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Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of this thesis is to add empirical findings of IMC strategies utilizing digital- and traditional marketing communication channels to build and maintain brand equity in the FMCG industry. More specifically awareness, associations/image and sales that are said to be critically affected by communication are the focus of the study.

Research Question: Are digital marketing communication channels in an IMC strategy effective in creating awareness, associations and sales within the FMCG industry?

Methodological approach: An exploratory case study was adopted utilizing a mix of data sources. An interview with the Nordic Marketing Manager at the focal firm combined with multiple-source secondary data was used to give the context of the IMC strategy. A survey was then conducted with 269 respondents, thus the study measures the outcome on an individual level.

Findings: The findings show that the digital marketing communication channels have little or no direct effects on awareness, associations and sales. When looking at light – heavy category users it is found that the traditional marketing communication channels have a greater effect on the lightest users. Social media from others than the firm was found to have greater effects on awareness for heavier category users. Synergy effects were found for social media from the focal firm and others. Although the touchpoints that gained synergy effects were unexpected: Seen at work, tasted at work, sample from i.e. friends and family and seen on shelf. Further research is needed.

Contribution: This study moves beyond the laboratory setting of most previous research, allowing study of the touchpoints in business practice/part of an IMC strategy. Some touchpoints studied seem to be part of a novel notion not studied in previous research i.e. in store activites. More touchpoints are studied than in most previous research found.
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Definitions

Before diving into the issues that this thesis addresses, important terminologies and concepts are shortly explained.

Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC)

Integrated marketing communication (IMC) is the process of integrating various communication tools. It “…does not mean that many media should be employed but rather, an optimal number of media with different and complementary characteristics and with consistent messages.” (Dijkstra, Buijtels, & van Raaij, 2005, p. 379).

Touchpoint

Touchpoints are “…instances of direct contact with the product / service in itself or a representative of it by the company or some third party.” (Meyer & Schwager, 2007, p. 119). Thus simply put a touchpoint is any form of contact a customer/consumer has with the firm, brand or product including for example friends and family recommendations (Harrison, 2013).

User Generated Content (UGC)

User generated content: (1) is made available through publicly accessible transmission media i.e. the internet; (2) reflect some degree of creative effort; and (3) is created for free outside of professional routines and practices (Christodoulides, Jevons & Bonhomme, 2012).

Digital Marketing

Online marketing refers to the promotion of products and services over the internet (i.e. search engine marketing, banner ads, mobile advertising and location-based apps). Social media marketing are forms of electronic communication through which user-generated content can be shared within the user’s social network. (Shimp & Andrew, 2013) In this thesis online marketing and social media are combined referred to as digital marketing.
Traditional Marketing Communication

Traditional marketing communications are considered to be radio, tv, print, direct marketing, sampling activities and in-store activities (i.e. Bruhn, Schoenmueller & Schäfer, 2012; and Danaher & Dagger, 2013). Basically the offline marketing communication channels.

Marketing Communication Channels / Channels

Marketing communication channels refers to the different promotional tools and options a marketer have i.e. TV, print, radio, banner ads, social media, website but also user generated content (UGC) i.e. customer reviews, social media and blogs. The term channel can sometimes be used for describing distribution channels but as this paper only focuses on marketing communication channels the terminology will at times be shortened to channel or marketing channel. If any other meaning of the term is used it will be emphasized or explained in the text.

Product brand

According to the American Marketing Association (2014, brand) a brand is a; “name, term, design, symbol, or any other feature that identifies one seller’s good or service as distinct from those of other sellers”. Another way to look upon a brand is by defining it as “the totality of thoughts, feelings, sensations and associations it evokes” (Yasin, Noor & Mohamad, 2007, p. 39). These definitions are not contradictory, combined they emphasize the tangible cues and the intangible cognitive nature of a brand. Furthermore a brand is customer experienced and name, symbol, sounds etc. can be developed to represent implicit values, ideas or even personality (American Marketing Association, 2014, brand and branding). A strong brand comes with many benefits i.e. increased marketing-communication and channel effectiveness, greater customer loyalty and improved perception of product performance (Hoeffler & Keller, 2003). Thus, when a customer is to make a choice between different products; brands and brand management is important for an organization (Keller, 2009).

Brand Equity

Brand equity is the value of a brand. From a customer point of view it is based on consumer attitudes about positive brand attributes and favorable consequences of brand use. From a marketers perspective it is a way to describe the value of having a well-known brand name in financial terms, basically it generates more money. (American Marketing Association, 2014)
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**Introduction**

*In this chapter the subject, problem, research question, purpose and aim of this thesis are introduced, furthermore the contribution of this thesis is also presented.*

We all know it; the digital era is here changing how businesses operate. The media environment has changed dramatically from what it was only a decade ago and the traditional advertising media such as TV and magazines are said to lose their grip on consumers. Combined with other factors technology has profoundly changed when, where, how and if consumers process communication. (Keller, 2009) Consumers appear to have adjusted to the change, “*experiencing media across an ever increasing number of channels, platforms and locations at an unprecedented rate*” (Steele et al., 2013, p. 417). To reach consumers through digital media has been said to be the most promising field of development within marketing (Smith, 2011).

Although it makes for exciting times the adoption of new technologies, and the advertising in them, has expanded at a faster rate than the knowledge of how to leverage them (Romaniuk, Beal, & Jeans, 2012). Media channel selection has never been more challenging for marketing managers. Although the traditional media is still attractive, the rise of the Internet introduced several new attractive communication channels. This is where the problem for marketing managers arise, while the number of available media outlets have proliferated the marketing budgets have remained almost static (Danaher & Rossiter, 2011). Thus marketers are faced with the question of how to reinforce a message or brand more efficiently with the same advertising budget (Havlena, Cardarelli & Montigny, 2007). Marketers lack the information they would like for making these media decisions today (Taylor et al., 2013). In this new media landscape, one of the most pressing issues within marketing is how the various media channels compare in term of effectiveness (Marketing Science Institute, 2010 in Danaher & Dagger, 2013).
Problem Background

Advertisers and marketers no longer rely solely on the traditional high-reach media such as TV, they are now using a mix of touchpoints embracing the opportunities technology has brought forth (Aitchison, 2011 in Romaniuk, Beal & Uncles, 2013). These kinds of combinations require wise media planning and integration in line with the concept of integrated marketing communication (IMC) (Romaniuk, Beal & Uncles, 2013). With roots in the early 1990s, it has become a natural part of marketing in the eyes of practitioners and academic literature (Kitchen et al., 2004). Simply put IMC deals with the integration of all kinds of touchpoints that can affect the consumer’s brand experience (Calder & Malthouse, 2005).

A key aspect within IMC is that of touchpoints’ effectiveness and possible synergies between them. This has become a trend where the assumption that media exposure equals advertising effectiveness is changing to dealing with the role of media integration on advertising effectiveness (Calder and Malthouse, 2005). Wakolbinger, Denk & Obercker (2009) argue that in practice a mix of media can lead to a better absolute reach than single-media campaigns. There is growing evidence that a mix of media can have a strong impact on the overall effectiveness and that one medium can improve the effectiveness of another (Kliatchko, 2008). Binet & Field (2009) found that campaigns that use multiple marketing channels tend to be more effective and efficient than campaigns using a single marketing channel. However they also found that the optimum effectiveness is usually achieved with around three to four advertising media, depending on budget size, more marketing channels only caused diminishing returns. Thus simply using all, or a majority of marketing channels, is not a viable option.

Although the evidence for IMC is growing the academic literature is calling out for research focused on: possible synergies between touchpoints (i.e. Wakolbinger, Denk & Obercker, 2009, the role of digital marketing as an individual marketing channel but also in an IMC strategy (i.e. Keller, 2009), business practice (i.e. Kitchen et al., 2004), how to incorporate the internet into business models and marketing plans (i.e. Pomirleanu et al., 2013) and how IMC effectiveness is related to brand awareness and brand image (i.e. Madhavaram, Badrinarayanan & McDonald, 2005)
So “Why is IMC being hailed as a major communication development of the 21st century?”, the simple answer is that it provides various benefits for firms (Madhavaram, Badrinarayanan & McDonald, 2005, p. 71). One important benefit is that IMC helps firms to build brand equity for their products through synergies (Naik & Raman, 2003) and brand equity in turn helps firms to achieve superior financial performance (Madhavaram, Badrinarayanan & McDonald, 2005). Brand equity is a competitive advantage for firms (Aaker, 1992) and is therefore of course a priority for many firms (Hoeffler & Keller, 2003). Brand equity can in its most simple definition be called the value of a brand for the consumer, customer and firm; in reality brand equity is complex and will be further explained and discussed later on in this thesis. Strong brand equity can affect the effectiveness of communication by making the consumer more willing to pay attention to communication, process it more favorably, and increase the consumer’s ability to recall the information and the cognitive and affective reactions that are imbedded in the communication (Keller, 2009). Therefore, brand equity is central to the way advertising works both as a goal in itself and as a mediator to other goals (Keller, 2009).

Measuring the effects can help develop strategies that can create more meaningful connections with the target market by understanding how advertising in each media shifts brand perceptions or encourages higher purchase intent. Research within the area can also help avoid advertising waste (Havlena, Cardarelli & Montigny, 2007).

**Problem Formulation**

As mentioned, the media environment has undergone a rapid change where practitioners and academics are struggling to gain an understanding for how the huge number of media channels can be leveraged. The concept of IMC has emerged as a way to explain and understand how to leverage the media channels, with success being associated with IMC effects and IMC synergies. Although rooted in the early 1990s research is still needed within the area to determine the effects of the different marketing channels and the synergy effects between them in an IMC strategy. The challenge companies are faced with is to find the optimum mix of a few marketing channels, and to do this one needs to understand the value of each marketing channel. Brand equity is one important way of measuring the effects of IMC.

Brand equity consists of multiple dimensions: awareness, associations/image, perceived quality and loyalty (Aaker, 1992), as will be further explained in the theoretical chapter of this
thesis. Out of these awareness and associations/image are said to be the only dimensions that are critically affected by communication (Madhavaram, Badrinarayanan & Mcdonald, 2005). At the same time there are expressed uncertainties if online advertisement can affect behavioral outcome in the form of sales (i.e. Fulgoni & Mörn, 2009).

Insights into how IMC strategies are using online and offline advertising to create value for brands are limited (Pfeiffer & Zinnbauer, 2010). Hollis (2005) mention the case of the car brand Crystler who has brought their advertising to the web. It was considered a rational choice for them as people research their next car online before purchasing it, so basically they are fishing where the fish is. This rationale cannot be said to be true for fast moving consumer goods (FMCG) brands that are typically characterized by low involvement. This makes the effects of the digital marketing channels in the FMCG industry especially interesting to study as it faces an uphill battle compared to other industries.

The purpose of this thesis is to add empirical findings of IMC strategies utilizing digital- and traditional marketing communication channels to build and maintain brand equity in the FMCG industry. More specifically awareness, associations and sales that can be critically affected by communication are the focus of the study. This thesis aims to help clarify how digital marketing can be leveraged in an IMC strategy by answering the following research question:

**Research question:** *Are digital marketing communication channels in an IMC strategy effective in creating awareness, associations and sales within the FMCG industry?*

**Contribution**

This study contributes to the current research within IMC and brand equity by trying to clarify the effectiveness of digital marketing communication relative to traditional marketing communication but also other touchpoints. In addition the synergy effects on other touchpoints are studied as this also contributes to determining the value of digital marketing channels in an IMC strategy. Previous research has primarily been experimental in laboratory settings where audiences are more or less forced to view either one sort of communication or both (i.e. Taylor et al., 2013; Wakolbinger, Denker & Obercker, 2009; Steele et al., 2013; Chang & Thorson, 2004; Dijkstra, Buijtels & van Raaij, 2005). The lack of connection to how
consumers are exposed to brands outside a laboratory can arguably negatively affect the validity for these previous studies. Furthermore drawbacks of this method are the very short term focus and the limited scope, where only a few channels, often only two or three, are investigated. As the media landscape has changed and IMC nowadays comprise of much more than only two-three media channels, and many more touchpoints, research is needed that follows the development within marketing communication.

This thesis takes a real life case approach, thus moving beyond the laboratory setting of most previous studies. This allows for insights into the effects and synergies within an IMC strategy. Drawing from the empirical data collected through an interview with the Nordic Marketing Manager for Wasa the communication channels were extended to comprise touchpoints such as in store activities, a novel notion not tested in any previous studies found. In addition the scope in number of channels/touchpoints investigated is greatly increased compared to previous studies, thus reflecting the modern reality of IMC.
Theoretical Framework and Previous Studies

In this chapter the concept of integrated marketing communication (IMC) will be defined and explained and the different factors influencing the choice of marketing channels. This is followed by an explanation and discussion of brand equity and its components. Previous research results, although scarce will also be presented. Lastly a conclusion/summary of this chapter will be presented.

Integrated marketing communication (IMC)

How IMC should be perceived, defined and developed is being questioned by researchers: is it new or old, is it a theoretical brand concept for the emerging digitalized environment or is it an invention for practitioners (Madhavaram, Badrinarayanan & Mcdonald, 2005). No matter what it is, researchers at least agree that to execute successful marketing communication various disciplines need to come together with high efficiency and high resonance meaning to stakeholders, customers and consumers. Within the concept of IMC, advertising and PR are the two major functions. (Kitchen et. al., 2004)

Schultz & Kitchen (2000, p.65) define IMC as:

“...a strategic business process used to plan, develop, execute and evaluate coordinated measurable, persuasive brand communication programs over time with consumers, customers, prospects, and other targeted, relevant external and internal audiences.”

