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Purpose: Based upon previous theories on customer-based brand equity, this study investigates whether the usage of either print or social media have relatively stronger impact upon the brand building components; brand awareness, emotional and functional brand image, willingness to pay a price premium and purchase intention.

Methodology and Empirical Evidence: Perceptions on fictional advertisements were collected from a total of 493 respondents. Data collection was made with an online survey, with questions derived from previously used measures of customer-based brand equity. Data was analyzed through comparisons between social and print media in order to test deduced hypotheses.

Theoretical perspectives: This study is based on theory of customer-based brand equity, the brand value chain and dimensions of brand personality.

Findings: No media was concluded as a significantly superior communication channel in order to elevate the perception of a brand on the tested customer-based brand equity elements. However, the findings show that both print and social media can have an impact on customers’ perceptions of brand personality traits related to a brand.
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1. Introduction

In this introductory chapter, the reader is introduced to the background of the study along with a discussion of the problem at hand. This initial chapter is concluded by the purpose of the study, its limitations and an outline of the thesis. The intention is to provide the reader with a situational overview, our desired research contribution and the essential knowledge required to understand the following sections of the study.

1.1 Background - the Decline of Traditional Media

Few industries have been spared from being overturned due to the digital revolution over the discourse of the last decade, but most got off lightly in comparison to the media industry. Traditional media, such as television and print, which previously was pampered with a steady stream of advertising revenue, suddenly found themselves challenged by new media of a digital nature. Among the different types of traditional media, print has found it particularly hard to cope with the competition brought on by the technological advances (The Economist, 2012). This can be exemplified by the 428 publications that ceased to print in 2009, in the U.S. and Canada alone (Connor, 2014). New media, such as Facebook and Google, have shown a steady growth of popularity amongst marketers. As these new platforms continue to refine their ways of providing better means of online marketing, revenue from advertising continue to dwindle for the print media industry (Sweney, 2015). The director of digital content at the Guardian, Emily Bell (as cited in Brook, 2008) expressed new media's impact on print media advertising in the United Kingdom with the following words:

“We could face complete market failure in some areas of regional papers [...] This is systematic collapse not just a cyclical downturn”

With this being said, the future of print media seems, at the very least, gloomy. Research conducted during the last decade examining new and traditional media do, however, paint another picture. In fact, these studies have generated findings that endorse traditional media over new media, in some aspects of building a strong brand. Their findings indicate that communications through both new and traditional media affect sales and have a significant impact on the creation of brand value. However, traditional media has a stronger impact on brand awareness and per-event sales (Stephen & Galak, 2010; Bruhn et al., 2012). Despite these findings, many organizations have decided to transfer their advertising spend from traditional
media and especially print media, to new media platforms such as Facebook. One of the best examples of such a transfer of funds, came recently when media mogul Rupert Murdoch announced the transfer of millions of GBP in advertising spend from the print industry, in which he once built his media conglomerate, to new media platforms (Mance, 2016). However, whether this seemingly impending doom of traditional media advertising is based upon blind faith in new media platforms, or actual market insights, is in many respects unclear.

1.2. The Vicious Circle of Print Media

Rupert Murdoch once described print media advertising as “rivers of gold”. However, as time passed, so did Mr. Murdoch’s optimistic view of print media, which was concluded by his simplistic statement of “sometimes rivers dry up” (Plunkett, 2005). These statements are very descriptive of the changes that the marketing landscape has undergone since the introduction of the Internet. In 2014, approximately two and a half decades after its introduction, 1.4 trillion USD were spent on new media marketing globally, which, with an expected growth of 5.1 percent in the next five years, makes it the fastest growing marketing category in the world (Bagchi et al., 2015). As described earlier, the most traditional of the traditional media, print, has been severely hurt by this transition and the segment fell by 22 billion USD between the short period of 2011 and 2014 (Carson, 2015). A decline, which is expected to continue for an incalculable future (Bagchi et al., 2015).

When examining this transition with an open mind, it is not difficult to understand why marketers have abandoned traditional media for new media alternatives, as the Internet has, more or less, made the whole world into a marketing arena of its own (Berthon et al., 2012). This can be exemplified by the inventions of various forms of social media, such as Facebook and Twitter, which combined is housing close to 2 billion active users, as per 2016 (Statista, 2016). Thus, providing a possible reach that no newspaper or magazine can compete with. As if this was not reason enough for companies to transfer their projected advertising expenditure to new media, these media have the possibility to provide the marketers with additional beneficial tools, such as data and advertising targeting. Many new media platforms are equipped with numerous ways to measure the penetration of a certain marketing activity, such as click-through rates, unique visitors, cost per unique visitor, page views, return visits, interaction rate, and time spent (Fisher, 2009). Thus providing indications, although of a short-term nature, of whether a marketer’s money is well spent or not (The Economist, 2006). Lastly, and maybe most
importantly, new media marketing tends to be significantly cheaper in comparison to traditional media, which naturally is a very important factor for most companies (Hanna et al., 2011).

In all the commotion of the Internet, social networks, click-through rates and the overall change in the marketing landscape, it seems like the negative impacts that may follow in the wake of a declining print industry have passed rather unnoticed. The industry is currently finding itself in a vicious circle, where buyers of advertising are leaving at an increased rate, as the readership and subscriptions continue to decline. Unsurprisingly, this has led to smaller budgets for the newsroom executives and operations that previously established newspapers as the fourth estate, for example investigating journalism, is increasingly being traded for opuses of an “entertaining” or “lifestyle” nature (The Economist, 2006). This vicious circle of print media is, of course, bad for the people working within the print industry, but it also has the possibility to pose as a bigger problem than revealed at a first glance. In fact, some people go as far as saying that the decline of print is actually putting the political system of democracy at risk. Since, the downsizing of journalist staff is compromising the overall quality of the reported news (Makar, 2014).

In conclusion, the decline of the print industry is clearly being accelerated by the marketers’ abandonment of this industry, for the seemingly greener pastures provided by new media. This realization adds an additional dimension to the importance of investigating whether marketers are on the verge of doing both themselves, as well as society, a misdeed by switching from traditional to new media. Especially, when the media’s impact is fairly unknown and the social ecosystem, in which print media holds a prominent role, faces the risk of being eroded.

1.3. Media and Brand Equity

As portrayed above, there is a clear linkage between the decline of traditional media and the introduction of the Internet, in which the print industry has suffered the hardest blow, whereas social media has shown an explosive growth. However, only a limited amount of research has been dedicated to the examination of the impact that such a substitution of communication channels might impose on a brand (Bezjian-Avery et al., 1998; Stephen & Galak, 2010; Bruhn et al., 2012; Draganska et al., 2014). This is rather peculiar, as Simon and Sullivan (1993) have found communication channels to be an important source of brand value creation, hence the choice of media appears to be an influential building block for one of the most valuable assets of any firm – the brand (Keller & Lehmann, 2003).
The concept of brands is broad and intangible. The need for a more tangible concept that allowed for further investigations, such as how certain elements or decisions affect the value of a brand, led to the emergence of brand equity theory (Persson, 2010). Brand equity has been on the receiving end of many researchers’ attention, since the latter part of the 20th century (Farquhar, 1989; Barwise, 1992). Farquhar (1989) was among the first to define the concept and his definition as “the added value endowed by the brand to the product” has formed the basis for future definitions of brand equity, by various prominent researchers in this field (e.g. D. Aaker, 1991; Keller, 1993; Lassar et al., 1995). Brand equity may be investigated through different viewpoints, these are, however, most often distinguished into two major perspectives, based on their primary focus. These perspectives are most commonly known as firm-based brand equity and customer-based brand equity (Christodoulides & de Chernatony, 2010). The main focus of the former is the monetary value of a brand, whereas the latter focuses on the relationships between customers and brands (Lassar et al., 1995; Yoo & Donthu, 2001; Christodoulides & de Chernatony, 2010). In this paper, the customer-based brand equity perspective holds most relevance, as this study focuses on customer-brand relationships, rather than the financial perspective of brand equity creation.

The customer-based brand equity perspective is defined by Keller (1993) as “the differential effect brand knowledge has on customers’ response to the marketing of that brand”. In other words, this perspective recognizes that the power of a brand resides in the minds of the customers. Thus, to understand how certain elements and decisions affect the equity of a brand, one must first create an understanding of how the customers themselves work. To do so, a deepened knowledge with regards to the factors that influence the behavior of the customer, is pivotal (Kotler & Keller, 2012).

In order obtain such a deepened knowledge of brand equity creation, researchers often depict its different steps by the use of a chain-like structure (Wood, 2000; Keller & Lehmann, 2003; Kapferer, 2012). In these chains, the steps are mapped out horizontally and not seldom sequentially. The horizontal format addresses the fact that brand management is strategic and connected to longevity, and that brands should be managed as long-term assets (Dean, 1966; Wood, 2000). Moreover, these chain models embrace both of the two major perspectives described earlier. They encapsulate both the financial perspective as well as the brand-customer relationship perspective, and are therefore providing a good overall picture of brand equity.
creation from the beginning to the end (Keller & Lehmann, 2003). It should, however, be noted that the design and inclusion of micro-elements may vary between different researchers, but their models usually share a number of common denominators (Wood, 2000; Keller & Lehmann, 2003; Kapferer, 2012). In this paper, we have chosen to make use of the acknowledged Brand Value Chain developed by Keller and Lehmann (2003), which is depicted in figure 1. The Brand Value Chain is, in our opinion, built upon many of the most important common denominators and reflects the brand equity creation process, in a fair and apprehensible way. Thus, making it a good tool for both graphical representation of the brand equity creation process, as well as a sound basis for our conceptual framework which will be introduced in chapter 2.

![Figure 1. The Brand Value Chain developed by Keller & Lehmann (2003).](image)

This model divides brand equity creation into four pillars and emphasizes its sequential nature, where the first two pillars are more inclined towards the perspective of customer-based brand equity, and the latter are more of a firm-based brand equity nature. The first pillar, marketing program investment, refers to any action, intentionally or unintentionally, undertaken by a firm that potentially can impact brand value development (Keller & Lehmann, 2003). This pillar is present in similar brand equity models developed by other researchers, such as Wood (2000), who argues that the first step of brand equity creation is generated through a firm’s use of the marketing mix. Customer mindset embraces everything that exists in the customers’ minds, with regards to a brand, such as thoughts, feelings, perceptions and attitudes. Keller and Lehmann (2003) have chosen to distinguish this pillar, whereas some researchers have chosen to merge it with the first stage (e.g. Wood, 2000; Kapferer, 2012). The following stage consists of brand performance, which refers to how the customers react and respond in the marketplace and concern elements such as price elasticity and profitability. Other researchers have attributed similar parameters to this part of of the brand equity creation process, under the name of “Brand Strength” (Wood, 2000; Kapferer, 2012). The final pillar consists of shareholder value and at this stage, the financial marketplace formulates opinions and performs assessments, based upon
available information on a brand. These opinions and assessments are, as per the model, influenced by the three other pillars, which ultimately affects important financial indicators, such as stock price (Keller & Lehmann, 2003). Researchers seem to agree that the latter parts of brand equity creation are of a financial nature and it is presented in a similar fashion in other conceptual models as well (Wood, 2000; Kapferer, 2012).

To present the creation of brand equity as a four-step chain is undoubtedly a simplification of the reality and there are of course additional factors included in such a process, that the Brand Value Chain does not account for. Despite these simplifications, the Brand Value Chain works as a useful frame of reference, when a deepened understanding of how brands create value is sought after (Keller & Lehmann, 2003). Such a statement is further strengthened by the amount of researchers that have utilized the brand value chain model in the past (e.g. Ambler et al., 2002, Keller & Lehmann, 2006; Bruhn et al., 2012; Anselmsson & Bondesson, 2015). Bearing the findings of Simon and Sullivan (1993) in mind, together with the lack of previous studies attempting to compare the impact that traditional and new media have upon the creation of brand equity, we find this to be a highly relevant topic of study. With this being said, the extensive frameworks developed within the field of brand equity, is not only providing us with a good starting point for such an investigation, but also a means of studying this concept from a customer-based perspective. In conclusion, utilizing the Brand Value Chain allows us to investigate how different marketing program investments, in this case advertising through traditional or new media, impact the relationships between a brand and its customers.

1.4 Problematization

Considering the previously mentioned changes of the marketing landscape and the transfer in advertising spend, we find it relevant to increase the knowledge of how traditional and new media, in themselves as communication channels, impact customer-based brand equity. This becomes increasingly important, when taking into consideration that previous research has found communication channels to be an important source of brand value creation (Simon & Sullivan, 1993). The choice of media channel may therefore have a “ripple effect” upon the brand equity creation process through the pillars of customer mindset, brand performance and ultimately the shareholder value of a brand (Keller & Lehmann, 2003).

To the best of our knowledge, only one previous study has investigated the impact imposed by traditional and new media upon a brand, from a customer-based brand equity perspective.
That study included many of the most important components of brand equity, however, one essential measure is absent; customers’ willingness to pay a price premium. We consider this to be problematic, as this component has been found to be a core part in the creation of customer-based brand equity (Keller, 1993; D. Aaker, 1996b; Farquhar, 1989; Netemeyer et al., 2004). Hence, we are under the impression that it is about time to apply this parameter to new and traditional media, in the light of customer-based brand equity. In addition to this, we are of the opinion that previous research has not delved deeply enough into another component included in the creation of customer-based brand equity, namely the emotional brand image. We intend to do so, by including the concept of brand personality, a parameter that has been attributed as an important part of emotional brand image creation and therefore could pose as a central element in customer-based brand equity creation (Aaker 1996b; Yoo & Donthu, 2001; Keller 2001; Netemeyer et al., 2004). Finally, no previous research has attempted to isolate the impact imposed by communication through traditional and new media upon a brand, which we find important, in order to fully grasp how the choice of media can affect the brand in question. Thus, we intend to do so by utilizing fictional brands, opposed to existing brands, in this paper.

Bearing all of this in mind, there are some voids in the current field of research upon new and traditional media in the light of brand equity creation. This paper, is thus an attempt to complement the previous research conducted within this field, as well as to provide new insights to the areas that still remain fairly unexplored. Finally, we are also of the opinion that this study holds practical relevance, as its findings could give indications to whether traditional media, such as print, holds advertising benefits that justifies its preservation from a brand equity perspective, or if new media simply is a superior alternative.

