

Earned Media by Commercial Video Sharing: The Impacts of Value and its Outcomes to Brands

Autoria

Cid Gonçalves Filho - cid@fumec.br

Prog de Mestr e Dout em Admin da FACE/FUMEC - Universidade FUMEC

Gustavo Quiroga Souki - gustavosouki@gmail.com

Programa de Mestrado Profissional em Administração/Centro Universitário Una

Flavia Braga Chinelato - flaviachinelato@gmail.com

Departamento de Posgrado en Negocios/CENTRUM Católica Graduate Business School - Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Lima, Perú

Marcos Ferreira Santos - marcosfsantos@gmail.com

Escuela Internacional de Ciencias Económicas y Administrativas/Universidad La Sabana
Observatorio SCALA/Universidad Los Andes

Resumo

The viral marketing offers resources for the structuring and disseminating quickly and large-scale information in favor of content, products and their brands. Organizations started to produce commercial videos and disseminate them in the social networks on a large scale. Lister (2018) highlights that a video generates 1.200% more shares than the text and images combined. However, most of the studies about video sharing are related to consumer content, not firm generated content. We also observe that are scarce research that relates to the impacts of sharing online media on brand constructs. In this sense, the objective of this study is to identify the antecedents of commercial video sharing and its impact on the consumers' attitudes. A total of 368 questionnaires were collected, preceded by the viewing of videos. The results reveal impacts of the entertainment value and utility value with the intention of sharing videos. The intention to share videos presents impacts on Brand Equity: directly, and indirectly mediated by Brand Attachment. In this sense, this study contributed by identifying strategies for firms in order to earn media from sharing of commercial videos, revealing its influences on brand equity and brand attachment.

**Earned Media by Commercial Video Sharing:
The Impacts of Value and its Outcomes to Brands**

Abstract

The viral marketing offers resources for the structuring and disseminating quickly and large-scale information in favor of content, products and their brands. Organizations started to produce commercial videos and disseminate them in the social networks on a large scale. Lister (2018) highlights that a video generates 1.200% more shares than the text and images combined. However, most of the studies about video sharing are related to consumer content, not firm generated content. We also observe that are scarce research that relates to the impacts of sharing online media on brand constructs. In this sense, the objective of this study is to identify the antecedents of commercial video sharing and its impact on the consumers' attitudes. A total of 368 questionnaires were collected, preceded by the viewing of videos. The results reveal impacts of the entertainment value and utility value with the intention of sharing videos. The intention to share videos presents impacts on Brand Equity: directly, and indirectly mediated by Brand Attachment. In this sense, this study contributed by identifying strategies for firms in order to earn media from sharing of commercial videos, revealing its influences on brand equity and brand attachment.

Keywords: viral marketing; commercial video sharing; digital marketing.

1 INTRODUCTION

A commercial video is a video that promotes a product, service or brand in order to produce awareness, brand equity, sales or maintain relationships with target audiences. A commercial video is different from user-generated content, as it is produced intentionally by a firm or advertiser. It uses free or paid media, contrasting with user content that is focused on free posting. By the other hand, a viral video is a video that becomes popular through the Internet or mobile sharing process, typically through sharing websites like social media. Videos have revealed themselves to be a media with supremacy over texts, images and static posts. According to Lister (2018), the marketing professionals that use commercial videos increase their revenue 49% faster than the users that do not use videos, and sixty-four percent of consumers purchase a product after watching social videos about a brand. Lister (2018) points out that a video that is socially-shared (viral) generates 1,200% more shares than the text and images combined. Allsop, Bassett and Hoskins (2007) demonstrate that 59% of people describe that they frequently share contents online.

In the “digital” advertising world, to have a “viral campaign” is one of the highest levels of achievement in marketing, which leads to the necessity of dedication, time allocation, and resources for a systematic analysis of how to encourage it. In this new communication's scenario in which the increase of social media has elevated the consumers' capacity in creating their message, as it has also amplified the consumer's choice about what to see and what to share. Sharing content online is part of modern life. People send newspaper articles to their friends, show videos from YouTube to their relatives and send critics about restaurants to their neighbors. This “social transmission” has also a substantial impact on consumers and companies' brands. Decades of research by Chevalier and Mayzlin (2006) and Godes and Mayzlin (2009) suggest that interpersonal communication affects the attitudes and decision making profoundly. Previous researches demonstrate the causal impact of electronic word of mouth on the adoption and on the sale of products. In the marketing field, the companies many times create advertisements online or encourage the propagation of content generated by the consumer, hoping that people will share this content with others, leading consequently to the virality of the message and of the company's brand. However, some of these efforts of sharing obtain success while others fail. In this sense, it is necessary to verify the viral marketing antecedents, their impacts on the brands and identify some of the characteristics that can predict if the content will be highly shared or not (Berger, 2014).

Video is a trend in terms of online communication and research had been made in order to understand how to increase the propagation of advert videos produced by organizations. Millions of dollars are spent on these efforts to persuade and generate an impact on their audiences target monthly (Lister, 2018). According to the IAB (2017) research, 61% of marketers intend to improve their investment in the online video ads in the next 12 months, and a +108% increase of use of commercial video ads was observed in the period of 2015-2017. Hubspot (2018) arguments that product videos can increase purchases by 144% and almost 50% of Internet users look for videos related to a product or service before visiting a store. In this sense, 45% of marketers plan to add YouTube to their strategy in 2019.

