (ibid.).

2.2 The Millennials, Generation Y & Z

2.2.1 Online Presence

The Millennials is a generation consistent of those born between 1979 and 1994 (Howe & Strauss, 2009). They grew up with the internet and over 90% of them are active online, over 80% of them have cell phones and the number of smartphone users are rapidly rising (Howe & Strauss, 2003).

Most Millennials in developed countries have access to broadband and they are combining their virtual experiences with their real presence through social media (Howe & Strauss, 2009). They are used to the technological climate where downloading music and watching videos online is a part of their everyday life (ibid.).

2.2.2 Consumer Behaviour

A close related group to The Millennials is Generation Y which is consisting of different individuals born between 1980 and 2000 (Weingarten, 2009). Many individuals in Generation Y like to spend their hard earned money on new products and are very influenced by western culture and way of living (Viswanathan & Jain, 2013). They like to purchase different products and brands and are sometimes called brand switchers (ibid.) because they have high brand awareness but are generally not brand loyal (Noble et al., 2009). Participation and emotional content serve as tools to get attention while branded goods and special offers are effective strategies to make Generation Y and Z to take action (Schroeder, 2002).
These individuals usually have several accomplishments and therefore sometimes are called the trophy kids (Viswanathan & Jain, 2013). The pursuit for accomplishment has connections to how these individuals were raised. Many people grow up and act differently depending on their childhood and home environment (ibid.). The Generation Y was commonly raised in a secure home with a goal driven environment (Howe & Strauss, 2003) and with few siblings (Viswanathan & Jain, 2013) which in turn generate very little competition from inside the family.

It should be pointed out that the lack of siblings does not have negative effect on Generation Y’s ability to work in groups. Generation Y likes to work in teams according to Borges, Manuel, Elam and Jones (2006). As mentioned before Generation Y is very goal driven and they believe that working together rather than alone would help them to accomplish their goals in a more effective way (Berkowitz & Schewe, 2011). Besides working with people Generation Y is very familiar with using technology in different ways which can be explained by Generation Y’s childhood where they grew up with technology, particularly internet which was used primarily for information gathering and amusement (Oblinger, 2003). Using the internet as an information source has depleted Generation Y’s interest in reading ordinary text books. Text oriented messages is therefore often rejected (Nielsen & Loranger, 2013) but Generation Y on the other hand prefers to read rich visual messages and text in digital media (Carr & Ly, 2009).

Generation Z are consistent of people born between 1990 and 2010, they are digitally competent and are frequently connected, Raymond (2012) says “technology is part of their DNA” (p.20). The world before the internet is something they simply do not remember. Generation Z communicate with friends through social media like Facebook and Twitter (Raymond, 2012). Nearly every experience and knowledge Generation Z encounter they share online. Similar to Generation Y, Generation Z are not very brand loyal, but a product they hear about on social media is more interesting than a product promoted through a carefully crafted marketing campaign (ibid.).

When you add Generation Z and Generation Y together, they are sometimes called the Millennials (Howe & Strauss, 2003).

2.3 Guerrilla marketing

The origin of Guerrilla marketing comes from war strategies explained by Che Guevara in his book Guerrilla Warfare released in 1961. He explained that the element of surprise is more important than the number of soldiers. This strategy has later been adapted to business and marketing by Levinson (1984) and has been praised by SME companies since big effects could be achieved with low marketing budgets. The efficiency of this type of advertising were intercepted and customized to fit even the big and international companies (Hutter & Hoffmann, 2011). Guerrilla marketing contains several different instruments which all are covered under the Guerrilla marketing-umbrella, which in turn has made Guerrilla marketing evolve into a generic name for innovative and eye-catching activities at low costs (Levinson, 2007). Guerrilla marketing has been copied under many different names for example convert-, diffusion- and under-the-radar-marketing (Margolis and Garrigan, 2008).

The primary purpose with Guerrilla marketing is to get attention from consumers and dumbfound them with new and unconventional ideas (Hutter & Hoffmann, 2011). Guerrilla marketers aim to create a diffusion effect to spread the advertising message witch results with low cost in comparison to benefits (ibid.).
The three tools of Guerrilla marketing that this study will focus on is Ambient marketing, Ambush marketing and Viral marketing. Down below the subject of Ambient-, Ambush- and Viral marketing will be discussed further.

2.4 Ambient marketing

Ambient marketing is a tool of Guerrilla marketing that serves the purpose of getting attention which Levinson (2007) describes as one of the fundamental core values of Guerrilla marketing. Ambient marketing, or more commonly known as Ambient advertising, is advertisement placed in fields that the receivers will not expect it to appear. By making the advertising in these areas abnormal it will seem unusual, draw attention to it and thereby enhance the effect. Shankar and Horton (1999) describe Ambient media as non-traditional out of home-media and serves as a great opportunity for engaged marketers. A well-aimed and abnormal message for example on the petrol pump nozzle or on the inside of a toilet door in a pub could generate far more effective advertising than big billboards if used correctly (Luxton & Drummond, 2000).

Luxton and Drummond (2000) define Ambient advertising as the "The placement of advertising in unusual and unexpected places (location) often with unconventional methods (execution) and being first or only ad execution to do so (temporal)” (p.735). The importance of the unconventional methods used and the importance of being the unique company with these methods highlight the rapid shifting in Ambient marketing (Luxton & Drummond, 2000). Even if the concept of Ambient marketing is hard to grasp, Hutter and Huffman (2011) state Ambient marketing as a Guerrilla marketing tool which specializes on the unusual locations for ad placement in the direct environment of the targeted group.

The word Ambient itself means “the surrounding” and in terms of Ambient marketing it would be regarding to the surrounding environment which states the nature of this kind of marketing (Jurca, 2012).
2.5 Ambush marketing

Ambush marketing is a low cost and high awareness kind of strategy. It is based on attempts by a company to get a free ride on the popularity of a special event or other types of marketing by creating some sort of association between itself and the event/marketing, without paying the official sponsor fees or without having permission from the relevant organization (McKelvey & Grady, 2004). The term Ambush in this case is described as an attempt by a company without formal rights to associate its own brand with the sponsored activity (O’Sullivan & Murphy, 1998).

There are many different ways in accomplish the ambush effect mentioned above. Basically it is possible to purchase advertising time on television before, during and after an event (Vassallo, Blemaster & Werner, 2009) this approach is a basic and common way of doing ambush marketing. To get the best effect you have to do something unexpected or out of the ordinary like giving away free tickets to the actual event as prizes in an advertising campaign (ibid.) or instead of sponsor the event try to sponsor individual teams or athletes to enhance the ambush effect (ibid.). There are many ways and methods but the goal you aiming for stays the same; take advantage of a big event to attract attention to your company’s products or services.

The question is whether this marketing strategy is ethically accepted or refused. Some people find it as smart marketing while others view it as parasitic marketing, this is totally understandable due to the angry and displeased sponsors who have put in a lot of their money into being an official sponsor of the event (O’Sullivan & Murphy, 1998).

Ambushing marketing may be seen as a form of theft, practiced by corporate piranhas (ibid.). In the context of property law, a discussion about the rights of an event owner can be strongly argued. Such rights of ownership are compared and discussed with the rights of competitors and this issue clearly lies within the domain of law (ibid.). However, the dilemma between responsibilities from the official sponsors to the behaviour of marketing ambushers leads inevitable into a discussion of ethical nature (ibid.). Perhaps ambush marketing, when it is used properly, is just another way to compete between companies and should not be looked upon as an unethical marketing method (ibid.).

Whatever if it is ethically correct or not, it is still a success. According to a survey three out of five companies most associated with the 1994 Winter Olympics in Lillehammer, Norway, were actually not part of the official sponsors (Vassallo et al., 2009). It should be noted that the cost of being an official sponsor that year was 40 million American dollars (ibid.). Only imagination ultimately limits the possibilities for ambush marketing, making it difficult for event owners and corporate sponsors to anticipate hostile competitive activities and protect themselves from them.

2.6 Viral marketing

Wilson (2005) describes viral marketing as a strategy which “… encourages individuals to pass on a marketing message to others, creating the potential for exponential growth in the message's exposure and influence. Like viruses, such strategies take advantage of rapid multiplication to exploit the message to thousands, to millions” (p.1).

Viral marketing is an attempt to create a digital diffusion effect which will spread online like a virus to potential costumers when the receivers of the message forward it to friends (Hutter & Hoffman, 2011). Consumers become commercial spreaders without considering their actions as advertising (Nufer, 2013). The viral effect can get by marketers who directly
communicate the message to addressed consumers who will forward the marketing message through direct channels or through other types of media (Hutter & Hoffman, 2011). Viral marketing tends to get more accepted because of the fact that it is often received from friends and family. This fact also makes the promotional message more trustworthy than if it is sent directly from advertisement agencies (Yang & Zhou, 2011). Nowadays marketers design webpages in a way that encourage the viral effect, these webpages are provided with a share button which makes the viral effect just one click away (Van der Lans et al., 2010).

The well-developed information techniques and communication technologies provide marketers with tools to create viral marketing. The most common way to do it is with video clips with the communication message embedded in an unconventional approach such as humour, sex or something taboo-breaking. This is a modification from classic TV-commercial (Hutter & Hoffman, 2011).

Within the diffusion effect of viral marketing the price will be low because the consumers are spreading the message themselves. Even though there is a low cost of spreading the message the marketers still needs to invest in creating the campaigns (Hutter & Hoffman, 2011).
3. Hypotheses

The two hypotheses are an outcome of previous investigations of theories. The third hypothesis, H2, is however regarded as a statement.

H0= In general, the type of marketing shows no difference when shared online.

H1= Guerrilla marketing generates more response and is more effective than traditional marketing when shared online.

In the section 5.1.3 Picture questions 1, listed under the Empirical / Gathered data section, 8 sets of four pictures will serve as a base of decision of which one of the hypotheses that will be accepted.

H2= Ambient marketing, Ambush marketing and Viral marketing combined is an attractive approach to reach the Millennials.

