Executive Summary

This thesis provides an evaluation of the initial business potential of a new Internet-based business idea at the conceptual stage.

The business idea is founded in the creation of a new Internet-based community based on the review, rating and discussion of advertisements. The concept aims to facilitate, process and structure community user information in preparation for the creating of an efficient, affordable and differentiated tool/product for testing advertisements and doing marketing research.

Methods of analysis include qualitative market research on potential clients of the product and quantitative market research on potential users of the online community. Other analysis and calculations include statistical analysis and a brief competition survey. A Concept Development Framework (CDF) is developed to track the results of the analysis and the impact on the business idea. All results and calculations can be found in the thesis and the appendices. Results of collected and analyzed data show the existence of an initial business potential.

Potential clients find the business idea appealing, but highlight the need for more traditional, customized, marketing research product solutions in a differentiated (faster, easier and more affordable) format. Furthermore, a concern with regards to overall business volume, not being large enough to sustain a long term business, is expressed. It is also noticeable that the potential clients are indifferent to how the data is obtained, (whether it's through a forum or a traditional web panel) – they just want reliable consumer insight.

The potential users of the community can be categorized with regards to interest and visit-intention. Certain characteristics are significantly predictive regarding users visit-intention towards the website. It is particularly notable that potential users find the overall business concept idea of rating and review interesting, but not necessarily the content which is advertisements. Results also indicate that a website should focus on the rating and review aspect, combined with community activity. The potential users do not find the social community aspect appealing in this context.

The results have led to a modification of the original business concept idea.

The recommendation put forward by this thesis is that further studies are needed to evaluate the business potential of the modified business concept. These studies should include; client and user interest and

attitudes towards the modified concept; the potential overall business volume; and the impact, on users and clients, of changing the content of the website.

Overall, the apparent business potential is not huge and therefore alterations to the business concept are needed, on the basis of further market studies, in order to obtain maximal potential.

The need for further studies is underpinned by the fact that the results of this thesis are limited by small survey sample sizes, a brief competition survey and a complete disregarding of other business idea aspects such as sales, marketing, economics, et cetera, which are to be developed at a later stage.

Researching the potential of an online rating and review community concerning

advertisements

Master's thesis

Table of contents

Chapter 1	Introduction	
1.1 Motiva	ation and actuality	
1.2 Proble	em Statement	
1.3 The St	ructure of the thesis	
1.4 Limita	tions	
1.5 Source	e criticism	
Chapter 2	Methodology	
2.1 Introd	uction	
2.2 Theory	y of science	
2.3 Definit	tion and terminology	
Chapter 3	Theory	
3.1 Introd	uction	1:
3.2 Discus	sion of suitable theories	
3.3 Choice	e of theory	
3.4 Uses a	nd gratifications theory	
3.5 Attitud	de and behaviour theory	
Chapter 4	The business idea	
4.1 Introd	uction	
4.2 Applie	d theoretical aspects in concept definition	
4.3 The or	iginal Business idea, CDF 1	
4.4 Busine	ess value circle	
4.5 Discus	sion of concept uniqueness	
4.6 Differe	entiated vs. unique	
Chapter 5	Primary data collection	
5.1 Introd	uction	30
5.2 Marke	ting research process	
5.3 Marke	eting decision problem and marketing research problem	3:
5.4 Develo	opping Research Questions	
5.5 Resea	rch questions	
5.6 Hypot	heses	
Chapter 6	Qualitative research	
6.1 Introd	uction	
6.2 Ration	ale for applying qualitative research	31
6.3 Qualit	ative research method	
6.4 Questi	ioning technique and questionnaire design	
6.5 Pretes	ting	
6.6 Questi	ionnaire argumentation	
6.7 Qualit	ative respondents	
6.8 Comm	nent on execution	
6.9 Means	s of documentation	
6.10 Quali	itative data analysis	
6.11 Main	conclusions from qualitative research	4
6.12 Impa	ct on Concept Development Framework, CDF 2	4
6.13 Apply	ying results from the qualitative survey to the quantitative	4
Chapter 7	Quantitative research	
7.1 Introd	uction	
7.2 Ration	ale for applying quantitative research	46
7.3 Quant	itative research method	46

7.4 Questionnaire design	49
7.5 Pretesting	
7.6 Questionnaire argumentation	53
7.7 Surveys conducted in Danish	61
7.8 Respondents	61
Chapter 8 Quantitative results and data analysis	64
8.1 Introduction	64
8.2 Applied approach	64
8.3 Choice of analysis and argumentation	65
8.4 Data quality - reliability and validity	69
8.5 Sample characteristics	72
8.6 Factor analysis – interest and attitude measurement	77
8.7 Hypothesis tests	
8.8 Predictive regression modelling	
8.9 Summary, discussion and conclusion of quantitative results	
Chapter 9 Overall results and applied theory	117
9.1 Introduction	
9.2 Qualitative research, uses and gratifications	
9.3 Quantitative research, uses and gratifications	
Chapter 10 Final Concept Development Framework	121
10.1 Final Concept Development Framework, CDF 3	
10.2 Comments on CDF 3	
Chapter 11 Conclusion and discussion of further work	124
11.1 Conclusion	
11.2 Critical assessment of the thesis	
11.3 Discussion of further studies	
Bibliography	128
Articles	
Articles Books and other	

Table of figures

Figure 1 - structure of the thesis	4
Figure 2 - choice of theory	14
Figure 3 - concept Development Framework, CDF 1	25
Figure 4 - business value circle	26
Figure 5 - marketing research process (Danya International)	31
Figure 6 - qualitative data analysis stages	39
Figure 7 - impact on Concept Development Framework, CDF 2	43
Figure 8 - questionnaire flowchart	55
Figure 9 - quantitative respondent contact	62
Figure 10 - plan of quantitative data analysis and preparation	64
Figure 11 - overall attitude, factor vs. single questions	86
Figure 12 - overall interest, factor vs. single questions	86
Figure 13 - hypothesis 1, Q22 (+G) normal distribution	87
Figure 14 - hypothesis 1, Q22 (-G) normal distribution	87
Figure 15 - hypothesis 1, Q22 Descriptives illustration	89
Figure 16 - final Concept Development Framework, CDF 3	121

Table of tables

Table 1 - overview of theories	12
Table 2 - selected aspects in concept definition	24
Table 3 - qualitative questionnaire argumentation	38
Table 4 - questionnaire pitfalls	51
Table 5 - quantitative question argumentation	57
Table 6 - sample size	73
Table 7 - representativity (age)	75
Table 8 - representativity (gender)	76
Table 9 - overall attitude factor, Correlation Matrix	78
Table 10 - overall attitude factor, KMO and Bartlett's test	78
Table 11 - overall attitude factor, Communalities	79
Table 12 - overall attitude factor, Total variance explained	79
Table 13 - overall attitude factor, Component Matrix	80
Table 14 - overall attitude factor, Case Processing Summary	81
Table 15 - overall attitude factor, Cronbach's alpha	81
Table 16 - overall attitude factor, Item Statistics	82
Table 17 - overall attitude factor, Scale Statistics	82
Table 18 - overall attitude factor, Multi-item variable statistics	82
Table 19 - overall interest factor, Total variance explained	83
Table 20 - overall interest factor, Cronbach's alpha	84
Table 21 - hypothesis 1, Q22 (-G and +G) Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test	88
Table 22 - hypothesis 1, Q22 Descriptives	88
Table 23 - hypothesis 1, Q22 ANOVA	89
Table 24 - hypothesis 1, Q22, Test of Homogeneity of Variances	90
Table 25 - hypothesis 1, Q22, Cross tabulation	91
Table 26 - hypothesis 1, Q22, Chi-Square Tests	91
Table 27 - hypothesis 2, Q23, ANOVA	93
Table 28 - hypothesis 3, Correlations	96
Table 29 - hypothesis 4, ANOVA	97
Table 30 - hypothesis 5, ANOVA	99
Table 31 - hypothesis 6, ANOVA1	01
Table 32 - the final predictive model, Hosmer and Lemeshow Test	06
Table 33 - the final predictive model, Hosmer and Lemeshow Test, Contingency Table	07
Table 34 - the final predictive model, Classification Table	07
Table 35 - the final predictive model, Variables in the equation	08
Table 36 - the final predictive model, Overall Model equation	09
Table 37 - the final predictive model, Reduced Model equation	09
Table 38 - user segmentation table1	15

Chapter 1 Introduction

"Online social networks and communities appear to have hit the Internet with the momentum of a runaway locomotive. These sites have attracted tremendous numbers of members in a very short period of time."

> The Ipsos Canadian Inter@ctive Reid Report Online Socialization, Social Networking and Online Communities

1.1 Motivation and actuality

Online communities have evolved immensely during the past 5 years and today, the most popular of their kind, play a big role in how we communicate with our surroundings and thus our social interaction.

Some of the most popular and best known communities in the western world presently include sites such as, www.myspace.com, www.facebook and www.linkedin.com, according to comscore.com. These represent online social utilities that specialize in, for example, music (MySpace), staying in touch and connecting with friends and acquaintances of all kinds (Facebook) and with business/professional networking (LinkedIn) – all letting users connect and interact with each other.

Other websites or online initiatives, such as www.youtube.com and www.imdb.com, have become some of the most visited websites in the world. YouTube being a video-sharing website and IMDB, in its form as an Internet Movie Database, which was not initially intended as a user driven community, but has since evolved into one. The ability to view, rate, comment and discuss interests with other users represents some of the basic features of communities.

Despite having different origins and areas of focus, all these websites have one thing in common – they are driven solely by user interaction and activity. By facilitating the possibility for user interaction and activity, these websites has grown into successful online communities (Gilberto Cintron (2008)).

The power and business value of a popular online community is, with its millions of registered users, incredible. YouTube was bought by Google in 2006 for 1.65 billion US dollars and Facebook is valued by experts to be worth approximately 15 billion US dollars (BBC, 2008)

YouTube and Facebook are the most successful among online communities and clearly highlight the value, or potential value, of a successful and popular online community.

2008

User interaction generates value

Generating online user interaction can be the source of potential business value. The challenge lies in generating valuable information among users that can also be valuable in a business context. Most businesses depend on user/consumer insight in order to generate effective marketing and sales activities. Information derived from consumer interaction can, therefore, be valuable.

Building a link between the businesses and consumers, based on online interaction and discussion in a community, moving information from the users to the businesses, could prove beneficial and valuable.

However, what is it that motivates people or users, to actively participate in an online community? And, is it possible to create a new online community with a more specific focus and appeal?

This thesis aims to investigate the potential for developing a new user interaction driven website or community, revolving around advertising and marketing.

1.2 Problem Statement

"What is the business potential of a Danish online community focused on the rating and review of advertisements?"

The following areas and problems are researched to provide background knowledge and theory enabling the authors to shed light on the problem stated above:

• Which theories can be applied to research and determine user motivation for online communities?

This will help to establish what drives the users, and can be progressively applied in determining some of the basic needs that an online community must fulfil.

What differentiates the original business concept idea?

The idea behind the new website is defined and brief empirical market studies, in order to identify strategic gaps, are conducted.

• Which research framework is most applicable in order to determine the requirements and potential of the new website?

This will help to form the best possible research framework to provide data for further analysis and discussion of the business potential and user requirements for the business concept.

• What characteristics define users with high website visit-intention?

Based on quantitative surveys and statistical predictive variables, characteristics of interested users are identified.

• What are the motivations of the potential users?

The results of the quantitative surveys will also help to define the motivations of the potential users.

• How do the collected data and findings correspond with theories of user motivation?

Analysis and discussion of how the theoretical studies and findings correspond and compares to the empirical findings.

• What defines the adapted concept framework?

This will represent the modified definition of the business concept based on the findings of the thesis.

Based on these objectives, this thesis aims to give a clear indication of whether or not the potential for a Danish online community, for rating and review of advertising, is present. Furthermore, the goal is to end up with a clear cut framework for possible realization of the concept.

In the case of the potential for the new online community not being present, it will be discussed what conceptual alterations could help to make it become a reality.

1.3 The Structure of the thesis



Figure 1 - structure of the thesis

1.4 Limitations

Due to the scope of this thesis, limits to the approaches and perspectives are applied. Below, a list of points clearly outline in which areas limits are imposed, and consequently, the reasons why some aspects are not taken into account.

- The object of this thesis is not to compile a completely finished business concept. This would require further studies and would include numerous aspects of business development, marketing and sales theories and strategies beyond the scope of the thesis.
- 2) The findings of this thesis are only in relation to the Danish market. The magnitude of studies beyond this market is simply beyond the capability of the researchers, due to the set amount of time for the writing of the thesis. Furthermore, the business idea and concept are aimed at the Danish market, making studies in other markets peripheral.
- 3) The conducted surveys and the obtained observations of this thesis are limited by time and money. As the thesis is to be completed in a set time and the monetary resources are defined by the authors own income, a substantial and representative study of both potential clients and users is simply not possible.

- 4) All respondents recruited for the in-depth interviews live within a 20 kilometre radius of Copenhagen. This is based on the Danish population and the business methods of the advertising industry being relatively homogeneous, and therefore is assumed that the results of the analysis would not differ significantly if the analysis had contained interviews with respondents from anywhere else in the country. Furthermore, only 3 respondents were interviewed, as the quantitative studies of this thesis are used to gain the first insights into the market. At a later stage in concept development, beyond this thesis, qualitative studies could be employed to a greater extent.
- 5) The use of specific attitude and behavioral theory is not founded in a discussion of potentially applicable theories, as in the case with uses and gratifications theory, as attitude and behavioral theory is used as a sub-point to uses and gratifications theory.
- 6) The overall problem statement of the thesis does not correlate with a substantial theoretical discussion of applicable theories and case studies, as previous theories are primarily used as references and as the basis for discussing empirical results and as a frame of reference for the findings in this thesis.
- 7) An extensive theoretically aligned competitive analysis is not conducted. The limited competitive analysis in this thesis is included to highlight potential areas of possible differentiation or POD's (Points of differentiation) and to single out potential USP's (Unique selling proposition).
- 8) Due to sample size, analyses of the quantitative data within the assumed representative population of respondents living in Region Hovedstaden, aged 21-30, is not conducted. The sample size of such analyses would be too small and it is sought to apply the entire sample throughout the analysis, in order to obtain the highest validity and reliability.
- Online communities are defined, but effects of and on these are not discussed. By this, a discussion of Network based Marketing is also beyond the scope of this thesis.

Limitations are, to a moderate extent, introduced throughout the thesis when relevant, e.g. the choice and limitations of statistical methods of analyses.

1.5 Source criticism

All discussions, analyses and conclusions in this thesis are based on obtained knowledge through various sources. Source criticism and the evaluation of applied sources are therefore essential, in order to obtain an overall validity, reliability, relevance and objectivity.

The sources in this thesis are comprised of books, articles, the Internet, persons and observations.

1.5.1 Books

All books applied in this thesis are written by acknowledged authors. The majority of the books are found on university literature lists, which underlines the general acceptance of these in the field.

The theories, quotes, et cetera, related to the referenced books of the thesis, are evaluated as being valid and reliable.

1.5.2 Articles

The applied reference articles are by well-known authors or authors referenced to by other authors in their articles, who include findings of good validity and reliability. The object is to use articles written only by respected authors and/or researchers within the various theoretic fields.

The choices of articles applied in this thesis are found to be as valid and reliable as possible.

1.5.3 Internet

The Internet as a source of information is used to some degree in this thesis. Only links that appear professional and valid are used as references. Using the Internet and links on the Internet will often be followed by some insecurity with regards to validity. However, this insecurity has been sought minimized by the use of common sense; no links that appeared even the slightest bit unsound are applied.

1.5.4 Persons

The persons who act as sources in this thesis are the interviewees for the qualitative studies. The eligibility of these is discussed thoroughly in the chapter regarding the qualitative studies.

Overall, there is some insecurity when dealing with persons as sources. Nonetheless, the information gained from these sources via the In-depth interviews, is evaluated as being useful and unbiased, and thereby valid and reliable.

6

1.5.5 Observations

The definition of observations in this thesis covers the aspect of the empirical data derived from the thesis' quantitative studies.

The validity, reliability and representativity is discussed, tested and evaluated in the chapter on the quantitative studies.

In general, the source of observations is evaluated as valid and reliable, but it is not representative of the entire research population.

Chapter 2 Methodology

2.1 Introduction

To answer the problem statement of this thesis requires a great amount of knowledge regarding the subject. Developed theories and gathered empirical data help establish the essential knowledge that is required. The theoretical knowledge is acquired through intensive study of literature. All potentially explanatory theories with relevance to the problem statement, are collected, studied and categorized for further discussion, analysis and subsequent conclusion.

The fundamental knowledge for the thesis is based on previously developed and collected empirical data from existing studies. However, to augment the validity of the analysis and conclusions, empirical studies are conducted, consisting of both qualitative and quantitative categories. These empirical studies assist in obtaining increased comprehension of the business concept idea (Chapter 4). These empirical studies aim to provide alternative, more concrete and tangible data, which will enhance the overall generated answer to the problem statement, in interaction with selected theories and existing studies.

The collaboration between secondary data, primary data, the existing theoretical foundation, as well as the background knowledge, provides the opportunity to emphasize and discuss issues throughout this thesis from several points of views.

The results of the thesis will be beneficial for those theorists and practicians looking for insight into this subject in the future.

2.2 Theory of science

To understand the choice of methodology and the means of discussing, analyzing and concluding in this thesis, it is important to know the theory of science on which the thesis is build upon. This is due to the attempt to correlate reader comprehension with author insight.

The authors preconceptions and subjective understanding of the world and its scientific principles, affects the way in which articles, texts and collected data is construed, and can, thus, influence the results which emerge.

This thesis uses theory of science ad hoc (Olsen, 2008), expressed through continual discussion of the assumptions as they arise.

8

The thesis' underlying basis and perception frame, theory of science, is critical rationalism. While most philosophical traditions regard knowledge as something that has to be certain and justified, critical rationalism takes the view that there are no ultimate answers, but knowledge is nevertheless possible and truth is an endless quest. The modern founder of critical rationalism was Karl Popper. Popper pointed out that it is not possible to justify anything, merely criticize and weed out bad ideas and work with what is left. He argued that it is not possible to justify any scientific theory, but it is possible to falsify it. In this way, science moves forward by weeding out bad theories, so to speak (Popper, 1999).

This approach will be consistent throughout this thesis founded on Popper's perspective concerning the belief in the non-existing "definitive-answer" and rational mentality. Additionally, the aspect of submitting a hypothesis and subsequently testing the hypothesis in accordance to how this thesis is accomplished is considered. This way of approaching the science and available data makes it impossible to verify specific theories, since there is no direct access to the "real" world behind. As a result, the next experiment can turn out to falsify any theory. Therefore, for now, exists only the best theory.

2.3 Definition and terminology

This section explains the choice of words and phrases used in the thesis.

2.3.1 Defining "Online community"

The use of the phrase "community", disregarding the phrase forum (enclosed under the online community definition), is based on statements, previous studies and discussions on communities. The concept "community" has a wide range of definitions (Abram, 2005). The thesis operates with the overall community idea because most specific definitions of community include aspects that are relevant to the presented business concept, such as "Interest" (Hill et al., 2006), "Discussion", "User assisted development", "Rating" (Hunter et al., 2008), "User activity" and "Interaction" (Kuchinskas, 1998). This thesis works with the idea of communities, based on above mentioned statements and discussions and with below selected definitions. These definitions are selected, given that the potential users of this website are inclined to have a certain interest in reviewing, rating, discussing and commenting advertisements.

2.3.1.1 Applied definitions

communities can be defined by location, race, ethnicity, age, occupation, interest in particular problems or outcomes, or other common bonds..."

"Community — A group of people, variable in size, who come together around a common purpose, goal, or interest."

"The aggregate of persons with common characteristics such as geographic, professional, cultural, racial, religious, or socio-economic similarities;

"Online community - users who are widely dispersed geographically but come together in cyberspace based on similar interests."

"A meeting place on the Internet for people who share common interests and needs. Online communities can be open to all or be limited to membership only and may or may not be moderated."

Utah System of Higher Education

"A specific reference to Web sites where people congregate online to discuss a subject or to introduce themselves for possible meeting in person."

Pcmag

"An online community is: Where a group of people with similar goals or interests connect and exchange information using web tools."

Jeremiah Qwyang

"A community is a group of people who form relationships over time by interacting regularly around shared experiences, which are of interest to all of them for varying individual reasons."

Jake Kee

2.3.1.2 Other thesis definitions

Clients:	Buyers and takers of the business concept products.
Users:	People that are registered as users on the website and contribute with information.
Advertising:	The overall concept of advertisements - "to advertise".
Advertisement:	One advertisement is equal to one TV-advert et cetera.
Concept content:	This refers to what the business concept contains. The rating and review is considered the overall concept, where as advertisements is considered the content. E.g. concept content is equal to advertisements.

Unknown

Unknown

Surf city host - glossary

Chapter 3 Theory

3.1 Introduction

To establish the optimal foundation for answering the problem statement, a discussion of relevant theories takes place. The most important aspect of having a comprehensive and valuable discussion of theories, concerning a given subject, is to identify which elements of the subject are to be answered entirely, or partly, through these theories.

The relevant theoretical elements of this thesis exist in the produced problem statement, which asks whether there is potential for a certain business concept idea, concerning rating and review on a community based mentality. As a result, it is important to identify, analyse and discuss potential theories to describe the underlying involved subjects.

Stated previously, the community mentality builds, to a great extent, on involvement from the users, and the users' presence per se. Without users and their interest in the subject, no community exists. Supposing there is the existence of potential users for this business concept idea and its content, the question is how the facilitator activates these latent users and makes them generate the community to actualize the concept idea.

This introduction to the indentifying of potential theories, expound the necessity of activating the users, as these are identified as the extensive part of the "content" of this concept.

The review below discusses suitable theories and arguments for screening.

3.2 Discussion of suitable theories

3.2.2 Overview of theories

Below is an overview of feasible theories which feature elements to expound and discuss how to activate "community-users", as well as implement other elements within the conceptual idea, such as media, et cetera. These theories should contain elements corresponding to the content of the business concept idea, including "online-approach", "media-choice", "user-involvement", et cetera.

Media effects theories	Media use and media choice theories
Media determinism theory	Model of mass audience behaviour
Social learning theory	Media richness theory
Cultivation theory	Uses and gratifications theory
Media dependency theory	
Media credibility theory	

Table 1 - overview of theories

As shown above, and in continuation of previous discussions, it emerges that communication theories are evident and relevant to employ for the use of processing the overall issues of this paper (McQuail, 2005). The reason that communication theories are selected is based on the concept of transmitting information from one person to another, which is consistent with the fundamentals of the concept idea.

3.2.3 Discussion of theories

"Who says what to whom through what channel with what effect?"

Harold Dwight Lasswell

Within the boundaries of communication theories exists several feasible theories for processing this paper and its thesis. As shown in table 1, two categories which contain various suitable theories and paradigms exist. The two main categories this thesis will use are, "Media effects theories" and "Media use and media choice theories". These two main categories treat elements suitable for the thesis, but differ significantly. Media effects theories discuss "what media does to people" and "media use and media choice theories" discuss "what people do with media" (Katz, 1959).

In accordance with the concept idea, the object is to identify the proper theory, which suits the thesis, on how to establish a community, and thereby generate interactivity between users. The interactivity within users necessitates users, per se.

This fact elucidates that to find the right theory for the thesis, the category "media use and media choice theories" is the most evident category to utilize, given that the concept idea is based on a user-driven perspective, and therefore needs to capture the attention of latent users, meet their needs and activate them as users in the community.

Based on this argumentation, three suitable theories remain:

- 1. Model of mass audience behaviour
- 2. Media richness theory
- 3. Uses and gratifications theory

3.2.3.1 Model of mass audience behaviour

The occurrence of media studies of models of mass audience, highlight the behavioural patterns among users of specific media. These theories also focus on online/Internet audiences and their way of acting when logged onto the Internet, including mapping of Internet behaviour and visited websites. These theories concerns are, as the name of the theories states, mass audience behaviour in general, and to a lesser extent, users' behaviour towards a specific website or concept.

3.2.3.2 Media richness theory

Media richness theory concerns descriptions of various mediums and their capability to recount the information sent using these mediums. This theory is in some way interconnected to information processing theory and treats the effectiveness of the various mediums and their ability to communicate information. The conclusion is that richer mediums (face-to-face, video conferencing) are by far the best and most effective way of transmitting information, supposing that no information may be lost in the process. These theories address which mediums to use and not what the medium should contain, to meet the needs of the users.

3.2.3.3 Uses and gratifications theory

Uses and gratifications theory treats the aspect concerning users' motivation regarding a specific media, e.g. websites, and which content and possibilities should be available for the users to visit and interact with on a specific site. This theory discusses how user needs affect which media they choose and also has focus on the gratification the media provides, and thereby clarifying the motivation of the users. This theory processes several media types, including the Internet media, which is the fundamental element of this thesis.

3.3 Choice of theory

The main theory to be employed, that will constitute the foundation for further progress with this thesis, will be "Uses and Gratifications". This selection is based on the above mentioned discussion, with emphasis

on the theory's ability to identify which reasons users have in their choice of a specific medium, in this case the Internet. Previous uses and gratifications studies on Internet subjects can establish a basis for preparing hypotheses for this thesis' own study, and in addition, establish basis for further discussions. Media richness theory is disregarded due to its focus on which medium to use, and which characteristics each media is in possession of. Since the selection of media type already has been performed, this is no longer relevant. Models of mass audience theories are also disregarded based on their emphasis on mapping Internet behaviour in general and not focusing on motivation to use a specific media/website. Previous uses and gratifications studies/theory will partly be tested in the study of this thesis, in order to determine whether the choice of theory is right and follows the progress based on the theory of science.

The figure below visualizes the above discussion, and underlines the process of finding the most suitable theory.





3.4 Uses and gratifications theory

3.4.1 Introduction

Uses and gratifications theory is basically a theoretical paradigm which seeks to identify users' motives with regards to their use of a specific type of media. The theory is based upon the question: "Why do people use media and what do they use them for?" (McQuail, 2005, p. 423). Existing perceptions explain how media use depends on the perceived satisfaction, needs, wishes or motives of the prospective audience member (McQuail, 2005, p. 423.) The most common identified forms of motivation for choosing these various media types are "information", "relaxation", "companionship", "diversion" and "escape".

The theory is generally used to outline users' motivation regarding specific media, to determine which user needs should be satisfied and to identify which gratification the user experiences when using the specific media, including the audience choice of media. Uses and gratifications differ from conventional audience related media theories, as this theory focuses on the audience as active users and not as inactive recipients of one-way communication/information.

Uses and gratifications theory clarifies the audiences' choice by mapping their reasons for using a certain media instead of others, as well as the form of gratification obtained by these media, based on individual social and psychological requirements.

The theory originates from traditional communications theory, as discussed in choice of theory, and has been used in numerous studies since the early Forties. The theory achieved its eligibility concurrent with the emergence of new media types and new different programs/perspectives within the same media (Lazarsfeld et al., 1944.)

Uses and gratifications theory has developed at the same time as new media types has emerged. Through the years every media platform has been studied, which will be discussed below. These comprise of various studies within each media type including radio, television, newspapers, the Internet et cetera.

3.4.2 Uses and gratifications theory in this thesis

The main objective of using uses and gratifications theory to elucidate this thesis, and in general, is to examine the motives of Internet usage. The major cause for using this theoretical framework in the thesis is the uses and gratifications theory's ability to effectively provide relevant perspectives, to explain psychological and behavioural dimensions concerning users' motivation towards various media (Lin, 1996).

The main reason for this theory being the most suitable for the thesis is its capacity to present essential information about users' motivation. This information is simultaneously the foundation on which to build a successful concept. Uses and gratifications theory, in accordance with the study of this thesis, makes it possible to examine the exact motivation factors of the audience. The theory has the advantage of supporting studies, whether they are studying general knowledge/motivation towards various media types, or specific categories within the media types. This is exemplified by the presented concept in this thesis, in which the theory facilitates the study of motivation towards a specific area within a general media type – the Internet. As a result of that, it is deemed that uses and gratifications theory is evident to use for developing this thesis.

Uses and gratifications theory meets a wide range of factors which are essential to propound and make use of, to accomplish a valid and profound study, and for the successful completion of this thesis.

The factors that highlight the uses and gratifications theory's ability to support this thesis are:

- 1. Motivation
- 2. Clarification
- 3. Activity
- 4. Psychological and behavioural factors

3.4.2.1 Motivation factor

Uses and gratifications theory grants the opportunity to investigate previous studies on motivations towards the Internet and Internet communities in general. It also enables the authors to modify and test these studies and assess whether they are suitable and applicable for the problem solving of this thesis.

Furthermore, the uses and gratifications theory represents the foundation and framework capable of guiding the study of this thesis, keeping the focus towards the motivation of specific areas of the Internet and community perspective.

These motivation studies should result in a specific outcome, clarifying and supporting the development of the conceptual idea.

3.4.2.2 Clarification factor

Clarification of the user's needs is interconnected with the above discussion. Uses and gratifications theory enables this more than the other discussed communication theories, among these; mass audience and media use theories. This theory provides the opportunity to pinpoint exactly which motivation factors the possible audience/users possess.

3.4.2.3 Activity factor

As discussed in the introduction to the use of the uses and gratifications theory; it is based on involvement or active behaviour from the users who are not considered as passive receivers of information. This perspective underpins the selection of the theory, given that the business idea is founded on involvement from an audience, perceived as a community. As this community perspective is fundamental for this concept, the understanding of users as active individuals is extremely important in order to produce a valid, reliable study.

2008

3.4.2.4 Psychological and behavioural factors

In line with several of the other communications theories, discussed in the selection of theory, uses and gratification treats psychological and behavioural dimensions, which interconnect with the previously mentioned discussion about the motivation factor.

These four factors constitute the foundation and argumentation for using uses and gratification as the theoretical framework for this thesis. The factors will continually be implicated in the working progress of the theoretical use, developing research questions, hypothesis, et cetera.

Above mentioned factors are important to clarify this study. Their influence will have increasing impact on the final edition of the presented concept in the CDF, Concept Development Framework, and thereby the overall conclusions in this thesis.

3.4.3 Previous studies

Numerous studies within uses and gratifications theory exist. Studies, concerning various types of media, with regards to general media types and specified areas within these. As discussed in the introduction, uses and gratifications theory is comprehensive and has been employed for numerous decades, on different media, such as Television, Radio, Newspaper and the Internet, amongst others.

As stated in the introduction and choice of theory, the presented concept works as the underlying basis for the theoretical framework within the thesis. As a result of the business idea concept's focus on Internet and community perspectives, this section primarily processes studies in which Internet and community uses and gratifications theory is the primary topic. By doing so, studies that have the main focus on different types of media are not emphasized.

3.4.3.1 Studies on heavy and light users

As the concept is based on active users and the involvement of these, it is important to identify potential variables, which motivate people to use the Internet, both in general, but also their use of specific websites (Stafford et al., 2004), lists and tests a wide range of variables in the search for clarifying American AOL users' Internet gratification (Stafford et al., 2004), outlines how users can be divided into two main groups; light users and heavy users. He explains how these groups differ in needs and motivation towards the use of the Internet. The understanding of how to satisfy light users by meeting their needs for design and interface and their progression into becoming heavy users is very interesting. The generating of 4 main factors (Searching, Information, Communication and Socializing) of motivation in this study can assist in the final development of the concept in this thesis. The first and most important factor (searching) is

disregarded in this study, as it is not relevant for the business concept idea. The 3 other factors are included in the hypotheses and study of this thesis. It is especially interesting that socializing (including Chatting and Interaction) is identified as gratifying, as the business concept idea features precisely these attributes.

3.4.3.2 Studies on gratification types

To specify the perspective of identifying the right gratifying factors referring to the presented business concept idea, (Stafford and Stafford et al., 2004), among others, split Internet gratification into three different types: 1. Internet process gratifications, 2. Internet content gratifications, 3. Internet social gratifications.

1. Internet process gratifications is primarily characterized by sub points, such as searching, surfing, search engines, et cetera, whereas; 2. Internet content gratifications are characterized by containing information, knowledge, learning, research, et cetera, and finally; 3. Internet social gratifications contain sub points such as chatting, interactions, people, et cetera (Stafford and Stafford et al., 2004), division of Internet gratification is used to focus on the type of gratification, which is coherent with the presented business concept idea. As the concept is built upon user interaction, discussion, et cetera, the evident gratifying factors are primarily located in Stafford and Stafford's 2004 classification - 3. Internet social gratifications.

Stafford and Stafford's 2004 study shows a strong motivation towards Internet use based on social implications, primarily highlighted by chatting and interacting. These factors might be interesting to test in this thesis.

3.4.3.3 Studies on interactivity

Ko et al., 2005 seeks to describe correlations between interactivity, as motivation to use the Internet, and user attitude in various situations. These situations include a study of how consumers' attitudes towards brands, sites, et cetera, proceed, when interactivity takes place. The key findings of the Ko et al., 2005 study are quoted below.

"Consumers who have high information, convenience, and/or social interaction motivations for using the Internet tend to stay at a Web site longer to satisfy their corresponding motivations; consumers who have high information motivations are more likely to engage in human-message interaction on a Web site; consumers who have high convenience and social interaction motivations are more likely to engage in human-human interaction on a Web site; consumers who engage more in human-message and humanhuman interactions evaluate the Web site more positively, which leads to positive attitude toward the brand and purchase intention; human-human interaction has a more significant effect on attitude toward the site than human-message interaction."

Ko et al., 2005

The Ko et al., 2005 results verify the assumption about interaction, presented in the introduction. As the presented concept builds on interactions from the users, this study provides important and interesting information. The presented concept requires users to stay on the website for a longer period of time, since as much information as possible is to be derived from the users. The results, furthermore, indicate that in order to receive large amounts of information from the users, users with high information, convenience and social interaction motives, are to be preferred.

Simultaneously, a conclusion is drawn on how users with high convenience and social interaction motivation factors, are more likely to engage in human-human interaction. This information is highly informative for the development of the final version of the business concept idea, as the concept builds on the mentality and perspective of a community in which human-human interaction is essential to its success.

3.4.3.4 Studies on motivation

Another study from Ko, Hanjon (Ko, 2000) concerns other factors such as motivation factors towards the Internet. The interesting aspect about this study, which is 5 years older than the one mentioned above, is the shortage of definite social factors. This proves that the awareness of social factors has developed in line with the Internet, as stated in the introduction. The results of this study are similar to other studies in which four primary motivation factors are identified: 1. Social escapism, 2. Passing time, 3. Interactive control 4. Information. The social escapism factor should not be identified as an antithesis to the social motivation factor discussed earlier, but as escapism to the "real" social side.

3.4.3.5 Monetary gratifications

Birnholtz et al, 2004 discuss the impact of monetary gratification and find that cash is a superior incentive for higher online survey response rates. Porter et al, 2003 discuss the use of lottery prizes and find that these have little effect on questionnaire response rates.

3.4.4 Use of previous studies – uses and gratifications

The studies illustrate elements, of uses and gratifications theory in interaction with the Internet, that have been identified earlier. These previous studies are used as argumentation for the approach to the study of this thesis. The selected studies present uses and gratifications towards the Internet, and assist in comprehending the division of various gratification elements, including the Internet social gratification (Stafford and Stafford et al., 2004), that is the foundation of the study of this thesis.

As outlined above, included Internet social gratification factors are coherent with the overall business concept idea. As the concept builds on users' interaction, chatting, information transferring, et cetera, Internet social gratification is used as the main parameter, frame and inspiration in this thesis. Furthermore, it is interesting to test the impact of monetary gratifications (Birnholtz et al., 2004 and Porter et al., 2003) on concept interest and use intention. Actual elaborated results are not used as direct argumentation in the conclusions, yet they provide background information to be used for discussion.

3.5 Attitude and behaviour theory

3.5.1 Introduction

In the uses and gratifications theory discussion, psychological and behavioural dimensions, attitude and behaviour are mentioned. These are part of the overall framework of uses and gratifications.

As the object of this thesis is to map the interest and visit-intention towards the business concept idea in its present form, attitude and behaviour are important factors to address when accomplishing the quantitative research.

Attitude and behavioural factors are also important to include in the research, in the search to identify which attitude and behavioural factors have influence on interest and visit-intention, regarding the business concept idea. These factors are used as possible variables on the visit-intention towards the concept, when developing a model for identifying possible predictive factors. The model, section 8.8, relates to a theoretical entry point based on the authors' conception of the respondents, the concept and previous studies on uses and gratifications theory, including attitude and behaviour.

3.5.2 A sub-point theory

Based on this argumentation, attitude and behaviour are included as a sub-point to the uses and gratifications theory within this thesis. Being a sub-point of the main theory of this thesis, an actual comprehensive and extensive discussion on underlying factors and construction of these factors are not included in this thesis. The focus on attitude and behaviour is solely founded on the factors influence in the mapping and identification of possible correlations between attitude and behaviour.

3.5.3 Previous studies - Attitude and Behaviour

Actual usable studies on attitudes relation to behaviour in the area concerning the presented business concept idea are not present, as the presented concept does not exist in any form. Therefore, a discussion on why attitudes are crucial to include and measure in the research is conducted instead.

As mentioned in the section above, the argument for including attitude is to find any predictive behaviour founded in attitudes. Within the theory of using measurement attitudes, the element concerning the use of attitudes as a predictor is the focal point. This definitely correlates to this thesis.

3.5.3.1 Studies on attitude and behaviour

A wide range of studies concerning attitude and attitudes relations towards behaviour exist. Among these (Ajzen et al., 1975) treats theories on attitudes, measurement techniques and prediction of behaviour based on attitude. The various techniques for measuring attitudes, beliefs and intention are described by Fishbein and Ajzen and the measuring techniques for this research are outlined in section 7.6.5.5 Attitude measurement.

As mentioned above, Fishbein and Ajzen interpret the connection between attitude and behaviour as *"predisposition to respond to an object in a consistently favourable or unfavourable manner."* This definition describes the link between attitude and behaviour that is also sought in this research. Furthermore, in line with the theory and measurement on attitudes, Fishbein and Ajzen conclude that the best predictor for a person's behaviour is the person's intention to conduct that behaviour.

3.5.3.2 Studies on planned behaviour

As well as Fishbein and Ajzen's ideas on attitude theory (above), Ajzen (Ajzen, 1985) discusses and defines the theory of planned behaviour as:

"Behavioural decisions are not made spontaneously but are the result of a reasoned process in which behaviour is influenced, albeit indirectly, **by attitudes**, norms, and perceptions of control over the behaviour."

Ajzen, 1985

This discussion about the theory of planned behaviour is strongly interconnected with the discussion on the relation between attitudes and behaviour, and underlines the importance of involvement of attitude, when mapping the respondents' behaviour.

As in the theory of planned behaviour, which Ajzen treats, Smith et al. (Smith et al., 2008) discuss positive attitude and behaviour towards the attitude measured. The study tests the theory of planned behaviour, which Ajzen treats in the previous study. The authors find that the theory is usable in attitude and behavioural connections, which again advocates for the inclusion of attitude in the research of this thesis.

3.5.3.3 Consumer values, the theory of planned behavior and online grocery shopping

Hansen T., also addresses the aspect within the theory of planned behaviour on attitudes positive correlation in connection with behaviour. Hansen T. (Hansen, 2008) defines it in this manner:

"The more favourable a person's attitude is towards some considered behaviour, the more likely it is that the person will want to engage in the behaviour".

Torben Hansen

The study finds a positive connection between the attitude and the behaviour, regarding attitude towards online grocery shopping and willingness to buy groceries online.

3.5.4 Use of previous studies

Generally, the previous studies and theory discussed in the sections treating attitude and behaviour, underline the importance of including attitude and especially the relation between attitude and behaviour in the thesis.

In connection with this research, Fishbein and Ajzens' definition of attitudes is employed. This research tries to find any predictive variables to explain the respondents' visit-intentions towards the presented business concept idea. As for attitude concerns, it is sought to identify any possible relation between attitude (overall attitude and interest) and advertisement. These attitude factors are subsequently analyzed in connection with the visit-intention. As Fishbein and Ajzen also conclude in their study, this research employs intention as the main behavioural factor. This means that the respondents' behaviour is stated by their visit-intention regarding the presented business concept idea.

Smith et al. argue for positive correlation between measured attitude and purchase intention (Smith et al., 2008). This interesting argument would be relevant to verify within this research, in order to identify which variable or attitude explains or predicts the visit-intention. Transferred to this research, it is interesting to discover whether there is a positive correlation between the respondent's attitude towards advertisement and their visit-intention regarding the presented business concept idea.

Hansen T. underlines the interesting aspect of testing attitude towards advertisement up against the behaviour (visit-intention) within this research (Hansen, 2008). This research seeks to find any possible correlation between the respondents' attitudes towards advertisement, and their willingness to use the presented concept.

On the foundation of the above mentioned, and discussed literature and studies, attitude theory is included as a part of the research in this thesis.

Chapter 4 The business idea

4.1 Introduction

It is important that the reader understands that this initial business idea is only the starting point for the development of a lasting business idea and concept. The very essence of this thesis is to examine the potential of the initial business idea and from this, develop a well-founded business concept.

"Reaching a sustainable business definition is a separate and challenging process."

Søren Hougaard

The business concept will be described in its initial idea and this description will serve as the foundation for this thesis' hypothesis and surveys.

The concept is described through a specially constructed framework, giving the authors, and the reader, the chance to more easily overview the changes that the original concept idea undergoes during the processing of this thesis.

4.2 Applied theoretical aspects in concept definition

Defining a business can be roughly divided into three basic dimensions (Hougaard, 2004):

- 1. For whom?
- 2. With what?
- 3. How?

These basic dimensions cover the following aspects:

Customer group (for whom?)	Who to attract?
Function (with what?)	What to offer?
Technology (how?)	How to do it?

23

 Focused:
 A focused business concept is focusing on a particular customer group, function or technology.

 Differentiated:
 A differentiated business concept differentiates from competition in a single dimension or more.

 Undifferentiated:
 An undifferentiated business concept does not differentiate from competition.

Furthermore, several questions about the business idea are raised and thus additional aspects have been selected as being important in defining the business idea.

The selected aspects in concept definition are shown below:

Aspect	Relevance
Overall concept idea	To the point description of the concept idea – an easily understandable and digestible description.
	5 1
In depth concept description	In depth description of the concept. Describing the concept idea in detail for
	those who takes part in the further development of the overall concept
Business type	Which type of business?
Product/service	What is the product or service that the business delivers?
USP/ESP	What is the Unique Selling Proposition of the business?
Competition	What types of businesses might be considered competitive?
Entry barriare	What obstacles might have an impact on the business gaining a foothold in
Linu y Darriers	the market?
Value Chain	How is value generated and in what sequence?

Table 2 - selected aspects in concept definition

In order to make all these various and independently important aspects of the business concept definition more easily understood, they have been aligned in a special developed framework that will be applied throughout this thesis.

Furthermore a business or business concept can be defined by establishing whether it is (Hougaard, 2004):

4.3 The original Business idea, CDF 1

The original business idea is presented through the specially constructed Concept Development Framework (CDF) based on the aspects introduced in section 4.2

Overall concept idea	An online web community/database based on the rating and review of advertisements. The concept is to facilitate, process and structure community user information in preparation of creating an efficient, affordable and differentiated tool/product for testing advertisements
In depth concept description	 An online community with registered users who are interested in advertising. Users will be prompted with questions and rating requests on different advertisements. User driven discussions about advertisements. Clients can create their own online advertisement test via a web application –uploading their own material to the website. The possibility to contact the company for professional sparring and help in creating the test. A fixed number of available product solutions. Reducing the cost of creating an entirely new type of test each time. The concept is focused on the type of customer/client that have some upfront experience in marketing research. The idea is to create a differentiated analysis concept, based on a different type of web panel, supplying customers with a fixed number of easy and fast product solutions.
Product/Service	The product/service provided consists of advertisement tests in a new, very basic, fast, affordable and simple format.
USP/ESP	Quick and affordable market insight - easy, fast, affordable and simple advertisement tests
Target Group - Client	Clients: Everybody that uses marketing research and tests in accordance with developing or implementing new advertisements in the Danish market of advertising: Major advertisers that conduct their own marketing research and testing, Advertising agencies and Media agencies. Users: A broad and represantative section of the Danish population interested in advertising.
Function	Clients: The ability to obtain valuable information about advertising in a fast, easy and affordable manor. Users: The oppotunity to discuss and rate advertisements on the basis of interest or possible gratification.
Technology	Internet - utilizing web 2.0 tendencies, creating a new online community on the Internet and a online marketing survey interface.
Competition	The competition is foreseen to be limited at implementation, but there is a risk that competition, new or adapted suppliers of similar products, will increase in short time if the concept is successful.
Entry Barriers	The entry barriers are generally low, but some ressources are required in the creation of a substantial group of users or panel.
Value Chain	Valuable user information $ ightarrow$ facilitation and processing of user information $ ightarrow$ valuable and applicable customer reports.

Figure 3 - concept Development Framework, CDF 1

4.4 Business value circle

The primary foundation for creating business value is the transferring of information from the population/users to clients, with the Concept/Website as the facilitator. All three dimensions of the business value circle can interact independently of the third dimension, but none is valuable without the existence of the others.



Figure 4 - business value circle

4.5 Discussion of concept uniqueness

"No one gets ahead by copying the status quo or imitating competitors. The concept of being unique or different is far more important today than it was ten years ago"

Unknown

Having established that the new business idea differs from the competition, the discussion of uniqueness is quite relevant. The concept differs, yes – but is it unique?

In order to discuss uniqueness, from a more factual point of view, a little research has been made into the competition, in order to obtain further information about the typical practices and prices in the market. This research can be viewed as a small and concise competitive analysis.

4.5.1 Competitive analysis

An e-mail inquiry (please see appendix 15.1 for the full e-mail) on how to solve a given analysis and test scenario was sent to a number of suppliers and potential competitors. Four responded, via e-mail or telephone, with a solution for the test scenario.

4.5.1.1 Enquired test scenario

The inquiry that was sent contained the following fictive test scenario:

- Test of one fictive TV advertisement 30 seconds.
- Online test through a Web panel.
- 50 respondents:
 - 50% men and 50% women.
 - Age: 18 to 49 years of age.
 - Geographic representation: From all over Denmark.

- No further segmentation was required.
- Questioning frame:
 - Consisting of 15 individual questions (13 closed + 2 open)
 - The question frame is delivered to the agency.
- Report:
 - Brief PowerPoint presentation approximately 15-20 pages.
 - Including graphic line-up of results and overall conclusions.

4.5.1.2 Questions to enquired test scenario

Furthermore, the following questions were asked: (appendix 15.1)

- Approximate overall price for the test?
- Price configuration prices for the individual parts of the test?
- Process time and expected delivery?
- Data foundation how are respondents recruited and how are they activated?

The purpose of the questions was to gain valuable information about the typical solutions offered by the market for the given test scenario – the intention was to use this information in the comparison to the original concept idea and in this way define the differentiation and uniqueness of the new concept, compared to the ones currently on the market.

4.5.2 Responses to inquired test scenario

Four responses were registered, all representing some of the major suppliers in the Danish market for analysis and testing. They each offered the differentiated product solutions, which can be seen in appendix 16.

4.5.3 Overall results from the competition analysis

The brief analysis of the competition makes it clear that all the major suppliers in the market are aligned in their response to the stated test scenario. They differ slightly in price and delivery time, but the services they provide are based on almost the same parameters.

This means that someone looking for a partner to solve the given test scenario, would be offered a solution at the price of approximately 18.000 DKK. Excluding VAT or more, and would have to wait approximately 10 days for the results. The results would, in all cases, be based on a web panel survey, and the respondents

would be inclined to participate for a small indirect financial incitement. In all cases the most costly part of

the process is the PowerPoint report.

In this particular case, 3 out of 4 responses recommended a larger sample in order to make the survey more valid.

Furthermore, it is worth taking into account that this small competition analysis only included a number of the largest and most well known players on the Danish market for analysis and testing. It would have been interesting to include some of the smaller suppliers in the market, but no responses were received from these minor suppliers. Furthermore, the authors' evaluate that most of these minor suppliers do not represent their own web panel, which indicates higher costs.

This small competition analysis gives a subtle, but relevant and applicable, insight into the Danish market for testing and analysis. This insight will be used to establish the originality, differentiation and uniqueness of the original business idea and concept in the following section.

4.5.4 Is the business concept unique?

There is unfortunately no Yes or No answer to this question, as the business concept, to some extent, is unique in the way that analysis and reports are generated, but the final outcome of the report, is not particularly unique in its current form.

The authors believe that much of the original business idea is unique. The idea of making an online survey partner with the ability to produce very fast and very affordable, yet applicable reports is revolutionary and a result of technology. It will be unique at the implementation stage, but easy to imitate, especially for the established suppliers in the market.

The idea of creating the panel of respondents through an online community is definitely unique. If it is possible to create an attractive and popular online community, focused on advertising, it will represent not only a community but also a whole new way of collecting data in the world of test and analysis. In many ways it can be argued that this method of gathering information and data is more objective than the current methods. Still, it all comes down to the online community – will it represent a diversity of people/users/consumers in the market or will it consist solely of a few, who find advertising particularly interesting or who have a professional approach to the community.

In summary; The Business concept is quite unique if it ends up in its original form, being founded on an online community based on the rating and review of advertising.
However, if the concept ends up becoming more traditional, providing faster and cheaper market surveys but based on more traditional methods, the concept is not particularly unique – only differentiated (Hougaard, 2004).

4.6 Differentiated vs. unique

It is important to keep in mind that this thesis does not represent a quest to create a unique business concept, but rather an economically sound business concept, meaning that a differentiated concept might prove to be the right way to proceed.

Chapter 5 Primary data collection

5.1 Introduction

Based on the problem statement, Marketing Research is applied to chart the market potential for the presented concept. The European Society for Opinion and Marketing Research (ESOMAR) defines marketing research as follows:

"Marketing research is a key element within the total field of marketing information. It links the consumer, customer and public to the marketer through information which is used to identify and define marketing opportunities and problems; to generate, refine and evaluate marketing actions; and to improve understanding of marketing as a process and of the ways in which specific marketing activities can be made more effective."

ESOMAR

The research carried out in this thesis only represents a constituent element of a complete marketing research project, as an absolute marketing research contains numerous and various elements.

The purpose of the conducted marketing research is to help answer the problem statement and underlying questions of the thesis.

5.1.1 Problem identification

Marketing research can be split into two main areas, "problem identification" and "problem solving" which engage two different approaches to marketing research (Malhotra et al., 2006).

"Problem identification" engages the perspective of identifying a problem, in this case, the market potential of the presented concept, including market potential research and market characteristics research. The market potential research in this thesis is accomplished by means of qualitative interviews; the main objective being to establish the potential of the presented concept on the market. Additionally, a market characteristics research is conducted, in the form of a brief competitive analysis (section 4.5).

5.1.2 Problem solving

Having established the market potential of the presented concept, the problem solving process takes place.

The problem solving process in this thesis is secondary to the problem identification research, as many of the typical problem solving research parameters are beyond the focus of this thesis. However, some problem solving research is touched upon in the partial segmentation research and pricing research.

30

5.2 Marketing research process

The development of research questions in this thesis is illustrated below.



Figure 5 - marketing research process (Danya International)

In the search for developing relevant and original research questions, previous studies within uses and gratifications theory on Internet use, are theoretically discussed. This discussion is used as a foundation, on which the argumentation for the importance of the research is based. Subsequently, the research questions are developed and these represent the base for the development of the analytical hypotheses in the thesis.

5.3 Marketing decision problem and marketing research problem

To identify the overall objective of the research, a marketing decision problem and marketing research problem are determined. The purpose of a marketing decision problem is to help the authors and presenters of the concept, to identify which possible actions can be taken, whereas the marketing research problem helps determine what information is needed and how to obtain it.

The marketing decision problem is phrased in accordance to the problem statement and expresses the authors' concerns about launching the presented concept. Simultaneously, the marketing research problem is focused on procuring the necessary information, to try to classify the possible users' motivation toward the presented concept. The marketing research problem is developed according to the perspective of placing the authors in a position to obtain all the information needed, to address the marketing decision problem, as well as guiding the authors in proceeding with the project and defining and developing research questions, hypotheses and the survey questionnaires.

5.3.1 Overall marketing decision problem for the research

Should the new business concept be introduced in its current conceptual format?

5.3.2 Overall marketing research problem for the research

Determine possible customers and users and establish their motivations for using the new business concept.

5.4 Developing Research Questions

"Refined statements of the specific components of the problem."

Malhotra and Birks

In order to conduct the research in an academic manner, utilizing a systematic effort, it is important to have a guideline, such as one or several research questions.

The research questions produced in this thesis are used as a statement to identify phenomenon's to be studied. This can only be done when the relevant literature is well known, discussed and analyzed - this is done in the theory part of the thesis. This theoretical discussion and exhaustive survey of previous studies, provides the authors with the opportunity to identify the most important research questions within users motivation towards the Internet. By doing so, it reveals that the presented concept and its potential for success cannot be determined only on the basis of previous studies.

The research questions in this thesis should be at the root of further exploration, as previous studies are not adequate in the search for answering the problem statement. Consequently, the research questions should enable the study to fill a gap and lead to greater understanding in this field as well as improve, verify and update previous theories and results. It is estimated, due to the current interest in the topic, that the timing for developing research questions and implementation of the study is right. In that respect, the results of this study could prove to be very interesting for various parties.

5.5 Research Questions

The research questions aim at aiding the authors/researchers in answering components of the overall problem statement. All the components, that the below research questions relate to, have an influence on the overall problem solving and the eventual business concept potential evaluation.

- Is there a market of potential customers for the new business concept?
- What are the requirements of these potential customers?

- How will monetary user gratification affect the intended use of the new business concept?
- Does an upfront interest and positive attitude towards advertising, correlate with a positive perception and use- intention of the new business concept?
- Does previous use of existing social websites correlate with a positive perception and use- intention of the new business concept?
- What defines the typical Internet user that intends on visiting the new web application?

5.6 Hypotheses

As a result of the process of creating and developing the marketing research, via the problem statement, previous studies, marketing decision problems, marketing research problems and research questions, the following hypotheses have been developed. The hypotheses are developed in order to fulfil the objective of mapping the field of users' motivation regarding the Internet and the presented concept.

5.6.1 Hypothesis 1

- H0: There is no difference in interest towards the presented concept, with or without monetary gratification.
- H1: There is a difference in interest towards the presented concept, with or without monetary gratification.

5.6.2 Hypothesis 2

- H0: There is no difference in visit-intention to the presented concept, with or without monetary gratification.
- H1: There is a difference in visit-intention to the presented concept, with or without monetary gratification.

5.6.3 Hypothesis 3

- H0: There is no difference in user interest and visit-intention.
- H1: There is a difference in user interest and visit-intention.

5.6.4 Hypothesis 4

H0: There is no difference in visit-intention based on the users' interest in advertising.

H1: There is a difference in visit-intention based on the users' interest in advertising.

5.6.5 Hypothesis 5

- H0: There is no difference in visit-intention based on the users' attitude towards advertising.
- H1: There is a difference in visit-intention based on the users' attitude towards advertising.

5.6.6 Hypothesis 6

- H0: There is no difference in visit-intention based on the users' activity on existing social websites.
- H1: There is a difference in visit-intention based on the users' activity on existing social websites.

Chapter 6 Qualitative research

"Qualitative research – An unstructured, primarily explorative design based on small samples, intended to provide insight and understanding."

Malhotra and Birks

6.1 Introduction

In this thesis, qualitative research is applied to gain insight into the needs of the potential clients of the business concept. The potential clients in this case, represent advertising- and media agencies in Denmark.

6.2 Rationale for applying qualitative research

The reason for using a qualitative research design in the thesis can be explained from two theoretical viewpoints (Malhotra et al., 2006).

- 1. The holistic dimension
- 2. Developing new theory

1. The holistic dimension is relevant in this case, as it is sought to gain a comprehensive and complete picture of the context in which analysis and testing is used, in the Danish advertising market. The goal is to establish the current usage of testing in the market and the underlying behaviour – why do advertising and media agencies test the way they do?

2. Developing new theory is particularly relevant in this thesis, as the goal is to develop a new business concept. The insight gained through qualitative testing with specifically chosen respondents is crucial in this process.

6.3 Qualitative research method

Various methods of qualitative research are available. The most well known and used method in qualitative marketing research is focus group testing. This method, however, requires the gathering of numerous respondents and the skill of an experienced moderator. It is not possible to gather the sort of respondents that could benefit the development of the business concept; due to their status in the advertising business, and since the authors do not have the financial resources to hire an experienced moderator. Focus group testing, has therefore, been dropped and in-depth interviews has been chosen as the sole means of qualitative testing in the thesis.

6.3.1 Rationale for using in-depth interviewing

The authors of this thesis have obtained a network within the Danish market of advertising, through previous employment in the field..This means that some of the critical aspects in the executing of a successful interview can be more easily controlled.

Furthermore, the authors have experience in conducting in-depth interviews, under professional conditions, also through previous employment.

Malhotra and Birks highlight that an interviewer should try the following, to make the interview process work (Malhotra et al., 2006):

- 1. Do their utmost to develop an empathy with the respondent.
- 2. Make sure the respondent is relaxed and comfortable.
- 3. Be personal, to encourage and motivate respondents.
- 4. Note issues that interest the respondent and develop questions around these issues.
- 5. Don't be content with brief "yes" or "no" answers.
- 6. Note where respondents have not clearly explained issues that need probing.

Having already established a relationship with the respondents, many of these aspects are well foreseen and will probably not present problems to the interview process.

6.3.2 Advantages and disadvantages of in-depth interviewing

An advantage of using in-depth interviewing (Malhotra et al., 2006) in this thesis is that they are better suited for uncovering greater depth of insight, than for instance, focus groups. In-depth interviews are suitable for generating a free exchange of information, as there is no social pressure to conform to the group response of a focus group. This makes the in-depth interview ideally suited for sensitive issues such as behaviour of business professionals and commercially sensitive issues.

One of the major disadvantages of conducting in-depth interviews (Malhotra et al., 2006) is the normally low number of conducted interviews, due to the length of each interview. This requires that the quality of the interviews is high, so that obtained data can actually be applied. Furthermore, the obtained data can be difficult to analyze and interpret, as the respondents answers cannot always be taken at face value.

2008

Nonetheless, the previous stated relationships between the authors/interviewers and the chosen interview respondents, make for a solid base of interviewing and applicable results.

6.4 Questioning technique and questionnaire design

A semi-structured questionnaire has been developed for the in-depth interviews (appendix 12). The idea behind this questionnaire is to set the overall setting of the interview, in order to keep it in line with the agenda and the goal of the interview (Malhotra et al., 2006).

The questionnaire consists of open-ended questions and will be used as a guideline, from which the interviewers can derive new questions as the interview progresses. It is an attempt to make the interview more structured (Malhotra et al., 2006).

As the respondents are familiar with the methods of in-depth interviewing, an open and straightforward questioning technique is used, in contrast to more complex techniques, such as laddering and projection (Malhotra et al., 2006).

The interview will start off with a number of open-ended questions about the current usage of testing in the Danish advertising market. At some point, the new business idea will be presented and this will be the main focus of the interview. The business idea presentation, that the respondents are shown, can be seen in appendix 11.

6.5 Pretesting

A pretest was conducted. The authors/interviewers/researchers felt capable of constructing a valid questionnaire, due to their previous experience. But as a precaution, the questionnaire was tested on two relatives first, to ensure overall understanding, question formulation and flow. No problems were encountered.

6.6 Questionnaire argumentation

The semi-structured questionnaire contained four sections with various underlying questions. As alternative questions were derived during the interview and not all prepared questions were asked, there is no point in augmenting the purpose of each question. The entire questionnaire can be seen in appendix 12 (in Danish).

А.	Background information	The questions in this section are mainly used for verifying the respondents, in order to
		establish that they are relevant to interview, possess relevant information and insight into
		the topics and to get the interview started. Getting the respondent to introduce and talk
		about himself and his experiences is a good way of getting started.
		The questions in this section are intended to highlight the respondents' knowledge of, and
в.	Current usage of test and analysis in the market	experiences with, test and analysis in the advertising market. It will help the authors gain
		knowledge about the attitude towards testing, the volume of testing and the typical
		reasoning for testing in the market.
		The purpose is to find out more about the typical buying behaviour in the market and the
		attitude towards various tests, pricing, complexity, and delivery times, et cetera.
		The purpose of the questions in this section is to establish the needs of the buyers and
		users of testing within advertising
	Lackings and opportunities in the current market	
c.		Having learned about the current behaviour and motivation in the previous section of
		questions, it is interesting to try and find out more about the potential needs of the buyers
		and users.
		The questions in this section are aimed at establishing whether there is a need for more
		swift and affordable test and analysis solutions within the market and advertising industry.
	Reaction to the presented concept	The purpose of the questions in this section is to get an indication of the respondent's
		attitude towards the presented business idea/concept. The goal is to make the respondent
D.		evaluate the idea and to possibly contribute with new ideas or add-ons - engaging the
		respondent in a form of creative sparring that could help to further develop the concept.

Table 3 - qualitative questionnaire argumentation

6.7 Qualitative respondents

In order to minimize the needed number of interviews and at the same time raise the quality of the interviews, with regards to profound market insight, three interviews with well established respondents within the advertising and media business have been conducted.

The selected respondents and the reasons for their selection is emphasised in appendix 12.1

6.8 Comment on execution

All interviews were carried out with great success. The three respondents seemed eager to help with this thesis and more than willing to share their knowledge and experience with the interviewers.