The search for the virality's antecedents has been recurrent in the literature. Classical studies, such as the one by Berger and Milkman (2012), analyze the history of the New York Times news' virality, and they observed that the content that evokes emotions of high positive or negative excitement (anger or anxiety) are the most viral. Berger (2014), on the other hand, complements that sharing and virality, in general, is related to value and social currency and its utility value. Regarding the video sharing, according to Akpınar and Berger (2017), data of hundreds of real online adverts, in a well-controlled experiment in a laboratory, demonstrates

that, in comparison with informative appeals (which have their focus on the product), emotional appeals (which humor, music and other emotion-evoking strategies) are more likely to be shared. Informative appeals, in contrast, would boost a brand, its evaluations and purchasing because a brand is an integral part of the advert's content. On the other hand, Taylor, Strutton, and Thompson (2012), seeking to identify the antecedents of video sharing, revealed that the self-congruence with the brand, the entertainment value and the involvement with the product's category, increase the self-expression of the online adverts, consequently increasing the probability of these adverts being shared. However, there is no research that focuses on value generation and integrates social, entertainment and utility values as antecedents of commercial video sharing in one study. We also do not observe research about sharing to firm produced advertising, as most of the research cited above is based in UGC (user-generated content). At the same direction, the impacts of video sharing on branding (as a brand attachment and equity) have not been explored yet, leaving some significant gaps to be explained and studied. In this sense, this article aims to identify the dimensions of value, which can impact and increase commercial videos sharing and its virality, and its impacts on branding.

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Viral Marketing

Since the 1960s, marketing authors have been analyzing the impact of word of mouth advertising on the consumers' perceptions. This type of advertising, called word of mouth (WOM), has been recognized as a promotional technique with strong influences on the purchasing decisions, mainly because the WOM communications type seem to be more trustworthy in the eyes of the consumers (Arndt, 1967; Bayus, 1985; Dichter, 1966; Richins, 1984). According to Rosen (2001, p.190), since every client that receives information from a friend can reproduce and distribute them instantly among dozens or hundreds of other friends, this form of marketing, using the internet, was baptized "viral marketing." Since consumers can communicate with several receptors simultaneously and also transmit advertising messages through site links, videos and games, the marketing professionals can distribute contents to the opinion-formers, that, when forwarding the message to several receivers in their network, it can generate a cascading effect that disseminates multiple receivers of that message.

According to Taylor, Strutton and Thompson (2012), the advertising content can spread in a rapid and exponential form from a handful of receivers to millions of consumers, being this called "viral marketing" (Watts, Peretti and Frumin, 2007). However, the speed and the global reach of today's communications has provided to the marketing professionals a mean to transcend the effectiveness of the traditional WOM, being nowadays defined as Electronic Word of Mouth (eWOM). Bentivegna (2002) argues that the growth of the number of consumers which are connected to the internet has motivated companies to search manners to maximize the word of mouth marketing through online tools, since the viral marketing is considered an evolution of the word of mouth marketing for the digital means. Thus, many companies have planned and executed viral marketing actions, using virtual networks to promote products and services, such as Facebook, e-mails, YouTube, instant messaging applications, such as WhatsApp. However, Andrade, Mazzon, and Katz (2005) declare that it is necessary to consider that this type of effect does not always work in a controlled form: it is possible that the sending of the message occurs negatively, as a flow that leads to the dissemination of discreditable remarks about the propagated material.

Viral marketing and viral advertising refer to the marketing technique that tries to explore social networks to produce exponential increases in the brand's awareness, with processes that are similar to an extension of an epidemic. The "viral advertising" term refers to the idea that people will pass and share contents. This technique is often sponsored by a brand

that seeks to build knowledge of a product or service. The viral advertisement is often produced in the form of funny video clips or games, interactive Flashes, images and even texts. For the professionals and academics, identifying the factors that motivate the consumers to share advertisements online, is a crucial step to understanding why some of the advertisements are viral. (Goyette et al. 2010).

2.2 Value and a General View of On-Line Sharing Antecedents

As one of the bases of this present study, an analysis of previous researches that tried to identify the antecedents of sharing videos was carried out, related according to the theme. Sheth, Newman and Gross (1991) presents a theory that focuses on the consumption values, explaining why the consumers choose to purchase or not to purchase (or use or not use) a specific product, and why the consumers choose a type of product in detriment of another and why consumers choose a brand in detriment of another. This theory would apply to choices that involve a complete range of non-durable goods, durable consumer goods, industrial goods and services and it has three principles: 1. The consumer's choice is a function of multiple consumption values; 2. The consumption values make differential contributions in any choice; 3. The consumption values are independent. Sheth, Newman and Gross (1991, p.160) define functional value as "the perceived utility acquired from the capacity of an alternative providing a functional, utilitarian or physical performance." According to the authors, functional attributes and rational thoughts dominate the consumer decision-making process, especially when purchasing useful items. The social value is defined as "a perceived social utility acquired from an association of alternatives with one or more specific social groups." Therefore, the consumption of visible products, such as clothes, is often driven by social values (Kosonen, 2014). On the other hand, the emotional value would represent "the perceived utility of the capacity as an alternative to awaking feelings or states." In fact, several types of goods and services are associated with emotions. Indeed, many of us recognize the dissemination and exploration of feelings in advertising, since many companies use associations which are awakened by feelings of comfort in their marketing strategies.

Kosonen (2014) explores how social, personal and emotional values determine the consumption of communication linked to actions of social responsibility. An empiric analysis confirms the findings of the theoretical analysis with regards to the quintuple typology of consumption values and their coexistence. The consumption values are frequently in coexistence, that is, the consumers derive several types of values simultaneously from their decisions and activities. Values usually influence the behavior by a relatively complex combination of, for example, social convenience, functional value and self-expressiveness, as also cultural aspects and many others. Theoretically, it is ideal for consumers to maximize all of their consumption's values. However, in reality, the consumers are willing to accept gaining less of a value to earn more on another. Based on empirical analysis, the consumers have functional consumption, social and emotional values, which were divided into primary and secondary consumption values, depending on the interviewee's motivation. According to the results, the functional value was clearly dominating the advertising consumption behavior. Despite this, the emotional and social consumption values are also recognized as important elements within the sample (Sheth, Newman and Gross, 1991; Kosonen, 2014).