This hypothesis is not based on facts, but is considered by the authors to be an interesting approach to test since it has not been mentioned in any of the theories taken part of and has rarely been used. The authors believe that this combined approach will have even better effect since it contains more components of Guerrilla marketing.

H2 is more of a statement than a hypothesis and it will be rejected or accepted independent of which one of the other hypotheses that gets accepted.
4. Methodology

This chapter describes the research process, the strategies and the approaches chosen. It also explains the data gathering methods, how they were conducted and how the respondents were selected.

4.1 Research Problem

One of the motivators to do a research project is to work in a way that is stimulating the intellect and is joyful (Kothari, 2004), therefore the general subject of Guerrilla marketing was chosen because it was found as interesting and entertaining. A Funnel Approach was used to outline our research question; it started with the general interest in the subject Guerrilla marketing and after further investigations the subject was realized as too wide to be fairly examined in one study. Therefore three of the Guerrilla marketing elements were outlined which was noticed to be more frequently discussed in theories and exposed online more than the others; Ambient-, Ambush- and Viral marketing. After studying these subjects closer in comparison to generational theories, a research problem could be outlined. The research problem provides the study with limitations and it is also outlining the research objective (Jacobsen, 2002). The research problem has been defined with explicit (ibid.) which means that the limitations about the rest of the elements of Guerrilla marketing consciously have been excluded from this research.

Model 2, The research funnel approach, Own processing.

4.2 Segment chosen

Further on in the research process the population of receivers had to be narrowed down to a certain segment to be examined further. Since a common cohort mentioned were the people growing up alongside the development of technology and the expansion of internet (Howe & Strauss, 2009). However, these individuals have been grouped under many different names and with several different definitions of the age range, but all with similar characteristics. The Millennials were chosen as scientific base, but the study will concentrate the researches on the middle of the cohort. The segment has been chosen with the research problem in consideration which is a normative way according to Backman (1998).
4.3 Research strategy

With the quantitative to qualitative approach the study will achieve Methodological triangulation, this is also the strategy chosen to get reliable and valid results (Jacobsen, 2002). Starting with a quantitative research is ideal when you already possess knowledge about the research subject and can make assumptions of what results you will get. When examining the results the outcome of the quantitative research will determine how the qualitative research will be constructed. The reason of using a qualitative approach after a quantitative is to dig deeper and find the motives behind the results. Nyberg and Tidström (2012) claim that quantitative and qualitative strategies gives different kind of answers to the research question. The results of a quantitative study gives answers on if, when, how when talking about behavior while a qualitative study gives deeper answers on why a behavior is existing. Nyberg and Tidström (2012) also confirm that the strategies do not exclude each other and that it is possible to make a combined study. The further investigation with the qualitative study will clarify understanding of the quantitative study and will make the data more valuable and useful (Jacobsen, 2002).

4.4 Time

The timeframe chosen, the first half of 2014, reflects on the period of time data was collected. It was completed in two steps; through a quantitative survey and qualitative interviews. To make a timeframe to a type of project that have not been done before is something that requires imagination because it is hard to determine how much time each part will take (Eriksson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 2006). Without knowledge about how time consuming each part of the project would be a plan was made but the plan has been changed along the way which is a result of progress.

4.5 Quantitative - Qualitative approach

To answer the research question data had to be collected with a quantitative approach, a survey with multiple respondents selected randomly out of the target audience; the Millennials. To limit the group of individuals examined the respondents were selected from Sweden in order to confirm or decline the hypothesis. The results from the survey will act as a base for the next step in the research; a qualitative approach in form of interviews. These were conducted in order to determine why the results in the quantitative survey were achieved.

The quantitative study examines if the Guerrilla marketing concept is effective or not. The qualitative study examines why the Guerrilla marketing concept is effective or not.

4.6 Deductive approach

There are two different ways to collect data for a research problem, the deductive approach and the inductive approach. The deductive research approach is based on earlier studies and theories (Eriksson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 2006; Jacobsen, 2002). The deductive research approach aims to create expectations about the world based on scientific proven theories and with this information in consideration collect empirical data in order to make a comparison with the earlier theories (Jacobsen, 2002). The inductive approach works the other way around, the researcher starts with collecting empirical data without any expectations and compares the results with theories afterwards (ibid.).

This study has the deductive approach because of the fact that there were already existing theories about the research subject which has been taken part of before the study.
4.7 Primary data collection
The reason for doing a combination of qualitative and quantitative researches is because there are both advantages and disadvantages in both approaches (Jacobsen, 2002). This study aims to counter the disadvantages with the combined advantages.

The advantages of a quantitative approach are that it is standardized and therefore easy to process and that you can get many respondents without spending a lot of time. The fact that you can get a lot of respondents makes it easier to generalize the empirical data than within a qualitative research (ibid.). The disadvantages of a quantitative research are that it is not as deep as a qualitative research. In a quantitative research the only answers you get are the ones you ask for, in a qualitative research you might get unexpected and valuable answers which you do not get in a quantitative research (ibid.).

Advantages with the qualitative research are flexibility and high validity. With the qualitative research approach you will get a better understanding of the data collected (ibid.). The disadvantages of the qualitative approach are that it takes a lot of resources, both in time and effort.

4.8 Secondary data collection
The secondary data for this research was gathered mainly from online published scientific articles and published scientific books. The databases used for searching for scientific articles were Google Scholar and the databases found on the webpage of Högskolan i Halmstad; Summon. The most frequently used words in the searching process were; “Guerrilla marketing”, “Online marketing”, “Ambient marketing”, “Ambush marketing”, “Viral marketing” and “The Millennials”. The secondary sources are tested theories that serve as frame of reference, by using this information a survey was created in order to collect empirical data.

4.9 Reliability and validity
As mentioned earlier, both quantitative and qualitative researches are used in this study in order to both be sure of the results of the quantitative data collection and to outline these results were achieved. This is called a pragmatic approach which Jacobsen (2002) mention as a way to achieve methodological triangulation and if the results of the researches correspond with each other it will increase the validity. Holter and Kalleberg (1996), Patton (1994) together with Glaser and Strauss (1967) all agree on the fact that quantitative and qualitative approaches does not compete but can complement each other to strengthen the reliability of the outcome.

4.10 Hypothesis
It is common that a research question is followed by several hypotheses about what the research conclusion will be. The hypotheses are only statements out of interpretations of theories and can only be rejected or accepted by empirical data (Jacobsen, 2002). Hypothesis can also be an advantage to have in a study because hypothesis can give guidelines of what needs to be studied to be able to accept or reject the hypothesis and answer the research question (Nyberg & Tidström, 2012).
4.11 Construction of Survey

4.11.1 General considerations

First of all when answering a question about the common behavioral of a large group of individuals one has to examine a large group of individuals as well, therefore a quantitative survey is preferred (Jacobsen, 2002). In the construction of the quantitative survey the researcher has to take several points in consideration.

When a large group of individuals are examined there are no room for errors and misunderstandings, therefore question wording is of great importance. Question wording is how you write the question in an objective point of view showing that the researcher is impartial (Czinkota & Ronkainen, 2007). Being impartial is essential to get valid results that correspond with the target audience (Jacobsen, 2002).

Since the study is researching the Millennials in their online atmosphere a survey amplified for online participation is a better way to collect more data in less time as Nielsen and Loranger (2013) describe that the Millennials often reject normal text oriented messages and instead prefers messages and text in digital media (Carr & Ly, 2009).

Measured in 2013, the population of people born between 1985 and 1995 summed up to 1,419,467 persons according to Statistiska centralbyrån (2014), out of this population the exact number of individuals examined was 312. Unfortunately not every one of them finished the survey and at certain places questions were left blank. Only the respondents who finished the survey to the end were used in the evaluation and analysis of the survey which gave the amount of 309 respondents with some minor deviation because of some blank answers. Over 267 answers were needed to be able to be sure of the results with a confidence interval of 6, meaning the results can vary 6% in either of the directions (Surveysystem, n.d). The goal was to get 384 respondents in order to establish the scientific standard of a 5% confidence interval (Surveysystem, n.d), but due to the time-limit of this study the required amount of respondents was not reached.

4.11.2 The different parts of the survey

Deciding how to create the question answers to get valid results, yet making it quick and easy for the respondent to answer, multiple choice tick boxes and Likert-scales of 6 stages were chosen to begin the survey. The Likert-scales was created in fields where a degree of opinion mattered which also allowed quick response. The Likert-scale was chosen because Ejlertsson (2005) and Jacobsen (2002) recommend that tool of measure when measuring attitudes. A scale consistent of 6 points were chosen in order to measure three different levels of pleasure or displeasure, avoiding a neutral state in the scale is a tactical move since individuals tend lean their opinions towards either one of the antipodes. The decision was to use a 6 point scale was made even though Ejlertsson (2005) claims that a Likert-scale should be presented in 5 or 7 points.

In the multiple choice tick boxes the most common answers by the Millennials were listed as options according to (Oblinger, 2003). Howe and Strauss (2009) agrees by stating; “Their normal online habits include playing games, downloading music and watching videos” when discussing the behavior of the Millennials, which confirm the validity of the choices available.
in the survey. An open answering field was put last in the list of answers in order to notice and evaluate divergent opinions by making other alternatives possible. Instructive statements in the questions limit the number of ticks the respondents have to put out, making the different opinions concentrated to fewer options and the data gathered more useful.

Beside the ordinary questions images were implemented in the survey, making it more attractive to the Millennials as they prefer to see visual messages rather than text (Carr & Ly, 2009). By choosing one out of four images the respondents picked the most attractive one showing the most appealing marketing. By mixing images of Guerrilla marketing with images of other types of marketing without telling the respondents of their belonging, the data gathered from this part will help to determine which hypothesis that should be accepted. Following up the images chosen were questions regarding the response towards the marketing type shown in the picture chosen. These alternatives were created within the same theoretical framework as the multiple choice questions mentioned earlier.

In addition to the multiple image questions there was a section of three single images consistent of both Ambient- and Ambush marketing followed by questions regarding the response towards these images, with alternative answers also supported by Oblinger (2003) together with Howe and Strauss (2009). This was made in order to measure whether the combination of Ambient- and Ambush marketing have potential to get the viral effect.

