CREATIVE VIDEO ADS IN COVID ERA: A PATH TO SOCIAL MEDIA ENGAGEMENT

Sónia Ferreira[1]*, Pedro Espírito Santo[2], Sara Santos[3]

[1]Prof. Dr., Center for Studies in Education and Innovation, School of Education, Polytechnic of Viseu, PORTUGAL, sonia.ferreira@esev.ipv.pt
[2]Prof. Dr., School of Technology and Management of Oliveira do Hospital, Polytechnic of Coimbra, PORTUGAL, pedro.santo@estgoh.ipc.pt
[3]Prof. Dr., School of Education, Polytechnic of Viseu, PORTUGAL, ssantos@esev.ipv.pt
*Corresponding Author

Abstract

In the social sciences, particularly in marketing, professors are present with constant challenges, therefore, they have been looking for new methods to engage students through content in the classroom. However, a global pandemic COVID-19 that led to the confinement of millions of people worldwide and launched new challenges for education in social sciences. There was a greater digitization of educational contents.

Therefore, the main objective of this study was to analyse the effects of content creativity on student engagement through WOW effect mediation. Thus, we presented a video available on YouTube and through a survey we obtained 178 responses from students of marketing courses. The results were analysed using PLS-SEM and show that creativity influences the WOW effect and, consequently, students' engagement with the contents. In this context, this study presents important conclusions for education in social sciences, specifically in the area of marketing.

Keywords: Engagement, Creativity, WOW effect, Video ad

1 INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, brands interact with consumers even more through social media, building close and continuous relationships. Social media has changed the way of communicating with consumer and influence its behavior (Gironda & Korgaonkar, 2014). Consumers spend more time online interacting with other people and brands, resulting in positive impacts on brand engagement (Morgan-Thomas & Veloutsou, 2013).

On social media platforms, advertising is one of the most popular content (Souiden, Chtourou, & Korai, 2017) and can be used to inform, increase brand awareness, improve brand image and profitability (Shimp, 2007). The evaluation of promotional activities on social media platforms also influences consumer's perceptions of brand authenticity. However, consumer brand engagement in social media has still been little studied and further investigation is needed (Wang et al., 2017; Algharabat et al., 2018; Shareef et al., 2018).

For Hollebeek et al. (2014) in the context of social media, the consumer brand engagement (CBE) is the capability to create psychological state in consumer's minds as consumers interact with brands. CBE is

defined as "consumers' psychological state of mind and intensity of their awareness, affection, participation, and connection with the brand" (Paruthi & Kaur, 2017, p. 133). Most authors consider engagement to be a multidimensional concept that includes the following dimensions: cognitive, emotional and affective (Brodie et al., 2011).

On social media, brand engagement explains behavior, emotions and cognitively valence in reaction to brand activities on social media (Hollebeek et al., 2014)

Muntinga, Moorman, and Smit (2011) developed the COBRAs model (Consumer's Online Brand-Related Activities) where they distinguish three levels of consumer interaction: consuming, contributing and creating. The consuming means a low level of activity, where consumers only see content, images and videos, assuming a more 'voyeuristic' and lurkers position. Contributing is the medium level of engagement where consumers comment videos, pictures, among others. On the top level, creation is the higher level of engagement where consumers produce content about brands (reviews, posts about brand, etc.). Based on this model Schivinski et al., (2016) proposed a scale to measure engagement on social networking sites.

Several studies have shown that consumer brand engagement is related to loyalty (Hollebeek et al., 2014; Schivinski & Dabrowski, 2015) as well as brand awareness /associations and perceived quality (Schivinski & Dabrowski, 2015).

Consumers' participation in social networks has an impact on CBE dimensions (Leckie et al., 2016). By contributing with comments, likes and shares they are showing their cognitive and affective states while creating information about the brands (Muntinga et al., 2011).