On the downside, the three interviews were conducted over a period of 2 months, due to a series of rescheduling to accommodate the respondents' busy working calendar. From the authors/researchers point of view, it would have been preferable to conduct the interviews in the course of one week, to ensure increased flow and the concentrated focus of the researchers. In the manner conducted, it was almost like starting from scratch each time because of the long intervals between the interviews. From a methodical point of view, this can though be viewed as a good thing, as this assisted in increasing the similarity and overall cross-comparability of the interviews.

6.9 Means of documentation

All interviews were documented through the use of audio recording. These recordings was then transcribed, appendix 13. During the interview, various notes were made by both authors/researchers. These notes cannot be documented, but enabled the authors/researchers to categorize and interpret the data in the following analysis.

6.10 Qualitative data analysis

"Qualitative analysis involves the process of making sense of data that is not expressed in numbers."

Malhotra and Birks

According to Malhotra and Birks (Malhotra et al., 2006), Qualitative data analysis should consist of at least 4 primary stages.



Figure 6 - qualitative data analysis stages

6.10.1 Stage 1 - Data assembly

Consists of collected data during the three in-depth interviews. This was done primarily via audio recording and transcription, and secondly, through researchers notes.

6.10.2 Stage 2 - Data reduction

The amount of collected data is substantial. More than 4 hours of audio recordings resulting in long transcripts. Hence, data reduction is required to make sense of the data and to highlight the essential parts.

The process of coding the data is one of the most critical in the entire qualitative research process. Coding the data means breaking down all the collected data into minor chunks of relevant data, and attaching a reference to these chunks (Malhotra et al., 2006).

The coding of qualitative data can be a very complex matter if Open, Axial or Selective coding theory is applied (Malhotra et al., 2006).

In this thesis a more simple approach to coding is utilized. The goal is to "strip down" the data, making it easier to have an overview of the overall data content. This is done via a table, which works as the data display.

This means of simple coding and data display can be used, due to the relatively low number of interviews conducted. In this case, the simpler the better, as a risk of manipulating the results/data in the coding process is present.

6.10.3 Stage 3 – Data display

To document the researchers' experiences during the interviews, a table of the most relevant questions or issues has been created. In this table, each of the three respondents' attitude and answers is boiled down to essentials; the interviews are more extensive than the table shows, as can be seen in the transcripts in appendix 13.

The purpose of the table is to visualize the whole body of data, making it easier for the researchers to oversee, grasp and play with ideas derived from the data. This is done in order to make the data appear more organized, for improved reader comprehension. The table is divided into four main sections, based on the context of the questionnaire, as explained in section 6.6 Questionnaire argumentation. The table can be seen in appendix 14.

6.10.4 Stage 4 – Data verification

In this case, data verification is important, due to the fact that the authors' bias may prove unintentionally critical. As the authors represent both the concept developers, the researchers and the analysts, they represent a potential methodical flaw in the entire process. The data can have been corrupted as there's a risk that the researchers might have heard what they wanted to hear, instead of what was actually said.

However, this risk of data corruption could not have been avoided due to the nature of this thesis, but is, nonetheless, important to have in mind.

The search for verification has been a major concern throughout the entire qualitative research process, as the authors have no intention of applying corrupted data to obtain wishful, but unrealistic, results.

It is very difficult to verify the data completely; however, notes taking during the interviews and discussions between the authors have been the main aspect of this verification. The outcome being, that the authors find the results objective and applicable.

6.11 Main conclusions from qualitative research

The conclusions to be drawn on behalf of the qualitative interviews are straightforward, but have some limitations that have to be taken into account. There for the primary conclusions are listed below, followed by an explanation of the possible limitations.

6.11.1 Primary conclusions

An important thing to have in mind with regards to the conclusions is the validity of the data. The respondents represent three very experienced persons within the advertising and media industry and they possess vast insight in the market. The primary conclusions to be drawn are:

- All respondents have used and still use test and analysis to great extend both qualitative and quantitative testing.
- Some tests are in the preliminary stages of concept/communication development (qualitative), some are at the later stages (qualitative) and some are on the measurement of effect and tracking (quantitative). In general most tests are done in order to please clients and ensure that the right messages are communicated or that the communication concept development is on the right track.
- More tests would be done if it was easier and cheaper to test simple things.
- GFK, Millward Brown, Norstat, Catinét, Gallup and Zapera are the best known in the business and they are all used. Some are better than others at online testing through web panels, and some are better at focus groups. No single partner is used Partners differ according to the assignment.
- The most important criteria in choice of analysis partner differ depending on what it is sought to test.

- Overall, Palle's background as an analyst shines through; he is more focused on quality and validity than the others, who focus more on ease of use, price and speed. As Christoffer and Ole are more representative of future possible clients, their evaluation of criteria is evaluated as being more important than that of Palle. The most important criteria for Christoffer and Ole are: Ease of use, Price and Speed.
- There is a general lack of more flexible, fast and easy methods of testing. Methods that would make it easier to obtain answers to immediate questions on concept development. This corresponds with the lacks in the current market, and a partner offering easy to use, fast and affordable online testing solutions definitely, would stand a good chance in the market.
- In general a positive response to the overall business concept idea is recorded. All three respondents see the potential of the business concept becoming founded in the market, and they could all benefit from it.
- The possibility of interacting with the users is something that all perceive as potentially very valuable. It is the consumer insight derived from building a valid panel of ordinary consumers that could be valuable and could sustain a future business.
- All respondents could see themselves using this product if it fulfils their needs, but are not sure how often. The concept would probably generate some business, but the problem is whether the demand, volume of business, is high enough to sustain running business or not.

The demand is driven by the value that the concept has to offer. This means that value has to be created through a valid panel of users/respondents that interact with each other and possible the client. If valuable information can be derived from the users, then the demand will follow.

• All would be interested in trying out the concept, but all agree that the price of the product should be lower than that of the alternatives in the market today, and well below 10.000 kr. Furthermore, it would have to be swift and easy to operate.

6.11.2 Conclusive limitations

 The conclusions are drawn on the basis of only three interviews which, with regards to quantity, is hardly representative of the overall population of possible clients. However, this lack of representativity was calculated on beforehand, why the conclusions are primarily used as indicators. The three respondents have had crossing career paths, in the sense that they have worked for some of the same companies/agencies and have also worked with each other. This creates possible similarity in their ways of doing business that might lead to somewhat similar answers and behavioural characteristics.

This is important to keep in mind, when interpreting the overall results and conclusions.

• The authors had an already established professional relationship to all three respondents, which should be taken into consideration. There is a risk that the respondents might have reacted overly positive to the presented business idea because of the relationship. However, it is the belief of the authors that the exact opposite effect was achieved; which is positive in terms of validity.

6.12 Impact on Concept Development Framework, CDF 2

Overall concept idea	An online web community/database based on the rating and review of advertisements. The concept is to facilitate, process and structure community user information in preparation of creating an efficient, affordable and differentiated tool/product for testing and marketing research on advertisements.	
In depth concept description	 An online community with registered users <u>who are interested in advertising.</u> Users will be prompted with questions and rating requests on different advertisements. These questions is generated on the behalf of advertisers, ad agencies or media agencies that want to pretest or posttest their advertisements or conceptual ideas. User driven discussions about advertisements. Clients can create their own online advertisement test via a web application <u>– creating their own questions</u> and uploading their own material to the website. The possibility to contact the company for professional sparring and help in creating an entirely new type of test each time. The concept is focused on the type of customer/client that have some upfront experience in marketing research. The idea is to create a differentiated analysis concept, based on a different type of webpanel, supplying customers with a fixed number of easy and fast product solutions. 	
Product/Service	The product/service provided consists of advertisement tests in a new, very basic, fast, affordable and simple format.	
USP/ESP	Quick and affordable market insight - easy, fast, affordable and simple advertisement tests and marketing surveys.	
Target Group - Client	Clients: Everybody that uses marketing research and tests in accordance with developing or implementing new advertisements in the Danish market of advertising: Major advertisers that conduct their own marketing research and testing, Advertising agencies and Media agencies. Users: A broad and represantative section of the Danish population interested in advertising.	
Function	Clients: The ability to obtain valuable information about advertising in a fast, easy and affordable manor. Users: The opportunity to discuss and rate advertisements on <u>the basis of interest</u> or possible gratification.	
Technology	Internet - utilizing web 2.0 tendencies, creating a new online community on the Internet and a online marketing survey interface.	
Competition	The competition is foreseen to be limited at implementation, but there is a risk that competition, new or adapted suppliers of similar products, will increase in short time if the concept is successful.	
Entry Barriers	The entry barriers are generally low, but some ressources are required in the creation of a substantial group of users or panel.	
Value Chain	Valuable user information \rightarrow facilitation and processing of user information \rightarrow valuable and applicable customer reports.	

Figure 7 - impact on Concept Development Framework, CDF 2

6.12.1 Comments to CDF alterations

Below, comments to the major changes in the Concept Development Framework (CDF 2) on the basis of qualitative studies are stated.

2008

6.12.1.1 More marketing research

The respondents force the business concept to move in a direction based on marketing research and not only testing and data-basing, as the original concept is based on. The marketing research aspect is emphasized by the respondents/clients' needs of market insight into the process of developing their advertisements/concepts, and not solely as a testing-tool of finished advertisements.

6.12.1.2 More customized solutions

The respondents call for a customized product, which corresponds with the need for specific marketing research and insight, which includes pretesting, post-testing and tests of conceptual ideas. The respondents want the business idea to consist of more customized product solutions than originally planned.

6.12.1.3 Adaptive surveys

In accordance with the above mentioned need for customization, the respondents also look for the opportunity to develop their own questions and compile their own surveys.

6.12.1.4 All sorts of people as users

The respondents require a more traditional marketing research approach. This means that their desire is to obtain market insight from a representative section of the Danish population and not only insight from people interested in advertisements, as the original business idea proposes.

6.12.1.5 CDF changes - summary

The qualitative interviews bring additional aspects to the business concept. The clients call for a more traditional marketing research perspective added to the concept, but still by means of faster and easier research, at a lower price than that of the present suppliers on the market.

The original concept idea of constructing a tool for testing and creating a database is altered by the respondents' needs for more comprehensive, customized and adapted information, which is more than what the initially standardized product solutions proposed in the original business idea, CDF 1, provided.

Additionally, the original idea of compiling a network of users interested in advertisement is problematic, as the respondents require information from a representative section of the population, and not only people interested in advertisements.

6.13 Applying results from the qualitative survey to the quantitative

The qualitative interviews generated some interesting results with regards to the presented original business idea (CDF1). In general, the respondents are positive towards the concept, and they address issues and opportunities that could help develop the concept in a direction for meeting their current needs. These results and issues are taken into consideration when developing the quantitative research in the next chapter, and consist of:

- 1. The aspect of disregarding interest in advertisements as screening for users of the business idea has an influence when developing the quantitative research. It is sought to examine whether interest in advertisement has an influence on visit-intention towards the business concept.
- 2. The qualitative respondents see a need for creating more marketing research based product solutions, hence changing the original idea of a tool for testing advertisements and creating a database of advertisements. This need does not influence the quantitative research as the concept description, in the upcoming quantitative questionnaire, does not include an explanation of how user answers are utilized when collected, apart from the description of rating charts of the advertisements.

The results of the qualitative interviews will have some, but not a great deal of influence when developing the quantitative research, as listed above. The purpose of quantitative research is to identify uses and gratifications of the potential users of a concept website, whereas the qualitative research has provided information from possible clients of the presented business concept.

Chapter 7 Quantitative research

"Quantitative Research - Use of sampling techniques (such as consumer surveys) whose findings may be expressed numerically, and are amenable to mathematical (statistical) manipulation enabling the researcher to estimate (forecast) future events or quantities."

Unknown

7.1 Introduction

In this thesis, quantitative research is applied to obtain valuable insight into the potential users' behaviour, intentions, attitudes, awareness and motivation for using the Internet and the presented business concept. This information is analysed along with demographic characteristics, in order to try and define a typical, suitable user and to establish a more specific target group of potential users.

7.2 Rationale for applying quantitative research

Whereas the qualitative research in this thesis was used to gain insight into the market from a business point of view, the quantitative research is aimed at producing more specific answers, from a user point of view.

As already established, the value of the business concept is created by attracting users and by creating user interaction. The quantitative research represents a more conclusive manner of research, which is suitable for testing and answering hypotheses concerning the potential users.

The purpose of the quantitative research in the thesis is to produce statistically sound answers, which are directly applicable in the evaluating of the business concept's potential.

7.3 Quantitative research method

There are various methods of collecting the necessary data and information to successfully answer the research questions and hypotheses in this thesis.

Two main methods of quantitative data collection exist (Brace, 2004):

- 1. Interviewer-administered
- 2. Self-completion

Interviewer-administered surveys are time-consuming, even if only a small sample size is sought; therefore a self-completion survey is chosen.

46

Two types of self-completion data collection methods exist. Both represent a possible and useable method for collecting data in this thesis. The two methods are (Brace, 2004):

- Printed self-completion questionnaires
- Web-based self-completion questionnaires

A web-based data collection method is applied.

Web-based self completion methods are numerous and varied, as Bradley (Bradley, 1999) summarizes in the following:

- 1. Open Web a website open to everybody.
- 2. Closed Web respondents are invited to visit a website to complete a questionnaire.
- 3. Hidden Web the questionnaire appears to a visitor only when triggered by a mechanism (e.g. date, visitor number, and interest in a specific page.) This is typical for pop-up surveys.
- 4. E-mail URL embedded a respondent is invited by e-mail to the survey site, and the e-mail contains a URL or Web address on which respondents click.
- 5. Simple e-mail an e-mail with questions contained in it.
- 6. E-mail attachment the questionnaire is sent as an attachment to an e-mail.

A Closed Web approach is applied, meaning that the overall quantitative research method can be categorized as closed-web self-completion.

7.3.1 Rationale for using a closed web self-completion method

Using a web-based questionnaire enables the possibility to apply complex routing, adjusted to the respondent's answers and the possibility to rotate questions and responses. The Web-based survey makes the processing and collection of data simpler and less of a demand on the researchers' resources, as the collected data can be transferred directly into a statistics analysis software program (SPSS). This is not possible with a printed questionnaire, where all answers would have to be typed in manually.

Open web is disregarded as a possibility, since the business idea is not yet publicized. Hidden web is disregarded for the same reason, and also because it does not represent any added value in answering the overall problem statement.

2008

Closed web and E-mail embedded collecting methods are closely related when discussing the carrying out of surveys. When using these methods to collect data, the researchers are capable of controlling who is exposed to the questionnaire. The simple e-mail and the E-mail attachment methods are not applied because of the length of the questionnaire (appendix 9), which would not be able to fit into a standard email. The e-mail could appear confusing for the respondents, producing the possibility of misunderstood and therefore unreliable answers.

Taking everything into account, the closed web self-completion method is chosen, primarily because of the diminished workload related to this, and the reliability of the produced results and answers.

7.3.2 Advantages and disadvantages of using a closed web self-completion survey

The advantages of using a web-based self-completion survey method have been discussed. The primary advantages are the ease of extracting and using the collected data. The results, if the questionnaire is compiled correctly and in accordance with optimum user understanding, will prove valid.

It is the authors' belief that the typical Internet user is familiar with this type of survey as Internet users are often prompted or invited to participate in similar surveys.

It is ideal to do a web survey, concerning questions of Internet usage and a new web application via the Internet, as this ensures that the respondents are actually Internet users; are in the potential target group and have something to contribute with.

The disadvantages of using a web-based self-completion survey method are the inability to include photographs, drawings and other written material, which in interviewer-administered methods demand for instruction and recitation by the interviewer. Another disadvantage is the fact that respondents have to be invited to participate – this means that in order to ensure who participates in the survey and who the business concept is revealed to, the authors have to select who to invite. This means that all respondents have some relation to the authors, perhaps making them less objective in their answering and ratings. In contrast, this relation might ensure more valid answers, as the respondents feel obliged to fill in the questionnaire properly, instead of just rushing through it.

7.3.3 Surveymonkey.com used as online survey application

The partly free of charge online survey utility www.surveymonkey.com is used as the focal point for the quantitative closed web survey.

Surveymonkey.com is useable for the authors in compiling the survey exactly as wanted. Surveymonkey.com makes it easy for the authors to administer the results and finally download them in the correct format, corresponding to that of the analysis software program SPSS.

Linking to the survey is easy, as it is possible to create your own link. Once the respondent clicks the link in the e-mail, he or she is taken directly to the survey.

Programming the questionnaire in the surveymonkey.com web application is time-consuming as it requires familiarity with the application.

Note: A PDF copy of the surveymonkey.com questionnaire can be seen in appendix 9. The composition of the questionnaire is elaborated in the following.

7.4 Questionnaire design

In order to develop a valid questionnaire, it is sought to describe and comply with prevalent and applicable theory on questionnaire development. To obtain the best possible approach and background in designing the questionnaire, it is important to determine the objective of the research. As discussed in previous sections, the quantitative research is conclusive.

As well as being in possession of necessary background information, it is important to be familiar with the potentially different vocabulary and terminology of the market. Bearing in mind the authors' previous employment in the advertising industry, the authors' knowledge of the market's vocabulary and terminology is well-developed and is evaluated as being sufficient in developing an adequate and profound questionnaire.

7.4.1 Questionnaire stakeholders

There are various stakeholders with an interest in the questionnaire. The difference from ordinary business related questionnaires is that several stakeholder groups are constituted by the same person(s) – the authors. To obtain the best possible and most valid data from the questionnaire, it is important to fulfil as many of the stakeholder needs as possible. The needs include; the respondents' needs to easily understand the questions in order to maintain interest in the questionnaire, the interviewers(authors) needs to record the respondents response to the questions, the data processors(authors) needs for an uncomplicated layout with regards to data analysis.

This thesis has the previously mentioned advantage, of the authors being present in the majority of the stakeholder groups. In this way every stakeholder, with the exception of the respondents, is represented in

the development of the entire questionnaire. This simplifies the process of making a questionnaire that satisfies all the needs of the stakeholders.

7.4.2 Questionnaire pitfalls

It is essential to reduce the number of errors in the collection of answers/data, in order to achieve valid results from the questionnaire. Brace, Ian 2004 outlines several elements to be aware of when developing a questionnaire. Brace, Ian 2004 at the same time underlines that complete accuracy within collecting data concerning behaviour or attitude is impossible.

The main pitfalls a good researcher should be aware of are:

Failure of the respondent to understand the question	The target group for this questionnaire is the Danish population, defined as men and women over 15 years of age, who use the Internet regularly; this means that all groups of people have to understand the question. When developing the questions, it is sought to avoid long and complex sentences, as these are likely to cause problems. Additionally, a simple and everyday vocabulary is applied, in order to create the best chance of the respondents' understanding each and every question.
Failure of the questionnaire to record the reply accurately or completely	It is sought to minimize failure in the recording of the answer, by providing a comprehensive list of possible answers. This will make the questionnaire capable of recording accurate answers. However, this type of failure is accepted to a certain extent, as the alternative would be an overly complicated process when processing the submitted answers.
Desire by the	Failure in this area is sought to be minimized by developing unequivocal questions, and by
respondent to answer a	doing so, minimizing the respondents' tendencies to interpret the question in a way that fits
different question to the	their circumstances. This failure has a relatively high risk of occurring, due to the web-based
one asked	collection method.
Inaccuracy of memory regarding behaviour	The researchers must be aware of the respondents' lack of ability to recall information. This survey takes this failing into account and attempts to help respondents recall information in the best possible way. This is done by relating to the respondents previous use of the Internet and similar situations, which hopefully creates a direct link, thus enabling them to recall the necessary information to answer the questions.
Inaccuracy of memory	This failing has a minor effect on the survey, as the time perspective used in this research is shorter than what the failure of this aspect normally treats. The thesis seeks to chart the
regarding time periods	respondents' use of the Internet for general outlook and background information. This can
(telescoping)	be done by referring to time periods within the last month, as a longer time period is of no use.

	The questionnaire features questions where the respondents' are forced to describe their
Asking respondents to describe attitudes towards subjects for which they have no apparent opinion	attitudes towards a completely new and only briefly introduced concept, of which they have no prior knowledge. To minimize failures within these questions, a brief concept-text of the presented concept is developed and shown to the respondents prior to the questions. With this concept-text, the respondents should be capable of answering questions linked to their attitude toward the concept accurately. In addition, the respondents are encouraged to answer quickly, not thinking too much about the questions. By using this method more valid information is obtained. (Brace, 2004, p. 21)
Respondents lying as an act of defiance	This is an odd flaw, where people intentionally provide information which is not true. This group is perceived to be few in number and their motives in providing false information are many-sided. The respondents, who provide this false information, can possibly be spotted in the analysis phase, because of inconsistencies in their responses. However, no specific means are taken to weed out these potential data corrupters in this thesis.
Respondents wishing to impress the interviewer	This failure is a social failure, in which the respondents are trying to impress the interviewer or researcher and thereby, not answering the questions correctly. This failure connects, in some aspects, with the above mentioned failure.
Respondents not willing to admit their attitudes or behaviour either consciously or subconsciously	This failure is, as the other social failures, difficult to spot. Respondents can, either intentionally or unconsciously, hold back the right information to the questions. There exist several reasons for the respondents' willingness to admit their attitudes. One of them is the violation of the respondents' private sphere, even though the questionnaire in this research is absolutely anonymous, and does not treat potentially personal issues.
Respondents trying to influence the outcome of the study and giving answers that they believe will lead to a particular conclusion	This failure is among the group of failures which, due to the collection method of this research, is practically impossible to spot.

Table 4 - questionnaire pitfalls

The above mentioned is a selection of pitfalls that can potentially affect the research of both the qualitative and the quantitative survey in this thesis. All of the failures have been discussed in reference to the research of the thesis, and in how to overcome the obstacles, in order to develop valid research, survey and data processing.

7.4.3 Two, almost identical questionnaires are implemented

In order to test if there is any significant difference in the results of the concept-text of the questionnaire, it is decided to create and implement two slightly different questionnaires.

Only two aspects of the questionnaire are altered:

1. No monetary gratification vs. monetary gratification

In one questionnaire the concept is introduced as a website with no monetary gratification – meaning that users would not receive any payment, or equivalent, for using the website and participating in the ratings and questioning.

In the second questionnaire the concept is introduced as a website with monetary gratification – meaning that users would receive some sort of payment or reward for participating in the ratings and questioning.

2. Tipping the scales

Some of the questions on attitude or interest are straightforward, and so is the choice of answer. In the one questionnaire, some of the important questions have the answer alternatives ranked from positive to negative, and in the other questionnaire these same questions answer alternatives are reversed so they rank from negative to positive.

In both cases the slightly altered questionnaire is implemented to test for significant differences in the corresponding answers (hypothesis 1 and 2), as a result the collected data should prove more valid and reliable.

7.5 Pretesting

In order to ensure that the questionnaire is comprehensive, 2 levels of pretests are conducted.

7.5.1 Pretest 1

Pretest 1 took place when the questionnaire had just been formulated. Two persons were submitted the questionnaire in a rough format. The purpose was to go through the questions and answer alternatives to check them for logic and comprehensibility.

Several issues were discovered. Primarily, some of the complex questions involving matrixes of answer alternatives had to be fine tuned. No other problems were encountered and the questionnaire was well received.

7.5.2 Pretest 2

Pretest 2 took place just prior to implementation. This pretest involved 5 persons who underwent the test in the actual format via surveymonkey.com. The purpose was to ensure that the functionality of each question in the web application and that the usability was high. It was important for the researchers to check if the data outcome was in the right format for future processing.

The pretest showed that a few scales should be adjusted in the web application to ensure the right data outcome, but the 5 pretest respondents had no problems understanding and answering the questions, or using the web application.

Based on the two pretests and some minor following adjustments, the two, almost identical, online web surveys were launched.

The success of the execution is emphasized in "7.8 Comment on execution".

7.6 Questionnaire argumentation

Before developing the questions for the questionnaire, it is sought to plan out the necessary information needed to conduct the survey. The research questions, hypotheses, marketing decision problem and marketing research problem combined and establishing the starting point for developing the questions. However, the information needed for this research is primarily defined by the outlined hypotheses.

7.6.1 Information sought through the questionnaire

As discussed in previous studies, the information required to determine the uses and gratifications regarding social websites include:

1. Motivation and gratification

This includes gathering information on the underlying behaviour for searching, communicating and socializing et cetera., via the Internet.

2. Involvement

This includes gathering information on initial attitude and involvement in the presented concept, on the basis of present community mentality and use.

Beyond this theoretically required information, it is a priority to gather specific information about the different groups of respondents, including heavy users, medium users and light users, the age of the users,

2008

their residence, their income, their experience with the Internet and their experience with online communities.

Some of the main aspects of the new concept have to correlate with the potential users. This means that some of the main features that make the concept unique, such as, the short delivery times, the community mindset and an interest in advertisement, have to correspond with the potential users' online behaviour. The importance in determining the potential users' web usage, and their interest in advertisement, is therefore evident.

Overall, the information needed in this research can be divided into primary and secondary information:

- 1. Primary information required:
 - Visit-intention to the business concept
 - Uses and gratifications regarding the business concept
 - Interest and attitude in advertisement
- 2. Secondary information required:
 - Particulars and experience with the Internet and online communities

7.6.2 Questionnaire structure

The structure of the questionnaire is important, in order to obtain the right information in the right flow. Within the structure, lies the potential of excluding or adding specific questions depending on previous answers. Furthermore, security and screening questions can be added.

7.6.3 Structure flowchart

In order to visualize the rather complex structure of the questionnaire, the below flowchart is developed. The structure of the questionnaire will be elaborated on in the following pages.



Figure 8 - questionnaire flowchart

7.6.4 Questionnaire structure elaboration

7.6.4.1 Exclusion questions

As discussed in section 7.8.1 (Means of respondent contact) whether the questionnaire should be available for everybody. The discussion is on the basis of the questionnaire included concept, which the authors sought to limit widespread knowledge of, in particular concerning people within the same industry.

Justified by the discussion above, is it decided not to include an exclusion question in the questionnaire, as the authors possess knowledge on the respondents and are in good control of who the questionnaire is submitted to.

7.6.4.2 Screening questions – research population

The possibility of including a screening question for the questionnaire is evaluated on the basis of respondents' eligibility towards the questionnaire. The important thing with a screening question is to eliminate respondents who are outside the research target group. The target group is determined to be the

same as the potential users to the presented concept and as such this represents the entire population of Denmark. Based on this argumentation a screening question is not included in the research/questionnaire, as every potential respondent fulfils the criteria to participate in the questionnaire.

7.6.4.3 Main questionnaire

In continuation of the discussions on exclusion questions and screening questions the main questionnaire is to be developed. A number of different theories and methods on how to develop such questionnaires and questionnaire flow exist. The main questionnaire is sought to comply with well-known and accepted theories and methods. The development of this research will follow the method of several authors who have comprehensive experience within this area, including Brace (2004), Malhotra (2006), Fishbein (1967), Oppenheim (1992), Fowler (2002) and Hague (1999).

7.6.4.4 Questions

In continuation of the determining of which information is required in the research and of the previous discussion on marketing decision problems, marketing research problems, research questions and hypotheses, a number of questions to be included in the questionnaire are developed. A total of 29 questions are developed for the questionnaire. Each of these questions is meaningful to the solving of the overall research problems and the argumentation for each question is listed in the table below.

1. Internet use (Where)	
2. Internet use (Time)	These 9 questions help identify the Internet use of the respondents, including where,
3. Internet use (Time – email)	what, when and how much the respondents make use of the Internet. These questions
4. Internet use (Time – at work)	are included, in order to determine previous experience with the Internet as well as the
5. Internet use (Non work-related)	usage hereof. The questions are to give the researchers the possibility of analyzing the
6. Internet use (Time – at home)	usage of the Internet, in relation to the interest and visit-intention towards the business
7. Internet use (Time – at school)	concept idea. This includes identification of the respondents' usage of the Internet, which
8. Internet use (Time – when)	can possibly provide valuable information on Internet behaviour on the Danish market.
9. Internet use (Purpose)	
10. Internet use (social community	These 3 questions also identify Internet use, but with focus on the usage of, and the
websites)	motivation for, using social community websites. These questions are included in order to
11. Internet use (social community	highlight motives, in line with uses and gratifications theory and will help the authors
websites - time)	identify what drives social website usage. These questions and answers can also prove
12. Internet use (social community	valuable in extracting information on concept visit-intention depending on social website
websites – purpose)	usage.

 Advertising (attitude) Advertising (overall attitude) Advertising (interest) Advertising (overall interest) Advertising (attitude – advertisement platform) Advertising (discussion) Advertising (influence on) Advertising (overall search on) Advertising (search on) 	Questions 13 to 21 are connected to the respondents' interest in, and attitude towards advertising. These questions ought to identify and map the attitude, interest and motivation towards advertising in general. The data will help create an overview of the respondents' experience with advertising and their attitude towards it; this information is analyzed in connection with particulars and interest towards the concept.
22. Concept interest 23. Concept visit-intention 24. Concept motivation/gratification	These questions treat the presented business concept and examine the respondents' interest, visit-intention, motivation, uses and gratifications towards the business concept. The questions are associated with the concept of uses and gratifications, with regards to the conceptual text in the questionnaire and at the same time, identify uses and gratifications towards the concept. The collected data from these questions ought to consolidate the questionnaire, as well as generate information that can form a background for analyses in order to answers hypotheses and research questions.
 25. Age 26. Gender 27. Region 28. Income 29. Occupation 	These particulars enable the researchers to perform analyses on age, gender, residence, income and occupation, towards measuring visit-intention, in connection with the other questions in the questionnaire. These particulars are important, because they enable the researcher to analyze separate groups and to get an overview of the respondents and the market. Finally, the data derived from these questions will prove critical when evaluating data representativity and when doing potential user segmentation.

Table 5 - quantitative question argumentation

Note: All 29 questions will be included as possible predictable variables in a statistical analysis.

7.6.4.5 Structure of the questionnaire

In the above section, the questions chosen to be included in the questionnaire are discussed. The questions' eligibility in connection to the hypotheses and research questions, as well as the questions position in the general analysis of the collected data, has been stated. The placement and flow of the questions in the questionnaire are to be discussed below.

As the questions included in the questionnaire have been decided, the structure of the survey remains to be established. Numerous rules are to be followed when developing a questionnaire, in order to obtain greater validity in the research and the collected data. This section discusses the structure of the questionnaire and in which sequence the questions are placed; the flow of the questions.

7.6.4.6 Behavioural questions

The structure of the questionnaire is based on previous studies and well-known theory. Brace (2004), covers the aspect of positioning questions in the right order, in order to obtain high validity in the collected data. This research and questionnaire complies with Ian Brace's theory, of positioning behavioural questions before attitude questions, based on the argument that behavioural questions are easier to answer because they require only recollection from the respondents. If attitude questions are positioned before behavioural questions, the risk of incorrect answers from the respondents occurs, as the behavioural questions are answered in order to justify their attitudes. This guideline has been followed in the design of the questionnaire, as questions 1-12 treat behaviour and the following questions are attitude-related.

7.6.4.7 Spontaneous and prompted questions

As this questionnaire is not about identifying respondents' immediate knowledge about specific brands et cetera, spontaneous questions are asked prior to the prompted questions. Question 10 is the only question in the questionnaire in which the respondents have to declare their awareness of any brands (existing social websites); however, this data is only collected in order to indentify which brands the respondents are familiar with. Question10 also functions as an introductory question to question 11, which is aimed at identifying behaviour on social websites.

7.6.4.8 Sensitive and classification questions (particulars)

As the questionnaires in this research do not contain great numbers of sensitive questions, in fact, the only included sensitive questions are particulars, all questions are treated simultaneously. Ian Brace outlines how to process sensitive questions and particulars, when placing them in questionnaires. Sensitive questions require that the respondents are familiar with the current situation and setting of the questionnaire. The best way of achieving this familiarity is by building up a relationship throughout the questionnaire, so that the respondents become increasingly more willing to answer sensitive questions. According to this, sensitive questions should be placed towards the end of the questionnaire. Particulars ought to be positioned at the very end of the questionnaire, as these questions are not directly connected to the subject of the questionnaire and can potentially be perceived as intrusive. This obtrusiveness puts the researcher in the position of attempting to minimize the number of particulars, so that only the absolutely necessary questions are included.

This research contains few sensitive questions and particulars, as it is sought to minimize the number of questions associated to this category, in order to obtain the most valid answers from the respondents. The

questions in this category are placed in accordance with the above theory, as the particulars (Q25, Q26, Q27, Q28 and Q29, of which Q28, income, is the only real sensitive question) are placed last in the questionnaires.

7.6.4.9 Question types

Various different types of questions exist, which all suit different ways of collecting data and obtaining answers from respondents. The questions for this research are all developed individually, although in an overall context with the other questions. The questionnaire for this research is characterized by containing a large number of closed and prompted questions. The argumentation for the inclusion of each question, the type of question and the type of data derived from each question, can be seen in the table in appendix 8.

7.6.5 Use of scales (Data type)

In continuation of the above, the following section describes and argues the use of the chosen scales. The scales used within this research are set-up and explained below. They are chosen in connection to the developed research questions and hypothesis, in order to establish the best possible foundation to carry out analysis.

7.6.5.1 Nominal

The nominal scales, are in general, as well as in this research, used to classify answers into separate categories by e.g. male/female, Region Hovedstaden/Region Nordjylland/Region Syddanmark, et cetera. This survey allocates a separate number for each category, in order to indentify the answers when analyzing (Malhotra et al., 2006). The number assigned to each category is arbitrary, has no value per se and is only for identification. At the same time, no numerical relationship between the number/categories exist. When analyzing variables consisting of nominal scaled data, nothing can be analyzed, except for total numbers in each category (Jensen et al., 2006, p. 70).

7.6.5.2 Ratio

The ratio scale is a sort of interval scale (which is not included in this research). The distance between each value has an explanation, as opposed to nominal and ordinal scales. The scale is constant and the zero point has a meaning (opposed to "normal" interval scales). Normally, income is ratio scaled, but in this research it is argued that these variables are nominal as the researchers have pre-defined specific groups of respondents. The ratio scale in this research is employed in questions concerning the respondents' use of the Internet in different situations (Home, Work, School et cetera.).

7.6.5.3 Ordinal

The ordinal scales or comparative scales rank the answers. As the ordinal scale consists of a ranking system, the purpose is to put the nominal data into appropriate order (ranking), but it explains nothing about the distance between the points (Jensen et al., 2006, p. 71). This research employs the scale in frequency questions, in which the respondents are to state "most used", "second most used" et cetera. However, as the ordinal scale is constructed, it tells nothing about the distance between "most used", "second most used", "second mos

7.6.5.4 Itemized rating - Interval

As for measuring attitudes (in connection with section 3.5.3.1) rating scales are used in this questionnaire. The rating scales included in the research consist of various statements developed by the researchers in order to measure attitudes. The distance between the points on the scale is even, and therefore it is possible to do comprehensive analysis on these scales. As seen in the section concerning data-preparation, the points used in this research are from 1-5. The rating-interval scales used consist of balanced scales, which mean that an even number of positive and negative options are present, including a neutral point. A 5-point scale is chosen, as this number of scale options is sufficient for the analysis in this research. Furthermore, 5-point scales are easily understood by the respondents (Jensen et al., 2006, p. 83).

7.6.5.5 Attitude measurement

As discussed in section 3.5.3.1 (theory on attitude and behaviour) attitude measurements are included in this research. Various ways of measuring attitude towards a specific object exist. The Likert summated ratings method, the semantic differential method, the Fishbein compensatory model and the Fishbein extended model are some of the best known. The upcoming explanation of the applied scales in this questionnaire does not deal with types of measurement scales that are not employed in the thesis.

7.6.5.6 Rating – Likert

The Likert scale, also known as the "agree-disagree" scale (Jensen et al., 2006, p. 87), is employed in this research as part of measuring an overall attitude towards advertisement. This scale sets up a string of attitude factors, with the objective being to measure a single, overall attitude score. It consists of 5 points, from "disagree" to "agree" with an even distance between the points. This research includes a 6th point, "don't know". As stated above, the scale is included in order to combine the different dimensions into a single attitude factor. This factor is developed by use of factor analysis (see section 8.6).

7.6.5.7 Rating - Semantic differential

As the Likert scale mentioned above, a semantic differential scale is included. It has the same purpose as the Likert, which is to develop one factor by means of factor analysis. The semantic differential scale differs from the Likert, by placing opposite statements at each end. The scale used in this research consists of 5 points even though it is normally recommended to make use of a 7-point scale (Osgood et al., 1957). This research employs the 5-point scale based on the argument that the pretest showed several pretest respondents being confused when a 7-point scale was included, as it differed from the 5-point scales throughout the rest of the questionnaire.

"Research has shown that S-D scales with seven intervals are usually optimal. However, some investigators prefer to use five-points or three-point scales for particular purposes. The technique really boils down to a selection of rating scales made up for the particular purpose at hand, on the basis of pilot interviews."

Oppenheim, 1992

Based on this and the results from the pretest a 5-point semantic scale is chosen.

7.7 Surveys conducted in Danish

The surveys are conducted in the native language of the respondents, which is Danish. This has been done in order to secure proper understanding and comprehension of the questions in the survey, and was necessary, in the attempt to maintain the validity.

Note: the appendix questionnaire is not translated to English, but all data processing is conducted in English, therefore no apparent need for a translated questionnaire is present.

7.8 Respondents

A target group for the questionnaire is to be defined. As the concept description specifies, the object of the presented concept is to facilitate the population's point of view towards various advertising-related material. Because of the demand for the population's point of view, it is essential to target the questionnaire to the right group of people. By doing so, the defined target group for this questionnaire is an apparently representative cross-section of the Danish population.

7.8.1 Means of respondent contact

The respondents are contacted by e-mail. The e-mail is developed by the researchers in preparation for release of the link to the questionnaire, see appendix 10. In total, two identical e-mails are developed, only differentiated by the link, which links to each of the two different questionnaires. Due to the two versions

of the questionnaire, the process of sending out the e-mails is split into two, since it is sought to achieve the same amount of respondents for both questionnaires.



Figure 9 - quantitative respondent contact

As illustrated in figure 9, questionnaire 1 (-G) and 2 (+G) are sent simultaneously, to the same amount of people. The first respondents to receive the questionnaire are well known by the authors/researchers, through which it is sought to select respondents without professional interest in the concept, as previously discussed.

The e-mail briefly describes the context of the situation and requests the receivers to forward the e-mail to family, friends, colleagues, et cetera.

By including this forwarding request to people/respondents who may be out of the researchers' acquaintance circle, a risk of uncertainty with regards to keeping the concept a secret occurs.

7.9 Comment on Execution

The process of collecting data was executed without excessive problems. In total 132 respondents answered the questionnaires during an approximate two-week period.

One major data error has been discovered e.g. all respondents have answered the particulars questions at the end of the questionnaire, while having failed to answer some of the previous questions. This error should have been evaded through the use of the forced answer code placed on all questions in Surveymonkey. The collected data is documented through a SPSS data-set of all registered observations. This data can be viewed on the enclosed CD-ROM.

Chapter 8 Quantitative results and data analysis

"The stage in the research process which assesses secondary and/or primary data and relates it to the defined issue or problem"

Prentice Hall

8.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on processing the collected quantitative data and producing statistical results and answers to the research questions and hypotheses of this thesis.

8.2 Applied approach

In an attempt to make the statistical process of data analysis comprehensible for the reader, as well as the researchers, the following approach to the presentation of the results is applied.

8.2.1 Plan of data analysis and presentation

The background work and information for the conducted quantitative test, and method of testing, has been introduced in chapter 7. This chapter deals, therefore, only with the results of the quantitative surveys.



Figure 10 - plan of quantitative data analysis and preparation
8.2.2 Data preparation

8.2.2.1 SPSS – Predictive Analysis Software

To process the collected quantitative data SPSS (www.spps.com), has been chosen as the Predictive Analysis software. All analysis on the quantitative data in this thesis will be processed through SPSS. SPSS is chosen due to availability and to the fact that the interface is similar to that of Excel.

8.2.2.2 Data file setup

In order to make SPSS capable of analyzing the collected data correctly, the data is prepared for the software. This is called arranging the data file (Jensen et al., 2006).

The actual surveys were conducted via www.surveymonkey.com (see section 7.3.3) and from this, two Excel files were generated - one file with the data from the -G survey, and one file with the data from the +G survey.

Each file is prepared individually in order to prevent corruption of the data. A step by step visual explanation of data file preparation can be seen in appendix 17.

8.3 Choice of analysis and argumentation

In this thesis, particular methods of analysis are chosen for the overall quantitative data analysis. Numerous forms of analysis exist and in order to make the analysis selection process easier to comprehend, these analysis' are divided into different levels based on complexity and order of use.

8.3.1 Level 1 analysis

The simplest form of analysis applied in this thesis consists of frequency distribution, cross-tabulation, and hypothesis testing (Jensen et al., 2006). These data analysis methods are the fundamental building blocks of quantitative data analysis, and they create the foundation for further, advanced analysis, and are useable in the overall interpretation of results (Malhotra et al., 2006).

8.3.1.1 Hypothesis testing

Hypothesis testing is in general the backbone of any statistical analysis and the overall analysis does not differ from this. Hypotheses are used and tested throughout the analysis. The level of significance applied in all hypothesis testing and all analysis in this thesis is 0.05. This roughly means that with 95% certainty the test results will be right.

8.3.1.2 Frequency distribution

Frequency distribution is a mathematical distribution showing the number of responses associated with different variables.

Frequency distribution is applied on all variables in this thesis, to create an overview of the collected data and the frequency of the answers (appendix 2). Frequency statistics is applied in the discussion section to highlight specific results.

8.3.1.3 Cross-tabulation and Chi-square

Cross-tabulation is an advanced frequency distribution. Instead of looking at one variable, cross-tabulation takes two variables into account and provides a statistical description of these two variables joint distribution.

Cross-tabulation is utilized in this thesis in the section about sample characteristics, as cross-tabulation is good for identifying coherence between two variables, like Income and Age.

The Chi-square test is a statistical test that is used to test the significance of the observed observation in a cross-tabulation, which helps to find any systematical association between variables (Malhotra et al., 2006).

The Chi-square test is applied in the test for representativity and the hypothesis testing in this thesis.

8.3.1.4 Non-parametric tests

The Non-parametric tests do not apply mean or standard deviation values, which is why these tests are applicable on variables with nominal- or ordinal scales.

A One-sample test is used in this thesis, through the application of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) for normal distribution.

The K-S test is a goodness-of-fit test that compares the distribution of the variable with cumulative frequency of a theoretical distribution (Malhotra et al., 2006). The K-S test is applied on all variables used for hypothesis testing to test for normal distribution, which will help determine if a T-test or an Anova Test should be applied.

8.3.1.5 Other methods of level 1 analysis - not applied

Parametric tests: The parametric tests are based on variables that are measured on a metric scale, for instance, an interval- or ratio scale. There is no need to apply

parametric tests, such as the T-test, in this survey, because the variables are suited for non-parametric tests.

- T-test: The T-test is not applied in this thesis, as the prerequisite of normal distribution is not fulfilled in most hypothesis variables. The ANOVA test is applied instead, see "Level 2 analysis".
- Z-test The Z-test is similar to the T-test, except that the standard deviation is known beforehand; nevertheless, the Z-test is not applied for the same reasons as the T-test.
- F-test The F-test is applied when testing if two independent samples have equal variance. The F-test is not applied in this thesis.
- Paired-samples The Paired-samples test is used when comparing respondents' answers on two different questions. The Paired-samples T-test is applied when the variables fulfil the demand of normal distribution and the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test is used when normal distribution in the variables is not present (Malhotra et al., 2006). In this thesis neither is applied.

8.3.2 Level 2 analysis

The level 2 analyses in this thesis are more advanced than level 1, taking into account many of the aspects of level 1 analyses and using these in a more complex statistical analysis.

8.3.2.1 ANOVA test

The ANOVA test is usually applied when examining the differences of more than two means, but in this thesis ANOVA is applied, instead of the more traditional T-test, for testing the difference in precisely two means. ANOVA is applied as it is considered a stronger test than the T-test, especially when the prerequisite of normal distribution is not fulfilled, which is the case in most of the variables in this survey. The ANOVA test is also applied for testing differences in more than two means.

ANOVA tests for variance and covariance between variables and it is used in the primary hypothesis testing. The dependent variable in the ANOVA hypothesis tests in this survey will be conceptual website visitintention. This is called a one-way ANOVA (Jensen et al., 2006), which is appropriate for testing significance of a null hypothesis, and thereby suitable for hypothesis testing (Malhotra et al., 2006).

8.3.2.2 Correlation analysis

Correlation is used to establish and understand possible association between two variables (Malhotra et al., 2006). Correlation analysis is used in hypothesis 3 in order to establish similarity and correlation between two variables.

Three different methods for measuring correlation exist, and are used depending on the variable data. The three methods are:

- 1. Pearson's correlation coefficient for two normal distributed and interval scaled variables.
- 2. Spearman's Rho for correlation analysis with one or more variables, without normal distribution or interval scales.
- 3. Kendall's Tau is closely related to Spearman's Rho, but is more useful if most observations are gathered in only a few of the answer categories.

The method used in this thesis is Pearson's correlation coefficient. See argumentation in hypothesis 3, section 8.7.

8.3.2.3 Other methods of level 2 analysis - not applied

ANCOVA, MANOVA, MANCOVA, N-way ANOWA. There are various versions of the ANOVA analysis, each useful for specific types of analysis and number and types of dependent and independent variables. None of these are applied in this thesis.

Spearman's Rho and Kendall's Tau are disregarded for correlation analysis.

8.3.3 Level 3 analysis

Level 3 analyses cover the most complex types of analysis in this thesis.

8.3.3.1 Logistic regression analysis

Logistic regression analysis is applied in this thesis in the search for a predictive model which explains a dependent variable, through various independent variables. The form of regression used in this thesis is logistic regression. Logistic regression helps develop a mathematical relationship between two or more independent variables and an interval-scaled dependent variable (Malhotra et al., 2006). In this thesis explanatory variables that can explain and predict the website visit-intention are sought.

The multiple logistic regression analysis is described in detail in section 8.8.

8.3.3.2 Factor analysis

Factor analysis is a structural analysis that is helpful when reducing several variables into one overall factor. Factor analysis is primarily used to create a seemingly more valid factor score in some of the attitude and interest questions regarding advertising.

8.3.3.3 Other methods of level 3 analysis - not applied

Bivariate regression	As bivariate regression is based on only a single independent metric variable this type of analysis is disregarded, as a model containing more than one explanatory variable is sought.
Multiple regression	Multiple regression is not applied as the dependent variable, as it is not interval scaled.
Discriminant analysis	The discriminant analysis and multiple discriminant analysis are closely related to the multiple regression analysis.
Cluster analysis	Cluster analysis is like a structural analysis, in line with factor analysis. Cluster analysis is useful in marketing surveys and segmentation and could have proven useful in this thesis as well (Jensen et al., 2006). Nevertheless, Cluster analysis is disregarded because the logistic multiple regression answers the same questions and on a more profound level.
Multidimensional scaling	Multidimensional scaling is not used in this thesis, as no questions in the questionnaire were focused on the respondents' perception and preferences of, for instance, social websites. This sort of ranking might have been interesting, but is not in line with the overall problem statement and research questions. The same argumentation can be applied for the disregarding of conjoint analysis.

8.4 Data quality - reliability and validity

8.4.1 Data Quality

The quality of the collected quantitative data is an important issue. This data represents the foundation for further analysis and concept development.

The data compiled from a qualitative survey is often presumed to be factual, as it is presented in numbers, statistics and figures (Jensen et al., 2006).

It is important to keep in mind, that the results generated in the empirical quantitative survey in this thesis, only represent a very small sample of the target population and that many of the questions, are questions about attitude towards specific issues, with only a limited and fixed number of response alternatives. Furthermore, there is an insecurity linked to the formulation and the way that questions are perceived and understood by individual respondents. These are just some of the aspects that researchers should keep in mind when analyzing qualitative data.

In this thesis, great emphasis is put on developing the quantitative survey method and questionnaire, in an attempt to foresee possible problems and issues concerning the quality of the collected data. However, this is no guarantee that the data remains uncorrupted, valid and applicable.

The quality of the conducted survey and the collected data is discussed in greater length in the following section, "Reliability and Validity coherence".

8.4.2 Reliability and Validity coherence

It is important to point out that reliability is a necessity for validity, but it does not ensure validity. Data can be reliable but not valid. However, if it is established that the data is completely valid it automatically indicates reliability.

The goal is to establish that the data is both reliable and valid and can be applied to the general population, thus making the quantitative survey a representative sample success.

8.4.3 Reliability

8.4.3.1 Reliability is of high importance

The reliability of the collected data is naturally a very important aspect of the survey. The data foundation for further analysis and concept development has to be sound and reliable, and not a result of randomized measurements, in order to achieve applicable results.

Reliability is mainly a measure of survey and data stability, taking into account the risk of random errors. Random errors make it difficult to achieve significance in statistical analyses. Many random errors consist of the respondents guessing what is meant by a particular unclear question or answer alternative (Jensen et al., 2006).

8.4.3.2 Example of uncertainty

There is, for instance, a risk that individual respondents have different perceptions of the answer alternatives "strongly agree" and "agree" in survey question number 24. It is easier, and provides more reliable data, to deal with response and answer values that are within the same frame of reference of the respondents. For example, questions involving time, with answer alternatives such as "½-1 hour", "1-1½ hours", which have been used widely in the survey, provide more reliable results and data, as these answer alternatives are perceived similarly by all or most respondents.

2008

8.4.3.3 Foreseeing reliability issues

It is impossible to prevent reliability issues and uncertainties one hundred percent. Some issues can, nonetheless, be foreseen and it is possible to take measures towards testing and increasing the reliability of the data.

In the conducted survey one question differs, as one that would not generate reliable results. The question (Q14) is: "What is your general attitude towards advertising?" The researchers agreed that this attitude question would generate biased and overly negative responses. Instead of taking this question out of the survey, due to relevance, the question remained in its original form, but is supplied with additional prequestions in a matrix (Q13), which is designed to test the respondents' attitude towards various aspects of advertising, generating truthful and reliable results. The results of these questions are compared (Jensen et al., 2006).

8.4.4 Validity

Having established that the data is reliable, it is time to examine the validity of the collected data.

Testing the validity of the collected data will help to ensure that the measurements represent characteristics that exist in the phenomenon under investigation (Malhotra et al., 2006).

8.4.4.1 Face validity

Face validity (Jensen et al., 2006), also called Content validity (Malhotra et al., 2006), is the easiest and least scientific method for judging and measuring validity. Face Validity is judged subjectively and despite not being very scientific in nature it is rather relevant in this case.

The researchers try to foresee any immediate validity issues, by developing the quantitative questionnaire over a long period of time, and by discussing each question and answer alternative and pretesting it twice.

The researchers have found no face validity issues during the survey. Furthermore, all respondents were encouraged to give feedback, positive and negative, on the survey and questionnaire. Only positive feedback was received, which indicates that none had problems understanding the questions. There is still the risk that some respondents have failed to understand some questions in the desired way, answered it anyway, or just did not care to mention it or give feedback. From a Face validity point of view however, the data appears valid.

8.4.4.2 Criterion Validity

The same aspects for determining Face validity can be applied for determining Criterion validity (Malhotra et al., 2006). Again the data appears valid.

8.4.4.3 Construct validity and other measures of validity

Construct, Discriminant, Nomological Concurrent and Predictive validity are not relevant in this case (Malhotra et al., 2006). Concurrent and Predictive validity analysis requires multiple samples at different times, which is not the case in this survey. Construct validity is particularly relevant in the measurement of complex issues of a more theoretical character (Jensen et al., 2006). Construct validity measurements are very common in, for instance, psychological testing.

The data is considered as valid. Having examined the data, the questionnaire and taking all aspects into account, the researchers find the data to be valid.

8.5 Sample characteristics

8.5.1 General level of significance

Throughout this analysis a 0.05 level of significance is consistently applied. This level is the most commonly used in statistical analysis within this type of marketing research. The 0.05 level of significance practically means that there is only a 5% risk of drawing the wrong statistical conclusions, like rejecting the wrong hypothesis, type one and type two errors. A diminished level of significance would be desirable, but using, for instance, a 0.01 level of significance would require a much larger sample size than could realistically be acquired in this thesis (Jensen et al., 2006).

8.5.2 Frequency tests and cross tables

For the sample characteristics definitions, frequency tests and cross tables are applied. The use of these assist the researchers in discovering invalid or inconsistent answers in the data file(s).

8.5.3 Sample size

As previously stated, two almost similar surveys were conducted. A total of 58 respondents answered one survey (-G) and 74 respondents answered the other survey (+G). A total of 132 responses were recorded; N=132. Even though the 132 responses represent two different surveys, the answers will be treated as one, as the questions differing on gratification have no influence and are not included (hypothesis 1 and 2).

	Q25Age	Q26Gender	Q27Region	Q28Income	Q29Occupation
N Valid	132	132	132	132	132
Missing	0	0	0	0	0

Table 6 - sample size

As the above figure shows, all 132 respondents were asked 5 questions on particulars. None failed to answer these questions.

8.5.4 Demographic particulars (frequency tests)

Please see appendix 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5

The age distribution is narrow, as for instance, more than 60% of the respondents are between 21 and 30 years of age. This will undoubtedly affect the representativity of the surveys. This is elaborated in section 8.5.6. Slightly more men have participated in the surveys than women. However, this off set can be expected with these sorts of relatively small sample sizes. Furthermore, the regional distribution is far from evenly dispersed. 86.4% of all respondents are from Region Hovedstaden, which will definitely affect the representativity of the surveys. The income distribution is as expected and when compared to the Occupational distribution, it makes perfect sense. The number of students, 42, corresponds very well with the number of persons with an income below 150.000 kr. per year, 37. There is a somewhat high factor of students that have participated in the surveys, other than that; the dispersion is more or less as to be expected.

8.5.5 Demographic tendencies (Cross tables)

8.5.5.1 Age vs. Occupation

Please see appendix 4.6

More than 50% of the respondents in the 21-30 age groups are students.

8.5.5.2 Age vs. income

Please see appendix 4.7

All of the respondents with an income below 150.000 kr., are below the age of 30. This corresponds with the high number of respondents in this age group that are also students.

8.5.5.3 Age vs. region

Please see appendix 4.8

The region factor is the most noticeable of all the demographic factors, because of the high number of respondents from Region Hovedstaden. Nonetheless, this actually corresponds well with the high number of young respondents and the high number of students among the respondents. Region Hovedstaden has a much higher number of young students than the rest of the country.

8.5.5.4 Age vs. gender

Please see appendix 4.9

As previously stated, there are more male than female respondents, an almost 60/40 ratio. The calculated average age of the male respondents is approximately 33 years and the female average age is approximately 43 years. This is quite a difference, but the numbers should be taken lightly as they are based on very simple interval calculations. E.g. a person in the 21-30 age group is set to 25 years of age and so on.

Nevertheless, the average female respondent is some years older than her male counterpart.

8.5.6 Representativity and generalisability

It is important to establish whether the collected samples are representative for the entire population or not, as this has a high impact on the validity of the acquired results and their potential use.

8.5.6.1 Statistical test of representativity and hypothesis

In order to test the representativity of the collected data in a more scientific manner, several Chi-Square tests of the collected data and data from Danish statistics are conducted.

The Chi-Square assists in determining whether a systematic association exists between the two variables (Malhotra et al., 2006), one collected data sample and the second is the demographic data from Danish Statistics.

H0 = same dispersion and distribution in the sample compared to the Danish Statistics material.

H1 = differentiated dispersion and distribution in the sample compared to the Danish Statistics material.

8.5.6.2 Representativity – age and gender

Two parameters have been chosen for the representativity test, age and gender. The remaining demographic parameters like Region, Income and Occupation have been disregarded, due to obvious lack of representativity (Region) and importance (Income and Occupation).

Age and Gender are the best indicators of representativity for the entire population.

Chi-Square test – Age:

Hypothesis conclusion:

H0 is rejected; as the level of significance is lower than 0.05. This means that the sample is not statistically representative for the entire population, with regards to age.

	Q25Age
Chi-Square	2,562E2
Df	5
Asymp. Sig.	,000

Test Statistics

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 18.8.

Table 7 - representativity (age)

Chi-Square test – Gender:

Hypothesis conclusion: H0 is rejected; as the level of significance is lower than 0.05. This means that the sample is not statistically representative for the entire population, with regards to gender.

Test Statistics

	Q26Gender
Chi-Square	4,818 ^ª
Df	1
Asymp. Sig.	,028

a. 0 cells (,0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 65,4.

Table 8 - representativity (gender)

8.5.7 Statistical representativity

It is important to test if the survey sample and results apply to the entire population. In this case, the entire population is equal to the population of Denmark. The results are definitely not applicable to other arenas, meaning countries or markets – new research and surveys would have to be conducted in the relevant arena (Malhotra et al., 2006).

There are discrepancies in the data, with regards to the age and region of the respondents. A very large portion of the respondents are between 21 and 30 years of age and live in Region Hovedstaden. This is called systematical bias in the sample, due to the manner of which the respondents were chosen (Jensen et al., 2006). Even though, Gender is not statistically representative, the 60/40 ratio is not far off, considering the relatively small sample size.

Unfortunately, the combined results create insecurity with regards to the general applicability of the data and therefore the results are not general for the entire population of Denmark. The sample size should have been larger and more differentiated, especially with regards to Age and Region, in order to produce general applicable results for the overall population.

8.5.8 Exception

Despite the lack of representativity, the results appear generally applicable for a smaller population, particularly young adults, age 21-30 living in the Copenhagen area and people with similar characteristics, for instance people between 21 and 30 years of age living in the major cities of Denmark. However, a statistical test for representativity on these terms is not conducted, as it is sought to treat the entire sample size, N=132, as one, utilizing the largest possible sample size.

8.6 Factor analysis - interest and attitude measurement

In order to accomplish hypothesis tests on hypothesis 4 and 5, section 5.6, two factor analyses are necessary to complete. The two factor analysis is to determine the respondents' overall attitude towards advertisement and their interest in advertisement. The variable used for execution of the factor analysis are Q13 (Likert Scale) and Q15 (Semantic differential scale), see section 7.6.5.

8.6.1 Method of analysis

Factor analysis	
Variables	(Q13 and Q15)
Factors	(Overall attitude Advert – Q13) (Interest Advert – Q15)
Reliability	Cronbach's alpha

8.6.2 Test completion

The purpose of the factor analysis is to reduce various variables into one or fewer variables, which can be explanatory for attitude and interest in hypothesis 4 and 5.

Q13, attitude variables, consists of 5 statements on Likert scale, which optimally has to transform into a single overall factor. Q15, interest variables, consists of 9 dimensions on a semantic differential scale (5 points), which likewise, is sought to transform into a single factor. Therefore, the object of the analysis is to reduce the numbers of variables into a single variable and identify underlying dimensions (attitude and interest). Simultaneously, multiple collinearity problems are reduced, as possible strongly correlated variables are transformed into a single independent factor.

8.6.3 Q13 overall attitude factor

8.6.3.1 Applicability – correlation matrix

The prerequisite for accomplishing factor analysis is to examine the variables for applicability to complete the analysis (Jensen et al., 2006).

	-	Q13V01AdvertisementSitu	Q13V02Advertisemen	Q13V03Advertisemen	Q13V04Advertisement	Q13V05Advertisem
		ationsValuableinformation	tSituationsInteresting	tSituationsSuggestive	SituationsEntertainment	entSituationsNeeds
Corre lation	Q13V01AdvertisementSitu ationsValuableinformation	1,000	,604	,550	,316	,462
	Q13V02AdvertisementSitu ationsInteresting	,604	1,000	,560	,568	,557
	Q13V03AdvertisementSitu ationsSuggestive	,550	,560	1,000	,417	,459
	Q13V04AdvertisementSitu ationsEntertainment	,316	,568	,417	1,000	,501
	Q13V05AdvertisementSitu ationsNeeds	,462	,557	,459	,501	1,000

Correlation Matrix

Table 9 above shows that the variables correlate well (>0.3) and that the variables in question 13 are applicable for a factor analysis. At the same time, the correlation matrix shows that some variables correlate more than others, which means that these have the possibility to belong to the same factors, in the case that the factor analysis should result in more than one factor (One factor is sought, see above).

8.6.3.2 Applicability – KMO and Bartlett's test

A KMO and Bartlett's test is accomplished in order to support the applicability of the analysis.

		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of	,813	
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	198,682
	Df	10,000
	Sig.	,000

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Table 10 - overall attitude factor, KMO and Bartlett's test

The KMO and Bartlett's test confirms the applicability for factor analysis. The KMO has a critical value of 0.5 and the KMO value for Q13 is 0.813, which is far greater than the critical value. This supports the applicability for the analysis which was found in the correlation matrix. Bartlett's test displays a significance level of 0.000, which indicate that the variables are correlated.

8.6.3.3 Applicability - Communalities

Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
Q13V01AdvertisementSituationsV aluableinformation	1,000	,576
Q13V02AdvertisementSituationsI nteresting	1,000	,737
Q13V03AdvertisementSituationsS uggestive	1,000	,595
Q13V04AdvertisementSituationsE ntertainment	1,000	,510
Q13V05AdvertisementSituationsN eeds	1,000	,589

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 11 - overall attitude factor, Communalities

The communalities output show that all the variables variances are included by more than 0.5. This means that all variables are capable of being included in the suggested factor. If less than 50% of the variance in a single variable is maintained, the researchers ought to consider removal of the variable or the creation of an additional factor. As the researchers of this thesis seek to compose only one single factor to measure the respondents' overall attitude towards advertisement, the output from communalities is very good.