Yes/No questions were avoided because they are imprecise when measuring behavior patterns (Wärneryd, 1993). Even so, one Yes/No question were stated in the end to see if there was any general interest at all in sharing marketing methods via social media. The Yes/No questions were constructed in a way so they cannot get interpreted in different ways which Ejlertsson (2005) mentions are of great importance.

4.12 Construction of Interview template

The first choice to consider when making a qualitative interview is if the interview should be face to face, by phone or by email. The template was e-mailed to the respondents so they could answer in their home environment and in their own pace. E-mail was chosen to minimize the interview effect. The interview effect is when the respondent acts abnormal when they are physically attending in an interview (Jacobsen, 2002).

The amount of time required to answer the interview was also taken into consideration. An interview that takes over one and a half hour is too long and an interview that takes only half an hour is too short according to Jacobsen (2002). The estimated time to answer the interview template was between 35 and 60 minutes.

The construction of the questions in the interview template was based on the results given by the quantitative survey in order to get deeper insight into the reasons behind the answers. These showed that funny and unusual content stood out from the rest of the marketing contents and served as a base when constructing the interview questions regarding the content that the respondents found worth sharing in online.

Sharing content between friends, relatives and inside groups in social media is a procedure within Viral marketing. Therefore questions were made to get the opinion of the respondents concerning the viral effect and if it turns out different when marketing content is shared by
friends rather than by companies. The main point of these questions were to see what kind of effect this so called “tell friends-spread” has on social media and the reason behind it.

A decision was made to let the respondents be anonymous because it was a request from some of the respondents and their name is not of importance for the purpose of the study.

4.13 Respondent Selection

4.13.1 Quantitative

When selecting respondents for the quantitative survey, the most important things to be sure of were that the respondents were Swedish and in the ages born between 1985 and 1995. The research still needed a lot of answers in a short period of time in order to be successful. Thereby social media, mass-emails and personal approaches were used to reach respondents. This way might have caused an uneven distribution between heavy and light users of the internet, however, Howe and Strauss (2003) states that the Millennials in general spends a lot of time online. Therefore the online approach was chosen to reach the Millennials.

4.13.2 Qualitative

As mentioned in Jacobsen, (2002) the reason behind a qualitative approach is to uncover what is unique and special and not what is general and typical. Therefore a small selection of Swedish respondents mixed in ages was the most favorable approach to the research. Due to restrictions in resources and that our location for conducting this study was in Brazil which brings a time difference to Sweden, a group of four respondents were chosen. According to Jacobsen (2002) a criterion with width and variation is to be taken in consideration when choosing respondents to increase validity and reliability. With this in mind a group consisting of two girls born in the years 1988 and 1989 were selected together with two boys born in the years 1990 and 1992 as respondents. The reason for the variation in gender and age was to give more validity to the empirical data. The quantitative survey was as mentioned before based on activities online and therefore the respondents were chosen according to their high degree of presence online to further increase the reliability from the empirical answers.
5. Empirical data

In this chapter the data from the quantitative survey and qualitative interviews are presented. The most relevant diagrams are presented in this chapter while more diagrams and information can be found in Appendix 1-7.

5.1 Presentation of the quantitative study

5.1.1 Respondent characteristics and Internet usage

To ask for the age was not only a matter of getting the right age group since the criterions of participation was stated both in the text in the beginning of the survey and in online spreads. This also made the spread in ages among the respondents within the target audience visible. When it comes to gender it might matter if the opinions are very diverse between the sexes, but as the study researches the Millennials as a whole the fact that women were dominant among the respondents (64% to 36%) will be of less importance.

Age of the respondents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram 1, Age spread, Own processing.

The age spread within the target audience is relatively even except for three years that were dominant among the respondents; 1990, 1991 and 1992. This however does not affect the results in a bad way since they are near the middle of the range examined.

When it comes to internet usage a measurement of how much time that is spent online and also in what fields was needed. Therefore the respondents were asked to list the two activities they spend most of their online time on.

How much time the respondents spend online on an average day:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 hour</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 2 hours</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 4 hours</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 6 hours</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 8 hours</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 10 hours</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 hours</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When looking at the internet usage among the respondents the study can outline that 79% are active online for more than 2 hours every day and summing up the total, more than 1060 hours are spent online daily with an average of 3½ online-hours per person. Just among the respondents that sums up to nearly 400 000 hours every year and calculating that every human need 8 hours of sleep means that the Millennials spend more than 20% of their lives in the online virtual world.

The respondent answers on what two online activities they spend most of their time on;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Browsing</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaming</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching for/listening for music</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching video clips</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading articles / blogs</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social media is significantly dominant over the other activities on which the Millennials spend their online time. Apart from the first and the second most common answers, the time spent on other activities are evenly spread out.

5.1.2 General attitudes towards online marketing

To make the respondents show their attitudes to different types of online marketing, a Likert-scale with 6 points between Dislike (1) and Like (6) was constructed in order to see if some marketing channels were preferred before others. The fields of online marketing that was measured were;

- Banner ads
- Pop-ups
- E-mail marketing
- Social media suggested offers
- Social media friends’ shares
- Market messages in text (in blogs, articles, etc);
- Competitions with prizes
- Offers and freebies
When looking at the tables in Appendix 2 one can tell that the people asked generally do not have a very positive attitude towards online marketing, but as soon as social media comes into the picture the number of positive respondents increases significantly. However, the respondents are between a negative and a neutral state when it comes to third party recommendations, competitions and freebies.

The latest online marketing method they had responded was also asked for and why this method was appealing in just this case.

The online marketing method the respondent latest responded to:

- Banner ads 16 5%
- Pop-ups 3 1%
- E-mail marketing 80 26%
- Social media suggested offers 31 10%
- Social media friends' shares 66 22%
- Marketing messages in text (articles, blogs, etc) 34 11%
- Competitions with prizes 21 7%
- Offers and freebies 27 9%
- Other 26 9%

*Diagram 4, Latest response, Own processing.*

On the post “Others” the respondents wrote; Video blogs on Youtube, Google Adwords and also that they do not respond to online marketing.

The diagram showing why the respondents found this marketing method appealing:

- Popularity 29 8%
- Bargain offer 83 22%
- Unusual marketing 18 5%
- Funny content 46 12%
- Interactivity 12 3%
- Recommendation 82 22%
- Special field of interest 79 21%
- Other 23 6%

*Diagram 5, Latest response reason, Own processing.*

On the post “Other” the respondents wrote that they never responded to online marketing. Among the respondents the top choices were E-mail marketing and social media marketing when asked which one they answered to the latest. Bargain offers, recommendations and special field of interests were the main reasons behind the attractiveness of the type of marketing responded to.
5.1.3 Picture questions 1

The main part of the survey was consistent of images where the respondent was to choose the most appealing image out of 4. There were 8 different sets of images (one set of 4 pictures) and in all sets there were images showing both traditional marketing and Guerrilla marketing. By doing this it will be noticed if the ones concerning Guerrilla marketing are more appealing or not, in order to accept one of the hypotheses.

- Picture question 1 had two answers based on Ambient marketing, Nr 2 and 3.
- Picture question 2 had one answer based on Ambient marketing, Nr 2
- Picture question 3 had one answer based on Ambient marketing, Nr 3
- Picture question 4 had one answer based on Ambient marketing, Nr 4
- Picture question 5 had two answers based on Ambush marketing, Nr 1 and 3
- Picture question 6 had one answer based on Ambush marketing, Nr 3
- Picture question 7 had one answer based on Ambush marketing, Nr 2
- Picture question 8 had one answer based on Ambush marketing, Nr 4, one answer that was based on Ambient marketing, Nr 3

(See Appendix 3 for complete list of pictures and tables.)

- In Picture question 1 the most common answer was Nr 1 and is not a result by chance according to the Chi Square-test. This option had no connection to Guerrilla marketing, but was still a funny and innovative way to promote Absolut Vodka with an island in the same shape as their famous bottle.

- In Picture question 2 the most common answer was Nr 2 and is not a result by chance according to the Chi Square-test. This option had strong connection to Guerrilla marketing as Kit-Kat normally is a chocolate bar and not a park bench.

- In Picture question 3 the most common answers were Nr 2 and Nr 3 with nearly the same amount of votes, but are not a result by chance according to the Chi Square-test. Of these options Nr 3 had strong connection to Guerrilla marketing with an odd ad-placement while Nr 2 did not have any Guerrilla marketing connection, but was graphically attractive instead.

- In Picture question 4 the most common answer was Nr 4 and is not a result by chance according to the Chi Square-test. This option had strong connection to Guerrilla marketing as it was graphically attractive in an odd and innovative way for an ad.

- In Picture question 5 the most common answer was Nr 3 but the answers were equally spread and are a result by chance according to the Chi Square-test. However, the most frequent answer had strong connection to Guerrilla marketing in a funny way even though the ad was an ambush on another company.
• In Picture question 6 the most common answer was Nr 3 but even if the answers are equally spread the result is not by chance according to the Chi Square-test. The most frequent answer had strong connection to Guerrilla marketing since the company used the symbol of the Olympic Games despite not being an official sponsor.

• In Picture question 7 the most common answers were Nr 1 and Nr 4 with nearly the same amount of votes, but are not a result by chance according to the Chi Square-test. None of these had connection to Guerrilla marketing but were visually attractive.

• In Picture question 8 the most common answer was Nr 1 and is not a result by chance according to the Chi Square-test. This option had no connection to Guerrilla marketing but was promoting low prices for popular services.

Generally the images connected to Guerrilla marketing were preferred over the others, however, in some cases the elements of ambient and ambush marketing were not successful. Even though these are not results by chance according to the Chi Square-test, the main reasons behind their popularity can be something else. This will be further investigated in the qualitative research.

All these image questions were followed by questions of how they would respond to the selected marketing, in order to measure the effect of the marketing methods. The way people would react to them will give a hint on the reasons behind their choices and the information will therefore serve as base for the construction of the interview template.