### 1.5 Purpose

Based upon previous theories on customer-based brand equity, we intend to investigate whether the usage of either print or social media have relatively stronger impact upon the brand building components; brand awareness, emotional and functional brand image, willingness to pay a price premium and purchase intention.
1.6 Focus and Delimitations

The concept of brand equity was introduced in section 1.3 along with the Brand Value Chain model. As previously mentioned, this model embraces both the more relationship inclined customer-based brand equity perspective, as well as the more financial perspective of firm-based brand equity. In this paper, we are primarily interested in new and traditional media's relative impact upon the relationships between customers and brands. We therefore delimit ourselves to investigations of the pillars of brand equity, which are relevant to our purpose. Therefore, we focus on the two first pillars of the Brand Value Chain, marketing program investment and customer mindset, as customer-based brand equity is generated through these stages of the brand equity creation process (Keller & Lehmann, 2003). The concept of customer-based brand equity and our investigation of this concept with regards to traditional and new media will be further discussed in chapter 2. Finally, it should be stressed that this study examines media from a brand equity perspective, and that the inferences generated through this paper are relevant merely to this particular subject area.

The concepts of traditional and new media are broad and their definitions may vary. In this paper we will make use of the definitions provided by Oxford Dictionaries, which defines traditional media, which is also known as old media, as “established or traditional means of mass communication considered collectively, especially contrasted with newer means; specifically media which are not interactive or do not involve the Internet” (Oxford Dictionaries, 2016a). The same dictionary defines new media as “means of mass communication using digital technologies such as the Internet” (Oxford Dictionaries, 2016b). Evidently, both of these definitions cover several different types of media and to examine the impact of new and traditional media in their entirety would not be feasible in a credible way. Therefore, this study will focus on two categories of media that naturally represent the new and traditional media concepts, namely print media and social media.

Print media is in this paper defined as “means of mass communication in the form of printed publications, such as newspapers and magazines” (Oxford Dictionaries, 2016c). This is an industry that, as described earlier, has been severely hurt by the introduction of the Internet and thus makes it a highly relevant subject of study (Sweney, 2015). As printed media has experienced decline due to the digital evolution, categories of new media have experienced a reverse scenario, in which social media has been particularly successful (Carson, 2015; Kemp, 2016). Social media is defined as “Websites and applications that enable users to create and
share content or to participate in social networking” (Oxford Dictionaries, 2016d), and is often considered as the archetype of new media (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). The fact that 2.3 billion out of the 3.4 billion individuals with an Internet presence in the world, are currently active on social media further establishes it as the most relevant representative of new media (Kemp, 2016).

In this study, new and traditional media will be used as overall concepts and applied for instances in which no further specification of the media itself is needed. Print media and social media, on the other hand, are used when an emphasis of the used media is deemed necessary. The concepts of print media and social media will be used to a greater extent in the latter part of this study, due to our delimitation of investigating these particular categories. A classification of the different concepts is depicted in table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Concept Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Classification of media concepts used in this study.

1.7 Outline and Disposition

In the introductory part of this study, we introduced the reader to the importance of further investigation of print and social media, from a customer-based brand equity perspective and how we aim to contribute to this field, which is concretized through our research purpose. From here on, our theoretical framework and relevant previous research conducted on new and traditional media will be presented, along with our conceptual framework and formulation of hypotheses. Next, our research methodology and a detailed description of the practical execution of the study is accounted for. Finally, our empirical findings will be presented and subjected to analysis, from which conclusions will be drawn and discussed. The thesis is concluded by managerial implications as well as limitations and suggestions for future studies.
2. Theoretical Framework

In this section, the collection of theory and previous research that is underpinning our study and hypotheses are presented and discussed. The reader will be introduced to the different perspectives of customer-based brand equity, our conceptual framework as well as relevant studies between new and traditional media. Lastly, a summarization of the derived hypotheses is presented.

2.1 The Concept of Customer-Based Brand Equity

The process of building a strong brand has, not surprisingly, captured the interest of both the business and academic world, as it has been proven to result in highly favorable benefits for the possessing company (Keller, 2001). Although, initially mostly studied from a financial perspective as a means to enable more precise estimates of the value of a brand for accounting purposes, strategic studies of brand equity have become increasingly prominent during the last decades (Keller, 1993). The motivation for studying brand equity from such a perspective has its foundation in findings showing that strong brands, inter alia, experience less vulnerability to competitive marketing activities, greater customer loyalty and larger margins (Keller, 2001). Bearing such competitive advantages in mind, many researchers have dedicated themselves to the development of both conceptual as well as operational blueprints and measurements for strategic brand equity creation (Anselmsson et al., 2014). Among a majority of these researchers, there is a common notion that the value of a brand is in the minds of the customers (e.g. Lassar, 1995; D. Aaker, 1991; 1996a; Keller, 2001). This perspective of brand equity is therefore psychologically rooted and referred to as customer-based brand equity (henceforth referred to as CBBE). Pioneers on the frontier of brand equity, from a CBBE-perspective, are D. Aaker (1991; 1996a) and Keller (2001), which have come to represent two conceptual schools of thought in terms of definition and measurement of the concept itself (Gill & Dawra, 2010).

D. Aaker (1991; 1996a) defines brand equity as “a set of brand assets (liabilities) linked to a brand, its name and symbol, that add to (subtract from) the value provided by a product or a service to a firm and/or that firm's customers”. These assets and liabilities may vary from context to context, but D. Aaker (1991; 1996a) argues that they can be successfully grouped into the following four major categories:
• **Brand awareness** – The ability for a buyer to recognize or recall that a brand is a member of a certain product category.

• **Perceived quality** – The quality of the products being sold by a firm in the minds of the customer, which has been found to have a large impact upon a customer’s overall perception of a brand.

• **Brand loyalty** – A measure of the amount of customers that are committed to a brand. Works as an entry barrier toward competitors and has been proven to be valuable as a predictor of future sales, hence proving as a good indicator of the overall financial value of a brand.

• **Brand associations** – Intangible associations that customers attach to a brand, which is largely driven by the brand identity. Hence, the brand identity and the brand associations are important tools of exhibiting what a brand wants to stand for, in the minds of the customers.

Taking these four categories into consideration, it is, according to D. Aaker (1996a), of utmost importance for companies to create and enhance these categories of assets in order to manage a firm’s brand equity and to allow for the creation of a strong brand. Which, ultimately is beneficial for both the firm and its customers.

In the other school of thought, and as previously mentioned, Keller (1993) defines CBBE as “the differential effect of the brand knowledge on customer response to the marketing of the brand”. Hence, brand equity is not seen as a compilation of assets, but rather as made up by the additional preferences that a customer has for a branded product, in comparison to a non-branded equivalent (Gill & Dawra, 2010). With this being said, marketers are faced with the challenge of ensuring that their customers are being exposed to the right kind of feelings, thoughts, images, beliefs and perceptions, and by extension link these to the brand (Keller, 2001). Keller (2001) has, much like D. Aaker (1991; 1996a), found certain aspects that are beneficial, in terms of creating brand equity, and in this case a classification is made into the following six, so called, “brand-building blocks”:

• **Brand salience** – How easily and how often the brand comes to mind during various purchase or consumption situations.

• **Brand performance** – How well the service or product meets the functional needs of the customer.

• **Brand imagery** – Describes the extrinsic properties of the service or product, including ways in which the brand attempts to meet the social or psychological needs of the customer.
• **Brand judgments** – *Focuses upon the personal opinions and evaluations of the customer.*

• **Brand feelings** – *Customers reactions and emotional responses with regards to the brand.*

• **Brand resonance** – *Describes the relationship customers have with the brand and to which extent they are feeling synchronized with the brand.*

The blocks presented above are, however, unlike D. Aaker’s (1991; 1996a) four categories, of a sequential nature, meaning that a firm has to excel in all six brand-building blocks, in order to create significant brand equity (Keller, 2001).

### 2.1.1 The Brand Value Chain

At a first glance, the field of CBBE may seem complex due to the varying definitions and measurements that have been brought forward, by different researchers over time (e.g. Keller, 1993; 2001; D. Aaker, 1991; 1996a). Thus, to increase the understanding of how CBBE is created, Keller and Lehmann (2003) developed a model called the *Brand Value Chain*, which was briefly discussed in section 1.3. This model has been proven to successfully reflect the common denominators of the different views of CBBE, such as the two schools of thought, depicted above (Keller & Lehmann, 2003, Anselmsson, 2013). The model follows Keller’s (2001) sequential view upon CBBE creation and is built on the four pillars of; marketing program investment, customer mindset, brand performance and shareholder value. In short, the model visualizes that the marketing program investments undertaken by a firm affects the mental associations and attitudes of the customer through the customer mindset, which finally influences the performance of a brand in the market. The performance of a brand is thus a main indicator, when the brand is evaluated by the financial marketplace. How well a firm is managing its CBBE is therefore directly influential upon important financial indicators, such as stock price (Keller & Lehmann, 2003). In conclusion, the Brand Value Chain, which is once more depicted in figure 2, poses as a good framework when an understanding of how marketing program investments are affecting different levels of CBBE is sought after.

![Marketing Program Investment → Customer Mindset → Brand Performance → Shareholder Value](image)

*Figure 2. The Brand Value Chain*
As we are interested in examining how the nature of print and social media is affecting the CBBE of brands, we are under impression that the Brand Value Chain poses as a good instrument in order to develop our own conceptual framework. This choice has its basis in the fact that the Brand Value Chain highlights one of the main areas of interest for this study, namely how the customer’s mindset is affected through the usage of either print or social media (Keller & Lehmann, 2003). In addition, the Brand Value Chain (and similar versions thereof) has been proven as a good operational model for the measurement of CBBE, by various researchers in the past (e.g. Ambler et al., 2002; Keller & Lehmann, 2006; Bruhn et al., 2012; Anselmsson & Bondesson, 2015).

2.2 Our Conceptual Framework

As previously mentioned, we build upon the conceptual framework, the Brand Value Chain, developed by Keller and Lehmann (2003). We have evaluated the framework itself, along with several modified conceptual models (e.g. Yoo et al., 2000; Netemeyer et al., 2004; Gill & Dawra, 2010), in order to create our own framework measuring the impact that social and print media have on CBBE. Based upon these evaluations, we have extracted a number of components, that we believe enable us to make a credible investigation of social and print media, in the light of CBBE. Our conceptual framework is presented in figure 3.

![Figure 3. Our conceptual framework of CBBE.](image-url)
2.2.1 Marketing Program Investment

As previously mentioned, any investment that has the potential to affect the development of brand value falls into the pillar of marketing program investment. This covers both intentional and unintentional activities (Keller & Lehmann, 2003). In this study, the marketing program investment is constituted by print and social media advertising. Several studies have examined new and traditional media and its differential impact on various CBBE metrics in the past (Bezjian-Avery et al., 1998; Stephen & Galak, 2010; Bruhn et al., 2012; Draganska et al., 2014). However, as previously mentioned, only one such study has its basis in conceptual frameworks of CBBE, which was conducted by Bruhn et al. (2012).

In the study by Bruhn et al. (2012), the authors investigated the relative impact of brand communication through new media, in comparison to traditional media, upon the creation of CBBE. The study was conducted through an examination of the 20 best selling brands in the industries of telecommunications, pharmaceuticals and tourism in German-speaking countries. In similarity to this paper, the study was performed by the use of a modified version of the the Brand Value Chain (Keller & Lehmann, 2003), where their first dimension is “the sender of brand-based communication content”. This dimension was adjusted in order to attend to peer-to-peer interactivity and user-generated content in social media, as the original Brand Value Chain takes off in company-generated market communications (Bruhn et. al., 2003; Keller & Lehmann, 2003). Thus, there is a difference between the conceptual framework used in this paper, in comparison to the one developed by Bruhn et al. (2012), as they incorporate user-generated content, whereas we are only interested in company-generated communication. The second dimension, in similarity to ours, measured customer mindset through brand awareness and brand image, where the latter was divided into a hedonistic and a functional component. These measures of brand image, are similar to our separation into functional and emotional brand image. However, the investigations were made through different metrics. We have, as per our model, chosen to evaluate these two components through perceived quality, perceived value for the cost, uniqueness and brand personality. Bruhn et al. (2012), on the other hand, measured functional brand image through explicit survey-questions on reliability, credibility and trust. Hedonic brand image was evaluated through questions regarding attractiveness, desire, as well as strength of character and personality (Bruhn et. al., 2003). These are fairly general questions which generated some findings, that we strive to build upon and investigate further. For example, we delve deeper into the measure of brand personality by examining if new and traditional media are associated with category brand personalities. The final dimension included in Bruhn et al’s
(2012) model is customer behavior, which is reflected by purchase intention. This is a commonly used CBBE-metric, that we have chosen to include in our model as well, as a behavioral indicator. However, and as previously mentioned, Bruhn et al. (2012) do not include the measurement of willingness to pay a price premium, which we find questionable, due to many researchers’ proclamation of this measure’s importance in CBBE creation (Farquhar, 1989; Keller, 1993; D. Aaker, 1996b; Netemeyer et al., 2004). In conclusion, the study by Bruhn et al. (2012) proves that an investigation between different traditional and new media marketing program investments and its impact upon CBBE is both relevant and feasible. Bearing this in mind, we have built upon the results generated by their study, along with other researchers investigating CBBE metrics in the same setting.

2.2.2 Customer Mindset

The dimension of customer mindset consists of everything that exists in the customer’s mind related to a certain brand, such as feelings, experiences and perceptions (Keller & Lehmann, 2003). In this paper, and as per our conceptual framework, the dimension of customer mindset consists of the five components; brand awareness, functional brand image, emotional brand image, willingness to pay a price premium and purchase intentions. These five components will be discussed in detail below.