The entertainment value could be defined as the pleasure and fun that a message reflects according to the advertisement shown to the consumers, can have a direct influence on the likelihood of sharing. The most common motivation to transmit e-mail messages is entertainment or pleasure, creating a desire to share (Taylor, Strutton, and Thompson, 2012). Berger (2014) argues the relevance of entertainment and of the emotions in sharing and making the information viral. The positive emotions, including good humor (funny), seem to affect positively in making the process viral. According to the author, the "social currency" refers to

impressing others with the message bringing positive social feedback to the issuer, as also allowing that the recipient to pass it on, being himself able to capitalize on impressions and improve his/her self-image with his/her pairs. In this sense, Pihlström and Brush (2008) found a high impact of the social value on the consumers' word of mouth, with regards to online services in mobile devices. Mulcahy et al. (2014) studied the mobile game market and observed that the entertainment value is related to the social value, having an impact on the consumers' behavior.

On the other hand, Berger (2014) argues that utility value of services and products is one of the critical antecedents of its virality, as well its association with entertainment and social as being relevant for sharing, but suggests them as independent antecedent factors. In this sense, Schulze, Scholer and Skiera (2014) observe that, with regards to games becoming viral on Facebook, the utility value predominates as a sharing antecedent. Taylor, Strutton, and Thompson (2012) argue that the entertainment value of a message reflects the extension that an online advertisement offers pleasure, fun or humor to the consumers. Similar to the congruence of the self to a brand, an entertainment value of the online message should exert influence on the likelihood of sharing, mediated by the self-expressiveness. According to Horning (2014), the virality serves as an equality tautological symbol of authenticity and is a substitute for the old sense of being spontaneous. Now, instead of that, being viral makes you authentic within this construction, within this particular type of individuality. The content recedes to a mere alibi to get involved emotionally with the circulation data, identified indirectly not as content, but as the form that information travels. Thus, entertainment value would cause positive impressions to whom posts or shares.

2.3 Social Networks and The Share of Brand Communication

Social media is a collection of applications based on the basis of web 2.0 and it allows the user to fill its content and can be in the form of forums, microblogging, social networking, social bookmarking, and wiki. The characteristic of social media is the message that is conveyed not only for one person but also for many people. But it's important to consider that it is essential that users filling content, otherwise the purpose dies (Tritama and Tarigan, 2016).


Social media has dramatically affected the way society currently interacts. An environment facilitates the exchange of information and sharing at a fast speed and at a very low cost (Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010). This new way of communicating has attracted attention from companies and the corporate world in general (Mir and Zaheer, 2012; Ohajionu and Mathews, 2016). Actually, social media has been acknowledged as possibly the most significant medium for relationship building (Bartlett, 2010; Hackworth and Kunz, 2010; Selina and Milz, 2009).

Attracted by a large number of users, companies have created brand communities in social media, such as Facebook, which boasts more than a billion monthly active users (Facebook, 2014). Twitter has approximately 650 million users and LinkedIn has approximately 200 million members worldwide. These statistics demonstrate the popularity of social media, which in turn provides an indication of the enormous influence such applications carry (Ohajionu and Mathews, 2016).

3 HYPOTHETICAL MODEL

Considering the objectives of this research, of identifying dimensions of value that are relevant for video sharing, a model was proposed based on Sheth, Newman and Gross (1991) - Consumption Value Theory; Berger and Milkman (2012) and Berger (2014) - social and utility value and share of electronic posts; Kosonen (2014) - dimensions of value related to consumption of communication; Taylor, Strutton, and Thompson (2012) - video sharing and entertainment value, a hypothetical was proposed and presented in Figure 1:

Figure 1 - Hypothetical Model of the Research.



Source: Elaborated by the authors.

4 HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

The entertainment value of a message reflects the extent to which an online advertisement provides pleasure, diversion, or amusement to consumers. Similar to self-brand congruity, an online message's entertainment value should exert a direct influence on likelihood to share, as well as an indirect influence mediated by self-enhancement value. The first effect is both intuitive and empirically supported. When consumers perceive online ads as entertaining, they are more likely to share messages with others (Taylor, Strutton, and Thompson, 2012). Phelps and colleagues (2004) demonstrate that the most common motivation for passing along e-mail messages is entertainment or enjoyment. Dobele et. al (2007) also argue that emotional reactions (e.g., surprise, joy, anger, sadness, fear) are fundamental to forwarding behavior. Similarly, Porter and Golan (2006) find that titillating messages are likely to be forwarded, and Brown, Bhadury and Pope (2010) uncover similar results for comedic, violent ads. Such affective responses, ranging from joy and amusement to surprise and fear, all may be categorized as entertainment; for example, roller coasters, "freak shows," and "tearjerker" movies are all entertaining, though they provoke different emotional responses (Brown, Bhadury and Pope, 2010). In this sense, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H1: Entertainment value has a positive influence on the intention of sharing a commercial video.