Overviewing Appendix 3 and the answers of response the most common one is that the respondents would not respond to the marketing selected. This is followed up by the category “tell friends” and depending on what kind of product it is they would either search for more product information or buy the product directly, another quite common response is to discuss the content of the marketing.

When concentrating on the questions where Guerrilla marketing was the top choice it can be outlined that the most common response towards the Guerrilla marketing is to tell friends about it. Since this was the response protruding from the rest, the matter of telling friends will be investigated further in the qualitative study.

5.1.4 Social media research

This sections purpose was to examine if it is common to share product purchases or marketing material in social media, and if yes, the reasons behind it. Also examined are friends’ influence on the purchase decision of an individual and how one would respond to friends’ shares or recommendations of marketing material.

The first two questions examined how often the respondents spread purchases in social networks and how often the respondents share marketing material on social networks. They were answered on a 6-point scale between rarely (1) and very often (6). The following two questions examined the response to marketing material shared by friends and how the respondents buying decisions were affected by other people online. This was also answered on a 6-point scale but with the extreme points unlikely (1) and most likely (6).

The results in Appendix 5 shows that it is not very common to spread neither purchases nor marketing material, but that the respondents are more open to marketing materials shared by friends even though they generally does not get affected by other people in the online atmosphere.
The following diagram shows why the respondents share or would share marketing on social networks, they could choose more than one answer.

![Diagram 6, Reason behind shares, Own processing.]

The main reason why respondents would spread marketing material if it was of funny content which also was a popular choice when review appealing marketing methods. The second most common answer, recommendations for friends, correspond with one of the top choices in the question previous mentioned. Unusual marketing and helping the business of a friend is also important among the Millennials.

### 5.1.5 Picture questions 2

This part of the survey was containing three individual images without any selection process. These images were chosen because they contained both elements of Ambient- and Ambush marketing and they were followed by a question of response to the given image.

The results show that nearly half of the respondents would not respond to the marketing even though they are consistent of two different elements of Guerrilla Marketing. The results indicate that the majority of the respondents would respond to the marketing shown, however, the answers of how they would respond are evenly spread out among the rest of the options. For detailed information see Appendix 6.

### 5.1.6 Ending section

In the end of the survey was a question asking if any of the pictures shown in the survey were worth sharing and how come they would do so if that was the case.

The respondents were asked if they would spread any of the images in the survey on social networks in order to measure if the viral effect was connected to marketing at all. Most of the respondents, 69%, would not do it while 31% would.
The respondent answers on why they would spread it online. They were able to choose more than one option, but if they answered no in the previous question they did not have to answer this one. Of the ones who said that they would spread any of the images shown in the survey through social media the two main reasons behind the shares were “Unusual marketing” and “Humoristic content”. Since the frequencies of these two alternatives were significantly higher than the others, they were decided to serve as base for the qualitative interviews.

### 5.2 Presentation of the qualitative study
The four respondents were anonymous but are referred to as respondent A, B, C and D.

#### 5.2.1 Share your opinion
The first four questions in the interview were based on statements regarding activities online where the respondent could give their personal opinion in the matter. These questions were built on the results from the quantitative survey in order to get a deeper understanding behind the choice of sharing marketing materials in social network. The questions in the first stage are shown below.

**Share your opinion in these facts;**
- Our generation spends a lot of time online, why do you think it is like that?
- Social media is the dominant activity, why do you think it is like that?
- Our generation often spread marketing material in social networks, why do you think it is like that?
- What makes/will make you share marketing material in social networks?

**Answers;**
Respondent D answered that our generation spends a lot of time online because they grow up with the internet so it is nothing strange to our generation while respondent B said that internet is always available through different devices and that it makes an easier living. Respondent A, B and D all thought that social media is the dominant activity because it is an easy and fast way to keep in touch with friends wherever they may be. The social media is
also one of the fastest ways to spread marketing material with less effort according to the same respondents, which would only spread this material themselves if it was for helping a friend or for something they cared about.

5.2.2 Sharing in social media

The second stage of the interview consisted of questions regarding what is worth and what not is worth sharing in social media followed by the reason behind it. These questions were also built on the results from the quantitative survey where some marketing content that was considered to be worth sharing stood out from the rest. This was amplified into the interview questions in order to see how the attributes in marketing content affect the sharing spree. The questions in the second stage are shown below.

The things important to you;

- Is the brand of importance when spreading marketing material? Why?
- Is funny content worth sharing more than others? Why?
- Is unusual content worth sharing more than others? Why?
- Is visually attractive content worth sharing more than others? Why?
- Are recommendations for friends’ worth sharing more than others? Why?
- Is helping friends’ businesses worth sharing more than others? Why?
- Is there one of these you prefer? Which one and why?

Answers;

When it comes to brand only respondent B answered that it has no importance when spreading marketing material. All the other respondents were brand loyal and would spread well-known brands they like. Funny content was of great importance to the respondents when sharing marketing material, all of them answered that funny content is worth sharing because it makes people smile which is always a great attribute. The same feelings goes for unusual content where all the answers pointed out that this kind of content appeals more to people because it makes the material more interesting and less monotonous compared to usual content.

Even if unusual and funny content shared the same amount of importance to the respondents they still had some different opinions towards visually attractive content. Respondent A answered that it was not worth sharing more than others and so did respondent D. But respondent B responded that only marketing material regarding selling advertisement had to be visually attractive and respondent C felt as long as something is beautiful and appealing it is worth sharing.

Recommendations for friends was worth sharing more than others according to respondent A and D because they would rather believe in recommendations from someone they know and share the taste than from someone they do not know. Respondent B did not think it would be worth sharing more than others and so did respondent C who would rather tell friends about marketing material directly to their faces.
When it comes to helping friends’ businesses all the respondents felt the same way. They answered that it is obvious and more fun to contribute and benefit their friends and family rather than a stranger.

Down below follows a list of the things that the respondents prefer the most:

- Respondent A prefers to help friends by sharing their materials to others.
- Respondent B prefers the unusual content because a width in the marketing material is needed.
- Respondent C prefers new and unusual things on the market because it is more attractive.
- Respondent D prefers funny content because it is always fun and does not take a lot of time.

5.2.3 Viral effect

The questions in the third and final stage were centered on the viral effect of sharing marketing material in social media, in order to see if there is a difference in response towards marketing content shared by friends and the ones shared by companies. These questions were constructed to point out the effect of “tell friends-spread”.

The questions in the final stage are shown below.

- When you tell your friends about marketing material, how would you tell your friends?
- When you tell your friends about marketing material, what would you tell your friends?
- How would it affect you if someone shared marketing material with you? Why?
- When a friend tells you about marketing, do you think the type of media matters in how you respond to it? Why?
- If a friend shared marketing material in social networks, are you more likely to respond to it than if you had discovered it elsewhere?
- Why do you think the attitudes towards friends’ shares of marketing material gets better response?
- Would you spread attractive marketing you see in real life in your social networks? Why?
- Would you further spread attractive marketing you see in your social networks? Why?
- What other effects do you think the “tell friends-spread” has?

Answers;
When asked how the respondents would tell their friends about marketing material the answers could be divided into two groups. In the first group respondent A and C would tell their friends though social media like Facebook and in the second group respondent B and D would rather tell their friends about marketing material directly face to face if their friends lives close by.
On what they would tell their friends, respondent A would tell things to make them interested while respondent B would only tell the story around the marketing material. Respondent C and D would only tell and share things that are within the same field of interest as their friends. If the respondents themselves were exposed to marketing material from someone they all felt that they would react according to who it is from and what kind of material it is. If the material suits the respondents and it came from a friend it would affect them in a good way, otherwise in a bad way. Respondent A, C and D felt that they would more likely respond to marketing materials that correspond with their field of interest and at the same time shared by a friend.

All of the respondents answered that this positive attitude towards friends’ shares comes from that people normally trust their friends and believes in their judgments when it comes to shared interests in materials and products. The respondents had some interesting opinions to what effects the “tell friends-spread” has. Respondent A answered that this spread goes in an unbelievable speed because it goes from friend to friend and therefore reach more people than the ones that received it from the beginning. Respondent B felt that this spread is taken more seriously because it feels more secure when one share friends’ material. Respondent C believed it could be troublesome if a friend keep on spamming marketing material too often but if there is a chance of winning a certain contest by sharing then it could be acceptable. Respondent D replied that this “tell friends-spread” contains a lot of benefits because it has the ability to spread fast and wide through networks of friends. A part from the benefits it could also be a risk of lost trust in friends if they keep on sharing material too often and with different kinds of materials.

Only respondent C would not spread marketing from real life into social networks because it takes too much time and energy. All the other respondents could on the other hand consider doing this if it would help their friends in some way or if the material stood for something they cherish. The same thing applies for the question regarding if they would further spread attractive marketing material on social networks. On this question all of the respondents except respondent C could picture themselves doing this, but only if it was in their friends’ field of interest.
6. Analysis

In the first part of the analysis the quantitative and qualitative results are treated separately in comparison to the theoretical framework. In the end of the chapter a total analysis will be implemented with both types of empirical data in comparison with the theoretical framework in order to establish the findings of this study.

6.1 Analysis of quantitative study

6.1.1 Respondent characteristics and Internet usage

The result of the survey shows that 97% of the respondents spend more than one hour on internet and almost 80% spend more than 2 hours online on their average day. Howe and Strauss (2003) writes that 90% of the Millennials use the internet, their theory is enhanced by this quantitative study that shows the high internet usage by the Millennials in Sweden.

Howe and Strauss (2009) also claim that social media, watching online videos and downloading music are important parts of the everyday life of the Millennials. The result of the survey where the respondents could choose two answers on which activities they spend most of their online time on shows that 34% of the respondents use social media primary. It also shows that 10% answered that they were searching and listening on music and 7% answered that they were watching video clips every day.