Brand Awareness

In our framework, the measurement of customer mindset begins with the perceptual component brand awareness which, according to both D. Aaker (1996b) and Keller (2003), is identified as a foundation of CBBE-creation. D. Aaker (1991) defines brand awareness as “the ability for a buyer to recognize or recall that a brand is a member of a certain product category” and this is an acknowledged measurement of CBBE, which have been utilized by many researchers in the past (e.g. Cobb-Walgren et al., 1995; Yoo et al., 2000; Yoo & Donthu, 2001; Netemeyer et al., 2004; Pappu et al., 2005). In terms of new and traditional media, this component was measured by Bruhn et al. (2012). Their findings suggest that traditional media has a stronger impact upon brand awareness, in comparison to new media (Bruhn et al., 2012). This can be corroborated by another study comparing television with Internet advertisements that generated similar findings (Draganska et al., 2014). However, in both of these studies, the authors utilized existing brands, potentially known to the participating respondents. Thus, one can not conclude that the difference in results, with regards to brand awareness, is caused by the media itself. Yet, measuring a customer’s actual brand awareness of a fictional brand is seemingly pointless.
However, we are of the opinion that the nature of a media may create an impression of recognition of a brand, even though an individual has never encountered it before. Therefore, based upon the previous findings of Bruhn et al. (2012) and Draganska et al. (2014), we assume that traditional media might transmit a perception of elevated levels of awareness. Thus, in this paper, we are measuring whether the respondents are exhibiting an elevated level of perceived brand awareness, when exposed to advertisements through print or social media and formulate the following hypothesis:

**H1:** Print media has a significantly stronger impact upon customers’ perceived brand awareness, in comparison to social media.

**Functional brand image**

As per the model, brand awareness affects the overall components of functional and emotional brand image, where the former is measured by the customer’s perceived quality of a brand and the perceived value for the cost. These measurements have been included in this model, as they are considered to be core components of CBBE, and have been found to be the main influencers of customer’s willingness to pay a price premium (Farquhar, 1989; Keller, 1993; D. Aaker, 1996b; Netemeyer et al., 2004). Perceived quality can be defined as a customer’s overall perception of a brand’s excellence, esteem and/or superiority, in relation to other brands. It should, however, not be mistaken for objective or actual quality, such as an attribute of a product, but is rather an assessment of the brand’s quality in the mind of the customer (Zeithaml, 1988). Meanwhile, perceived value for the cost, is closely linked to perceived quality, and is defined by Netemeyer et al. (2004) as “the customer’s overall assessment of the utility of the brand, based on perceptions of what is received (e.g. quality and satisfaction) and what is given (e.g. price and nonmonetary costs) relative to other brands”. We classify these two components as representatives of the measurement of the functional brand image, as they are of a more rational and tangible nature and are being evaluated through factors such as price and performance (Netemeyer et al., 2004). The only prior study investigating the impact generated by this component of CBBE from a traditional and new media perspective, was conducted by Bruhn et al. (2012). Their findings suggest that both traditional and new media yields a significant positive influence on the functional brand image (Bruhn et al., 2012). We are however interested in the investigation of whether a certain medium yields a significantly higher impact upon CBBE than the other. As no other prior study has covered this
measurement of brand image in a print and social media setting, we take a cautious approach and based on the previous findings we formulate the following hypothesis:

**H2:** Either print or social media has a significantly stronger impact upon customers’ perceived functional brand image, in comparison to the other.

**Emotional Brand Image**

The emotional brand image is also affected by brand awareness, and is measured through *brand uniqueness* and *brand personality* in this particular study. Brand uniqueness, much like perceived quality and perceived value for the cost, is also found to be a main influencer of a customer’s willingness to pay a price premium (Farquhar, 1989; Keller, 1993; D. Aaker, 1996b; Netemeyer et al., 2004). This measure is defined as “the degree to which customers feel the brand is different from competing brands – how distinct it is relative to competitors”, and is of a symbolic and emotional nature (Netemeyer et al., 2004). Based upon this, we have chosen to include brand uniqueness as one of the representatives in the measurement of emotional brand image.

The second representative is the component of brand personality. This may seem as a rather unorthodox choice, since few studies have included brand personality as an indicator of CBBE in the past (Yoo & Donthu, 2001; Netemeyer et al., 2004). Nevertheless, D. Aaker (1996b) indicates that brand personality is an important emotional element of brand image, which is further strengthened by Keller’s (2001) attribution of brand personality as a sub-dimension of his brand imagery building-block in his conceptual CBBE framework. Additional researchers, such as Netemeyer et al. (2004) and Yoo and Donthu (2001), have also indicated that brand personality may be a core part of CBBE creation and that future studies should investigate this area from a CBBE point of view. Based upon this, we have chosen to include brand personality in our conceptual framework. The concept of brand personality is closely linked to a study conducted by J. Aaker (1997) and is defined as “the set of human characteristics associated with a brand”. The study comprises a framework of five distinct brand personality dimensions, namely *Sincerity, Excitement, Competence, Sophistication* and *Ruggedness*, that customers can find brands to possess. To the best of our knowledge, no research has confirmed a link between customers’ willingness to pay a price premium and brand personality, yet some researchers argue that such a relationship may exist (Persson, 2010). We share this view and believe that brand personality may be a driver of customers’ willingness to pay a price premium, since this component shares the basis of differentiation with brand uniqueness (Aaker, 1996b; Netemeyer et al., 2004).
et al., 2004). However, conducting studies upon categories of traditional and new media from a brand personality perspective have been difficult in the past, as the concept only has been investigated on individual brands. Findings of researchers such as Batra et al. (2006) and Machle et al. (2011) do, however, add a whole new dimension to the investigation of brand personality, since they found that brand personalities are not isolated to individual brands, but applicable to whole product categories as well. Thus, allowing us to investigate the new and traditional media categories of print and social media and its impact upon CBBE from a brand personality perspective. In conclusion, we classify brand uniqueness and brand personality as representatives of the emotional brand image component, as they are of a symbolic and intangible nature (Netemeyer et al., 2004).

As in the case of functional brand image, emotional brand image is a fairly unexplored area in terms of new and traditional media, which, to our knowledge, only has been investigated by Bruhn et al. (2012). Their findings suggest that neither new, nor traditional media advertising have an impact upon the emotional brand image (Bruhn et al., 2012). We are, however, under the impression that the nature of a medium has an impact on the emotional brand image component. This is based on findings implying that magazines, a sub-category of print media, is perceived as sharing a common category personality of Competence (Batra et al., 2006). Therefore, we are not entirely willing to accept such a suggestion, without further investigation on the matter. Consequently, we formulate the following hypothesis:

**H3:** Either social or print media has a significantly stronger impact upon customers’ perceived brand uniqueness, in comparison to the other.

Identifying personalities might be an important part of CBBE due to its previously mentioned differential characteristics, and its possible linkage to price premium (Persson, 2010; Aaker, 1996b). In addition to this, previous researchers argue that a brand’s personality, that is consistent with an individual's own personality, tend to increase his or her preference for said brand (Kotler & Keller, 2012) Thus, if print and social media communication possess categorical personalities, an understanding of which personalities these convey could enable more successful marketing program investments. The findings by Batra et al. (2012) on the print media category of magazines imply that new and traditional media in general, as well as print and social media in particular, can be subjected to further investigation. Therefore, we will delve deeper into J. Aaker's (1997) brand personality framework, with regards to print and social
media. As magazines have been connected to the personality dimension of Competence, it is reasonable to assume that the whole category of print media could be perceived as to possess the same, or a similar, personality. Such a notion becomes further evident as Batra et al. (2012) found the categorical personalities that emerged through their study to be of an intuitive nature, e.g. the category of jeans being linked to the personality dimension Ruggedness. With this being said, and as no prior research has been conducted upon the category personality of print and social media, we have used our own intuitive perception and logical reasoning when formulating the following hypotheses (H4a-H4e) and motivations for the same.

Social media is constructed around the idea of facilitating information exchange between users, and a clear majority of the content available on these sites are user-generated (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010), which may lead to increased levels of perceived sincerity in this media. Such a notion has been strengthened by other studies, showing that customers perceive social media as a more trustworthy source of information, in comparison to traditional media (Foux, 2006). We are under the impression that this perceived trustworthiness may be transmitted upon the brands being marketed through social media and thus formulate the following hypothesis:

**H4a:** Brands communicated through social media show a significantly elevated level of Sincerity, in comparison to print media.

With the interactivity of social media comes the possibility to increase the customer’s sense of ownership and engagement (Mangold & Faulds, 2009). This interactive element of social media, that is not present in print, presumably increases the perceived level of excitement for brands advertised through this media. In addition, social media is a rather new phenomenon, whereas the modern newspaper has been around since the 19th century (Weibull, 1983, cited in Nationalencyklopedin, 2016), which most likely enhances the customer's view upon social media advertisements as newer and more exciting. Consequently, we formulate the following hypotheses, with regards to the Excitement dimension:

**H4b:** Brands communicated through social media show a significantly elevated level of Excitement, in comparison to print media.

As mentioned in the introductory chapter of this paper, print media has traditionally been viewed upon as an important part of the social ecosystem and is often described as a fourth
estate (The Economist, 2006). It is therefore reasonable to assume that these characteristics will be reflected in customers' perceptions of print media, as more competent than social media. Moreover, previous research suggests that magazines, which are categorized as print media together with newspapers (Oxford Dictionaries, 2016c), possess an overall personality of Competence (Bruhn et al., 2012). We are therefore under the impression that a brand advertised through print media is perceived as having significantly higher levels of this dimension and formulate the following hypothesis:

**H4c:** Brands communicated through print media show a significantly elevated level of Competence, in comparison to social media.

We are under the impression that neither social nor print media can be intuitively attributed to the brand personality dimension of Sophistication. As a consequence of this, we have taken a cautious approach when formulating the following hypothesis, with regards to this dimension:

**H4d:** Brands communicated through neither social nor print media show significantly elevated levels of Sophistication, in comparison to the other.

In terms of Ruggedness, we find it difficult to find any logical reasoning for why one of the two media should be significantly more linked to this particular dimension than the other. Therefore, much like in the case of Sophistication, we formulate the following hypothesis:

**H4e:** Brands communicated through neither social nor print media show significantly elevated levels of Ruggedness, in comparison to the other.

**Willingness to Pay a Price Premium**

A customer’s willingness to pay a price premium can be explained as the amount a customer is willing to pay for a certain brand in relation to other brands, that offer similar benefits (Aaker, 1996b). This component has been frequently used as a measurement of CBBE and is often proclaimed to be the most useful indicator of brand equity (Aaker, 1996b, Netemeyer et al., 2004; Anselmsson et al., 2014). As per the model, willingness to pay a price premium is linked to purchase intentions, since this component directly affects brand purchase behavior (Netemeyer et al., 2004). To the best of our knowledge, no previous study has investigated this component in relation to new and traditional media despite its, as previously mentioned, proven
usefulness. Due to the lack of previous investigations, we have chosen to base our hypothesis for this CBBE component upon logical reasoning. This reasoning has led us to believe that customers might exhibit a higher willingness to pay a price premium for brands advertised through print media, as consumption of print media tends to involve exchange of money, whereas social media is normally free of charge. Hence, we formulate the following hypothesis:

**H5**: Print media have a significantly stronger impact upon customers’ willingness to pay a price premium, in comparison to social media.

**Purchase Intentions**

The final component included in the model, purchase intention, has been included as it has been proven to be a good behavioral measure of what a customer is planning, or is likely, to buy (Anselmsson & Bondesson, 2015). Bruhn et al. (2012) found that both new and traditional media had a positive effect upon purchase intentions, where the former had the strongest impact. Another study comparing traditional and new media advertising does however generate an opposite result, where traditional media proved to be more persuasive in terms of purchase intentions, compared to new media (Bezjian-Avery et al., 1998). Thus, with these studies combined, both of the two media had a positive impact upon purchase intentions. However, there is no consensus with regards to which media that is generating the strongest impact. The contradictory findings could indicate that no significant differences exist, when comparing the relative impact between the two media, upon the component of purchase intentions. We are, however under the impression that the difference in time between the execution of these two studies has played a large role upon their findings, since customers were presumably more comfortable and accustomed with new media advertisements in 2012, compared to 1998. Thus, we chose to formulate the following hypothesis, based on the results of Bruhn et al. (2012):

**H6**: Social media has a significantly stronger impact upon customers’ purchase intentions, in comparison to print media.

**2.2.3 Brand Performance and Shareholder Value**

The dimensions of brand performance and shareholder value have been included in the model, in order to demonstrate the entire brand equity creation process. Brand Performance is affected by the customer mindset and refers to how customers respond and react on the market, with respect to the brand (Keller & Lehmann, 2003). Shareholder value is thus directly influenced
by the dimension of brand performance and indirectly influenced by customer mindset. As previously mentioned, we will not examine the dimensions of brand performance and shareholder value, as we have limited ourselves to the investigation of how print and social media affect CBBE, which is covered by the dimension of customer mindset (Aaker 1996a; Keller, 2001).

2.2.4 Summary of Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H1</th>
<th>Brand Awareness</th>
<th>Print media has a significantly stronger impact upon customers’ perceived brand awareness, in comparison to social media.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Functional Brand Image</td>
<td>Either print or social media has a significantly stronger impact upon customers’ perceived functional brand image, in comparison to the other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Emotional Brand Image - Brand Uniqueness</td>
<td>Either social or print media has a significantly stronger impact upon customers’ perceived brand uniqueness, in comparison to the other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a</td>
<td>Emotional Brand Image - Brand Personality</td>
<td>Brands communicated through social media show a significantly elevated level of Sincerity, in comparison to print media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b</td>
<td>Emotional Brand Image - Brand Personality</td>
<td>Brands communicated through social media show a significantly elevated level of Excitement, in comparison to print media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4c</td>
<td>Emotional Brand Image - Brand Personality</td>
<td>Brands communicated through print media show a significantly elevated level of Competence, in comparison to social media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4d</td>
<td>Emotional Brand Image - Brand Personality</td>
<td>Brands communicated through neither social nor print media show significantly elevated levels of Sophistication, in comparison to the other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4e</td>
<td>Emotional Brand Image - Brand Personality</td>
<td>Brands communicated through neither social nor print media show significantly elevated levels of Ruggedness, in comparison to the other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Willingness to Pay a Price Premium</td>
<td>Print media have a significantly stronger impact upon customers’ willingness to pay a price premium, in comparison to social media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Purchase Intentions</td>
<td>Social media has a significantly stronger impact upon customers’ purchase intentions, in comparison to print media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Summary of hypotheses
3. Methodology

In this section, a description of the research methodology is presented. The reader will be provided with a general exposition on different areas of research, but also an argumentation for the choices made when formulating the methodology of this study.