8.6.3.4 Applicability – total variance explained

	Initial Eigenvalues			Extrac	tion Sums of Sq	uared Loadings
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3,008	60,150	60,150	3,008	60,150	60,150
2	,726	14,522	74,672			
3	,504	10,080	84,752			
4	,449	8,988	93,740			
5	,313	6,260	100,000			

Total Variance Explained

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 12 - overall attitude factor, Total variance explained

Table 18 shows the data total variance, based on factors with Eigenvalues above 1.0. The number of factors computed is one, and the percentage of variance is 60.150, which means that the identified factor explains 60.15% of the data total variance. The percentage of 60.15 means that the 5 original variables can be

reduced to a single factor variable. The new factor ought to explain a minimum of 60% of the data original variance, which it complies with (Jensen et al., 2006).

8.6.3.5 Applicability – component matrix

Component Matrix^a

	Component
	1
Q13V01AdvertisementSituationsValuableinformation	,759
Q13V02AdvertisementSituationsInteresting	,859
Q13V03AdvertisementSituationsSuggestive	,771
Q13V04AdvertisementSituationsEntertainment	,714
Q13V05AdvertisementSituationsNeeds	,768

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.

Table 13 - overall attitude factor, Component Matrix

Table 13 shows that the entire set of variables has high factor loadings (>0.714) on the suggested factor, and supports the previous calculations. This output is especially used when several factors are suggested, in order to determine the variables calculated affiliation towards the factors.

8.6.3.6 Preparing the new factor variable

The new variable is compounded by a simple addition and average calculation within the 5 variables. The argument for compounding the factor scale like that is the high loading from all of the variables. By compounding the variables with this simple method, and not letting SPSS compute the new variable, the same level of scales as the original variables are obtained. The method is more demanding on the researchers' resources though, as the addition and average calculation is done manually.

8.6.3.7 Reliability – Q13 factor

This multi-item scale constructed above from the variables in question Q13 is used to measure the overall attitudes towards advertisement. The scale is developed in order to have a positive effect on the reliability and validity of the research, as discussed in use of scales. This section consists of an analysis of reliability for the multi-item scale of question Q13. The analysis examines whether the five variables in Q13 are measuring the same object (Jensen et al., 2006). The analysis employs Cronbach's alpha which tests the internal consistency within the data derived from the questions. Cronbach's alpha is the most employed test-form within reliability testing (Jensen et al., 2006).

When doing the test for reliability by means of Cronbach's alpha, several prerequisites exist. The questions should be of interval scale and the correlation between the variables should be positive. Both of these prerequisites are fulfilled in question Q13 (see table 9 – Correlation matrix Q13) and as a consequence of that, the analysis is implemented.

	-	Ν	%
Cases	Valid	110	83,3
	Excluded ^a	22	16,7
	Total	132	100,0

Case Processing Summary

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Table 14 - overall attitude factor, Case Processing Summary

Table 14 shows the number of valid and excluded observations when processing the analysis. 110 of the observations are valid; all of the variables in Q13 are answered.

8.6.3.8 Cronbach's alpha

Henability Statistics					
	Cronbach's Alpha				
	Based on				
Cronbach's Alpha	Standardized Items	N of Items			
,830	,833	5			

Baliability Statistics

Table 15 - overall attitude factor, Cronbach's alpha

Cronbach's alpha for the proposed multi-item variable is 0.833 (Standardized item) which is far greater than the acceptable limit of 0.60 and greater than 0.70, which is considered as a very reliable measurement (Jensen et al., 2006). The Cronbach's alpha of 0.833 is very good and proves the good reliability of the multi-item scale composed from the variables in Q13.

The value of 0.833 means that the scale explains 83.3% of the variance included in the "new" object measured (overall attitude). As a consequence of the high value, no variables ought to be omitted from the new scale.

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Ν
Q13V01AdvertisementSituationsValuableinformation	3,03	1,200	110
Q13V02AdvertisementSituationsInteresting	3,55	1,054	110
Q13V03AdvertisementSituationsSuggestive	3,05	1,152	110
Q13V04AdvertisementSituationsEntertainment	4,10	,888	110
Q13V05AdvertisementSituationsNeeds	3,22	1,229	110

Table 16 - overall attitude factor, Item Statistics

Table 16 shows that all the variables have means above the middle value of the scale and there are no significant deviations in the variance. These numbers interconnect with the Cronbach's alpha and the standardized Cronbach's alpha which are very close as a result of the standard deviation in variables.

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
16,95	18,382	4,287	5

Table 17 - overall attitude factor, Scale Statistics

Table 17 shows the means, variance standard deviation of the new suggested scale.

8.6.3.9 Multi-item variable statistics

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Q13V01AdvertisementSituationsValuableinformation	13,92	11,856	,616	,450	,800
Q13V02AdvertisementSituationsInteresting	13,39	11,873	,743	,566	,764
Q13V03AdvertisementSituationsSuggestive	13,90	12,017	,630	,411	,795
Q13V04AdvertisementSituationsEntertainment	12,85	13,912	,556	,388	,817
Q13V05AdvertisementSituationsNeeds	13,73	11,668	,619	,398	,800

Table 18 - overall attitude factor, Multi-item variable statistics

Table 18 shows the variables connection to the new multi-item variable. All the variables are strongly correlated to the new variable >0.556, even though some variables produce a substantial contribution to the measurement of the reliability (Q13V02 = 0.743). The column Cronbach's alpha if item deleted, shows the Cronbach's alpha for the multi-item scale, if the concerned variable is removed. The numbers explain that an exclusion of any of the variables is not beneficial for the overall reliability, as no increase in Cronbach's alpha takes place if any of the variables are removed. If a Cronbach's alpha increase is possible,

through removal of a variable, the researcher ought to be aware of this (Jensen et al., 2006). The proposed factor variable, including the 5 variables, is kept as a result of the factor analysis.

8.6.4 Q15 overall interest factor

The factor analysis for Q15 follows the same procedure as the factor analysis of Q13.

8.6.4.1 Applicability – correlation matrix

For table, see appendix 5. The variables correlate well and even better than the variables in Q13 (>0.54) and that the variables in question 15 are applicable for factor analysis. The correlation matrix states that some variables correlate more than others, which means that these possess the ability to belong to the same factors, if the factor analysis establish more than one factor (One factor is sought, see above)

8.6.4.2 Applicability – KMO and Bartlett's test

For table, see appendix 5. A KMO and Bartlett's test confirm the applicability for factor analysis. The KMO value for Q15 is 0.943 which is far greater than the critical value and supports the applicability for the analysis which was found in the correlation matrix. Bartlett's test displays a significant level on 0.000 which indicates that the variables are correlated.

8.6.4.3 Applicability – Communalities

For table, see appendix 5. The communalities output shows all the variables variances are included by more than 0.5 (>0.59), which indicates that the variables are capable of being included in the suggested factor. As the researchers of the thesis seek to compose one single factor to measure the respondents' overall attitude towards advertisement, the output from communalities is good.

8.6.4.4	Applicability	y – total variance	explained
---------	---------------	--------------------	-----------

		Initial Eigen	values	Extrac	tion Sums of Sq	uared Loadings
Componen	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	6,469	71,874	71,874	6,469	71,874	71,874
2	,618	6,867	78,742			
3	,421	4,675	83,416			
4	,364	4,042	87,458			

Table 19 - overall interest factor, Total variance explained

Table 19 (for complete table, see appendix 5) shows that a single factor is computed, the same number as desired and the same number as Q13 factor analysis. The percentage of variance is 71.874, which means

2008

that the identified factor explains 71.874% of the data total variance. The percentage of 71.874 means that the 9 original variables can be reduced to a single factor. The new factor explains far more than the minimum of 60% of the data original variance (Jensen et al., 2006).

8.6.4.5 Applicability – component matrix

For table, see appendix 5. The variables have high factor loadings (>0.768) on the suggested factor, and support the previous calculations done on the variable to establish a single factor to replace the nine existing.

8.6.4.6 Preparing the new factor variable

The addition of the variables in Q15 is conducted as in Q13 factor analysis. (See section 8.6.3.6 – preparing the new factor variable Q13). The addition is done manually and SPSS is deselected to accomplish this assignment - the argument for this can be seen in the discussion of Q13.

8.6.4.7 Reliability – Q15 factor

For table, see appendix 5. This section accomplishes an analysis on reliability for the multi-item scale of question Q15, as done with Q13 as well, the analysis examines whether the nine variables in Q13 are measuring the same object (Jensen et al., 2006). The analysis is done as the reliability analysis of Q13.

The requirements for accomplishing the reliability test (Cronbach's alpha) are fulfilled by question Q15 and as a consequence of that, the analysis is implemented. The total valid cases are 110.

8.6.4.8 Cronbach's alpha

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	Cronbach's Alpha		
	Based on		
Cronbach's Alpha	Standardized Items	N of Items	
,951	,951		9

Reliability Statistics

Table 20 - overall interest factor, Cronbach's alpha

Cronbach's alpha for the suggested variable is 0.951 (Standardized item) which is extremely high. The Cronbach's alpha of 0.951 is very good and evidence of the good reliability of the multi-item factor composed from the nine variables. As a consequence of the high value, no variables ought to be omitted from the new scale.

No significant deviations in the variance exist, and as seen in the factor analysis of Q13, the numbers interconnect with the Cronbach's alpha and the standardized Cronbach's alpha, which are exactly the same as a result of the standard deviation in variables.

8.6.4.9 Multi-item variable statistics

For table, see appendix 5. The table shows that the entire set of variables is strongly correlated to the new variable >0.713. An exclusion of any of the variables is not beneficial for the overall reliability, as no increase in Cronbach's alpha would take place if any of the variables are removed. The suggested variable, based on the nine original variables, is kept as a result of the factor analysis.

8.6.5 Conclusion on factor analysis

The object of the factor analyses of question Q13 and Q15 was to compose two multi-item variables on the basis of the five variables in Q13 and the nine variables in Q15. It was sought to compose a single factor for each of the overall questions. The process of analyzing the variables within the two questions has shown that both cases (five variables and nine variables) can be merged into two individual factors. A factor of attitude (Q13factorAttitudeAdverts) consisting of Q13V1, Q13V2, Q13V3, Q13V4 and Q13V5, and a factor of interest (Q15factorInterestAdverts) Q15V1, Q15V2, Q15V3, Q15V4, Q15V5, Q15V6, Q15V7, Q15V8 and Q15V9. The prerequisites are fulfilled, the variables are correlated, the KMO test shows the applicability for the factor analyses and the new factors explain a minimum of 60% of the data original variance (Jensen et al., 2006). The reliability, measured by means of Cronbach's alpha, within the suggested factors are very good.

On the basis of the implemented factor analyses and reliability tests of these, two new factors are composed, and are employed henceforward, when operating with "Attitude towards advertisement" and "interest in advertisement".

8.6.6 Factor vs. single questions

As previously discussed, it is sought to uncover attitude and interests towards advertisement by means of factors analysis. In the questionnaire developed, two single questions (Q14 and Q16) are included, which directly ask the respondents about their attitude and interest towards advertisement, with two questions (a single question for attitude and a single question for interest). The motive for including these single questions is to see if the respondents' computed attitude and interest via factor analyses are in accordance with their answers to the single question.



Figure 11 - overall attitude, factor vs. single questions

Figure 12 - overall interest, factor vs. single questions

The figures show that accordance between the single questions and the factor values is detected. The illustrations show that the respondents answer almost identically, when the single question and the factor value answers are compared.

On the basis of the derived results from the above shown illustrations, it is decided to base remaining analysis with the calculated factors, as these are considered most valid.

8.7 Hypothesis tests

8.7.1 Hypothesis 1

8.7.1.1 Hypothesis configuration

- H0: There is no difference in interest towards the presented concept, with or without monetary gratification.
- H1: There is a difference in interest towards the presented concept, with or without monetary gratification

8.7.1.2 Method of analysis

Compare means	(ANOVA-t-test)
ANOVA	One-way between groups
One dependent	(Q23ConceptVisit)
One independent variable	(With_without_gratification)

8.7.1.3 Test completion

Various analyses to compare means exist. The t-test, ANOVA and the different extensions of ANOVA including ANCOVA, MANOVA, and MANCOVA have already been mentioned in section 8.3. The difference between the t-test and ANOVA is the prerequisite in which the t-test demands very stringent fulfilment of the requirements for normal distribution. ANOVA is on the other hand, a stronger analysis concerning this requirement - where it is possible to complete a test on means without compliance with normal distribution. ANOVA is also capable of comparing several means at the same time. Concurrently, ANOVA implements a test on variance between the groups.

The first test chosen for this hypothesis is the t-test, as this is a simple test to compare means between two variables scaled by ratings. This test meets the demands for answering the hypothesis.

8.7.1.4 T-test prerequisite – normal distribution not present

Normal distribution:

In order to prepare a valid completion of the t-test, graphic presentations of the distribution of the answers are produced. As mentioned above in test completion, the distribution must meet the demands of normal distribution.





Figure 13 - hypothesis 1, Q22 (+G) normal distribution

Figure 14 - hypothesis 1, Q22 (-G) normal distribution

The graphic presentation of the test for normal distribution above shows that both of the variables are abnormally distributed. A K-S test for normal distribution is at the same time accomplished, in order to statistically test for normal distribution.

	-	Q22ConceptIntere	Q22ConceptIntere
		stWithGrat	stWithoutGrat
Ν		66	47
Normal Parameters ^a	Mean	2,5000	2,64
	Std. Deviation	1,40603	1,390
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,236	,230
	Positive	,236	,230
	Negative	-,205	-,219
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1,915	1,578
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,001	,014

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

Table 21 - hypothesis 1, Q22 (-G and +G) Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

The K-S test table shows, that the distribution within the answers of question Q22 (-G and +G) are abnormally distributed, as the sig. level is below 0.05.

This lack of normal distribution, which is a prerequisite to continue the t-test, means that the t-test cannot be accomplished. With this lack of prerequisite-compliance of the t-test as reason, another analysis to accomplish the test of comparing means is chosen. As discussed in the test completion, the ANOVA test meets the demands of the researcher in order to produce a comparative means test. The ANOVA test will consequently be employed, as this is less sensitive with regards to the prerequisite of normal distribution.

Descriptives

Q22ConceptInterest

					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
-G	47	2,64	1,390	,203	2,23	3,05	1	5
+G	66	2,50	1,406	,173	2,15	2,85	1	5
Total	113	2,56	1,395	,131	2,30	2,82	1	5

Table 22 - hypothesis 1, Q22 Descriptives

By processing the ANOVA test it is sought to produce an overview of the two variables +G (with gratification) and –G (without gratification). Table 22, displays the difference in means between the two variables (samples), which is 0.14 (2.64-2.50) as well as the population size and standard deviation. As the object of this test is to compare means, a graphic illustration is placed below, in order to visualize the potential differences in the means.



Figure 15 - hypothesis 1, Q22 Descriptives illustration

Following the graph illustrating the difference of the two means, the ANOVA results will now be presented. The ANOVA results present three sources of variability, between groups, within groups and total.

ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	,525	1	,525	,268	,606
Within Groups	217,351	111	1,958		
Total	217,876	112			

Q22ConceptInterest

Table 23 - hypothesis 1, Q22 ANOVA

8.7.1.5 Hypothesis accepted

When identifying the results of the ANOVA, the F value is 0.268, (calculated as the mean square between divided by the mean square within) and the p-value is 0.606. Given that the significance level is far greater than 0.05 (section 8.5.1 – general level of significance) and there is no sign of difference in the variance between the two groups, the null hypothesis is accepted, which means that:

H0: There is no difference in interest towards the presented concept, with or without monetary gratification.

8.7.1.6 Test of Homogeneity of Variances

The ANOVA analysis and results state that there is no significant difference between the two groups within the means of the variable Q22. As noted in 8.2.1 the two samples (+G and -G) are processed individually, unless a test can establish a reason to process these together. As some of the hypothesis subsequently deals with the variable Q22, it is relevant to test whether this variable is approximately the same across the two samples, in order to combine them and process them together.

The ANOVA results present a test of homogeneity of variances in connection with the above shown figures. This result (presented below in table 24) can clarify the opportunity to process the two samples together when including Q22 as a test variable.

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Q22ConceptInterest

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
,074	1	111	,786

Table 24 - hypothesis 1, Q22, Test of Homogeneity of Variances

The test of homogeneity of variance shows that a rejection of identical variance cannot occur (p=0.786), which means that the variable Q22 can be processed as one sample (+G and –G) henceforward.

8.7.1.7 Chi-square test

As the ANOVA test on means proved, there is no significant difference in means between the two samples. In order to support the conclusion based on the ANOVA results, a chi-square test on independence within the variables is carried out.

Hypothesis within the chi-square

H0: There is independence within the variables

H1: There is dependence within the variables

As table 25 shows, the chi-square test consists of a 2x5 crosstab, in which the same variables as the ANOVA test are included.

r.	-	-						
					Q22Conce	ptInterest		
					Neither			
			Disagree		agree or		Agree	
			strongly	Disagree	disagreed	Agree	strongly	Total
Without_with_gratif	Without	Count	13	13	3	14	4	47
ication	gratification	Expected Count	15,8	9,6	4,6	13,7	3,3	47,0
		% within Q22ConceptInterest	34,2%	56,5%	27,3%	42,4%	50,0%	41,6%
		Adjusted Residual	-1,1	1,6	-1,0	,1	,5	
	With gratification	Count	25	10	8	19	4	66
		Expected Count	22,2	13,4	6,4	19,3	4,7	66,0
		% within Q22ConceptInterest	65,8%	43,5%	72,7%	57,6%	50,0%	58,4%
		Adjusted Residual	1,1	-1,6	1,0	-,1	-,5	
	Total	Count	38	23	11	33	8	113
		Expected Count	38,0	23,0	11,0	33,0	8,0	113,0
		% within Q22ConceptInterest	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Without_with_gratification * Q22ConceptInterest Crosstabulation

Table 25 - hypothesis 1, Q22, Cross tabulation

To conclude on the chi-square test, the below fitted output is applied. This thesis uses the Pearson chisquare as reference point, in order to conclude on independence/dependence within the variables.

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4,133ª	4	,388
Likelihood Ratio	4,156	4	,385
Linear-by-Linear Association	,270	1	,603
N of Valid Cases	113		

a. 3 cells (30,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3,33.

Table 26 - hypothesis 1, Q22, Chi-Square Tests

As seen in table 31, the tests do not comply with the assumption that maximum 20% of the cells have expected counts less than 5 (Jensen et al., 2006), in this case the expected counts are 30%. Notwithstanding, the chi-square test is still accomplished, as it is possible to implement a chi-square test with the assumption that maximum 20% of the cells have expected counts less than 3 (instead of 5), and the minimum expected count is 3.33.

The chi-square value of 0.388 proves independence within the employed variables in the test, as the value is above 0.05. The variables are significantly independent, also proven by the residual values that are within the -1.96/1.96 area.

This means that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

H0: There is independence within the variables

8.7.1.8 Conclusion - Hypothesis 1:

The ANOVA test used to test hypothesis 1 shows no significant difference between the means of the two samples, which indicates no effect of monetary gratification. Concurrently, the two samples can be processed as one, when testing the Q22 as there is no indication of difference in the variance between the two samples. The chi-square test supports the ANOVA results, by concluding that the variables are independent.

8.7.2 Hypothesis 2

8.7.2.1 Hypothesis configuration

- H0: There is no difference in visit-intention towards the presented concept, with or without monetary gratification.
- H1: There is a difference in visit-intention towards the presented concept, with or without monetary gratification.

8.7.2.2 Method of analysis

Compare means	(ANOVA-t-test)
ANOVA	One-way between groups
One dependent	(Q23ConceptVisit)
One independent variable	(With_without_gratification)

8.7.2.3 Test completion

The test is processed in the same way as hypothesis 1, starting with a simple t-test in order to compare means between the two samples (+G and -G), as the hypothesis seeks to identify any differences. A detailed review of the theoretical approach is to be found within the description of hypothesis 1.

All figures and statistics regarding the analysis of this hypothesis can be found in appendix 6.1.

Normal distribution:

As the figures in appendix 6.1 show, the prerequisite for the t-test is not fulfilled, as normal distributions are seemingly not present from a visual point of view; even though they might be close to normal distribution. This means that the t-test is not suitable to compare means within this hypothesis, which is the same occurrence as in hypothesis 1. The new approach is, equal to hypothesis 1, a one-way ANOVA test.

The K-S test actually shows that the answers of question 23 just manage to fulfil the requirements for normal distribution, as the values are higher than 0.05, see appendix 6.1. Nevertheless, as the values are so close to the borderline for acceptance, the T-test is still disregarded with a view to the ANOVA test.

ANOVA:

The calculated results (appendix 6.1) show a slight difference in means between the two samples - a difference of 0.1894.

In order to identify any statistical differences between the two samples, they are compared in the ANOVA test below.

Q23ConceptVisit					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	,997	1	,997	,618	,43
Within Groups	180,758	112	1,614		
Total	181,754	113			

ANOVA

Table 27 - hypothesis 2, Q23, ANOVA

8.7.2.4 Hypothesis accepted

The results from table 27, illustrate that there is a difference between the means of the groups, but it is not significant. The p-value is 0.434 and greater than the significance level of 0.05 and as a result of that, the null hypothesis is accepted, which means that:

H0: There is no difference in visit-intention towards the presented concept, with or without monetary gratification.

8.7.2.5 Test of Homogeneity of Variances

The ANOVA analysis and results state that there is no significant difference between the two groups within the means of the variable Q23. As discussed in section 8.2.1 and in the detailed approach description of the ANOVA in hypothesis 1, the two samples are processed individually as a starting point, but are then tested for variance, in order to check for the possibility of combining the two samples into one overall sample.

The test of homogeneity of variance shows that a rejection of identical variance cannot occur (p=0.547), which means that the two samples of variable Q23 can be processed as one overall sample (+G and -G) henceforward (appendix 6.1).

8.7.2.6 Chi-square test

As in hypothesis 1, the ANOVA test on means proved that there is no significant difference in means between the two samples. In order to support the conclusion based on the ANOVA results, a test on independence within the variables is accomplished. To identify whether a possible dependence or independence is present a chi-square test is employed.

Hypothesis within the chi-square

H0: There is independence within the variables

H1: There is dependence within the variables

As appendix 6.1 shows, the chi-square test consists of a 2x5 crosstab, in which the same variables as the ANOVA test are included.

The chi-square value of 0.626 proves independence within the employed variables in the test, as the value is above 0.05. The variables are significantly independent, also proven by the residual values that are within the -1.96/1.96 area.

This means that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected - meaning that the variables are independent.

8.7.2.7 Conclusion - Hypothesis 2

The ANOVA test used to test hypothesis 2 illustrates no significant difference between the means of the two samples, which indicates no effect of monetary gratification on visit-intention towards the presented concept. Furthermore, it is possible to process the two samples as one in the remaining analyses, as Q23 shows no indication of difference in the variance between the two samples.

8.7.3 Hypothesis 3

8.7.3.1 Hypothesis configuration

8.7.3.2 Method of analysis		
H1:	There is a difference in user interest and visit-intention.	
H0:	There is no difference in user interest and visit-intention.	

Correlation	Product moment correlation (Malhotra et al., 2006)
Variable X	(Q22Conceptinterest)
Variable Y	(Q23ConceptVisit)

8.7.3.2 Test completion

Both variables in this correlation analysis are metric on a five-point scale. Even though the individual scale definitions of the two variables vary in between, they are considered alike, as they both measure interest on an interval scale.

The results of the correlation analysis are displayed in the figure below. The Pearson Correlation coefficient (r), also known as a bivariate correlation, indicates to what extent the variation in Q22 is related to the variation in Q23. The higher the value of the Pearson Correlation coefficient, the more linear the relationship between the two variables is.

Another important aspect of the correlation analysis is the Covariance between the two variables. The covariance indicates if a change in one variable implies a corresponding change in the other and whether it is positive or negative.

		Q22ConceptInterest	Q23ConceptVisit
Q22ConceptInterest	Pearson Correlation	1	,892 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	217,876	176,823
	Covariance	1,945	1,579
	Ν	113	113
Q23ConceptVisit	Pearson Correlation	,892	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	176,823	181,754
	Covariance	1,579	1,608
	Ν	113	114

Correlations

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 28 - hypothesis 3, Correlations

8.7.3.4 Hypothesis accepted

With a significance level of 0.000 as indicated in the previous figure, and a Pearson Correlation coefficient of 0.892 the two variables correlate, to a great extent.

This means that the H0 hypothesis is accepted:

H0: There is no difference in user interest and visit-intention.

8.7.3.5 Covariance

Despite having no direct influence on the acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis, the Covariance level is noteworthy. The value of approximately 1.6 indicates a positive systematic relationship between the two variables.

This means that a change towards higher interest in Q22 will imply a positive change in Q23, visit-intention.

8.7.3.6 Conclusion - Hypothesis 3

The H0 hypothesis is accepted with a Pearson Correlation coefficient of 0.892, indicating that the relationship between the variations in the two variables is linear.

This is an important conclusion, since it underlines that visit-intention can be used as the dependent variable in hypothesis 4, 5 and 6, as visit-intention correlates well with concept interest.

8.7.4 Hypothesis 4

8.7.4.1 Hypothesis configuration

8.7.4.2 Metho	od of analysis
H1:	There is a difference in visit-intention based on the users' interest in advertising.
H0:	There is no difference in visit-intention based on the users' interest in advertising.

Compare means	(ANOVA-t-test)
ANOVA	One-way between groups
One dependent	(Q23ConceptVisit)
One independent variable	(Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert)

8.7.4.3 Test completion

Normal distribution:

One variable has normal distribution and one has not, see appendix 6.2 for visual confirmation and the Kolmogorov-Smirnoff test schematics.

On the basis of this the ANOVA test is applied.

ANOVA:

The mean value of the two variables is different (appendix 6.2). Not interested in advertising has a mean value of visit-intention of 3.69 and Interested in advertising has a mean value of just 2.18, a difference of 1.51.

In order to identify any statistical differences between the two samples they are compared in the ANOVA test below.

ANOVA

Q23ConceptVisit

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	39,973	1	39,973	34,212	,000
Within Groups	80,619	69	1,168		u
Total	120,592	70			u

Table 29 - hypothesis 4, ANOVA

8.7.4.4 Hypothesis rejected

The hypothesis is rejected as the level of significance is far below the 0.05 margin, at 0.000. This means that there is a significant difference in visit-intention based on interest in advertising. (The significant difference is the complete opposite of expected results – this will be elaborated later in the thesis). The null hypothesis is rejected and H1 remains:

H1: There is a difference in visit-intention based on the users' interest in advertising.

8.7.4.5 Test of Homogeneity of Variances

The level of homogeneity of variance is 0.965 (appendix 6.2), which is a prerequisite for a valid ANOVA test. It is not the most important prerequisite and the ANOVA can be done even with heterogeneous variances, but the high level of homogeneity in this case, is a positive indicator of a valid test.

8.7.4.6 Chi-square test

The Pearson chi-square level is 0.000 (appendix 6.2) implying that there is a definite significant difference in the two variables. This is also established via residual values that are outside the -1.96/1.96 area (appendix 6.2).

This means that the null hypothesis is rejected - meaning that the variables are dependent.

8.7.4.7 Conclusion - Hypothesis 4

The ANOVA test revealed a significant difference in mean values of the variables, which is why the H0 hypothesis was rejected and the H1 hypothesis stands. This means that there is a rather clear difference in the users' visit-intention based on the users' interest in advertising.

The interesting result is that it is negatively dependant; meaning that the more interested a user is in advertising, the lower the visit-intention. This was definitely not foreseen by the authors, and is discussed further in section 8.9.6.

8.7.5 Hypothesis 5

8.7.5.1 Hypothesis configuration

- H0: There is no difference in visit-intention based on the users' attitude towards advertising.
- H1: There is a difference in visit-intention based on the users' attitude towards advertising.

98

8.7.5.2 Method of analysis

Compare means	(ANOVA-t-test)
ANOVA	One-way between groups
One dependent	(Q23ConceptVisit)
One independent variable	(Q13FactorNegative/PositiveAttitudeAdvertising)

8.7.5.3 Test completion

Normal distribution:

One variable has normal distribution and one has not, see appendix 6.3 for visual confirmation and the Kolmogorov-Smirnoff test schematics.

On the basis of this the ANOVA test is applied.

ANOVA:

The mean values of the two variables differ slightly (appendix 6.3). Negative attitude towards advertising has a mean value of visit-intention of 2.42 and positive attitude towards advertising 3.06, a difference of 0.64.

In order to identify any statistical differences between the two samples they are compared in the ANOVA test below.

ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sia.
					- 9
Between Groups	7,347	1	7,347	5,019	,027
Within Groups	137,611	94	1,464		
Total	144,958	95			

Table 30 - hypothesis 5, ANOVA

8.7.5.4 Hypothesis rejected

Q23ConceptVisit

The hypothesis is rejected as the level of significance is below the 0.05 margin, at 0.027. This means that there is a significant difference in visit-intention based on the attitude towards advertising. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected and the H1 hypothesis counts:

H1: There is a difference in visit-intention based on the users' attitude towards advertising.

8.7.5.5 Test of Homogeneity of Variances

The level of homogeneity of variance is 0.101 (appendix 6.3), which is low in this prerequisite for a valid ANOVA test. However, as previously mentioned, this parameter is not the most important prerequisite for the ANOVA test and though the level of homogeneity is low, the ANOVA test is still applicable.

8.7.5.6 Chi-square test

The Pearson chi-square level is 0.017 (appendix 6.3) implying that there is a significant difference in the two variables. The residual values are dispersed outside and inside the -1.96/1.96 area (appendix 6.3).

This means that the null hypothesis is rejected - meaning that the variables are dependent.

8.7.5.7 Conclusion - Hypothesis 5

The ANOVA test revealed a significant difference in mean values of the variables, which is why the H0 hypothesis was rejected and the H1 hypothesis stands. This means that there is a rather clear difference in the users' visit-intention based on the users' attitude towards advertising.

These variables are positively coherent, meaning that a more positive attitude towards advertising corresponds with higher visit-intention. This is contradictory to the results of hypothesis 4, but these results were expected, whereas the hypothesis 4 results were much unexpected.

8.7.6 Hypothesis 6

8.7.6.1 Hypothesis configuration

H0: There is no difference in visit-intention based on the users' activity on existing social websites.

H1: There is a difference in visit-intention based on the users' activity on existing social websites.

8.7.6.2 Method of analysis

Compare means	(ANOVA-t-test)		
ANOVA	One-way between groups		
One dependent	(Q23ConceptVisit)		
One independent variable	(Q11SocialWebsiteUseHeavy_Light)		

2008
8.7.6.3 Test completion

Normal distribution:

One variable is normal distributed, with a KS-value of 0.008, but the other is not normal distributed, see appendix 6.4 for visual confirmation and the Kolmogorov-Smirnoff test schematics.

On the basis of this the ANOVA test is applied.

ANOVA:

The mean values of the two variables differ extremely little (appendix 6.4). Light users of social websites have a slightly higher mean value of 2.85 than heavy users that have a mean value of 2.76. This indicates that users that are light users of social websites have a slightly higher visit-intention than heavy users.

In order to identify any statistical differences between the two samples, they are compared in the ANOVA test below.

ANOVA

Q23ConceptVisit

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	,211	1	,211	,130	,719
Within Groups	180,108	111	1,623	u	u da se
Total	180,319	112		u L	



8.7.6.4 Hypothesis accepted

The null hypothesis is accepted, (as expected, having looked at the mean values), as the level of significance is far beyond the 0.05 margin, at 0.719. This means that there is no significant difference in visit-intention based on the usage of existing social websites. Therefore the null hypothesis stands:

H0: There is no difference in visit-intention based on the users' activity on existing social websites.

8.7.6.5 Test of Homogeneity of Variances

The level of homogeneity of variance is 0.589 (appendix 6.4), which is a good prerequisite for a valid ANOVA test.

8.7.6.6 Chi-square test

The Pearson chi-square level is 0.574 (appendix 6.4) implying that there is no significant difference in the two variables. The residual values are all within the -1.96/1.96 area (appendix 6.4).

This means that the null hypothesis is accepted - meaning that the variables are independent.

8.7.6.7 Conclusion - Hypothesis 6

The ANOVA test indicates an insignificant difference in mean values of the variables, which is why the H0 hypothesis was accepted. This means that there is no significant difference in the users' visit-intention, based on the users' usage of existing social websites.

8.8 Predictive regression modelling

8.8.1 Introduction

By means of logistic regression it is sought to identify coherence between the concept visit-intention and selected significant data variables from the sample. Apart from any possible coherence, it is sought to uncover whether these data variables can be used to predict the concept visit-intention. The purpose of the logistic regression analysis is to construct a predictive model that can be used to identify the odds/chances of a respondent's visit-intention depending on specific answer characteristics.

8.8.2 Logistic regression type

Various kinds of logistic regression exist - depending on the collected/developed data as well as the overall objective of the analysis.

The goal of the logistic regression analysis in this research is to predict the respondents' affiliation with two categories within one variable. The variable is, as mentioned above, "concept visit-intention", which is split into two different categories, "Positive" and "Negative" or "Interested" and "Not interested", as it often appears in statistical outputs.

The variable "concept visit-intention" is subsequently tested against various data variables. These variables consist of both categorical and continuous variables, which are identified by the scales of the answers in the questions. This method of developing a logistic regression model, with several covariates consisting of the data variables, makes the analysis multivariate.

Logistic regression	Predictive model
Binary / binomial	One dependent variable two categories (Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit)
Multivariate	Several independent variables tested
One step	All variables tested simultaneously

8.8.3 Hypothesis

- H0: There is no difference between observed and model-predicted values
- H1: There is a difference between observed and model-predicted values

8.8.4 Preparing the dataset for modelling

The dataset is to be configured to comply with the demands of the logistic regression. Therefore some variables have been disregarded:

• Disregarding "don't know" and "other".

These entries are disregarded due to lack of eligibility. Either might prove significant and predictive, but will not provide any answers for the research, due to their unclassified nature.

Disregarded variables: Q01V04, Q01V05, Q08V09, Q09V07, and Q09V08.

• Disregarding answer-dependent questions.

Some of the questions in the surveys are dependent on the answer of the previous question, for instance Q21 which is dependent on the answer in Q20.

Disregarded variables: Q21

• Previously established factor analysis and pooled values are employed.

Disregarded variables: Q13, Q14, Q15, Q16, Q22, Q23

Included variables: Interested_NotinterestedQ15Advert, Positive_Negative_AttitudeQ13Advert, Q22Conceptinterest_Notinterest, Q23Conceptvisit_Notvisit,

(Note: Interested_NotinterestedQ13Advert, Positive_Negative_AttitudeQ15Advert differ from the ones used in the hypothesis testing as a neutral value is included)

8.8.5 Modelling the predictive model

8.8.5.1 Modelling - step 1

Developing the final predictive model is done through a long series of testing and modelling of data. At first, all variables (questions and answers) from the sample are included, resulting in an SPSS error, as a model cannot be configured, since the number of variables (parameters) is much higher than the number of observations (N).

Variables can be disregarded on the basis of various argumentations, but mainly due to insignificance. In this manner, variables are disregarded one by one, until a predictive and significant model is obtained.

In the following, the next steps of the process of defining a final predictive model are described.

Note. Each of the described steps in modelling the data consists of several data reductions, but a new analysis has been run, in between each reduction of each variable, to ensure validity.

8.8.5.2 Modelling - step 2

See appendix 1.1, 2 and 3.2

In order to severely limit the number of variables (parameters), selected data is pooled into groups. Pooling data is necessary because of the relatively small sample size limiting the number of variables (parameters) that can be used in the model.

Through SPSS processed frequency tables, large sample characteristic dispersions are identified. Variables with very uneven data dispersions and selected values are pooled.

Having pooled the data and reduced the total number of variables (parameters) by 12, a new SPSS analysis is run. The result of this is another SPSS error. A model cannot be configured, as there are still more parameters than observations.

8.8.5.3 Modelling - step 3

See appendix 1.2 and 3.3

Since too many variables are experienced (parameters) for SPSS to generate a model, the next step is to pool both additional variables and their values.

The number of observations (N) is increased; however it is still not possible to produce an actual predictive model.

8.8.5.4 Modelling - step 4

See appendix 1.3 and 3.4

Upon this reduction and exclusion a model is achieved. The model has no relevance as there are no significantly explanatory variables. Therefore, further modelling is required.

8.8.5.5 Modelling - step 5

See appendix 1.4 and 3.5

The achieved model enables the further reduction of variables by level of significance. The level of significance is high for all variables (they are in fact insignificant) and this means that the variable reduction cannot be based solely on level of significance.

Some levels of significance have been reduced slightly. Further modelling is required.

8.8.5.6 Modelling - step 6

See appendix 1.5 and 3.6

As the model still doesn't provide any useable results, further modelling and data reduction is required.

A useable model is being developed. The variables in the equation have various levels of significance, which indicates that some of the variables are predictive and possess the ability to remain in the final model. However, some variables still prove insignificant, thus further modelling continues.

8.8.5.7 Modelling - step 7

See appendix 1.6 and 3.7

In the following step, excluded or pooled variables are chosen on the basis of their level of significance.

The model is becoming applicable but an even more applicable model is still sought.

8.8.5.8 Modelling - step 8

See appendix 1.7 and 3.8

In the following step excluded or pooled variables are chosen on the basis of their level of significance.

2008

The analysis output show that the level of significance within the predictive variable with the most significance has reduced drastically through the step by step manual data reduction and modelling. The lowest level of significance is Q19 at 0.018 and the highest level is Q24V05 at 0.987. The relatively high level of significance among some of the remaining variables calls for further data reduction.

8.8.5.9 Modelling - step 9

See appendix 1.8 and 3.9

8.8.5.10 Modelling - step 10

See appendix 1.9 and 3.10

From this reduction an applicable model is derived, and this will be the final model that concludes the logistic regression modelling.

8.8.6 - The final predictive model

8.8.6.1 Hosmer and Lemeshow significance test

The significance test for this analysis is Hosmer and Lemeshow chi-square test of goodness of fit. This test is chosen as the overall test for suitability of this logistic regression model. This test is selected as it is considered more solid and suitable for this particular analysis than a traditional chi-square test. The argumentation for this is the presence of continuous covariates and the relatively small sample size (Malhotra et al., 2006).

Step	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1	7,268	8	,508

Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Table 32 - the final predictive model, Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

The Hosmer and Lemeshow Test significance is greater than 0.05, which means that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. This indicates that there is no significant difference between the observed and the model-predicted values, implying that the model's estimates fit the data at an acceptable level. This does not mean that the model necessarily explains much of the variance in the dependent variable, only that it is significant (Malhotra et al., 2006).

	-	Q23ConceptVis intere	it_notVisit = Not ested	Q23ConceptVisit_r		
Observed Expected		Observed	Total			
Step 1	1	8	7,962	0	,038	8
	2	8	7,831	0	,169	8
	3	7	7,676	1	,324	8
	4	7	7,142	1	,858	8
	5	7	5,498	1	2,502	8
	6	3	4,366	5	3,634	8
	7	2	2,242	6	5,758	8
	8	3	1,379	5	6,621	8
	9	0	,657	8	7,343	8
	10	0	,246	11	10,754	11

Contingency Table for Hosmer and Lemeshow Test



The Contingency table above reveals the actual observed values in the sample and the model-expected values, and as the Hosmer and Lemeshow significance test indicates, no significant difference between the observed and expected values can be seen.

8.8.6.2 Classification table

Classification	Table ^a
----------------	--------------------

	Predicted				
	Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit				
Observed	Not interested	Interested	Percentage Correct		
Step 1 Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit Not interested	40	5	88,9		
Interested	6	32	84,2		
Overall Percentage		[86,7		

a. The cut value is ,500

Table 34 - the final predictive model, Classification Table

The above classification table shows how well the model is capable of predicting the right answers. As a predictive of the "Not interested" or "Negative" category, the model is 88.9% correct, where as the other category "Interested" is predicted in 84.2% of the cases. This leads to an overall predictive percentage of 86.7%. This means that by applying the model, there is a better chance of predicting whether or not a

respondent will be interested in visiting the concept website. Without the model, the chance of predicting the right answer is 50%. The model increases the probability of predicting the answer with 36.7% (total of 86.7%).

8.8.6.3 Variables in the Equation

To identify any explanatory variables from the covariate variables, both are included in the figure below. The "Variables in the Equation" figure displays the odds ratio and the significance by which the covariate explains the dependent variable.

	-							95,0% EXF	C.I.for P(B)
		В	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower	Upper
Step 1	Q06InternetUseTimeHome(1)	-2,670	1,330	028	1	,045	,069	,005	,939
	Q09V01InternetUsePurposeSocialwebsites(1)	1,187	1,028	1,333	1	,248	3,279	,437	24,612
	Q09V02InternetUsePurposeGeneralsurfing(1)	-1,081	,849	1,622	1	,203	,339	,064	1,791
	Q19AdvertisementInfluence	1,554	,396	15,385	1	,000	4,731	2,176	10,284
	Q20AdvertisementOverallSearch(1)	-1,190	,800	2,213	1	,137	,304	,063	1,459
	Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert			6,248	2	,044			
	Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(1)	-2,636	1,065	6,125	1	,013	,072	,009	,578
	Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(2)	-1,025	,924	1,230	1	,267	,359	,059	2,196
	Q26Gender_Original(1)	-1,463	,916	2,552	1	,110	,232	,039	1,394
	Q11Social_website_Use_Heavy_Light(1)	-1,136	1,074	1,118	1	,290	,321	,039	2,637
	Constant	-1,534	1,363	1,267	1	,260	,216		

Variables in the Equation

Table 35 - the final predictive model, Variables in the equation

When reviewing the significance level of the different variables, it shows that 3 variables are significantly explanatory of the "concept visit-intention" variable. The most significant variable is Q19, Advertisement influence, which is the significant variable with the highest Exp(B), odds/ratio value. This means that a high level of influence in the development of advertising means positive visit-intention. The second most significant variable is Interested in advertising, "Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(1)", has a low Exp(B) value of 0.072. The moving from "Not interested" towards "Interested" in advertising, means that the level of interest in visiting the concept website is drastically reduced. The last of the significant variables is "Q06InternetUseTimeHome(1)". This is significant at the 0.95 confidence level and the Exp (B) value is very

low at 0.069 explaining that heavy users of the Internet at home, are less prone to visiting the concept website.

8.8.6.4 Model equation

The final regression equation is expressed by the equation variables and the equation constant as follows:

Y = Constant - Q06InternetUseTimeHome(1) X1 + Q09V01InternetUsePurposeSocialwebsites(1) X2 + Q09V02InternetUsePurposeGeneralsurfing(1) X3 + Q19AdvertisementInfluence X4 + Q20AdvertisementOverallSearch(1) X5 + Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(1) X6 + Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(2) X7 + Q26Gender_Original(1) X8 + Q11Social_website_Use_Heavy_Light(1) X9

Table 36 - the final predictive model, Overall Model equation

The B coefficient expresses the constant value of each equation variable and this expresses the final model equation:

Y = -1,534 - 2,670 x1 + 1,1871 x2 - 1,081 x3 + 1,554 x4 - 1,190 x5 - 2,636 x6 - 1,025 x7 - 1,463 x8 - 1,136 x9

Table 37 - the final predictive model, Reduced Model equation

8.8.6.5 Overall model conclusion

The developed logistic regression model has an acceptable level of predicting the outcome from the respondents, based on the independent variables. Three variables have been identified as being significantly explanatory and predictive of the visit-intention towards the concept website. Overall, the model is definitely applicable in predicting visit-intention.

8.9 Summary, discussion and conclusion of quantitative results

The following sections are used to summarize and discuss the primary results of the quantitative survey. These summarizations and discussions are brief and also work as conclusions on the quantitative part of this thesis, in order to avoid massive repetition.

8.9.1 Data quality and representativity

The data is valid. Having examined the data, the questionnaire and taking all aspects into account, the researchers find the data to be valid.

Unfortunately, the combined results of the surveys are not representative of the entire population of Denmark. The sample size should have been larger and more differentiated, especially with regards to Age and Region, to produce generally applicable results for the overall population.

However, the results appear generally applicable for a smaller population, particularly young adults, age 21-30 living in Region Hovedstaden and people with similar characteristics, for instance people between 21 and 30 years of age, living in the major cities of Denmark.

8.9.2 Hypothesis 1

The test of Hypothesis 1 is extremely relevant in this thesis, as it deals with gratification and interest in the concept website. This hypothesis is aligned with the use of uses and gratifications theory in the thesis (this will be discussed thoroughly in chapter 9).

Hypothesis 1 was developed in order to establish whether there was a difference between two sample populations, with regards to concept interest based on monetary gratification. This would help to create valuable information about the needs and requirements of the potential users, in line with the problem statement and sub-questions. The basic research question to be answered was: Would users be more interested in the concept if they were offered money for participating on the website?

The ANOVA test used to test hypothesis 1, shows no significant difference between the means of the two samples, which indicates no effect of monetary gratification. The chi-square test supports the ANOVA results, by concluding that the variables are independent. The null hypothesis stands:

H0: There is no difference in interest towards the presented concept, with or without monetary gratification.

The little and insignificant difference between the samples, indirectly prove that gratification, in the form of money, was not the main incentive for being interested in the concept.

The result gives an indication that it might be possible to combine the two samples, + G and –G, into one sample for remaining analyses.

8.9.3 Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 is similar to hypothesis 1. The difference is that instead of testing interest in the concept up against monetary gratification, visit-intention of the concept website is tested up against monetary gratification. Again, this hypothesis is much in line with the use of uses and gratifications theory.

Testing for visit-intention and monetary gratification is important, since visit-intention is the primary indicator of possible use of the concept. Concept interest tested whether respondents found the concept interesting, but visit-intention indicates if they would seriously consider using the concept website.

The ANOVA test used to test hypothesis 2 illustrates no significant difference between the means of the two samples, which indicates no effect of monetary gratification on visit-intention towards the presented concept. The null hypothesis is therefore accepted:

H0: There is no difference in visit-intention towards the presented concept, with or without monetary gratification.

One of the conclusions drawn from this is that monetary gratification is not one of the primary incentives for visit-intention, just as this sort of gratification had no significant impact on interest in hypothesis 1.

The insignificant difference proved in this hypothesis test, along with the results of hypothesis 1, creates the background for combining the two samples, +G and -G, into one, for the remaining hypotheses and analyses in this thesis.

8.9.4 Hypothesis 3

The correlation analysis of interest and visit-intention in the combined sample was relevant, to determine if visit-intention could rightfully be used as the dependent variable in hypothesis 4, 5, 6 and in a predictive logistic regression model.

The correlation analysis showed that the null hypothesis is accepted with a Pearson Correlation coefficient of 0.892, indicating that the relationship between the variations in the two variables is linear. The null hypothesis is accepted:

H0: There is no difference in user interest and visit-intention.

This is an important conclusion, since it underlines that visit-intention can be used as the dependent variable in hypothesis 4, 5, 6 and in the predictive regression model, as visit-intention correlates well with concept interest.

8.9.5 Factor analysis

The object of the factor analysis on question Q13 and Q15 was to compose two multi-item variables, on the basis of the five variables in Q13 and the nine variables in Q15. It was sought to compose a single factor for

each of the overall questions. The prerequisites for implementing these calculated factors are, to a great extent, fulfilled.

The result of the factor analysis was compared to single questions from the survey to ensure partial collinearity. The two variables were relatively aligned and thus the calculated factor values are implemented, as these have been analyzed and judged to be valid (see section 8.6).

On the basis of the implemented factor analyses and reliability test of these, two new factors were composed and employed henceforward, when operating with attitude towards advertisement and interest in advertisement.

This means that the calculated factor values are used as variables in hypothesis 4 and 5.

8.9.6 Hypothesis 4

Testing to see if there is a significant difference in visit-intention depending on the users' interest in advertising is important, when trying to identify the behaviour of the potential customers.

The authors had the belief that a high level of interest in advertising, would lead to a greater level of interest, and especially visit-intention, towards the concept website as this revolves around advertising.

The ANOVA test showed a significant difference in mean values of the variables, which is why the H0 hypothesis was rejected and the H1 hypothesis remains. This means that there is a clear difference in the users' visit-intention based on the users' interest in advertising, just as assumed.

H1: There is a difference in visit-intention based on the users' interest in advertising.

The interesting result is that they are negatively dependent; meaning that the more interested a user is in advertising, the lower the visit-intention. This result was definitely not foreseen by the authors and at first seemed like a result of corrupted data in this variable.

However, having checked the original data and the analysis approach several times, the result still stands. Despite being completely contradictive to assumptions, the result displays that interest in advertising and visit-intention is negatively coherent, which is of course quite a problem with regards to the overall concept of the business idea. It does not seem likely that users who are not interested in advertising are more likely to visit a website about advertising, than users who in fact are interested in advertising.

It is very difficult to explain this phenomenon and the result must be considered in relation to the small sample size of the survey. This is one issue in particular that would be extremely interesting to pursue in future research.

8.9.7 Hypothesis 5

The apparently contradictive, but valid results of hypothesis 4, makes the results of hypothesis 5 more important.

Is visit-intention positively coherent with attitude towards advertising? The assumption is that a user with a positive attitude towards advertising would be more inclined to visit the concept website.

The ANOVA test proved that there is a significant difference in mean values of the variables, which is why the H0 hypothesis was rejected and the H1 hypothesis stands. This means that there is a rather clear difference in the users' visit-intention based on the users' attitude towards advertising.

H1: There is a difference in visit-intention based on the users' attitude towards advertising.

These variables are positively coherent, meaning that a more positive attitude towards advertising corresponds with higher visit-intention; just as assumed. This is contradictive to the results of hypothesis 4, but these results were expected, whereas the hypothesis 4 results were unexpected.

8.9.8 Hypothesis 6

Testing to see if there is a significant relationship between visit-intention and current usage of social websites was interesting, in order to identity if users already attracted to the online social networking phenomenon, would be more interested in visiting the concept website. This could also lead to an indirect indication of whether the social aspect of the business idea was a primary driving force for usage.

The ANOVA test showed an insignificant difference in mean values of the variables, which is why the H0 hypothesis was accepted. This means that there is no significant difference in the users' visit-intention based on the users' usage of existing social websites.

H0: There is no difference in visit-intention based on the users' activity on existing social websites.

As the visit-intention and social website activity are independent, it cannot be assumed that active social website users are more inclined to visit the concept website. Furthermore, this can lead to the assumption that the social aspect of the concept is not one of the primary incentives of potential usage.

8.9.9 Predictive logistic regression model

The purpose of developing a logistic regression model was to provide a tool for predicting visit-intention.

A multivariate logistic regression was used with visit-intention as the dependent variable and all other questionnaire variables as independent variables. After a comprehensive process of reducing, pooling and disregarding insignificant variables, a final predictive was achieved.

The model consists of 7 variables, of which only 3 are significant on a 95% level but all variables affect the model results. The model predicts visit-intention with 86.7% which is definitely an applicable predictive percentage.

Overall, the model is definitely applicable in predicting visit-intention.

8.9.10 User segmentation on the basis of predictive model

Having established an applicable logistic regression model, it is possible to do valuable user segmentation. This assists in identifying common characteristics of the potential target group of interested users.

Taking a starting point in the B- values in the "Variables in the Equation" (Table 35), the characteristics of an "interested in visiting" the website and a "not interested" or "positive" and "negative" user can be defined. The characteristics of the interested and not interested will of course be directly contradictory.

8.9.10.1 User segmentation table

Interested and not interested user characteristics based on the logistic regression model – the characteristics are prioritized primarily on levels of significance and secondly on B-value.

Interested in visiting the concept website User characteristics	Level of Significance	B-value	<u>Not</u> interested in visiting the concept website User characteristics				
Light user of the Internet at home. Less than 2 hours a day	0,045	-2,67	Heavy user of the Internet at home. More than 2 hours a day				
Not interested in advertising	0,013	-2,636	Interested in Advertising				
Wanting influence on the development of advertising	0,000	1,554	Not wanting influence on the development of advertising				
The remaining characteristics are tested as insignit	The remaining characteristics are tested as insignificant on a 0.95 level of confidence. However they can still be used as an indicator of user characteristics.						
Male	0,110	-1,463	Female				
Would/could search for advertisement on the Internet	0,137	-1,190	Would/could not search for advertisement on the Internet				

Does not use the Internet for general surfing	0,203	-1,081	Uses the Internet for general surfing
Uses the Internet for social websites use	0,248	1,187	Does not use the Internet for social website use
Light user of Social websites	,290	-1,136	Heavy user of Social websites

Table 38 - user segmentation table

Note: The variable Neutral towards advertising "Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(2)" is not incorporated, as it is closely related to interested or not interested in advertising and because of its high significance level and a B-value very close to 1/-1 (-1.025).

8.9.10.2 User segmentation table – argumentation

As the characteristics of the interested and not interested user are directly contradictive, due to the nature of the user segmentation table, the focus will be on what characterizes the interested user. The interested user can also be defined as the most likely potential user.

8.9.10.3 Statistically significant characteristics

As highlighted in the user segmentation table, only three characteristics are significantly indicative and/or predictive of the overall interest in visit-intention. This means that the average interested user, on a statistically significant level, is characterized by using the Internet less than 2 hours a day at home, he/she is not interested in advertising but he/she wants to have an influence on the development of advertising.

The two later characteristics obviously seem contradictive – why would you want an influence on the development of advertising if you are not interested in advertisement?

This seemingly contradictive characteristic is true for this sample, but due to the small sample size and the lack of representativity, this cannot be projected to the entire population.

8.9.10.4 Other characteristics

Even though the remaining characteristics are not individually significant on a statistical level, they contribute to the overall logistic regression model which is significant and predicts with 86.7 percent accuracy. Therefore they cannot be disregarded.

The most noticeable characteristic of the remaining is Gender. There is a tendency towards the typical potential user-type being male. Furthermore, he might search the Internet for advertisement; his primary use of the Internet is not for general surfing, but it might be for using social websites, of which, he is only a light user. This means that he uses social websites weekly or less frequently.

8.9.10.5 Potential amount of interested users

Through the survey and the logistic model, 38 out of 83 observations state an interest in visiting the website. The predictive numbers of the logistic model say that 37 out of 83 are interested in visiting the website. Overall, this means that approximately 45% (37,5/83) of the survey respondents are interested in visiting the website. Had the survey and sample been representative of the entire population this would have created a large amount of interested users, but this sample does not validate this assumption.

Chapter 9 Overall results and applied theory

9.1 Introduction

This chapter contains an overall discussion of the combined research results in this thesis and compares it to the uses and gratifications mindset which was introduced in section 3.4.

The business concept introduced in the thesis is original and because of this, all research surrounding this concept is, in effect, pioneering. By comparison to previous studies of uses and gratifications, it is sought to find possible coherence and tendencies. Furthermore, this comparison might lead to the emergence and establishment of new findings in the uses and gratifications field.

9.2 Qualitative research, uses and gratifications

The choice of uses and gratifications theory in the thesis is based on the business concept's basic idea of transferring consumer/user information to potential clients. The choice of theory is valid, which is underlined by the findings in the qualitative research, where all respondents highlight the importance of establishing a wide network of users and keeping them motivated, as one of main barriers for success. In other words, the potential value of the business concept is created by user interest. If no or only few users find the concept interesting, motivating or gratifying, there is no basis for generating business potential and a marketable product to clients. Hence, the primary emphasis of generating business should be on generating usage of and activity on the website.

9.3 Quantitative research, uses and gratifications

Having established that user attraction and the building of a network of interested users is the first step in value creation, it becomes interesting to look at uses and gratifications theory and the results derived from the quantitative research.

9.3.1 Motivation, clarification, activity and psychological/behavioural factors

The discussion of motivation is primarily based on the results of the hypothesis testing and user segmentation based on modelling. Secondly, clarification of motivation factors towards media types and specific websites are included in the discussion.

The four factors, motivation being the primary factor (McQuail, 2005), for establishing uses and gratifications were introduced in section 3.4.2.

The motivation factor has been researched in the thesis – motivation is deemed equal to intention, for instance visit-intention.

9.3.2 Research results

9.3.2.1 Impact of monetary gratification

The assumption tested in hypothesis 1 and 2, that there is a difference in concept interest and/or visitintention based on monetary gratification, was rejected. Monetary gratification has no influence on the interest and/or visit-intention towards the concept, and apparently, based on the hypothesis, money is not a defining motivation factor.

However, compared to other motivation factors such as "Internet social gratification" (Stafford and Stafford et al., 2004) equal to "socializing", "Internet content gratification" (Stafford and Stafford et al., 2004) equal to "professional discussion" and "Internet process gratification" (Stafford and Stafford et al., 2004) equal to"past time work/home", money and/or prizes are rated as more motivating, see appendix 7.1. The mean value of money and prizes is neutral but significantly higher than other motivation measures. Still, this level makes it impossible to conclude whether money and prizes have a motivating effect or not, as the mean is in the neutral area.

Overall, monetary gratification or prizes cannot be considered a direct factor of motivation.

9.3.2.2 Impact of advertising interest

Based on the business concept the assumption was that a high interest in advertising would lead to higher visit-intention, hence hypothesis 4. The result of hypothesis 4 was, as previously stated and discussed, a significant difference with a surprisingly negative dependency. A higher interest in advertising would lead to minimal visit-intention.

As discussed in section 3.5, attitude and behavioural theory, means of predicting positive intent towards a product or service can be addressed through level of attitude, called Planned Behaviour, Hansen (2008). Instead of measuring concept interest and visit behaviour, concept content (see definition in section 2.3.1.2) interest and visit behaviour is measured.

The result of definite dependency based on advertising interest but with negative correlation, conflicts with previous studies that show the exact opposite. This leads to speculation that the results of this specific question and hypothesis might be defective, which is important to keep in mind when evaluating the overall results.

9.3.2.3 Impact of advertising attitude

As with interest in advertising, attitude towards advertising was assumed to be positively dependent to visit-intention. The results of the hypothesis showed a significant and positive dependency between these two variables, meaning that a positive attitude towards advertising leads to higher visit-intention. This means that the assumption was correct.

The planned behaviour theory, Hansen (2008), underlines this result. Planned behaviour in this case is measured on the attitude towards concept content, which is advertisement, and visit-intention.

The result is consistent with previous studies and as such, the results appear more valid and applicable than for instance the result of the similar hypothesis on interest.

9.3.2.4 Impact of social website usage

Hypothesis 6 was tested in order to establish whether there was a significant difference in visit-intention, based on user activity on existing social websites. No significant difference was established. Had a significant difference been established, heavy users having higher visit-intention, it would have been interesting to elaborate on what motivates the usage of social websites in general; Q12.

The thesis refers to previous studies of uses and gratifications theory. Stafford, T et al. (2004), for example, divide users into light and heavy and establish differences in the needs and motivations towards Internet usage, light and heavy users are also divided by the their usage of social websites. These aspects are incorporated in the thesis as they are an important part of the defining of the business concept. As established in hypothesis 6, the use of existing social websites, light or heavy, does not have a significant effect on visit-intention. Furthermore, there are no significant differences in the motivation factors between heavy and light users with regards to concept website visit-intention, see appendix 7.3.

Differences between heavy and light users of social websites have been detected, with regards to their motivation towards social websites in general (appendix 7.6). Heavy users are primarily motivated by interest and entertainment, whereas light users consider the ability to obtain knowledge, entertainment and interest as being significantly more important than other factors. These are, however, not directly motivating and not at the same level as heavy users.

9.3.2.5 Impact of Internet usage

Even though no hypothesis was created, and thus tested, with regards to Internet usage in general and visit-intention, it is still the assumption that heavy users of the Internet have higher visit-intention than

light users. Heavy users are defined by spending 2 hours or more daily, on the Internet, and light users are defined by spending less than 2 hours.

The idea behind this assumption is the concept parameter of fast delivery times. The assumption is that it will be easier to obtain fast delivery times if the users and value/information creators are online a large part of the day and therefore easier to access at all times.

The results show that there is no significant difference in visit-intention based on light or heavy usage of the Internet (appendix 7.10). Furthermore, there is no significant difference in the measured gratifications between heavy and light Internet users (appendix 7.11).

9.3.2.6 Impact of advertisement discussion

There is a significant tendency towards respondents with positive visit-intention discuss advertisements more often than respondents with negative visit-intention (appendix 7.9).

Chapter 10 Final Concept Development Framework

On the basis of qualitative interviews and the latest addition of results from the quantitative research, the final Concept Development Framework (CDF 3) is developed.

CDF 3 represents the concept in its current format on the basis of the research conducted in this thesis. This means that it does not constitute a fully developed business idea, which is in accordance with the problem statement and the limitations of the thesis.

10.1 Final Concept Development Framework, CDF 3

Overall concept idea	An online web community/database based on the rating and review of advertisements. The concept is to facilitate, process and structure community user information in preparation of creating an efficient, affordable and differentiated tool/product for testing and marketing research on advertisements.
In depth concept description	 An online community with registered <u>users who are interested in advertising</u>. Users will be prompted with questions and rating requests on different advertisements. These questions is generated on the behalf of advertisers, ad agencies or media agencies that want to pretest or posttest their advertisements or conceptual ideas. User driven discussions about advertisements. Clients can create their own online advertisement test via a web application – creating their own questions and uploading their own material to the website. The possibility to contact the company for professional sparring and help in creating the test. A fixed number of available product solutions. Reducing the cost of creating an entirely new type of test each time. The concept is focused on the type of customer/client that have some upfront experience in marketing research. The idea is to create a differentiated analysis concept, based on a different type of web panel, supplying customers with a fixed number of easy and fast product solutions.
Product/Service	The product/service provided consists of advertisement tests in a new, very basic, fast, affordable and simple format.
USP/ESP	Quick and affordable market insight - easy, fast, affordable and simple advertisement tests and marketing surveys.
Target Group - Client	Clients: Everybody that uses marketing research and tests in accordance with developing or implementing new advertisements in the Danish market of advertising: Major advertisers that conduct their own marketing research and testing, Advertising agencies and Media agencies. Users: A broad and represantative section of the Danish population interested in advertising .
Function	Clients: The ability to obtain valuable information about advertising in a fast, easy and affordable manor. Users: The opportunity to discuss and rate advertisements <u>on the basis of interest or possible gratification</u> .
Technology	Internet - utilizing web 2.0 tendencies, creating a new online community on the Internet and a online marketing survey interface.
Competition	The competition is foreseen to be limited at implementation, but there is a risk that competition, new or adapted suppliers of similar products, will increase in short time if the concept is successful.
Entry Barriers	The entry barriers are generally low, but some ressources are required in the creation of a substantial group of users or panel.
Value Chain	Valuable user information \rightarrow facilitation and processing of user information \rightarrow valuable and applicable customer reports.