6.1.2 General attitudes towards online marketing

The quantitative study shows that the Millennials in general strongly dislike marketing in pop-ups, 87% dislike this marketing method. The attitude towards banner-ads is more positive 37% dislike but 26% answered 3 on the six step scale. 45% disliked e-mail marketing even though e-mail marketing was the marketing method that most of the respondents responded to the latest. The marketing method the respondents liked the most were marketing shared by friends in social media, number four on the scale got 27% of the answers and number 5 got 15%. Our results are confirmed by the theories of Raymond (2012) who claim that the Millennials find products they hear about in social media more interesting than other marketing campaigns. It is also proved by Yang and Zhou (2011) who writes that marketing messages tends to be more accepted when they are being received from friends, they write that this makes the message more trustworthy than if the message is sent from advertisement agencies.

The main reasons the Millennials responded to latest marketing were when there was a bargain offer, recommendations from friends or a special field of interest. Millennials characteristics explained by Schroeder (2002) confirms the strong results in the category bargain offers, while the theory of Raymond (2012) better confirms the strong results in the categories recommendations and special field of interest since he mention these as important values of the Millennials.

6.1.3 Picture questions 1

To test the hypotheses the Chi Square-test was used. According to Körner and Wahlgren (2006) the Chi Square-test is used to compare observed absolute frequenses with expected
frequenses. A Chi Square-test measures if the spread of the observation results are an act of chance or if the results vary enough to be scientifically trustworthy (Körner & Wahlgren, 2006). What get measured in a Chi Square-test is if the more frequent answers deviates enough to give an answer to the question or if the answers deviates by accident (Byström & Byström, 2011). This method was suitable because there were protruding answers from the online survey that needed to be processed in order to tell whether they were trustworthy or not (Byström & Byström, 2011). Because of diffuse outcomes in the Chi Square-tests examining each picture set individually, a total Chi Square-test was made. Here the total of the expected observations was put in comparison with the total of the actual observations, counting the amount of answers each type of picture did receive listed as values in the table below.

The expected values are calculated from the fact that 34,375% of the pictures had guerrilla characteristics and 65,625 % of the pictures were traditional marketing. Because of the different proportions the expected value of the pictures with guerrilla characteristics is lower than for the pictures of traditional marketing. The expected values are calculated with the percentage compared to total amount of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square-test</th>
<th>Observed value</th>
<th>Expected value</th>
<th>$\chi^2 = \sum (E-O)^2 / E$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guerilla</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>843,90625</td>
<td>32,30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>1611,09375</td>
<td>16,92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\sum = 49,22$

Table 1, Chi Square of total response, Own processing.

49,22 > 3,841 = H0 gets rejected and H1 get accepted.

See Appendix 4 for detailed information.

6.1.4 Picture questions 2

The results show that many of the respondents would not see these examples as attractive as the previous pictures even though they are consistent of two different elements of Guerrilla Marketing. Nevertheless, the results indicate that the majority of the respondents would respond to the marketing shown with telling friends being a more popular choice than the other options. The “Tell friends”-option is confirmed popular by Raymond (2012) who says that the importance of friends, and to assert oneself among them, is essential to the Millennials. But the low overall results are speaking against the theories regarding the effectiveness of Ambient marketing by Shankar and Horton (1999) who states it is more effective than traditional marketing, and also against Vassallo et al. (2009) who says Ambush marketing – no matter if it is ethically correct or not – still is a success.

6.1.5 Social media research and Ending section

The data gathered showed that more than 90% of the respondents do not often spread their purchases through social networks and the statistics shows the same for sharing marketing materials. However the quantitative study shows that more than 50% would respond to
marketing methods shown in the images, this show engagement even though the choice of response is not through social media. This low commitment is the opposite to the theory from Howe and Strauss (2009) who is saying that most Millennials are combining their online experience with living presence in things they share in social media. On the other hand Hoyer and Macinnis (2008) are saying that Millennials only tends to react when they are entertained or emotionally engaged which the results from the picture 1 questions shows.

The Millennials seem to respond more often to marketing material shared by their friends than other types of online marketing, however, the respondents’ attitudes towards friends’ shares of marketing material in social media are better than their actual response rate. The study still indicates that both the attitudes and the response rates follow the same pattern, this is also confirmed by Raymond (2012) who claims that product the Millennials hear about in social media are more interesting.

The results point out that the main drivers behind sharing marketing materials are when the content is of unusual or humoristic nature. Schroeder (2002) mention that emotional content is appealing to the Millennials which confirms the popularity of the humoristic content while Hutter and Hoffman (2011) can confirm the popularity of unusual content when describing the surprise effect.

Even though the Millennials does not claim that their buying decisions are affected by other people in their online atmosphere, still 22% say that the latest online marketing method they responded to was appealing because it was recommended by friends. Raymond (2012) agrees of the importance of friends when the Millennials spend time online.

6.2 Analysis of qualitative study

6.2.1 Share your opinion

The answers from the first stage of the qualitative interview shows that the Millennials spends a lot time online because it is easy to find available information there when they do not have much time to spend searching. Another reason is that internet is easy accessible through various devices like; computers, iPads and smartphones. The usage of internet is nothing strange to the Millennials because it was something they grew up with which can be confirmed by Oblinger (2003).

The answers shows that why the social media is the dominant activity online for the Millennials are that they want to keep in touch with all their friends at the same time, which is impossible to manage face to face in real life. One respondent gave the answer that people are worried that they will miss important events and happening in their friends’ lives and therefore use social networks frequently each day. This high usage of social media in the Millennials everyday life is also discussed by Howe and Strauss (2009).

On the question why our generation often spread marketing materials on social networks the respondents replied that; social networks is the place where young people spend their time and it is the fastest way to spread information in a short period of time. It is better and faster to spread marketing material in social networks compared to ads in letter boxes and posters on pillars in cities one respondent answered. The choice of spreading through social networks instead of posters on pillars in the cities can also be described in the theory of (Nielsen &
Loranger, 2013) in which he discuss that the Millennials often rejects books and text messages that is not connected to technology. The main reasons on what makes the respondents share marketing material on social networks were if it would benefit themselves, their friends and family or if the material stood for something within their field of interest.

### 6.2.2 Sharing in social media

In the questions about what is important and worth sharing when it comes to marketing material the respondents’ answers were different but their opinions were much alike. When it comes to brand the majority felt that a famous and trustworthy brand is of importance when spreading marketing material because it is easier to recognize and trust. This high brand awareness among the Millennials is also confirmed by Noble et al. (2009).

But material built on humoristic content seemed to be of great importance to all the respondents. They all answered that they believe that funny content is worth sharing than others. The importance of funny content in the Millennials life seems to be of importance but one respondent said that the content should not be too much immature which gives the feeling of lack of quality.

Unusual content was also worth sharing more according to all the respondents. They answered that unusual content makes the material less monotonous and more fun to share because it appeals to people. That the Millennials is appealed by unusual content is also discussed by Carr and Ly (2009). Even if unusual content was important to the respondents, they still thought that visually attractive content was only worth sharing if it was beautiful enough to share or if the content was made for an attractive product advertisement. Recommendations for friends and helping friends’ businesses were two important things worth sharing according to the respondents. They answered that it feels more natural to share things your friends have recommended if you have the same taste and helping a friends’ businesses is worth sharing because it benefits them. The respondents felt that it is more fun and obvious to help a friend in need before a stranger.

Of all the things worth sharing described above, the respondents preferred unusual or funny content and helping friends before the rest, this because unusual and funny content creates a width in the marketing material and helping friends is always important.

### 6.2.3 Viral effect

The answers from the final stage of the interview shows that the respondents did not normally tell their friends about marketing material, but when the times comes they would rather tell their friends in person or if their friends live far away they would use social networks or e-mail to share the material. On the question what they would tell their friends the respondents answered that they would tell and show material that interest or could interest their friends. Here the common interest to help friends once again shines through the respondents answers. Yang and Zhou (2011) say that it is usal to share between friends and family and (Raymond (2012) states that the Millennials share nearly every encounter online.

Even if they all would share marketing materials to friends, like Raymond (2012) declare, the effect they described from receiving marketing materials from friends were different from each other. Receiving marketing materials from friends could affect the respondents in a good way or a bad way. According to Noble et al. (2009) the Millennials are brand switchers and
can change their mind quickly. It all depended on who shared the material and what kind of content it contained. The good effect would arise from interesting material from a trustworthy friend and the bad effect from the straight opposite. The type of media which the marketing material is presented in was also important to the respondents when receiving it from friends. The answers showed that they would respond to the material better if it is well prepared and appealing to their likings. Van der Lans (2009) say that good Viral marketing today is often prepared with a share-button and also gives immediate access to the product webpage marketed.

The respondents answered on the other hand that they would not respond to material differently if it comes from a friend than if they had found it elsewhere. Some would respond to it directly if the material came from a good friend and if it corresponds with what the respondents were looking for. The respondents’ thoughts about why marketing material shared by friends gets better response than others were vey alike. They all believe that friends normally know where one another’s interest lies within and they trust each other’s judgment when it comes to good material. One of the respondents answered that people are probably more open minded towards friends’ shares than towards shares from unknown people. This corresponds with Yang and Zhou (2011) who claim that Viral marketing is more accepted when received from friends and family. Helping friends and family is also one of the top reasons for spreading marketing further in their social networks according to the respondents.

The final answers from the respondents indicated that they probably would not share marketing they see in real life on social networks which is speaking against the theory of Raymond (2012) who say the Millennials are spreading every encounter online. Only if the purpose is to benefit a friend or if the marketing stands for something they care for and is amusing enough to create a lot of response which on the other hand is confirmed by Schroeder (2002) who declare the importance of emotional content to the Millennials.

The last question which regarded other effects that the “tell friends-spread” has gave various answers, the common opinion among the respondents’ was that they all believed that the “tell friends-spread” feels more secure and trustworthy and therefore can be taken more seriously. This result is really close to the statements of Raymond (2012) mentioned earlier. They also believed that it has a lot of other benefits; one of them was the fast and wide spread throughout social networks, which is the definition of viral marketing (Wilson, 2005). But they also mentioned that it could be risky and troublesome if a friend spam too much marketing material which can reduce his/her trustworthiness.