3.1 Research Strategy

As the purpose of this study is to investigate whether the usage of either print and social media have a relatively stronger impact upon different components of CBBE, a suitable research strategy is required. That is, a strategy well adapted to the nature of the research problem at hand. Research strategy refers to the general orientation in which research is conducted and it is commonly divided into two distinctive clusters – qualitative research and quantitative research (Bryman & Bell, 2011a). Qualitative research tends to be of an inductive nature, where the theoretical reasoning is created from observations and data analysis. In other words, theory is the target outcome of research (Bryman & Bell, 2011a). This research strategy is commonly connected to methods such as interviews, ethnography, focus groups and text analysis (Bryman & Bell 2011a). Meanwhile, a deductive approach implies that the relationships between research and theory is examined through the testing of hypotheses, deduced from an existing theoretical foundation. To test hypotheses, it is common to apply a quantitative research approach, where investigations are conducted by quantification in collection and analysis of data (Bryman & Bell 2011a).

The authors of this study have adopted a deductive approach, as we are under the impression that the current literature in our area of interests constitutes a sufficient foundation, from which hypotheses can be deduced and investigated. Previous research shows that comparisons between traditional and new media are viable (Bezjian-Avery et al., 1998; Stephen & Galak; 2010; Bruhn et al., 2012; Draganska et al., 2014) and that brand personality can be examined from a category personality perspective (Batra et al., 2006; Maehle et al., 2011). Furthermore, the extensive research available in the field of CBBE provides a comprehensive conceptual and theoretical basis (D. Aaker, 1991, 1996b; J. Aaker, 1997; Keller, 1993, 2001). In addition, there are acknowledged publications available that demonstrates how this can be investigated operationally (Yoo et al., 2000; Netemeyer et al., 2004; Lehmann et al., 2008).
This investigation will be made by applying a quantitative research strategy, based on the following three arguments: (1) Measurements in quantitative research make it possible to delineate small differences in the responses from our subjects (Bryman & Bell, 2011a). This is important as we intend to measure the effects of the media itself through an identification of customers’ perceptual differences with regards to print and social media advertising. (2) In addition, these measurements generate more consistent results, not heavily affected by the timing of the data collection or by the subjectivity of the researcher. Nonetheless, the degree of measurement validity must not be neglected (see section 3.4.3). (3) Finally, quantitative research allows for more precise estimates of the relationship between different concepts that are relevant to this study, e.g. the relationship between a social media advertisement and the level of perceived quality (Bryman & Bell, 2011a).

3.2 Research Design – Cross-sectional Survey Research

A research design provides a framework for empirical data collection and subsequent analysis. It reflects the degree of antecedence given to different dimensions of the research process. This study conforms to a research design that is firmly connected to the context of quantitative research strategy, namely the cross-sectional research design. However, cross-sectional research is a broad term that embodies several different modes of procedures (Bryman & Bell, 2011a). In this study, the associated survey research design is applied. Bryman and Bell (2011a) describe survey research as a design where data are collected mainly by a questionnaire on more than one case and at a single point of time. This is made in order to acquire data connected to different variables, which are later investigated to detect patterns of association. Below follows a clarification of the different elements of the design in more detail.

In order to identify the subjects’ different perceptions, the research design includes an empirical data collection method that enables a variety of cases, rather than data from merely one instance. This is in accordance with previous researchers investigating new and traditional media, which increases the likelihood of encountering variation in the variables of interest (Bezjian-Avery et al., 1998; Stephen & Galak, 2010; Bruhn et al., 2012; Draganska et al., 2014). Moreover, it is important to have a systematic and standardized method to enable a consistent gauging of these variations. The subject’s perceptions are examined at one point of time (Bryman & Bell, 2011a). In this case, each subject was asked to provide a response just once, and the data collection process took place during a period of three days. In conclusion, patterns of associations are investigated through an examination of possible relationships between the
different variables. It should however be stated that a cross-sectional design cannot with certainty ensure and compute a causal relationship between two variables, yet it can draw causal inferences and suggest that such a relationship exists (see section 3.4.3 for a further discussion on causality) (Bryman & Bell, 2011a; 54).

3.2.2 Structure of the Cross-sectional Design

This research includes the perceptions of customers, which are not quantities per se. Therefore, the study is utilizing indicators, which represent perception concepts that are not directly quantifiable. Indicators in this study are devised from a series of questions in a survey (see section 3.3.1) (Bryman & Bell, 2011a).

The cross-sectional research design comprises a collection of data on a series of variables, where $Obs$ represents an observation made in relation to a variable and $n$ is the number of observations. The observed variables represent the different indicators mentioned above and the observations are made for each respondent of the study, referred to as $Case_n$. The data are ordered into a matrix, as depicted in table 3 (Bryman & Bell, 2011a). For each separate case, data are available for all variables of interest in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example of Cross-sectional Research Data Rectangle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obs₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseₙ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3. An example of the construct of a research data rectangle used in cross-sectional research.*

3.3 Research Method

The research method refers to the applied technique and practical execution of empirical data collection (Bryman & Bell, 2011a). There are three major sources for collecting quantitative data; through surveys, through observations and by using secondary data sources. Some are
more suitable than others depending on the nature of the study and the amount of previously collected data applicable for research (Easterby-Smith et al., 2008). In this case, the empirical material consists of primary data collected for this particular study, as our intention is to investigate components of CBBE, which previously have not been examined in the light of print and social media (Easterby-Smith et al., 2008).

3.3.1 Self-completion Questionnaire

The empirical data was collected by a self-completion questionnaire accessed online (henceforth referred to as survey). The survey consisted mainly of closed questions, which made it easier for the subjects to respond, but also enabled a pre-coding of the questions into indicators facilitating the subsequent computerized analysis (Bryman & Bell, 2011a). The survey was centered around two fictitious brands, a fashion retailer and a furniture retailer advertised in print and social media, on which the participants were asked to express their opinion (see picture 1 and 2).

![Picture 1. Advertising from Sänggiganten](image1)

![Picture 2. Advertising from Kim.se](image2)

Half of the respondents were exposed to the fashion retailer in print media and the furniture retailer in social media, whereas the other half were exposed to identical advertisements, but in the opposite media. This was made in order to identify differences in the respondents’ perceptions of a brand, with the only difference being the media in which it was advertised. A further discussion of the creation of these brands and their associated advertisements is presented in section 3.3.3.
In terms of the questioning format we made use of Likert scales, that provided five-point response alternatives, in an interval scale. These alternatives had a natural ordering from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”, with a neutral mid-point. Hence the two response alternatives, on each side of the neutral mid-point, represented moderate or extreme views for, or against the asked statement (Easterby-Smith et al., 2008). It can be discussed whether or not the respondents should be able to express a neutral opinion, as both the presence and the absence of a neutral mid-point may lead to distortions of the result (Garland, 1991). With this being said, we have chosen to include a five-point Likert scale, much due to the fact that a large portion of our survey rests upon the framework Dimensions of Brand Personality, in which such a scale was used (J. Aaker, 1997). We further motivate this approach to scaling, as it has been utilized by several researchers in the past (Siguaw et al., 1999; Kim et al., 2001; Yoo & Donthu, 2001; Esch et al., 2006; Hosany et al., 2006).

The questions included in the study are stemming to a great extent from the established brand personality framework created by J. Aaker (1997). These questions are included to test hypothesis $H4a-H4e$. Brand personality is, however, merely one ingredient in our conceptual framework (see figure 3). In order to evaluate print and social media’s impact upon the components of customer mindset and CBBE, we have drawn upon established measurements developed by previous researchers. In the measurement of brand awareness and testing of hypothesis $H1$, metrics developed by Yoo et al. (2000) have been utilized, as these have been used in different studies of CBBE in the past (Washburn & Plank, 2002; Attilgan et al., 2005; Mohd Yasin et al., 2007; Kim & Hyun, 2011). The measurements of the functional and emotional brand image (brand personality excluded) components, as well as customers’ willingness to pay a price premium have been derived from the works of Netemeyer et al. (2004) in order to test hypothesis $H2$, $H3$ and $H5$. We include these metrics, as they have been identified as core components in the creation of CBBE, furthermore these metrics are said to be operational across different product categories (Netemeyer et al., 2004). In addition, the metrics have been used in previous research (Buil et al., 2008; 2013; Anselmsson et al., 2014).

The final part of our conceptual framework, purchase intentions, has been measured through the metrics of Keller (as cited in Lehmann et al., 2008). This metric has, much like the ones by Netemeyer et al. (2004), proved to be useful across product categories, and will therefore be used for the testing of hypothesis $H6$ (Lehmann et al., 2008). The measurements used in this study are both of a descriptive and inferential nature. All metrics used and the studies from which the inferential measurements are derived, can be found in Table 4.
SURVEY ITEMS

Determinants of Inclusion or Exclusion in the Study
1. How often do you visit Facebook?
2. How often do you read a printed newspaper or a copy of a printed paper in a pdf-version on a tablet or computer? (i.e. not only news from a website)

Liking
1. I like the name of the brand in the ad
2. I like this ad

Suitability of Media
1. I find appropriate for (brand) to advertise in "Dagens Nyheter"
2. I find it appropriate for (brand) to advertise on Facebook

Brand Personality & Brand Personality Traits (J. Aaker, 1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sincerity</th>
<th>Excitement</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Sophistication</th>
<th>Ruggedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Down-to-Earth</td>
<td>Daring</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>Upper class</td>
<td>Outdoorsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-oriented</td>
<td>Trendy</td>
<td>Hard working</td>
<td>Glamorous</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-town</td>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>Good looking</td>
<td>Western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>Spirited</td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>Charming</td>
<td>Tough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>Rugged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>Smooth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesome</td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>Successful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Unique</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>Up-to-date</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentimetal</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>Contemporary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceived Brand Awareness (Yoo et al. 2000)
1. I instantly recognize several of the characteristics that this brand possesses.
2. I have no problems memorizing the symbol/logotype of this brand
3. I feel that I have a good overall view of this brand

Perceived Quality (Netemeyer et al. 2004)
1. In comparison to other stores, I get the feeling that this brand is of high quality
2. I get the feeling that this brand is the best in its product category
3. I get the feeling that this brand is better than others in the same product category

Perceived Value for the Cost (Netemeyer et al. 2004)
1. I get the feeling that what I get from this brand is well worth the cost
2. With factors such as time, price and effort from my side in mind, I get the feeling that products from this brand is a good buy
3. In comparison to similar products from other brands, I get the feeling that this brand provides good value for the money

Uniqueness (Netemeyer et al. 2004)
1. This brand seemingly differs from other brands with similar products
2. This brand really stands out in comparison to other brands in the same category
3. This brand feels unique in comparison to other brands in the same category

Price Premium (Netemeyer et al. 2004)
1. I would be willing to pay a higher price for products from this brand in comparison to products from other brands in the same category
2. I am willing to pay significantly more for a product from this brand in comparison to other brands from the same category

Purchase Intentions (Keller, as cited in Lehmann et al. 2008)
1. I plan to purchase from this brand in the future
2. If I purchase this kind of products, its likely that I would purchase from this brand

N.B: some questions were slightly rephrased in order to be more suitable in Swedish.

Table 4. A description of the items included in the survey and the authors from which the items are derived.
In order to identify potential confusions and errors in the survey design, it was sent to seven of our colleagues for screening and third-party feedback. After this peer-review, the design was sent to Nordstat, a European field work agency, which was willing to sponsor us with the encoding of the survey and collection of data. The initial survey questions are determinants of inclusion or exclusion in the sample, along with demographic metrics in order to ensure that the characteristics of the respondents were in line with our sample requirements. The following questions were mandatory and assorted into categories based on which CBBE-component they concerned. These categories were also divided into two overall parts, where part A was comprised of categories with reference to the Brand Personality-component and part B concerned the other components of customer mindset (see table 4). The categories’ order of appearance was randomized within each overall part. Similarly, the arrangement of questions was randomized within each category. The purpose of this randomization was to detract any recurring measurement error, which may occur during extensive survey questioning, as a consequence of respondent “fatigue effects” (Bradley & Daly, 1994; Malholtra et al., 2007). To further cope with this potential “fatigue effect”, the survey design allowed the respondents to answer each question, for both advertisements, on the same occasion.

3.3.2 The Selection of Media

In terms of the representatives of the categories of print and social media, we have chosen to use the Swedish daily newspaper Dagens Nyheter for the former and the social network Facebook for the latter. The reason for choosing Dagens Nyheter to represent print media, rests upon its position as the biggest daily newspaper in Sweden. Dagens Nyheter publishes approximately one-third as many editions each year, relative to the second biggest daily newspaper (Sveriges Annonsörers mediekommitté för dagspress, 2015). Because of its magnitude, we are under the impression that the results generated by the usage of this print media will be of relevance for other Swedish media, belonging to the same category. The choice of Facebook is based on a similar argument as it is not only the biggest social network, in terms of active users, in Sweden, but also worldwide (Davidsson, 2014). As per 2016, Facebook has 1,59 billion active users worldwide, and 5,6 out of Sweden's total population of 9,8 million inhabitants currently have an active membership (Statista, 2016; Statistics Sweden, 2016). This naturally establishes Facebook as the most substantial social media available and, much like in the case of Dagens Nyheter, we are under the impression that the results generated with regards to this social media is relevant to the category as a whole.
3.3.3 The Creation of Fictional Advertisement

In order to evaluate the impact that print and social media have upon the creation of CBBE, we made use of two different fictitious brands and advertisements. The reason for using fictional, as opposed to existing brands, stems from our desire to eliminate as many external factors as possible, which may affect the confidence with which we can identify causal relationships between the variables (Bryman & Bell, 2011a). We have previously raised some concern with regards to the findings of Bruhn et al. (2012), due to their use of existing brands, potentially known to the respondents. We are under the impression that, in order to evaluate a media’s impact upon CBBE creation, one should try to minimize the amount of previous associations toward a brand, that is held by the respondents. Bearing this in mind, we chose to create two different brands, “Sänggiganten” and “Kim.se”, both engineered as to belong in the retail sector. The former, poses as a furniture retailer, whereas the latter poses as a clothing retailer. The reason for choosing the retail sector and the two sub-categories of furniture and clothing is based on observational fieldwork and secondary data sources. In the observational fieldwork, we conducted an investigation upon the most frequently advertised industries in Aftonbladet and Dagens Nyheter, two of Sweden’s largest newspapers (Sveriges Annonsörers mediekommitté för dagspress, 2015). In total, ten editions of each newspaper were examined, covering each weekday over a period of two months, and the results revealed that furniture and clothing retailers are the most frequently advertised sub-categories of the retail industry (see Appendix A). The decision of utilizing clothing and furniture retailers is further strengthened by a social media analysis of the retail sector conducted in 2014. This analysis found clothing retailers to be the most connected to social media, whereas home goods, although displaying growth in the social media arena, were less connected (Yesmail Interactive, 2014). In addition, Charlotte Almlöf Andersson (personal communication, 17 May 2016), Business Director at the advertising agency Starcom confirms that clothing retailers are among the biggest advertising spenders in social media. Including both retailers is thus an attempt to reduce biased results, that might occur if only one of the two had been utilized. Since one is seemingly more inclined towards social media, whereas the other is more connected to print media. An inclination that we have highlighted by adding the Swedish domain “.se” in the brand name of Kim.se. With this being said, we are under the impression that the fictional furniture and clothing retailing advertisements, provide us with a sound basis for evaluating the impact of print and new media upon CBBE.
It should also be stated that the graphical design, as well as the brand names were constructed to be as neutral as possible. In terms of naming, Kim.se has been named as such, since “Kim” is among the most common gender-neutral names in Sweden (Statistics Sweden, 2011). The name of Sänggiganten, on the other hand, has been inspired by other brands in similar retail categories in order to seem realistic yet remain fairly neutral. In the advertisements’ graphical design, we merely included objects that are not attributed to a certain gender or hold previous associations, since some products such as jeans have been found to possess certain brand personalities, e.g. Ruggedness (Batra et al., 2006). The Sänggiganten advertisement solely displays a bed, a product that is equally used by men and women. In the fashion advertisement of Kim.se, we excluded people and apparel that could be associated with a certain clothing style. Instead, simply a zipper was shown in order to graphically represent clothing. In addition, the advertisements had similar written messages and neither prices nor discounts were displayed, thus eliminating potential associations in the mind of the respondent. As of the questionnaire, the advertisements were embedded as both a sponsored post on Facebook and as an advertisement in Dagens Nyheter. The media background was identical for both Sänggiganten and Kim.se, with the only exception being the image caption on Facebook that was slightly adjusted for each brand. Lastly, the user-response alternatives on Facebook, such as comments, likes and shares were blurred to further minimize influence from external factors. The advertisements can be found in appendix B.