Berger (2014) argues that virality has a relationship with what is called "social currency." People talk about things that make them look good. Updated, with knowledge and funny instead of obsolete. This provides the status for the other ones. Al-Rawi (2017) in an analysis of the most seen videos seen in the Guardian, New York Times, Washington Post and in the Wall Street, YouTube News Channels, as also the news that was mostly commented, used a mixed model to examine the viral news, borrowing from previous studies about emotions and others that concentrated on sharing. The results indicate that the readers of social media news prefer to read and share overwhelmingly positive news, while social significance and unpredictability are the news are the most attractive elements of the viral news. Parker et.al (2016) observe that viral campaigns of Non-Profit Organizations should create an emotional

connection, use reliable sources, have social relevance for the viewer and facilitate the distribution/viral sharing of the content with others. Kim et al (2012) arguments that participation of content sites (as video social networks/YouTube) requires more active involvement, and it consists of not only consuming these contents. According to these authors, users are mostly motivated by a desire of social interaction with people who share the same interests through which participants may gain a sense of communion, as they tend to value social and emotional aspects of media features more. Other authors, such as Jiao, Gao and Yang (2015) investigated how social value impact flow in online media and observed a positive influence (std. weight. 0,336). So, this hypothesis was proposed:

H2: Social value has a positive influence on the intention of sharing a commercial video.

Sheth, Newman and Gross (1991) propose that the perceived utility of a message comes from its capabilities of a generation of functional and utilitarian values for the receiver. According to Berger's (2014) research, people share more what is useful and that which contributes to their lives. This sharing reflects, in a positive manner, elements about a person that shares them, which reinforces what Taylor, Strutton and Thompson's (2012) positioned when they also suggested an objective of self-expressiveness to strengthen their identity or in the intention of constructing an identity closer to the ideal, and that is correlated to utility value of the video. Kim et. al (2012) observed that the usage of content appears to have a dynamic and interactive mechanism consisting of functional, emotional, and social elements. Berger and Milkman (2012) indicate that utility information about health and education are more shared than those of sport, tragedy, politics, among others. In this sense, to offer practical value would make things contagious. Therefore, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H3: Utility value has a positive influence on the intention of sharing a commercial video.

The main objective of commercial videos is to generate impacts on the brand and purchasing intentions. The consumers that share the brand's communication are expected to be more strongly impacted by this attitude of sharing, and receive influence from this communication. Severi (2014) had already observed that in the social media context, the sharing of content causes a positive impact on brand equity. Ratna et al. (2017) observed the impacts of the WOM on brand equity and the purchasing intention in the context of online communities. Jalilvand and Samiei (2012) verified that in the automotive industry, the impacts of the eWOM on the brand's image and the purchasing intention are significant. In this sense, Manthiou et.al.(2016), based on a survey of 397 French and Chinese luxury brand customers who follow the brands in social media, presented findings that demonstrated the links between social media marketing efforts, brand equity, and its consequences including preference, loyalty, and price premium. Therefore, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H4: Likelihood to share has a positive influence on brand equity.

The impact of social media on influencing customer choice, forging positive emotions regarding a product or service and enhancing brand relationships, has been a sense in the literature, suggesting that social media acts as an enabler for enhancing brand perceptions (Das and Mandal, 2016). On the other hand, the influence of video on brand attitudes has been studied in the last 50 years. According to Linna (2018), there are some usual measures that are used to explore advertising results, as awareness, perceived value, emotional connection and loyalty regarding a brand. (VanAuken, 2008). The results of Kiuru's (2014) research, suggests that the marketing professionals should have as their objective to create trust, communicate the self-expressiveness of their brand and emphasize the hedonic characteristics of their brands in order to create love towards the brand among the consumers. This research demonstrates that positive emotions as love towards a brand, analogously to brand attachment, receives a strong

impact of self-expressiveness, as proposed by Karjaluoto et al. (2016). Kim et al. (2013) observed that attachment positively impacts the eWOM of smartphones applications. On the other hand, Japutra et al. (2014) explore the antecedents and consequences of brand attachment and observe that it also presents relationships with the WOM, purchasing intention, revisit the company, resilience to negative information and the act of defending a brand. Hudson et.al (2015) proved that social media interactions do not affect directly brand relationship quality. However, according to their findings, social media interactions presented direct effects on emotional attachment, and subsequently, emotional attachment impacted brand relationship quality.. Therefore, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H5: Likelihood to share has a positive influence on brand attachment.

The brand equity consists of the ‘aggregated value’ with which a determined brand endows a product (Farquhar, 1989). In this sense it is expected that a greater brand attachment will have positive impacts on the brand equity for the consumer. Sreejesh & Roy (2015) proposed and tested a comprehensive model of Consumer-Brand Relationships, which verified the impact of brand attachment on brand equity mediated by brand commitment. In the same direction, Park et al. (2010) observed a significant relationship of brand attachment as an essential antecedent to brand equity. At the same direction, Sajjad et al. (2015) have empirically proven that brand loyalty and attachment have a significant impact on brand equity. In this sense, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H6: Brand attachment has a positive influence on brand equity.

5 METHODOLOGY

A quantitative survey was carried out in which a random sample was chosen. As a base for this study, 5 commercial videos were selected from a list of the most seen videos of 2017, according to the special edition of YouTube published in December of the same year. Furthermore, a further 05 videos were selected among the *top of mind* brands that were most remembered by the Brazilians in 64 categories, according to the EXAME publication on the 27th October 2017, with a significant number of viewing in the YouTube. A total of 10 videos were analyzed about the brands AMIL, COCA COLA, LACTA, NESTLÉ, NIKE, NISSAN, OMO, SAMSUNG, UNILEVER, and VIVO. This approach was chosen in order to promote variability in the sample in order to explore and test the hypotheses. Thus, the videos that represent consolidated products in the market were analyzed and brought with them an essential relationship of the brand with the viewer, without any segment repetition. In this manner, the influence of product category was minimized, since they will not be any direct competitors among them. The data were collected among undergraduate students of five higher education institutions in the 3rd biggest city in Brazil. This population has representativeness in the population of interest as all of them have mobile access to social networks and internet access, being probably get involved with eWOM sharing, more than previous generations. The data collection was done in November and December 2017. Each respondent was submitted to one video, that used a quoted sample (about 36 respondents per video).