By increasing engagement, the consumer's relationship with the brand also becomes closer, increasing satisfaction, purchases and affinity (Brodie et al., 2013; Laroche, Habibi, & Richard, 2013). Thus, their brand knowledge also increases, and brands become stronger and with unique consumer associations (Hutter et al., 2013).

Directly related to branding and advertising efficiency is creativity as a constructor of consumer attitudes and associations towards ads (Smith, Chen, & Yang, 2008; Lee & Hong, 2016), along with information and entertainment (Gao & Koufaris, 2006; Taylor, Lewin, & Strutton, 2011). According to the empirical investigation by Lee and Hong (2016), both informativeness and creativity, often emphasized in public literature, reveal themselves as the main drivers of behavior favorable to advertisements on social networking services, promoting intentions purchase. This is an indication left to marketers. To increase the likelihood of purchase, public messages must become more informative and more creative, inducing users to express their empathy, but without forgetting the product class.

Knowing the challenges that the global COVID-19 pandemic brought to education, due to mandatory confinement and teaching through digital platforms, professors in the field of marketing have been looking for new ways of student involvement through the presentation and study of advertisements in video. Specifically, the aim is to analyze the effects of the ad's creativity through the WOW effect on marketing students. The wow-effect is a concept that captures users' responses to awe-inducing stimuli (Javornik, 2016), and in this study is understood as a mediator between stimuli considered salient, surprising or different and that cause positive influence on social media engagement.

So, the hypotheses to test are:

H1: Creativity has positive effects on Social Media Engagement

H2: Creativity has positive effects on WOW effect

H3: WOW effect has a positive influence on Social media engagement

2 METHODOLOGY

To achieve the research objectives and evaluate the proposed model we conducted a study in the context of social media with a video presentation at the begin (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Geus4SNwVkQ). It is an advertising video from a telecommunications company, produced and disseminated during the COVID-19 pandemic. The underlying message was "Let's stay at home. Let's stay connected".

The variables were measured using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) and adapted from existing scales to the context of our study to make more relevant items. Thus, following Lee & Hong (2016) we used 4 items for creativity. The variable WOW effect was measured by Hinsch, Felix & Rauschnabel (2020) scale. For Social Media Brand Engagement we used 6 items from the scale of Schivinski, Christodoulides & Dabrowski (2016). Table 1 contains the complete list of the items.

Variable	Item	code
Creativity (Lee & Hong, 2016)	The video presented is unique.	CRT1
	The video presented is really out of the ordinary.	CRT2
	The video presented is intriguing.	CRT3
	The video presented is surprising.	CRT4
WOW Effect (Hinsch et al., 2020)	This video surprised me.	WOW1
	At the end of this video, I think "wow!"	WOW2
	This video touched me from the beginning.	WOW3
Social Media Brand Engagement (Schivinski et al., 2016)	I will follow this brand on social media.	SMBE1
	I will look for more about this brand.	SMBE2
	I will look for fan pages of this brand.	SMBE3
	I want to comment on this video.	SMBE4
	I will look for more videos of this brand.	SMBE5
	I will share this video.	SMBE6

Table 1 – Construct list items

The data were collected through a self-completion survey. The sample has 178 valid responses and the data collection took place from May 2020 to June 2020.

Table 2 shows that 77.0% are female and most of them are from individuals aged between 20 and 29 years old.

Variable	Category	N	%
Gender	Female	137	77.0 %
	Male	41	23.0 %
Age	< 20	43	24.2 %
	20 a 29	133	74.7 %
	30 a 39	2	1.1 %
	Total	178	100.0

Table 2 – Sample

3 RESULTS

A preliminary data analysis was conducted to calculate the Variance Inflactor Factor (VIF). The VIF values (VIF = [1.447 .. 4.900]) are below the threshold (VIF <5) and therefore we assume that multicollinearity is not considered problematic. We also verified the Skewness (Sk) and Kurtosis (Ku) and we concluded that the items do not diverge from normality (Sk <3; Ku <7).