3.3.4 Processing and Analysis of the Collected Data

In the survey that was sent to Nordstat for collection of data, five background variables were included to be used as descriptive statistics. These variables were; gender, age, frequency of Facebook usage, frequency of newspaper exposure, liking and media suitability. The initial two variables were intended to be used as means of ensuring that our requested distribution of respondents were met, and are thus primarily of a descriptive character. The inclusion of the frequency of usage of Facebook and exposure to newspapers, on the other hand, were essential in order to secure that our respondents were eligible for participation in the study, and that the study did not generate misleading results. The measures of liking and suitability of media was included in order to increase the respondent’s awareness of the different media, but also as a means to examine if there was a difference in the respondents’ perception of the fictional advertisements per se.
The data collected by Nordstat was conveniently adapted to the statistical analysis software SPSS, and were processed through a number of statistical analyses deemed as being relevant for this particular study. The statistical measurement of arithmetic mean (henceforth referred to as mean) was utilized throughout the processing of the data, and the reason for using the mean, rather than the median, has its foundation in the design of the survey. As previously mentioned, a five-point Likert scale was used in the collection of the data, which motivates the usage of mean. Since, the answers provided through a Likert scale is contained between a number of predetermined values, in this case between 1-5, and thus no outliers exist (Körner & Wahlgren, 2012). In addition to this, and as mentioned earlier, the scale is of an interval nature, which further motivates the use of mean (Körner & Wahlgren, 2012). To conclude our motivation of the usage of mean, we refer to previous researchers processing the data in a similar manner (J. Aaker, 1997; Yoo et al., 2000).

One of the tests that we subjected our data to was Cronbach’s Alpha, which is a measurement of reliability and internal consistency. The test itself can be viewed as an indicator of the general correlation between a number of variables, and whether they are measuring the same construct or not. This test is very beneficial in our case as we are interested in parallel measurements of different variables, in order to determine their correlation to a larger phenomenon, which Cronbach’s Alpha permits (Bryman & Bell, 2011b). The alpha coefficient varies between 0 and 1, in which 0 equals no existing reliability and 1 equals perfect reliability. There has been a debate with regards to what level the alpha coefficient should exhibit in order to be acceptable. Some argue that this level should be on either 0.7 or 0.8, whereas others argue that no specific level is needed in order for the test to be acceptable, in terms of reliability (Malholtra & Birks, 2003; Bryman & Bell, 2011b; Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). There is, however, consensus that a high alpha coefficient is more reliable than a low equivalent (Malholtra & Birks, 2003; Bryman & Bell, 2011b).

To distinguish statistically significant differences in the means of the advertisements and the usage of print and social media, we utilized the function Custom tables, which is embedded within SPSS. Custom tables was deemed as the best option for distinguishing possible statistically significant results, as it allows for the development of personalized tables and inclusion of multiple variables, without compromising the results (Wahlgren, 2012).
3.3.5 Cluster Sampling

A sample refers to a segment of a population that is subjected to examination. A population is a constellation of units, from where the sample is selected and destined to represent (Bryman & Bell, 2011a). The sample frame in this study consists of approximately 93,000 Swedish panelists that have been randomly selected by Nordstat, in order to constitute a representable population, from which generalizations can be made (Nordstat, 2015). The sample in this study aims to represent the population of citizens living in urban areas in Sweden, as approximately 85 percent of the Swedish population reside in densely built-up areas (Statistics Sweden, 2013). Sweden poses as a suitable target population, in terms of gathering data on print and social media, since 68 percent of all Swedes are active users on Facebook and 48 percent visit new media platforms on a daily basis (Davidsson, 2014). In addition, Sweden has had a traditionally strong industry of print media, which has experienced a decline in recent years (Weibull et al., 2016). In this study, we have used a cluster sampling method due to its efficiency, as a simple random sample would require all Swedish citizens to have an equal chance of being part of the sample (Easterby-Smith et al., 2008). In that case, every urban area in Sweden would have been part of the sample frame. Instead, with the use of cluster sampling some selected urban areas, or clusters, constitutes the primary sampling unit, in order to represent the entire population (Bryman & Bell, 2011a). A benefit of making a cluster sample with randomly selected respondents, is that findings derived from the sample can be generalized to the entire population (Bryman & Bell, 2011a). The clusters of this sample are the five biggest counties in Sweden; Stockholm, Västra Götaland, Skåne, Uppsala and Västmanland (Statistics Sweden, 2013). A proportionate amount of respondents has been randomly sampled from each county, in order to represent the national urban population.

Cluster sampling can entail stratification, which is a method to ensure that the population is accurately represented. Based on a criterion, respondents are categorized into different groups from which random samples are collected (Bryman & Bell, 2011a; Easterby-Smith et al., 2008). Our sample was divided into four equally sized strata (25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-65) that were limited to an interval between 25 to 65 years. The minimum age criterion for inclusion was set to 25 years, as we are of the notion that few individuals of an age younger than 25 are likely to be responsive to advertising that is communicating furniture in general and bed articles in particular. Meanwhile, the determination of the maximum age limit is based on the Swedish population’s use of Facebook, as individuals of an age of 65 or older tend to use Facebook to a remarkably lower extent, than younger age groups (Findahl & Davidsson, 2015). As a final
criterion for inclusion, each respondent was asked on how frequently they used Facebook and read a printed (or PDF-equivalent) newspaper edition (see table 4). A selection of the response alternative never led to an immediate closure of the survey, as these respondents were considered unfit for participation.

3.4 Evaluation Criteria and Critique

3.4.1 Replication

Quantitative research can be evaluated through the criterion of replication, and replicability in particular. This means that other researchers, by reading a study, should be able to reproduce the same research on their own. For this to be feasible, the research process must be presented in a clear and explicit fashion (Bryman & Bell, 2011a). Our efforts to meet this criterion can be reflected by our extensive accounts of the work process in the methodology chapter and its subsequent chapters, together with attached appendices.

3.4.2 Reliability

Reliability is the degree to which the results of a study are repeatable, and is particularly at issue in connection with quantitative research, such as this study. The term refers to whether a measure is stable. That is, if a repetition of the study would receive the same results if repeated. Large fluctuations in the results implies that the measures are unreliable (Bryman & Bell, 2011a). In our cross-sectional research design, the reliability criteria are primarily related to the quality and consistency of the measures used to gauge the different CBBE concepts (Bryman & Bell, 2011a). The reliability is associated with three factors; stability, internal reliability and inter-observer consistency. Stability refers to whether or not a measure for a sample is stable over time and does not fluctuate, if tested again. The degree of stability is usually measured by a test-retest method, where a test is carried out on one occasion and later repeated on the same sample at another time (Bryman & Bell, 2011a). However, as of this study a limited time-frame hinders the possibility to conduct a test-retest on the sample, hence the stability cannot be guaranteed. As of internal reliability, the key issue is whether or not the respondents’ answers tend to be consistent. It is associated with the use of multiple-indicator measures, which is a method where all the respondents’ answers are aggregated to form a cumulative item. If the aggregated indicators are not related to the same thing, the item may be indicating something different than what it is intended to do. In order to measure the internal reliability in this study, we used the most widely used objective measure of reliability, namely Cronbach’s Alpha (Tavakol &
Dennick, 2011). Alpha values have been used to test the internal reliability of scales in previous studies on both CBBE and new and traditional media (Yoo et al., 2000; Kim et al., 2001; Bryman & Bell, 2011a; Bruhn et al., 2012; Anselmsson et al., 2014). The final reliability factor is inter-observer consistency, which refers to the degree of consistency in the subjective translation of data when several researchers’ part-take in the same investigation (Bryman & Bell, 2011a). Although there are two authors of this study, inter-observer consistency is not expected to be affected to a great extent, as the survey contains closed questions and therefore leaves little room for subjective interpretation.

### 3.4.3 Measurement Validity, Causality and External Validity

*Measurement validity* refers to whether the questions asked and the measurement of the outcome, actually concern the concepts that the researchers are supposed to examine. Consequently, if there are doubts about the measurement validity, the findings will be questioned. If a measure is unstable, which can manifest itself in incoherent outcomes, it cannot be considered to constitute a valid measure for its concept (Bryman & Bell, 2011a). As mentioned before, this study applies established measurements developed by previous researchers as an arrangement to ensure the measurement validity (Yoo et al., 2000; Netemeyer et al., 2004; Lehmann et al., 2008).

*Causality* is concerned with the degree of confidence that an independent variable is causing a variation, identified in the dependent variable. This is affected by the probability that external factors may have an impact on the variation of the dependent variable (Bryman & Bell, 2011a). The causality of a cross-sectional research design is weak, as it produces associations, rather than findings, from which inferences can be made (Bryman & Bell, 2011a). In order to strengthen the confidence in our identifications of causal relationships, we have taken measures to eliminate the impact of external factors. A detailed account of these measures can be found in section 3.3.3.

External validity refers to the feasibility of generalizing conclusions beyond a specific research context, and is heavily based on the research sample (Bryman & Bell, 2011a). The sample can be reviewed by two basic principles; representativeness and precision. A sample’s representativeness is the accuracy of conclusions drawn from a sample, and is dependent on whether the characteristics of the sample are the same as the population it is supposed to represent (Easterby-Smith et al., 2008). In this respect, Nordstat (2015) claims to provide
samples representative of the Swedish population. However, as the sampling was conducted by an external actor, we cannot fully guarantee that this is the case. The other principle, precision, refers to how credible a sample is. That is, whether the sample is of sufficient size, in order to draw credible conclusions on the population (Easterby-Smith et al., 2008). A sufficient sample size is related to the size of the population. However, as the population size increases, the comparative sample size increase required for it to be representative, diminishes and remains relatively constant at slightly more than 380 cases. This indicates that this study has a sufficient sample size (see section 4.1.1) (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970).
4. Empirical Results and Analysis

In this chapter, the empirical results will be described in detail and subjected to further analysis. Initially, the sample will be presented, followed by a review of the measurement reliability. Lastly, the results from each component of our conceptual framework will be presented and our hypotheses will be tested as well as discussed based upon our theoretical framework.

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

4.1.1 Sample Screening

The sample received from Nordstat consisted of 493 respondents and was initially screened in order to remove cases that were not considered credible and suitable for the study. The screening process involved the removal of respondents that had been notably uninvolved and, for example, provided the same response alternative on all questions. In addition, the two personality traits original and real were used as indicators of response bias, as these two factors are very similar and thus should generate fairly corresponding answers. With that being said, respondents who provided answers with intervals greater than two on these brand personalities were discarded. The final and adjusted sample consisted of 426 eligible respondents and their answers constitute the basis for the results presented throughout this chapter.

4.1.2 Sample Characteristics

The sample was geographically divided into the five major counties in Sweden, namely Stockholm, Västra Götaland, Skåne, Uppsala and Västmanland. This was made in order to cover the five major cities of Sweden, which are located in these counties, and the sample is distributed in order to meet the relative size of each county.
In terms of age distribution, the average age was 44.17 years (st. dev. 11.7) and the sample was categorized into the following four age group strata; 25-34, 35-44, 45-54 and 55-65. The distribution of respondents is shown in Table 6. Notably, the age distribution was not allocated in line with our ambition of equally sized strata and was therefore weighted in SPSS, in order to be more evenly distributed.

As a determinant of inclusion or exclusion in the study, the respondents were inquired on their media usage. The results showed that a clear majority of the respondents read newspapers on a weekly or monthly basis and that they visit Facebook even more frequently. As mentioned in the research methodology chapter, the sample was divided into two different groupings that were shown the same advertisements but in different media. In sample 1, Sänggiganten was advertised on Facebook and Kim.se was advertised in Dagens Nyheter. In sample 2,
Sänggiganten was advertised in Dagens Nyheter and Kim.se was advertised on Facebook. Sample 1 consisted of 48,5 percent of the adjusted sample and had a gender distribution of 57 percent men and 43 percent women. Whereas sample 2 consisted of 51,5 percent of the respondents, with a gender distribution of 54 percent men and 46 percent women. All information with regards to the sample distribution can be found in table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Response Alternative</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Sample 1</th>
<th>Sample 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you visit Facebook?</td>
<td>1=Several times a week, 5=Never</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you read a printed newspaper or a copy of a printed paper in a pdf-version on a tablet or computer? (i.e. not only news from a website)</td>
<td>1=Several times a week, 5=Never</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. The distribution of the sample and frequency of exposure to media

4.1.3 Liking and Suitability of Media

The respondents were initially asked to submit their opinion on the two advertisements in terms of liking and each brand’s suitability, in the particular media (see table 4). The results generated through these questions were intended to mainly be used as descriptive statistics. A comparison of means across the two different samples resulted in two statistically significant outcomes; (1) respondents showed a significantly ($p = 0.05$) higher liking of Sänggiganten when advertised in Facebook compared to when advertised in Dagens Nyheter. (2) The advertisement of Sänggiganten was considered to be significantly ($p = 0.01$) more suitable in Dagens Nyheter than on Facebook.