In order to approach to create an environment similar to real situations, the respondents viewed the videos individually assigned randomly on a tablet. After the viewing it, a questionnaire, with five scales using LIKERT style (eleven points), was presented to the interviewee. The scales were obtained in the literature and are listed in Table 1:

Table 1 - Operationalization of Constructs

Construct	Number of items	Sample Items	Source
1. Utility Value	5	This video is useful for me. ... is useful for my friends.	Izawac (2010)
2. Social Value	10	This video will make my friends happy will help me to be more accepted by others ...	Izawac (2010) and Sweeneya and Soutarb (2001)
3. Entertainment	5	This video is fun entertains me ...	Taylor, Strutton and Thompson (2012).
4. Brand Equity	4It makes sense to buy X instead of any other brand, even if they are the sameEven if another brand has the same features as X, I would prefer to buy X	Yoo and Donthu (2001)
5. Brand Attachment	10	To what extentThis (brand name) part of you and who you are?Do you feel personally connected to (brand name)?	Park et. al. (2010)
6. Likelihood to share	7	Possibility to share the videodefinitely no definitely yes ...no possibility certainly	Taylor, Strutton and Thompson (2012).

Source: Authors.

6 ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS

With the objective of evaluating the possible limitations and advisements in the interpretation of the results, the applications, such as SPSS 23 and SMARTPLS, were used, as suggested in the literature by authors, such as Hair et al. (2014), Tabachnick and Fidel (2007) and Kline (2005).

6.1 Exploratory Analysis

6.1.1. Description of the sample

A total of 368 questionnaires were collected online, using Google Docs as a tool. The characteristics of the respondents of the research are presented in Table 2:

Table 2 – Summary of Sample Profile

Variable Category	N	Valid %	Variable Category
Gender	Female	166	45%
	Male	202	55%
Marital status	Married	88	23%
	Divorced	12	3%
	Single	286	74%
	Widowed	0	0%
	Less than 20	77	20%
Age	Between 21 and 40	259	67%
	Greater than 41	50	13%
	US\$ 1000 or less	58	15,00%
Household income	Between US\$ 1.001 and US\$ 2000	127	33,00%
	Between US\$ 2001 and US\$ 4000	93	24,00%
	Between US\$ 4001 and US\$ 6000	58	15,00%
	More than US\$ 4000	50	13%

Source: research data

6.1.2 Outliers and Normality

In order to look for outliers, an estimate with Z value was used to identify univariate values. With $Z + -2.58$ value, 19 positive and negative values were identified, which represents 1.72% of the total number of responses. The univariate outliers were advanced and classified in a later analysis, starting in the case of multivariate cases. For this purpose, we used the Mahalanobis distance. The highest Mahalanobis distance (D2) ratio was of 3.40, with 2 cases, which represented less than 0.5% of the sample size. Regarding the normality¹ evaluation, the analyzes of normal parameters of asymmetry and kurtosis, demonstrate that the significant parts of the variables present deviation from normality, especially in terms of asymmetry (positive); however, the magnitude of the deviations is not worrisome or concern. The linearity of the relationships of the indicators was also tested by means of the significance of the *Pearson* estimation, which, according to the research's data, it was possible to observe a considerable adherence to the linearity in the proposed indicators.

6.2 Validity and Reliability of Measurements

The verification of the quality of the measurement was based on the evaluation of the dimensionality of the measurements. First, an explorative factor analysis (EFA) was conducted in order to assess the underlying structure of our data and compare it with our theoretical framework. Principal component extraction method with varimax rotation was used to test whether the items loaded on the expected factors. It was possible to observe that in general, after the purification of the dimensional solutions obtained, it was possible to obtain analysis adequacy, with variance explained by the factors between 75% and 91%, KMO measures of sample adequacy between 0.74 and 0.90 and significant Bartlett sphericity tests, demonstrating the existence of conditions favorable to AFE application (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). It is observed that the conditions for the application of AFE are acceptable, with a considerable percentage of variance extracted from the constructs, and one-dimensionality of the tested constructs was observed.

To evaluate if the measurements were effectively related to the constructs of interest to the point of confirming that they are proper measurements of the latent constructs, the method of evaluating the convergent validity suggested by Bagozzi et al. (1991) was applied. This proposal seeks to verify the convergent validity through the evaluation of the constructs' significant factorial weights at a 1% level. In this sense, all the constructs presented convergent validity, as all the weights presented significant at $p < 0,01$. Discriminant validity was evaluated using the method suggested by Fornell and Larcker (1981) was used. Table 3 presents these results:

Table 3 – Evaluation of the discriminant validity and General quality of the Measurements

Construct	Ent.val.	Lik.share	Social v.	Utility v.	Brand Equity	Brand Attach.
1. Entertainment value	0,85					
2. Likelihood to share	0,63	0,95				
3. Social Value	0,47	0,54	0,90			
4. Utility Value	0,42	0,52	0,78	0,89		
5. Brand Equity	0,32	0,40	0,63	0,55	0,92	
6. Brand Attachment	0,28	0,37	0,65	0,53	0,67	0,90
AVE	0,73	0,91	0,81	0,80	0,83	0,81
CR	0,93	0,97	0,95	0,94	0,95	0,95
CA	0,91	0,95	0,94	0,92	0,93	0,94

Source: data from the research. The data below the table show the correlation to the square and the main diagonal is the square root of the AVE. AVE = average extracted variance; CR= Composite Reliability and CA = Cronbach's Alpha.