Additionally, we analysed common method bias, because our data were collected from the same source and

there have been a problem with commom method bias. To attend to this potential bias, we employed *ex ante* and *ex post* procedures. *Ex-ante* procedures were followed by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee e Podsakoff (2003) recommendations. We pre-test the survey to avoid vague concepts and complex syntax and double barrelled questions. At the first page of the survey we informed respondents that answers are anonymous and there are no right or wrong answers to each question. *Ex post*, we execute the Harman's one factor test and the result show four factors and fist factor explained 36.47% of the variance.

3.1. Measurement Model

Convergent validity and reliability was examined through the Average Variance extracted (AVE) and Composite Reliability (CR). Table 3 shows that AVE (ranging from 0.679 to 0.786) and CR (ranging from 0.893 to 0.957) are above the threshold values (AVE>0.5; CR>0.7) (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). Also, we analysed Cronbach's alpha (α), and values, ranging from 0.841 to 0.946 shows that reliability is good. Additionally, we examine the standardized loadings (λ) and all of them are above the recommended value (λ>0.7).

	λ	*t* values	*p value*	Cronbach's α	CR	AVE
Creativity (CRT)				0.841	0.893	0.679
CRT1	0.821	26.346	0.000			
CRT2	0.885	42.033	0.000			
CRT3	0.690	10.196	0.000			
CRT4	0.885	53.941	0.000			
WOW Effect (WOW)				0.854	0.912	0.775
WOW1	0.859	32.156	0.000			
WOW2	0.916	72.580	0.000			
WOW3	0.864	37.863	0.000			
Social Media Engagement (SMBE)				0.946	0.957	0.786
SMBE1	0.884	35.804	0.000			
SMBE2	0.868	31.253	0.000			
SMBE3	0.879	37.031	0.000			
SMBE4	0.883	35.431	0.000			
SMBE5	0.925	69.894	0.000			
SMBE6	0.881	44.562	0.000			

Table 3 – convergent validity and reliability

To examine discriminant validity, we analyse Fornell-Larcker criterion, cross loadings and heterotrait-monotrait (HTMT) ratio of correlations (Hair, Hult, Ringle & Sarstedt, 2016; Hair, Risher, Sarstedt & Ringle, 2018). First, the results of Fornell-Larcker criterion are presented on table 4 and we verified that all square root of AVE values are higher than inter-construct correlation estimates (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Thus, Fornell-Larcker criterion was verified. Second, on table 5 we analyse that loadings of the items are higher than cross loadings in the model and this criterion was satisfied. Third, table 6 presents the HTMT ratio of correlations and these values are lower than threshold (HTMT < 0.9). In summary, we conclude that exists discriminant validity (Henseler, Ringle & Sarstedt, 2015).

	Creativity	Social Media Engagement	WOW Effect
Creativity	0.824		
Social Media Engagement	0.613	0.887	
WOW Effect	0.761	0.654	0.880

Table 4 – Discriminant validity: Fornell and larcker criterion

	Creativity	Social Media Engagement	WOW Effect
WOW1	0.658	0.553	0.859
WOW2	0.719	0.600	0.916
WOW3	0.628	0.575	0.864
CRT1	0.821	0.475	0.614
CRT2	0.885	0.528	0.605
CRT3	0.690	0.396	0.423
CRT4	0.885	0.591	0.795
SMBE1	0.496	0.884	0.541
SMBE2	0.567	0.868	0.570
SMBE3	0.511	0.879	0.541
SMBE4	0.532	0.883	0.617
SMBE5	0.548	0.925	0.602
SMBE6	0.598	0.881	0.603

Table 5 – Discriminant validity: cross- loadings criterion

		Social Media Engagement	WOW Effect
Creativity			
Social Media Engagement	0.677		
WOW Effect	0.873	0.726	