4.2 Measurement Reliability

After subjecting our data to the previously mentioned screening process, we were interested in investigating the reliability of our data. For the purpose of doing so, we utilized the estimate of Cronbach’s Alpha. All CBBE-measures of brand awareness, perceived value for the cost, perceived quality, uniqueness, willingness to pay a price premium, purchase intentions as well as the measures of the five brand personalities were subjected to this test. The results generated through the Cronbach’s alpha test are portrayed in table 8.
Table 8. Cronbach’s Alpha estimates for all CBBE-measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall CBBE Measurements</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Awareness</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Quality</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value for the Cost</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. to pay a Price Premium</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intentions</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Personality Dimensions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophistication</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruggedness</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As per the table, the CBBE-measures demonstrated consistently high estimates of the alpha coefficient, ranging between 0.705 to 0.946. These results are all exceeding the most commonly recommended level of acceptance, which is 0.7 (Bland & Altman, 1997; Tavakol & Dennick, 2011; Bryman & Bell, 2011b). This indicates that there are high levels of correlations between the items included in each of the overall CBBE components (Bryman & Bell, 2011b). In conclusion, the results generated by the Cronbach’s alpha test indicates that the underlying items are, in fact, good measurements of the overall construct that they are intended to measure.

4.3 Results with Regards to the Overall CBBE Measurements

The Cronbach’s alpha test, as mentioned above, provided us with results that indicated that our measurements were reliable, with high internal correlation between the items used to measure a bigger construct. With this knowledge as a basis, the data was subjected to further examination, with regards to whether the usage of print or social media had a significant impact upon the different components of CBBE. The presentation of the results will follow the design of our conceptual framework and the most important metrics of mean, statistical significance as
well as standard deviation have been included in the tables. In order to draw conclusions on the overall CBBE measurements of brand awareness, perceived quality, perceived value for the cost, brand uniqueness, willingness to pay a price premium and purchase intentions, a summarization of the items that construct each measurement, has also been included. It should be noted that the statistical significance is the most interesting result generated from the processing of the data, as it demonstrates whether the mean of two compared variables are significantly different. If such a scenario occurs, the significant variable is attributed with one of two capital letters; the print media of Dagens Nyheter is in this case represented by A, and the social media Facebook by B. This is shown in e.g. table 13, where the letter A can be found under the the column “statistical significance”, meaning that the brand of Sänggiganten are perceived as being significantly more “Cheerful”, when being marketed through Facebook, in comparison to Dagens Nyheter. In the tables presented throughout this chapter, the degree of significance is marked with either one (*) or two (**) asterisks, where one asterisk represents a $p$-value (Sig. 2-tailed) equal to, or lower than 5 percent and two asterisks represent a $p$-value equal to, or lower than 1 percent (Körner & Wahlgren, 2006).

4.3.1 Brand Awareness

*Results*

The first component of our conceptual framework is the measurement of brand awareness, which is estimated through the three items developed by Yoo et al. (2000) (see table 4). No significant differences between media or brands were identified for this component, neither when the items were summarized nor when measured independently. In terms of means, the ratings varied somewhat between the two brands, with Sänggiganten having higher ratings on item 1 and 3, whereas Kim.se showed higher ratings on item 2. However, internally the means proved to be very similar. In terms of standard deviation, the results indicate a somewhat lower coherence with regards to the ratings of Sänggiganten in comparison to Kim.se.
Table 9. Results with regards to mean, statistical significance and standard deviation for the component of brand awareness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Std. Deviation 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>Std. Deviation 2</th>
<th>Mean 3</th>
<th>Std. Deviation 3</th>
<th>Mean 4</th>
<th>Std. Deviation 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Awareness 1.</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Awareness 2.</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Awareness 3.</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarized Brand</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis, Testing of Hypothesis H1 and Discussion

According to these results, we reject hypothesis H1 (Print media has a significantly stronger impact upon customers’ perceived brand awareness, in comparison to social media), as no significant difference in the impact on the customers’ perceived brand awareness can be derived from the print media advertisements. Our results therefore suggest that neither of the two media, per se, are transmitting a perception of elevated levels of awareness upon the advertised brands. Previous researchers show that traditional media has a stronger impact on brand awareness than new media (Bruhn et al., 2012; Draganska et al., 2014), which is contradictory to our results. It is likely that the difference in results derives from the application of different research methodologies, as the studies indicating a traditional media superiority, in terms of brand awareness, utilized existing brands in their investigations in comparison to our fictional counterparts (Bruhn et al., 2012; Draganska et al., 2014).

4.3.2 Functional Brand Image

Results

The second component included in our conceptual framework is that of functional brand image, which is measured through the metrics of perceived quality and perceived value for the cost, based on three survey items each, derived from Netemeyer et al. (2004). In similarity to the component of brand awareness, no significant differences, derived from the use of social or print media upon the brands of Sänggiganten and Kim.se, were to be found in this component. Sänggiganten has continuously higher ratings in terms of mean, in comparison to Kim.se, but once again, these ratings proved to be very similar internally between the two brands. Lastly,
the standard deviation showed fairly steady ratings upon all items used in the functional brand image component.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Kim.se 1</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Säggiğanten 2</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Dagom Njehot (A) 1</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Facebook (B) 2</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Dagom Njehot (A) 1</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Quality 1</td>
<td>2,29</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1,11</td>
<td>2,18</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,99</td>
<td>2,49</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1,06</td>
<td>2,35</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,35</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Quality 2</td>
<td>1,86</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,98</td>
<td>1,62</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>2,04</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1,01</td>
<td>1,93</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1,02</td>
<td>1,93</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1,02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Quality 3</td>
<td>1,52</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,89</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,91</td>
<td>2,05</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,99</td>
<td>2,01</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1,05</td>
<td>2,01</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1,05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarized Perceived Quality</td>
<td>2,03</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,97</td>
<td>1,97</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,84</td>
<td>2,19</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,93</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,95</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Results with regards to mean, statistical significance and standard deviation for the measure of perceived quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Kim.se 1</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Säggiğanten 2</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Dagom Njehot (A) 1</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Facebook (B) 2</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Dagom Njehot (A) 1</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value for the Cost 1</td>
<td>2,21</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,99</td>
<td>2,11</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,97</td>
<td>2,43</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1,07</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1,07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value for the Cost 2</td>
<td>2,25</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,18</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,98</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1,02</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1,03</td>
<td>2,58</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1,03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value for the Cost 3</td>
<td>2,25</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,95</td>
<td>2,12</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,95</td>
<td>2,41</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1,05</td>
<td>2,56</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,98</td>
<td>2,56</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarized Perceived Value for the Cost</td>
<td>2,24</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>2,14</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,89</td>
<td>2,45</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,94</td>
<td>2,57</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,95</td>
<td>2,57</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0,95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Results with regards to mean, statistical significance and standard deviation for the measure of perceived value for the cost.

Analysis, Testing of Hypothesis H2 and Discussion

Previous research show that both traditional and new media have a significant effect on the functional brand image (Bruhn et al., 2012). However, when compared to each other, our findings suggest that none of the two media have a significantly stronger impact upon this component, neither on the individual items nor when summarized. Hence, we reject hypothesis H2 (Either print or social media has a significantly stronger impact upon customers’ perceived functional brand image, in comparison to the other). As in the case of the component of brand awareness, the usage of
fictional brands and advertisements may have affected the respondent's' ability to evaluate the perceived value for the cost and perceived quality. Consequently, we suggest that no media has a relatively stronger impact upon the functional image component, compared to the other. However, we can not rule out that such an impact may exist, when using existing brands instead of fictional equivalents.

4.3.3 Emotional Brand Image

Results

The emotional brand image component was measured by perceived brand uniqueness and brand personality. No significant differences between print and social media were found with regards to perceived brand uniqueness. Kim.se has slightly higher ratings in terms of mean for both media, in comparison to Sänggiganen. Still, these ratings proved to be very similar internally between the two brands. The standard deviation showed similar ratings across both brands and the two media.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness 1.</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness 2.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness 3.</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarized  Uniqueness</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Results with regards to mean, statistical significance and standard deviation for the measure of uniqueness.

Analysis, Testing of Hypothesis H3 and Discussion

As per the results presented in table 12, we reject H3 (Either social or print media has a significantly stronger impact upon customers' perceived brand uniqueness, in comparison to the other), as no statistical findings were present in terms of the customers’ perceived brand uniqueness. This is in line with the previous findings by Bruhn et al. (2012). However, the rejection of this hypothesis does not imply that the whole component of emotional brand equity is unaffected by the usage of either
print or social media. Since, we also incorporate brand personality as a measurement of this component.

The brand personality part of emotional brand image was measured through the metrics developed by J. Aaker (1997). The initial intention was to gauge the impact of print and social media upon the five dimensions; Sincerity, Excitement, Competence, Sophistication and Ruggedness. Such an examination was additionally strengthened by the Cronbach’s Alpha tests presented earlier (see table 8.). Despite exhibiting high estimates of the alpha coefficient, grouping of the underlying items that construct these five dimensions proved to be unfruitful. We found this to be rather odd, due to indications of significant differences, when subjecting these individual personality traits to a custom tables test. A further examination of the reliability of the five dimensions, and whether they were good indicators of the measurements of these five bigger constructs, was therefore performed through a factor analysis. The factor analysis indicated that the reliability was questionable and suggested that six dimensions ought to be used, rather than five. Not doing so, would render approximately 38 percent of the results useless (see appendix. C). Consequently, we decided to examine the 42 individual personality traits included in the five dimensions, rather than analyzing these dimensions as a whole. By disassembling the personality dimension constructs, we are able to analyze whether print and social media shows indications of impacting the personality of a brand. However, by doing so, we are not able to draw conclusions, on whether these two categories of media possess different category personalities, but merely if they show signs of possessing individual personality traits.

Results with regards to the personality traits of Sincerity

The first brand personality dimension included in J. Aaker’s (1997) framework is that of Sincerity, which is constructed by a total of eleven personality traits. In terms of significant differences between the usage of social media and print media, one emerged in the case of Sänggiganten through the personality trait “Cheerful”. Apart from this statistically significant difference, both brands and media showed fairly similar means, with Sänggiganten having somewhat higher ratings in general. Finally, there seems to be an elevated level of consistency regarding the ratings of the personality traits among the respondents, as the standard deviation is consistent around 1.
Table 13. Results with regards to mean, statistical significance and standard deviation for the individual traits of the brand dimension Sincerity.

Analysis, Testing of Hypothesis H4a and Discussion with regards to the personality traits of Sincerity

The significant difference between the identical advertisements communicated through Facebook and Dagens Nyheter indicates that the respondents perceive Sänggiganten as significantly more "Cheerful", when communicated through social media, in comparison to print media. Therefore, we can not reject H4a (Brands communicated through social media show a significantly elevated level of Sincerity, in comparison to print media), as Sänggiganten showed a significantly elevated rating on one of the personality traits included in the personality dimension of Sincerity. Thus, there are, at least, indications of the presence of this personality dimension in the category of social media. Meanwhile, one cannot rule out that this significant difference is affected by the respondents’ significantly higher liking of Sänggiganten when advertised on Facebook (see section 4.1.3).

Results with regards to the personality traits of Excitement

The second dimension of brand personality is Excitement, which also includes a total of eleven underlying personality traits. As per table 14, one significant difference was found within this dimension as well, in this case, however, the difference was attributed to the brand of Kim.se. This brand showed significantly higher ratings on the personality trait “Young”, when advertised through Facebook. In terms of mean, the ratings were generally higher on Kim.se in comparison to Sänggiganten. The consistency of the ratings among the respondents, on the
different personality traits, were greater when evaluating Sänggiganen in contrast to Kim.se, which is revealed through the standard deviation.

Analysis, Testing of Hypothesis H4b and Discussion with regards to the personality traits of Excitement

The results generated in terms of the second brand dimension, Excitement, obstruct the ability to reject H4b (Brands communicated through social media show a significantly elevated level of Excitement, in comparison to print media). Since, the findings suggest that social media possesses, at least, one of the personality traits contained within this brand personality dimension. The media's possession of this particular personality trait could be attributed to the fact that social media platforms, such as Facebook, are a relatively new phenomenon. Whereas, print media has been a part of the media landscape for a substantially longer time (Pollay, 1985; Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). In addition to this, the active users of social media are often attributed as being members of younger generations, which might lead to the transfer of a “Young” personality trait upon a brand, even though older generations show signs of becoming increasingly active on new media platforms (Findahl & Davidsson, 2015).

Results with regards to the personality traits of Competence

The brand personality dimension of Competence includes nine underlying personality traits and a number of significant differences emerged as these were subjected to the custom tables test. The significant differences were limited to the brand of Kim.se and involved, as per table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Kim.se</th>
<th>Sänggiganen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Statistical Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trendy</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daring</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirited</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Var-to-date</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Results with regards to mean, statistical significance and standard deviation for the individual traits of the brand dimension excitement.
15, the personality traits of; Hard working, Secure, Intelligent, Corporate and Leader. In terms of mean, no specific pattern emerges, but it should be noted that the respondents seem to be more unanimous with regards to their ratings, in comparison to the dimensions of Sincerity and Excitement, as the standard deviation ranges between 0.86 and 1.06.

Table 15. Results with regards to mean, statistical significance and standard deviation for the individual traits of the brand dimension competence.

Analysis, Testing of Hypothesis H4c and Discussion with regards to the personality traits of Competence

Print media’s position as a fourth estate in society was assumed to be reflected in the customers’ perceptions on the brand personality dimension of Competence. In addition, the category personality study conducted by Batra et al. (2006) suggests that magazines, which together with newspapers belong to the category of print media (Oxford Dictionaries, 2016c), possess an overall personality of Competence. Based on this reasoning, we hypothesized that both newspapers, as well as the category of print media as whole, may be in possession of this very personality. Our findings indicate that this might be the case, as Kim.se shows significantly higher ratings on five out of nine personality traits included within this brand personality dimension, when marketed through print media. Thus, our findings are in line with the results provided by Batra et al. (2006) and H4c (Brands communicated through print media show a significantly elevated level of Competence, in comparison to social media) can therefore not be rejected. The fact that significant differences were found with regards to Kim.se and not Sänggiganten are, however, rather peculiar. Since, a significant number of respondents had previously stated that Sänggiganten was more suitable for being advertised in print media. Based upon this, one would
assume that these significant results should be linked to Sänggiganten, rather than Kim.se. We are under the impression that some sort of dissonance might be the reason for these results, as clothing retailers such as Kim.se are more inclined towards social media (Yesmail Interactive, 2014). The Competence personality held by print media might therefore have an especially strong impact upon typical social media brands, being advertised through this media, as most individuals may not be accustomed to seeing such a brand in this context.