Figure 16 - final Concept Development Framework, CDF 3

10.2 Comments on CDF 3

Below, comments on the major changes in the Concept Development Framework (CDF) on the basis of qualitative and the quantitative studies are stated.

2008

10.2.1 The original business concept idea is modified

The business concept is modified from the original business concept idea. The qualitative interviews show that a demand for a more traditional marketing research aspect is present. This issue is solved by adding the opportunity for clients to customize questions and surveys, along with some standardized rate and review questions that will be included in all surveys. This will enable clients the opportunity to customize surveys and still provide an overall tool for testing and comparing advertisements and creating a database of advertisements.

10.2.2 No social community mindset

The social community mindset (closely connected to social websites) is removed, as the possible clients are indifferent to the origin of the information. Furthermore, the quantitative research shows that the gratification obtained by the users of social websites and the gratification obtained from the business concept are different (appendix 7.1 and 7.2). At the same time, the hypothesis about no difference in the concept visit-intention based on heavy and light users of social websites is accepted. By removing the social community part of the business concept, only the overall community part of the concept remains, as it is necessary to register users in order to be able to contact them when needed.

10.2.3 Interest in advertising is not a driving force or prerequisite

As stated in section 6.12.1, "Comments to CDF alterations", the qualitative respondents discuss the original business concept idea attribute, of founding the business concept on users that are interested in advertising. The analysis shows that there are significant differences in visit-intention (Hypothesis 4) compared to interest in advertising, with a negative correlation opposite to the assumed. This means that people not interested in advertising are less prone to visit the website. The exact opposite results were achieved when analyzing visit-intention and attitude to advertising (Hypothesis 5).

As a result of these findings, the authors find it difficult to maintain the original business concept idea as outlined in CDF 1. Consequently, the current business concept (CDF 3) is not founded on users interested in advertising, but instead on a user panel, representative of the Danish population.

10.2.4 No monetary gratification needed

As the qualitative research showed the respondents' doubts and focus on creating value through attracting users and keeping the users interested over a longer period of time, the assumption of the impact of monetary gratification was tested (hypothesis 1+2). The findings show no difference in visit-intention and interest in the concept based on monetary gratification. These findings influence the current function of

the concept. Whereas the original business concept idea (CDF 1) included monetary gratification, the gratification is now removed in the current concept (CDF 3). This removal is supported by the findings of which gratification the respondents require, if they should visit the business concept (appendix 7.1). This shows that monetary gratification such as prizes or money, are significantly different from other forms of gratification. However, as the mean values of prizes and money are within the "neutral" zone, these findings indicate that none of the outlined forms of gratification affect the visit-intention significantly. Hypothesis 3 shows, through correlation, that an interest in the business concept idea is positively correlated with visit- intention.

Overall, this means that visit-intention is not driven by an interest in advertising or monetary gratification, but is definitely defined by the users' apparent interest in the business concept. This is something that differentiates the current business concept idea from other suppliers on the market, who base their user panels on monetary gratification.

10.2.5 Target group and user characteristics

By means of the logistic regression in section 8.8 and the above mentioned findings, the present target group is a broad representative section of the Danish population. The logistic regression assisted in finding characteristics of the "average" interested business concept user and as such, identified which people are most prone to visiting the website.

Even though the target group is a broad representative section of the Danish population, the logistic regression analysis shows that users with specific characteristics are more likely to be attracted to the business concept. This will most likely create a network of users with somewhat similar characteristics, which in turn will mean that the business concept will be specialized in deriving information from users with these particular characteristics.

Chapter 11 Conclusion and discussion of further work

11.1 Conclusion

The latent business potential of creating a popular online community is evident. User-driven interaction and information-transferring is valuable in many business contexts, as insight into consumer behaviour is considered extremely valuable for most modern businesses, especially with regards to marketing and sales activities. The qualitative research of the thesis clearly supports this statement.

The business potential of the original business concept idea (CDF 1) is acceptable, based on the overall findings of the qualitative and quantitative research.

Based on the assumption, supported by the qualitative findings, that value is generated through user activity and interaction, uses and gratifications theory is employed. Attitude and behaviour theories are also employed, due to the fact that interest and attitude in advertising is tested as being predictive of website visit-intention.

The original concept idea is defined (CDF 1) and business concepts PODs and USPs are identified. The concept differs from the current suppliers on the market, as it offers faster delivery times, a simpler approach, lower prices and user community interaction.

The research framework consists of qualitative in-depth interviews, in preparation for obtaining potential client attitudes and views on the market potential and demand of the business concept. A comprehensive questionnaire is compiled to conduct a quantitative web-based survey on the Internet and social website usage, interest and attitude towards advertising and business concept interest, visit-intention and gratification of the potential website users.

Through the use of logistic regression modelling, characteristics of users with a high visit-intention are identified. Three variables are significantly predictive of high visit-intention: 1. Light user of the Internet at home (less than 2 hours a day), 2. Not interested in advertising, 3. Want to influence the development of advertising.

Furthermore, the final logistic regression model indicates that high visit-intention is predicted by: 4. Gender (males have higher visit-intention), 5. Proneness to search for advertisements on the Internet (a proneness to search leads to higher visit-intention), 6. Internet usage, general surfing (no general surfing leads to higher visit-intention), 7. Internet usage, social websites (the use of social websites leads to higher visit-intention), 8. Social website usage (Light users of social websites are prone to higher visit-intention).

2008

The logistic regression model has a correct predictive percentage of 86.7%. Visit-intention is also characterized by interest in advertising (hypothesis 4), attitude towards advertising (hypothesis 5) and social website usage (hypothesis 6). All things being equal, high visit-intention is defined by a low interest in advertising, a positive attitude towards advertising and no difference on the basis of social website usage.

Monetary gratification, in contrast to previous assumptions, leads to no significant change in visit-intention (hypothesis 1 and 2). No particular respondent gratification with regards to visit-intention is identified, based on the quantitative studies. However, "Money" and "Prizes" are significantly higher than other prompted alternatives, but due to a neutral mean value, this sort of monetary gratification cannot be identified as a motivator of visit-intention.

The apparent motivation for visiting the website is based on respondent interest in the business concept, as this correlates to visit-intention (hypothesis 3).

The overall findings of the research justify the employment of the uses and gratifications theory. The qualitative research highlights the importance of attracting and motivating users, while the quantitative research is focused on establishing what attracts and motivates potential users; the emphasis of all research is in line with uses and gratifications theory.

The primary factor of uses and gratifications theory researched in this thesis is motivation, as motivation is considered equal to visit-intention. Various variables are tested as sources of motivation for visit-intention and the primary conclusion is that monetary gratification or prizes cannot be considered as direct factors of motivation. Furthermore, heavy users of social websites are primarily motivated by "interest" and "entertainment". Light users of social websites consider the ability to obtain knowledge, "entertainment" and "interest" as being significantly more important than other factors, but not directly motivating (based on mean value analysis).

The theory of Planned Behavior predicts that positive attitude leads to positive intention, which is in accordance with the findings of this thesis. When measuring interest in advertising and the content of the business concept, the results are surprisingly contradictive to previous assumptions. Based on the results, an interest in advertising is not positively coherent with visit-intention, meaning that the content of the concept is not a stimulus for visiting the website. However, positive coherence between visit-intention and interest in the overall business concept, not its content, is found. These findings are partly in line with the theory of Planned Behaviour, but it is curious that users might find the overall business concept interesting, but not its content. One apparent explanation of this phenomenon is the relationship between attitude and interest in advertising, which is interesting but, unfortunately, beyond the scope of this thesis. Another

explanation of this phenomenon could be that users find the overall business concept of rating and review interesting, but are not interested in the current content of advertisements. This indicates the possibility of altering the content into something different, that people find more interesting.

Throughout the thesis the business concept idea undergoes modifications based on empirical research findings. These modifications are gradually implemented and discussed in the Concept Development Framework (CDF), created for the purpose.

The main modifications in the final adapted business concept description (CDF 3) consist of: 1. Adding more traditional Marketing Research aspects, enabling customized and client- generated product solutions, 2. Removing some of the community aspects of the website – the website's primary function will be the rating and review of advertisements, combined with a forum for discussion and the ability to prompt users with specific client-generated questions and/or visuals on specific advertisements, or conceptual ideas, 3. Removing monetary gratification for user activity, differentiating the user panel motivations, from other suppliers on the market, 4. Removing the original concept prerequisite of a user panel, built on people interested in advertising – the clients demand insight from all types of people and not only people interested in advertising. In addition to this, interest in advertising is not a motivating factor for interest in the business concept, as previously established.

The main conclusion of the thesis is that business potential for a Danish website focused on the rating and review of advertisements exists. However, the apparent business potential is not huge and therefore alterations to the business concept are needed in order to obtain maximum potential. As a result further studies are needed.

11.2 Critical assessment of the thesis

Concurrently and following the accomplishment of this thesis, questions arise on which aspects of the thesis could have been done differently.

Questioning techniques could have been different, for example by including open-ended questions in order to gain knowledge for further research, as preparation for e.g. focus groups, (see 11.3) and to identify exactly what gratification each respondent obtains by using the business concept.

A more comprehensive concept description in the questionnaire could have been embedded, including an illustration of the website/concept, in order to increase the respondents' business concept comprehension. However, this was not possible due to the level of development of the concept at the time and the technical limitations of surveymonkey.com.

Collecting data over a longer of time period, in order to obtain a representative sample size and particulars distribution, could have increased the validity and representativity for the entire Danish population.

11.3 Discussion of further studies

As stated in the research and exposition of the thesis, it is sought to develop the business concept further from the first concept developed framework (CDF1). The research generated useful findings on which uses and gratifications the possible users have towards the business concept and identified the market potential. The users are the main asset of the business, as these constitute the value in the informationtransferring process to the possible clients.

This discussion and above argumentation prepare for further studies on the users. These studies ought to elaborate the users' point of view, on the concept developed framework, CDF 3, and more accurately, uses and gratifications toward the final developed concept. At the same time, it is sought, as stated in the conclusion, to identify whether the users are primarily interested in the concept framework (rate and review and the database), and only secondly interested in the concept content. These future findings can be obtained by means of qualitative research on the users, which is beyond the research in this thesis. The qualitative findings can emerge from focus groups, qualitative in-depth interviews, et cetera. The object is to obtain knowledge which cannot be derived from quantitative research, e.g. qualitative sparring. These focus groups and in-depth qualitative interviews ought to provide comprehensive knowledge that was not obtained in the thesis' research. Future research will create a foundation to develop the final concept framework.

Bibliography

Articles

- Abram, Stephen (2005)"Community exploded" Library Journal, Winter2005 Net Connect, Vol. 130, p14-15, 2p
- Ahtola, Olli T.,(1979) "SOME ISSUES IN ATTITUDE THEORY AND MEASUREMENT", Advances *in* Consumer Research, 1979, Vol. 6 Issue 1, p253-255, 3p

Ajzen, I. (2001) "Nature and operation of attitudes,. Annual Review of Psychology, 52, 27-58.

Ajzen, I. (1985). *"From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behaviour"*. (J. Kuhl & J.Beckman (Eds.), Action control: From cognition to behavior (pp. 11-39). Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.)

- Alden, Jay (2007) "SURVEYING ATTITUDES: QUESTIONNAIRES VERSUS OPINIONNAIRES", Performance Improvement, vol. 46, no. 6, July 2007
- Anderson, Deborah S., Kristiansen, Connie M., (2001) "Measuring Attitude Functions", the journal of Social psychology, 130(3), 419-421
- BBC 2008, *"15 reasons Facebook may be worth \$15bn"* http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/technology/7061398.stm
- Birnholtz, Jeremy P., Horn, Daniel B., Finholt, Thomas A. & Bae, Sung Joo., (2004), "The Effects of Cash, Electronic, and Paper Gift Certificates as Respondent Incentives for a Web-Based Survey of Technologically Sophisticated Respondents", Social Science Computer Review 2004; 22; 355
- Bouton, Richard A., Gallaher, Peggy E., Garlinghouse, Paul Arthur., Leal, Terri., Rosenstein, Leslie D. & Young, Robert K (1987) "Scales for Measuring Fear of AIDS and Homophobia", journal of personality assessment, 1987, 51(4), 606-614

- Carini, M. Robert., Hayek, John C., Kuh, George D., Kennedy, John M. & Quimet, Judith A (2003) "College students responses to web and paper surveys: Does Mode Matter?", Research in Higher Education, Vol. 44, No. 1, February 2003
- Cintron, Gilberto (2008)"On starting A Forum" http://ezinearticles.com/?On-Starting-A-Forum&id=1141474)
- Dimmick, John., Chen, Yan. & Li, Zhan (2004) "Competition between the Internet and Traditional News Media: The Gratification-Opportunities Niche Dimension", The journal of media economics, 17(1), 19-33
- Garson, David G. (2006) *"Chi-Square Significance Tests",* Chi-Square Tests: Statnotes, from North Carolina State University, Public Administration Program
- Hansen, Torben (2008) "Consumer values, the theory of planned behaviour and online grocery shopping", International Journal of Consumer Studies **32** (2008) 128–137
- Hill, Shandra, Foster Provost and Chris Volinsky (2006), "Network-Based marketing: Identifying Likely Adopters via Consumer Networks" Statistical Science, Vol. 21, No. 2, 256-276.
- Hunter, Mark; Soberman, David A. 2008 "The Emperor Has No Clothes": Measuring and Explaining the Impact of Online Communities on Consumer Markets." INSEAD Working Papers Collection, 2008 Issue 43, preceding p1-31, 34p

Katz, E. (1959). *"Mass communication research and the study of culture"*. Studies in Public Communication, 2, 1-6

Ko, Hanjun, Cho, Chang-Hoan & Roberts, Marilyn S. (2005) *"Internet uses and gratifications – a structural equation model of interactive advertising"* journal of advertising, vol. 34, no 2 (summer 2005) pp. 57-70

- Ko, Hanjun, (2000) *"Internet uses and gratifications: understanding motivations for using the Internet"* Presented at the annual meeting of the association for education in journalism and mass coummunication (83rd, Phoenix, AZ, August 9-12 2000)
- Kraus, S. J. (1995) "Attitude and the prediction of behavior: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature." Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21, 58-75.

Kuchinskas, Susan., "People who need people" Adweek, 11/30/98, Vol. 39 Issue 48, p38.

Lazarsfeld, P.F. & Stanton, F. (1944) "Radio Research 1942-3." NY: Duell, Sloan and Pearce

- Liao, Ziqi. Cheung, Michael Tow (2008) "Measuring consumer satisfaction in Internet banking: a core framework", COMMUNICATIONS OF THE ACM April 2008/Vol. 51, No. 4
- Lieberman, Bernhardt (1971) "Contemporary problems in statistics". NY: Oxford. Section 5 deals with assumptions of chi-square procedures.
- Lin, C. A. (1996) "Looking Back: The Contribution of Blumler and Katz's Uses of Mass Communication Research" Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media(40). No. 4, pp.574-581
- Lin, C. A (1999) *"OnlineService Adoption Likelihood"* March . April 1999 Journal of Advertising Research, Mar/Apr99, Vol. 39 Issue 2, p79-89, 11p

McCollum Spielman Worldwide, "Choosing the Right Attitude Measure" nr. 38

- McDonald, Heath. & Adam, Stewart (2003), "A comparison of online and postal data collection methods in marketing research", Marketing Intelligence & Planning 21/2 (2003) 85-95
- Ostrom, T. M., Bond, C. F., Jr., Krosnick, J. A. & Sedikides, C. (1994), "Attitude scales: How we measure the immeasurable".
 (Timothy C. Brock & Melanie Colette Green (2005), "Persuasion: Psychological insights and perspectives" (pp. 15-42))
- Porter, Stephen R. & Whitcomb, Michael E. (2003) *"The impact of lottery incentives on student survey response rates"*, Research in Higher Education, Vol. 44, No. 4, August 2003

- Porter, Stephen R. & Whitcomb, Michael E. (2003) *"THE IMPACT OF CONTACT TYPE ON WEB SURVEY RESPONSE RATES"*, Public Opinion Quarterly, Winter2003, Vol. 67 Issue 4, p579-588, 10p
- Smith, Joanne R., Terry, Deborah, J., Manstead, Antony S. R., Louis, Winnifred R., & Wolfs, Diana Kotterman Jacqueline (2008) "The Attitude–Behavior Relationship in Consumer Conduct: The Role of Norms, Past Behavior, and Self-Identity", The Journal of Social Psychology, 2008, 148(3), 311–333
- Soley, Lawrence C. "SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALES IN ADVERTISING RESEARCH: A CRITICAL APPRAISAL" American Academy of Advertising Conference Proceedings, 2006, p10-19, 10p
- Song, Indeok., Larose, Robert., Eastin, Matthew S. & Lin, C. A (2004) *"Internet Gratifications and Internet Addiction: On the Uses and Abuses of New Media"* CYBER PSYCHOLOGY & BEHAVIOR Volume 7, Number 4, 2004
- Spears, Nancy and Singh, Surendra N. (2004), "Measuring Attitude Toward the Brand and Purchase Intentions", Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising, Volume 26, Number 2 (Fall 2004)
- Stafford, T. F & Gonier, D (2004) *"What Americans like about being online"* Communications of the acm November 2004/vol 47, No. 11
- Stafford, T. F, Stafford, M. R & Schkade, L. L (2004) *"Determining Uses and Gratifications for the Internet"* Decisions Science Vol 35 No. 2
- Verhallen, Theo M. M. & Pieters, Rik G. M (1984) "Attitude theory and behavioral costs" Journal of Economic Psychology 5 (1984) 273-249
- Zaichkowsky, Judith Lynne (1985) "Measuring the involvement Construct" JOURNAL OF CONSUMER RESEARCH, Vol. 12, December 1985
- Zhang, Yin (1999) "Using the Internet for Survey Research: A Case Study", JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR INFORMATION SCIENCE. 51(1):57-68, 1999

Books and other

Ajzen, Icek & Fishbein, Martin, Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behavior, Prentice Hall, 1980

- Albarracin, Dolores, Johnson, Blair T. & Zanna, Mark P., *The Handbook of Attitudes*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2005
- Bech, Mickael, Birk-Olsen, Mette & Gundgaard, Jens, *Introduktion til statistisk med SPSS Version 13,* Syddansk Universitet, Institut for Sundhedstjenesteforskning, 2006
- Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: Del 2, An Introduction to Theory and Research, Located on Copenhagen Business School library (301.151 – fis), "Kopieret i henhold til bekendtgørelse 876 §4- 28. November 1997"
- Birkegaard, Hans Christian & Porsgaard, Rasmus, Introduktion til SPSS 11.5, Aarhus School of Business, 2003

Brace, Ian, Questionnaire design, Kogan Page, 2004

Brock, Timothy C. & Green, Melanie Colette, *Persuasion: Psychological Insights and Perspectives,* Sage Publications, 2005

Clark-Carter, David, Quantitative psychological research, Psychology press, 2004

Cooper-Chen, Anne, Global Entertainment Media, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, 2005

Dainton, Marianne, Applying communication theory for professional life, SAGE Publications, 2005

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research* Addison-Wesley Pub, 1975

Fishbein, Martin, Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement, John Wiley & Sons Inc, 1967

Fowler, Floyd, Survey research methods, Sage Publications, 2002

Fowler, Floyd, Standardized survey interviewing: minimizing interviewer, Sage Publications, 1990

Hague, Paul, Market research: a guide to planning, methodology and evaluation, Kogan Page, 1999

Hougaard, Søren, The business idea, Samfundslitteratur, 2004, 1th edition

Hougaard, Søren, Forretningsideen, Samfundslitteratur, 2004, 1. Udgave

Jensen, Jan Møller & Knudsen, Thorbjørn, *Analyse af spørgeskemadata med SPSS,* Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2006

Kirkpatrick, Lee A. & Feeney, Brook C. A simple Guide to SPSS for windows, Thomson Wadsworth, 2007

Malhotra, Naresh K. & Birks, David F., *Marketing Research, an applied approach,* Prentice hall, 2006 Second European edition

Malmberg, Allan C., Erlang S – Statistiske tabeller, Gads forlag

McQuail, Denis, McQuail's Mass Communication Theory, SAGE Publications, 2005 Fifth edition

McQuail, Denis, McQuail's Reader in Mass Communication Theory, SAGE Publications, 2002

Olsen, Poul Bitsch, Problem-oriented Projectwork, Roskilde Universitetsforlag, 2008

Oppenheim A. N., Questionnaire Design, Interviewing and Attitude Measurement, Continuum, 1992

Osgood, C E, Suci, G J and Tannenbaum, P, *The measurement of meaning*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, IL, 1957

Popper, Karl, All life is problem solving, Routledge 1999,

Ratneshwar, S. Mick, David Glen. & Huffman, Cynthia The why of consumption, Routledge, 2000

- Ruggiero, Thomas E., *Mass Communication & Society*, Communication Theory in the 21st Century, Uses and Gratifications Theory in the 21st Century, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates (2000) Volume 3, Number 1, 2000 Winter
- Salwen, Michael B., Garrison, Bruce & Driscoll, Paul D., *Online News and the Public,* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 2005

Schiffman, Leon G. & Kanuk, Leslie Lazar, Consumer behavior, Prentice hall, 2007, 9th edition

Schuman, Howard & Presser, Stanley, Questions & Answers in Attitude Surveys, Sage Publication 1996

133

Appendices - table of contents

Appendix 1 – Logistic regression alphanumeric list of variables	136
Appendix 1.1 Modelling – step 2	143
Appendix 1.2 Modelling – step 3	143
Appendix 1.3 Modelling – step 4	143
Appendix 1.4 Modelling – step 5	144
Appendix 1.5 Modelling – step 6	144
Appendix 1.6 Modelling – step 7	144
Appendix 1.7 Modelling – step 8	144
Appendix 1.8 Modelling – step 9	145
Appendix 1.9 Modelling – step 10	146
Appendix 2 – Frequencies list of all variables	147
Appendix 3 – Logistic regression analysis	178
Appendix 3.1	
Appendix 3.2	
Appendix 3.3	
Appendix 3.4	
Appendix 3.5	
Appendix 3.6	
Appendix 3.7	
Appendix 3.8	
Appendix 3.9	
Appendix 3.10	201
Appendix 4 – Demographic particulars and tendencies	205
Appendix 4.1 - Age distribution	205
Appendix 4.2 – Gender distribution	205
Appendix 4.3 – Regional distribution	205
Appendix 4.4 – Income distribution	206
Appendix 4.5 – Occupational distribution	206
Appendix 4.6 – Age vs. occupation	206
Appendix 4.7 – Age vs. income	207
Appendix 4.8 – Age vs. region	207
Appendix 4.9 – Age vs. gender	208
Appendix 5 – Factor analysis	209
Appendix 6 – Hypothesis analysis	213
Appendix 6.1 – Hypothesis 2	213
Appendix 6.2 – Hypothesis 4	215
Appendix 6.3 – Hypothesis 5	217
Appendix 6.4 – Hypothesis 6	219
Appendix 7 – Means analysis	222
Appendix 7.1 – Q24 all	
Appendix 7.2 – Q12 all	226
Appendix 7.3 – Q24 Light/heavy social	229
Appendix 7.4 – Q24 Light	236
Appendix 7.5 – Q24 Heavy	238
Appendix 7.6 – Q12 Light/heavy social	242
Appendix 7.7 – Q12 Light	244
Appendix 7.8 – Q12 Heavy	246
Appendix 7.9 – Q18 Visit/NotVisit	250
Appendix 7.10 – Q23 Heavy/Light Internet Usage	251

Appendix 7.11 – Q24 Heavy/Light Internet Usage		253
Appendix 8 – Quantitative questions types and argumentation	255	
Appendix 9 – Quantitative questionnaire	259	
Appendix 10 – E-mail to quantitative respondents	273	
Appendix 11 – Concept presentation for qualitative interviews	274	
Appendix 12 – Qualitative questionnaire	275	
Appendix 12.1 Qualitative respondents		277
Appendix 13 – Transcription of qualitative interviews	278	
Appendix 13.1 Transcripation - interview #1 Christoffer Back		278
Appendix 13.2 Transcripation - interview #2 Palle Nielsen		283
Appendix 13.3 Transcripation - interview #3 Ole Herstal		288
Appendix 14 – Qualititative data display – highlighted issues	292	
Appendix 15 – Competitive analysis answers	297	
Appendix 15.1 E-mail proposition to suppliers/competitors		297
Appendix 15.2 E-mail response Norstat		298
Appendix 15.3 E-mail response Catinet		299
Appendix 15.4 E-mail response Zapera		300

Appendix 16 – Supplier responses to test scenario	302
Appendix 17 – Data file preparation, step by step visual explanation	304

Appendix 1 – Logistic regression alphanumeric list of variables

Variable / Question – Original	Options	Options		
Q01V01InternetUseWhereHome	2	0=no, 1=yes	Identifying whether the respondents use internet at home	
Q01V02InternetUseWhereWork	2	0=no, 1=yes	Identifying whether the respondents use internet at work	
Q01V03InternetUseWhereScool	2	0=no, 1=yes	Identifying whether the respondents use internet at School	
Q01V04InternetUseWhereOther	2	0=no, 1=yes	Identifying whether the respondents use internet Other places	
Q01V05InternetUseWhereDontknow	2	0=no, 1=ves		
Q02InternetUseTime	10	1=/5 1=/5 hour, 2=½-1 hour, 3=½-1 hour, 4=1½-2 hour, 5=2-2½ hour, 6=3-3½ hour, 7=3-3½ hour, 8=3½-4 hour, 9=> 4 hour 10/99=Dontknow	Identifying the overall internet time consumption	
Q03InternetUseTimeEmail	10	1=<½ hour, 2=¾-1 hour, 3=¾-1 hour, 4=1½-2 hour, 5=2-2½ hour, 6=3-3½ hour, 7=3-3½ hour, 8=¾-4 hour, 9=> 4 hour 10/99=Dontknow	Identifying the email time consumption	
Q04InternetUseTimeWork	10	1=<½ hour, 2=½-1 hour, 3=½-1 hour, 4=1½-2 hour, 5=2-2½ hour, 6=3-3½ hour, 7=3-3½ hour, 8=3½-4 hour, 9=> 4 hour 10/99=Dontknow	Identifying the internet at work time consumption	
Q05InternetUseTimeNonworkrelated	6	1=Never, 2=Monthly 3=Weekly 4=Daily 5=SeveralDaily 6=Dontknow	Identifying whether the respondents are willing to use time on non work related content, when they are at work.	
Q06InternetUseTimeHome	10	 1=√2 hour, 2=½-1 hour, 3=½-1 hour, 3=½-1 hour, 5=2-2½ hour, 6=3-3½ hour, 7=3-3½ hour, 7=3-3½ hour, 8=3½-4 hour, 9=> 4 hour 10/99=Dontknow 	Identifying the internet at home time consumption	
Q07InternetUseTimeSchool	10	1=<% hour, 2=%-1 hour, 3=%-1 hour, 4=1%-2 hour, 5=2-2% hour, 6=3-3% hour, 7=3-3% hour, 8=3%-4 hour, 9=> 4 hour 10/99=Dontknow	Identifying the internet at school time consumption	
Q08V01InternetUseTimeWhen6am8am	4	0=No, 1=Most used, 2=Second most used, 3=Third most used	Identifying the most used, second most used and third most used internet period	
Q08V02InternetUseTimeWhen8am12pm	4	0=No, 1=Most used, 2=Second most used, 3=Third most used	Identifying the most used, second most used and third most used internet period	
Q08V03InternetUseTimeWhen12pm4pm	4	0=No, 1=Most used, 2=Second most used, 3=Third most used	Identifying the most used, second most used and third most used internet period	
Q08V04InternetUSeTimeWhen4pm6pm	4	0=No, 1=Most used, 2=Second most used, 3=Third most used	Identifying the most used, second most used and third most used internet period	
Q08V05InternetUseTimeWhen6pm8pm	4	0=No, 1=Most used, 2=Second most used,	Identifying the most used, second most used and third most used internet period	
		3-Third most used		
---	---	--	---	--
Q08V06InternetUseTimeWhen8pm10pm	4	0=No, 1=Most used, 2=Second most used,	Identifying the most used, second most used and third most used internet period	
Q08V07InternetUseTimeWhen10pm12am	4	0=No, 1=Most used, 2=Second most used, 3=Third most used	Identifying the most used, second most used and third most used internet period	
Q08V08InternetUseTimeWhen12am6m	4	0=No, 1=Most used, 2=Second most used, 3=Third most used	Identifying the most used, second most used and third most used internet period	
Q08V09InternetUseTimeWhenDontknow	4	0=No, 1=Most used, 2=Second most used, 3=Third most used		
Q09V01InternetUsePurposeSocialwebsites	2	0=no, 1=yes	Identifying whether the respondents use the internet for Social websites	
Q09V02InternetUsePurposeGeneralsurfing	2	0=no, 1=yes	Identifying whether the respondents use the internet for General surfing	
Q09V03InternetUsePurposeInformationsearch	2	0=no, 1=yes	Identifying whether the respondents use the internet for Information Search	
Q09V04InternetUsePurposeWorkrelatedsearch	2	0=no, 1=yes	Identifying whether the respondents use the internet for Work related Search	
Q09V05InternetUsePurposeNewsSportsETC	2	0=no, 1=yes	Identifying whether the respondents use the internet for News Sports	
Q09V06InternetUsePurposeEmail	2	0=no, 1=ves	Identifying whether the respondents use the internet for Email	
Q09V07InternetUsePurposeOther	2	0=no, 1=ves	Identifying whether the respondents use the internet for Other	
Q09V08InternetUsePurposeDontknow	2	0=no, 1=ves		
Q10V01SocialwebsitesFacebook	2	1=Knows/uses/have used, 2=Dont know the site	Identifying the respondents affiliation to Facebook	
Q10V02SocialwebsitesMyspace	2	1=Knows/uses/have used, 2=Dont know the site	Identifying the respondents affiliation to MySpace	
Q10V03SocialwebsitesMessenger	2	1=Knows/uses/have used, 2=Dont know the site	Identifying the respondents affiliation to Messenger	
Q10V04SocialwebsitesArto	2	1=Knows/uses/have used, 2=Dont know the site	Identifying the respondents affiliation to Arto	
Q10V05SocialwebsitesYoutube	2	1=Knows/uses/have used,	Identifying the respondents affiliation to Youtube	
Q10V06SocialwebsitesLinkedin	2	1=Knows/uses/have used,	Identifying the respondents affiliation to Linkedin	
Q10V07SocialwebsitesFlickr	2	1=Knows/uses/have used,	Identifying the respondents affiliation to Flickr	
Q10V08SocialwebsitesBebo	2	1=Knows/uses/have used,	Identifying the respondents affiliation to Bebo	
Q10V09SocialwebsitesHi5	2	1=Knows/uses/have used, 2=Dont know the site	Identifying the respondents affiliation to HI5	
Q10V10SocialwebsitesFora	2	1=Knows/uses/have used, 2=Dont know the site	Identifying the respondents affiliation to Other fora	
Q11V01SocialwebsitesTimeFacebook	7	1=Never, 2=Monthly, 3=Weekly, 4=SeveralWeekly, 5=Daily, 6=SeveralDaily, 7=Dontknow	Identifying the respondents visit-frequency to Facebook	
Q11V02SocialwebsitesTimeMyspace	7	1=Never, 2=Monthly, 3=Weekly, 4=SeveralWeekly, 5=Daily, 6=SeveralDaily, 7=Dontknow	Identifying the respondents visit-frequency to MySpace	
Q11V03SocialwebsitesTimeMessenger	7	1=Never, 2=Monthly, 3=Weekly, 4=SeveralWeekly, 5=Daily, 6=SeveralDaily, 7=Dontknow	Identifying the respondents visit-frequency to Messenger	
Q11V04SocialwebsitesTimeArto	7	1=Never, 2=Monthly, 3=Weekly, 4=SeveralWeekly, 5=Daily, 6=SeveralDaily, 7=Dontknow	Identifying the respondents visit-frequency Arto	
Q11V05SocialwebsitesTimeYoutube	7	1=Never, 2=Monthly, 3=Weekly, 4=SeveralWeekly, 5=Daily, 6=SeveralDaily,	Identifying the respondents visit-frequency to Youtube	

		7=Dontknow	
Q11V06SocialwebsitesTimeLinkedin	7	1=Never	Identifying the respondents visit-frequency to Linkedin
L coociamessics initelineani	,	2=Monthly,	seems and respondents voir requercy to smaculi
		3=Weekly,	
		4=SeveralWeekly,	
		5=Daily,	
		6=SeveralDaily,	
011\/075 acialwabsitasTimaElickr	7	1=Nover	Identifying the respondents visit frequency to Flickr
Q11V07SocialwebsitesTimeFlicki	/	2=Monthly	identifying the respondents visit-frequency to Fickr
		3=Weekly,	
		4=SeveralWeekly,	
		5=Daily,	
		6=SeveralDaily,	
044)/000	7	7=Dontknow	Island frida a bla an an an da aba sin far an an an an ba Dala a
Q11V08SocialwebsitesTimeBebo	/	1=Never,	identifying the respondents visit-frequency to Bebo
		3=Weekly.	
		4=SeveralWeekly,	
		5=Daily,	
		6=SeveralDaily,	
		7=Dontknow	
Q11V09SocialwebsitesTimeHi5	7	1=Never,	Identifying the respondents visit-frequency to HI5
		2=Workhy	
		4=SeveralWeekly.	
		5=Daily,	
		6=SeveralDaily,	
		7=Dontknow	
Q11V10SocialwebsitesTimeFora	7	1=Never,	Identifying the respondents visit-frequency to Other fora
		2=Monthly,	
		J-WEEKIY, A=SeveralWeekly	
		5=Daily.	
		6=SeveralDaily,	
		7=Dontknow	
Q12V01SocialwebsitesPurposeInterest	6	1=Disagree strongly,	Identifying the respondents Social website purpose
		2=Disagree,	
		3=Neither agree or disagree,	
		5=Agree strongly	
		6=Dontknow	
Q12V02SocialwebsitesPurposeObtainKnowledge	6	1=Disagree strongly,	Identifying the respondents Social website purpose
		2=Disagree,	
		3=Neither agree or disagree,	
		4=Agree,	
		5=Agree strongly,	
012V03SocialwebsitesBurnoseShareKnowledge	6	D=Dolltkilow	Identifying the recoordents Social website purpose
Q12 V0350Claiwebsitesr ui posesnarekitowieuge	0	2=Disagree.	identifying the respondents social website purpose
		3=Neither agree or disagree,	
		4=Agree,	
		5=Agree strongly,	
	-	6=Dontknow	
Q12V04SocialwebsitesPurposeGetHelp	6	1=Disagree strongly,	Identifying the respondents Social website purpose
		2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree or disagree	
		4=Agree.	
		5=Agree strongly,	
		6=Dontknow	
Q12V05SocialwebsitesPurposeEntertainment	6	1=Disagree strongly,	Identifying the respondents Social website purpose
		2=Disagree,	
		s=iveither agree of disagree,	
		5=Agree strongly.	
		6=Dontknow	
Q12V06SocialwebsitesPurposeObtainPoints	6	1=Disagree strongly,	Identifying the respondents Social website purpose
		2=Disagree,	
		3=Neither agree or disagree,	
		4=Agree,	
		6=Dontknow	
Q13V01AdvertisementSituationsValuableinformation	6	1=Disagree strongly.	Preparation for measuring "Attitude on advertising"
	-	2=Disagree,	
		3=Neither agree or disagree,	
		4=Agree,	
		5=Agree strongly,	
013V024dvertisementSituationsInteresting	6	1=Disagree strongly	Preparation for measuring "Attitude on advertising"
dra rozhavernoementoituarionomitereotilik	U	2=Disagree,	A construction for measuring Automation advertising
		3=Neither agree or disagree,	
		4=Agree,	
		5=Agree strongly,	
		6=Dontknow	
Q13V03AdvertisementSituationsSuggestive	6	1=Disagree strongly,	Preparation for measuring "Attitude on advertising"
		2-Disagree, 3=Neither agree or disagree	
		4=Agree,	
		5=Agree strongly,	

		6=Dontknow		
Q13V04AdvertisementSituationsEntertainment	6	1=Disagree strongly, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree or disagree, 4=Agree,	Preparation for measuring "Attitude on advertising"	
		5=Agree strongly, 6=Dontknow		
Q13V05AdvertisementSituationsNeeds	6	1=Disagree strongly, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree or disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Agree strongly, 6=Dontknow	Preparation for measuring "Attitude on advertising"	
Q14AdvertisementOverallAttitude	6	1=Very negative.	Identifying the respondents "Attitude on advertising" with a single question	
		2=Negative, 3=Neither positive or negative, 4=Positive, 5=Very positive, 6=Dontknow		
Q15V01AdvertisementAttitudeValuable	5	1=1, 2=2, 3=3, 4=4, 5=5	Preparation for measuring "Interest on advertising"	
Q15V02AdvertisementAttitudeInteresting	5	1=1, 2=2, 3=3, 4=4, 5=5	Preparation for measuring "Interest on advertising"	
Q15V03AdvertisementAttitudeAttractive	5	1=1, 2=2, 3=3, 4=4, 5=5	Preparation for measuring "Interest on advertising"	
Q15V04AdvertisementAttitudeImportant	5	1=1, 2=2, 3=3, 4=4, 5=5	Preparation for measuring "Interest on advertising"	
Q15V05AdvertisementAttitudeExciting	5	1=1, 2=2, 3=3, 4=4, 5=5	Preparation for measuring "Interest on advertising"	
Q15V06AdvertisementAttitudeRelevant	5	1=1, 2=2, 3=3, 4=4, 5=5	Preparation for measuring "Interest on advertising"	
Q15V07AdvertisementAttitudeMeaningful	5	1=1, 2=2, 3=3, 4=4, 5=5	Preparation for measuring "Interest on advertising"	
Q15V08AdvertisementAttitudeUseable	5	3-3 1=1, 2=2, 3=3, 4=4, 5=5	Preparation for measuring "Interest on advertising"	
Q15V09AdvertisementAttitudeWanted	5	1=1, 2=2, 3=3, 4=4, 5=5	Preparation for measuring "Interest on advertising"	
Q16AdvertisementOverallInterest	6	1=Not at all interested, 2=Not interested, 3=Neither, 4=Interested, 5=Very interested, 6=Dontknow	Identifying the respondents "Interest on advertising" with a single question	
Q17V01AdvertisementAttitudePlatformMailbox	6	1=Very negative, 2=Negative, 3=Neither positive or negative, 4=Positive, 5=Very positive, 6=Dontknow	Identifying the respondents attitude towards Mailbox	
Q17V02AdvertisementAttitudePlatformTV	6	1=Very negative, 2=Negative, 3=Neither positive or negative, 4=Positive, 5=Very positive, 6=Dontknow	Identifying the respondents attitude towards TV	
Q17V03AdvertisementAttitudePlatformInternet	6	1=Very negative, 2=Negative, 3=Neither positive or negative, 4=Positive, 5=Very positive, 6=Dontknow	Identifying the respondents attitude towards Internet	

Q17V04AdvertisementAttitudePlatformOutdoor	6	1=Very negative, 2=Negative, 3=Neither positive or negative, 4=Positive, 5=Very nositive	Identifying the respondents attitude towards Outdoor
		6=Dontknow	
Q17V05AdvertisementAttitudePlatformPrint	6	1=Very negative, 2=Negative, 3=Neither positive or negative, 4=Positive, 5=Very positive, 6=Dontknow	Identifying the respondents attitude towards Print
Q18V01AdvertisementDiscussionFamilyFriends	6	1=Discuss – Never, 2=Discuss – infrequent, 3=Discuss – sometimes, 4=Discuss – frequently, 5=Discuss – always, 6=Dontknow	Identifying the respondents discussion-frequency with Friends and family
Q18V02AdvertisementDiscussionWork	6	1=Discuss – Never, 2=Discuss – infrequent, 3=Discuss – sometimes, 4=Discuss – frequently, 5=Discuss – always, 6=Dontknow	Identifying the respondents discussion-frequency on Work
Q18V03AdvertisementDiscussionInternet	6	1=Discuss – Never, 2=Discuss – infrequent, 3=Discuss – sometimes, 4=Discuss – frequently, 5=Discuss – always, 6=Dontknow	Identifying the respondents discussion-frequency with Others on the internet
Q19AdvertisementInfluence	6	1=Disagree strongly, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree or disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Agree strongly, 6=Dontknow	Identifying the respondents attitude towards having influence on advertising
Q20AdvertisementOverallSearch	2	1=Yes, 2=No	Identifying if the respondents have search for advertisements on the internet
Q21V01AdvertisementSearchProduct	6	1=Disagree strongly, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree or disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Agree strongly, 6=Dontknow	Identifying the reason for searching for advertisements on the internet
Q21V02AdvertisementSearchOffer	6	1=Disagree strongly, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree or disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Agree strongly, 6=Dontknow	Identifying the reason for searching for advertisements on the internet
Q21V03AdvertisementSearchEntertainment	6	1=Disagree strongly, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree or disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Agree strongly, 6=Dontknow	Identifying the reason for searching for advertisements on the internet
Q21V04AdvertisementSearchPasttimeWork	6	1=Disagree strongly, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree or disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Agree strongly, 6=Dontknow	Identifying the reason for searching for advertisements on the internet
Q21V05AdvertisementSearchPasttimeHome	6	1=Disagree strongly, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree or disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Agree strongly, 6=Dontknow	Identifying the reason for searching for advertisements on the internet
Q21V06AdvertisementSearchPoints	6	1=Disagree strongly, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree or disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Agree strongly, 6=Dontknow	Identifying the reason for searching for advertisements on the internet
Q21V07AdvertisementSearchSocialising	6	1=Disagree strongly, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree or disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Agree strongly, 6=Dontknow	Identifying the reason for searching for advertisements on the internet
Q21V08AdvertisementSearchProfessionalDiscussion	6	1=Disagree strongly, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree or disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Agree strongly, 6=Dontknow	Identifying the reason for searching for advertisements on the internet
Q22ConceptInterest	6	1=Disagree strongly,	Identifying the concept interest
		2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree or disagree,	

		4=Agree,	
		5=Agree strongly,	
022Concent/lisit	c	5=Dollknow	Identifying the sensent visit intention
dz sconcept visit	0	2=No.	identifying the concept visit intention
		3=Maybe,	
		4=Yes,	
		5=Absolutely	
Q241/Q1ConcontGratificationMonoy	6	5=Dontknow	Identifying the gratification /reason to visit the business concept
Q24V01C0nceptoratincationivioney	0	2=Disagree.	identifying the gratification/reason to visit the business concept
		3=Neither agree or disagree,	
		4=Agree,	
		5=Agree strongly,	
024V/02ConcentGratificationBridge	6	6=Dontknow	Identifying the gratification /reason to visit the business concept
dz4v0zeonceptoratineation nees	0	2=Disagree.	dentifying the gratilication/reason to visit the busiliess concept
		3=Neither agree or disagree,	
		4=Agree,	
		5=Agree strongly,	
0241/03ConcentGratificationSocialising	6	1-Disagree strongly	Identifying the gratification /reason to visit the business concept
Q24V05Conceptoratineation50claising	0	2=Disagree,	dentifying the gratilication/reason to visit the business concept
		3=Neither agree or disagree,	
		4=Agree,	
		5=Agree strongly,	
024V04ConcentGratificationPasttimeWork	6	1=Disagree strongly	Identifying the gratification/reason to visit the business concent
Q24V04C0ICeptoratification astitine work	0	2=Disagree.	dentifying the gratilication/reason to visit the business concept
		3=Neither agree or disagree,	
		4=Agree,	
		5=Agree strongly,	
024V05ConcentGratificationPasttimeHome	6	1=Disagree strongly	Identifying the gratification/reason to visit the business concent
	ů	2=Disagree,	action for gradient of the constrained control of the constraints control of
		3=Neither agree or disagree,	
		4=Agree,	
		5=Agree strongly,	
024V06ConceptGratificationProfessionalDiscussion	6	1=Disagree strongly	Identifying the gratification/reason to visit the business concept
	0	2=Disagree,	action for gradient of the constrained control of the constraints control of
		3=Neither agree or disagree,	
		4=Agree,	
		5=Agree strongly, 6=Dontknow	
Q25Age	7	1=10-20,	Identifying the Age of the respondents
		2=21-30,	
		3=31-40,	
		4=41-50, 5-51-60	
		6=61-70.	
		7=>70	
Q26Gender	2	1=Male,	Identifying the Gender of the respondents
0270	-	2=Female	Identify the the Destance of the second state
Q27Region	5	1=Region Nordjylland, 2=Region Midtivlland	Identifying the Region of the respondents
		3=Region Syddanmark,	
		4=Region Sjælland,	
		5=Region Hovedstaden	
Q28Income	6	1=>150.000 kr.,	Identifying the Income of the respondents
		2-130.001-300.000 kr., 3=300.001-450.000 kr.,	
		4=450.001-600.000 kr.,	
		5=>600.000 kr.	
		6=Dontknow	
Q29Occupation	7	1=Employed - private sector,	identifying the Occupation of the respondents
		3=Self-employed,	
		4=Unemployed / non-working,	
		5=Student,	
		6=Ketired, 7=Other	
Variable / Question - Modified	Options		
AttitudeFactorQ13	6	1=Very negative,	Identifying the overall "Attitude towards advertising"
		2=Negative,	
		3=Neither positive or negative,	
		4=POSITIVE, 5=Very positive	
		6=Dontknow	
InterestFactorQ15	5	1=1,	Identifying the overall "Interest towards advertising"
		2=2,	

Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit	2	1=Not interested /Not visit	Identifying whether the respondents would visit / not visit the business
		2=Interested / Visit	concept
Q22ConceptInterest_notInterest	2	1=Not interested,	Identifying whether the respondents are interested / not interested in the
		2=Interested	business concept
Without_WithGratification	2	1=Without gratification, 2=With gratifictaion	Respondents without and with gratification

Appendix 1.1 Modelling – step 2

Question/variable/values	Original	New (pooled)
Q01 V02 and V03 are combined to V02, as school and work are often not complementary.	V02, V03	V02 + V03 = V02
Q04 and Q07 As a result of the pooled data in Q01, these variables are also combined.	Q04, Q07	Q04 + Q07 = Q0407
	1 = <½ hour	
	2 = ½-1 hour	
Q02, Q03, Q06, Q0407	3 = 1-½ hour	1 (2) hours
The values in these questions have been reduced from 9 to 2. They have	4 = 1½-2 hour	1 = < 2 hours
been pooled to either light- or heavy user.	5 = 2-2½ hour	2 = 2 nours
Light user is defined by <2 hours and heavy is defined by >2 hours.	6 = 2½-3 hour	
	7 = 3-3½ hour	
	8 = 3½-4 hour	
	9 = > 4 hour	
Q08 V01-V09 values are classified based on the primary time of usage.	V01-V09	V01 + V02 + V03 + V04 + V05 + V06 + V07 + V08 + V09 = Q08
Q18 V01, V02 and V03 are combined to just one variable. Highest score in the previous variables is the determinant.	V01-V03	V01 + V02 + V03 = Q18

Appendix 1.2 Modelling – step 3

Question/variable/values	Original	New (pooled)
Q10		
Q10 is completely disregarded in order to measure usage instead of	V01-V10	None
awareness. This is done in continuation of the variable pooling in Q11.		
Q11		V01 + V02 + V03 + V04 + V05 +
V01-V10 are combined to one variable based on the highest score in the	V01-V10	V06 + V07 + V08 + V09 + V10 =
previous variables.		Q11
Q18 Values are pooled to either "no" or "yes"	1 = never 2 = infrequent 3 = sometimes 4 = frequently	1 = no 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 = yes
	5 = always	

Appendix 1.3 Modelling – step 4

Question/variable/values	Original	New (pooled)
Q11 The values in Q11 are pooled to represent either light- or heavy user.	1 = never 2 = monthly 3 = weekly 4 = several weekly 5 = daily 6 = several daily	1 + 2 + 3 = light 4 + 5 + 6 = heavy
Q12 Q12 is disregarded completely as the number of missing values has a large negative effect on the number of observations that makes it through the model. Appendix XXX LR 5.	V01-V06	None

Appendix 1.4 Modelling – step 5

Question/variable/values	Original	New (pooled)
Q17 Q17 is completely disregarded due to less evaluated importance of the remaining variables in answering the research questions.	V01-V05	None
Q25 Age is pooled into two groups, because of the very uneven dispersion in the data.	1 = 10-20 years of age 2 = 21-30 years of age 3 = 31-40 years of age 4 = 41-50 years of age 5 = 51-60 years of age 6 = 61-70 years of age 7 = 70+ years of age	1 + 2 + 3 = < 31 4 + 5 + 6 + 7 = > 30
Q28 Income is pooled into two groups, in order to increase the possible variable significance and provide more conclusive results. Furthermore, income is correlated to age.	1 = < 150.000 kr. 2 = 150 - 300.000 kr. 3 = 300 - 450.000 kr. 4 = 450 - 600.000 kr. 5 = > 600.000 kr.	1 + 2 = < 300.000 kr. 3 + 4 +5 = > 300.000 kr.

Appendix 1.5 Modelling – step 6

Question/variable/values	Original	New (pooled)
Q01		
Q01 is excluded because where you use the Internet is not as important as to	V01 + V02	None
what extent you use the Internet.		
Q08		
Is removed because of lack of significance, uneven dispersion and since	Q08	None
Q0407 is partly explanatory of this variable.		

Appendix 1.6 Modelling – step 7

Question/variable/values	Original	New (pooled)
Q27 Region is excluded because of poor dispersion and very high levels of significance (appendix XXX LR2 & LR8). Pooling is not an option, as the dispersion is too uneven.	Q27	None
Q29 Occupation is pooled into two groups in an attempt to achieve more significant results.	1 = private sector 2 = public sector 3 = self-employed 4 = unemployed 5 = student 6 = retired 7 = other	1 + 2 + 3 = working 4 + 5 + 6 + 7 = student or other

Appendix 1.7 Modelling – step 8

Question/variable/values	Original	New (pooled)
Q29		
The pooling of occupation provided no change and occupation is still	Q29	None
among the variables with least significance.		
Q03		
Amount of E-mail use is completely disregarded due to the highest	Q03	None
level of significance of the remaining variables.		
Q18	Q18	None

Advertisement discussion is disregarded due to the highest level of significance of the remaining variables.		
Q05 This variable is disregarded due to the highest level of significance of the remaining variables.	Q05	None
Q02 InternetUseTime is disregarded due to the highest level of significance of the remaining variables.	Q02	None
Q28 Income is disregarded due to the highest level of significance of the remaining variables.	Q28	None

Appendix 1.8 Modelling – step 9

Question/variable/values	Original	New (pooled)
Q24V01 This variable is disregarded due to the highest level of significance of the remaining variables.	Q24V01	None
Q24V03 This variable is disregarded due to the highest level of significance of the remaining variables.	Q24V03	None
Q24V04 This variable is disregarded due to the highest level of significance of the remaining variables.	Q24V04	None
Q24V05 This variable is disregarded due to the highest level of significance of the remaining variables.	Q24V05	None
Q13factor Positive_Negative_AttitudeQ13Advert is disregarded due to the highest level of significance of the remaining variables.	Q13factor	None
Q09V03 Information Search is disregarded due to the highest level of significance of the remaining variables.	Q09V03	None
Q0407 This combined variable is disregarded due to the highest level of significance of the remaining variables.	Q0407	None

Appendix 1.9 Modelling – step 10

Question/variable/values	Original	New (pooled)
Q24V02		
This variable is disregarded due to the highest level of significance of the	Q24V02	None
remaining variables.		
Q09V04		
This variable is disregarded due to the highest level of significance of the	Q09V04	None
remaining variables.		
Q25		
Age is completely disregarded due to the highest level of significance of the	Q25	None
remaining variables.		
Q24V06		
This variable is disregarded due to the highest level of significance of the	Q24V06	None
remaining variables.		
Q09V05		
This variable is disregarded due to the highest level of significance of the	Q09V05	None
remaining variables.		
With or Without gratification		
This variable is disregarded due to the highest level of significance of the	With or Without gratification	None
remaining variables.		
Q09V06		
This variable is disregarded due to the highest level of significance of the	Q09V06	None
remaining variables.		