Table 6 – Discriminant validity: HTMT ratio of correlations criterion

3.2. Structural Model

This study aims to analyse and test the hypothesis through structural equations PLS-SEM. To estimate path coefficients and their significance we used bootstrapping resampling method with 5000 subsamples. The direct effects between constructs are presented on table 7 and indirect effects on the model are presented on table 8

	β	*t* values	*p value*	95% confidence Interval	*f²*
Creativity → Social Media Engagement	0.273	3.166	0.002	[0.102 .. 0.440]	0.058
Creativity → WOW Effect	0.761	24.778	0.000	[0.700 .. 0.819]	1.373
WOW Effect → Social Media Engagement	0.446	5.005	0.000	[0.272 .. 0.621]	0.155

Table 7 – Structural Coefficients (Direct effects)

	β	*t* values	*p value*	95% confidence Interval
Creativity → WOW effect → Social Media Engagement	0.340	4.812	0.000	[0.206 .. 0.485]

Table 8 – Structural Coefficients (indirect effects)

In order to test the relationships between constructs, the model suggest an acceptable model by the R^2 analysis and f^2. Our investigation show that creativity explains WOW effect ($R^2 = 0.576$). Additionally, social media brand engagement has effects from WOW effect and creativity ($R^2 = 0.454$).

4 CONCLUSIONS

This study aimed to analyse the impact of creativity on Social Media Engagement on students. Presents the analysis of the direct effects between the constructs and the analysis of the indirect effects in the model through the moderation of the WOW effect construct.

The H1 hypothesis was tested and we concluded that creativity has an influence on students' engagement in social networks with brands and their content ($β = 0.273$; $t = 3.166$; $p < 0.01$). The values obtained suggest that the contents that are unique show greater engagement.

The research supports that creativity impacts the WOW effect ($β = 0.761$; $t = 24.778$; $p < 0.01$), confirming hypothesis H2. This conclusion shows that the unique contents can surprise students due to the existing novelty. Additionally, the WOW Effect influences students' Social Media Engagement, by confirming hypothesis H3 ($β=0.446$; $t= 5.005$; $p < 0.01$).

The surprise in the content allows students to look for more about the brand and the content, which causes greater engagement. Finally, our study analysed the indirect effects on the model and found that creativity influences social media engagement through the moderating effect of the emotional and surprising effect that is reflected in the WOW effect ($β=0.340$; $t= 4.812$; $p < 0.01$).

Thus, as practical recommendations, our study provides important information to managers and teachers, since social media engagement depends on the creativity existing in the contents.

In this context, we consider that this study is a contribution to social science education although there is future research that is important to continue. Thus, we consider relevant the analysis of new studies with the inclusion of the students' congruence with the presented contents.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCE LIST

Algharabat, R., Rana, N. P., Dwivedi, Y. K., Alalwan, A. A., & Qasem, Z. (2018) 'The effect of telepresence,

social presence and involvement on consumer brand engagement: An empirical study of non-profit organizations'. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services,* 40, 139-149.

Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 16*(1), 74-94. doi: 10.1007/BF02723327

Brodie, R.J., Hollebeek, L.D., Jurić, B., & Ilić, A. (2011). Customer engagement: conceptual domain, fundamental propositions, and implications for research. *Journal of Service Research*, 14 (3), 252-271.

Brodie, R.J., Ilic, A., Juric, & B., Hollebeek, L. (2013). Consumer engagement in a virtual brand community: an exploratory analysis. *Journal of Bussiness Research*, 66 (1), 105-114.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error. *Journal of Marketing Research, 18*(1), 39-50. doi: 10.2307/3151312

Gao, Y., & Koufaris, M. (2006). Perceptual antecedents of user attitude in electoniccommerce. ACM SIGMIS, 37, 43-50.

Gironda, J. & Korgaonkar, P. (2014). Understanding consumers' social networking site usage' *Journal of Marketing Management*, 30 (5-6), 571-605.

Hair, J., Hult, G., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2016). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*: SAGE Publications.