### 6.3 Overall Analysis

#### 6.3.1 Internet usage

As Chaffey et al. (2009) points out that the consumers today have a lot of advantages thanks to internet such as price comparing-sites and forums. The Millennials grew up alongside the internet and these attributes as well (Howe & Strauss, 2009) making it harder for companies to get their message forward. But when the Millennials spend an average of 20% of their time awake online according to the quantitative study, it is an attractive field for marketers. When looking at what online activities the Millennials spend most of their time on the results are all attuned. Social media is the top answer among both the survey respondents and the interview respondents. With these findings – together with the theories made by Margolis and Garrigan
(2008) who says that the Millennials daily communicate interests and personal values through social networks, by Raymond (2012) and by Howe and Straus (2009) who both agrees on that social media plays a major role in the Millennials life – an assumption of social media being the Millennials’ number one media channel that they are active within can be made.

6.3.2 Attitudes towards online marketing

Both the respondents of the survey and the interviews correspond that they do not like marketing material, however, this only confirms they do not like material when they actually know it is marketing. Consumers are often commercial spreaders without regarding their actions as advertising according to Nufer (2013) and when reviewing the Model 1 of Guerrilla marketing (Mayners, 2013) one of the components seen is undercover marketing, if the marketing material is disguised it might have a lot more effect than when the marketing message is obvious. A slight change in attitude was observed in the survey results when the marketing was delivered through social media, this is confirmed by Raymond (2012) who says that a product the Millennials hear about in social media is more interesting than any other media channel, which also is strengthened by the answers from the interview respondents.

6.3.3 Social media and the importance of friends

The interview respondents highlight the importance of friends’ needs and interests, not only when responding to marketing material, but especially when spreading it further. The results from both the quantitative and qualitative studies show that recommendations for friends and helping a friends’ business are of high importance to the Millennials. The Millennials seems to accept marketing content shared by friends to a greater extent than from any other parties which is also confirmed by Yang and Zhou (2011) who describes marketing messages to be more appealing if the sender is a friend. Also Raymond (2012) says that a product the Millennials find out about in social media generally is more interesting.

The data gathered in the qualitative interviews show that people normally trust their friends and therefore do not hesitate to give the material received from friends extra attention. Since one often has at least a couple of friends with common interests, the shares from these friends are more easily noticed. The results from the picture questions in the quantitative survey displayed that the option tell friends is one of the most common reactions when responding to marketing material. Together with the qualitative interview answers it indicates that the Millennials like to share the material with their friends, however, two of the four interview respondents said that they would rather tell their friends in person. But if the physical distance to that person prevents face-to-face conversation social media would be their second choice.

In the quantitative study there was a result of 22% of the respondents who found the latest online marketing they responded to appealing because it was recommended from their friends. The same positive attitudes towards friends’ shares could be seen in the interviews where the respondents answered that they usually trust their friends and the things they receive from them. Every respondent in the qualitative interviews agreed that when it comes down to helping a friends’ business by sharing marketing material on social media they all valued it very high, this was also the third most frequent answer in the survey question about why they share or would share marketing material, lagging behind the options recommendations for friends and funny content.
6.3.4 Humoristic & unusual content

The efficiency of Guerrilla marketing in terms of Ambient and Ambush is confirmed by the results of the survey, however, when researching the reasons behind the answers it can be outlined that it is not the Guerrilla marketing itself that is the key to success. In the survey a majority of the attracted respondents answered that funny and/or unusual content was behind their choices, which also were the main two key factors when sharing the material in social media.

Funny content appear to be something the Millennials cherish and appreciate, in the diagrams displaying the results of the quantitative survey funny and humoristic content is the top choice in both the reasons behind sharing marketing material on social networks and when asked why they would spread any of the images shown online. This response to entertainment among the Millennials is confirmed by the interview respondents and further strengthened by Hoyer and Macinnis (2008) who says that the Millennials tend to react only when they are entertained and/or emotionally engaged. In other words, humour is a very important part of the Millennials lifestyle and responding to humoristic material serves natural. Hoyer and Macinnis (2008) says that the Millennials are very flexible when it comes to taste, so the sort of humour desired has to be monitored and adapted to the latest trends and also has to stay mature to represent quality, as one of the interview respondents claimed was of importance to still have trust in the brand. Noble et al. (2009) also declare that the Millennials are brand switchers which highlight the importance of staying up to date within marketing campaigns.

Unusual content within marketing seems to be a desirable attribute among the Millennials as well because of the high exposure of marketing messages every day which Schroeder (2002) explains as a high level of noise in the online atmosphere. When it comes to unusual marketing the quantitative study showed that 13 % of the respondents would share marketing material because it is unusual, making it the fourth most popular choice. When asked why the respondents would spread any of the images shown in the survey online, one of the two top answers was because of the unusual marketing. According to respondent B in the qualitative interviews unusual content is worth sharing more on social media than others because the same kinds of shared marketing you see all the time have a tendency to become monotonous in the eyes of the reader. Unusual content is more appealing to read, watch and share than content that everybody already knows answered respondent A, who also implied that a width is needed in today’s marketing material.

This call for differentiation by the Millennials appears to be a great opportunity for future marketers, which is also discussed by Laduque, (2009) who says that one of the keys to success is to be noticed and be the one who stands out from the crowd. A similar answer can be found stated by Hoyer & Macinnis (2008) who are describing the way to reach the Millennials is through marketing campaigns that are exclusive, entertaining and that offers an enhancing experience.

6.3.5 Combination of Ambient-, Ambush- and Viral marketing

With a high amount of the respondent showing disinterest in the images containing the Ambient- and Ambush combination the efficiency of it is strongly doubted. Telling friends might have been a more popular choice than other options of response but nearly half of the
survey respondents reject this combined marketing method which is by numbers far greater than the ones showing disinterest in the previous picture questions. Also, half of the interview respondents say they would rather tell friends in person and not through social media. That is confirmed by the low rates in the category share in social networks which received an average of less than 10% of the votes, thereby the marketing the viral effect is lost. Ambient- and Ambush is neither the perfect combination since Ambush marketing can sometimes be perceived as offensive (Vassallo et al., 2009). The Millennials believe that there are more important components of marketing, such as humoristic and unusual content, which are worth sharing and these does not fit the Ambient- and Ambush combination.

The poor and obvious results in this category made a test of the hypothesis unnecessary, also because the H2-hypthesis is considered to be more of a statement. Therefore the H2-hypothesis can be rejected.

6.3.6 Bottom line

With the Millennials spending much time online but still being resistant towards traditional marketing, the companies has to go another way around to reach their targets. The importance of friends and the amount of trust the Millennials put in them are the key to penetrate these barriers. If marketing material gets shared by friends or if friends recommend products its attractiveness rises rapidly, if the product is of personal interest and/or if it is a well-perceived brand it will raise even further. Humoristic and unusual content are the two top components of marketing material if the Millennials are going to pay attention to it, whether its spread by friends or not. The effect is enhanced if the material contains the humoristic and/or the unusual attributes at the same time as it has the friend connection.
7. Conclusions and Final discussion

In this chapter the findings are presented along with an answer to the research question. There are also recommendations and methodological critique in order to help future academics.

7.1 Findings

After analysing the data from both the quantitative and the qualitative study in comparison with previous theories vital findings could be made regarding the Millennials in Sweden.

The first important finding in this study is that humoristic and unusual content of marketing is of greater importance than the method of marketing itself. In order to reach the Millennials through social networks a marketer has to make sure that the marketing material is differenced by using humoristic and/or unusual content that suits and stimulates the targeted segment in order to enhance the viral effect.

The second important finding in this study is the importance of friends’ needs and interests, not only when responding to marketing material, but especially when spreading it further. The trust the Millennials put in their friends’ shares is connected to their common taste and benevolence inside their social circle which prove not only their loyal friendships between each other but also their need of asserting themselves towards one another.

The third important finding in this study is that even though Ambush marketing combined with Ambient marketing first seemed as a great combination together with Viral marketing, the results from the survey showed otherwise. The last part of the quantitative survey consisted of 3 pictures questions displaying Ambush Marketing combined with Ambient Marketing in order to reveal if these marketing methods worked well together in the eye of the respondents. The low frequencies in the following questions of response together with interview answers are showing that the Millennials rather tell friends in person diminishing the viral effect. Therefore the combination of Ambient-, Ambush- and Viral marketing is not an attractive approach to reach the Millennials.

This study also confirms that the Millennials are frequent users of internet as previous studies already have shown and that they are not very interested in online marketing when it is mediated by an unknown party.

7.2 Answer of Research Question

Findings show that the answer to our research question is that the Millennials are finding the Guerrilla marketing concept appealing, this is proved by the acceptance the H1 hypothesis. Why it is like this is because the Millennials are positively responding to marketing material consisting of unusual and humoristic content which are common components within Guerrilla marketing.

7.3 Recommendations

The findings show that it is rather the components of the marketing than Guerrilla marketing itself that mattered in order to reach the Millennials. A recommendation is therefore to research humoristic and unusual marketing and what the Millennials find funny and unusual to be able to reach them even better.
Another recommendation is to study a smaller group of the Millennials, for example; the ones who got children, the ones who study in the university or different levels of company employees. Even though the Millennials have common characteristics they are a generation of diversity both in occupation, economical status, stages of life and their belonging to different subcultures. It can be of interest to find the differences within the generation or differences comparing to other generations, but also to test the findings in different countries.

7.4 Methodological Critique

A broader scientific base could have been researched but since the research subjects has not been widely examined before a broader research would have meant examination of theories not connected to the research subjects which would result in interpretations by the authors.

Jacobsen (2002) mention that if the qualitative and quantitative researches does not reach the same results, it should be taken as a warning. The whole research or at least the selective process of data gathering should then be reviewed if that is the case.

Some criticism can be pointed towards the method chosen regarding the use of pictures in the construction of the survey, it is something that is not usual. When showing pictures there is always a risk that the pictures do not have equal chance to be chosen. There might be factors that make that a specific picture more popular than the form of marketing because of uncontrollable factors such as resolution, specific colours or popular brands. The method was chosen anyway because of the fact that not all of the Millennials are familiar with academic marketing expressions that would have been confusing if used in text questions. Another reason for doing this way is because Ambient- and Ambush marketing is not the same when converted to written words as they are in graphics.