Shimp & Andrew (2013, p.12) offer a more comprehensible definition for this thesis’s purpose:

“IMC is the coordination of the promotional mix elements (advertising, public relations, sales promotion, personal selling, direct marketing and online marketing/social media) with each other and with the other elements of the brands’ marketing mix (product, place, price) such that all elements speak with one voice.”
As the definitions attest IMC is multifaceted, Shimp (2010) offer five key aspects of the concept: (1) starts with the customers or prospects; (2) use any form of relevant contact or touchpoint; (3) speak with a single voice so that brand equity is not destroyed (4) build relationships and lastly (5) affect behavior. Although not all form of touchpoints are equal in efficiency or engagement. Shimp (2010) argue that a highly relevant internet site is more effective than a low interest TV-program. Thus there is a relationship between message media (touchpoint) and message content.

Key aspects within IMC are that of effectiveness of the touchpoints and the synergies between these touchpoints (Keller, 2009; and Laurie & Mortimer, 2011). Keller (2009) argues that marketers should be media-neutral and evaluate possible communication options based on effectiveness considerations. For the concept of IMC to be implemented within an organization one needs to understand how to create synergies between marketing communication channels. There is of course no mathematical formula but an important aspect is the brand’s life-cycle stage where newer brands require larger investments in promotions (i.e. sampling) while mature brands might need greater advertising investments to enhance brand image (Shimp, 2010). Havlena, Cardarelli & Montigny (2007) also conclude that synergies are found when using multiple marketing channels in communicating with consumers in the FMCG industry.

Keller (2001b & 2009) proposes a number of factors that should be considered when “developing the most effective and efficient marketing communication program possible” (Keller, 2009, p. 149). These are:

**Coverage:** refers to how many % of the target market is reached by each communication option and how much they overlap. Overlap refers to if the same or different consumers make up that market (Keller, 2001b & 2009). Romaniuk, Beal & Uncles (2013) found that a second medium/touch point reached duplicated audiences (60 %) in a higher extent than new audience. They draw the conclusion that new media should be added after the first one has exhausted its capacity to achieve cost-efficient reach. Taylor et al., (2013) support these findings, by stating that the extra reach by adding online advertisement to a TV campaign is primarily duplicated (75 %).
**Contribution:** refers to what ability a communication has in isolation. That is the effect the channel has on consumers processing of a communication and the resulting outcome i.e. building awareness, enhancing image, eliciting response or/and inducing sales. (Keller, 2001b & 2009)

**Commonality:** is the extent to which common associations are reinforced across channels. In other words, the extent to which information conveyed by different communications shares meaning. (Keller, 2001b & 2009)

**Complementarity:** relates to the extent different associations and linkages are emphasized across communication options (Keller, 2001b & 2009). Keller (2009) argues that ideally the communications chosen should mutually compensate and reinforce in order to create desired consumer knowledge structures.

**Versatility:** the extent that a marketing communication option is robust and effective for different groups of consumers. A communication option is considered versatile when it achieves desired effect regardless of consumers’ past communication history, level of brand or product knowledge or processing goals etc. (Keller, 2001b & 2009). In literature consumers are viewed on a continuum from light-users to heavy-users that represents these differences.

Binet & Field (2009) found that the far most popular targeting strategy focuses on reaching heavy brand buyers this despite the finding that the opposite strategy, that is focusing on light and non-customers is associated with far higher sales. Nelson-Field, Riebe & Sharp (2012) describe the reasoning behind the popularity as: the logical assumption that it makes sense to spend more on customers who are worth more to the brand. But this logic is flawed as it does not matter how much the customer spends but rather how they respond to advertising. This as a customer who is already 100 % loyal cannot give the brand any more of their category spending. Therefore, for a brand to grow it needs to communicate with its light and non-customers also. The heavier customers, that are by definition more loyal, are easier to reach as they more easily notice and mentally process the brand’s advertising messages (Sharp, 2010 from Nelson-Field, Riebe & Sharp, 2012). Steele et al., (2013) and Dijkstra, Buijtels, & van Raaij (2005) also found that the difference between TV- and web advertisement was due to the low visual attention to the latter.
The implication of this is that marketing channels that reach light- and non-customers are particularly valuable. With this in mind Nelson-Field, Riebe & Sharp (2012) suggest that the ideal mix of marketing channels reach all category buyers. Furthermore they studied the buying concentration of Facebook fans for two FMCG brands and found that it skewed towards heavy brand buyers more so than the population of customers and audience of the Super Bowl (sport tournament), and thus making it unappealing to marketers due to its low quality in reach. Taylor et al., (2013) also found that positive word of mouth and social media tended to reach heavy brand and category users. Romaniuk, Beal and Uncle (2013) studied 16 touchpoints and found that TV, gift-packs, in-store displays and outdoor advertisements closely matched category user profiles, all other touchpoints studied were skewed towards heavy category users. Steele et al., (2013) found that TV was better at creating an emotional response for unfamiliar brands than online displays where no previous brand equity existed.

With this in mind the first hypothesis is formulated:

**Hypothesis 1**: Digital marketing communication channels have a higher effect on heavier category users than lighter category users, compared to traditional marketing communication channels, in an IMC strategy.

**Cost**: the above criteria’s need to be weighed against their costs to achieve the most effective and efficient communication program (Keller, 2001 & 2009). Briggs, Krishnam & Borin (2005) found that a brand that previously spent 90% of their advertisements budget on TV advertisements to generate awareness and consideration increased their exposure by 20% when re-allocating the budget partly to the more efficient media: magazines and online media.

**Consumer-Based-Brand Equity (CBBE)**

According to Aaker (1992) brand equity: (1) is a set of brand assets and liabilities; (2) is linked to the brand’s name and symbol; (3) can subtract from, as well as add to, the value provided by a product or service; and (4) provide value to customers as well as to a firm. Keller (2009, p. 142) who has developed the consumer based brand equity (CBBE) model state that “Brand equity is fundamentally determined by the brand knowledge created in consumer’s minds by marketing programs and activities”. Brand knowledge here refers to all thoughts, feelings, perceptions, images, and experiences etc. that are linked to the brand in the consumers’ minds. Thus the power of the brand lies in the mind of the consumer (Keller,
These views on brand equity are in line with each other, and it should be mentioned that Aaker’ and Keller’ conceptualizations of brand equity are the two most popular. Keller’s model operationalizes CBBE from a consumer perception point of view whilst Aaker’s model takes on a more behavioral approach.

Keller’s (2009) definition may be interpreted that marketers are in control of the brand, but the change in the media environment has called this view of marketing into question (Harris & Rae, 2010). Therefore, the assumption of marketers having complete control will not be used in this thesis. Rather this paper sees the change in power from the marketer to the consumers. It allows for the characteristics of social media and other user generated content that can affect brand equity to be seen as equally important as marketing programs and activities.

The strength of a brand, and thus brand equity, of an advertised brand can affect the effectiveness of the communication. This by making consumers (1) more willing to attend to additional communication, (2) process the communication more favorably and (3) ability to recall the communication and the cognitive and affective reactions that are embedded in the communication increase. Therefore, brand equity is stated as central to the way advertising works, either as a goal in itself or as a mediator to other goals. (Keller, 2009)

Madhavaram, Badrinarauanan & McDonald (2005) puts forth a conceptual work arguing that IMC is a critical part of building and maintaining brand equity, despite that much is still being debated within the concept of IMC, this is something that is agreed upon (i.e. Keller, 2009 and Kitchen et. al., 2004). During the past decade two different paradigms have been put forth to explain how effectiveness of online marketing should be assessed: brand building or direct response (Hollis, 2005). However Hollis (2005) conclude that both brand equity and sales can be positively influenced by online marketing. More specifically he states that click-through\(^1\) is primarily a consequence of the brand building effect and the interest to learn more about a brand and its product and services when in an immediate need for them. Other authors have also studied the relationship between digital marketing and brand equity; the findings will be presented later in this chapter after a deeper look upon brand equity in the FMCG industry.

\(^1\) “Click-through is the ratio of the number of times an online advertisement is clicked to the number of advertising impressions.” (Hollis, 2005, p. 254).
The Dimensions of Brand Equity in the FMCG industry

Aaker’s (1992) model proposes five dimensions of brand equity, which till this day are the most popular. The five dimensions are brand loyalty, brand name awareness, perceived brand quality, brand associations in addition to perceived quality, and lastly other proprietary brand assets (i.e. patents and trademarks). The last dimension is usually of lesser importance (Aaker, 1992) and in the FMCG industry it has no importance at all for CBBE (see i.e. Yoo & Donthu, 2001) therefore it will be excluded from this paper. These four dimensions will lay out the structure of a CBBE framework for this paper and will be explained and motivated below.

**Loyalty**

Loyalty is the attachment a customer has with a brand. Brand equity is largely created by brand loyalty (Yasin, Noor & Mohamad, 2007). Loyalty is defined either as an attitude or as a behavior (Hallowell, 1996). In Aaker’s model the latter is emphasized. Aaker (1992) considered brand loyalty to be vital for brand equity as it translates into a profit stream. He states that loyalty is an effective way to manage brand equity because customer satisfaction and repeat buying patterns are often indicators of a healthy brand. Keller (2009) agrees with this view on loyalty but also add in the share of consumers total spending in a specific product group as an indication for loyalty. A brand’s value is considered substantial when customers faced with competitor’s brands that have superior features still stay loyal (Yasin, Noor & Mohamad, 2007).

Loyalty is a vital part in building a relationship with the customer and Keller’s (2001a) model conceptualize it as part of the final step, called resonance, for achieving brand equity. Resonance consist of the categories: behavioral loyalty (purchase); attitudinal attachment (see the brand as special); sense of community (kinship with other people associated with the brand) and; active engagement (investment of time, energy, money etc.). The categories relate to each other i.e. active engagement is achieved with attitudinal attachment and/or sense of community. (Keller, 2001a)

**Brand Awareness**

Brand awareness is vital as it is the base for a strong and successful brand as it provides an anchor to where associations can be linked (Aaker, 1992). There are two levels of brand awareness; recognition (ability to confirm prior exposure) and recall (ability to retrieve the
brand when given cue of category) (Keller, 1993). Even recognition awareness can contribute by providing the brand with familiarity, substance and commitment (Aaker, 1992). Macdonald & Sharp (2000) showed that consumers are more likely to buy brands they recognize because more familiar products are normally preferred (simplifying heuristic). The recall level further affects the consumer’s choice by influencing which brands get considered and selected (Aaker, 1992).

Thus awareness is vital for affecting behavior in the purchase situation (Macdonald & Sharp, 2000), and especially for FMCGs that are low involvement products. The higher awareness a brand achieves the more dominant is the brand, which increases the probability that the brand is considered in purchase situations (Yasin, Noor & Mohamad, 2007). Keller (2001a) argues that in addition to the ‘top of mind’/depth of awareness described above, it is vital to look at the breadth, that is when and where consumers think of a brand, as it otherwise can be forgotten at possible usage situations. This is related to the brand identity which is further elaborated on below when presenting the association dimension of brand equity.

Advertising is important for building brand awareness as it exposes the brand to customers and consumers (Yoo, Donthu & Lee, 2000). Worth mentioning is the study by Huang & Sarigöllu (2012) set in a mature FMCG category and brands with high awareness, they found that increasing advertising in this setting had little effect on increasing brand awareness. They also found that brand usage experience contribute to awareness, thus sometimes experience with a brand precedes awareness.

**Perceived Quality**

Perceived quality generates value by providing: a reason to buy, a point of differentiation, act as a base for line extensions; and supporting a higher price (Aaker, 1992). High perceived quality is achieved when consumers recognize the differentiation and superiority of the brand compared to competing brands (Yasin, Noor, Mohamad, 2007).

Keller (2001a) divides perceived quality into ‘performance’ and ‘judgment’. ‘Performance’ relates to what meaning the brand has for the consumer and considers things such as characteristics, features, product reliability, style, design and price. Keller (2001a) says that it is built up through associations from advertising, experience and/or from word-of-mouth. ‘Judgement’ on the other hand revolves around how a consumer responds to a brand and is
the consumer’s own personal opinion and evaluations about i.e. quality, consideration and superiority.

Perceived quality received its own primary dimension in Aaker’s (1992) model because it was considered very important for companies’ sustainable competitive advantage (strategy). It reduces the customer’s perceived risk (Aaker, 1992; Keller, 1993), but as the FMCG industry is characterized by low involvement this dimension might be questioned. Mohan & Sequeira (2012) found that the dimension perceived quality has a high correlation with brand equity in the FMCG industry. Other researchers also agree that perceived quality is an important dimension (i.e. Yoo & Donthu, 2001; and Pappu, Quester & Cooksey, 2005). But as it will be shown below this dimension has shared content and outcomes with that of brand associations.

**Brand Associations**

Brand associations/brand image is one of the most accepted aspects of brand equity (Aaker, 1992) and contains the meaning of a brand held in the consumer’s memory (Keller, 1993). Keller (1993, p. 3) defines brand image as “perceptions about a brand as reflected by the brand associations held in consumer memory”. It includes product attributes, customer benefit, uses, users, life-styles, product classes, competitors and countries (Aaker, 1992). It helps the customer process and retrieve information; it can be the basis for differentiation and extensions; a reason to buy; and it can create positive feelings. An example is that of the chocolate brand Hershey’s that can exploit its brand name by introducing an extension such as Hershey’s chocolate milk (Aaker, 1992).

Keller (2001a) divides associations into ‘imagery’ and ‘feelings’. ‘Imagery’ relates to what meaning the brand has for the consumer and is related to user profiles, purchase and usage situations, personality, values, history, heritage and experiences. It is said to be built up through associations from advertising, experience and/or from word-of-mouth. While ‘feelings’ are the customer’s emotional response in respect to the brand (i.e. warmth, fun, excitement, security, social approval and self-respect). (Keller, 2001a)

Brand identity, that is intangible and tangible qualities that create a unique set of brand associations that the brand strategist (i.e. a brand manager) aspire to create and maintain, drives brand associations/brand image (Aaker, 1996). Thus the selection, creation and
maintenance of brand associations are important steps in managing brand equity (Till, Baack & Waterman, 2011).