Results with regards to the personality traits of Sophistication

The fourth out of the five dimensions included in the study by J. Aaker (1997) is Sophistication, which is measured through six underlying personality traits. A total of three statistically significant differences were found among these personality traits, where Kim.se had significantly higher ratings of “Good looking” and “Feminine”, when marketed through the social media Facebook. The latter personality trait also had a significantly higher rating for the brand of Sänggiganten, in the same media. In terms of mean, most ratings range between 2.5 and 3, and the standard deviation shows no major indications of disagreement. It should, however, be noted that the ratings of the personality trait “Smooth”, on the brand of Sänggiganten, is substantially higher than the others.

Analysis, Testing of Hypothesis H4d and Discussion with regards to the personality traits of Sophistication

The results presented in table 16, indicate that, social media may possess a category personality of Sophistication, as both Sänggiganten and Kim.se had significant differences in one or two of the personality traits. With this being said, we reject H4d (Brands communicated through neither social

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Statistical</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Statistical</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Class</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glamorous</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good looking</td>
<td>.2.74</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charming</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. Results with regards to mean, statistical significance and standard deviation for the individual traits of the brand dimension sophistication.
nor print media show significantly elevated levels of Sophistication, in comparison to the other). The most interesting finding in this case, is that of the personality trait “Feminine”, which has significantly higher ratings in both brands when marketed on Facebook. This finding clearly indicates that the social media itself is transmitting a perception of femininity upon the brand, regardless of the brand being advertised. The reason for this elevated level of femininity may be explained by the fact that Swedish females visit Facebook, and social media in general, more frequently on a daily basis, in comparison to men (Findahl, 2014). The significantly higher ratings of the personality trait “Good looking”, is more ambiguous. We are under the impression that the aesthetic design of Facebook might be more appealing than that of the print media Dagens Nyheter, which is transmitted onto the advertised brand. A minor tendency of such a transfer can also be seen in the same personality trait of Sänggiganten, where the mean is slightly higher for the social media advertisement, even though its not statistically significant. Finally, as previously mentioned, Sänggiganten showed notably higher means on the personality trait of “Smooth”. In this case, it is presumably the product, rather than the media, that is the driving force of the higher ratings, as a bed was depicted in the advertisement of Sänggiganten (see picture 1.).

Results with regards to the personality traits of Ruggedness

Ruggedness is the fifth dimension of brand personality (J. Aaker, 1997) and is constructed by five personality traits. The analysis shows that the personality traits “Masculine” and “Rugged” portrayed significantly higher ratings, upon the brand Kim.se, when marketed through Dagens Nyheter. Except for the two significant findings, the means were fairly similar between the two brands and the media, and the standard deviation showed no signs of ambiguity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Kim.se</th>
<th>Sänggiganten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>B**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugged</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>B**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17. Results with regards to mean, statistical significance and standard deviation for the individual traits of the brand dimension ruggedness.
Analysis, Testing of Hypothesis H4e and Discussion with regards to the personality traits of Ruggedness

The findings generated through the analysis of the five underlying traits indicate that print media may be in possession of such a category personality, which it transmits on the advertised brand. As, Kim.se, was perceived as significantly more “Masculine” and “Rugged” when advertised through Dagens Nyheter. Hence, we reject H4e (Brands communicated through neither social nor print media show significantly elevated levels of Ruggedness, in comparison to the other). Based on logical reasoning, the significantly higher ratings of “Rugged” may very well be explained by fact that print media traditionally is seen as physical objects, whereas social media is not. The findings related to the “Masculine” trait is more difficult to explain, but could be derived from the fact that males seem to be overrepresented, both historically and in present time, in terms of visual presence in a majority of the newspapers in Sweden (Wisterberg, 2015). In addition, the “Masculine” trait is particularly interesting when considered in relation to the findings on the “Feminine” trait, in the personality dimension “Sophistication”. The data processing indicate that Kim.se is perceived as significantly more “Masculine”, when advertised through print media, whereas, it was perceived as significantly more “Feminine”, when advertised through social media. This clearly indicates, that the media in itself has an impact upon the perceived personality traits of a brand. However, Sänggiganten did not show the same tendencies. Just like Kim.se, it shows a significantly higher rating of the “Feminine” personality trait when advertised through social media. Still, although not statistically significant, it had a lower mean on the trait “Masculine” in print than in social media. A possible explanation for this inconsistency is that some product categories are more susceptible to certain brand personality traits, than others. In this case, fashion retailers would be more prone to be affected by the choice of media, which impacts the customers’ perception of a brand as being either more masculine or feminine. Meanwhile, the furniture retailer only showed such tendencies on the “feminine” personality trait, which implies that the media does not have an equally strong impact on the perception of the personality traits of this product category.

4.3.4 Willingness to Pay a Price Premium

Results

The respondents’ willingness to pay a price premium was measured by two survey items derived from Netemeyer et al. (2014). No significant results were generated for this component. As of table 18, neither the means, nor the standard deviations showed anything worthy of note.
Table 18. Results with regards to mean, statistical significance and standard deviation for the component of willingness to pay a price premium.

Analysis, Testing of Hypothesis H5 and Discussion

As per our conceptual framework, willingness to pay a price premium was included due to its previously proven usefulness as a measurement of CBBE and influencer of the customers’ purchase intentions (Aaker, 1996b; Netemeyer et al., 2004; Anselmsson et al., 2014). Our findings did, however, not generate any indications of a significant difference between advertisements communicated through print or social media and we therefore reject H5 (Print media have a significantly stronger impact upon customers’ willingness to pay a price premium, in comparison to social media). With this being said, there are no indications that print media, which is usually linked to monetary exchanges, is transmitting such a characteristic onto brands being advertised through this media. Instead, this finding suggest that neither of the two media is superior, in comparison to the other, as an actuator of the customer’s willingness to pay a price premium. Lastly, we once more want to stress that we have made use of fictional brands. Thus, we can not rule out that differences might emerge if real brands, as in the study of Bruhn et al. (2012), had been included instead of our fictional equivalents.

4.3.5 Purchase Intentions

Results

The final component of our conceptual framework is the measurement of purchase intentions, which was gauged by the use of metrics developed by Keller (as cited in Lehmann et al., 2008). As seen in table 19, the analysis shows that Sänggiganten had a significantly higher mean when advertised on Facebook. Apart from this significant difference, the brand of Sänggiganten show continuously higher means, in comparison to Kim.se, whereas the standard deviation showed no notable differences.
Analysis, Testing of Hypothesis H6 and Discussion

Previous researchers agree that both new and traditional media have a positive impact upon the component of purchase intention, they are however not in agreement upon which media that is superior, in comparison to the other (Bezjian-Avery et al., 1998; Bruhn et al., 2012). The findings generated through our analysis of the purchase intention component are in line with the findings of Bruhn et al. (2012), as Sänggiganten showed a significantly higher rating upon one of the two items, when advertised on Facebook. Due to this finding, we cannot reject H6 (Social media has a significantly stronger impact upon customers’ purchase intentions, in comparison to print media). Still, no conclusions in favor of social media can be drawn, with regard to purchase intentions, as the summarized results do not show any significant differences between the two media. Although we are not able to reject H6, the respondents’ ratings of the two items are rather contradicting. When communicated on social media, Sänggiganten generated significantly stronger results, compared to print media. However, in the case of Kim.se, the tendencies were the opposite, as print media had a higher mean than social media. Even though the latter is not statistically significant, these tendencies are in line with the contradictory findings of previous research (Bezjian-Avery et al., 1998; Bruhn et al., 2012). A possible reason for the significantly stronger impact for Sänggiganten on Facebook, might be explained by the respondents elevated liking of this constellation (see section 4.1.3), and this expressed liking might elevate this result to a delusive degree. Another explanation for these findings might be that of dissonance, which was previously discussed in relation to the brand personality of Competence. Sänggiganten is a brand that is more inclined towards print media, and advertising such a brand through social media, might thus capture the attention of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Kim.se</th>
<th>Sänggiganten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>Facebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Statistical Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intentions 1.</td>
<td>1,62</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intentions 2.</td>
<td>1,78</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarized Purchase Intentions</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19. Results with regards to mean, statistical significance and standard deviation for the component of purchase intentions.
respondents to a higher degree and, by extension, increase their purchase intentions. This would also explain the higher means of Kim.se, when being marketed through print media, as this brand is more inclined towards social media marketing.

### 4.4 Summarized Results from Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td><em>Print media has a significantly stronger impact upon customers’ perceived brand awareness, in comparison to social media.</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td><em>Either print or social media has a significantly stronger impact upon customers’ perceived functional brand image, in comparison to the other.</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td><em>Either social or print media has a significantly stronger impact upon customers’ perceived brand uniqueness, in comparison to the other.</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a</td>
<td><em>Brands communicated through social media show a significantly elevated level of Sincerity, in comparison to print media.</em></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b</td>
<td><em>Brands communicated through social media show a significantly elevated level of Excitement, in comparison to print media.</em></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4c</td>
<td><em>Brands communicated through print media show a significantly elevated level of Competence, in comparison to social media.</em></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4d</td>
<td><em>Brands communicated through neither social nor print media show significantly elevated levels of Sophistication, in comparison to the other.</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4e</td>
<td><em>Brands communicated through neither social nor print media show significantly elevated levels of Ruggedness, in comparison to the other.</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td><em>Print media have a significantly stronger impact upon customers’ willingness to pay a price premium, in comparison to social media.</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td><em>Social media has a significantly stronger impact upon customers’ purchase intentions, in comparison to print media.</em></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\checkmark = \text{Supported}, \ X = \text{Rejected}, \ - = \text{Can neither be Rejected nor Supported}\]

*Table 20. Results from hypotheses.*
5. Conclusions

In this final chapter we present the theoretical findings generated in our study along with managerial implications, for each of the investigated components of CBBE. This chapter, and the thesis, will be concluded by limitations and recommendations for further studies.

The media landscape has changed dramatically over the last couple of decades, much due to the introduction of the Internet. This change has naturally affected the field of marketing in both positive and negative ways, and the saying “one man's loss, another man's gain” is very suitable in this context. New media has through its reach, possibility of data measures and lower costs, allured marketers worldwide, at the expense of traditional communication channels (Bagchi et al., 2015; Carson, 2015). Such a development would be self-evident, if it was not for the fact that previous research show that traditional media has a stronger impact on many of the components attributed to the creation of brand equity (Bezjian-Avery et al., 1998; Stephen & Galak, 2010; Bruhn et al., 2012; Draganska et al., 2014). It is in the light of this situation that this study has its foundation, as its purpose is to further investigate the relative impact of social, versus print media, on various CBBE components. This has been done by measuring brand awareness, emotional and functional brand image, willingness to pay a price premium and purchase intention on brands advertised in a newspaper and on a social media platform. In contrast to previous researchers, our contribution is partly based on the methodological aspect of utilizing fictitious brands, as it enables us to measure the impact of print and social media, per se. In addition to this, we have complemented previous research of traditional and new media in association to CBBE, by the inclusion of other brand equity measurements, such as brand personality and willingness to pay a price premium. In conclusion, we are under the impression that our findings have generated beneficial insights, with regards to the impact that the categories of print and social media have upon a brand, when advertised in these channels of communication.

5.1 Findings

The choice of media does not influence the perceived brand awareness and functional brand image

The results generated with regard to these CBBE components show that none of the two media, per se, have a significantly stronger impact, in relation to the other. This is interesting, as previous research suggests that traditional media is superior, in comparison to new media, in
terms of the brand awareness component (Bruhn et al., 2012; Draganska et al., 2014). In addition, previous research suggests that both traditional and new media has a positive impact upon the functional brand image (Bruhn et al., 2012; Draganska et al., 2014). Our lack of significant differences, therefore indicate that when the media is isolated from existing brands, traditional media does not transmit comparatively stronger perceptions of elevated brand awareness. In terms of functional brand image, the absence of differences, when the two media is compared unrelated to existing brands, strengthens the previous notion of both media being equally effective. In conclusion, our results therefore indicate that, in order to utilize the previously found superiority of traditional media, in terms of creating elevated levels of brand awareness, the customers’ are required to have at least some pre-existing knowledge of the advertised brand. Furthermore, by isolating the media, our results suggest that neither of the two media are superior in terms of enhancing the customer's perception of the functional brand image.

The choice of media partly influences emotional brand image

Emotional brand image has previously been found to be unaffected by the choice of media (Bruhn et al., 2012). Our initial measurement of this component, through the utilization of Netemeyer et al’s (2004) CBBE metrics of brand uniqueness, showed similar results. The inclusion of J. Aaker’s (1997) five brand personality dimensions did, however, indicate that the emotional brand image, in fact, may be affected by the choice of media. This indication stems from our finding of significant differences in the respondents’ ratings of the brands, when marketed through either social or print media, on at least one personality trait included in each of the five overall dimensions of brand personality. The most notable finding for these personality traits, is that social media is transmitting a “Feminine” perception upon a brand, whereas traditional media shows signs of transmitting a “Masculine” perception. This clearly indicates that the media itself, regardless of the brand being advertised, has an impact upon how a brand is perceived in the minds of the customers. Thus, although not being able to make any statements for the five overall dimensions of brand personality, our findings conclude that print and social media can be successfully used in order to increase the respondent’s associations of certain personality traits, linked to a brand. With this being said, our findings indicate that the choice of media may play a more important role, in terms of emotional brand image, than previously thought, which makes brand personality in relation to CBBE a very interesting topic for future studies.
The choice of media does not influence customers’ willingness to pay a price premium

To the best of our knowledge, no previous study has examined customers’ willingness to pay a price premium, in the light of traditional and new media. Thus, our results with regards to this component is a new contribution to this scope of research. The metrics used to gauge this CBBE component did not show any significant differences, neither when analyzed individually, nor when summarized. Due to this outcome, we suggest that neither print nor social media, per se, are transmitting any specific characteristics upon the advertised brand and they are thus to be considered as equally efficient, for advertising purposes, in this regard. However, we can not rule out that differences between social and print media may emerge, if this component were to be examined through empirical data collection based on real brands, as in the case of previous research (e.g. Bruhn et al., 2012), instead of the fictional brands used in this study.