Another aspect to show criticism towards is the combined quantitative and qualitative approach as it has been very time consuming to create, implement and evaluate both a survey and interviews. To make only one of the two methods would have given more time to go deeper into one specific method. To only do a qualitative or quantitative study would have given more time for conducting interviews or gathering more survey answers.
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Attachments

Appendix 1; Gender and Share

Gender of respondents:

- Male: 111 (36%)
- Female: 201 (64%)

Is any of the pictures shown in the survey was worth sharing?

- Yes: 94 (31%)
- No: 210 (69%)
Appendix 2; Attitudes towards online marketing

Banner Ads;

1: 115  37%
2: 59   19%
3: 82   26%
4: 39   13%
5: 15   5%
6: 0    0%

Pop-Ups;

1: 269  87%
2: 26   8%
3: 9    3%
4: 4    1%
5: 1    0%
6: 1    0%

E-mail marketing;

1: 138  45%
2: 57   18%
3: 70   23%
4: 30   10%
5: 9    3%
6: 5    2%

Social Media suggested offers;

1: 90   29%
2: 63   20%
3: 84   27%
4: 47   15%
5: 21   7%
6: 4    1%
Social media friends’ shares;

1: 50 16%
2: 48 16%
3: 71 23%
4: 84 27%
5: 47 15%
6: 9 3%

Market messages in text (in blogs, articles, etc);

1: 74 24%
2: 58 19%
3: 91 29%
4: 59 19%
5: 20 6%
6: 7 2%

Competitions with prizes;

1: 73 24%
2: 55 18%
3: 70 23%
4: 58 19%
5: 36 12%
6: 17 6%

Offers and Freebies;

1: 60 19%
2: 56 18%
3: 74 24%
4: 56 18%
5: 40 13%
6: 22 7%
Appendix 3; Picture questions 1 with answers
P1. Picture-set 1;

The picture that most respondents found appealing was picture 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picture 1</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of how they would respond to the picture they liked the most;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell friends about it</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss the content</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share on social networks</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased brand loyalty</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy the product/service</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search for more product information</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the product category</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not respond to it</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The picture that most respondents found appealing was picture 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picture 1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 2</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of how they would respond to the picture they liked the most:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell friends about it</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss the content</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share on social networks</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased brand loyalty</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy the product/service</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search for more product information</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the product category</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not respond to it</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P3. Picture-set 3;

The picture that most respondents found appealing was picture 3.

The result of how they would respond to the picture they liked the most;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell friends about it</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss the content</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share on social networks</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased brand loyalty</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy the product/service</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search for more product information</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the product category</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not respond to it</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P4. Picture-set 4;

The picture that most respondents found appealing was picture 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of how they would respond to the picture they liked the most;

- Tell friends about it: 125 (29%)
- Discuss the content: 59 (13%)
- Share on social networks: 45 (10%)
- Increased brand loyalty: 10 (2%)
- Buy the product/service: 21 (5%)
- Search for more product information: 50 (11%)
- Consider the service category: 32 (7%)
- I would not respond to it: 94 (21%)
- Other: 2 (0%)
The picture that most respondents found appealing was picture 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picture 1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of how they would respond to the picture they liked the most:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell friends about it</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss the content</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share on social networks</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased brand loyalty</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy the product/service</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search for more product information</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the product/service category</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not respond to it</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The picture that most respondents found appealing was picture 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of how they would respond to the picture they liked the most:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell friends about it</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss the content</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share on social networks</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased brand loyalty</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy the product/service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search for more product information</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the product category</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not respond to it</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P7. Picture-set 7;

The picture that most respondents found appealing was picture 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picture 1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 4</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of how they would respond to the picture they liked the most:

- Tell friends about it: 67 (18%)
- Discuss the content: 38 (10%)
- Share on social networks: 17 (5%)
- Increased brand loyalty: 19 (5%)
- Buy the product/service: 7 (2%)
- Search for more product information: 31 (9%)
- Consider the product category: 21 (6%)
- I would not respond to it: 158 (43%)
- Other: 6 (2%)
The picture that most respondents found appealing was picture 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picture 1</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture 4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diagram of the results of how they would respond to the picture they liked the most;

- Tell friends about it: 65 (17%)
- Discuss the content: 32 (8%)
- Share on social networks: 20 (5%)
- Increased brand loyalty: 14 (4%)
- Buy the product/service: 17 (4%)
- Search for more product information: 53 (14%)
- Consider the service category: 33 (9%)
- I would not respond to it: 145 (38%)
- Other: 4 (1%)
**Appendix 4; χ² on Picture questions 1**

Test of the hypothesis with the Chi Square-test.

The result of the Chi Square-test on every picture set individually gave a result were H1 got accepted in all cases except one. This is a test where observed values are compared with expected values and the Chi Square-value gets higher depending on how much difference it is between observed and expected values. In this case the result shows that H1 is true even though it was not a picture with guerrilla characteristics that was most frequent answer. This is because of the structure of the Chi Square-function. To reject or accept the hypothesis further analysis was required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture set 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picture</td>
<td>Observed value</td>
<td>Expected value</td>
<td>χ² = ( \sum (E-O)^2 / E )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>77,25</td>
<td>33,34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77,25</td>
<td>17,96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>77,25</td>
<td>0,68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77,25</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \sum = 52,48 \]

52,48>7,815 = H0 Gets rejected and H1 gets accepted.

Mathematically is H1 accepted in this set, but the most frequent answers are pictures without the guerrilla characteristics. The Chi-Square test proves that these answers was not selected by chance and are valid answers. H1 gets rejected because the picture set doesn’t prove that guerrilla marketing generates more response than other types of marketing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture set 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picture</td>
<td>Observed value</td>
<td>Expected value</td>
<td>χ² = ( \sum (E-O)^2 / E )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1,57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>107,54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>46,75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \sum = 171,06 \]

171,06>7,815 = H0 gets rejected and H1 gets accepted.

In this set H1 gets accepted because the most frequent answer is the picture with the guerrilla characteristics and the Chi Square-test proves the validity of the answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture set 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picture</td>
<td>Observed value</td>
<td>Expected value</td>
<td>χ² = ( \sum (E-O)^2 / E )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>77,25</td>
<td>26,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>77,25</td>
<td>9,96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>77,25</td>
<td>13,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>77,25</td>
<td>2,63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \sum = 52,92 \]

52,92>7,815 = H0 gets rejected and H1 gets accepted.

In this set H1 gets accepted because the most frequent answer is the picture with the guerrilla characteristics and the Chi Square-test proves the validity of the answers, even though the second most frequent answer was very close and did not have guerrilla characteristics.
In this set H1 gets accepted because the most frequent answer is the picture with the guerilla characteristics and the Chi Square-test proves the validity of the answers.

In this set H0 gets accepted and H1 gets rejected because the observed values are very close to the expected values.

In this set H1 gets accepted because the most frequent answer is the picture with the guerilla characteristics and the Chi Square-test proves the validity of the answers.

Mathematically is H1 accepted in this set, but the most frequent answers are pictures without the guerilla characteristics. The Chi-Square test proves that these answers was not selected by...
chance and are valid answers. H1 gets rejected because the picture set doesn’t prove that guerilla marketing generates more response than other types of marketing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Observed value</th>
<th>Expected value</th>
<th>$\chi^2 = \sum (E-O)^2 / E$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>97.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>41.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>31.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\sum_1 = 174.92$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$174.92 > 7.815 = H0$ gets rejected and H1 gets accepted.

Mathematically is H1 accepted in this set, but the most frequent answers are pictures without the guerilla characteristics. The Chi-Square test proves that these answers was not selected by chance and are valid answers. H1 gets rejected because the picture set doesn’t prove that guerilla marketing generates more response than other types of marketing.
Appendix 5; Social Media research

The diagram shows how often the respondents spread purchases on social networks. They answered on a 6-point scale where one was rarely and six was very often.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diagram shows how often the respondents share marketing material on social networks. They answered on a 6-point scale where one was rarely and six was very often.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diagram shows if the respondents would respond to marketing material shared by friends. They answered on a 6-point scale where one was unlikely and six was most likely.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diagram shows how the respondents buying decisions is affected by other people online. They answered on a 6-point scale where one was unlikely and six was most likely.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6; Picture questions 2 with answers

Only one image was shown in each of these 3 questions and the idea behind this section was to see if Ambient-, Ambush- and Viral marketing work well together in the eye of the respondents.

- Picture question 1-3 shows Ambush Marketing combined with Ambient Marketing.

All these image questions were followed by a question of how they would respond to it, similar to the other picture questions, but now the measurement is directly towards Guerrilla Marketing methods. By doing this it would be noticed in what way people would react to the field of research – Guerilla Marketing – even if they prefer other types of marketing.

P9. Picture A;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell friends about it</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss the content</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share on social networks</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased brand loyalty</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy the product/service</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search for more product information</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the product category</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not respond to it</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tell friends about it 91 24%
Discuss the content 47 12%
Share on social networks 39 10%
Increased brand loyalty 14 4%
Buy the product/service 6 2%
Search for more product information 14 4%
Consider the service category 15 4%
I would not respond to it 153 40%
Other 3 1%
Many of the respondents would not see these examples as attractive even though they are consistent of two different elements of Guerrilla Marketing. Even so, around 20% would chose to tell friends but the other options did not receive much attention.
Appendix 7; Interview Answers

Interview Template - Semi structured

Share your opinion in these facts;

Our generation spends a lot of time online, why do you think it is like that?

- Respondent A
  - Everything is available online - it's easy to look up information there. We are certainly also very restless. As soon as we have a free moment, so it's easy to pick up the phone and check around online to pass the time.

- Respondent B
  - Because it is an opportunity that Internet is always available, laptops, smartphones etc. Also, one can do so many different things online, for an easier living.

- Respondent C
  - Easy to communicate, a lot of alternatives and happenings.

- Respondent D
  - It’s easy and comfortable to access any type of information on the internet. Our generation did grow up with the internet so it’s nothing strange to us.