**How the dimensions interact to create brand equity**

Aaker (1992) and Keller (2001a) do not conceptualize how the dimensions relate to each other in the same manner. Keller’s (1993) see the different dimensions as a pyramid where the step before must be achieved to reach the higher levels. Aaker’s (1992) model on the other hand does not have this flow chart but rather all dimensions can influence brand equity isolated, affect each other and brand equity can in turn influence the dimensions. It should be said that loyalty is viewed as special. Loyalty can be affected strongly by one single other dimension and in other cases it occurs quite independent of the other dimensions; it is also affected by overall brand equity (Aaker, 2009). The models are illustrated in figure 1 below.

**Figure 1 Models of Brand Equity**

![Figure 1 Models of Brand Equity](image)

(Source: The figure to the left is from Keller (2001a, p.17), but colored to match the figure to the right, which is authors own based on the work of Aaker (1992).)

Dyson, Farr & Hollis (1996) bring some clarity into this matter, they also see the interactions between the dimensions as a flow chart in the form of a pyramid. Where most consumers will achieve the lower levels of the pyramid (i.e. awareness) and relatively few will reach the top (loyalty). But Dyson, Farr & Hollis (1996), who studied loyalty, argue that a customer does not need to reach the higher levels in the pyramid to be a regular purchaser (behavioral
loyalty). The higher loyalty the customer achieves the higher the brand’s percent (share) of spending in the category. Thus the lower levels of the pyramid also affect purchase behavior directly. This is illustrated in figure 2 below using the example of a FMCG product in the US.

Figure 2 A Model of Loyalty

![Proportion of Consumer Loyalty](image)

(Source: Dyson, Farr & Hollis (1996, p. 14), coloration by author.)

Brand awareness and brand associations have been questioned as separate dimensions (i.e. Yoo, Donthu & Lee, 2000 (camera film, athletic shoes, color tv sets); Yoo & Donthu, 2001 (camera film, athletic shoes, color tv sets); Washburn & Plank, 2002 (co-brands in FMCG); Kayaman & Arasli, 2007 (hotel)) while others confirm their validity as separate dimensions i.e. (Mohan & Sequeira, 2012 (FMCG); Pappu, Quester & Cooksey, 2005 (cars and television). This thesis will take the original view that treats the constructs as separate, as no consensus has been reached to change the original model of brand equity. Furthermore the research within measuring awareness and associations treat them as separate constructs and thus adopting this view makes it possible to adopt these methods to measure the constructs. Mohan & Sequeira (2012) found that Aaker’s four dimensions explained 74.7 % of brand equity. Thus attesting to the fact that the model or the measurements are not perfect, but together with Keller’s model they are the main frameworks for conceptualizing brand equity (Buil, Chernatony & Martinez, 2008). Yoo & Donthu (2001) also argue that although the models are widely accepted the validity of the measures is still unanswered.
Previous studies of synergy effects between marketing communication channels

Chang & Thorson (2004) found in their study that synergies existed between TV & Web advertisement. Mixing the two marketing communication channels led to higher attention to the ad, higher message credibility, generated more cognitive thoughts and more positive thoughts. While positive attitude toward the brand, higher purchase intention and higher perceived brand credibility did not show any synergy effects. Steele et al., (2013) also found synergy effects between TV and online advertisement on emotional engagement which carried over to the brand resonance experience. Havlena, Cardarelli & Montigny (2007) found no synergies between these for awareness and purchase intent.

Wakolbinger, Denker & Obercker (2009) studied print and online advertisement and found no synergy effects for awareness; even though the marketing channels effectiveness on recall was equal. Dijkstra, Buijtels, & van Raaij (2005) found varying results when studying synergies between TV, print and online advertisement. Thus, their studies contradict the notion of the previous studies that synergies are created in an IMC strategy that mixes traditional- and digital marketing communication channels. Naik & Peters (2009) literature review found mixed results, i.e. synergies between traditional marketing channels were found but the addition of online banner advertising gave few or no synergy effects. Naik & Peters (2009) own study of the groupings of offline- and online marketing communication channels effect on visits to a dealerships webpage and offline dealers and found that there were synergies within the groups but also between. Thus the previous research within the field has not reached a consensus.

Although previous research has received varying results, synergies are a basic assumption within IMC therefore the following hypothesis is formulated:

**Hypothesis 2**: Digital marketing communication channels have synergy effects with other touchpoints in an IMC strategy.

**Brand Equity and Marketing Communication Studies**

Some research has been done into how the different marketing communication channels relate to building and managing brand equity. But a significant problem within digital marketing is that research becomes out of date often before it has even been published. An example of this is Danaher & Rossiter (2011) who conducted surveys to investigate a total of eleven
marketing communication channels, one at a time, based on entertainment, trustworthy, informative and convenient (rather than brand equity) and through these dimensions determine engagement and the synergy effects. Although the most comprehensive study found, it was submitted in 2008 and is very out of date evident by that the digital channels comprise of e-mail alone. Furthermore the study fails to investigate the synergy effects between media, despite trying to make some conclusion regarding the fact.

Below all found studies capturing the relationship between marketing communication channels and the brand equity dimensions awareness and associations as well as sales are presented. As previously mentioned, the brand equity dimensions critically affected by communication are brand awareness and brand image (Madhavaram, Badrinarayanan & Mcdonald, 2005).

**Awareness**

Bruhn, Schoenmueller & Schäfer (2012) studied the comparative effects between traditional media, firm created social media and user-generated social media (the latter is UGC). They found that traditional media has a very strong impact on awareness compared to social media. Social media created by the firm had a positive effect on brand awareness, while UGC did not affect awareness. Wakolbinger, Denker & Obercker (2009) found that print and online advertisements are equally effective in providing recall (awareness). Their literature review also showed that the majority of studies agree with their result, even though research is not conclusive. Thus it might be TV (high in engagement) alone that stands for the absolute majority of the effect seen on awareness from marketing communication channels.

Binet & Field (2009) studied 880 marketing campaigns in ‘extremely diverse range of categories’ that were submitted to the IPA effectiveness awards. Although the study is limited to cases that are considered very effective and to U.K. based campaigns and cannot compare effects between traditional and digital marketing channels they could draw some interesting conclusions. They found, among other things, that the most effective campaigns when looking at profit: (1) focused on ‘hard’ objectives (i.e. market share) and specifically supported firmer pricing rather than volume sales, (2) focused on customer acquisition and / or penetration rather than loyalty, (3) incorporate TV which the study showed has become more effective not less, and lastly (4) that it is the most efficient to focus spending on a small number of channels
(approximately 3-4 depending on budget) working in synergy. Thus, the findings support the relative importance of TV in an IMC strategy.

In addition Steele et al., (2013, p. 419) argue that “the complex interaction between media content, platform characteristics and consumer’s motivational states result in viewing experiences that can be more immersive or flexible”, which will affect the manner and degree to which consumers engage with advertisements and brands. Steele et al., (2013) found that TV advertisements had a greater effect on brand resonance than did web advertisements. The difference is stated to be driven by the low visual attention to online display advertisement in comparison to TV.

With this in mind the third hypothesis is formulated:

**Hypothesis 3:** TV has a higher effect on awareness than the digital marketing communication channels in an IMC strategy.

**Associations/Image**

Bruhn, Schoenmueller & Schäfer (2012) found that both functional brand image (related to product attributes) and hedonic brand image (unrelated to specific product attributes) was influenced by traditional media. The results show that traditional media had a much lower effect compared to social media from both the firm and others. Interestingly firm created social media had a stronger affect on functional brand image while it showed almost no effect on hedonic brand image. The opposite result was found for user-generated social media that had a strong affect on hedonic brand image and no effect on functional brand image. Thus the study shows that different aspects of brand image are affected depending on the transmitter of the message through social media.

The finding of Steele et al., (2013) showed a greater emotional engagement for advertisements on TV compared to online, when for the respondent unfamiliar brands were studied. They also found that the emotional engagement translated over to the brand resonance experience. The low result for online advertisements was due to the lack of visual attention directed towards them; the visual attention for TV was much higher. Furthermore, online advertisement was more relevant and effective when prior emotional connections exist. The findings of Steele et al., (2013) confirm the previous study of Dijkstra, Buijtels, & van Raaij (2005) that also found this connection for recall of brand claims.
Although the previous research results vary the following hypothesis is formulated:

**Hypothesis 4:** Digital marketing communication channels have a higher effect on associations than traditional marketing communication channels in an IMC strategy.

**Sales**

As was shown above brand equity is a complex concept where sales or purchase intent can be viewed as part of loyalty, but it can also be an outcome from each individual level of brand equity and even an outcome of brand equity as such. But one should take note that there is a difference between short term and long term effects. Sales have a tendency to measure short term effects while loyalty/brand equity can be said to stand for the long term effects. It should also be mentioned that advertising-sales effect are often difficult, if not impossible to evaluate because advertising work as a reminder for the consumer to buy the preferred brand and thereby keep the existing buying propensities (Kennedy, McDonald & Sharp, 2008, in Taylor et al., 2013). Purchase is probably the most used variable to measure outcome, therefore only a few recent studies were chosen to display where research is today, instead of all that were found.

Danaher & Dagger (2013) studied ten different channels: six traditional (TV, newspaper, radio, magazines, catalog and direct mail) and four new (online display, sponsored search, social media and e-mail) and their effectiveness on sales. They found that catalogs, television and direct mail most strongly influence sales and profit, followed by radio and newspaper. Of the new media only e-mail and sponsored search influenced purchase outcomes. Thus magazines, online display advertising and social media has no significant relation with purchase incidence or outcome. Important to note is the efficiency of the display ads was less than optimal and is brought forth by the authors as a possible cause for the negative result.

Taylor et al., (2013) found that a single TV exposure still has a strong affect on short term sales and that higher frequency typically brings extra sales but the added effect diminishes. They also found that online advertisement led to sales but the effect was inconsistent amongst the respondents. TV was found to have the highest affect on sales, but surprisingly there were no significant synergy effects on sales for the marketing communication channels.

In light of this the fifth and last hypothesis is formulated:
Hypothesis 5: Traditional marketing communication channels have a higher effect on sales/purchase intent than digital marketing communications in an IMC strategy.

Conclusion/Summary of the theoretical framework and literature review

This chapter started with looking at integrated marketing communication (IMC) that deals with the integration of touchpoints. Key aspects are the effectiveness and synergies between the multiple touchpoints making out the IMC-strategy. There are multiple factors to consider when determining what channels to use i.e. coverage, contribution and versatility.

One way of measuring the outcome of an IMC strategy is to look upon brand equity. Researchers have argued that only awareness and associations/image are critically affected by communication. As this thesis focuses upon the effectiveness of digital marketing communication relative to traditional marketing communication it was natural to focus upon these dimensions of brand equity. Sales which can be considered a part of loyalty, an outcome of the individual brand equity dimensions as well as overall brand equity as such was also focused upon. This gives the thesis an opportunity to look upon long-term effects and short-term effects. Below figure 3 illustrates these different concepts addressed in the theoretical review.

Figure 3 Summary of Theory

The current literature within the subject is scarce. As the literature review attest, the stream of studies addressing synergy effects contradict each other. In that way this review shares the findings of Naik & Peters (2009) who’s review of studies of multimedia synergies, with focus
on traditional and digital marketing channels found varying results. Few studies address more than three channels at a time, and focus has been on television relative to different types of online adverts both in effectiveness and synergy studies. Previous studies studying the effectiveness of traditional marketing communication compared to digital marketing communication found that traditional marketing has a higher effect on awareness and sales while digital marketing communication has possibly a stronger effect on image. A summary of the hypothesis formulated in the theoretical chapter are shown below. Most of the previous studies are although set in a laboratory setting (i.e. Chang & Thorson, 2004; Steele et al., 2013; Wakolbinger, Denker & Obercker, 2009; Dijkstra, Buijtels & van Raaij, 2005) and not studied in the real life context of an IMC strategy. Thus differences in the results between this study and previous studies are possible, due to the methodological differences. The methodological approach for this thesis will be addressed in the coming chapter.

Hypothesis formulated throughout the theoretical chapter:

**Hypothesis 1**: Digital marketing communication channels have a higher effect on heavier category users than lighter category users, compared to traditional marketing communication channels, in an IMC strategy.

**Hypothesis 2**: Digital marketing communication channels have synergy effects with other touchpoints in an IMC strategy.

**Hypothesis 3**: TV has a higher effect on awareness than the digital marketing communication channels in an IMC strategy.

**Hypothesis 4**: Digital marketing communication channels have a higher effect on associations than traditional marketing communication channels in an IMC strategy.

**Hypothesis 5**: Traditional marketing communication channels have a higher effect on sales/purchase intent than digital marketing communications in an IMC strategy.
Methodology

A vital part of a research study is to be transparent and to be able to motivate decisions made throughout the study. This chapter contributes to that end.

Research Design

The purpose of this thesis is to add empirical findings of IMC strategies utilizing digital- and traditional marketing communication channels to build and maintain brand equity in the FMCG industry. In order to reach the purpose the following research question was formulated: “Are digital marketing communication channels in an IMC strategy effective in creating awareness, associations and sales within the FMCG industry?”. To answer the research question an explanatory case study approach was chosen, drawing data from both qualitative and quantitative sources, as well as primary and secondary data. The benefit with this mixed approach is that it can draw on the strength and minimize the weaknesses of both methods. But as with any case study the results are hard to generalize beyond the context of the case. A qualitative method was chosen as it enables an in-depth understanding of a phenomenon, the focus in qualitative research is to understand, explain, explore, discover and clarify i.e. situations and experiences (Kamur, 2010). In this thesis the qualitative method was used to explore the perception and use of IMC within the specific case as well as to understand why and how the different channels were used. Some of the insights and information gathered through the qualitative data as well as secondary research received from the case company were used as a foundation for a quantitative survey. A quantitative method was chosen as it adds a numerical dimension of the relationship between variables, and it can be analyzed through statistics where validity can be tested. In this study the quantitative method contributed by investigating the touchpoints, both firm initiated and others, effect on awareness, associations/image and sales.