Appendix 2 – Frequencies list of all variables

	QUIVUIIIternetOsewhereHome					
	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	no	2	1,5	1,6	1,6	
	Yes	125	94,7	98,4	100,0	
	Total	127	96,2	100,0		
Missing	Missing	5	3,8			
Total		132	100,0			

Q01V01InternetUseWhereHome

Q01V02InternetUseWhereWork

L

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no	24	18,2	18,9	18,9
	Yes	103	78,0	81,1	100,0
	Total	127	96,2	100,0	
Missing	Missing	5	3,8		
Total		132	100,0		

-	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	84	63,6	66,1	66,1
	Yes	43	32,6	33,9	100,0
	Total	127	96,2	100,0	
Missing	Missing	5	3,8		
Total		132	100,0		

-	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	98	74,2	77,2	77,2
	Yes	29	22,0	22,8	100,0
	Total	127	96,2	100,0	
Missing	Missing	5	3,8		
Total		132	100,0		

Q01V05InternetUseWhereOtherDontknow

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	131	99,2	100,0	100,0
Missing	Missing	1	,8		
Total		132	100,0		

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	<1⁄2 hour	12	9,1	9,1	9,1
	1/2-1 hour	25	18,9	18,9	28,0
	1-1½ hour	32	24,2	24,2	52,3
	11/2-2 hour	17	12,9	12,9	65,2
	2-2½ hour	9	6,8	6,8	72,0
	21/2-3 hour	7	5,3	5,3	77,3
	3-3½ hour	9	6,8	6,8	84,1
	31⁄2-4 hour	6	4,5	4,5	88,6
	> 4 hour	10	7,6	7,6	96,2
	Dont know	5	3,8	3,8	100,0
	Total	132	100,0	100,0	

Q02InternetUseTime

	Q03InternetUseTimeEmail						
	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	<1/2 hour	47	35,6	35,6	35,6		
	1/2-1 hour	33	25,0	25,0	60,6		
	1-1½ hour	12	9,1	9,1	69,7		
	11/2-2 hour	18	13,6	13,6	83,3		
	2-21/2 hour	6	4,5	4,5	87,9		
	21/2-3 hour	4	3,0	3,0	90,9		
	3-31⁄2 hour	2	1,5	1,5	92,4		
	> 4 hour	5	3,8	3,8	96,2		
	Dont know	5	3,8	3.8	100.0		
	Total	132	100,0	100,0	,-		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	<½ hour	29	22,0	22,0	22,0
	1/2-1 hour	24	18,2	18,2	40,2
	1-1½ hour	14	10,6	10,6	50,8
	11/2-2 hour	8	6,1	6,1	56,8
	2-21/2 hour	9	6,8	6,8	63,6
	21/2-3 hour	7	5,3	5,3	68,9
	3-31⁄2 hour	2	1,5	1,5	70,5
	31⁄2-4 hour	2	1,5	1,5	72,0
	> 4 hour	9	6,8	6,8	78,8
	Missing	28	21,2	21,2	100,0
	Total	132	100,0	100,0	

	Q05InternetUseTimeNonworkrelated						
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	Never	4	3,0	3,8	3,8		
	Monthly	10	7,6	9,5	13,3		
	Weekly	21	15,9	20,0	33,3		
	Daily	46	34,8	43,8	77,1		
	SeveralDaily	22	16,7	21,0	98,1		
	Dont know	2	1,5	1,9	100,0		
	Total	105	79,5	100,0			
Missing	Missing	27	20,5				
Total		132	100,0				

Q06InternetUseTimeHome

-	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	<½ hour	22	16,7	16,7	16,7
	1/2-1 hour	48	36,4	36,4	53,0
	1-1½ hour	28	21,2	21,2	74,2
	11/2-2 hour	11	8,3	8,3	82,6
	2-21/2 hour	6	4,5	4,5	87,1
	21/2-3 hour	3	2,3	2,3	89,4
	3-31/2 hour	2	1,5	1,5	90,9

		1		l
31⁄2-4 hour	1	,8	,8	91,7
> 4 hour	4	3,0	3,0	94,7
Dont know	7	5,3	5,3	100,0
Total	132	100,0	100,0	

	Q07InternetUseTimeSchool							
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent			
Valid	<½ hour	22	16,7	16,7	16,7			
	1/2-1 hour	11	8,3	8,3	25,0			
	1-1½ hour	6	4,5	4,5	29,5			
	11/2-2 hour	3	2,3	2,3	31,8			
	2-21/2 hour	1	,8	,8	32,6			
	> 4 hour	1	,8	,8	33,3			
	Missing	88	66,7	66,7	100,0			
	Total	132	100,0	100,0				

Q08V01InternetUseTimeWhen6am8am

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	120	90,9	90,9	90,9
	Most used	5	3,8	3,8	94,7
	Second most used	4	3,0	3,0	97,7
	Third most used	3	2,3	2,3	100,0
	Total	132	100,0	100,0	

Q08V02InternetUseTimeWhen8am12pm

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	51	38,6	38,6	38,6
	Most used	41	31,1	31,1	69,7
	Second most used	27	20,5	20,5	90,2
	Third most used	13	9,8	9,8	100,0
	Total	132	100,0	100,0	

Q08V03InternetUseTimeWhen12pm4pm

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	52	39,4	39,4	39,4
	Most used	24	18,2	18,2	57,6

Second most used	42	31,8	31,8	89,4
Third most used	14	10,6	10,6	100,0
Total	132	100,0	100,0	

Q08V04InternetUSeTimeWhen4pm6pm

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	81	61,4	61,4	61,4
	Most used	15	11,4	11,4	72,7
	Second most used	11	8,3	8,3	81,1
	Third most used	25	18,9	18,9	100,0

Q08V05InternetUseTimeWhen6pm8pm

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	90	68,2	68,2	68,2
	Most used	14	10,6	10,6	78,8
	Second most used	17	12,9	12,9	91,7
	Third most used	11	8,3	8,3	100,0
	Total	132	100,0	100,0	

Q08V06InternetUseTimeWhen8pm10pm

-	_	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	67	50,8	50,8	50,8
	Most used	17	12,9	12,9	63,6
	Second most used	17	12,9	12,9	76,5
	Third most used	31	23,5	23,5	100,0
	Total	132	100,0	100,0	

Q08V07InternetUseTimeWhen10pm12am

-		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	110	83,3	83,3	83,3
	Most used	8	6,1	6,1	89,4
	Second most used	3	2,3	2,3	91,7
	Third most used	11	8,3	8,3	100,0
	Total	132	100,0	100,0	

Q08V08InternetUseTimeWhen12am6am

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	127	96,2	96,2	96,2
	Most used	1	,8	,8	97,0
	Third most used	4	3,0	3,0	100,0

Q08V10InternetUseTimeWhenDontknow

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Dont know	130	98,5	98,5	98,5
	Dont know	2	1,5	1,5	100,0
	Total	132	100,0	100,0	

Q09V01InternetUsePurposeSocialwebsites							
	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	No	57	43,2	43,2	43,2		
	Yes	75	56,8	56,8	100,0		
	Total	132	100,0	100,0			

Q09V02InternetUsePurposeGeneralsurfing

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	83	62,9	62,9	62,9
	Yes	49	37,1	37,1	100,0
	Total	132	100,0	100,0	

Q09V03InternetUsePurposeInformationsear

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	25	18,9	18,9	18,9
	Yes	107	81,1	81,1	100,0
	Total	132	100,0	100,0	

Q09V04InternetUsePurposeWorkrelatedsearch

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	56	42,4	42,4	42,4
	Yes	76	57,6	57,6	100,0
	Total	132	100,0	100,0	

	_	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	40	30,3	30,3	30,3
	Yes	92	69,7	69,7	100,0
	Total	132	100,0	100,0	

Q09V06InternetUsePurposeEmail

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	24	18,2	18,2	18,2
	Yes	108	81,8	81,8	100,0
	Total	132	100,0	100,0	

Q09V07InternetUsePurposeOther

-	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	107	81,1	81,1	81,1
	Yes	25	18,9	18,9	100,0

Q09V09InternetUsePurposeDontknow

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	132	100,0	100,0	100,0

Q10V01SocialwebsitesFacebook

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Knows/uses/have used	103	78,0	85,8	85,8
	Dont know the site	17	12,9	14,2	100,0
	Total	120	90,9	100,0	
Missing	Missing	12	9,1		
Total		132	100,0		

Q10V02SocialwebsitesMyspace

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	- Knows/uses/have used	79	59,8	73,8	73,8
	Dont know the site	28	21,2	26,2	100,0
	Total	107	81,1	100,0	
Missing	Missing	25	18,9		
Total		132	100,0		

Q10V03SocialwebsitesMessenger

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	- Knows/uses/have used	102	77,3	87,9	87,9
	Dont know the site	14	10,6	12,1	100,0
	Total	116	87,9	100,0	
Missing	Missing	16	12,1		
Total		132	100,0		

Q10V04SocialwebsitesArto

-		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	- Knows/uses/have used	54	40,9	51,4	51,4
	Dont know the site	51	38,6	48,6	100,0
	Total	105	79,5	100,0	
Missing	Missing	27	20,5		
Total		132	100,0		

Q10V05SocialwebsitesYoutube

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	- Knows/uses/have used	101	76,5	86,3	86,3
	Dont know the site	16	12,1	13,7	100,0
	Total	117	88,6	100,0	
Missing	Missing	15	11,4		
Total		132	100,0		

Q10V06SocialwebsitesLinkedin

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	- Knows/uses/have used	46	34,8	43,8	43,8
	Dont know the site	59	44,7	56,2	100,0
	Total	105	79,5	100,0	
Missing	Missing	27	20,5		
Total		132	100,0		

Q10V07SocialwebsitesFlickr

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	- Knows/uses/have used	21	15,9	20,0	20,0
	Dont know the site	84	63,6	80,0	100,0
	Total	105	79,5	100,0	
Missing	Missing	27	20,5		

Q01V05InternetUseWhereOtherDontknow

-	_	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	131	99,2	100	,0 100,0
Missing	Missing	1	,8		<u> </u>
Total				132 100,0	

Q10V08SocialwebsitesBebo

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Knows/uses/have used	2	1,5	1,9	1,9
	Dont know the site	101	76,5	98,1	100,0
	Total	103	78,0	100,0	
Missing	Missing	29	22,0		
Total		132	100,0		

	Q10V09SocialwebsitesHi5						
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	- Knows/uses/have used	9	6,8	8,5	8,5		
	Dont know the site	97	73,5	91,5	100,0		
	Total	106	80,3	100,0			
Missing	Missing	26	19,7				
Total		132	100,0				

Q10V10SocialwebsitesFora

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Knows/uses/have used	48	36,4	51,6	51,6
	Dont know the site	45	34,1	48,4	100,0
	Total	93	70,5	100,0	
Missing	Missing	39	29,5		
Total		132	100,0		

Q11V01SocialwebsitesTimeFacebook

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	40	30,3	33,6	33,6
	Monthly	8	6,1	6,7	40,3
	Weekly	12	9,1	10,1	50,4
	Severalweekly	18	13,6	15,1	65,5
			15	5	

			-		
	Daily	23	17,4	19,3	84,9
	Severaldaily	17	12,9	14,3	99,2
	Dont know	1	,8	,8	100,0
	Total	119	90,2	100,0	
Missing	Missing	13	9,8		
Total		132	100,0		

Q11V02SocialwebsitesTimeMyspace

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	83	62,9	76,1	76,1
	Monthly	19	14,4	17,4	93,6
	Weekly	3	2,3	2,8	96,3
	Severalweekly	2	1,5	1,8	98,2
	Daily	1	,8	,9	99,1
	Dont know	1	,8	,9	100,0
	Total	109	82,6	100,0	
Missing	Missing	23	17,4		
Total		132	100,0		

Q11V03SocialwebsitesTimeMessenger

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	41	31,1	35,0	35,0
	Monthly	15	11,4	12,8	47,9
	Weekly	13	9,8	11,1	59,0
	Severalweekly	8	6,1	6,8	65,8
	Daily	20	15,2	17,1	82,9
	Severaldaily	19	14,4	16,2	99,1
	Dont know	1	,8	,9	100,0
	Total	117	88,6	100,0	
Missing	Missing	15	11,4		
Total		132	100,0		

Q11V04SocialwebsitesTimeArto

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	104	78,8	98,1	98,1
	Weekly	1	,8	,9	99,1
	Dont know	1	,8	,9	100,0
	Total	106	80,3	100,0	
Missing	Missing	26	19,7		
Total		132	100,0		

Q11V05SocialwebsitesTimeYoutube

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	34	25,8	29,1	29,1
	Monthly	33	25,0	28,2	57,3
	Weekly	28	21,2	23,9	81,2
	Severalweekly	8	6,1	6,8	88,0
	Daily	8	6,1	6,8	94,9
	Severaldaily	3	2,3	2,6	97,4
	Dont know	3	2,3	2,6	100,0
	Total	117	88,6	100,0	
Missing	Missing	15	11,4		
Total		132	100,0		

Q11V06SocialwebsitesTimeLinkedin

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	77	58,3	71,3	71,3
	Monthly	19	14,4	17,6	88,9
	Weekly	6	4,5	5,6	94,4
	Severalweekly	3	2,3	2,8	97,2
	Daily	1	,8	,9	98,1
	Dont know	2	1,5	1,9	100,0
	Total	108	81,8	100,0	
Missing	Missing	24	18,2		
Total		132	100,0		

Q11V07SocialwebsitesTimeFlickr

Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent

Valid	Never	103	78,0	92,8	92,8
	Monthly	4	3,0	3,6	96,4
	Weekly	2	1,5	1,8	98,2
	Severalweekly	1	,8	,9	99,1
	Dont know	1	,8	,9	100,0
	Total	111	84,1	100,0	
Missing	Missing	21	15,9		
Total		132	100,0		

Q11V08SocialwebsitesTimeBebo Frequency Percent Valid Percent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	108	81,8	98,2	98,2
	Dont know	2	1,5	1,8	100,0
	Total	110	83,3	100,0	
Missing	Missing	22	16,7		
Total		132	100,0		

	Q11V09SocialwebsitesTimeHi5						
1	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	Never	104	78,8	98,1	98,1		
	Dont know	2	1,5	1,9	100,0		
	Total	106	80,3	100,0			
Missing	Missing	26	19,7				
Total		132	100,0				

	Q11V10SocialwebsitesTimeFora								
	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent				
Valid	Never	54	40,9	54,5	54,5				
	Monthly	13	9,8	13,1	67,7				
	Weekly	6	4,5	6,1	73,7				
	Severalweekly	10	7,6	10,1	83,8				
	Daily	7	5,3	7,1	90,9				
	Severaldaily	3	2,3	3,0	93,9				
	Dont know	6	4,5	6,1	100,0				
	Total	99	75,0	100,0					

Missing	Missing		33	25,0			
Total			132	100,0			
VAR00003							
	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	1,00	18	13,6	13,6	13,6		
	2,00	12	9,1	9,1	22,7		
	3,00	14	10,6	10,6	33,3		
	1.00						

49,2		15,9	15,9	21	4,00
72,0		22,7	22,7	30	5,00
93,9		22,0	22,0	29	6,00
00,0	1	6,1	6,1	8	99,00
		100,0	100,0	132	Total

Q12V01SocialwebsitesPurposeInterest

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree strongly	15	11,4	12,7	12,7
	Disagree	3	2,3	2,5	15,3
	Neither agree or disagree	5	3,8	4,2	19,5
	Agree	33	25,0	28,0	47,5
	Agree strongly	54	40,9	45,8	93,2
	Dont know	8	6,1	6,8	100,0
	Total	118	89,4	100,0	
Missing	Missing	14	10,6		
Total		132	100,0		

${\tt Q12V02Social websites Purpose Obtain Knowledge}$

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	- Disagree strongly	19	14,4	16,4	16,4
	Disagree	13	9,8	11,2	27,6
	Neither agree or disagree	8	6,1	6,9	34,5
	Agree	41	31,1	35,3	69,8
	Agree strongly	29	22,0	25,0	94,8
	Dont know	6	4,5	5,2	100,0
	Total	116	87,9	100,0	

Missing Total	Missing		16	12,1		
- otal		Q12V03Soc	cialwebsitesPurpos	eShareKnowled	ae	

Frequency Percent Valid Percent Cumulative Percent Valid Disagree strongly 28 21,2 25,7 25,7 Disagree 28 21,2 25,7 51,4 Neither agree or disagree 18 13,6 16,5 67,9 23 17,4 21,1 89,0 Agree Agree strongly 5 3,8 4,6 93,6 Dont know 7 5,3 6,4 100,0 100,0 Total 109 82,6 Missing Missing 23 17,4 Total 132 100,0

Q12V04SocialwebsitesPurposeGetHelp

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	- Disagree strongly	28	21,2	25,2	25,2
	Disagree	27	20,5	24,3	49,5
	Neither agree or disagree	16	12,1	14,4	64,0
	Agree	30	22,7	27,0	91,0
	Agree strongly	4	3,0	3,6	94,6
	Dont know	6	4,5	5,4	100,0
	Total	111	84,1	100,0	
Missing	Missing	21	15,9		
Total		132	100,0		

Q12V05SocialwebsitesPurposeEntertainment

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree strongly	13	9,8	11,4	11,4
	Disagree	5	3,8	4,4	15,8
	Neither agree or disagree	6	4,5	5,3	21,1
	Agree	26	19,7	22,8	43,9
	Agree strongly	57	43,2	50,0	93,9
	Dont know	7	5,3	6,1	100,0

	Total	114	86,4	100,0	
Missing	Missing	18	13,6		
Total		132	100,0		

Q12V06SocialwebsitesPurposeObtainPoints

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree strongly	77	58,3	71,3	71,3
	Disagree	8	6,1	7,4	78,7
	Neither agree or disagree	9	6,8	8,3	87,0
	Agree	3	2,3	2,8	89,8
	Agree strongly	4	3,0	3,7	93,5
	Dont know	7	5,3	6,5	100,0
	Total	108	81,8	100,0	
Missing	Missing	24	18,2		
Total		132	100,0		

Q13V01AdvertisementSituationsValuableinformation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	- Disagree strongly	21	15,9	18,3	18,3
	Disagree	15	11,4	13,0	31,3
	Neither agree or disagree	29	22,0	25,2	56,5
	Agree	44	33,3	38,3	94,8
	Agree strongly	6	4,5	5,2	100,0
	Total	115	87,1	100,0	
Missing	99	17	12,9		
Total		132	100,0		

Q13V02AdvertisementSituationsInteresting

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree strongly	10	7,6	8,6	8,6
	Disagree	10	7,6	8,6	17,2
	Neither agree or disagree	12	9,1	10,3	27,6
	Agree	73	55,3	62,9	90,5
	Agree strongly	11	8,3	9,5	100,0
	Total	116	87,9	100,0	

Missing 99	16	12,1	
Total	132	100,0	

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	Disagree strongly	17	12,9	14,9	14,9		
	Disagree	17	12,9	14,9	29,8		
	Neither agree or disagree	31	23,5	27,2	57,0		
	Agree	43	32,6	37,7	94,7		
	Agree strongly	6	4,5	5,3	100,0		
	Total	114	86,4	100,0			
Missing	99	18	13,6				
Total		132	100,0				

Q13V03AdvertisementSituationsSuggestive

Q13V04AdvertisementSituationsEntertainment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree strongly	4	3,0	3,5	3,5
	Disagree	3	2,3	2,7	6,2
	Neither agree or disagree	5	3,8	4,4	10,6
	Agree	66	50,0	58,4	69,0
	Agree strongly	35	26,5	31,0	100,0
	Total	113	85,6	100,0	
Missing	99	19	14,4		
Total		132	100,0		

Q13V05AdvertisementSituationsNeeds

-	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree strongly	19	14,4	16,8	16,8
	Disagree	11	8,3	9,7	26,5
	Neither agree or disagree	25	18,9	22,1	48,7
	Agree	47	35,6	41,6	90,3
	Agree strongly	11	8,3	9,7	100,0
	Total	113	85,6	100,0	
Missing	99	19	14,4		
Total		132	100,0		

Q14AdvertisementOverallAttitude

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very negative	8	6,1	6,8	6,8
	Negative	32	24,2	27,4	34,2
	Neither positive or negative	38	28,8	32,5	66,7
	Positive	37	28,0	31,6	98,3
	Very positive	2	1,5	1,7	100,0
	Total	117	88,6	100,0	
Missing	Missing	15	11,4		
Total		132	100,0		

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	9	6,8	7,7	7,7
	2	25	18,9	21,4	29,1
	3	45	34,1	38,5	67,5
	4	22	16,7	18,8	86,3
	5	16	12,1	13,7	100,0
	Total	117	88,6	100,0	
Missing	Missing	15	11,4		
Total		132	100,0		

	Q15V02AdvertisementAttitudeInteresting						
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	1	6	4,5	5,2	5,2		
	2	43	32,6	37,1	42,2		
	3	27	20,5	23,3	65,5		
	4	28	21,2	24,1	89,7		
	5	12	9,1	10,3	100,0		
	Total	116	87,9	100,0			
Missing	Missing	16	12,1				
Total		132	100,0				

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	2	1,5	1,8	1,8

			1		
	2	44	33,3	38,9	40,7
	3	34	25,8	30,1	70,8
	4	21	15,9	18,6	89,4
	5	12	9,1	10,6	100,0
	Total	113	85,6	100,0	
Missing	Missing	19	14,4		
Total		132	100,0		

Q15V04AdvertisementAttitudeImportant

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	1,5	1,7	1,7
	2	21	15,9	18,1	19,8
	3	39	29,5	33,6	53,4
	4	31	23,5	26,7	80,2
	5	23	17,4	19,8	100,0
	Total	116	87,9	100,0	
Missing	Missing	16	12,1		
Total		132	100,0		

Q15V05AdvertisementAttitudeExciting							
-		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	1	2	1,5	1,7	1,7		
	2	31	23,5	26,5	28,2		
	3	51	38,6	43,6	71,8		
	4	25	18,9	21,4	93,2		
	5	8	6,1	6,8	100,0		
	Total	117	88,6	100,0			
Missing	Missing	15	11,4				
Total		132	100,0				

Q15V06AdvertisementAttitud	eReleva
----------------------------	---------

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	34	25,8	29,3	29,3
	3	44	33,3	37,9	67,2
	4	28	21,2	24,1	91,4

	5	10	7,6	8,6	100,0
	Total	116	87,9	100,0	
Missing	Missing	16	12,1		
Total		132	100,0		

Q15V07AdvertisementAttitudeMeaningful

-	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	1,5	1,7	1,7
	2	23	17,4	19,8	21,6
	3	43	32,6	37,1	58,6
	4	33	25,0	28,4	87,1
	5	15	11,4	12,9	100,0
	Total	116	87,9	100,0	
Missing	Missing	16	12,1		
Total		132	100,0		

Q15V08AdvertisementAttitudeUseable

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	1,5	1,7	1,7
	2	45	34,1	39,1	40,9
	3	33	25,0	28,7	69,6
	4	24	18,2	20,9	90,4
	5	11	8,3	9,6	100,0
	Total	115	87,1	100,0	
Missing	Missing	17	12,9		
Total		132	100,0		

Q15V09AdvertisementAttitudeWanted

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	,8	,9	,9
	2	27	20,5	23,3	24,1
	3	39	29,5	33,6	57,8
	4	24	18,2	20,7	78,4
	5	25	18,9	21,6	100,0
	Total	116	87,9	100,0	

Missing	Missing	16	12,1	
Total		132	100,0	

Q16AdvertisementOverallInterest

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all interested	6	4,5	5,2	5,2
	Not interested	36	27,3	31,0	36,2
	Neither	26	19,7	22,4	58,6
	Interested	33	25,0	28,4	87,1
	Very interested	15	11,4	12,9	100,0
	Total	116	87,9	100,0	
Missing	Missing	16	12,1		
Total		132	100,0		

	Q17V01AdvertisementAttitudePlatformMailbox							
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent			
Valid	Very negative	40	30,3	34,2	34,2			
	Negative	19	14,4	16,2	50,4			
	Neither positive or negative	19	14,4	16,2	66,7			
	Positive	33	25,0	28,2	94,9			
	Very positive	6	4,5	5,1	100,0			
	Total	117	88,6	100,0				
Missing	Missing	15	11,4					
Total		132	100,0					

Q17V02AdvertisementAttitudePlatformTV

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very negative	26	19,7	22,4	22,4
	Negative	32	24,2	27,6	50,0
	Neither positive or negative	30	22,7	25,9	75,9
	Positive	26	19,7	22,4	98,3
	Very positive	2	1,5	1,7	100,0
	Total	116	87,9	100,0	
Missing	Missing	16	12,1		
Total		132	100,0		

Q17V03AdvertisementAttitudePlatformInternet

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very negative	25	18,9	21,4	21,4
	Negative	29	22,0	24,8	46,2
	Neither positive or negative	37	28,0	31,6	77,8
	Positive	24	18,2	20,5	98,3
	Dont know	2	1,5	1,7	100,0
	Total	117	88,6	100,0	
Missing	Missing	15	11,4		
Total		132	100,0		

Q17V04AdvertisementAttitudePlatformOutdoor

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very negative	7	5,3	6,0	6,0
	Negative	12	9,1	10,3	16,2
	Neither positive or negative	49	37,1	41,9	58,1
	Positive	40	30,3	34,2	92,3
	Very positive	8	6,1	6,8	99,1
	Dont know	1	,8	,9	100,0
	Total	117	88,6	100,0	
Missing	Missing	15	11,4		
Total		132	100,0		

Q17V05AdvertisementAttitudePlatformPrint

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very negative	7	5,3	6,0	6,0
	Negative	15	11,4	12,8	18,8
	Neither positive or negative	39	29,5	33,3	52,1
	Positive	50	37,9	42,7	94,9
	Very positive	6	4,5	5,1	100,0
	Total	117	88,6	100,0	
Missing	Missing	15	11,4		
Total		132	100,0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	Discuss – Never	15	11,4	12,8	12,8	
	Discuss – infrequent	48	36,4	41,0	53,8	
	Discuss – sometimes	38	28,8	32,5	86,3	
	Discuss – frequently	14	10,6	12,0	98,3	
	Discuss – always	1	,8	,9	99,1	
	Dont know	1	,8	,9	100,0	
	Total	117	88,6	100,0		
Missing	Missing	15	11,4	ļ		
Total		132	100,0	1		

Q18V01AdvertisementDiscussionFamilyFriends

Q18V02AdvertisementDiscussionWork

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Discuss – Never	34	25,8	29,1	29,1
	Discuss – infrequent	37	28,0	31,6	60,7
	Discuss – sometimes	29	22,0	24,8	85,5
	Discuss – frequently	9	6,8	7,7	93,2
	Discuss – always	5	3,8	4,3	97,4
	Dont know	3	2,3	2,6	100,0
	Total	117	88,6	100,0	
Missing	Missing	15	11,4		
Total		132	100,0		

Q18V03AdvertisementDiscussionInternet

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	- Discuss – Never	92	69,7	78,6	78,6
	Discuss – infrequent	17	12,9	14,5	93,2
	Discuss – sometimes	3	2,3	2,6	95,7
	Discuss – always	2	1,5	1,7	97,4
	Dont know	3	2,3	2,6	100,0
	Total	117	88,6	100,0	
Missing	Missing	15	11,4		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	- Discuss – Never	15	11,4	12,8	12,8
	Discuss – infrequent	48	36,4	41,0	53,8
	Discuss – sometimes	38	28,8	32,5	86,3
	Discuss – frequently	14	10,6	12,0	98,3
	Discuss – always	1	,8	,9	99,1
	Dont know	1	,8	,9	100,0
	Total	117	88,6	100,0	
Missing	Missing	15	11,4		
Total		132	100,0		

Q18V01AdvertisementDiscussionFamilyFriends

	Q18OverallDiscussion							
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent			
Valid	Discuss – Never	11	8,3	9,5	9,5			
	Discuss – infrequent	43	32,6	37,1	46,6			
	Discuss – sometimes	39	29,5	33,6	80,2			
	Discuss – frequently	15	11,4	12,9	93,1			
	Discuss – always	8	6,1	6,9	100,0			
	Total	116	87,9	100,0				
Missing	Missing	16	12,1					
Total		132	100,0					

Q19AdvertisementInfluence

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree strongly	26	19,7	22,2	22,2
	Disagree	26	19,7	22,2	44,4
	Neither agree or disagree	18	13,6	15,4	59,8
	Agree	28	21,2	23,9	83,8
	Agree strongly	13	9,8	11,1	94,9
	Dont know	6	4,5	5,1	100,0
	Total	117	88,6	100,0	
Missing	Missing	15	11,4		
Total		132	100,0		

Q20AdvertisementOverallSearch

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	51	38,6	43,6	43,6
	No	64	48,5	54,7	98,3
	Dont know	2	1,5	1,7	100,0
	Total	117	88,6	100,0	
Missing	Missing	15	11,4		
Total		132	100,0		

Q21V01AdvertisementSearchProduct

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree strongly	6	4,5	12,0	12,0
	Disagree	14	10,6	28,0	40,0
	Neither agree or disagree	1	,8	2,0	42,0
	Agree	17	12,9	34,0	76,0
	Agree strongly	12	9,1	24,0	100,0
	Total	50	37,9	100,0	
Missing	Missing	82	62,1		
Total		132	100,0		

Q21V02AdvertisementSearchOffer

-		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree strongly	6	4,5	12,0	12,0
	Disagree	11	8,3	22,0	34,0
	Neither agree or disagree	6	4,5	12,0	46,0
	Agree	13	9,8	26,0	72,0
	Agree strongly	14	10,6	28,0	100,0
	Total	50	37,9	100,0	
Missing	Missing	82	62,1		
Total		132	100,0		

Q21V03AdvertisementSearchEntertainment

-	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree strongly	5	3,8	10,0	10,0
	Disagree	6	4,5	12,0	22,0

	Neither agree or disagree	8	6,1	16,0	38,0
	Agree	9	6,8	18,0	56,0
	Agree strongly	22	16,7	44,0	100,0
	Total	50	37,9	100,0	
Missing	Missing	82	62,1		
Total		132	100,0		

Q21V04AdvertisementSearchPasttimeWork

_	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree strongly	29	22,0	59,2	59,2
	Disagree	5	3,8	10,2	69,4
	Neither agree or disagree	6	4,5	12,2	81,6
	Agree	7	5,3	14,3	95,9
	Agree strongly	2	1,5	4,1	100,0
	Total	49	37,1	100,0	
Missing	Missing	83	62,9		
Total		132	100,0		

Q21V05AdvertisementSearchPasttimeHome

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree strongly	25	18,9	50,0	50,0
	Disagree	5	3,8	10,0	60,0
	Neither agree or disagree	9	6,8	18,0	78,0
	Agree	7	5,3	14,0	92,0
	Agree strongly	4	3,0	8,0	100,0
	Total	50	37,9	100,0	
Missing	Missing	82	62,1		
Total		132	100,0		

Q21V06AdvertisementSearchPoints

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	- Disagree strongly	29	22,0	58,0	58,0
	Disagree	7	5,3	14,0	72,0
	Neither agree or disagree	8	6,1	16,0	88,0
	Agree	5	3,8	10,0	98,0
	Agree strongly	1	,8	2,0	100,0
---------	----------------	-----	-------	-------	-------
	Total	50	37,9	100,0	
Missing	Missing	82	62,1		
Total		132	100,0		

Q21V07AdvertisementSearchSocialising

_	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree strongly	22	16,7	44,0	44,0
	Disagree	9	6,8	18,0	62,0
	Neither agree or disagree	8	6,1	16,0	78,0
	Agree	9	6,8	18,0	96,0
	Agree strongly	2	1,5	4,0	100,0
	Total	50	37,9	100,0	
Missing	Missing	82	62,1		
Total		132	100,0		

${\tt Q21V08Advert} is ement {\tt SearchProfessionalDiscussion}$

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree strongly	25	18,9	50,0	50,0
	Disagree	3	2,3	6,0	56,0
	Neither agree or disagree	8	6,1	16,0	72,0
	Agree	11	8,3	22,0	94,0
	Agree strongly	3	2,3	6,0	100,0
	Total	50	37,9	100,0	
Missing	Missing	82	62,1		
Total		132	100,0		

Q22ConceptInterest

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree strongly	38	28,8	33,6	33,6
	Disagree	23	17,4	20,4	54,0
	Neither agree or disagree	11	8,3	9,7	63,7
	Agree	33	25,0	29,2	92,9
	Agree strongly	8	6,1	7,1	100,0
	Total	113	85,6	100,0	

Missing Missing	19	14,4	
Total	132	100,0	

Q23ConceptVisit

	_	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Absolutely no	22	16,7	19,3	19,3
	No	28	21,2	24,6	43,9
	Maybe	24	18,2	21,1	64,9
	Yes	30	22,7	26,3	91,2
	Absolutely yes	10	7,6	8,8	100,0
	Total	114	86,4	100,0	
Missing	Missing	18	13,6		
Total		132	100,0		

	Q24V01ConceptGratificationMoney						
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	Disagree strongly	34	3,2	31,5	31,5		
	Disagree	9	,8	8,3	39,8		
	Neither agree or disagree	13	1,2	12,0	51,9		
	Agree	27	2,5	25,0	76,9		
	Agree strongly	25	2,4	23,1	100,0		
	Total	108	10,2	100,0			
Missing	Missing	24	2,3				
	System	927	87,5				
	Total	951	89,8				
Total		1059	100,0				

Q24V02ConceptGratificationPrices					
	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	- Disagree strongly	25	2,4	23,4	23,4
	Disagree	19	1,8	17,8	41,1
	Neither agree or disagree	13	1,2	12,1	53,3
	Agree	35	3,3	32,7	86,0
	Agree strongly	15	1,4	14,0	100,0
	Total	107	10,1	100,0	
Missing	Missing	25	2,4		

System	927	87,5	
Total	952	89,9	
Total	1059	100,0	

Q24V03ConceptGratificationSocialising

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree strongly	54	5,1	50,0	50,0
	Disagree	29	2,7	26,9	76,9
	Neither agree or disagree	7	,7	6,5	83,3
	Agree	14	1,3	13,0	96,3
	Agree strongly	4	,4	3,7	100,0
	Total	108	10,2	100,0	
Missing	Missing	24	2,3		
	System	927	87,5		
	Total	951	89,8		
Total		1059	100,0		

${\tt Q24V04ConceptGratificationPasttimeWork}$

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree strongly	61	5,8	56,5	56,5
	Disagree	21	2,0	19,4	75,9
	Neither agree or disagree	10	,9	9,3	85,2
	Agree	14	1,3	13,0	98,1
	Agree strongly	2	,2	1,9	100,0
	Total	108	10,2	100,0	
Missing	Missing	24	2,3		
	System	927	87,5		
	Total	951	89,8		
Total		1059	100,0		

Q24V05ConceptGratificationPasttimeHome

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree strongly	61	5,8	56,0	56,0
	Disagree	19	1,8	17,4	73,4
	Neither agree or disagree	14	1,3	12,8	86,2
	Agree	13	1,2	11,9	98,2

	Agree strongly	2	,2	1,8	100,0
	Total	109	10,3	100,0	
Missing	Missing	23	2,2		
	System	927	87,5		
	Total	950	89,7		
Total		1059	100,0		

	Q24V06ConceptGratificationProfessionalDiscussion									
1		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent					
Valid	Disagree strongly	47	4,4	43,5	43,5					
	Disagree	18	1,7	16,7	60,2					
	Neither agree or disagree	16	1,5	14,8	75,0					
	Agree	22	2,1	20,4	95,4					
	Agree strongly	5	,5	4,6	100,0					
	Total	108	10,2	100,0						
Missing	Missing	24	2,3							
	System	927	87,5							
	Total	951	89,8							
Total		1059	100,0							

	Q25Age											
	_	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent							
Valid	10-20	1	,8	,8	,8							
	21-30	83	62,9	62,9	63,6							
	31-40	8	6,1	6,1	69,7							
	41-50	19	14,4	14,4	84,1							
	51-60	19	14,4	14,4	98,5							
	61-70	2	1,5	1,5	100,0							
	Total	132	100,0	100,0								

ຸດ	260	Sen	der

	-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	78	59,1	59,1	59,1
	Female	54	40,9	40,9	100,0
	Total	132	100,0	100,0	

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	- Region Nordjylland	2	1,5	1,5	1,5
	Region Midtjylland	4	3,0	3,0	4,5
	Region Syddanmark	2	1,5	1,5	6,1
	Region Sjælland	10	7,6	7,6	13,6
	Region Hovedstaden	114	86,4	86,4	100,0
	Total	132	100,0	100,0	

Q28Income

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	<150.000 kr	37	28,0	28,0	28,0
	150.001-300.000 kr.	23	17,4	17,4	45,5
	300.001-450.000 kr.	48	36,4	36,4	81,8
	450.001-600.000 kr.	16	12,1	12,1	93,9
	>600.000 kr.	5	3,8	3,8	97,7
	Dont know	3	2,3	2,3	100,0
	Total	132	100,0	100,0	

Q29Occupation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Employed - private sector	53	40,2	40,2	40,2
	Employed - public sector	27	20,5	20,5	60,6
	Self-employed	4	3,0	3,0	63,6
	Unemployed / non-working	2	1,5	1,5	65,2
	Student	42	31,8	31,8	97,0
	Retired	2	1,5	1,5	98,5
	Other	2	1,5	1,5	100,0
	Total	132	100,0	100,0	

Appendix 3 – Logistic regression analysis

Appendix 3.1

Block 1: Method = Enter

Variables in the Equation^a

a. Model cannot be fitted because number of observations is less than or equal to number of model parameters.

Appendix 3.2

	Case Processing Sum	Case Processing Summary						
Unweighted Cases ^a		Ν	Percent					
Selected Cases	Included in Analysis	36	27,3					
	Missing Cases	96	72,7					
	Total	132	100,0					
	Unselected Cases	0	,0					
	Total	132	100,0					

a. If weight is in effect, see classification table for the total number of cases.

b. The category variable Q01V01InternetUseWhereHome is constant for all selected cases. Since a constant was requested in the model, it will be removed from the analysis.

Dependent Variable Encoding

Original Value	Internal Value
Not interested	0
Interested	1

Categorical Variables Codings

	-		Parameter coding						
					i didi		oung		
		Frequency	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Q08InternetUseTimeWhen	6am8am	2	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	8am12pm	15	1,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	12pm4pm	7	,000	1,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	4pm6pm	2	,000	,000	1,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	6pm8pm	3	,000	,000	,000	1,000	,000	,000	,000
	8pm10pm	3	,000	,000	,000	,000	1,000	,000	,000
	10pm12pm	3	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	1,000	,000

2008

.

	12pm6am	1	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	1,000
Q11V01SocialwebsitesTimeFacebook	Never	8	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	

... the remainder of the Categorical Variables Coding table is excluded due to considerable size.

The Categorical Variables Coding tables are excluded throughout the 3.X appendices, except for the last.

Classification Table^{a,b}

			Predicted		
			Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit		
	Observed		Not interested	Interested	Percentage Correct
Step 0	Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit	Not interested	0	17	,0,
		Interested	0	19	100,0
		Overall Percentage			52,8

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. The cut value is ,500

Variables in the Equation

		В	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 0	Constant	,111	,334	,111	1	,739	1,118

Variables not in the Equation^a

	-		Score	df	Sig.
Step 0	Variables	Q01V02InternetUseWhereSchoolW	1,150	1	,284
		Q02InternetUseTime(1)	,175	1	,676

a. Residual Chi-Squares are not computed because of redundancies.

...the remainder of the Variables not in the Equation table is excluded due to considerable size.

The Variables not in the Equation tables are excluded throughout the 3.X appendices, except for the last.

Block 1: Method = Enter

Variables in the Equation^a

a. Model cannot be fitted because number of observations is less than or equal to number of model parameters.

Appendix 3.3

Case Processing Summary

Unweighted Cases ^a	N	Percent	
Selected Cases	Included in Analysis	64	48,5
	Missing Cases	68	51,5
	Total	132	100,0
	Unselected Cases	0	,0
	Total	132	100,0

a. If weight is in effect, see classification table for the total number of cases.

b. The category variable Q01V01InternetUseWhereHome is constant for all selected cases.

Since a constant was requested in the model, it will be removed from the analysis.

Dependent Variable Encoding

Original Value	Internal Value
Not interested	0
Interested	1

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	88,660	58	,006
	Block	88,660	58	,006
	Model	88,660	58	,006

Model Summary

		Cox & Snell R	Nagelkerke R
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Square	Square
1	,000 ^a	,750	1,000

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 19 because a perfect fit is detected. This solution is not unique.

Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Step	Chi-square	df	Sig.	
1	,000	8	1,000	

Contingency Table for Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

		Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit = Not interested		Q23ConceptVisit_r		
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Total
Step 1	1	6	6,000	0	,000	6
	2	6	6,000	0	,000	6

					-
3	6	6,000	0	,000	6
4	6	6,000	0	,000	6
5	6	6,000	0	,000	6
6	3	3,000	3	3,000	6
7	0	,000	6	6,000	6
8	0	,000	7	7,000	7
9	0	,000	6	6,000	6
10	0	,000	9	9,000	9

		Predicted			
		Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit			
	Observed		Not interested	Interested	Percentage Correct
Step 0	Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit	Not interested	33	0	100,0
		Interested	31	0	,0
		Overall Percentage			51,6

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. The cut value is ,500

Variables in the Equation

	-	В	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 0	Constant	-,063	,250	,062	1	,803	,939

Block 1: Method = Enter

Variables in the Equation^a

a. Model cannot be fitted because number of observations is less than or equal to number of model parameters.

Appendix 3.4

Case Processing Summary

Unweighted Cases ^a		N	Percent	
Selected Cases	Included in Analysis		72	54,5
	Missing Cases		60	45,5
	Total		132	100,0
	Unselected Cases		о	,0,
	Total		132	100,0

a. If weight is in effect, see classification table for the total number of cases.

b. The category variable Q01V01InternetUseWhereHome is constant for all selected cases. Since a constant was requested in the model, it will be removed from the analysis.

Dependent Variable Encoding

Original Value	Internal Value
Not interested	0
Interested	1

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	98,922	53	,000
	Block	98,922	53	,000
	Model	98,922	53	,000

Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	,000ª	,747	1,000

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 20 because maximum iterations has been reached. Final solution cannot be found.

Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Step	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1	,000	8	1,000

Contingency Table for Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

		Q23ConceptVisit_not	Visit = Not interested	Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit = Interested		
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Total
Step 1	1	7	7,000	0	,000	7
	2	7	7,000	0	,000	7
	3	7	7,000	0	,000	7

		-			
4	7	7,000	0	,000	7
5	7	7,000	0	,000	7
6	5	5,000	2	2,000	7
7	0	,000	7	7,000	7
8	0	,000	7	7,000	7
9	0	,000	7	7,000	7
10	0	,000	9	9,000	9

			Predicted						
			Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit						
	Observed		Not interested	Interested	Percentage Correct				
Step 1	Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit	Not interested	40	0	100,0				
		Interested	0	32	100,0				
		Overall Percentage			100,0				

a. The cut value is ,500

								95,0% EXI	C.I.for P(B)
		В	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower	Upper
Step	Q01V02InternetUseWhereSchoolWork(1)	26,228	216808,642	,000	1	1,000	2,458E11	,000	
1	Q02InternetUseTime(1)	38,745	63519,807	,000	1	1,000	6,710E16	,000	
	Q03InternetUseTimeEmail(1)	-35,180	65722,298	,000	1	1,000	,000	,000	
	Q05InternetUseTimeNonworkrelated(1)	14,036	93981,758	,000	1	1,000	1246870,756	,000	
	Q06InternetUseTimeHome(1)	-61,787	66163,546	,000	1	,999	,000	,000	
	Q0407InternetUseTimeSchoolWork(1)	-5,286	37421,314	,000	1	1,000	,005	,000	
	Q08InternetUseTimeWhen			,000	7	1,000			
	Q08InternetUseTimeWhen(1)	83,303	102952,284	,000	1	,999	1,506E36	,000	
	Q08InternetUseTimeWhen(2)	88,280	136168,402	,000	1	,999	2,184E38	,000	
	Q08InternetUseTimeWhen(3)	84,091	111950,574	,000	1	,999	3,313E36	,000	
	Q08InternetUseTimeWhen(4)	171,993	117831,506	,000	1	,999	4,962E74	,000	
	Q08InternetUseTimeWhen(5)	98,609	161991,721	,000	1	1,000	6,690E42	,000	
	Q08InternetUseTimeWhen(6)	88,675	169727,357	,000	1	1,000	3,245E38	,000	

Master's thesis

		-					
Q08InternetUseTimeWhen(7)	201,733	209932,700	,000	1	,999	4,089E87	,000
Q09V01InternetUsePurposeSocialwebsites(1)	3,279	61226,177	,000	1	1,000	26,538	,000
Q09V02InternetUsePurposeGeneralsurfing(1)	9,932	60377,113	,000	1	1,000	20579,630	,000
Q09V03InternetUsePurposeInformationsearch(1)	-24,838	55781,311	,000	1	1,000	,000	,000
Q09V04InternetUsePurposeWorkrelatedsearch(1)	22,136	65430,473	,000	1	1,000	4,109E9	,000
Q09V05InternetUsePurposeNewsSportsETC(1)	-9,150	133108,481	,000	1	1,000	,000	,000
Q09V06InternetUsePurposeEmail(1)	-,209	108168,872	,000	1	1,000	,812	,000
Q17V01AdvertisementAttitudePlatformMailbox	4,922	13527,739	,000	1	1,000	137,309	,000
Q17V02AdvertisementAttitudePlatformTV	-19,504	27757,564	,000	1	,999	,000	,000
Q17V03AdvertisementAttitudePlatformInternet	-10,222	31368,731	,000	1	1,000	,000	,000
Q17V04AdvertisementAttitudePlatformOutdoor	-1,058	33233,975	,000	1	1,000	,347	,000
Q17V05AdvertisementAttitudePlatformPrint	25,302	16936,923	,000	1	,999	9,740E10	,000
Q19AdvertisementInfluence	4,176	12758,071	,000	1	1,000	65,109	,000
Q20AdvertisementOverallSearch(1)	-9,304	43040,659	,000	1	1,000	,000	,000
Positive_Negative_AttitudeQ13Advert			,000	2	1,000		
Positive_Negative_AttitudeQ13Advert(1)	-8,877	147219,200	,000	1	1,000	,000	,000
Positive_Negative_AttitudeQ13Advert(2)	-39,371	109626,125	,000	1	1,000	,000	,000
Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert			,000	2	1,000		
Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(1)	-49,019	95488,774	,000	1	1,000	,000	,000
Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(2)	-40,860	38625,556	,000	1	,999	,000	,000
Without_with_gratification(1)	-10,795	58973,354	,000	1	1,000	,000	,000
Q25Age_Original	19,493	36410,849	,000	1	1,000	2,922E8	,000
Q26Gender_Original(1)	21,737	73602,465	,000	1	1,000	2,755E9	,000
Q27Region_Original			,000	4	1,000		l.
Q27Region_Original(1)	81,987	171826,032	,000	1	1,000	4,042E35	,000
Q27Region_Original(2)	69,774	148426,822	,000	1	1,000	2,007E30	,000
Q27Region_Original(3)	-55,723	203986,614	,000	1	1,000	,000	,000
Q27Region_Original(4)	48,678	152404,463	,000	1	1,000	1,383E21	,000
Q28Income_Original			,000	5	1,000		
Q28Income_Original(1)	78,110	68868,658	,000	1	,999	8,374E33	,000
_Q28Income_Original(2)	90,425	85630,559	,000	1	,999	1,866E39	,000

		-		_			-	
Q28Income_Original(3)	122,301	89128,178	,000	1	,999	1,302E53	,000	
Q28Income_Original(4)	137,366	158615,251	,000	1	,999	4,540E59	,000	
Q28Income_Original(5)	-8,656	256725,755	,000	1	1,000	,000	,000	
Q29Occupation_Original			,000	3	1,000			
Q29Occupation_Original(1)	-43,203	81494,275	,000	1	1,000	,000	,000	
Q29Occupation_Original(2)	36,332	210346,094	,000	1	1,000	6,009E15	,000	
Q29Occupation_Original(3)	89,035	67914,205	,000	1	,999	4,649E38	,000	
Q24V01ConceptGratificationMoney	-,031	12573,811	,000	1	1,000	,970	,000	
Q24V02ConceptGratificationPrices	1,178	12130,469	,000	1	1,000	3,247	,000	
Q24V03ConceptGratificationSocialising	6,371	18408,271	,000	1	1,000	584,911	,000	
Q24V04ConceptGratificationPasttimeWork	-10,167	16825,839	,000	1	1,000	,000	,000	
Q24V05ConceptGratificationPasttimeHome	9,799	13801,903	,000	1	,999	18014,461	,000	
Q24V06ConceptGratificationProfessionalDiscussion	-7,352	23570,710	,000	1	1,000	,001	,000	
Q18V03AdvertisementDiscussion(1)	62,866	140326,407	,000	1	1,000	2,007E27	,000	
Q11Social_website_Use_Heavy_Light(1)	-39,428	32895,500	,000	1	,999	,000	,000	
Constant	-317,345	282782,239	,000	1	,999	,000		

				Predicted				
				Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit				
	Observed		Not interested	Interested	Percentage Correct			
Step 0	Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit	Not interested	40	0	100,0			
		Interested	32	0	,0			
		Overall Percentage			55,6			

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. The cut value is ,500

		В	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 0	Constant	-,223	,237	,885	1	,347	,800

Appendix 3.5

Case Processing Summary

Unweighted Cases ^a		N	Percent
Selected Cases	Included in Analysis	72	54,5
	Missing Cases	60	45,5
	Total	132	100,0
	Unselected Cases	0	,0
	Total	132	100,0

a. If weight is in effect, see classification table for the total number of cases.

b. The category variable Q01V01InternetUseWhereHome is constant for all selected cases. Since a constant was requested in the model, it will be removed from the analysis.

Dependent Variable Encoding

Original Value	Internal Value
Not interested	0
Interested	1

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	99,313	44	,000
	Block	99,313	44	,000
	Model	99,313	44	,000

Model Summary

		Cox & Snell R	Nagelkerke R
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Square	Square
1	,000 ^a	,748	1,000

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 20 because maximum iterations has been reached. Final solution cannot be found.

Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Step	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1	,000	8	1,000

Contingency Table for Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

		Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit = Not interested		Q23ConceptVisit_r		
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Total
Step 1	-	7	7,000	0	,000	7
	2	7	7,000	0	,000	7
	3	7	7,000	0	,000	7

		-			
4	7	7,000	0	,000	7
5	7	7,000	0	,000	7
6	4	4,000	3	3,000	7
7	0	,000	7	7,000	7
8	0	,000	7	7,000	7
9	0	,000	4	4,000	4
10	0	,000	12	12,000	12

			Predicted				
			Q23	Visit			
	Observed		Not interested	Interested	Percentage Correct		
Step 1	Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit	Not interested	39	0	100,0		
		Interested	0	33	100,0		
		Overall Percentage			100,0		

a. The cut value is ,500

Variables	in	the	Equ	uatior
-----------	----	-----	-----	--------

								95, C.I EXI	0% .for P(B)
		В	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower	Upper
Ste	Q01V02InternetUseWhereSchoolWork(1)	22,547	140220,030	,000	1	1,000	6,197E9	,000	
p 1	Q02InternetUseTime(1)	40,190	40145,858	,000	1	,999	2,845E17	,000	
	Q03InternetUseTimeEmail(1)	-70,268	52104,739	,000	1	,999	,000	,000	
	Q05InternetUseTimeNonworkrelated(1)	-55,239	52284,657	,000	1	,999	,000	,000	
	Q06InternetUseTimeHome(1)	-131,437	31568,706	,000	1	,997	,000	,000	
	Q0407InternetUseTimeSchoolWork(1)	-87,484	35414,235	,000	1	,998	,000	,000	
	Q08InternetUseTimeWhen			,000	7	1,000			
	Q08InternetUseTimeWhen(1)	71,254	76847,432	,000	1	,999	8,815E30	,000	
	Q08InternetUseTimeWhen(2)	54,545	65350,557	,000	1	,999	4,881E23	,000	-
	Q08InternetUseTimeWhen(3)	-109,516	60736,363	,000	1	,999	,000	,000	
	Q08InternetUseTimeWhen(4)	108,072	47390,835	,000	1	,998	8,612E46	,000	
	Q08InternetUseTimeWhen(5)	-36,474	54041,338	,000	1	,999	,000	,000	

Q08InternetUseTimeWhen(6)	-161,629	67123,523	,000	1	,998	,000	,000	
Q08InternetUseTimeWhen(7)	30,984	86097,289	,000	1	1,000	2,860E13	,000	
Q09V01InternetUsePurposeSocialwebsites(1)	142,399	32852,422	,000	1	,997	6,971E61	,000	
Q09V02InternetUsePurposeGeneralsurfing(1)	-15,549	30611,800	,000	1	1,000	,000	,000	
Q09V03InternetUsePurposeInformationsearch(1)	-158,959	31918,012	,000	1	,996	,000	,000	
Q09V04InternetUsePurposeWorkrelatedsearch(1)	34,818	28241,989	,000	1	,999	1,322E15	,000	
Q09V05InternetUsePurposeNewsSportsETC(1)	-24,336	48381,399	,000	1	1,000	,000	,000	
Q09V06InternetUsePurposeEmail(1)	-47,720	53255,227	,000	1	,999	,000	,000	
Q19AdvertisementInfluence	39,593	7284,140	,000	1	,996	1,567E17	,000	
Q20AdvertisementOverallSearch(1)	-6,593	29065,686	,000	1	1,000	,001	,000	
Positive_Negative_AttitudeQ13Advert			,000	2	1,000			
Positive_Negative_AttitudeQ13Advert(1)	121,237	55460,892	,000	1	,998	4,494E52	,000	
Positive_Negative_AttitudeQ13Advert(2)	138,526	54509,294	,000	1	,998	1,449E60	,000	
Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert			,000	2	1,000			
Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(1)	50,327	46620,181	,000	1	,999	7,190E21	,000	
Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(2)	-1,851	14922,245	,000	1	1,000	,157	,000	
Without_with_gratification(1)	17,822	15064,403	,000	1	,999	5,497E7	,000	
Q26Gender_Original(1)	-142,546	23253,006	,000	1	,995	,000	,000	
Q27Region_Original			,000	4	1,000			
Q27Region_Original(1)	-150,085	195820,853	,000	1	,999	,000	,000	
Q27Region_Original(2)	-180,430	136453,112	,000	1	,999	,000	,000	
Q27Region_Original(3)	-193,582	202802,274	,000	1	,999	,000	,000	
Q27Region_Original(4)	-214,726	163523,225	,000	1	,999	,000	,000	
Q29Occupation_Original			,000	3	1,000			
Q29Occupation_Original(1)	-78,156	46600,152	,000	1	,999	,000	,000	
Q29Occupation_Original(2)	-70,581	147916,830	,000	1	1,000	,000	,000	
Q29Occupation_Original(3)	93,728	27569,045	,000	1	,997	5,075E40	,000	
Q24V01ConceptGratificationMoney	-25,392	4737,019	,000	1	,996	,000	,000	
Q24V02ConceptGratificationPrices	14,595	11240,878	,000	1	,999	2179671,524	,000	
Q24V03ConceptGratificationSocialising	-7,528	9129,542	,000	1	,999	,001	,000	
Q24V04ConceptGratificationPasttimeWork	-49,654	13887,386	,000	1	,997	,000	,000	

Q24V05ConceptGratificationPasttimeHome	27,662	15440,253	,000	1	,999	1,032E12	,000	
Q24V06ConceptGratificationProfessionalDiscussion	18,172	16046,856	,000	1	,999	7,798E7	,000	
Q18V03AdvertisementDiscussion(1)	191,686	61456,067	,000	1	,998	1,771E83	,000	
Q11Social_website_Use_Heavy_Light(1)	-104,643	90785,028	,000	1	,999	,000	,000	
Q25Age_NEW(1)	104,609	29636,370	,000	1	,997	2,698E45	,000	
Q28Income_New(1)	37,440	22205,014	,000	1	,999	1,820E16	,000	
Constant	27,976	276594,014	,000	1	1,000	1,412E12		

				Predicted	t
			Q2	3ConceptVisit	_notVisit
	Observed		Not interested	Interested	Percentage Correct
Step 0	_ Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit	Not interested	39	0	100,0
		Interested	33	0	,0
		Overall Percentage			54,2

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. The cut value is ,500

Variables	in	the	Equation
variables	IN	tne	Equation

	-	В	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 0	Constant	-,167	,237	,499	1	,480	,846

Appendix 3.6

	Case Processing S	ummary		N Percent 73 55,3 59 44,7 132 100,0 0 ,0 132 100,0
Unweighted Cases ^a			Ν	Percent
Selected Cases	Included in Analysis		73	55,3
	Missing Cases		59	44,7
	Total		132	100,0
	Unselected Cases		0	,0
	Total		132	100,0

a. If weight is in effect, see classification table for the total number of cases.

Dependent Variable Encoding

Original Value	Internal Value
Not interested	0
Interested	1

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

	-	Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	100,857	37	,000
	Block	100,857	37	,000
	Model	100,857	37	,000

Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	,000ª	,749	1,000

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 20 because maximum iterations has been reached. Final solution cannot be found.

Hosmer and Lemeshow Test						
Step Chi-square df Sig.						
1	,000	8	1,000			

Contingency Table for Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

	-	Q23ConceptVisit_not	tVisit = Not interested	Q23ConceptVisit_n	otVisit = Interested	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Total
Step 1	1	7	7,000	0	,000	7
	2	7	7,000	0	,000	7
	3	7	7,000	0	,000	7
	4	7	7,000	0	,000	7
	5	7	7,000	0	,000	7
	6	4	4,000	3	3,000	7
	7	0	,000	7	7,000	7
	8	0	,000	7	7,000	7
	9	0	,000	1	1,000	1

Classification Table^a

				Predicted				
			Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit					
	Observed		Not interested	Interested	Percentage Correct			
Step 1	Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit	Not interested	39	0	100,0			

	Interested			0)		34		10
	Overall Percentage	;			1				10
a. The	ecut value is ,500	<u> </u>			<u> </u>		<u>L</u>		
	Variable	es in the E	quation	·				·	
_								95,0%	C.I.for
								EXF	Р(В)
		В	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower	Upper
Step	Q02InternetUseTime(1)	-208,782	5440,015	,001	1	,969	,000	,000	
1	Q03InternetUseTimeEmail(1)	428,979	8487,950	,003	1	,960	2,010E186	,000	
	Q05InternetUseTimeNonworkrelated(1)	212,529	5332,795	,002	1	,968	1,996E92	,000	
	Q06InternetUseTimeHome(1)	-371,727	6199,780	,004	1	,952	,000	,000	
	Q0407InternetUseTimeSchoolWork(1)	345,968	6599,145	,003	1	,958	1,786E150	,000	
	Q09V01InternetUsePurposeSocialwebsites(1)	114,638	4660,927	,001	1	,980	6,118E49	,000	
	Q09V02InternetUsePurposeGeneralsurfing(1)	110,363	3045,022	,001	1	,971	8,509E47	,000	
	Q09V03InternetUsePurposeInformationsearch(1)	13,432	2478,492	,000	1	,996	681222,956	,000	
	Q09V04InternetUsePurposeWorkrelatedsearch(1)	-244,924	4995,252	,002	1	,961	,000	,000	
	Q09V05InternetUsePurposeNewsSportsETC(1)	-238,919	4501,213	,003	1	,958	,000	,000	
	Q09V06InternetUsePurposeEmail(1)	-575,252	10056,227	,003	1	,954	,000	,000	
	Q19AdvertisementInfluence	171,548	2723,573	,004	1	,950	3,178E74	,000	
	Q20AdvertisementOverallSearch(1)	-175,626	3078,919	,003	1	,955	,000	,000	
	Positive_Negative_AttitudeQ13Advert			,003	2	,998			
	Positive_Negative_AttitudeQ13Advert(1)	-42,331	2273,266	,000	1	,985	,000	,000	
	Positive_Negative_AttitudeQ13Advert(2)	-441,573	7971,889	,003	1	,956	,000	,000	
	Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert			,002	2	,999			
	Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(1)	-290,020	6176,762	,002	1	,963	,000	,000	
	Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(2)	-145,887	3209,843	,002	1	,964	,000	,000	
	Without_with_gratification(1)	165,352	3486,613	,002	1	,962	6,478E71	,000	
	Q26Gender_Original(1)	-135,877	2458,258	,003	1	,956	,000	,000	
	Q27Region_Original			,000	4	1,000			
	Q27Region_Original(1)	-934,534	59830.596	,000	1	,988	.000	,000	
	Q27Region_Original(2)	-567,964	58229 998	,000	1	,992	000	,000	
	O27Begion_Original/3)	-800 615	3763433 845	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	4	1 000	,000	,	

191

	_	_	_		-			
Q27Region_Original(4)	-650,707	42700,696	,000	1	,988	,000	,000	
Q29Occupation_Original	l.		,003	4	1,000		l	
Q29Occupation_Original(1)	-88,054	2611,815	,001	1	,973	,000	,000	
Q29Occupation_Original(2)	877,247	44958,232	,000	1	,984		,000	
Q29Occupation_Original(3)	193,628	3964,914	,002	1	,961	1,234E84	,000	
Q29Occupation_Original(4)	273,466	42969,384	,000	1	,995	5,816E118	,000	
Q24V01ConceptGratificationMoney	21,687	738,887	,001	1	,977	2,621E9	,000	
Q24V02ConceptGratificationPrices	-47,195	1335,171	,001	1	,972	,000	,000	
Q24V03ConceptGratificationSocialising	41,124	1078,323	,001	1	,970	7,242E17	,000	
Q24V04ConceptGratificationPasttimeWork	-46,031	1494,547	,001	1	,975	,000	,000	
Q24V05ConceptGratificationPasttimeHome	40,002	2440,109	,000	1	,987	2,358E17	,000	
Q24V06ConceptGratificationProfessionalDiscussion	-134,456	2471,882	,003	1	,957	,000	,000	
Q18V03AdvertisementDiscussion(1)	-13,493	13999,912	,000	1	,999	,000	,000	
Q11Social_website_Use_Heavy_Light(1)	273,109	5438,650	,003	1	,960	4,070E118	,000	
Q25Age_NEW(1)	81,436	2678,053	,001	1	,976	2,330E35	,000	
Q28Income_New(1)	232,898	4691,842	,002	1	,960	1,400E101	,000	
Constant	870,188	46278,216	,000	1	,985	-		

-				Predicted					
					_notVisit				
	Observed	Not interested	Interested	Percentage Correct					
Step 0	- Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit	Not interested	39	0	100,0				
		Interested	34	0	,0				
		Overall Percentage			53,4				

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. The cut value is ,500

		В	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 0	Constant	-,137	,235	,342	1	,559	,872

Appendix 3.7

Case Processing Summary

Unweighted Cases ^a		Ν	Percent
Selected Cases	Included in Analysis	73	55,3
	Missing Cases	59	44,7
	Total	132	100,0
	Unselected Cases	0	,0
	Total	132	100,0

a. If weight is in effect, see classification table for the total number of cases.

Dependent Variable Encoding

Original Value	Internal Value
Not interested	0
Interested	1

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

	_	Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	100,856	30	,000
	Block	100,856	30	,000
	Model	100,856	30	,000

Model Summary

		Cox & Snell R	
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	,000 ^ª	,749	1,000

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 20 because maximum iterations has been reached. Final solution cannot be found.

Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Step	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1	,000	6	1,000

Contingency Table for Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

	-	Q23ConceptVisit_not	23ConceptVisit_notVisit = Not interested		Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit = Interested			
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Total		
Step 1	1	15	15,000	0	,000	15		
	2	7	7,000	0	,000	7		
	3	7	7,000	0	,000	7		

4	7	7,000	0	,000	7
5	3	3,000	4	4,000	7
6	0	,000	7	7,000	7
7	0	,000	5	5,000	5
8	0	,000	18	18,000	18

			1	Predicted	
			Q23	3ConceptVisit_n	otVisit
	Observed		Not interested	Interested	Percentage Correct
Step 1	Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit	Not interested	39	0	100,0
		Interested	0	34	100,0
		Overall Percentage			100,0

a. The cut value is ,500

								95,0 E	% C.I.for XP(B)
		В	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower	Upper
Step	Q02InternetUseTime(1)	-376,457	4262,652	,008	1	,930	,000	,000	
1	Q03InternetUseTimeEmail(1)	527,633	41371,926	,000	1	,990	1,406E229	,000	
	Q05InternetUseTimeNonworkrelated(1)	104,116	1723,657	,004	1	,952	1,648E45	,000	
	Q06InternetUseTimeHome(1)	-602,424	4658,747	,017	1	,897	,000	,000	
	Q0407InternetUseTimeSchoolWork(1)	496,521	4125,956	,014	1	,904	4,327E215	,000	
	Q09V01InternetUsePurposeSocialwebsites(1)	575,285	4228,817	,019	1	,892	6,967E249	,000	
	Q09V02InternetUsePurposeGeneralsurfing(1)	-36,962	747,636	,002	1	,961	,000	,000	
	Q09V03InternetUsePurposeInformationsearch(1)	-74,376	1370,231	,003	1	,957	,000	,000	
	Q09V04InternetUsePurposeWorkrelatedsearch(1)	-336,169	2679,865	,016	1	,900	,000	,000	
	Q09V05InternetUsePurposeNewsSportsETC(1)	-344,777	2572,167	,018	1	,893	,000	,000	
	Q09V06InternetUsePurposeEmail(1)	-957,503	7789,253	,015	1	,902	,000	,000	
	Q19AdvertisementInfluence	279,699	2030,020	,019	1	,890	2,963E121	,000	
	Q20AdvertisementOverallSearch(1)	-503,108	3530,201	,020	1	,887	,000	,000	
	Positive_Negative_AttitudeQ13Advert			,019	2	,991			
	Positive_Negative_AttitudeQ13Advert(1)	-10,038	775,005	,000	1	,990	,000	,000	

Positive_Negative_AttitudeQ13Advert(2)	-741,829	5662,215	,017	1	,896	,000	,000	
Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert			,019	2	,991			
Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(1)	-659,093	4815,657	,019	1	,891	,000	,000	
Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(2)	-405,429	2947,410	,019	1	,891	,000	,000	
Without_with_gratification(1)	251,797	2448,647	,011	1	,918	2,259E109	,000	
Q26Gender_Original(1)	-129,653	2598,072	,002	1	,960	,000	,000	
Q24V01ConceptGratificationMoney	20,724	269,050	,006	1	,939	1,001E9	,000	1,039E238
Q24V02ConceptGratificationPrices	-55,302	710,274	,006	1	,938	,000	,000	
Q24V03ConceptGratificationSocialising		498,164	,002	1	,963	1,022E10	,000	
Q24V04ConceptGratificationPasttimeWork	-54,345	775,246	,005	1	,944	,000	,000	
Q24V05ConceptGratificationPasttimeHome	136,154	1158,181	,014	1	,906	1,352E59	,000	
Q24V06ConceptGratificationProfessionalDiscussion	-288,142	2112,827	,019	1	,892	,000	,000	
Q18V03AdvertisementDiscussion(1)	-165,499	6592,519	,001	1	,980	,000	,000	
Q11Social_website_Use_Heavy_Light(1)	442,175	3027,862	,021	1	,884	1,082E192	,000	
Q25Age_NEW(1)		1148,649	,000	1	,992	,000	,000	
Q28Income_New(1)		2984,570	,018	1	,892	1,904E176	,000	
Q29Occupation(1)	106,713	1451,956	,005	1	,941	2,212E46	,000	
Constant	886,819	9914,077	,008	1	,929			

			Q23	ConceptVisit_	notVisit
	Observed		Not interested	Interested	Percentage Correct
Step 0	Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit	Not interested	39	0	100,0
		Interested	34	0	,0
		Overall Percentage			53,4

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. The cut value is ,500

		В	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 0	Constant	-,137	,235	,342	1	,559	,872

Appendix 3.8

Case Processing Summary

Unweighted Cases ^a		N	Percent
Selected Cases	Included in Analysis	75	56,8
	Missing Cases	57	43,2
	Total	132	100,0
	Unselected Cases	0	,0
	Total	132	100,0

a. If weight is in effect, see classification table for the total number of cases.