The choice of media might influence customers purchase intentions

Previous studies have shown that traditional and new media have a positive impact on customers’ purchase intentions. However, researchers disagree with regards to which media that is superior in relation to the other (Bezjian-Avery et al., 1998; Bruhn et al., 2012). Much like the findings of previous research, our results for this component were contradictory. Therefore, no conclusions can be drawn in terms of whether one of the two media, per se, have a relatively stronger impact on customers’ purchase intentions. Still, one significant result in favor of social media did emerge, which is in line with the findings of Bruhn et al. (2012). This indicates that social media, as such, might be a stronger driver of purchase intentions, in comparison to print media.

5.2 Managerial Implications

In the introductory part of this paper we expressed a desire to provide practical insights, with regards to whether the change in the marketing landscape is rational due to new media’s superiority, or whether it should be halted, as traditional media still exhibits enough benefits for it to be preserved. In general, our results are inclined to the first of these two scenarios, as a majority of our findings are in favor of social media. Nevertheless, some findings clearly indicate that traditional media, and more specifically print media, still holds an important role in the marketing landscape of today. With this being said, the practical insights derived from our results, with regards to how the utilization of these two communication channels influences the different components of CBBE creation, will be presented in detail during the remainder of this section.
The investigation of print and social media communication has demonstrated that neither of the two media, per se, have a relatively stronger impact upon the customers’ perceived brand awareness. For practitioners, this finding is of relevance, as it indicates that when the customers have no prior knowledge of a brand, neither print nor social media is transmitting a comparatively stronger perception of elevated brand awareness. Thus, in cases where totally new brands are being launched or when existing brands are introduced to a new market, we recommend the utilization of social media as a communication tool in the initial phases of the introduction process. This recommendation has its foundation in the advantages offered by social media, in comparison to print, in terms of reach, data measurements and lower costs. However, it should be noted that traditional media has previously been found to be a superior communication channel in terms of brand awareness, when established brands are being advertised. Hence, new brands might do well in switching to, or at least include, traditional media advertising, such as print, when the customers have become more accustomed to the brand in question.

In terms of functional brand image, no significant differences emerged from our comparison between print and social media. There are therefore no indications that a certain media, in itself, can generate a stronger impact on the customers’ perception of functional brand image. Consequently, we suggest that practitioners should base their choice of media upon other components of CBBE. Alternatively, if the functional brand image is considered as the most important component, we recommend social media as it provides a greater variety of means to communicate a brand’s functional brand image, due to its previously mentioned benefits.

The component of emotional brand image generated the most interesting findings from a theoretical perspective and the same holds true from a practical standpoint. By the inclusion of brand personalities, we have found results indicating that print and social media have the possibility to transmit certain personality traits to the advertised brand, which, by extension affect the customer's perception of said brand. For example, we found strong indications that brands advertised in social media are perceived as more “Feminine”, compared to brands advertised in print media, which instead show signs of being perceived as more “Masculine”. Findings like these can be of relevance for practitioners, as they could enable more successful marketing program investments. Bearing this in mind, brands striving to be perceived as
“Feminine”, are preferably advertised in social media, whereas brands aimed to be perceived as “Masculine” would do best in turning to print media.

To the extent of our knowledge, the component of willingness to pay a price premium, in the context of new and traditional media, has never been examined prior to this study and these results are therefore the first of its kind. In terms of practical implications, our results indicate that none of the two media, when used for advertising purposes, generate an elevated level of willingness to pay a price premium. This result is, in our opinion, in favor of social media, due to its benefits discussed earlier. In addition, we provide further reassurance toward marketers utilizing new media platforms, as there are no evidence showing that this media, per se, is eroding their possibility of charging a higher price.

In the context of CBBE, the component of purchase intentions is often referred to as one of the most attractive outcomes of a marketing program investment, as it is closely linked to actual sales. The results in this study, although showing indications in favor of social media, are not conclusive and we can not provide practitioners with any distinct recommendations in this regard. With our and previous findings in mind, we therefore suggest that the choice of media, much like in the case of functional brand image, should be based upon other components of CBBE.

To sum up, based on the majority of our findings, we can not dispute the trend of transferring advertising spend from traditional to new media alternatives, as print and social media, per se, tend to generate similar impact upon most of the components of CBBE creation. From a brand equity perspective, this implicates that the current evolution of the marketing landscape is justifiable, as new media is better in terms of reach, cost and functionality. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the main driver of this media evolution is constituted by the practical benefits of social media, rather than its relative impact, compared to print media. However, our findings on brand personality and previous findings of brand awareness show that print media, as an advertising medium, should not be abandoned altogether. As this media seemingly still offers certain benefits that social media is unable to provide.
5.3 Limitations and Future Research

This study is conducted within a field of research that is fairly unexplored and we have been able to provide some new insights with regards to the impact of traditional and new media upon brands and the creation of CBBE. Despite this, there is undoubtedly going to be a need of future studies, to fully grasp how the utilization of both new and traditional media is affecting brands. In order to pave the way for such studies, the following section is dedicated to specifications of the limitations of our study, as well as how our findings can be used in the future.

To begin with, and as previously mentioned, it should be stressed that this study examines media from a brand equity perspective, which implies that its conclusions and implications are relevant merely to this particular subject area. We would further like to highlight the fact that we have made use of fictional brands, designed by individuals who are neither professional in advertising, nor in graphical design. Although the advertisements were configured in order to be as neutral as possible, unidentified biasing factors that may have an influence on the results can not be ruled out. Consequently, it would be interesting to see further research on particularly willingness to pay a price premium and brand personality on new and traditional media, but with the use of existing brands. Since these components, to our knowledge, still constitute an uncharted void in this field of research. This could entail complementary findings on print and social media that we were not able to identify with our research method. This is especially interesting for the emotional brand image in general, and brand personality in particular, as our findings indicate that advertising in different media affects a customer’s perception of certain brand personality traits. A future study examining the concept of brand personality, through the use of existing brands, might therefore not only be able to shed more light upon the linkage between personality traits and the choice of media, but also be able to identify such linkages for the overall brand personalities.

As we have applied brands in the retail sector in our data collection, readers should be advised that the findings may not be generalizable to all types of industries. The brands used in the fictional advertisements of this study belong to the industry of slow-moving consumer goods, and the findings could presumably be applied to other brands and product categories in this industry. However, the findings are not necessarily generalizable to other industries, e.g. fast-moving consumer goods. With this being said, it would be interesting to see similar studies conducted on brands originating from other industries, in the future.
It should also be noted that this study has been conducted on a sample of Swedish respondents and subsequently analyzed in comparison to previous studies made with samples of other nationalities (e.g. German-speaking countries). No measures have been taken in order to address potential cultural differences between the samples, therefore inferences drawn in relation to other studies may be biased. Moreover, the sample frame merely incorporated individuals living in urban areas, hence the findings are limited to this characteristic.

Finally, we are of the opinion that more research is required in the particular scope of how different media affect elements of CBBE. Not merely in comparison to each other, but also how brand equity elements, such as brand personality, can be derived from certain types of media. In conclusion, we are under the impression that the changing marketing landscape, and the Internet’s substitution of print, are highly relevant topics for both branding researchers and practitioners, but also for society as a whole.
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Appendix A: Results of the observational fieldwork upon the most frequently advertised industries in *Aftonbladet* and *Dagens Nyheter*.
Appendix B: Fictional advertisements of Kim.se and Sänggiganten in Dagens Nyheter and Facebook

Sänggiganten, Dagens Nyheter

Häktad fick inte läsa privat brev


Stefan Linuski
stefan.linuski@premium.se

JO-kritik mot isolering.


Per Lindhagen, tillsammans i aklagaremyndigheten, säger att aklagaren inte vill ha mig.


Efter att ha pragnit av fängelse har jag inte emot. Jag är inte emot. Jag är inte emot.
Sänggiganten, Facebook

Vi erbjuder det mesta för det sovrum, oavsett vilken stall du föredrar!

WWW.SANGGIGANTEN.SE
Stockholm Göteborg Malmö Örebro Uppsala Västerås

2 evenemang den här veckan

Rebecca & Pia (88) LIVE
tabelmartino.se
Den 26 april kommer Rebecca & Pia till åter till tabel för att köra in!

Spela gratis
Legends of Honor
Ladda in armén i krig i Legends of Honor!
Spela gratis nu!

Svenska · English (US) · Arabic · Pashto · Español · Português (Brasil)
Sändningar · Avsnittslistor · Cookies · 
Kontakta oss · Anmälning · Användnings villkor · Läs mer ·
Facebook 9 2016
**Nyheter**

**I korthet.**

En pappa som misstänkts för mishandel av sina barn hölls isolerad från sin familj under lång tid. Nu riktar social-ombudsmannen (JO) kritik mot åklagarens beslut om restriktionen. Åklagaren fick för långt, enligt JO.

Stefan Linabäck
stefan.linaback@gmail.com

"Jo har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion.

Segern och Marias famly vill i ett brev samband till Aklagarmyndigheten. Villingsskorna och paras är De nya staden där de bor. En viktig sats här är att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion.

**Jag kan inte tro amnesti på att åklagaren vill klämma mig extra**

I ett brev har Marias familj skrivit till Aklagarmyndigheten. "Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

**JO-kritik mot isolering.**

Häktad fick inte läsa privata brev

Söndag 24 april 2016 - Dagens Nyheter

Effel förstörde tuntals portioner mat till äldre


"Jag har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

**Jag kan inte tro amnesti på att åklagaren vill klämma mig extra**

"Jag kan inte tro amnesti på att åklagaren vill klämma mig extra" skriver Bente. "Jag har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

**Eurosamarbetet kommenterar: Svensk kritik på avkörning av bostäder.**

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

---

**Kultur**

Beverly Stevenson

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

---

**Nyhet och aktiviteter**

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

---

**Skatt**

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

---

**Såklar**

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

---

**Beteckning**

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

---

**Nyheter**

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

---

**Kultur**

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

---

**Skatt**

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

---

**Beteckning**

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

"Vi har funnit att det inte är tillräckligt att ha misstänkt för mishandel för att det ska röra sig om en restriktion."

---
Nu är det våra på KIM Fashion, med mängder av nya vårkollektioner i butiken. Besök oss även i någon av våra fysiska butiker i Stockholm, Göteborg, Malmö, Uppsala eller Västerås. Vi ser!
Appendix C: Factor Analysis on the Five Dimensions of Brand Personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Total % of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Total % of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Total % of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.881</td>
<td>11.762</td>
<td>49.385</td>
<td>14.091</td>
<td>52.476</td>
<td>52.476</td>
<td>9.356</td>
<td>22.725</td>
<td>45.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.930</td>
<td>3.860</td>
<td>56.062</td>
<td>4.300</td>
<td>56.062</td>
<td>56.062</td>
<td>2.756</td>
<td>6.582</td>
<td>52.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.580</td>
<td>3.160</td>
<td>60.668</td>
<td>3.784</td>
<td>60.668</td>
<td>60.668</td>
<td>2.248</td>
<td>5.347</td>
<td>57.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.297</td>
<td>2.594</td>
<td>63.293</td>
<td>3.005</td>
<td>63.293</td>
<td>63.293</td>
<td>1.927</td>
<td>4.721</td>
<td>62.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>70.002</td>
<td>1.887</td>
<td>71.887</td>
<td>71.887</td>
<td>1.583</td>
<td>3.566</td>
<td>75.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>1.590</td>
<td>71.592</td>
<td>1.803</td>
<td>73.395</td>
<td>73.395</td>
<td>1.547</td>
<td>3.613</td>
<td>78.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>1.448</td>
<td>73.029</td>
<td>1.723</td>
<td>74.752</td>
<td>74.752</td>
<td>1.412</td>
<td>3.514</td>
<td>79.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>74.063</td>
<td>1.460</td>
<td>75.523</td>
<td>75.523</td>
<td>1.212</td>
<td>3.225</td>
<td>79.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>74.559</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td>75.906</td>
<td>75.906</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>3.142</td>
<td>79.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>74.841</td>
<td>1.310</td>
<td>76.151</td>
<td>76.151</td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>3.103</td>
<td>80.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>75.225</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>76.475</td>
<td>76.475</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>3.065</td>
<td>80.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>75.456</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>76.656</td>
<td>76.656</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>3.018</td>
<td>80.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>75.838</td>
<td>1.183</td>
<td>76.021</td>
<td>76.021</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>2.983</td>
<td>80.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>76.214</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>76.364</td>
<td>76.364</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>2.954</td>
<td>80.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>76.561</td>
<td>1.137</td>
<td>76.698</td>
<td>76.698</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>2.919</td>
<td>80.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>76.885</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>76.999</td>
<td>76.999</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>2.880</td>
<td>80.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>77.220</td>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>77.312</td>
<td>77.312</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>2.841</td>
<td>80.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>77.550</td>
<td>1.085</td>
<td>77.695</td>
<td>77.695</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>2.813</td>
<td>80.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>77.875</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>77.965</td>
<td>77.965</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>2.784</td>
<td>80.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>78.200</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>78.256</td>
<td>78.256</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>2.755</td>
<td>80.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>78.525</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>78.567</td>
<td>78.567</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>2.727</td>
<td>80.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>78.850</td>
<td>1.028</td>
<td>78.878</td>
<td>78.878</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>2.700</td>
<td>80.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>79.175</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>79.192</td>
<td>79.192</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>2.673</td>
<td>80.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>79.500</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>79.590</td>
<td>79.590</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>2.647</td>
<td>80.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>79.778</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>79.744</td>
<td>79.744</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>2.621</td>
<td>80.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>80.281</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>80.197</td>
<td>80.197</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>2.595</td>
<td>80.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>80.505</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>80.385</td>
<td>80.385</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>2.570</td>
<td>80.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>80.711</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>80.557</td>
<td>80.557</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>2.545</td>
<td>80.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>80.917</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>80.759</td>
<td>80.759</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>2.520</td>
<td>80.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>81.123</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>80.917</td>
<td>80.917</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>2.496</td>
<td>80.459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.