Evident by the previous research within the field: studying brand equity is complicated, but even more complicated are the effects of marketing channels. The qualitative approach of this thesis made it possible to gain inspiration and insights for the survey. But more so it contributed by adding the context of the marketplace and the variables that influence an IMC approach, such as the behavior and importance of the target group, the relative effect of the media channels and the synergy effects that the brand relies on and tries to achieve. How the
firm uses its resources and how they look upon the IMC approach is vital as it affects how they have used the media channels. Thus the mixed approach was vital in the study to gather a deeper understanding for the context within which awareness, associations/image and sales are managed.

**Choosing the case of Wasa’s small round: ‘Kanel’**

Wasa was chosen as the case company mainly due to the fact that they had an ongoing multi-channel campaign during the weeks following up to the collection of survey data. The ability to capitalize on a recent intense period of media activity was crucial as the survey measures the conscious awareness of exposure to different media. The respondents therefore needed to remember where and approximately how many times (frequency) they have seen the communication or related brand activities. One could argue that because a survey cannot measure if the respondents actually have been exposed to a marketing activity the validity of the study will be affected negatively. But as Hollis (2005) states, people must remember that they have seen a brand advertisement if that advertisement is likely to have any substantial effect on the relationship with the brand. Thus using a survey method should not have a negative effect on the validity of the study.

Furthermore Wasa operates in a product category with a high penetration (approximately at 80 %) with their own penetration at approximately 66 %. Thus it attests to the fact that it is a well recognized brand and category, relevant to the majority of the Swedish population. That the message needs to be relevant to the consumer is a basic but important assumption in any marketing communication. Thus the choice of category and brand lends itself more easily to a sample of convenience.

In this campaign three products are marketed ‘Kanel’, ‘French Herbs’ and ‘Sesam och Havssalt’. While the two latter are new product launches ‘Kanel’ is an old product that has been around for over a decade. Because of this it is likely that Wasa has managed to build more recognition for ‘Kanel’ and thus it will be easier to find respondents. This can although also be considered negative as the respondents might have forgotten where they have seen or heard of the product, and thus have a negative effect on the validity of this study. But again Hollis (2005) states that people must remember the advertisement if it is likely to have a substantial effect. Furthermore even though ‘Kanel’ has been around for a very long time, it has just in recent years been given advertisement support. Here it should be mentioned that a
pre-survey was conducted with both ‘Kanel’ and ‘French Herbs’, but only 25 respondents were found that could recognize ‘French Herbs’ compared to 75 for ‘Kanel’. Because of the low number of respondents it became a necessity to use ‘Kanel’ to gain a large enough sample.

**Qualitative Expert Interview**

**Sample**
The interview was mainly conducted to gain an understanding for how Wasa has built their IMC-strategy and why they had chosen the approach. Carl Lehmann, Nordic Marketing Manager for Wasa at Barilla was approached with an invitation to an interview due to his lengthy experience working with the communications for the Wasa brand. His current role entails, among other things, the responsibility for the marketing communications at a strategic level. This made him the ideal expert for the interview. Thus a purposive- or as it is also called a judgemental sampling was used (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 287).

**Data Collection**
A semi-structured interview was chosen as an appropriate method for data collection, in addition to understanding ‘what’ and ‘how’ this method for interviews emphasis ‘why’ (Saunders et al., 2012). By this method the interviewee can talk more freely about the subject and might contribute with aspect previously not considered but that are significant for the study. The result of this approach is thus rich and detailed data, although a drawback of using semi-structured interviews is the negative effect it has on the studies reliability as it will be hard to replicate an interview without standardized questions (Saunders et al., 2012). Semi-structured interview questions with key topics were prepared (see Appendix A) for the face-to-face interview at the Barilla office in Stockholm.

The 24th of April the approximately one hour long interview with Carl Lehmann, Nordic Marketing Manager started with Lehmann presenting Wasa in the crisp bread category, the product at hand for this thesis and the communication activities for this campaign. This presentation touched upon most of the semi-structured interview questions prepared.

Therefore, the follow up topics prepared for the interview was in a higher extent used to gain a deeper understanding for the choices the brand has made for their marketing. Even though only one interview was conducted; the questions in Appendix A vary in their phrasing, specification and order to minimize repeat topics and issues already talked about during the
interview. This probably does not affect the reliability of the study negatively, more than can be expected when using semi-structured interviews where subjects are freely talked about. While conducting the interviews the interviewer tried to avoid interview bias by avoiding asking leading questions. Interview bias is the influence of the interviewer on the respondent which has a negative effect on the reliability (Saunders et al., 2012).

The language used was Swedish as it is the native tongue of the interviewee and the researcher allowing the parties to better express themselves and thus risks for misunderstandings are reduced. The interviews were recorded and transcribed to achieve accurate and unbiased records but also to allow the interviewer to concentrate on questioning and listening to the respondents. There are many upsides to recording interviews but it may also hinder responses and thereby reduce reliability, but by explaining why and how the recording will be used the risk was reduced (Saunders et al., 2012).

The interview was recorded but notes were still taken during the interview to be able to build follow up questions on previous answers. After the interview impressions of the interview were written down and the recording of the interview was transcribed to ensure a minimal loss of data. The transcript was not in itself translated into English, rather the translation occurred whilst writing the empirical section of this thesis. This is not considered to have had any negative effect on the study.

Data Analysis

The analysis of course already started during the interview, with topics previously not focused upon emerging as vital and prompted follow up questions. These initial findings were incorporated into the survey. In the analysis and discussion chapters of this thesis the findings were compared to the results of the survey.

Quantitative Surveys

Operationalization of Variables

The dependent variables are Awareness, Associations/Image, Consumption and Purchase Intent and are measured on a 7 – point Likert scale. It should be mentioned that consumption can be viewed as both a dependent and an independent variable, this because consumption which is considered experience with the product can both be an outcome and a predecessor of the brand equity dimensions (Huang & Sarigöllü, 2012). The measurement of Awareness and
Associations are mainly based on Yoo, Donthu & Lee (2000) because their work within the field of brand equity measurement is highly recognized and used, furthermore the paper has been cited 160 times as of 6\textsuperscript{th} of May 2014 attesting to its popularity.

Awareness is measured by the first question in the survey: “Jag känner till Wasas knäckebröd ‘Kanel’” / I am aware of Wasa’s crisp bread ‘Kanel’. This question is taken from Yoo, Donthu & Lee (2000); Yoo & Donthu (2001); and Washburn & Plank (2002) that all proved its validity as a measurement of Awareness. This question’s validity across cultures has also been proven by Buil, Charnatony & Martinez (2008). The original question is ‘I am aware of brand X’.

Awareness is also measured by the second question: ”När jag tänker på knäckebröd är Wasa ’Kanel’ en av de produkterna som jag kommer att tänka på” / When I think of crisp bread, Wasa ‘Kanel’ is one of the products that comes to mind. This question is taken from Buil, Charnatony & Martinez (2008) who adapted it from Yoo, Donthu & Lee (2000) and Netemeyer et al., (2004) and proved its validity across cultures. The original question is ‘When I think of PC, brand X is one of the brands that comes to mind’. PC stands for product category and brand X for the brand that is supposed to be measured. These questions are thus supposed to be adapted for every study.

Associations is measured by question 3: ”Jag kan snabbt och enkelt komma på karaktäristiska drag för knäckebrödet ’Kanel’ (t.ex. utseendet på produkten, smak etc.)” / I can quickly and easily think of characteristics of the crisp bread ‘Kanel’ (i.e. how the product looks like, taste etc.). This question is taken from Yoo, Donthu & Lee (2000) and Yoo & Donthu (2001). Examples are given to clarify what a characteristic for a crisp bread might be.

Question 4 also measures associations and is adapted from Yoo & Donthu (2001) and Yoo, Donthu & Lee (2000) question “I can quickly recall the symbol or logo of X”. X indicates the brand name of choice. The question has also been validated by Washburn & Plank (2002). The question was changed to measure recall for package this because the product ‘Kanel’ does not have any symbol or logo comparable to that of a brand, the closest thing is the package that is distinct from other products on the market.

Two associations of the product ‘Kanel’ were measured specifically because they are the main messages pushed by Wasa in all their communication efforts. These are measured by question
5 “Knäckebrödet ‘Kanel’ passar bra som ett mellanmål” / The crisp bread ‘Kanel’ fits well as a snack and question 6 “Knäckebrödet ‘Kanel’ är rik på smak” / The crisp bread ‘Kanel’ is rich in flavour’.

Consumption is measured with question 7: “Jag äter knäckebrödet Wasa ‘Kanel’ regelbundet / I eat the crisp bread ‘Kanel’ on a regularly basis. Consumption is here considered equal to experience with the product. Experience with the product should lead to product knowledge which affects the brand equity dimensions (Keller, 2001a). The pre-survey also showed that consumption has a high explanatory power for brand awareness and associations. Previous studies have also showed that awareness does not always precede consumption (Huang & Sarigöllu, 2012).

Purchase intent is measured with question 8 “Jag planerar att köpa knäckebrödet ‘Kanel’ i framtiden” / I plan to buy the crisp bread ‘Kanel’ in the future. This question was asked to see the touchpoints’ effect on purchase intent.

Question number 9 asks the respondent where they first heard of the product and is stated as follow: “Hur fick du först kännedom om Wasas knäckebröd ‘Kanel’? (t.ex. TV-reklam eller en vän bjöd mig)” / How did you first gain knowledge of Wasa’s crispsbread ‘Kanel’?

Question number 10 is a control question. Banners and magazines have only been used during the months following up to the survey. If the respondent answer that they have not seen advertisement during the year of 2014 and later answers that they have seen the product in a banner or advert in magazine, their answer will be removed. The question is stated as follow: “Har du sett reklam för Wasa ‘Kanel’ på TV, i tidning eller på nätet under år 2014?” / Have you seen advertisement for Wasa ‘Kanel’ on TV, in magazine or online during the year 2014?

It was later found that ‘Kanel’ played a substantial role in the advertisements for Wasa’s campaign ‘discover a new taste from Wasa’, therefore this control question could unfortunately not be used.

Question number 11 shows a picture of the new and old packages for ‘Kanel’ and asks the respondent if it was this product that they thought of (“Var det denna produkt du tänkte på?”) The question makes sure that the respondent has been thinking about the right product, and is thus a control question.
To measure the respondent’s exposure to different channels the following item/question 12 was used: “Nedan ber jag dig vänligen kryssa i vart du har sett och hört talas om Wasas knäckebröd ’Kanel’ någonsin, och även uppskatta ungefär hur många gånger. Det är viktigt att du faktiskt kommer ihåg att du sett/hört talas om produkten på just det sättet. Kryssa i alla som stämmer, lämna resterande blanka.”/Below I ask you to please mark where you have seen or heard of Wasa’s crisp bread ‘Kanel’, and to also approximate how many times you have seen it. It is important that you actually remember that you have seen/heard of the product in that way. Mark all that are applicable, leave the rest blank. The respondent chose between 1-2 times and +3 times, this because it might be difficult for the respondents to estimate frequency and the optimal goal for a person to be reached by a message is 1-3 times (Havlana, Cardarelli & Montigny, 2007). The list of touchpoint can be found in Appendix B, with the complete survey. It should be said that the list is compiled based on the findings from the interview with the Marketing Manager for Wasa (i.e. exclusion of radio) as well as comments given to the author from respondents of the pre-study. From the latter it was discovered that i.e. seen and tasted at work, which appeared to be common, called for its own item, this because it is common in Sweden to have access to crisp bread at work.

Question 12 – 13 are demographic questions asking for gender and age.

Question 14 measure if the respondent is a non-consumer to heavy consumer of the crisp bread category. This question was asked because studies show (Ehrenberg, 2005 in Nelson-field, Riebe & Sharp, 2012) that the ideal mix of communication reaches both heavy consumers but also light consumers. Steele et al., (2013) also found that TV was better at creating an emotional response for unfamiliar brands than online displays where no previous brand equity existed. Consumers that find the product relevant will probably also pay more attention to advertisement than will non-consumers. Thus, it makes it possible to answer hypothesis one.

**Population and Sample**

The population is considered to be all people in Sweden that understand Swedish, and hence can understand the advertisement from Wasa, and know of the crisp bread product Wasa ‘Kanel’. A total of 288 respondents answered the survey, out of these 269 answers were possible to use, the other 19 were inadmissible because they answered the control question (no. 11) with a ‘no’ and thus did not qualify to the study. The distribution of the sample is
displayed in the empirical section of the thesis. Due to how the data collection was done it is impossible to state exactly how many did not recognize the product and exactly how many said no to answer the survey.

**Data collection**

A sample of convenience was chosen because it is a relatively quick and inexpensive method to reach respondents (Saunders et al., 2012). This method made it possible to reach respondents that have knowledge about the product ‘Kanel’. Although a necessity to reach the aim of this thesis, the sample cannot claim to be representative for the population.