As observed, the construct's reliability could be attested, as we found AVE's, Composite Reliability and Cronbach's Alpha values greater than 0,7 (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). The discriminant validity was assessed using Fornel and Larcker (1971) by comparing the square root of each AVE in the diagonal with the correlation coefficients (off-diagonal) for each construct in the relevant rows and columns. Overall, the results support the discriminant validity between the constructs.

7 ANALYSIS OF THE HYPOTHESES


The proposed model was able to explain 48% of the intention of commercial video sharing by the respondents. The complete results including the probabilities and T-value are presented in Table 4:

Table 4 – Test of Model Hypotheses

Hypotheses	Sample	Std. Error	T value	P value	Result
Entertainment value -> Likelihood to share	0,481	0,062	7,68	$p < 0,01$	Supported
Social Value -> Likelihood to share	0,171	0,093	1,82	$p > 0,05$	Nonsupp.
Utility Value -> Likelihood to share	0,182	0,086	2,09	$P < 0,05$	Supported
Brand Attachment -> Brand Equity	0,610	0,052	11,38	$p < 0,01$	Supported
Likelihood to Share -> Brand Attachment	0,377	0,061	6,29	$p < 0,01$	Supported
Likelihood to Share -> Brand Equity	0,171	0,063	2,09	$p < 0,05$	Supported

SOURCE: Research data. Observations: a) SAMPLE is the standardized weight obtained for complete sample; b) The error is the estimated error of the estimate; c) The value t is the ratio of the weight not standardized by its standard error. d) is the significance of the relation.

Figure 2 - Presents the path diagram that resulted from data analysis:



Source: Elaborated by the authors.

According to the results, the entertainment value is the most critical antecedent of sharing of commercial videos ($\beta=0,481$). Taylor et.al. (2012) found an impact (standardized weigh) of 0,34 of the entertainment value on likelihood to share, testing using commercial videos with a college students' sample in the UK. In this sense, it seems that “entertainment” is more significant in sharing in a Latin America population (this sample) or the level of entertainment applied by advertisers in their commercial videos in LATAM is higher than in UK (or both).

The second most relevant antecedent of sharing is utility value (UV), with a standardized weight of 0,181. Berger and Milkman (2012) found that practical utility has an impact varying from 0,18 to 0,34 (depending on control variables) on the sharing newspaper news by email. UV seems more representative in some categories, as Health insurance and utilitarian products (as soap), and this topic is discussed below.

On the other hand, the social value presented a nonsignificant impact at 5%, probably due to the variability of the sample videos, as they presented very different levels of social value. Similar results were found by Kim et.al. (2012), suggesting that this construct could be more significant in the case of noncommercial videos.

The results also revealed that the intensity of Likelihood to Share videos causes a significant impact of 0,377 on Brand Attachment and a direct impact of 0,170 on Brand Equity. It also presented an indirect effect of 0,23 on Brand Equity (mediated by Brand Attachment). These results suggest that videos could be an adequate communication tool to create attachment on consumers. The intention to share a video (and probably the sharing of a video) has positive correlations with Brand Attachment and Equity, suggesting that this action is relevant for Brand Building.

7 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

This work explored the primary antecedents of video sharing, bringing examples of commercial cases, using a sample of real videos of a high number of views and high brand equity firms. This is the first work that tests a tree dimension model of value, as antecedents of video sharing simultaneously, according to the literature (Berger and Milkman, 2012; Taylor, 2012 and Kim 2012).

The results suggested that the most important antecedent for video sharing is entertainment value, that presented the higher impact and correlation with the likelihood to share. The weight found (0,48, $p < 0,01$) is higher than previous researches are done in western countries, suggesting that entertainment could be more relevant for commercial video sharing in the LATAM region than in Western countries. In this sense, be funny is a crucial video resource for managers to create videos. The second most crucial antecedent found in this research was utility value. Firms that sell products and services related to utilitarian benefits (as health insurance and cleaning agents) could earn sharing using these arguments, as we observed that AMIL and UNILEVER video cases. Social and Utility Value seems to be highly correlated, suggesting that what is useful is social, in the case of commercial videos. However, it seems that only 21% of consumers have a high intention to share videos. At about 78% have low and medium intention (30% medium), suggesting that most of the advertisers could receive a higher ROI from their investment on media, creating more value and stimulating sharing.

The model revealed that the intensity of Likelihood to Share videos has a significant impact of 0,377 on Brand Attachment and a direct impact of 0,170 on Brand Equity. It also presented an indirect effect of 0,23 on Brand Equity (mediated by Brand Attachment). These results suggest the intention to share a video has positive correlations with Brand Attachment and Equity, suggesting that this action is relevant for Brand Building.

The main limitations of this study area related to the sample, that is limited to one location and mostly composed by a young population (28 to 39 years old). The second limitation is related to the model, that explains 48% of likelihood to share, demonstrating that constructs should be added to the model in order to improve its power of explanation.

For future research, we suggest to explore the interactions between value and self expressiveness (as suggested by Taylor, Strutton and Thompson, 2012) and include emotions generated by video exposure as an antecedent of value, as suggested by Izawac (2010).