Hair, J., Risher, J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. (2018). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review,* 1(31), 2-24. doi: 10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 43*(1), 115-135. doi: 10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8

Hinsch, C., Felix, R., & Rauschnabel, P. A. (2020). Nostalgia beats the wow-effect: Inspiration, awe and meaningful associations in augmented reality marketing. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 53*, 101987. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.101987

Hollebeek, L.D., Glynn, M., and Brodie, R. (2014). Consumer brand engagement in social media: conceptualization, scale development and validation. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 28 (2), 149-165.

Hutter , K.; Hautz, J.; Dennhardt, S. & Füller, J. (2013). The impact of user interactions in social media on brand awareness and purchase intention: the case of MINI on Facebook. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 22(5/6), 342-351.

Javornik, A., 2016. Augmented reality: research agenda for studying the impact of its media characteristics on consumer behaviour. *Journal of Retailing Consumer Services*, 30, 252-261. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2016.02.004.

Laroche, M., & Habibi, M. R., and Richard, M.-O. (2013) 'To be or not to be in social media: How brand loyalty is affected by social media?' *International Journal of Information Management*, 33, 76-82.

Leckie, C., Nyadzayo, & M., Johnson, L. (2016) 'Antecedents of consumer brand engagement and brand loyalty' *Journal of Marketing Management*, 32 (5-6), 558-578.

Lee, J., & Hong, I. B. (2016). Predicting positive user responses to social media advertising: The roles of emotional appeal, informativeness, and creativity. *International Journal of Information Management, 36*(3), 360-373. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2016.01.001

Morgan-Thomas, A., & Veloutsou, C. (2013). Beyond technology acceptance: Brand relationships and online brand experience. *Journal of Business Research, 66*(1), 21-27.

Muntinga, D.G., Moorman, & M., Smit, E.G. (2011). Introducing COBRAs: exploring motivations for brand-related social media use'. *International Journal of Advertising*, 30 (1), 13-46.

Paruthi, M., & Kaur, H. (2017). Scale development and validation for measuring online engagement. *Journal of Internet Commerce*, 16 (2), 127-147.

Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie, S., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. (2003). Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies. *The Journal of applied psychology, 88*, 879-903. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879.

Schivinski, B., & Dabrowski, D. (2015). The impact of brand communication on brand equity through

Facebook. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, 9 (1), 31-53.

Schivinski, B., Christodoulides, G., & Dabrowski, D. (2016). Measuring Consumers Engagement With Brand-Related Social-Media Content. *Journal of Advertising Research, 56*(1), 64. doi: 10.2501/JAR-2016-004

Shareef, M.A., Mukerji, B., Alryalat, M.A.A., Wright, A., & Dwivedi, Y.K. (2018). Advertisements on Facebook: identifying the persuasive elements in the development of positive attitudes in consumers. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 43, 258-268.

Shimp, T. A. (2007). Advertising, promotion, and other aspects of integrated marketing communications. Mason, OH: Thomson/South-Western.

Smith, R.E., Chen, J. & Yang, X. (2008). The Impact of Advertising Creativity on the Hierarchy of Effects. *Journal of Advertising*, 37(4), 47-62. doi: 10.2753/JOA0091-3367370404

Souiden, N., Chtourou, S., & Korai, B. (2017). Consumer attitudes toward online advertising: The moderating role of personality. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 23 (2), 207-227.

Taylor, D. G., Lewin, J. E., & Strutton, D. (2011). Friends, fans, and followers: do adswork on social networks? Journal of Advertising Research, 51, 258-275.

Utz, S. & Beukeboom, C.J. (2011). The Role of Social Network Sites in Romantic Relationships: Effects on Jealousy and Relationship Happiness. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 16(4), 511-527

Wang, R., Kim, J., Xiao, A., and Jung, Y. J. (2017). Networked narratives on humans of New York: A content analysis of social media engagement on Facebook. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 66, 149-153.