The data was collected on the 8th and 9th of May 2014 at 8 – 16 o’clock on the commuter trains in the vicinity of Stockholm and on Stockholm central station. The commuters that were asked to respond was either sitting on a train or in the waiting areas at Stockholm central station. Commuters were chosen because they were considered to be more willing to answer the three minute long survey, compared to someone going about their day in a shopping mall or outside a store. As the respondents were surveyed in a situation where they were just waiting for a train or their stop the respondents had plenty of time to answer the survey, and maybe even supplied some entertainment the quality of the responses are considered high. In addition to commuters the survey was distributed at a workplace and through a store, both in the vicinity of Stockholm. Only people who said that they recognized the product with the verbal cue “knäckebrödet Wasa Kanel” / the crisp bread Wasa ‘Kanel’ were asked to complete the survey. Furthermore everyone who the researcher came across that was sitting down on the trains or waiting area at Stockholm central and who looked like they could possibly be 18 years old or above were asked. No other considerations were taken.

**Data analysis**

The collected surveys were screened to make sure everyone had answered yes on question 11, that they had been thinking of ‘Kanel’ (shown on two pictures with both the old and new package) when answering the survey. The remaining surveys were coded into Excel before transferred to SPSS. Multiple regression analysis are used to analyze the relative effect of the independent variables, more specifically backward multiple regressions are used that only include independent variables that improves the model, thus redundant variables in the models are removed. Backward regressions were done based on usage of the category as this is expected to strongly influence the effect of the touchpoints. Dividing the respondents based
on usage of ‘Kanel’ was not possible because the sample size is too small. Backward multiple regressions were also done with only respondents within the targeted age group 30-50 years but did not yield models including other touchpoints than those for the entire sample, therefore these are not displayed. Lastly backward multiple regressions were done for only the channels in which the focal firm can directly influence; this did not yield a different result for these.

To find synergy effects created (by the digital marketing communication channels only) independent t-test were done for all touchpoint that emerged as statistically significant in the backward multiple regression models. Only synergies statistically significant were presented in the empirical results for the survey. This method to assert synergy effect is borrowed from Chang & Thorson (2004) who also use t-tests in the same manner to find synergy effects.

**Multiple-source secondary data**

Multiple-source secondary data is defined by that it is compiled from documentary and /or survey secondary data (Saunders et al., 2012). The study was supplied by Barilla and reports on category insights within crisp bread, it is 128 pages long.

It is conducted by the professional market research firm Norm through the qualitative methods of focus groups, in home interviews and diaries during January 2012. All participants in the focus groups and in home interviews were tasked to complete a crisp bread diary, that is take notes of their crisp bread consumption prior to meeting the researchers. Six focus groups with 5-6 respondents in each group were conducted in Stockholm. In total there were 35 respondents, 9 men and 26 women. The focus groups lasted for two hours. In home interviews (in the respondents’ homes) were conducted with 12 consumers in Stockholm, 6 women and 6 men, and lasted for 60 minutes. There is no mention of reliability, generalizability or validity in the report but as the study was done by professional interviewers, skilled in market research the report is considered of high quality. Furthermore it most likely hold a higher quality then can be obtained by a business student (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 318).
Empirical Result - Interview

In this chapter the empirical findings from the interview with Carl Lehmann, Nordic Marketing Manager for Wasa will be presented. In the next chapter the statistical results from the survey will be presented.

Interview with Carl Lehmann, Nordic Marketing Manager

Carl Lehmann started our meeting by presenting the crisp bread category in Sweden; Wasa’s role within it; the background for the campaign and what marketing activities they are using. Questions were asked during this presentation but mostly afterwards to get at more specific issues regarding the choice of marketing channels. The PowerPoint presentation is called “Nyhet Wasa Lilla Runda v. 7 2014” which also included information from the report made by NORM. Below is a summary of the presentation, interview and NORM’s research study divided based on the key topics; background, message pushed & target group and marketing communication channels. The findings are based on the interview with Carl Lehmann if no other source has been referred to.

Background

The crisp bread category has seen a volume growth since 2012 driven by product innovations within the sourdough trend. Wasa is shown to be the brand that is driving the volume increase for the category. An increase in penetration for the category has also been achieved reaching 83,8 % for the overall category and 68,6 % for Wasa (Lehmann & NORM).

The occasion for consuming crisp bread is brought up during the presentation; the information in the presentation is based on the report from NORM. Breakfast has been found to be the most common consumption occasion followed by snack in between meals, with the third most common occasion being evening snack. The NORM report from 2012 show that for snacking consumers value something filling, tasty, ready to eat and for it to be quick and easy. Crisp bread is considered 52 % of times for both snacking in-between meals and evening snack and actually chosen only 17 % of the time respectively 21 % for evening snack. This low conversion rate is seen throughout all consumption occasions for crisp bread. The substitute products for the snacking occasion are mainly fruits and vegetables.
The background to the decision to launch the concept ‘small rounds’ is based on insights (NORM’s research report) stating that crisp bread is perceived as boring and tasteless amongst consumers. This Lehmann accredits to previously weak innovation from Wasa and that the communication has focused on rational benefits connected to health, which might have been perceived as boring. Thus the communication was not pushing the association of taste. Taste is considered the purchase barrier for crisp bread and is perceived as the challenge that Wasa is faced with. This is thus where the small rounds or “tasty rounds” as they are also called come in.

**Message pushed & Target group**

The goal for Wasa is to add taste to the category, find new consumption occasions and also recruit new younger consumers to the category. The message to the market is (translated from Swedish to English by author): “Discover Wasa small rounds, brickle wheat crisp bread with rich flavor and crunchy texture, surprisingly good to eat as they are or with your favorite toppings anytime, anywhere!”. The functional benefits involve the flavor and the small round shape, where the emotional benefits consist of rich flavor, the healthy things from Wasa in a crisp bread that one can indulge in. ‘Kanel’ is an old product that received a new design so that the products in the range for ‘small rounds’ would look more consistent with each other. The design focuses on visualizing the taste of the product.

The image Wasa want to have is that of tasteful products, healthy, credible, natural ingredients, variation in their breads and that they can be consumed at different occasions. Lehmann displayed the NORM study previously mentioned where consumers have stated the positive associations as: credible, trusted brand, value for money, convenience, tasty, wide range of products, crunchy, very Swedish and also that they have childhood memories from school of Wasa. The negative associations found are: not modern, not innovative, boring, no more the only healthy bread, mass-produced and not Swedish anymore.

The target group is women and men, 30-50 years old, that has an active lifestyle, are searching for flavor, are health conscious and care about right nutrition. Although the penetration for crisp bread and Wasa is high, Wasa only target the above stated group in their communication efforts this because, as all marketers, they have a limited budget that should be used as efficiently as possible.
This target group is younger than the traditional target group for Wasa: women 40+. The age of the target group is explained by the fact that crisp bread becomes more relevant for the consumers as they become older and start to care more for their health.

**Marketing communication**

In the last half of 2012 ‘Kanel’ received, for the first time, a TV-commercial which resulted in a heavy upswing in volume sales as can be seen in figure 4 below. The blue line illustrates the volume sales in tons for ‘Kanel’ and the green bars illustrate the time for when the TV-commercials dedicated to ‘Kanel’ were aired. What this chart shows is that TV had a substantial effect on the sales for ‘Kanel’. It should also be mentioned that during the end of 2012 a promo banner was placed on the package of ‘Kanel’ as part of a Christmas theme, this probably also explains some of the uplift during that time.

As Lehmann presented this part of the presentation he mentioned that Wasa supported the product ‘above the line’ foremost with TV but of course also in store. This gave way for asking whether it was the marketing communications that was the driver or in store activities. His answer was that it is a combination of both. ‘Kanel’ has not previously been advertised, and it is hard to see what exactly is driving sales as it is a combination of all the activities that are done. But, with all the rest the same and the fact that there has not been any ‘above the line’ support before, he would credit a large portion of the growth seen for ‘Kanel’ to the use of TV. He further expands on this saying that naturally it is about creating relevance for this type of product. People might know about ‘Kanel’, maybe they have tasted the product 10 or 15 years ago but have now been reminded about the product.

**Figure 4 TV’s effect on volume sales**

![Figure 4 TV’s effect on volume sales](Source: Wasa’s PowerPoint presentation called “Nyhet Wasa Lilla Runda v. 7 2014”, based on data from AC Nielsen.)
Moving to present day, the campaign started in week seven of 2014, with marketing activities starting five weeks after this point. This is normal within the crisp bread category in Sweden as the marketing activities do not commence until the product has gained an adequate distribution in stores, which takes approximately five weeks. Figure 5 below shows the “massive support” this launch is receiving, with the time (week) of the marketing activities displayed. It should be noted that figure 5 only displays when the activities were done and not the intensity of the activity during the week. A 360 degree approach is implemented and Lehmann mentions that a study conducted by AC Nielsen proved that when syncing all activities ‘above’ and ‘below’ the line Wasa gains the greatest effect.

**Figure 5 Wasa’s use of Marketing Activities**

![Table showing marketing activities]

(Source: Wasa PowerPoint presentation called “Nyhet Wasa Lilla Runda v. 7 2014”. The first row shows time of launch and the last row coupons.)

Lehmann goes on to explain how they reasoned around the use of their marketing activities. With Wasa’s wide target group in mind TV commercials are used to quickly build awareness for the product, which works very well. TV is used at a high frequency during three to four weeks when starting off to set the message and again a few weeks later to “give it an extra push”. Later in the year (not shown in figure 5 above) TV will be used again, but with less frequency, to maintain a certain awareness of the product throughout the year. As consumers are becoming more digital and not only sitting in front of the TV but also being online often, a digital banner campaign was used to add reach. The print activity above is advertisements in women’s magazines; the reason for choosing women’s magazines (rather than men’s) is that of cost efficiency. Print is also used to add reach, although Lehmann later adds that a benefit with print above TV is the different setting where the consumer is in a positive mindset and
can in peace process the advertisement; it becomes a more qualitative experience. The print advertisement also contains more product information than the TV commercial. He refers to these three marketing communication channels as the awareness building campaigns.

Facebook is used to build engagement and awareness for the product but also drive trials, for this product launch a memory game was created but Facebook ads are also used. Facebook is considered a natural platform for Wasa as it offers an opportunity to interact with consumers, but also a way to get new launches out.

In combination with the above mentioned, sampling is also used to get people to try the product because if they like the product they will likely purchase it. The sampling was done in Stockholm and Gothenburg and everyone that the Wasa-cyclists met receives a bag with three slices of crisp bread, one of each flavor, and a coupon to drive sales. Secondary placements are also used, secondary placements refer to placing the product in other places in the store than the shelf, this to get more exposure. This is connected to different pricing campaigns. In addition in-store tastings are done, so that people walking in a store get the opportunity to try the product.

Wasa’s goal in terms of frequency is for 55-60% of the target group to see the advertisements at least three times, but it is also important to quickly make the consumers see the advertisement at least one time in a new launch like this. The message has a higher likelihood of “sticking” if the consumer is exposed multiple times. Where TV and digital is used to add the reach combined with print that, as mentioned above adds more of a qualitative setting. Just for Wasa print has a great effect. When asked about synergies Lehmann also mentions synergies for TV & outdoors and TV & WebTV. These are although not used in this campaign. He also stresses the importance of in-store activities where they have great synergies with the media communication.

Of course, although the ‘small rounds’ are receiving massive support, not all marketing communication channels are used. Radio is said to be a media in decline but also not suitable due to lack of visible images as Wasa’s goal is to communicate flavor. It is perceived as a media more suitable for sales messages than to visually explain the product. Daily newspapers are considered very broad, that is it is hard to target the marketing communication to the specific target group of mainly women between the ages of 30-50. Therefore, rather than daily
newspapers, women’s magazines are used where one stays ‘on air’ for longer. In magazines adverts are placed once a month to keep up a certain minimum awareness for a longer time. The reach is not as high as for TV but as a complement it is great for Wasa, which has been shown in a Nielsen study Wasa has ordered. Lehmann brings up outdoor campaigns as a good way to increase the impact of a launch but this would require a larger budget and one would reach a very broad audience. Youtube was also brought up by the author; this because radio was stated to not be visual enough and daily newspapers not targeted enough, characteristics not associated with Youtube. Lehmann explained that they do have a Youtube channel but it is not something they are pushing as they only have commercials uploaded. The use of Youtube and other channels always comes down to priorities.

When talking about the different medias Lehmann almost always refers back to reach, awareness, how targeted the media is and its relation to cost efficiency. This prompted for a question regarding how they build loyalty amongst their consumers. Lehmann brings up the in-store activities as a main contributor with activities such as 2 for 1 promotions and the use of i.e. ICA’s loyalty card where campaigns can be done targeting those that eat crisp bread. Basically loyalty is not built through the marketing communication channels, with the exception of maybe Facebook which is used to build engagement and interaction between consumers and with Wasa’s brand. But considering the size of the potential consumers (approximately 80 % of the population) the 27 000 fans on Facebook is a relatively small group, although they are probably the brands most “absolute hardcore fans”. Lehmann mentions that the average number of loyalty is around the 1 % mark while Wasa’s is about 3 % which shows that Wasa’s consumers are loyal and active. Although he do perceive the consumers to mostly react on the brand’s activities rather than consumers participating in creating user generated content.

When asked how much of the budget is allocated towards the digital marketing channels he approximates the number to around 20 %. He continues stating that just a few years ago Wasa only used TV. This can be credited to their Italian owners, in Italy the media landscape is said to be different with TV still holding its strong position. In Sweden the digital has come much faster, “if you are not online you do not really exist”.


Empirical results - Survey

In this chapter of the thesis the respondents’ profile is presented. The results from the backward multiple regressions and the t-tests will also be presented and interpreted. In the next chapter the results will be analyzed and the hypothesis will be rejected or supported based on these results.

Respondent’s profile

The distribution of respondents based on age and gender is shown in figure 6 below. Ranging from 16 – 80 years old the sample is slightly larger in the ages 30-50, followed by 16-29, and with fewer respondents in the higher ages. The reader should be aware that the total sample is only n = 269 and thus each age is represented by less than ten respondents. The sample consists of 93 men and 175 women, with one person not willing to answer the question.