We conclude that for Commercial Videos created by firms, consumers would share when appeals that are humoristic, funny and that are able to entertain them and their contacts. On the other hand, useful videos (as a discount, promotion or instructions to avoid a disease or traffic jam) are also a second way to earn media and conversations from consumers. In this sense, the main contributions of this research are to provide an integrated framework of a three-value component model of video sharing, that explains at about 48% of its variations, exploring the research gap of video sharing of commercial videos and its impacts on branding, generating relevant contributions to managers and academicians.

8. REFERENCES

- Akpinar, E., & Berger, J. (2017). Valuable Virality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54(2), 318–330.
- Al-Rawi, A. (2017): Viral News on Social Media, *Digital Journalism*, 5(1), 1-17. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2017.1387062>
- Allsop, Dee T.; Bassett, Bryce R.; & Hoskins James A. (2007). Word-of-Mouth Research: Principles and Applications. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 47 (4) 398-411;

- Andrade, j.; Mazzon, j. a. & Katz, s. (2006). Você viu o vídeo do Ronaldinho? Uma reflexão a respeito da associação entre marcas e celebridades e o uso do marketing viral como ferramenta de comunicação de marketing». In Encontro Nacional dos Programas de Pós-Graduação em Administração, 2005, Salvador, Anais..., ANPAD, Salvador.
- Arndt, J. (1967). Role of product—Related conversations in the diffusion of a new product. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 4, 291-295
- Bagozzi, R.P., Yi, Y. & Phillips, L.W. (1991) Assessing Construct Validity in *Organizational Research. Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 421-458.
- Bartlett, M. (2010). How to use social media to develop realtor relationships. *Credit Union Journal*, 14(39), 4.
- Bayus, B. L. (1985). Word of mouth The indirect effects of marketing efforts. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 25, 31-39.
- Bentivegna, F. J. (2002). Boca-a-boca, On-line e Viral. *GV-executivo*, 1(2).
- Berger, J. (2014). Word of mouth and interpersonal communication: A review and directions for future research. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 24(4), 586–607.
doi:10.1016/j.jcps.2014.05.002
- Berger, J., & Milkman, K. L. (2012). What makes online content viral?. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 49(2), 192-205.
- Brown, M.R., Bhadury, R. K., & Pope, N.K. (2010). The Impact of Comedic Violence on Viral Advertising Effectiveness. *Journal of Advertising*, 39(1), 49-65.
- Chevalier, J. A., & Mayzlin, D. (2006). The Effect of Word of Mouth on Sales Online Book Reviews. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 43, 345-354.
- Das, P., & Mandal, S. (2016). Evaluating the influence of social media on brand sacralization: An empirical study among young online consumers. *South Asian Journal of Global Business Research*, 5(3), 424-446.
- Dichter, E. (1966). How word-of-mouth advertising works. *Harvard Business Review*, 44(6), 147-166.
- Dobele, A., Lindgreen, A., Beverland, M., Vanhamme, J., & Van Wijk, R. (2007). Why pass on viral messages? Because they connect emotionally. *Business Horizons*, 50, p. 291–304.
- Facebook (2014). Available at www.Facebook.com/about. Assessed 17 October 2014
- Farquhar, P.H. (1989) Managing Brand Equity. *Marketing Research*, 1, 24-33.
- Fornell, Claes & David F. Larcker (1981). Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (1), 39-50.
- Godes, D., & Mayzlin, D. (2009). Firm-Created Word-of-Mouth Communication: Evidence from a Field Test. *Marketing Science*, 28(4), 721–739.
- Goyette, I., Ricard, L., Bergeron, J., & Marticotte, F. (2010). e-WOM scale: Word-of-mouth measurement scale for e-services context. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 27, 5– 23.
- Hair Jr., J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E. (2014), *Multivariate Data Analysis*, Seventh ed., Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hackworth, B.A. & Kunz, M.B. (2010). Health care and social media: building relationships via social networks. *Academy of Health Care Management Journal*, 6(1), 55-67.
- Horning, Rob (2014) Virality, Uncreativity and the End of Self-Expression. *Theorizing the Web 2014* » Gone Viral: All Watched Over by Memes of Loving Grace on 04/26/2014.
disponível em: <http://opentranscripts.org/transcript/virality-uncreativity-self-expression/>
- Hudson, S., Roth, MS., Madden, TJ., & Hudson, R. (2015) The effects of social media on emotions, brand relationship quality, and word of mouth: an empirical study of music festival attendees, *Journal of Tourism Management*. 45(1), 68-76.