Social media is the dominant activity, why do you think it is like that?

- Respondent A
  - Nowadays, one can easily and quickly connect with people from all over the world. Therefore, it is easier to keep in touch with friends. Our generation has a busy everyday life, which means we do not have time to meet with all friends. Then it is easy to contact them through social media, because it goes fast. Then we're probably also worried that we miss important events if you do not check in social media, because almost all the friends update there several times each day. You also get to see and hear a lot about your friends' lives, and I think that interests people.

- Respondent B
  - It is an easy way to keep in touch with acquaintances, when everybody moves all over Sweden and the globe after school, college, work etc.
• Respondent C
  ➢ A lot of gossip, always new things very day.

• Respondent D
  ➢ Because you can keep updated on what is going on in everyone’s daily life. It’s great tool to maintain contact with your friends, wherever they are.

Our generation often spread marketing material on social networks, why do you think it is like that?

• Respondent A
  ➢ We quickly reach out to many people, and thus spread information quickly. Almost everyone is inside and check social media multiple times each day.

• Respondent B
  ➢ I think it is one of the fastest ways to spread marketing material, compared to, for instance, ads in letter boxes and on pillars in cities.

• Respondent C
  ➢ Because all younger people spends a lot of time there.

• Respondent D
  ➢ Because it doesn’t require much effort to spread and share material on a social network, chances of a successful spread effect is high if you have a lot of friends on a social network.

What makes/will make you share marketing material on social networks?

• Respondent A
  ➢ Same answer as the previous question. I do not usually do that, but you will reach out quickly to people and you also reach out to friends of friends who spread it forward to their friends, etc.

• Respondent B
  ➢ If I am a part of it, has something to do with my friends, my work or me personally. Or if it has something to do with things I really care for, environment or animals etc.

• Respondent C
  ➢ There are a lot of readers there.
• Respondent D
  ➢ If it would benefit me or some of my friends than I would gladly share marketing material on social networks.

The things important to you;

Is the brand of importance when spreading marketing material? Why?
• Respondent A
  ➢ Yes. I put my trust in well-known brands.
• Respondent B
  ➢ No, the actual meaning of the material is of bigger importance to me.
• Respondent C
  ➢ Yes, it feels better to buy a recognized brand because you usually know its quality.
• Respondent D
  ➢ If it is a famous brand that I personally trust than yes, I would not share or spread any brand that I do not believe in.

Is funny content worth sharing more than others? Why?
• Respondent A
  ➢ Yes. It is more natural to share things that are funny with others.
• Respondent B
  ➢ Yes, a funny sharing make people smile, which is of importance.
• Respondent C
  ➢ Yes absolutely, as long as funny content still represent quality, content that seems too funny and immature can get a feeling of lesser quality.
• Respondent D
  ➢ Something funny and emotionally uplifting is always nice to share before other content, because funny content is usually more appreciated by people.
Is unusual content worth sharing more than others? Why?
• Respondent A
  ➢ Yes. Things that are unusual (and trustworthy) appeals more to people rather than things that everybody already knows.
• Respondent B
  ➢ Yes, otherwise there would only be the same kind of sharing which makes it monotonous. The width is important.
• Respondent C
  ➢ Yes, new unusual content is always fun and can sometimes be worth to share.
• Respondent D
  ➢ Maybe if it is interesting to me or my friends, sharing unusual content could be a great way to get a lot of different response from people.

Is visually attractive content worth sharing more than others? Why?
• Respondent A
  ➢ No, I do not think so.
• Respondent B
  ➢ Depends on what one will reach by the sharing. Is it just advertisement for a thing, it is important to be visually attractive. Is it some kind of information, it is not as it doesn’t have to be selling.
• Respondent C
  ➢ Yes, things that are beautiful and appealing are often more attractive to share.
• Respondent D
  ➢ I do not believe that, because people think differently about what is visually attractive to them or others.

Are recommendations for friends’ worth sharing more than others? Why?
• Respondent A
  ➢ Yes, it feels more natural to share the things that friends have recommended, because I usually have about the same taste as my friends. Then I share what I and they like.
• Respondent B
- It is not worth sharing more, but I would probably do it just because it is my friend.
  - Respondent C
- No, I do not believe people commonly have the energy to share advertisement with their friends. In that case I think you will tell your friends about the advertisement/offer directly in person.
  - Respondent D
- Sometimes yes, I believe I would rather believe in recommendations from someone I know than from someone I don’t know.

Is helping friends’ businesses worth sharing more than others? Why?
- Respondent A
  - Yes, it feels very obvious to help friends by sharing with others, because it benefits them.
- Respondent B
  - Yes, people do take help from family and friends and it is important, especially when it comes to business and work.
- Respondent C
  - Yes it is more fun to help a friend than a stranger.
- Respondent D
  - Yes of course, if I can help my friends or family with their businesses through sharing than I will gladly do it.

Is there one of these you prefer? Which one and why?
- Respondent A
  - Yes, to help my friends by sharing their material to others.
- Respondent B
  - Yes I think the unusual content is the most important. I think we really need a width in marketing material.
- Respondent C
  - Yes new and unusual things on the market is more attractive.
• Respondent D
  ➢ Sharing funny content is always fun and does not take too much time.

The most common outcome of sharing marketing material is that the respondents will tell their friends about it. Down below follows a few questions about the Viral Effect which is the procedure of spreading material.

When you tell your friends about marketing material, **HOW** would you tell your friends?

• Respondent A
  ➢ I do not normally do that, but if I would it would be on social media.

• Respondent B
  ➢ Depends on if it is a friend living close to me who I see often, or if it is a friend further away. Is it a friend I see I would probably show him or her the material and explain it on the same time. Is it a friend further away I would sent a text message or an e-mail on Facebook.

• Respondent C
  ➢ By Facebook, mail or via phone calls.

• Respondent D
  ➢ I would prefer to tell them person to person but otherwise I would use a social network like Facebook.

When you tell your friends about marketing material, **WHAT** would you tell your friends?

• Respondent A
  ➢ I probably would make them interested so they would like to know more. Especially if it is about helping a friend by sharing his/her information.

• Respondent B
  ➢ The story around it, not necessary what the marketing material refers to.

• Respondent C
  ➢ I will share the advertisement if there is a common interest or if it is advertising that I know any of my friends looking for.

• Respondent D
  ➢ Things that I know would benefit or interest my friends. Or maybe something that I like to buy but I want their opinions first.
How would it affect you if someone shared marketing material with you? Why?

- Respondent A
  - It depends a lot on who's sharing it with me. Then it depends also on what material it is. If I do not want it, I usually do not spend more time on it.

- Respondent B
  - Probably it wouldn’t affect me so much if it refers to an item but unconsciously if it refers to a habit.

- Respondent C
  - It would affect me in a bad way because I like to choose my own advertisement.

- Respondent D
  - It would affect me in a good way if the material interests me or if I can help friends by sharing it, otherwise I would just ignore it. The thing about social network is that you have the choice to respond or ignore to shared materials.

When a friend tells you about marketing, do you think the type of media matters in how you respond to it? Why?

- Respondent A
  - No I do not think so.

- Respondent B
  - Definitely! If I think it is fun or really means something I would respond better to it than if I think it is boring or meaningless.

- Respondent C
  - Yes, advertisement that is well prepared gives me better feeling towards the product.

- Respondent D
  - Yes if it is appealing to me than I probably would respond to it with more effort than otherwise.

If a friend shared marketing material on social networks, are you more likely to respond to it than if you had discovered it elsewhere?

- Respondent A
  - Yes, if a friend of mine recommends it I will probably be more interested.
• Respondent B
  ➢ No, I think I would respond more to it if we really discussed a topic face to face. Also, it is very easy to just scroll by on social networks and therefore miss it.

• Respondent C
  ➢ It depends on the type material, but I will probably respond to it if the content suits my field of interest.

• Respondent D
  ➢ Yes, I probably would if I know that my friend has the same taste in products as I do or if the marketing material contains something I have been looking for.

Why do you think the attitudes towards “Friends’ shares” of marketing material gets better response?
• Respondent A
  ➢ Because most of the time you can trust your friends judgment when it comes to good material.

• Respondent B
  ➢ You know the friend and therefore really know why he or she shares it, if it means something special.

• Respondent C
  ➢ Actually I have no idea, maybe you trust your friends.

• Respondent D
  ➢ Because people normally follow their friends activities online and would probably be more open minded towards “Friends’ shares” than towards material from unknown people.

Would you spread attractive marketing you see in real life on your social networks? Why?
• Respondent A
  ➢ I usually do not do that, but maybe if it’s benefitting my friends.

• Respondent B
  ➢ Yes, as I wrote before, if it is something that I really care for, I would share. I could take a photo or copy a sentence and share.
• Respondent C
  ➢ No, I do not think I have the energy to spread and share marketing on companies’ behalf.

• Respondent D
  ➢ Yes, if it is something funny and amusing enough to create a lot of responses. Or if it contains content that could interest or benefit friends.

Would you further spread attractive marketing you see on your social networks? Why?
• Respondent A
  ➢ No, only if it is something that my friends want me to spread because it benefits them.

• Respondent B
  ➢ No, not normally. See the answer above.

• Respondent C
  ➢ No, it takes too much of my time.

• Respondent D
  ➢ Maybe to see if it would get a lot of response or if it could help my friends or family in some way.

What other effects do you think the “tell friends-spread” has?
• Respondent A
  ➢ It will spread very fast from friends to friends etc. Therefore it can reach more people than the ones you shared to from the beginning.

• Respondent B
  ➢ I think it feels more secure when one shares a friends material. And therefore it is taken more seriously.

• Respondent C
  ➢ I believe it can be troublesome if friends keep on spamming marketing material all the time. But sometimes you can anticipate in contests with a chance of winning if you share marketing materials with you friends, which can be nice.
Respondent D

- The “tell friends-spread” has the ability to spread material fast and wide through networks of friends and therefore contains a lot benefits. But the risk lies within friends that shares marketing materials too often with different kind of materials which could eventually make them lose trustworthiness.
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