Dependent Variable Encoding

Original Value	Internal Value
Not interested	0
Interested	1

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	64,263	24	,000
	Block	64,263	24	,000
	Model	64,263	24	,000

Model Summary

		Cox & Snell R	Nagelkerke R
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Square	Square
1	39,376 ^ª	,575	,768

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 10 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Step	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1	4,788	7	,686

Contingency Table for Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

	_	Q23ConceptVisit_not	tVisit = Not interested	Q23ConceptVisit_r	-	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Total
Step 1	1	8	8,000	0	,000	8
	2	8	7,977	0	,023	8
	3	7	7,795	1	,205	8

F

4	7	6,900	1	1,100	8
5	6	4,806	2	3,194	8
6	2	2,687	6	5,313	8
7	2	1,485	6	6,515	8
8	0	,312	8	7,688	8

Classification Table^a

			Predicted						
			Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit						
	Observed		Not interested Interested		Percentage Correct				
Step 1	Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit	Not interested	36	4	90,0				
		Interested	2	33	94,3				
		Overall Percentage			92,0				

a. The cut value is ,500

								95,0% EX	% C.I.for (P(B)
		В	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower	Upper
Step	Q06InternetUseTimeHome(1)	-5,288	3,099	2,911	1	,088	,005	,000	2,195
1	Q0407InternetUseTimeSchoolWork(1)	,370	1,323	,078	1	,780	1,448	,108	19,337
	Q09V01InternetUsePurposeSocialwebsites(1)	3,395	1,854	3,354	1	,067	29,813	,788	1127,830
	Q09V02InternetUsePurposeGeneralsurfing(1)	-1,196	1,509	,629	1	,428	,302	,016	5,815
	Q09V03InternetUsePurposeInformationsearch(1)	-,353	1,525	,054	1	,817	,703	,035	13,969
	Q09V04InternetUsePurposeWorkrelatedsearch(1)	-2,302	2,016	1,304	1	,253	,100	,002	5,204
	Q09V05InternetUsePurposeNewsSportsETC(1)	-1,869	2,158	,750	1	,386	,154	,002	10,597
	Q09V06InternetUsePurposeEmail(1)	-3,400	2,514	1,829	1	,176	,033	,000	4,606
	Q19AdvertisementInfluence	2,457	1,039	5,600	1	,018	11,675	1,525	89,379
	Q20AdvertisementOverallSearch(1)	-3,106	1,938	2,568	1	,109	,045	,001	1,999
	Positive_Negative_AttitudeQ13Advert			,655	2	,721			
	Positive_Negative_AttitudeQ13Advert(1)	-,388	1,945	,040	1	,842	,679	,015	30,724
	Positive_Negative_AttitudeQ13Advert(2)	-1,937	2,421	,640	1	,424	,144	,001	16,567
	Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert		1	2,293	2	,318			
	Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(1)	-4,182	2,764	2,290	1	,130	,015	,000	3,437

						1		
Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(2)	-2,068	2,048	1,019	1	,313	,126	,002	7,006
Without_with_gratification(1)	1,230	1,374	,802	1	,371	3,423	,231	50,614
Q26Gender_Original(1)	-1,838	1,587	1,341	1	,247	,159	,007	3,569
Q24V01ConceptGratificationMoney	,049	,447	,012	1	,913	1,050	,437	2,522
Q24V02ConceptGratificationPrices	-,265	,587	,204	1	,652	,767	,243	2,425
Q24V03ConceptGratificationSocialising	,254	,784	,105	1	,745	1,290	,278	5,992
Q24V04ConceptGratificationPasttimeWork	,139	,791	,031	1	,860	1,150	,244	5,421
Q24V05ConceptGratificationPasttimeHome	-,013	,789	,000	1	,987	,987	,210	4,633
Q24V06ConceptGratificationProfessionalDiscussio	-,676	,644	1,102	1	,294	,509	,144	1,797
Q11Social_website_Use_Heavy_Light(1)	-1,532	1,758	,759	1	,384	,216	,007	6,775
Q25Age_NEW(1)	-,810	1,371	,349	1	,555	,445	,030	6,534
Constant	5,095	5,237	,946	1	,331	163,153		

				Predicted	
			Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit		
	Observed		Not interested	Interested	Percentage Correct
Step 0	Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit	Not interested	40	0	100,0
		Interested	35	0	,0
		Overall Percentage			53,3

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. The cut value is ,500

_	-	В	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 0	Constant	-,134	,231	,333	1	,564	,875

Appendix 3.9

Case Processing Summary

Unweighted Cases ^a		N	Percent
Selected Cases	Included in Analysis	83	62,9
	Missing Cases	49	37,1
	Total	132	100,0
	Unselected Cases	0	,0
	Total	132	100,0

a. If weight is in effect, see classification table for the total number of cases.

Dependent Variable Encoding

Original Value	Internal Value
Not interested	0
Interested	1

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	68,922	16	,000
	Block	68,922	16	,000
	Model	68,922	16	,000

Model Summary

		Cox & Snell R	Nagelkerke R
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Square	Square
1	45,550 ^ª	,564	,754

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 8 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Step	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1	8,312	8	,404

Contingency Table for Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

		Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit = Not interested		Q23ConceptVisit_r		
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Total
Step 1	1	8	7,994	0	,006	8
	2	8	7,962	0	,038	8
	3	7	7,777	1	,223	8

					-
4	7	7,364	1	,636	8
5	8	6,234	0	1,766	8
6	2	3,666	6	4,334	8
7	4	2,576	4	5,424	8
8	1	1,019	7	6,981	8
9	0	,334	8	7,666	8
10	0	,073	11	10,927	11

				Predic	ted
		Q	23ConceptV	isit_notVisit	
	Observed		Not interested	Interested	Percentage Correct
Step 1	Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit	Not interested	38	7	84,4
		Interested	4	34	89,5
		Overall Percentage			86,7

a. The cut value is ,500

Variables	in the	Equation
-----------	--------	----------

								95,0% EX	C.I.for P(B)
		В	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower	Upper
Step	Q06InternetUseTimeHome(1)	-3,654	1,678	4,744	1	,029	,026	,001	,694
1	Q09V01InternetUsePurposeSocialwebsites(1)	2,675	1,382	3,749	1	,053	14,517	,968	217,760
	Q09V02InternetUsePurposeGeneralsurfing(1)	-1,582	1,039	2,317	1	,128	,206	,027	1,576
	Q09V04InternetUsePurposeWorkrelatedsearch(1)	-,373	,982	,144	1	,704	,689	,101	4,716
C	Q09V05InternetUsePurposeNewsSportsETC(1)	-1,409	1,327	1,127	1	,288	,244	,018	3,294
	Q09V06InternetUsePurposeEmail(1)	-,835	1,330	,394	1	,530	,434	,032	5,883
	Q19AdvertisementInfluence	2,050	,555	13,631	1	,000	7,769	2,616	23,068
	Q20AdvertisementOverallSearch(1)	-1,127	,986	1,306	1	,253	,324	,047	2,239
	Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert			6,868	2	,032			
	Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(1)	-4,259	1,627	6,857	1	,009	,014	,001	,343
	Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(2)	-2,446	1,314	3,467	1	,063	,087	,007	1,137
	Without_with_gratification(1)	,689	,945	,532	1	,466	1,992	,312	12,706
	Q26Gender_Original(1)	-1,455	1,112	1,713	1	,191	,233	,026	2,064

						ĺ		
Q24V02ConceptGratificationPrices	,058	,253	,053	1	,818	1,060	,645	1,742
Q24V06ConceptGratificationProfessionalDiscussion	-,172	,260	,437	1	,509	,842	,506	1,402
Q11Social_website_Use_Heavy_Light(1)	-1,333	1,453	,841	1	,359	,264	,015	4,549
Q25Age_NEW(1)	-,426	1,141	,139	1	,709	,653	,070	6,113
Constant	-,175	2,438	,005	1	,943	,839		

				Predicted	
		Q23Cc	onceptVisit_	notVisit	
	Observed		Not interested	Interested	Percentage Correct
Step 0	Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit	Not interested	45	0	100,0
		Interested	38	0	,0
		Overall Percentage	1		54,2

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. The cut value is ,500

Variables in the Equation

	-	В	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 0	Constant	-,169	,220	,589	1	,443	,844

Appendix 3.10

Case Processing Summary

Unweighted Cases ^a		N	Percent
Selected Cases	Included in Analysis	83	62,9
	Missing Cases	49	37,1
	Total	132	100,0
	Unselected Cases	0	,0
	Total	132	100,0

a. If weight is in effect, see classification table for the total number of cases.

Dependent Variable Encoding

Original Value	Internal Value
Not interested	0
Interested	1

			Paramete	er coding
		Frequency	(1)	(2)
Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert	Not interested	22	,000	,000
	Interested	29	1,000	,000
	Neutral	32	,000	1,000
Social_website_Use_Heavy_LightQ11	Light	27	,000	
	Heavy	56	1,000	
Q09V01InternetUsePurposeSocialwebsite	No	33	,000	
s	Yes	50	1,000	
Q09V02InternetUsePurposeGeneralsurfing	I No	48	,000	
	Yes	35	1,000	
Q20AdvertisementOverallSearch	Yes	39	,000	
	No	44	1,000	
Q26Gender_Original	Male	54	,000	
	Female	29	1,000	
Q06InternetUseTimeHome	Light	70	,000	
	Heavy	13	1,000	

Categorical Variables Codings

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

	-	Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	60,376	9	,000
	Block	60,376	9	,000
	Model	60,376	9	,000

Model Summary

		Cox & Snell R	Nagelkerke R
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Square	Square
1	54,095 ^ª	,517	,691

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 6 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Step	Chi-square	df	Sig.	
1	7,268	8	,508	

2008

	-	Q23ConceptVisit_not	Visit = Not interested	Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit = Interested		
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Total
Step 1	1	8	7,962	0	,038	8
	2	8	7,831	0	,169	8
	3	7	7,676	1	,324	8
	4	7	7,142	1	,858	8
	5	7	5,498	1	2,502	8
	6	3	4,366	5	3,634	8
	7	2	2,242	6	5,758	8
	8	3	1,379	5	6,621	8
	9	0	,657	8	7,343	8
	10	0	,246	11	10,754	11

Contingency	Table	for	Hosmer	and	Lemeshow	Test
Contingency	Tuble		110011101	unu	Lenneshow	1000

			Predicted					
			Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit					
	Observed		Not interested	Interested	Percentage Correct			
Step 1	Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit	Not interested	40	5	88,9			
		Interested	6	32	84,2			
		Overall Percentage			86,7			

a. The cut value is ,500

								95,0% EXF	C.I.for P(B)
		в	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower	Upper
Step	Q06InternetUseTimeHome(1)	-2,670	1,330	4,028	1	,045	,069	,005	,939
1	Q09V01InternetUsePurposeSocialwebsites(1)	1,187	1,028	1,333	1	,248	3,279	,437	24,612
	Q09V02InternetUsePurposeGeneralsurfing(1)	-1,081	,849	1,622	1	,203	,339	,064	1,791
	Q19AdvertisementInfluence	1,554	,396	15,385	1	,000	4,731	2,176	10,284
	Q20AdvertisementOverallSearch(1)	-1,190	,800	2,213	1	,137	,304	,063	1,459
	Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert			6,248	2	,044	ļ		
	Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(1)	-2,636	1,065	6,125	1	,013	,072	,009	,578

Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(2)	-1,025	,924	1,230	1	,267	,359	,059	2,196
Q26Gender_Original(1)	-1,463	,916	2,552	1	,110	,232	,039	1,394
Q11Social_website_Use_Heavy_Light(1)	-1,136	1,074	1,118	1	,290	,321	,039	2,637

			Predicted					
			Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit					
	Observed		Not interested	Interested	Percentage Correct			
Step 0	Q23ConceptVisit_notVisit	Not interested	45	0	100,0			
		Interested	38	0	,0			
		Overall Percentage			54,2			

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. The cut value is ,500

Variables in the Equation

	-	В	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 0	Constant	-,169	,220	,589	1	,443	,844

	-	Score	df	Sig.
Step 0 Variables	Q06InternetUseTimeHome(1)	,001	1	,977
	Q09V01InternetUsePurposeSocialwebsites(1)	1,958	1	,162
	Q09V02InternetUsePurposeGeneralsurfing(1)	,190	1	,663
	Q19AdvertisementInfluence	34,880	1	,000
	Q20AdvertisementOverallSearch(1)	9,947	1	,002
	Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert	21,042	2	,000
	Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(1)	14,629	1	,000
	Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert(2)	,025	1	,874
	Q26Gender_Original(1)	,348	1	,555
	Q11Social_website_Use_Heavy_Light(1)	,029	1	,865
	Overall Statistics	45,475	9	,000

Appendix 4 – Demographic particulars and tendencies

Appendix 4.1 - Age distribution

Q25Age										
-	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent						
Valid 10-20	1	,8	,8	,8						
21-30	83	62,9	62,9	63,6						
31-40	8	6,1	6,1	69,7						
41-50	19	14,4	14,4	84,1						
51-60	19	14,4	14,4	98,5						
61-70	2	1,5	1,5	100,0						
Total	132	100,0	100,0							

Appendix 4.2 – Gender distribution

	Q26Gender									
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent					
Valid	Male	78	59,1	59,1	59,1					
	Female	54	40,9	40,9	100,0					
	Total	132	100,0	100,0						

Appendix 4.3 – Regional distribution

	Q27Region										
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent						
Valid	Region Nordjylland	2	1,5	1,5	1,5						
	Region Midtjylland	4	3,0	3,0	4,5						
	Region Syddanmark	2	1,5	1,5	6,1						
	Region Sjælland	10	7,6	7,6	13,6						
	Region Hovedstaden	114	86,4	86,4	100,0						
	Total	132	100,0	100,0							

Appendix 4.4 – Income distribution

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	<150.000 kr.	37	28,0	28,0	28,0
	150.001-300.000 kr.	23	17,4	17,4	45,5
	300.001-450.000 kr.	48	36,4	36,4	81,8
	450.001-600.000 kr.	16	12,1	12,1	93,9
	>600.000 kr.	5	3,8	3,8	97,7
	Don't know	3	2,3	2,3	100,0
	Total	132	100,0	100,0	

Appendix 4.5 – Occupational distribution

		Q29Occupa	ation		
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Employed - private sector	53	40,2	40,2	40,2
	Employed - public sector	27	20,5	20,5	60,6
	Self-employed	4	3,0	3,0	63,6
	Unemployed / non-working	2	1,5	1,5	65,2
	Student	42	31,8	31,8	97,0
	Retired	2	1,5	1,5	98,5
	Other	2	1,5	1,5	100,0
	Total	132	100,0	100,0	1

Appendix 4.6 – Age vs. occupation

			Q29Occupation							
		Employed -	Employed -		Unemployed /					
		private sector	public sector	Self-employed	non-working	Student	Retired	Other	Total	
Q25Age	10-20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	21-30	31	10	0	0	42	0	0	83	
	31-40	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	

41-50	9	7	2	0	0	0	1	19
51-60	6	8	2	2	0	1	0	19
61-70	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Total	53	27	4	2	42	2	2	132

Appendix 4.7 – Age vs. income

		Q28Income						
			150.001-300.000	300.001-450.000	450.001-600.000			
		<150.000 kr	kr.	kr.	kr.	>600.000 kr.	Dont know	Total
Q25Age	10-20	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	21-30	36	15	27	4	0	1	83
	31-40	0	1	5	2	0	0	8
	41-50	0	4	7	4	3	1	19
	51-60	0	2	9	5	2	1	19
	61-70	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
	Total	37	23	48	16	5	3	132

Appendix 4.8 – Age vs. region

		Q27Region					
		Region		Region		Region	
		Nordjylland	Region Midtjylland	Syddanmark	Region Sjælland	Hovedstaden	Total
Q25Age	10-20	0	0	0	1	0	1
	21-30	0	4	0	3	76	83
	31-40	0	0	0	1	7	8
	41-50	0	0	0	3	16	19
	51-60	2	0	2	1	14	19
	61-70	0	0	0	1	1	2
	Total	2	4	2	10	114	132
-							

Appendix 4.9 – Age vs. gender

	Q26Gender					
	Male	Female	Total			
Q25Age 10-20	0	1	1			
21-30	52	31	83			
31-40	4	4	8			
41-50	9	10	19			
51-60	11	8	19			
61-70	2	0	2			
Total	78	54	132			
Appendix 5 – Factor analysis

	Correlation Matrix									
		Q15V01Adver	Q15V02Advert	Q15V03Adver	Q15V04Adver	Q15V05Adve	Q15V06Adver	Q15V07Advert	Q15V08Adve	Q15V09Adve
	I	tisementAttitu	isementAttitud	tisementAttitu	tisementAttitu	rtisementAttit	tisementAttitu	isementAttitud	rtisementAttit	rtisementAttit
		deValuable	eInteresting	deAttractive	deImportant	udeExciting	deRelevant	eMeaningful	udeUseable	udeWanted
Cor	Q15V01Advert									
rela	isementAttitud	1,000	,757	,694	,739	,628	,767	,753	,736	,708
tion	eValuable									
	Q15V02Advert									
	isementAttitud	,757	1,000	,752	,679	,664	,707	,711	,743	,710
	eInteresting									
	Q15V03Advert									
	isementAttitud	,694	,752	1,000	,577	,617	,649	,608	,712	,700
	eAttractive									
	Q15V04Advert									
	isementAttitud	,739	,679	,577	1,000	,597	,720	,750	,706	,662
	elmportant					1				
	Q15V05Advert									
	isementAttitud	,628	,664	,617	,597	1,000	,581	,543	,639	,628
	eExciting	!								
	Q15V06Advert									
	isementAttitud	,767	,707	,649	,720	,581	1,000	,788	,752	,644
	eRelevant									
	Q15V07Advert									
	isementAttitud	,753	,711	,608	,750	,543	,788	1,000	,646	,569
	eMeaningful									
	Q15V08Advert									
	isementAttitud	,736	,743	,712	,706	,639	,752	,646	1,000	,725
	eUseable									
	Q15V09Advert									
	isementAttitud	,708	,710	,700	,662	,628	,644	,569	,725	1,000
1	eWanted									

KMO and Bartlett's Test					
- Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sa	,943				
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	844,403			
	df	36,000			
	Sig.	,000			

Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
Q15V01AdvertisementAttitudeValuable	1,000	,795
Q15V02AdvertisementAttitudeInteresting	1,000	,779
Q15V03AdvertisementAttitudeAttractive	1,000	,683
Q15V04AdvertisementAttitudeImportant	1,000	,711
Q15V05AdvertisementAttitudeExciting	1,000	,590
Q15V06AdvertisementAttitudeRelevant	1,000	,754
Q15V07AdvertisementAttitudeMeaningful	1,000	,699
Q15V08AdvertisementAttitudeUseable	1,000	,765
Q15V09AdvertisementAttitudeWanted	1,000	,691

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Total Variance Explained

	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
						Cumulative
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	%
1	6,469	71,874	71,874	6,469	71,874	71,874
2	,618	6,867	78,742			
3	,421	4,675	83,416			
4	,364	4,042	87,458	u .		
5	,289	3,213	90,671			
6	,244	2,714	93,385			
7	,225	2,500	95,885	u .		
8	,213	2,369	98,254			
9	,157	1,746	100,000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix^a

Component

	1
Q15V01AdvertisementAttitudeValuable	,892
Q15V02AdvertisementAttitudeInteresting	,883
Q15V03AdvertisementAttitudeAttractive	,827
Q15V04AdvertisementAttitudeImportant	,843
Q15V05AdvertisementAttitudeExciting	,768
Q15V06AdvertisementAttitudeRelevant	,868
Q15V07AdvertisementAttitudeMeaningful	,836
Q15V08AdvertisementAttitudeUseable	,875
Q15V09AdvertisementAttitudeWanted	,831

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.

Case Processing Summary

	-	Ν	%
Cases	Valid	110	83,3
	Excluded ^a	22	16,7
	Total	132	100,0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Q15V01AdvertisementAttitudeValuable	3,13	1,118	110
Q15V02AdvertisementAttitudeInteresting	2,98	1,109	110
Q15V03AdvertisementAttitudeAttractive	2,97	1,045	110
Q15V04AdvertisementAttitudeImportant	3,46	1,072	110
Q15V05AdvertisementAttitudeExciting	3,08	,900	110
Q15V06AdvertisementAttitudeRelevant	3,15	,940	110
Q15V07AdvertisementAttitudeMeaningful	3,33	,996	110
Q15V08AdvertisementAttitudeUseable	3,01	1,036	110
Q15V09AdvertisementAttitudeWanted	3,40	1,094	110

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
28,52	62,417	7,900	9

Item-Total Statistics

	Saala Maan if	Saala Varianaa if	Corrected	Squared	Cronbach's
	Item Deleted	Item Deleted	Correlation	Correlation	Deleted
	25.30	47 010	857	7/3	942
	20,09	47,910	,007	,740	,342
Q15V02AdvertisementAttitudeInteresting	25,54	48,159	,847	,733	,942
Q15V03AdvertisementAttitudeAttractive	25,55	49,828	,780	,659	,946
Q15V04AdvertisementAttitudeImportant	25,05	49,263	,797	,688	,945
Q15V05AdvertisementAttitudeExciting	25,44	52,322	,713	,527	,949
Q15V06AdvertisementAttitudeRelevant	25,36	50,472	,828	,739	,944
Q15V07AdvertisementAttitudeMeaningful	25,19	50,284	,788	,731	,946
Q15V08AdvertisementAttitudeUseable	25,51	49,188	,836	,722	,943
Q15V09AdvertisementAttitudeWanted	25,12	49,169	,786	,658	,946

Appendix 6 – Hypothesis analysis

Appendix 6.1 – Hypothesis 2



		Q23ConceptVisitW ithOutGrat	Q23ConceptVisitW ithGrat
N	-	48	66
Normal Parameters ^a	Mean	2,9167	2,7273
	Std. Deviation	1,31818	1,23470
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,194	,167
	Positive	,194	,161
	Negative	-,190	-,167
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1,345	1,356
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,054	,051

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

Descriptives

Q23ConceptVisit

					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	Ν	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
-G	48	2,9167	1,31818	,19026	2,5339	3,2994	1,00	5,00
+G	66	2,7273	1,23470	,15198	2,4237	3,0308	1,00	5,00
Total	114	2,8070	1,26825	,11878	2,5717	3,0423	1,00	5,00



Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Q23ConceptVisit

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.	
,365	1	112	,547	

	<u>-</u>		Q23ConceptVisit						
			Absolutely				Absolutely		
			no	No	Maybe	Yes	yes	Total	
Without_wit	Without gratification	Count	8	13	8	13	6	48	
h_gratificati		% within Q23ConceptVisit	36,4%	46,4%	33,3%	43,3%	60,0%	42,1%	
on		Adjusted Residual	-,6	,5	-1,0	,2	1,2		
	With gratification	Count	14	15	16	17	4	66	
		% within Q23ConceptVisit	63,6%	53,6%	66,7%	56,7%	40,0%	57,9%	
		Adjusted Residual	,6	-,5	1,0	-,2	-1,2		
	Total	Count	22	28	24	30	10	114	
		% within Q23ConceptVisit	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	

Without_with_gratification * Q23ConceptVisit Crosstabulation

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2,602 ^a	4	,626

Likelihood Ratio	2,602	4	,626
Linear-by-Linear Association	,620	1	,431

a. 1 cells (10,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4,21.

Appendix 6.2 – Hypothesis 4

Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)



One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test				
		Q23ConceptVisitN otInterestedAdvert	Q23ConceptVisitIr erestedAdvert	
N		32	3	
Normal Parameters ^a	Mean	3,69	2,1	
	Std. Deviation	1,061	1,09	
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,241	,200	
	Positive	,134	,200	
	Negative	-,241	-,14	
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1,363	1,280	
		-	-	

,049

,073

Descriptives

Q23ConceptVisit

					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			-
	Ν	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
Not interested	32	3,69	1,061	,187	3,31	4,07	2	5
Interested	39	2,18	1,097	,176	1,82	2,54	1	5
Total	71	2,86	1,313	,156	2,55	3,17	1	5



Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Q23ConceptVisit

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
,002	1	69	,965

Interested_NotInterested_Q15Advert * Q23ConceptVisit Crosstabulation

	-		Q23ConceptVisit					
			Absolutely Absolute			Absolutely		
			no	No	Maybe	Yes	yes	Total
Interested_NotInterest	Not interested	Count	0	6	6	12	8	32
ed_Q15Advert		% within Q23ConceptVisit	,0%	33,3%	40,0%	75,0%	88,9%	45,1%
		Adjusted Residual	-3,6	-1,2	-,4	2,7	2,8	
	Interested	Count	13	12	9	4	1	39
		% within Q23ConceptVisit	100,0%	66,7%	60,0%	25,0%	11,1%	54,9%

	Adjusted Residual	3,6	1,2	,4	-2,7	-2,8	
Total	Count	13	18	15	16	9	71
	% within Q23ConceptVisit	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24,593ª	4	,000
Likelihood Ratio	30,357	4	,000
Linear-by-Linear Association	23,203	1	,000
N of Valid Cases	71		

a. 2 cells (20,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4,06.

Appendix 6.3 – Hypothesis 5



One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Q23Attitu Neg	udeAdvert gative	Q23AttitudeAdver Positive
Ν			24	7
Normal Parameters ^a	Mean		2,42	3,0
	Std. Deviation		1,381	1,14
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute		,223	,19
	Positive		,223	,18
	Negative		-,152	-,19
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z			1,091	1,67

	1	
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	,185	,007

Descriptives

Q23ConceptVisit

					95% Confidence	Interval for Mean		
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
Negative	24	2,42	1,381	,282	1,83	3,00	1	5
Positive	72	3,06	1,149	,135	2,79	3,33	1	5
Total	96	2,90	1,235	,126	2,65	3,15	1	5



Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Q23ConceptVisit

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
2,750	1	94	,101

Positive_Negative_AttitudeQ13Advert * Q23ConceptVisit Crosstabulation

			Q23ConceptVisit					
						Absolutely		
			Absolutely no	No	Maybe	Yes	yes	Total
Positive_Negative_Attit	Negative	Count	9	4	5	4	2	24
udeQ13Advert		% within Q23ConceptVisit	60,0%	16,7%	22,7%	15,4%	22,2%	25,0%
_		Adjusted Residual	3,4	-1,1	-,3	-1,3	-,2	
I	Positive	Count	6	20	17	22	7	72

	% within Q23ConceptVisit	40,0%	83,3%	77,3%	84,6%	77,8%	75,0%
	Adjusted Residual	-3,4	1,1	,3	1,3	,2	
Total	Count	15	24	22	26	9	96
	% within Q23ConceptVisit	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

			Asymp. Sig. (2-
	Value	df	sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12,069 ^a	4	,017
Likelihood Ratio	10,709	4	,030
Linear-by-Linear Association	4,815	1	,028
N of Valid Cases	96		

a. 2 cells (20,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,25.

Appendix 6.4 – Hypothesis 6



One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Q23ConceptVisit_ SocialWebUseLigh t	Q23ConceptVisit_ SocialWebUseHea vy
N		42	72
Normal Parameters ^a	Mean	2,88	2,7639
	Std. Deviation	1,273	1,27260
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,160	,195
	Positive	,160	,184

Negative	-,144	-,195
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	1,039	1,658
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	,230	,008

Descriptives

Q23ConceptVisit

					95% Confidence	Interval for Mean		
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
Light	41	2,85	1,276	,199	2,45	3,26	1	5
Heavy	72	2,76	1,273	,150	2,46	3,06	1	5
Total	113	2,80	1,269	,119	2,56	3,03	1	5



Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Q23ConceptVisit

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
,293	1	111	,589

Social_website_Use_Heavy_LightQ11 * Q23ConceptVisit Crosstabulation

		Q23ConceptVisit					
						Absolutely	
		Absolutely no	No	Maybe	Yes	yes	Total
Social_website_Use_He Light	Count	7	10	11	8	5	41
avy_LightQ11	% within Q23ConceptVisit	31,8%	35,7%	45,8%	27,6%	50,0%	36,3%
	Adjusted Residual	-,5	,0	1,1	-1,1	,9	

Heavy	Count	15	18	13	21	5	72
	% within Q23ConceptVisit	68,2%	64,3%	54,2%	72,4%	50,0%	63,7%
_	Adjusted Residual	,5	,1	-1,1	1,1	-,9	
Total	Count	22	28	24	29	10	113
	% within Q23ConceptVisit	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests								
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)					
Pearson Chi-Square	2,903 ^a	4	,574					
Likelihood Ratio	2,888	4	,577					
Linear-by-Linear Association	,131	1	,718					
N of Valid Cases	113							

a. 1 cells (10,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3,63.

Appendix 7 – Means analysis

Notes: For post hoc test Dunnetts T3 when the test of homogeneity of variances is (sig≤0.050) and Scheffé when the test is (sig>0.050) (Jensen et al., 2006) is employed.

ANOVA is employed in the following analysis, since more than two groups are tested, and ANOVA is a strong test when the prerequisite of normal distribution is not present. In consequence of that test on normal distribution on the variables are disregarded (Jensen et al., 2006).

Appendix 7.1 – Q24 all

Gratification towards the presented concept Q24

- H0: There is no difference between the groups
- H1: There is a difference between the groups

Hypothesis within the chi-square

- H0: There is independence within the variables
- H1: There is dependence within the variables

H0 rejected as ANOVA (sig = 0.000) and Chi-Square (sig=0.000), use of Dunnett T3 multiple comparisons as test of homogeneity of variances (sig=0.000).

	Descriptives									
					95% Confidence Interval for Mean					
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum		
Money	108	3,0000	1,59438	,15342	2,6959	3,3041	1,00	5,00		
Prices	107	2,9626	1,42037	,13731	2,6904	3,2349	1,00	5,00		
Socialising	108	1,9352	1,19401	,11489	1,7074	2,1629	1,00	5,00		
PasttimeWork	108	1,8426	1,15331	,11098	1,6226	2,0626	1,00	5,00		
PasttimeHome	109	1,8624	1,15043	,11019	1,6440	2,0808	1,00	5,00		
ProfessionelDiscussion	108	2,2593	1,32813	,12780	2,0059	2,5126	1,00	5,00		
Total	648	2,3086	1,40119	,05504	2,2006	2,4167	1,00	5,00		

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Q24Means

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
10,125	5	642	,000

	ANOVA								
Q24Means									
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.				
Between Groups	157,874	5	31,575	18,223	,000				
Within Groups	1112,397	642	1,733						
Total	1270,272	647							



Multiple Comparisons

Q24Means

Dunnett T3

					95% Confidence Interval	
(I) Q24Groups	(J) Q24Groups	(I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Money	Prices	,03738	,20589	1,000	-,5720	,6468
	Socialising	1,06481 [*]	,19167	,000	,4971	1,6325
	PasttimeWork	1,15741 [*]	,18935	,000	,5965	1,7183
	PasttimeHome	1,13761 [*]	,18889	,000	,5781	1,6972
	ProfessionelDiscussion	,74074 [*]	,19968	,004	,1497	1,3318
Prices	Money	-,03738	,20589	1,000	-,6468	,5720

		_				
	Socialising	1,02743 [*]	,17904	,000	,4974	1,5575
	PasttimeWork	1,12002	,17655	,000	,5973	1,6428
	PasttimeHome	1,10023	,17606	,000	,5790	1,6215
	ProfessionelDiscussion	,70336 [*]	,18758	,003	,1482	1,2585
Socialising	Money	-1,06481 [*]	,19167	,000	-1,6325	-,4971
	Prices	-1,02743 [*]	,17904	,000	-1,5575	-,4974
	PasttimeWork	,09259	,15974	1,000	-,3801	,5653
	PasttimeHome	,07280	,15919	1,000	-,3983	,5439
	ProfessionelDiscussion	-,32407	,17185	,602	-,8327	,1845
PasttimeWork	Money	-1,15741 [*]	,18935	,000	-1,7183	-,5965
	Prices	-1,12002 [*]	,17655	,000	-1,6428	-,5973
	Socialising	-,09259	,15974	1,000	-,5653	,3801
	PasttimeHome	-,01979	,15639	1,000	-,4826	,4430
	ProfessionelDiscussion	-,41667	,16926	,196	-,9176	,0843
PasttimeHome	Money	-1,13761 [*]	,18889	,000	-1,6972	-,5781
	Prices	-1,10023 [*]	,17606	,000	-1,6215	-,5790
	Socialising	-,07280	,15919	1,000	-,5439	,3983
	PasttimeWork	,01979	,15639	1,000	-,4430	,4826
	ProfessionelDiscussion	-,39687	,16874	,254	-,8963	,1026
ProfessionelDiscussion	Money	-,74074 [*]	,19968	,004	-1,3318	-,1497
	Prices	-,70336 [*]	,18758	,003	-1,2585	-,1482
	Socialising	,32407	,17185	,602	-,1845	,8327
	PasttimeWork	,41667	,16926	,196	-,0843	,9176
	PasttimeHome	,39687	,16874	,254	-,1026	,8963

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

Q24Groups * Q24Means Crosstabulation

			Q24Means					
			Disagree		Neither agree		Agree	
			strongly	Disagree	or disagree	Agree	strongly	Total
Q24Groups	Money	Count	34	9	13	27	25	108
		Expected Count	47,0	19,2	12,2	20,8	8,8	108,0
		Adjusted Residual	-2,8	-2,8	,3	1,6	6,2	
	Prices	Count	25	19	13	35	15	107

					-	-		
		Expected Count	46,6	19,0	12,1	20,6	8,8	107,0
		Adjusted Residual	-4,6	,0	,3	3,9	2,4	
Sc	ocialising	Count	54	29	7	14	4	108
		Expected Count	47,0	19,2	12,2	20,8	8,8	108,0
		Adjusted Residual	1,5	2,7	-1,7	-1,8	-1,9	
Pa	asttimeWork	Count	61	21	10	14	2	108
		Expected Count	47,0	19,2	12,2	20,8	8,8	108,0
		Adjusted Residual	3,0	,5	-,7	-1,8	-2,6	
Pa	asttimeHome	Count	61	19	14	13	2	109
		Expected Count	47,4	19,3	12,3	21,0	8,9	109,0
		Adjusted Residual	2,9	,0	,6	-2,1	-2,7	
Pr	ofessionelDiscussion	Count	47	18	16	22	5	108
		Expected Count	47,0	19,2	12,2	20,8	8,8	108,0
		Adjusted Residual	,0	-,3	1,3	,3	-1,5	
То	otal	Count	282	115	73	125	53	648
		Expected Count	282,0	115,0	73,0	125,0	53,0	648,0
		Chi-Square Tests						

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1,060E2	20	,000
Likelihood Ratio	102,998	20	,000
Linear-by-Linear Association	39,517	1	,000
N of Valid Cases	648		

a. 0 cells (,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8,75.

Appendix 7.2 – Q12 all

Gratification towards social websites Q12

- H0: There is no difference between the groups
- H1: There is a difference between the groups

Hypothesis within the chi-square

- H0: There is independence within the variables
- H1: There is dependence within the variables

H0 rejected as ANOVA (sig = 0.000) and Chi-Square (sig=0.000), use of Dunnett T3 multiple comparisons as test of homogeneity of variances (sig=0.000)

	Descriptives									
					95% Confiden Me	ce Interval for an				
	Ν	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum		
Interest	110	3,9818	1,37462	,13106	3,7221	4,2416	1,00	5,00		
Knowledge	110	3,4364	1,43691	,13700	3,1648	3,7079	1,00	5,00		
ShareKnowledge	102	2,5000	1,24876	,12365	2,2547	2,7453	1,00	5,00		
GetHelp	105	2,5714	1,26230	,12319	2,3271	2,8157	1,00	5,00		
Entertainment	107	4,0187	1,37348	,13278	3,7554	4,2819	1,00	5,00		
MoneyPoints	101	1,5050	1,04522	,10400	1,2986	1,7113	1,00	5,00		
Total	635	3,0283	1,57439	,06248	2,9057	3,1510	1,00	5,00		

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Q12Means

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
4,794	5	629	,000

ANOVA

Q12Means					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	508,047	5	101,609	60,099	,000
Within Groups	1063,443	629	1,691		
Total	1571,490	634			



Multiple Comparisons

Q12Means

Dunnett T3

		Mean Difference (I-			95% Confide	ence Interval
(I) Q12Groups	(J) Q12Groups	J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Interest	Knowledge	,54545	,18960	,064	-,0155	1,1064
	ShareKnowledge	1,48182 [*]	,18018	,000	,9485	2,0151
	GetHelp	1,41039 [*]	,17987	,000	,8781	1,9427
	Entertainment	-,03687	,18657	1,000	-,5889	,5152
	MoneyPoints	2,47687 [*]	,16732	,000	1,9814	2,9723
Knowledge	Interest	-,54545	,18960	,064	-1,1064	,0155
	ShareKnowledge	,93636 [*]	,18455	,000	,3901	1,4826
	GetHelp	,86494 [*]	,18424	,000	,3197	1,4102
	Entertainment	-,58233	,19079	,038	-1,1469	-,0178
	MoneyPoints	1,93141 [*]	,17201	,000	1,4220	2,4408
ShareKnowledge	Interest	-1,48182 [*]	,18018	,000	-2,0151	-,9485
	Knowledge	-,93636 [*]	,18455	,000	-1,4826	-,3901
	GetHelp	-,07143	,17454	1,000	-,5882	,4453
	Entertainment	-1,51869 [°]	,18143	,000	-2,0558	-,9816
	MoneyPoints	,99505 [*]	,16157	,000	,5165	1,4736
GetHelp	Interest	-1,41039 [°]	,17987	,000	-1,9427	-,8781
	Knowledge	-,86494 [*]	,18424	,000	-1,4102	-,3197
	ShareKnowledge	,07143	,17454	1,000	-,4453	,5882
	Entertainment	-1,44726 [*]	,18112	,000	-1,9834	-,9112

	MoneyPoints	1,06648 [*]	,16122	,000	,5890	1,5439
Entertainment	Interest	,03687	,18657	1,000	-,5152	,5889
	Knowledge	,58233 [*]	,19079	,038	,0178	1,1469
	ShareKnowledge	1,51869 [*]	,18143	,000	,9816	2,0558
	GetHelp	1,44726 [*]	,18112	,000	,9112	1,9834
	MoneyPoints	2,51374 [*]	,16866	,000	2,0142	3,0133
MoneyPoints	Interest	-2,47687 [*]	,16732	,000	-2,9723	-1,9814
	Knowledge	-1,93141 [*]	,17201	,000	-2,4408	-1,4220
	ShareKnowledge	-,99505 [*]	,16157	,000	-1,4736	-,5165
	GetHelp	-1,06648 [*]	,16122	,000	-1,5439	-,5890
	Entertainment	-2,51374 [*]	,16866	,000	-3,0133	-2,0142

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

Q12Groups * Q12Means Crosstabulation

					Q12Mea	ins		
			Disagree		Neither agree			
			strongly	Disagree	or disagree	Agree	Agree strongly	Total
Q12Groups	Interest	Count	15	3	5	33	54	110
		Expected Count	31,2	14,6	10,7	27,0	26,5	110,0
		Adjusted Residual	-3,8	-3,6	-2,0	1,5	6,7	
	Knowledge	Count	19	13	8	41	29	110
		Expected Count	31,2	14,6	10,7	27,0	26,5	110,0
		Adjusted Residual	-2,8	-,5	-1,0	3,4	,6	
	ShareKnowledge	Count	28	28	18	23	5	102
		Expected Count	28,9	13,5	10,0	25,1	24,6	102,0
		Adjusted Residual	-,2	4,6	2,9	-,5	-4,9	
	GetHelp	Count	28	27	16	30	4	105
		Expected Count	29,8	13,9	10,3	25,8	25,3	105,0
		Adjusted Residual	-,4	4,1	2,1	1,0	-5,3	
	Entertainment	Count	13	5	6	26	57	107
		Expected Count	30,3	14,2	10,4	26,3	25,8	107,0
		Adjusted Residual	-4,1	-2,9	-1,6	,0	7,7	

MoneyPoints	pints Count		8	9	3	4	101
	Expected Count	28,6	13,4	9,9	24,8	24,3	101,0
	Adjusted Residual	11,6	-1,7	-,3	-5,5	-5,2	
Total	Count	180	84	62	156	153	635
	Expected Count	180,0	84,0	62,0	156,0	153,0	635,0

Chi-Square Tests

			Asymp. Sig. (2-
	Value	df	sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3,114E2	20	,000
Likelihood Ratio	311,636	20	,000
Linear-by-Linear Association	66,238	1	,000
N of Valid Cases	635		

a. 0 cells (,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9,86.

Appendix 7.3 – Q24 Light/heavy social

Light/heavy social websites for Q24

- H0: There is no difference between the groups light/heavy
- H1: There is a difference between the groups light/heavy

Hypothesis within the chi-square

- H0: There is independence within the variables
- H1: There is dependence within the variables

H0 accepted as ANOVA (sig > 0.05) and Chi-Square (sig>0.050)

	Descriptives										
	-					95% Con Interval fo	fidence or Mean				
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum		
Q24V01ConceptGrat	ificatio Light	40	3,0250	1,49336	,23612	2,5474	3,5026	1,00	5,00		
nMoney	Heavy	67	2,9701	1,66942	,20395	2,5629	3,3774	1,00	5,00		

	•				I		1	I	. I
	Total	107	2,9907	1,59891	,15457	2,6842	3,2971	1,00	5,00
Q24V02ConceptGratificatio	Light	39	3,0000	1,37649	,22042	2,5538	3,4462	1,00	5,00
nPrices	Heavy	67	2,9254	1,45970	,17833	2,5693	3,2814	1,00	5,00
	Total	106	2,9528	1,42349	,13826	2,6787	3,2270	1,00	5,00
Q24V03ConceptGratificatio	Light	39	1,7949	1,15119	,18434	1,4217	2,1680	1,00	5,00
nSocialising	Heavy	68	2,0294	1,22134	,14811	1,7338	2,3250	1,00	5,00
	Total	107	1,9439	1,19616	,11564	1,7147	2,1732	1,00	5,00
Q24V04ConceptGratificatio	Light	39	1,6410	1,01274	,16217	1,3127	1,9693	1,00	4,00
nPasttimeWork	Heavy	68	1,9706	1,22134	,14811	1,6750	2,2662	1,00	5,00
	Total	107	1,8505	1,15582	,11174	1,6289	2,0720	1,00	5,00
Q24V05ConceptGratificatio	Light	40	1,6500	,97534	,15421	1,3381	1,9619	1,00	4,00
nPasttimeHome	Heavy	68	2,0000	1,23385	,14963	1,7013	2,2987	1,00	5,00
	Total	108	1,8704	1,15275	,11092	1,6505	2,0903	1,00	5,00
Q24V06ConceptGratificatio	Light	39	2,1538	1,36764	,21900	1,7105	2,5972	1,00	5,00
nProfessionalDiscussion	Heavy	68	2,3382	1,31138	,15903	2,0208	2,6557	1,00	5,00
	Total	107	2,2710	1,32871	,12845	2,0164	2,5257	1,00	5,00

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Q24V01ConceptGratificationMoney	3,314	1	105	,072
Q24V02ConceptGratificationPrices	,978	1	104	,325
Q24V03ConceptGratificationSocialisin g	,160	1	105	,690
Q24V04ConceptGratificationPasttime Work	1,831	1	105	,179
Q24V05ConceptGratificationPasttime Home	3,091	1	106	,082
Q24V06ConceptGratificationProfessio nalDiscussion	,004	1	105	,952

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q24V01ConceptGratificationMoney	Between Groups	,075	1	,075	,029	,865
	Within Groups	270,915	105	2,580		
	Total	270,991	106			
Q24V02ConceptGratificationPrices	Between Groups	,137	1	,137	,067	,796

	Within Groups	212,627	104	2,044		
	Total	212,764	105			
Q24V03ConceptGratificationSocialising	Between Groups	1,363	1	1,363	,952	,331
	Within Groups	150,300	105	1,431		
	Total	151,664	106			
Q24V04ConceptGratificationPasttimeW	Between Groups	2,692	1	2,692	2,035	,157
ork	Within Groups	138,916	105	1,323		
	Total	141,607	106			
Q24V05ConceptGratificationPasttimeHo	Between Groups	3,085	1	3,085	2,351	,128
me	Within Groups	139,100	106	1,312		
	Total	142,185	107			
Q24V06ConceptGratificationProfession	Between Groups	,843	1	,843	,475	,492
alDiscussion	Within Groups	186,298	105	1,774		
	Total	187,140	106			

Crosstab

			Q24\	/06Concept	Gratification	Professio	onalDiscussio	ı
					Neither			
			Disagree		agree or		Agree	
	-		strongly	Disagree	disagree	Agree	strongly	Total
Social_website_Use_He	Light	Count	19	7	3	8	2	39
avy_LightQ11		Expected Count	16,8	6,6	5,8	8,0	1,8	39,0
		Adjusted Residual	,9	,2	-1,6	,0	,2	
	Heavy	Count	27	11	13	14	3	68
		Expected Count	29,2	11,4	10,2	14,0	3,2	68,0
		Adjusted Residual	-,9	-,2	1,6	,0	-,2	
	Total	Count	46	18	16	22	5	107
		Expected Count	46,0	18,0	16,0	22,0	5,0	107,0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2,705 ^a	4	,608
Likelihood Ratio	2,933	4	,569
Linear-by-Linear Association	,477	1	,490
N of Valid Cases	107		

								-	
	_					95% Con Interval fo	fidence or Mean		
				Std.		Lower	Upper		
		Ν	Mean	Deviation	Std. Error	Bound	Bound	Minimum	Maximum
Q24V01ConceptGratificatio	Light	40	3,0250	1,49336	,23612	2,5474	3,5026	1,00	5,00
nMoney	Heavy	67	2,9701	1,66942	,20395	2,5629	3,3774	1,00	5,00
	Total	107	2,9907	1,59891	,15457	2,6842	3,2971	1,00	5,00
Q24V02ConceptGratificatio	Light	39	3,0000	1,37649	,22042	2,5538	3,4462	1,00	5,00
nPrices	Heavy	67	2,9254	1,45970	,17833	2,5693	3,2814	1,00	5,00
	Total	106	2,9528	1,42349	,13826	2,6787	3,2270	1,00	5,00
Q24V03ConceptGratificatio	Light	39	1,7949	1,15119	,18434	1,4217	2,1680	1,00	5,00
nSocialising	Heavy	68	2,0294	1,22134	,14811	1,7338	2,3250	1,00	5,00
	Total	107	1,9439	1,19616	,11564	1,7147	2,1732	1,00	5,00
Q24V04ConceptGratificatio	Light	39	1,6410	1,01274	,16217	1,3127	1,9693	1,00	4,00
nPasttimeWork	Heavy	68	1,9706	1,22134	,14811	1,6750	2,2662	1,00	5,00
	Total	107	1,8505	1,15582	,11174	1,6289	2,0720	1,00	5,00
Q24V05ConceptGratificatio	Light	40	1,6500	,97534	,15421	1,3381	1,9619	1,00	4,00
nPasttimeHome	Heavy	68	2,0000	1,23385	,14963	1,7013	2,2987	1,00	5,00
	Total	108	1,8704	1,15275	,11092	1,6505	2,0903	1,00	5,00
Q24V06ConceptGratificatio	Light	39	2,1538	1,36764	,21900	1,7105	2,5972	1,00	5,00
nProfessionalDiscussion	Heavy	68	2,3382	1,31138	,15903	2,0208	2,6557	1,00	5,00

Descriptives

a. 2 cells (20,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,82.

		Crosstab						
	-	_	Q24	/05Concep	otGratificat	ionPast	timeHome)
			Diagaraa		Neither		Agroo	
			Disagree		agree or		Agree	
			strongly	Disagree	disagree	Agree	strongly	Total
Social_website_Use_Heavy_LightQ11	Light	Count	25	7	5	3	0	40
		Expected Count	22,2	7,0	5,2	4,8	,7	40,0
		Adjusted Residual	1,1	,0	-,1	-1,1	-1,1	
	Heavy	Count	35	12	9	10	2	68
	_	Expected Count	37,8	12,0	8,8	8,2	1,3	68,0

	Adjusted Residual	-1,1	,0	,1	1,1	1,1	
Total	Count	60	19	14	13	2	108
	Expected Count	60,0	19,0	14,0	13,0	2,0	108,0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2,825 ^ª	4	,587
Likelihood Ratio	3,571	4	,467
Linear-by-Linear Association	2,322	1	,128
N of Valid Cases	108		

a. 3 cells (30,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,74.

		Cros	sstab					
			Q2	24V04Con	ceptGratific	ationPas	sttimeWork	
					Neither			
			Disagree		agree or		Agree	
			strongly	Disagree	disagree	Agree	strongly	Total
Social_website_Use_H eavy_LightQ11	Light	Count	25	7	3	4	0	39
		Expected Count	21,9	7,7	3,6	5,1	,7	39,0
		Adjusted Residual	1,3	-,3	-,4	-,7	-1,1	
	Heavy	Count	35	14	7	10	2	68
		Expected Count	38,1	13,3	6,4	8,9	1,3	68,0
		Adjusted Residual	-1,3	,3	,4	,7	1,1	
	Total	Count	60	21	10	14	2	107
		Expected Count	60,0	21,0	10,0	14,0	2,0	107,0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2,495ª	4	,646
Likelihood Ratio	3,169	4	,530
Linear-by-Linear Association	2,015	1	,156
N of Valid Cases	107		

a. 3 cells (30,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,73.

Crosstab

				Q24V03C	onceptGratif	icationSo	cialising	
					Neither			
			Disagree		agree or		Agree	
			strongly	Disagree	disagree	Agree	strongly	Total
Social_website_Use_H eavy_LightQ11	Light	Count	22	9	4	2	2	39
		Expected Count	19,3	10,6	2,6	5,1	1,5	39,0
		Adjusted Residual	1,1	-,7	1,2	-1,8	,6	
	Heavy	Count	31	20	3	12	2	68
		Expected Count	33,7	18,4	4,4	8,9	2,5	68,0
		Adjusted Residual	-1,1	,7	-1,2	1,8	-,6	
	Total	Count	53	29	7	14	4	107
		Expected Count	53,0	29,0	7,0	14,0	4,0	107,0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5,533ª	4	,237
Likelihood Ratio	5,924	4	,205
Linear-by-Linear Association	,953	1	,329
N of Valid Cases	107		

a. 4 cells (40,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,46.

Crosstab

		_		Q24V02	2ConceptGra	utification	Prices	
					Neither			
			Disagree		agree or		Agree	
			strongly	Disagree	disagree	Agree	strongly	Total
Social_website_Use_H	Light	Count	8	7	6	13	5	39
eavy_LightQ11		Expected Count	9,2	7,0	4,8	12,5	5,5	39,0
		Adjusted Residual	-,6	,0	,7	,2	-,3	
	Heavy	Count	17	12	7	21	10	67
		Expected Count	15,8	12,0	8,2	21,5	9,5	67,0
		Adjusted Residual	,6	,0	-,7	-,2	,3	
	Total	Count	25	19	13	34	15	106
		Expected Count	25,0	19,0	13,0	34,0	15,0	106,0

Chi-Square Tests

			Asymp. Sig. (2-
	Value	df	sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	,844 ^a	4	,932
Likelihood Ratio	,837	4	,933
Linear-by-Linear Association	,068	1	,795
N of Valid Cases	106		

a. 1 cells (10,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4,78.

		Cros	stab				Crosstab											
			Q24V01ConceptGratificationMoney															
					Neither													
			Disagree		agree or		Agree											
			strongly	Disagree	disagree	Agree	strongly	Total										
Social_website_Us e_Heavy_LightQ11	Light	ht Count		3	7	12	7	40										
		Expected Count	12,7	3,4	4,9	9,7	9,3	40,0										
		Adjusted Residual	-,7	-,3	1,3	1,1	-1,1											
	Heavy	Count	23	6	6	14	18	67										
		Expected Count	21,3	5,6	8,1	16,3	15,7	67,0										
		Adjusted Residual	,7	,3	-1,3	-1,1	1,1											
	Total	Count	34	9	13	26	25	107										
		Expected Count	34,0	9,0	13,0	26,0	25,0	107,0										

Chi-Square Tests

			Asymp. Sig. (2-
	Value	df	sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3,731ª	4	,444
Likelihood Ratio	3,701	4	,448
Linear-by-Linear Association	,029	1	,864
N of Valid Cases	107		

a. 2 cells (20,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3,36.

Appendix 7.4 – Q24 Light

Light social websites for Q24 Light

H0: There is no difference between the groups light

H1: There is a difference between the groups light

Hypothesis within the chi-square is not included as the expected counts exceed the applicable limit

(Jensen et al., 2006)

H0 rejected as ANOVA (sig = 0.000), use of Dunnett T3 multiple comparisons as test of homogeneity of variances (sig=0.002)

Descriptives										
					95% Confidence Interval for Mean					
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum		
Money	40	3,0250	1,49336	,23612	2,5474	3,5026	1,00	5,00		
Prices	39	3,0000	1,37649	,22042	2,5538	3,4462	1,00	5,00		
Socialising	39	1,7949	1,15119	,18434	1,4217	2,1680	1,00	5,00		
PasttimeWork	39	1,6410	1,01274	,16217	1,3127	1,9693	1,00	4,00		
PasttimeHome	40	1,6500	,97534	,15421	1,3381	1,9619	1,00	4,00		
ProfessionelDiscussion	39	2,1538	1,36764	,21900	1,7105	2,5972	1,00	5,00		
Total	236	2,2119	1,36741	,08901	2,0365	2,3872	1,00	5,00		

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Q24MeansLight

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
3,934	5	230	,002

	ANOVA										
Q24MeansLight											
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.						
Between Groups	82,922	5	16,584	10,700	,000						
Within Groups	356,485	230	1,550								
Total	439,407	235									



Multiple Comparisons

Q24MeansLight

Dunnett T3

		Mean Difference			95% Confidence Interval	
(I) Q24GroupsLight	(J) Q24GroupsLight	(I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Money	Prices	,02500	,32301	1,000	-,9493	,9993
	Socialising	1,23013	,29956	,002	,3253	2,1350
	PasttimeWork	1,38397	,28645	,000	,5170	2,2510
	PasttimeHome	1,37500 [*]	,28202	,000	,5207	2,2293
	ProfessionelDiscussion	,87115	,32205	,116	-,1002	1,8425
Prices	Money	-,02500	,32301	1,000	-,9993	,9493
	Socialising	1,20513 [°]	,28734	,001	,3374	2,0729
	PasttimeWork	1,35897 [*]	,27364	,000	,5312	2,1868
	PasttimeHome	1,35000 [*]	,26901	,000	,5356	2,1644
	ProfessionelDiscussion	,84615	,31071	,111	-,0913	1,7836
Socialising	Money	-1,23013 [*]	,29956	,002	-2,1350	-,3253
	Prices	-1,20513	,28734	,001	-2,0729	-,3374
	PasttimeWork	,15385	,24552	1,000	-,5873	,8950
	PasttimeHome	,14487	,24034	1,000	-,5807	,8705
	ProfessionelDiscussion	-,35897	,28625	,966	-1,2234	,5054
PasttimeWork	Money	-1,38397 [*]	,28645	,000	-2,2510	-,5170
	Prices	-1,35897 [*]	,27364	,000	-2,1868	-,5312
	Socialising	-,15385	,24552	1,000	-,8950	,5873
	PasttimeHome	-,00897	,22379	1,000	-,6840	,6660

	—	-				
	ProfessionelDiscussion	-,51282	,27250	,608	-1,3371	,3115
PasttimeHome	Money	-1,37500*	,28202	,000	-2,2293	-,5207
	Prices	-1,35000*	,26901	,000	-2,1644	-,5356
	Socialising	-,14487	,24034	1,000	-,8705	,5807
	PasttimeWork	,00897	,22379	1,000	-,6660	,6840
	ProfessionelDiscussion	-,50385	,26785	,608	-1,3146	,3069
ProfessionelDiscussion	Money	-,87115	,32205	,116	-1,8425	,1002
	Prices	-,84615	,31071	,111	-1,7836	,0913
	Socialising	,35897	,28625	,966	-,5054	1,2234
	PasttimeWork	,51282	,27250	,608	-,3115	1,3371
	PasttimeHome	,50385	,26785	,608	-,3069	1,3146

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

Appendix 7.5 – Q24 Heavy

Heavy social websites for Q24 Light

- H0: There is no difference between the groups Heavy
- H1: There is a difference between the groups Heavy

Hypothesis within the chi-square

- H0: There is independence within the variables
- H1: There is dependence within the variables

H0 rejected as ANOVA (sig = 0.000) and Chi-Square (sig=0.000), use of Dunnett T3 multiple comparisons as test of homogeneity of variances (sig=0.000)

Descriptives												
					95% Confiden Me	ice Interval for ean						
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum				
Money	67	2,9701	1,66942	,20395	2,5629	3,3774	1,00	5,00				
Prices	67	2,9254	1,45970	,17833	2,5693	3,2814	1,00	5,00				
Socialising	68	2,0294	1,22134	,14811	1,7338	2,3250	1,00	5,00				
PasttimeWork	68	1,9706	1,22134	,14811	1,6750	2,2662	1,00	5,00				

PasttimeHome	68	2,0000	1,23385	,14963	1,7013	2,2987	1,00	5,00
ProfessionelDiscussion	68	2,3382	1,31138	,15903	2,0208	2,6557	1,00	5,00
Total	406	2,3695	1,41821	,07038	2,2311	2,5078	1,00	5,00

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Q24MeansHeavy

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
7,404	5	400	,00

ANOVA

Q24MeansHeavy

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	Mean Square F	
Between Groups	72,911	5	14,582	7,865	,000
Within Groups	741,670	400	1,854		
Total	814,581	405			



Multiple Comparisons

Q24MeansHeavy

Dunnett T3						
	-	Mean Difference	-	-	95% Confidence Interval	
(I) Q24GroupsHeavy	(J) Q24GroupsHeavy	(I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Money	Prices	,04478	,27092	1,000	-,7625	,8521
	Socialising	,94074 [*]	,25206	,004	,1887	1,6928
	PasttimeWork	,99956 [*]	,25206	,002	,2475	1,7516
	PasttimeHome	,97015 [*]	,25295	,003	,2155	1,7248
	ProfessionelDiscussion	,63191	,25862	,210	-,1392	1,4031

Prices	Money	-,04478	,27092	1,000	-,8521	,7625
	Socialising	,89596 [*]	,23181	,003	,2051	1,5868
	PasttimeWork	,95478 [*]	,23181	,001	,2639	1,6457
	PasttimeHome	,92537 [*]	,23279	,002	,2316	1,6191
	ProfessionelDiscussion	,58714	,23894	,203	-,1247	1,2990
Socialising	Money	-,94074 [*]	,25206	,004	-1,6928	-,1887
	Prices	-,89596 [*]	,23181	,003	-1,5868	-,2051
	PasttimeWork	,05882	,20946	1,000	-,5650	,6826
	PasttimeHome	,02941	,21053	1,000	-,5976	,6564
	ProfessionelDiscussion	-,30882	,21732	,916	-,9561	,3384
PasttimeWork	Money	-,99956 [*]	,25206	,002	-1,7516	-,2475
	Prices	-,95478 [*]	,23181	,001	-1,6457	-,2639
	Socialising	-,05882	,20946	1,000	-,6826	,5650
	PasttimeHome	-,02941	,21053	1,000	-,6564	,5976
	ProfessionelDiscussion	-,36765	,21732	,757	-1,0149	,2796
PasttimeHome	Money	-,97015 [*]	,25295	,003	-1,7248	-,2155
	Prices	-,92537 [*]	,23279	,002	-1,6191	-,2316
	Socialising	-,02941	,21053	1,000	-,6564	,5976
	PasttimeWork	,02941	,21053	1,000	-,5976	,6564
	ProfessionelDiscussion	-,33824	,21835	,852	-,9886	,3121
ProfessionelDiscussion	Money	-,63191	,25862	,210	-1,4031	,1392
	Prices	-,58714	,23894	,203	-1,2990	,1247
	Socialising	,30882	,21732	,916	-,3384	,9561
	PasttimeWork	,36765	,21732	,757	-,2796	1,0149
	PasttimeHome	,33824	,21835	,852	-,3121	,9886

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

Q24GroupsHeavy * Q24MeansHeavy Crosstabulation

	_	Q24MeansHeavy						
		Disagree		Neither agree		Agree		
		strongly	Disagree	or disagree	Agree	strongly	Total	
Q24GroupsHeavy Money	Count	23	6	6	14	18	67	
	Expected Count	27,7	12,4	7,4	13,4	6,1	67,0	

-	·						
	Adjusted	-1.3	-2,2	-,6	.2	5,5	
	Residual	.,0	_,_	,0	,_	-,•	
Prices	Count	17	12	7	21	10	67
	Expected Count	27,7	12,4	7,4	13,4	6,1	67,0
	Adjusted Residual	-2,9	-,1	-,2	2,6	1,8	
Socialising	Count	31	20	3	12	2	68
	Expected Count	28,1	12,6	7,5	13,6	6,2	68,0
	Adjusted Residual	,8	2,5	-1,9	-,5	-1,9	
PasttimeWork	Count	35	14	7	10	2	68
	Expected Count	28,1	12,6	7,5	13,6	6,2	68,0
	Adjusted Residual	1,9	,5	-,2	-1,2	-1,9	
PasttimeHome	Count	35	12	9	10	2	68
	Expected Count	28,1	12,6	7,5	13,6	6,2	68,0
	Adjusted Residual	1,9	-,2	,6	-1,2	-1,9	
ProfessionelDiscussion	Count	27	11	13	14	3	68
	Expected Count	28,1	12,6	7,5	13,6	6,2	68,0
	Adjusted Residual	-,3	-,5	2,3	,1	-1,5	
Total	Count	168	75	45	81	37	406
	Expected Count	168,0	75,0	45,0	81,0	37,0	406,0

Chi-Square Tests							
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)				
Pearson Chi-Square	66,323 ^a	20	,000				
Likelihood Ratio	61,582	20	,000				
Linear-by-Linear Association	17,083	1	,000				
N of Valid Cases	406						

a. 0 cells (,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6,11.