Wasa’s target group for ‘Kanel’, men and women in the age of 30 – 50, is also interesting to look upon as they might be more favorable to the product and message but maybe more importantly they are more likely to be exposed to marketing communications from Wasa. The sample consists of a total of 114 respondents that can be considered part of the target group, whereof 52 are men and 62 are women.

Figure 6 All Respondents: Age and Gender

It is also important to view the distribution of non-consumers to heavy consumers of the category as the communication and other touchpoints are likely more influential on someone
who finds the category relevant (Sharp, 2010 in Nelson-Field, Riebe & Sharp, 2012). Furthermore it is important because the value of a touchpoint can be viewed from its ability to reach light category users (Binet & Field, 2009). Figure 7 below shows that only 7 respondents never eat crisp bread, 24 rarely eat crisp bread, 69 sometimes, 80 often and 89 very often. Thus the majority of respondents eat crisp bread often to very often. Those that eat crisp bread very often are considered the heaviest category users, ‘never’ are considered non-category users and ‘rarely’ are the lightest category users.

Figure 7 Respondents divided by consumption of category

The distribution of respondents depending on regular consumption of ‘Kanel’ is displayed in figure 8 below. It shows that the clear majority of respondents do not consider themselves to eat ‘Kanel’ on a regular basis, and few respondents consider themselves regular eaters of ‘Kanel’. More specifically 118 respondents entirely disagree to the statement that they are regular eaters of ‘Kanel’, 48 mostly disagree, 31 somewhat disagree. On the other side of the continuum 9 respondents entirely agree to the statement, 8 mostly agree and 23 somewhat agree. 32 respondents stated that they neither agree nor disagree, thus they are considered to be somewhere in the middle between a light consumer and a heavy consumer.
As mentioned the value of a touchpoint can be viewed in the light of its capability to reach light users. Non-category users are not of interest here because they give no value to the firm in the form of revenue and thus an investment in a touchpoint reaching them would not generate a return. Of course this is a simplified logic as non-consumers can still affect others that might be category consumers, but this is beyond the scope of this thesis. The results showed that WOM and TV have a strong reach on the total of respondents. While Facebook from Wasa, Facebook from others, Banner and Instore/Wasa sample managed to reach a relatively small percentage of all respondents. Facebook from Wasa reached light consumers to a higher extent than heavier consumers. Facebook from others, Banner, Outdoor advert and WOM mention reached consumers relatively evenly between the categories. The most common ways the respondents had first gained knowledge of ‘Kanel’ was through WOM sample, TV, in store sampling and at work.

**Statistical results**

All independent variables were added to a standard multiple regression analysis creating ‘model 1’ and thereafter a backward multiple regression analysis was done creating ‘model 2’. Because ‘model 2’ show only independent variables that cannot be deleted without losing value to the model these models will be used in the analysis. The models displayed below have thus no redundant independent variables. To preserve the transparency of this thesis ‘Model 1’ for all dependent variables are found in Appendix C.
**Awareness (AW)**

The first two statements in the survey are “I know of Wasa’s crisp bread ‘Kanel’” and “when I think of crisp bread Wasa ‘Kanel’ is one of the products that come to mind”. These two Likert items were computed in SPSS into a Likert scale for awareness. A backward regression shows that consumption ($\beta=,471$), tasted at work ($\beta=,226$), seen at work ($\beta=,152$), seen on shelf ($\beta=,148$), TV ($\beta=,110$) and WOM sample ($\beta=,102$) are the independent variables that can explain the variation in awareness, and are statistically significant.

The model in table 1 below shows that ‘Consumption’ of ‘Kanel’ has a relatively higher impact on awareness than the other touchpoints. ‘Tasted at work’ also stands out with a higher effect than the other touchpoints, with ‘WOM sample’ also having an effect but with a low $t$-value ($<2$). All these touchpoints are connected to usage situations, ‘Consumption’ more than the others, which can be interpreted as experience with the product increases awareness.

‘Seen on shelf’, ‘Seen at work’ and ‘TV’ also has an effect on awareness, although smaller than the previously mentioned. ‘TV’ is the only marketing communication channel that has a statistical significance on awareness. The independent variable ‘Seen at work’ has a negative ($\beta=,-,152$) coefficient in the model. This can, wrongfully, be interpreted as if a respondent has seen ‘Kanel’ at work they will have less awareness than if they had not seen it at all. This is of course not the case, it should be interpreted that the variable, although remembered, did not have a substantial enough effect to counteract influence from competitors. These competitors can be other products from Wasa, other brands or even other categories. The interpretation is in line with that of Hollis (2005, p. 262) who state that “…the weaker online advertising did not in fact have a direct negative effect on consideration, rather it failed to counteract advertising pressure from competitive brands”. Although Hollis (2005) was interpreting an analysis for the outcome consideration (part of awareness) the interpretation of statistically negative effects of advertising can without a stretch be used here.

**Table 1 Backward Multiple Regression for Awareness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T. AW (all)</th>
<th>Touchpoint</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $r^2$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Backward</strong> Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>2.249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seen at Work</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>-2.322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tasted at Work</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>3.343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seen on Shelf</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>2.946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOM sample</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>1.992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumption</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>9.138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Independent t-tests were used to determine if any of the digital touchpoints had a synergy effect with the statistically significant touchpoints in the model. ‘Banner’ and ‘Facebook from Wasa’, do not display a synergy effect with any other touchpoint on awareness. Facebook from others than Wasa displayed a synergy with ‘Seen at work’ and ‘WOM sample’.

Tabel 2 Synergies for Awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T. AW (all)</th>
<th>Touchpoint</th>
<th>Mean/SD</th>
<th>Mean/SD with FB others</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seen at work</td>
<td>4,8169 /0,93059 /n=71</td>
<td>5,1471 /1,43358 /n=17</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOM sample</td>
<td>5,0174 /0,98660 /n=115</td>
<td>5,3571 /1,49908 /n=14</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Awareness divided by category user

In addition to the backward multiple regressions for all respondents, ‘model 2’ were also done divided by how often the respondents eat crisp bread, these multiple regression models can all be found in Appendix D. Below the results from the multiple regressions for awareness are presented.

The model AW rarely shows the highest explanatory power ($r^2=0,765$) followed by AW very often ($r^2=0,558$), AW sometimes ($r^2=0,460$) and lastly AW often ($r^2=0,330$). The explanatory power of the models is not ideal but it does show that the touchpoints do have a substantial effect on awareness.

The marketing communication channels ‘TV’ and ‘Print’ only have a statistical significance for the multiple regression model AW rarely, but the relative effects are high with ($\beta = .720$) and ($\beta = .604$) respectively. Communication through ‘Facebook from others’ has an impact on AW sometimes and AW very often, although the relative effect is higher for the respondents that are heavier consumers. ‘Outdoor advert’ has a negative effect ($\beta=-.542$) in the model AW rarely, which means that it has not been effective in creating awareness for ‘Kanel’.

‘Leaflet’ ($\beta = .288$) also had an impact on AW rarely. While ‘Seen at work’ displays a positive coefficient ($\beta = .289$) for AW rarely, a negative coefficient ($\beta = -.231$) is displayed for AW often. Which means that seeing ‘Kanel’ at work did effect the awareness for
respondents who are light users of the category while the effect could not measure up to the competition from other products for those respondents that are heavier consumers of crisp bread.

Similar connections can be seen for sampling: ‘WOM sample’, ‘Instore/Wasa sample’ and ‘Sample other’. The different kinds of sampling show a positive effect for the lighter consumers while the touchpoints show a negative effect for respondents with a higher consumption of crisp bread. ‘Consumption’ of ‘Kanel’ has the highest impact on awareness on all respondents except for those that eat crisp bread rarely. ‘Tasted at work’ has an effect on both AW sometimes and AW very often. Thus consumption has a more substantial effect on heavier category consumers while communication from the firm influences those consumers that rarely eat crisp bread.

**Association (AS)**

The third statement was “I can quickly and easily think of characteristics for the crisp bread Wasa ‘Kanel’ and the fourth statement was “I can quickly and easily imagine the package of Wasa ‘Kanel’”. As a reminder: the package was used as a substitute for a brand symbol or logo. In addition to these questions, that was formulated out of theoretical measurement for associations two questions were asked that are directly linked to the image that Wasa want the consumers to have regarding ‘Kanel’. These were statement five: “The crisp bread Wasa ‘Kanel’ fits well as a snack” and statement six: “The crisp bread Wasa ‘Kanel’ is rich in flavor”. These items that combined measure association were, just as the Likert items for awareness, computed in SPSS into a Likert scale. ‘Consumption’ (β=0.466), ‘WOM sample’ (β=0.173), ‘Seen on shelf’ (β=0.170), ‘Tasted at Work’ (β=0.164), and ‘Seen at Work’ (β=-0.146) are the touchpoints that can explain the variation in associations, and are statistically significant. The resulting backward multiple regression model has an explanatory power (r²=0.407) that is not ideal but does show that the touchpoints combined do have some explanatory power. The independent variables in the model all relate to actually eating the product or seeing it on the shelf or at work. No media communication is present as a statistically significant independent variable in the model.
Table 3 Backward Multiple Regression for Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Touchpoint</th>
<th>r²</th>
<th>Adjusted r²</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seen at Work</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>-1.146</td>
<td>-2.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasted at Work</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>3.376</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>3.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen on Shelf</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>3.390</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>3.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOM sample</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>3.390</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>3.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>9.017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again independent t-tests were used to determine if any of the digital touchpoints had a synergy effect with the statistically significant touchpoints in the model. ‘FB others’ and ‘FB Wasa’ displayed synergies with ‘Seen on shelf’. ‘Banner’ did not show synergies with any of the touchpoints in the model.

Table 4 Results of t-test for Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Touchpoint</th>
<th>Mean/SD</th>
<th>Mean/SD with FB others</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Mean/SD with FB Wasa</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seen on shelf</td>
<td>5.3561</td>
<td>5.8088</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>5.9583</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.15369</td>
<td>0.81264</td>
<td>n=193 n=17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3561</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.14887</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=198 n=12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Association divided by user category

The result above in regard to the connection with experiences with the product is also evident when looking upon how the touchpoints affect different kinds of consumers. ‘Consumption’ influences association in all models except for AS rarely where instead ‘WOM sample’ is the only touchpoint with a statistical significance. ‘Seen on shelf’ has an effect on AS often. ‘Outdoor advert’ (β = .154) has a positive effect on AS very often, but it is smaller than all other touchpoints. ‘Tasted at Work’ also had an effect on AS very often. ‘Second placement’ and ‘Seen at work’ had negative coefficient on AS often and AS very often respectively, meaning that although leaving lasting impressions on the respondents the touchpoints did not manage to influence associations for ‘Kanel’. Thus consumption is the prevailing conformity between the levels of category usage. The only marketing communication channel that can be said to be statistically significant (p > 0.090) is ‘Outdoor advert’ for the heaviest category users and the effect is, as said, small compared to other touchpoints in the model for AS very often.
Sales

Statement seven in the survey is “I eat the crisp bread Wasa ‘Kanel’ on a regular basis” and statement eight is “I plan to buy the crisp bread ‘Kanel’ in the future”. These two Likert items were computed in SPSS to a Likert scale measuring sales. The aggregated model for Sales ($r^2 = 0.17$) show that ‘Tasted at Work’ ($\beta = .236$), ‘WOM mention’ ($\beta = .198$), ‘WOM sample’ ($\beta = .140$), ‘Leaflet’ ($\beta = .136$) and ‘Seen at work’ ($\beta = -.137$) has a statistically significant impact on sales. The models explanatory power is low with only 17% of the variation in sales explained. Leaflet is the only marketing communication channel that is statistically significant, as seen in table 5 below.

Table 5 Backward Multiple Regression for Sales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T. Sales (all)</th>
<th>Touchpoint</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $r^2$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backward</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seen at Work</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>-1.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tasted at Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>3.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leaflet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>2.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOM mention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>2.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOM sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>2.070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again independent t-tests were used to determine if any of the digital touchpoints had a synergy effect with the statistically significant touchpoints in the model. ‘Banner’ and ‘FB others’ did not show synergies with any of the touchpoints in the model. ‘FB Wasa’ shows synergy effect with ‘Tasted at Work’. Table 6 below shows the results for the statistically significant synergy effect.

Table 6 Synergies for Sales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T. Sales (all)</th>
<th>Touchpoint</th>
<th>Mean/SD</th>
<th>Mean/SD with FB Wasa</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasted at work</td>
<td>3.6882</td>
<td>3.7500</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.74058</td>
<td>2.35997</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sales divided by category user

The data shows that ‘TV’ exposure ($\beta = .343$) has an impact on respondents that eat crisp bread rarely while other consumer groups do not show any influence from media. ‘WOM mention’ has a strong influence on heavier consumers, while ‘WOM sample’ has a strong effect ($\beta = .489$) on the lightest consumers. The effects of WOM are not caught by the model Sales sometimes. ‘Banner’ is included in the model sales rarely and sales often but with
negative coefficients, thus despite making a lasting impression the touchpoint has not been effective in influencing the respondents usage of the product over competing products. ‘Seen at work’ which is part of the model Sales sometimes also lacks an effect on sales. ‘Leaflet’, which is in most cases attached to different kinds of price discounts, has a high effect on Sales rarely and Sales often. ‘Tasted at work’ has a strong impact on Sales sometimes ($\beta = .567$) and, although smaller, does have an impact on sales often ($\beta = .186$). ‘Seen on shelf’ ($\beta = .237$) has an effect for Sales sometimes, and ‘Second placement’ ($\beta = .223$) has a strong impact on Sales very often. Thus experience with the product in the form of samples has a stronger impact on lighter consumers and the same goes for media exposure. Evident is that touchpoints such as Facebook and Print did not have a statistically significant impact in any of these models.
Analysis

This chapter will analyze the empirical results, and compare these to theory and previous research. The five hypothesis formulated in the theoretical chapter will form the structure and are rejected or supported based on this analysis. A summary of these are presented in the end of the chapter.