- Hubspot. (2018) The Ultimate List of Marketing Statistics for 2018. **Hubspot**: Cambridge. Available at <https://www.hubspot.com/marketing-statistics>
- Izawa, Michiko. (2010) What Makes Viral Videos Viral: Roles of Emotion, Impression, Utility, and Social Ties in Online Sharing Behavior. *Communication, The Johns Hopkins University*.
- Karjaluoto, H., Munnukka, J., & Kiuru, K. (2016). Brand love and positive word of mouth: the moderating effects of experience and price. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 25(6), 527–537.
- Kaplan, A.M. & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media. *Business Horizons*, 53(1), 59-68.
- Kim, J. (2015), A critical review on self-congruity effects, *Journal of Psychology Research*, 57: 348-362.
- Kiuru, K. (2014) The Relationship between Brand Love and Positive Word of Mouth. *University of Jyväskylä, Master's Thesis, Marketing* 67p.
- Kline, R. B. (2005) Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling. 2. ed. New York, USA: The Guilford Press.
- Kosonen, T. (2014). To Work or Not to Work? The Effect of Childcare Subsidies on the Labour Supply of Parents. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 14(3), pp. 817-848.
- IAB (2017). IAB Video Ad Spend Study 2017 NewFronts. New Youk: *Interactive Advertising Bureau*. Available at: <https://www.iab.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/2017-IAB-NewFronts-Video-Ad-Spend-Report.pdf>
- Jalilvand, M.R. & Samiei, N. (2012) The Effect of Electronic Word of Mouth on Brand Image and Purchase Intention. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 30, 460-476.
- Japutra, A., Ekinci, Y., Simkin, L., et al. (2014) The Dark Side of Brand Attachment: A Conceptual Framework of Brand Attachment's Detrimental Outcomes. *The Marketing Review*, 14, 245-264.
- Jiao, Y., Gao, J. & Yang, J. (2014). Social Value and Content Value in Social Media: Two Ways to Flow. *Journal of Advanced Management Science*, 3(4), 299-306
- Linna, Tuuli. (2018) The Effects of Digital Advertising on Brand Image. Thesis. Turku University of Applied Sciences. 43 pages.
- Lister, M. (2018) 37 Staggering Video Marketing Statistics for 2018. *WorldStream*. Retrieved on 07/13/2018, at <https://www.worldstream.com/blog/ws/2017/03/08/video-marketing-statistics>
- Mangold, W.G. & Faulds, D.J. (2009). Social media: the new hybrid element of the promotion mix. *Business Horizons*, 52(4), 357-366.
- Manthiou A., Rokka J., Godey B., & Tang L.. (2016) How Social Media Marketing Efforts Influence Brand Equity Creation and Its Consequences: The Case of Luxury Brands. In: Obal M., Krey N., Bushardt C. (eds) Let's Get Engaged! Crossing the Threshold of Marketing's Engagement Era. *Developments in Marketing Science: Proceedings of the Academy of Marketing Science*. Springer, Cham.
- Mir, I. & Zaheer, A. (2012). Verification of Social Impact Theory Claims in Social Media Context. *Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce*, 17(1): 1-15.
- Mulcahy, Rory, Russell-Bennett, Rebekah, & Kuhn, Kerri-Ann (2014) Balancing entertainment and behaviour value: M-games as a social marketing agent of change. In Rundle-Thiele, Sharyn, Kubacki, Krzysztof, & Arli, Denni (Eds.) *Proceedings of the 2014 Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference: Agents of Change*, ANZMAC, Brisbane, Qld, p. 627.
- Parker, H.D., Wachter, K., Sloan H., Ghomi V. (2016) Viral Marketing in the non Profit Sector: Crafting Messages. *The Marketing Management Journal*, 26(2), 101-116.

- Phelps, J.E., Lewis, R., Mobilio, L., Perry, D., & Raman, N. (2004). Viral marketing or electronic word-of-mouth advertising: examining consumer responses and motivations to pass along email. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 44(4), p.333- 348.
- Pihlstrom, M., & Brush, G. (2008). Comparing the Perceived Value of Information and Entertainment Mobile Services. *Psychology & Marketing*, 25(8), 732-755.
- Porter, L. & Golan, G. J. (2006) From subservient chickens to brawny men: A comparison of viral advertising to television advertising. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 6 (2).
- Richins, M. L. (1984). Word of Mouth Communication as Negative Information. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 11, 679-702.
- Rosen C.M., (2001). Environmental strategy and competitive advantage: Na introduction,” *California Management Review*, 43(3), 8–17.
- Sajjad, F., Rasheed H., Muhammad I., Hussain S., Abass N. (2015) Impact of Consumer’s Loyalty and Attachment on Brand Equity, *Journal of Marketing and Consumer Research*, 12(1),42-26.
- Schulze, C., Scholer, L., & Skiera, B. (2014). Not all fun and games: Viral marketing for utilitarian products. *Journal of Marketing*, 78(1), 1-19.
- Selina, D. & Milz, T. (2009). Social media will be a driving force for relationship development. *Credit Union Journal*, 13(32), 16.
- Severi, E., Choon L., Kwek A.N. (2014). The Impacts of Electronic Word of Mouth on Brand Equity in the Context of Social Media. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 9(8), 84-95. 10.5539/ijbm.v9n8p84.
- Sheth, J.N., Bruce, I., Newman, B. & Gross, L. (1991) Why We Buy What We Buy: A Theory of Consumption Values. *Journal of Business Research*, 22, 159-170.
- Sreejesh, S. & Roy, S. (2015). A New Consumer Brand Relationships Framework. In Fetscherin, M.; & Heilmann, T. (Eds), *Consumer Brand Relationships* (pp. 165-197). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ratna.A.R; Suharyono K.S. (2017). The Influence of the Woed of Mouth (WOM) on Brand Equity and the Impact on Purchasing Decision: a Study on Cosplay Community. *Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio- Intelligence & Planning*, 30(4), 460-476, <https://doi.org/10.1108/02634501211231946>.
- Tabachnick, b. G.; & Fidell, L. S. (2007) *Using Multivariate Statistics*. 5. ed. Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- Taylor, David G. et al. (2012) Self-Enhancement as a Motivation for Sharing Online Advertising. *Journal of Interactive Advertising* 12(2): 13-28.
- Tritama, H.B. & dan Tarigan, R.E. (2016). TheEffect of Social Media to the Brand Awareness of a Product of a Company, *CommIT Journal*, 10 (1), 9–14.
- Ohajionu, C.U; Mathews, S. (2015). Advertising on social media and benefits to brands. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 10(2) 335-351.
- VanAuken, B. (2008). The Top Ten Brand Measures. Haettu 2017 osoitteesta Branding Strategy Insider: <https://www.brandingstrategyinsider.com/2008/03/the-top-tenbra.html#.WRdE4VOGOu4>
- Watts, D. J.; Peretti, J. and Frumin, M. (2007) Viral marketing for the real world. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(5), 22-23.