Appendix 7.6 – Q12 Light/heavy social

Light/heavy social websites for Q12

H0: There is no difference between the groups light/heavy

H1: There is a difference between the groups light/heavy

Hypothesis within the chi-square is not included as the expected counts exceed the applicable limit (Jensen et al., 2006)

H0 rejected as ANOVA (sig < 0.05)

			Descriptive	s					
						95% Co	onfidence		
				Std.		Interval	IOI Mean		
				Deviatio	Std.	Lower	Upper		
	-	N	Mean	n	Error	Bound	Bound	Minimum	Maximum
Q12V01SocialwebsitesPurpos	Light	33	2,85	1,661	,289	2,26	3,44	1	5
eInterest	Heavy	77	4,47	,867	,099	4,27	4,66	1	5
	Total	110	3,98	1,375	,131	3,72	4,24	1	5
Q12V02SocialwebsitesPurpos	Light	32	2,97	1,769	,313	2,33	3,61	1	5
eObtainKnowledge	Heavy	78	3,63	1,239	,140	3,35	3,91	1	5
	Total	110	3,44	1,437	,137	3,16	3,71	1	5
Q12V03SocialwebsitesPurpos eShareKnowledge	Light	28	1,82	1,124	,212	1,39	2,26	1	4
	Heavy	74	2,76	1,203	,140	2,48	3,04	1	5
	Total	102	2,50	1,249	,124	2,25	2,75	1	5
Q12V04SocialwebsitesPurpos	Light	29	2,03	1,239	,230	1,56	2,51	1	4
eGetHelp	Heavy	76	2,78	1,218	,140	2,50	3,05	1	5
	Total	105	2,57	1,262	,123	2,33	2,82	1	5
Q12V05SocialwebsitesPurpos	Light	32	2,91	1,614	,285	2,32	3,49	1	5
eEntertainment	Heavy	75	4,49	,921	,106	4,28	4,71	1	5
	Total	107	4,02	1,373	,133	3,76	4,28	1	5
Q12V06SocialwebsitesPurpos	Light	28	1,29	,897	,169	,94	1,63	1	5
eObtainPoints	Heavy	73	1,59	1,091	,128	1,33	1,84	1	5
	Total	101	1,50	1,045	,104	1,30	1,71	1	5

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Q12V01SocialwebsitesPurposeInterest	64,007	1	108	,000
Q12V02SocialwebsitesPurposeObtainKnowledge	21,894	1	108	,000
Q12V03SocialwebsitesPurposeShareKnowledge	,597	1	100	,442
Q12V04SocialwebsitesPurposeGetHelp	,000	1	103	,986
Q12V05SocialwebsitesPurposeEntertainment	29,724	1	105	,000
Q12V06SocialwebsitesPurposeObtainPoints	4,454	1	99	,037

	ANOVA									
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.				
Q12V01SocialwebsitesPurposeIn	Between Groups	60,552	1	60,552	44,974	,000				
terest	Within Groups	145,411	108	1,346						
	Total	205,964	109							
Q12V02SocialwebsitesPurposeO	Between Groups	9,868	1	9,868	4,953	,028				
btainKnowledge	Within Groups	215,187	108	1,992						
	Total	225,055	109							
Q12V03SocialwebsitesPurposeS	Between Groups	17,771	1	17,771	12,718	,001				
hareKnowledge	Within Groups	139,729	100	1,397						
	Total	157,500	101							
Q12V04SocialwebsitesPurposeG	Between Groups	11,551	1	11,551	7,718	,006				
etHelp	Within Groups	154,163	103	1,497						
	Total	165,714	104							
Q12V05SocialwebsitesPurposeE	Between Groups	56,497	1	56,497	41,349	,000				
ntertainment	Within Groups	143,465	105	1,366						
	Total	199,963	106							
Q12V06SocialwebsitesPurposeO	Between Groups	1,862	1	1,862	1,717	,193				
btainPoints	Within Groups	107,386	99	1,085						
	Total	109,248	100							

Appendix 7.7 – Q12 Light

Light social websites for Q12

H0: There is no difference between the groups light

H1: There is a difference between the groups light

Hypothesis within the chi-square is not included as the expected counts exceed the applicable limit

(Jensen et al., 2006)

H0 rejected as ANOVA (sig = 0.000), use of Dunnett T3 multiple comparisons as test of homogeneity of variances (sig=0.000)

			D	escriptives				
					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	Ν	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
Interest	33	2,8485	1,66060	,28907	2,2597	3,4373	1,00	5,00
Knowledge	32	2,9688	1,76862	,31265	2,3311	3,6064	1,00	5,00
ShareKnowledge	28	1,8214	1,12393	,21240	1,3856	2,2572	1,00	4,00
GetHelp	29	2,0345	1,23874	,23003	1,5633	2,5057	1,00	4,00
Entertainment	32	2,9062	1,61364	,28525	2,3245	3,4880	1,00	5,00
MoneyPoints	28	1,2857	,89679	,16948	,9380	1,6335	1,00	5,00
Total	182	2,3516	1,55470	,11524	2,1243	2,5790	1,00	5,00

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Q12MeansLight

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
15,131	5	176	,000

|--|

Q12MeansLight					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	72,778	5	14,556	7,024	,000
Within Groups	364,717	176	2,072		

244


Multiple Comparisons

Q12MeansLight

Dunnett T3

		Mean Difference (I-			95% Confidence Interval		
(I) Q12GroupsLight	(J) Q12GroupsLight	J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Interest	Knowledge	-,12027	,42581	1,000	-1,4134	1,1729	
	ShareKnowledge	1,02706	,35872	,082	-,0666	2,1207	
	GetHelp	,81400	,36943	,365	-,3106	1,9387	
	Entertainment	-,05777	,40612	1,000	-1,2907	1,1752	
	MoneyPoints	1,56277 [*]	,33509	,000	,5365	2,5891	
Knowledge	Interest	,12027	,42581	1,000	-1,1729	1,4134	
	ShareKnowledge	1,14732	,37798	,053	-,0079	2,3025	
	GetHelp	,93427	,38815	,244	-,2498	2,1184	
	Entertainment	,06250	,42323	1,000	-1,2235	1,3485	
	MoneyPoints	1,68304	,35563	,000	,5902	2,7759	
ShareKnowledge	Interest	-1,02706	,35872	,082	-2,1207	,0666	
	Knowledge	-1,14732	,37798	,053	-2,3025	,0079	
	GetHelp	-,21305	,31309	1,000	-1,1688	,7426	
	Entertainment	-1,08482	,35565	,050	-2,1699	,0003	
	MoneyPoints	,53571	,27173	,538	-,2960	1,3674	
GetHelp	Interest	-,81400	,36943	,365	-1,9387	,3106	
	Knowledge	-,93427	,38815	,244	-2,1184	,2498	
	ShareKnowledge	,21305	,31309	1,000	-,7426	1,1688	
	Entertainment	-,87177	,36645	,258	-1,9881	,2446	
	MoneyPoints	,74877	,28572	,153	-,1260	1,6236	

Entertainment	Interest	,05777	,40612	1,000	-1,1752	1,2907
	Knowledge	-,06250	,42323	1,000	-1,3485	1,2235
	ShareKnowledge	1,08482	,35565	,050	-,0003	2,1699
	GetHelp	,87177	,36645	,258	-,2446	1,9881
	MoneyPoints	1,62054	,33180	,000	,6033	2,6377
MoneyPoints	Interest	-1,56277 [*]	,33509	,000	-2,5891	-,5365
	Knowledge	-1,68304 [*]	,35563	,000	-2,7759	-,5902
	ShareKnowledge	-,53571	,27173	,538	-1,3674	,2960
	GetHelp	-,74877	,28572	,153	-1,6236	,1260
	Entertainment	-1,62054 [*]	,33180	,000	-2,6377	-,6033

 $^{\star}\!.$ The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Appendix 7.8 – Q12 Heavy

Heavy social websites for Q12

H0: There is no difference between the groups Heavy

H1: There is a difference between the groups Heavy

Hypothesis within the chi-square

- H0: There is independence within the variables
- H1: There is dependence within the variables

H0 rejected as ANOVA (sig = 0.000) and Chi-Square (sig=0.000), use of Dunnett T3 multiple comparisons as test of homogeneity of variances (sig=0.000)

	Descriptives										
					95% Confidence	Interval for Mean					
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum			
Interest	77	4,4675	,86731	,09884	4,2707	4,6644	1,00	5,00			
Knowledge	78	3,6282	1,23907	,14030	3,3488	3,9076	1,00	5,00			
ShareKnowledge	74	2,7568	1,20286	,13983	2,4781	3,0354	1,00	5,00			
GetHelp	76	2,7763	1,21763	,13967	2,4981	3,0546	1,00	5,00			
Entertainment	75	4,4933	,92083	,10633	4,2815	4,7052	1,00	5,00			
MoneyPoints	73	1,5890	1,09082	,12767	1,3345	1,8435	1,00	5,00			

Descriptives											
					95% Confidence	Interval for Mean					
	Ν	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum			
Interest	77	4,4675	,86731	,09884	4,2707	4,6644	1,00	5,00			
Knowledge	78	3,6282	1,23907	,14030	3,3488	3,9076	1,00	5,00			
ShareKnowledge	74	2,7568	1,20286	,13983	2,4781	3,0354	1,00	5,00			
GetHelp	76	2,7763	1,21763	,13967	2,4981	3,0546	1,00	5,00			
Entertainment	75	4,4933	,92083	,10633	4,2815	4,7052	1,00	5,00			
MoneyPoints	73	1,5890	1,09082	,12767	1,3345	1,8435	1,00	5,00			
Total	453	3,3002	1,50013	,07048	3,1617	3,4387	1,00	5,00			

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Q12MeansHeavy

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
6,860	5	447	,000

ANOVA

Q12MeansHeavy

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	476,546	5	95,309	78,804	,000
Within Groups	540,624	447	1,209		
Total	1017,170	452			



Multiple Comparisons

Q12MeansHeavy

Dunnett T3

		Mean Difference			95% Confide	ence Interval
(I) Q12GroupsHeavy	(J) Q12GroupsHeavy	(I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Interest	Knowledge	,83933 [*]	,17162	,000	,3285	1,3502
	ShareKnowledge	1,71078 [*]	,17124	,000	1,2007	2,2208
	GetHelp	1,69122 [*]	,17111	,000	1,1817	2,2007
	Entertainment	-,02580	,14517	1,000	-,4574	,4058
	MoneyPoints	2,87849 [*]	,16146	,000	2,3979	3,3591
Knowledge	Interest	-,83933 [*]	,17162	,000	-1,3502	-,3285
	ShareKnowledge	,87145 [*]	,19808	,000	,2826	1,4603
	GetHelp	,85189 [*]	,19797	,000	,2635	1,4403
	Entertainment	-,86513 [*]	,17604	,000	-1,3889	-,3414
	MoneyPoints	2,03916 [*]	,18969	,000	1,4752	2,6031
ShareKnowledge	Interest	-1,71078 [*]	,17124	,000	-2,2208	-1,2007
	Knowledge	-,87145 [*]	,19808	,000	-1,4603	-,2826
	GetHelp	-,01956	,19764	1,000	-,6072	,5681
	Entertainment	-1,73658 [*]	,17566	,000	-2,2595	-1,2136
	MoneyPoints	1,16772 [*]	,18935	,000	,6045	1,7309
GetHelp	Interest	-1,69122 [*]	,17111	,000	-2,2007	-1,1817
	Knowledge	-,85189 [*]	,19797	,000	-1,4403	-,2635
	ShareKnowledge	,01956	,19764	1,000	-,5681	,6072
	Entertainment	-1,71702 [*]	,17554	,000	-2,2394	-1,1946
	MoneyPoints	1,18727 [*]	,18923	,000	,6245	1,7500
Entertainment	Interest	,02580	,14517	1,000	-,4058	,4574
	Knowledge	,86513 [*]	,17604	,000	,3414	1,3889
	ShareKnowledge	1,73658 [*]	,17566	,000	1,2136	2,2595
	GetHelp	1,71702 [*]	,17554	,000	1,1946	2,2394
	MoneyPoints	2,90429 [*]	,16615	,000	2,4099	3,3987
MoneyPoints	Interest	-2,87849 [*]	,16146	,000	-3,3591	-2,3979
	Knowledge	-2,03916	,18969	,000	-2,6031	-1,4752

ShareKnowledge	-1,16772 [*]	,18935	,000	-1,7309	-,6045
GetHelp	-1,18727 [*]	,18923	,000	-1,7500	-,6245
Entertainment	-2,90429*	,16615	,000	-3,3987	-2,4099

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

	-	-			Q12Means	Heavy		
					Neither			
			Disagree		agree or		Agree	
	-	_	strongly	Disagree	disagree	Agree	strongly	Total
Q12GroupsHeavy	Interest	Count	2	1	4	22	48	77
		Expected Count	14,8	11,9	7,8	20,4	22,1	77,0
		Adjusted Residual	-4,1	-3,8	-1,6	,5	7,2	
	Knowledge	Count	6	12	7	33	20	78
		Expected Count	15,0	12,1	7,9	20,7	22,4	78,0
		Adjusted Residual	-2,8	,0	-,4	3,5	-,7	
	ShareKnowledge	Count	12	23	15	19	5	74
		Expected Count	14,2	11,4	7,5	19,6	21,2	74,0
		Adjusted Residual	-,7	4,1	3,1	-,2	-4,6	
	GetHelp	Count	13	23	12	24	4	76
		Expected Count	14,6	11,7	7,7	20,1	21,8	76,0
		Adjusted Residual	-,5	3,9	1,8	1,1	-5,0	
	Entertainment	Count	2	3	1	19	50	75
		Expected Count	14,4	11,6	7,6	19,9	21,5	75,0
		Adjusted Residual	-4,0	-3,0	-2,8	-,2	8,0	
	MoneyPoints	Count	52	8	7	3	3	73
		Expected Count	14,0	11,3	7,4	19,3	20,9	73,0
		Adjusted Residual	12,3	-1,2	-,2	-4,7	-5,1	
	Total	Count	87	70	46	120	130	453
		Expected Count	87,0	70,0	46,0	120,0	130,0	453,0

Q12GroupsHeavy * Q12MeansHeavy Crosstabulation

Chi-Square Tests							
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)				
Pearson Chi-Square	3,206E2	20	,000				

Likelihood Ratio	309,310	20	,000
Linear-by-Linear Association	65,512	1	,000
N of Valid Cases	453		

a. 0 cells (,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7,41.

Appendix 7.9 – Q18 Visit/NotVisit

Discussion advertisement Q18 Visit/NotVisit

H0: There is no difference between the groups Visit/NotVisit

H1: There is a difference between the groups Visit/NotVisit

Hypothesis within the chi-square is not included as the expected counts exceed the applicable limit

(Jensen et al., 2006)

H0 rejected as ANOVA (sig < 0.05)

			Descriptiv	es					
	-					95% Co Interval 1	nfidence or Mean		
				Std.	Std.	Lower	Upper		
		Ν	Mean	Deviation	Error	Bound	Bound	Minimum	Maximum
Q18V01AdvertisementDiscus Not interested		49	2,0612	,74744	,10678	1,8465	2,2759	1,00	4,00
sionFamilyFriends	Interested	40	3,0750	,82858	,13101	2,8100	3,3400	1,00	5,00
	Total	89	2,5169	,93069	,09865	2,3208	2,7129	1,00	5,00
Q18V02AdvertisementDiscu	s Not interested	48	1,8333	,85883	,12396	1,5840	2,0827	1,00	5,00
sionWork	Interested	40	2,8750	1,26466	,19996	2,4705	3,2795	1,00	5,00
	Total	88	2,3068	1,17794	,12557	2,0572	2,5564	1,00	5,00
Q18V03AdvertisementDiscu	s Not interested	49	1,2041	,49915	,07131	1,0607	1,3475	1,00	3,00
sionInternet	Interested	39	1,3590	,77755	,12451	1,1069	1,6110	1,00	5,00
	Total	88	1,2727	,63838	,06805	1,1375	1,4080	1,00	5,00

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Q18V01AdvertisementDiscussionFamilyFriends	,338	1	87	,562
Q18V02AdvertisementDiscussionWork	6,645	1	86	,012
Q18V03AdvertisementDiscussionInternet	3,816	1	86	,054

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q18V01AdvertisementDiscussi	Between Groups	22,633	1	22,633	36,743	,000
onFamilyFriends	Within Groups	53,591	87	,616		
	Total	76,225	88			
Q18V02AdvertisementDiscussi	Between Groups	23,674	1	23,674	20,981	,000
onWork	Within Groups	97,042	86	1,128		
	Total	120,716	87			
Q18V03AdvertisementDiscussi	Between Groups	,521	1	,521	1,283	,261
onInternet	Within Groups	34,934	86	,406		
	Total	35,455	87			

Appendix 7.10 – Q23 Heavy/Light Internet Usage

Visit-intention towards the presented concept for Q23 Heavy/Light Internet Usage

H0: There is no difference between the groups Heavy/Light Internet Usage

H1: There is a difference between the groups Heavy/Light Internet Usage

Hypothesis within the chi-square

- H0: There is independence within the variables
- H1: There is dependence within the variables

H0 accepted as ANOVA (sig = 0.604) and Chi-Square (sig=0.770)

	Descriptives										
					95% Confidence	Interval for Mean					
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum			
Light	76	2,7632	1,22058	,14001	2,4842	3,0421	1,00	5,00			
Heavy	38	2,8947	1,37132	,22246	2,4440	3,3455	1,00	5,00			
Total	114	2,8070	1,26825	,11878	2,5717	3,0423	1,00	5,00			

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Q23ConceptVisit

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
,960	1	112	,329

ANOVA

Q23ConceptVisit					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	,439	1	,439	,271	,604
Within Groups	181,316	112	1,619		
Total	181,754	113			

Q07HeavyLight * Q23ConceptVisit Crosstabulation

		-		Q23ConceptVisit					
			Absolutely no	No	Maybe	Yes	Absolutely yes	Total	
Q07HeavyLight	Light	Count	14	20	17	20	5	76	
		Adjusted Residual	-,3	,6	,5	,0	-1,2		
	Heavy	Count	8	8	7	10	5	38	
		Adjusted Residual	,3	-,6	-,5	,0	1,2		
	Total	Count	22	28	24	30	10	114	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1,814 ^ª	4	,770
Likelihood Ratio	1,753	4	,781
Linear-by-Linear Association	,273	1	,602
N of Valid Cases	114		

a. 1 cells (10,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3,33.

Appendix 7.11 – Q24 Heavy/Light Internet Usage

Gratification towards the presented concept for Q24 Heavy/Light Internet Usage

- H0: There is no difference between the groups Heavy/Light Internet Usage
- H1: There is a difference between the groups Heavy/Light Internet Usage

Hypothesis within the chi-square is not included as the expected counts exceed the applicable limit (Jensen et al., 2006)

H0 accepted as ANOVA (sig > 0.050)

			Descriptives	S					
						95% Co Interval	nfidence for Mean		
				Std.	Std.	Lower	Upper	Minimu	
		Ν	Mean	Deviation	Error	Bound	Bound	m	Maximum
Q24V01ConceptGratificati	Light	71	3,1127	1,54503	,18336	2,7470	3,4784	1,00	5,00
onMoney	Heavy	37	2,7838	1,68548	,27709	2,2218	3,3458	1,00	5,00
	Total	108	3,0000	1,59438	,15342	2,6959	3,3041	1,00	5,00
Q24V02ConceptGratificati	Light	70	3,0000	1,29660	,15497	2,6908	3,3092	1,00	5,00
onPrices	Heavy	37	2,8919	1,64627	,27065	2,3430	3,4408	1,00	5,00
	Total	107	2,9626	1,42037	,13731	2,6904	3,2349	1,00	5,00
Q24V03ConceptGratificati	Light	71	1,8873	1,16557	,13833	1,6114	2,1632	1,00	5,00
onSocialising	Heavy	37	2,0270	1,25801	,20682	1,6076	2,4465	1,00	5,00
	Total	108	1,9352	1,19401	,11489	1,7074	2,1629	1,00	5,00
Q24V04ConceptGratificati	Light	71	1,7746	1,14888	,13635	1,5027	2,0466	1,00	5,00
onPasttimeWork	Heavy	37	1,9730	1,16634	,19175	1,5841	2,3619	1,00	5,00
	Total	108	1,8426	1,15331	,11098	1,6226	2,0626	1,00	5,00
Q24V05ConceptGratificati	Light	72	1,8194	1,14235	,13463	1,5510	2,0879	1,00	5,00
onPasttimeHome	Heavy	37	1,9459	1,17724	,19354	1,5534	2,3385	1,00	5,00
	Total	109	1,8624	1,15043	,11019	1,6440	2,0808	1,00	5,00
Q24V06ConceptGratificati	Light	71	2,2535	1,32792	,15760	1,9392	2,5678	1,00	5,00
onProfessionalDiscussion	Heavy	37	2,2703	1,34678	,22141	1,8212	2,7193	1,00	5,00
	Total	108	2,2593	1,32813	,12780	2,0059	2,5126	1,00	5,00

rest of homogeneity of variances							
	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.			
Q24V01ConceptGratificationMoney	2,317	1	106	,13 ⁻			
Q24V02ConceptGratificationPrices	9,888	1	105	,002			
Q24V03ConceptGratificationSocialisin g	,055	1	106	,815			
Q24V04ConceptGratificationPasttime Work	,243	1	106	,623			
Q24V05ConceptGratificationPasttime Home	,211	1	107	,647			
Q24V06ConceptGratificationProfessio nalDiscussion	,002	1	106	,96 ⁻			

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

ANOVA

	-	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q24V01ConceptGratificationMoney	Between Groups	2,631	1	2,631	1,035	,311
	Within Groups	269,369	106	2,541		
	Total	272,000	107			
Q24V02ConceptGratificationPrices	Between Groups	,283	1	,283	,139	,710
	Within Groups	213,568	105	2,034		
	Total	213,850	106			
Q24V03ConceptGratificationSocialis	Between Groups	,475	1	,475	,331	,566
ing	Within Groups	152,072	106	1,435		
	Total	152,546	107			
Q24V04ConceptGratificationPasttim	Between Groups	,957	1	,957	,717	,399
eWork	Within Groups	141,367	106	1,334		
	Total	142,324	107			
Q24V05ConceptGratificationPasttim	Between Groups	,391	1	,391	,294	,589
eHome	Within Groups	142,545	107	1,332		
	Total	142,936	108			
Q24V06ConceptGratificationProfess	Between Groups	,007	1	,007	,004	,951
ionalDiscussion	Within Groups	188,734	106	1,781		
	Total	188,741	107			

Question number	Question type	Data type (scale)	Argument
1, 9	Closed	Nominal	The questions are closed and prompted as the researchers
	Prompted		have pre-defined the possible answers (multiple choice)
	Pre-coded		and it is not possible for the respondents to add their own.
	- "don't know" included		The researchers sought to obtain and identify respondents'
	Multiple choice		use of Internet via these predefined options. The pre-coded
			types of questions are based on the large amount of
			resources to be used if the respondents have the options to
			write in.
			Nominal scale is chosen as the questions are to determine
			which categories the respondents belong to. The number
			assigned is only to identification as there is no value
			implied between the categories.
2, 3, 4, 6, 7	Closed	Ratio	The questions are closed and prompted as options are pre-
	Prompted		defined by the researchers. Only a single answer is possible
	Pre-coded		in order to identify the respondents' affiliation concerning
	- "don't know" included		the pre-coded categories. These types of options are
	- "no use of" included		developed to identify the precise categories which the
	Single choice		respondents belongs to, and not open the possibility to let
			the respondents write in their own categories.
			The questions are ratio scaled as the options are interval
			scaled, thus the zero point has a real meaning, and an equal
			distance between each noint
5	Closed	Nominal	The question is closed with pre-coded prompted options.
	Prompted		The options are developed in preparation for identification
	Pre-coded		of the respondents' affiliation to one (single choice) of the
	- "don't know" included		pre-defined categories. The categories are pre-coded in
	Single choice		order to be able to place respondents in the categories
			defined by the researchers, as writing in the categories by
			the respondents demands too large amounts of data
			processing.
			The substitution is nominal cooled, as it is to determine which
			setereries the respondents helper to The surplus
			categories the respondents belong to. The number
			assigned is only to connect the respondent to a category, as
			there is no value implied between the categories.
8	Closed	Ordinal	The question is pre-coded and closed , in order to indentify
	Prompted		the respondents' use of Internet in specific periods. By
	Pre-coded		means of prompted options are the respondents helped to

Appendix 8 – Quantitative questions types and argumentation

			and the state day of the second second of the sheet second
	- "don't know" included		recall their behaviour. The options are multiple-choice as
	Multiple choice		the question is a ranking question, which requires several
			answers.
			The question is ordinal scaled , as it is nominal categories
			the respondents are to rank, here frequency of use. This
			scale puts the nominal data into correct order, but with no
			explanation on the distance between the points.
10	Closed	Nominal	The question is closed. The pre-coded and prompted
	Prompted		methods are underlined by the set up of brand names in
	Pre-coded		the question, with the structure of placing a single answer
	- "don't know" included		pr. Brand. The question is to decide which social network
	Single choice pr. Brand		websites the respondents are familiar with.
			The question is nominal scaled, as it is to determine which
			categories the respondents belong to.
11	Closed	Nominal	The question is closed , prompted and pre-coded with the
	Prompted		opportunity to answer "don't know". The pre-coded and
	Pre-coded		options are to determine the respondents affiliation within
	- "don't know" included		the different brands their "Know/Use/Have used"
	Single choice pr. Brand		The question is nominal scaled, as it is to determine which
			categories the respondents belong to from "never" to
			"several times daily", without any internal ranking between
			the possible answers.
12, 17, 18, 21, 24	Closed	Rating	These closed, prompted and pre-coded questions are the
	Prompted	Itomizod	first questions to make use of the balanced scale. The
	Pre-coded	iternized	questions are included to determine for what reason the
	- "don't know" included	Balanced	respondents use the social websites, attitudes towards
	Single choice pr. Statement		various advertising platforms, reasons to use the presented
		5 points (odd)	concept and under which conditions the respondents
			discusses advertisement. The prompted aspect is to help
			the respondents to recall their attitudes within the
			framework of the authors/researchers of this thesis.
			The question is a rating, itemized, balanced scale. The
			actual options are among others "agree-disagree" as used
			in a Likert scale. A rating scale is chosen in order to
			determine the respondents' attitude within the pre-coded
			options.
12	Closed	Dating	The supprise is alread, anomated and are and dated
13	Bromptod	Kating	included in order to identify the record dust stitute
	Prompteu	Likert	towards advortisement by means of likest scale and faster
	- "don't know" included		analysis in this way is sought to obtain a single factor to
1		1	analysis, in this way is sought to obtain a single factor to

	Single choice pr. Statement		describe the attitude. See use of scales XXX.
			The question is Likert scaled in order to accomplish a factor analysis.
14, 16	Closed Prompted Pre-coded - "don't know" included Single choice	Rating Itemized Balanced 5 points (odd)	These closed , prompted and pre-coded questions are included in continuation of question 13 and 15, in order to identify any variations in the respondents' attitude and interests towards advertisement when using a single factor by means of Likert / semantic differential scale and using a single question. The questions are rating , itemized , balanced scales . The rating scales are chosen in order to determine the respondents' attitude within the pre-coded options.
15	Closed Prompted Pre-coded - "don't know" not included Single choice pr. Statement	Semantic differential 5 points	The question is closed , prompted and pre-coded as its underlying basis is semantic differential scale. The question is developed to map the respondents' interest towards advertisement. The questions is closed and pre-coded as it is sought to let the respondents' make up one's mind about predetermined factors concerning advertisement. The scale used in this question is semantic differential .
20	Closed Prompted Pre-coded - "don't know" included Single choice	Nominal	The questions are closed and prompted as the researchers have pre-defined the possible answers (single choice) and it is not possible for the respondents to add their own. Nominal scale is chosen as the question is to determine which categories the respondents belong to. The number assigned is only to identification as there is no value implied between the categories.
19, 22, 23	Closed Prompted Pre-coded - "don't know" included Single choice	Rating Itemized Balanced 5 points (odd)	These closed and pre-defined questions are developed in order to identify the respondents' advertisement influence as well as identifying attitudes toward the presented concept. The prompted aspect is to help the respondents to recall their attitudes within the framework of the authors/researchers of this thesis. The question is a rating, itemized, balanced scale . The actual options are among others "agree-disagree" as used in a Likert scale. A rating scale is chosen in order to determine the respondents' attitude within the pre-coded options.

25, 26, 27, 28, 29	Closed	Nominal	The questions are closed and prompted as the researchers
	Prompted		have pre-defined the possible answers (single choice) and it
	Pre-coded		is not possible for the respondents to add their own. The
	- "don't know" not included		questions are to collect demographic data from the
	Single choice		respondents', which are to be used in to the other
			questions. The pre-coded types of questions are based on
			the large amount of resources to be used if the
			respondents have the options to write in.
			Nominal scale is chosen as the questions are to determine
			which categories the respondents belong to. The number
			assigned is only for identification as there is no value
			implied between the categories.
			Question 28: "don't know" is included

Appendix 9 – Quantitative questionnaire

1. Intro og Internet brugsvaner

Tak fordi du vil deltage i denne undersøgelse. Undersøgelsen handler delvist om dit Internetforbrug og delvist om din holdning til reklamer.

Undersøgelsen tager ca. 10-15 minutter og er 100% anonym.

Du må meget gerne forsøge at svare på alle spørgsmål i spørgeskemaet, også selvom enkelte spørgmål måske ikke umiddelbart virker relevante for dig.

De følgende spørgsmål drejer sig om dine brugsvaner på Internettet.

1. Hvor bruger du Internettet? (Vælg gerne flere)
Hjemme
Arbejdet
Studiet
Andre steder
Ved ikke
2. Hvor meget tid bruger du gennemsnitligt dagligt på Internettet? (Her medregnes ikke brug af e-mail)
◯ Mindre end en ½ time
─ V ₂ -1 time
○ 1-1½ time
\bigcap 1½-2 timer
○ 2-2½ time
O 2½−3 timer
O 3-31/2 time
◯ 31⁄2-4 timer
Mere end 4 timer
Ved ikke

Internettet på arbejdet?
Internettet på arbejdet?
ikke direkte – i så fald hvor ofte?

6. Hvor meget tid br	uger du dagligt ı	på Internettet i hjemmet	?
◯ Mindre end en ½ time			
∑ ½-1 time			
☐ 1-1½ time			
☐ 1½-2 timer			
\bigcirc 2-21/2 time			
$\int 2^{1/2} 2^{1/2} \operatorname{time}_{2}$			
$\bigcirc 2^{3/2-3} \text{ time}$			
31/2-4 timer			
Mere end 4 timer			
🚫 Ved ikke			
7. Hvor meget tid br	uger du dagligt į	på Internettet på studiet	?
Mindre end en ½ time			
∕ 1⁄2-1 time			
0 1-1½ time			
) 11/2-2 timer			
\bigcirc 2 ^{1/2} -3 timer			
\bigcirc 3-31/2 time			
Mere end 4 timer			
Ved ikke			
8. I løbet af en almir	ndelig dag, hvorr	når er du da typisk på Int	ernettet? (Vælg 1-3
tidspunkter hvor du	oftest er på Inte	ernettet)	Traditional
kl. 06.01-08.00		Næstillest	
kl. 08.01-12.00	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ
kl. 12.01-16.00	Ō	Õ	Ō
kl. 16.01-18.00	0	0	0
kl. 18.01-20.00	0	Ő	0
kl. 20.01-22.00	Ö	Ö	Ö
kl. 22.01-24.00	0	0	0
kl. 24.01-06.00	0	0	0
Vealkke	0	0	0

gruppe fuer inglietite.) inreal'surfing', tidsfordriv mv. formationssegning at læse nyheder, sport mv. mail mv. det d ikke	Besøger sociale	sider (Eks. Facebook, Myspace, Messenger, Arto, Youtube, Linkedin, flickr, Bebo, Hi5, Fora
formationssegning bejdsrelateret segning at lesse nyheder, sport mv. mail mv. det d ikke	Generel 'surfing'	ingnende.)
beidsrelateret sogning at læse nyheder, sport mv. mal mv. det d kke	Informationsson	
up us te da de la se nyheder, sport mv. mail mv. det d kke	Arbaidaralatarat	
al læse nyheder, sport mv. nail mv. det d ikke	Arbejdsrelateret	søgning
ta i mv. det d ikke	fil at læse nyhed	der, sport mv.
det d ikke	E-mail mv.	
d ikke	Andet	
	/ed ikke	

2. Internet Brugsvaner - interessesider

Følgende spørgsmål drejer sig stadig om dine brugsvaner på Internettet, men bliver mere specifikke omkring din brug af sociale sider, sociale netværk og online fora.

10. Hvilke af følgende sociale sider kender og benytter du?

Du må meget gerne svare for alle sider, også dem som du måske aldrig har hørt om.

	Kender/Benytter/Har benyttet	Kender ikke
Facebook	0	0
Myspace	0	0
Messenger	\bigcirc	0
Arto	0	0
Youtube	0	0
Linkedin	0	0
Flickr	0	0
Bebo	0	0
Hi5	0	0
Interessefora (eks. forum om bolig, biler, idræt osv.)	0	0

11. Hvor ofte bruger du nedenstående sociale sider?

Sider som du er på af personlig interesse eller for at kommunikere med venner og bekendte mv.?

Du må meget gerne svare for alle sider, også dem som du måske aldrig har hørt om.

	Aldrig	Månedligt	Ugentligt	Flere gange ugentligt	Dagligt	Flere gange dagligt	Ved ikke
Facebook	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Музрасе	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Messenger	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arto	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Youtube	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Linkedin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Flickr	\bigcirc	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bebo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hi5	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	0	0
Interessefora (eks. forum om bolig, biler, idræt osv.)	0	0	Ο	0	0	0	0

12. Af hvilke grunde	/årsager b	enytter du	disse socia	le sider?		
Du må meget gerne umiddelbart virker r	svare for a elevante fo	lle situation or dig.	ner, også de	em som må	ske ikke	
I sle	tingen grad Im	nindre grad Hv	erken/eller Ir	nogen grad	I høj grad	Ved ikke
Benytter af interesse	Ó	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	Ô	\bigcirc
	ŏ	ŏ	Ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ
For at opna viden	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Õ
For at dele ud af min	0	0	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	0
	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\frown	\frown	\bigcirc
For at få hjælp af andre	Q	Q	Õ	Q	Õ	Õ
Til underholdning	0	0	0	0	0	0
For at tjene	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
penge/optjene point	\cup	\cup	\bigcirc	\cup	\bigcirc	\cup

3. Holdning til reklamer									
De følgende spørgsmål drejer sig om din holdning til reklamer									
13. Tilkendegiv hvor enig eller uenig du er i følgende udsagn om reklamer.									
Du må meget ger	Du må meget gerne svare for alle situationer, også dem som måske ikke								
umiddelbart virke	er relevante	for dig.	ationer, også		musike ikke				
Reklamer giver mig til	Meget uenig	Uenig	Hverken/eller	Enig	Meget enig	Ved ikke			
tider værdifuld information?	0	0	0	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc			
Nogle reklamer er interessante?	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Nogle reklamer er dybsindige og tankevækkende?	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Nogle reklamer er sjove/underholdende?	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Nogle reklamer vækker et behov hos mig?	0	0	0	0	0	0			
14. Hvad er din o	verordnede	holdning	til reklamer?						
O Meget positiv									
Hverken eller									
O Negativ									
O Meget negativ									
🚫 Ved ikke									

ier vil du blive mødt af en række modsatte værdier, og du skal vælge på en skala ra 1-5 hvilken værdi du forbinder reklamer generelt med. Eks. Værdifulde vs. Værdiløse: Hvis du mener at reklamer er meget værdifulde vælger du værdien '1' Hvis du mener at reklamer er lidt værdifulde vælger du værdien '2'									
- Hvis du er indiffe - Hvis du mener at - Hvis du mener at Således fortsætter	rent vælge reklamer (reklamer (er du værd er lidt vær er meget v	ien 'hverke diløse vælg værdiløse va	n eller' er du væ ælger du	rdier '4' værdien '5'				
Du må meget gern	e svare for	r alle værd	isæt, også (dem som	måske ikke				
umiddelbart virker	[,] relevante	for dig.							
	1	2	Hverker	n eller	4	5			
Værdifulde vs. Værdiløse Interessante vs.	0	00	C)	0	0			
Uinteressante Tiltrækkende vs. Utiltrækkende	0	0	C)	0	0			
Vigtige vs. Ikke vigtige	0	0	C)	0	0			
spændende vs. Kedenge		Ŏ)	0	0			
Relevante vs. Irrelevante	0	0	C		0	0			
Betydningsløse	0	0	C)	0	0			
Brugbare vs. Ubrugelige	0	0	C)	0	0			
Ønskede vs. Uønskede	0	0	C)	0	0			
16. Hvor interesse	ret er du i	reklamer?							
O Meget interesseret									
O Interesseret									
O Hverken eller									
O Ikke interesseret									
O Slet ikke interesseret									
🔘 Ved ikke									
17. Hvad er din hol	ldning til di	isse forske	llige reklam	neformer?					
Du må meget gern	e svare foi	[,] alle slags	reklamer.						
Ν	1eget negativ	Negativ	Hverken eller	Positiv	Meget positiv	Ved ikke			
Reklamer i postkassen	0	0	Ö	Ö	Ö	0			
iv-reklamer	\mathbf{O}	0	0	Ő	Ö	0			
Reklamer på Internettet	0	0		0	0	0			
steder (Eks.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc			
busstoppesteder)	\sim	\sim	\sim	\sim	\sim	\sim			
veriamer i blade og	()	()	()	()					

2008

4. Internet og reklamer

De følgende spørgsmål drejer sig om dine oplevelser med reklamer på Internettet.

20. Har du nogensinde selv opsøgt reklamer på Internettet, f.eks. søgt efter en reklame på YouTube eller via et link fra en ven eller bekendt?

O Ja	I
	ej
O_{V}	ed ikke

5. Hvorfor opsøger du selv reklamer?

21. Hvorfor opsøger du selv at se reklamer?

Du må meget gerne svare for alle situationer, også dem som måske ikke umiddelbart virker relevante for dig.

	I slet ingen grad	I mindre grad	Hverken/eller	I nogen grad	I høj grad	Ved ikke
Interesse for produktet	0	0	\circ	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0
Interesse for tilbuddet	0	0	0	0	0	0
Interesse for reklamens udformning/reklamen som film og underholdning	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tidsfordriv på arbejde	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tidsfordriv i hjemmet	0	0	0	\circ	0	0
For at tjene penge/Vinde præmier	0	0	0	0	0	0
For at kunne tale med andre om reklamen	0	0	0	0	0	0
Faglig sparring/diskussion	0	0	0	0	0	0

6. Koncepttest							
Du vil nu blive præsenter	et for et koncept,	hvortil der vil	være en række	e spørgsmål.			
Forestil dig en hjemmeside, hvor du opretter en profil, for at kunne se og diskutere forskellige reklamer.							
Du bliver en del af et n	Du bliver en del af et netværk, der diskuterer reklamer.						
Du har mulighed for at bedømmelse/karakterer i	svare på spørgsm forskellige katego	nål vedrørende orier.	enkelte reklam	er, samtidig ka	n du give rekla	amerne	
Der vil, på hjemmeside	n, være hitlister o	over de bedste	reklamer overo	ordnet og inden	for en række k	ategorier.	
Du vil, som følge af din Rejser og lignende, eller	aktivitet på hjem optjene point son	nmesiden, delta n har kontant v	age i konkurren værdi.	cer om præmie	r som iPods, №	lobiltelefoner,	
22. I hvilken gra	ad finder du c	len præser	iterede hjer	nmeside in	teressant?		
🔘 I slet ingen grad							
O I mindre grad							
Hverken/eller							
I nogen grad							
I høi grad							
Ved ikke							
23. Kunne du fi	nde på at kig	ge nærmer	e på en såd	an hjemme	side?		
🔵 Ja - helt sikkert							
🔘 Ja - formodentlig							
🔘 Måske							
🔘 Nej - ikke umiddelb	part						
🔘 Nej - slet ikke							
🚫 Ved ikke							
24. Hvad skulle den præsentere Du må meget ge umiddelbart vir	der til for at o ede hjemmes erne svare for ker relevante	du, af egen ide? r alle situat for dig. I mindre grad	fri vilje, sku tioner, også	ulle opsøge dem som r I nogen grad	/se på rek nåske ikke	lamer på	
For at tjene penge	Q	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö	
præmier	0	0	0	0	0	0	
reklamer	O	0	0	0	0	0	
Tidsfordriv på arbejde	Ő	0	Õ	0	Õ	0	
Tidsfordriv i hjemmet	Ö	Ő	Ő	Ő	Ö	\bigcirc	
rayny sparring/diskussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	

7. Demografi
25. Hvad er din alder?
O 10-20 år
🔾 21-30 år
🔘 31-40 år
🔘 41-50 år
○ 51-60 år
O 61-70 år
Over 70 år
26. Hvad er dit køn?
O Mand
○ Kvinde
27. Hvilken region bor du i?
O Region Nordjylland
O Region Midtjylland
O Region Syddanmark
O Region Sjælland
O Region Hovedstaden
28. Hvad er din personlige årlige indkomst?
O Mindre end 150.000 kr.
O 150.001-300.000 kr.
○ 300.001-450.000 kr.
O 450.001-600.000 kr.
O Mere end 600.000 kr.
Ved ikke
29. Hvad er din primære beskæftigelse?
🔘 Lønmodtager/funktionær i den private sektor, arbejder
O Lønmodtager/funktionær i den offentlige sektor
Selvstændig
O Arbejdsledig/Hjemmegående
⊖ Studerende
⊖ Andet

Tusind tak fordi din deltagelse i denne undersøgelse.

Appendix 10 – E-mail to quantitative respondents

	9 🛛 🔛	* *	=							Hjælp til a	ifhandling	- Message	(HTML)			
	Message	Insert	Options	Format Text												
Paste	∦ Cut ⊫ Copy ∛ Format P	ainter	• 10 B I <u>U</u>	· (A` ∧`) !≡ · · A ·) ≡ ≡ ≡		Address Book	Check Names	U Attach File	Attach Item	Business Card *	Calendar	Signature *	Follow Up *	Permission Permission High Impor	▼ tance tance	ABC Spelling
C	lipboard	G.		Basic Text	G	Nar	mes			Include		G.		Options	G.	Proofing
= " end	Cc	 Hjælp	til afhandling													

Hej,

Vi vil sætte utrolig stor pris på det, hvis du vil afse ca. 10 minutter af din tid, på at svare på et spørgskema til vores kandidatafhandling.

Følg linket nedenfor og husk at trykke på "færdig" til sidst.

Du må selvfølgelig gerne sende denne mail videre til alle du kender, således at vi får så mange svar som muligt. Vi kan bruge svar fra alle slags mennesker.

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=q3U2Wv3P2MzxsJ1xdvRs5g_3d_3d

Tak for hjælpen og konstruktiv kritik modtages altid ;0)

Hilsner Christian & Casper

Overall concept idea	An online web community/database based on the rating and review of advertisements. The concept is to facilitate, process and structure community user information in preparation of creating an efficient, affordable and differentiated tool/product for testing advertisements
In depth concept description	 An online community with registered users who are interested in advertising. Users will be prompted with questions and rating requests on different advertisements. User driven discussions about advertisements. Clients can create their own online advertisement test via a web application –uploading their own material to the website. The possibility to contact the company for professional sparring and help in creating the test. A fixed number of available product solutions. Reducing the cost of creating an entirely new type of test each time. The concept is focused on the type of customer/client that have some upfront experience in marketing research. The idea is to create a differentiated analysis concept, based on a different type of web panel, supplying customers with a fixed number of easy and fast product solutions.
Product/Service	The product/service provided consists of advertisement tests in a new, very basic, fast, affordable and simple format.
USP/ESP	Quick and affordable market insight - easy, fast, affordable and simple advertisement tests
Target Group - Client	Clients: Everybody that uses marketing research and tests in accordance with developing or implementing new advertisements in the Danish market of advertising: Major advertisers that conduct their own marketing research and testing, Advertising agencies and Media agencies.
Function	Clients: The ability to obtain valuable information about advertising in a fast, easy and affordable manor. Users: The oppotunity to discuss and rate advertisements on the basis of interest or possible gratification.
Technology	Internet - utilizing web 2.0 tendencies, creating a new online community on the Internet and a online marketing survey interface.
Competition	The competition is foreseen to be limited at implementation, but there is a risk that competition, new or adapted suppliers of similar products, will increase in short time if the concept is successful.
Entry Barriers	The entry barriers are generally low, but some ressources are required in the creation of a substantial group of users or panel.
Value Chain	Valuable user information \rightarrow facilitation and processing of user information \rightarrow valuable and applicable customer reports.

Appendix 12 – Qualitative questionnaire

1. Baggrundsoplysninger:

- 1.1 Nuværende stilling og ansvarsområde?
- 1.2 Anden relevant erfaring fra Reklamebranchen eller mediebranchen?

2. Den nuværende branche for test og pretest af reklamer, og brugen heraf:

- 2.1 I hvilket omfang tester I jeres reklamer? (pretest, posttest, print, tv, online, radio osv.)
 - 2.1.1 Hvorfor benytter I ikke tests i større omfang?
 - 2.1.2 Hvordan minimerer I så risikoen for fejl/forbiere?

2.2 Hvilke behov dækker jeres tests?

- 2.2.1 Tilpasser I jeres materiale på baggrund af tests?
- 2.3 Hvem er jeres nuværende samarbejdspartnere omkring test og analyse af reklamer? (Behøver ikke svare)
- 2.4 Hvad er deres kompetence? (Hurtighed, pris, kvalitet, validitet?)
- 2.5 Dækker de nuværende udbydere af analyser og tests behovet for dig/Jer?
- - 2.6.2 Er der nogen mangler herved?
- 2.7 Hvilken procedure følger du/l normalt omkring test og pretest af reklamer?
- 2.8 Ville I teste mere hvis det var nemmere og billigere?

3. Muligheder/mangler i det nuværende marked:

- 3.1 Synes du umiddelbart der mangler noget på markedet for tests lige nu?
- 3.2 Hvad synes du er den største mangel indenfor testsmarkedet?
- 3.3 Ville det kunne skabe yderligere værdi i forhold til Jer/Jeres kunder hvis I havde større mulighed for at teste jeres kreative arbejde inden implementering?
- 3.4 Hvad indebærer den optimale test for Jer? (Hurtighed, Pris, validitet) Prioriter gerne i rækkefølge
- 3.5 I hvor høj grad er Jeres kunder interesseret i at få testet det materiale I laver for dem?

Koncept præsenteres – Fokus på USP'er

- 4. Umiddelbar reaktion på det præsenterede koncept:
- 4.1 Hvad synes du umiddelbart om konceptet?

2008

- 4.2 Ser du en mulighed for at I kunne drage nytte af et sådant forretningsinitiativ?
- 4.3 Ser du et behov for et sådant netværk af interesserede forbrugere i branchen?
- 4.4 Hvad synes du om ideen om at interagere med interesserede forbruger som bidrager med input af egen fri vilje, i modsætning til f.eks. en kunstigt sammensæt mindre fokusgruppe?
- 4.5 Kan du forestille dig at benytte et sådant koncept som et led i den kreative process og udviklingen af reklamer? (Dvs. at du har mulighed for at spare med forbrugeren i selve udviklingen mhb. på at opnå den bedste effekt)
- 4.6 Ser du nogen umiddelbare forhindringer i dette koncept? (Er det meningsløst? For besværligt? Er der overhovedet et behov for en sådan sparring?)
- 4.7 I hvilken forbindelse ser du umiddelbart, at et sådant koncept kunne skabe værdi for Jer og jeres kunder?
- 4.8 Hvor ofte kunne I drage nytte af et sådant koncept? (På alt I udvikler eller kun større ting)
- 4.9 Ville du kunne se en fordel, i forhold til jeres kunder i at teste yderligere i den kreative udvikling? (Vil det give det I laver mere substans og troværdighed)

Lang diskussion omkring konceptet - snak om forskellige idéer

5. Krav til en evt. udbyder af det præsenterede koncept:

- 5.1 Hvad er det primære aspekt ved det nye koncept som du have en værdi for Jer?
- 5.2 Hvad skal konceptet kunne bidrage med for at du/I ville benytte Jer heraf? (Hastighed, pris, indsigt, enkelthed mv.?)
- 5.3 Ser du konceptet som en konkurrent til jeres nuværende samarbejdspartner eller mere som en alternativ samarbejdspartner?
- 5.4 Hvad er det vigtigste for Jer mht. kommunikationen med Jeres samarbejdspartner?
- 5.5 Vil det være en fordel eller ulempe for Jer hvis der er tale om et Do-it-yourself koncept hvor I selv står for upload af materiale og opsætning af evt. spørgeskema på hjemmesiden?
- 5.6 Eller ser I helst, at man gennem samarbejdet med en konsulent briefer på opgaven og konsulenten så står for den egentlige praktiske udførelse heraf?
- 5.7 Ser du en fordel i at modtage en relativt simplificeret afrapportering, som er meget nemt forståelig?
- 5.7 Ville du/I være interesseret i at afprøve konceptet såfremt du blev tilbudt en meget billig eller gratis prøveløsning?
 - 5.7.1 Hvor billig skulle en sådan prøveløsning være?

Appendix 12.1 Qualitative respondents

Respondent	Business and position	Argumentation
Christoffer Back	Co+Høgh Consulting (Advertising Company Copenhagen) www.co-hogh.com Partner & Group Account Director	 Christoffer Back has work experience from Kunde & Co, BrandHouse and Co+Høgh and was previously an entrepreneur, starting his own online business. Christoffer has great insight into the advertising and media market, and has used all sorts of test methods, ranging from concept development tests to ad-liking tests.
Palle Nielsen	Co+Contact (Media consulting agency copenhagen) www.co+contact.com Partner	 Palle Nielsen has work experience from a media agency (StarCom) and Catinét as a consultant and researcher. This enables Palle to see things from the perspective of a media consultant and also from a more typical research consultant's point of view. Palle has great insight into the usage of test & analysis in the media world, but even more important, he knows a lot about the market of research and analysis and can prove very important in judging and developing the new business concept.
Ole Herstal	Current employment: Impaq Cph (founder and partner) Experience: Managing Director of Co+Høgh and partner of Kunde & Co.	 Ole Herstal has work experience from the top of the Danish advertising industry, having worked as the Managing Director of Co+Høgh since the start of the company in 2006, and as partner of Kunde & Co prior to this. Furthermore, he has worked in marketing for a number of telecommunication companies and IBM in the USA. Ole has a professional and analytical approach to business and business ideas. Ole works towards creating added value and economically sound business concepts. Furthermore, his present company has an interest in web 2.0 and new media channels. He has also worked with almost all types of testing and analysis throughout his career.

Appendix 13 – Transcription of qualitative interviews

Appendix 13.1 Transcripation - interview #1 Christoffer Back

Hvad er dit navn, din nuværende stilling, din baggrund og tidligere erfaringer?

Svar: Mit navn er Christoffer Back. Jeg har arbejdet som kundekontakt på Co+Høgh og Brandhouse. Jeg har haft min egen it virksomhed, været salgs- og marketings ass. i en virksomhed som havde med ultralydscanninger at gøre. Nu er jeg blevet partner hos Co+Høgh. Jeg laver det samme som jeg gjorde før, der er dog lidt mere administrativt i det.

I hvilket omfang tester I jeres reklamer? (pretest, posttest, print, tv, online, radio osv.)

Svar: Der kan blive testet på alle niveauer. Man kan teste kommunikation på alle niveauer. Det afhænger af hvilken type test man vil lave. Hvis man tester på ide eller koncept, så laver man en overordnet test for forståelse. Forstår en målgruppe hvad det er det indeholder? eller helt ned til testen af et færdigt element og forstår de så de enkelte budskaber? Går fra den samlet forståelse til detail forståelse, så man kan faktisk teste hele vejen igennem.

Bruger i noget tilsvarende på nuværende tidspunkt?

Svar: Vi anvender alle typer af test, men vi er i højere grad begyndt at teste mere og mere på nettet, altså bruge webcamera. Grunden til dette er at det er lettere at sætte op og omkostningerne er ikke så høje. Et webpanel kan man få i de forskellige udbydere der er, kan man eksempelvis få tilsendt dem nogle annoncer overfor 100 personer i en målgruppe og det koster et beløb og det samme koster det at teste 8 personer i en målgrupper. Men det man lige skal tænke over er, at i fokusgrupper vil man typisk teste på ide og forståelse, mens man ved webpanel vil teste budskaber i færdige elementer. Vi tester ret meget og fordi det er blevet billigere og billigere så er kunderne også begyndt at checke for at være 100% sikre på at det hele er ok inden det kører igennem.

Hvilket behov dækker det overfor jer? er det jeres argumentation overfor kunden for at ideen er i orden?

Svar: Det kan det godt være, men oftest er det kunden der efterspørger fordi de gerne vil være 100% sikre på at det vi laver, er det rigtige. Vi bliver nødt til at tro på at det vi laver, det virker, for problemet med test er også, at man ikke kan teste noget som er unikt eller anderledes fordi vi reagerer som mennesker på den måde, at når vi ser noget som vi ikke har set før, så bliver vi usikre og det vil påvirke testen i en negativ

Man skal ikke teste for testen skyld. Her tester vi for kundens skyld for at være sikker på, at vi gør det på den rigtige måde. Der findes også en anden type af test og det er den indledende del hvor vi ikke bare laver den for at være sikre, men også gør der for at involvere folk, så vi også fået vore potentielle kunder til at byde med ind. På den måde kan vi også efterfølgende sige, at det er kunderne der har været med inde over. Så bruger vi faktisk testen til noget andet end at sætte to streger under men som et involveringsværktøj.

Bruger i så de her test resultater til at ændre jeres materiale?

retning og så kan vi risikere at slagte alle mulige fede ting.

Svar: Ja det synes jeg. Nogle gange kommer der nogle soleklare konklusioner fra test om det er fokusgrupper eller webpanel, hvor man ser hvad der skal ændres. Jeg har også været ude for særlig fokusgrupper, hvor der har været feedback, hvor de har sagt, at de ikke vil være med til det og i den gruppe på 8 kan der så være en stærk person som er dominerende og derfor kan påvirke de andre på en negativ måde. Der må man gå ind og sige, at den her fokusgruppe kan vi ikke bruge. Det er vigtigt når man tester, at man forstår at en fokusgruppe kan have de mest unikke ideer og så bliver man bange for ideen fordi man ikke har set det før, og siger at det vil vi ikke have, og så er det ikke længere unikt

Hvem bruger i som samarbejdspartnere?

Svar: Vi har brugt stort set alle. FOA til noget webtest. Så har vi brugt GFK til fokusgrupper og Norstat. Så har vi brugt Alsteds research særligt til fokusgrupper. Så har vi brugt Cantinet og dem har vi både brugt til webundersøgelse og til Cati.

Hvad er det vigtigste for jer. Er det hurtigheden i det, kvaliteten eller er det at det er billigt?

Svar: De er eksperter i at gennemføre test så de skal også være eksperter i at kunne analysere testen og komme med de rigtige konklusioner. Det er ekstremt vigtigt at når man køber en test udefra at den efterfølgende rapportering giver mening og det ikke bare er en gengivelse af hvad test personerne har sagt. Det der giver værdi for mig når jeg skal give det videre til kunden, det er hvis de kan konkludere hurtigt og nemt på testen.

Men synes du de nuværende udbydere dækker dette behov for rapportering?

Svar: Det er der nogle af dem der gør. Alsteds research er gode. De går ind og laver nogle konklusioner. Det er super vigtigt at man kan sætte sig ind i det. Dem der er eksperter, det er dem der kan komme med konklusioner og fortælle hvad man skal kigge på, og det er dem der er de gode.

Hvilken type test har I god erfaring med i udvikling af jeres reklame?

Svar: Der er den kvantitative og den kvalitative og det afhænger af hvad man vil have ud af testen. Vi har gode erfaring med begge ting. Jeg har altid haft det svært ved fokusgrupper fordi jeg oftest har set, at unikke ideer bliver slået ihjel.

Hvilke procedurer følger I ved tests?

Svar: Der skal laves noget på det man gerne vil teste og det man tester skal være konkret. Der skal være en form for materiale eller en forklaring eller forståelse for ellers kan du risikere at 200 respondenter har svaret på 200 forskellige måder. Der er det vigtigt at man har noget ordentligt testmateriale for ellers har man ikke noget at forholde sig til og ellers får man ikke noget ud af testen. Man skal tænke på, hvad er det vi tester og hvad er det vi gerne vil have ud af det, en struktureret proces.

Ville I teste mere hvis det var nemmere og billigere?

Svar: Jeg er i tvivl om man vil teste mere bare fordi man kan. Det der er problemet med processen er, at man kan risikere at ende et sted hvor man ikke har lyst til at være. Som reklamebureau skal vi tro på at vi udvikler kommunikation som virker og reelt skal det kunne køres igennem uden at testes. Vi skal sige at vi er eksperterne og I betaler os 1.500 kr. i timen for at udvikle noget som virker. Så det er jeg i tvivl om, om man ville, men det ville jeg sku tage stilling til konkret.

Men hvor mange at jeres kunder tror på at, i kan køre igennem hele vejen uden at teste?

Svar: Det er forskelligt. Det afhænger af hvem der styrer projektet og måden man fremstiller projektet på og hvor meget man selv tror på projektet. Men det er meget sjældent at vi foreslår tests medmindre det er en del af udviklingsprocessen.
Er det mere reglen eller undtagelsen at I tester eller pretester færdige elementer?

Svar: Vi er dårligere til det her end man er andre steder. Det er ikke hver gang at vi tester, men til gengæld tester vi de fleste af vores film, test, tracking når de er færdige og så bruger man de learnings som man får det til at udvikle. På den måde kan man få noget kvalitativ feedback på filmene så man kan bruge til udviklingen.

Har du set nogen anden måde som andre har gjort det på hvor du har tænkt hvorfor I ikke har gjort det på den måde før?

Svar: Nogen gange kunne man godt tænke sig at det var lidt lettere at teste. At man f.eks bare kunne stille et spørgsmål til en abonnement uden at skulle igennem analysebureauer og sætte spørgsmålene op og vente på svarene. Men selvfølgelig skal det stadig være pålideligt. Det ville være smart hvis man kunne bruge mobilmarkedet til at teste, men jeg tror ikke helt at det ville fungere. Men det bliver bedre og bedre. Men samtidig skal man også tænke på prisen. Hvis jeg sku betale 15.000 kr. for at få svar på et spørgsmål, så ville jeg hellere sende en studentermedhjælper ud som i sidste ende ville kunne give et ligeså pålideligt svar.

Ville det være lettere hvis der bare var en person som man kontaktede hver gang i stedet for at bruge forskellige hver gang?

Svar: Jo det selvfølgelig rart, men det er svært for et analysebureau at have det hele og så er der bare forskel på hvad de har og hvad de kan. Det kunne være rart, men jeg tror ikke det kan lade sig gøre.

Hvor høj grad er jeres kunder interesseret i at der bliver testet?

Svar: Det er oftest kunderne. Hvis man kunne lave nogle små test som ikke kostede så meget og ville være hurtige, så ville vi i højere grad kunne bruge det, men når vi taler om færdigt materiale så er det kunderne. Hvis det er en del af udviklingsprocessen, så laver vi en test.

Det nye koncept introduceres...

Svar: det er 100 procent en god ide, men jeg tror I bliver nødt til at tænke over hvad kan vi gøre udover bare at kigge på reklame. Der skal være noget som gør at folk får lyst til at komme derind hele tiden. Lidt ligesom Facebook. Måske mulighed for at teste nogle produkter eller vinde nogle produkter. I kunne sige de første 20 der svarer får en biografbillet eller noget lign. Det skal bare være spændende hele tiden. Ligesom youtube. Men jeg tror det kan være svært fordi folk har set det før. Der skal være noget wauv effekt. Måske noget webcam ind over. Noget online fokusgruppe. Det skal være noget nyt, som ikke ligner andre salgstyper. Men det skal stadigvæk fremlægges på et board for kunden, så det på den måde virker godt, enkelt og pålideligt.

Ser du et behov for et sådant netværk af interesserede forbrugere i branchen?

Svar: Der er en del eksempler på at forbrugere går op i sådan noget. Iphone f.eks blev der lavet på nettet tusinde eksempler på hvordan den sku' se ud. Som bruger vil man selv have indflydelse på hvordan tingene skal se ud. Så det tror jeg der er et behov for. Jeg tror også folk vil synes det kunne være sjovt hvis man selv kunne ændre en masse ting ved ting og reklamer.

Tror du at det kan skabe en yderligere værdi for jer og jeres kunder?

Svar: Ja hvis I kan vise hvordan I bruger det overfor kunderne, og viser en god præsentation. Det er også vigtigt at i viser at det fungerer og at det er noget specielt.

Hvordan ser du det her i forhold til jeres nuværende samarbejdspartnere?

Svar: Det kan bruges til revurderinger af nogle ideer og til at opstille nogle hypoteser, hvor de andre test er større er det her er den hurtige del. Den her er den hurtige og billige løsning.

Appendix 13.2 Transcripation - interview #2 Palle Nielsen

Hvad er dit navn, din nuværende stilling, din baggrund og tidligere erfaringer?

Svar: Jeg hedder Palle Nilsen og er partner i Co+Contact. Mit ansvar er at udvikle mediestrategi og min baggrund er 10 år i mediebranchen, tre år på Kunde & Co, tre år på IM, to år på Starcom som kontaktansvarlig for kunder og to år hos Catinet. Jeg er uddannet cand.merc.

I hvilket omfang tester I jeres reklamer?

Svar: Vi bruger alle typer test. Det afhænger af om det er pretestning eller effekt målinger, men vi gør brug af begge dele. Jeg har lavet flere hundrede forskellige analyser i hele Europa af forskellig slags. Hvis det er meget tidligt, så er det typisk på storyboard niveau og så er det mere på det overordnede koncept niveau, og hvis det er nede i det specifikke element, så er det typisk pre eller tv.

Hvilke behov dækker de her test for jer?

Svar: Det er både godt og dårligt. Det kan være nødvendigt at få forbrugerens holdning til det du har lavet. Det kan dræbe den gode ide for du kan ikke bede forbrugeren være reklame ekspert, og det er den største anke mod pretest, men det kan give nogle rigtig værdifulde input.

Hvem har i arbejdet sammen med?

Svar: Gallup, Milward Brown, GFK, Norstat

Hvorfor har du ikke bare holdt dig til en?

Svar: Det er fordi de har forskellige styrker og det har også noget at gøre med hvor mange penge der er til det. Hvis det er web, så er der nogle der har gode paneler og nogle der har dårlige paneler, så det afhænger meget af, om du har pengene til det gode eller dårlige panel.

Er der nogle der er bedst?

Svar: Hvis du skal have dækning for det du gør, så er det Gallup og GFK. Super kendte brands. Men du betaler også rigtig meget for det.

Hvis du selv skulle bruge nogle resultater fra et analyse bureau, ville det så betyde noget for dig om det var det ene brand eller det andet?