Hypothesis 1

- Partially supported

Sharp, (2010 in Nelson-Field, Riebe & Sharp, 2012) found that heavier customers, that by definition can be considered more loyal, are easier to reach with advertising messages as they more easily notice and mentally process it. Previous studies also show that social media and WOM tend to skew towards heavier category users (Nelson-Field, Riebe & Sharp, 2012; Taylor et al., 2013; and Romaniuk, Beal & Uncles, 2013). Steele et al., (2013) found that TV was better at creating an emotional response for unfamiliar brands than online displays where no previous brand equity existed. Their neurological study also found that the difference in effect between the marketing channels was due to low visual attention for the web advertisement. Thus heavier category users are more likely to notice communication about the product and they are in a higher extent reached my social media and WOM, while TV was shown to have a higher reach on non/light-category users. In addition visual attention has a substantial influence on the effectiveness of the channels. With this in mind hypothesis one was formulated: “Digital marketing communication channels have a higher effect on heavier category users than lighter category users, compared to traditional marketing communication channels, in an IMC strategy.”.

The results from the survey showed that Facebook from others than Wasa was the only digital touchpoint that effected awareness, more specifically for those respondents claiming to eat crisp bread very often and sometimes. TV, Print and Leaflet had a positive effect on awareness for those respondents that eat crisp bread rarely. Outdoor advert and Instore/Wasa sample (that is an activity managed by Wasa) was also statistically significant but did not have positive coefficients which is interpreted as being ineffective in creating awareness for ‘Kanel’. Thus social media from others than the firm has a statistically significant effect on
heavier category users while traditional advertising had a statistically significant effect on light category users. Therefore, the hypothesis is interpreted as being supported for awareness.

In the results for associations the only marketing communications activity that is statistically significant and has a positive coefficient is Outdoor advert for the heaviest category users. Therefore, the hypothesis is interpreted as rejected for associations.

Finally the results for sales show that traditional marketing communications have an effect for all category users except for those that claim to eat crisp bread sometimes, although the touchpoints do vary. For the lightest category users TV and Leaflet has a strong effect. Leaflet also has a strong effect on those that eat crisp bread often. Second placement that arguably is a traditional marketing communication activity has an effect on the heaviest category users. Banner is statistically significant for the lightest category users and those that eat crisp bread often, but the coefficient is negative and thus is interpreted as having no effect. Thus traditional marketing communication has a statistically significant effect on both the heaviest and the lightest category users while the digital marketing communications do not. Therefore, the hypothesis is rejected for sales.

The finding of Nelson-Field, Riebe & Sharp (2012) and the interview with the Nordic Marketing Manager for Wasa showed that reaching potential customers is one way of looking upon the effectiveness and value of touchpoints. The results from this study show that Facebook from the firm reached the light category users in a higher extent than the heavy category users, thus proving value to the IMC strategy. This is not in line with previous research stating that social media tend to reach heavy category users in a higher extent (Taylor et al., 2013)

**Hypothesis 2**

- **Supported**

One of the key aspects within IMC is that synergies are built through combining touchpoints (Keller, 2009). Havlena, Cardarelli & Montigny (2007) and Naik & Peters (2009) concluded that synergies are created when using multiple marketing channels when communicating with consumers in the FMCG industry. The creation of synergies between digital marketing communication and other touchpoints in an IMC strategy has although not reached a
consensus, and research is scarce. Previous research has found synergies between online advertisement and TV for associations (Chang & Thorson, 2004), while synergies for awareness and purchase intent were not found (Havlena, Cardarelli & Montigny, 2007; and Chang & Thorson, 2004). Steele et al., (2013) found that combined they create a more emotional response, this is although not connected to one single dimension of brand equity. Wakolbinger, Denker & Obercker (2009) studied synergies between print and online advertisement and found no synergy effect for awareness. Naik & Peters (2009) found that adding online banner advertisement to the mix gave few or no synergy effects. Thus, previous research has received mixed results regarding if digital marketing channels do create synergies, but it is still a basic assumption within IMC. Therefore, hypothesis two was formulated: “Digital marketing communication channels have synergy effects with other touchpoints in an IMC strategy.”

The result from the survey shows that for awareness Facebook from others than the firm have statistically significant synergies with Seen at work and WOM sample. For Associations Facebook from the firm and Facebook from others have synergies with Seen on shelf. For sales Facebook from firm have synergies with Tasted at work. No synergies at all were found between digital- and traditional marketing communication touchpoints. The lack of synergies between digital and traditional for creating awareness and purchase intent is in line with previous research Chang & Thorson (2004); Wakolbinger, Denker & Obercker (2009); Naik & Peters (2009); and (Havlena, Cardarelli & Montigny (2007). While the lack of synergies between these for associations are contradictory to previous research findings by Chang & Thorson (2004). It should be mentioned that no media channel had a statistically significant effect on associations.

Thus the result shows that online marketing did not display synergies while social media did, these are the two components of digital marketing. Social media was not studied in any of the previous research studies found and it is these that turned out to have synergy effects, although unexpectedly with seeing the product on the shelf, seeing it and tasting/eating it at work and receiving a taste from i.e. a friend or family member. Again these finding cannot be compared to previous research as no previous research studying these synergies have been found. Furthermore they were not mentioned during the interview with Carl Lehmann, the Nordic Marketing Manager for Wasa. This is not surprising since the combinations are a bit ‘outside the box’ for what normally is considered. Although the results differ from
expectations in how the synergies present themselves, they are there, and therefore the second hypothesis is supported.

**Hypothesis 3**
- **Supported**

Previous research studying communication channels and awareness have found that TV has a very strong effect on awareness (Bruhn, Schoenmueller & Schäfer, 2012; Binet & Field, 2009; Steele et al., 2013). Wakolbinger, Denker & Obercker (2009) found that print and online advertisements are equally effective in providing recall (part of awareness). Bruhn, Schoenmueller & Schäfer (2012) also found that social media created by the firm had an effect on awareness; this was although not true for user generated social media. With this in mind hypothesis three was formulated: “TV has a higher effect on awareness than the digital marketing communication channels in an IMC strategy.”.

In the results it is evident that TV has the highest effect on awareness, which is in line with previous research. In the aggregated backward multiple regression model the digital channels are not even statistically significant in explaining the variation in awareness. This is not in line with previous research. When looking at the backward regression models that are divided by category usage, the very strong effects of the traditional marketing communication channels are evident on the lightest category users. TV again has a very strong effect, but so does print on this category, notably digital marketing communication channels are not even statistically significant for this model. Thus the findings are not in line with Wakolbinger, Denker & Obercker (2009) finding that print and online advertisement is equally effective. Facebook from others than the firm also has an effect in the models AW sometimes and AW very often. The findings of this thesis are thus not consistent with Bruhn, Schoenmueller & Schäfer (2012) findings stating that social media from the firm effects awareness while social media from others than the firm does not. Thus the hypothesis is supported.

**Hypothesis 4**
- **Cannot reject nor support**

Previous studies show that traditional media do influence associations/image but that the effect is smaller than from social media both from the firm and others (Bruhn, Schoenmueller
More specifically Bruhn, Schoenmueller & Schäfer (2012) found that social media from the firm had an effect on associations regarding product attributes while social media from others had an effect on associations not related to product attributes. Steele et al., (2013) found that TV had a greater effect than online advertisement on the brand resonance experience (brand equity). While Dijkstra, Buijtels, & van Raaij (2005) found the same connection in regard to brand claims specifically. With this in mind the fourth hypothesis was formulated: “Digital marketing communication channels have a higher effect on associations than traditional marketing communication channels in an IMC strategy.”.

The results from the survey show that consumption is the variable that has an effect on the aggregated model for associations, all other variables that showed a statistical significant effect were also related to consumption. Thus the effects that were displayed in previous research were not found, and a comparison between digital- and traditional marketing communication channels was not possible. When looking at the models split by category usage only outdoor advert for AS very often were statistically significant, but it has a small effect and $p < 0.1$ which is far from optimal. No digital marketing channel had a statistical significance. Therefore, it is considered that the hypothesis cannot be rejected nor supported.

**Hypothesis 5**

- **Supported**

Danaher & Dagger (2013) found that TV and direct mail (Leaflet) followed by radio and newspaper has the strongest influence on purchase outcomes. They also found that magazine, online display advertising and social media had no significant effect. Taylor et al., (2013) also found that TV has a strong effect on short term sales. While Binet & Field (2009) argue that the most effective campaigns incorporate TV. Therefore, the following hypothesis was formulated: “Traditional marketing communication channels have a higher effect on sales/purchase intent than digital marketing communications in an IMC strategy.”.

The aggregated model for sales showed that out of the marketing communication channels only Leaflet has a statistically significant effect on sales. Leaflet is considered a traditional marketing communication channel and the result is thus in line with previous research. When considering the backward multiple regressions that were done based on category usage the result hold. Traditional marketing communication is statistically significant in all models except for Sales sometimes where digital marketing communications are not included either.
Banner is evident in the models sales rarely and sales often, but has a negative coefficient and thus regarded as not having an effect, this whilst the traditional channels Leaflet and TV has a substantial effect. Therefore, the hypothesis is considered supported.

Summary of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: “Digital marketing communication channels have a higher effect on heavier category users than lighter category users, compared to traditional marketing communication channels, in an IMC strategy.”

- Partially supported

Hypothesis 2: “Digital marketing communication channels have synergy effects with other touchpoints in an IMC strategy.”.

- Supported

Hypothesis 3: “TV has a higher effect on awareness than the digital marketing communication channels in an IMC strategy.”

- Supported

Hypothesis 4: “Digital marketing communication channels have a higher effect on associations than traditional marketing communication channels in an IMC strategy.”

- Cannot reject nor support

Hypothesis 5: “Traditional marketing communication channels have a higher effect on sales/purchase intent than digital marketing communications in an IMC strategy.”

- Supported
Conclusion

In this chapter of the thesis conclusions will be drawn and the research question will be answered. In the next chapters the findings will be discussed, limitations of the study will be addressed and future research will be suggested.

The aim of this thesis is to help clarify how digital marketing can be leveraged in an IMC strategy by answering the following research question: “Are digital marketing communication channels in an IMC strategy effective in creating awareness, associations and sales within the FMCG industry?”. The analysis showed that digital marketing channels did not have a statistically significant effect on awareness, associations nor sales in the aggregated backward multiple regression models. But from this the conclusion that these channels do not have an effect in the IMC strategy cannot be drawn. The sample of the study is small and not generalizable to the population, which the reader should keep in mind. Furthermore when dividing the respondents based on level of category usage, an interesting finding was made: the effect of the touchpoints vary significantly between the users. It was in these backward multiple regressions that digital marketing communications appeared as statistically significant. Although Banner advertisement appeared as statistically significant, it was consistently with a negative effect which, based on Hollis (2005), was interpreted as having no effect at all. Facebook from others than Wasa showed an effect for awareness amongst users who eat crisp bread very often and sometimes. This is although not directly influenced by a firm and can be said to be online WOM, which is arguably one of the most powerful concepts within marketing. Furthermore the findings show that touchpoints connected to experience with the product have the strongest effect on the outcomes. The analysis of synergy effects suggest that social media have some statistically significant synergy effects on touchpoint that influence the outcome in regard to awareness, associations and sales. Although this study cannot draw conclusions regarding the relative effectiveness of the digital marketing channels at an aggregated level. The analysis implies that digital marketing channels might have an effect on the outcomes through the synergy on other touchpoints. But further research is needed to verify this conclusion.
Discussion

In this chapter a final discussion on the research findings of this study will be presented. In the next chapter the limitations of the study and recommendations for future research are presented.

It is said to be exciting times with technological changes creating new opportunities to reach consumers. With this the paradigm of integrated marketing communication has evolved. This thesis has studied some of these new opportunities within the context of an integrated marketing communication strategy. The study is conducted from an individual consumer perspective rather than aggregated data of i.e. sales, which is the more common approach within practice. Considering the hype that surrounds the new digital marketing communication channels the results of this study are disappointing. The results show that the effect is minimal at best and non-existing in most part. But, there are some mitigating circumstances to this result that the reader should be made aware of.

The interview with the Nordic Marketing Manager for Wasa showed that digital marketing channels were not considered among the more vital parts of their IMC strategy. TV and Print were perceived as the most effective marketing channels combined with in store activities (below the line). Wasa’s relatively old target group of 30 – 50 year olds for ‘Kanel’ and with 40+ overall the brand just barely manage to reach the ‘millenials’ (generation Y) that are considered to drive online marketing (i.e. Smith, 2011). Therefore, it is understandable that the digital marketing communications are not the most vital part of the IMC strategy. The low relative importance is evident in Lehmann’s approximation of allocation of budget: 80 % vs. 20 % in benefit of the traditional marketing communication channels. Thus combined the findings imply that digital marketing communication channels are not priorities in Wasa’s marketing strategies and maybe they should not be at this point in time. But as the ‘millenials’ grow older and if the ‘millenials’ follow the consumption patterns of the older generations, combined with the likely continuing changes in the media landscape, digital marketing might prove vital in the future for the brand.

Furthermore a “few years ago” Wasa only used TV as a marketing communication channel due to its Italian connection. Thus using an IMC strategy comprising of digital marketing communication is relatively new for them. The challenges for web advertisement is the low
visual attention given to them by potential consumers (i.e. Steele et al., 2013) thus banners need to really pull in the viewer. The quality of the integration and advertisement might have affected the results but this is beyond the scope of this thesis.

This thesis measures the effect on awareness, association and sales. Kennedy, McDonald & Sharp (2008 in Taylor et al., 2013) argue that advertising work as a reminder for consumers to buy the preferred brand and thus keep the status quo. During the interview with the Nordic Marketing Manager for Wasa it was evident that an important goal with the advertisement is to remind the consumers of ‘Kanel’, making reach an important measurement. The respondent’s profile also shows that reach by Facebook from Wasa was slightly skewed towards the light users, not in line with theory, thus the reach can be considered more valuable than expected. Thus Wasa look at the effect of marketing communication from a different perspective where the value of the digital marketing communication channels might be visible. In the interview Lehmann mention that they have seen synergies between i.e. TV and WebTV advertisement. Although WebTV was not used in the focal IMC campaign it does imply that digital marketing communication channels have important effects, but was not caught in the scope of this thesis.

Furthermore the findings of this thesis show that touchpoints connected to experience with the product have the strongest effect on the outcomes, although sampling in store and from Wasa did not have an effect, trying the product in other situations did. Thus the long-term goals awareness and associations, which are part of brand equity, are mostly built through experience. But the backward regression models have all limited explanatory power, indicating that other factors not taken into consideration in the scope of this thesis also affects the outcome. For example the models for sales, which showed the least explanatory power a likely explanation is differing preferences for the product ‘Kanel’ amongst the respondents. Although aware of the product they might not like the taste, or they might even be gluten intolerant. But this is of course beyond the scope of this thesis. A further explanation for the low explanatory power can be seen when looking upon awareness. The aggregated model has an explanatory power of approximately 39 % while the divided models vary between 33 – 77 %, with the lightest category users displaying a much higher value. The chosen touchpoints have a good fit for the lighter category users while other touchpoints or factors seem to have a substantial influence on the heavier category users. Further research is thus needed.
Limitations & Future Research

Here limitations of this thesis are addressed and future research is suggested.

Research within IMC is still in its infancy and has predominantly addressed the definition issues of the concept. This thesis has made an attempt to further the understanding of how different touchpoints in an IMC strategy affect outcomes of awareness, association and sales on an individual respondent level. Future research can be done in many areas, below are some suggestions based on the limitations of this study.

This thesis and the majority of previous studies found have small samples and do not consider the quality of the advertisement nor of the integration. Studies with larger and representative samples can be done to see if the findings are generalizable and/or consider the quality of the IMC and the advertisement. Furthermore different methodological approaches can be used in attempt to increase validity of the study i.e. diaries over exposure to touchpoints to make sure the respondent remembers correctly. Because the touchpoint need to be remembered by the respondent to have a substantial effect (Hollis, 2005) the respondent should still be surveyed, but a way to improve the survey could be to incorporate visual cues. Although these require resources (time and access to respondents) beyond those supplied for a mere Master thesis.

This thesis studies an IMC strategy within the context of a mature FMCG category. Other product categories but also other industries with higher involvement would be interesting to study as the IMC strategy and respondents behaviors are likely to differ. Studying the effect of touchpoints between cases would also make for an interesting study. Other outcomes than awareness, associations and sales, which are used in this study, can also be studied.
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Appendix A – Interview guide in Swedish & English

Swedish (original):

Min master uppsats avser att svara på hur digital marknadsföring effektivt kan användas i en integrerad marknadsföringsstrategi för att bygga varumärkeskapital (brand equity).

Dina svar kommer användas för att bygga upp en fallstudie för en av Wasas senaste produktlanseringar samt 'Kanel'. Syftet med intervjun är att få kunskap om hur ni byggt upp er marknadsföringskommunikation för de här produkterna och hur ni resonerat i valet av kanaler. Frågor rörande Wasas målgrupp och varumärkesimage kommer även ställas för att användas som grund för en enkätstudie som avser mäta varumärkeskapital för Franska Örter och Kanel.

Frågorna:

1) Berätta om din roll på Wasa.
2) Vilken image/personlighet vill Wasa ha? Hur skiljer sig Franska Örter/Kanel från den?
3) Vilken målgrupp har Wasa? Hur skiljer den sig för Franska Örter/Kanel?
   a. Är er marknadsföringskommunikation utformad efter denna grupp enbart?
4) Under vilken period pågår produktlanseringen?
5) Vilka marknadsföringskanaler använder ni i produktlanseringen?
6) Varför valde ni de marknadsföringskanalerna?
7) Går samma budskap ut genom de olika kanalerna?
8) Hur koordinerar ni era marknadsföringskanaler?
9) Hur mäter ni påverkan som marknadsföringskanalerna har på ert varumärke?

Har du några andra tankar kring detta?

Är det okej att jag hör av mig fall om jag kommer på fler frågor?

Tack så mycket för att du tog dig tid att svara på mina frågor!
English (translation):

My master's thesis aims to answer how digital marketing can be effectively leveraged in an integrated marketing strategy to build brand equity.

Your answers will be used to build up a case study for one of Wasa's latest product launches and ‘Kanel’. The purpose of the interview is to gather information about how you built up your marketing communications for these products and how you have reasoned in the selection of channels. Questions regarding Wasa's target group and brand image will also be asked to later be used as the basis of a questionnaire designed to measure brand equity for French Herbs and ‘Kanel’.

The questions:

1) Tell me about your role at Wasa.

2) What image / personality are Wasa aiming for? How do ‘French Herbs’ / ‘Kanel’ differ from it?

3) What is the target audience for Wasa? How is it different for French Herbs / ‘Kanel’?

   a. Are you a marketing communications designed for this group alone?

4) During which period is the product launch ongoing?

5) What marketing channels do you use in the product launch?

6) Why did you choose these marketing channels?

7) Does the same message go out through the different channels?

8) How do you coordinate your marketing channels?

9) How do you measure the impact the marketing channels have on your brand?

Do you have any other thought around this subject?

Is it okay if I get back in touch with you if more questions arise?

Thank you so much for taking the time to answer my questions!
Appendix B - Complete Survey

Hej, den här enkäten är en del av en Masteruppsats i strategisk marknadsföring som avser mäta effekten av kommunikation på varumärkeskapital. Enkäten tar ca 3 minuter att slutföra och din medverkan är mycket uppskattad!

### UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stämmer mycket däligt</th>
<th>Stämmer däligt</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska däligt</th>
<th>Stämmer varken däligt eller ganska bra</th>
<th>Stämmer ganska bra</th>
<th>Stämmer bra</th>
<th>Stämmer mycket bra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jag känner till Wasas knäckebröd 'Kanel'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. När jag tänker på knäckebröd är Wasa 'Kanel' en av de produkterna som jag kommer att tänka på</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jag kan snabbt och enkelt komma på karakteristiska drag för knäckebrödet Wasa 'Kanel' (t.ex. utseendet på produkten, smak etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Jag kan snabbt och enkelt förstå att knäckebrödet Wasa 'Kanel' är rik på smak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Knäckebrödet Wasa 'Kanel' passar bra som ett mellanmål</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Knäckebrödet Wasa 'Kanel' är rik på smak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Jag äter knäckebrödet Wasa 'Kanel' regelbundet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


10. Har du sett reklam för Wasa Kanel på TV, i tidning eller på nätet under år 2014?

   □ Ja □ Nej

[Vänd]
11. Var det denna produkt du tänkte på?

☐ Ja  ☐ Nej

Svarade du nej och känner inte igen produkten nu, trots att du sett bilderna ovanför, hoppa till fråga 13.


1-2 gånger  3+ gånger
☐ ☐ I TV-Reklam
☐ ☐ Annonser i vecko/månads tidning (t.ex. damernas värld)
☐ ☐ Memory spel eller annat inlägg på/från Wasas Facebook sida
☐ ☐ Inlägg om/med 'Kanel' från annan än Wasa på Sociala Medier
☐ ☐ Annonser (banner) med 'Kanel' på nätet
☐ ☐ Sett 'Kanel' i utomhusreklam t.ex. på bussen.
☐ ☐ Sett 'Kanel' på jobbet
☐ ☐ Åtit 'Kanel' på jobbet
☐ ☐ Jag kommer ihåg att jag sett 'Kanel' i knäckebrödshyllan i butik
☐ ☐ Jag kommer ihåg att jag sett 'Kanel' på annan plats i butik än knäckebrödshyllan
☐ ☐ Sett 'Kanel' i reklamblad
☐ ☐ En familjemedlem, släkt, vän eller bekant har nämnt 'Kanel' för mig
☐ ☐ En familjemedlem, släkt, vän eller bekant har bjudit mig på 'Kanel'
☐ ☐ Jag har fått ett smakprov på 'Kanel' i butik eller av Wasa
☐ ☐ Jag har sett/hört om 'Kanel' på annat sätt (t.ex. blogg), vänligen specificera:..................
☐ ☐ Jag har smakat på 'Kanel' i annat sammanhang, vänligen specificera:..................

Sist vill jag be dig svara på några enkla frågor om dig själv:

13. Jag är: ☐ Man  ☐ Kvinna

14. Jag är _______ år

15. Jag äter knäckebröd: ☐ Aldrig  ☐ Sällan  ☐ Ibland  ☐ Ofta  ☐ Mycket Ofta

Tack för din medverkan!
Appendix C – Standard multiple regression models

### Awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T.AW (all)</th>
<th>Touchpoints</th>
<th>r2</th>
<th>Adjusted r2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>1.765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td></td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB Wasa</td>
<td></td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>1.420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB others</td>
<td></td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banner</td>
<td></td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>-1.207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor advert</td>
<td></td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>1.259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen at Work**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>-2.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasted at Work**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>2.967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen on Shelf**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>2.959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample other</td>
<td></td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-5.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet</td>
<td></td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-5.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOM mention</td>
<td></td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOM sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instore/Wasa sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-8.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen/heard other</td>
<td></td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>8.853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.1 ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

### Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T.AS (all)</th>
<th>Touchpoints</th>
<th>r2</th>
<th>Adjusted r2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td></td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td></td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB Wasa</td>
<td></td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB others</td>
<td></td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>1.306</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banner</td>
<td></td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor advert</td>
<td></td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>1.198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen at Work**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>-2.186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasted at Work**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen on Shelf***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>3.321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second placement</td>
<td></td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-1.341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet</td>
<td></td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOM mention</td>
<td></td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOM sample**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>2.925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instore/Wasa sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>-1.329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen/heard other</td>
<td></td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-.669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial other</td>
<td></td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>9.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.1 ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01
### Sales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sales (all)</th>
<th>Touchpoints</th>
<th>r2</th>
<th>Adjusted r2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td></td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td></td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-1.038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB Wasa</td>
<td></td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-2.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB others</td>
<td></td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-8.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banner</td>
<td></td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor advert</td>
<td></td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-2.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen at Work*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>-1.660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasted at Work**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>2.967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen on Shelf</td>
<td></td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>1.029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second placement</td>
<td></td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>2.155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOM mention**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>2.886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOM sample*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>1.827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instore/Wasa sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen/heard other</td>
<td></td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial other</td>
<td></td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-6.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>9.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01
## Appendix D – Backward multiple regression models

### Awareness by level of category consumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T. AW (rarely)</th>
<th>Touchpoint</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $r^2$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Backward Model 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>,765</td>
<td>,662</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>4.763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>3.707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor advert</td>
<td></td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.542</td>
<td>2.968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen at Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>2.148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet</td>
<td></td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>1.798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOM sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>3.345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample other</td>
<td></td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>2.435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T. AW (sometimes)</th>
<th>Touchpoint</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $r^2$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Backward Model 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>,460</td>
<td>,426</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB others</td>
<td></td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>,167</td>
<td>1.778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasted at Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>,181</td>
<td>1.882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOM mention</td>
<td></td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>,189</td>
<td>1.995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>,508</td>
<td>5.336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T. AW (often)</th>
<th>Touchpoint</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $r^2$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Backward Model 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>,330</td>
<td>,295</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen at Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>,231</td>
<td>2.403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen on Shelf</td>
<td></td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>,276</td>
<td>2.814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOM sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>,172</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>,351</td>
<td>3.520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T. AW (very often)</th>
<th>Touchpoint</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $r^2$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Backward Model 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>,588</td>
<td>,563</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB others</td>
<td></td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>,215</td>
<td>2.669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasted at Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>,279</td>
<td>3.689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instore/Wasa sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>,146</td>
<td>1.860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample other</td>
<td></td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>,150</td>
<td>2.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>,616</td>
<td>8.278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Associations by level of category consumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T. AS rarely</th>
<th>Touchpoint</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $r^2$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backward</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOM sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>3,340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T. AS sometimes</th>
<th>Touchpoint</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $r^2$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backward</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOM sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>1,806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>5,756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T. AS (often)</th>
<th>Touchpoint</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $r^2$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backward</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seen on Shelf</td>
<td></td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>2,656</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second placement</td>
<td></td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.243</td>
<td>-2.764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOM sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>4,525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T. AS very often</th>
<th>Touchpoint</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $r^2$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backward</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor advert</td>
<td></td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>1,719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen at Work</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.259</td>
<td>-2.335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasted at Work</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>2.523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>6,127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sales by level of category consumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sales (Rarely)</th>
<th>Touchpoint</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $r^2$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backward Model 2</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Banner</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td></td>
<td>.343</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.859</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leaflet</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.341</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOM sample</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td></td>
<td>.379</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sales (Sometimes)</th>
<th>Touchpoint</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $r^2$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backward Model 2</td>
<td>Seen at Work</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tasted at Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.036</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.430</td>
<td>-2.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seen on Shelf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>2.836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sales (Often)</th>
<th>Touchpoint</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $r^2$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backward Model 2</td>
<td>Banner</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tasted at Work</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.282</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leaflet</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td></td>
<td>.186</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOM mention</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td></td>
<td>.219</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOM sample</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td></td>
<td>.225</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sales (Very Often)</th>
<th>Touchpoint</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $r^2$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backward Model 2</td>
<td>Second placement</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOM mention</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td></td>
<td>.223</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td>.311</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>