Svar: Det betyder ikke noget for mig hvis det er Gallup, men der er nogle brands hvor jeg tænker om det er validt nok, og der er nogle brands som ikke er valide nok, så det skal man altid lige have i baghovedet. Så skal man også tænke på hvad det er for en beslutning man skal træffe på grundlag af det her og så er der nogle brands som man bare ikke kan bruge.

Synes du at analyse bureauerne dækker dine behov?

Svar: Det kommer an på hvilket niveau du har behov for. Med analyse ved man ikke særlig meget om og derfor bliver det svært at vide hvad man forventer.

Hvilken type test har i god erfaring med i udvikling med jeres reklame?

Svar: Fokusgrupper er rigtig gode og så holde det på et fornuftigt niveau og vide, at du ikke får nogen svar. Det er det du kan bruge, for hvis du bruger det på de rigtig præmisser, så er det godt.

Ville I teste mere hvis det var nemmere og billigere?

Svar: Nej faktisk ikke, fordi det er nogle bestemte situationer hvor du bliver skubbet ud i det. Det er kun hvis der er behov for det.

Hvad synes du er den største mangel indenfor reklamebranchen?

Svar: Vi er et lille land og er ikke langt fremme med nettet, og der eksempler på at vi er lidt bagud med en masse ting. F. eks kan de i Tyskland køre test hvor de eksponerer tilfældigt med tv medie system hvor de kan sammenligne test over national på tv-effekter og kan gå detaljeret ned, og det kan vi ikke i Danmark.

Hvad indebærer den optimale test for jer?

Når det er en seriøs analyse hvor der bliver truffet beslutninger på grundlag af det, så er det kvaliteten, men det går jo ikke at du træffer beslutninger på et grundlag som ikke er i orden. Kvalitet og så pris.

Hvad med hurtigheden, er det vigtigt for jer?

Svar: Der er bare grænser for hvor hurtigt man kan lave ordentlige analyser. Man kan jo ikke bare tage de første 500 mennesker for man skal jo have alle typer igennem for at testen bliver optimal.

2008

Er det kunden der ønsker at for testet tingen eller er det en samtale hvor i bliver enige om at få det testet?

Svar: Det er kunderne der tit føder ideen, men vi har set i vores proces at den sidste del af en proces fase, det er også en evaluering af effekter hvor man finder ud af om det har virket, og det er i alles interesser, og der er markedsanalyse en del af det. Så på det effektmæssige, er det lige så meget os selv, mens jeg må være ærlig og sige at pre testning nok mest er kunden.

Det nye koncept introduceres...

Hvad synes du umiddelbart om projektet? Er det noget der mangler på markedet?

Svar: I kunne tilføje som værdi nemt, hurtigt, billigt og så skulle der også stå sjov. Man får jo noget ud af det ved at man får nogle input, men det er jo på ingen måde analyse som sådan, men det vil være over mod det kvalitative, men nogle gange har man brug for nogle andre. Hvordan man får forretning i det, ved jeg ikke om man kan, men helt metodisk er det jo ikke analyse, men man har jo bare brug for nogle input, så jeg tror mere at det er fokusgrupperne online, hvor man kan gå derind og spørge i stedet for at gå på gaden. Så det vil meget være reklamebureauerne der er målgruppen.

Er der mulighed for at i ville drage nytte af sådan at program?

Svar: Nej, men jeg kan godt se at reklamebureauerne vil bruge det for at have nogle andres menneskers input.

Ser du et behov for et sådant netværk af interesserede forbrugere i branchen?

Svar: Jeg ved ikke om der er et behov, men man skal nok få medlemmer fordi folk er nysgerrige.

Er det en god ide at man kan spare og diskutere med brugeren?

Svar: Ja. Det er jo et problem med f. eks fokusgrupper, hvor du sætter dem i en rolle, så de er jo ikke sig selv. På den måde kan du sikkert ramme nogle ligeså godt der, men hvis der er en vis masse, så kan jeg godt se det.

Tror du man ville gøre brug af en sådan hurtig måde?

Svar: Ja men det kunne man sagtens og hvis man husker det. Igen ikke som en analyse, men noget input. Den del der vil blive svært er, at skulle betale for det. Det er jo noget nyt og det er den del der er svær. Jeg tror at i skal under 10.0000 kr, måske 3-4.000 kr.. Men det er det leje man vil give for nogle input. Så det skal være nede i mikro projekt størrelse.

Ser du nogen forhindring ved det her koncept?

Svar: Jeg ser helt klart forretningsprocenten er rimelig svær at få til at blive interessant for at drive det. Der vil komme lang tid før det kommer volumen idet før folk bliver vant til at bruge det, og det tror jeg vil blive den største forhindring. Men jo, der er helt klart nogle der ville drage nytte af det hvis det kom op at køre.

Hvilke aspekter tror du i ville drage nytte af her hvor du sidder nu?

Svar: Det ville være ideen af det, respons og hastigheden. Men det kunne være interessant at være direkte med forbrugerne. Altså interaktionen som også ville være sjovt for os at bruge det.

Ser du konceptet som en konkurrent til nogle af den andre analyse bureauer?

Svar: Nej slet ikke

Vil det være en fordel eller ulempe for Jer hvis der er tale om et Do-it-yourself koncept – hvor I selv står for upload af materiale og opsætning af evt. spørgeskema på hjemmesidder eller ser I helst, at man gennem samarbejdet med en konsulent briefer på opgaven og konsulenten så står for den egentlige praktiske udførelse heraf?

Svar: Der er mange reklamebrugere der har købt sig ind til forskellige institutters software til opsætning af spørgeskemaer, så du selv kan sætte analysen op og sample den ud, så det er der nogle der synes er interessant.

Hvor meget koster det hvis I selv sætter det ud?

Svar: 7-8.000 kr og så bruger de selv et par timer.

Ville du kunne se en fordel i at få et meget kvalificeret svar?

Svar: Ja det skal bare være klare og overskuelige tabeller.

Ville du/I være interesseret i at afprøve konceptet såfremt du blev tilbudt en meget billig eller gratis prøveløsning?

Svar: Det vil vi gerne for omkring 3.000 kr.

Hvad ville du gøre hvis du skulle sælge det her projekt?

Svar: Så skulle det helt klart være interaktionen. Det at kunne få kontakt til forbrugerne.

Appendix 13.3 Transcripation - interview #3 Ole Herstal

Hvad er dit navn, din nuværende stilling, din baggrund og tidligere erfaringer?

Svar: Mit navn er Ole Herstal. Jeg har arbejdet hos Co + Høgh i fire år. Før har jeg været partner i fem år hos Kunde & Co.. Før det har jeg arbejdet i telebranchen hos Orange.

I hvilket omfang tester I jeres reklamer? (pretest, posttest, print, tv, online, radio osv)

Svar: Det er meget forskelligt. Det afhænger af hvilke kunder man har. Det vigtigste er at lave pretest. Pretest kan jo foregå på mange niveauer og der er det klart, at der er nogle reklamer der bliver forkastet og andre der bliver accepteret.

Hvor har I typisk testes mest. På koncept plan eller på det færdige?

Svar: Jeg har for det meste testet på konceptniveauet, altså på ide niveauet. Jeg synes mere at det er den overordnede ide, der er den vigtigste. Hvorvidt folk kan sætte sig ind i ideen eller ej.

Hvem bruger I som samarbejdspartnere?

Svar: Vi har arbejdet en del med mllward Brown og GFK - hvor vi har arbejdet meget omkring pretesting. Så har vi også arbejdet sammen med Zapera og forskellige andre.

Hvad er det vigtigste for jer. Er det hurtigheden, kvaliteten eller er det at det er billigt?

Svar: Der er to forskellige ting jeg har gået efter. Der er nogle af de analysebureauer som er meget bedre til den kvalitative proces, f. eks er GFK rigtig gode til denne proces og er rigtig gode til at finde ind til kernen. Hvorimod Milward Brown er meget firkantet i det. Så der er mange forskelle. Milward Brown er meget baseret på tracking og effekt og er ikke så kvalitative som de andre.

Hvilken type test har I god erfaring med i udvikling af reklamer?

2008

Svar: Der er mange forskellige analysetilgange, designtest og smagstest og jeg mangler nogle gange at analyserne er mere sammenhængende.

Ville I teste mere hvis det var nemmere og billigere?

Svar: Der er ingen tvivl om, at de sporadiske analyser hvor man meget hurtigt vil have nogle insides, det er jo ikke deres gebet. De har en opstart hver gang og derfor er vi nødt til selv at gøre ting, så vi kan få bekræftet eller afkræftet nogle hypoteser, og der er de alt for tunge. Så kan man overveje om der findes nogle webpaneler hvor man lige hurtigt kører en undersøgelse, men det er jo også mange penge man bruger på det. Så jeg mangler lidt den service. Det hele skal kunne fungere hurtigt.

Hvad med validiteten?

Svar: Der bliver man nødt til at gå på kompromis. Man har brug for et kvalitativt indspark hvor man får noget tilbage som man kan arbejde med, og der er jeg ligeglad med om jeg spørger 10 eller 50 personer, bare jeg får noget tilbage som jeg kan arbejde med. Det er stort set det samme som at lave en fokusgruppe.

Ville det kunne skabe yderligere værdi overfor jeres kunder hvis I havde større mulighed for at teste jeres kreative materielle?

Svar: Jeg tror alle former for test kan skabe værdi, der er nogle elementer som altid vil være vigtige. Der er værdien - hvad koster det at teste? hvor meget vil du investere i at få et bedre resultat?. Der afhænger det meget af kunden, for det er ikke altid at kunden gider at betale for det. Så er der den tredje dimension og det er deadlines som skal køres igennem og i og med at det er en kreativ proces, kan man nogle gange sortere nogle ting fra fordi nu skal man være klar til at teste, og i en kreativ proces ved man heller ikke hvornår det bliver. Så hvis man skal gøre det på den måde, så kræver det et større udviklingsforløb.

Hvad er den optimale test for dig?

Svar: Det er at finde ud af hvornår det giver værdi at teste og den anden fleksibiliteten, altså hurtigheden.

Er det typisk kunden der ønsker at for testet tingene? eller er det en samtale hvor I bliver enige om at få det testet?

Svar: Det er typisk kunderne der ønsker at få det testet for at være sikre. Der er nogen der har tiltro til os. Jeg vil sige at de lidt mere professionelle virksomheder hvor man tracker tingene løbende og har et mærke og et brand man arbejder ud fra, det er den måde man kvalificerer marketingindsatsen.

Introduktion til det nye koncept...

Hvad synes du umiddelbart om projektet?

Svar: Jeg synes det lyder meget spændende. Folk er jo villige til alt på nettet. Man skal bare passe på når det kombineres med noget tungt forretningsmæssigt, og man skal derfor passe på med ikke at overskride nogle grænser indenfor brugermiljøet for så er de oppe på dupperne. Det er det jeg tror vil være den største udfordring ved det her koncept. Derudover ligger der også en udfordring i at få etableret et panel.

Ser du et behov for et sådant netværk af interesserede forbrugere i branchen?

Svar: Nej, jeg tror det ville være de samme to hundrede mand der sviner hinanden til og halvdelen er fra forskellige reklamebureauer. Der tror jeg virkelig man skal passe på, jeg tror ikke man kan lave et lukket site, for kommunikation er jo bare en del man møder i sin hverdag. Det jeg har behov for er, at få en umiddelbar feedback og ikke en feinsmecker. Det kan selvfølgelig godt være at man har nogle eksperter, men jeg er mere interesseret i en upåvirket feedback for ellers er det bare en stor fokusgruppe. Det er utrolig vigtigt at det er meget rent, hurtigt og enkelt.

Er det en god ide at man kan spare og diskutere med brugeren?

Svar: Ja helt klart. Men mange gange skal man bare passe på med at involvere brugerne for meget. De kan godt komme med ideer, men det kommer an på hvad man vil bruge det til. Vil man lave et chatroom eller en fokusgruppe. Der skal man bare stille sig selv meget klart om hvad man vil have ud af det. Vil man have noget community hvor man får en masse holdninger og adfærd eller vil man have noget helt andet.

Ser du nogen forhindring ved det her koncept?

Svar: Forhindringen ved det her koncept - det er jo at få det bredt ud.

Hvad skulle få dig til at bruge det?

Svar: Der skal være nogle klare budskaber for hvad man kan teste og hvordan. Det der ligger i forhindringerne er om bureau verden er for arrogante til at ville bruge tid på det. Det skal komme fra kunderne af, eller fra nogle bureauer som ser det som en værdi.

Ser du konceptet som en konkurrent til nogle af den andre analyse bureauer?

Svar: Dem der er online orienteret ville hurtigt komme efter det her. Det er at bygge noget ekstra på. Det der er ved det er jo, at bygge det så enkelt og så selvbetjenings agtigt op som overhovedet muligt, så kunderne kan se værdi i det.

Vil det være en fordel eller ulempe for Jer hvis der er tale om et Do-it-yourself koncept – hvor I selv står for upload af materiale og opsætning af evt. spørgeskema på hjemmesidder, eller ser I helst, at man gennem samarbejdet med en konsulent briefer på opgaven og konsulenten så står for den egentlige praktiske udførelse heraf?

Svar: Ja jeg tror der er behov for at der er nogen der lige kan få en til at komme op og køre med det her. Det kræver at det virkeligt bliver intuitivt. Det der er vigtigt er, at jeg kan vælge to til tre standard rapporter, som er meget simple, med søjler osv. Nogle ting hvor man hurtigt kan visualisere det. Et output i noget som er grafisk i stedet for noget rapport for det er jo ikke det der koster penge.

Ville du/I være interesseret i at afprøve konceptet såfremt du blev tilbudt en meget billig eller gratis prøveløsning?

Svar: Vi skal ned og tale 10.000 kr og under.

Hvad ville du gøre hvis du skulle sælge det her projekt?

Svar: jeg tror jeg ville få fat i nogle virksomheder og lave nogle produkter hvor man har brug for meget hurtige svar i processen. Det der er svagheden ved det her, det er jo at der ikke ligger nogen validitet i det her. Det her er en anden form for test og det skal man have kommunikeret ud, som en speedtest eller noget lign. Det der ville tricke folk var, hvis man kan opbygge et panel som har mere form af et socialt community fordi det er så populært i øjeblikket, så kunne det være interessant at fange den rette målgruppe. Og man skal være meget fokuseret på hvad det er for en målgruppe man søger. Det er test på de unges præmisser, og det hele afhænger om i får skaffet et godt panel.

Interviews \ Issues	Interview #1 Christoffer Back	Interview #2 Palle Nielsen	Interview #3 Ole Herstal	Highlighted notes on similarities and/or differences in responses							
A. Background information											
Current position	Partner & Group Consultant Co+Høgh.	Partner Co+Contact	Partner of newly started Marketing Consultant agency Impaq Cph.	All are employed in the marketing and media business in management positions.							
Relevant experience	 Consultant Kunde & Co. Consultant Brandhouse. Owner of IT-company (now sold). 	- Kunde & Co. - IM. - StarCom. - Catinét. - cand.merc.	- Partner and CEO, Co+Høgh. - Partner Kunde & Co. - Orange.	All have vast experience within marketing and marketing research, having worked for several Danish agencies. All have worked at Kunde & Co – Denmark's largest advertising agency.							
	B. Curren	t usage of test and analy	vsis in the market								
Current and previous use of test and analysis	 Has used and uses tests of communication on all levels. Increased use of Online testing through web panels, due to ease of use and lower costs. Uses focus groups at the early stage of communication/concept development. Uses online web panel testing for most finished communication elements, in order to ensure effectiveness before implementation. 	 Uses all sorts of tests, it depends if it is pretesting or measurements of effects. Has participated in several hundred analyses all over Europe. If it is tests on the overall concept level then we test via storyboards. 	 It depends a great deal on the sort of client you are dealing with, some want to test a lot and some not so much. The most important thing is to make pretests on the conceptual level to see if we are working in the right direction and that the right message gets through. 	All have used and still use test and analysis to great extent, both qualitative and quantitative testing. Some test are in the preliminary stages of concept/communication development (qualitative) and some are at the later stages (qualitative) and some are on the measurement of effect and tracking (quantitative).							
Why do you test?	- Often, testing is used to please the client, in order to ensure that the communication elements work the way	- "Pretesting can be both really useful and really destroying. Getting the consumers attitude to the elements can	- We test to ensure that people perceive the right thing when we want to communicate	In general most tests are done in order to please clients and ensure that the right messages are communicated or that							

Appendix 14 – Qualititative data display – highlighted issues

	they are supposed to. - On the other hand tests can sometimes kill the new and original	be very worthwhile, but sometimes it can also kill the good idea. Nevertheless you always obtain	something specific. - And also to please some clients.	the communication concept development is on the right track. More tests would be
	idea – sometimes we advise the client not to test. - In some case we use	some sort of valuable input."		done by some if it was easier and cheaper.
	involvement tool, encouraging potential customers of the product to help develop the communication.			
		- Gallup - Millward Brown	- Millward Brown - GFK	GFK, Millward Brown, Norstat, Catinét, Gallup and Zapera are the best known in the business
Who do you work	- GFK - Norstat	- GFK - Norstat	- Zapera - GFK are really good at the qualitative process, where as Millward Brown are	and they are all used. Some are better than others at online testing
with (partner)?	- Alsted - Catinét	-"We use different partners as they have different areas of		through web panels, and some are better at
		expertise. Some are good at web panels and some are good at focus groups."	really good at tracking and measuring effect.	partner is used - Partners differ according to the assignment.
	- They naturally have to be experts at conducting surveys and producing the right conclusions.	- It depends on the situation and the decisions that have to be made on the basis of the research.	- Price and speed/flexibility.	The most important criteria in choice of analysis partner differ from person to person and also depend on the
The most important criteria in choice of partner	 It is extremely important that boiled down essentials and conclusions are delivered and not just a print of what the participants in focus group said during the test. When you hire professionals to do test and analysis then you expect professional results. This is however 	If you want really valid data and results I would go with partners like Gallup and GFK. They are expensive but they also have the best reputation. For less demanding clients or decisions I might go with someone that costs less. It also depends a lot on the client.	- "Sometimes quality and validity are compromised, as what I am looking for is qualitative inspiration and information. I don't care if there are 10 or 50 respondents as long as I get some information to work with."	are looking at. Overall, Palle's background as an analyst shines through; he is more focused on quality than the others, who focus more on ease of use, price and speed. As Christoffer and Ole are more representative of possible clients, their evaluation of criteria is more important than

	not always the case in	The most important		that of Palle's
	the real world	- The most important		that of Palle 5.
		quality then price		Ease of use, price and
		quality, then price.		speed are the most
				important criteria.
	C. Lacking	s and opportunities in th	ne current market	
	- Sometimes testing might be disregarded as being too troublesome, too time consuming and too expensive. It would be nice if it was easier	- Denmark is a little bit behind some of the larger countries	 There is a lack of sporadic test opportunities. The current suppliers on the market often need a long time to execute, as they have to start up a whole operation to do a single test 	The focus is on the statements of Christoffer and Ole, as Palle's statements again differ from the others. There is a general lack
Lackings	to come into contact with the respondents, not always having to go through an agency and having to wait days for the answers. However, the results have to be reliable.	like Germany. Here they have more advanced TV-testing than in Denmark.	to do a single test. - Sometimes it would nice with a more flexible and swift operator that could help in the fast answer of ideas/hypotheses. - Sometimes it just has to be much faster.	of more flexible, fast and easy methods of testing. Methods that would make it easier to obtain answers to immediate questions around concept development.
Opportunities	 "It would be smart if you could test via the mobile network for instance. It might be fast and efficient. But I don't think that this is quite ready yet. If I had to pay 15.000 kr. To get a response on one question, I might as well send one our student workers on the street to ask people – this would be cheaper and would produce just as valid results." Might consider testing more of our finished elements in order to please our clients. But only if testing was 	- More advanced testing of for instance TV-ads. Eye tracking is becoming better known in Denmark.	 There is a definite opportunity for a much faster and flexible product for testing more simple things. Also, see lackings. 	This corresponds with the lackings in the current market. A partner offering easy- to-use, fast and affordable online testing solutions definitely would stand a chance in the market.

	cheaper and easier than			
	it is now.			
	D. 1	Reaction to the presente	ed concept	
Initial response	 "It's a really good idea; 100 percent". However, it is important that a WAU(note menes der WOW?)-effect is created, beyond just looking at advertising. Something that will make users want to go to the website again and again. It has to be exciting all the time, like youtube.com. Maybe the possibility to win some prizes or try out some new products could do it. Maybe you should consider using web cameras and create some kind of online focus group. 	 You could add values, such as easy, fast, cheap and then funny. You will obtain some input but I wouldn't call it a real analysis. It is very qualitative in nature, but I would call it a "Quick & Dirty" with the clear emphasis on speed and price at the expense of quality. I would compare it a bit to Online focus groups – which I think that advertising agencies will benefit from even more in the future. The interesting part of this concept is the possible interaction with the users/consumers. That could be worth something. 	 It sounds pretty interesting, since people are more or less willing to do everything online. It is going to be tricky to combine the online community with big business, since people/users are very alert to these things. A challenge also lies in sustaining a valid panel of respondents. Actual consumers that are not affiliated with advertising in their everyday job. The idea of sparring with the users/consumers is really good, but you also have to watch out that you don't involve them too much. 	In general a positive response to the overall concept idea. They all see a potential in an idea of this sort getting founded in the market, and could all benefit from it. The possibility of interacting with the users is something that all perceive as potentially very valuable. It is the consumer insight derived from building a valid panel of ordinary consumers that could be valuable.
Do you see a demand?	 There are some examples of users doing these sorts of things, for instance with the launch of the IPhone, where thousands of people posted their design guess on what the phone would look like. "As a user these days you want influence and the ability to affect what things look like – I think that this also applies to advertising." 	 - I see some demand, but I am not sure if enough volume can be obtained. But I am sure that there will definitely be interest both from a consumer and users' point of view as it is a new concept. - I think that this concept is more relevant for advertising agencies than media agencies, 	 I'm afraid that the users will be the same 200 persons every time, half from the advertising business, going at each other every time, as you see in many forums. The need is there if you are able to get feedback from actual ordinary consumers and not connoisseurs. This is 	All three could see themselves using this product if it fulfills their needs, but are not sure how often. The concept would probably generate some business, but the problem is if the demand, volume of business, is high enough to sustain running the business. The demand is driven by

		like us. - I don't see the concept as an alternative to current analysis agencies – this is something else, not as methodically profound.	concerns. It is the ordinary users' input that I want.	concept has to offer. This means that value has to be created through a valid panel of users/respondents that interact with each other and possibly the client. If valuable information can be derived from the users, then the demand will follow.
Would you consider trying it out? And why/why not?	 "Yes – If you are able to show how you utilize it both with regards to users and clients, and present it well. Furthermore, it is important that you can contribute with something new in the market." This would represent the fast, easy and affordable test that could be useable in testing ideas and hypotheses at an early stage. 	- I would be interested in trying it out, but it should be cheap. Something like 3.000-4.000 kr.	 "I would, but the price would have to be low; 10.000 kr. or less." "Furthermore, it would have to be very easy to operate – it should not be completely "do- it-yourself" at the beginning. Assistance would be required in order to get started with a survey." I also think that the concept should be very clear. What can I test? And to what extent? The report should also be very basic - built on the same frame every time. The main focus of this concept should be on building the panel – the right panel is what will generate value for all. 	All would be interested in trying out the concept, but all agree that the price of the product should be lower than that of the alternatives on the market today, and well below 10.000 kr. Furthermore, it would have to be swift and easy to operate.

Appendix 15 - Competitive analysis answers

Appendix 15.1 E-mail proposition to suppliers/competitors

Ca	🗒 🔊 🗗 🛧 🕈	+	Forespøre	jsel på online-webpaneltest af tv-rek	lame - cand.merc. spec	iale - Message (HTML)	
	Message Inser	t Options Format Text					
Paste	¥ Cut i Copy ✓ Format Painter Clipboard ♀	Calibri ▼ 12 ▼ A* A* E = ▼ E ● B Z U ● ▲ ● E = ■ E = ■ Basic Text F#	Address Check Book Names Names	Image: Description of the second	Signature *	Permission * High Importance Low Importance Options Pro	oofing
Send	To Cc Subject: Fores	porgsel på online-webpaneltest af tv-reklame - cand.	merc. speciale				

Til rette vedkommende,

I forbindelse med færdiggørelsen af cand.merc. speciale, vil vi meget gerne bede om et ikke bindende prisoverslag på følgende groft optrukne testscenarie:

TESTSCENARIE:

- Online test i webpanel
- 50 respondenter 50 % mænd og 50 % kvinder, 18-49 år, fra hele DK.
- Test af én Tv-reklame (30 sek.).
- 15 (13 lukkede + 2 åbne) spørgsmål omkring reklamen. (Spørgeramme leveres af os).
- Kortfattet afrapportering i PowerPoint format med resultater i grafer og tal, samt konklusioner på den samlede test.

SPØRGSMÅL TIL TESTSCENARIE:

- Hvad vil prisen ca. være for en sådan test? (ikke bindende, blot vejledende pris)
- Hvad er leveringstiden? (fra I har fuldt testmateriale, dvs. video+spørgeramme fra os)
- Datagrundlag hvordan indhentes og aktiveres respondenter?
- Såfremt det et problem at lave afrapportering i PowerPoint format, hvad er så evt. alternativer?

<u>Nb.</u>

- Jeg gør opmærksom på at vi indhenter "tilbud" fra flere udbydere, hvorfor vi helst ser svar pr. e-mail.
 - Elektronisk informationsmateriale og lign. modtages ligeså gerne pr. e-mail.

Med venlig hilsen Christian K. Pedersen & Casper D.S. Pedersen

Cand.Merc. *115. 27140805*

Appendix 15.2 E-mail response Norstat

	nun respt			_	
Message			FW: Forespø	rgsel på online-	webpaneltest af tv-reklame - Message (HTML)
		Safe Lists +	At Fin	En	
Reply Reply Forward Delete Move to	Create Other	Block 🔄 Not Junk	Mark as	ted - Send t	0
to All Folder Respond Ad	r Rule Actions ▼ S tions	iender Junk E-mail 🕞	Options Is Fir	d OneNo	te te
rom: Mark Lindencrone Saylor [mark.	saylor@norstat.dk]				Sent: on 26-03-2008 17:3
o: christiankokborg@hotmail.com .c:					
ubject: FW: Foresporgsel på online-v	vebpaneltest af tv-rekli 2008 odf (465 KB)	ame	🕅 Norstat Danmari	- Standard sale	s, on hetalingsbetingelser doc (102 KB)
	zeeelpan (105 hb)			. Starraura sarg	y og ocennigersennes fræ net
Hej Christian Tak for din forespørgsel. Prisen vil se	nogenlunde ud som :	følger. Alle priser er i	i DKK og er eksklusi	moms	ſ
One astroing / we is little deles	50 interview				
Dataindsamling	1500				
Rodning at abne Rapportering - PowerPoint	10000				
Total	16300				
Hvis I kan nøjes med tabeller i Excel (og et datasæt i SPS	S kan vi klare rappor	teringen for 2000 kr.		
Tidsrammen vil formentlig være en lille 4-5 dage. PowerPoint vil være 2-3 dag	e uges tid fra modtag e oveni.	else af gennemarbej	det spørgeramme til l	kan modtage	Excel/SPSS. Dog kan dette gøres hurtigere hvis nødvendigt, men som udgangspunkt vil vi gerne lade vores undersøgelser løbe
Mht. til dit spørgsmål om datagrundla doneres til Red Barnet. Jeg har vedhæ	g kan jeg oplyse, at eftet lidt mere inform:	vi både har telefonrek ation om vores panel	krutterede og selvrek er i form af vores Par	utterede panel el Book.	ister. Panelisterne aflønnes med point hver gang de deltager i en undersøgelse. Pointene kan veksles til et "Supergavekort" eller
For en god ordens skyld har jeg også	vedhæftet vores star	ndard salgs- og betal	lingsbetingelser.		
Kind regards / Med venlig hilsen Mark Lindencrone Saylor					
Position Project Manager					
Company Norstat Danmark A/S Address Frederiksborggade 1, DK 1360	ĸ				
Phone + 45 35 39 20 60 Direct + 45 27 77 20 14					
Fax + 45 35 35 90 59					
🙀 🕫 ए 🔹 🔹 💿			RE: Forespø	gsel på online-	vebpaneltest af tv-reklame - Message (HTML)
Message		6	AA ru		
😂 😂 😂 🗙 📑	D E	🍪 🥵 Safe Lists 🔹		ted -	
Reply Reply Forward Delete Move to to All Folder	Create Other Rule Actions ▼ S	Block 🔄 Not Junk iender	Mark as Unread	ct * Send t OneNo	o te
Respond Ac	tions	Junk E-mail 🛛 🕞	Options 🖻 🛛 Fir	d OneNo	te Cant: to 27.03.2009.00:
o: Christian K. Pedersen	saylor (en lor scac, ang				5ette (0 21905-2000 05.5
c: ubject: RE: Forespørgsel på online-w	ebpaneltest af tv-rekla	me			
Hej Christian					
Hermed svar på dine spørgsmål. Prise	erne ved de forskellig	e antal interview vil s	e ud som nedenfor. (er er egentlig	ikke noget kryptisk i udregningen. Der er blot regnet med en pris på 30 kr. pr. interview. Dette er en almindelig pris ved det antal
spørgsmål du vil stille. Når vi kommer	over 500 eller 1000 i	interview indbygger vi	i normalt en mængde	rabat.	
	25 interview 50	interview 100 i	interview 200 int	erview	
Opsætning/projektledelse Dataindsamling	4000	4000	4000	4000	
Kodning af abne	800	800	800	800	
Rapportering - PowerPoint Total	10000	16300	10000	20800	
- Du har helt ret i at afrapporter dataindsamlingen. Det er her	ing i PowerPoint er u vi er effektive og det	uforholdsmæssigt dy er her vi er konkurrer	rt i forhold til resten. ncedygtige. Vi kan di	Det skyldes si g sagtens ud:	mpelthen det høje tidsforbrug, som en af vores projektledere vil have i forbindelse med det. Vores kemekompetence er selve rbejde en PowerPoint, det er bare ikke det vi beskæftiger os mest med. Virksomheden har tidligere haft et andet fokus, så vi
har medarbejdere der kan der - TV-reklamen vil kun blive vist	n slags og medarbejo for de respondenter i	dere der har erfaring i der er inviteret til und	med det fra andre virk Iersøgelsen. Vore≈ n:	somheder. Så nelister vil mo	du skal ikke tvivle på kvaliteten, det koster bare tid. dtage en e-mail med et link til undersøgelsen. Vi laver ofte pre/posttests afreklamer for de bliver vist på TV. Der er ingen fare for
de bliver "offentliggjort". Kun ti - Der er umiddelhart ingen tekn	l de inviterede paneli iske restriktioner mi	ister, som kun kan g nt. de lukkede snørre	ennemgå undersøgel smål og antal af svarr	sen en gang. Tuligheder Så	længe det bliver holdt indenfor rimelighedens grænser, er det i orden med ns. Det giver sekfølgelig nogle hedre svar bøke der
ikke er et overvældende antal Jeg håber du kan bruge mine svar.	svaralternativer. Det	er en fordel hvis det	kan være på en side	så responden	en ikke skal scrolle for meget.
Kind regards / Med venlig hilsen					
Mark Lindencrone Saylor					
Direct: +45 27 77 20 14					

Appendix 15.3 E-mail response Catinet

	📕 ୬ ଓ 🛧 🕯	÷		FW: Forespørgsel p	på online-webpaneltest af tv-reklame – Message (HTML)
9	Message				
		X 💾 🖄 🖹	🇞 😵 Safe Lists 🔹	And Find	
Reply	Reply Forward to All	Delete Move to Create Other Folder + Rule Actions +	Block 🔄 Not Junk Sender	Mark as Unread	Send to OneNote
	Respond	Actions	Junk E-mail 🛛 🕞	Options 🖻 Find	OneNote
From: To:	Brian Skov [B christiankokb	rian.Skov@catinet.dk] org@hotmail.com			Sent: to 27-03-2008 10:10
Cc: Subject:	FW: Forespo	rgsel på online-webpaneltest af tv-re	eklame		
Hej Cl	hristian				
Jeg ha	ar modtaget din r	nail omkring test af én TV reklam	e. Tak for dette.		
Jeg ur	ndrer mig dog ove	er, at jeg ik ke kan se hvilken virks	omhed du arbejder i. Det	undrer mig også, at Ikur	n vil have indsamlet 50 interviews. Dette er et meget begrænset antal at udføre en undersøgelse på. Jeg vil i stedet foreslå mindst 200,
să du	fär en base på 11	30 kvinder og 100 mænd.			
Et hur For 20	rtigt prisoverslag 30 interviews vil p	for 50 interviews vil lyde på 18.20 (risen blive ca. 22.500 DKK ekskl.	0 DKK ekskl. moms. Det . moms. Det er altså selv	te inkluderer en powerpoi e rapporten der koster.	int rapport på ca. 8-12 slides samt levering i PDF.
Leveri	ngstiden fra vi ha	r fuld spørgeramme ca. 1-1,5 uge			
Respo	ondenter indhente	es vha. af vores internetpanel, son	n består af mere end 30.0	000 danskere.	
Det er	r ikke noget probl	em at lave afrapportering i powerp	point.		
Jeg gl	æder mig til at h	øre fra dig.			
Med v	enlig hilsen/best	regards			
Brian	Andreas Theill	Skov			
Analy	sekonsulent / Re	search Consultant			
Catin	át A/S				
Caun	el A/S				

Appendix 15.4 E-mail response Zapera

)							Inform	7	Assessed (LE	TMUX							
	Message	Insert	Options	Eormat Te	ot	_			THIS ON	r∠apera - n	nessage (H	TIVIL)		_		_			<u> </u>
	∦ Cut		* 12	(A*)	.*)(:= .):=		22 23	l n	 0		m 🖸	2 🐦	- 🖂 Per	mission *	ABC				
Paste	🚡 Сору		7 II 8	abz A -			ddress Check	Attac	h Attach Bu	siness Caler	🗄 🛛 💆 ndar Signat	ture Follov	Y Hig	h Importance	Spelling				
Cli	Format Paper pboard	ainter 🛄	- <u>-</u>	Basic Text			Book Names	File	Item C	ard * dude	*	Up *	Option	v Importance s ធ	Proofing				
	То																		
Send	Cc																		
	Subject:	Info om 3	Iapera																
Hey, ha	ar netop tal	lt med Zap	era.																
De lønr	ner deres re	espondent	erm. en va	erdiaf1 kr +	moms pr. n	ninut de del	taqeriun der	søaelser	1.										
Interes	sant var o	det at hør end ved	e deres be konkurren	evæggrund se betaling	for at tilbyd Det kan ie	le respond	enter fast b	etaling Desud	istedet for	at lave ko let også s	nkurrenc	er. de mer t det var p	nte at der	ville være f	færre "shoj volde de fa	opere" som et betalte re	blot skyndte snandenter	sig gennem ske til ilden and ve	emaet ved
konku	rrence bet	talte resp	ondenter.	det kan jeg	også følge	ham i.	ibige dem i	Desur	en virkeue i	ici også s	on on a	e accivar in	cimiere	at signe og i	ionae ae na	se becane re	spondenter	ai nacii, cha ve	u
de tilbe	id en stand	lard under	søgelse, hv	or man ikke	fik indflydels	e på spørg	eskemaet for	ca. 23.0	000 kr. ved 2	00 respon	denter. De	t ville tage o	dem ca. 8-	10 dage at le	evere				
hvis ma	an skulle h	ave indflyc	else på sp	ørgeskemaet	, ville det ko	ste ca. 30.	000 kr. og lev	ering vill	le være 10-1:	2 dage.									
de sen	der mig i ø	vrigt en ko	piafderes	standardspø	rgeskema -	til inspiratio	n :0)												
Gal	H 9	ር 🔶	*) =	ž							SV: SV	: Forespø	orgsel på	i online-w	ebpanelt	est af tv-re	eklame - N	/lessage (HTM	IL)
	Messag	ge																	
			X	- 33	D.	-9-	2	8.0	afa lists v			🐴 Find		En					
						E		~ √ 3	are croco			Relat	ted *	<u>1</u>					
керту	to All	Forward	Delet	Folder	Rule	Actions *	Sender		lot Junk	Unr	ead	Selec	ct -	OneNote					
	Respond	1		A	tions		Ju	nk E-m	ail 6	Optio	ns 🗟	Find	:	OneNote					
From:	All	an Vince	ntz [av@z	zapera.com]														
To:	Ch	nristian K	Pederse	n															
Subject:	SV	/: SV: Fo	resporgs	el på onlir	ne-webpa	neltest af	tv-reklam	e											
Mes:	sage	Ende	ligt skem	a.pdf (25 l	(B)														
			-																
Hej C	hristiar	n,																	
Tak f	or snal	kken p	r. telefi	on i dao															
		men P																	
Som	ovet e	et link t	il omta	alen på r	nettet a	if vores	annond	etest	ts hos B	erlings	ke: <u>ht</u>	<u>tp://wv</u>	ww.bu	siness.d	k/article	e/20080:	304/mec	lier/802250	<u>91/</u>
I den	skrevr	ne vers	sion er	den slåe	et lidt s	tørre oj	э.												
Vedla	igt er s	så et e	ksempe	el på de	t spørge	eskema	vi ville l	køre (på en sä	idan te	est.								
Som	nævnt	vil vi k	unne la	ave det	for ca.	23-24.	000, ink	l. Ber	nchmark	ing på	alle de	e tidlige	re rek	lamer.					
Jeg h	åber a	t høre	fra dig	om det	videre	forløb,	og sig t	il hvis	s der ski	ulle væ	re spø	igsmål.							
Med	venlia ł	hilsen/	Best re	gards															
Allan	Vince	entz		galas															
Resea	arch Co	onsulta	nt/Int.	. Project	: Manag	ler													
Zape	ra.cor	n A/S																	
Ryeso	gade 3	A, 1 (H	IQ)																
DK-22	200 Co	penha	gen N																
VAT	no. (C\	/R): 2	504545	9															
Tel: (Mobili	(+45) 7	7027 2	224 7 7970																
E-ma	il: <u>av@</u>	<u>zaper</u>	a.com																

Appendix 15.5 E-mail response GFK

👝 🖪 ២ ៥ 🔺	v =			RE: Forespøra	sel - Message (Plain Text)			
Message								
Reply Reply Forward to All Respond	Delete Move to Create Folder * Rule A Actions	Other Actions * Block Not Junk Sender Junk E-mail	Mark as Unread Options ☞ Find	Send to OneNote OneNote				
From: Bjarne Linde To: christiankok Cc: Line Strecke Subject: RE: Forespo	mose [Bjarne.Lindemose@gfk. oorg@hotmail.com r Hansen; Azeem Ahmad orgsel	dk]			Sent: ma :			
Hej Christian,								
Hermed som lovet	vores pris for ne	edenstående projekt.						
DKK: 34.500								
Bemærk venligst	at vi har inkluder	et 100 interviews da vo	ores panel leverean	dør arbej	der med et minimums fee - vi kan derfor ligeså godt få de ekstra interviews med.			
Budgettet inklud	lerer skema program	mering, online felt, ko	odning, databehandl	ing samt	levering af resultater som PowerPoint rapport.			
Du skal regne me %-1 uge til opsæ % uge til felt 1 uge til kodnin	ed etning og programme ng, edb, rapporteri	ring						
Ser frem til at	høre fra dig.							
Med venlig hilse	en / Best regards							
Bjarne Lindemose Senior Research Custom Research	Bjarne Lindemose Senior Research Executive Custom Research							

GfK. Growth from > VAT no. DK 136 > <u>www.gfk.dk</u>	1 Knowledge 339582							

Supplier	Price	Price configuration	Delivery time	Data foundation		
Norstat www.norstat.dk	Norstat's initial price offer for the test scenario was 16.300 DKK excl. VAT.	Norstat proved very willing in defining the costs for each part of the process and they came up with a scheme, which clearly illustrates the price configuration for a number of different panel sizes. This scheme can be seen just below this table. It is very clear, that the most costly part of the entire process is the actual reporting of the results. Norstat could also offer the data, in the form of an Excel sheet or SPSS file, without the PowerPoint presentation – the price for this is was 2.000 DKK. The price per extra respondent/interview was 30 DKK, placed under Data collection, which is the only parameter that changes in this scenario of different panel sizes.	No matter the size of the panel, the expected process and delivery time was approximately 5 days, without the PowerPoint report (only excel or SPSS) and more importantly 7-8 days with the PowerPoint report	Norstat utilizes their own panels of respondents that consists of both telephone recruited and self-recruited online panellists. Each panellist is rewarded, or gratified, with points for their participation in a survey. The combined points can be exchanged into gift certificates or can be donated to the "Red Barnet" (Save the Children) Charity organization.		
Catinet www.catinet.dk	Catinet's initial price offer for the test scenario was 18.200 DKK excl. VAT. They recommended, however, a larger sample size of 200 respondents, due to validity, at the price of 22.500 DKK excl. VAT.	No thorough price configuration was offered by Catinet. However, taking the price differentiation from 50 respondents to 200 respondents helps define that the cost per extra respondent is approximately 29 DKK. (Calculation: (22.500 DKK -18.200 DKK)/150 respondents = 28,67 DKK per respondent.) Having this in mind, it becomes clear that the price configuration can be foreseen to be very similar to the one from Norstat – it's the preparation, coordination and especially the report in PowerPoint that is most costly.	Catinet expected a process and delivery time of approximately 1- 1½ weeks, equal to 7-10 days total.	Catinet also utilizes their own Internet Panel of respondents, which they claim consists of more than 30.000 persons. The respondents are rewarded through a points system where points can be exchanged into goods, gift certificates or donations. Again very similar to the system that Norstat incorporates.		
GFK www.gfk.dk	The GFK price was based on 150 respondents, which their panel supplier enforces a	No indication of price configuration was supplied by GFK, therefore no conclusions will be drawn	Expected delivery time was 2-2½ weeks, equal to 14-17 days. The long delivery time is probably	No information about the data applied exists, other than the fact that they use an external		

Appendix 16 – Supplier responses to test scenario

	minimum of. The price for the test scenario with 150 respondents was 34.500 DKK excl. VAT.	upon this, except for the one that their use of an external panel supplier, indicates that their cost per panellist will be somewhat higher than the ones of Norstat and Catinet.	a result of the use of an external panel supplier.	panel supplier.
Zapera www.zapera.se	Zapera offered a price of approximately 24.000 DKK excl. VAT for a test with 200 respondents. The price included benchmarking against other relevant TV- commercials, through a concept that they have launched with www.business.dk; called Denmark's best TV- commercial of the year. This benchmarking, by contrast, included a set questionnaire, meaning a customer would have no influence on the questions asked. If a customer would like to influence the questionnaire, the price for a test with 200 respondents would be approximately 31.000 DKK excl. VAT. In this case it is not possible to benchmark.	No actual price configuration was supplied. It is none the less relevant that one will receive a very standardized product, due to the benchmarking.	Supply time for the standardized format would be approximately 8-10 days, and if influence in the questionnaire was required, the supply time would be approximately 10-12 days.	Zapera utilizes their own Internet Panel that covers all of Scandinavia. Respondents are rewarded through a points system like the ones that Norstat and Catinet use. On average, a respondent is given points equal to approximately 1 DKK per minute they spend on the survey/test.

Norstat price configuration scheme:

All prices in DKK excl. VAT.	25 interviews	50 interviews	100 interviews	200 interviews
Preparation and coordination	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
Data collection	750	1.500	3.000	6.000
Coding of open questions	800	800	800	800
Report – PowerPoint	10.000	10.000	10.000	10.000
Total	15.550	16.300	17.800	20.800

Step	Action	Visual description								
A.	Loading the Excel file into SPSS	Variable view								
		Image: Second Processing Counting Countin								
В.	Removing irrelevant entries	Variable view								
υ.	Some entries are auto-generated by Surveymonkey and are removed, as they serve no purpose in the statistical SPSS analysis. Removed entries: Respondent ID StartDate EndDate IPAddress EmailAddress FirstName LastName CustomData	Wattribue Verweiter Wattribue Verweiter Verweiter der Verweiter Verweiter Verweiter Verweiter Verweiter Verweiter Verweiter Verweiter Verweiter Verweiter Verweiter Verweiter Verweiter Verweiter <th colsp<="" td=""></th>								
C.	Renaming questions and variables All questions and variables are translated into English from Danish and given a code depending a question number and variable number. E.g. Q01V01InternetUseWhereHome This renaming helps to keep the data sorted and contributes to making directly useable outputs in the form of graphs and tables.	Userable view Userable view <td< th=""></td<>								
D.	Renaming 'labels'	Variable view								
	To ensure easy processing and creation of graphs and tables the label of each question is updated with the correct 'new' name. All labels are the same as the 'name' in the Data files. Nb. The columns 'Width' and 'Decimals' are auto-generated in SPSS and no changes are made to these auto values.	Dir Oft Jene Ges Jenetis Jenet Steller Mallon Greiter jenet Dir Oft Jene Ges Jenetis Ges Jenetis Jenet Steller Mallon Greiter jenet Dir Oft Jene Ges Jenetis Ges Jenetis Jenet Mallon Greiter Jenetis Geschlander Steller Mallon Greiter Jenetis Geschlander Jenetis Geschlander Steller Jenetis Geschlander Steller Mallon Greiter Jenetis Geschlander Jenetis Geschlander Jenetis Geschlander Geschlander Steller Jenetis Geschlander Geschland								
E.	Filling in 'no' values – '0'	Data view								
	In some questions blanks occurred in the data file due to the setup of the survey in									

Appendix 17 – Data file preparation, step by step visual explanation

	Surveymonkey. However, all spaces on the	UG - Renset data 2.sav [DataSet1] - SPSS Data Editor						
	data file have to have a value to ensure that	File Edit View Data Iransform Analyze Graphs Utilities Add-ons Window Help						
	no data is uncounted for in the analyses to be							
	made.	1: Q01V02InternetUseWh 0						
	In the case of an empty space representing a	Q01V01InternetLie Q01V02Intern Q01V03Inte Q01V04Inte Q01V0 Q02Intern Q02InternetLiesTi						
	'no' for instance in the first question as shown	eWhereHome etUseWhere metUseWh metUseWh 5Intern etUseTime meEmail						
	to the right – this blank is replaced with a '0'.	Work ereScool ereOther et						
	Other blanks are filled in with '99'							
	representing missing values as described in							
	the next step.							
		8 1 2 0 0 0 4 2						
F.	Filling in missing values – '99'	Data view						
	Some spaces in the data files are empty due to	File Edit View Data Transform Analyze Graphs Utilities Add- <u>o</u> ns <u>Wi</u> ndow <u>H</u> elp						
	a missing response from that particular	▷ ■ Δ						
	respondent.	9 : Q01 V01InternetUsel/Vh 99						
	These blanks are singled out and filled in with	Q01VD1InternetUs Q01VD2Intern Q01VD3Inte Q01VD4Inte Q01VD Q02Intern Q03InternetUseTi Q04InternetLiceTimeWork						
	the value 99. This value represents 'missing	eWhereHome Work ereScool ereOther et etUseTime meEmail downterrefosemineWork						
	value' which is critical to take into account							
	when doing the analyses.							
	The '99' value is correlated to step I, which	4 1 2 3 4 0 5 2 9						
	accounts for setting the assigned 'missing	5 1 2 0 4 0 4 1 1						
	value' for each question.							
	All questions in these data files apply '99' as	8 1 2 0 0 0 4 2 3						
	the missing value.	9 99 99 99 0 99 99 99						
G.	Defining value 'type" – numerical	Variable view						
	All the questions and variables on these	File Edit View Data Transform Analyze Graphs Utilities Add-gns Window Help						
	datasets represent numerical values.	≥∎≙ ⊡ ♦♥ ‱₽₽ A ╢∰ ▦∰₽ A						
	Therefore all questions are changed from	Name Type Width Decimals						
	'String' type questions to 'Numerical' type	QUTVD1intemetUseWhereHome Numeric 22 QUTVD2intemetUseWhereWork Numeric 22						
	questions.	3 Q01V03InternetUseWhereScool Numeric 22 Ontweetc						
		4 Q01V04InternetUseWhereOther Numeric 22 Ogomma Width 22						
		5 QU1VUSInternetUseWhereDontknow Numeric 8 Decimal Places: 0 know						
		7 Q03InternetUseTimeEmail Numeric 22 Scientific notation						
		8 Q04InternetUseTimeWork Numeric 22 Dogle ligt d						
		10 Q06InternetUseTimeHome Numeric 22 Custom currency						
		11 Q07InternetUseTimeSchool Numeric 22 Ostring						
		12 Q08VD1InternetUseTimeWhen6am8am Numeric 22 OK Cancel Help m						
		13 GDBV02InternetUseTimeWhen12pm4pm Numeric 22 0 GDBV03InternetUseTimeWhen12pm4pm						
Н.	Defining 'values' for each question	Variable view						
	Each question applies different values	Biller Heustehn Zweitbenschie Späns Edner De Der Sper Dei Tenenn Spänse Späns Unter Adlige Winder Het Er De Sper Dei Tenenn Spänse Unter Adlige Winder Het						
	according to the number of variables in the	Control of the second sec						
	question. Therefore each question consists of	2 GOVD/Internation/wave/bade Junear 22 0 GOVD/Internation/wave/bade [1, 36] 56 3 GOVD/Internation/wave/bade Junear 22 0 GOVD/Internation/wave/bade [1, 36] 56 3 GOVD/Internation/wave/bade Junear 22 0 GOVD/Internation/wave/bade [1, 36] 56						
	a different set of values.	4 COV/Sinternel/Low/cess/branc Funnet: 22 0 COV/Sinternel/Low/cess/branc [0, 16; 2] 98 5 COV/Sinternel/Low/cess/branc Numeric 0 0 COV/Sinternel/Low/cess/branc [0, 16; 2] 98 6 COV/Sinternel/Low/cess/branc (0, 16; 2) 0 COV/Sinternel/Low/cess/branc [0, 16; 2] (0, 16; 2) 98						
		6 0020ment/selline Numeric 22 0 0020ment/selline Numeric <						
	E.g. Q01V01InternetUseWhereHome	O Contrast de Carlo Servicio O Contrast de Carlo Servicio						
		11 000mment befin sefacid Numeric 2 0 000mment/befin sefacit 000mment 10 10 10 10 10						
	Have two possible values: 0 and 1 0	12 0001/221/cmed/bis/fme/free/						
	have two possible values. 6 and 1.6	16 000 Of Istand U.S. Condition Application Numeric 22 0 0000 Others and State 20 0000						
	representing 'no' and 1 representing 'yes'.	IE ODE/OS/terretUse*Time*/terros/metin Nume: 22 ODE/OS/terretUse*Time*/terros/metin Nume: 90						
	representing 'no' and 1 representing 'yes'. In some cases '99' could be a value if some	i z zodości tenerotwe funktie adar z z o zodości tenerotwe funktie do za kalencie z kalencie z z o zodości tenerotwe funktie z z o z o z o z o z o z o z o z o z o						
	representing 'no' and 1 representing 'yes'. In some cases '99' could be a value if some respondents have failed to answer the specific	v 300°/25 harrellvr, Tanifradyrdyn hanri, 22 0 300°/25 harrellvr, Tanifradyrdor henr 30 henr 90						
	representing 'no' and 1 representing 'yes'. In some cases '99' could be a value if some respondents have failed to answer the specific question. This is however not the case in	v 300/25/haredhu/Tanifrady-dga haari, 22 0 300/25/haredhurTanifradyadar haar 90						
	representing 'no' and 1 representing 'yes'. In some cases '99' could be a value if some respondents have failed to answer the specific question. This is however not the case in Q01V01InternetUseWhereHome.	C 000/25/heredhu-Tani/r-adg-dga huari, 22 0 000/25/haredhu-Tani/r-adg-dga huare 20						
l.	representing 'no' and 1 representing 'yes'. In some cases '99' could be a value if some respondents have failed to answer the specific question. This is however not the case in Q01V01InternetUseWhereHome. Defining 'missing' value for each question	Otriable view						
I.	representing 'no' and 1 representing 'yes'. In some cases '99' could be a value if some respondents have failed to answer the specific question. This is however not the case in Q01V01InternetUseWhereHome. Defining 'missing' value for each question In order to ensure that the spaces with the	0 000000000000000000000000000000000000						
I.	representing 'no' and 1 representing 'yes'. In some cases '99' could be a value if some respondents have failed to answer the specific question. This is however not the case in Q01V01InternetUseWhereHome. Defining 'missing' value for each question In order to ensure that the spaces with the entries '99' are accounted for as missing	000000000000000000000000000000000000						
Ι.	representing 'no' and 1 representing 'yes'. In some cases '99' could be a value if some respondents have failed to answer the specific question. This is however not the case in Q01V01InternetUseWhereHome. Defining 'missing' value for each question In order to ensure that the spaces with the entries '99' are accounted for as missing values, the Missing value for all questions are	E O00/25/thread/or/Tax/Frad/ordgin Hume: 2 0 SOD/25/thread/or/Tax/Frad/ordgin Hume: 0 Variable view Image: I						
Ι.	representing 'no' and 1 representing 'yes'. In some cases '99' could be a value if some respondents have failed to answer the specific question. This is however not the case in Q01V01InternetUseWhereHome. Defining 'missing' value for each question In order to ensure that the spaces with the entries '99' are accounted for as missing values, the Missing value for all questions are set as '99' in the corresponding box.	E OD0/25/thread/to/The/Prody-dgin Hume 2 0 SOD0/25/thread/to/The/Prody-dgin Hume 20 Variable view Variable view Variable view New 0 <t< th=""></t<>						
I.	representing 'no' and 1 representing 'yes'. In some cases '99' could be a value if some respondents have failed to answer the specific question. This is however not the case in Q01V01InternetUseWhereHome. Defining 'missing' value for each question In order to ensure that the spaces with the entries '99' are accounted for as missing values, the Missing value for all questions are set as '99' in the corresponding box.	E ORC/25/Intered/tor/Intel/Fodge Puert 2 0 SOU/25/Intered/tor/Intel/Fodge/Intered/tor/Intered/todde/Intered/todde/Intered/todde/Intered/tor/Intered/tor/Intered/to						
ι.	representing 'no' and 1 representing 'yes'. In some cases '99' could be a value if some respondents have failed to answer the specific question. This is however not the case in Q01V01InternetUseWhereHome. Defining 'missing' value for each question In order to ensure that the spaces with the entries '99' are accounted for as missing values, the Missing value for all questions are set as '99' in the corresponding box.	E OD0/25/thread/to-Time/Trady-dgin Humel, 22 0 SOD0/25/thread/to-Time/Trady-dgin Humel, 20 Variable view Values						
ι.	representing 'no' and 1 representing 'yes'. In some cases '99' could be a value if some respondents have failed to answer the specific question. This is however not the case in Q01V01InternetUseWhereHome. Defining 'missing' value for each question In order to ensure that the spaces with the entries '99' are accounted for as missing values, the Missing value for all questions are set as '99' in the corresponding box.	E ODD/25thered/to/Tac/Pudge Nume 2 0 SOD/25thered/to/Tac/Pudge Nume 20 Variable view Variable view Variable view Image: Display the state of the state						
ι.	representing 'no' and 1 representing 'yes'. In some cases '99' could be a value if some respondents have failed to answer the specific question. This is however not the case in Q01V01InternetUseWhereHome. Defining 'missing' value for each question In order to ensure that the spaces with the entries '99' are accounted for as missing values, the Missing value for all questions are set as '99' in the corresponding box.	Control of the strength of the						
ι.	representing 'no' and 1 representing 'yes'. In some cases '99' could be a value if some respondents have failed to answer the specific question. This is however not the case in Q01V01InternetUseWhereHome. Defining 'missing' value for each question In order to ensure that the spaces with the entries '99' are accounted for as missing values, the Missing value for all questions are set as '99' in the corresponding box.	1 300 252 truncition Marce 2 0 300 252 truncition Marce 9 Variable view Variable view <td colspan="2" th="" v<=""></td>						
I.	representing 'no' and 1 representing 'yes'. In some cases '99' could be a value if some respondents have failed to answer the specific question. This is however not the case in Q01V01InternetUseWhereHome. Defining 'missing' value for each question In order to ensure that the spaces with the entries '99' are accounted for as missing values, the Missing value for all questions are set as '99' in the corresponding box.	i 300 252 transformation June 2 0 200 252 transformation June 0 0 Value 2 0 200 250 transformation June 0 Value Value <th colspan="4" th="" value<<=""></th>						

К.

The measure for each question is set in the	E DG - Renset data	Zoow (DataSet)) - SPSS L Data Ironatomi Analy	iota Editor 2e : Qrophs : La	ics Add-gre Winder	- Hel:						- 0
final column depending on what type of scale	🌫 🗐 🔁 😨		4 4 6 8	⊕ ≣ % % %		1.1.1				consection of	- Hurry
mar column, depending on what type of scale	1 meric	22 0	converter Converter	emetUse\MereHome		1401		(0, ro)	. 39	ti ≣ Le£	Normal - *
was originally intended to be used. See section	2 meric 3 meric	22 0 22 0	001V02In 001V05In	ematuls/WhereWork ematulset/thereScopi				(0, Na (0, Na	1. 99	8 = Let. 7 = Let	Scale
XXX use of scales.	4 menia	22 0	001\/04lm	ernatilise\WhereOther	hard and			(0, No	1. 99	7 = Let	Nominal Naminal
Final arranged file for SPSS						Variable	view				
Howing gong through those verieus stone to	DataFileN	lew.sav [DataSet1] - SPSS Dat	a Editor		(diffusio					
Flaving gone through these various Steps to Fle Eat View Data Transform Analyze Graphs Utilies Window Help											
prepare and arrange the data files, the files	😂 🖩 🚔	📴 🔶 🖶	🏪 📑 🔐	🗛 📲 📩	🔡 🕀 📑	🕷 🙆 🌑					
are ready for analysis.		Name	Type	Width	Decimals	Label	Values	Missing	Columns	Align	Measure
	1	Q01V01Inte	Numeric	22	0	Q01V01Internet	{0, no}	99	11	E Left	🚴 Nominal
	2	Q01V02Inte	Numeric	8	0	Q01V02Internet	{0, no}	99	8	E Left	🚴 Nominal
	3	Q02Internet	Numeric	22	0	Q02InternetUse	{1, Light}	99	6	E Left	💫 Nominal
	4	Q03Internet	Numeric	22	0	Q03InternetUse	{1, Light}	99	7	E Left	💑 Nominal
	5	Q05Internet	Numeric	22	0	Q05InternetUse	{1, No}	99	12	E Left	Ordinal
	6	GUbintemet	Numeric	22	0	QU6InternetUse	{1, Light}	99	0 7	E Leπ .	Nominal
	- /	Q0407 Intern.	Numeric	0 8	0	Q0407 Internet0	{1, Light}	99	0 7	≣ Right E Loft	Nominal
	9	009\/01Inte	Numeric	138	0	009\/01Internet	(T, barnbarn	99	13	E Leit	Nominal
	10	009\/02inte	Numeric	34	0	Q09V02Internet	(0, No)	99	13	Fleft	& Nominal
	11	Q09\/03Inte	Numeric	22	0	Q09V03Internet	(D. No)	99	15	E Left	& Nominal
	12	Q09V04Inte	Numeric	24	0	Q09V04Internet	{0, No}	99	15	E Left	💑 Nominal
	13	Q09V05Inte	Numeric	30	0	Q09V05Internet	{0, No}	99	15	E Left	💦 Nominal
	14	Q09V06Inte	Numeric	22	0	Q09V06Internet	{0, No}	99	15	E Left	💦 Nominal
	15	Q12V01Soc	Numeric	22	0	Q12V01Social	{1, Disagree	99	8	E Left	🛷 Scale
	16	Q12V02Soc	Numeric	22	0	Q12V02Social	{1, Disagree	99	8	E Left	🛷 Scale
	17	Q12V03Soc	Numeric	40	0	Q12V03Social	{1, Disagree	99	8	E Left	🛷 Scale
	18	Q12V04Soc	Numeric	24	0	Q12V04Social	{1, Disagree	99	8	E Left .	🔗 Scale
	19	Q12V05Soc	Numeric	22	0	Q12V05Social	{1, Disagree	99	7	E Left	Scale .
	20	Q12V06Soc	Numeric	32	0	Q12V06Social	{1, Disagree	99	8	E Left	🖉 Scale
	1 OC IVO little netUr	enh. 1									Visit: et 110 of 110 V
	(201 a)	V0:InternetUs Afterefriome Scheof	/hore 202intern /hore etUseTime Work	GUSInternet UseTimoEm eNome	netUseTim srkrelated Home	mesUseTimeSch sofWork	atU urposoSociakeeb	ske uposeGeneralsuf	seP 209V00internetU fing oseinformations	cePerp 009V04Internet carch opetVorkrolater	JooFuip CCPV05Internet. dsearch coeNewsSport
	1 1	1	2	1 2	1	1 2	0	0	3	4	0
	2	1	i	2	i	1 :	0	2	a	0	5
	4 1	1	1	2	1	14	0	0	3	0	5
	6 1	1	1	2 2	ĩ	12	1	õ	3	4	C
	7 1	0	2	1 99	2	99.2	0	0	3	3	5
	9 1	1	1	2 2	i	1.0	1	2	3	4	s
	10 1	1	1	1 1	1		0	0	a 0	4	0
	12	1	2	1 2	1	18	1	0	3	0	5
	13 1	1	2	1 2	1	22	1	2	3	4	5
	15 1	1	2	2 2	1	2 2	1	2	3	4	ŝ
	16 1	1	1 2	2 2	1	12	0	0	3	4	0
	18 1	0	1	1 56	1	99.2	0	0	3	4	0
	10 1	1	2	1 2	1	22	1	0	3	4	5